University of Massachusetts Amherst

Parents, Patriarchy, And Decision-Making Power: A Study Of Gender Relations As Reflected By Co-Residence Patterns Of Older Parents In The Immigrant Household

Item Type	Dissertation (Open Access)
Authors	Lin, Lang
DOI	10.7275/5646004
Download date	2025-05-13 06:46:42
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/15618

PARENTS, PATRIARCHY, AND DECISION-MAKING POWER: A STUDY OF GENDER RELATIONS AS REFLECTED BY CO-RESIDENCE PATTERNS OF OLDER PARENTS IN THE IMMIGRANT HOUSEHOLD

A Dissertation Presented

By

LANG LIN

Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

February 2009

Sociology

© Copyright by Lang Lin 2009

All Rights Reserved

PARENTS, PATRIARCHY, AND DECISION-MAKING POWER:
A STUDY OF GENDER RELATIONS AS REFLECTED BY CO-RESIDENCE PATTERNS OF OLDER PARENTS IN THE IMMIGRANT HOUSEHOLD

A Dissertation Presented

By

LANG LIN

Approved as to style and content by:

____
Suzanne W. Model, Chairperson

____
Cuong Nguyen Le, Member

____
Richard T. Chu, Outside Member

____
Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, Chairperson
Department of Sociology

ABSTRACT

PARENTS, PATRIARCHY, AND DECISION-MAKING POWER:

A STUDY OF GENDER RELATIONS AS REFLECTED BY CO-RESIDENCE PATTERNS OF OLDER PARENTS IN THE IMMIGRANT HOUSEHOLD

FEBRUARY 2009

LANG LIN, B.A., PEKING UNIVERSITY

M.A., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Ph.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Suzanne W. Model

This dissertation focuses on the living arrangements of multi-generational households among ten biggest immigrant groups in the United States. Specifically, it examines whether the husband's or the wife's older parents were more likely to be present. Co-residence patterns were taken as a proxy that reflected relative decision-making power in the family. A number of factors hypothesized to be associated with the outcome were examined to explore the effect of immigration on gender role ideology and gender relations in the post-1965 immigrant family. More than 102,000 multi-generational households from the 2000 U.S. Census were included in the analyses.

Results suggested that while there were positive signs for women's increasing status and relative decision-making power, the influence of original sending culture where immigrants have come from proved to be strong and persistent. Those from more

patriarchal sending cultures, represented by India, Korea, and China, were more likely to have the husband's parents co-residing; while those from less patriarchal sending cultures, represented by Jamaica, Cuba, and El Salvador, were more likely to have the wife's parents present in the household.

These findings illustrate the complex nature of gender relations in the immigrant family whereby the effect of assimilation is found in some domains, while the influence of sending culture is enduring or even reinforced in other domains. Results of this research contribute to the better understanding of the diversity of changes in gender relations that accompany immigration.

CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT iv

LIST OF TABLES x

CHAPTER

1. **INTRODUCTION 1**

1.1. Introduction 1

1.2. A Sketch of the Developmental Path of Post-1965 Gender and Immigration Research 2

1.3. A Few Key Points to Highlight in Gender and Immigration Research 6

1.4. Research Topic of the Current Study 7

1.5. How the Current Study Fits into the Bigger Picture 10

1.6. Arrangement of the Following Chapters 11

2. **REVIEW OF THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS 15**

2.1. Introduction 15

2.2. Gender Theories 16

2.2.1. Gender, Gender Relations, and Sources of Change 16

2.2.2. Patriarchy – A General Framework 20

2.3. Assimilation Theories 22

2.3.1. Immigration and Assimilation 22

2.3.2. Family and Gender in Migration 31

2.4. Family Decision Making Power Theories 35

2.4.1. Decision Making Power in Marriage and Family 35

2.4.2. Decision Making Power in the Immigrant Family 37

2.5. Living Arrangements of Older Immigrants 39

2.6. Conclusion 43

3. OVERVIEW OF GENDER RELATIONS IN SENDING CULTURES AND AFTER IMMIGRATION 46

3.1. Introduction.. 46

3.2. General Description of Gender Relations in the Sending Culture.................... 47

3.2.1. The Philippines 47

3.2.2. Cuba 49

3.2.3. China 51

3.2.4. Vietnam 53

3.2.5. India 55

3.2.6. Korea 58

3.2.7. Poland 60

3.2.8. El Salvador 63

3.2.9. Mexico 65

3.2.10. Jamaica 67

3.2.11. Selected Gender Equity Indicators: All Ten Countries................................ 70

3.3. Changes in Gender Relations After Migration 72

3.3.1. Increased Labor Force Participation/Economic Contribution 73

3.3.2. Exposure To The Receiving Culture... 75

3.3.3. Positive Effects On Gender Relations... 76

3.3.4. Negative Effects On Gender Relations 78

3.4. Conclusion 81

4. **DATA AND METHODS** **83**

4.1. Introduction 83

4.2. Data 85

4.2.1. Description of Original Data and Data Restructuring 85

4.2.2. Data Accuracy of the Time of Arrival Information 88

4.3. Methods 90

4.3.1. Description of Variables and Analytical Models 90

4.3.1.1. Predicting Whether Older Parent(s) in Home 91

4.3.1.2. Predicting Whose Older Parent(s) in Home 96

4.3.2. Analytical Steps 99

4.4. Conclusion 103

5. **WHETHER PARENTS IN HOME: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** **105**

5.1. Introduction 105

5.2. Descriptive Statistics 106

5.2.1. Dependent Variable 106

5.2.2. Independent Variables 110

5.3. Bivariate Analyses 122

5.4. Logistic Regression Analyses 129

5.4.1. Predicting Presence of Parents in Home, All Ten Countries 129

5.4.2. Predicting Presence of Parents in Home, Each Country 139

5.4.3. Comparison of Different Models and Discussion 140

5.5. Conclusion 144

6. **WHOSE PARENTS IN HOME: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** **146**

6.1. Introduction ... 146

6.2. Descriptive Statistics ... 147

6.3. Bivariate Analyses ... 161

6.4. Logistic Regression Analyses ... 169

6.4.1. Separate-Spouse vs. Joint-Spouse Approach, All Ten Countries ... 169

6.4.2. Separate-Spouse vs. Joint-Spouse Approach, Each Country ... 186

6.4.3. Comparison of Different Models and Discussion ... 189

6.5. Conclusion ... 193

7. CONCLUSION ... 195

7.1. Introduction ... 195

7.2. Implications of Current Findings ... 196

7.2.1. "Whether Parents" vs. "Whose Parents" ... 196

7.2.2. Separate-Spouse Model vs. Joint-Spouse Model ... 198

7.2.3. Inferring on Possible "Causality" Relationships ... 200

7.3. Limitations of the Current Study ... 204

7.4. Implications For Different Stakeholders and Future Research ... 206

7.5. Conclusion ... 212

BIBLIOGRAPHY ... 214

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

3.1: Data on Selected Gender Equity Indicators for All Ten Countries.. 71

4.1: Number of Households and Percentage by Country.. 88

4.2: Independent Variables Predicting Presence of Older Parents in Home and Their Coding Scheme 92

4.3A: Independent Variables Predicting Whose Older Parents In Home and Their Coding Scheme: Separate-spouse Approach 97

4.3B: Independent Variables Predicting Whose Older Parents In Home and Their Coding Scheme: Joint-spouse Approach 101

5.1: Percentage of Immigrant Households with Older Parents Present 107

5.2: Summary Statistics for Main Independent Variables by Gender and Country..................... 108

5.3: Results of Bivariate Analyses between Presence of Parents and Main Independent Variables by Gender and Country 114

5.4: Logistic Regressions Predicting Presence of Older Parents in Home: All-Country Results 127

5.5A: Logistic Regression Results Predicting Presence of Older Parents in Home: By-country Results (Using Husband's Data for "Married Abroad") 135

5.5B: Logistic Regression Results for Presence of Older Parents in Home: By-country Results (Using Wife's Data for "Married Abroad") 137

5.6: The Likelihood of Having Older Parents in Home: p-values for Between-country Comparisons Before and After Regression... 144

6.1: Results of Bivariate Analyses between Whose Parents in Home and Selected Independent Variables by Gender and Country... 148

6.2: Logistic Regression Results for Whose Parents in Home: Separate-Spouse vs. Joint-Spouse Approach, All Ten Countries 166

6.3: The Likelihood of Having Husband's Parents in Home: p-values for Between-country Comparisons Before and After Regression... 174

6.4: Logistic Regression Results for Whose Parents in Home: Separate-Spouse vs. Joint-Spouse Approach, for Each of the Ten Countries... 178

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

As the United States sees a new wave of immigrants since 1960s, research on immigration in this country has become abundant, focusing on the post-1965 immigrants as opposed to the previous immigration wave in the second half of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. Indeed, scholars of immigration have produced numerous studies covering various aspects on the immigrants' settlement, adaptation, and socioeconomic incorporation into the U.S. society.

Yet, there are still many "holes" (using Gans' (1999) choice of word) that need to be filled in the research of immigration. A particularly worth noticing one among them is that in the area of gender and immigration. As a fundamental social institution both affected by and interacting with immigration, gender is surely one of the crucial areas in the study of immigrants as they move between cultures and consequently the construction of gender roles and identities experience change. Gender can be placed at the center as an organizing principle and used fruitfully to investigate not only immigrants and the immigration process, but also broader assumptions about being male and female in the social construction of gender.

Despite its theoretical importance, the research of gender and immigration has not received the attention it deserves from the beginning among immigration scholars. In the following I will first provide a brief review of the general directions in which gender and immigration research has taken on the post-1965 wave of immigration in U.S., followed by an introduction of the current research topic, and a discussion of how the current study fits into the big picture of gender and immigration as a research area.

1.2. A Sketch of the Developmental Path of Post-1965 Gender and Immigration Research

The general trajectory by which gender and immigration research on the post-1965 new immigrants (immigration) has developed is summed up into three stages by Hondagneu-Sotelo (2005). Although the developments in the immigration research area are not as clear-cut or linear as in this summary, it still provides us with a good understanding of the genealogy of gender and immigration research on new immigrants in this country. In the following I will discuss three stages of the research largely following Hondagneu-Sotelo's summary.

The first stage covers research done in the 1970s and early 1980s, when investigators focused primarily on remedying the exclusion and omission of women in migration research. Studies of this early stage often relied entirely on immigrant men's responses and generalized conclusions were then applied to the whole immigrant population, which is inconceivable to researchers today. Other studies of this era focused exclusively on immigrant women, which, conversely, produced a women-only skewed picture. Furthermore, as scholars such as Moch (2005) and Hondagneu-Sotelo (2005) have

reviewed and discussed, most of the research of this era is based on the assumption that migration begins with males, often temporary workers, then becomes more settled communities when women and children follow. Such an assumption, as later empirical studies demonstrated, has led to misrepresentation or distortion of the real pictures. Among other things, it fails to recognize that the role of women in migration is much more than just a dependent one in many cases. Moreover, the diversity among the post-1965 immigrants in race, nation and class has led to complex interactions between race, nation, class and gender. Yet, given the historical blank in research on women's presence in immigration, the early stage took an important step of adding women into the design of research picture. This approach is often referred to as "add the stir" nowadays, which means that gender is added as another variable in measuring certain socioeconomic outcomes such as earnings and labor force participation.

The second stage of women and migration research in U.S. emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Scholars in this era recognized gender as both shaping and shaped by migration. They stressed the fluid nature of gender relations, and underlined the necessity of examining the interaction between gender, race and class. Research studies in this stage are exemplified by Nazli Kibria's study of Vietnamese refugees settled in Philadelphia in *Family Tightrope: The Changing Lives of Vietnamese Americans* (1993), Sherri Grasmuck and Patricia Pessar's study of Dominican migration to New York City in *Between Two Islands: Dominican International Migration* (1991), Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo's study of Mexican undocumented migration to California in *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration* (1994), and Cecilia Menjivar's study of Salvadorian and Guatemalan immigrants in "The Intersection of

Work and Gender: Central American Immigrant Women and Employment in California" (1999). Findings of these studies share a common point, in rejecting the assumption of the immigrant family as a unified decision making ground undivided by gender or generational hierarchies of power, authority and resources. Instead, gender relations are seen by these authors more through a lens of uneven powers and conflicts along gender and sometimes generational lines. The second stage research also draws attention to the ways in which immigrant gender relations change through the process of migration, taking into account not only women's but also men's perspectives based on findings from interviews and ethnographical work. Furthermore, research projects in this period shed light on answering an important question, i.e. whether women's status always improves with immigration. Despite repeated findings of positive impact of women's wage earning on great gender equality in the family across several immigrant groups (Espiritu, 1999b; Menjivar, 1999; Kurien, 1999), the effect is much more complicated than an either-or conclusion. One of the findings, for example, shows that women's employment and earning more than their husbands have resulted in even greater domestic inequalities (Menjivar, 1999; Grasmuck and Pessar, 1991). Other findings suggest that while women's gains in one domain (e.g. more personal autonomy and independence in the family) may be more prominent, they are frequently accompanied by strains, constrictions and even backward steps in another domain (e.g. in ethnic associations as reported by Kurien (1999) in the case of Indian immigrant women). Still other findings indicate that immigrants, in a reverse direction, seek to recommit themselves to more patriarchal family systems from the sending culture, as founded by Kibria (1993) in the case of Vietnamese immigrant mothers' efforts to deal with their transgressive children,

and by Espiritu (1999a) in the case of Filipino immigrant parents to reinforce a patriarchal control over their daughters' autonomy in accordance with the Filipino notion of female chastity. Overall, the second stage of research has clearly taken the important step from "women and migration" to "gender and migration", but more effort is still needed to account for uneven effects, seeming inconsistencies, and diverse contexts of gender and migration.

The third stage of gender and migration research is just now emerging, seeking to go beyond the analysis of gender relations on the family and household level to broader social arenas such as workplace, labor market, state policies, media, and other public institutions. The emphasis of the current stage, in Hongdagneu-Sotelo's (2005) words,

> "is on looking at gender as a key, constitutive element of immigration. In this current phase, research is beginning to look at the extent to which gender permeates a variety of practices, identities and institutions implicated in immigration. Here, patterns of labor incorporation, globalization, religious practice and values, ethnic enclave businesses, citizenship, sexuality and ethnic identity are interrogated in ways that reveal how gender is incorporated into a myriad of daily operations and institutional political and economic structures" (Hongdagneu-Sotelo, 2005, p. 10).

Examples of existing research in this stage include the study of Latino immigrant political identity in New York City by Jones-Correa (1998), the study of transnational Mexican hometown associations by Goldring (2003), and the study of how local, national, and transnational processes intercept to shape immigrant social networks and gender ideals for Salvadorian children and youth in the sending communities (Mahler, 1999). These new themes and topics suggest the broad width and vast space for continuous research in the area of gender and immigration.

1.3. A Few Key Points to Highlight in Gender and Immigration Research

As I explained earlier, the brief review above is to provide a general understanding of the developments of the field of gender and immigration research in post-1965 U.S. My purpose for doing so is to underline several key points and trends in this research area, before introducing the current research project and discussing how it fits into the bigger picture.

The first point, as I brought up in the beginning before discussing the three stages, is that although gender and immigration can provide an important angle to study various issues in the immigration process (e.g. acculturation, identity, preservation of the sending culture vs. assimilation into the host culture) as well as more general issues in how gender as a social institution is defined and continuously influenced and reshaped through interactions of social and individual factors, the development of gender and immigration as a research area has not been an easy or straight forward one, nor has it always received the attention it deserves. After going through roughly three stages, as reviewed above, gender and immigration research is now at a point where new research projects, building on existing findings, can truly contribute towards getting a clearer picture of migration as a gendered process, and of gender relations' evolvement as a result of migration.

Secondly, it is crucial for students of gender and immigration to consider and take into account the consistent interactions between gender, ethnicity (nation), and class. As indicated by existing empirical findings, the effects of gender enmeshed with class and

ethnicity have created a complicated context for the examination of gender relations across immigrant groups.

Thirdly, studies of gender in the immigrant family should include both men and women, since gender is the result of constant interactions between both sides. Failure to do so would turn the research into that of "women and immigration" instead of "gender and immigration".

Lastly, the direction in which students and scholars in this area are to take research projects should be one that stresses incorporating influences on the individual immigrant level as well as family/household level and societal/cultural level, and considers how these three factors come together to impact the different dimensions and directions of gender relations in the immigrant family.

It is against this background that the current study is conducted. In the research design and plan of analysis I try to address the key points highlighted above, despite limitations that arise from the data used (which is discussed in details in Chapter 4). Next I will first introduce the research topic of the current study, followed by a discussion of how it fits into the big picture (of the gender and immigration research area). After that, in the end of this chapter I will briefly explain the arrangement of the whole dissertation by going over what each chapter will cover and deal with.

1.4. Research Topic of the Current Study

The current study examines the presence of elderly parents in immigrant households and tries to identify factors associated with predicting if the husband's parents or the wife's

parents live with the married couple. Whether or not a couple live with one or more of their parents is a good research question worth looking into for two reasons. First and foremost, presumably immigrants from less economically developed sending countries consider immigration to U.S. an important step towards higher living standards and economic betterment, which makes it a desired outcome for most economic immigrants, i.e. those immigrants who come to the United States primarily for better economic conditions. However, oftentimes limited resources of the immigrant family make it impossible to have a big number of people from the extended family immigrate at the same time. As previous research (see, e.g. Massey et al., 1993, for a comprehensive review) has showed, economic immigration (here I refer to only immigration for economic improvement, as opposed to refugees, since refugees, by definition, do not actually have a choice in the timing and manner in which their immigration takes place) typically happens in a series of steps, which is referred to as "chain migration". Given the fact that this kind of immigration may be a process involving a prolonged period of time, it may very well make a difference as to whose parents the immigrant couple brings to US first, either the husband's parents or the wife's parents. The focus on examining whose parents live in the household can indicate the relative decision making power between the married couple, which, in turn, reflects on marital gender relations in the immigrant family. To the extent there is considerable differences in gender relations between the sending culture and the receiving (U.S. in this case) culture, studying possible changes in marital gender relations is a meaningful way of indicating 1) to what extent immigration is linked with changes in gender relations for immigrants from different sending countries, and 2) which factors (e.g. individual characteristics such as

husband's and wife's income and education, and family characteristics such as home ownership) are associated with the decision on whose parents are present in the household. A second (although less directly relevant) reason for the usefulness of the current research topic is that since the multi generational family living arrangement is a preferred practice in many of the post-1965 immigrant sending societies (as compared to the nuclear family which is the dominant arrangement in the American culture), to what extent this practice is preserved in U.S. can reflect, to a certain degree, how "Americanized" the immigrant family is. This information can be used to assist the interpretation and understanding of gender relations changes in the immigrant family.

For immigrants who come from traditionally male-dominant cultures, I expect to see more husbands' parents in the household, as a result of more power commanded by the husband in making the decision to have his own parents come to live with them in the US. On the other hand, immigrants from cultures where the woman's role is more independent may be more likely to have the wife's parents living with the married couple, reflecting higher status of the wife in couples from more matrifocal cultures and having more say in the matter of having her parents live in her household. However, although these are the basic hypotheses I start this project with based on the belief that gender relations are primarily formed and decided under the influence of the sending culture, I also fully recognize that potential complications and exceptions are possible, because different sending cultures coupled with various socioeconomic class factors and receiving conditions (i.e. the context under which immigrants are received and settled in U.S.) can create very different contexts for gender relations changes that my overall hypotheses above do not capture.

The current study also explores the overall effect of sending culture on a group level, by including multiple (ten countries) immigrant groups and comparing them. Given that immigrants come from sending cultures with different marital gender equality to start with, it is meaningful to compare across groups and look at to what extent the old patterns of gender relations get preserved and reflected in the life after immigration, and how much they may be influenced by "circumstantial" changes such as change in relative earning power between the married couple which may lead to a more equal gender relation. In addition, the effect of national origin may be intertwined with socioeconomic class, resulting in more complex contexts for gender relations changes. The interaction between gender, nation (sending culture), and class will all be taken into account in the design of the current study. Comparing across immigrant groups on a large scale like the current study can shed light on the differences between immigrant groups in terms of gender relations changes given the rich diversity of cultures and socioeconomic class backgrounds where the post-1965 immigrants come from. By exploring answers to these research questions I believe this study will contribute to the research on marital gender equality in the contemporary immigrant family in the American society. In a broader scope, the studying of immigration and gender relations changes contribute to our understanding of the overall assimilation process of the new immigrants.

1.5. How the Current Study Fits into the Bigger Picture

This study can be considered as belonging to the second stage of research in the area of gender and immigration, as the primary arena of research I focus on is the immigrant family (as opposed to a higher level of public, social arenas mentioned in the 3rd stage

above). However, the current study differentiates from most of the existing second stage research projects in the following two ways. First, most of the second stage research is based mainly on qualitative studies and their findings from interviews and ethnography in terms of methodology. They have provided valuable information on the individual immigrant level and identified the issues and themes to research on. On the other hand, to what extent their conclusions can be generalized still remains to be confirmed by studies using large scale data. The current project is one of such studies that use large scale data to examine some of the themes and issues already reported by previous qualitative research. Findings from the current study can be viewed as more generalizable to the bigger immigrant population because it uses national level data from the United States. Secondly, by including and comparing ten immigrant groups in the analysis at the same time the current study may see new findings emerge on the group (sending-country) level which smaller qualitative studies (focusing on one or two groups) are unable to discover. In this sense, the current study fits into the bigger area of gender and immigration research by building on themes and findings found by previous smaller scale qualitative studies, but goes beyond existing findings to contribute new information to the field by analyzing large scale data which makes the findings more generalizable.

1.6. Arrangement of the Following Chapters

In the previous sections of this chapter, I have briefly reviewed the development of gender and immigration research on the post-1965 immigration in this country. In addition, I lay out the context in which the current study is conducted, and identify the

points of contribution this study can make to the gender and immigration research field. In the following, I give an overview of the chapters in this dissertation.

In Chapter 2 I outline and review theoretical frameworks that are helpful in conceptualizing the research topic. Relevant theories from three main areas of literature are discussed, including 1) 1) General theories on gender relations and gender equality; 2) The sociological literature on assimilation, focusing mainly on the line of general assimilation theory developed by Gordon (1964) and added by later sociologists such as Alba and Nee (1997), and Portes and Zhou (1993); 3) Family decision making power theories, focusing on the approach of bargaining theory in the household decision making research. I also explain in details how each of these theoretical frameworks fits into the current research project.

Given that gender relations of immigrants are primarily formed in the original sending culture, and since the current study is designed to examine gender relations changes in the immigrant family, it makes sense to start by examining gender relations in the sending culture for the ten immigrant group included in this study. Chapter 3 of this dissertation does just that. Mainly based on literature review, Chapter 3 first provides a general cultural background to gender relations in the sending cultures, to give an understanding of what gender relations are like, i.e. providing a starting point of where the immigrants come from in terms of gender culture. Corresponding to the first part which deals with "how it was before", the second half of Chapter 3 then presents relevant findings of "how it has changed after", mainly based on existing empirical studies on the immigrant groups in this study. It is worth noting that these findings are not meant to be

a comprehensive literature review of all the empirical findings on these immigrant groups. Rather, it serves to identify and highlight the findings that are most important and relevant to the current project.

Chapter 4 describes in detail the data and methods used in this study. Description about the data includes data source, structure, available variables, and the process by which a final dataset is obtained for the statistical analysis. The original data comes from the public use 5% 2000 census data, downloaded from the IPUMS (Integrated Public Use Microdata Series by Minnesota Population Center) website. Immigrants 18 years or older, from ten culturally and geographically representative sending countries were included in the study. These ten countries are Mexico, China, India, the Philippines, Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, El Salvador, Poland, and Jamaica. Only couples who were married (not including cohabiting couples) and reported their spouse present in the household at the time of the census were included in the analysis. After data restructuring a final data set was obtained, with household as the unit of analysis. Then I proceed to discuss the analytical method and statistical models used in the analyses. Descriptive statistics were first obtained from the data for the dependent variable, i.e. which spouse's parents lived with the married couple, followed by descriptive statistics for a number of factors identified as possibly affecting the dependent variable, such as the immigrant couples' age, length of time here in US, naturalized citizenship status, education level, and family income. A series of bivariate analyses were then conducted cross tabulating by sending country the dependent variable and each of the independent variables. Finally, logistic regression was used to test for the association between the

dependent variable (whether the husband's or the wife's parents were more likely to be present in the household) and the independent variables.

Chapters 5 and 6 discusses the findings on the two main outcomes of this study, including discussion of analytical results on predicting the likelihood of 1) whether immigrant parents were present in the house, and 2) whose parents were more likely to be living with the immigrant couple. Throughout the discussion of results attention will be given to how different immigrant groups compared, taking into account possible interactions between sending culture, gender, and class.

Chapter 7 is the conclusion of the study. In this chapter I discuss the implications of my findings, and how they may fit in the area of gender and immigration research. Limitations of the current study are also discussed. Besides limitations of the data (the biggest data limitation being that they did not capture those immigrants who help their parents immigrate but do not live in the same household in U.S.), one limitation in the research design lied in the assumption that the presence of parents in the house was a result of relative decision making power between the husband and wife. This assumption did not take into account other possible reasons why parents were living with the immigrant couple, such as practical help (e.g. the immigrant couple needed help taking care of young kids and only one of the spouse's parents were available to give such help). These factors should be taken into consideration when it comes to interpreting the findings.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

2.1. Introduction

In the previous chapter I have outlined the research topic for the current study, i.e., focusing on gender relations as reflected by each spouse's decision making power on whose parents would come to US to live with the immigrant couple. Gender relations and marital gender equality in turn reflects changes which gender as a social institution undergoes in the process of immigration. In this chapter I outline and review theoretical frameworks that are helpful in conceptualizing the research topic. Relevant theories from three main areas of literature will be discussed in the following:

1) General theories on gender relations and gender equality, drawing on the sociological and feminist framework on patriarchy. As mentioned in the last chapter, variation in the degree of patriarchal-ness exists in the countries where immigrants in this study are from. While country-specific discussion on gender culture will be done later (in Chapter 3), I will provide a general theoretical framework in this chapter on gender relations and patriarchy. This part of discussion is presented in Section 2.2 below.

2) The sociological literature on assimilation, focusing mainly on the line of general assimilation theory developed by Gordon (1964) and added by later sociologists such as Alba and Nee (1997). Different aspects of assimilation including socioeconomic

assimilation and cultural assimilation will be discussed to provide a theoretical frame of discussion to the current research topic, i.e., how marital gender equality may change as a result of assimilation. This part of discussion is presented in Section 2.3 below.

3) Family decision making power, focusing on the approach of bargaining theory in the household decision making research. The bargaining theory states that household decisions are reached largely as a result of an internal bargaining process by individual family members. Household members use their "bargaining power", most notably the amount of income or wealth they can control, to have household resources allocated in a way that most closely matches their personal preferences. In this context, the result of the bargaining process is whose parents are to live with the couple, and the bargaining power by each spouse is expected to be associated with that result. This part of discussion is presented in Section 2.4 below.

Lastly, as the current study focuses on older immigrant parents' coresidence patterns as the outcome, a brief review will be provided in Section 2.5 on older immigrants' living arrangements in U.S. as well as factors that have been found to determine these arrangements, to provide a summary of research finding on this topic.

2.2. Gender Theories

2.2.1. Gender, Gender Relations, and Sources of Change

As a theoretical starting point, the *doing gender* perspective is worth our attention. West and Zimmerman (1987) present a theoretical approach of viewing gender as a routine and recurring accomplishment in everyday interaction, an emergent feature of social

situations. Previously, the authors argue, sociologists have viewed gender either as a social role in the conventional sense which men and women take on based on their biological ascription, or as a social display in Goffman's (1976) terminology. West and Zimmerman contend that treating gender as a social role obscures the work and the dynamic nature that is involved in producing gender in everyday activities, while treating gender as a display reduces it to only a superficial sense of interaction. Instead, West and Zimmerman propose a new understanding of gender that shifts our attention from internal properties of individuals to the interactional and, ultimately, institutional arenas. Specifically, the doing gender perspective "involves a complex of socially guided perceptual, interactional, and micropolitical activities that cast particular pursuits as expressions of masculine and feminine 'natures'" (West and Zimmerman, 1987, p. 126). In other words, West and Zimmerman are proposing a new theoretical frame within which gender is no longer seen as a property of individuals; rather it is an outcome of constant interactions emerged from social situations and social institutions. (The family as a social institution undoubtedly is such an important arena where gender relations demonstrate such a dynamic, ever-changing nature.) Men and women participate in everyday activities, organize their behavior and response to reflect or express gender, and they are also disposed to view and interpret the behavior of others in such a light. This emphasis on gender as an interactional, recurring, and dynamic process provides an important theoretical basis for understanding change in gender roles and gender relations either as a result of interactions between man and woman, or, as I will argue later in this study, as a result of change in structural arrangements.

Similar with the conventional view of gender as a social role, the doing gender perspective acknowledges the existence of a set of normative guidelines for individuals to refer to and base gender behavior and expectations on. These normative guidelines provide the foundation and legitimation for gender hierarchy. They come from the native culture where individuals grow up in. The most important theoretical contribution of the doing gender perspective, however, lies in its emphasis of the *continuous* and *interactive* nature of gender's construction and confirmation by individual men and women in daily life. As such, it leaves room for the possibility of change in the analysis of gender behaviors and gender relations. In the study of immigrants, this conceptulization provides a theoretical tool for understanding change in gender relations in the receiving country. Such change may follow change in structural factors such as employment status and earning power of each spouse, and change in cultural factors such as exposure to norms and practices in the new country. As such, the doing gender conceptualization provides a helpful framework to analyze change in gender relations among immigrant couples.

Taking the doing gender perspective one step further, Sullivan (2006) proposes an integrative approach to better explain changing gender relations. Based on both existing theories and empirical research findings, Sullivan's approach emphasizes linking the analysis of daily interaction from the doing gender perspective with the concept of *changing gender consciousness*. Gender consciousness is described as a continuum, one end of which indicates a "generalized awareness of gender issues", and the other end "a full consciousness of the rights associated with specific gender locations" (Sullivan, 2006, p. 11). The development of gender awareness, Sullivan explains, "involves a process

including a growing recognition of rights. The conditions under which this consciousness develops depend partly on information from the wider society. For example, the rise of feminism provided new conditions for an awareness of rights and thus for the development of gender consciousness" (Sullivan, 2006, p. 11). In other words, change in gender relations can happen not only as a result of individual interactions between men and women, but also as a result of exposure to changing attitudes and norms in broader social climates. By incorporating the broader concept of gender consciousness, Sullivan's approach puts even more emphasis on the "transformative potential of everyday interaction" (Sullivan, 2006, p.13), and underscores the non-static, ever-changing nature of gender relations. This "transformative potential", according to Sullivan, includes two analytic components: cultural meanings, norms, and expectations on the one hand and interactive processes on the other. That is to say, sources of change in gender relations can come from both macro-level cultural changes in the larger society, and micro-scale changes in interactions between individuals. This new analytical framework thus incorporates the influence of changing attitudes and norms on the societal level, which can therefore "facilitate analysis of how cultural meanings, norms, and expectations can be challenged, resisted, revised, and eventually changed in the ongoing process of interaction" (Sullivan, 2006, p. 13).

Indeed, I believe the current study is a good case where this analytic framework can be applied to demonstrate the *interactive, continuously changing* nature of gender relations as a result of both inter-personal level and larger societal/cultural level influences. It examines how gender relations are reproduced and reaffirmed on the one hand, while challenged and negotiated on the other. As I will argue later, among the immigrant

groups in the current study, exposure to new cultural norms and expectations in the U.S. as well as structural changes such as increasing contribution of women to the family income have probably resulted in women's increasing status in the marital gender relations. At the same time, old cultural norms and beliefs die hard: the male-dominant pattern of gender relations still seem to play a decisive part, as reflected in the greater likelihood of the husband's parents living in the immigrant household.

2.2.2. Patriarchy – A General Framework

The theoretical framework of patriarchy is an important concept in the study of immigrant gender relations, since patriarchy exists in all countries (including the United States), although, as I will show in later chapters, the extent to which it exists in every immigrant sending country in this study varies.

What is patriarchy? Bennett (2006) defines patriarchy as "a familial-social, ideological, political system in which men – by force, direct pressure, or through ritual, tradition, law, and language, customs, etiquette, education, and the division of labor, determine what part women shall or shall not play, and in which the female is everywhere subsumed under the male" (Bennett, 2006, p. 55). Allan Johnson (2005) believes that "A society is patriarchal to the degree that it promotes male privileges by being *male dominated, male identified, and male centered*. It is also organized around an obsession with control and involves as one of its key aspects the oppression of women" (Johnson, 2005, p. 5). Patriarchy, Johnson further states, is a system, including "cultural ideas about men and women, the web of relationships that structure social life, and the unequal distribution of

power, rewards and resources that underlies privilege and oppression" (Johnson 2005, p. 38).

Patriarchy exists in all the sending cultures where immigrants in this study come from, although as I discuss later in Chapter 3, a variation in the degree of patriarchal-ness is found across countries. Patriarchy is embedded in immigrants' beliefs and behavior, reflected in their everyday life and decisions. Patriarchal patterns in gender relations among immigrant couples are shaped predominantly by pre-migration cultural beliefs and social practices, which immigrants bring with them from their home societies, as I'll discuss in more details in Chapter 3. For example, traditional gender roles in the Mexican marriage requires that husband and wife take very separate roles in the family, with the husband taking a dominant position in the family's relationship with the outside world and remaining uninvolved in childrearing and domestic duties, which are considered to be all the wife's job (cf Pedraza, 1991, p. 320). Patriarchal patterns in gender relations are often reshaped, reconfigured and renegociated in the new setting after migration. Out of economic necessity a lot of immigrant women join the labor force here in U.S., to help increase the family income when their husbands are not able to make enough money as the sole bread winner for the whole family. On the other hand, the labor market structure in U.S. provides job opportunities for immigrant women in areas such as nannies/domestic help, service sector, apparel manufacturing, and health care. Overall the impact of women's entering wage work has been found to be greater personal autonomy and independence (Pessar, 1999). For example, women's increased wage earning power and their greater contribution to household income enable them to have more control over household budgeting and other family decisions. It also provides

women with more negotiating power in appeals for their husbands' assistance in daily household chores (Pessar, 1999, p. 585). That is to say, as gender relations undergo change between immigrant husband and wife, patriarchal attitudes, practices or believes also change. I will go into detail discussion later in the second half of Chapter 4. The patriarchal framework is therefore an important part in understanding post-migration gender relations of immigrants in this study.

2.3. Assimilation Theories

2.3.1. Immigration and Assimilation

As the current study focuses on immigrants and their gender relations, theories on assimilation is a central part in the analytical framework. In this section several concepts and typologies in the general assimilation framework that are more relevant to the current study are discussed.

In 1964, Milton Gordon published his influential conceptual framework for the immigrant assimilation process, which remains a necessary foundation for assimilation theories today. In this model Gordon proposed seven dimensions (what the author called "subprocesses") of assimilation that may happen either simultaneously or separately. They include: 1) cultural assimilation, or acculturation, 2) structural assimilation, 3) marital assimilation, 4) identificational assimilation, 5) attitude receptional assimilation, 6) behavior receptional assimilation, and 7) civic assimilation. Individuals may go through all or some of these dimensions, in varying degrees. (Gordon, 1964)

Among the seven dimensions Gordon considers the most critical distinction to be between acculturation and structural assimilation. Acculturation, as defined by Gordon, refers to the minority group's adoption of "cultural patterns" of the host society. These cultural patterns include not only the acquisition of the English language but also things like ways of dressing and outward emotional expression (Gordon, 1964, p. 79). Gordon argues that these can be considered as extrinsic cultural traits, which are less central to a person's group identity and cultural heritage than intrinsic cultural traits, exemplified by one's religion and musical tastes. In the process of assimilation, acculturation typically comes first and is inevitable. Moreover, acculturation could occur without being accompanied by other dimensions of assimilation. Structural assimilation, on the other hand, is defined as the "entrance of the minority group into the social cliques, clubs, and institutions of the core society at the primary group level" (p. 80). Once that happens, Gordon hypothesizes, prejudice and discrimination against that particular minority group will decrease if not totally disappear, intermarriage will be common, and the separate minority group identity will decrease.

Gordon's account of acculturation is apparently a one-way process: while keeping their most important intrinsic cultural traits such as religious identity, the minority group gradually adopts the "core culture" of the primary group, defined as the "middle-class cultural patterns of, largely, white Protestant, Anglo-Saxon origins" (Gordon, 1964, p. 72). Gordon perceives the core culture as a cultural standard for acculturation of minority groups, and only acknowledges the possibility of small changes of the core culture being affected and modified by minority cultures, e.g. "minor modifications in

cuisine, recreational patterns, place names, speech, residential architecture, sources of artistic inspiration, and perhaps few other areas" (p. 100).

The significance of Gordon's contribution is not only identifying the component dimensions, but the theoretical acknowledgement that assimilation is not a linear process, and some immigrants may never fully assimilate. In the current context, although gender relations is something that belongs to the more fundamental part of one's cultural upbringing and group identity and cannot be measured directly, Gordon's account of assimilation/acculturation will still be an important conceptual tool in inferring gender relations in the immigrant family, as reflected by the presence of husband's or wife's parents in the household. For example, several of the immigrant groups in this study come from traditionally highly patriarchal culture, where multi-generation households with the husband's parents living in home is both a cultural norm and a common practice in sending countries such as India, China and Korea. To what extent has this practice been preserved in U.S. among the households of immigrants from these countries? Answer to this question may, first of all, give some indication of whether there has been change towards the more "American" nuclear family pattern (i.e., assimilation to the mainstream norm) in this regard. More importantly, to the extent that having older parents immigrate to U.S. brings both a higher living standard for the parents and family reunion between immigrants and their older parents, it is reasonable to speculate that this is a favored outcome for the wife's parents as well (as for the husband's parents). Therefore, finding out not only whether there are older parents living in home but also *whose* parents there are living in home may indicate change in gender relations in the immigrant family. Suppose that higher than expected numbers of households in a

particular immigrant group are found to have the wife's parents living in home. This finding will also need to be interpreted in the bigger framework of assimilation, probably a result of various structural (e.g. the wife's increasing contribution to the household income) and cultural factors (e.g. exposure to the more egalitarian marital relationship in U.S.) in the receiving society. Finally, comparing the pattern of parental presence in house across immigrant groups enables us to assess the extent to which various degrees of patriarchal gender relations among different immigrant groups has changed as a result of migration and possibly assimilation (acculturation), and explore possible factors that are associated with cross-group variation.

Gordon's conceptual scheme proves to be useful to researchers of ethnicity and immigration, and has become a milestone for studies of assimilation in the American society. By 1990s, however, a popular discussion is well underway among the academic community on the usefulness of assimilation concept and theories. In the midst of this intellectual debate Alba and Nee (1997) published their influential article reevaluating and reformulating assimilation theory in the new setting of the post-1965 immigration wave. One of the gaps in Gordon's assimilation framework, Alba and Nee (1997) contended, is the omission of dimensions covering the socioeconomic assimilation such as occupational mobility and economic assimilation. Socioeconomic assimilation is of great importance to the study of assimilation since difference with the majority group in socioeconomic status is a central indicator of assimilation. Moreover, "socioeconomic mobility creates the social conditions conducive to other forms of assimilation since it likely results in equal status contact across ethnic line in workplaces and neighborhoods" (p. 835). In the current study I use Alba and Nee's definition of socioeconomic

assimilation, which is also the most common usage in the ethnicity and assimilation literature: “socioeconomic assimilation is equated with attainment of average or above average socioeconomic standing, as measured by indicators such as education, occupation, and income” (pp. 835-836). As Alba and Nee explain, these measures are important indicators of the distance between immigrant groups and the native mainstream norm in terms of socioeconomic status, and therefore indicative of the immigrant groups’ level of economic assimilation; moreover, examining the level of socioeconomic assimilation may be helpful in understanding assimilation in other areas harder to measure (i.e. cultural assimilation of values and norms). For example, the Jamaican immigrants in South Florida studied by Portes and Zhou (1993) who predominantly settled in poor urban areas and occupied low-level menial labor jobs were more likely to be exposed to norms and values of the adversarial inner city subculture, norms such as devaluation of education and less likely to see it as a way of social mobility out of poverty.

Alba and Nee (1997) added another aspect to Gordon’s classical assimilation framework. They argued that when looking at the assimilation process, one should also take group factors in the larger social context into account, such factors as spatial distribution, coethnic populations, and group size. Gordon’s analysis of assimilation, noted Alba and Nee, is oriented towards micro-sociological (i.e. individual) level of assimilation rather than being conceptually placed on the group level in the context of a larger social process. As a result it inadvertently overlooks an important line of investigation in the study of assimilation, i.e., the reciprocal effects between group process and individual attainment. In other words, Alba and Nee argue that a theory of assimilation must take into account

the interaction between individuals and immigrant groups which they belong to, as the supply side of ethnicity may influence its members' propensities to assimilate (Alba and Nee, 1997, p. 835). For instance, settlement pattern, or spatial concentration of immigrant groups (e.g., Portes and Rumbaut, 1996; Massey 1985; Massey and Denton, 1988), and the existence of an ethnic enclave economy (e.g., Zhou 1992) are a couple of factors on the group level that may affect its individual members' likelihood or speed of assimilation.

In addition to the more "structural" group factors such as spatial distribution, coethnic populations, and group size, other research such as Le (2007) and Neckerman et al. (1999) highlighted the importance of another kind of group factor in the process of assimilation, one that is more cultural in nature. Focusing on five Asian American groups, Le (2007) examined a number of outcomes including income, occupational prestige, small business ownership, residential segregation, and intermarriage as indicators of these groups' socioeconomic and institutional integration. His findings suggested that compared to the other Asian groups most Vietnamese Americans were able to successfully achieve structural integration in a relatively short amount of time while experiencing little disadvantage or inequality in terms of structural integration into the American society. The author attributed this relatively fast process of integration to the successful use of collective resources and cultural tradition by Vietnamese Americans to achieve socioeconomic mobility and maintain ethnic solidarity and cohesion (Le, 2007). Neckerman et al. (1999) considers the assimilation experience of middle class minorities and proposed the idea of minority culture of mobility in facilitating successful incorporation into the mainstream society. Facing with challenges of overcoming

socioeconomic and cultural difficulties in the incorporation process, middle class minorities utilize a set of cultural elements responsive to distinctive problems they face in order to achieve social and economic mobility. This conceptualization provides a useful way of conceptualization to consider the more "cultural" group factors that affect the assimilation process. It can be applied to cases such as that of the Vietnamese Americans by Le (2007) above and by Kibria (1993), or of the South Asian immigrants in California by Portes and Zhou (1993).

Although Alba and Nee (1997) raised an important and valid point in making the argument about linking larger social structures and processes to the microsociological level analysis of assimilation, their proposal of incorporating ecological analysis into Gordon's framework is less convincing and of limited use when applied to empirical studies like the current one. On the other hand, the concept of segmented assimilation proposed by Portes and Zhou (1993) is more relevant and useful to apply here. Although the typology of segmented assimilation is originally based on explaining diverse outcomes of the incorporation process of second generation immigrants into the American society, it lends a helpful way of conceptualizing the research question in this study as I try to explore intergroup variations in terms of change in gender relations, where not only immigrants' individual human capital characteristics but also group factors and larger pre-migration cultural factors need to be taken into consideration.

The segmented assimilation theory emphasizes that there is no singular outcome for immigrants' incorporation into the receiving society, since there is no uniform core culture that immigrants assimilate to. Instead, as the host society is a stratified system in

itself, the process of assimilation for the new second generation (i.e. children of the contemporary immigrant groups) has become segmented. Portes and Zhou (1993) identified three distinct ways of adaptation. "Instead of a relatively uniform mainstream whose mores and prejudices dictate a common path of integration, we observe today several distinct forms of adaptation. One of them replicates the time-honored portrayal of growing acculturation and parallel integration into the white middle-class; a second leads straight in the opposite direction to permanent poverty and assimilation into the underclass; still a third associates rapid economic advancement with deliberate preservation of the immigrant community's values and tight solidarity (p. 82). Zhou (1997) provided further elaboration of the theory, which seems to make it more general to be applicable to not only second generation but also first generation immigrants' adaptation and incorporation into the host society. She wrote, "…this theory places the process of becoming American, in terms of both acculturation and economic adaptation, in the context of a society consisting of segregated and unequal segments and considers this process to be composed of at least three possible multidirectional patterns… The theory attempts to explain what determines into which segment of American society a particular immigrant group may assimilate" (p. 984). Possible determinants that influence immigrant adaptation are manyfold, but can be categorized into two sets of variables, i.e. individual level factors and contextual factors. The most important individual level factors include place of birth, education, and other variables associated with exposure to the American society such as English language ability, age upon arrival, and length of residence in U.S. Contextual (structural) factors include racial status, family socioeconomic background, and place of residence. Overall, it is expected that

higher educational achievement, more proficiency in English, arrival at a younger age, longer U.S. residence, lighter skin color, higher family socioeconomic status, and residence outside ethnic enclaves would have a positive effect on successful adaptation (Zhou, 1997). In other words, the segmented assimilation theory anticipates that residential/employment segregation in ethnic enclaves would be associated with slower assimilation/acculturation into the mainstream society. Applied to this study, the idea of segmented assimilation is useful to consider as it points out the possible "delayed assimilation" to the more egalitarian gender relations in the mainstream American society if immigrants live and work primarily in ethnic enclaves, as in the cases of Korean and Chinese immigrants in New York described by Min (2001) and Zhou (1992).

As I will discuss in more details in Chapter 4, the current study explores measurable differences in many of the same indicators of assimilation listed above, such as income, education, English proficiency, length of residence in U.S., place of residence, and country of origin. Based on these results from empirical data analyses as well as information from the literature on pre-migration cultural norms and post-migration research findings (on specific immigrant groups in U.S.), inferences can then be made in regard to possible effects of these indicators on decision making power in the family and possible changes in gender relations as a result of migration. These findings may shed more light on the reciprocal effect between group process and individual assimilation in the respect of gender relations, as well as factors contributing to intergroup variations in terms of gender relations in the assimilation process of different immigrant groups in the American society.

2.3.2. Family and Gender in Migration

For a long time the role of women in migration has not received the full attention that it deserves. Whereas gender should be treated as a central organizing principle, it has been treated as only one of many variables in the study of migration. Pedraza (1991) reviewed the available literature on the neglected role of women in migration, and organized her review around three main topics: 1) the relationship between gender and the decision to migrate; 2) the pattern of labor force participation of women immigrants; and 3) the impact of wage labor on gender relations. The second and third topics are useful to review for the purpose of the current study.

Using findings on Cuban immigrant women as an example, Pedraza illustrated how immigration can have a decided impact on women's labor force participation. Although traditional Cuban notion has it that a woman's place is in the home, a very high rate of labor force participation has been found among Cuban women who emigrated to the U.S. This fact is attributed to the desire to achieve upward mobility of the Cuban immigrant family. Indeed, there is evidence that "Cuban women overwhelmingly saw work as the opportunity to help the family, rather than as an opportunity for self-realization. … Cuban women were an example of employment without liberation. Cubans had apparently stretch the traditional view of women existing for the family to include employment as part of that role, while implying no necessary change in values (Pedraza, 1991, p. 313).

Immigrant women's regular wage work has frequently been found to affect marital satisfaction and gender relations. For example, Mexican women who were employed

outside the home were able to establish a more cooperative relationship with their husbands, sharing decision-making power in activities, while women who did not work for wages became increasingly dependent on their husbands to help them negotiate life in the new country (Pedraza, 1991, p. 320). Another study of Dominican women immigrants (Pessar, 1984) also found that for women who did not previously work in the Dominican Republic but worked outside the home in the U.S., this change had an important effect on their gender relations. "Patriarchal roles in the households were transformed, the women's self-esteem was heightened, their capacity to participate as equals in household decision-making was enhanced, and they secured more income with which to actualize their roles (Pedraza, 1991, p. 322).

Pedraza's reviews highlighted her argument that most research studies have treated gender as a variable (e.g. in the examination of labor market outcomes of immigrants) rather than as a central theoretical principle. In addition, many studies tend to compare between all immigrants vs. the native-born, and fail to take into account the substantial variation of different immigrant groups (p. 314). Instead, the author stressed the necessity to understand how ethnicity, class, and gender interact in the process of migration and settlement. Mexican and Cuban immigrant women are used as an example to illustrate how ethnicity, gender, and class can interact, resulting in very different circumstances under which immigrant women enter labor force, and in different effects on power relations within the family. While Mexican immigration to the U.S. has mainly been unskilled and semiskilled labor, the Cuban migration mostly comprised of skilled political refugees that led to the creation of an ethnic enclave in Miami. Thus, Mexican women working in the garment industry has been more out of economic necessity to

survive: to make up for their husbands' inadequate earnings, or to raise the family alone as head of household due to illness, death, or abandonment by their husband. By contrast, Cuban immigrant women working in the garment industry were considered a transitional arrangement to help their family recover from the loss of middle-class level of living, or help their husband establish a self-employed business. The two different circumstances lead to different implications in male-female power relations in the family. While Mexican women may experience disillusionment with men and become more aspired to rely on themselves and be more independent, Cuban women face the pressure from their husband to stop working outside the home once their middle-class level of living is achieved (Pedraza, 1991, pp. 316-317).

Pessar (1999) provided another useful review highlighting contributions of studies which have treated gender as a central organizing principle in migration. Her review confirmed the finding by many scholars that the impact immigrant women's regular wage work has on gender relations has been positive. Despite gender inequalities in the labor market and workplace, immigrant women employed in the U.S. generally make gains in personal independence, more control over family decision making such as household budgeting, and more negotiating power with their husband on household chores. Changes in traditional patriarchal attitudes and gender relations are also well illustrated by immigrants' own words, such as in Nazli Kibria's (1993) study of Vietnamese immigrants. In her study several Vietnamese men described gender transformations as, "In Vietnam the man of the house is king. Below him the children, then the pets of the home, and then the women. Here, the woman is the king and the man holds a position below the pets" (Pessar, 1999, p. 585, original quote in Kibria, 1993, p. 108).

Besides providing a good picture of main findings in this research area, these reviews highlight a couple of points directly relevant to the current study. First, changes in both structural factors, most notably increasing earning power and economic contribution of women to the immigrant family, and cultural factors, e.g. exposure to the more egalitarian gender relations in U.S., have been found to play a positive role in women's increasing power in the marital relationship. The current study continues in this line of investigation, by examining the effects of socioeconomic characteristics (e.g. income, education) and cultural factors (e.g. the influence of original sending cultures as indicated by the country of origin variable, and the influence of receiving culture as indicated by length of residence here and English proficiency). Secondly, both reviews stress the importance of treating gender as a central theoretical principle in the investigation, as well as the importance of taking into account the interaction between ethnicity, class and gender. The research design of the current study fits into this framework of treating gender as the main organizing principle, as it specifically looks at whose (the husband's or the wife's) parents are present in the immigrant household, and links it to the respective characteristics of each spouse to explore factors that may be associated with the underlying gender relations. In addition, adding the influence of sending cultures and the effect of socioeconomic class status to the analytical model enables the current investigation to examine potential interactions between ethnicity, class and gender, which, as previous research has suggested, may play an important role in the process of migration and assimilation.

2.4. Family Decision Making Power Theories

2.4.1. Decision Making Power in Marriage and Family

The household decision making framework started in the field of economics. It is generally attributed to Gary Becker's (1964) seminal work which applies economic analysis to the marriage decision and other decisions made in the family. Becker's framework sees all individuals in the family as having a common interest (also called "household utility function" in the economic literature), and advancing the family interest (i.e., "maximizing the household utility function") is the goal for all family members. Therefore when family decisions are made all members are assumed to prefer decisions that maximize the overall family welfare. For example, in the case of immigration, Massey et al. (1987) shows that immigration is often seen as a family survival strategy for many Mexican families in the changing economy, and decisions about who should immigrate first are often important family decisions. For many poor families, international migration becomes a way to alleviate pressing economic conditions caused by many dependents and few workers. It is important that the first family member(s) to immigrate should be the ones with the most chance to succeed in getting a foothold in the new country relatively soon and well. Applying Becker's decision-making framework here, it follows that all family members would have a common preference/consensus and support the decision which best serves the common interest of the family. In other words, this model treats a household as a unified unit, like a single individual, where all household resources are pooled together and household decisions are based on joint benefit of the whole household.

Becker's framework above is also referred to as the common preference approach. It is based on the assumption that all family members have a common preference when family decisions are made, which does not apply so well to situations where family members have different or even conflicting interests. Manser and Brown (1980) presented another framework, often called the bargaining approach, as an alternative to Becker's common preference framework. The bargaining approach argues that household decisions are often made, and household resources distributed, through an internal bargaining process by its members. Individual household members use their "bargaining power", most notably the amount of income or wealth they can control, to have household decisions made / resources allocated in a way that most closely matches their personal preferences. The relative resources possessed by each spouse, such as income, occupational status, and education, provide "leverage" in the bargaining and negotiation between spouses, thus affect marital power, and therefore the decision making power in the family. Since the early 1980s the bargaining approach has played a central role in the analysis of family decision making behavior (Pollak, 2005).

Among various factors that are considered to affect one's bargaining power in the marriage or in household decisions, economic power has always been identified as the key variable in the bargaining power balance (Friedberg and Webb, 2006; Blumberg and Coleman, 1989; Blood and Wolfe, 1960, cf Lim, 1997). For example, a study by Blumstein and Schwartz (1983) indicated that the amount of money a spouse earns is the main factor in establishing relative power in any kind of relationship except among lesbians. Most notably, Friedberg and Webb (2006) provided direct evidence for the effect of economic power on decision making power in the family. The majority of

bargaining power research links household outcomes (such as financial investment decisions, e.g., stock portfolio allocations) to variables that are assumed to influence the amount of bargaining power within the household. In a strict sense, findings of such studies should be seen as indirect evidence for the association between the bargaining power distribution and these household decisions. In contrast, Friedberg and Webb's (2006) study was based on household survey data which specifically asked the respondents to report who had the final say when it comes to major family decisions. Their findings showed that of all the factors tested that may influence decision-making power, relative household earnings (i.e. the ratio of average life earnings between husband and wife) has the biggest effect. Additionally, occupation, education, race, national origin (U.S. vs. foreign born), Hispanic ethnicity and religion have also been found to influence decision making power, but to a lesser extent.

2.4.2. Decision Making Power in the Immigrant Family

In immigration studies critics of the common preference approach have also objected the notion that immigrant families are "organized solely on principle of reciprocity, consensus, and altruism. … [a]lthough household members' orientations and actions may sometimes be guided by norms of solidarity, they may equally be informed by hierarchies of power along gender and generational lines" (Pessar, 1999, p. 582). Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo (1994) provided such a critique of "household consensus" with her research on Mexican undocumented migration to California. Lack of consensus among family members is well illustrated by the case where a young Mexican wife, fearing of abandonment by her husband who is migrating to U.S., hoped her husband would be

apprehended at the border and sent back to her and her young children in Mexico (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994, p.43). The author argues that migration among these Mexican families is a highly gendered process, and the decision-making around such migrations are shaped by intra-household relations of power along gender lines. "In some families, for example, sons and fathers migrate easily because they are accorded the authority and the social network resources with which to do so. Meanwhile, daughters and wives may not be accorded permission or family resources with which to migrate" (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2000, p. 115). By the same token, Grasmuck and Pessar's (1991) study of Dominican migration to New York City, and Kibria's (1993) study of Vietnamese Americans also showed a counter-image of "a unitary household undivided by gender and generational hierarchies of power, authority and resources" (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2005, p. 115).

In line with the more recent empirical findings, the current study is also based on the assumption of the bargain approach. As explained previously, having one's older parents immigrate to U.S. is presumably a desirable outcome for the immigrant family, both economically (a higher living standard for the older parents), emotionally (family union of immigrants and their older parents), and culturally (for some immigrant groups from cultures that stress multi-generation household and filial piety). However, to the extent that it is often not possible to help sponsor the immigration of both spouses' parents at the same time because of limited resources of the immigrant family, this becomes a situation where family members have different personal preference and the final decision reflects the result of relative bargaining power of the spouses. The relative bargaining power, in

turn, gives an indication of the gender relations between husband and wife, which, in the context of immigrant family, has probably undergone changes as a result of migration.

2.5. Living Arrangements of Older Immigrants

Although studies on immigrants in general have been abundant, research specifically focusing on older immigrants has received far less attention (Gelfand, 1989, cf Wilmoth, 2001). Literature on living arrangements of older immigrants in particular is mainly represented by a few studies (Van Hook and Glick, 2007; Sarkisian, Gerena, and Gerstel, 2007; Schwede, Blumberg, and Chan, 2005; Glick and Van Hook, 2002; Wilmoth, 2001). Furthermore, the findings of these studies seemed to be inconsistent and even contradictory in some cases.

Overall, existing findings suggested that there are considerable racial and ethnic variations on the propensity of older adults to live in multigenerational households, and the factors affecting older immigrants' living arrangements included preferences, resources and needs, and challenges associated with international immigration (Wilmoth, 2001; Schwede, Blumberg, and Chan, 2005; Van Hook and Glick, 2007).

Preferences are mostly inferred through race and ethnicity. Based on findings of numerous studies on the living arrangements of older Americans by race and ethnicity, it has been widely accepted that older Hispanic and Asian Americans are more likely than non-Hispanic whites to live in multi-generational households. Hispanic culture prevalent in Central and South American countries is characterized by "strong kinship bonds, frequent intergenerational interaction, mutual exchanges between extended family members, and hierarchical family relationships. … These family-oriented cultural values

create normative obligations to other family members, particularly older adults" (reviewed by Wilmoth, 2001, p. 229; Schwede, Blumberg, and Chan, 2005). Previous research suggested that a majority of older adults in Latin America do live in extended family households (De Vos, 1990, cf, Wilmoth, 2001) although exact numbers were not available. Similarly, the cultural traditions in many Asian countries encourage elderly parents to live with children, primarily with their oldest son. According to one estimate, 75% of older adults live with their children in Asian countries (Martin, 1988, cf. Wilmoth, 2001). It is suggested that immigrants who arrived more recently, are less acculturated, and have fewer economic resources are more likely to live in multigenerational households (Wilmoth, 2001), while the fact that immigrants who have been in U.S. for longer periods tend to choose nuclear family household arrangements is attributed to cultural assimilation into U.S. mainstream norms and values (Goerman, 2005).

Besides cultural preferences, the likelihood of living in extended family households are also affected by individual-level characteristics including resources, needs, and availability of children. Previous research consistently showed that greater economic resources increase the likelihood of independent living arrangements of older people. Among minorities and immigrants extended family living arrangements are often used as a strategy to pool income or provide financial and social support to dependent kin; overall, economic resources are believed to have the most influence on later life living arrangements (Wilmoth, 2001; Schwede, Blumberg, and Chan, 2005). Needs that increase the likelihood of living with extended family include poor health status of the elderly and the need for support of younger family members at certain life stages such as marriage, divorce, or having children.

Besides the above factors, international immigration itself has led to greater likelihood of multi-generational living arrangements. For instance, the U.S. immigration policies that encourage family reunification require sponsors to sign affidavits of support for people they are sponsoring to immigrate. Family reunification policies provide the opportunity to bring older adult relatives to U.S., and the adult children who sponsor their older parents' immigration are expected to provide housing and economic support to these relatives[1].

It is important to note that there seemed to be inconsistencies in the empirical findings among these studies, which can be categorized as two main groups of findings: one supporting the effect of economic resources and social class variables while the other attributing the effect to cultural preferences and background. Glick and Van Hook (2002) used data from the Current Population Surveys to examine variation in the prevalence of intergenerational coresidence across immigrant groups in U.S. Their findings revealed that recent immigrant parents, especially Asian and Central and South American immigrant parents, were more likely to live in the same households with their adult children who provided most of the household income. The high levels of coresidence were not explained by differences in socioeconomic and demographic measures. Wilmoth (2001) used the 1990 5% census data to identify factors that affect living arrangements among older immigrants in the U.S. Her results also indicated that Hispanic and most Asian immigrants, particularly those from Mexico, Central and South

---

[1] The 1996 Welfare Reform Act and its subsequent amendments reduced eligibility for most kinds of welfare for immigrants arriving later than August 22, 1996 (Glick and Van Hook, 2002), although the effect of this Act is not expected to play a role in the current data.

America, India, and the Pacific Islands, were at a greater risk of living with family than no-Hispanic white immigrants. Individual and demographic characteristics also influenced the risk of living with family, but these individual-level factors did not explain away the observed differences across immigrant groups. Both these studies suggested that living arrangements of older immigrants are shaped by cultural background.

On the other hand, Sarkisian et al. (2007), using National Survey of Families and Households II data, compared the extended family integration of Euro and Mexican American women and men and assessed the importance of class and culture in explaining ethnic differences. Their findings showed that rates of kin coresidence and proximity were higher among Mexican Americans, but rates of financial support were higher among Euro Americans. In explaining these differences, social class (income, education, and employment) was the key factor, while cultural variables (gender traditionalism, extended familism, and church attendance) had little effect. Schwede et al. (2005) reported the results of a small-scale ethnographic study of complex households in six different ethnic groups (25 households in each group) which included Mexican and Korean immigrants. Their findings about Mexican immigrants suggested that economic reason was the primary reason for the forming of complex households (both "horizontally extended" households that consisted of relative and non-relatives of the same generation and "vertically extended" households that included multiple generations) among Mexican immigrants. Their findings did not support the effect of cultural preference, as a number of respondents expressed the idea that nuclear family living was the ideal and the norm in their country, and they cited the National Institute of Geography and Informatics of Mexico reporting that 73.8% of Mexican households were comprised of nuclear families

in 1995 (Goerman, 2005, p. 154). These studies seemed to underscore the effects of socioeconomic factors on immigrants' living arrangements while downplay the effect of cultural background.

In summary, older immigrants in U.S. have been found to be more likely to live in multi-generational households than native born non-Hispanic whites, and between-group variations are expected on the propensity to live in extended family households. Overall economic, cultural, and life course explanations have been suggested to affect older immigrants' living arrangements, but findings on the relative importance of economic and cultural factors have been inconsistent.

2.6. Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented in three main areas theoretical frameworks most relevant to the current study, i.e. in the areas of gender and gender relations, assimilation, and family decision making power. As migration brings about changes in structural arrangements such as employment status and earning power, changes in other areas (e.g. ideas, attitudes, and norms) are slower to occur and harder to detect. Gender relations clearly is such an area.

Gender relations in immigrant marriages are shaped by cultural norms and social practices immigrants bring with them from their home countries, as well as reshaped by economic, social and cultural factors in the new country. As Nancy Foner (1997) put it,

> Clearly, a host of structural constraints and conditions immigrants confront in their new environment shape the kinds of family arrangements, roles and orientations that emerge among them. So do the norms and values they encounter when they move to the United States. Moreover, immigrants are not passive individuals who are acted upon by external

> forces. They play an active role in reconstructing and redefining family life. … Obviously, immigrants do not exactly reproduce their old cultural patterns when they move to a new land; but these patterns continue to have a powerful influence in shaping family values and norms as well as actual patterns of behavior that develop in the new setting. Indeed, as Nazli Kibria (1993) observes, immigrants may walk a delicate tightrope as they challenge certain aspects of traditional family systems while they also try to retain others. (Foner, 1997, p. 962)

Given the different starting points in terms of gender relations and marital gender equality across sending cultures, the extent of change and the end result may very well vary across immigrant groups. Moreover, as the discussion in this chapter shows, findings of empirical studies have clearly indicated the complex nature of change in gender relations in the immigrant family. Our understanding of assimilation has already passed the stage where it was oriented towards the male perspective with gender treated as a regular variable like education and marital status, and where assimilation was considered to be a one-way process. However, research is far from enough to enable a clear understanding of how gender intertwined with ethnicity and class has impacted different courses of assimilation among immigrants. As some scholars (e.g. Menjivar, 1999; Pessar, 1999) have pointed out, changes in gender relations in the immigrant family may very well include inconsistencies and ambiguity, as immigrant women gain in one arena but lose in another. For instance, while the effects of U.S. employment has generally been found to be a positive one leading to more egalitarian relationships among immigrant couples, it can also bring opposite consequences for women as described by Menjivar (1999) in the case of central American immigrant women. Women's employment advantage, coupled with men's inability to fulfill the traditionally ascribed role as the breadwinner, has resulted in more family tensions, domestic violence, and household inequalities (Menjivar, 1999).

It is against this research background that the current study is conducted. It aims to explore gender relations changes among the biggest immigrant groups in U.S. through the lens of relative decision making power as reflected by which spouse's parents live with the couple in their household, and by examining a number of socioeconomic and ethnicity factors presumably associated with such changes. I believe the findings of this study will add to the growing literature on the effects of immigration on gender relations to reflect more accurately contemporary immigrants and the immigrant family.

CHAPTER 3

OVERVIEW OF GENDER RELATIONS IN SENDING CULTURES AND AFTER IMMIGRATION

3.1. Introduction

As outlined in Chapter One, the current study aims to examine gender relations changes in the immigrant family, comparing these changes across major immigrant groups in the U.S. The theoretical discussion in Chapter Two indicates that gender relations of immigrants are primarily formed in the original sending culture. Hence, it is useful to start my investigation with reviewing the cultural background for gender relations in the sending culture for each immigrant group included in this study. This chapter first provides an overview of gender relations culture in the ten sending countries: Mexico, China, India, the Philippines, Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, El Salvador, Poland, and Jamaica. I rely mostly on literature review to provide general background information on gender culture in each of the ten countries. Following this discussion of "what it was like before", the second half of the chapter presents a summary of research findings on gender relations among these immigrant groups in the U.S. Based mainly on results of existing empirical studies, the second half of the chapter is meant to present the most notable and relevant findings of "how it has changed after (immigration)". Combined, the two parts of this chapter serve to give a good understanding of a specific background for gender relations of the ten immigrant groups in the current research.

3.2. General Description of Gender Relations in the Sending Culture

3.2.1. The Philippines

Compared with the several East Asian countries such as China, Korea, and Vietnam where Confucian influences on gender relations have had a long, prominent history, the gender relations culture in the Philippines is quite different. In general, gender relations in the Filipino society can be described as relatively egalitarian (Tapales, 2003; Hindin and Adair, 2002; Mason, 1996).

Historically women in the Philippines have had a more equal status with men, particularly in comparison to other women in Asia. In the pre-colonization era (before 1521), customary laws gave women the right to be equal to men, and the native women of the Philippines enjoyed high socio-economic status. They could own property, contribute to the economy, even serve as priestesses, or take the tribal throne. Some of the women's roles were undermined with the start of the Spanish colonization (1521-1898), which relegated the native women to the home and (the Catholic) church. On the other hand, the American colonization (1898-1946) opened the public schools as well as the professions to women. In 1937, women in the Philippines got the right to vote (Tapales, 2003; Hindin and Adair, 2002). Today, the labor participation rate of women is quite high (52.8 percent for women vs. 80.3 percent for men as reported by census figures in 2001) (Tapales, 2003), women's educational attainment is quite similar to men's (in 1978 female students accounted for 53.0 percent of all students across all educational levels (United Nations, 1983)), and women are highly visible in Philippine politics taking

positions from president to various levels of government officials (Hinidin and Adair, 2002). For example, Tapales (2003) reported that women accounted for 35 percent of the highest ranked civil servants, and 72 percent of technical and professional ranks in the civil service.

Socially, the more equal status between men and women also has to do with the kinship and family systems that are predominant in the Philippines, particularly with regard to bilateral inheritance, nuclear family structure, and the status accorded to women (Eder, 2006). Contrary to the practice in many Asian countries where property ownership and inheritance only devolve along the male line, the bilateral inheritance system of the Philippines has it that inheritance follows both the male and the female line. Land is either inherited by the eldest male or female child, or all male and female heirs inherit equally. Philippine husbands and wives are typically considered as household co-heads, and share household planning responsibility. Consistently, empirical research reported findings that women take a predominant role in daily economic and social life in the Philippines society. Women are either directly involved in income-earning activities or take the role of managers of household economic resources controlling the family "purse strings" (Eder, 2006, p. 402). Women are believed to be better at household economic planning and budget allocation; while men are thought to have more skills in family finances investments. Furthermore, the literature on Philippine households and gender relations frequently supported the relative egalitarianism in domestic relations and democratic consultation between spouses on matters of labor allocation and household expenditures (Eder, 2006). A review of literature by Hindin and Adair (2002) also led to the conclusion that findings of most studies indicate joint decision-making as the "norm"

in Philippine homes, although within this norm there is often a division of specialization of men's and women's roles (i.e. women are more likely to have the power to decide about financial resources allocation and are seen as the treasurer of the household). Even in rural households, the notion of husband and wife as household co-heads is commonly accepted and joint-decision making is expected about household planning and allocation (Eder, 2006).

In recent decades the Philippines has become the biggest sender of health professionals to the U. S., with nearly 25,000 nurses to this country between 1966 and 1985 and another 10,000 between 1989 and 1991 (Ong and Azores, 1994, cf Espiritu, 1999, p. 631). As a result, more Filipino immigrant women have professional jobs than women from other immigrant groups; in addition, Filipino women are more likely to be the principle immigrants who have migrated first and sponsored their husbands and children. This fact has been found to have an effect on gender relations and domestic roles, when immigrant men who came to this country as their wives' dependents experienced downward professional mobility while their wives kept the professional status (Espiritu, 1999).

3.2.2. Cuba

Similar to the case of China the gender culture in Cuba was affected by socialist ideology and government intervention. As a result it has undergone noticeable changes from its traditional form. As the Cuban immigration to U.S. included those who have fled Cuba at the time when Castro's government took over the country in 1959 as well as those who left later (most notably the 1980 inflow of Cubans from Mariel) the changes in the gender

culture in Cuba should be kept in mind later on when trying to understand the results of this study.

Traditionally the Cuban woman's place is believed to be in the home, and the female labor force participation in Cuba prior to the revolution was very low (Pedraza, 1991). This is especially true for women from the middle class background in Cuba, which describes most of the skilled Cuban political refugees that came to U.S. following the revolution (Portes and Bach, 1985). To many Cubans the wife staying in home taking care of the family instead of working outside the home is seen as an indicator of the family's middle-class status and a kind of privilege. The influence of this traditional view of gender roles is found to be the reason behind Cuban women's belief after immigration that paid work is the opportunity to help the family rather than an opportunity of self-actualization (Pedraza, 1991).

Historically Cuban women from poor families had to work out of economic necessity: at the time of the Cuban revolution there was an estimated female labor force of around 194,000 in the country, seventy percent of whom worked as low-level domestic servants, with long working hours and poor pay (Randall, 1981). After 1959 the Cuban government made it a national policy to encourage women to go into the paid labor force, with systematic efforts to provide women with basic education and job training. Other social services to support women's full participation into the work force included dining rooms at all work places, free (from 1965 to 1977) day care for pre-school children, and the option of sending children from the junior high school level and up to all-week boarding schools (Randall, 1981). In 1979, females accounted for 46.4 percent of all

students at all educational levels (United Nations, 1983), and 30 percent of the work force in Cuba was female (Randall, 1981, p. 25). By the time of 1985-1986, women accounted for 38 percent of the labor force and 56 percent of all professional and technical workers in the state civil sector. In education, 52 percent of all university graduates and 54 percent of upper-secondary-level graduates were women by the same time (Sarmiento, 2003).

While gender relations have become more egalitarian as a result of government efforts after 1959, empirical studies have still found persistent imbalance of the gender division of labor within the home, with women still bearing a larger share of housework (Toro-Morn, Roschelle, & Facio, 2003).

3.2.3. China

The traditional gender culture in China is a highly patriarchal one. It assigns a passive and submissive role to women, whose primary position is staying at home, taking care of housework and raising children. Historically Chinese women receive little or no education, and remain economically dependent on men throughout their lives. The family is structured around the male line. This form of family system, referred to as patrilineality, involves passing on the main productive assets through the male line, which makes women's ability to be economically independent impossible. Once a woman gets married, she leaves her own household to live with her husband's family. This practice, referred to as patrilocality or patrilocal residence, is closely related to the traditional kinship and economic system which assigns a subordinate and secondary role to women in the family and consequently in the society.

In the several decades following the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949, the government upheld the Engelsian notion that paid employment was an important step towards improving women's status, and adopted various policies based on the belief that men and women are equal (Edwards, 2000; Das Gupta, Lee, Uberoi, Wang, Wang, et al. 2000). As a result, from 1949 onwards women entered the workforce on a large scale. By 1980s eighty-five per cent of all Chinese women are in work and women make up almost 40 percent of China's total labor force (Edwards, 2000; Hall 1997; Croll 1995). (In recent years with the growing unemployment problem in China resulted from the closing of loss-making state-owned enterprises, women as "auxiliary workers" are particularly vulnerable to layoffs. One estimate is that women constitute for 62.8 percent of the laid-off workers, while they account for less than 39 percent of the total urban workforce (Wang, 2000). In rural areas, agriculture is still the main source of employment for women, and women have always been playing a significant role in the agricultural activities (Croll 1995). Overall, despite fluctuations in women's employment rate in past several decades, Chinese women in the waged employment have reached a high level, and dual earner families have been a norm, especially in the urban area.

The education of women has received particular attention and made rapid growth since 1949. Three nation-wide literacy campaigns were launched within a few years since 1952, during which time as many as 1.6 million illiterate women learned to read and write. In 1977, female students accounted for 30 percent of all students across all educational levels (United Nations, 1983). By 1992 school attendance rate of school age girls has reached 96.2 percent, and women students accounted for 43.1 percent of all

students on the secondary level and 33.7 percent at the college level (Edwards, 2000, p. 77), despite continuing significant differences between urban and distant poor rural areas.

Working, as well as taking care of the family, has become the lifestyle of the majority of Chinese women. As a result, gender relations have become more egalitarian as women become economically independent and gain autonomy and experience outside the home. In the contemporary Chinese family a greater degree of sharing than before has been found in terms of the division of domestic tasks (Edwards, 2000; Bonney, Sheng, and Stockman, 1994). For the most part, women in China are still carrying the double burden of work and family, spending on average between 2-3 hours more on housework every day than men (Edwards, 2000, p. 70).

3.2.4. Vietnam

Traditionally the gender relations culture in Vietnam has been heavily influenced by the Chinese culture, as a result of Vietnam's history of being under Chinese control for more than 1,000 years. The traditional family in Vietnam was strongly patriarchal, with the father exerting authority over his wife and children. Wives were supposed to defer to their husbands, although some argue that in Vietnamese society, the woman's deference was not total, and the Vietnamese respected strong women (Sonneborn, 2007). Women conventionally leave their parental household after marriage to live with their husbands' families. The practice of patriarchal residence puts women in a disadvantaged position in several ways: women often lose their own social network and emotional support from her parental family, they typically lose their rights to family land and property and thus become more dependent on their husbands (Long, Hung, Truitt, Mai, & Anh, 2000).

Overall, some Vietnamese scholars argue that Confucian ideals and patriarchy are latent within the Vietnamese culture, with women's subordination to men and male preference "shaped and reinforced over so many generations that is deeply rooted in people's mind and exists as a social stronghold resistant to opposition" (Nguyen, 1997, cf Long, et al., 2000, p. 29). Even today, gender relationships in Vietnam may still generally be characterized as Confucian relationships, i.e. based on the superiority of the male line and the subordination of the female line within the family (Ungar, 2000).

In both rural and urban areas it was not unusual for women to work outside the house or to handle household finances (Sonneborn, 2007). From 1947 onward, state policies of the socialist government combined with the effect of war (the period of time from 1945 to 1973, including the war against the French and the communist-led North Vietnam against the American-supported South Vietnam) has led to some changes in gender relations. Socialism brought state-mandated rights to women in terms of equal status in employment, access to land/properties, education and health facilities. War, on the other hand, drew millions of men into military service and women were left with more responsibilities in the family as well as some leadership positions in the community and some public sectors (Ungar, 2000). Although women's representation on the state and commune levels went through a falling trend after 1975 as men returned from war, and women were encouraged to direct their energies to restoring family life, the degree and scope of women's involvement in the economic sphere has not changed. In terms of labor force participation, through 1986 women formed 70 percent-80 percent of agricultural labor and over 46 percent of industrial labor in state enterprises (Ungar, 2000, p. 296). In 1994, women workers make up 53 percent of the total labor force; in

agriculture women comprise 76 percent of labor, 62 percent in the health sector, 76 percent in education, while they are barely found in heavy industry and construction (Long, et al. 2000). In education, the percentage of female students across all educational levels was 31.6 in 1978 (United Nations, 1983). Today, a gender gap still persists at all levels: one study showed that 32 percent of females compared to 20 percent of males had a low (under primary) education level; on the other hand, 5.3 percent of women went to college/universities compared to 7.1 percent of their male counterparts (Long, et al. 2000).

3.2.5. India

India's gender culture shares important similarities with that of China. These include patrilineal kinship system, where children acquire their social identity only through taking the father's name, and productive assets are only passed on to sons but not to daughters. Patrilocal residence is another similarity, where women move to the husband's village and live with his family after marriage. The combination of rigid patrilineality and patrilocality effectively makes it virtually impossible for women to be economically or socially independent (Das Gupta, et al. 2000). Beyond these similarities, Indian's situation is more complex than China because of the cultural diversity arising from the caste system as well as vast regional, ethnic, class and religious variations (Ganguly-Scrase, 2000).

Historically, Northern India has a gender culture that is more oppressive to women than Southern India, characterized by rigid patrilineal kinship systems and patriarchal values which leave women little room for autonomy. Southern India is quite different. Some places in South and East India had matrilineal systems of descent and inheritance, while

in yet other places children of both sexes can inherit from both parents. Women in the South can have considerably more interaction with her birth family after marriage, and can have more room to function as independent person. However, during the British colonial rule in India colonial policies were highly supportive of the more patrilineal system. This support reinforced the rigid patriarchal system which marginalized women, and effectively dismantled the matrilineal systems, particularly in the Southwest (Das Gupta, et al., 2000; Ganguly-Scrase, 2000).

The gender culture in India is also significantly shaped by the caste system. As a powerful social institution, caste is "a system of hereditary social ranking associated with Hinduism, which governs social relations and the distribution of power in Indian society" (Ganguly-Scrase, 2000, p. 89). The influence of caste on the gender culture is particularly evident in the beliefs surrounding female sexuality. As expressed by Ganguly-Scrase (2000), "[F]emale sexuality is seen to pose a danger to caste purity due to the perceived threat of lower caste men gaining sexual access to upper caste women … Therefore, within higher castes, religious ideologies prescribe a greater control over women to ensure caste purity" (p. 89). Still, in modern India there is the phenomenon where lower castes follow the practices of upper castes to gain higher status, and men have thus women in general have been subjected to greater restrictions over their mobility (Ganguly-Scrase, 2000).

Despite increasing labor force participation of middle-class women in recent years, scholars warn against drawing the wrong conclusion about Indian women's situation, because the gains in education and employment are only for a small segment of the

country's population (Das Gupta, et al., 2000; Kumar 1994; Ali 1991). For example, in 1976 female students only accounted for 24.4 percent of all students across all educational levels (United Nations, 1983), and university educated women only make up 3 percent of the female population (Ganguly-Scrase, 2000, p. 87). The female labor force participation rate in 1971 is only 12.1 percent, which improved slightly to 22.3 percent after 20 years in 1991 (Ganguly-Scrase, 2000, p. 87). There are regional and class differences in the employment experience of Indian women; and the reasons are cultural and historical as well as economic (Desai & Krishnaraj, 1990). Women's presence in the workforce is not viewed as desirable: "opposition to increasing opportunities for women's participation in economic activities springs…from a conservative view regarding women's 'proper' role in society" (Forbes 1996: 239). Stereotyped images and roles attributed to the sexes are still being reinforced in education programs and the media. Women are typically portrayed as "home maker" and "good women" in the role of chaste self-sacrificing wives and obedient daughter-in-law, emphasizing that women have to play a supportive and subordinate role in social and economic development (Das Gupta, et al., 2000; Reddy & Kusuma, 1994). There is a strong cultural expectation that women will not be employed outside the home on marriage, especially among the rural population (which accounts for over 80 percent of the total female population according to the 1981 census), although the majority of women in both rural and urban households have always actively participated in the production within the family (Ganguly-Scrase, 2000; Kumar, 1994).

3.2.6. Korea

Like China and India, historically the gender relations culture in Korea can be characterized as a traditional patriarchal system marked by the practice of patrilineality and patrilocality. As explained before, patrilineality means that family name (and hence, social identity) is passed only through the male line. This involves mainly the passing of key productive assets from fathers to sons, thus making it impossible for women to be economically independent without relying on a male (father, husband, or son). Patrilocality means that it is normative for a married woman to live in her husband's home. Daughters don't have the right to inherit productive assets, and to their parents they are of limited value since their labor is lost upon marriage. Combined, patrilineality and patrilocality effectively make women both economically and socially marginalized (Das Gupta, et al, 2000).

The contemporary development of gender relations in the Korean society (note: I am focusing on the Republic of Korea (South Korea) in the current study since Korean immigrants in the U.S. come from South Korea) has been summarized as rapid economic growth combined with little change in fundamental aspects of family organization and gender equality (Das Gupta, et al, 2000). In the second half of the twentieth century the living conditions of Korean women as well as men were greatly improved; however women's position in the family and society remained the same. Korean women's choices are still constrained by the key axioms of Confucian thought: filial piety, family loyalty, and conformity to group norms and chastity (Hampson, 2000). Patrilineal social organization and segregated gender roles are still considered to be central to the Korean

culture. For example, although women's participation in the labor force rose substantially over the decades since 1950s (the labor force participation rate of women increased from 26.8 percent in 1960 to 47.6 percent in 1995 (Hampson, 2000)), strong cultural norms regarding women's proper role as the wife and mother continue to prevail, and many employers and employees alike expect that female employees will leave their job once they get married. And that is what happens (often involuntarily) in the cases of most married women. One survey in 1985 found that over 80 percent of women who had worked outside of the home before marriage quite their jobs upon getting married (Min, 2001, p.305). Moreover, women in paid employment are considered to have lower status than housewives because their need for money is perceived as indicating lower class (Hampson, 2000). The traditional Confucian definition of Korean women as "wives and mothers" or "bearers of sons" continues to be strongly believed. Education-wise, although the enrollment rate for women in higher education has increased sharply in recent decades (from below 9 percent in 1980 to 45 percent in 1996), there is still a wide gender gap in enrollment in higher education (Das Gupta, et al. 2000, p. 19). In 1979, female students took up only 24.2 percent of the whole student population across all educational levels (United Nations, 1983). Moreover, higher education for women is perceived as a mechanism for attracting a higher status husband. When it comes to division of labor in the family, it is still believed that husbands should not share domestic duties, as it is perceived as demeaning to men and greatly disapproved by parents-in-law (Das Gupta, et al. 2000).

3.2.7. Poland

In researching for the current study I came to discover how little information (in academic publication available in U.S.) is available on the family, women's position in the society, or gender relations in the Polish (and Polish-American) culture. This impression is confirmed by Radzilowski (1996). Although there has been quite a rich literature of scholarly works focusing on the Polish-American community, identity, parishes, neighborhoods, and institutions in the early part of the 20th century, little has been done on the Polish-American family. A search on more general terms about Polish gender culture or contemporary Polish family did not turn out to be fruitful either. As a result I primarily relied on Radzilowski's (1996) chapter on "Family, Women, and Gender: The Polish Experience" for a brief description of traditional gender culture in Poland, and a lot of the discussion below are basically descriptive.

Historically Poland is a peasant society, and its culture also influenced by religion (Roman Catholic Church). Gender relations in the Polish culture share some similarities with those in some Asian countries described above. An important one is patrilocal residence, i.e. a woman is expected to go to her husband's family to live after marriage. Gender roles and the division of labor within the family are quite clear-cut for men and women, with men as the head of the household responsible to support the family and discipline children. The tradition of dowry exists in the old Polish culture, which was later ended among Polish immigrants to America because of the relative imbalance of available men and women in the new land resulting in a favorable marriage market for women (Radzilowski, 1996, p. 62).

Since the first big wave of Polish immigration to U.S. from the turn of the century before World War I, there have been several waves of immigrants from Poland which are very different in social background and circumstances of leaving. Polish immigrants that came to America before World War I, now often referred to as the Old Polonia, are mostly from peasant background. They are economic immigrants in pursuit of economic opportunities (or for the opportunity of a better marriage for many women). The Polish immigrant family at that time typically composed of a husband that works at an industrial job in the city at some distance from home, working for long hours every week including Saturdays. As a result more duties and the task of disciplining children fell on the mother, who usually took on boarders in the house to supplement for family income, besides the regular household chores and taking care of children. She also began to take on some public functions which used to be the responsibility of the husband, as "the family representative that dealt with teachers, priests, social workers, city officials, and policemen" (p. 62). As a result the Polish woman as wife and mother played a new, more independent role in the family.

Poles that arrived in the U.S. during and after World War II are consisted mostly of people fleeing from Nazi occupation and war, many of whom came from middle-class backgrounds in the old country. The majority of early war refugees arrived here between 1939 and 1941, among them numerous artists, scholars, writers, politicians, and representatives of the Polish governmental and social establishments (p. 156). Polish war refugees that came later included 18,000 Polish veterans in Great Britain who were admitted under a special 1950 amendment. Many immigrants in this group were quite established at the time of leaving Poland, had high educational level, and were politically

active. Overall, however, research on this group is so little and fragmentary (Radzilowski, 1996), that I was not able to find any research on gender relations for this study.

The next wave of immigration from Poland started in 1956, after the October 1956 workers' revolt (this group also called post-October immigrants). INS statistics show that there are 130,576 quota and non-quota immigrants and 20,755 refugees from Poland for the years 1953-1970, not including about 20,000 Jews, persons of Jewish origin, and intellectuals in 1968 after a government-induced anti-Semitic campaign in Poland (p. 166). During the 1970s a new wave of immigrants came as a result of both the collapse of the Polish economy and the hard political repression and censorship in Poland. It is hard to characterize this group as either political refugees or economic immigrants. INS statistics show that between 1971 and 1980 a total of 43,000 immigrants were admitted, including 5,882 refugees (p. 167). Immigrants from this group also mainly come from middle class background in Poland. One study found that among immigrants arriving between 1974 and 1984, the majority of respondents came from big cities; almost one-third had a college education, and 90 percent had high school or vocational school diplomas (p. 167). Although, again, research on gender relations among this group is not available, based on the general socio-demographic composition of the group it is reasonable to assume that the gender culture and gender relations for the later waves of immigrants would be different from that of the Old Polonia.

Information published by United Nations (1983) put the percentage of female students out of all students at 55.4 percent in 1978. In terms of labor force participation, the percentage of female employees was 48.5 in 1981 (International Labor Office, 1990).

Both percentages (in education and labor force) were not low, compared to the other countries in this study.

3.2.8. El Salvador

Gender relations in El Salvador can be described as traditional "authoritarian patriarchal relations between the sexes" (Thomson, 1986, p.32). Dominance of male over female is socially sanctioned, with the existence of domestic violence (wife beating) and sexual assault being common and going unreported. There is still great importance attached to female virginity; girls are closely watched over, or beaten into submission, and their social activities greatly restricted (Thomson, 1986). Like in many Asian countries such as India, China, and Vietnam, patrilocal postmarital residence is practiced in Salvador, both in formal marriage and in common unions. The wife is expected to move to the hamlet where the husband's family lives, and often into her in-laws' home (Mahler, 1999). In this way, not only can a married woman be considered as added labor power to the husband's family, but the wife is constantly under the watchful eye of her husband's kin, especially in families where the husband migrates (Mahler, 1999). On the other hand, historically it is common for rural, poor men in Salvador to make a living as seasonal migrant workers. Given their inability to provide regular support to their families and the difficulty of moving the entire family around with them, many men respond by avoiding that responsibility, which results in a relatively higher number of female headed households. The estimated national rate of female headed households in El Salvador ranges from 27% to 40% by two sources published in 1989 (Menjivar, 1999, p. 614).

Within the family the wife depends on the husband to provide funds for household expenditures, as expressed by a Salvadorian immigrant woman,

> In El Salvador only the husband works …There the man is in charge and the wife has to do what her husband says. Even today this is the custom. … It's different in El Salvador because there the husband gives the wife the money. And if the husband says it's okay to buy a dress then [the wife] buys it, but if it is too expensive then he won't let her (Mahler, 1999, p. 699).

The outbreak of the Salvadorian civil war (1979-1992) drove many Salvadorians to leave the country, and many of them migrated to the United States. It has been estimated that close to one million Salvadorians overall have come to the U.S. (Mahler, 1999). Since they were not treated as political refugees by the U.S. government, their petitions for political asylum were systematically denied in the 1980s. Their undocumented status considerably narrows Salvadorian immigrants' employment opportunities and the availability of resources. As illegal aliens most Salvadorians were ineligible for government assistance on the resettlement and could find only poorly paying jobs. As will be discussed later, this has significant repercussions on gender relations in the Salvadorian immigrant family.

Women's education rate is on the lower side in El Salvador. In 1978 female students only accounted for 32.2 percent of all students across all educational levels (United Nations, 1983). On the other hand, Salvadorian women have a long tradition of labor force participation. The rate of female employment in the formal sector reached 37 percent in 1988, and might have been up to 40 percent in 1990 (Menjivar, 1999, p. 623). Moreover, women's involvement in the informal sector is substantial (Menjivar, 1999).

3.2.9. Mexico

The gender culture in Mexico can be described as from a highly patriarchal tradition. Ideals about gender roles assign men as "sexually assertive, independent, emotionally restrained, to wield absolute authority over their wives and children, and to serve as family breadwinners", while women are expected to show "dependence, subordination, responsibility for all domestic chores, and selfless devotion to family and children" (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994, p. 9). As late as the 1960s, especially in rural Mexico, the highly patriarchal tradition is still shown in gender relations in the peasant society, characterized by a clear-cut division of authority between husband and wife, a sharp household division of labor by gender, and different spaces for men's and women's activities. Men are considered to be the patriarchs in family life and responsible for supporting the whole family (with the help of older sons). Women take charge of the home and children, often enclosed in the limited space of the home except to attend Mass or when doing chores such as fetching water from the river. Patrilocal residence is also practiced: for at least a period of time after marriage the newly wedded couples live with the husband's family until they are able to be economically independent. During this time the wife is expected to show subordination to their parents-in-law, especially their mother-in-law (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994).

In the latter half of the twentieth century, urbanization, industrialization, and migration combined have to a certain extent transformed gender relations in the Mexican society. Urbanization has played an important role because it is associated with increasing education and employment for women, although female education rate was still relatively

lower in Mexico. In 1978, only 28.6 percent of the total student population was female (United Nations, 1983). On the other hand, in spite of the traditional patriarchal ideals about women's staying at home to take care of the family, Mexican women's labor force participation increased more than 50 percent during the 1970s, while men's labor force participation rate increased only 10 percent during the same period (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994, p. 11). In 1980, females accounted for 26.2 percent of all employees (International Labor Office, 1990). Relatively well educated women were able to take jobs such as teachers, medical assistants, and secretaries and other administrative positions; while poor uneducated women (many of them rural to urban migrants) found jobs in domestic service and export assembly plants along Mexico's northern border. Another factor that affected gender relations is the migration of Mexican men to the United States, starting from as early as 1940s and continuing through the recent decades. As remittance from their husbands often turns out to be not enough, many women are propelled to seek paid employment outside of the home. Official statistics indicated that the percentage of rural women in the wage labor force rose from 5.6 percent in 1975 to 20 percent in 1985, and the number is believed to be 10 percent higher in 1990 (Stephen, 2002).

While women's incorporation into the paid labor force has challenged men's position as sole breadwinners of the family, it does not necessarily lead to real changes towards gender equality. There have been research findings showing that women's employment in Mexico has neither really eroded domestic patriarchy nor improved women's status in the family (Stephen, 2002; Fernandez-Kelly, 1983, cf Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994). Males in the family, when they are present, still take the authority as the head of family, while employed women are still responsible for household chores. When it comes to decision

making that affects the whole family such as the decision to migrate, it is still the husband who has the authority and power while the wife is often not included as an active participant, as illustrated by Hondagneu-Sotelo's (1994) study of Mexican migration.

3.2.10. Jamaica

In terms of gender culture and kinship system, Jamaica is a unique case among the ten countries in the study. Being part of what is often referred to as the Caribbean or West Indian culture, the family structure and kinship system in Jamaica has been characterized as matrifocal. Family group is centered on the mother's side, with close emotional ties between mother and children, as well as strong bonds between female kin, mainly daughters and children of daughters. Matrifocality in the Jamaican culture represents a focus on matrilateral relationships, regardless of presence or absence of the husband/father in the household. Besides emphasizing the mother-child bond as the most important and enduring bond in life, another cultural ideal in the Caribbean holds that child care is a collective responsibility within the extended family rather than the sole responsibility of the biological parents. In reality child care is provided by groups of female kin, and it is common for children to be shifted between household to live with different kin members other than their parents (Ho, 2002).

Historical reasons are partly responsible for the matrifocal culture. During the colonial period the Jamaican society had a rigid status system based on color. A so-called dual-union system is practiced by all classes, which allows the coexistence of concubines along with legal marriages. Men from the ruling class reserve legal marriage to women with the same social status, while taking concubines of lower class status through

nonlegal unions. On the other hand, men from lower classes often have nonlegal unions only and tend to avoid legal marriage until later in life, partly because they lack the economic resources to support a wife and children, but mainly because of the cultural ideology of a sharp separation between sexual relations and legal marriage. As a result there is a tendency of polygyny among men in general which is widespread and accepted in the Jamaican society. Given this, the matrifocal family structure is not the cause but actually a solution to the problem of economic support of women and children (Ho, 2002).

Gender roles in the Jamaican culture are highly segregated, with men and women leading quite separate lives. Conjugal relationships are much less solid or stable than the mother-child bond. Conjugal partners are not expected to provide emotional support or share domestic chores or child care, which responsibilities fall disproportionally on women and result in the matrifocal kin system and Caribbean women's strong and independent cultural tradition (Ho, 2002).

Women in the Caribbean have always worked, dating back to the days of slavery where women worked on the plantations. Slaves were emancipated in 1830s, and Jamaican women have been active in employment outside the home. It is estimated that in the late 1970s women account for about 40 percent of the total labor force in Jamaica, and about 46 percent in the late 1990s (Foner, 2005). Another report put the percentage of female employees to be 39.2 percent of the total employed population in 1980 (International Labor Office, 1990). The female education rate was relatively high: in 2006 the female

enrollment rate in primary, secondary, and tertiary education was 91, 81, and 26 percent respectively[2].

The several decades after 1965 saw large numbers of Jamaicans immigrated to U.S. In 2000 the Jamaican immigrant population reached 513,228 people (Foner, 2005, p. 133). As the structure of job opportunities in U.S. favored immigrants in particular occupations (as well as close relatives of U.S. citizens and permanent residents), more Jamaican women qualified for labor certification than men, resulting in Jamaican women's outnumbering men in almost every year since 1967. The proportion of women among Jamaican immigrants reached as high as 76 and 73 percents for 1967 and 1968 (Foner, 2005, p. 159). In general, Jamaican women found jobs in U.S. as private household workers (accounting for 48 percent of the total number of women immigrants from Jamaica in 1967 and 50 percent in 1968) or nurses (constituting about one third of legal Jamaican immigrants classified as professionals between 1962 and 1972, and 28 percent between 1990 and 1992) (Foner, 2005, pp. 159-160). Therefore, as in the case of Filipino immigrants, a high number of female-first immigration is found among Jamaicans, which could have implications on the post-migration gender relations among this group and should be kept in mind when trying to understand/interpret results.

---

[2] retrieved 8/12/2008, from http://www.weforum.org/pdf/gendergap/jamaica.pdf

3.2.11. Selected Gender Equity Indicators: All Ten Countries

It is clear from the review above that considerable variations exist among the ten countries in terms of gender culture, historical background and recent occurrences and policies. Different circumstances shape and influence the current status of gender culture, gender relations, and gender equity in each society. Despite these differences, using a number of commonly used gender equity indicators can provide a helpful comparison on some of the most important measures on women's development and gender equity across countries.

Table 3.1 presents this information, including the gender gap on labor, education, income, and leadership in each of the ten countries. On these statistics I tried to find data around the year of 1980, or as close to that as possible, since the majority of immigrants in the current study were estimated to have left in their sending country around that time (based on information from the data on the length of time in US, which was roughly 20 years on average; for details see the summary statistics in Chapter 5).

Table 3.1: Data on Selected Gender Equity Indicators for All Ten Countries

	Labor [a]	Education [b]				Income [b]	Decision-making [b]
	Percentage of females in total labor force (1980)	Literacy ratio (women/men, 1990)	Net primary enrolment ratio (women/men, 1991)*	Net secondary enrolment ratio (women/men, 1991)*	Net tertiary enrolment ratio (women/men, 1991)*	Estimated earned income ratio (women/men, 1991 & 2004)	% of women in decision-making positions in government at ministerial level (1995)
Mexico	27.54	0.98	0.97	0.99 (1999 data)	0.74	0.39	7.0
Philippines	38.47	1.00	0.99	1.09 (1998 data)	1.42	0.60	24.0
China	43.39	0.95	0.96	n/a	0.52	0.64	4.0
Vietnam	48.00	0.99	0.92	n/a	0.76 (1999 data)	0.71	4.0
India	32.76	0.74	0.82 (2000 data)	n/a	0.54	0.31	6.0
Cuba	31.17	1.00	1.01	1.14	1.40	n/a	8.0
Jamaica	46.51	1.09	1.00	1.06	0.74	0.57	13.0
Korea	36.74	1.00	1.01	0.98	0.49	0.46	2.0
Poland	45.31	1.00	1.00	1.08	1.34	0.59	8.0
El Salvador	33.23	0.97	1.17 (1998 data)	0.99 (1998 data)	1.24 (1998 data)	0.43	18.0

Note:
*** based on 1991 data unless otherwise indicated in parentheses.**
[a]: source: World Development Indicators database on NationMaster.com, http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/lab_for_fem_of_tot_lab_for-labor-force-female-of-total&date=1980.
[b]: source: Gender Equity Index on Social Watch, http://www.socialwatch.org/en/avancesyRetrocesos/IEG_2008/index.htm.

Across the board, Philippines and Jamaica were noticeable as the countries with the least overall gender gap on these indicators, with relatively higher female presentation in labor force, school enrolment, and government decision-making. A second group of countries included those with narrow gaps on some measures but bigger gaps on others, indicating an unbalanced status on gender equity. For example, Vietnam had the highest percentage of female labor force participation among the ten countries in 1980, and the highest estimated earned income ratio (71%) between women and men. On the other hand, females only took 4% of the government decision-making positions. China, Cuba, Poland, and El Salvador could also be categorized into this middle group, with higher equity in some areas abut greater gap in others such as decision-making or female labor force participation. Lastly, countries including India, Korea, and Mexico had lower numbers on most of these indicators, signifying greater gaps in gender equity. It is worth pointing out that although these indicators could be seen as somewhat related to a country's general degree of economic development, they were not always consistent. For instance, despite higher economic development in Korea, the gender gap remained quite significant on labor force participation, tertiary education enrolment, earned income, and decision-making.

3.3. Changes in Gender Relations After Migration

In the above I have provided a general sketch of the "core" gender culture in each of the sending societies. These descriptions, although brief, can serve as good starting points to which migration-induced changes in gender relations can be compared. Gender relations, to a great extent, are culturally determined. On the other hand, as the theoretical

discussion in Chapter 2 has highlighted, gender relations and gender culture are by no means static; instead, the very *interactive* nature of gender relations between individual men and women, as well as structural and cultural factors on both micro and macro levels, all come into play in the constant reshaping and renegotiating of gender cultures. This is particularly obvious in the case of immigrants, where the moving from one culture to another inevitably brings about changes in a number of structural and cultural factors which affect old behavior patterns, beliefs, and assumptions of gender relations immigrants brought from the sending country. However, as a significant body of empirical research has clearly demonstrated, the degree and extent to which such changes have occurred varies greatly across immigrant groups. In the following I will review and summarize the main findings in existing empirical studies on changes in gender relations and gender roles among the post-1965 immigrants.

3.3.1. Increased Labor Force Participation/Economic Contribution

A central theme in the empirical studies reviewed is immigrant women's increasing participation in the labor force in U.S. and its impact on their gender relations. This has been reported in numerous research (e.g. Foner, 2005; Min, 2001; Espiritu, 1999; Pessar, 1999; Kurien, 1999; Lim, 1997; Pessar, 1995; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994; Kibria, 1993; Chen, 2005; Pedraza, 1991) for most of the post-1965 immigrant groups included in this study.

Immigration has a decided impact on immigrant women's labor force participation in this country, as well illustrated by the cases of Cubans and Koreans. In contrast to the low

rates of female labor force participation prior to the revolution, Cuban immigrant women in U.S. have had a massive entrance into the labor force. For most of these women who had come from middle class backgrounds in Cuba, work is seen by many as a transition, an opportunity to help the family and their husband to overcome the initial economic hardship and loss of social status (Pessar, 1999, p. 590; Pedraza, 1991). Among Korean immigrant women the contrast is perhaps even more surprising. According to Min (2001), although there is a demand for blue-collar workers in Korean-owned ethnic economy, many Korean male immigrants, most highly educated (47 percent of those 25 years or older hold a college degree as reported by the 1990 census) are not willing to take such blue-collar jobs in Korean-owned stores. As a result, financial and social status loss for many Korean immigrant families is also significant, which makes it necessary for women to go in the labor force here. A 1988 survey of Korean married women in New York City found 70 percent of the respondents participated in the labor force, in contrast of only 23 percent who reported working in Korea after they were married. Nearly half of the working Korean women were self-employed in small businesses (mostly co-owned with their husbands), and another 36 percent employed in co-ethnic businesses (Min, 2001, p. 306).

In addition to the economic necessity for survival facing new immigrants, another factor has contributed to immigrant women's increased labor force participation, i.e. the economic structure and job market in U.S. provide better job opportunities for immigrant women (Foner, 2005; Espiritu, 1999; Menjivar, 1999; Pessar, 1999). In labor intensive industries such as garment and microelectronics manufacturing, immigrant women from Latin American and Asia are employed in large numbers (and women are more preferred

compared to immigrant men), because many employers believe that women are willing to work for less, and do not mind dead-end jobs. Immigrant women also find jobs in the fields of domestic service (Menjivar, 1999; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994) and health-care (Foner, 2005; Espiritu, 1999; Kurien, 1999), where the U.S. job market has a big demand.

3.3.2. Exposure To The Receiving Culture

In her research on Central American immigrant women, Menjivar (1999) found that the work these women perform (as domestic workers, especially live-in domestics) give them an opportunity to observe "practices and behaviors beyond their immediate groups, which they may selectively incorporate in their own routines. … This is not a crude form of assimilation, for these women do not claim to abandon practices they bring with them and become "Americanized," but a more subtle social process that takes place as they come into contact with the world of their employers" (Menjivar, 1999, p. 619). Having more exposure to the middle class patterns of behavior and to the more egalitarian gender relations in their employers' household sometime lead immigrant women to try patterning their own relationship with their husbands based on what they perceive as the American model. On the other hand, most of these women's husbands work in jobs such as construction, landscaping, and restaurant services, which brings them closer with other Latino men in most cases, and working serves to reaffirm the men's traditional patriarchal beliefs and behavior about gender relations (Menjivar, 1999).

The effects of different degrees of exposure to the receiving culture on immigrants' gender relations are also discussed in the case of Korean immigrant (Min, 2001). With the increased economic role that they play, Korean immigrant women attempt to

challenge traditional gender role attitudes and behavior within the family. However, three structural factors keep Korean immigrants socially separated from the main stream society, which in turn help perpetuate the strongly patriarchal ideology they brought from Korea, i.e. Korean immigrants' cultural homogeneity, their economic segregation (concentration in the Korean ethnic economy), and their high degree of participation in Korean ethnic churches (Min, 2001).

3.3.3. Positive Effects On Gender Relations

As mentioned above, many scholars have examined the impact of immigrant women's regular wage work on gender relations. Almost all the evidence points to the finding that despite gender inequality in the labor market and workplace, immigrant women employed in the U.S. generally gain greater autonomy, independence, and status in the relationship with their husband, as a result of the more important economic role they play (e.g. Chen, 2005; Min, 2001; Espiritu, 1999; Pessar, 1999; Kurien, 1999; Lim, 1997; Pessar, 1995; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994; Kibria, 1993; Pedraza, 1991), whereas men lose ground because of their declining earning power or even unemployment (Min, 2001; Menjivar, 1999; Kibria, 1993). Women's access to regular wages and their greater contribution to the family income have enabled them to be in more control of household budgeting and other domestic decision making. For example, the words of a Taiwanese immigrant woman illustrated how her employment changed the gender dynamics between her and her husband of 17 years:

> In Taiwan he [my husband] used to take care of all the financial matters, and I didn't know how much money he made. All of our money was in his control. It's not like that here in America. There, he was working and he took care of all the payments. I had to ask him for money. Now, because I work, we have a joint bank account. Financial

> matters are joint decisions. My name is on those documents, so he needs to ask for my permission. Before, in Taiwan, he bought two houses without even telling me. Now he can't do that. (Chen, 2005, p. 343)

Immigrant women's gain in earning power and personal autonomy also give them more leverage in appealing for their husband's assistance in household chores (e.g. Foner, 2005; Espiritu, 1999; Kurien, 1999; Menjivar, 1999; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1992; Pessar, 1999). For example, Kurien (1999) reported that among highly educated Indian couples who are both employed, women were often able to get their husbands to help with housework, at least to some degree (p. 659). Among the Central American immigrants that Menjivar (1999) studied, women's employment has directly led to a bigger share of household labor by their husbands (p. 616). Similarly, Hondagneu-Sotelo (1992) found that among Mexican immigrant families, especially those with the husband immigrating to the U.S. prior to 1965, a more egalitarian gender division of labor emerged when the family reunited. As the author noted, although "[T]hese changes are modest if we judge them by ideal standards of feminist egalitarianism, but they are significant if we compare them to normative patriarchal practices" (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1992, p. 408). In general, as Espiritu (1999) found, based upon a review of existing works, that greater male involvement in household labor seemed to be associated with higher-educated, salaried professional immigrant families. Examples of this finding include Filipino and Jamaican immigrant women who worked as nurses, whose husbands are found to assume greater responsibilities in child care and other household labor (Espiritu, 1999; Foner, 2005). Whereas among immigrant families where the husband experiences reduced economic role (e.g. lower-paid wage laborers), gender role reversal (with wives' increased economic role and husband's declining earning power) seemed to be the most

pronounced, which often led to spousal abuse and divorce (Menjivar, 1999, p. 609; Min, 2001, p. 313; Kibria, 1993). Between these two groups are the self-employed entrepreneurs, where despite greater economic role and contribution of immigrant wives, most still have to bear the added burden of the double work of family business as well as domestic labor (Lim, 1997).

With their increased contribution to the family economy and improved status in the marital relationship, many immigrant women also gain personally and psychologically. Many of them reported gaining from employment a sense of achievement and self-fulfillment (Kurien 1999, p. 659) as well as feelings of being honorable, fair, worthy, and proud (Lim 1997, p. 39). Another positive effect that has been found to be related to immigrant women's labor force participation is a closer relationship with their husband, resulting from their greater dependency on each other for companionship and emotional support, especially given the loss of traditional kinship and support structures of the old country. This is found to be the case among some Indian and Mexican couples (Kurien 1999, p. 657; Pedraza 1991, p. 320).

3.3.4. Negative Effects On Gender Relations

Despite the positive outcomes that immigrant women have gained, it has also become clear by now that the changes in gender relations after immigration has been mixed. For many immigrant women, the gain in one aspect (e.g. increased autonomy and resources) is often coupled with greater gender subordination in another (e.g. gender role reversal causing domestic violence and divorce, as mentioned above (Min, 2001; Menjivar, 1999;

Espiritu, 1999; Kibria, 1993), or greater personal burden of the double responsibility for both work and domestic labor (Espiritu, 1999)).

More importantly, existing findings have made it clear that researchers of immigrant gender relations should go beyond the either-or framework when studying changes of gender relations after immigration. Previous research has indicated that, although varied by the degree of patriarchal-ness in the original sending culture, for most immigrant women it is not their goal to radically restructure the patriarchal family system, values, or behavior in a fundamental way, and oftentimes they don't see work in a liberating light but rather an extension of the traditional view about women's role and obligation for helping their husband and the family. Despite constant appeal and negotiation with their husbands (e.g. for a more equal division of household labor or for greater say in family decision making), immigrant women are, to a large extent, constrained by the gender relations culturally prescribed in their sending country. As some scholars (Kandiyoti, 1988, cf Kurien, 1999 and Lim, 1997) called, this is a "patriarchal bargain", in which immigrant women try to contest the traditional hierarchies of their family life and maximize their power within the patriarchal gender relations, but never at the cost of threatening the nuclear family (Chen, 2005). Or, as Kibria (1993) argued, Vietnamese American women walk an "ideological family tightrope, struggling both to preserve traditional Vietnamese family system and to enhance their power within the context of this system (Espiritu, 1999, p. 642).

This point is illustrated by Lim's (1997) discussion of Korean women's resignation to unequal division of family work. Although a lot of them do appeal to or demand their

husbands to take up a greater share of family work, a number of factors ultimately contribute to their continued endurance of bearing the double burden of work and family alone. Among them the two main reasons are patriarchal cultural beliefs brought from the sending country (that housework is demeaning to men, that women should endure any marital relations no matter how unfair they perceive them to be, and that women should sacrifice for their families), as well as the fear of divorce and a declining standard of living, and the desire to keep the family intact (Lim, 1997). Similarly, the Vietnamese immigrant women that Kibria (1993) studied expressed their ambivalence about the patriarchal family systems, because of the economic protection that the family can give them and the power it gives parents in disciplining children (Kibria, 1993). For the Central American women in Menjivar's (1999) research, even if their husbands are not able to fulfill the culturally expected role of being the provider of the family (or even when the women themselves become the sole providers), they still make a conscious effort to avoid making their husbands or partners feel inadequate, by doing all the household chores as well. According to the author, there is a cultural explanation behind these women's behavior, besides fears that they will be left financially incapacitated if they separate from their husbands: the social meaning of a marital union. "In the case of many Central Americans, the conjugal unit is an idealized family pattern – a symbol associated with middle-class standing and a luxury that cannot be shared by all. Female-headed households, on the other hand, are commonly associated with lower-class background (Menjivar, 1999, p. 619).

3.4. Conclusion

Gender relations among immigrants are predominantly determined in the sending culture but also profoundly affected by post-migration structural and cultural factors in the receiving country. In this chapter I have provided a sketch of the general gender culture in each of ten sending countries in the current study, followed by a summary of existing research findings on gender relations changes among main recent immigrant groups in U.S. Combined, these two sections should provide a good understanding of the empirical background for the current investigation.

Clearly gender relations have undergone very noticeable changes among these immigrant groups after migration. In general, the gain for immigrant women has been quite impressive in terms of increased labor force participation and greater role in the family economy, as well as greater personal autonomy and independence. Women's greater contribution to the household income, which is often accompanied by their husbands' reduced earning power, has led to women's improved status in the family and men's loss in patriarchal authority to a certain degree. The shift in relative status is reflected not only in a more equal division of household labor but also in a more equal distribution of decision making power within the family on issues of household budgeting and finances. On the other hand, the review of previous research also shows how profound and deep-rooted the influence of the sending culture is. While the post migration changes in gender relations have been mixed (i.e. gain in one aspect and loss in another aspect) for many immigrant women, ultimately, immigrant women do not seek to radically challenge and restructure the old gender relations patterns and patriarchal family system. Instead,

as some scholars argue, immigrant women try to engage in the 'patriarchal bargain', by attempting to secure greater power and status for more equal gender relations, without challenging the fundamental beliefs and structure of the patriarchal gender relations.

Based on the existing findings, the current study focuses on examining the relative decision making power between husband and wife on another important family decision, i.e. the decision to migrate, in this case the decision to help older parents migrate and have them live in home. Given the predominantly patriarchal gender culture and family structure in most of the sending countries, one can conceivably argue that the husband's parents are more likely to be the ones to immigrate (before the wife's parents do) and live with the immigrant couple among most of these immigrant groups. On the other hand, given that gender relations has undoubtedly undergone changes as a result of women's increasing economic role in the family and their exposure to the more gender-equal American culture, has relative decision making power between husband and wife (as reflected by the presence of either spouse's older parents' living with them) been affected? How is relative decision making power related to personal and household characteristics as well as group cultural factors? How does socioeconomic class factor in and interact with gender and race/culture? These are the question that the current investigation seeks to answer.

In the next chapter I will describe the data used for this study, including data preparation, analytical steps and methods for the following analysis, followed by results and discussion of the complete analyses in the chapter after that.

CHAPTER 4

DATA AND METHODS

4.1. Introduction

In the first three chapters I have outlined the research question, discussed relevant theoretical frameworks, as well as reviewed general background and existing empirical findings for the current study. In this chapter I will discuss in detail the data and methods to be used in the analyses.

Existing research on gender relations changes has found that immigrant women's increased labor force participation, greater contribution to the family economy, as well as greater exposure to the receiving culture has resulted in considerable changes in gender relations after migration. In general, immigrant women's greater economic role (relative to that of their husbands) has led to increased status in the family as well as greater personal autonomy and independence for women. Higher status in the family is reflected in women's greater involvement in the budgeting and financial decisions, in addition to a more equal division of household labor in many cases.

Fitting into this line of investigation, the current study seeks to explore another issue in regard to the relative decision making power in the immigrant family which presumably reflects gender relations changes, i.e. the decision to have older parents immigrate to U.S. as well and live in the same household. Given that most sending cultures among the post-

1965 wave of immigrants are highly patriarchal, one can conceivably argue that the more patriarchal the gender relations in an immigrant couple's sending culture is, the more likely that the husband's parents are found to live in the household. The following assumptions underlie the above general hypothesis. On one hand, as mentioned above in Chapter 1, most economic immigrants come to U.S. for pursuit of a higher living standard and better economic conditions. In the chain migration process typically found among economic migration, once the early arrivals (usually younger healthy working-age males in the family) gain a foothold in the new country, the rest of the extended family are then sent for to come and join them in U.S. Moreover, the multi-generation family living arrangement is a preferred practice in many post-1965 immigrant sending societies (as compared to the nuclear family which is the dominant arrangement in the American culture). On the other hand, during the frequently long process of family chain migrations most immigrant families are prevented by limited resources to have both spouses' parents come and live in home at the same time. Additionally, older parents' presence in the household has probably required some degree of help from their adult immigrant children (e.g. in terms of money, time and knowledge in the process of helping the older parents immigrate), which can also be considered as valuable resources to spend. In this sense, which spouse's parents are present in the immigrant family is able to reflect the outcome of relative household status and decision making power between the spouses. Given these assumptions, focusing on the co-residence pattern of older parents in the immigrant household can shed light on the relative decision making power between the husband and wife, which in turn will further indicate possible effects of migration on gender relations. Furthermore, as various immigrant groups in the post-1965

immigration come from sending cultures with different degrees of patriarchal-ness, comparison across different immigrant groups will give researchers some idea as to how and to what extent the sending culture play a role in such changes in gender relations in the receiving country. Moreover, as existing research has shown the importance of taking not only gender but also class into consideration, examining the association between whose parents are present in the household and the immigrants' socioeconomic characteristics could help further unravel the relationship behind relative decision making power and the gender/class/sending culture triangle.

4.2. Data

4.2.1. Description of Original Data and Data Restructuring

The original data for this study came from the public use 5% sample U.S. 2000 census data, downloaded from the IPUMS website (Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 4.0 [Machine-readable database], Ruggles, Sobek, Alexander, Fitch, Goeken, et al. 2008, http://usa.ipums.org/usa/). The downloaded IPUMS data were stored in a rectangular that contained individual-level information including demographic, family interrelationship, race/ethnicity/nativity, education, occupation, income, migration, etc.[3] In other words, the basic unit of these data is individuals in the census rather than households. However, each individual record has a household identification number, which can be used to link together all respondents living in the same household. As the

[3] Please refer to the IPUMS website at http://usa.ipums.org/usa-action/variableAvailability.do?display=Person#Technical for detailed explanations of available IPUMS variables, coding scheme as well as the wording of original census questions.

current analyses focus on the household level (examining the presence of older parents in home as well as exploring the association between older parents' presence and a number of both husband's and wife's socioeconomic and culture factors), it is necessary to first restructure the original downloaded data so that household becomes the unit of analysis and all individuals from the same household are saved in the same line of record. I will explain the data restructuring process in more details below.

All individual records who met the following three conditions were pulled from IPUMS and formed the basic set of original data: 1) the reported place of birth was one of the ten study countries including Mexico, China, India, the Philippines, Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, El Salvador, Poland, and Jamaica; and 2) was 18 years of age or over at the time of the 2000 U.S. census; and 3) reported their marital status as "married and spouse present" in the household at the time of the 2000 U.S. census.

For the purposes of this study, I kept only married couples who were *both* born in the same sending culture, and excluded couples who were either of different races or born in different countries. Excluding biracial or bicultural couples would better enable the analyses to capture the culture effect of different sending culture on marital gender equality as reflected by the presence of either spouse's parents in the household.

Data restructuring was performed to get the data ready for the analyses in this study. It included the following steps: First, using both the "relationship to household head" and "sex" variables in each individual record, a series of four data subsets were generated for each country, i.e. 1) a data subset (called the "husbands" data) of individuals who were identified as either the male household head or male spouse of household head, 2) a data

subset (called the “wives” data) of individuals who were identified as either the female spouse of household head or female household head, 3) a data subset (called the “husbands’ parents” data) of all individuals identified as parents of the husbands, and 4) a data subset (called the “wives’ parents” data) of all individuals identified as parents of the wives. Second, using the “household ID” variable in each individual record, the four subsets of data generated above were merged to form a data set in which each line consisted of a household. This meant that, the more people a household had, the longer (wider) the record is. The two steps above were then repeated for each of the ten countries, obtaining a data set for each country, all of which were then appended into a combined total data set for all ten countries. In this restructured data set the unit of analysis was household, each record being a married couple, but the number of people in each household record varied depending on whether any parent (either the husband’s or the wife’s parents) was present, and how many parents were living with the couple. There were a total of 102,942 household records in the restructured dataset (Table 4.1).

TABLE 4.1: Number of Households and Percentage by Country

Sending Country	Number of Households	Percent
China	15,264	14.83
Cuba	6,881	6.68
El Salvador	5,428	5.27
India	12,550	12.19
Jamaica	2,787	2.71
Korea	7,841	7.62
Mexico	29,950	29.09
The Philippines	10,824	10.51
Poland	3,917	3.81
Vietnam	7,500	7.29
Total	102,942	100.00

4.2.2. Data Accuracy of the Time of Arrival Information

Before going further onto detailed descriptions about variables and analytical methods, the issue of data accuracy should to be mentioned. Questions about the wording of the original census question have been raised regarding the reliability of information collected on immigrants' time of arrival in U.S. (Redstone and Massey, 2003, cf Myers, 2004; Jasso, Massey, Rosenzweig, and Smith, 2000; Ellis and Wright, 1998). The accuracy of the time of entry information is certainly relevant in the case of the current analyses as well.

In the 2000 census, the question asked a respondent to answer, "When did this person come to live in the United States?" and enter a year[4]. The wording of "come to live in the

[4] (http://usa.ipums.org/usa/voliii/items2000.shtml#P14, retrieved on June 20, 2008).

United States" could be confusing to respondents. According to Jasso et al. (2000), the census question apparently assumed that most immigrants were entering U.S. for the first time, or that, if they had made multiple trips, their last entry was the one in which they came to stay. In fact, such assumptions are probably incorrect. There are findings suggesting that most "newly admitted" legal immigrants were not entering this country for the first time. Instead, two thirds had prior experience in U.S., and some were not coming "to stay". This has to do with how the U.S. census counts people: the 2000 census counted people who were here in the country on April 1, 2000, and did not distinguish among illegal aliens, persons on student visas, on business and travel visas, on work permits, green card holders, and citizens. It undoubtedly included a good number of respondents who did not come "to stay". Even among those newly arrived immigrants who came after obtaining an immigrant visa abroad, more than one quarter had prior experience of being in U.S. before entering with the immigrant visa (Jasso, et al., 2000). Although Jasso et al. (2000) was referring to the year of arrival question in the 1970,1980 and 1990 censuses, where the wording of the question was "For persons born in a foreign country…..When did he come to the United States to stay?", apparently the slight change of wording from "to stay" in the previous three censuses to "to live" in the 2000 census did not correct the problem of inconsistency previously found between the year of arrival and place of residence five years before the census data (Myers, 2004).

On the other hand, findings of the Census Bureau data quality evaluation (through reinterview surveys) suggested that the year of arrival data provides substantial assurance of relative data accuracy, except in the case of recent immigrants who had arrived within the last 5 years before the census (Myers, 2004). Although the extent to which this issue

might affect analyses results is hard to ascertain, it is not expected to significantly change the general pattern of findings as the current data include immigrants who have been in U.S. for a wide range of time. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy to raise it in discussion and bear the issue in mind before proceeding to analytical models and steps.

4.3. Methods

4.3.1. Description of Variables and Analytical Models

As the current study focused on the outcome of which spouse' parents were present in the immigrant household, that outcome was the main dependent variable in the analyses. In addition, whether older parents (regardless of whose parents) were present in the household was considered a secondary dependent variable. In other words, there were two dependent variables for my analyses: 1) whether any older parent(s) were present in the immigrant household, and 2) whose parent(s) were present in the immigrant household. To examine the likelihood of older parents' presence in home as one outcomes was: 1) logically the first step before examining whose parents were in home; and 2) statistically serving as a control for selection effect for the outcome of "whose parents were in home", as the analyses on the latter outcome included only those households who did have older parents present (Tabachnik and Fidell, 2001). These two main outcomes and their respective analytical model are discussed in details below.

Presence of older parents in the family is defined as having at least one of the spouses' older parents living with a married and spouse present immigrant couple. The following two types of immigrant households were not included in the study: 1) households with

cohabiting couples who were not reported being legally married; and 2) households where the spouses were not both present (living in the same household) at the time of the census.

As the discussions in Chapters 2 and 3 showed, both structural and cultural factors play a role in shaping the circumstances leading to whether and whose older parents were coresiding in the immigrant household. Factors that were expected to affect the two outcomes respectively are presented in the following, in two analytical models predicting the two dependent variables.

4.3.1.1. Predicting Whether Older Parent(s) in Home

In this study I tested the effects of both socioeconomic and cultural factors on the likelihood of having older parents in the immigrant household. Based on the review of previous research, the following analytical model was developed to predict the first outcome, i.e. whether any older parents were present in the immigrant household.

TABLE 4.2: Independent Variables Predicting Presence of Older Parents in Home and Their Coding Scheme

Family characteristics	
Family income	Total yearly family income (in thousands)
Age	Age in years
Age squared term	Age in squared term
Husband immigrated to U.S. before 13 years old	Coded 1 if husband immigrated to U.S. before 13 years old, 0 otherwise
Wife immigrated to U.S. before 13 years old	Coded 1 if wife immigrated to U.S. before 13 years old, 0 otherwise
Education	Years of education
Educated abroad	Coded 1 if received all education abroad (before immigrating to U.S.), 0 otherwise
Married abroad	Coded 1 if immigrated to U.S. after age 21 for men, or after age 17 for women, 0 otherwise
Occupational status	SEI (Duncan Socioeconomic Index) score ranging from 4 to 96, with higher score indicating higher occupational status
Husband's usual hours worked per week	Number of hours
Wife's usual hours worked per week	Number of hours
Husband's self-employment indicator	Coded 1 if self-employed or employee of own corporation, 0 otherwise
Wife's self-employment indicator	Coded 1 if self-employed or employee of own corporation, 0 otherwise
Home ownership	Coded 1 if owns a home, 0 otherwise
Living in a metropolitan area	Coded 1 if living in one of the metropolitan areas, 0 otherwise
Presence of young children in home	Coded 1 if children under 5 present in home, 0 otherwise
Exposure to the American society	
Years since immigration to U.S.	Number of years
Years since immigration, squared term	Number of years squared
Citizenship status	Coded 1 if naturalized citizen, 0 otherwise
English proficiency	Coded in 5 intervals: 1 if cannot speak English, 2 if can speak English but not well, 3 if speaks English well, 4 if speaks English very well, and 5 if speaks only English
Sending country	
Country of origin	A series of 10 dichotomous variables indicating the sending country, with Mexico as the omitted reference group

Three groups of independent variables were included in the model predicting presence of older parents in home. The first group consisted of those that measured the

socioeconomic characteristics of the household, including family income, educational level, occupational status, usual hours worked per week, self-employment indicator, home ownership, living in a metropolitan area, and having young children in home. To control for possible age effect on the outcome (i.e. immigrant couples in the study who were either very young or very old might be less likely to have older parents living with them), immigrant husband or wife's age was included in the model. A squared term of age was also included to test for non-linear effect.

Gender role socialization happens earlier in life primarily before and during adolescent years (Jacklin, 1989, Berry & Sam, 1997, cf Talbani & Hasanili, 2000). In addition, given existing findings on the effect of being so-called second and 1.5-generation for immigrant children mainly on socioeconomic outcomes such as earnings and self-employment and on acculturation outcomes such as ethnic and gendered identity (e.g. Allensworth, 1997, Ip & Hsu, 2006, Kim, Brenner, Liang & Asay, 2003), the following variables were also added: 1) an indicator for arriving in U.S. before age 13 (often defined as being 1.5-generation immigrants), 2) an indicator for probably receiving all education abroad before coming to U.S. (by comparing the rough ages when the respondent finished his or her education and when they immigrated to U.S.); and 3) a weak proxy for possibly getting married abroad before coming to U.S. (defined as arriving in U.S. after age 21 for men, and after age 17 for women). The variable of being married abroad had two sets of values for each couple, one derived from the husband's age of arrival, and the other from the wife's age of arrival, as information on the exact time and place of marriage was not available in these data. If any, the effect of being 1.5 generation immigrants was expected to be associated with less traditional attitude and

behavior, while receiving one's education abroad and getting married abroad associated with more traditional attitude and behavior in terms of multi-generational coresidence.

Given the high correlations between husband and wife's data on a lot of these measures (e.g. age (correlation = 0.93), education (correlation = 0.72), occupational status (correlation = 0.39), years since immigration (correlation = 0.77), citizenship (correlation = 0.58), English proficiency (correlation = 0.70), educated abroad (correlation = 0.39), and married abroad (correlation = 0.41)), only the husband's or the wife's data were included in the model at a time, running the same regression model twice. Results for both regressions were compared.

Although one of the main reasons for extended family living arrangements was shortage of economic resources, in this case family income, education, and occupational status were all expected to increase the likelihood of older parents' presence. My hypothesis is that for most of these immigrant households, having older parents coresiding meant having to support extra people in the family; since higher income, higher education and high status jobs are associated with increased ability to support more individuals in the family, these three factors were all expected to have a positive effect on the outcome. Immigrating to U.S. before age 13, as described above, was hypothesized to decrease the likelihood of having older parents living together, while receiving one's education abroad and getting married abroad were both expected to increase the likelihood of older parents' presence in home. Both spouses' hours worked per week and self-employment status were included, as long working hours and being self-employed were expected to increase the likelihood of needing help with household labor (e.g. Korean immigrants

who were small store owners had to spend long hours tending the store). The last three variables in this group were included to control for the family's residential environment (living in metropolitan area), life-course stage (presence of young children in home), and housing (home ownership) background (Van Hook and Glick, 2007, Glick and Van Hook, 2002). All three variables were hypothesized to increase the likelihood of having older parents at home.

The second group of independent variables included measures of the household's exposure to the American society. Again, because of the issue of high correlations between husband and wife's data (correlations were 0.77 on years since immigration, 0.58 on citizenship status, and 0.70 on English proficiency), only husband's values were used in the analyses to represent the family value on those measures. Since too recent immigrants were probably not established enough to be able to sponsor older parent's immigration, longer time here is expected to be associated with a higher likelihood of having older parents. However, it has also been suggested that long time in U.S. may be associated with preference of nuclear family households because of the acceptance of the American norm on living arrangements. Therefore a squared term of years since immigration was added to test for a possible curvilinear effect. Being a naturalized citizen implied being more "settled" in this country, and was expected to increase the likelihood of having parents in home. On the other hand, higher English proficiency implied more acculturation to the American society (and hence probably preferring nuclear family living arrangements instead), and was expected to decrease the likelihood of having older parents coresiding.

Lastly, a group of ten dichotomous variables for sending country was included to examine differences across immigrant groups in terms of the propensity of having three-generational households.

4.3.1.2. Predicting Whose Older Parent(s) in Home

As reviewed in Chapter 3, existing research findings suggested that on the one hand, the wife's increased economic role and immigrants' exposure to more egalitarian gender culture in the receiving society challenge old gender inequality at home. On the other hand, gender norms and expectations brought from the sending country are persistent and deep-rooted. Furthermore, the relative resources possessed by each spouse (i.e. personal characteristics most notably income, education, and occupational status) constitute each spouse' relative bargaining power in family decision making. Based on both theoretical and empirical knowledge and the availability of information from the current data, four groups of independent variables were included in the general analytical model (Table 4.3A).

TABLE 4.3A: Independent Variables Predicting Whose Older Parents In Home and Their Coding Scheme: Separate-spouse Approach

Personal characteristics	
Education	Years of Education
Income	Total yearly income (in thousands)
Occupational status	SEI (Duncan Socioeconomic Index) score ranging from 4 to 96, with higher score indicating higher occupational status
Self-employment indicator	Coded 1 if self-employed or employee of own corporation, 0 otherwise
Exposure to the American society	
Years since immigration to U.S.	Number of years
Citizenship status	Coded 1 if naturalized citizen, 0 otherwise
English proficiency	Coded in 5 intervals: 1 if cannot speak English, 2 if can speak English but not well, 3 if speaks English well, 4 if speaks English very well, and 5 if speaks only English
Educated abroad	Coded 1 if received all education abroad (before immigrating to U.S.), 0 otherwise
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 years old	Coded 1 if immigrated to U.S. before 13 years old, 0 otherwise
Control variables	
Parents' income	Total yearly income (in thousands)
Disability status of older parents	Coded 1 if at least one older parent in home reported as having a long-lasting condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities, such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting, or carrying, 0 otherwise
Married abroad	Coded 1 if husband immigrated to U.S. after age 21, 0 otherwise
Age difference between couple	Husband's age minus wife's age
Sending country	
Country of origin	A series of 10 dichotomous variables indicating the sending country, with Mexico as the omitted reference group

For the first two groups of independent variables (personal characteristics and indicators of exposure to the American society), both the husband's and the wife's data will be entered simultaneously in the analyses, to account for the relative personal resources of each spouse which can be considered as bargaining power in family decision making. In other words, there will be two sets of these variables in the final analytical model, one for each of the spouses. This specification allows the analyses to detect possible "counter-

balancing" effect of the spouses' relative personal resources, i.e. the stronger the effect of one spouse's personal resources, the more it is expected to suppress the effect of the other spouse's power (Friedberg and Webb, 2006). As discussed in the previous two chapters, education, income, and occupational status are considered as indicators of personal resources which represent bargaining power in family decision making (Manser and Brown, 1980; Friedberg and Webb, 2006; Blumstein and Schwartz, 1983); the self-employment status has been found to associate with less exposure to the more gender egalitarian culture in the receiving society (Min, 2001; Lim, 1997); and length of residence in U.S., citizenship status, and English language ability have been found to associate with adaptation/assimilation (Zhou, 1997; Woodrow-Lafield, Xu, Kersen, & Poch, 2004) and therefore may be used as proxy of exposure to the host culture. Similarly, as in the discussion above for the first outcome, immigrating to U.S. before the teenage years was hypothesized to be associated with greater exposure to a more equal gender culture and therefore a greater likelihood of a less traditional outcome here, while being totally educated abroad and getting married abroad before immigrating to U.S. may be associated with more traditional attitudes and behavior, i.e. greater likelihood of having husband's parents in home.

Parents' income and disability status were included in the model to control for older parents' economic and health conditions, as economic and health reasons were expected to be two main factors affecting older immigrants' living arrangements. In addition, age difference between the husband and wife was included in the model to control for the scenario where one spouse (usually the husband) was much older in age than the other

and therefore less likely to have parents who needed care (as they were more likely to have died).

The group of dummy variables for country of birth is rough proxies for the cultural legacy of the sending country. In general, for sending cultures with higher degrees of patriarchal beliefs and expectations, the culture variable is expected to increase the likelihood of the husband's parents being present; on the other hand, for cultures with lower degrees of patriarchal authority and behavior, the culture variable is expected to have weaker effect on the likelihood of the husband's parents living in home while possibly increase the likelihood of having the wife's parents in the house, controlling for other factors.

4.3.2. Analytical Steps

First, descriptive statistics will be obtained to give a general understanding of the data on the following variables: 1) the dependent variables, i.e. whether older parents were present in the household, and which spouse's parents were present; 2) each of the independent variables listed in Tables 4.2 and 4.3A. Cross tabulations of the "personal resources" and "exposure to the American society" variables by both gender and country compared between husbands and wives on these variables by immigrant group.

Next, bivariate analyses were conducted cross tabulating, by sending country, the two dependent variables with the independent variables: 1) the percent of couples who had parents in home, and 2) the percent of couples with the husband's or the wife's parents. Statistics obtained from this step would further illustrate the variation across immigrant groups on the outcome variables, as well as giving indications to the relationships

between whose parents are present and the independent variables that might affect this outcome.

Finally, based on the results of the bivariate analyses, logistic regression was used to test for the association between the first outcome (whether older parents were in home) and the independent variables. Regression analysis, in general, models relationships between dependent and independent variables, and determine the magnitude of these relationships. Logistic regression is the appropriate choice of method in this case, as the dependent variable was dichotomous (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). On the second outcome (whose older parents were in home), the Heckman maximum-likelihood probit model was first used to test for possible bias of sample selection, since the second outcome depended on the first outcome. This part of the analyses only included those households who had one spouse's parents in home (i.e. households that did not have any older parents and the 227 households in the data that had both spouses' parents present were all excluded from the analyses predicting whose older parents were coresiding). Results of the Heckman analyses showed that selection bias was not found using the model in Table 4.3A[5], and therefore logistic regression was used to predict the second outcome as well.

In modeling whose parents were in home using logistic regressions, I approached the analyses in two ways: 1) the "separate" approach, where the characteristics of the married couple were used as predictors independently. In other words, a set of the husband's characteristics such as age, citizenship, years here in US, income, education, English

---

[5] Results available upon request.

proficiency, and a same set of the wife's characteristics were entered into the regression model simultaneously; and 2) the "joint" approach, where a series of dichotomous variables were created to indicate some joint characteristics of the couple, such as both the husband and the wife being naturalized citizens, both being self-employed, both speaking English very well, as well as differences in income, education, and occupational status between the two spouses (Table 4.3B). Both the separate and the joint models included the same controlling factors of parents' income and physical difficulty. This two-approach design was expected to better evaluate whether it is the two spouses' personal characteristics that act independently in counter balance, or it is the *relative* power or the *difference* between the spouses' resources that matters more and affects the outcomes in a more direct manner. Results of the two different approaches were then compared to evaluate and discuss which model better described the data.

TABLE 4.3B: Independent Variables Predicting Whose Older Parents in Home and Their Coding Scheme: Joint-spouse Approach
(Table continues on the next page)

Personal characteristics	
Difference in education	Husband's years of education minus wife's years of education
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total yearly income	Wife's yearly income over the sum of both spouses' yearly income
Difference in occupational status	Husband's SEI score minus wife's SEI score
Both spouses self-employed	Coded 1 if both spouses were self-employed or employee of own corporation, 0 otherwise
Exposure to the American society	
Husband arrived at least 5 years earlier	Coded 1 if husband arrived in U.S. at least 5 years earlier than wife, 0 otherwise
Wife arrived at least 5 years earlier	Coded 1 if wife arrived in U.S. at least 5 years earlier than husband, 0 otherwise
Husband and wife arrived within 5 years of each other	Coded 1 if husband and wife arrived in U.S. within 5 years of each other, 0 otherwise
Husband and wife both citizens	Coded 1 if both husband and wife were naturalized citizens, 0 otherwise

(Table continued from the previous page)

Husband citizen and wife non-citizen	Coded 1 if husband was naturalized citizen and wife was non-citizen, 0 otherwise
Husband non-citizen and wife citizen	Coded 1 if husband was non-citizen and wife was naturalized citizen, 0 otherwise
Husband wife both non-citizens	Coded 1 if both husband and wife were non-citizens, 0 otherwise
Husband and wife both well proficient in English	Coded 1 if both husband and wife reported speaking English well, very well, or speaking only English, 0 otherwise
Husband and wife both immigrated before 13	Coded 1 if both husband and wife immigrated to U.S. before 13 years old, 0 otherwise
Husband immigrated before 13 wife not	Coded 1 if husband immigrated to U.S. before 13 years old and wife not (i.e. wife immigrated after 13), 0 otherwise
Wife immigrated before 13 husband not	Coded 1 if wife immigrated to U.S. before 13 years old and husband not (i.e. husband immigrated after 13), 0 otherwise
Husband and wife both immigrated after 13	Coded 1 if husband and wife both immigrated to U.S. after 13 years old, 0 otherwise
Husband and wife both educated abroad	Coded 1 if both husband and wife only educated abroad before immigrating to U.S., 0 otherwise
Husband educated abroad wife not	Coded 1 if husband only educated abroad before immigrating to U.S. and wife not (i.e. wife received more education in U.S.), 0 otherwise
Wife educated abroad husband not	Coded 1 if wife only educated abroad before immigrating to U.S. and husband not (i.e. husband received more education in U.S.), 0 otherwise
Husband & wife both partly educated in U.S.	Coded 1 if husband and wife both received more education after immigrating to U.S., 0 otherwise
Control variables	
Parents' income	Total yearly income (in thousands)
Disability status of older parents	Coded 1 if at least one older parent in home reported as having a long-lasting condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities, such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting, or carrying, 0 otherwise
Married abroad	Coded 1 if husband immigrated to U.S. after age 21, 0 otherwise
Age difference between couple	Husband's age minus wife's age
Sending country	
Country of origin	A series of 10 dichotomous variables indicating the sending country, with Mexico as the omitted reference group

Given the noticeable variation among different immigrant groups, the effects of the sending culture were controlled for in two ways. First I tested a model where a set of dichotomous variables was used which represents the ten sending countries. Then I tested the model again, with the same independent variables but running the regression analysis *separately for each country*. This strategy allowed for interactions with birthplace; that is to say, if there were differences in the effect of one or more independent variables on which spouse's parents were in home, they could be identified through this method. Results from the two approaches were compared and discussed on how sending cultures shaped the decision of which spouse's parents lived with the immigrant couple, and to what extent that decision may have been affected by the couples' individual bargaining power.

4.4. Conclusion

Based on the frameworks of both bargaining and patriarchy theories, available information from the 2000 U.S. census data will be used to examine the coresidence pattern among ten biggest immigrant groups which are culturally diversified in terms of gender relations. Specifically, my analyses will focus on the presence of older parents in the immigrant household. Using logistic regression models, I try to determine the association between which spouse's parents are present in home and a number of predicting factors including each spouse's personal resources, the effect of the sending culture, and family circumstances. Results of these analyses will shed light on the relative decision making power in the immigrant family, as well as the ways it is related with selected structural (socioeconomic) and culture factors. By examining *both* spouses'

relative decision making power instead of focusing only on immigrant women, the current analyses will also help tease out some of the complex interaction between gender, class and race (in this case, sending culture). In addition, as the study compares ten immigrant groups which cover various degrees of patriarchal gender relations in the sending culture, from a group perspective the findings will contribute to the understanding of the effect of sending culture on the post-migration changes in the contemporary immigrant family.

In the next two chapters I go on to presenting results of the analyses outlined above, followed by discussion of the results.

CHAPTER 5

WHETHER PARENTS IN HOME: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction

In the previous chapter I discussed the data and outlined the analytical plan of this study. The main goal of the analyses was to examine which spouse's parents were present in multi-generational immigrant households. At the same time, factors that predicted presence of any older parents' presence (regardless of whose parents it was) in the household were also examined. In this chapter I present and discuss results on the first outcome, i.e. whether any parents were in home. In the next chapter results on the second outcome, i.e. whose parents were in home will be presented.

Factors expected to affect the first outcome (whether parents in home) were listed in Table 4.2. As discussed in Chapter 4, these factors were obtained based on both theoretical reasons and existing empirical findings. A process of three analytical steps was carried out according to the analytical plan outlined in Chapter 4 to examine the association between these predicting factors and the outcome. The general hypotheses of the current analyses were as follows: 1) immigrant families that had more resources such as higher family income and home ownership were more likely to have older parents present in home; 2) immigrants families that were better "settled" in this country such as

having been in U.S. longer, having naturalized citizenship, and having better English proficiency were more likely to have older parents in home; and 3) immigrant families that were going through certain stages in life and may be more likely to have "practical needs" for older parents to help out in home such as those who worked for long hours and those with young children were more likely to have older parents. In the following I first describe the analyses performed and then discuss the results in detail.

5.2. Descriptive Statistics

5.2.1. Dependent Variable

Out of the 102,942 households in the data, about 8.5% (8,696 households) had at least one parent (either of the husband's parents or the wife's parents) living in home (Table 5.1). Although this number is not high, three considerations should be taken into account. 1) This percentage only reflects those households where a *married* immigrant couple was living with at least one of the spouses' older parents; in other words, households with cohabiting couples who did not report as being legally married were not included. 2) As explained before, all households in the analyses have both spouses present at the time of the census, and therefore the above percentage did not include any single-parent (either not married or married but spouse absent) immigrant households which, in the practical sense, may be more likely to need help from other family kin including older parents, on tasks such as help with household chores and taking care of young children. 3) Existing research findings suggest that while a higher prevalence rate of extended family coresidence was found among immigrants than among the native-born non-Hispanic white population, recent immigrants were most likely to be found in "horizontal" and

non-kin coresidence, i.e. residing with "horizontal" kin from the same generation (primarily siblings and cousins) and non-kin, rather than with older family members such as parents (Van Hook and Glick, 2007). As the current analyses include immigrants who have been in the U.S. for a wide span in length of time (ranging from less than one year to ninety years in this country), we can expect the effect to be mitigated; nevertheless it is still helpful to keep these considerations in mind.

TABLE 5.1: Percentage of Immigrant Households with Older Parents Present

	Presence of Parents in Home		Whose Parents Present in Home		
	No (%)	**Yes (%)**	**Husband's (%)**	**Wife's (%)**	**Both spouses' (%)**
All countries	94,246 (91.55)	8,696 (8.45)	4,465 (51.35)	4,004 (46.04)	227 (2.61)
Mexico	28,362 (94.70)	1,588 (5.30)	759 (47.80)	797 (50.19)	32 (2.02)
Philippines	9,337 (86.26)	1,487 (13.74)	595 (40.01)	849 (57.09)	43 (2.89)
China	13,644 (89.39)	1,620 (10.61)	870 (53.70)	696 (42.96)	54 (3.33)
Vietnam	6,789 (90.52)	711 (9.48)	375 (52.74)	317 (44.59)	19 (2.67)
India	11,315 (90.16)	1,235 (9.84)	910 (73.68)	290 (23.48)	35 (2.83)
Cuba	6,259 (90.96)	622 (9.04)	230 (36.98)	377 (60.61)	15 (2.41)
Jamaica	2,628 (94.29)	159 (5.71)	49 (30.82)	107 (67.30)	3 (1.89)
Korea	7,285 (92.91)	556 (7.09)	356 (64.03)	189 (33.99)	11 (1.98)
Poland	3,671 (93.72)	246 (6.28)	112 (45.53)	130 (52.85)	4 (1.63)
El Salvador	4,956 (91.30)	472 (8.70)	209 (44.28)	252 (53.39)	11 (2.33)

TABLE 5.2: Summary Statistics for Main Independent Variables by Gender and Country (Table continues on the next page)

	All Countries n=102,942		Mexico n=29,950		Philippines n=10,824		China n=15,264		Vietnam n=7,500		India n=12,550	
	H	W	H	W	H	W	H	W	H	W	H	W
Mean age	45.46 (13.52)	42.39 (13.05)	40.34 (12.46)	37.57 (11.95)	49.59 (12.78)	47.25 (11.97)	48.34 (13.32)	45.07 (12.48)	46.10 (11.45)	42.35 (11.36)	42.80 (11.14)	38.63 (10.97)
Education (years)	11.93 (5.11)	11.48 (4.89)	8.04 (4.57)	8.05 (4.44)	14.27 (3.04)	14.47 (3.14)	14.16 (4.97)	13.09 (4.72)	12.08 (4.28)	10.70 (4.60)	16.04 (2.86)	15.02 (3.21)
Educated abroad (%)	82.73	82.61	83.14	83.17	82.42	83.64	82.17	84.74	78.96	80.17	81.08	79.52
Yearly income[a]	39.37 (50.18)	16.86 (28.87)	23.89 (27.75)	6.99 (15.20)	39.69 (41.52)	31.10 (32.37)	49.14 (58.37)	22.36 (33.21)	35.06 (40.76)	16.94 (23.19)	70.81 (73.81)	22.71 (40.76)
Occupational status (SEI)	36.19 (27.77)	26.93 (27.20)	21.96 (18.45)	14.35 (19.32)	38.82 (26.77)	38.41 (24.70)	47.71 (30.47)	36.62 (30.25)	33.78 (26.63)	25.10 (24.48)	59.66 (24.24)	37.39 (31.32)
Self-employed (%)	13.71	9.37	9.24	6.66	6.71	4.15	14.82	9.50	13.69	12.65	14.17	8.22
Years since immigration	17.64 (11.25)	15.71 (10.95)	17.82 (11.27)	14.80 (11.04)	19.83 (11.44)	18.08 (10.20)	16.95 (11.68)	15.17 (10.57)	15.39 (7.40)	13.46 (7.57)	14.02 (9.69)	12.05 (9.38)
Came to US before 13 (%)	5.72	6.59	8.40	9.44	4.68	4.00	3.47	3.23	5.28	7.23	2.14	3.23
Married abroad (%)	68.57	83.48	45.01	72.76	75.87	91.00	83.65	91.93	69.73	82.39	85.86	92.86
Citizens (%)	49.82	45.57	30.93	24.59	73.51	69.70	58.10	56.43	70.95	58.63	46.21	40.69
English well or above (%)	67.64	59.69	49.44	36.36	94.34	94.62	68.21	62.25	61.85	49.85	96.18	89.93
Family's total yearly income[a]	64.67 (66.43)		38.98 (38.48)		83.45 (60.26)		79.14 (76.71)		64.32 (52.55)		99.72 (92.91)	
Home owners (%)	59.34		49.97		73.36		67.96		62.25		56.62	
Living in a metro area (%)	93.75		87.46		94.06		97.10		96.97		95.29	
Young children in home (%)	26.97		40.83		18.28		19.51		26.08		28.33	
Parents' total income[a]	3.17 (13.37)		2.16 (11.14)		3.52 (11.61)		3.33 (11.91)		3.55 (9.24)		4.87 (23.63)	
Parents with physical difficulty (%)	2.38		1.15		4.93		2.11		3.57		3.14	

(Table continued from the previous page)

	Cuba n=6,881		Jamaica n=2,787		Korea n=7,841		Poland n=3,917		El Salvador n=5,428	
	H	W	H	W	H	W	H	W	H	W
Mean age	56.41 (15.31)	53.23 (15.10)	49.77 (12.81)	46.82 (12.56	47.43 (12.22)	44.39 (11.56)	50.67 (15.89)	47.73 (15.02)	39.96 (10.17)	37.71 (9.95)
Education (years)	11.48 (4.41)	11.35 (4.18)	12.08 (3.17)	12.67 (2.97)	14.82 (3.08)	13.77 (3.09)	12.62 (3.61)	12.59 (3.35)	8.46 (4.69)	8.30 (4.62)
Educated abroad (%)	80.83	76.17	84.64	79.15	83.62	85.61	88.58	85.56	87.73	85.54
Yearly income[a]	33.29 (46.57)	14.99 (25.09)	35.86 (37.81)	25.48 (29.25)	46.59 (61.83)	17.22 (31.32)	43.48 (44.68)	17.55 (27.33)	26.62 (30.86)	10.72 (19.32)
Occupational status (SEI)	30.08 (26.87)	26.37 (27.15)	31.71 (24.25)	32.58 (24.56)	47.83 (27.81)	30.80 (28.40)	30.08 (25.49)	24.85 (26.41)	23.78 (18.68)	18.34 (20.19)
Self-employed (%)	20.32	8.39	10.45	5.11	35.56	25.89	15.94	11.93	10.40	10.60
Years since immigration	24.68 (13.48)	24.77 (13.30)	19.19 (10.14)	18.83 (10.06)	16.30 (9.51)	15.01 (9.23)	20.62 (15.63)	19.35 (15.38)	15.88 (6.90)	14.47 (7.30)
Came to US before 13 (%)	11.21	15.20	4.70	5.96	5.31	4.46	3.91	5.21	3.80	5.84
Married abroad (%)	76.60	77.20	78.58	83.28	83.10	90.09	82.06	88.12	54.03	78.94
Citizens (%)	65.51	67.53	60.46	66.70	50.64	47.05	55.27	52.90	32.09	29.73
English Well or above (%)	52.52	50.69	99.75	99.68	64.29	51.36	75.11	76.08	57.30	46.26
Family's total yearly income[a]	56.75 (60.74)		68.55 (54.79)		69.62 (76.30)		67.36 (57.62)		46.73 (46.08)	
Home owners (%)	70.47		73.27		50.76		72.63		42.58	
Living in a metro area (%)	98.29		97.70		96.86		95.15		97.16	
Young children in home (%)	9.46		18.41		18.58		14.19		34.75	
Parents' total income[a]	2.92 (8.13)		0.96 (4.96)		2.10 (10.40)		4.27 (13.45)		1.68 (6.69)	
Parents with physical difficulty (%)	3.60		1.72		1.94		1.40		1.60	

Note:
[a]: **income in thousands.**

5.2.2. Independent Variables

Table 5.2 presents summary statistics for the main independent variables in Tables 4.2 and 4.3A (given the overlapping of independent variables for the two outcomes of this study), tabulated by gender and country. Overall these results revealed significant variations across immigrant groups on most of the variables, while differences between husbands and wives within each group also existed but to a much lesser extent.

In terms of education level, the ten immigrant groups roughly fell into three tiers: the upper tier consisted of Philippines, China, India, and Korea, with the highest average number (from 13 to 16) of years of education; the middle tier included Vietnam, Cuba, Jamaica, and Poland, whose education ranged from 10 to 12 years; Mexico and El Salvador fell into the lower tier, both averaging less than 9 years of education. Most of the immigrants in this study received all of their education abroad before immigrating to U.S., ranging from about 80% to 85%. Corresponding to the education level, yearly total income and occupational status also roughly fell into the same three tiers. That is to say, immigrants from Philippines, China, India, and Korea had the highest status jobs, and earned the highest level of yearly income, followed by immigrants from Vietnam, Cuba, Jamaica and Poland on both these measures. Compared to the above eight groups, immigrants from Mexico and El Salvador ranked the lowest in occupational status and yearly earning. On the other hand, patterns of within-group differences between the genders were not as straight forward. Difference in yearly income and occupational status between husbands and wives were bigger among those from China, India, and Korea, which was a little surprising given the almost comparable levels of education

between men and women for those groups. In other words, these numbers suggested that immigrant women from China, India, and Korea got lower returns for their education, compared to their male counterparts.

Self employment was the most common among Korean immigrants (both men and women) in these data, followed by immigrant men from Cuba and Poland. Compared to the Koreans, the other immigrant groups not only had a much lower rate of being self employed, but also had a bigger gender difference within group.

On average, immigrants from Cuban in this data set have been in U.S. the longest time (almost 25 years), followed by those from Poland, Philippines, and Jamaica, while the other groups were more recent immigrants many of whom have been here for around 15 years. Not surprisingly, the percent of citizens was also the highest among immigrants from Cuba, Philippines, and Jamaica. However, immigrants from Poland were an exception in this case, who had a lower rate of citizens than the Vietnamese and Chinese, although the latter two groups have been in this country for a shorter time. The percentage of immigrants who came to U.S. before 13 years of age (1.5-generation immigrants) was generally low (at around 5%) in every group, with the exceptions of Cuba and Mexico. In the case of Cuba, it is likely that when whole families came to U.S. following the revolution, a considerable number of children came in this group. In the case of Mexico, it is possible that close distance between the two countries make it easier for immigrant families to have the wife and children stay behind in Mexico for a few years before children also come to U.S. (before teenage years). The variable “married abroad”, as explained in Chapter 4, was actually a weak proxy at trying to indicate if the

respondent might have been married abroad before they came to U.S. It was obtained by using the respondent's age of arrival to this country, i.e. if a man came after 21 years old, he was defined as being married abroad; and if a woman came after 17 years of age, she was defined as being married abroad. The results for this variable in Table 5.2 showed that 1) the majority of these immigrants did come to US after 21 (for men) or 17 (for women) years old; and 2) there were considerable differences between the numbers for men and women. While the men's number mostly ranged from 70% to 85%, the women's numbers were significantly higher, reaching 90% among half of the groups. Comparing the numbers of men and women more closely, I tended to believe that the men's numbers were possibly more accurate and closer to the real percentages.

Language-wise, immigrants from Philippines, Jamaica, and India had the largest number of people who could speak English well, very well, or spoke only English. This is not surprising, given the fact that English was either one of the official languages or very commonly spoken in those countries. On the three "exposure to the American society" measures (i.e. years since immigration, percent of citizens, and percent who spoke English well or above), there didn't seem to have much gender difference within each group. The only exception was citizen rate between Vietnamese men and women, where the husbands had a much higher likelihood of naturalization than the wives. However this is just a preliminary observation, which remained to be further tested in following analyses.

The average family yearly income for all immigrants in this study was around 65,000 dollars, with significant variation across groups which can also be roughly grouped into

three tiers. Immigrant families from India, Philippines, and China had the highest yearly family income, which formed the first tier. They are followed by immigrant families from Korea, Jamaica, Poland, Vietnam, and Cuba, which can be viewed as the second tier in terms of family income. Families from El Salvador and Mexico had the lowest yearly income among the ten groups, and constituted the third tier of countries on this measure.

The control variables for family circumstances didn't yield any unexpected results. Home ownership rate was the lowest among immigrants from Mexico and El Salvador, consistent with the finding above on the relatively low income among these two groups. Mexico and El Salvador were also the two groups that were the most likely to have young (5 years or younger) children at home, while the Cubans were the least likely. This was consistent with the results for age: immigrants from Mexico and El Salvador had the youngest mean age, while those from Cuba were the oldest among the ten groups. The majority of immigrants in these data lived in a metro area, reflecting the high concentration of immigrants in major metropolitan areas such as Los Angeles, Orange County and San Jose in California, New York, Miami, Chicago, Houston, Dallas, and Washington DC. Older parents' incomes were generally low among these immigrant households, with an average annual income of around 3,000 dollars. Older immigrant parents from India and Poland had the highest income among all groups, with close to 5,000 and about 4,270 dollars respectively. Immigrant parents from Jamaica and El Salvador were on the other end of income scale, with only 960 and 1,700 dollars annual income respectively. Finally, immigrant parents from the Philippines reported the highest rate of having physical difficulty (close to 5%), followed by Cuban and Vietnamese parents. Nevertheless these rates were not high overall.

TABLE 5.3: Results of Bivariate Analyses between Presence of Parents and Main Independent Variables by Gender and Country
(Table continues on the next page)

All Countries

	Presence of Parents in Home					
	Yes (8%)		No (92%)			
	Husband	Wife	Husband	Wife	Test of Difference Between Husbands	Test of Difference Between Wives
Number of obs.	8696	8696	94246	94246		
Mean age	41.97 (9.92)	39.26 (9.63)	45.78 (13.76)	42.68 (13.28)	t = 33.01 p = 0.0000	t = 30.48 p = 0.0000
Education (years)	12.80 (4.42)	12.56 (4.23)	11.85 (5.16)	11.38 (4.93)	t = -19.00 p = 0.0000	t = -24.52 p = 0.0000
Educated abroad (%)	77.02	77.08	83.26	83.12	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 216.86 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 202.35 p = .000
Yearly income[a]	44.81 (54.13)	22.94 (31.18)	38.87 (49.77)	16.30 (28.58)	t = -9.86 p = 0.0000	t = -19.13 p = 0.0000
Occupational status (SEI)	40.60 (26.42)	34.26 (26.78)	35.78 (27.86)	26.26 (27.14)	t = -16.20 p = 0.0000	t = -26.62 p = 0.0000
Self employed (%)	15.05	9.27	13.58	9.38	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 13.97 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.08 p = 0.776
Years since immigration	17.14 (8.74)	15.32 (8.78)	17.69 (11.45)	15.75 (11.13)	t = 5.50 p = 0.0000	t = 4.22 p = 0.0000
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	6.57	7.24	5.65	6.53	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 12.51 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 6.61 p = .010
Citizens (%)	61.96	58.59	48.69	44.36	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 560.33 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 649.54 p = 0.000
Speaks English well or above (%)	75.01	68.97	66.96	58.83	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 236.03 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 340.48 p = 0.000
Married abroad	63.28	80.91	69.06	83.72	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 123.46 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 45.64 p = .000
Family's total yearly income[a]	84.65 (73.46)		62.83 (65.44)		t = -26.74 p = 0.0000	
Home owners (%)	74.21		57.96		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 870.58 p = 0.000	
Living in metro area (%)	95.94		93.55		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 77.63 p = 0.000	
Young children in home (%)	34.13		26.31		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 247.45 p = 0.000	

Mexico

	Presence of Parents in Home					
	Yes (5%)		No (95%)			
	Husband	Wife	Husband	Wife	Test of Difference Between Husbands	Test of Difference Between Wives
Number of obs.	1588	1588	28362	28362		

(Table continued from the previous page)

Mean age	37.01 (9.99)	34.82 (9.67)	40.52 (12.56)	37.73 (12.05)	t = 13.40 p = 0.0000	t = 11.51 p = 0.0000
Education (years)	8.54 (4.46)	8.73 (4.22)	8.02 (4.57)	8.01 (4.45)	t = -4.57 p = 0.0000	t = -6.57 p = 0.0000
Educated abroad (%)	77.83	77.90	83.44	83.46	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 33.66 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 33.26 p = .000
Yearly income[a]	25.19 (23.65)	8.06 (12.84)	23.82 (27.96)	6.93 (15.32)	t = -2.23 p = 0.0257	t = -3.37 p = 0.0008
Occupational status (SEI)	24.04 (18.68)	17.34 (20.76)	21.84 (18.43)	14.19 (19.22)	t = -4.58 p = 0.0000	t = -5.92 p = 0.0000
Self employed (%)	9.94	6.67	9.20	6.65	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.96 p = 0.326	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.00 p = 0.982
Years since immigration	16.80 (9.53)	14.34 (9.64)	17.87 (11.35)	14.83 (11.11)	t = 4.30 p = 0.0000	t = 1.94 p = 0.0529
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	10.26	10.58	8.29	9.38	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 7.62 p = .006	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.54 p = .111
Citizens (%)	33.63	27.52	30.78	24.43	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 5.70 p = 0.017	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 7.73 p = 0.005
Speaks English well or above (%)	53.15	39.04	49.23	36.21	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 9.21 p = 0.002	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 5.21 p = 0.022
Married abroad	35.26	67.00	45.56	73.08	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 64.40 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 28.03 p = .000
Family's total yearly income[a]	52.03 (40.24)		38.25 (38.24)		t = -13.32 p = 0.0000	
Home owners (%)	56.93		49.58		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 32.50 p = 0.000	
Living in metro area (%)	91.50		87.24		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 24.91 p = 0.000	
Young children in home (%)	48.61		40.40		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 42.01 p = 0.000	

Philippines

	Presence of Parents in Home					
	Yes (14%)		No (86%)			
	Husband	Wife	Husband	Wife	Test of Difference Between Husbands	Test of Difference Between Wives
Number of obs.	1487	1487	9337	9337		
Mean age	44.01 (8.73)	42.18 (8.29)	50.48 (13.10)	48.05 (12.27)	t = 24.50 p = 0.0000	t = 23.50 p = 0.0000
Education (years)	14.49 (2.48)	15.00 (2.27)	14.24 (3.12)	14.39 (3.25)	t = -3.50 p = 0.0005	t = -8.94 p = 0.0000
Educated abroad (%)	78.41	81.17	83.05	84.03	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 19.07 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 7.67 p = .006
Yearly income[a]	40.79 (42.26)	34.86 (27.12)	39.51 (41.40)	30.50 (33.10)	t = -1.09 p = 0.2773	t = -5.57 p = 0.0000
Occupational status (SEI)	40.15 (24.34)	42.76 (22.05)	38.61 (27.13)	37.72 (25.03)	t = -2.23 p = 0.0261	t = -8.03 p = 0.0000
Self employed (%)	5.12	3.20	6.99	4.32	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 6.83 p = 0.009	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.82 p = 0.051

(Table continued from the previous page)

	Husband	Wife	Husband	Wife	Test of Difference Between Husbands	Test of Difference Between Wives
Years since immigration	17.77 (8.26)	16.30 (7.64)	20.15 (11.84)	18.37 (10.52)	t = 9.65 p = 0.0000	t = 9.13 p = 0.0000
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	5.51	3.43	4.55	4.09	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.66 p = .103	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.46 p = .227
Citizens (%)	78.41	78.68	72.73	68.27	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 21.26 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 65.89 p = 0.000
Speaks English well or above (%)	95.97	97.24	94.08	94.21	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 8.56 p = 0.003	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 23.25 p = 0.000
Married abroad	70.75	90.65	76.68	91.06	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 24.68 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.26 p = .612
Family's total yearly income[a]	94.37 (57.64)		81.71 (60.48)		t = -7.81 p = 0.0000	
Home owners (%)	82.04		71.97		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 66.59 p = 0.000	
Living in metro area (%)	94.82		93.94		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.79 p = 0.181	
Young children in home (%)	26.29		17.01		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 74.05 p = 0.000	

China

	Presence of Parents in Home					
	Yes (11%)		**No (89%)**			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	1620	1620	13644	13644		
Mean age	43.43 (9.14)	40.40 (8.63)	48.93 (13.61)	45.62 (12.75)	t = 21.53 p = 0.0000	t = 21.68 p = 0.0000
Education (years)	13.77 (4.62)	13.18 (4.32)	14.21 (5.01)	13.08 (4.77)	t = 3.61 p = 0.0003	t = -0.91 p = 0.3646
Educated abroad (%)	78.58	80.99	82.59	85.19	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 15.90 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 19.76 p = .000
Yearly income[a]	52.60 (61.66)	27.68 (37.07)	48.73 (57.96)	21.73 (32.66)	t = -2.40 p = 0.0163	t = -6.18 p = 0.0000
Occupational status (SEI)	48.34 (27.60)	41.31 (27.61)	47.64 (30.80)	36.06 (30.50)	t = -0.96 p = 0.3361	t = -7.15 p = 0.0000
Self employed (%)	17.36	9.42	14.49	9.51	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 9.05 p = 0.003	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.01 p = 0.912
Years since immigration	16.70 (8.49)	14.62 (7.85)	16.98 (12.01)	15.23 (10.85)	t = 1.21 p = 0.2250	t = 2.82 p = 0.0049
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	4.38	3.77	3.36	3.17	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 4.55 p = .033	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.66 p = .197
Citizens (%)	68.46	70.25	56.87	54.79	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 79.79 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 140.78 p = 0.000
Speaks English well or above (%)	68.58	66.54	68.16	61.74	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.12 p = 0.732	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 14.21 p = 0.000
Married abroad	75.93	89.07	84.57	92.27	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 79.14 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 19.90 p = .000

(Table continued from the previous page)

Family's total yearly income[a]	93.69 (83.11)	77.41 (75.73)	t = -7.52 p = 0.0000
Home owners (%)	81.36	66.37	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 149.33 p = 0.000
Living in metro area (%)	97.59	97.04	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.57 p = 0.210
Young children in home (%)	32.35	17.99	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 190.14 p = 0.000

Vietnam

	Presence of Parents in Home					
	Yes (9%)		**No (91%)**			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	711	711	6789	6789		
Mean age	40.41 (9.20)	36.92 (9.11)	46.70 (11.50)	42.92 (11.43)	t = 16.92 p = 0.0000	t = 16.29 p = 0.0000
Education (years)	12.72 (3.84)	11.65 (4.01)	12.02 (4.32)	10.60 (4.65)	t = -4.61 p = 0.0000	t = -6.56 p = 0.0000
Educated abroad (%)	68.07	73.00	80.10	80.93	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 56.04 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 25.46 p = .000
Yearly income[a]	41.42 (41.86)	19.74 (22.47)	34.39 (40.59)	16.65 (23.25)	t = -4.27 p = 0.0000	t = -3.48 p = 0.0005
Occupational status (SEI)	39.95 (25.43)	29.47 (24.99)	33.13 (26.67)	24.64 (24.38)	t = -6.76 p = 0.0000	t = -4.91 p = 0.0000
Self employed (%)	12.81	12.79	13.79	12.64	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.50 p = 0.479	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.01 p = 0.917
Years since immigration	16.19 (6.40)	13.29 (7.00)	15.30 (7.49)	13.48 (7.63)	t = -3.45 p = 0.0006	t = 0.67 p = 0.5014
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	6.47	8.58	5.16	7.08	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.22 p = .136	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.14 p = .143
Citizens (%)	79.75	62.59	70.03	58.21	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 29.51 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 5.08 p = 0.024
Speaks English well or above (%)	74.82	62.87	60.49	48.49	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 56.01 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 53.23 p = 0.000
Married abroad	54.01	76.23	71.38	83.03	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 92.02 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 20.51 p = .000
Family's total yearly income[a]	83.60 (60.50)		62.30 (55.75)		t = -9.00 p = 0.0000	
Home owners (%)	78.06		60.60		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 83.51 p = 0.000	
Living in metro area (%)	98.17		96.85		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.84 p = 0.050	
Young children in home (%)	41.07		24.51		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 91.54 p = 0.000	

(Table continued from the previous page)

India

	Presence of Parents in Home					
	Yes (10%)		**No (90%)**			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	1235	1235	11315	11315		
Mean age	41.49 (8.13)	37.54 (8.09)	42.94 (11.41)	38.75 (11.24)	t = 5.68 p = 0.0000	t = 4.78 p = 0.0000
Education (years)	15.61 (2.75)	14.73 (2.99)	16.09 (2.87)	15.05 (3.23)	t = 5.77 p = 0.0000	t = 3.52 p = 0.0004
Educated abroad (%)	74.57	70.77	81.79	80.48	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 37.73 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 64.44 p = .000
Yearly income[a]	74.97 (81.40)	28.39 (40.27)	70.35 (72.92)	22.09 (40.77)	t = -1.91 p = 0.0561	t = -5.21 p = 0.0000
Occupational status (SEI)	57.52 (24.73)	42.27 (28.23)	59.90 (24.17)	36.85 (31.59)	t = 3.21 p = 0.0013	t = -6.32 p = 0.0000
Self employed (%)	19.70	10.62	13.55	7.89	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 33.96 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 8.83 p = 0.003
Years since immigration	16.09 (7.36)	13.91 (7.47)	13.79 (9.88)	11.84 (9.54)	t = -10.03 p = 0.0000	t = -8.94 p = 0.0000
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	4.13	5.83	1.92	2.94	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 26.06 p = .0000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 29.72 p = .000
Citizens (%)	72.87	62.19	43.30	38.34	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 391.91 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 262.41 p = 0.000
Speaks English well or above (%)	97.09	91.17	96.08	89.79	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.08 p = 0.079	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.35 p = 0.126
Married abroad	75.95	85.02	86.94	93.72	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 110.68 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 127.01 p = .000
Family's total yearly income[a]	118.21 (103.79)		97.70 (91.42)		t = -6.67 p = 0.0000	
Home owners (%)	78.62		54.22		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 269.97 p = 0.000	
Living in metro area (%)	96.28		95.18		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.96 p = 0.085	
Young children in home (%)	38.30		27.24		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 67.10 p = 0.000	

Cuba

	Presence of Parents in Home					
	Yes (9%)		**No (91%)**			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	622	622	6259	6259		
Mean age	49.45 (12.06)	46.76 (11.71)	57.10 (15.42)	53.87 (15.25)	t = 14.66 p = 0.0000	t = 14.01 p = 0.0000

(Table continued from the previous page)

Education (years)	12.29 (3.67)	12.19 (3.41)	11.40 (4.47)	11.27 (4.24)	t = -5.61 p = 0.0000	t = -6.30 p = 0.0000
Educated abroad (%)	74.44	68.01	81.46	76.98	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 18.03 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 25.08 p = .000
Yearly income[a]	34.92 (39.55)	17.08 (23.63)	33.13 (47.21)	14.78 (25.22)	t = -1.05 p = 0.2919	t = -2.30 p = 0.0218
Occupational status (SEI)	36.29 (24.48)	34.86 (26.86)	29.46 (27.02)	25.53 (27.03)	t = -6.57 p = 0.0000	t = -8.26 p = 0.0000
Self employed (%)	21.42	6.21	20.19	8.67	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.48 p = 0.489	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.36 p = 0.067
Years since immigration	21.96 (12.66)	22.01 (12.54)	24.95 (13.53)	25.04 (13.34)	t = 5.58 p = 0.0000	t = 5.71 p = 0.0000
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	13.83	18.17	10.95	14.91	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 4.72 p = .030	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 4.67 p = .031
Citizens (%)	59.32	63.83	66.13	67.90	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 11.59 p = 0.001	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 4.29 p = 0.038
Speaks English well or above (%)	59.16	56.59	51.86	50.10	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 12.10 p = 0.001	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 9.53 p = 0.002
Married abroad	68.97	70.10	77.36	77.90	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 22.20 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 19.59 p = .000
Family's total yearly income[a]	70.15 (58.18)		55.42 (60.84)		t = -6.00 p = 0.0000	
Home owners (%)	81.67		69.36		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 41.24 p = 0.000	
Living in metro area (%)	99.20		98.19		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.37 p = 0.067	
Young children in home (%)	12.86		9.12		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 9.23 p = 0.002	

Jamaica

	Presence of Parents in Home					
	Yes (6%)		**No (94%)**			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	159	159	2628	2628		
Mean age	45.99 (10.17)	43.14 (10.02)	50.00 (12.92)	47.04 (12.66)	t = 4.75 p = 0.0000	t = 4.69 p = 0.0000
Education (years)	12.52 (2.76)	13.21 (2.72)	12.05 (3.19)	12.64 (2.98)	t = -2.05 p = 0.0421	t = -2.54 p = 0.0119
Educated abroad (%)	84.28	74.21	84.67	79.45	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.02 p = .895	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.49 p = .114
Yearly income[a]	35.05 (26.10)	32.58 (37.42)	34.85 (38.41)	25.06 (28.63)	t = -0.09 p = 0.9269	t = -2.49 p = 0.0137
Occupational status (SEI)	33.73 (24.40)	37.15 (22.68)	31.58 (24.24)	32.30 (24.64)	t = -1.08 p = 0.2830	t = -2.60 p = 0.0100
Self employed (%)	12.75	4.61	10.30	5.15	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.90 p = 0.343	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.09 p = 0.769

(Table continued from the previous page)

Years since immigration	19.20 (9.13)	18.82 (8.58)	19.19 (10.19)	18.83 (10.15)	t = -0.01 p = 0.9899	t = 0.01 p = 0.9958
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	2.52	4.40	4.83	6.05	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.80 p = .180	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.73 p = .394
Citizens (%)	61.01	79.25	60.43	65.94	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.02 p = 0.884	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 11.94 p = 0.001
Speaks English well or above (%)	100.00	99.37	99.73	99.70	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.42 p = 0.515	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.49 p = 0.484
Married abroad	72.33	78.62	78.96	83.56	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.92 p = .048	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.63 p = .105
Family's total yearly income[a]	81.65 (54.39)		67.76 (54.72)		t = -3.12 p = 0.0021	
Home owners (%)	84.91		72.56		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 11.66 p = 0.001	
Living in metro area (%)	99.37		97.60		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.09 p = 0.148	
Young children in home (%)	23.27		18.11		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.66 p = 0.103	

Korea

	Presence of Parents in Home					
	Yes (7%)		No (93%)			
	Husband	Wife	Husband	Wife	Test of Difference Between Husbands	Test of Difference Between Wives
Number of obs.	556	556	7285	7285		
Mean age	43.08 (9.02)	40.30 (8.60)	47.76 (12.37)	44.71 (11.70)	t = 11.44 p = 0.0000	t = 11.30 p = 0.0000
Education (years)	14.63 (2.61)	14.03 (2.33)	14.83 (3.12)	13.75 (3.14)	t = 1.73 p = 0.0838	t = -2.66 p = 0.0079
Educated abroad (%)	78.42	78.78	84.02	86.13	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 11.84 p = .001	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 22.70 p = .000
Yearly income[a]	50.60 (61.93)	23.02 (34.48)	46.29 (61.81)	16.77 (31.02)	t = -1.58 p = 0.1136	t = -4.15 p = 0.0000
Occupational status (SEI)	49.90 (24.46)	36.58 (27.43)	47.67 (28.04)	30.36 (28.42)	t = -2.05 p = 0.0410	t = -5.14 p = 0.0000
Self employed (%)	40.75	28.38	35.14	25.67	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 6.79 p = 0.009	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.53 p = 0.216
Years since immigration	16.32 (7.48)	14.78 (7.92)	16.30 (9.65)	15.02 (9.32)	t = -0.06 p = 0.9518	t = 0.68 p = 0.4977
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	6.65	6.65	5.20	4.30	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.17 p = .141	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 6.73 p = .009
Citizens (%)	57.01	53.42	50.16	46.56	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 9.72 p = 0.002	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 9.75 p = 0.002
Speaks English well or above (%)	66.91	54.14	64.09	51.15	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.78 p = 0.182	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.85 p = 0.174
Married abroad	75.00	85.61	83.72	90.43	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 27.95 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 13.44 p = .000

(Table continued from the previous page)

Family's total yearly income[a]	86.34 (79.31)	68.35 (75.93)	t = -5.17 p = 0.0000
Home owners (%)	64.39	49.72	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 44.48 p = 0.000
Living in metro area (%)	97.84	96.79	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 1.89 p = 0.169
Young children in home (%)	27.52	17.90	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 31.59 p = 0.000

Poland

	Presence of Parents in Home					
	Yes (6%)		**No (94%)**			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	246	246	3671	3671		
Mean age	41.93 (9.73)	39.58 (9.63)	51.25 (16.05)	48.27 (15.16)	t = 13.82 p = 0.0000	t = 13.10 p = 0.0000
Education (years)	13.17 (2.73)	13.26 (2.38)	12.58 (3.66)	12.55 (3.40)	t = -3.21 p = 0.0015	t = -4.41 p = 0.0000
Educated abroad (%)	82.93	81.71	88.96	85.82	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 8.29 p = .004	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 3.16 p = .075
Yearly income[a]	45.96 (39.83)	21.65 (30.27)	43.32 (44.99)	17.27 (27.11)	t = -1.00 p = 0.3174	t = -2.21 p = 0.0281
Occupational status (SEI)	35.84 (23.88)	31.28 (27.60)	29.69 (25.55)	24.42 (26.27)	t = -3.89 p = 0.0001	t = -3.78 p = 0.0002
Self employed (%)	13.81	13.71	16.10	11.78	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.87 p = 0.351	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.64 p = 0.423
Years since immigration	16.03 (9.89)	15.13 (10.16)	20.93 (15.89)	19.63 (15.63)	t = 7.17 p = 0.0000	t = 6.45 p = 0.0000
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	4.07	7.32	3.90	5.07	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.02 p = .896	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 2.35 p = .125
Citizens (%)	52.44	54.07	55.46	52.82	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.85 p = 0.356	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.14 p = 0.705
Speaks English well or above (%)	74.39	79.27	75.16	75.86	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.07 p = 0.788	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 1.47 p = 0.226
Married abroad	73.17	85.77	82.66	88.28	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 14.11 p = .000	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 1.38 p = .240
Family's total yearly income[a]	85.58 (63.57)		66.14 (57.00)		t = -4.67 p = 0.0000	
Home owners (%)	83.74		71.89		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 16.29 p = 0.000	
Living in metro area (%)	94.31		95.21		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.40 p = 0.526	
Young children in home (%)	27.24		13.32		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 36.65 p = 0.000	

(Table continued from the previous page)

El Salvador

	Presence of Parents in Home					
	Yes (9%)		No (91%)			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	472	472	4956	4956		
Mean age	38.29 (8.96)	36.58 (8.71)	40.12 (10.26)	37.81 (10.05)	t = 4.18 p = 0.0000	t = 2.89 p = 0.0040
Education (years)	9.69 (4.32)	9.53 (4.40)	8.34 (4.71)	8.18 (4.63)	t = -6.42 p = 0.0000	t = -6.35 p = 0.0000
Educated abroad (%)	80.72	79.24	88.40	86.14	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 23.60 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 16.59 p = .000
Yearly income[a]	31.86 (39.11)	14.78 (27.33)	26.12 (29.92)	10.33 (18.33)	t = -3.11 p = 0.0020	t = -3.46 p = 0.0006
Occupational status (SEI)	27.43 (21.10)	23.49 (22.34)	23.43 (18.40)	17.85 (19.90)	t = -3.97 p = 0.0001	t = -5.28 p = 0.0000
Self employed (%)	10.04	10.55	10.43	10.61	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.07 p = 0.793	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.00 p = 0.974
Years since immigration	16.42 (6.37)	15.46 (7.09)	15.83 (6.94)	14.37 (7.31)	t = -1.91 p = 0.0565	t = -3.19 p = 0.0015
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	4.45	8.90	3.73	5.55	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.61 p = .436	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 8.79 p = .003
Citizens (%)	42.37	38.98	31.11	28.85	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 25.07 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 21.16 p = 0.000
Speaks English well or above (%)	69.49	58.26	56.13	45.12	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 31.43 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 29.96 p = 0.000
Married abroad	41.95	72.25	55.19	79.58	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 30.40 p = .000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 13.95 p = .000
Family's total yearly income[a]	64.10 (58.39)		45.07 (44.39)		t = -6.89 p = 0.0000	
Home owners (%)	58.90		41.02		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 56.34 p = 0.000	
Living in metro area (%)	97.67		97.11		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.48 p = 0.488	
Young children in home (%)	37.92		34.44		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.30 p = 0.129	

Note:
a: income in thousands.

5.3. Bivariate Analyses

Table 5.3 presents the results of bivariate analyses between the "whether older parents were present" outcome and the main independent variables by gender and country. For each continuous independent variable the mean and standard deviation (SD) were

obtained, while for each dichotomous variable the percentage of the "Yes" answer was calculated. As the independent variables were hypothesized to affect the outcome, differences between the "yes" and "no" groups were expected to exist on these variables. Thus, appropriate bivariate tests for differences between the means (of the "parents present" and "parents absent" groups) were conducted for husbands and wives respectively: Student's t-tests for each of the continuous variables, and Pearson's Chi-square tests for each of the dichotomous variables. Results of these bivariate tests would shed light on the nature and direction of relationships between the outcome (i.e. presence of older parents in home) and the hypothesized predictor/control variables in Table 4.2.

Looking at the trend of all countries as a whole, the results in Table 5.3 showed that compared to their no-parents counterparts, immigrants (both husbands and wives) who had older parents in home were more likely to:

1. be younger in age,
2. have higher education level,
3. have received some of their education in U.S. after immigrating to this country,
4. have higher annual income,
5. have higher status jobs,
6. have been here in U.S. for a slightly shorter period of time but also slightly more likely to have immigrated before 13 years old,
7. be naturalized citizens,
8. speak better English,
9. have higher family income;
10. own their home,
11. live in a metro area, and
12. have young children age five years old or younger.

In addition, immigrant husbands (but not wives) from multi-generational households were more likely to be self-employed, compared to their counterparts from households with no parents.

Results by each country again revealed differences on most of the independent variables between households that had older parents in home and those that did not. The by-country results are summarized in the bullets below.

- Across most of the ten immigrant groups, these findings suggested that immigrant households that had older parents present were more likely to be younger in age, had higher education level, higher annual income as well as higher status jobs. This was particularly true among wives. The exception on these variables was the case of India, where immigrant husbands from "with-parents households" actually had lower education level and lower status jobs than their counterparts from "no-parents households". Indian immigrant wives from "with-parents households" also had slightly lower education level than their counterparts from "no-parents households", although the "with-parents" group also had higher yearly income and higher status jobs at the same time.

- Self-employment had a less universal effect across immigrant groups. Out of the ten sending countries, self-employment rate was found to be significantly different among Chinese husbands, Indian husbands and wives, and Korean husbands. In all four cases those from "with-parents households" were more likely to be self-employed than their counterparts from "no-parents households".

- Years since immigration also had a somewhat mixed effect across immigrant groups. On the one hand, it was negatively related to presence of parents among Mexican husbands, Pilipino husbands and wives, Chinese wives, Cuban husbands and wives, as well as Polish husbands and wives. In other words, for immigrants in these groups, the longer they have been in U.S., the less likely it was to find a parent present in their family. On the other hand, it had the opposite effect among Vietnamese husbands, Indian husbands and wives, and Salvadorian wives. For immigrants in these groups, the longer they have been in U.S., the more likely they had at least one parent living with them.

- Looking at the percentage of immigrants who immigrated to U.S. before 13, we found that in about half of the groups those from "with-parents" households were slightly more likely to have come before their teen years, compared to their counterparts from "no-parents" families. This was consistent with the findings that the average age of arrival for "with-parents" immigrants was younger than their "no-parents" counterparts (24.83 vs. 28.10 for husbands, and 23.94 vs. 26.93 for wives). It was also consistent with the findings that immigrants from "no-parents" households were more likely to have received all their education abroad and have married abroad before immigrating to U.S.

- For all of the sending countries except Cuba and Poland, both husbands and wives were more likely to be naturalized citizens if they had parents living with them. Surprisingly, Cuban husbands and wives who had parents in home were *less*

likely to be citizens than their counterparts who did not have any parents co-residing. In the case of Poland, the difference was not significant.

- Better English proficiency was associated with having parents in home for six of the ten immigrant groups (both husbands and wives) in the data except among Indians, Jamaicans, Koreans, and Poles. For immigrants from the latter four sending countries the difference in English proficiency between the "with-parents" husbands and wives and their "no-parents" counterparts was not found to be statistically significant.

- As expected, immigrant households with older parents present had significantly higher family income, and were more likely to own a home and have young kids in the house, compared to households that did not have older parents. These findings were universally true for all ten immigrant groups, although the differences on metro area residence and having young children were not statistically significant for Jamaicans and Salvadorians. Living in metro areas was found to be positively associated with having parents in home among only Mexican and Vietnamese immigrants.

Although the results from bivariate analyses were indicative of the relationships between the outcome (whose parents were present) and the predictors (independent variables), they were by no means conclusive of these associations. For one thing, the relationships suggested here were only between two variables (i.e. the dependent variable and the particular independent variable that were being cross tabulated), without taking into account any other factors that might also affect the outcome. This

is where regression analyses come in, to model the relationship between the dependent variable and a number of predictors, while controlling for other factors that may also affect the outcome. In the following I present and discuss logistic regression analyses results on the first main outcome of this study, i.e. whether any older parents were present in the immigrant household.

TABLE 5.4: Logistic Regressions Predicting Presence of Older Parents in Home: All-Country Results
(Table continues on the next page)

	Dependent Variable: Presence of Older Parents at Home (1=yes, 0=no)	
Variable	**Model 1 (using Husband's data)** Coefficient (SE)	**Model 2 (using wife's data)** Coefficient (SE)
Family characteristics:		
Age	.042*** (.012)	.044*** (.012)
Age squared term	-.001*** (.000)	-.001*** (.000)
Family's total yearly income[a]	.002*** (.000)	.002*** (.000)
Education (years)	-.011** (.004)	-.003 (.005)
Educated abroad	.090 (.047)	.159*** (.047)
Occupational status (SEI)	-.005*** (.001)	-.004*** (.001)
Husband's usual hours worked per week	.000 (.001)	.001 (.001)
Wife's usual hours worked per week	.005*** (.001)	.005*** (.001)
Husband self-employed	.047 (.040)	.029 (.040)
Wife self-employed	.000 (.048)	-.004 (.048)
Owning home	.540*** (.034)	.524*** (.034)
Living in metro area	.323*** (.067)	.320*** (.066)
Young children in home	.304*** (.032)	.317*** (.032)

(Table continued from the previous page)

Variable	Dependent Variable: Presence of Older Parents at Home (1=yes, 0=no)	
	Model 1 (using Husband's data) Coefficient (SE)	**Model 2 (using wife's data)** Coefficient (SE)
Exposure to American society:		
Years since immigration	.053*** (.006)	.052*** (.007)
Years since immigration squared term	-.001*** (.000)	-.001*** (.000)
Husband arrived before 13 years old	-.257*** (.066)	-.133* (.057)
Wife arrived before 13 years old	-.249*** (.054)	-.328*** (.066)
Being naturalized citizen	.490*** (.033)	.545*** (.034)
English proficiency	-.077*** (.019)	-.073*** (.018)
Married abroad	.041 (.047)	.013 (.054)
Sending country: (reference group: Mexico)		
Philippines	1.176*** (.054)	1.126*** (.056)
China	.985*** (.054)	.825*** (.053)
Vietnam	.552*** (.060)	.446*** (.059)
India	.954*** (.060)	.758*** (.058)
Cuba	1.217*** (.067)	1.137*** (.066)
Jamaica	.311** (.103)	.183 (.103)
Korea	.645*** (.069)	.479*** (.068)
Poland	.417*** (.087)	.341*** (.087)
El Salvador	.446*** (.065)	.411*** (.065)
Number of observations	67,570	67,570
Log likelihood	-20873.07	-20908.22
Pseudo R^2	.0678	.0662

Note:
*** significant at .05 level; ** significant at .01 level; *** significant at .001 level.**
[a]: income in thousands.

5.4. Logistic Regression Analyses

5.4.1. Predicting Presence of Parents in Home, All Ten Countries

Table 5.4 presents the regression results on the first outcome of this study, i.e. presence of older parents in the immigrant household. As explained in the analytical plan in Chapter 4, two regression models were tested to examine the effects of the hypothesized predictors in Table 4.2. Both included the same family characteristics, exposure to American society variables, and sending-country variables. But Model 1 used the husband's data, while Model 2 used the wife's data to represent the "family characteristics" on age, education, occupational status, years since immigration, citizenship status, English proficiency, educated abroad, and married abroad. In addition, for both Model 1 and Model 2 I ran two regressions: once without the sending country variables and a second time with the sending country variables (results for regressions that did not include sending country variables were not presented in Table 5.4). Likelihood ratio tests were then performed to test for significant change in the ability to explain variances between the with-sending-country and without-sending-country results. This approach allowed comparison of models with husband's or the wife's data, and better determination of the effect of sending countries through examining the two sets of regression coefficients and testing for difference between the two models.

The second column of Table 5.4 contains results of Model 1. The family's socioeconomic characteristics included annual family income, education level and occupational status. Both the husband's and wife's usual hours worked per week were included to account for the family's need for help with household labor in the situation

where both spouses worked for long hours. Self-employment status was also included in the model, based on a previous finding on self-employed Korean immigrants having older parents (especially mothers and mothers-in-law) living together in the household to help out with family work and child rearing (Lim, 1997). Other family circumstances variables included home ownership, living in a metro area, and having young (five years old or younger) children at home, all of which were expected to increase the likelihood of having older parents present. In addition, educated abroad and married abroad were included to test if receiving all one's education and being married before immigrating to U.S. might be associated with more traditional outcome. Exposure to American society variables included husband's years since immigration, the squared term of years since immigration to account for possible curvilinear effect, and citizenship status and English proficiency. Whether the husband or wife arrived in U.S. before the age of 13 were both included in the model to test for the effect of growing up in U.S. as 1.5-generation immigrants on the outcome, which was hypothesized to decrease the likelihood of having the more traditional multi-generational household. Both spouses' variables were included because the correlation was not high between spouses on this variable (correlation = 0.31), and husband's or wife's status as being 1.5-generation immigrant might have different effect on the outcome.

Results for Model 1 indicated that, first of all, age did have a curvilinear effect on the likelihood of having older parents in home, which was consistent with what I had expected, i.e. the very young and the very old were less likely to have multi-generational households. Family income was significantly positively related to the presence of older parents in home. This was consistent with my hypothesis that greater resources increase

the likelihood of older parents' presence. On the other hand, curiously, both education and occupational status had opposite effects on the outcome: while higher income increased the likelihood of having older parents, higher education and occupational status would decrease it. Moreover, it was also somewhat surprising to see that self-employment status did not matter – neither spouse's self-employment was significant. Wife's hours worked, however, was a good predictor of the outcome: as expected, the longer hours wife worked, the more likely that older parents were present in the household. Home ownership, living in a metro area, and having young children all significantly increased the probability of older parents' presence as predicted.

Years since immigration turned out to have a curvilinear effect on the outcome as well: while the regular term was positively associated with older parents' presence, the squared term had the negative effect. In other words, while immigrant families who were very recent arrivals may not be established enough in U.S. and therefore lack the necessary resources to have older parents over, those who have been here for a very long time were also less likely to have older parents possibly because of the influence of the American preference of nuclear family living arrangements. As expected, immigrating to U.S. at an early age (before 13) had a negative effect, i.e. significantly decreasing the possibility of having multi-generational households. This was true for both spouses. Becoming a naturalized citizen significantly increased the likelihood of having older parents, but English proficiency had the opposite effect: the better one's English proficiency, the less likely to have older parents in home. This could be interpreted as being consistent with the hypothesis that as immigrants become more "Americanized" (measured by one's

English proficiency), they were less likely to have the more traditional multi-generational household structure.

The last column of Table 5.4 shows the results for Model 2 on the same dependent variable (i.e. presence of older parents in home or not). All the same independent variables in Model 1 were included in this model, except for the ones that substituted husband's data with wife's data as explained above. Overall, results of Model 2 stayed the same as those of Model 1 on most family characteristics and exposure to American society measures, with the only difference found in the effects of education and educated abroad. While the effect of education was negative in Model 1, it changed to be not-significant in Model 2. Educated abroad had the opposite pattern: it was not-significant in Model 1 but showed a significantly positive effect in Model 2. In other words, while for the husband it was education level that mattered (regardless of where he received that education), for the wife it was the location where she received her education (regardless of how much) that mattered. More education on the husband's part decrease the likelihood of having older parents in home; while receiving all her education abroad before immigrating to U.S. increased that likelihood. These results revealed interesting findings on the effects of education and country-of-education by gender. On the other hand, being married abroad before coming to U.S. was not found to be significant in either model.

The country effects were all significant in both Model 1 and Model 2 (except for the case of Jamaica in Model 2). That is to say, compared to immigrants from Mexico, the biggest group in this study, those from all other countries except Jamaica were

significantly more likely to have older parents present in home. Results of likelihood ratio tests showed that adding the country variables significantly increased the explained variances for both Model 1 (LR $chi2_{(9)} = 697.07$, Prob > chi2 = .0000) and Model 2 (LR $chi2_{(9)} = 620.56$, Prob > chi2 = .0000). Further testing was then performed to test for significant differences between the country coefficients, which suggested that the ten sending countries could be seen as roughly four groups in terms of the effect (size of coefficient) on the outcome. The first group of countries was Mexico and Jamaica, whose immigrants were the least likely among the ten to have older parents living together in the household. Poland, El Salvador, Vietnam, and Korea consisted of the second group: immigrants from these countries were more likely to have older parents in home compared to those from Mexico and Jamaica. The third group included India and China: the likelihood of immigrants from these countries to have older parents present was higher than that of the first two groups but lower than that of Philippines and Cuba. The latter two countries made up the fourth group, which had the biggest positive effects among the ten countries on having older parents in home, when other factors are controlled for. This pattern remained the same for both Model 1 and Model 2, regardless of which spouse's data were used to represent the selected family characteristics as explained above.

To summarize the findings of this part of analyses, two regression models, one using husband's data and the other using wife's data to represent some family characteristics, yielded largely the same results. To predict the presence of older parents in home, family income, wife's usual hours worked per week, naturalized citizenship, home ownership, metro area residence, and having young children were all found to be significant factors,

all positively influencing the likelihood of having older parents. Age and years since immigration had a curvilinear effect, suggesting that it first increased the probability of older parents' presence to a certain point then decreased it. Education and occupational status had been expected to increase the likelihood of having older parents, but instead were found to both decrease that likelihood (in men's case). Immigrating to U.S. before 13 and high English proficiency both decreased the likelihood of multi-generational household, possibly reflecting the effect of greater exposure and acceptance of the preference for nuclear families in the American society.

As explained in the analytical plan in Chapter 4, after examining factors influencing presence of older parents among all ten immigrant groups together, I repeated the same analyses for each of the countries to control for possible interaction with birth places. In the next section I report the by-country regression results.

TABLE 5.5A: Logistic Regression Results Predicting Presence of Older Parents in Home: By-country Results (Using Husband's Data for "Married Abroad")
(Table continues on the next page)

Country	Mexico	Philippines	China	Vietnam	India	Cuba	Jamaica	Korea	Poland	El Salvador
Education (years)	-0.004 (0.009)	-0.003 (0.016)	-0.036*** (0.009)	0.004 (0.015)	-0.038* (0.017)	0.003 (0.017)	-0.000 (0.038)	0.014 (0.023)	-0.025 (0.034)	0.048** (0.015)
Family's total yearly income[a]	0.005*** (0.001)	0.004*** (0.001)	0.002*** (0.000)	0.005*** (0.001)	0.001** (0.000)	0.002* (0.001)	0.003 (0.002)	0.002** (0.001)	0.004*** (0.001)	0.004*** (0.001)
Occupational status (SEI)	0.001 (0.002)	-0.007*** (0.001)	-0.007*** (0.002)	-0.002 (0.002)	-0.006*** (0.002)	-0.003 (0.003)	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.002 (0.002)	0.002 (0.004)	0.003 (0.003)
Husband's usual hours worked per week	0.003 (0.003)	-0.005 (0.003)	-0.001 (0.002)	0.000 (0.004)	0.004 (0.003)	-0.000 (0.004)	-0.004 (0.007)	-0.004 (0.003)	0.001 (0.006)	-0.006 (0.005)
Wife's usual hours worked per week	0.001 (0.002)	-0.000 (0.002)	0.007*** (0.002)	0.000 (0.003)	0.011*** (0.002)	0.002 (0.003)	0.000 (0.006)	0.010*** (0.003)	0.010* (0.005)	0.006 (0.004)
Husband self-employed	0.044 (0.117)	-0.119 (0.142)	0.085 (0.089)	-0.110 (0.141)	0.092 (0.102)	0.118 (0.126)	0.194 (0.270)	-0.011 (0.120)	-0.483* (0.238)	-0.195 (0.193)
Wife self-employed	0.057 (0.134)	-0.279 (0.177)	-0.158 (0.111)	0.034 (0.142)	0.190 (0.127)	-0.375 (0.210)	-0.013 (0.412)	0.066 (0.131)	0.339 (0.237)	0.038 (0.189)
Years since immigration	0.049** (0.016)	0.034* (0.016)	0.084*** (0.015)	0.054 (0.034)	0.088*** (0.022)	0.048* (0.020)	0.091* (0.046)	0.081** (0.028)	0.075* (0.036)	0.067 (0.039)
Years since immigration squared term	-0.001* (0.000)	-0.001* (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.002*** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.002** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.002 (0.001)
Being naturalized citizen	0.221** (0.077)	0.504*** (0.086)	0.461*** (0.080)	0.259 (0.133)	1.173*** (0.093)	-0.010 (0.143)	-0.096 (0.196)	0.274* (0.128)	0.120 (0.183)	0.368** (0.131)
English proficiency	-0.035 (0.035)	0.033 (0.058)	-0.106* (0.044)	0.029 (0.070)	-0.136 (0.073)	0.012 (0.062)	0.334 (0.347)	-0.266*** (0.080)	-0.296* (0.116)	0.083 (0.068)

(Table continued from the previous page)

Country	Mexico	Philippines	China	Vietnam	India	Cuba	Jamaica	Korea	Poland	El Salvador
Owning home	0.431***	0.493***	0.551***	0.505***	0.667***	0.692***	0.673**	0.492***	0.625**	0.479***
	(0.075)	(0.082)	(0.086)	(0.121)	(0.098)	(0.142)	(0.250)	(0.122)	(0.218)	(0.123)
Living in metro area	0.450***	-0.031	0.141	0.572	0.256	0.926		0.491	-0.210	0.183
	(0.115)	(0.138)	(0.196)	(0.334)	(0.189)	(0.602)		(0.374)	(0.341)	(0.341)
Young children in home	0.143	0.187*	0.585***	0.311**	0.487***	-0.070	0.033	0.373**	0.558**	0.072
	(0.074)	(0.080)	(0.074)	(0.102)	(0.086)	(0.161)	(0.234)	(0.141)	(0.202)	(0.128)
Husband arrived before 13 years old	-0.106	-0.133	-0.304	-0.522*	-0.254	-0.229	-1.085	-0.194	-1.241*	-0.411
	(0.147)	(0.165)	(0.174)	(0.216)	(0.223)	(0.199)	(0.587)	(0.261)	(0.513)	(0.334)
Wife arrived before 13 years old	-0.181	-0.543**	-0.351*	-0.476**	0.236	-0.427**	-0.450	0.020	0.043	-0.094
	(0.104)	(0.172)	(0.161)	(0.170)	(0.161)	(0.150)	(0.415)	(0.219)	(0.306)	(0.223)
Educated abroad	-0.003	0.038	0.247*	0.160	0.193	0.139	0.705	0.259	-0.352	0.053
	(0.115)	(0.131)	(0.113)	(0.165)	(0.132)	(0.258)	(0.363)	(0.264)	(0.330)	(0.189)
Age	-0.101***	0.185***	0.036	-0.091	0.156***	0.103**	-0.012	0.072	0.144	-0.097
	(0.027)	(0.033)	(0.031)	(0.049)	(0.044)	(0.038)	(0.086)	(0.057)	(0.079)	(0.057)
Age squared term	0.001*	-0.003***	-0.001**	0.000	-0.002***	-0.001***	-0.001	-0.001*	-0.002**	0.001
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Married abroad	0.173	0.078	-0.114	0.254	-0.105	0.246	-0.022	-0.119	-0.033	-0.108
	(0.111)	(0.128)	(0.118)	(0.164)	(0.141)	(0.244)	(0.324)	(0.259)	(0.310)	(0.185)
Number of observations	16568	8802	10744	5449	8419	3916	2173	5052	2508	3893
Log likelihood	-3697.84	-3554.76	-3769.76	-1753.19	-2679.22	-1378.85	-505.30	-1379.07	-623.03	-1153.53
Pseudo R^2	0.0300	0.0676	0.0810	0.0680	0.1269	0.0378	0.0465	0.0561	0.0842	0.0512

TABLE 5.5B: Logistic Regression Results for Presence of Older Parents in Home: By-country Results (Using Wife's Data for "Married Abroad")
(Table continues on the next page)

Country	Mexico	Philippines	China	Vietnam	India	Cuba	Jamaica	Korea	Poland	El Salvador
Education (years)	0.014 (0.009)	0.031 (0.017)	-0.034*** (0.010)	-0.003 (0.014)	-0.028 (0.016)	-0.013 (0.018)	0.038 (0.042)	0.022 (0.025)	0.012 (0.037)	0.045** (0.015)
Family's total yearly income[a]	0.005*** (0.001)	0.003*** (0.001)	0.001*** (0.000)	0.005*** (0.001)	0.001*** (0.000)	0.001 (0.001)	0.003 (0.002)	0.002** (0.001)	0.004*** (0.001)	0.004*** (0.001)
Occupational status (SEI)	0.000 (0.002)	-0.003 (0.002)	-0.005** (0.002)	-0.003 (0.002)	-0.008*** (0.002)	0.004 (0.003)	-0.005 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.003)	-0.002 (0.004)	0.005 (0.003)
Husband's usual hours worked per week	0.003 (0.003)	-0.004 (0.003)	0.001 (0.002)	0.001 (0.004)	0.004 (0.003)	0.001 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.006)	-0.003 (0.003)	0.002 (0.006)	-0.003 (0.005)
Wife's usual hours worked per week	0.000 (0.002)	-0.000 (0.002)	0.009*** (0.002)	0.000 (0.003)	0.010*** (0.002)	0.001 (0.003)	-0.001 (0.006)	0.011*** (0.003)	0.010* (0.005)	0.004 (0.004)
Husband self-employed	-0.004 (0.117)	-0.205 (0.142)	0.099 (0.089)	-0.090 (0.140)	0.067 (0.102)	0.100 (0.126)	0.172 (0.271)	0.019 (0.120)	-0.530* (0.239)	-0.229 (0.193)
Wife self-employed	0.048 (0.134)	-0.229 (0.178)	-0.124 (0.112)	0.013 (0.142)	0.214 (0.127)	-0.385 (0.210)	-0.064 (0.416)	0.068 (0.131)	0.320 (0.238)	0.018 (0.189)
Years since immigration	0.043** (0.014)	0.056** (0.018)	0.087*** (0.017)	0.066* (0.032)	0.104*** (0.023)	0.028 (0.020)	0.072 (0.051)	0.028 (0.027)	0.077* (0.037)	0.065 (0.035)
Years since immigration squared term	-0.001 (0.000)	-0.002** (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)	-0.002* (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)
Being naturalized citizen	0.238** (0.083)	0.742*** (0.086)	0.715*** (0.083)	-0.020 (0.120)	0.776*** (0.089)	0.071 (0.151)	0.669** (0.237)	0.297* (0.130)	0.247 (0.181)	0.188 (0.134)
English proficiency	-0.021 (0.033)	-0.108 (0.061)	-0.075 (0.043)	0.157* (0.064)	-0.204*** (0.061)	0.006 (0.060)	-0.324 (0.217)	-0.309*** (0.077)	-0.129 (0.116)	0.106 (0.060)

(Table continued from the previous page)

Country	Mexico	Philippines	China	Vietnam	India	Cuba	Jamaica	Korea	Poland	El Salvador
Owning home	0.348***	0.425***	0.555***	0.536***	0.762***	0.660***	0.621*	0.532***	0.606**	0.444***
	(0.075)	(0.083)	(0.086)	(0.120)	(0.098)	(0.143)	(0.253)	(0.124)	(0.220)	(0.121)
Living in metro area	0.414***	-0.044	0.112	0.627	0.357	0.832		0.505	-0.240	0.149
	(0.116)	(0.138)	(0.195)	(0.335)	(0.189)	(0.602)		(0.373)	(0.337)	(0.340)
Young children in home	0.214**	0.153	0.518***	0.299**	0.536***	0.037	-0.027	0.373**	0.491*	0.134
	(0.076)	(0.082)	(0.074)	(0.104)	(0.087)	(0.166)	(0.241)	(0.142)	(0.203)	(0.132)
Husband arrived before 13 years old	0.114	-0.197	-0.157	-0.349	0.309	-0.203	-0.932	-0.286	-0.594	-0.159
	(0.109)	(0.144)	(0.156)	(0.195)	(0.197)	(0.159)	(0.530)	(0.228)	(0.444)	(0.289)
Wife arrived before 13 years old	-0.506***	-0.371	-0.345	-0.404*	-0.307	-0.337	-0.881	0.197	0.497	-0.279
	(0.140)	(0.211)	(0.194)	(0.201)	(0.209)	(0.191)	(0.460)	(0.278)	(0.476)	(0.268)
Educated abroad	-0.086	0.240*	0.366***	0.260	0.127	-0.174	0.668	-0.138	0.808*	0.400
	(0.125)	(0.112)	(0.110)	(0.188)	(0.111)	(0.282)	(0.406)	(0.219)	(0.393)	(0.219)
Age	-0.048	0.127***	-0.036	-0.040	0.146***	0.143***	-0.043	0.049	0.059	-0.024
	(0.027)	(0.035)	(0.033)	(0.046)	(0.042)	(0.038)	(0.085)	(0.056)	(0.077)	(0.059)
Age squared term	0.000	-0.002***	-0.000	-0.000	-0.002***	-0.002***	-0.000	-0.001*	-0.002	-0.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Married abroad	0.081	0.189	0.035	0.061	-0.424**	0.178	-0.315	0.325	0.261	-0.056
	(0.109)	(0.162)	(0.147)	(0.192)	(0.160)	(0.292)	(0.421)	(0.268)	(0.475)	(0.200)
Number of observations	16568	8802	10744	5449	8419	3916	2173	5052	2508	3893
Log likelihood	-3705.54	-3532.11	-3761.28	-1761.77	-2720.93	-1381.88	-500.89	-1381.85	-625.44	-1159.45
Pseudo R^2	0.0280	0.0736	0.0831	0.0634	0.1133	0.0357	0.0548	0.0542	0.0807	0.0464

Note:

*** significant at .05 level; ** significant at .01 level; *** significant at .001 level.**

[a]: income in thousands.

[b]: All households who reported not living in a metro area belonged to the outcome=0 group; therefore it was dropped from the regression and 46 observations not used.

5.4.2. Predicting Presence of Parents in Home, Each Country

Table 5.5 shows the by-country regression results on the outcome "whether older parents were present in home". The same regression models, i.e. Model 1 and Model 2 in Table 5.4 were run separately for each of the ten countries, and results are presented in Table 5.5A and Table 5.5B respectively. Overall these results repeated the same patterns of findings seen in the all-country analyses, but lost statistical significance in some countries when countries were analyzed separately. Below I'll focus on Table 5.5A (by-country results of Model 1 in Table 5.4, using husband's data to represent selected family characteristics) and go over the main findings.

While the positive effect of family income was still strong and universal across all groups except Jamaica (where it was not significant), the negative effects of education and occupational status were found to be significant in only less than half of the countries. Moreover, there was opposite effects of education among different immigrant groups: it was negative among immigrant families from China and India but positive among those from El Salvador. Receiving all her education abroad before coming to U.S. was found to increase the likelihood of having multi-generational households only for immigrant wives from China. Occupational status was negatively associated with older parents' presence among immigrants from Philippines, China, and India. Wife's usual hours worked per week were positively related to older parents' presence, but only significant among Chinese, Indian, Korean and Polish immigrants. For immigrant families from Poland, the husband's self-employment status was found to decrease the likelihood of having older parents in home. While home ownership still had a universally positive

effect for every immigrant group, living in a metro area was not significant among most groups except Mexicans. Having young children increased the likelihood of having older parents in most of the groups, except among Mexicans, Cubans, Jamaicans, and Salvadorians.

As in the all-country analyses, the effects of both age and years since immigration was curvilinear: it first increased then decreased the likelihood of having older parents in home among immigrant families from most of these groups. Either husband or wife immigrating to U.S. before 13 was also found to have a negative effect in five of the immigrant groups, consistent with the all-country results. Being a naturalized citizen increased the probability of having older parents among almost all groups except Vietnam, Cuba, Jamaica, and Poland. English proficiency was found to significantly decrease the likelihood of parents' presence among Chinese, Korean, and Polish immigrants.

In summary, although the analyses by each country yielded mostly the same patterns of findings as those from the all-country analyses on predicting presence of older parents in home, significant results were much less common than in the all-country regressions. In the case of education, results by each country revealed contradictory findings across immigrant groups. In the next section I compared and discuss results from all-country and each-country analyses in more detail.

5.4.3. Comparison of Different Models and Discussion

As reviewed above, results obtained from all the analyses were mostly consistent, despite findings of education's opposite effects across immigrant groups. Overall, findings from

all-country and by-country analyses confirmed each other with no apparent interactions found between any of the independent variables and birthplace. Having the two sets of results was helpful in drawing more accurate conclusions about effects of the independent variables on the outcome and identifying the particular immigrant groups where the effects were significant. While significant results from all-country analyses may give wrong impressions about their real generalizability across immigrant groups, separate analyses by each country was able to correct that tendency by further revealing the effects of the predictors among each immigrant group. This is especially helpful in situations where significant variations exist across groups, as in the case of the current study. For instance, while the effect of metro area residence was found significant in the all-country analyses, later revelation by each-country analyses of their significance only among Mexican immigrants (the biggest group in the study) helped pinpoint the true extent of the findings and avoid wrong generalization of the effect of this factor.

Overall, on the first outcome of this study (whether older parents were present in home), the results can be summarized as following. Family income and home ownership both had universally positive effect on older parents' presence across all immigrant groups, which findings were consistent with my hypothesis that greater resources of the family would increase the likelihood of the outcome. Unexpectedly, the effects of education and occupational status were both negative, although the effect of education was positive among Salvadorian immigrants. Wife's working long hours and having young children in the family were two factors that significantly increased the likelihood of older parents' presence. This is consistent with the hypothesis that immigrant families' practical need for help with household work and child rearing would increase the likelihood of having

older parents in home. By-country analyses further narrowed down the effect of having young children to among groups other than Mexican, Cuban, Jamaican, and Salvadorian immigrants. This finding might be a result reflecting lower probability of having young children at home because of older age of Cuban immigrants on average (see Table 5.1), and because of the relatively common practice of leaving young children behind in Jamaica among Jamaican immigrants (Foner, 2005). Years since immigration had a nonlinear relationship with having older parents, as it first increased then decreased the likelihood of parents' presence, possibly reflecting the effect of longer exposure to American society and the influence of the preference for nuclear family living arrangement here. The negative effect of English proficiency may also be understood as reflecting the degree of "assimilation" to the hose society culture. Citizenship significantly increased the probability of the outcome among most immigrant groups, while self-employment was not a good predictor of having older parents in home.

After-model tests in the all-country analyses comparing all the country coefficients further suggested that immigrant families from these ten sending countries can be seen as roughly falling into four groups in terms of the relative probability of having older parents in home. These four groups included immigrant families from: 1) Mexico and Jamaica, 2) Poland, Vietnam, Korea, and El Salvador, 3) India and China, and 4) Philippines and Cuba. The likelihood of having older parents in home significantly increased with each of the four groups, while countries in the same group were not significantly different from each other in most cases in terms of the probability of older parents' co-residence.

Table 5.6 presents the p-values of all pair-wise comparisons for all ten immigrant groups before and after regression (based on results from Model 1 in Table 5.4). These results were consistent with the results of after-model tests for difference between coefficients. With the row of blank cells diagonally across the table being the separator, the left/lower half of p-values indicates the significance of comparisons before regression on the prevalence of older parents' presence in home. The right/upper half of the table, on the other hand, contained all the p-values for pair-wise comparison after regression, i.e. with all the socioeconomic and acculturation factors controlled for. Examining the change in p-values before and after regression indicated whether difference between two countries still existed after other factors were taken into account. These numbers showed that differences between the following countries were not significant after other factors were controlled for: 1) Philippines and Cuba; 2) India and China; 3) Vietnam and Korea, 4) Vietnam and Poland, 5) Jamaica and El Salvador, and 6) Poland and El Salvador.

TABLE 5.6: The Likelihood of Having Older Parents in Home: p-values for Between-country Comparisons Before and After Regression

	Mexico	Philippines	China	Vietnam	India	Cuba	Jamaica	Korea	Poland	El Salvador
Mexico		.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0026	.0000	.0000	.0000
Philippines	.0000		.0000	.0000	.0000	.5208	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000
China	.0000	.0000		.0000	.5120	.0002	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000
Vietnam	.0000	.0000	.0081		.0000	.0000	.0219	.1845	.1288	.1534
India	.0000	.0000	.0347	.4039		.0001	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000
Cuba	.0000	.0000	.0003	.3628	.0693		.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000
Jamaica	.3655	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000		.0025	.3800	.2232
Korea	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0123		.0147	.0147
Poland	.0111	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.3301	.1005		.7644
El Salvador	.0000	.0000	.0001	.1270	.0163	.5058	.0000	.0007	.0000	

Note: The left/lower half of p-values indicates the significance of comparisons before regression on the prevalence of older parents' presence in home. The right/upper half of the table contains p-values for pair-wise comparison after regression, i.e. with all the socioeconomic and acculturation factors controlled for.

5.5. Conclusion

The analyses performed in this chapter tried to predict the outcome of whether older parents were present in the immigrant household.

Methodologically, the analyses performed included three major steps and two ways of controlling for the effects of sending countries. The three major steps included: 1) obtaining summary statistics for both the outcome and the predictors to get a good understanding of the current data in terms of the distribution of dependent and independent variables; 2) performing bivariate analyses between the outcome and each of the predicting factors to explore the nature and direction of relationships between them as

well as variation across groups; and 3) performing regression analyses to further examine the effects of predictors on the outcome. The two ways of controlling for the effects of sending countries refers to the regression analyses being performed both at the all-ten-country level, and separately at the each-country level, to better control for variations between groups and possible interaction of any predictor with sending country.

Overall, findings from these analyses supported the three general hypotheses outlined in the beginning of this chapter: 1) immigrant families that had more resources such as higher family income and home ownership were found to be more likely to have older parents present in home; 2) immigrants families that had greater “exposure” in this country including having been in U.S. longer, immigrating at an earlier age (before 13 as defined in the analyses), and having naturalized citizenship were found to be more likely to have older parents in home; and 3) immigrant families that may be going through particular life stages and had “practical needs” for older parents to help out in home such as those who worked for long hours and those with young children were found to be more likely to have older parents present in the household.

The next chapter, Chapter 6, will present and discuss findings on the main outcome of this study, i.e. which spouse’s parents were more likely to be found in immigrant households that did have older parents present.

CHAPTER 6

WHOSE PARENTS IN HOME: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

6.1. Introduction

In the previous chapter I presented results on the first outcome of this study, i.e. whether any parents were present in the immigrant household. In this chapter results on the second outcome, i.e. which spouse' parents were in home are presented.

The general hypotheses of the current analyses were as follows. 1) In the multi-generational immigrant household the spouse that had more personal resources (considered as bargaining leverage and decision making power) such as income, education and occupational status was more likely to have his or her parents present in home. 2) Both structural and cultural factors such as women's increasing economic contribution to the family and greater exposure to the more egalitarian gender culture in the American society may be associated with changes in gender relations among immigrants, to the extent that co-residence patterns of older parents reflected gender relations, relative status, and decision making power in the immigrant household. Translated into results, this means that immigrant families where the wife played a relatively bigger economic role were more likely to have her parents present, as were families that had been in U.S. for a longer period of time (and therefore presumably more exposed to the more egalitarian gender relations in this country). 3) There is great variation in the degree of patriarchy and hence very different "starting points" in gender

relations among the ten sending countries in the current study. Immigrants from countries with more patriarchal gender cultures were expected to be more likely to have the husband's parents present, whereas immigrants from countries with relatively less patriarchal gender cultures were more likely to have the wife's parents living in the household.

In the following I describe the analyses performed and discuss the results.

6.2. Descriptive Statistics

As shown in Table 5.1, among all the households that had older parent(s) present, slightly more of them were the husband's parents (51.4%) than the wife's parents (46.0%), while about 2.6% of the households had both spouses' parents (Table 5.1 in Chapter 5). Although these percentages suggested that the numbers of households with the husband's parents and those with the wife's parents are almost the same, wider variations were found across immigrant groups. Among the ten sending countries, immigrants from India had the highest proportion (76%) of households that had the husband's parents, followed by immigrants from Korea (65%), China (56%), Vietnam (54%), Mexico (49%), Poland (46%), El Salvador (45%), Philippines (41%), Cuba (38%), and Jamaica (31%). The proportion of households that had the wife's parents present in home followed the reverse order in the list above.

As expected, among immigrants from more patriarchal sending cultures the percentage of households with the husband's parents in home was found to be higher, represented by the cases of India (74% with husband's parents vs. 23% with wife's parents) and Korea (64% with husband's parents vs. 34% with wife's parents). On the other hand, among

immigrants from less patriarchal cultures the number of households with the wife's parents was found to be higher, represented by the cases of the Philippines (40% with husband's parents vs. 57% with wife's parents) and Jamaica (31% with husband's parents vs. 67% with wife's parents). This preliminary finding showed a trend consistent with Hypothesis 3 above.

Next, bivariate analyses between the outcome and the independent variables expected to affect the outcome were performed and results presented in the next section.

TABLE 6.1: Results of Bivariate Analyses between Whose Parents in Home and Selected Independent Variables by Gender and Country
(Table continues on the next page)

All Countries

	Whose Parents in Home					
	Husband's (53%)		**Wife's (47%)**			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	4465	4465	4004	4004		
Mean age	41.10 (9.52)	38.38 (9.45)	42.96 (10.32)	40.26 (9.76)	t = 8.55 p = 0.0000	t = 8.99 p = 0.0000
Education (years)	13.04 (4.32)	12.50 (4.29)	12.50 (4.53)	12.61 (4.18)	t = -5.55 p = 0.0000	t = 1.21 p = 0.2255
Difference in education[b]	0.54 (3.37)		-0.11 (3.43)		t = -8.74 p = 0.0000	
Educated abroad (%)	75.95	76.13	78.42	78.25	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 7.33 p = .007	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 5.39 p = .020
Yearly income[a]	46.58 (54.86)	21.73 (31.54)	42.56 (53.25)	24.26 (30.89)	t = -3.42 p = 0.0006	t = 3.73 p = 0.0002
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income	0.31 (0.26)		0.35 (0.27)		t = 7.44 p = 0.0000	
Occupational status (SEI)	42.34 (26.53)	33.35 (26.79)	38.55 (26.14)	35.16 (26.78)	t = -6.62 p = 0.0000	t = 3.10 p = 0.0019
Difference in occupational status score[b]	8.99 (29.64)		3.39 (29.84)		t = -8.65 p = 0.0000	
Self employed (%)	16.16	9.81	13.80	8.73	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 8.88 p = 0.003	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.41 p = 0.121
Husband and wife both self-employed (%)	5.44		4.11		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 6.58 p = 0.010	
Years since immigration	16.50 (8.16)	14.42 (8.49)	17.81 (9.33)	16.31 (9.02)	t = 6.83 p = 0.0000	t = 9.90 p = 0.0000

(Table continued from the previous page)

Husband arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	24.46		21.18		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 12.85 p = 0.000	
Wife arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	10.21		10.21		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.00 p = 0.998	
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	6.23	7.46	6.79	6.97	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.12 p = .290	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.76 p = .385
Citizens (%)	64.05	53.84	59.12	63.29	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 21.79 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 77.48 p = 0.000
Husband and wife both citizens (%)	45.78		50.27		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 17.10 p = 0.000	
Husband citizen wife non-citizen (%)	18.28		8.84		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 157.80 p = 0.000	
Husband non-citizen wife citizen (%)	8.06		13.01		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 55.48 p = 0.000	
Speaks English well or above (%)	76.75	68.35	73.05	69.48	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 15.42 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.25 p = 0.264
Both speak English well, very well, or speak only English (%)	63.45		62.54		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.75 p = 0.386	
Married abroad	62.80		63.84		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.98 p = .323	
Age difference between couple	2.73		2.70		t = -0.28 p = .7822	
Parents' yearly income[a]	3.50 (15.52)		2.80 (10.45)		t = -2.46 p = 0.0139	
Parents with physical disability (%)	27.93		27.75		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.03 p = 0.853	

Mexico

	Whose Parents in Home					
	Husband's (49%)		Wife's (51%)			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	759	759	797	797		
Mean age	36.02 (9.35)	33.87 (9.33)	37.99 (10.51)	35.75 (9.88)	t = 3.93 p = 0.0001	t = 3.85 p = 0.0001
Education (years)	8.76 (4.48)	8.58 (4.31)	8.28 (4.44)	8.83 (4.15)	t = -2.12 p = 0.0340	t = 1.18 p = 0.2377
Difference in education[b]	0.18 (4.40)		-0.55 (4.35)		t=-3.31 p=0.0010	
Educated abroad (%)	75.49	75.36	80.80	80.68	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 6.43 p = .011	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 6.42 p = .011
Yearly income[a]	25.08 (23.96)	7.19 (10.23)	25.25 (23.67)	8.75 (14.71)	t = 0.14 p = 0.8852	t = 2.45 p = 0.0145
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income	0.20 (0.24)		0.22 (0.24)		t = 2.03 p = 0.0430	
Occupational status (SEI)	24.28 (18.75)	16.11 (19.72)	23.73 (18.62)	18.40 (21.52)	t = -0.58 p = 0.5643	t = 2.19 p = 0.0288

(Table continued from the previous page)

Difference in occupational status score[b]	8.17 (24.93)		5.34 (25.44)		t = -2.22 p = 0.0265	
Self employed (%)	10.42	5.83	9.64	7.49	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.26 p = 0.612	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.11 p = 0.292
Husband and wife both self-employed (%)	1.91		2.30		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.18 p = 0.671	
Years since immigration	16.52 (8.97)	13.45 (9.25)	17.03 (10.05)	15.19 (9.97)	t = 1.06 p = 0.2881	t = 3.56 p = 0.0004
Husband arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	30.83		23.59		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 10.31 p = 0.001	
Wife arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	9.49		10.92		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.87 p = 0.352	
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	10.80	11.73	9.28	9.03	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.99 p = .319	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.04 p = .081
Citizens (%)	35.57	24.64	31.24	29.74	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.28 p = 0.070	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 5.10 p = 0.024
Husband and wife both citizens (%)	17.52		18.70		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.36 p = 0.549	
Husband citizen wife non-citizen (%)	18.05		12.55		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 9.12 p = 0.003	
Husband non-citizen wife citizen (%)	7.11		11.04		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 7.23 p = 0.007	
Speaks English well or above (%)	55.99	38.21	50.06	39.65	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 5.49 p = 0.019	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.34 p = 0.560
Both speak English well, very well, or speak only English (%)	31.49		29.74		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.56 p = 0.453	
Married abroad	31.49		39.15		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 9.97 p = .002	
Age difference between couple	2.14		2.24		t = 0.39 p = .6961	
Parents' yearly income[a]	2.47 (9.13)		1.87 (12.76)		t = -1.07 p = 0.2833	
Parents with physical disability (%)	19.10		23.46		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 4.40 p = 0.036	

Philippines

	Whose Parents in Home					
	Husband's (41%)		Wife's (59%)			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	595	595	849	849		
Mean age	43.28 (8.76)	41.77 (8.90)	44.62 (8.72)	42.56 (7.89)	t = 2.86 p = 0.0043	t = 1.75 p = 0.0802
Education (years)	14.48 (2.29)	14.68 (2.45)	14.52 (2.58)	15.24 (2.11)	t = 0.33 p = 0.7410	t = 4.56 p = 0.0000
Difference in education[b]	-0.20 (2.40)		-0.72 (2.58)		t = -3.95 p = 0.0001	
Educated abroad (%)	79.83	79.66	77.50	82.33	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.12 p = .289	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.63 p = .201

(Table continued from the previous page)

Yearly income[a]	40.48 (40.54)	31.48 (26.28)	41.02 (43.26)	37.43 (27.72)	t = 0.25 p = 0.8045	t = 4.14 p = 0.0000
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income	0.44 (0.23)		0.49 (0.23)		t = 3.76 p = 0.0002	
Occupational status (SEI)	39.09 (23.37)	40.40 (22.34)	41.05 (24.93)	44.51 (21.89)	t = 1.52 p = 0.1278	t = 3.47 p = 0.0005
Difference in occupational status score[b]	-1.31 (27.97)		-3.46 (28.68)		t = -1.42 p = 0.1547	
Self employed (%)	5.03	2.68	5.08	3.71	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.00 p = 0.961	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.10 p = 0.294
Husband and wife both self-employed (%)	0.91		1.15		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.17 p = 0.682	
Years since immigration	16.44 (7.85)	15.65 (7.99)	18.66 (8.49)	16.79 (7.39)	t = 5.11 p = 0.0000	t = 2.75 p = 0.0060
Husband arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	22.69		29.80		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 9.00 p = 0.003	
Wife arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	17.65		13.55		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 4.56 p = 0.033	
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	3.53	3.53	6.71	3.30	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 6.94 p = .008	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.06 p = .811
Citizens (%)	77.31	70.92	78.92	84.10	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.53 p = 0.467	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 36.19 p = 0.000
Husband and wife both citizens (%)	62.52		72.67		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 16.71 p = 0.000	
Husband citizen wife non-citizen (%)	14.79		6.24		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 29.01 p = 0.000	
Husband non-citizen wife citizen (%)	8.40		11.43		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.49 p = 0.062	
Speaks English well or above (%)	95.63	96.64	96.11	97.53	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.21 p = 0.648	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.00 p = 0.317
Both speak English well, very well, or speak only English (%)	94.45		94.58		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.01 p = 0.916	
Married abroad	73.28		69.14		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.90 p = .089	
Age difference between couple	1.51		2.06		t = 1.97 p = .0488	
Parents' yearly income[a]	3.27 (11.33)		3.69 (11.81)		t = 0.68 p = 0.4959	
Parents with physical disability (%)	31.93		37.69		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 5.08 p = 0.024	

China

	Whose Parents in Home					
	Husband's (56%)		**Wife's (44%)**			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	870	870	696	696		

(Table continued from the previous page)

Mean age	42.98 (9.22)	40.22 (8.69)	44.05 (9.10)	40.66 (8.60)	t = 2.30 p = 0.0216	t = 1.00 p = 0.3187
Education (years)	13.70 (4.53)	12.94 (4.35)	13.83 (4.75)	13.49 (4.28)	t = 0.55 p = 0.5827	t = 2.50 p = 0.0124
Difference in education[b]	0.76 (3.20)		0.34 (3.15)		t = -2.59 p = 0.0096	
Educated abroad (%)	77.70	80.69	79.74	81.90	$Chi2_{(1)} = 0.96$ p = .328	$Chi2_{(1)} = 0.37$ p = .543
Yearly income[a]	50.79 (59.18)	27.02 (39.92)	54.74 (65.00)	28.60 (33.90)	t = 1.24 p = 0.2143	t = 0.84 p = 0.3992
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income	0.35 (0.26)		0.36 (0.26)		t = 1.11 p = 0.2686	
Occupational status (SEI)	48.01 (27.32)	39.47 (27.33)	48.59 (27.93)	43.54 (27.87)	t = 0.41 p = 0.6818	t = 2.90 p = 0.0038
Difference in occupational status score[b]	8.55 (30.16)		5.05 (31.00)		t = -2.25 p = 0.0249	
Self employed (%)	17.60	10.95	16.79	7.50	$Chi2_{(1)} = 0.17$ p = 0.679	$Chi2_{(1)} = 4.67$ p = 0.031
Husband and wife both self-employed (%)	6.34		4.68		$Chi2_{(1)} = 1.72$ p = 0.190	
Years since immigration	16.81 (8.22)	14.54 (7.89)	16.63 (8.85)	14.77 (7.86)	t = -0.41 p = 0.6814	t = 0.57 p = 0.5668
Husband arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	20.23		17.67		$Chi2_{(1)} = 1.64$ p = 0.201	
Wife arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	6.09		6.47		$Chi2_{(1)} = 0.09$ p = 0.762	
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	4.48	3.79	4.17	3.74	$Chi2_{(1)} = 0.09$ p = .760	$Chi2_{(1)} = 0.00$ p = .953
Citizens (%)	72.53	67.47	63.22	73.28	$Chi2_{(1)} = 15.50$ p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)} = 6.21$ p = 0.013
Husband and wife both citizens (%)	59.31		57.04		$Chi2_{(1)} = 0.82$ p = 0.365	
Husband citizen wife non-citizen (%)	13.22		6.18		$Chi2_{(1)} = 21.13$ p = 0.000	
Husband non-citizen wife citizen (%)	8.16		16.24		$Chi2_{(1)} = 24.31$ p = 0.000	
Speaks English well or above (%)	69.54	66.55	68.10	66.52	$Chi2_{(1)} = 0.37$ p = 0.542	$Chi2_{(1)} = 0.00$ p = 0.990
Both speak English well, very well, or speak only English (%)	59.77		58.33		$Chi2_{(1)} = 0.33$ p = 0.565	
Married abroad	73.22		79.17		$Chi2_{(1)} = 7.47$ p = .006	
Age difference between couple	2.76		3.40		t = 2.83 p = .0047	
Parents' yearly income[a]	3.72 (14.20)		2.85 (8.18)		t = -1.53 p = 0.1272	
Parents with physical disability (%)	22.18		16.67		$Chi2_{(1)} = 7.43$ p = 0.006	

(Table continued from the previous page)

Vietnam

	Whose Parents in Home					
	Husband's (54%)		Wife's (46%)			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	375	375	317	317		
Mean age	39.73 (8.83)	36.37 (8.87)	41.19 (9.66)	37.61 (9.40)	t = 2.05 p = 0.0404	t = 1.77 p = 0.0776
Education (years)	12.82 (3.63)	11.53 (4.15)	12.62 (4.09)	11.80 (3.87)	t = -0.67 p = 0.5004	t = 0.90 p = 0.3709
Difference in education[b]	1.29 (3.30)		0.82 (3.22)		t = -1.90 p = 0.0574	
Educated abroad (%)	66.40	72.00	69.09	73.50	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.57 p = .452	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.20 p = .659
Yearly income[a]	40.46 (31.63)	18.41 (22.43)	41.62 (49.18)	21.31 (22.70)	t = 0.36 p = 0.7190	t = 1.68 p = 0.0930
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income	0.30 (0.24)		0.35 (0.26)		t = 2.54 p = 0.0115	
Occupational status (SEI)	40.52 (25.56)	28.86 (25.36)	39.45 (25.56)	30.26 (24.54)	t = -0.55 p = 0.5847	t = 0.74 p = 0.4608
Difference in occupational status score[b]	11.66 (28.48)		9.19 (28.10)		t = -1.14 p = 0.2528	
Self employed (%)	11.11	11.50	14.94	14.23	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.16 p = 0.141	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.99 p = 0.319
Husband and wife both self-employed (%)	5.23		5.84		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.10 p = 0.748	
Years since immigration	15.69 (6.33)	12.72 (7.33)	16.67 (6.48)	13.97 (6.57)	t = 1.99 p = 0.0467	t = 2.37 p = 0.0179
Husband arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	29.60		27.44		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.39 p = 0.532	
Wife arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	6.13		3.79		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.97 p = 0.160	
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	5.60	10.67	7.57	6.62	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.10 p = .295	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.49 p = .062
Citizens (%)	79.73	58.93	80.13	66.88	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.02 p = 0.898	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 4.63 p = 0.031
Husband and wife both citizens (%)	54.67		62.78		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 4.65 p = 0.031	
Husband citizen wife non-citizen (%)	25.07		17.35		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 6.05 p = 0.014	
Husband non-citizen wife citizen (%)	4.27		4.10		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.01 p = 0.914	
Speaks English well or above (%)	76.00	60.00	73.50	66.25	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.57 p = 0.450	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.87 p = 0.090
Both speak English well, very well, or speak only English (%)	54.67		60.25		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.19 p = 0.139	
Married abroad	52.53		55.52		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.62 p = .432	

(Table continued from the previous page)

Age difference between couple	3.36	3.58	t = 0.59 p = .5538
Parents' yearly income[a]	3.74 (9.95)	3.33 (8.33)	t = -0.59 p = 0.5524
Parents with physical disability (%)	40.00	34.07	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.58 p = 0.108

India

	Whose Parents in Home					
	Husband's (76%)		Wife's (24%)			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	910	910	290	290		
Mean age	40.81 (7.79)	36.97 (7.85)	43.58 (8.83)	39.10 (8.57)	t = 4.79 p = 0.0000	t = 3.77 p = 0.0002
Education (years)	15.51 (2.78)	14.60 (3.06)	15.85 (2.70)	15.10 (2.80)	t = 1.84 p = 0.0661	t = 2.59 p = 0.0098
Difference in education[b]	0.92 (2.87)		0.75 (2.86)		t = -0.85 p = 0.3967	
Educated abroad (%)	73.30	70.55	79.66	71.03	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 4.72 p = .030	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.03 p = .874
Yearly income[a]	72.34 (76.36)	26.43 (36.68)	82.27 (96.31)	34.25 (48.56)	t = 1.60 p = 0.1097	t = 2.52 p = 0.0121
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income	0.28 (0.25)		0.31 (0.28)		t = 2.00 p = 0.0462	
Occupational status (SEI)	57.59 (24.19)	41.05 (28.21)	57.44 (26.29)	46.32 (27.86)	t = -0.08 p = 0.9340	t = 2.80 p = 0.0054
Difference in occupational status score[b]	16.54 (32.25)		11.12 (34.11)		t = -2.39 p = 0.0175	
Self employed (%)	20.07	11.04	18.09	9.35	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.53 p = 0.465	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.55 p = 0.457
Husband and wife both self-employed (%)	6.27		4.20		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.41 p = 0.235	
Years since immigration	15.81 (7.13)	13.60 (7.47)	16.74 (8.02)	14.67 (7.42)	t = 1.77 p = 0.0769	t = 2.13 p = 0.0333
Husband arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	28.90		23.45		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.27 p = 0.070	
Wife arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	13.30		8.62		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 4.50 p = 0.034	
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	4.95	6.37	1.38	4.14	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 7.14 p = .008	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.00 p = .157
Citizens (%)	75.49	57.36	63.45	74.83	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 16.04 p = 0.000	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 28.35 p = 0.000
Husband and wife both citizens (%)	49.34		53.79		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.74 p = 0.187	
Husband citizen wife non-citizen (%)	26.15		9.66		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 34.70 p = 0.000	

(Table continued from the previous page)

Husband non-citizen wife citizen (%)	8.02		21.03		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 37.54 p = 0.000	
Speaks English well or above (%)	96.92	90.33	97.24	93.79	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.08 p = 0.782	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.28 p = 0.070
Both speak English well, very well, or speak only English (%)	89.56		92.41		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.03 p = 0.154	
Married abroad	73.63		83.79		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 12.49 p = .000	
Age difference between couple	3.84		4.48		t = 2.44 p = .0148	
Parents' yearly income[a]	5.27 (26.19)		3.61 (12.48)		t = -1.46 p = 0.1450	
Parents with physical disability (%)	33.52		25.86		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 5.95 p = 0.015	

Cuba

	Whose Parents in Home					
	Husband's (38%)		**Wife's (62%)**			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	230	230	377	377		
Mean age	49.03 (11.52)	46.12 (11.57)	49.75 (12.37)	47.15 (11.74)	t = 0.73 p = 0.4636	t = 1.06 p = 0.2900
Education (years)	12.12 (3.72)	11.79 (3.80)	12.35 (3.67)	12.42 (3.17)	t = 0.74 p = 0.4612	t = 2.09 p = 0.0372
Difference in education[b]	0.33 (3.30)		-0.07 (3.81)		t = -1.35 p = 0.1765	
Educated abroad (%)	75.65	70.00	73.74	66.58	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.27 p = .600	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.77 p = .381
Yearly income[a]	36.70 (41.81)	15.83 (21.89)	33.57 (38.36)	17.72 (24.76)	t = -0.92 p = 0.3560	t = 0.98 p = 0.3282
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income	0.30 (0.26)		0.33 (0.26)		t = 1.72 p = 0.0858	
Occupational status (SEI)	36.33 (24.87)	33.64 (25.82)	36.01 (24.35)	35.66 (27.57)	t = -0.15 p = 0.8776	t = 0.91 p = 0.3623
Difference in occupational status score[b]	2.69 (29.03)		0.35 (32.54)		t = -0.92 p = 0.3582	
Self employed (%)	22.79	6.04	20.86	6.21	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.29 p = 0.588	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.01 p = 0.943
Husband and wife both self-employed (%)	1.69		3.94		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.86 p = 0.172	
Years since immigration	20.81 (12.72)	20.32 (12.86)	22.66 (12.60)	22.95 (12.30)	t = 1.75 p = 0.0814	t = 2.49 p = 0.0132
Husband arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	11.74		9.02		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.17 p = 0.279	
Wife arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	9.13		12.47		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.60 p = 0.206	

(Table continued from the previous page)

Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	13.04	16.96	14.32	19.10	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.20 p = .658	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.44 p = .508
Citizens (%)	56.09	57.39	60.48	67.37	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.14 p = 0.286	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 6.15 p = 0.013
Husband and wife both citizens (%)	49.13		56.76		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.35 p = 0.067	
Husband citizen wife non-citizen (%)	6.96		3.71		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.20 p = 0.074	
Husband non-citizen wife citizen (%)	8.26		10.61		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.90 p = 0.343	
Speaks English well or above (%)	60.87	53.48	58.09	58.89	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.46 p = 0.499	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.70 p = 0.192
Both speak English well, very well, or speak only English (%)	45.65		46.68		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.06 p = 0.805	
Married abroad	71.30		67.64		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.90 p = .343	
Age difference between couple	2.91		2.60		t = -0.68 p = .4954	
Parents' yearly income[a]	2.48 (7.08)		3.23 (8.70)		t = 1.16 p = 0.2470	
Parents with physical disability (%)	36.96		40.32		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.68 p = 0.410	

Jamaica

	Whose Parents in Home					
	Husband's (31%)		Wife's (69%)			
	Husband	Wife	Husband	Wife	Test of Difference Between Husbands	Test of Difference Between Wives
Number of obs.	49	49	107	107		
Mean age	44.27 (10.66)	42.22 (10.56)	46.74 (9.98)	43.56 (9.87)	t = 1.37 p = 0.1737	t = 0.75 p = 0.4561
Education (years)	12.90 (2.14)	13.29 (2.27)	12.25 (2.94)	13.14 (2.92)	t = -1.55 p = 0.1248	t = -0.34 p = 0.7356
Difference in education[b]	-0.39 (2.40)		-0.89 (2.74)		t = -1.15 p = 0.2515	
Educated abroad (%)	87.76	77.55	82.24	71.96	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.76 p = .384	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.54 p = .462
Yearly income[a]	33.98 (26.02)	31.04 (20.20)	35.66 (26.46)	33.55 (43.44)	t = 0.37 p = 0.7105	t = 0.49 p = 0.6231
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income	0.46 (0.23)		0.45 (0.27)		t = -0.30 p = 0.7679	
Occupational status (SEI)	33.94 (22.26)	36.00 (20.45)	33.24 (25.09)	37.70 (23.90)	t = -0.17 p = 0.8622	t = 0.46 p = 0.6488
Difference in occupational status score[b]	-2.06 (23.11)		-4.46 (29.34)		t = -0.55 p = 0.5830	
Self employed (%)	10.42	6.52	13.27	3.88	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.24 p = 0.623	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.49 p = 0.482

(Table continued from the previous page)

Husband and wife both self-employed (%)	4.44		3.13		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.16 p = 0.693	
Years since immigration	18.12 (8.27)	17.04 (8.80)	19.83 (9.55)	19.71 (8.49)	t = 1.14 p = 0.2570	t = 1.78 p = 0.0788
Husband arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	20.41		16.82		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.29 p = 0.588	
Wife arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	12.24		16.82		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.54 p = 0.462	
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	0.00	4.08	3.74	4.67	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 1.88 p = .170	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.03 p = .868
Citizens (%)	73.47	77.55	54.21	79.44	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 5.21 p = 0.022	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.07 p = 0.789
Husband and wife both citizens (%)	57.14		47.66		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 1.21 p = 0.272	
Husband citizen wife non-citizen (%)	16.33		6.54		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 3.70 p = 0.054	
Husband non-citizen wife citizen (%)	20.41		31.78		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 2.14 p = 0.143	
Speaks English well or above (%)	100.00	97.96	100.00	100.00	-	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 2.20 p = 0.138
Both speak English well, very well, or speak only English (%)	97.96		100.00		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 2.20 p = 0.138	
Married abroad	69.39		72.90		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.20 p = .651	
Age difference between couple	2.04		3.18		t = 1.27 p = .2078	
Parents' yearly income[a]	0.79 (4.52)		1.04 (5.16)		t = 0.30 p = 0.7650	
Parents with physical disability (%)	26.53		30.84		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.30 p = 0.584	

Korea

	Whose Parents in Home					
	Husband's (65%)		**Wife's (35%)**			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	356	356	189	189		
Mean age	42.58 (9.14)	39.53 (8.62)	44.19 (8.61)	41.90 (8.32)	t = 2.04 p = 0.0421	t = 3.12 p = 0.0019
Education (years)	14.55 (2.62)	13.90 (2.35)	14.76 (2.60)	14.25 (2.30)	t = 0.89 p = 0.3738	t = 1.71 p = 0.0873
Difference in education[b]	0.65 (2.57)		0.50 (2.39)		t = -0.67 p = 0.5002	
Educated abroad (%)	78.65	79.21	79.37	79.37	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.04 p = .846	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.00 p = .967
Yearly income[a]	51.80 (63.81)	22.54 (37.87)	48.22 (59.38)	24.13 (27.90)	t = -0.65 p = 0.5149	t = 0.56 p = 0.5768

(Table continued from the previous page)

Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income	0.31 (0.29)		0.33 (0.28)		t = 0.61 p = 0.5425	
Occupational status (SEI)	50.88 (24.58)	35.83 (27.48)	47.88 (24.21)	37.47 (27.53)	t = -1.37 p = 0.1715	t = 0.66 p = 0.5083
Difference in occupational status score[b]	15.05 (31.43)		10.41 (32.77)		t = -1.60 p = 0.1114	
Self employed (%)	40.94	28.26	41.21	29.14	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.00 p = 0.952	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.04 p = 0.848
Husband and wife both self-employed (%)	22.22		21.23		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.05 p = 0.816	
Years since immigration	15.85 (7.17)	14.06 (7.66)	17.06 (8.08)	16.03 (8.11)	t = 1.73 p = 0.0841	t = 2.74 p = 0.0064
Husband arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	19.66		15.87		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.18 p = 0.277	
Wife arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	7.58		6.35		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.28 p = 0.594	
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	7.30	7.58	4.76	3.70	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.33 p = .249	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.18 p = .075
Citizens (%)	57.58	48.88	56.61	61.90	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.05 p = 0.827	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 8.42 p = 0.004
Husband and wife both citizens (%)	40.17		47.62		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.80 p = 0.094	
Husband citizen wife non-citizen (%)	17.42		8.99		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 7.06 p = 0.008	
Husband non-citizen wife citizen (%)	8.71		14.29		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 4.04 p = 0.044	
Speaks English well or above (%)	64.61	53.09	70.90	55.56	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.20 p = 0.138	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.30 p = 0.583
Both speak English well, very well, or speak only English (%)	45.51		50.79		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.38 p = 0.239	
Married abroad	75.28		76.72		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.14 p = .709	
Age difference between couple	3.04		2.29		t = -2.54 p = .0114	
Parents' yearly income[a]	2.45 (11.83)		1.44 (6.94)		t = -1.25 p = 0.2119	
Parents with physical disability (%)	28.37		25.40		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.55 p = 0.458	

Poland

	Whose Parents in Home					
	Husband's (46%)		Wife's (54%)			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	112	112	130	130		
Mean age	41.20 (9.27)	38.84 (9.12)	42.78 (10.10)	40.48 (10.01)	t = 1.27 p = 0.2037	t = 1.33 p = 0.1844

(Table continued from the previous page)

Education (years)	13.43 (2.83)	13.21 (2.54)	12.94 (2.65)	13.30 (2.27)	t = -1.38 p = 0.1677	t = 0.30 p = 0.7620
Difference in education[b]	0.22 (2.44)		-0.36 (2.31)		t = -1.90 p = 0.0582	
Educated abroad (%)	81.25	82.14	83.85	80.77	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.28 p = .595	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.08 p = .784
Yearly income[a]	41.63 (29.00)	21.06 (23.23)	49.89 (47.49)	22.66 (35.55)	t = 1.66 p = 0.0990	t = 0.42 p = 0.6739
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income	0.30 (0.24)		0.30 (0.23)		t = -0.13 p = 0.8966	
Occupational status (SEI)	38.50 (26.08)	30.71 (27.77)	33.72 (21.71)	32.22 (27.48)	t = -1.53 p = 0.1265	t = 0.43 p = 0.6706
Difference in occupational status score[b]	7.79 (29.11)		1.50 (31.36)		t = -1.62 p = 0.1070	
Self employed (%)	9.82	10.64	17.07	16.83	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 2.62 p = 0.105	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 1.57 p = 0.211
Husband and wife both self-employed (%)	1.06		5.15		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 2.63 p = 0.105	
Years since immigration	15.67 (8.55)	14.65 (9.50)	16.54 (10.99)	15.80 (10.75)	t = 0.69 p = 0.4903	t = 0.88 p = 0.3786
Husband arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	18.75		11.54		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 2.47 p = 0.116	
Wife arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	10.71		7.69		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.66 p = 0.415	
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	2.68	8.04	5.38	6.92	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 1.11 p = .292	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.11 p = .742
Citizens (%)	50.89	53.57	53.85	55.38	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.21 p = 0.646	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.08 p = 0.778
Husband and wife both citizens (%)	38.39		46.92		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 1.79 p = 0.181	
Husband citizen wife non-citizen (%)	12.50		6.92		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 2.18 p = 0.140	
Husband non-citizen wife citizen (%)	15.18		8.46		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 2.65 p = 0.103	
Speaks English well or above (%)	80.36	79.46	69.23	79.23	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 3.91 p = 0.048	Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.00 p = 0.964
Both speak English well, very well, or speak only English (%)	72.32		66.15		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 1.07 p = 0.301	
Married abroad	70.54		74.62		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.50 p = .477	
Age difference between couple	2.36		2.31		t = -0.09 p = .9264	
Parents' yearly income[a]	4.43 (13.89)		4.14 (13.12)		t = -0.17 p = 0.8686	
Parents with physical disability (%)	25.00		20.00		Chi2$_{(1)}$ = 0.87 p = 0.352	

(Table continued from the previous page)

El Salvador

	Whose Parents in Home					
	Husband's (45%)		**Wife's (55%)**			
	Husband	**Wife**	**Husband**	**Wife**	**Test of Difference Between Husbands**	**Test of Difference Between Wives**
Number of obs.	209	209	252	252		
Mean age	37.33 (8.34)	35.50 (9.13)	38.94 (9.41)	37.26 (8.30)	t = 1.95 p = 0.0516	t = 2.15 p = 0.0324
Education (years)	9.64 (4.30)	9.13 (4.73)	9.85 (4.25)	9.89 (4.01)	t = 0.52 p = 0.6017	t = 1.84 p = 0.0672
Difference in education[b]	0.50 (5.14)		-0.05 (4.25)		t = -1.24 p = 0.2169	
Educated abroad (%)	77.99	79.43	82.54	78.97	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.50 p = .220	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.01 p = .904
Yearly income[a]	30.98 (33.38)	13.51 (28.12)	32.71 (43.76)	15.99 (27.23)	t = 0.48 p = 0.6302	t = 0.96 p = 0.3395
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income	0.26 (0.26)		0.32 (0.26)		t = 2.51 p = 0.0123	
Occupational status (SEI)	26.62 (20.21)	21.31 (20.73)	27.94 (21.45)	24.83 (23.22)	t = 0.68 p = 0.4980	t = 1.72 p = 0.0858
Difference in occupational status score[b]	5.32 (25.47)		3.11 (27.31)		t = -0.90 p = 0.3702	
Self employed (%)	10.40	5.49	9.76	14.08	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.05 p = 0.823	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 7.31 p = 0.007
Husband and wife both self-employed (%)	2.55		3.96		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.55 p = 0.460	
Years since immigration	16.27 (6.27)	14.05 (6.90)	16.45 (6.48)	16.49 (7.07)	t = 0.31 p = 0.7570	t = 3.74 p = 0.0002
Husband arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	21.53		12.70		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 6.41 p = 0.011	
Wife arrived 5 years earlier or more (%)	7.66		15.08		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 6.09 p = 0.014	
Immigrated to U.S. before 13 (%)	5.26	7.18	3.97	10.71	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.44 p = .507	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.73 p = .189
Citizens (%)	41.15	29.19	42.46	46.03	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.08 p = 0.776	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 13.71 p = 0.000
Husband and wife both citizens (%)	20.10		31.35		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 7.47 p = 0.006	
Husband citizen wife non-citizen (%)	21.05		11.11		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 8.57 p = 0.003	
Husband non-citizen wife citizen (%)	9.09		14.68		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.35 p = 0.067	
Speaks English well or above (%)	72.73	53.59	67.86	61.90	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.29 p = 0.256	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 3.25 p = 0.072
Both speak English well, very well, or speak only English (%)	45.93		53.17		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 2.40 p = 0.122	
Married abroad	38.28		44.44		$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 1.79 p = .181	

Age difference between couple	1.83	1.69	t = -0.25 p = .8021
Parents' yearly income[a]	1.94 (7.07)	1.46 (6.37)	t = -0.76 p = 0.4457
Parents with physical disability (%)	17.70	18.25	$Chi2_{(1)}$ = 0.02 p = 0.878

Note:
[a]: income in thousands.
[b]: All "difference" variables were calculated by subtracting wife's number from husband's number.

6.3. Bivariate Analyses

Table 6.1 presents the results of bivariate analyses between the "whose parents were present" outcome and the main independent variables (plus age) by gender and country. These bivariate analyses were conducted in the same approach as the ones performed in Section 5.3.1, but on a different outcome, i.e. which spouse's parents were present in home. Student's t-tests and Pearson's Chi-square tests were again used to detect differences on the independent variables between households with the husband's parents and those with the wife's parents. Overall much fewer differences between those who had the husband's parents and those who had the wife's parents were found to be significant, compared to the findings in the last chapter.

Again results for all ten countries combined together are first presented (the first part of Table 6.1). For easier discussion, immigrant families where the husband's parents were present are called "his-parents" families below; similarly, those where the wife's parents were present are called "her-parents" families. Overall, compared to immigrant husbands and wives from households where her parents were present, husbands and wives from "his-parents" families were both younger in age. On average, his-parents husbands had higher education than their counterparts from her-parents families. Looking at the

difference of education between husband and wife: among his-parents families husbands had higher education than their wives, whereas among her-parents families wives had higher education than their husbands. This suggested a pattern of “his advantage associated with his parents’ presence, and her advantage associated with her parents’ presence”. Results on income showed the same pattern: his-parents husbands earned more than their her-parents counterparts, while his-parents wives earned less than their her-parents counterparts. The proportion that wife’s income accounted for in the couple’s total income was higher in her-parents families. Occupational status for her-parents wives was higher, and the difference in occupational status (SEI score) between husband and wife was smaller among her-parents families. Both spouses being self-employed was more common among his-parents families, and husbands from his-parents families were more likely to be self-employed. Immigrant couples from his-parents families have been in U.S. for a shorter time than their her-parents counterparts. Citizenship status again demonstrated the same pattern as income and education above: his-parents husbands were more likely to be citizens than their her-parents counterparts, while his-parents wives were less likely to be citizens than her-parents wives. Both spouses being citizen was more common among her-parents families; in families where only one spouse was citizen and the other one was not, the spouse who was citizen was more likely to have his/her parents in home. Lastly, his-parents husbands had better English proficiency than her-parents husbands; receiving all one’s education abroad before coming to U.S. was found to be more common among families with her parents in home, while English proficiency, immigrating before 13, married abroad, age difference

between the couple, and presence of parents with physical difficulty were not found to be significantly different between the two groups of the outcome.

Next, the same analysis was repeated for each country separately, which results further revealed cross-group differences. They are summarized into the following main points.

- Immigrant couples who had the wife's parents in home tended to be older in age compared to those who had the husband's parents, although the difference was only significant among Mexicans, Indians and Koreans for both spouses, among Filipinos, Chinese, and Vietnamese for only the husbands, and among Salvadorian wives.

- Immigrant wives from Philippines, China, India, and Cuba who had their parents in home received higher education than their counterparts in families where husband's parents were present. Furthermore, results on difference in education between husband and wife revealed interesting variations across groups: among Mexican immigrants, husbands got higher education than their wives in families with his parents, but husbands had lower education than their wives in families with her parents; among Filipino immigrants, husbands got lower education than their wives regardless of whose parents were in home, but the difference in education was smaller in families with his parents than in families with her parents; among Chinese immigrants, husbands had higher education than their wives regardless of whose parents were in home, but the difference in education was greater in families with his parents than in families with her parents. Receiving all one's education abroad was only significant among immigrants

from Mexico (both spouses), and among Indian immigrant husbands. In all three cases those with the wife's parents in home were more likely to have received all their education abroad, compared to their counterparts from families with his parents present.

- Yearly income of immigrant wives from Mexico, Philippines, and India who had her parents in home was significantly higher than their counterparts who had their husband's parents in home. Furthermore, wife's income accounted for a significantly higher proportion of the couple's total income in families with her parents in home among immigrants from Mexico, Philippines, Vietnam, India, and El Salvador. Mexican, Filipino, Chinese, and Indian immigrant wife's occupational status was found to be higher in families where her parents were present compared to their counterparts' occupational status in households where the husband's parents were present.

- The finding on self-employment was few and inconsistent, as self-employment rate was higher among Chinese immigrant households with the husband's parents, while it was higher among Salvadorian immigrant households with the wife's parents.

- For all immigrant groups except Jamaicans and Poles, the wives among "wife's parents present" households had been in U.S. for a longer time and more likely to be naturalized citizens, compared to the wives in "husband's parents present" households. Immigrating before 13 was only significant among Filipino and Indian immigrant husbands, and the findings were opposite of each other: Filipino

husbands from “her-parents” families were more likely to be 1.5-generation immigrants, while Indian husband from “his-parents” families were more likely to have immigrated before 13. Both spouses being naturalized citizens was more common among families where wife’s parents were in home; in families where only one spouse was citizen, results showed that it was always that spouse’s parents who were present, although this trend was not statistically significant among all groups.

- Higher English proficiency on the husband’s part was found among Mexican and Polish households where husband’s parents were co-residing, while it was not significant in all other groups.

- Finally, older immigrant parents’ incomes were not significantly different between husband’s parents and wife’s parents in any of the ten groups. Older parents with substantially limited physical difficulty was more likely to be the wife’s parents among Mexican and Filipino immigrants, but more likely to be the husband’s parents among the Chinese and Indians. Married abroad was significant among immigrants from Mexico, China, and India, and in all three cases couples from “her-parents” families were more likely to have got married abroad compared to those from “his-parents” families. Lastly, age difference between husband and wife (where husband was older than wife in all cases) was significantly bigger among couples from “her-parents” families for those from Philippines, China and India, but it was bigger among couples from “his-parents” families for those from Korea.

TABLE 6.2: Logistic Regression Results for Whose Parents in Home: Separate-Spouse vs. Joint-Spouse Approach, All Ten Countries
(Table continues on the next page)

Variable	Dependent Variable: Whose Parents at Home (1=husband's parents, 0=wife's parents)			
	Separate-Spouse Approach		Joint-Spouse Approach	
	Model 1 (using Husband data) Coefficient (SE)	**Model 2 (using Wife's data)** Coefficient (SE)	**Model 1 (using Husband's data)** Coefficient (SE)	**Model 2 (using Wife's data)** Coefficient (SE)
Personal characteristics:				
Husband's education (years)	.028** (.010)	.028** (.010)		
Wife's education (years)	-.059*** (.010)	-.055*** (.010)		
Difference in education[b]			.041*** (.009)	.037*** (.009)
Husband's yearly income[a]	-.000 (.001)	-.000 (.001)		
Wife's yearly income[a]	-.001 (.001)	-.001 (.001)		
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income			-.290* (.115)	-.288* (.115)
Husband's occupational status (SEI)	.002 (.001)	.002 (.001)		
Wife's occupational status (SEI)	-.005*** (.001)	-.005*** (.001)		
Difference in occupational status score[b]			.003** (.001)	.003** (.001)
Husband self-employed	.084 (.080)	.087 (.080)		
Wife self-employed	-.032 (.094)	-.029 (.094)		
Husband and wife both self-employed			.065 (.124)	.067 (.124)
Exposure to American society:				
Husband's years since immigration	-.001 (.006)	.003 (.006)		
Wife's years since immigration	-.019** (.006)	-.024*** (.006)		
Husband arriving 5 years earlier or more			.032 (.079)	.094 (.076)
Wife arriving 5 years earlier or more			.114 (.098)	.047 (.098)

(Table continued from the previous page)

Variable	Dependent Variable: Whose Parents at Home (1=husband's parents, 0=wife's parents)			
	Separate-Spouse Approach		**Joint-Spouse Approach**	
	Model 1 (using Husband data) Coefficient (SE)	**Model 2 (using Wife's data)** Coefficient (SE)	**Model 1 (using Husband's data)** Coefficient (SE)	**Model 2 (using Wife's data)** Coefficient (SE)
Husband being naturalized citizen	.550*** (.068)	.555*** (.069)		
Wife being naturalized citizen	-.514*** (.070)	-.517*** (.070)		
Husband and wife both citizens			-.160* (.070)	-.161* (.070)
Husband citizen wife non-citizen			.570*** (.095)	.573*** (.095)
Husband non-citizen wife citizen			-.526*** (.096)	-.538*** (.096)
Husband's English proficiency	.060 (.042)	.059 (.042)		
Wife's English proficiency	-.029 (.040)	-.031 (.040)		
Husband and wife both speak English well, very well, or speak only English			-.051 (.065)	-.054 (.065)
Parents' yearly income[a]	.001 (.002)	.001 (.002)	.001 (.002)	.001 (.002)
Parents with physical difficulty	.140* (.060)	.140* (.060)	.093 (.059)	.089 (.059)
Husband educated abroad	.084 (.094)	.068 (.082)		
Wife educated abroad	-.353*** (.083)	-.215* (.094)		
Husband and wife both educated abroad			-.085 (.113)	-.033 (.111)
Husband educated abroad wife not			.046 (.125)	-.021 (.118)
Wife educated abroad husband not			-.353** (.119)	-.214 (.128)
Husband arrived before 13 years old	-.284* (.126)	-.331** (.127)		
Wife arrived before 13 years old	.392** (.125)	.295* (.129)		
Husband and wife both arrived before 13			-.147 (.200)	-.269 (.205)

(Table continued from the previous page)

Variable	Dependent Variable: Whose Parents at Home (1=husband's parents, 0=wife's parents)			
	Separate-Spouse Approach		Joint-Spouse Approach	
	Model 1 (using Husband data) Coefficient (SE)	**Model 2 (using Wife's data)** Coefficient (SE)	**Model 1 (using Husband's data)** Coefficient (SE)	**Model 2 (using Wife's data)** Coefficient (SE)
Husband arrived before 13 wife not			-.184 (.140)	-.221 (.140)
Wife arrived before 13 husband not			.283* (.135)	.189 (.139)
Married abroad	-.073 (.085)	-.335*** (.104)	-.170* (.082)	-.330*** (.101)
Age difference between couple	-.026*** (.007)	-.029*** (.007)	-.019** (.006)	-.024*** (.006)
Sending Country: (reference group: Mexico)				
Philippines	.057 (.110)	.090 (.110)	-.005 (.105)	.008 (.103)
China	.582*** (.103)	.608*** (.102)	.507*** (.097)	.511*** (.095)
Vietnam	.187 (.118)	.203 (.117)	.218 (.115)	.221 (.114)
India	1.468*** (.124)	1.499*** (.123)	1.353*** (.115)	1.361*** (.114)
Cuba	-.097 (.127)	-.082 (.126)	-.209 (.124)	-.220 (.122)
Jamaica	-.335 (.218)	-.319 (.217)	-.349 (.203)	-.358 (.203)
Korea	.972*** (.139)	.995*** (.139)	.842*** (.131)	.845*** (.130)
Poland	.328 (.168)	.354* (.168)	.248 (.165)	.253 (.164)
El Salvador	-.115 (.129)	-.104 (.129)	-.120 (.128)	-.108 (.128)
Number of observations	6,738	6,738	6,738	6,738
Log likelihood	-4346.02	-4341.14	-4364.00	-4360.84
Pseudo R^2	.0682	.0693	.0644	.0651

Note:
*** significant at .05 level; ** significant at .01 level; *** significant at .001 level.**
[a]: income in thousands.
[b]: All "difference" variables were calculated by subtracting wife's number from husband's number.

6.4. Logistic Regression Analyses

6.4.1. Separate-Spouse vs. Joint-Spouse Approach, All Ten Countries

Table 6.2 presents results of the logistic regression analyses on the outcome "whose parents were present in home". The population of analyses became only those households with either husband's or wife's parents present. A small number of households (n=227, see Table 5.1) that had both spouses' parents in home were excluded from this part of the analyses. Among the 8,469 households with either spouse's parents, 4465 of them had parents of the husband's (coded 1 on the dependent variable) and 4004 had parents of the wife's (coded 0 on the dependent variable). Using the same analytical process as was used on the first outcome (whether any parents were present), a Model 1 was first run using husband's data for the "married abroad" variable (i.e. if the husband had immigrated to U.S. after the age of 21). Then Model 2 used the same independent variables as Model 1 but using wife's data to represent the "married abroad" information (i.e. if the wife had immigrated to U.S. after the age of 17). The same process was repeated for both the Separate-Spouse and Joint-Spouse approaches, whose results are shown in the four columns in Table 6.2.

In the Separate-Spouse Model 1 (the second column of Table 6.2), both spouses' personal characteristics and exposure to the American society variables were put in the regression simultaneously, followed by four control variables for married abroad, age difference between husband and wife, parents' yearly income, and the indicator of whether there was an older parent with physical difficulty in the household. As these

results suggested, each spouse's educational level and citizenship status were associated with increasing likelihood of his or her own parents' presence. Higher education level of the husband increased the probability of having his parents, while higher education level of the wife increased the probability of having her parents in home. In the same way, each spouse's citizenship significantly increased the presence of his/her own parents in home. On the measures of occupational status, years of immigration, and being educated abroad, only the wife's information was associated with significantly increased probability of her parents' presence while the effects of the husband's information on these measures were not significant. These results, however, should be taken with caution, because of the high statistical correlations between husband and wife's data on these variables (correlation = .39 on occupational status, correlation = .77 on years since immigration, and correlation = .39 on receiving all education abroad). Unexpectedly, neither spouse's income was found to be significant. The effect of being a 1.5-generation immigrant was also a little surprising: each spouse's 1.5-generation immigrant status actually increased the likelihood of the other spouse's parents being in home. While the effect of the husband's 1.5-generation immigrant status could be viewed as being less traditional and less patriarchal, the effect of the wife's 1.5-gerenation immigrant status was not as straight-forward to interpret. This finding therefore warrants further exploration in future research. Two of the control variables, parents' physical difficulty and age difference between husband and wife were both found to be significant but their effects in opposite directions. While parents' with physical difficulty were more likely to be husband's parents, in immigrant families where the age difference between husband and wife was bigger, it was the wife's parents who were more likely to be present. Self-

employment, English proficiency, parents' income, and married abroad were not found to have any significant effect.

Similar to the analytical steps in the last chapter, I tested Model 1 first without and then with the country variables, and performed likelihood ratio test for statistical difference between the two regressions. Results of the likelihood ratio test showed that adding country variables into the regression model significantly increased its power of explaining variances (LR $chi2_{(9)} = 319.56$, $p > chi2 = .0000$). The country effects were less obvious in this model than in the previous model predicting whether any older parents were in home. Compared to Mexican immigrant households, only those from India, Korea and China were significantly more likely to have the husband's parents in home, while none of the other sending countries was found to have a significant effect on the outcome. Considering that India, Korea, and China are arguably the three most patriarchal sending countries in this study, these results were consistent with the expectation that immigrants from more patriarchal cultures were more likely to have the husband's parents. On the other hand, although Jamaica and the Philippines could be viewed as two of the least patriarchal cultures in this study (see Table 3.1), neither of them was found to have a significant effect in these regression results. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that the regression coefficients for Jamaica, El Salvador, and Cuba were negative (although not significant), indicating a trend for these groups being more likely to have the wife's parents in home. In other words, there are probably relations between the general status of women in a sending country and the outcome of interest here, i.e. whose parents were more likely to be in residence within the immigrant family, although these relations were not able to be fully established with these regression results directly.

After-model testing between country-coefficients was then performed to further probe for differences between sending cultures. Results suggested that differences indeed existed across groups which the regression analyses above were not able to reveal. The ten countries roughly fell into four groups, in terms of the likelihood of whose parents were present in home. Jamaica, El Salvador, and Cuba formed the first group, whose immigrants were more likely to have wife's parents home (negative coefficients, as compared to Mexican immigrants). Meanwhile, Vietnam and Poland made up the second group, whose immigrants were more likely to have husband's parents home (positive coefficients, significantly different from the three negative coefficients above). While the coefficient for Philippines was positive, after-model testing showed that the difference between Philippines and the two groups above were both not significant. Thus Philippines and Mexico (the reference group in the regression) formed a third group. All these three groups, in term, were all significantly different from India, Korea, and China, which, as discussed above, can be considered as the most patriarchal sending cultures in the study. Moreover, it was a little surprising to find that the differences between these three countries were significant as well: Indian immigrants were significantly more likely to have husband's parents in home than Korean immigrants, who in turn were significantly more likely to have husband's parents in home than Chinese immigrants. Overall these finding were largely consistent with the information presented in Table 3.1 in Chapter 3, further indicating that the probability of whose parents to have in home was to a certain extent related to women's status and gender equality in the sending culture.

Table 6.3 presents the p-values of all pair-wise comparisons for all ten immigrant groups before and after regression (based on results from the separate-spouse approach Model 1

in Table 6.2). These results were more complete but consistent with the results of after-model tests for differences between the country coefficients. With the row of blank cells diagonally across the table as the separator, the left/lower half of p-values indicates the significance of comparisons before regression on the likelihood of having husband's parents' presence in home. The right/upper half of the table, on the other hand, contained all the p-values for pair-wise comparison after regression, i.e. with all socioeconomic and acculturation factors controlled for. Examining the change in p-values before and after regression indicated whether difference between two countries still existed after other factors were taken into account. These numbers showed that most before-regression differences became non-significant after other factors were controlled for, except in only one case where the change went in the opposite direction. The difference between Vietnam and China were not significant before regression but became very significant after. This indicated that at the first look Vietnam and China may seem similar in terms of multi-generational immigrant household living arrangements but the similarity was probably associated more with socioeconomic and acculturation factors and less with sending culture. Overall the information in Table 6.3 supported the pattern of ten countries falling roughly into four general groups as discussed above: Jamaica, El Salvador, and Cuba were the first group; Philippines and Mexico made up the second group; the third group consisted of Vietnam and Poland; and the last group included China, Korea, and India. On the probability of whose parents were in home, the likelihood of having husband's parents increased from the first to the fourth group, while the likelihood of having wife's parents decreased from the first to the last group.

TABLE 6.3: The Likelihood of Having Husband's Parents in Home: p-values for Between-country Comparisons Before and After Regression

	Mexico	Philippines	China	Vietnam	India	Cuba	Jamaica	Korea	Poland	El Salvador
Mexico		.6012	.0000	.1122	.0000	.4418	.1242	.0000	.0511	.3696
Philippines	.0000		.0000	.2418	.0000	.2138	.0533	.0000	.0913	.2010
China	.0002	.0000		.0002	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0015	.1123	.0000
Vietnam	.0187	.0000	.5413		.0000	.0377	.0182	.0000	.4133	.0365
India	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000		.0000	.0000	.0003	.0000	.0000
Cuba	.0000	.1430	.0000	.0000	.0000		.2998	.0000	.0184	.9076
Jamaica	.0000	.0186	.0000	.0000	.0000	.1459		.0000	.0075	.3384
Korea	.0000	.0000	.0001	.0001	.0000	.0000	.0000		.0005	.0000
Poland	.4765	.1381	.0075	.0359	.0000	.0219	.0033	.0000		.0179
El Salvador	.2108	.1112	.0001	.0039	.0000	.0116	.0024	.0000	.8268	

Note: The left/lower half of p-values indicates the significance of comparisons before regression on the prevalence of having husband's parents present in home. The right/upper half of the table contains p-values for pair-wise comparison after regression, i.e. with all the socioeconomic and acculturation factors controlled for.

Results for Model 2 of the Separate-Spouse approach were presented in the third column of Table 6.2. The only difference of this model from Model 1 was Model 2 used the wife's data to indicate if the couple had got married abroad. The above-presented results from Model 1 remained mostly unchanged in Model 2, except for a couple of different findings. First, the effect of being married abroad became significant in this model, which increased the probability of the wife's parents in home. As explained in Chapter 4, the "married abroad" variable was a weak proxy based on age of immigration since the exact location of marriage was not available, which should be kept in mind when looking at this finding. The second different finding of Model 2 was that among the sending

countries, Poland was found to have a positive effect on having husband's parents in home, along with India, Korea, and China.

Regression results of the Joint-Spouse approach are presented in the last two columns of Table 6.2. Column 4 showed the results of Joint-Spouse Model 1 (using husband's information for the "married abroad" variable). They showed that, first of all, bigger differences between the spouses in education and occupational status increased the likelihood of having husband's parents, but greater proportions of wife's income in the couple's total income increased the likelihood of having wife's parents. Compared with the finding from the separate-spouse model above that showed neither spouse's income had a significant effect individually, this finding on the proportion of wife's income out of the couple's total income indicated the importance of *wife*'s economic power: *regardless of her husband's (or her own) overall income level, the greater proportion her income took up in the family income, the more likely she had her own parents in home.*

In terms of citizenship, these results showed that wife's parents were more likely to be present when both spouses were citizens, and also when wife was citizen and husband was not, compared to immigrant couples that were both non-citizens. Husband's parents were more likely to be present only when husband was citizen and wife was non-citizen. This finding implied something worth noting, i.e. wife's citizenship seemed to be a more decisive factor than husband's citizenship. Husband's citizenship status had an effect only when wife was not citizen; once she became one, her parents' presence in home was significantly increased, regardless of her husband's citizenship status. Wife's information was found to have a significant effect on two other measures in this model:

educated abroad and arriving before 13. In families where the wife received all her education abroad while her husband got more education after coming to U.S. her parents were more likely to be present. Additionally, in families where the wife immigrated before 13 and her husband came after 13 years old, his parents were more likely to be present. These findings were a little puzzling, as they seemed to suggest that foreign-educated wives had more power in the decision of whose parents were to live with them, and 1.5-generation wives were the ones more traditional in having her in-laws living together. In the same manner, married abroad was found to have an effect that was somewhat counterintuitive as well: being married abroad actually increased the likelihood of wife's parents in home, not husband's parents. On the other hand, bigger age difference between the couple was found to increase the probability of his parents' presence, consistent with what I had expected. Meanwhile, years since immigration, English proficiency, older parents' income, and parents with physical difficulty were not found to have any significant effects.

Country effects were found to be the same as in the Separate-Spouse approach Model 2 above, i.e. compared to immigrants from Mexico, those from India, Korea, and China were more likely to have husband's parents in home, while the other countries were not found to have significant effect on the outcome.

The last column of Table 6.2 shows results of Model 2 by the Joint-Spouse approach, which used wife's information for the "married abroad" indicator instead of husband's information in Model 1. Again, the general pattern of findings remained the same as that from Model 1, with the only differences being the following two variables losing their

significant effects in Model 1: “wife educated abroad and husband not” and “wife immigrating before 13 and husband not”. Main findings on other variables remained the same: most importantly, the proportion of wife’s income in the total income between husband and wife was significant. Greater proportions of the wife’s income in the couple’s total income significantly increased the likelihood of her parents being in the household. Bigger differences in education and occupational status between husband and wife were found to associate with higher possibility of having the husband’s parents in home. The effect of citizenship also remained the same as in the Joint-spouse Model 1 above. Husband’s citizenship was associated with higher likelihood of his parents’ presence when wife was non-citizen; but in immigrant families where both spouses were citizens, wife’s parents were more likely to be found in the household, compared to families where both spouses were non-citizens.

After running the above regressions for ten countries together, I ran the same analyses again for each country separately, to have an additional set of analyses to control for variations across immigrant groups as well as possible interactions between the independent variables and sending countries. Results are discussed next.

TABLE 6.4: Logistic Regression Results for Whose Parents in Home: Separate-Spouse vs. Joint-Spouse Approach, for Each of the Ten Countries
(Table continues on the next page)

	Mexico		Philippines		China		Vietnam		India	
	Spt.†	Jnt.†	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.
Husband's education (years)	0.043* (0.020)		0.052 (0.032)		0.026 (0.022)		0.070 (0.037)		-0.025 (0.045)	
Wife's education (years)	-0.046* (0.021)		-0.103** (0.035)		-0.063** (0.024)		-0.081* (0.036)		-0.013 (0.042)	
Difference in education[b]		0.045** (0.017)		0.063* (0.027)		0.039* (0.020)		0.066* (0.031)		-0.002 (0.033)
Husband educated abroad	0.073 (0.221)		-0.182 (0.254)		0.209 (0.216)		0.143 (0.317)		-0.129 (0.299)	
Wife educated abroad	-0.624** (0.228)		-0.439* (0.183)		-0.361 (0.197)		-0.489 (0.297)		-0.132 (0.216)	
Husband and wife both educated abroad		-0.282 (0.289)		-0.724* (0.315)		0.206 (0.256)		-0.379 (0.354)		0.316 (0.335)
Husband educated abroad wife not		0.354 (0.313)		-0.559 (0.338)		0.300 (0.300)		-0.327 (0.392)		0.218 (0.363)
Wife educated abroad husband not		-0.228 (0.315)		-0.820** (0.285)		-0.241 (0.270)		-0.690 (0.368)		0.189 (0.352)
Husband's yearly income[a]	-0.002 (0.003)		0.002 (0.002)		-0.002 (0.001)		-0.001 (0.002)		-0.000 (0.001)	
Wife's yearly income[a]	-0.003 (0.005)		-0.006* (0.003)		0.002 (0.002)		-0.003 (0.004)		-0.002 (0.002)	

(Table continued from the previous page)

	Mexico		Philippines		China		Vietnam		India	
	Spt.†	Jnt.†	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income		-0.140 (0.296)		-0.953*** (0.295)		0.235 (0.257)		-0.749 (0.401)		-0.039 (0.355)
Husband's occupational status (SEI)	0.002 (0.004)		-0.000 (0.003)		0.003 (0.003)		0.002 (0.004)		0.005 (0.004)	
Wife's occupational status (SEI)	-0.005 (0.004)		-0.006 (0.003)		-0.007* (0.003)		0.006 (0.005)		-0.005 (0.005)	
Difference in occupational status score[b]		0.004 (0.003)		0.002 (0.002)		0.004 (0.002)		-0.003 (0.003)		0.005 (0.003)
Husband self-employed	0.001 (0.235)		0.291 (0.279)		-0.012 (0.166)		-0.379 (0.278)		0.107 (0.222)	
Wife self-employed	-0.280 (0.270)		-0.365 (0.353)		0.441* (0.217)		-0.026 (0.278)		0.163 (0.276)	
Husband and wife both self-employed		-0.307 (0.459)		-0.365 (0.596)		0.293 (0.256)		-0.068 (0.386)		0.441 (0.371)
Husband's years since immigration	0.046** (0.015)		-0.027* (0.013)		0.002 (0.016)		0.002 (0.024)		-0.047* (0.021)	
Wife's years since immigration	-0.055*** (0.015)		0.010 (0.014)		-0.007 (0.016)		-0.042 (0.024)		0.012 (0.023)	
Husband arriving 5 years earlier or more		0.500** (0.185)		-0.256 (0.166)		-0.115 (0.201)		0.106 (0.261)		-0.114 (0.236)
Wife arriving 5 years earlier or more		-0.582* (0.256)		0.353 (0.181)		-0.079 (0.266)		0.126 (0.464)		1.125*** (0.354)

(Table continued from the previous page)

	Mexico		Philippines		China		Vietnam		India	
	Spt.†	Jnt.†	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.
Husband arrived before 13 years old	-0.496 (0.269)		-0.517 (0.350)		-0.378 (0.336)		-0.866* (0.414)		1.097 (0.670)	
Wife arrived before 13 years old	0.797** (0.289)		-0.361 (0.394)		-0.001 (0.345)		1.435*** (0.397)		0.229 (0.450)	
Husband and wife both arrived before 13		0.182 (0.489)		-1.676* (0.688)		-0.701 (0.641)		0.270 (0.617)		
Husband arrived before 13 wife not		-0.339 (0.282)		-0.579 (0.372)		-0.083 (0.354)		-0.807 (0.478)		0.577 (0.652)
Wife arrived before 13 husband not		0.687* (0.307)		-0.256 (0.455)		0.223 (0.381)		1.210** (0.443)		-0.306 (0.457)
Husband being naturalized citizen	0.283 (0.163)		0.486** (0.169)		0.759*** (0.159)		0.221 (0.279)		1.191*** (0.196)	
Wife being naturalized citizen	-0.148 (0.179)		-0.864*** (0.170)		-0.698*** (0.165)		-0.413 (0.245)		-0.850*** (0.209)	
Husband and wife both citizens		0.001 (0.182)		-0.531** (0.185)		0.060 (0.154)		-0.347 (0.264)		-0.017 (0.233)
Husband citizen wife non-citizen		0.173 (0.202)		0.617* (0.261)		0.844*** (0.247)		0.287 (0.319)		1.080*** (0.317)
Husband non-citizen wife citizen		-0.334 (0.222)		-0.717** (0.256)		-0.541* (0.213)		-0.140 (0.491)		-1.103*** (0.291)
Husband's English proficiency	0.035 (0.079)		-0.109 (0.135)		-0.012 (0.100)		-0.004 (0.155)		0.003 (0.212)	

(Table continued from the previous page)

	Mexico		Philippines		China		Vietnam		India	
	Spt.†	Jnt.†	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.
Wife's English proficiency	-0.054		0.148		0.110		-0.006		-0.232	
	(0.074)		(0.150)		(0.101)		(0.146)		(0.182)	
Husband and wife both speak English well, very well, or speak only English		-0.043		0.035		0.043		-0.192		-0.158
		(0.153)		(0.286)		(0.129)		(0.197)		(0.320)
Parents' yearly income[a]	-0.000	0.000	-0.003	-0.002	0.011	0.012	0.006	0.010	0.001	0.003
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Parents with physical difficulty	-0.234	-0.253	-0.246*	-0.261*	0.463**	0.454**	0.356	0.332	0.514**	0.486**
	(0.173)	(0.167)	(0.125)	(0.124)	(0.154)	(0.151)	(0.184)	(0.183)	(0.181)	(0.176)
Married abroad	0.028	-0.013	0.340	0.240	-0.299	-0.496*	0.244	0.158	-0.369	-0.572
	(0.173)	(0.165)	(0.239)	(0.231)	(0.212)	(0.206)	(0.302)	(0.284)	(0.312)	(0.300)
Age difference between couple	-0.041*	-0.032	-0.039*	-0.032*	-0.037*	-0.026	-0.049*	-0.042*	-0.048	-0.044
	(0.018)	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.027)	(0.025)
Number of observations	986	986	1332	1332	1317	1317	579	579	971	965
Log likelihood	-657.70	-660.75	-850.08	-851.27	-866.83	-873.73	-379.27	-380.25	-489.56	-491.84
Pseudo R^2	0.0357	0.0313	0.0574	0.0561	0.0442	0.0366	0.0530	0.0506	0.0947	0.0876

(Table continued from the previous page)

	Cuba		Jamaica		Korea		Poland		El Salvador	
	Spt.†	**Jnt.†**	**Spt.**	**Jnt.**	**Spt.**	**Jnt.**	**Spt.**	**Jnt.**	**Spt.**	**Jnt.**
Husband's education (years)	-0.007 (0.041)		0.247* (0.124)		-0.022 (0.056)		0.064 (0.084)		-0.017 (0.033)	
Wife's education (years)	-0.059 (0.042)		0.026 (0.111)		-0.060 (0.064)		-0.081 (0.104)		-0.081* (0.033)	
Difference in education[b]		0.048 (0.034)		0.122 (0.087)		0.009 (0.048)		0.056 (0.074)		0.026 (0.027)
Husband educated abroad	-0.218 (0.511)		1.379 (0.838)		-0.243 (0.512)		-0.010 (0.701)		0.242 (0.384)	
Wife educated abroad	-0.055 (0.395)		-0.027 (0.645)		-0.213 (0.359)		0.451 (0.684)		-0.909* (0.405)	
Husband and wife both educated abroad		-0.209 (0.560)		1.134 (0.880)		-0.177 (0.574)		0.501 (0.892)		-0.269 (0.499)
Husband educated abroad wife not		-0.150 (0.521)		1.134 (0.974)		-0.201 (0.625)		-0.096 (0.964)		0.445 (0.578)
Wife educated abroad husband not		0.101 (0.616)		-0.026 (1.159)		-0.052 (0.575)		0.490 (0.918)		-0.552 (0.586)
Husband's yearly income[a]	0.003 (0.003)		-0.003 (0.008)		-0.001 (0.002)		-0.004 (0.005)		0.001 (0.003)	
Wife's yearly income[a]	-0.006 (0.005)		-0.003 (0.007)		0.001 (0.003)		-0.005 (0.007)		-0.001 (0.004)	
Proportion of wife's income in couple's total income		-0.684 (0.424)		1.137 (0.844)		-0.021 (0.440)		-0.707 (0.799)		-1.218* (0.517)

(Table continued from the previous page)

	Cuba		Jamaica		Korea		Poland		El Salvador	
	Spt.†	Jnt.†	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.
Husband's occupational status (SEI)	0.003 (0.005)		-0.008 (0.011)		0.012* (0.006)		0.001 (0.009)		0.005 (0.006)	
Wife's occupational status (SEI)	-0.003 (0.006)		-0.015 (0.012)		0.000 (0.006)		-0.013 (0.008)		-0.008 (0.006)	
Difference in occupational status score[b]		0.004 (0.004)		-0.003 (0.008)		0.007 (0.005)		0.009 (0.007)		0.003 (0.005)
Husband self-employed	0.290 (0.255)		0.063 (0.731)		0.285 (0.251)		-0.665 (0.503)		0.325 (0.427)	
Wife self-employed	-0.060 (0.437)		0.875 (0.982)		-0.039 (0.276)		-0.950 (0.518)		-1.255** (0.448)	
Husband and wife both self-employed		-0.945 (0.676)		0.939 (1.070)		0.214 (0.267)		-1.835 (1.155)		-0.544 (0.654)
Husband's years since immigration	-0.008 (0.022)		-0.013 (0.043)		-0.015 (0.031)		0.016 (0.039)		0.046 (0.034)	
Wife's years since immigration	-0.013 (0.022)		-0.060 (0.043)		-0.028 (0.032)		-0.041 (0.042)		-0.094** (0.033)	
Husband arriving 5 years earlier or more		0.409 (0.458)		0.016 (0.587)		-0.285 (0.425)		0.776 (0.556)		0.473 (0.380)
Wife arriving 5 years earlier or more		-0.036 (0.429)		0.099 (0.674)		0.346 (0.478)		0.433 (0.697)		-0.635 (0.462)
Husband arrived before 13 years old	-0.223 (0.391)				0.413 (0.576)		-2.954* (1.308)		0.076 (0.652)	

(Table continued from the previous page)

	Cuba		Jamaica		Korea		Poland		El Salvador	
	Spt.†	Jnt.†	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.
Wife arrived before 13 years old	0.009 (0.376)		0.532 (1.035)		1.191* (0.607)		1.221 (0.952)		-0.616 (0.558)	
Husband and wife both arrived before 13		-0.183 (0.456)				1.017 (0.920)				-0.192 (1.115)
Husband arrived before 13 wife not		-0.904 (0.643)				0.366 (0.616)		-2.119 (1.352)		0.035 (0.693)
Wife arrived before 13 husband not		-0.350 (0.433)		-0.078 (0.988)		0.793 (0.669)		0.895 (0.882)		-0.982 (0.584)
Husband being naturalized citizen	0.127 (0.299)		0.748 (0.491)		0.535 (0.287)		-0.274 (0.434)		0.306 (0.283)	
Wife being naturalized citizen	-0.255 (0.323)		0.291 (0.568)		-0.308 (0.308)		0.004 (0.457)		-0.311 (0.285)	
Husband and wife both citizens		-0.272 (0.249)		0.857 (0.714)		-0.154 (0.266)		-0.116 (0.411)		-0.371 (0.297)
Husband citizen wife non-citizen		0.505 (0.465)		1.410 (0.910)		0.448 (0.406)		0.848 (0.653)		0.388 (0.341)
Husband non-citizen wife citizen		-0.081 (0.386)		0.529 (0.766)		-0.591 (0.383)		0.776 (0.569)		-0.245 (0.371)
Husband’s English proficiency	0.431** (0.146)		1.964 (1.658)		-0.193 (0.187)		0.696* (0.312)		0.160 (0.155)	
Wife’s English proficiency	-0.136 (0.130)		-0.361 (0.647)		-0.175 (0.186)		0.075 (0.313)		0.048 (0.140)	

(Table continued from the previous page)

	Cuba		Jamaica		Korea		Poland		El Salvador	
	Spt.†	Jnt.†	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.	Spt.	Jnt.
Husband and wife both speak English well, very well, or speak only English		0.142 (0.252)				-0.321 (0.234)		0.474 (0.392)		-0.122 (0.250)
Parents' yearly income[a]	-0.012 (0.013)	-0.007 (0.013)	0.007 (0.041)	0.004 (0.040)	-0.005 (0.016)	-0.003 (0.016)	0.008 (0.013)	0.011 (0.012)	-0.007 (0.021)	-0.000 (0.021)
Parents with physical difficulty	0.006 (0.218)	-0.059 (0.212)	0.058 (0.501)	-0.083 (0.453)	0.228 (0.254)	0.143 (0.247)	0.454 (0.422)	0.385 (0.405)	-0.013 (0.311)	-0.181 (0.299)
Married abroad	0.111 (0.459)	0.033 (0.459)	-1.489* (0.638)	-1.032 (0.596)	0.223 (0.497)	-0.036 (0.486)	-0.160 (0.600)	-0.351 (0.599)	0.210 (0.293)	-0.007 (0.283)
Age difference between couple	0.017 (0.024)	0.016 (0.023)	-0.022 (0.049)	-0.006 (0.045)	0.077 (0.040)	0.082* (0.039)	-0.003 (0.046)	0.002 (0.043)	-0.034 (0.027)	-0.015 (0.025)
Number of observations	452	452	137	136	413	413	191	189	356	356
Log likelihood	-289.32	-291.89	-76.36	-80.77	-250.45	-255.68	-116.90	-117.94	-224.09	-230.78
Pseudo R^2	0.0410	0.0325	0.1196	0.0566	0.0622	0.0426	0.1168	0.0997	0.0817	0.0543

Note:

†Spt.: Separate-Spouse model; Jnt.: Joint-Spouse model.

*** significant at .05 level; ** significant at .01 level; *** significant at .001 level.**

[a]: income in thousands.

[b]: All "difference" variables were calculated by subtracting wife's number from husband's number.

[c]: All households where both husband and wife could speak English well, very well, or speak only English had only the husband's parents in home; therefore it was dropped from the regression and 1 observation not used. (In the selection model all households who reported not living in a metro area belonged to the outcome=0 group; therefore it was dropped from the regression and 46 observations not used.)

6.4.2. Separate-Spouse vs. Joint-Spouse Approach, Each Country

By-country regression results on the main outcome "whose parents were in home" are presented in Table 6.4. Compared to results above from the all-country analyses on the same dependent variable, the current results from by-country regressions lost statistical significance among some of the immigrant groups.

While both husband's and wife's education had significant (but opposite) effects in the all-country models, husband's education was significant only for immigrants from Mexico and Jamaica, and wife's education significant for immigrants from Mexico, Philippines, China, Vietnam, and El Salvador. Same as in the all-country models, higher education on the husband's part increased the likelihood of his parents in home, while wife's education increased the likelihood of her parents in the house. Additionally, among immigrants from Mexico, Philippines, China, and Vietnam, bigger difference between the spouses in years of education was associated with higher probability of having the husband's parents. These findings were consistent with the hypothesis of the bargaining theory: each spouse's personal resource (education, in this case) increased his/her power in the family decision.

Besides the amount of education, the country where immigrant wives (but not husbands) received all of her education was also found to have an effect. Receiving all her education abroad significantly increased the likelihood of the wife's own parents in home among those from Mexico, Philippines, and El Salvador. This finding was not consistent with my hypothesis that receiving all one's education (and being married) abroad would

be associated with more traditional outcome, in this case greater likelihood of having husband's parents in home.

Like in the all-country analyses, income was not found to have an effect in almost all immigrant groups, which was unexpected. The only significant finding was that wife's yearly income was associated with increased likelihood of having her parents only among Filipino immigrants. Higher proportion of the wife's yearly income in the couple's total income increased the probability of the wife's parents in home among immigrants from Philippines and El Salvador.

Occupational status did not have significant effects in most immigrant groups except in the case of Korea (where husband's higher occupational status was associated with increased probability of his parents in home) and China (where wife's higher occupational standing significantly increased her parents' presence in the house). Self-employment of the husband was not found to have an effect among any of the groups, while self-employment of the wife had opposite effects across groups: Chinese immigrant wife's self-employment increased her husband's parents' presence, while self-employment of Salvadorian women made her own parents' present more likely.

The "years since immigration" variables showed significant results in four out of the ten countries, and its effect was also opposite across groups. Longer years here increased each spouse's own parents' probability of presence for Mexican immigrant husbands and wives. On the opposite, among immigrants from Philippines and India, husband's longer years here in U.S. was associated with increased probability of his wife's parents in home; moreover, among Salvadorian immigrant households, longer years in U.S. on the wife's

part significantly increased the likelihood of her own parents in home. Coming to U.S. before 13 showed an interesting effect as well: each spouse's 1.5-generation immigrant status was found to increase the likelihood of the other spouse's parents in home. Specifically, 1.5-generation immigrant husbands from Vietnam and Poland were more likely to have his wife's parents in home, while 1.5-generation immigrant wives from Mexico, Vietnam, and Korea were more likely to have her husband's parents in the house. Since the effect of being 1.5-generation immigrants was hypothesized to be associated with less traditional gender relations, this finding was again unexpected and need further clarification by future research.

In the current by-country analyses the effect of citizenship was only significant among immigrants from Philippines, China, and India. Among these three groups the overall pattern of findings on citizenship was consistent with the findings from the all-country models: when looked at separately, husband's citizenship and wife's citizenship increased the probability of each spouse's own parents' presence in home; however if looked at together, these results suggested that husband's citizenship only had effect when his wife was non citizen. In the two scenarios where the wife had citizenship (i.e. in families where both spouses were citizens, and in families where wife was citizen and husband was non-citizen), her parents were more likely to be in home regardless of her husband's citizenship status.

The effect of English proficiency was found only among Cuban and Polish immigrants, where better English on the husband's part increased the likelihood of his parents in home. It was not significant in any of the other categories and countries.

Parents with physical difficulty were more likely to be wife's parents among immigrants from Philippines, but more likely to be husband's parents among those from China and India. Consistent with the all-country findings, bigger age difference between the couple increased the likelihood of her parents in home, significant in the cases of Mexico, Philippines, China, Vietnam, and Korea.

Next I compare the different approaches and models used above based on the results they have yielded.

6.4.3. Comparison of Different Models and Discussion

Different models and approaches of analyses were used in this chapter to find the best fitting model to explain whose parents were present in the immigrant household. This process included three parts. 1) Based on the research question and the current data, the Heckman probit model was first tested whose results (not reported) showed that selection bias was not significant in this case and therefore correction was not warranted. Regular logistic regression was then used to examine whose parents were in home given the dichotomous outcome. 2) In the all-country analyses two models were employed, Model 1 using husband's data to represent the couple's information on the "married abroad" variable and Model 2 using wife's data for that variable. Testing both possibilities gave a more complete estimate since exact information on the country of marriage was not available and both spouses' data on age of arrival in U.S. could be used as weak proxies to indicate if they might have been married abroad before immigration. In addition, for each model two regressions were run, one without and the other with sending-country variables. The purpose of this approach was to assess the effect of sending countries.

Likelihood ratio test results showed that adding the sending countries significantly increased the explained variances in both models. 3) A separate-spouse model and a joint-spouse model were used to predict the outcome of whose parents were in home. Results of both models confirmed and complemented each other for the most part. An examination of the significance and magnitude of coefficients yielded by each model led to the conclusion that the two models' ability to predict the outcome were about the same, with no one model obviously or significantly better than the other at explaining variances.

Overall, my findings lent support to the bargaining theory framework, where each spouse's (especially the wife's) personal resources including education, occupational status, income, length of time here in U.S., citizenship status, and English proficiency were found to be associated with increased probability of having their own parents in home. More specifically, on the educational attainment (i.e. years of education), husband's resource increased the likelihood of his parents in home, while wife's resource increased hers. Sending-country-wise, Mexican and Jamaican immigrant husbands' higher education was associated with increased possibility of his parents in home, while higher education of immigrant wives' from Mexico, Philippines, China, Vietnam, and El Salvador made it more likely to have her parents in the house. On country of education (i.e. receiving all education abroad before immigrating to U.S.), where the husband had received his education did not seem to matter; however if the wife had received all her education abroad, the likelihood of her parents being present was significantly increased. How to interpret this finding was not immediately clear in this study and needs future research to better understand. Neither spouse's income was a direct predictor of older parents' presence, but among Filipino immigrant families wife's higher income

significantly predicted having her parents' in home. Moreover, the joint-spouse model showed that the proportion of wife's income out of the total income between husband and wife had a significantly positive effect on having her parents in home: the higher proportion her income took up in the couple's total income, the more likely her parents were found living together with the married couple. Higher occupational status and greater length of time since immigration on the wife's part were associated with increased probability of her parents' presence in home; but these results should be taken with the high correlations between husband and wife on these measures in mind. Immigrating before 13 yielded some unexpected results: husband's coming-before-13 status was associated with increased likelihood of having his wife's parents in home, and wife's coming before 13 increased the probability of her husband's parents' presence. In other words, the 1.5-generation-status for one spouse appeared to positively affect the likelihood of the other spouse's parents' presence. This somewhat counter-intuitive result was found in both all-country and each-country analyses (among immigrants from Mexico, Vietnam, Korea, and Poland). In the separate-spouse approach, citizenship status was found to have the same effect as education, i.e. each spouse's citizenship increased the likelihood of their own parents' presence in home. However, joint-approach models also revealed that wife's citizenship seemed to play a more decisive role than husband's citizenship: in households where wife was noncitizen, husband's citizenship would make his parent's presence in home more likely; in households where wife was citizen, her parents' presence were more likely, regardless of her husband's citizenship status. Finally, husband's English proficiency predicted his parents' presence in the household only among Cuban and Polish immigrants, being married abroad

appeared to increase the likelihood of wife's parents in home for Chinese and Jamaican immigrants, and bigger age difference between the couple was associated with greater probability of her parents' presence among those from Mexico, Philippines, China, Vietnam, and Korea.

To summarize, different approaches and models used in this study revealed results that were mostly consistent and complemental. On the outcome of "which spouse's parents were present in home", my findings provided support for the bargaining theory, where the spouse (more importantly, the wife) that had more personal resources and therefore more bargaining power in family decision making were more likely to influence the outcome. Moreover, there was also evidence apparently indicating wife's increasing role in the relative power balance among immigrant couples. This evidence included two main findings. The first one was on the importance of wife's income in the total income between both spouses: higher proportions that the wife's yearly income accounted for in the couple's total income significantly increased the likelihood of having her parents in home. The other finding was on the important role of wife's citizenship: husband's citizenship had a positive effect on his parents' presence only if his wife was non citizen; once she naturalized, the likelihood of her parents' presence was significantly increased, regardless of her husband's citizenship status. Although conclusive causal relationship could not be determined from these results alone, they were nevertheless indicative of changes in gender relations in favor of women's increasing status and decision making power in the immigrant family.

Despite signs of changes in relative marital power, the influence of sending cultures on gender relations proved to be persistent and strong among particular groups of immigrants in this study. Given the different degrees of patriarchy in gender relations in the sending countries, it is not unexpected to find that immigrants from India, Korea, and China were significantly more likely than the other countries to have husband's parents present in home, while immigrants from Jamaica and Cuba were more likely to have wife's parents in the household. After-model tests showed that significant differences existed between sending countries, which can be divided into four general groups, in terms of the likelihood of whose parents were likely to be present in home. Immigrants from Jamaica, El Salvador, and Cuba were the most likely to have wife's parents in home (and the least likely to have husband's parents); on the other hand those from China, Korea, and India were the most likely to have husband's parents present (and the least likely to have wife's parents in home). Taking into consideration the general gender relations culture in these sending countries (reviewed in Chapter 3), these findings supported the hypotheses that immigrants from more patriarchal cultures were more likely to have the husband's parents co-residing in the household, and those from less patriarchal cultures were comparatively more likely to have the wife's parents. In other words, the influence of sending culture on gender relations continued to be strong and clear among many post-1965 immigrants in this country.

6.5. Conclusion

The analyses performed in this chapter tried to predict the outcomes of whose parents were present among the multi-generational immigrant household. Through examining

the effects of a number of predictors on this outcome, the main goal of this study was to determine what factors (including socioeconomic and cultural) may have affected relative decision making power in the immigrant family, to the extent that co-residence patterns of older parents reflects the result of that power balance and gender relations.

Overall, findings from these analyses supported the bargaining theory, i.e. in the immigrant household the spouse that had relatively more personal resources seemed to be more likely to have his or her parents present. While there were results indicating women's increasing status and greater decision making role within the family, the effects of gender relations from the sending culture proved to be persistent. Immigrants from more patriarchal cultures were more likely to have husband's parents in home even when other factors were taken into account.

In the next (concluding) chapter, the main limitations of this study as well as implications for future research on immigrant gender relations will be discussed.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

7.1. Introduction

The goal of this study was to examine the effect of migration on gender relations by focusing on coresidence patterns in the multi-generational immigrant household and factors that were associated with these patterns. All the statistical analyses performed in the previous two chapters aimed to assess the effect of a number of socioeconomic, immigration experience, and cultural factors on two outcomes, i.e. whether any older parents were present in the household, and whose older parents were present in the household.

Overall the results were consistent with my general hypotheses on both outcomes. In terms of presence of older parents in home, the findings suggested that immigrant households with more resources (higher family income, home ownership, and being naturalized citizen) were more likely to have older parents, as well as households that had practical need for help from family members probably due to particular life stages (working long hours, and having young children). In terms of whose parents were in home, the findings supported the bargaining theory where the spouse, especially if the wife, had more personal resources (education, income, occupational status, and citizenship status), he or she was more likely to have his/her own parents present in home. Moreover, the effect of sending culture on gender relations proved to be persistently strong after migration: immigrants from more patriarchal sending cultures (India, Korea,

and China) were more likely to have husband's parents, while immigrants from less patriarchal sending cultures (Jamaica, El Salvador, and Cuba) were more likely to have wife's parents in home.

In this concluding chapter I turn to a discussion of implications of my findings, as well as limitations of the study and suggestion for future research.

7.2. Implications of Current Findings

7.2.1. "Whether Parents" vs. "Whose Parents"

Although the focus of this study was "whose parents were in home" as a proxy to reflect gender relations in the immigrant household, examining "whether parents in home at all" served as a necessary and important first step before the main outcome. Empirically it provided a background by answering the question of which immigrant groups were more likely to have multi-generational households, while statistically it controlled for the selection effect of older parents' presence in home. Findings on the two outcomes showed overlaps as well as distinctions between immigrant groups.

On the outcome of "whether older parents were coresiding in the household", immigrants from Cuba, the Philippines, China, India, and Korea were found to be particularly more likely to have a multi-generational home, compared to the biggest immigrant group in this study, the Mexican immigrants. Given the traditional preference for multigenerational households in some Asian countries such as China, India, and Korea, it was not surprising to see this practice continuing at a relatively high degree after migration among these groups. Meanwhile, more needs to be known about the

circumstances under which multigenerational residence was preferred among immigrant groups such as Cubans and Filipinos. More research should be done to look into the question why it was more common among some groups than among others. For instance, the majority of immigration from both the Philippines and Jamaica to U.S. was initiated by women whose jobs concentrated in the areas of health care or domestic help in U.S. However, Filipino immigrants were much more likely to have older parents' in the household than Jamaican immigrants. One hypothesis is that this fact can be partly explained by the relatively common practice of leaving young children behind in the charge of female relatives among Jamaican immigrants (Foner, 1997). So far most existing research has focused on younger, working-age immigrants and the relatively earlier stages of family chain migrations (e.g. Massey, et al., 1987). Less is known about older immigrants and factors associated with their immigration. Research in this area will provide a more complete understanding of family chain migrations to U.S., specifically in regard to different mechanisms and circumstances associated with immigrants across the whole demographic spectrum. Furthermore, this information can be useful to policy makers in assessing the needs of immigrants of different age and group compositions and in public policies planning (e.g. immigration and public health policies) accordingly.

On the outcome of "whose parents were present in the household", my findings showed that immigrants from India, Korea, and China were the most likely to have the husband's parents, compared to other immigrant groups in the study. Comparing this list with that from the "whether older parents were in home" list above, the conclusion was that immigrants from India, Korea, and China were the most likely to have multi-generation

households, and the older parents in the house were most likely to be the husband's parents.

7.2.2. Separate-Spouse Model vs. Joint-Spouse Model

The separate-spouse vs. joint-spouse approach in predicting whose parents were present in home yielded same patterns of results. In summary, findings from the separate-spouse model were consistent with the bargaining theory where each spouse' personal resources increased the likelihood of an outcome that was favorable to him/her. These personal resources could be considered as bargaining power in the family decision making process and they included education, income, occupational status, years here in U.S., and citizenship status. However, because of high statistical correlations between the spouses' data on some of the measures, the joint-spouse models were considered as a way of controlling for redundancy of information in the regressions, and they provided another way of checking the findings of the separate-spouse models as well. Results from the joint-spouse approach also further clarified the relationships for easier interpretation on some of these measures. For example, the joint-spouse model on proportion of wife's income out of the total income of the couple showed one of the most important findings in this study: it was not the absolute amount of wife's income that mattered the most; rather, it was how much the wife's income accounted for in the couple's total income that significantly increased her bargaining power in the family decision-making. Another example was the effect of citizenship. While the separate-spouse model results showed that each spouse's naturalized citizenship increased their respective parents' probability of being present in the household, the joint-spouse model results further revealed an

important finding on the effect of wife's citizenship status. Breaking down all possible scenarios of both spouses' citizenship status into four combinations and using four dichotomous variables to represent these scenarios in the joint model, the joint-spouse model results showed that husband's citizenship increased his parents' presence only when his wife was non-citizen; when both spouses were naturalized citizens the wife's parents were more likely to be present in the household. This finding has a significant indication on marital gender power among immigrants: it suggested a sign of increasing status and power for women in the immigrant household. It is another one of the most important findings of this study in support of changing gender relations towards being more egalitarian after immigration. Although these signs of immigrant women's gain in marital gender power were offset by findings of persistently strong effects of patriarchal sending cultures, its significance is not to be overlooked by researchers of immigrant gender relations. Overall, this study found that while post-immigration gender relations saw signs of positive (i.e. more egalitarian) changes following immigrant women's increased economic power, the effects of the original sending culture continued to be very significant. Gender relations among immigrants from traditionally more patriarchal sending cultures were found to be still more patriarchal where men continued to have greater decision-making power in the family, compared to immigrants from less patriarchal gender cultures. Compared to the effects of structural changes such as women's increasing economic power, the effects of sending cultures on the post-migration gender relations remained great in explaining outcomes of family decision making power.

7.2.3. Inferring on Possible "Causality" Relationships

Findings of the analyses performed in Chapters 5 & 6 showed associations between many of the predictors and their respective outcome. Like in many cases of social sciences research, these relationships can only be characterized as association rather than causation. Statistical findings from quantitative studies need to be supplemented by qualitative research to get an accurate and complete picture. However it is still helpful to infer on possible causalities and discuss hypothetical scenarios consistent with the quantitative findings, in order to provoke further thoughts and point out potential future research directions.

For instance, in predicting presence of older parents in home, the following factors were found to affect the outcome as hypothesized: higher family income, longer working hours for the wife, home ownership, having young children, and being naturalized citizens all significantly increased the likelihood of having older parents. Years since immigration had a curvilinear relationship with the outcome, i.e. it first increased then decreased the probability of older parents' presence. This effect can be viewed as showing the likelihood of having older parents first going up as immigrants settled down and became more established in U.S, and then going down after a certain point of time partly as the result of longer exposure to the American norm of nuclear family households, with age being controlled for. More unexpected was the findings of negative effects of education and occupational status. One possible explanation might be that for these immigrants, education to some extent played a role of "breaking from traditions" in terms of some traditional practices and beliefs, such as the preference for multi-generational residence in

some (e.g. East Asian) cultures. Another factor worth discussing is the effect of living in a metro area. My analyses found that metro area residence significantly increased the likelihood of older parents' presence in the immigrant household. Two possible factors came into mind which may explain this finding. The first is the fact that immigrants in these census data were highly concentrated in several big metropolitan areas including California, New York, Florida, Texas, New Jersey, and Illinois, the so-called "big six" immigrant receiving states in U.S. In 1999, as much as 69.9% of all foreign-born population lived in these six states (Passel and Zimmerman, 2001). In 2000, California was the top state of settlement for immigrants from Mexico, Philippines, China, India, Vietnam, Korea, and El Salvador, while Florida was the top state for immigrants from Cuba, New York the top state for those from Jamaica, and Illinois the top state for those from Poland. Such high concentrations of immigrant settlements created many co-ethnic residential neighborhoods. It is reasonable to hypothesize that some common practices and sharing of information existed resulting from concentrated residential enclaves among immigrants from the same sending country (e.g. the example described by Zhou, 1992 of family chain immigrations among Chinese immigrants in New York). In the same way, highly concentrated co-ethnic residence may have had the same effect on the practice of having older parents immigrate and come live together in U.S. among immigrants, leading to increased likelihood of older parents' presence. Secondly, living in a metro area may have increased the probability of having older parents in home because it is presumably easier and more suitable for older immigrant parents to live in a metro environment with closely settled co-ethnic communities and a relatively easy access to public transportation. In contrast, living in suburban areas may prove to be

harder for older immigrants who are more likely to experience more language difficulty and feelings of loneliness because of the unavailability of a co-ethnic community. Again, these hypotheses need to be tested by further research.

Findings of difference among immigrant groups on the likelihood of having older parents in home were intriguing but harder to hypothesize in some cases. Immigrants from Cuba were the most likely among all ten groups to have older parents in home. Information on traditional norms in the Cuban culture about multi-generational households is lacking in the current study, and given the unavailability of statistics on prevalence of multi-generational households in Cuba, it is hard to come up with hypothesized scenarios although two factors were taken into consideration in the interpretation of this finding. The first factor is that the Cuban immigrants in these data have been in U.S. for a long time (in fact they were the group who had been in this country for the longest time out of the ten groups in this study, see Table 5.2). The time of arrival showed that most of these Cuban immigrants possibly came to U.S. from late 1950s and 1960s because of the Cuban revolution. Unlike the later wave of Cuban immigrants in 1980s, many from this earlier wave were from higher social classes, well-off economically and privileged socially. Having the necessary resources to immigrate and the geographical proximity of Cuba to U.S. made it more possible for whole families to come to the U.S. together and also settled down with whole families living together in multi-generational households in this country. The second-likely to have older parents in home were immigrants from Philippines. Although review of literature did not suggest a strong preference in the Filipino culture for multi-generational households, the situation may be changed after immigration partly because of the fact that a majority of Filipino immigrant women were

employed in health care (hospitals) and service (restaurants) jobs. Because of the demanding schedules of these jobs it is likely that they needed more help with household labor, leading to a higher likelihood of having older parents in home. The same reason may apply to Salvadorian immigrant households as well. Most of the immigrant women from El Salvador worked in food service (restaurants) and domestic helper (private households) jobs in U.S. As a result of long working hours (and in the case of women working as live-in domestic helpers they were able to spend even less time in home) the need for help from family members on home making and child rearing may be even greater. Immigrants from China and India were two groups among the top five most likely to have older parents home. Given the emphasis on multi-generational residence in the traditional cultures of both countries, this finding was not surprising. However, more research (especially qualitative research) is certainly needed to fill in the gaps in interpreting these findings.

Compared to the results on "whether older parents were in home", the findings on "whose parents were in home" yielded less "unexpected" effects. Overall, it is not surprising to find India, Korea, and China as the three sending countries whose immigrants were the most likely to have husband's parents in home, given the strongly patriarchal gender culture in all three sending countries and the norm of living with husband's family. On the other hand, Jamaica and the Philippines had been expected to be the most likely to have wife's parents present in the household. As the review in Chapter 3 showed, the gender culture in both Jamaica and the Philippines were much less patriarchal, and the two countries were arguably the most matrifocal ones among all ten groups in this study. As it turned out, however, Jamaican and Filipino immigrants were

not more likely to have wife's parents, compared to immigrants from Mexico and the rest of the countries except India, Korea, and China. This result was somewhat disappointing and the real picture is hard to be captured with these quantitative results alone.

7.3. Limitations of the Current Study

While findings of this study contributed to a better understanding of gender relations among the biggest groups of post-1965 immigrants in U.S., several limitations are worth noting. First, a main limitation in the research design lies in the assumption that the presence of parents in the house is a result of relative decision making power between the husband and wife. This assumption does not take into account other possible reasons why parents are living with the immigrant couple, such as the *availability* to provide practical help from family members (e.g. the immigrant couple needs help taking care of young kids and only one of the spouse's parents are available to give such help).

Secondly, using coresidence patterns as a proxy to study gender relations and relative marital status is by no means a direct measure of the outcome. As discussed in Chapter 1, the research design was based on the assumptions that 1) having older parents immigrate to U.S. and living together was a desirable outcome among immigrants; 2) the presence of older parents in the immigrant household involved spending resources, time, and effort on the immigrants' part to help sponsoring the immigration of older parents; 3) because of resources limitations it is not realistic to have both spouses' parents come and live together at the same time. In this sense the outcome of "whose parents were present in home" represented the result of an important family decision and the relative decision-making power between the spouses. However, the analyses of this study were not able to

capture and distinguish the following scenarios: 1) immigrants helped bringing their older parents to U.S. but they did NOT live in the same household at the time of the census; 2) older parents were sponsored to immigrate to U.S. by other son or daughter of theirs other than the one they were living with at the time of the census; and 3) older parents who came first to U.S. as immigrants and then sponsored the immigration of their son or daughter who they were living with at the time of the census. In addition, there should be a small percentage of households in the data where older parents were staying on a temporary basis (e.g. to visit or to help out with taking care of young children for a short time). In that case the older parents were not immigrating to U.S. and it should not be assumed that staying in U.S. was a "desired" outcome for either immigrants or their older parents.

The above limitation in research design is connected to the limitation of data, and as a matter of fact resulting from the limitation of data. As census data did not contain information on immigration sponsorship, it was not possible for the current study to distinguish the order of immigration within the extended family and the direction of sponsorship. Instead, available information in the census data that was useful in this regard was year of immigration, based on which years since immigration was calculated. Comparison of the years of immigration between immigrants and their older parents showed a small percentage of households (6.9%) in these data where immigrant parents arrived in U.S. earlier than their adult children. It was probable that these households belonged to the second or third scenarios above. However as the percentage was small and exact information on the direction of sponsorships was not available, they were kept in the study and were not expected to change the general patterns of results.

7.4. Implications For Different Stakeholders and Future Research

The current study contributed to the field of immigrant gender relations in the following ways. As discussed above, results of this study have confirmed the bargaining theory on personal resources and the relative decision making power in the immigrant family, as influenced by post-migration structural (socioeconomic) and culture factors. Moreover, by examining *both* spouses' relative decision making power (instead of focusing only on immigrant women), and by comparing ten immigrant groups covering various degrees of patriarchal gender relations in the sending culture, the current analyses teased out some of the complex effects between gender, class and race. In summary, my analyses found that sending culture still plays a decisive role on gender relations than structural (economic) factors among the post-1965 U.S. immigrants. These findings contributed to better knowledge and a more accurate understanding of post immigration gender relations. It fits into the second of three stages of gender and immigration research discussed in Chapter 1. It added to the effort of overcoming an either-all framework when looking at the effect of migration on gender relations, and trying to account for uneven effects of migration.

Another implication of the current study's findings is to the Englesian belief on raising women's status through women's obtaining economic power. Although this study focused on immigrants, the findings also have implications on changing gender relations and raising women's status in general. This study showed that structural changes and increased economic power and independence alone are not enough to bring about real

changes in gender relations; they need to be accompanied by fundamental changes in cultural beliefs and norms as well.

For immigrant families, especially those from traditionally highly patriarchal cultures (e.g. immigrant families from many Asian sending countries), the relevance of the current study lies in the empirical confirmation of the powerful effect of sending cultures on gender relations. Although men's patriarchal power in the immigrant family has been challenged by women's increasing status and economic contribution, the fundamental influence of sending culture has helped explaining women's ambivalence towards drastically changing existing power balance and patterns of gender relations. Empirical examples of this have been found by previous researchers, such as Korean immigrant women's unwillingness to challenge patriarchal beliefs and practices in family/gender relations (Lim, 1997) and Vietnamese immigrant women's desire to use the patriarchal family system to preserve what they saw as better in the Vietnamese culture than the American culture (Kibria, 1993). In this sense, immigrant women also participate in maintaining patriarchy after immigration. Their engagement in this "patriarchal bargain" (Kandiyoti, 1988, cf Lim, 1997; Kibria, 1993) warrants further research for a better understanding of what and how women "choose their battles" and make decisions as to what they challenge and what they keep maintaining in the patriarchal culture.

Finally, some of the findings in this study also fit into the public debate about immigration reform, especially on the issues of immigration reduction and cutting down social services. In the current debate over immigration policy reform there are calls for significantly reducing the existing levels of family reunification immigration. Since 1965

U.S. immigration laws have been mainly based on the principle of broadly defined family reunification, which enables immigrants to sponsor their relatives back home to immigrate to U.S. as well. Family reunification has indeed been the most important way by which legal immigrants come to the United States. For example, in 2001 about 63% of all immigrants admitted entered through the family reunification program. The program is particularly important for immigrants from specific countries, such as Mexico (where 95% of all immigrants come through family reunification) and Dominican Republic (where 98% come through family reunification).

However, examining the family reunification system more carefully shows that the proposed reduction of family-reunification immigration may not be as straight-forward a way to cut down overall immigration as might have been suggested. Within the family reunification system there are two subcategories: 1) immediate relatives of U.S. citizens, and 2) family sponsorship according to preference categories. The first subcategory, immediate relatives of U.S. citizens, includes the non-native spouses of US citizens, unmarried minor children (aged 21 or under) of US citizens, orphans adopted by US citizens, and the parents of US citizens over the age of 21. This category has no numerical ceiling, and the number of immigrants entering through this subcategory affects, to a usually non-significant degree, the number of places available to immigrants entering through the second subcategory, that of family sponsorship. The family sponsorship category of the preference entry system includes four numerically limited categories: 1) unmarried, adult (aged 21 or over) sons and daughters of US citizens; 2) spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of US permanent resident aliens ("green card holders"); 3) married sons and daughters of US citizens; and 4) brothers and sisters of

adult US citizens. Theoretically, 480,000 slots are available for family reunification (U. S. INS statistical yearbook, 2002). This detailed category break-down shows that among all family-reunification based immigration, the majority of immigrants are either spouses or minor children of U.S. citizens or green card holders, while the other relatives (parents, adult children, and siblings) account for only a relatively small part of family-based immigration. This is supported by numbers published by the government: for example, out of a total of 849,807 individuals admitted as legal immigrants in 2000, only 67,619 (8%) were parents of U.S. citizens, 22,833 (2.7%) married sons or daughters of U.S. citizens, and 60,145 (7.1%) siblings of U.S. citizens. The percentage of immigrants admitted as parents of citizens stayed low across different fiscal years: e.g., in the 8 years from 1993 to 2000, parents of U.S. citizens accounted for 6.7% (1995) to 9.5% (1999) of the total immigrants admitted (U.S. INS statistical yearbook, 2002). From the data of this study it was also found that co-residing parents of immigrants were not common in the immigrant household (only about 8.4%). Although the current data were not able to capture those immigrants who did sponsor their parents to U.S. but did not live with them in the same household at the time of the census, it is quite unlikely that the true percentage would be drastically different from the 8.4% found in this study and 8% reported by the immigration service above on the estimated number of parents sponsored to immigrate. In other words, unless the proposed reduction of family-based immigration includes dramatically cutting the number of spouses and minor children of U.S. citizens and permanent residents, it is not too likely to meaningfully reduce the number of immigrants to U.S. through family reunification.

In the current immigration reform discussion another hotly-debated topic is cutting social services for illegal and even legal immigrants. While the costs and other issues associated with illegal immigrants are beyond the scope of the current study, findings of my analyses did shed light on legal immigrants that is helpful to the social services discussion. As shown in Chapter 5, immigrant households who had older parents present in home had significantly higher family income, higher education level and more prestigious jobs, compared to their counterparts that did not have older parents present. Overall, with a mean family income of about $85,000 yearly, it is hard to argue that these multi-generational immigrant households would qualify for and use public programs such as food stamps, Medicaid, or free or reduced price lunches for children in public schools. The multi-generational immigrant households were also significantly more likely to own their home (74.2% of with-parents households were home owners vs. 58% of no-parents households). Furthermore, while a very small fraction (2.4%) of multi-generational immigrant households included older parents with physical difficulty, my findings from regression analyses suggested that the reasons for multi-generation immigrant households were more likely to be the practical need for help with domestic labor and childcare, instead of immigrants coming to US to get social services as has been suggested for illegal immigrants. Of course, as in the case of older native-born individuals, older immigrants are likely to need more health care services than their younger counterparts. However, based on the above findings that only a small percentage of immigrants came to U.S. each year as older parents sponsored by their adult children, and that older immigrants who did come in this category were often from households that were relatively better off and financially more established in U.S., it is not likely that their

health care would be a significant burden on the existing social services. On the other hand, reliable help from family members (such as older parents) on household labor and child care could alleviate the financial and emotional burden of immigrant households and thus facilitating a faster and smoother transition and establishment in the new community.

It should also be kept in mind, though, that cross-group difference in characteristics and sending culture existed and could very well translate into different needs and policy implications for various immigrant groups. For example, the findings that immigrants from Mexico and Jamaica were less likely to have older parents coresiding compared to those from Philippines, Cuba, China, and India could imply that: 1) cultural practices and expectations in terms of household structure and multi-generational residence patterns are very different between countries. Some immigrant groups are simply less likely to have multi generational households. 2) Given this, the need for social services and public programs should be varied in towns and states with different immigrant groups. For instances, in places with a concentrated population from Mexico and El Salvador it might be more important to provide affordable child care for immigrant households with relatively lower family income, as many immigrants families were less likely to have multi generational households and more likely to have lower family income. Whereas in places with considerable numbers of highly skilled professional immigrants from India and Philippines it might be more applicable to provide adequate and accessible health care particularly for older people, as well as community services such as seniors centers, as immigrant households from these groups may be more likely to have older parents coresiding because of cultural preferences. In this sense, findings of this study could be

helpful on the public policy level, mainly for states and local governments where there are relatively high concentrations of immigrant groups that are more likely to have older parents in multi-generational coresidence. The planning of public funding allocations and for specific social services can benefit from better knowledge and anticipation of the demographic composition of immigrant population in particular states and areas.

7.5. Conclusion

Changes in gender relations among post-1965 immigrants in U.S. is a good example that highlights how immigration has affected immigrants' gender relations and women's status within the family. The current study focused on the living arrangements among ten biggest immigrant groups and used it as a proxy to infer on how these arrangements may have been the outcome of men and women's decision making power in the family, therefore reflecting possible changes brought about by immigration. The main findings of this study showed that as immigrant women gained more economic power and higher status in this country, their relative decision making power within the family increased as a result. On the other hand, my findings also underlined the strong and long lasting influence of the sending culture. Despite positive signs showing greater decision making power and gender equality for women, immigrant men from the traditionally patriarchal cultures (represented by India, Korea, and China) still exerted more power and influence on important family decisions such as whose parents were to live together in the multi-generational household. As a matter of fact, on both outcomes of the study sending cultures were found to have significant effects that contributed to considerable between-group variations, even after other socioeconomic, demographic, and immigration

experience factors were controlled for. With regard to the likelihood of having older parents in home, immigrants from Philippines and Cuba were the most likely to have multi-generational households, and those from Mexico and Jamaica were the least likely to have older parents in home. In terms of whose parents were more likely to be present, immigrants from India, Korea, and China were the most likely to have husband's parents in home, and those from Jamaica, El Salvador, and Cuba were more likely to have wife's parents. Comparing these findings on the two outcomes again underlined the complex nature of cross-group difference and the importance of sending culture: e.g. while immigrants from Cuba and Jamaica were both more likely to have wife's parents in home, multi-generational households were much less common among those from Jamaica. This was probably related to the matri-focal family structure and kinship system in the Jamaican culture, as well as the relatively common practice of leaving young children behind in the care of other female kin among Jamaican immigrant families.

These findings contributed to the study of immigration and gender relations in general. Additionally, findings on the characteristics of multi-generational immigrant households increased our understanding of post-1965 immigrants' living arrangements in this country. This knowledge is also timely and helpful for policy makers, students and scholars of immigration, as well as the general public.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbassi, J., & Lutjens, S. L. (Eds.). (2002). *Rereading women in Latin America and the Caribbean: the political economy of gender*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Alba, R., & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration. *International Migration Review*, 31, 4, 826-874.

Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2003). *Remaking the American mainstream: assimilation and contemporary immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ali, A. A. (1991). *The Resurgence of Indian Women*. New Delhi: Radiant Publishers.

Allensworth, E. M. (1997). "Earnings Mobility of First and '1.5' Generation Mexican-Origin Women and Men: A Comparison with U.S.-Born Mexican Americans and Non-Hispanic Whites". *International Migration Review*, 31, 2, 386-410.

Becker, G. (1964). *Human Capital*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bennett, J. M. (2006). *History matters: patriarchy and the challenge of feminism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bever, S. W. (2002). Migration and the transformation of gender roles and hierarchies in Yucatan. *Urban Anthropology & Studies of Cultural Systems & World Economic Development,* 31, 2, 199-132.

Blood, R. O. & Wolfe, D. M. (1960). *Husbands and Wives*. New York: Free Press.

Blumberg, R. L. & Coleman, M. T. (1989). A Theoretical Look at the Gender Balance of Power in the American Couple. *Journal of Family Issues*, 10, 2, 225-250.

Blumstein, P. & Schwartz, P. (1983). *American Couples*. New York: William Morrow.

Bonney, N., Sheng, X., & Stockman, N. (1994). Gender Roles and the Family Division of Labor at Home and in Paid Work in China, Japan, and Great Britain. In P. L. Lin, K. Mei, & H. Peng (Eds.), *Marriage and the Family in Chinese Societies: Selected Readings*. Indianapolis: University of Indianapolis Press.

Booth, A., Crouter, A. C., & Landale, N. (1997). *Immigration and the family: research and policy on U.S. immigrants*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Brines, J. (1994). Economic dependency, gender, and the division of labor at home. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100, 3, 652–688.

Bukowczyk, J. J. (Ed.). (1996). *Polish Americans and their history: community, culture, and politics*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press.

Chang, C. O., Chen, S. M., & Somerville, T. (2003). Economic and Social Status in Household Decision-Making: Evidence Relating to Extended Family Mobility. *Urban Studies*, 40, 4, 733–746.

Chen, C. (2005). A Self of One's Own: Taiwanese Immigrant Women and Religious Conversion. *Gender & Society*, 19, 3, 336-357.

Chong, K. H. (2006). Negotiating Patriarchy: South Korean Evangelical Women and the Politics of Gender. *Gender & Society*, 20, 6, 697-724.

Croll, E. (1995). *Changing Identities of Chinese Women: Rhetoric, Experience and Self-perception in Twentieth-century China*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Das Gupta, M., Lee, S., Uberoi, P., Wang, D., Wang, L., & Zhang, X. (2000). State Policies and Women's Autonomy in China, The Republic of Korea, and India 1950-2000: Lessons from Contrasting Experiences (Gender and Development Working Paper Series No. 16). The World Bank. Also available from http://www.worldbank.org/gender/prr.

De Vos, S. (1990). Extended Family Living Among Older People in Six Latin American Countries. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 45, S87-S94.

Desai, N., & Krishnaraj, M. (1990). *Women and Society in India*. Delhi: Ajanta Publication (India).

Eder, J. F. (2006). Gender Relations and Household Economic Planning in the Rural Philippines. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 37, 3, 397-413.

Edwards, L. (2000). Women in the People's Republic of China: new challenges to the grand gender narrative. In L. Edwards & M. Roces (Eds.), *Women in Asia: tradition, modernity, and globalization*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Edwards, L., & Roces, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Women in Asia: tradition, modernity, and globalization*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Ellis, M., & Wright, R. (1998). When immigrants are not migrants: Counting arrivals of the foreign born using the US census. *International Migration Review*, 32, 127-144.

Espiritu, Y. L. (1999a). "Americans Have a Different Attitude": Family, Sexuality, and Gender in Filipina American Lives. In M. B. Zinn, P. Hondagneu-Sotelo, & M. Messner (Eds.), *Gender Through the Prism of Difference* (2nd ed., pp. 233-244). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Espiritu, Y. L. (1999b). Gender and Labor in Asian Immigrant Families. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42, 4, 628-647.

Estrada, S. L. (2003). Work, gender, and space: Women's home-based work in Tijuana, Mexico. In C. Menjivar (Ed.), *Through the eyes of women: gender, social networks, family and structural change in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Willowdale, ON, Canada: de Sitter Publications.

Filiatrault, P., Ritchie, J. R. B. (1980). Joint Purchasing Decisions: A Comparison of Influence Structure in Family and Couple Decision-Making Units. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 7, 2, 131-140.

Foner, N. (1997). The Immigrant Family: Cultural Legacies and Cultural Changes. *International Migration Review*, 31, 4, 961-974.

Foner, N. (1998). Benefits and Burdens: Immigrant Women and Work in New York City. *Gender Issues*, Fall 1998, 5-24.

Foner, N. (2005). *In a new land: a comparative view of immigration*. New York: New York University Press.

Friedberg, L. & Webb, A. (2006). Determinants and Consequences of Bargaining Power in Households (Working Paper 12367). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Ganguly-Scrase, R. (2000). Diversity and the status of women: the Indian experience. In L. Edwards, & M. Roces (Eds.), *Women in Asia: tradition, modernity, and globalization*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Gans, H. J. (1999). Filling in Some Holes: Six Areas of Needed Immigration Research. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42, 9, 1302-1313.

Gelfand, D. E. (1989). Immigration, Aging, and Intergenerational Relationships. *The Gerontologists*, 29, 366-372.

Glick, J. E. & Van Hook, J. (2002). Parents' Coresidence With Adult Children: Can Immigration Explain Racial and Ethnic Variation? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 240-253.

Goerman, P. L. (2005). Making ends meet: the complex household as a temporary survival strategy among new Latino immigrants to Virginia. In L. Schwede, R. L. Blumberg, & A. Y. Chan (Eds.), *Complex Ethnic Households in America* (pp. 149-180). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Goffman, E. (1976). Gender Display. *Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication*, 3, 69-77.

Goldring, L. (2003). Gender, Status, and the State in Transnational Spaces: The Gendering of Political Participation and Mexican Hometown Associations. In P. Hongdaneu-Sotelo (Ed.), *Gender and U.S. Immigration: Contemporary Trends* (pp. 341-358). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life: the role of race, religion, and national origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Grasmuck, S., & Pessar, P. (1991). *Between Two Islands: Dominican International Migration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Greenstein, T.N. (2000). Economic dependence, gender, and the division of labor in the home: a replication and extension. *Journal of Marriage and the Family,* 62, 2, 322–335.

Hall, C. (1997). *Daughters of the Dragon: Women's Lives in Contemporary China*. London: Scarlet Press.

Hampson, S. (2000). Rhetoric or reality?: contesting definitions of women in Korea. In L. Edwards & M. Roces (Eds.), *Women in Asia: tradition, modernity, and globalization*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Hindin, M. J. & Adair, L. S. (2002). Who's at risk? Factors associated with intimate partner violence in the Philippines. *Social Science & Medicine*, 55, 1385-1399.

Ho, C. G. T. (2002). Caribbean Transnationalism As a Gendered Process. In J. Abbassi, & S. L. Lutjens (Eds.), *Rereading women in Latin America and the Caribbean: the political economy of gender* (pp. 112-130). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (1992). Overcoming Patriarchal Constraints: The Reconstruction of Gender Relations among Mexican Immigrant Women and Men. *Gender & Society*, 6, 3, 393-415.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (1994). *Gendered transitions: Mexican experiences of immigration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (2000). Feminism and Migration. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 571, 107-120.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (Ed.). (2003). *Gender and U.S. Immigration: Contemporary Trends*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (2005). Gendering Migration: Not for "feminists only" – and not only in the household (CMD Working Paper #05-02f). Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, The Center for Migration and Development Working Paper Series.

International Labour Office, Geneva. (1990). *Yearbook of Labour Statistics*. 1989-1990. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Organisation.

Ip, D., & Hsu, R. J. C. (2006). Transnationalism and Gendered Identity: The Case of the "One and a Half Generation" Taiwanese Migrants. *Asian Studies Review*, 30, 273–288.

Jacklin, C. N. (1989). Female and Male: Issues of Gender. *American Psychologist*, 44, 127-133.

Jasso, G., Massey, D. S., Rosenzweig, M. R., & Smith, J.P. (2000). The New Immigrant Survey Pilot (NIS-P): Overview and New Findings about U.S. Legal Immigrants at Admission. *Demography*, 37, 1, 127-138.

Johnson, A. G. (2005). *The Gender Knot: Unraveling Our Patriarchal Legacy*. Philadelphia, PA : Temple University Press.

Jones-Correa, M. (1998). *Between Two Nations: The Political Predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kandiyoti, D, (1988). Bargaining with Patriarchy. Gender & Society, 2, 3, 274-290.

Kibria, N. (1993). *Family Tightrope: The Changing Lives of Vietnamese Americans*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kim, B. S. K., Brenner, B. R., Liang, C. T. H., & Asay, P.A. (2003). A Qualitative Study of Adaptation Experiences of 1.5-Generation Asian Americans. *Cultural diversity & ethnic minority psychology*, 9, 2, 156 -170.

Kumar, G. S. J. (1994). Changing Directions in the Status and Role of Women in India. In C. Chakrapani, & S. V. Kumar (Eds.), *Changing Status and Role of Women in Indian Society* (pp. 51-63). New Delhi: M D Publications Pvt Ltd.

Kurien, P. (1999). Gendered Ethnicity: Creating a Hindu Indian Identity in the United States. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42, 4, 648-670.

Le, C. N. (2007). *Asian American Assimilation: Ethnicity, Immigration, and Socioeconomic Attainment*. El Paso: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.

Lim, I. S. (1997). Korean Immigrant Women's Challenge to Gender Inequality at Home: The Interplay of Economic Resources, Gender, and Family. *Gender & Society*, 11, 1, 31-51.

Long, L. D., Hung, L. N., Truitt, A., Mai, L. T. P., & Anh, D. N. (2000). Changing Gender Relations in Vietnam's Post Doi Moi Era (Gender and Development Working Paper Series No. 14). The World Bank. Also available from http://www.worldbank.org/gender/prr.

Lutjens, S. L. (2002). Reading Between the Lines: Women, the State, and Rctification in Cuba. In J. Abbassi, & S. L. Lutjens (Eds.), *Rereading women in Latin America and the Caribbean: the political economy of gender* (pp. 213-230). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Mahler, S. J. (1999). Engendering Transnational Migration: A Case Study of Salvadorians. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42, 4, 690-719.

Manser, M. & Brown, M. (1980). Marriage and Household Decision-making: A Bargaining Analysis. *International Economic Review*, 21, 1, 31-44.

Martin, L. G. (1988). The Aging of Asia. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 43, S99-S113.

Mason, K. O. (1996). Wives' Economic Decision-making Power in the Family in Five Asian Countries (Working Paper, Population Series No. 86). Honolulu: East-West Center.

Massey, D. S. (1985). Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Review. *Sociology and Social Research*, 69, 315-350.

Massey, D. S., Alarcon, R., Durand, J., & Gonzalez, H. (1987). *Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. (1988). The Dimensions of Residential Segregation. *Social Forces*, 67, 2, 281-315.

Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A. & Taylor, J. E. (1993). Theories of international migration: a review and appraisal. *Population and Development Review,* 19, 4, pp. 431-466.

McAdoo, H. P. (Ed.). (1999). *Family ethnicity: strength in diversity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Menjivar, C. (1999). The Intersection of Work and Gender: Central American Immigrant Women and Employment in California. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42, 4, 601-627.

Menjivar, C. (Ed.). (2003). *Through the eyes of women: gender, social networks, family and structural change in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Willowdale, ON, Canada: de Sitter Publications.

Min, P. G. (2001). Changes in Korean Immigrants' Gender Role and Social Status, and Their Marital Conflicts. *Sociological Forum*, 16, 2, 301-320.

Moch, L. P. (2005). Gender and Migration Research. In M. Bommes, & E. T. Morawska (Eds.), *International Migration Research: Constructions, Omissions, and the Promises* (pp. 95-110). Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

Myers, D. (2004). Accuracy of Data Collected by the Census Question on Immigrants' Year of Arrival (Working Paper PDRG04-01). University of Southern California, Population Dynamics Research Group. Available from http://www-rcf.usc.edu/~dowell/pdf/Year_of_Arrival_Brief10b.pdf.

Neckerman, K. M., Carter, P. & Lee, J. (1999). Segmented Assimilation and Minority Cultures of Mobility. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22, 6, 945-965.

Nguyen, K. C. (1997). Women's Movement and the Vietnamese Women's Role through Historical Periods. *Asian Women*, 5, 69-81.

Ong, P. & Azores, T. (1994). Health Professionals on the Front Line. In P. Ong (Ed.), *The State of Asian Pacific America: Economic Diversity, Issues, and Policies* (pp. 139-163). Los Angeles: LEAP Asian Pacific American Public Policy Institute and University of California at Los Angeles Asian American Studies Center.

Parrado, E. A., & Flippen, C. A. (2005). Migration and Gender among Mexican Women. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 4, 606-632.

Passel, J. S. & Zimmermann, W. (2001). Are Immigrants Leaving California? Settlement Patterns of Immigrants in the Late 1990s (Research Report). Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Also available from http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410287.

Pedraza, S. (1991). Women and Migration: The Social Consequences of Gender. *Annual Reviews of Sociology*, 17, 303-325.

Pessar, P. R. (1984). The linkage between the household and workplace in the experience of Dominican immigrant women in the United States. *International Migration Review*, 18, 1188-1211.

Pessar, P. R. (1995). *A visa for a dream: Dominicans in the United States*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Pessar, P. R. (1999). Engendering Migration Studies: The Case of New Immigrants in the United States. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42, 4, 577-600.

Pollak, R. A. (1994). For Better or Worse: The Roles of Power in Models of Distribution Within Marriage. *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 84, No. 2, 148-152.

Pollak, R. A. (2005). Bargaining Power in Marriage: Earnings, Wage Rates and Household Production (Working Paper 11239). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Portes, A. & Bach, R. L. (1985). *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (1996). *Immigrant America: a portrait*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530, 74-97.

Quisumbing, A. R., & Maluccio, J. A. (2000). Intrahousehold Allocation and Gender Relations: New Empirical Evidence from Four Developing Countries (FCND Discussion Paper No. 84). Washington D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Radzilowski, T. C. (1996). Family, women, and gender: the Polish experience. In J. J. Bukowczyk (Ed.), *Polish Americans and Their History: Community, Culture, and Politics*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Randall, M. (1981). *Women in Cuba, twenty years later*. New York, NY: Smyrna Press.

Reddy, G. L., & Kusuma, A. (1994). Rural Women: Strategies for Development. In C. Chakrapani, & S. V. Kumar (Eds.), *Changing Status and Role of Women in Indian Society* (pp. 39-49). New Delhi: M D Publications Pvt Ltd.

Redstone, I., & Massey, D. S. (2003). Coming to Stay: An Analysis of the U.S. Census Question on Year of Arrival. Paper presented at the Population Association of America meetings in Minneapolis.

Roces, M. (2000). Negotiating modernities: Filipino women 1970-2000. In L. Edwards & M. Roces (Eds.), *Women in Asia: tradition, modernity, and globalization*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Ruggles, S., Sobek, M., Alexander, T., Fitch, C. A., Goeken, R., Hall, P. K., King, M., & Ronnander, C. (2006). Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 4.0 [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center.

Sarkisian, N., Gerena, M., & Gerstel, N. (2007). Extended Family Integration Among Euro and Mexican Americans: Ethnicity, Gender, and Class. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 40-54.

Sarmiento, M. N. (2003). Gender Studies in Cuba: Methodological Approaches, 1974-2001. *Gender & Society*, 17, 1, 7-32.

Schwede, L., Blumberg, R. L., & Chan, A. Y. (Eds.). (2005). *Complex Ethnic Households in America*. Lahnam, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Sen, S. (2000). Toward a Feminist Politics? The Indian Women's Movement in Historical Perspective (Gender and Development Working Paper Series No. 9). The World Bank. Also available from http://www.worldbank.org/gender/prr.

Shayne, J. D. (2004). *The Revolution Question: Feminisms in El Salvador, Chile, and Cuba*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers U Press, 2004.

Sonneborn, L. (2007). *Vietnamese Americans*. In R. D. Johnson (Ed.), *The New Immigrants*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, An Imprint of Infobase Publishing.

Stephen, L. (2002). Women in Mexico's Popular Movements: Survival Strategies against Ecological and Economic Impoverishment. In J. Abbassi, & S. L. Lutjens (Eds.), *Rereading women in Latin America and the Caribbean: the political economy of gender* (pp. 91-111). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Sullivan, O. (2006). *Changing Gender Relations, Changing Families: Tracing the Pace of Change over Time*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Tabachnik, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2001). Using Multivariate Statistics. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Talbani, A., & Hasanali, P. (2000). Adolescent Females between Tradition and Modernity: Gender Role Socialization in South Asian Immigrant Culture. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 5, 615 -627.

Tapales, P. D. (2003). Gender Policies and Responses Towards Greater Women Empowerment in the Philippines. In *Public Administration and Globalization: Enhancing Public-Private Collaboration in Public Service Delivery*. United Nations, Division for Public Administration and Development Management Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

Thomas, D. (1990). Intra-household resource allocation: an inferential approach. *Journal of Human Resources,* 25, 4, 635–664.

Thomson, M. (1986). *Women of El Salvador: the price of freedom*. London: Zed Books Ltd.

Toro-Morn, M. I., Roschelle, A. R., & Facio, E. (2003). Gender, work and family in Cuba: The Challenges of the Special Period. In C. Menjivar (Ed.), *Through the eyes of women: gender, social networks, family and structural change in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Willowdale, ON, Canada: de Sitter Publications.

Ungar, E. (2000). Re-gendering Vietnam: from militant to market socialism. In L. Edwards, & M. Roces (Eds.), *Women in Asia: tradition, modernity, and globalization* (pp. 291-317). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

United Nations. Statistical Office. (1983). *1981 Statistical yearbook, Annuaire statistique.* New York: United Nations.

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. (2002). Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 2000. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Van Hook, J. & Glick, J. E. (2007). Immigration and Living Arrangements: Moving Beyond Economic Need versus Acculturation. *Demography*, 44, 2, 225-249.

Wang, Z. (2000). Gender, Employment and Women's Resistance. In E. J. Perry & M. Seldon (Eds.), *Chinese Society: Change, Conflict and Resistance* (2nd ed., pp. 158-182). London: Routledge.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender and Society*, 1, 2, 125-151.

Wilmoth, J. M. (2001). Living Arrangements Among Older Immigrants in the United States. *The Gerontologist* 41, 228-238.

Woodrow-Lafield, K. A., Xu, X., Kersen, T., & Poch, B. (2004). Naturalization of U.S. Immigrants: Highlights from Ten Countries. Population Research and Policy Review, 23, 187-218.

Yodanis, C. (2005). Divorce Culture and Marital Gender Equality: A Cross-National Study. *Gender & Society*, 19, 5, 644-659.

Zhou, M. (1992). *Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of an Urban Enclave*. Temple University Press.

Zhou, M. (1997). Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation. *International Migration Review*, 31, 975-1019.