

HOME AND FLAG: THE NEW YORK STORY

Karen A. Woodrow-Lafield and Bunnak Poch

Institute for Latino Studies, University of Notre Dame, 230 McKenna, Notre Dame, IN 46556-0764*

KEY WORDS: Immigrants, Citizens, Demography, Hazards Models

Introduction

The influxes of Caribbean and European immigrants that began in the 1970s contrasted with the Eastern European and Russian Jewish immigrants who arrived at Ellis Island at the beginning of the 20th century. Until the 1990s, the East was relatively unaffected by significant Mexican migration primarily to California and the Southwest, but influxes from other Latin American nations to New York conveyed a share of the growing Hispanic population nationally. Some of the nation's unauthorized migrants were in New York in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s (Passel and Woodrow 1984; Passel and Clark 1998), mainly from North and Central America, the Caribbean, and China. For many in New York, their path to lawful status was by regular mechanisms rather than the amnesty available under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) (Meissner and Papademetriou 1988).

The national profile of the foreign-born population is a changing one over time as authorized immigration, unauthorized migration, and temporary migration have increased in volume and complexity. Subnational studies over the past decade give exciting insights, e.g., New York City (Cordero-Guzmán and Grosfoguel 2000; Foner 2000; Salvo and Ortiz 1992; Smith 1985), Los Angeles (Waldinger and Bozorgmehr 1996), Houston (Hagan 1994), and Washington, D.C. (Repak 1999). The history of major cities and the six most populated states showing sizable immigrant populations is a long one (Gibson and Lennon 1999). American communities with established immigrant communities remain popular destinations for newly arriving immigrants as professionals and retirees move away (Frey and DeVol 2000). Cities with large foreign-born populations seemed to grow most in the 1990s (Glaeser and Shapiro 2001), prompting detailed study of geographic settlement of immigrants (Singer, Friedman, Cheung, and Price 2001). Nevertheless, an immigrant presence emerged in many other communities (Camarota and Keeley 2001).

Following the IRCA legislation providing for amnesty to many Mexican and Central American residents and workers, Mexican settlement became national in scope and less focused on the traditional gateway states, and New York was among the states to which Mexican settlement emerged in the 1990s (Durand, Massey, and Charvet 2000). Immigrants' choices may reflect the attractiveness of economic and cultural opportunities or other amenities or the role of social networks in facilitating migration and adjustment, as aliens and naturalized citizens sponsor family members who choose to live nearby. Zavadny (1999) demonstrated a strong association between foreign-born population share of the total population and locational choices over 1989-1994 for family-sponsored and IRCA legalized immigrants. For employment-sponsored immigrants, choices were affected by economic conditions, but IRCA legalized immigrants were unaffected by unemployment rates, wages, or marginal tax rates. Locations for new refugees and asylees, the consequence of either their choice or that of the resettlement officials, were more influenced by aid to families with dependent children and food stamp benefits. The state's share of their national origin group is the primary determinant of locational choice.

For the first time since 1950, New York City's population increased in the 2000 census (Sachs 2001), and immigrants are a major source of the city's growth to more than eight million. An era of stagnation has ended for New York when there was low immigration, low native-born fertility, and professional and retirement migration to the West and South during economic restructuring and recessions in the Rust Belt. The 1980 and 1990 censuses showed immigration impacts, and metropolitan New York usually received more permanent resident admissions than any other area. Officially, New York and New York City have offered a friendly welcome to immigrants throughout anti-immigrant debates in the 1990s, and the New York Immigration Coalition, led by Executive Director Margie McHugh, sought to help recent immigrants and amnestied immigrants deal with naturalization applications and voter registration. Local institutions may be influential in providing

assistance to immigrants seeking information on public benefits or with family problems (Johnson, Reyes, Mameesch, and Barbour 1999; Baker 1997; Singer and Gilbertson 2000).

Based on Zavodny (1999), New York is likely to persist as a primary choice among new immigrants, including increased numbers of employment-sponsored immigrants and the new diversity immigrants after the Immigration Act of 1990. Because studies show immigrants naturalize more when living in cities and communities with others from their countries (Yang 1994b), this study explores the timing of naturalization for immigrants in New York City. Naturalizations in the state showed the same pattern as nationally in the 1990s, peaking in 1996, and amounted to 740,813, or 13.2 percent, of the national total for 1991-2000.

The agenda of possibilities in naturalization research is ample in the context of New York City. Naturalization holds new significance for entitlement, settlement, participation, and family. In 1996, the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) or the 1996 Welfare Reform Act restricted immigrants' sponsorship of family members by applying higher income thresholds and by making the long required affidavit of support legally binding and enforceable for ten years or until the immigrant naturalized, established penalties for unauthorized immigrants, and included language to bar noncitizen immigrants from several federal and state benefits. Several nations have or are in the process of changing the nationality and voting provisions with regard to their citizenry abroad.

Theorizing on Citizenship

From the early studies of naturalization, length of residence and socioeconomic experiences in America are correlated with whether or not an immigrant has become naturalized (DeSipio 1987). For much of the past century, the actual timing of naturalization was not considered. Immigration was at lower levels than in earlier decades (Massey 1995), and many of the earlier immigrants had simply returned to their native countries (Hatton and Williamson 1994; Morawska 1990). As Latin American and Asian migration rose in the 1960s and 1970s, dramatic differences by origin appeared in the 1980 and 1990 censuses on citizenship status. Asians, many arriving as refugees, naturalized quickly, but Latin American immigrants seemed to be

naturalizing more slowly, and naturalization levels for the Mexican-born and Latin American-born populations were low in the 1980 and 1990 censuses (Yang 1994a; Liang 1994a; Chiswick and Sullivan 1995).

Similar differentials in naturalization rates by origin were illustrated with linked immigrant and naturalization administrative records for 1977 and 1982 (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), various years). The leading study of naturalization by Jasso and Rosenzweig (1986, 1990) focused on the 1971 cohort, before immigrant composition on country of origin, numerical limitation, and preference category had really begun to be shaped by the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) Amendments of 1965 that abolished the national origins quota system, established a preference system for the Eastern Hemisphere, maintained numerical restrictions for Eastern Hemisphere, and initiated them for the Western Hemisphere. Subject to numerical limitations, family preferences were established for spouses and children of permanent residents, unmarried sons or daughters of citizens, siblings of citizens, and married sons or daughters of citizens. The employment preferences, also numerically limited, were for professional workers and skilled workers, along with their dependents. Citizens could sponsor immediate relatives (parents, children and spouses) without any limitation. Jasso and Rosenzweig sought to quantify immigration multipliers, that is, to identify the consequences from immigrants arriving in the 1960s, who, having naturalized, became eligible to sponsor several relatives with dependents. Their study quieted concerns that chain migration would be exponential in volume (Hesburgh 1981, quoted in Jasso and Rosenzweig (1986)).

Their study supported microeconomic strategies in that immigrants with fewer family members here were more likely to naturalize, presumably to sponsor family members for visas, and in addition, immigrants with stronger attachment to the labor force, i.e., being an employment-sponsored immigrant, were more likely to naturalize, presumably to gain greater opportunity in the labor market. The effects of contextual variables for origin, such as gross national product per capita (GNP), literacy rate, distance, centrally planned economy, English as official language, U.S. military base presence, and Voice of America broadcasts in native language, were as expected. Immigrants from high GNP countries were significantly less likely

to have naturalized. VOA broadcasts in native language were also associated with increased naturalizing. Being from a country with English as an official language facilitated naturalization. There was variation among visa categories and women from the Western Hemisphere seemed to have lesser likelihood of naturalizing.

The present study seeks to elaborate on this prior research framework for the timing of naturalization as influenced by admission criteria. These criteria substitute for the individual endowments for receiving a visa and making their way as Americans whether considering social or economic dimensions. Secondary analyses of large data sources are fruitful for understanding many details about “who we are, how we got here, where we are going,” quoting from Farley (1996), but area studies draw on multiple strategies and data sources hold infinite value. Immigrants in a metropolitan context have daily experiences with social institutions oriented in unique ways to their backgrounds, present situations, and hopes or expectations.

Foreign-born persons within the U.S. borders hold a variety of statuses beginning with the dichotomy of authorized or unauthorized and ending with the dichotomy of alien or naturalized citizen. Persons whose presence is unauthorized may be forced to leave so their stays are tenuous. Naturalized citizens have every right that natives have except the right to hold the office of President. The meaning of naturalized citizenship is embellished with family reunification privileges, social and political participation, and full access in social institutions. Following passage of PRWORA and the IIRIRA, citizenship conveys reassurance of access to public benefits in health and welfare. The meaning may be shaded by the individuals’ nationality of origin and the origin country’s continued recognition of those rights (Singer and Gilbertson 2000). However, holding the U.S. passport also conveys ease in traveling abroad in making easier returns to the United States.

Data and Methods

The Immigration-to-Naturalization Project (INP) includes data for lawful immigrants of 1978-1991, with subsequent naturalization outcomes during 1978-1996 (Woodrow-Lafield, Xu, Kersen, and Poch 2001a, 2002). The INS Statistics Office provided these data files as available in June 1999. Processing of naturalization applications and approvals for 1997 was slow, incurring delays to individuals

and to compilation of final data for 1997 until December 1999. These data are similar to the INS 1977 Immigrant-Naturalization Cohort and INS 1982 Immigrant-Naturalization Cohort, linked administrative records available from the INS. Variables include characteristics at admission or adjustment, such as country of birth, admission criteria, and date of naturalization. There are more than 9 million (9,085,945) immigrant records for fiscal years 1978-1992 and about 5.5 million (5,539,763) naturalization records over fiscal years 1978-1996. After record linkage, there were 2.8 million (2,805,599) immigrants with a matched naturalization record and 6.1 million (6,120,647) immigrants without a corresponding naturalization record, including individuals of all ages. Analyses exclude those under 21 years of age at admission, because they may have derived citizenship upon a parent’s naturalization without their parents having filed for a naturalization certificate.

These cohorts were admitted under the immigration preference system established in 1965 and numerical limitations in place for both Eastern and Western Hemispheres, with the preference system and per country limit applied to the Western Hemisphere countries after the INA Amendments of 1976. They were admitted before changes under the Immigration Act of 1990 were effective. Immigrants legalized under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, who became lawful permanent residents in 1988-1991, are not included in the INP. (See INS 2002.)

To define the analytic sample of immigrants for New York City, place of intended residence on the lawful permanent resident record for mailing the I-554 residence card is assumed as the initial place of settlement (Salvo and Ortiz 1992; Zavodny 1999; Bartel 1989). The initial step is selection on intended place of residence or place of residence at naturalization in New York City using zip code information on each of these items except that only state and area codes were available prior to 1983, and this is replicated for New York. As described elsewhere (Greenwood, McDowell, and Trabka 1991; Salvo and Ortiz 1992; Woodrow-Lafield et al. 2000), state and area of intended residence were incompletely recorded in data for fiscal years 1980 and 1981, and about four percent of records were also incomplete for data in 1982 and 1983. Salvo and Ortiz concluded the missing data were not biased toward New York State or New York City, but they noted another

limitation with bias was the missing data for Soviet refugees adjusting to permanent residence in the New York INS office in 1982 and 1983. These cases represent an immigrant sample for which New York City is the locational choice subject to some caveats. Although the data are limited as to tracking subsequent migration, residence at time of naturalization allows capture of a portion of New York City residents.

This analysis extends earlier INP strategies of event history modeling to explore variation in the timing of naturalization with the dependent variable as waiting time or duration of residence until naturalization (Woodrow-Lafield et al. 2001b; 2003). Differences in timing are visible in administrative data on naturalizations and analyses by Liang (1994b) and Jasso and Rosenzweig (1986, 1990), and origin is a characteristic on which there is variation. Origin differentials may be illustrated with origin-pooled proportional hazards models (Woodrow-Lafield et al. 2000a, 2000b).

This study takes the approach of focusing on specific origins of immigrants. The first stage is selection of the most appropriate hazard models in continuous-time formulation (Allison, 1995; Blossfeld, Hamerle, and Mayer 1989) for the stochastic process of naturalizing over time, as specified below, for the underlying hazard or survival function over duration of residence:

$$h(t_j) = h_0(t) g(\mathbf{x}_j),$$

where $h(t_j)$ is the hazard function (in this study, it is defined as the risk of naturalization at time t , $h_0(t)$ is the baseline hazard function and $g(\mathbf{x}_j)$ is a nonnegative function of the covariates. In the current study, $h_0(t)$ is assumed to be parametric. In Stata, three continuous-time proportional hazard models are implemented, namely the exponential, Weibull, and Gompertz models (Stata, 2001). Likewise, Stata has also implemented another family of continuous-time models as accelerated failure-time (AFT) models. These models can be generally denoted as

$$\ln t_j = \mathbf{x}_j \beta + z_j$$

where \mathbf{x}_j is a vector of covariates, z is the error with density $f()$, which determines the regression models such as log-normal, log-logistic, or generalized gamma. Although either the log-normal or logistic model is expected to be the best choice for Asian immigrants believed to naturalize quickly as both allow for an inverted U-shape hazard, and the Gompertz model is expected as appropriate for Latin American immigrants with a monotonic upward shape of distribution, all the models mentioned above

should be estimated in order to select the best model for each country of origin across entry cohorts.

An implicit assumption in continuous-time hazard or survival models is that the regression model includes all the relevant covariates among age group, gender, marital status, visa class of admission, whether an adjustment, and occupational category. The occupational categories are three (managerial and professional workers, technical, sales and administrative support, or all other categories). Admission criteria or class of admission is categorized simply as family-sponsored preference, employment-sponsored preference, and a combined category of exempt immediate relatives, refugees, asylees and other. (See Woodrow-Lafield et al. 2000a for more detailed treatment of admission criteria.)

Omission of influences would lead to bias in the estimated form of the baseline hazard and in the covariate effects. Thus, the ideal strategy is to estimate hazard or survival models with and without corrections for unobservable heterogeneity to discern which models are better. With unobservable heterogeneity, the hazard function can be described as an unobservable multiplicative effect α and the model can be depicted as $h(t|\alpha) = \alpha h(t)$, where $h(t)$ is a non-frailty function. As elaborated in Woodrow-Lafield et al. (2001b), the Inverse-Gaussian frailty distribution is chosen for the frailty models, and the presence of unobservable heterogeneity is allowed to change with entry cohort in predicting the timing and occurrence of naturalization. Given that no allowance is made explicitly for either mortality or return migration, that is part of uncontrolled heterogeneity.

The study begins with models for naturalizing for immigrants from the Dominican Republic, and future research may involve immigrants from the other three leading origin countries in New York City (Jamaica, China, and India). Dominican immigrants are very important in New York, accounting for 59 percent of Dominicans nationally in the 2000 census, and contingent in New York City represents a substantial share of Dominicans nationally within the state. For each immigrant origin group, the scope involved six models within entry cohort (fourteen) without allowance for unobserved heterogeneity, and the same set of 84 models is then calculated with inverse Gaussian heterogeneity. Again, the aim is to avoid bias in the coefficients for interpreting influences for naturalizing among this sample.

Description and Results from Hazards Models

New York City was the designated place of residence for 364,920 immigrants, including 355,480 initially and 9,440 at naturalization. For comparison, nearly one million (995,803) immigrants gave New York as either the state of intended residence (958,368) or the state of residence at naturalization (37,435) (Tables 1a and 1b). (Space limitations prevent inclusion of tables and figures, and these are available on request.) The leading origin countries for INP immigrants in New York City were the Dominican Republic (19.9 percent), China (10.0 percent), Jamaica (7.6 percent), Haiti (4.2 percent), Guyana (4.1 percent), Colombia (3.3 percent), Ecuador (2.8 percent), India (2.8 percent), Philippines (2.6 percent), and Korea (2.2 percent), and several other countries were also represented (Soviet Union, Trinidad, Cuba, Italy, Barbados, and Greece).

Pooling all entry cohorts, even recent ones with little time to naturalize by 1996, more than one-third were naturalized. The level ranged between 39.6 percent for residents in New York City at immigration or naturalization to 34.9 percent for those resident initially in New York. For the New York sample, the majority that naturalized still lived in New York. However, for the New York City sample, the majority that naturalized were not still living in the city. This suggests individuals migrated from the city to suburbia or neighboring states of New Jersey and Connecticut.

Surprisingly, substantial numbers of those under 21 years at admission were found to have a naturalization record, which had not previously examined with INP data. This research started with the master file including cases of children at admission and both residence variables. More than 20 percent of children from China entered 1981-1986 or 1987-1991 had a naturalization record. Of children from the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Jamaica, and Colombia, those from Colombia were more likely to have naturalized. These sketchy results suggest further investigation as to whether coverage of younger immigrants' naturalization may be better than presumed (Jasso and Rosenzweig 1987), and the extent to which certain parents are diligent in obtaining the citizenship certificate or children who accompanied their parents are naturalizing independently.

Immigrants from ten leading origin countries (except 5th ranked Guyana, whose U.S. immigrants are mainly ethnic Indians) are similar

whether settling in New York City or elsewhere in the nation (INS 2002). The majority of immigrants were admitted under family preferences for several countries, especially the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Jamaica. Employment-sponsored immigration is minimal for the Dominican Republic and Haiti, and this is at much greater levels for India and the Philippines. For the Philippines, Ecuador, and Colombia, immigration of immediate relatives and others is substantial. Managerial and professional occupations are held by small percentages for most of these origin groups, with higher percentages for Indians and Filipinos. For Jamaicans and Ecuadoreans, the percentage in technical sales or administrative work are greater than for other origins. The majority of immigrants are in the other category of occupations.

Goodness-of-fit statistics were examined for all six of the models estimated and the Akaike Information Criterion statistics were used to select the best fitting model (Table 2). The AIC statistics penalize the log likelihood statistics by taking the number of parameters being estimated in a particular model into consideration. This statistic is defined as

$$AIC = -2 (\log \text{likelihood}) + 2 (c + p + 1),$$

where c is the number of parameters and p is the number of model-specific ancillary parameters. From these reviews of model testing, the best fitting models are generally those utilizing the log-normal functional form for the hazard function, with Inverse Gaussian controls for unobserved heterogeneity. That is, models that allow for influences beyond characteristics measured at admission are preferable. For eight cohorts, the log-normal frailty model is the best model, and the similar log-logistic model is best for the 1987 entry cohort. The Weibull model suits the 1979 and 1984 cohorts, and the Gompertz matches for the three most recent cohorts in their initial segment of naturalization transition. In other work (Woodrow-Lafield et al. 2001, 2003) we did not examine the functional form of the hazard function for Dominican cohorts, although another analysis (Woodrow-Lafield et al. 2000) utilized the log-logistic form in estimating Cox models for naturalization of Dominican immigrants of 1978-1987. Interestingly, the probabilities of naturalizing are somewhat higher for Dominicans than for Mexicans just after meeting the residence requirement.

In discussion of model coefficients from the selected models (Table 3), the regression

coefficients in the accelerated failure time (AFT) models are opposite, in direction, to those from hazard models, for which a positive sign indicates propensity to naturalize. For nearly all cohorts (1978-1988), admission under family-sponsored preference categories is associated with lower propensity to naturalize than for the reference group (immediate relatives and others). This finding tentatively suggests that those arriving on family criteria may have lesser human or social capital to draw on for naturalizing than those with sponsoring parents, spouses, or children already naturalized or than employment-sponsored immigrants. These individuals are even less likely to naturalize in the recent cohorts of 1989-1991 based on the Gompertz models. The family-sponsored category is primarily Dominican spouses of permanent resident aliens. Husbands and wives may have been reluctant to naturalize, so that the couple would wholly or partially retain Dominican nationality (Jones-Correa 1998a).

Employment-sponsored Dominican immigrants of 1980, 1984 and 1987, and to some degree of 1982 and 1985, showed more naturalization propensity than other immigrants. The similarity of propensity in naturalizing for employment-sponsored immigrants and the reference group seems to suggest these groups have similar skill levels on English proficiency and U.S. knowledge as well as similar motivations to stay rather than return. The absence of greater propensity for some recent employment-sponsored immigrants is interesting because an escalation in naturalization might have been plausible following the Dominican Republic's passage of legislation in 1994 to recognize the principle of dual nationality. That could have occurred after 1996, of course, when this shift was publicized in the presidential candidates' support for legalizing dual nationality and voting from abroad in national elections (Jones-Correa 2001). Over 1994-1996, the Dominican government's position became better known, and an increase in Dominicans naturalizing was evident in official data for 1996-2000 (INS 2002).

Immigrants in both occupational categories had higher propensity in naturalizing than the reference group of other occupations. Dominicans have had lower labor force participation rates and higher unemployment levels (Cordero-Guzmán and Grosfoguel 2000), but they were being incorporated within growing low wage industrial and service sectors. Dominican women work informally as

household and support workers (Torres and Bonilla 1993; Morales and Bonilla 1993; Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994; Sassen 1988). These findings as to occupational and admission backgrounds suggest that immediate relatives of citizens may find more opportunities than spouses of aliens that are helpful in settlement and relatives may particularly encourage them toward naturalization and political participation. As found for other groups, the younger, the married, and the U.S. experienced individuals are more likely to naturalize than the older, the unmarried, and the non U.S.-experienced individuals.

A key finding is that Dominican men in New York City are less likely to naturalize than women, suggested earlier by Salvo and Ortiz (1992). From qualitative research of recent Latin American immigrants, including Dominicans, in New York City (Jones-Correa 1998a, b), decisionmaking as to political socialization and behavior is gender-differentiated. Latino males are typically downwardly mobile relative to before migration, and their social relationships inside ethnic or immigrant organizations tend to be status compensating. Women's U.S. labor market experiences are enhancing their human capital and sense of power within the household and community, and their goals merge with long-term strategies to stay in the U.S. "Women immigrants disproportionately become citizens; but among those from a handful of Latin American countries, the tendency for women to become citizens is much greater than that for men This is particularly true for Dominican and Colombians and among Hondurans and Salvadorans" (Jones-Correa 1998b: 340). Women may have more ties to public institutions than men through their children. Dominican men, regardless of their spouses' characteristics and motivations, may have deep-seated yearning for the higher status they held in their origin community and naturalize more slowly because they have real or hypothetical strategies to return (Jones-Correa 1998 a, b).

Dominican women admitted as skilled immigrants or as wives of skilled immigrants were the most likely to naturalize, followed by wives of citizens. Mothers of citizens are very unlikely to naturalize, as are daughters of aliens and sisters of citizens. Curiously, mothers of citizens are less likely to naturalize than the fathers of citizens. Employment-sponsored men are the most likely to naturalize, and those men entering in the skilled worker category naturalize significantly more quickly than their female

counterparts. Married sons of citizens are significantly more likely to naturalize compared with married daughters of citizens. Several other categories of immigrants show some propensity to naturalize including sons-in-law and husbands of skilled immigrants. The only men less likely to naturalize than the reference category are children of aliens. Sister-siblings are less likely to naturalize than brother-siblings.

An important finding from Woodrow-Lafield et al. (2000) was that Dominican women admitted after 1981 were as likely as men to naturalize, although their predecessors admitted in 1978-1981 were not. This suggests more effective community ties in the 1980s with the labor market and social institutions. Women's interactions within households of highly successful professional classes in New York City may lead to acquisition of English proficiency and they may receive some assistance with the history and civics examinations. From these results, gender may be less relevant for more recent cohorts or in early residence. Dominican males may have benefited economically from labor sector changes and growth of the political strength of the Dominican community in New York City.

Conclusion

This study contributed a new perspective on naturalization experiences for immigrants in New York City. Drawing on a new data source of linked administrative records on immigration and naturalization, the main focus was the Dominican experience, appropriate because the majority of Dominican immigrants reside in New York. The migration stream is very family oriented, and those entering as spouses of lawful permanent residents or U.S. citizens accounted for more than one-half of all adult immigrants over 1978-1991. These spouses seem to be less likely to naturalize than immigrants sponsored under immediate relatives provisions. Employment sponsored immigrants show advantages in naturalizing more quickly, and those immigrants in higher occupation categories also naturalized more. Dominican men may have benefited greatly from labor sector shifts in the 1990s, and Dominican women may simply have integrated well and sought the status of citizenship. Beyond the present scope, measures for income and occupational mobility could answer questions about naturalizing.

This study adopted an urban focus on New York City rather than merely national comparison of several origins on naturalization

outcomes. One limitation on the present study is the INP data are as of 1996, because many immigrants naturalized in 1997-2001 in New York City, especially in 1999-2001. Further work might explore naturalization for other groups of immigrants from China and perhaps from Jamaica, India, Haiti, Colombia, or Ecuador. Incidental findings about naturalization for "children" at admission suggest the merit of examining their naturalization outcomes in the INP data.

Nor is the INP useful for discerning any influences on naturalizing of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. Qualitative studies and anecdotal accounts (Singer and Gilbertson 2000) suggest varying reasons for naturalizing that are associated with legislation and current events post-September 11, 2001. In one account (Llorente 2002), a Dominican native stated "I wasn't interested in becoming a citizen before . . . I like to visit my country often, and now, with all the security and tougher immigration rules, I'm afraid I may not be let back in if I am not a U.S. citizen." Ample opportunity remains for social scientists to draw on qualitative and quantitative orientations to study naturalization and political incorporation of immigrants within New York City and other metropolitan areas.

* This research was supported by a grant from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) (R01 HD37279) to the first author at the Social Science Research Center at Mississippi State University. The contents are solely the responsibility of the author and do not necessarily represent the official views of the NICHD or the National Institutes of Health.

References

- Allison, Paul D. 1995. *Survival Analysis Using the SAS System: A Practical Guide*. Gary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.
- Baker, Susan Gonzalez. 1997. "The "Amnesty" Aftermath: Current Policy Issues Stemming from the Legalization Programs of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act," *International Migration Review* 31 (1): 5-27.
- Bartel, Ann. 1989. "Where Do the New U.S. Immigrants Live?" *Journal of Labor Economics* 7 (October, 4): 371-391.
- Blossfeld, Hans-Peter, Alfred Hamerle, and Karl Ulrich Mayer. 1989. *Event History Analysis: Statistical Theory and Application in the Social*

- Sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Camarota, Steven A. and John Keeley. 2001. *The New Ellis Islands: Examining Non-Traditional Areas of Immigrant Settlement in the 1990s*. September. Washington: Center for Immigration Studies.
- Chiswick, B.R. and T.A. Sullivan. 1995. "The New Immigrants." In R. Farley (ed.), *State of the Union: America in the 1990s, Volume Two: Social Trends*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Pp. 211-270.
- Cordero-Guzmán, Héctor and Ramon Grosfoguel. 2000. "The Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics of Post-1965 Immigrants to New York City," *International Migration* 38 (4): 41-78.
- DeSipio, Louis. 1987. "Social Science Literature and the Naturalization Process," *International Migration Review* 21(2): 390-405.
- Durand, Jorge, Douglas S. Massey, and Fernando Charvet. 2000. "The Changing Geography of Mexican Immigration to the United States: 1910-1996." *Social Science Quarterly* 81(1): 1-15.
- Farley, Reynolds. 1996. *The New American Reality: Who We Are, How We Got Here, Where We Are Going*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Foner, Nancy. 2000. *From Ellis Island to JFK: New York's Two Great Waves of Immigration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Frey, William and Ross C. DeVol. 2000. *America's Demography in the New Century: Aging Baby Boomers and New Immigrants as Major Players*. Policy Brief, Number 9, March 8. Santa Monica: Milken Institute.
- Gibson, Campbell and Emily Lennon. 1999. *Historical census statistics on the foreign-born population of the United States: 1850 to 1990*. Working Paper No. 29, Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau.
- Glaeser, Edward L. and Jesse M. Shapiro. 2001. *City Growth and the 2000 Census: Which Places Grew, and Why.* May. Washington: Center for Urban & Metropolitan Policy, The Brookings Institution.
- Greenwood, M.J., J.M. McDowell and E. Trabka. 1991. "Conducting Descriptive and Analytic Research with the Immigration and Naturalization Service Public-Use Tapes," *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement* 17(3,4): 131-154.
- Hagan, Jacqueline Maria. 1994. *Deciding to be Legal: A Maya Community in Houston*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Harris, Richard. 1991. Pp. in *Dual City: Restructuring New York*, John H. Mollenkopf and Manuel Castells (eds.). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hatton, T.J. and J.G. Williamson. 1994. "What Drove the Mass Migrations From Europe," *Population and Development Review* 20(3): 533-560.
- Hesburgh, Theodore M. 1981. Supplemental statement. Pp. 335-341 in *U.S. Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, Final Report: U.S. Immigration Policy and the National Interest*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 1994. *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jasso, Guillermina and Mark Rosenzweig. 1986. "Family Reunification and the Immigration Multiplier: U.S. Immigration Law, Origin-Country Conditions, and the Reproduction of Immigrants," *Demography* 23(3): 291-312.
- Jasso, Guillermina and Mark Rosenzweig. 1987. "Using National Recording Systems for the Measurement and Analysis of Immigration to the United States," *International Migration Review* 21(4):1212-1244.
- Jasso, Guillermina and Mark Rosenzweig. 1990. *The New Chosen People*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Johnson, Hans P., Belinda I. Reyes, Laura Mameesh, and Elisa Barbour. 1999. *Taking the Oath: An Analysis of Naturalization in California and the United States*. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Jones-Correa, Michael. 2001. "Under Two Flags: Dual Nationality in Latin America and Its Consequences for the United States," *International Migration Review* 35 (Winter): 997-1029.
- Jones-Correa, Michael. 1998a. *Between Two Nations: The Political Predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Jones-Correa, Michael. 1998b. "Different Paths: Gender, Immigration, and Political Participation," *International Migration Review* 32 (2): 0326-0349.
- Levitt, Margaret. 2001. *Transnational Villagers*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Liang, Zai. 1994a. "Social Contact, Social Capital, and the Naturalization Process: Evidence from Six Immigrant Groups," *Social Science Research* 23:407-437.

- Liang, Zai. 1994b. "On the Measurement of Naturalization," *Demography* 31:525-48.
- Llorente, Elizabeth. 2002. "Experts Say Immigrants Feel Pressure to Take Oath," *The Record*, June 30.
- Massey, Douglas S. 1995. "The New Immigration and Ethnicity in the United States," *Population and Development Review* 21(3): 631-652.
- Meissner, D. and D.G. Papademetriou. 1988. "The Legalization Countdown: A Third-Quarter Assessment." Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace)
- Morales, Rebecca and Frank Bonilla. 1993. "Restructuring and the New Inequality," Pp. 1-27 in *Latinos in a Changing U.S. Economy: Comparative Perspectives on Growing Inequality, Volume 7, Series on Race and Ethnic Relations*, edited by Rebecca Morales and Frank Bonilla. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Morawska, E. 1990. "The Sociology and Historiography of Immigration." *Immigration Reconsidered*. V. Yans-McLaughlin (ed.). New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 187-240.
- Passel, Jeffrey S. and Rebecca L. Clark. 1998. *Immigrants in New York: Their Legal Status, Incomes, and Taxes*. The Urban Institute: Washington, D.C.
- Passel, Jeffrey S. and Karen A. Woodrow. 1984. "Geographic Distribution of Undocumented Immigrants: Estimates of Undocumented Aliens Counted in the 1980 Census by State," *International Migration Review* 18: 642-671.
- Repak, Terry. 1999. *Waiting on Washington*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Sachs, Susan. 2001. "New York City Tops 8 Million for First Time," *The New York Times*, March 16.
- Salvo, Joseph J. and Ronald J. Ortiz. 1992. *The Newest New Yorkers: Immigration into New York City During the 1990s*. New York: New York City Department of City Planning.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1988. *The Mobility of Labor and Capital: A Study in International Investment and Labor Flow*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Singer, Audrey and Greta Gilbertson. 2000. *Naturalization in the Wake of Anti-Immigrant Legislation: Dominicans in New York City*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, International Migration Policy Program, Global Policy Program, Working Paper Number 10, February.
- Singer, Audrey, Samantha Friedman, Ivan Cheung, and Marie Price. 2001. *The World in a Zip Code: Greater Washington, D.C. as a New Region of Immigration*. April. Washington: Center on Urban & Metropolitan Policy, The Brookings Institution.
- Smith, Christopher J. 1985. "Asian New York: The Geography and Politics of Diversity," *International Migration Review* 24 (1, Spring): 59-84.
- Torres, Andreas and Frank Bonilla. 1993. "Decline Within Decline: the New York Perspective," Pp. 85-108 in *Latinos in a Changing U.S. Economy: Comparative Perspectives on Growing Inequality, Volume 7, Series on Race and Ethnic Relations*, edited by Rebecca Morales and Frank Bonilla. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. 2002. *2000 Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service*. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Waldinger, Roger and Mehdi Bozorgmehr (eds.). 1996. *Ethnic Los Angeles*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A., Xiaohe Xu, Thomas Kersen, and Bunnak Poch. 2000a. "Gender and the Family Reunification Hypothesis for Naturalization," Presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Los Angeles, California.
- Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A., Xiaohe Xu, Thomas Kersen, and Bunnak Poch. 2000b. "Gender, Origin, Admission Criteria, and Naturalization Outcomes," Presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Demographic Association, New Orleans.
- Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A., Xiaohe Xu, Thomas Kersen, and Bunnak Poch. 2001a. "Naturalization Experiences of U.S. Immigrants," *Proceedings of the Social/Government Statistics Section, American Statistical Association, 2000 Joint Statistical Meetings*, pp. 106-111.
- Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A., Xiaohe Xu, Bunnak Poch, and Thomas Kersen. 2001b. "The Hazards of Naturalizing in America: Mexican and Chinese Immigrants," Presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, Atlanta.
- Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A. 2002. "The Immigration-to-Naturalization Project: Inception, Guidelines, Analyses, and Possibilities," *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the American Statistical Association, 2001 Joint Statistical Meetings*, March 2002.
- Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A., Xiaohe Xu, Bunnak Poch, and Thomas Kersen. 2003. "The Process of Naturalizing: Contrasts Among Asian

and Latin American Immigrants." Prepared for presentation.

Yang, P.Q. 1994a. "Ethnicity and Naturalization," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17(4):593-618.

Yang, P.Q. 1994b. "Explaining Immigrant Naturalization," *International Migration Review* 28(3): 449-477.

Zavodny, Madeline. 1999. "Determinants of Recent Immigrants' Locational Choices," *International Migration Review* 33 (4, Winter): 1014-1030.