



Triumphant Transitions: Socioeconomic Achievements of the Second Generation in Canada

Author(s): Monica Boyd and Elizabeth M. Grieco

Source: *International Migration Review*, Vol. 32, No. 4 (Winter, 1998), pp. 853-876

Published by: The Center for Migration Studies of New York, Inc.

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2547663>

Accessed: 27/10/2009 14:50

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cmigrations>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Center for Migration Studies of New York, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Migration Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Triumphant Transitions: Socioeconomic Achievements of the Second Generation in Canada

Monica Boyd
Elizabeth M. Grieco
Florida State University

Articulated within the last decade, the revisionary perspective on second generation integration argues that the model of equal or above average success of the second generation in North America is historically specific, based on the postwar entry of a white second generation in boom economic times. One implication is that the past patterns of second generation success may not hold now and in the future for immigrant offspring. Using data from the 1994 Canadian General Social Survey for women and men, age 25–64, this article assesses the proposition of triumphant transitions in which the second generation experiences high levels of educational and labor market achievements. Multivariate analyses confirm second generation success with respect to educational levels and occupational status, thus contradicting verdicts of a new chapter to be written for the second generation in Canada. Although limited by the small number of cases in the General Social Survey, exploratory analysis finds variations in educational and occupational attainments exist within second generation groups distinguished by parental region of origin. These findings support the argument that degrees of success are not uniformly assured for all second generation groups.

Since the early 1990s, scholars in the United States have paid considerable attention to the experiences of children of immigrants. There has been an outpouring of funded research, conferences, special journal issues, books and countless articles, a major overview in the *Annual Review of Sociology*, and the formation of a National Academy of Sciences committee on the Health and Adjustment of Immigrant Children and Families (see Booth, Crouter and Landale, 1997; *International Migration Review*, 1994, 1997; Zhou, 1997a). Hampered by the failures of the 1980 and 1990 censuses to ask questions on birthplace of parents, most studies focus on experiences of those young children, teenagers, or very young adults who still reside with foreign-born parents. Questions about socioeconomic successes or failures of adult offspring of the foreign born remain relatively underexamined.

In Canada, only a handful of early studies investigate the socioeconomic situation of either the second generation or the 1.5 generation (persons immigrating as children) (*see* Boyd, 1982; Boyd and Norris, 1994; Chimos, 1990; Isajiw, Sev'er and Driedger, 1993; Jones, 1985; Kalbach *et al.*, 1983; Koch, 1986; Richmond, 1986; Richmond and Verma, 1978). As is the case in the United States, scarcity of data is the primary reason for the neglect. The 1971 census of Canada was the last census to ask birthplace of parents (*see* Richmond and Kalbach, 1980). Together, both parental birthplace and respondents' birthplace are necessary to distinguish among generation groups, consisting of the first generation (the foreign born), the second generation (persons who are Canadian born but have at least one foreign-born parent), and the third or higher generations (persons who are Canadian born with Canadian-born parents).¹ Surveys conducted by academics in the 1970s produced information on the achievements of second generation Canadians (*see* Kalbach *et al.*, 1983; Isajiw, Sev'er and Driedger, 1993; Richmond, 1986). However, from the mid-1970s on, national surveys did not collect data on Canada's second generation adults.

This absence of data was remedied when Statistics Canada fielded the 1986 and 1994 General Social Surveys (GSSs). In their analysis of data from the 1986 GSS, Boyd and Norris (1994) find evidence of second generation success, especially for adults with two foreign-born parents. These individuals have higher educational attainments and occupational status on average than do the other generation groups, and the magnitude of intergenerational mobility is higher than for the first and third generation Canadians. The findings are consistent with the linear (or straight-line) theory of assimilation and acculturation and with the related "success-orientation" model of second generation achievement.

In this article, we return to the topic of second generation success, using data from the 1994 GSS. We ask if support still exists for the model of second generation overachievement in Canada. This is not a vacuous question. The dominant message of research in the United States during the 1990s emphasizes the demise of the second generation success-orientation model, at least for some immigrant descent groups. While our analysis does document second generation success, some evidence is also found to support the view that the magnitudes of achievement vary for different immigrant origin groups.

¹The third or higher generation will be referred to as either the third generation or the third-plus generation, hereinafter.

FOR BETTER OR WORSE, RICHER OR POORER

During the first half of the twentieth century, linear assimilation theory was used by social scientists in both Canada and the United States to conceptualize the integration of immigrants and their offspring into the receiving societies. Although scholars now note that the requirements of a “theory” are rarely met by previous works on assimilation and acculturation (Alba and Nee, 1997; DeWind and Kasinitz, 1997; Portes, 1997), the linear (straight-line) assimilation model has remained a central force in much of the North American thinking of immigrants and their children over the twentieth century. According to this perspective, with time each generation of native-born descendants undergoes further acculturation and raises its status vis-à-vis its parental group. Usually after two to three generations in the host society, the descendants of immigrants are virtually indistinguishable from the rest of society in their educational and occupational achievements (Gans, 1992:174). Such increasing similarities imply that any disadvantages faced by immigrants are overcome by subsequent generations.

Scholars note that this linear or straight-line depiction is an oversimplified rendition of the experiences of immigrant offspring and subsequent generations. Even if the general direction is a consistent one (DeWind and Kasinitz, 1997:1099), the patterns of progress are diverse for various groups (Alba and Nee, 1997; Perlmann and Waldinger, 1997), implying that a “bumpy line” label is more appropriate (Gans, 1992). In actual usage, this latter phrase appears most frequently when concern focuses on the relative underachievement of the second generation compared with those who have far more lengthy residential histories in the host society.

Less explicitly discussed is the fact that the linear progression model, or its relabelled bumpy line depiction, also includes images of success. What we term as the success-orientation model slightly modifies the scenario of continuous progress made by the consecutive generation groups. While the success-orientation model does emphasize the progress made by the newcomer group through time, it stresses the relative overachievements of the second generation. Such overachievements are attributed to two factors: 1) the success orientation of the foreign-born family of origin which communicates high aspirations and expectations to its offspring; and, alternatively, 2) the marginality which the second generation experiences as a result of standing between two cultures – that of their parents and that of the host society – which also may heighten achievement orientations (Handlin, 1966:xv; Park, 1928; Stonequist, 1937).

Research on socioeconomic achievements frequently equates assimilation with the attainment of average or above average socioeconomic achievement, often emphasizing the social mobility of groups over generations (Alba and Nee, 1997). This approach invokes two types of comparisons: 1) assessing the socioeconomic position of the second generation relative to the first or third-plus groups; and 2) comparing groups with respect to levels of intergenerational mobility. The success orientation model in particular implies that the second generation will experience greater amounts of intergenerational change compared to the third-plus group.

Derived either from non-North American contexts and/or using structural perspectives, more recent models contradict the optimistic view of integration and acculturation implied by the linear assimilation approach and its related overachievement model. The European experience, with its inflow of migrants viewed as racially distinctive, portrays a situation of structural impediments to both the first and second generation groups and the formation and persistence of a "foreign" underclass (*see* Wilpert, 1988). In such circumstances, social mobility of the second generation is depressed, and the socioeconomic position of the second generation is expected to be similar to that of the first generation. Both are disadvantaged compared to the third-plus generation. Although such disadvantages can be interpreted as indicative of a bumpy line model holding in the short term, the existence of structural impediments, including racism, implies not only inequalities of opportunity but temporally lasting inequalities of outcome described in underclass terminology.

This portrayal of second generation disadvantage is not uniquely European. For the past decade, analysts in the United States have noted the underclass characteristics of Mexican, Puerto Rican and Haitian groups. More recently, two American sociologists (Portes, 1995; Portes and Zhou, 1993; Zhou, 1997a,b) have articulated three distinctive forms of second generation integration. The first assumes the familiar second generation story of socioeconomic progress. Over time, acculturation occurs alongside the integration of the (white) immigrant offspring into (white) mainstream economic and social life. However, this experience does not necessarily hold for all second generation groups. Rather, the pattern can be one of segmented assimilation incorporating two additional scenarios. One depicts offspring rejection of parental values emphasizing education and hard work as mechanisms of mobility in the host society. Instead, second generation offspring undergo acculturation and integration into a primarily black inner-city underclass where outcomes are those of poverty and irregular employment. According to Portes and Zhou (1993), second generation Caribbean youths are examples

of this segmented, or truncated, assimilation. The other scenario emphasizes economic advancement but with deliberate preservation of ethnic membership and values and with continued economic attachment to ethnic communities. Second generation groups most likely to display this pattern are members of immigrant groups that have well-developed ethnic economies such as the Chinese or Cuban origin groups (Portes, 1995; Portes and Zhou, 1993; *see also* Hirschman, 1994; Waters, 1994, 1997).

These scenarios ultimately reflect three factors: 1) different modes of incorporation of first generation groups in the host society, depending on the context of their admission as refugees, family members, or economic migrants; 2) the changed source countries of the "new" immigrant groups (*see* Rumbaut, 1997); and 3) the accompanying racialization of newcomers by host country residents (Miles, 1989). However, additional support for the second generation "decline" motif in North America arises from the downturn in the Canadian and United States economies in the past two decades. Portes (1995) and Sassen (1988) observe a changing demand for immigrant labor (and by implication for their descendants). In contrast to earlier times, demand for foreign labor no longer comes from manufacturing industries. Instead, the advent of the post-industrial economy means jobs in high-wage service industries exist alongside high demand for workers in low-wage service jobs where economic advancement may be limited. Based on this current economic restructuring and on related pessimistic economic scenarios for the future, Gans (1992) questions the linear model of upward mobility across generations. He suggests that the previous second generation success story may be a vision of the past or at least less universally experienced.

DATA AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

Given the implications of these newer models of immigrant integration and assimilation, is there evidence to suggest that earlier portraits of second generation achievements are a thing of the past? Limited by the absence of a census question on birthplace of parents, recent U.S. research largely is limited to the experiences of teenagers and very young adults who represent the 1.5 or second generations of new immigrant groups. Despite findings which depict segmented assimilation for some groups, several scholars caution that the rejection of the straight-line scenario may not be tenable when these groups reach the midlife stages examined in earlier research on the straight-line assimilation model (Alba and Nee, 1997; DeWind and Kasinitz, 1997; Gans, 1997).

In this article, we ask if a model of second generation success still holds in Canada, given increased warnings to the contrary. In answering this question, we focus on the adult population, analyzing educational and occupational data collected in the 1994 GSS by Statistics Canada. The target population in this survey consists of persons age fifteen years or older living in the ten provinces, excluding full-time residents of institutions. Stratified random samples were derived from each province, and respondents were interviewed by telephone. Data were collected over a twelve-month period, starting in January 1994. The survey consists of a sample size of 11,876. (For further details, *see* Statistics Canada, 1995.)

The rationale for analyzing data from the 1994 GSS is twofold. It is the most recent nationally representative survey of adults with information on respondents' parental birthplace. Based on this information, all individuals born in Canada can be divided into the three generation groups required in this analysis. Because a number of studies have found differences between the socioeconomic achievements of men and women with only one foreign-born parent when compared to those with two foreign-born parents (Boyd and Norris, 1994; Jones, 1985; Martin and Poston, 1977), the second generation is further divided into two groups: those with both parents foreign born and those with only one parent foreign born. Small sample sizes prevent further divisions of the latter group into those with a foreign-born mother and those with a foreign-born father. Highly aggregated period-of-immigration data and the absence of an age-at-immigration variable on the publicly released GSS data base also prevent studying the experiences of the 1.5 generation, consisting of the foreign born who immigrated as children.

The 1994 GSS also includes information on the origin family structure and measures of both respondent and parental educational and labor market characteristics. Information on family structure and parental characteristics is important when analyzing second generation achievements in Canada for three reasons. First, studies suggest that coming from a single-parent family, as opposed to a mother-father present family, is associated with lower levels of schooling and lower socioeconomic achievements (Parsons, 1990). Here we are less concerned about the reasons for such findings than we are about their consequences for studies of second generation success or failure. Our initial analysis of the 1994 GSS indicates that generation groups vary with respect to the structure of the origin family. Second generation adults with both parents foreign born are more likely than other generation groups to come from two-adults families (defined as families either where both parents were present when respondent was age fifteen or where one parent and a

mother/father substitute were present).² One implication is that measures of second generation achievement vis-à-vis other groups could reflect the greater propensity to come from two-adults families. In order to minimize this possibility, we investigate the socioeconomic achievements of generation groups from two-adults families. Additional considerations also dictated this choice of population. When respondents had only one parent present at age fifteen, high nonresponses exist for the characteristics of the absent parent. Also, dividing respondents from single-parent families into generation groups generates very small samples, preventing a separate analysis of these one-parent family offspring.

Second, knowing parental socioeconomic characteristics allows us to ask, and answer, the question about how far offspring have come. Is intergenerational mobility of the second generation the same, greater, or less than that of the third generation with whom they are frequently compared under a linear assimilation model? Third, having information on the origin family permits analysis which takes into account the well-documented association between social origins and the socioeconomic achievements of offspring in adult life. One reason for calling the second generation “a success story” may be that they come from families where resources allow them to continue their education and thus to advance occupationally. If this is true, the tale of second generation achievement would be tempered by the realization that admitting immigrants with high educational or occupational skills has benefits in both the short and long term. Conversely, one reason for a second generation decline may well be less advantageous levels of resources in the parental home while offspring were maturing. United States literature frequently alludes to the declining quality of immigrants. One implication, discussed by Portes (1995) with respect to Haitians, is that immigrant parents lack resources to motivate and set their offspring on a linear assimilation path.

Despite the benefits of having information on family structure and parental characteristics, the 1994 GSS data base does place constraints – sometimes severe – on our research design. Analytically, the most significant restraint is the limitation of the 1994 GSS to approximately 10,000 respondents. From within this population age fifteen and older, we examine the educational and occupational characteristics of persons who not only came from

²Of the respective groups defined as first generation, second generation two foreign-born parents, second generation one foreign-born parent, and third generation, 75, 93, 87, and 89%, respectively, were from families with both parents present or where one parent and a mother/father substitute existed when respondents were age fifteen. In their analysis of children living with parents in the United States, Oropesa and Landale (1997:Table 3) also find that the second generation are less likely than other groups to live in single-parent families.

intact families but also who were between the ages of 25 and 64 years old. Persons over age 24 years are selected in order to allow for the likely completion of education. Persons age 65 and older are excluded because of the high numbers who are no longer in the labor force. The targeted age group, 25–64 from two-adults families, represents 68 percent of the entire 1994 GSS population, and 70 percent of respondents from two-adults families of origin.

As might be expected, the third-plus generation group in Canada is the largest of the generation groups, both in relative and actual size. When inflated to representative national estimates, the third generation is nearly two-thirds (62%) of the population under investigation, followed by 19 percent for the foreign-born (first) generation and 9.6 and 9.8, respectively, for the second generation with two foreign-born parents and with one foreign-born parent. In total, the second generation in Canada is as large as the first generation although the latter receives almost all of the research attention.

The actual number of respondents in groups other than the third generation is fairly small, especially when groups are defined by gender. The small number of cases for the second generation groups becomes particularly problematic when question-nonresponse effects cumulate in our multivariate analyses. For this reason we analyze the occupational attainments of individuals who were either working during the last twelve months preceding the survey or who are currently in the labor force and reporting an occupation.

Conceptually, the 1994 GSS also is more limited than we would have liked in testing the second generation success or decline scenario. The public microdata file does not code a variable indicating race or visible minority status.³ This is unfortunate. In recent decades, immigrants increasingly come from non-European countries. Such origin shifts motivate the recent rethinking of second generation scenarios which emphasize racialization and racism as sources of blocked or segmented assimilation. At the same time, the major constraint for our analysis remains the relatively small number of respondents in the 1994 GSS more generally and for each gender-generation group more specifically. Even the available information on parental region of birth could not be incorporated into in our multivariate analysis because of the very small numbers of respondents in each parental birthplace category.

One final limitation also is associated with the small sample of the GSS and with Statistics Canada's efforts to preserve confidentiality of the data. The

³Visible minority is a term first used in Canada in the early 1980s to denote groups that are distinctive by virtue of their race, color, or "visibility." In the 1986 and 1991 censuses, visible minority membership is determined from responses to the census questions on ethnic origins, birthplace, mother tongue, and religion in accordance guidelines established by the federal government's Interdepartmental Working Group on Equity Employment.

GSS data base contains a measure of socioeconomic status called the Blishen, Carroll and Moore (1987) index (hereafter referred to as the BCM index). We use this measure to examine occupational attainments of generation groups. The occupational status index is a composite rating of nearly 500 occupational titles in the census classification, based primarily on the education and earnings of each occupation. The scale ranges from a low of 17.81 to a high of 101.32 points. What does it capture? Kerckhoff *et al.* (1989:159) observe that “socio-economic status scales are summary records of the tangible credentials and economic rewards associated with occupations.” Similarly, Featherman and Hauser (1978; *see also* Featherman, Jones and Hauser, 1975) have concluded from their research that resulting socioeconomic status scores represent the socioeconomic “goodness” of occupations.

It is relatively easy to reconstruct the approximately 500+ CCDO (Census Classification and Dictionary of Occupations) codes and titles from Blishen codes when combined with other detailed labor market information such as industry of employment. In order to prevent this reconstruction (thereby guaranteeing anonymity of respondents to the survey), Statistics Canada collapsed the detailed BCM index into twelve categories. We have reestablished the interval nature of the scale by assigning 20 and 80 to the upper and lower ends and by choosing the midpoints between other groups (*see* Statistics Canada, 1995). However, to the extent that aggregation effects exist (and we have no way of knowing this without access to the full underlying BCM distribution), the usual impact is to minimize statistically significant differences between groups.

In the analysis that follows, the GSS sample is weighted to represent Canada’s national population, and then downweighted to correspond to the original sample size observed for each gender-generation group. This procedure ensures that estimates correspond to those from a nationally representative sample but that the statistical tests performed take into account the original sample size. Without downweighting in this manner, virtually all generational group comparisons would be statistically significant since tests would use national population counts from the weighted GSS sample. The downweighting procedures as well as potential aggregation effects associated with coding of the BCM occupational scores mean that our analysis offers a statistically conservative approach, in which the risk is that some generational group differences are not found to be statistically significant.

THE SECOND GENERATION IN CANADA

Considerable evidence exists for the overachievements of the second generation in 1994, particularly those with two foreign-born parents. This latter

group displays the most intergenerational educational and occupational mobility of all generational groups (Table 1, panel A). Educational mobility is defined as the difference between respondents' years of schooling and those of their fathers and mothers. Occupational mobility is expressed as the difference between respondents' BCM socioeconomic scores for the main occupation held at the time of the survey or in the preceding twelve months and those of fathers when respondents were age fifteen.⁴

Educational and occupational intergenerational mobility is substantially enhanced for the second generation when both parents are foreign born, but less so when only one parent is foreign born. Amounts of intergenerational educational and occupational mobility for the latter group are not statistically different from levels observed for the third generation group.

Respondent-parental mobility gaps reflect one of three circumstances: 1) all parents in all generational groups have identical characteristics, with offspring differing substantially in their achievements; 2) parents associated with various generational groups differ substantially in educational and occupational characteristics, but respondents do not; and 3) the characteristics of both parents and respondents assigned to a given generation group differ from those in other generation groups. As shown by the educational and occupational data in Table 1, it is the latter that appears to account for the pattern of high intergenerational mobility observed for the second generation. Parents of the second generation group with two foreign-born parents have less education on average than parents of the third generation groups, whereas parents of the second generation of one foreign-born parent have more. These latter foreign-born parents are more likely than parents in the two-foreign-born second generation group to be born in North America and in the United Kingdom or Ireland, although further analysis is prevented by small numbers. Parental differences in mean occupational statuses are more muted, in part because fathers of the third-plus generation also had comparatively lower occupational statuses (Table 1, panel B). Percentage distributions reveal that the fathers of the second generation with two foreign-born parents are the most likely of all groups to have held jobs in blue collar occupations when respondents were age fifteen.

Variations in socioeconomic characteristics also exist for GSS respondents. Compared to the third generation, the second generation with two foreign-

⁴The 1994 GSS also collected information on the occupation of mothers. However, less than 30 percent of mothers had been employed when respondents were fifteen years of age. When combined with generational status, numbers became very small with the result that the variable on mothers' occupations was not included in the analysis.

TABLE 1
MEANS AND PERCENT DISTRIBUTIONS FOR SELECT SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PARENTS AND OFFSPRING,
BY SEX, FOR FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD-PLUS GENERATIONS, CANADA 1994

	Females				Males			
	Second Generation		Second Generation		Second Generation		Second Generation	
	Foreign Born (FB) (1)	Both Parents FB (2)	Parent FB (3)	Third-Plus (4)	Foreign Born (FB) (5)	Both Parents FB (6)	Parent FB (7)	Third-Plus (8)
Differences ^a								
Offspring-father's education ^b	1.3 ^f	3.3 ^{g,h,i}	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.3 ^h	1.2 ^j	1.8
Offspring-mother's education ^b	2.2 ^f	3.3 ^{g,h,i}	1.0 ^j	1.5	3.1 ^f	3.0 ^{h,i}	0.9 ^j	1.2
Offspring-father's occupational statuses ^c	-1.2 ^f	8.8 ^{g,h,i}	1.3	2.4	1.9	7.9 ^{g,h,i}	4.3	3.7
Parental Characteristics								
Years of schooling								
Mother	9.3	8.7 ^{h,i}	10.2 ^{h,k}	9.5	9.0 ^f	9.2 ^h	10.8 ^{h,k}	9.5
Father	10.4	8.9 ^g	9.1 ^j	8.8	10.1 ^f	9.4 ^h	10.3 ^k	8.9
Fathers' occupational status ^c	42.9 ^f	39.8 ^g	41.4	40.6	42.9 ^f	38.9 ^{g,h}	43.0 ^k	40.9
Percent with fathers in:								
Farming	14.7	14.9	13.4	12.9	15.4	15.1	11.4	15.1
Blue collar ^d	35.0	52.1	44.8	49.4	33.0	53.9	44.1	42.6
Clerical, sales, service	23.5	14.3	20.8	19.5	23.3	17.0	17.6	17.9
Science, teaching, artist ^e	12.0	5.5	10.2	7.2	14.4	7.7	13.4	6.6
Managerial, administrative	14.9	13.3	10.7	11.0	13.9	6.3	13.5	13.7
Respondents' Characteristics								
Years of schooling	12.6	13.3 ^{g,h,i}	12.8 ^k	12.4	13.2 ^f	13.2 ^{g,i}	13.0 ^k	12.3
Occupational status ^c	42.4	47.1 ^{g,h,i}	42.4	43.6	45.4	47.7 ⁱ	47.6 ^k	44.5
Percent in:								
Farming	1.1	3.5	4.6	2.7	1.4	7.4	4.1	3.9
Blue collar ^d	12.3	5.8	9.5	7.6	40.0	36.5	35.4	41.5
Clerical, sales, service	44.4	35.6	49.6	46.0	22.3	14.8	17.4	20.0
Science, teaching, artist ^e	25.3	39.9	25.0	27.2	20.0	18.8	18.2	14.4
Managerial, administrative	16.9	15.2	11.2	16.5	15.5	22.4	25.0	19.2

Source: Produced by authors from 1994 General Social Survey, Public Use Microdata File, Statistics Canada.
^a Calculated as the average of the offspring-parent differences. This differs from values obtained by calculating the difference between mean values of offspring and parents.
^b Coded to represent years of schooling.
^c Coded in BCGM scores (Blisshen, Carroll and Moore, 1987).
^d Includes mining, quarrying, fishing and hunting occupations.
^e Includes occupations in life sciences, math, computers, architecture, engineering, social sciences, religion, teaching, medicine and health, arts, literature, and recreation.
^f Values between the first and third generation are significantly different at p < .05 or less, using a two-tailed t-test and downweighted to produce N's of the original sample size.
^g Values between the first and second generation with two foreign-born parents are significantly different at p < .05 or less.
^h Values between the second generation with two foreign-born parents and the second generation with one foreign-born parent are significantly different at p < .05 or less.
ⁱ Values between the second generation with two foreign-born parents and the third generation are significantly different at p < .05 or less.
^j Values between the second generation with one foreign-born parent and the first generation are significantly different at p < .05 or less.
^k Values between the second generation with one foreign-born parent and the third generation are significantly different at p < .05 or less.

born parents on average have nearly one more year of schooling and the second generation with one foreign-born parent also has higher educational attainments (Table 1, panel C). The second generation also has significantly higher average BCM occupational status than does the third generation. Compared to other generation groups, Canadian-born women with two foreign-born parents concentrate in upper white-collar jobs, including medicine and health, natural and social sciences, teaching and artistic occupations. Second generation men are more likely than first or third generation men to be employed in managerial and administrative occupations.

Parental characteristics, respondents' schooling, and occupational achievements are sequentially linked. Parental resources, measured here in terms of socioeconomic characteristics, are positively correlated with the educational attainments of offspring. In turn, education is a powerful allocating mechanism in the labor market, and thus it affects the occupational positions held by offspring. We can statistically adjust for the influence exerted by parental resources in the educational and occupational attainments of offspring and for the influence that educational attainments exist in the occupational achievements of various first, second and third generation groups in Canada. This adjustment uses Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) (Andrews, Morgan and Sonquist, 1967), which is a variant of dummy variable regression. The MCA technique shows the generational group attainments that would exist if all groups were (hypothetically) endowed with identical distributions for each background characteristic, such as age, father's education, mother's education, and father's occupational status.

These adjusted values show that even when age and family-of-origin composition differences between generational groups are taken into account, the earlier patterns of generational differences remain (Table 2). The second generation with two foreign-born parents on average has higher levels of education and occupational status than do other generational groups (Table 2). In fact, if all groups (hypothetically) had identical parental characteristics, the educational attainments for this second generation group would be even higher than actually observed (Table 2, row 3). The increase between the actual, or observed, educational attainment and the adjusted levels occur because the parents of this second generation group actually have lower average levels of schooling and lower paternal occupational status than do other groups (Table 1). Given the transmission of educational achievements across generations, this has a modest depressant effect of the actual educational attainments of the second generation with two foreign-born parents.

It is possible to decompose the difference between actual and adjusted or expected values and depict the relative influence of key variables.⁵ We do this with respect to occupational status (Table 2, panel B). The exercise shows that the higher than average educational attainments of the second generation with two foreign-born parents play important roles in the higher than average occupational statuses of this group. For example, second generation women with two foreign-born parents have in actuality an average occupational status of 48.7, which is 1.6 points higher than would be expected if all groups had the same distributions with respect to age, parental characteristics, and education. The decomposition shows that the somewhat younger age distributions of this second generation group lowers their occupational status slightly as does the lower educational levels of parents and the lower paternal occupational status (*see* Table 1). However, the depressant effects of these age and background resources are more than recouped by the relatively high levels of schooling of these women. Second generation women who have two foreign-born parents boost their average occupational status by over 3 points as a result of their educational attainments (Table 2, panel A). The story is similar for their male second generation counterparts.

The adjusted values presented in Table 2 assume that the relationship between independent and dependent variables are the same for all generational groups. For example, as a variant of main effects dummy variable regression, MCA assumes that the impact of education on an offspring's occupational attainment is the same regardless of whether or not the offspring is foreign born, second or third generation. In fact, this latter assumption is an oversimplification of what produces inequalities between groups. Typically, differential outcomes are produced because groups differ not only in crucial resources and characteristics, but also in how these characteristics influence educational and occupational attainments.⁶ This is evident by running separate regression equations for each group and comparing the independent variables effects across generation groups.

Tracking the routes by which parental resources affect educational and occupational attainments are standard exercises in the North American stratification

⁵The methodology parallels the strategy of beginning with a reduced-form structural equation model, which in this case regresses occupational status only on generation groups, and then sequentially adds other variables of interest. The regression coefficients for generation groups in each preceding equation can be compared with those found in the successive equation, and the difference indicates the effect mediated by the inclusion of one or more newly introduced variables in the successive equation.

⁶Reasons for differential effects are diverse, ranging from structural impediments such as racism and discrimination to lack of familiarity with local labor markets.

TABLE 2
 ACTUAL AND ADJUSTED YEARS OF SCHOOLING AND OCCUPATIONAL STATUS, WITH DECOMPOSITIONS, FOR FIRST,
 SECOND, AND THIRD-PLUS GENERATIONS, BY SEX, CANADA 1994

	Females				Males			
	Second Generation		Third-Plus		Second Generation		Third-Plus	
	Foreign Born (FB) (1)	Both Parents FB (2)	One Parent FB (3)	Third-Plus (4)	Foreign Born (FB) (5)	Both Parents FB (6)	One Parent FB (7)	Third-Plus (8)
Respondents' Years of Schooling, Sample <i>N</i>	288	135	231	1608	316	132	179	1424
Actual	13.1	13.6	13.0	12.6	13.7	13.6	13.5	12.6
Adjusted	13.0	14.0	13.1	12.6	13.4	13.8	13.2	12.7
Respondents' SES, Sample <i>N</i>	206	97	165	1167	273	113	148	1248
Actual	43.6	48.7	43.4	44.3	46.2	49.3	48.1	46.1
Adjusted	41.4	47.1	43.4	45.0	43.6	48.8	45.8	47.2
Difference	2.2	1.6	-0.0	-0.7	2.6	0.6	2.3	-1.0
Due to:								
Age	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2	0.1	0.2	-0.9	0.3	-0.0
Family of origin	0.9	-1.4	0.4	-0.1	1.4	-1.2	1.3	-0.4
Education	1.4	3.3	-0.2	-0.6	1.0	2.6	0.6	-0.6

Source: Calculated by authors from 1994 General Social Survey, Public Use Microdata File, Statistics Canada.

literature (Boyd *et al.*, 1985; Featherman and Hauser, 1978; Mata, 1997). We do not emphasize such paths in this article because of the lengthy discussions generated by all possible comparisons and the insignificant direct effects of many origin variables, particularly when examining the process of occupational attainments.⁷ As well, our own research findings suggest that education is the major pathway to second generation occupational success in Canada.

Not only does the second generation, particularly those with two foreign-born parents, have higher levels of education, but also these higher levels boost their subsequent occupational attainments (*see* Tables 1 and 2). Moreover, the higher occupational status of the second generation, particularly those with two foreign-born parents, reflects not just higher levels of education but a greater occupational “pay-off” for education in general. For each year of schooling, the second generation with two foreign-born parents receives a higher increment in occupational status than do other groups. This is evident from Table 3, which presents regression coefficients for education, obtained from a model that regresses occupational status on age, parental characteristics, and education for each gender-generational group. Canadian-born women with two foreign-born parents receive about 3.5 BCM points in occupational status for each year of schooling, a return that is significantly higher than that observed for foreign-born women and substantively, although not significantly, higher than the increment of 3.3 points for the third generation.⁸ The substantive impact of the generation-specific effects of education on occupational status are not inconsequential, with differences among groups rising with higher levels of educational attainments. If all women had the same average education of third generation women (13.06 years), second generation women with two foreign-born parents would receive an increment of 46 BCM points compared to 26, 42, and 43 points, respectively, for the first, second with one foreign-born parent, and third generations (Table 3).⁹

⁷Regression equations for effects of parental resources on educational attainments and for effects of parental resources and education on occupations SES are available upon request.

⁸Again it must be remembered that if aggregation effects exist with respect to the occupational status scale, our tests for statistical significance will be conservative. As well, in comparing *b* coefficients across generation groups, we use the formula

$$t=(b1-b2)/\text{sqrt}(se^2(b1) + se^2(b2)),$$

where *se*(*b*1) and *se*(*b*2) are the standard errors of the coefficients *b*1 and *b*2, respectively. According to Wright (1979:256), if anything, this simpler procedure produces slightly more conservative results than the conventional pooled dummy variable interaction model.

⁹Decomposition of differences (Jones and Kelley, 1984) and simply substituting the education of the third generation into the generation-specific equations are two additional strategies that could have been employed. However, these methods use the parameters of the entire regression equations, including variables whose direct effects are insignificant. Our strategy emphasizes the importance of education in the process of educational attainments net of these variables.

TABLE 3
POINT INCREMENT IN OCCUPATIONAL STATUS PER YEAR INCREASE IN SCHOOLING,
BY GENERATIONAL STATUS AND SEX, CANADA 1994

	First	Second		Third-Plus
	(1)	2 Parents (2)	1 Parent (3)	(4)
Women				
Actual education	13.56	14.00	13.27	13.06
b, education	1.987 ^a	3.549 ^b	3.177 ^c	3.267
Increment to SES from education:				
At hypothetical years of schooling				
6	11.9	21.3	19.1	19.6
8	15.9	28.4	25.4	26.1
10	19.9	35.5	31.8	32.7
12	23.8	42.6	38.1	39.2
14	27.8	49.7	44.5	45.7
16	31.8	56.8	50.8	52.3
20	39.7	71.0	63.5	65.3
At average level of third-plus				
13.06	26.0	46.3	41.5	42.7
Men				
Actual education	13.68	13.56	13.76	12.82
b, education	2.605	4.130 ^{b,c,d}	3.031	2.883
Increment to SES from education:				
At hypothetical years of schooling				
6	15.6	24.8	18.2	17.3
8	20.8	33.0	24.2	23.1
10	26.0	41.3	30.3	28.8
12	31.3	49.6	36.4	34.6
14	36.5	57.8	42.4	40.4
16	41.7	66.1	48.5	46.1
20	52.1	82.6	60.6	57.7
At average level of third-plus				
12.82	33.4	53.0	38.9	37.0

^a Values between first and third generation are significantly different at $p < .05$ or less, using a two-tailed t-test and downweighted to produce N 's of the original sample size.

^b Values between first and second generation with two foreign-born parents are significantly different at $p < .05$ or less.

^c Values between second generation with two foreign-born parents and second generation with one foreign-born parent are significantly different at $p < .05$ or less.

^d Values between second generation with two foreign-born parents and third generation are significantly different at $p < .05$ or less.

^e Values between second generation with one foreign-born parent and first generation are significantly different at $p < .05$ or less.

Differences in returns to education are even more pronounced for men. Second generation men with two foreign-born parents increase their occupational status by 4.1 BCM points for each year of education, and this increment is statistically higher than the increments received by other generation groups. If they had the same average years of schooling as the third generation, these men would receive a 53 BCM point increment in occupational status compared to that of 37 points for the third generation (Table 3). This high return to education does not characterize those men and women who have only one foreign-born parent, for they display educational returns that

are similar to those of the third-plus generation. Although small numbers prevent further multivariate analyses, the similarities between the second generation with only one foreign-born parent and the third-plus generation mirror the sociodemographic similarities of the two groups. Not only is at least one parent Canadian born, but also among the second generation, the sole foreign-born parent is likely to be of Anglo ethnic and linguistic origins. As a result of the historical political and economic dominance of the British, British-Anglo origin groups form a sizable share of Canada's third-plus generation population (Boyd, 1997).

CONCLUSION AND CODA

In the United States, the early 1990s have been fertile ground for newly emergent research on the second generation. Gans (1992) and Massey (1995) raise the possibility that the results of earlier studies are historically specific, rooted in the cessation of immigration between the two world wars, the European origins of the second generation, and the expansionary labor markets of the 1950s and 1960s. Other researchers suggest that the previous second generation socioeconomic success story may now be less universal for the second generation. Also implied is the end of a linear model of assimilation in which there is a steady progression of increasing socioeconomic similarity or even overachievement from first to second to third generations.

The 1994 GSS derived findings contradict such verdicts of a new chapter to be written for second generation adults in Canada. On average, the second generation experiences the same or greater magnitude of intergenerational mobility as does the third-plus generation. Similarly, educational attainments and occupational status of the second generation are either the same or greater than observed for third-plus generation Canadians. Multivariate analysis confirms that the success of the second generation matches or exceeds the achievements of the third generation. Even if the first, second and third-plus generation groups had the identical distributions for age, family origin characteristics, and education, second generation groups in Canada would still do as well or better than the third generation.

In such comparisons, the second generation with two foreign-born parents are particularly noteworthy in their successes. With parental resources slightly below those observed for other generation groups, their educational attainments and occupational achievements are the highest among all generational groups. While their higher education provides a boost to their occupational status, men in this group also benefit from their higher occupational status returns for each year of education. Simply put, the higher education of the second generation with two foreign-born parents exceeds what would be

expected given their families of origin. The second generation with two foreign-born parents has higher occupational status on average partly because of these high levels of education, but also partly because, at least among men, they get more occupational "mileage" from each year of education than do other groups.

How are these findings of second generation success to be reconciled with the recent multifaceted findings of American scholars? First, our research examines the achievement of adults whereas the bulk of current American studies focuses on children, teenagers, or young adults. Second, differences exist between Canada and the United States with respect to the demographic complexion of immigration flows and with respect to historically rooted societal settings. Although both countries have experienced substantial declines in European origin flows, the new immigration source countries differ. The United States has a much longer history of Mexican, Caribbean and South American inflows. In Canada, the major areas of new immigration are South and Southeast Asia. In the United States, arrival and settlement occurs within the context of over 200 years of race relations, whereas in Canada the legacy of the English-French split has emphasized language and culture rather than race. These different national contexts may well produce different socioeconomic outcomes for immigrant groups and their descendants. In his comparisons of immigrant integration in Australia, Canada, and the United States, Reitz (1998) argues that national differences reflect not only country-specific race relations but also differing institutional contexts, particularly those pertaining to immigration policy, labor markets, educational systems, and social welfare.

A third explanation is that it simply is too soon to assess the second generation decline in Canada, in part because the shift away from European origins is less pronounced than in the United States, and the shift is less influenced by inflows of a few large groups, such as Mexican migrants (*see* Zlotnik, 1996:Table 1). In the 1994 GSS, second generation respondents who were between the ages of 25 and 64, *i.e.*, born between 1930 and 1969. The birthplaces of their parents overwhelmingly were either North American or European. Ninety-four and 95 percent of the second generation in our study, respectively, had mothers or fathers born in North America, the United Kingdom or Ireland, or elsewhere in Europe. To a considerable extent, these second generation Canadians do not represent the populations considered by American scholars to be most at risk for second generation decline and for segmented assimilation.

Limited analysis of the second generation by parental birthplace does show that even within these North American-European generation groups, variations exist in the amount of mobility and in levels of educational and occupational attainments (Table 4). The numbers of respondents are extremely small. The

TABLE 4
 AVERAGE (MEAN) INTERGENERATIONAL MOBILITY, RESPONDENTS' YEARS OF EDUCATION AND OCCUPATIONAL STATUS FOR SECOND GENERATION BY SELECTED AREAS OF PARENTAL BIRTH^a, CANADA 1994

Sample N	Respondents' Education		Respondents' SES		Respondents' Average	
	Fathers (1)	Minus Mothers (2)	Minus Fathers SES (3)	Years of Schooling (4)	Occupational SES (5)	
One Parent Foreign Born						
Born in N. America	73	72	49	83	56	
Born in U.K., Ireland	101	99	80	134	86	
Born in other European	77	89	66	111	69	
Both Parents Foreign Born						
Born in U.K., Ireland	64	63	54	95	56	
Born in other European	184	186	169	244	179	
Mobility and Attainments						
One Parent Foreign Born						
Born in N. America	2.3	2.1	3.1	13.1	44.8	
Born in U.K., Ireland	0.9	0.8	0.4	12.7	44.3	
Born in other European	2.5	0.4	9.7	12.1	44.7	
Both Parents Foreign Born						
Born in U.K., Ireland	0.5	0.5	2.5	12.4	45.2	
Born in other European	3.9	4.4	11.1	13.5	48.8	

^a Areas of birth for foreign-born parents are: North America (United States, Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon, Greenland), United Kingdom and Ireland, and other European countries. Respondents with parents born elsewhere (e.g., Asia, the Caribbean) are excluded from this table.

TABLE 5
 PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS FROM FARM ORIGINS AND INTERGENERATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AND STATUS FOR NONFARM ORIGIN RESPONDENTS FOR
 SECOND GENERATION BY SELECTED AREAS OF PARENTAL BIRTHS^a, CANADA 1994

	Percent with Father in Farming (1)	Sample N (2)	Nonfarm Origin Respondents	
			Respondents' SES Minus Fathers SES (3)	Respondents' Occupational SES (4)
One Parent Foreign Born				
Born in N. America	13.7	42	1.7	45.8
Born in U.K., Ireland	8.6	68	-1.5	44.4
Born in other European	23.3	43	9.2	48.4
Both Parents Foreign Born				
Born in U.K., Ireland	5.3	50	1.8	45.0
Born in other European	17.2	128	10.8	49.6

^a Areas of birth for foreign-born parents are: North America (United States, Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon, Greenland), United Kingdom and Ireland, and other European countries. Respondents with parents born elsewhere (e.g., Asia, the Caribbean) are excluded from this table.

second generation with one foreign-born parent and two foreign-born parents consists of 49 and 54 respondents, respectively. As a result, these findings are illustrative rather than definitive. For the second generation groups, paternal intergenerational mobility is highest for those born in areas of Europe other than the United Kingdom and Ireland. Less variation by parental birthplace is evident when comparing the average education and occupational achievements of second generation groups. This partially reflects the influence of higher farm origins for the second generation with one or both parents born outside the United Kingdom and Ireland. Among those second generation groups whose fathers were not in farming, it is the second generation with one or both parents born in the other European areas who have on average the highest occupational achievements (Table 5).

These data show that regions of origins are associated with relative levels of mobility and attainments even within the European-origin second generation population. It is likely, therefore, that as new waves of immigrants arrive in Canada and bear and raise children, varied outcomes will occur within the second generation. Whether such outcomes continue to uphold a linear assimilation model, with bumpy-line or success model variations, or whether they indicate segmented assimilation remains a yet unanswered question. The resolution awaits future investigations that incorporate the Canadian-born offspring of Canada's post-1960s immigrants, including those of color and of non-European origins.

REFERENCES

- Alba, R. and V. Nee
1997 "Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Assimilation," *International Migration Review*, 31(4):826-874.
- Andrews, F. M., J. N. Morgan and J. A. Sonquist
1967 *Multiple Classification Analysis*. Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.
- Blishen, B., W. Carroll and C. Moore
1987 "The 1981 Socio-economic Index for Occupations in Canada," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 24(4):465-488.
- Booth, A., A. C. Crouter and N. Landale, eds.
1997 *Immigration and the Family: Research and Policy on U.S. Immigrants*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Boyd, M.
1997 "Offspring-Parent Shifts in Ancestry: Ethnic Bedrock or Ethnic Quicksand?" Working Paper Series No. 97-138. Tallahassee: Center for the Study of Population and Demography, Florida State University.
-
- 1985 "Educational and Occupational Attainments of Native-born Canadian Men and Women." In *Ascription and Achievement: Studies in Mobility and Status Attainment in Canada*. M. Boyd, J. Goyder, F. E. Jones, H. A. McRoberts, P. C. Pineo, and J. Porter. Ottawa: Carleton University Press. Pp. 229-296.

- 1982 "Sex and Generational Achievement: Canada." Paper presented at the International Sociological Association meeting, Mexico City.
- Boyd, M., J. Goyder, F. E. Jones, H. A. McRoberts, P. C. Pineo and J. Porter
 1985 *Ascription and Achievement: Studies in Mobility and Status Attainment in Canada*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Boyd, M. and D. Norris
 1994 "Generating Success: Educational and Occupational Achievements of the Second Generation in Canada." Working Paper Series No. 94-117. Tallahassee: Center for the Study of Population, Florida State University.
- Chimos, P. D.
 1990 "A Comparative Study of Intergenerational Mobility: Children of Immigrants in Canada and Children of the Same Age Cohort in a Greek Village of Origin." Paper presented at 1992 meeting of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, Victoria, British Columbia.
- DeWind, J. and P. Kasinitz
 1997 "Everything Old Is New Again? Processes and Theories of Immigrant Incorporation," *International Migration Review*, 31(4):1096-1111.
- Featherman, D. C. and R. M. Hauser
 1978 *Opportunity and Change*. New York: Academic Press.
- Featherman, D. C., F. L. Jones and R. M. Hauser
 1975 "Assumptions of Social Mobility Research in the United States: The Case of Occupational Status," *Social Science Research*, 4:329-360. December.
- Gans, H. J.
 1997 "Towards a Reconciliation of 'Assimilation' and 'Pluralism': The Interplay of Acculturation and Ethnic Retention," *International Migration Review*, 31(4):875-892.
-
- 1992 "Second Generation Decline: Scenarios for the Economic and Ethnic Futures of the Post-1965 American Immigrants," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 15:173-191.
- Handlin, O.
 1966 *Children of the Uprooted*. New York: George Braziller.
- Hirschman, C.
 1994 "Problems and Prospects of Studying Immigrant Adaptation from the 1990 Population Census: From Generational Comparisons to the Process of 'Becoming American,'" *International Migration Review*, 28(4):690-713.
- International Migration Review*
 1994 "The New Second Generation," ed. A. Portes, *International Migration Review*, 28(4):632-881. Winter.
-
- 1997 "Immigrant Adaptation and Native-Born Responses in the Making of Americans," ed. J. DeWind, C. Hirschman, and P. Kasinitz, *International Migration Review*, 31(4):799-1111.
- Isajiw, W. W., A. Sev'er and L. Driedger
 1993 "Ethnic Identity and Social Mobility. A Test of the 'Drawback' Model," *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 18(2):177-198.
- Jones, F. E.
 1985 "Nativity: Further Considerations." In *Ascription and Achievement: Studies in Mobility and Status Attainment in Canada*, M. Boyd, J. Goyder, F. E. Jones, H. A. McRoberts, P. C. Pineo, J. Porter. Ottawa: Carleton University Press. Pp. 447-478.
- Jones, F. L. and J. Kelley
 1984 "Decomposing Differences Between Groups: A Cautionary Note on Measuring Discrimination," *Sociological Methods and Research*, 12:323-343. February.

- Kalbach, W., M. Lanphier, D. Rhyne and A. H. Richmond
1983 *Ethnogenational Factors in Socio-Economic Achievement in Toronto: The Second Generation During the 1970s*. Toronto: Institute for Behavioral Research, York University.
- Kerckhoff, A. C., R. T. Campbell, J. M. Trott and V. Kraus
1989 "The Transmission of Socioeconomic Status and Prestige in Great Britain and the United States," *Sociological Forum*, 4(2):155-177.
- Koch, A.
1986 "The Socioeconomic Adjustment of Immigrants in Canada: A Case Study of German First and Second Generation Immigrants in Edmonton, Alberta." Paper presented at 1986 annual meeting of the Canadian Population Society, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Martin, W.T. and D. L. Poston
1977 "Differentials in the Ability to Convert Education into Income: The Case of the European Ethnic," *International Migration Review*, 11(2):215-231.
- Massey, D.
1995 "The New Immigration and Ethnicity in the United States," *Population and Development Review*, 21:631-652. September.
- Mata, F.
1997 "Intergenerational Transmission of Education and Socio-Economic Status: A Look at Immigrants, Visible Minorities and Aboriginals." Income and Labor Dynamics Working Paper Series No. 97-07. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Miles, R.
1989 *Racism*. London: Routledge.
- Oropesa, R. S. and N. S. Landale
1997 "Immigrant Legacies: Ethnicity, Generation and Children's Familial and Economic Lives," *Social Science Quarterly*, 78:399-416. June.
- Park, R.
1928 "Human Migration and the Marginal Man," *American Journal of Sociology*, 33:881-893. May.
- Parsons, M.
1990 "Lone Parent Canadian Families and the Socioeconomic Achievements of Children as Adults," *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 21:353-368. Autumn.
- Perlmann, J. and R. Waldinger
1997 "Second Generation Decline? Children of Immigrants, Past and Present - A Reconsideration," *International Migration Review*, 31(4):893-922.
- Portes, A.
1997 "Immigration Theory for a New Century: Some Problems and Opportunities," *International Migration Review*, 31(4):799-825.
-
- 1995 "Children of Immigrants: Segmented Assimilation and Its Determinants." In *The Economic Sociology of Immigration: Essays on Networks, Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship*. Ed. A. Portes. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Pp. 248-279
- Portes, A. and M. Zhou
1993 "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530:74-96. November.
- Reitz, J. G.
1998 *Warmth of Welcome: The Social Causes of Economic Success for Immigrants in Different Nations and Cities*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Richmond, A. H.
1986 "Ethnocultural Variation in Educational Achievement," *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 18(3):75-89.

- Richmond, A. H. and W. Kalbach
1980 *Factors in the Adjustment of Immigrants and Their Descendants*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, Canada.
- Richmond, A. H. and R. Verma
1978 "The Economic Adaptation of Immigrants: A New Theoretical Perspective," *International Migration Review*, 12(1):3–38.
- Rumbaut, R. G.
1997 "Ties that Bind: Immigration and Immigrant Families in the United States." In *Immigration and the Family: Research and Policy on U.S. Immigrants*. Ed. A. Booth, A. C. Crouter, and N. Landale. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Pp. 3–46.
- Sassen, S.
1988 *The Mobility of Labor and Capital: A Study in International Investment and Labor Flow*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Statistics Canada
1995 The 1994 General Social Survey – Cycle 9. Education, Work and Retirement. Public Use Microdata File Documentation and User's Guide. Ottawa: Statistics Canada
- Stonequist, E. V.
1937 *The Marginal Man*. New York: Scribner and Sons.
- Waters, M.
1997 "Immigrant Families at Risk: Factors that Undermine Chances for Success." In *Immigration and the Family: Research and Policy on U.S. Immigrants*. Ed. A. Booth, A. C. Crouter, and N. Landale. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Pp. 79–87.
-
- 1994 "Ethnic and Racial Identities of Second Generation Black Immigrants in New York City," *International Migration Review*, 28(4):795–820.
- Wilpert, C.
1988 "From One Generation to Another: Occupational Position and Social Reproduction – Immigrant and Ethnic Minorities in Europe." In *Entering the Working World: Following the Descendants of Europe's Immigrant Labor Force*. Ed. C. Wilpert. Aldershot, England: Gower Publishing. Pp. 1–23.
- Wright, E. O.
1979 *Class Structure and Income Determination*. New York: Academic Press.
- Zhou, M.
1997a "Growing Up American: The Challenge Confronting Immigrant Children and Children of Immigrants," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23:63–95.
-
- 1997b "Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies and Recent Research on the New Second Generation," *International Migration Review*, 31(4):975–1008.
- Zlotnik, H.
1996 "Policies and Migration Trends in North American Systems." In *International Migration, Refugee Flows and Human Rights in North America: The Impact of Trade and Restructuring*. Ed. A. Simmons. New York: Center for Migration Studies. Pp. 81–103.