UC Irvine
UC Irvine Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title
Generational Variations in Mexican-Origin Intermarriage

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5ck984t0

Author
Cedillo, Rosalio

Publication Date
2015

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
IRVINE

Generational Variations in Mexican-Origin Intermarriage

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in Sociology

by

Rosalío Cedillo

Dissertation Committee:
Professor Frank D. Bean, Co-Chair
Associate Professor Susan K. Brown, Co-Chair
Professor Ann Hironaka
Professor Jennifer Lee

2015

©2015 Rosalío Cedillo

DEDICATION

To my parents María and Ángel, my siblings Sofía, Ángel and Aarón, my partner Romain, and all immigrants and their children who experience the joys and endure the challenges of making the U.S. home.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to greatly thank my advisors Frank D. Bean and Susan K. Brown for their time, assistance, and their thorough feedback during this dissertation process and throughout the doctoral program. I would also like to thank dissertation committee members Ann Hironaka and Jennifer Lee for taking the time to also provide me with great feedback.

I am very grateful to Ann for going above and beyond to provide students with the academic and non-academic resources they need to complete the doctoral program and create a positive environment while in graduate school.

I also want to thank the Graduate Division at UC Irvine for providing financial support in the form of the President's Dissertation Year Fellowship, which I applied for with Ann's encouragement.

Finally, the completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the help and support of my family, including my partner, and my friends. I have thanked each of you personally for making life in graduate school brighter.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Rosalío Cedillo

Education

University of California, Irvine
Ph.D. in Sociology 2015
Dissertation: Generational Variations in Mexican-Origin Intermarriage
M.A. in Social Science, Demographic and Social Analysis 2009
Thesis: School Enrollment and Labor Force Participation among Mexican-origin Youth in the United States

London School of Economics (LSE)
M.Sc. in Comparative Politics 2004

University of California, Irvine
B.A. in Economics, International Studies 2002
Education Abroad Program, Lyon, France – Sciences Po Lyon (Fall 1999)

Teaching Experience

Loyola Marymount University
Instructor/Postdoctoral Faculty Fellow, Department of Sociology, **August 2015 – June 2016**
Courses: Sociology 100 – Principles of Sociology
Sociology 399 – Social Inequalities
Sociology 210 – Quantitative Research Methods

University of California, Irvine
Instructor, Department of Sociology, **Summer Session 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014**
Course: Sociology 2 – Introduction to International Sociology

University of California, Irvine
Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of Sociology, **2009-2011 and 2012-2014**
Courses: Sociology 1 – Introduction to Sociology
Sociology 2 – Introduction to International Sociology
Sociology 44 – Populations
Soc. Sci. 184GW – Upper Div. Media Writing
Soc. Sci. 184GW (online) – Upper Div. Media Writing
Chicano/a Latino/a Studies 61 – Introduction to Chicano/a Latino/a Studies

Research Related Work Experience

Migration Policy Institute, Washington D.C.
Research Intern June 2008 – September 2008
Analyzed current and proposed state and federal immigration legislation, the effect of changes in immigration law and policy, and prospects for immigration reform

Academic Conferences

Eastern Sociological Society, New York, NY 2015
American Sociological Association, San Francisco, CA 2014
Eastern Sociological Society, Baltimore, MD 2014
Roundtable session: What accounts for the variation in the rate of intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white majority group across generations of the Mexican-origin population?
American Sociological Association, New York, NY 2013
American Sociological Association, Las Vegas, NV 2011
Roundtable Session: Generational Shifts in Mexican-Origin Intermarriage: Implications for Theoretical Perspectives about Incorporation
Population Association of America, New Orleans, LA 2009

Publication

Bean, Frank, Brown, Susan K., Bachmeier, James D., Noam, Kris, Cedillo, Rosalío, and Chris Smith. 2015. "Chapter 7: The Mosaic of Sociocultural Incorporation," in *Parents Without Papers: The Progress and Pitfalls of Mexican American Integration.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Fellowship Awards

Postdoctoral Faculty Fellowship, Loyola Marymount University, (competitive nationwide)
President Dissertation Year, University of California, Irvine (competitive campus wide), '14-'15
Dean, School of Social Sciences University of California, Irvine, Winter 2013
Merit, School of Social Sciences, University of California, Irvine, 2011-2012
Graduate Opportunity, University of California, Irvine (competitive campus wide), '08-'09
Eugene Cota-Robles, University of California, San Diego (awarded, but not accepted)
San Diego, University of California, San Diego (awarded, but not accepted)

Skills

Statistical Software – Stata and SPSS
Learning Technologies – Blackboard, Moodle, Electronic Educational Environment (EEE)
Foreign Languages – Spanish (native fluency) and French (advanced fluency)

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Generational Variations in Mexican-origin Intermarriage

By

Rosalío Cedillo

Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology

University of California, Irvine, 2015

Professor Frank D. Bean, Co-Chair
Associate Professor Susan K. Brown, Co-Chair

This dissertation examines intermarriage across generations of the Mexican-origin population in order to better understand how this population is incorporating in U.S. society, and looks at parental migration status and parental nativity as factors that may impede or facilitate intermarriage incorporation. Using data from the Immigration and Intergenerational Mobility in Metropolitan Los Angeles (IIMMLA) survey the research shows that: the majority of intermarriages among the Mexican-origin population occur with non-Hispanic white spouses, third-generation Mexican-American women are significantly more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared with third-generation Mexican-American men, the children of naturalized mothers are more likely to participate in intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white majority group compared with children who have at least one parent that is unauthorized/unknown, second-generation Mexican-origin children whose parents are of mixed-nativity are more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared with those whose parents are foreign-born, and second-generation daughters whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born demonstrate the highest likelihood of intermarriage participation with the non-Hispanic white majority group compared with those whose parents are foreign-born. Overall the results indicate that the Mexican-origin population is incorporating in U.S. society and demonstrate some evidence of delayed incorporation. Parental migration status, parental nativity, generation, gender, and parent's gender affect intermarriage incorporation among the Mexican-origin population.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Unlike previous waves of immigrants that came to the United States from Europe, recent post 1965 immigrants have arrived from Latin America and Asia, and this difference has raised questions about their incorporation prospects as non-Europeans. In particular, much attention is being focused on Mexican-origin immigrants and their descendants. Since 1980 this immigrant group has been the largest in the United States and over half of Mexican-origin immigrants arrive to the United States as undocumented laborers with low skill sets and a low level of educational attainment (Terrazas, 2010). The Pew Hispanic Research Center estimated that as of the year 2012 the number of unauthorized Mexican immigrants living in the United States was 5.9 million, which is a decline from the 6.4 million estimated in 2009, but a large population nonetheless, and the number of authorized Mexican immigrants increased to 5.8 million in 2011 (Passel et al, 2012; Krogstad and Passel 2015). They also estimated that in 2010 the Mexican-origin population, which includes unauthorized and authorized immigrants and U.S. born individuals with Mexican ancestry, numbered 33 million or about 10 percent of the total population. Between 2000 and 2010 births surpassed immigration as the main reason for growth of the Mexican-origin population in the United States (Passel et al., 2012). Owing to these circumstances, there has been a lot of debate on the extent to which the Mexican-origin population is incorporating in American society. Not only is there concern about how this population is incorporating economically, but also socioculturally. Samuel Huntington went as far as saying that, "The persistent inflow of Hispanic immigrants threatens to divide the United States into two peoples, two cultures, and two languages.

Unlike past immigrant groups, Mexicans and other Latinos have not assimilated into mainstream U.S. culture, forming instead their own political and linguistic enclaves -- from Los Angeles to Miami -- and rejecting the Anglo-Protestant values that built the American dream. The United States ignores this challenge at its peril" (Huntington, 2004).

One way to gauge the extent to which the Mexican-origin population is becoming integrated socioculturally in the United States is by assessing intermarriage patterns. This dissertation examines intermarriage, an act that reflects the weakening of social boundaries between racial/ethnic groups and contact and similarity between groups. It focuses on this key aspect of incorporation, across several generations, thus shedding light on how the Mexican-origin population is incorporating in American society the longer they have been in the country. The main research question for this dissertation is what factors account for variation in the rate of Mexican-American intermarriage across generations of the Mexican-origin population and what do these mean for integration?

I present three academic papers that address this research question and add to the academic literature by analyzing factors that may impede or facilitate intermarriage incorporation among the Mexican-origin population. Chapter 2 looks at the overall level of intermarriage participation experienced by the Mexican-origin population. The paper then focuses on intermarriage patterns with the non-Hispanic white population since most intermarriage occurs with this group and intermarriage with the majority group demonstrates sociocultural incorporation (Gordon, 1964; Grebler, Moore and Guzman, 1970; Murguía, 1982; Lieberson and Waters, 1988; Kalmijn, 1998; Feliciano, 2001; Rosenfeld, 2002; Bean and Stevens, 2003; Alba and Nee, 2003; Lee and Bean, 2010). Generational and gender differences in intermarriage participation among the Mexican-

origin population are explored in order to better understand who intermarries and what could help explain intermarriage. Chapter 3 looks at parental migration status as a factor that may impede intermarriage incorporation among the 1.5 and second generations. How does parental migration status affect intermarriage participation among their children, and does the effect occur through education? Chapter 4 looks at parental cross-nativity as a factor that may affect intermarriage incorporation among their second-generation children. Will marriages involving one immigrant parent of Mexican-origin and one native-born parent of Mexican-origin affect intermarriage participation among the second generation?

Sociologists have extensively researched how immigrant populations shift from immigrant to native through the study of incorporation and intermarriage. Bean and Stevens (2003) provide contemporary definitions for assimilation and incorporation. With Alba and Nee (2003) in mind they define assimilation as, "convergence of newcomer and host groups, with each affecting the other, not unidirectional movement of newcomers toward native groups" (p. 94). They define incorporation as, "the broader processes by which new groups establish relationships with host societies," and define the assimilation process as, "one type of incorporation process" (p. 95). Sociologists view intermarriage as a litmus test of sociolcultural incorporation (Alba 1995; Bean and Stevens 2003). Bean and Stevens (2003) explain that, "high levels of racial and ethnic intermarriage provide strong evidence of sociocultural incorporation because the familial relations between members of different racially or ethnically defined groups bespeaks the lack of barriers to social interaction between group members and the fading or acceptance of cultural differences" (p. 172).

Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess were the first sociologists that attempted to define assimilation. They defined it as, "a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons and groups and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them a common cultural life" (Park and Burgess 1921: 735). Gordon (1964) theorized that assimilation is a process that involves several steps. He argued that after the acquisition of culture and language comes structural assimilation, where the descendants of immigrants form close social relations with members of the host society. He argued that structural assimilation leads to a large amount of intermarriage participation with members of the host society. Ultimately, he believed that once marital assimilation occurs, "the minority group loses its ethnic identity in the larger host or core society, and identificational assimilation takes place…Prejudice and discrimination are no longer a problem, since eventually the descendants of the original minority group become indistinguishable" (Gordon 1964: 80). Gordon argued that a group becomes assimilated by the third generation. Gordon laid out his theory of assimilation during a time when the last major waves of immigration during the early 20th century came from Europe, so his theories speak more of what was experienced by European origin immigrants during a time when academic literature reflected a United States that was racially a black and white society, and was written before the arrival of the major waves of migration from non-European countries, mostly from Asia and Latin America (Rumbaut, 1997). Alba and Nee (2003) built on Gordon's work and formulated a more contemporary perspective on classic assimilation theory, known as the new assimilation model, that reflects more current sociological research on trends in immigration, assimilation, and the American racial structure.

Alba and Nee (2003) recognized that earlier classic assimilation theory had to be modified in order to reflect the contemporary United States of America. They addressed what they saw as deficiencies in the earlier forms of the theory. One such deficiency they pointed out was the idea that assimilation was one-directional and the assumption that minorities change themselves to more closely resemble the majority group. Alba and Nee recognized that assimilation is not just one-directional, but also involves change on the part of the majority group. They mentioned that, the American mainstream continues to change with the incorporation of new immigrant groups and believe this is evident in contemporary American society, which "increasingly reflects a composite culture made up of diverse ethnic elements" (Alba and Nee 2003: 64). They also acknowledged that assimilation is a very complex process that involves many factors, such as race, intermarriage, human capital, and segregation, which can accelerate or slow the process of assimilation. They also explained that incorporation is the unintended consequence of immigrant groups pursuing life goals and making choices that help them achieve these goals such as a better job or a more desirable residence. Alba and Nee maintain the idea that assimilation is a process that most likely will occur over time. Both the earlier version of classic assimilation theory and the more contemporary version stress the idea that the immigrant minority group and the majority group become more similar in norms, values, and behaviors as time of residence in the host country progresses, and also stress the idea that later-generation descendants of immigrants will share more similarities with the majority group (Bean and Brown, 2006).

Kennedy (1944) linked the study of intermarriage and the study of incorporation and argued that a triple melting pot scenario was occurring where different ethnic groups

in New Haven, Connecticut were intermarrying and incorporating, but were doing so while remaining within religious boundaries, that of Catholicism, Judaism, and Protestantism. Gordon (1964) continued with the idea of using intermarriage rates as an index of assimilation and outlined seven steps that he believed are involved in the classic assimilation process. As mentioned, he believed that intermarriage with the majority group, or marital assimilation, would naturally follow after cultural assimilation and structural assimilation. Thus, according to Gordon, intermarriage was one of the final steps of assimilation.

While the classic assimilation perspective argues that incorporation occurs in a linear manner where later-generation descendants of immigrants eventually converge with the majority group, the racial/ethnic disadvantage model and the segmented assimilation model argue that incorporation does not always follow a linear pattern. The racial/ethnic disadvantage model of incorporation states that non-white immigrant groups are prevented from incorporating due to, "lingering discrimination and institutional barriers to employment and other opportunities" (Bean and Brown 2006: 5). Segmented assimilation combines ideas from the racial/ethnic disadvantage model and classic assimilation model, and states that incorporation outcomes vary from incorporation into the mainstream to incorporation into a permanent underclass, for different groups and individuals based on various factors such as socioeconomic status, national origin, and race (Zhou and Portes, 1993; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001; Bean and Brown, 2006). Telles and Ortiz (2008) in their study concluded that the Mexican-origin population is not incorporating in a similar manner compared to earlier European immigrant groups, and argued that their study shows that the Mexican-origin population is facing a large degree of ethnic disadvantage.

They found that for third and fourth-generation Mexican Americans, "ethnic boundaries are much more than merely symbolic, which they are for later-generation European Americans. Mexican American ethnicity continues to influence their language, who they choose as friends and marriage partners, where they live, how they see themselves, and how they vote." (Telles and Ortiz 2008: 264). In their study they minimize the role of intermarriage as an indicator of incorporation and mentioned that, "high intermarriage rates do not generally mean assimilation," and argued that intermarriage rates should not be taken seriously as a measure of incorporation, because most people do not intermarry (Telles and Ortiz 2008: 178-179).

The delayed incorporation model indicates that traditional incorporation is not evident until the third generation (Brown, 2007). According to this perspective the 1.5 and second generations are constrained by working-class stagnation, and mostly financial family obligations. Bean and Brown (2015) drawing on the works of Perlmann and Waldinger (1997), Waldinger et al. (2007), and Terriquez (2014) describe the working-class stagnation approach as an unfinished integration process, "emphasizing that Mexican immigrants, given their largely rural and working-class backgrounds in Mexico and their labor-migrant roots have assimilated into the U.S. working-class," and, "emphasize delayed but not forestalled integration in the Mexican-American case because the integration processes for that group begin from such a low structural point" (p. 41). With the disappearance of well-paying manufacturing jobs and lower wages (Terriquez, 2014), the Mexican-origin population find themselves with fewer opportunities to economically incorporate, which may delay their incorporation process. The delayed incorporation perspective also explains that the children of immigrants have to bear extra financial costs

to assist their parents, due to their parents' low levels of education, possible undocumented status, low wages, lack of access to health care services, and lack of retirement financial plans. Agius and Lee (2009) found that members of the 1.5 and second generations that financially assist their families are unable to become homeowners, save money, fund their retirement accounts, pay off debts in their names incurred by family members, and pay off student loans. Traditionally, in Mexican-origin households, greater demands are placed on women to fulfill family obligations. There are great demands on women to take care of their families in the form of care giving and/or financial assistance (Martin, 1990). The delayed incorporation model states that the third generation is less burdened by family obligations and financial constraints, because their parents are born in the United States and thus are citizens, are fluent in English, have more access to healthcare services and more employment opportunities, including employment that provides retirement plans, allowing the third generation to more fully incorporate. Fuller incorporation allows for more contact with different racial/ethnic groups, which may in turn promote intermarriage incorporation.

Intermarriage with the majority group can create opportunity for socioeconomic mobility and incorporation. Intermarriage increases cultural capital due to enlarged and diversified social networks, as a result individuals from impoverished or disadvantaged social networks greatly benefit from intermarriage with the majority group (Patterson 1997; Lee and Bean 2010). Lee and Bean (2010) found that second-generation Latino and Asian respondents in their study viewed marriage with non-Hispanic whites as part of the process of becoming American. Lee and Bean mentioned that "the very process of 'becoming American' is in itself a form of upward mobility because it connotes a movement

from immigrant to native and from foreign to familiar, so in this sense intermarriage with a white partner can accelerate incorporation, whether that goal is intended or not" (Lee and Bean 2010:97). Arguably, individuals that form part of the majority group have more cultural capital and more established social networks due to their family's long presence in the United States compared to first-generation immigrants and the children of immigrants. Therefore a non-majority group individual that gets married to someone pertaining to the majority group may gain access to their spouse's higher levels of cultural capital and more established social networks.

Intermarriage has been often used as a measure of incorporation and social distance between racial/ethnic groups. Intermarriage with a majority group is a function of both contact and similarity, since individuals choose spouses who are similar across multiple dimensions including age, education, and race/ethnicity. Intermarriage rates can measure, and are a reflection of, the social acceptance of individuals and their racial/ethnic group, and therefore can measure the rigidity of racial/ethnic boundaries and the extent to which racially and ethnically different immigrant groups are incorporated and received by the majority group (Gordon, 1964; Grebler, Moore and Guzman, 1970; Murguía, 1982; Lieberson and Waters, 1988; Kalmijn, 1998; Feliciano, 2001; Rosenfeld, 2002; Bean and Stevens, 2003; Alba and Nee, 2003).

Race is an important factor affecting the marriage market. Although intermarriage rates are rising among different racial groups, sociologists have found that it is still uncommon and remains at levels lower than would be expected from chance alone indicating that race matters in the marriage market (Lee and Bean 2010; Alba and Golden 1986; Sandefur and McKinnell 1986; Kalmijn 1993; Moran 2001; Qian and Lichter 2001,

2007). Lee and Bean (2010) explain that it is not surprising that intermarriage is still uncommon since the last antimiscegenation laws were overturned by the Supreme Court in 1967 with the Loving vs. Virginia case ruling. In their study they found that race was an important factor affecting the marriage market. They found that the newer nonwhite groups in the United States, Asians and Latinos, experience considerably higher rates of intermarriage compared to the black population and argue that these findings suggest that, "the boundaries for Asians and Latinos are more porous than they are for blacks. Racial status may be declining in significance more rapidly for these groups than for African Americans" (Lee and Bean 2010: 88).

Aside from race, structural factors may also affect intermarriage participation. According to Kalmijn and Van Tubergen (2010) the most noted structural factor is that of group size. They mention that the, "size of an immigrant community influences people's daily opportunities of meeting members of their own group. Because members of larger groups more often meet group members, members of large groups are likely to marry endogamously" (p. 462). Conversely members of small groups have lower chances of marrying a member of their own group compared to members of larger groups (Kalmijn 1998). According to Murguia and Cazares (1982) intermarriage rates are lower among the Mexican-American population in areas where the size of the Mexican-American population is large.

Studying Mexican-origin intermarriage in one region heavily inhabited by the Mexican-origin population, the Los Angeles metropolitan area, allows for the controlling of group size. Data from the 2004 Immigration and Intergenerational Mobility in Metropolitan Los Angeles (IIMMLA) survey are used for this study, which allows for the

controlling of group size by focusing on this one region. The Mexican-origin population in the Los Angeles metropolitan area is sizeable. According to estimates from Rand California Population and Demographic Statistics in the year 2004, of the 5,219,251 individuals that were between the ages of 20 to 39 and lived in the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura, 48.5 percent of them were of Hispanic origin and 31.8 percent were non-Hispanic white. Although these figures do not indicate the exact percentage of individuals that were of Mexican-origin it is safe to assume that they made up the majority in the Hispanic category. This demographic situation increases the chances of Mexican-origin individuals to find a marriage partner from the same racial/ethnic group or Latino pan-ethnic group. Therefore if the likelihood and the rates of intermarriage are high in this region it indicates that factors other than group size are affecting intermarriage among the Mexican-origin population and controlling for group size can provide more insight into understanding Mexican-origin intermarriage across generations.

Educational attainment also greatly affects the rate of intermarriage. Educational attainment is a measure of socioeconomic status. Previous studies have found that more educated individuals marry outside of their racial/ethnic group at larger rates compared to less educated individuals (Lieberson & Waters 1988; Kalmijn 1993, 1998; Qian, 1997). Previous studies have also found that educational attainment is a strong predictor of racial/ethnic minority intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites (Qian 1997; Rosenfeld 2005; Batson, Qian, and Lichter 2006; Qian and Lichter 2007). Qian (1997) found that among Hispanics and Asian-Americans, interracial marriages with non-Hispanic whites increase with educational attainment. According to Kalmijn (1998) the effect of education has been interpreted in terms of opportunity and preference. In terms of opportunity,

Kalmijn mentioned that, "better educated minority members are more often exposed to settings such as colleges and high-status occupations where they form a relatively smaller group than in the population at large" (Kalmijn 1998: 413). More educated individuals may also experience higher levels of intermarriage, because higher educated minorities tend to live in neighborhoods that are not segregated (Zhou and Logan, 1991; Qian, 1997). Therefore, in the case of racial/ethnic minorities, there is less opportunity for these individuals to form relationships with people from the same racial/ethnic group, because there are a smaller number of racial minorities at colleges, high status occupations, and their residential neighborhoods. In terms of preference, Kalmijn mentioned that more highly educated individuals, "have a more individualistic attitude, are less attached to their family and community of origin, and have a more universalistic view on life than lesser-educated persons," which Kalmijn argues results in ascribed characteristics being less important for these individuals when they decide on a marriage partner (Kalmijn 1998: 413). Women currently attain more education than men in the United States (DiPrete and Buchmann 2006, 2013, 2014; Buchman and DiPrete 2006; Bailey and Dynarski 2011). Bean and Brown (2015) argue that in the case of Mexican-origin women, "migration and family exigencies will be more likely, at least across the first two generations, to encourage males more than females to sacrifice post-secondary education for employment" (p. 124). They argue that this may be a consequence of a cultural tendency to protect and supervise daughters via school activities, which may consequently lead to greater female educational gains (Zhou and Bankston 1998; Bean and Brown 2015). Since education greatly affects intermarriage participation, women, including Mexican-origin women, should be more likely to intermarry than men.

Mexican-origin women may also be more inclined to out-marry compared to Mexican-origin men, because as mentioned, in traditional Mexican-origin households, greater demands are placed on women to fulfill family obligations. There are great demands on women to take care of their families in the form of care giving and/or financial assistance (Martin, 1990). Dreby (2010) mentions that families in Mexico adhere to clearly defined gender roles where men are assigned the role of economic provider and women are assigned the role of caregiver. Dreby explains that, "Women's authority in Mexican families is related to their morality as the primary family caregiver. Women's roles as caregivers are celebrated and likened to the self-sacrificing characteristics of the Virgin of Guadalupe. Latin American scholars describe this culturally specific version of maternity as marianismo. According to this ideal, a woman should be self-negating and a martyr for her children, because she is spiritually and morally superior to men" (Dreby 2010: 60). Moran (2001) described the disappointment highly educated Chicana/Latina women experience when they discover that their Latino husbands want them to be "traditional women" despite all of their accomplishments. Murguía and Cazares (1982) mentioned that, "the major advantage in intermarriage for Anglo males is that they marry women who are husband and family oriented, so oriented because of their class standing as well as their cultural and religious socialization" (p. 96).

As mentioned, I present three academic papers that look at generational variations in Mexican-origin intermarriage and add to the academic literature by analyzing factors that may impede or facilitate intermarriage incorporation among the Mexican-origin population. Chapter 2 looks at the overall level of intermarriage participation experienced by the Mexican-origin population. Generational and gender differences in intermarriage

participation among the Mexican-origin population are explored in order to better understand who intermarries and what could help explain intermarriage. Chapter 3 looks at how parental migration status affects intermarriage participation among the children of immigrants, and explores how the effect occurs through education. Chapter 4 looks at parental cross-nativity (marriages involving one immigrant parent of Mexican-origin and one native-born parent of Mexican-origin) as a factor that may affect intermarriage incorporation among their second-generation children.

CHAPTER 2

GENERATIONAL SHIFTS IN MEXICAN-ORIGIN INTERMARRIAGE: IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ABOUT INCORPORATION

Introduction

The public, politicians, and academics debate and question the incorporation prospects of Mexican-origin immigrants and their descendants. Since 1980 the Mexican-origin immigrant group has been the largest in the United States and over half of Mexican-origin immigrants arrive to the United States as undocumented laborers with low skill sets and a low level of educational attainment (Terrazas, 2010). Not only is there concern about their economic incorporation, but also their sociocultural incorporation with academics such as Samuel P. Huntington heightening public fear that the Mexican-origin population is dividing the country and creating two distinct sociocultural identities. Due to these circumstances, there has been a lot of debate on the extent to which the Mexican-origin population is incorporating in American society. By focusing on intermarriage, an act that demonstrates the weakening of social boundaries between racial/ethnic groups, contact and similarity between groups, and a key aspect of incorporation, across many generations, this study examines how the Mexican-origin population is incorporating in the United States socioculturally. This chapter looks at how generation since immigration relates to the rate of intermarriage between the Mexican-origin population and members of the non-Hispanic white majority group. In terms of intermarriage, is the Mexican-origin population demonstrating a pattern of incorporation or a pattern of ethnic disadvantage and exclusion from the American mainstream? If so, what does this pattern look like, and are there any gender differences in intermarriage?

Unlike previous studies on intermarriage among the Mexican-origin population, this study allows for a current analysis of intermarriage among this population in the Los Angeles area using 2004 Immigration and Intergenerational Mobility in Metropolitan Los Angeles (IIMMLA) survey data, and unlike previous studies, this survey allows for the isolation of the Mexican-origin third generation from the fourth plus generation. Access to an isolated Mexican-origin third generation allows for a more clear analysis on how generation relates to intermarriage among the Mexican-origin population, since studies with groups labeled third plus or fourth plus include individuals whose ancestry dates back not just three or four generations, but even further. Such data possibly bias the effect generation has on intermarriage incorporation patterns.

Literature Review

Previous studies have attempted to answer the question of how generation affects intermarriage among the Mexican-origin population, and have analyzed the intermarriage patterns of the Mexican-origin population. Analyzing how generational status affects intermarriage prospects is important, because the idea that incorporation is positively correlated with the amount of time and exposure to the norms, ideals, and values of the receiving society is debatable. Mittelbach and Moore (1968) and Grebler, Moore and Guzmán (1970) studied intermarriage among three generations of Mexican Americans in Los Angeles County, by looking at surnames and marriage licenses. They found that exogamy rates were higher for later generations that were no longer associated with immigrant status, and also higher for individuals that were considered to be of higher status in terms of occupation. They believed that occupation was significant and not

generation status. They also found that women were more likely to intermarry. Schoen and Cohen (1980) revisited the Mittelbach and Moore study and analyzed the data by conducting a log linear statistical analysis. Their results differed from Mittelbach and Moore (1968) in that they found that generation status is what actually explained Mexican-American intermarriage rates. Anderson and Saenz (1994) found that opportunity for contact, such as having similar residential patterns, greatly predicts intermarriage between Mexican Americans and non-Hispanic whites. Although Qian and Lichter (2001) did not specifically look at the intermarriage patterns of the Mexican-origin population, they found that native-born Latina women are more likely than Latino men to marry with non-Hispanic whites, and found that Latinos are more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to other racial/ethnic groups in the United States. Rosenfeld (2002) found that Mexican Americans intermarry with non-Hispanic Whites in great numbers. Rosenfeld argued that among the Mexican-origin population, young native Mexican Americans are the most assimilated with non-Hispanic whites and mentioned that they "intermarry with Whites in a way that reveals little evidence of the influence of social isolation or segregation from Whites" (Rosenfeld 2002:161). Rosenfeld also mentioned that earlier generations of Mexican Americans experienced more social isolation from non-Hispanic whites, and mentioned that current Mexican immigrants continue to face social isolation from non-Hispanic whites. In order to further understand the association between generation status, intermarriage, and incorporation, it is important to review different incorporation theoretical perspectives.

Gordon (1964) and Alba and Nee (2003) maintain the idea that assimilation is a process that most likely will occur over time. Both the earlier version of classic

assimilation theory and the more contemporary version stress the idea that the immigrant minority group and the majority group become more similar in norms, values, and behaviors as time of residence in the host country progresses, and also stress the idea that later-generation descendants of immigrants will share more similarities with the majority group (Bean and Brown, 2006).

The delayed incorporation perspective argues that traditional incorporation is not evident until the third generation (Brown, 2007). According to this perspective the 1.5 and second generations are constrained by working-class stagnation (Bean and Brown 2015) and financial family obligations. This perspective explains that the children of Mexican immigrants have to bear extra financial costs to assist their parents, due to their parents' low levels of education, possible undocumented status, low wages, and lack of retirement financial plans. Agius and Lee (2009) found that members of the 1.5 and second generations that financially assist their families are unable to become homeowners, save money, fund their retirement accounts, pay off debts in their names incurred by family members, and pay off student loans. As explained previously, greater demands are placed on women to fulfill family obligations in traditional Mexican-origin households.

As mentioned, this study attempts to analyze the effect generation has on intermarriage and on the incorporation prospects of the Mexican-origin population, but in doing so, it also seeks to analyze whether intergenerational intermarriage patterns can shed light on whether or not the Mexican-origin population is demonstrating evidence of a strong pattern of ethnic disadvantage. The racial/ethnic disadvantage model of incorporation states that non-white immigrant groups are prevented from incorporating due to, "lingering discrimination and institutional barriers to employment and other

opportunities" (Bean and Brown 2006: 5). Segmented assimilation combines ideas from the racial/ethnic disadvantage model and classic assimilation model, and states that incorporation outcomes vary from incorporation into the mainstream to incorporation into a permanent underclass, for different groups and individuals based on various factors such as socioeconomic status, national origin, and race (Zhou and Portes, 1993; Rumbaut and Portes, 2001; Bean and Brown, 2006).

Telles and Ortiz (2008) in their study concluded that the Mexican-origin population is not incorporating in a similar manner compared to earlier European immigrant groups, and argued that their study shows that the Mexican-origin population is facing a large degree of ethnic disadvantage. They minimize the role of intermarriage as an indicator of incorporation and mentioned that, "high intermarriage rates do not generally mean assimilation," and argued that intermarriage rates should not be taken seriously as a measure of incorporation, because most people do not intermarry (Telles and Ortiz 2008: 178-179).

Based on the incorporation theoretical perspectives of classic incorporation, ethnic disadvantage, and delayed incorporation, in the case of intermarriage, a classic incorporation pattern would involve progressively higher rates of intermarriage for each generation group more removed from the first generation. A delayed incorporation pattern would involve low levels of intermarriage for the 1.5 and second generations, but a higher level of intermarriage for the third generation. The difference should be greater for women, due to the great family obligation demands placed on them in traditional Mexican-origin households in the form of care giving and financial assistance, which possibly

encourages Mexican-origin women to outmarry. An ethnic disadvantage pattern would involve low levels of intermarriage for each generation group regardless of gender.

Data and Methods

The data that are used for this study come from the Immigration and Intergenerational Mobility in Metropolitan Los Angeles (IIMMLA) survey, which is a cross sectional survey. These data were collected from Mexican-origin respondents and non-Hispanic white respondents in 2004 by using random sampling in the greater metropolitan area of Los Angeles, which includes the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, San Bernardino, and Riverside. For Mexican-origin respondents the IIMMLA survey was conducted via telephone interview among 1st, 1.5, 2nd and 3rd-plus generation adults between the ages of 20 to 40. For non-Hispanic white respondents the IIMMLA survey was conducted via telephone interview among third-plus generation adults.

Information provided by the respondents of the survey pertaining to race/ethnicity, race/ethnicity of spouse, place of birth, parent's place of birth, and grandparent's place of birth allowed for the creation of different Mexican-origin racial/ethnic generation groups. The following generation groups were created: the first generation are those individuals that were born in Mexico and arrived in the United States at age 13 or older, the 1.5 generation are those individuals that were born in Mexico, but arrived in the United States between the ages of 0 to 12, the 2nd generation are those individuals that were born in the United States and have one or two parents that were born in Mexico, the 3rd generation are those individuals that were born in the United States and whose parents were also born in the United States, and who have one grandparent or more that were born in Mexico. What

is unique about the IIMMLA survey is that due to the birth of grandparent question it allows for the isolation of the 3rd-generation group from the 4th-plus generation group. Since one of my research questions looks at the relationship between generation and intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites, it is best to not include the 4th-plus generation in the analysis. The 4th-plus generation consists of a large mix of individuals that belong to different unknown later-generation groups. In addition, selective attrition out of the Mexican-origin ethnic group may make data related to the fourth-plus generation difficult to interpret (Alba and Islam 2009; Duncan and Trejo 2011; Bean and Brown 2015). Bean and Brown (2015) explain that, "notable numbers of later-generation Mexican Americans of higher socioeconomic status marry outside of their ethnic group, with many of these (and many of their children) thereby no longer identifying themselves as members of the ethnic group" (p. 15). This unknown mix of later-generation groups and selective attrition out of the Mexican-origin ethnic group makes it difficult to interpret and rely on results associated with the 4th-plus generation.

Analyzing data pertaining to the Los Angeles metropolitan area is ideal for studying the dynamics of intermarriage and incorporation among the Mexican-origin population, because the Mexican-origin population is quite large in this region, and focusing on one region allows for the controlling of group size. The demographic situation in Los Angeles increases the chances of Mexican-origin individuals to find a marriage partner from the same racial/ethnic group or Latino pan-ethnic group. As a result, studying intermarriage and incorporation in the Los Angeles metropolitan area among the Mexican-origin population not only allows us to analyze intermarriage rates associated with group size, but we can also determine if intermarriage rates among the Mexican-origin population are

being affected by factors other than group size. Consequently studying intermarriage among the Mexican-origin population in the Los Angeles metropolitan area allows us to see whether or not intermarriage occurs as a result of chance alone.

Percentage rates and odds ratios measuring the rate of intermarriage and the likelihood of intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white majority group among the Mexican-origin generation groups are used as a measure of incorporation. The entire sample size of the IIMMLA data set is 4,780, from this sample the analysis was limited to the Mexican-origin that were intermarried with non-Hispanic whites, resulting in a subsample of 492. To determine intermarriage, first married individuals were identified, and by looking at the information provided by the respondent on their own race/ethnicity and their spouse's race/ethnicity, intermarried individuals were defined as those individuals that were married to somebody that belongs to a different racial/ethnic group other than their own racial/ethnic group. Any respondents that had spouses with any Mexican-origin or other Latino-origin background were not considered to be intermarried. Respondents with other Latino-origin spouses are not considered intermarried in this study, because arguably the non-Mexican Latino-origin population shares some common sociocultural experiences with the Mexican-origin population, such as the common use of the Spanish language.

Since the dependent variable of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites is binary, logistic regression was used to analyze the different odds ratio results for each Mexican-origin generation group. This measure provides a glimpse into the social distance that exists between the non-Hispanic white majority group and the different Mexican-origin

generation groups, which in turn provides information on how each Mexican-origin generation group is incorporating.

Findings

Without controls, on average the Mexican-origin population demonstrates evidence of increased intermarriage rates the further removed a generation is from the first generation immigrant group. Table 2.1 demonstrates that the Mexican-origin first generation has an intermarriage rate of 3.7 percent, the 1.5 generation has an intermarriage rate of 11.1 percent, the second generation has an intermarriage rate of 13.7 percent, and the third generation has an intermarriage rate of 35.2 percent. There is a substantial difference between the intermarriage rate of the second generation, and the intermarriage rate of the third generation. The intermarriage rate for the third generation is 2.5 times greater compared to the second generation. This shows evidence of delayed incorporation, where intermarriage is low for the 1.5 and second generations, and higher for the third generation.

Substantial marriage occurs between Mexican-origin individuals and other Latino individuals, but these marriages are not considered intermarriages in this study, because marriage between a Mexican-origin individual and another Latino may not have the same incorporation significance as intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites. Arguably, racial/ethnic boundaries are possibly not very salient between the Mexican-origin population and other Latinos, because both populations fall under the same pan-ethnic identity of Latino, and may share similar experiences, such as familiarity with the Spanish language. The 1st generation marries with other Latinos at a rate of 8.6 percent, the 1.5

generation marries at a rate of 5.9 percent, the 2nd generation at a rate of 9.6 percent, and the 3rd generation at a rate of 9.5 percent.

Most intermarriage among the Mexican-origin population occurs with the non-Hispanic white majority group. Table 2.1 demonstrates that the lowest rate between both racial/ethnic groups occurs among the first generation with an intermarriage rate of 3.7 percent. This figure is not surprising since most first-generation immigrants of Mexican-origin arrive to the United States already married and with limited knowledge of the English language. More than likely they have limited social interaction with non-Spanish speakers in the United States. Without controls, the intermarriage rate among the Mexican-origin population and non-Hispanic whites is increasingly larger for each generation group from the first generation until the third generation, the further the generation is removed from the first immigrant generation. The second generation intermarries with the non-Hispanic whites at a rate of 10.5 percent. The highest rate of intermarriage occurs between the Mexican-origin third generation and non-Hispanic whites, with an intermarriage rate of 32.4 percent. We can see that there is a substantial difference between the 1.5 and second generations, and the third generation. The intermarriage rate triples between the second generation and the third generation. Again, this provides evidence of delayed incorporation.

The intermarriage rates between Asian & Pacific Islanders and non-Hispanic blacks and the Mexican-origin population are low. The lowest rates of intermarriage occur with non-Hispanic blacks. There are no intermarriages between the Mexican-origin first generation and non-Hispanic blacks, and the same is true of the 1.5 generation. As mentioned, the figures for the first generation are not surprising. The Mexican-origin

second generation intermarried with non-Hispanic blacks at a rate of 1.8 percent, while the third generation intermarried with non-Hispanic blacks at a rate of 1.4 percent.

The first model of the logistic regression analysis (table 2.2), which does not contain control variables, demonstrates that Mexican-origin generation groups removed from the first-generation immigrant group are more likely to intermarry with the non-Hispanic white majority group. The Mexican-origin first-generation group is the least likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites. Since they are the reference group the odds ratio for this group is 1. The Mexican-origin 1.5 generation is 2.6 times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to the first generation. The Mexican-origin second generation is 3.05 times more likely than the first generation to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites. The Mexican-origin third generation is 12.48 times more likely to intermarry with the non-Hispanic white majority group compared to the first generation. Again, there is a notable difference between the 1.5 and second generations, and the third generation, which provides evidence of delayed incorporation. Results for the third generation are statistically significant at the one percent level. After running further tests, results indicated that the difference between the second and third generations is statistically significant. These data indicate that in terms of intermarriage the Mexican-origin third-plus generation demonstrates the highest levels of incorporation. In order to further analyze the substantial difference in the intermarriage rate between the 1.5 and second generations, and the third generation, controls will be added to the model to try to help explain this substantial difference.

Model 2 (table 2.2) includes the different Mexican-origin generation variables and the control variables of gender, age, years of education, and growing up speaking English in

the household. Model 2 demonstrates that gender, age, and growing up speaking English in the household, are not significant. It is surprising that growing up speaking English in the household does not significantly help explain intermarriage between the different Mexican-origin generations and the majority non-Hispanic white group, in particular the third generation. Years of education is significant at the one percent level, but years of education alone does not entirely explain intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites. Each additional year of education increases the likelihood of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites by 36 percent. Education attenuates the effect of generation on the likelihood of intermarriage, but it does not eliminate it. We can see that a substantial difference in the likelihood to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites remains between the Mexican-origin 1.5 and second, and third generations. After controlling for years of education, the odds ratio for the third generation decreases from 12.48 to 7.47, indicating that education greatly explains the likelihood of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites for this group. Again results for the third generation are statistically significant at the one percent level, and further tests demonstrated that the difference between the second and third generations is statistically significant. The fact that a substantial difference in the likelihood to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites remains between the Mexican-origin 1.5 and second generations, and the third-generation, indicates that generation does help explain the likelihood of intermarriage among the Mexican-origin generation groups and the non-Hispanic white group.

Logistic regression analysis provides evidence that in terms of intermarriage, the Mexican-origin group is demonstrating a pattern of delayed incorporation, but does not demonstrate a strong pattern of ethnic disadvantage, because if the Mexican-origin

population were experiencing a strong pattern of ethnic disadvantage we would expect to see low intermarriage rates between all the Mexican-origin generation groups and the majority non-Hispanic white group. Instead, we see that the likelihood of intermarriage is quite high for the Mexican-origin third generation.

Additional analysis was done to analyze gender differences in intermarriage. Table 2.3 demonstrates the odds of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites for Mexican-origin women and men. In the case of Mexican-origin women, without controls the 1.5-generation is about 2.5 times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to the first generation. Second-generation Mexican-American women are about 3.5 times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to the first generation. There is a significant jump in the odds of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites for third-generation Mexican-American women. Third-generation Mexican-American women are about 28.5 times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to the first generation. The results for third-generation Mexican-American women are significant at the one percent level.

When controls for age, years of education, and growing up speaking English in the household are added to the model, it is evident that years of education attenuates the effect of generation, but it does not eliminate it. The control variable for years of education is significant at the one percent level. Each additional year of education increases the odds of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites for Mexican-origin women by 59 percent. With controls 1.5-generation Mexican-origin women are 1.75 times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites, and second-generation Mexican-origin women are about 2.31 times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to the first generation.

Even with controls, it is evident that there is a large increase in the odds of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites for third-generation Mexican-American women. With controls, third-generation Mexican-American women are about 15.24 times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to the first generation. Even with controls, this result for third-generation Mexican-American women is significant at the one percent level. The fact that third-generation Mexican-American women are still more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites even after controlling for age, years of education, and growing up speaking English in the household provides evidence that generation affects the odds of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites. The higher odds of intermarriage for third-generation Mexican-American women also provides evidence that Mexican-origin women are demonstrating an incorporation pattern similar to that of delayed incorporation and in terms of intermarriage they are not demonstrating a strong pattern of ethnic disadvantage.

Results shown in table 2.3 for the odds of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites among Mexican-origin men reveal some differences compared to Mexican-origin women. Without controls 1.5 and second-generation men of Mexican-origin are about three times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to the first generation. Similar to the case of third-generation Mexican-American women, we can see that third-generation Mexican-origin men have higher odds of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to the 1.5 and second generations. Third-generation Mexican-American men are six times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to the first generation. This result is significant at the five percent level. Similar to Mexican-origin women, this intermarriage pattern demonstrates evidence of delayed incorporation.

When the control variables of age, years of education, and growing up speaking English in the household are included in the model, it is evident that years of education explains the effect of generation for men. As opposed to the case of third-generation Mexican-American women, third-generation Mexican-American men do not demonstrate higher odds of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to 1.5 and second-generation Mexican-origin men. After including control variables in the model the odds of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites for 1.5-generation Mexican-origin men is 3.46 compared to the first generation. For the Mexican-origin second generation their odds of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites are 3.02 compared to the first generation. For the Mexican-origin third generation, their odds of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites are 3.53 compared to the first generation.

After analyzing gender differences in intermarriage in the Mexican-origin population, it is evident that third-generation Mexican-American women have much higher odds of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to third-generation Mexican-American men. As mentioned, without controls, third-generation Mexican-American women are 28.5 times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to the first generation, while third-generation Mexican-American men are six times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to the first generation. As previously stated, after controlling for years of education we can see that the odds of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites for third-generation Mexican-American women remains high at 15.24, while the odds of intermarriage for third-generation Mexican-American men is 3.53. After running an interaction effect (see table 2.4) between the Mexican-origin third-generation variable and gender one can see that this gender difference in the third

generation in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites is statistically significant. The greater likelihood of intermarrying with non-Hispanic whites in third-generation Mexican Americans is significantly stronger among women than men.

Discussion/Conclusion

The extent of incorporation among the Mexican-origin population in American society is widely debated, and this study has shed more light on this debate. This study and these findings add to our understanding of generation status and how it relates to intermarriage and incorporation. Analyzing the IIMMLA data set, which allowed for the isolation of the third generation from the fourth-plus generation allowed for a more comprehensive analysis on the effect generation has on intermarriage among the Mexican-origin population in Los Angeles. In terms of intermarriage, the data suggest that generation does explain the odds of intermarriage between the Mexican-origin population and the majority non-Hispanic white population. This finding is similar to that of Schoen and Cohen (1980), but this current study also found that in the case of Mexican-origin women, education attenuates, but does not eliminate the generation effect on intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites, and found that in the case of Mexican-origin men generational differences in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites are explained by education. Similar to Mittelbach and Moore (1968), this current study finds that third-generation Mexican-American women are the most likely to intermarry, but this current research finds that the intermarriage difference between third-generation Mexican-American men and women is statistically significant, so third-generation Mexican-American women are significantly more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites

compared to third-generation Mexican-American men. The significant gender differences in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites among third-generation Mexican-origin men and third-generation Mexican-origin women may be due to the great demands that are placed on women to fulfill family obligations in traditional Mexican-origin households. Delayed incorporation theory explains that third-generation Mexican Americans are less burdened by financial constraints, because their parents were born in the United States, and as a result their parents are possibly in more financially stable situations, have more access to retirement and pension plans, and have more access to health care services. This situation allows the third-generation to have more opportunity to pursue higher education and spatially assimilate, which in turn may increase contact and intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white majority group. Anderson and Saenz (1994) mentioned that similar residential patterns have a great effect on the intermarriage rate between Mexican Americans and non-Hispanic whites. Gender differences in intermarriage among the Mexican-origin population, may result from second-generation Mexican-American women noticing that traditional households require much of them. Martin (1990) found that in traditional Mexican-origin households, great demands are placed on women to fulfill family obligations in the form of care giving and alleviating financial constraints. Possibly, third-generation Mexican-American women become aware of the great demands that are expected of them in Mexican-origin households and opt to not marry a Mexican-origin spouse. As mentioned, Moran found that highly educated Chicana/Latina women experienced disappointment when they discovered that their Latino husbands wanted them to be "traditional women" despite their high levels of success. Overall, the results suggest that in the case of intermarriage the Mexican-origin population is demonstrating a

pattern of delayed incorporation and is not demonstrating a strong pattern of ethnic disadvantage.

Unlike the Telles and Ortiz (2008) study, this research finds that intermarriage among the Mexican-origin population and the non-Hispanic white groups should not be overlooked. About a third of the Mexican-origin third generation intermarries with the non-Hispanic white majority group. This finding may possibly indicate that racial/ethnic boundaries between both of these groups are weakening. The fact that growing up speaking English in the household was not significant provides evidence that these groups are finding common ground in other areas. These findings demonstrate that even though the Mexican-origin population experiences some ethnic disadvantage, they are not experiencing a strong pattern of ethnic disadvantage.

There are a couple limitations to the study. First, the data are cross sectional and not longitudinal, so it measures intermarriage for different generation groups at a particular moment in time, and it cannot be assumed that future Mexican-origin generations will experience the intermarriage rates presented in this study. Second, the data only speaks for the Los Angeles area, so national assumptions cannot be made, but Los Angeles and California have always been seen as a metropolitan area and a state that promote future trends in other parts of the nation. Also, since the study is limited to the Los Angeles area, it is possible that intermarriage rates between the Mexican-origin population and non-Hispanic whites may appear to be lower compared to other parts of the nation, because there is a larger population of Mexican-origin individuals in Los Angeles, thus creating a large pool of potential Mexican-origin spouses for Mexican-origin individuals.

Future research should further analyze the role gender plays in intermarriage among non-Hispanic whites and the Mexican-origin population. As mentioned, this study found that third-generation Mexican-origin women are significantly more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to third-generation Mexican-origin men. Due to this statistically significant difference, gender and how it affects Mexican-origin intermarriage incorporation should be further explored.

Table 2.1 In-group and Out-group Marriage Rates for Mexican-origin Respondents, by Generation and Race/Ethnicity of Spouses

Mexican-Origin Generation	Race/Ethnicity of Spouse						Percent Inter-married	Total Married (N)
	Mexican-Origin	Other Latino	NH White	NH Black	Asian & PI	Other		
1st	87.7	8.6	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	81
1.5	83.1	5.9	9.3	0.0	0.9	0.9	11.1	118
2nd	76.7	9.6	10.5	1.8	0.9	0.5	13.7	219
3rd	55.4	9.5	32.4	1.4	0.0	1.4	35.2	74
								N=492

Table 2.2 Odds of Intermarriage among Mexican-origin Generation Groups and the Non-Hispanic White Group

	Non-Hispanic White Spouse	
VARIABLES	Model 1	Model 2
1st Generation (ref.)	--	--
1.5 Generation	2.67	2.67
2nd Generation	3.05*	2.70
3rd Generation	12.48***	7.47***
Female		0.96
Age		1.03
Years of Education		1.36***
English (grew up speaking only English in the household)		1.71
Observations	492	492

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

Table 2.3 Odds of Intermarriage among Mexican-origin Women and Men and the Non-Hispanic White Group

	Non-Hispanic White Spouse			
	Women		*Men*	
VARIABLES	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
1st Generation (ref.)	--	--	--	--
1.5 Generation	2.49	1.75	3.04	3.46
2nd Generation	3.57	2.31	3.04	3.02
3rd Generation	28.50***	15.24**	6.00**	3.53
Age		1.07		0.99
Years of Education		1.59***		1.27*
English (grew up speaking only English in the household)		1.27		2.19
Observations	267	267	225	225

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

Table 2.4 Significance Test for Mexican-origin Third-generation Gender Differences

VARIABLES	Non-Hispanic White Spouse
1st, 1.5, and 2nd Generations (ref.)	--
3rd Generation	1.61
3rd Gen**X**Female	4.67**
Female	0.60
Age	1.02
Years of Education	1.44***
English (grew up speaking only English in the household)	1.42
Observations	492

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

CHAPTER 3

PARENTAL MIGRATION STATUS AND INTERMARRIAGE AMONG THE CHILDREN OF MEXICAN IMMIGRANTS

Introduction

This study investigates how parental migration status among the Mexican-origin immigrant population affects intermarriage incorporation among their 1.5 and second-generation children. Previous research has not addressed this inquiry. Many studies have highlighted how unauthorized immigrants are negatively affected and marginalized due to their migration status (Chavez, 1998; Bean and Brown et al., 2006; Abrego, 2006; Menjívar and Abrego, 2009; Abrego and Gonzales, 2010; Bean and Brown et al., 2011; Gonzales, 2011; Suarez-Orozco, C. et al., 2011; Yoshikawa, 2011; Gonzales and Chavez, 2012; Abrego and Gleeson, 2014; Bean and Brown 2015). Bean and Brown et al. (2011) were the first to capture how the migration status of parents negatively impacts socioeconomic attainment among their children. They found that children with unauthorized parents achieved one less year of education compared to children with parents that were authorized to live and work in the United States, and found that the children of unauthorized mothers average two years less education compared to the children of documented mothers (Bean and Brown 2011: 370, 372). Previous intermarriage research has found that achieving higher levels of education increases intermarriage participation (Lieberson & Waters 1988; Kalmijn 1993, 1998; Qian, 1997). Since parental migration status affects educational attainment among their children, in particular the migration status of mothers, and education increases intermarriage participation, one can argue that the migration status of Mexican-origin mothers may affect intermarriage incorporation among their 1.5 and

second-generation children, providing support for the delayed incorporation perspective, which argues that the unauthorized migration status of Mexican-origin parents may have legacy effects and delay their children's incorporation process.

Literature Review

Intermarriage has been often used as a measure of incorporation and social distance between racial/ethnic groups in American society, and a measure of inclusion or exclusion. Intermarriage with a majority group is a function of both contact and similarity, since individuals choose spouses who are similar across multiple dimensions including age, education, and race/ethnicity. Intermarriage rates can measure, and are a reflection of, the social distance between racial/ethnic groups, as well as the social acceptance of individuals and their racial/ethnic group, and therefore can measure the rigidity of racial/ethnic boundaries and the extent to which racially and ethnically different immigrant groups are incorporated and received by the majority group (Davis, 1941; Gordon, 1964; Grebler, Moore and Guzman, 1970; Murguía, 1982; Lieberson and Waters, 1988; Kalmijn, 1998; Feliciano, 2001; Rosenfeld, 2002; Bean and Stevens, 2003; Alba and Nee, 2003; Lee and Bean, 2010).

As mentioned, intermarriage with the majority group can facilitate incorporation for immigrants and their descendants by creating opportunity for socioeconomic mobility. Intermarriage increases cultural capital due to enlarged and diversified social networks, as a result individuals from impoverished or disadvantaged social networks greatly benefit from intermarriage with the majority group (Patterson 1997; Lee and Bean 2010). According to this argument, low educated Mexican immigrants and their descendants

would benefit from the cultural capital gained from intermarriage with the majority group. Arguably, individuals that form part of the majority group have more cultural capital and more established social networks due to their family's long presence in the United States compared to first-generation immigrants and their children. Therefore a non-majority group individual that gets married to someone pertaining to the majority group may gain access to their spouse's higher levels of cultural capital and more established social networks. In addition, Lee and Bean (2010) found that second-generation Latino and Asian respondents in their study viewed marriage with non-Hispanic whites as part of the process of becoming American. Lee and Bean mentioned that "the very process of 'becoming American' is in itself a form of upward mobility because it connotes a movement from immigrant to native and from foreign to familiar, so in this sense intermarriage with a white partner can accelerate incorporation, whether that goal is intended or not" (Lee and Bean 2010:97).

Sociologists have extensively researched how intermarriage and other factors allow for immigrant populations to incorporate in U.S. society. Various incorporation theoretical perspectives have been produced to try to explain the incorporation process of immigrant populations in the United States. Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess were the first sociologists that attempted to define assimilation. They defined it as, "a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons and groups and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them a common cultural life" (Park and Burgess 1921: 735).

Gordon (1964) and Alba and Nee (2003) maintained the idea that assimilation is a process that most likely will occur over time. Both the earlier version of classic

assimilation theory and the more contemporary version stress the idea that the immigrant minority group and the majority group become more similar in norms, values, and behaviors as time of residence in the host country progresses, and also stress the idea that later-generation descendants of immigrants will share more similarities with the majority group (Bean and Brown, 2006).

While the classic assimilation perspective argues that later-generation descendants of immigrants eventually converge with the majority group, the racial/ethnic disadvantage perspective states that non-white immigrant groups are prevented from incorporating due to discrimination. Segmented assimilation combines ideas from the racial/ethnic disadvantage model and classic assimilation model, and states that incorporation outcomes vary from incorporation into the mainstream to incorporation into a permanent underclass, for different groups and individuals based on various factors such as socioeconomic status, national origin, and race (Zhou and Portes, 1993; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001; Bean and Brown, 2006).

The delayed incorporation perspective argues that the Mexican-origin population is not demonstrating a pattern of ethnic disadvantage, but is instead demonstrating a pattern where traditional incorporation is not evident until the third generation (Brown, 2007). This theory was developed with spatial incorporation in mind. According to this perspective the 1.5 and second generations are constrained by working-class stagnation (Bean and Brown 2015) and financial family obligations related to their parents' possible unauthorized migration status. This perspective explains that the children of Mexican-origin immigrants have to bear extra financial costs to assist their parents, due to their parents' possible unauthorized migration status, low levels of education, low wages, and

lack of retirement financial plans. The delayed incorporation model states that the third generation is less burdened by family obligations and financial constraints, because their parents are born in the United States and thus are citizens, are fluent in English, have more access to health care services and more employment opportunities, including employment that provides retirement plans, allowing the third generation to more fully incorporate.

The majority of research related to Mexican-origin intermarriage seems to demonstrate that intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites increases with each successive generation providing support for the classic assimilation perspective (Mittelbach and Moore 1968; Grebler, Moore and Guzman 1970; Rosenfeld 2002), but has not explored how an immigrant parent's migration status, in particular unauthorized/unknown status, may impede intermarriage incorporation among their 1.5 and second-generation children, and has not explored how this process may relate to delayed incorporation theory. Although the delayed incorporation theory was developed with spatial incorporation in mind, this theory could help explain other aspects of incorporation such as intermarriage.

According to Bean and Brown et al. (2011) the migration status of parents/grandparents may delay incorporation for later-generation Mexican Americans. Bean and Brown et. al. argued that incorporation might take longer for immigrant groups such as the Mexican-origin group, because many individuals are unauthorized, some have a temporary stay mind set, and achieving permanent residency or citizenship is costly and takes a lot of time. Marginalized groups may experience less contact opportunity with non-Hispanic whites. Bean and Brown et al. also argue that:

> "The difference in perspective between delayed and other kinds of incorporation is more than semantic because the former implies that what often appears as an

> overall lower level of incorporation among Mexicans of any generation may not result mainly from factors affecting the entire group. Rather it may derive from transitional membership statuses among the first generation members of the group that curtail the pace not only of their own incorporation, but also through legacy effects the attainment of later generation group members as well" (p. 351).

Many scholars have researched how undocumented/unauthorized migration status negatively affects and marginalizes the lives of immigrants and their children (Chavez, 1998; Bean and Brown et al., 2006; Abrego, 2006; Menjívar and Abrego, 2009; Abrego and Gonzales, 2010; Bean and Brown et al., 2011; Gonzales, 2011; Suarez-Orozco, C. et al., 2011; Yoshikawa, 2011; Gonzales and Chavez, 2012; Abrego and Gleeson, 2014; Bean and Brown 2015). Abrego (2006) found that, "undocumented immigrants face the worst possible context of reception because their status keeps them from incorporating legally, if not socially, in to the institutions of this country" (p. 226). Bean and Brown (2015) argue that unauthorized parents are susceptible to socially isolating themselves and their children due to fear of being deported and argue that mothers are more susceptible to social isolation "in part because they are often more embedded in a traditional culture that makes them more dependent on men, a vulnerability that can become exacerbated when they also face workplace isolation" (Menjívar 2000; Bean and Brown 2015: 281). Abrego and Gonzales (2010) found that due to parents' unauthorized status and fear of deportation, they, "may be afraid to go into a government agency to apply for the children's health care benefits" (p. 148), and found that, "like other children who grow up in poverty, children of undocumented immigrants also face high levels of street violence and generally ineffective schools" (p. 148), which they argue greatly lead to a marginalized and segregated existence,

since education is a key factor that facilitates many facets of incorporation including intermarriage.

Bean and Brown et al. (2006) were the first to adequately document that parent's migration status, and in particular unauthorized status, negatively affects the socioeconomic attainment, including educational achievement, of the Mexican-origin second generation. They found that the adult U.S. born children of Mexican immigrants that remained unauthorized in Los Angeles were economically worse off compared to those that had parents that eventually became authorized to legally live and work in the United States. The former reported an average income of $19,230 dollars, while the latter reported an average income of $23,234 dollars (Bean and Brown 2006: 10). Bean and Brown et al. (2011) found that children with unauthorized parents achieved one less year of education compared to children with parents that were authorized to live and work in the United States, and found that the children of unauthorized mothers average two years less education compared to the children of documented mothers (pp. 370, 372). An outcome Bean and Brown (2015) associate to unauthorized parents, especially mothers, being more susceptible to socially isolating themselves and their children due to fear of deportation. Yoshikawa (2011), in his ethnographic study, found that, "several aspects of being an undocumented parent in a new wave of low-income migration – sparse social networks, lower-quality jobs, less access to stimulating child care, fewer financial resources to invest in children – harm early development by increasing parental stress and reducing the amount of stimulation that parents can provide and purchase for young children" (pp. 135, 136).

Since the migration status of parents affects educational attainment among second-generation Mexican Americans, can the migration status of parents be a factor that impedes marital incorporation among 1.5 and second-generation Mexican Americans? According to many sociologists education greatly affects the rate of intermarriage. Previous studies have found that more educated individuals marry outside of their racial/ethnic group at larger rates compared to less educated individuals (Lieberson & Waters 1988; Kalmijn 1993, 1998; Qian, 1997). Previous studies have also found that educational attainment is a strong predictor of racial/ethnic minority intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites (Qian 1997; Rosenfeld 2005; Batson, Qian, and Lichter 2006; Qian and Lichter 2007). According to Kalmijn (1998) the effect of education has been interpreted in terms of opportunity and preference. In terms of opportunity, Kalmijn argues that educated minorities find themselves in colleges and high status occupations where their racial/ethnic group size is small, so there is greater opportunity to marry outside their racial/ethnic group. More educated individuals may also experience higher levels of intermarriage, because higher educated minorities tend to live in neighborhoods that are not segregated (Zhou and Logan, 1991; Qian, 1997). In terms of preference, Kalmijn argued that among highly educated individuals the ascribed characteristics of potential marriage partners become less important because a more universal mind set is adopted after achieving more education.

As mentioned Bean and Brown et al. (2011) found that the migration status of parents affects educational attainment among the second generation. Since the migration status of parents affects their children's educational incorporation, and educational attainment affects the rate of intermarriage, it can be argued that the migration status of

parents may also affect the rate of intermarriage among the children of immigrants (the Mexican-origin 1.5 and second generations). Arguably the odds of intermarriage should be higher among respondents with naturalized mothers, since this group would make the most educational gains as a result of their mother's migration status.

Data and Methods

The data used for this study come from the Immigration and Intergenerational Mobility in Metropolitan Los Angeles (IIMMLA) survey, which is a cross sectional survey. These data were collected from Mexican-origin respondents and non-Hispanic white respondents in 2004 by using random sampling in the greater metropolitan area of Los Angeles, which includes the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, San Bernardino, and Riverside. For Mexican-origin respondents the IIMMLA survey was conducted via telephone interview among 1st, 1.5, 2nd and 3rd-plus generation adults between the ages of 20 to 40. For non-Hispanic white respondents the IIMMLA survey was conducted via telephone interview among third-plus generation adults.

Analyzing data pertaining to the Los Angeles metropolitan area is ideal for studying the dynamics of intermarriage and incorporation among the Mexican-origin population, because the Mexican-origin population is quite large in this region, and focusing on one region allows for the controlling of group size. The demographic situation in Los Angeles increases the chances of Mexican-origin individuals to find a marriage partner from the same racial/ethnic group or Latino pan-ethnic group. As a result, studying intermarriage and incorporation in the Los Angeles metropolitan area among the Mexican-origin population not only allows us to analyze intermarriage rates associated with group size,

but we can also determine if intermarriage rates among the Mexican-origin population are being affected by factors other than group size. Consequently studying intermarriage among the Mexican-origin population in the Los Angeles metropolitan area allows us to see whether or not intermarriage occurs as a result of chance alone.

Information provided by the respondents of the IIMMLA survey pertaining to race/ethnicity, race/ethnicity of spouse, place of birth, parent's place of birth, and grandparent's place of birth allows for the creation of different Mexican-origin racial/ethnic generation groups. The following generation groups were created: the first generation are those individuals that were born in Mexico and arrived in the United States at age 13 or older, the 1.5 generation are those individuals that were born in Mexico, but arrived in the United States between the ages of 0 to 12, the 2nd generation are those individuals that were born in the United States and have one or two parents that were born in Mexico, the 3rd generation are those individuals that were born in the United States and whose parents were also born in the United States, and who have one grandparent or more that were born in Mexico. Since this study focuses on how parental migration status affects intermarriage incorporation among their children, the analysis is limited to the 1.5 generation and second generation.

Information provided by the respondents of the IIMMLA survey pertaining to their parents' place of birth, number of years lived in the United States, permanent resident status at entry, and whether or not they eventually became permanent residents or naturalized citizens allowed for the creation of mother migration status dummy variables and father migration status dummy variables. Mothers and fathers were coded as naturalized citizens if they were foreign-born, have lived in the United States for more than

five years, and eventually became naturalized citizens. Mothers and fathers were coded as permanent residents if they were foreign-born, have lived in the United States for more than five years, and did not become a naturalized citizen, but eventually became a permanent resident or entered the country as a permanent resident and remained with this migration status. Mothers and fathers were coded as unauthorized/unknown if they were foreign-born, have lived in the United States for more than five years, volunteered information about unauthorized parent entry, or the parent did not enter the country as a permanent resident and did not become a permanent resident or become a naturalized citizen. They were also coded unauthorized/unknown if the respondent did not know or refused to provide information about their parent's migration status.

Odds ratios measuring the likelihood of intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white majority group among the Mexican-origin 1.5 generation and Mexican-origin second generation are used as a measure of incorporation. The entire sample size of the IIMMLA data set is 4,780, from this sample the analysis was limited to the Mexican-origin 1.5 and second generations that were married, resulting in a subsample of 337. To determine intermarriage, first married individuals were identified, and by looking at the information provided by the respondent on their own race/ethnicity and their spouse's race/ethnicity, intermarried individuals were defined as those respondents that were married to somebody that belongs to a different racial/ethnic group other than their own racial/ethnic group. Any respondents who had spouses with any Mexican-origin or other Latino-origin background were not considered to be intermarried. Respondents with other Latino-origin spouses are not considered intermarried in this study, because arguably the non-Mexican

Latino-origin population shares some common sociocultural experiences with the Mexican-origin population, such as the common use of the Spanish language.

Since the dependent variable of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites is binary, logistic regression is used to analyze the different odds ratio results associated with naturalized mothers, naturalized fathers, permanent resident mothers, and permanent resident fathers. Odds ratios are compared to unauthorized/unknown mothers and fathers (the reference group). This measure provides a glimpse into the social distance that exists between the non-Hispanic white majority group and the children of immigrants (Mexican-origin 1.5 and second-generation groups), which in turn provides information on how the children of immigrants are incorporating based on their parents' migration status at time of interview.

Control dummy variables were created to help better understand how parents' migration status affects the likelihood of intermarriage between the children of Mexican-origin immigrants and the non-Hispanic white population. Control dummy variables were created for age, gender, only spoke English at home while growing up, university graduate (B.A. degree), mother high school graduate, father high school graduate, and Mexican-origin second generation.

Findings

This study seeks to better understand how the migration status of parents (first-generation Mexican-origin immigrants) affects intermarriage participation among their children (the Mexican-origin 1.5 and 2nd generations). Logistic regression analysis is used to help understand these effects, but before employing this method it is important to

analyze the percentage of Mexican-origin 1.5-generation and Mexican-origin second-generation individuals that participate in intermarriage. It is also helpful to analyze descriptive statistics and correlations.

Most interracial marriages among the Mexican-origin population occur with the non-Hispanic white majority group, and marriage with the majority group demonstrates incorporation. Table 2.1 reports that the Mexican-origin 1.5 generation participates in intermarriage at a rate of 11.1 percent and participates in intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white population at a rate of 9.3 percent. The Mexican-origin second generation participates in intermarriage at a rate of 13.7 percent and participates in intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white population at a rate of 10.5 percent. Second-generation Mexican-origin individuals intermarry with non-Hispanic whites at a slightly higher rate compared to 1.5-generation Mexican-origin individuals; a difference of 1.2 percentage points.

The summary statistics reported in table 3.1 demonstrate that the mean of having a mother whose migration status is naturalized citizen among married Mexican-origin 1.5-generation and second-generation individuals is 48.4 percent and the mean of having a father whose migration status is naturalized citizen is 46.6 percent. The mean for naturalized mothers is slightly larger with a difference of almost 2 percentage points. The mean for having a mother whose migration status is permanent resident is 27.9 percent and the mean for having a father whose migration status is permanent resident is 24.6 percent. Once again the mean for mothers is slightly higher compared to fathers with a difference of 3.3 percentage points. The mean for having a mother whose migration status is unauthorized/unknown is 11 percent. The mean for having a father whose migration

status is unauthorized/unknown is 18.1 percent. In the case of unauthorized/unknown mothers and fathers, it is evident that the mean is larger for fathers with a difference of 7.1 percentage points. The mean age among Mexican-origin 1.5 and second-generation individuals is 30.7 years of age.

The correlation matrix presented in table 3.2 demonstrates that among married Mexican-origin 1.5-generation and second-generation individuals the variables mother unauthorized/unknown, father unauthorized/unknown, mother permanent resident, father permanent resident, and female are negatively correlated with the variable non-Hispanic white spouse. It also demonstrates that the variables mother naturalized, father naturalized, Mexican-origin second-generation group, growing up speaking only English in the household, age, B.A. degree, mother high school graduate, and father high school graduate are positively correlated with the variable non-Hispanic white spouse.

Logistic regression analysis is used in order to achieve odds ratios to better understand how a Mexican-origin parent's migration status can affect the likelihood of intermarriage participation with non-Hispanic whites among their 1.5-generation and second-generation children. Results are presented in table 3.3. The reference group is parent(s) unauthorized/unknown (mother and/or father is unauthorized/unknown). In the first logistic regression model without controls, respondents with a mother who is a naturalized citizen are 3.4 times more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared with respondents who have a parent with the migration status of unauthorized/unknown. This odds ratio is statistically significant at the five percent level. Respondents with mothers who are permanent residents are 18 percent more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to the reference group.

This finding is not significant. The odds ratios associated with mother's migration status are larger compared to the odds ratios associated with father's migration status. In the second logistic regression model controls are added in order to help better understand the effect parental migration status has on intermarriage participation among their children. When controls such as age, gender, growing up speaking only English in the household, B.A. degree, mother high school graduate, and father high school graduate are added to the model it is evident that the variable for naturalized mother remains significant. The additional controls scarcely change the effect of mother's migration status. Respondents with a naturalized mother are 3.2 times more likely to participate in an interracial marriage with a non-Hispanic white individual compared to respondents with at least one parent whose migration status is unauthorized/unknown. This odds ratio remains statistically significant at the five percent level. Respondents with mothers who are permanent residents are 50 percent more likely to intermarry non-Hispanic whites compared to the reference group. This finding is not significant. Respondents with naturalized fathers are 19 percent more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to respondents with at least one parent who is unauthorized/unknown. This result is not significant. Once again we see that the odds ratios associated with mother's migration status are larger compared to the odds ratios associated with father's migration status, but nevertheless authorized legal status seems to increase the likelihood of intermarriage incorporation among the Mexican-origin 1.5 and second generations.

The results in the second model also demonstrate that respondents that grew up speaking only English in the household are 3.5 times more likely to participate in interracial marriage with a non-Hispanic white individual compared to the reference

group. This finding is statistically significant at the five percent level. Respondents that completed higher education and received a B.A. degree are 3.3 times more likely to intermarry with the non-Hispanic white majority group, and this finding is highly significant at the one percent level. Also, respondents whose mothers completed a high school education are 2.4 times more likely to marry someone from the non-Hispanic white group compared to the reference group. This figure is significant at the five percent level. Although the odds ratios for having a B.A. degree and having a mother who is a high school graduate do not seem to explain the significance of having a mother that is a naturalized citizen, they do indicate that education plays a very important role in facilitating intermarriage between the children of immigrants and the non-Hispanic white majority.

Discussion/Conclusion

This study found that the children of naturalized mothers, naturalized fathers, and permanent resident mothers demonstrate higher likelihoods of intermarriage incorporation with the non-Hispanic white majority group compared to children with at least one parent that is unauthorized/unknown. The children of naturalized mothers demonstrate the highest likelihood of intermarriage incorporation. For the children of Mexican-origin immigrants the likelihood of participating in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites is negatively affected when a parent is unauthorized/unknown. These findings demonstrate that parental migration status matters while explaining intermarriage incorporation among the Mexican-origin population, and suggests that parental unauthorized/unknown migration status may impede intermarriage incorporation among their children, which supports the delayed incorporation perspective.

As mentioned, the delayed incorporation theory was developed by Brown (2007) and Bean and Brown (2011) with the Mexican-origin population in mind and argues that traditional incorporation is not evident until the third generation, because the 1.5 and second generations are constrained by family obligations, mostly financial, as a result of having to bear extra financial costs to assist their parents, due to their parents' low levels of education, possible unauthorized status, low wages, and lack of retirement financial plans. Although this study does not focus on the third generation, the findings demonstrate that parental migration status affects intermarriage incorporation among their 1.5 and second-generation children. As mentioned delayed incorporation theory explains that parental migration status is a factor that may delay incorporation among the children of immigrants (Bean and Brown et al. 2011).

The logistic regression analysis demonstrates that without controls Mexican-origin 1.5 and second-generation individuals with naturalized mothers are 3.4 times more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to respondents who have at least one parent that is unauthorized/unknown, and with controls, which includes education (B.A. degree) they are 3.2 time more likely to participate in such intermarriage. These results are significant at the five percent level. This finding indicates that education explains some of the effect, but also indicates that mother's naturalized migration status alone has a significant effect on intermarriage incorporation outcomes among their children. Even though the control variable of B.A. degree does not fully explain the significance of mother's naturalized migration status, arguably the effect of parental migration status on intermarriage participation among the 1.5 and second generation of Mexican-origin is occurring through education. The higher likelihood of intermarriage

participation among the children of naturalized mothers compared with the children of unauthorized/unknown parent(s) is consistent with the finding in the Bean and Brown et al. (2011) study which demonstrated that the children of unauthorized mothers average fewer years of education compared with the children of authorized mothers. The highest educational losses found in their study, which Bean and Brown (2015) argue may be due to the greater social isolation that traditional immigrant women and mothers experience (from dependence on men and workplace isolation), due to fears of deportation, which also affects their children. As mentioned, previous research on intermarriage has demonstrated that attaining more education increases the chances of exogamy (Lieberson & Waters 1988; Kalmijn 1993, 1998; Qian, 1997). In fact, we can see in this analysis that Mexican-origin 1.5 and second-generation respondents with a B.A. degree are 3.3 times more likely to participate in intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white majority group compared to respondents with unauthorized/unknown parents, and this finding is highly significant at the one percent level. Since the children of authorized Mexican-origin mothers make the most educational gains compared to the children of unauthorized mothers, it can be argued that the children of authorized mothers may also make the most gains in terms of intermarriage participation. Therefore it can be argued that Mexican-origin 1.5 and second-generation individuals with naturalized mothers are more likely to participate in intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white majority group compared to individuals with unauthorized/unknown parents, because they achieve more education and are not socially isolated as a result of their mother's naturalized status.

Not only does unauthorized migration status affect the lives of Mexican-origin immigrants themselves, but this study demonstrates that the migration status of parents

also affects the life outcomes of their children, including their sociocultural incorporation outcomes. Consequently, U.S. immigration policies should change in order to provide Mexican-origin unauthorized immigrants a path towards naturalization in order to prevent delays in the incorporation trajectories of their descendants. Not changing immigration policies to provide a path to naturalization for Mexican-origin immigrants places their descendants at great risk of a delayed incorporation process. Although this study only focused on the Mexican-origin immigrant population, it is within the best interest of the United States to provide a path to naturalization for all unauthorized immigrants.

Table 3.1 Summary Statistics for the Married Mexican-origin 1.5 and 2nd Generations

Variables	N=337	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Mexican-origin 1.5 Generation		0.35	0.48	0	1
Mexican-origin 2nd Generation		0.65	0.48	0	1
Intermarried		0.13	0.33	0	1
Mother Naturalized		0.48	0.50	0	1
Father Naturalized		0.47	0.50	0	1
Mother Permanent Resident		0.28	0.45	0	1
Father Permanent Resident		0.25	0.43	0	1
Mother Unauthorized/Unknown		0.11	0.31	0	1
Father Unauthorized/Unknown		0.18	0.39	0	1
Age		30.68	5.32	20	40
Female		0.57	0.50	0	1
English (grew up speaking only English in the household)		0.08	0.28	0	1
B.A. Degree		0.14	0.35	0	1
Mother High School Graduate		0.20	0.40	0	1
Father High School Graduate		0.18	0.39	0	1

Table 3.2 Correlation Table for the Married Mexican-origin 1.5 and 2nd Generations

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
A. Non-Hispanic White Spouse	1.00														
B. Mother Unauthorized/Unknown	-0.12	1.00													
C. Father Unauthorized/Unknown	-0.11	0.33	1.00												
D. Mother Naturalized	0.17	-0.34	-0.12	1.00											
E. Mother Permanent Resident	-0.10	-0.22	-0.07	-0.60	1.00										
F. Father Naturalized	0.04	-0.21	-0.44	0.27	-0.26	1.00									
G. Father Permanent Resident	-0.08	0.00	-0.27	-0.31	0.40	-0.53	1.00								
H. Female	-0.09	-0.06	0.05	-0.09	0.11	-0.07	0.02	1.00							
I. Mexican-origin 1.5 Generation	-0.02	0.22	0.08	-0.20	0.18	-0.14	0.19	-0.03	1.00						
J. Mexican-origin 2nd Generation	0.02	-0.22	-0.08	0.20	-0.18	0.14	-0.19	0.03	-1.00	1.00					
K. English*	0.11	0.07	0.08	-0.03	-0.07	-0.13	-0.10	-0.07	0.05	-0.05	1.00				
L. Age	0.12	0.01	0.03	0.06	-0.14	-0.04	-0.08	-0.10	0.10	-0.10	0.11	1.00			
M. B.A. Degree	0.17	-0.06	-0.04	0.15	-0.05	-0.06	0.06	-0.08	-0.09	0.09	-0.09	0.00	1.00		
N. Mother High School Graduate	0.15	-0.11	-0.03	0.10	-0.14	0.09	-0.10	-0.10	-0.22	0.22	0.01	0.01	0.07	1.00	
O. Father High School Graduate	0.04	-0.09	-0.14	0.05	-0.02	0.09	-0.06	-0.13	-0.12	0.12	0.02	-0.02	0.07	0.18	1.00

*Respondent grew up speaking only English in the household

Table 3.3 Odds Ratios for Parental Migration Status and the Likelihood of Intermarriage with Non-Hispanic Whites among the Mexican 1.5 and 2nd Generations

	Non-Hispanic White Spouse	
VARIABLES	Model 1	Model 2
Parent(s) Unauthorized/Unknown (ref.)	--	--
Mother Naturalized	3.43**	3.24**
Mother Permanent Resident	1.18	1.50
Father Naturalized	0.86	1.19
Father Permanent Resident	0.66	0.87
Age		1.07*
Female		0.77
Mexican-origin 2nd Generation		0.81
English (grew up speaking only English in the household)		3.47**
B.A. Degree		3.33***
Mother High School Graduate		2.42**
Father High School Graduate		0.91
Observations	337	337

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

CHAPTER 4

PARENTAL NATIVITY AND INTERMARRIAGE AMONG SECOND-GENERATION MEXICAN AMERICANS

Introduction

This study looks at nativity as a factor that may facilitate intermarriage incorporation among second-generation Mexican Americans. Many incorporation scholars argue that nativity, which implies a larger amount of time spent in a host society and implies exposure and familiarity with institutions and mainstream language, norms, values, behaviors, and characteristics can facilitate incorporation across generations, including intermarriage incorporation (Gordon 1964; Gans 1979, 1988; Alba and Nee 2003; Bean and Brown, 2006). The influence of nativity is gauged in this study by analyzing how parental cross-nativity, marriages between one native-born parent of Mexican-origin and one foreign-born parent of Mexican-origin, affects the likelihood of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites among their children. Are second-generation children resulting from cross-nativity marriages more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites, compared to children that have two foreign-born parents? Are there any gender differences? In this dissertation the second generation is defined as those individuals whose parents are both foreign-born, or who have one-parent that is foreign-born (also known as the 2.5 generation).

This study finds that the Mexican-origin children of mixed-nativity parents are more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to the children of Mexican-origin foreign-born parents. The daughters of foreign-born mothers and native-born fathers demonstrate the highest likelihood of intermarriage participation with the

non-Hispanic white majority group. The findings support the idea that nativity, which implies greater length of time and exposure to American mainstream society, can facilitate intermarriage incorporation among the Mexican-origin second generation, especially among women.

Literature Review

Sociologists have extensively researched how immigrant populations shift from immigrant to native through the study of incorporation and intermarriage. As discussed previously, intermarriage has been often used as a measure of incorporation and social distance between racial/ethnic groups in American society, and a measure of inclusion or exclusion. Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess were the first sociologists that attempted to define assimilation. They defined it as, "a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons and groups and, by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them a common cultural life" (Park and Burgess 1921: 735). Classic incorporation theories stress the idea that the immigrant minority group and the majority group become more similar in norms, values, behaviors, and characteristics as time of residence in the host country progresses, and also stress the idea that later-generation descendants of immigrants will share more similarities with the majority group (Gordon 1964; Gans 1979, 1988; Alba and Nee 2003; Bean and Brown, 2006). Therefore according to this perspective, nativity, which implies a larger amount of time spent in a host society and implies exposure and familiarity with institutions and mainstream language, norms, values, behaviors, and

characteristics can facilitate incorporation across generations, including intermarriage incorporation.

Qian and Lichter (2001) argue that the native-born, including the native-born children of immigrants, are in a more favorable position to participate in mainstream society compared to the foreign-born. They argue that on average the native-born, "are more likely to be formally educated and to have good English language and job skills, which lead to lower unemployment rates and higher earnings" (Qian and Lichter 2001: 292). Previous research has found that their assessment does a fair job of describing the Mexican-origin immigration case. Many sociologists have found that the Mexican-origin native-born population attains higher English language skills, higher incomes, and higher educational outcomes compared to the Mexican-origin foreign-born population (Bean and Tienda 1987; Wojtkiewicz and Donato 1995; Bean and Stevens 2003; Telles and Ortiz 2008; Bean and Brown et al. 2011; Bean and Brown 2015). Also, the Mexican-origin native-born population, especially the third generation, demonstrates more spatial incorporation (Brown 2007; Bean and Brown 2015). Previous immigration research has also found that intermarriage participation is higher among native-born Hispanics/Latinos compared to their foreign-born counterparts (Qian and Lichter 2001; Bean and Stevens 2003). Rosenfeld (2002) and Telles and Ortiz (2008) found that intermarriage participation among the Mexican-origin native-born is higher compared to the Mexican-origin foreign-born. All of these findings suggest that nativity facilitates the incorporation process for the Mexican-origin population including intermarriage incorporation, due to longer exposure and familiarity with the American mainstream. As a result, it can be argued that the children of one Mexican-origin native-born parent and one Mexican-origin foreign-born

parent are more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to children whose parents are both foreign-born, because they are further removed from the immigrant generation and are more exposed to the American mainstream via their native-born parent.

While the classic assimilation perspective (old and new) argues that incorporation occurs in a linear manner where later-generation descendants of immigrants eventually converge with the majority group, the racial/ethnic disadvantage model and the segmented assimilation model argue that incorporation does not always follow a linear pattern and argues that nativity does not always lead to incorporation. As mentioned, both the earlier version of classic assimilation theory and the more contemporary version stress the idea that the immigrant minority group and the majority group become more similar in norms, values, behaviors, and characteristics as time of residence in the host country progresses, and also stress the idea that later-generation descendants of immigrants will share more similarities with the majority group (Bean and Brown, 2006). As discussed previously this indicates that nativity status may play an important role in intermarriage incorporation, especially since arguably marriage with someone that is native-born may expand social capital and social networks.

Intermarriage with the majority group, or marriage with a native-born co-ethnic, can facilitate incorporation for immigrants and their descendants by creating opportunity for socioeconomic mobility. Intermarriage increases cultural capital due to the enlarging and diversification of social networks, as a result individuals from impoverished or disadvantaged social networks greatly benefit from intermarriage with the majority group (Patterson 1997; Lee and Bean 2010). A non-majority group individual, such as a person of

Mexican-origin, that gets married to someone pertaining to the majority group, non-Hispanic white, may gain access to their spouse's higher levels of cultural capital and more established social networks. Individuals that form part of the majority group have more cultural capital and more established social networks due to their family's long presence in the United States. In addition, Lee and Bean (2010) found that second-generation Latino and Asian respondents in their study viewed marriage with non-Hispanic whites as part of the process of becoming American. Lee and Bean mentioned that "the very process of 'becoming American' is in itself a form of upward mobility because it connotes a movement from immigrant to native and from foreign to familiar, so in this sense intermarriage with a white partner can accelerate incorporation, whether that goal is intended or not" (Lee and Bean 2010:97).

Although native-born Mexican-origin individuals do not form part of the majority group they arguably have more cultural capital that can assist with navigating within U.S. society and have larger and more diverse social networks compared to a foreign-born person of Mexican-origin, because of their greater length of exposure to mainstream American society. Qian and Lichter (2001) mentioned that, "Native-born minorities today comprise a mix of many different generations (i.e., second, third, or higher generations), which reflects length of exposure to the majority culture and the degree of acculturation and structural assimilation" (p. 292). A foreign-born Mexican-origin individual would gain more cultural capital and access to larger and more diverse social networks after marrying a native-born person of Mexican-origin. Consequently, marriage between a foreign-born person of Mexican-origin and a native-born person of Mexican-origin, may positively affect intermarriage participation with non-Hispanic whites among their children, because they

would benefit from the cultural capital and social network resources attained by their native-born parent.

Scholars such as Macias (2006) and Telles and Ortiz (2008) argue that Mexican-origin marriage to a co-ethnic, native-born or foreign-born, may hinder intermarriage incorporation. They argue that marriage to a co-ethnic may imply that the Mexican-origin population experiences less contact with the majority group and therefore less opportunity to intermarry, because of residential segregation, or a large racial/ethnic group population size or what Tomás Jiménez (2010) describes as ethnic replenishment due to immigration from Mexico. Macias argues that, "from a cultural pluralist perspective, ongoing immigration from Mexico may serve to reinforce Mexican identity and community, encouraging ethnic bonds across generations, slowing down the process of assimilation, and decreasing the likelihood that even native-born Mexican Americans would marry outside their group" (p. 76). Other scholars have found that cross-nativity marriages can lead to intermarriage incorporation.

Perlmann and Waters (2004) argued that, because of a native-born parent, the Mexican-origin 2.5 generation are, "further from immigrant roots, more familiar with American ways, and more likely to out-marry than a child of two Mexican immigrants" (p. 267). In their study they found that the children of mixed-nativity parents participated in intermarriage at a larger rate compared to respondents with two foreign-born parents. They looked at the Mexican-origin population born between 1966 and 1980, and found that in the case of 2.5-generation men, 35 percent had spouses with no Hispanic origins, while this figure was 18 percent for individuals with foreign-born parents. In the case of 2.5-generation Mexican-origin women, 24 percent had spouses with no Hispanic-origins, while

this figure was 8 percent for individuals with foreign-born parents (Perlmann and Waters 2004: 269). Although they looked at gender differences in intermarriage participation among respondents whose parents are of mixed-nativity, they did not explore gender dynamics among their parents.

As discussed previously, gender plays an important role in the incorporation process of the Mexican-origin population. Bean and Brown (2015) found that there are gender differences in educational attainment among the Mexican-origin second generation. They found that, "migration and family exigencies will be more likely, at least across the first two generations, to encourage males more than females to sacrifice post-secondary education for employment" (p. 124). They argue that this may be a consequence of a cultural tendency to protect and supervise daughters via school activities, which may consequently lead to greater female educational gains (Zhou and Bankston 1998; Bean and Brown 2015). They mention that among high school graduates 62.6 percent of females start college, while 57.1 percent of males start college, and also found that, "females whose parents underwent post-entry legalization transitions show higher schooling levels relative to those whose parents stayed unauthorized" (Bean and Brown 2015: 125). Intermarriage research has found that achieving higher levels of education increases intermarriage participation, because there is less opportunity for minorities to form relationships with people from the same racial/ethnic group, since there are a smaller number of racial minorities at colleges, high status occupations, and their residential neighborhoods, also more educated individuals attain a more universal view of the world and become less attached to their families and communities of origin (Lieberson & Waters 1988; Zhou and Logan, 1991; Kalmijn 1993, 1998; Qian, 1997).

Mexican-origin women may be encouraged to out marry, because of the greater demands placed on them to fulfill family obligations in traditional Mexican-origin households. There are great demands on women to take care of their families in the form of care giving and/or financial assistance (Martin, 1990). Gender roles in mainstream American society are considered to be more egalitarian (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994; Vasquez 2011; Bean and Brown 2015). Dreby (2010) mentions that families in Mexico adhere to clearly defined gender roles where men are assigned the role of economic provider and women are assigned the role of caregiver. Dreby explains that, "Women's authority in Mexican families is related to their morality as the primary family caregiver. Women's roles as caregivers are celebrated and likened to the self-sacrificing characteristics of the Virgin of Guadalupe. Latin American scholars describe this culturally specific version of maternity as marianismo. According to this ideal, a woman should be self-negating and a martyr for her children, because she is spiritually and morally superior to men" (Dreby 2010: 60). Moran (2001) described the disappointment highly educated Chicana/Latina women experience when they discover that their Latino husbands want them to be "traditional women" despite all of their accomplishments. Murguía and Cazares (1982) mentioned that, "the major advantage in intermarriage for Anglo males is that they marry women who are husband and family oriented, so oriented because of their class standing as well as their cultural and religious socialization" (p. 96).

Parent's gender has also proven to be an important factor in the incorporation process of the Mexican-origin population. The migration status of mothers affects educational and intermarriage outcomes among their children. Bean and Brown et. al (2011) found that the children of unauthorized mothers average two years less education

compared to the children of documented mothers (p. 372). The previous chapter discussed that the children of naturalized mothers are more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to the children of unauthorized/unknown parents. Arguably, Mexican-origin mothers are important in the incorporation process, because of their gender role in Mexican-origin households. Due to the great demands placed on them to fulfill family obligations, they are arguably important socializing agents for their children. In fact, previous research has demonstrated that regular caregivers, a role taken on mostly by mothers, are major socializing agents for developing children (Adams and Coltrane et al. 2007; Coltrane and Adams 2008). Previous research has also demonstrated that Mexican-origin and other Latina mothers are highly influential in the socialization process of their daughters (Gandara 1982; Gil and Vasquez 1996). Gandara (1982) while studying high achieving Chicanas found that mothers played a very important role in their families, and found that mothers were more likely than fathers to, "encourage higher education and nontraditional roles for their daughters" (p. 171). Gil and Vasquez (1996) in their clinical study found that the early mother-daughter relationship shapes and affects the daughters' relationships, "later in life with husbands, lovers, friends, children, grandchildren, even colleagues" (p. 57). It is evident that mothers have a tremendous influence on the incorporation outcomes of their children, so it can be argued that mothers that are more inclined towards the new country and incorporation, demonstrated by marriage to a native-born co-ethnic, can socialize their children, and in particular their daughters, toward incorporation.

Data and Methods

The data used for this study come from the Immigration and Intergenerational Mobility in Metropolitan Los Angeles (IIMMLA) survey, which is a cross sectional survey. These data were collected from Mexican-origin respondents and non-Hispanic white respondents in 2004 by using random sampling in the greater metropolitan area of Los Angeles, which includes the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, San Bernardino, and Riverside. For Mexican-origin respondents the IIMMLA survey was conducted via telephone interview among 1st, 1.5, 2nd and 3rd-plus generation adults between the ages of 20 to 40. For non-Hispanic white respondents the IIMMLA survey was conducted via telephone interview among third-plus generation adults.

Analyzing data pertaining to the Los Angeles metropolitan area is ideal for studying the dynamics of intermarriage and incorporation among the Mexican-origin population, because the Mexican-origin population is quite large in this region, and focusing on one region allows for the controlling of group size. The demographic situation in Los Angeles increases the chances of Mexican-origin individuals to find a marriage partner from the same racial/ethnic group or Latino pan-ethnic group. As a result, studying intermarriage and incorporation in the Los Angeles metropolitan area among the Mexican-origin population not only allows us to analyze intermarriage rates associated with group size, but we can also determine if intermarriage rates among the Mexican-origin population are being affected by factors other than group size. Consequently studying intermarriage among the Mexican-origin population in the Los Angeles metropolitan area allows us to see whether or not intermarriage occurs as a result of chance alone.

Information provided by the respondents of the IIMMLA survey pertaining to race/ethnicity, race/ethnicity of spouse, place of birth, parent's place of birth, and grandparent's place of birth allows for the creation of different Mexican-origin racial/ethnic generation groups. The following generation groups were created: the first generation are those individuals that were born in Mexico and arrived in the United States at age 13 or older, the 1.5 generation are those individuals that were born in Mexico, but arrived in the United States between the ages of 0 to 12, the 2nd generation are those individuals that were born in the United States and have one or two parents that were born in Mexico, the 3rd generation are those individuals that were born in the United States and whose parents were also born in the United States, and who have one grandparent or more that were born in Mexico. Since this study looks at how cross-nativity among parents of Mexican-origin affects intermarriage participation among their children, the analysis is limited to second-generation respondents.

Information provided by the respondents of the IIMMLA survey pertaining to their mother's and father's place of birth, and whether their parents are currently married, divorced, or legally separated to/from each other, allowed for the creation of dummy variables that reflect whether both parents are foreign-born, whether the father is native-born and the mother is foreign-born (parental cross-nativity), or whether the mother is native-born and the father is foreign-born (parental cross-nativity), and these dummy variables reflect that these parents engaged in marriage to each other.

Odds ratios measuring the likelihood of intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white majority group among the Mexican-origin second generation are used as a measure of incorporation. The entire sample size of the IIMMLA data set is 4,780, from this sample the

analysis was limited to the Mexican-origin second generation that is intermarried with non-Hispanic whites, resulting in a subsample of 219. To determine intermarriage, first married individuals were identified, and by looking at the information provided by the respondent on their own race/ethnicity and their spouse's race/ethnicity, I defined intermarried individuals as those respondents that were married to somebody that belongs to a different racial/ethnic group other than their own racial/ethnic group. Any respondents that had spouses with any Mexican-origin or Latino-origin background were not considered to be intermarried. Respondents with a Latino-origin spouse are not considered intermarried in this study, because arguably the non-Mexican Latino-origin population shares some common sociocultural experiences with the Mexican-origin population, such as the common use of the Spanish language.

Since the dependent variable of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites is binary, logistic regression is used to analyze the different odds ratio results associated with the cross-nativity status of parents (one parent is U.S. native-born of Mexican-origin and the other is foreign-born of Mexican-origin and are currently married, divorced, or separated to/from each other). Odds ratios are compared to respondents with foreign-born parents of Mexican-origin (the reference group). This measure provides a glimpse into the social distance that exists between the non-Hispanic white majority group and the children of immigrants (second-generation group), which in turn provides information on how the children of immigrants are incorporating based on their parents' participation in cross-nativity.

Control dummy variables were created to help better understand how parent's cross-nativity participation affects the likelihood of intermarriage between the children of

Mexican-origin immigrants and the non-Hispanic white population. Control dummy variables were created for age, gender, only spoke English at home while growing up, university graduate (B.A. degree), mother high school graduate, father high school graduate, and Mexican-origin second generation.

Results reported in the tables use a two-tail test of significance, but using a one-tail test of significance is also appropriate to help better understand the effect Mexican-origin parental cross-nativity has on intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites among their children. Using a one-tail test is also appropriate for this study, because the opposite outcome of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites is zero intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites, and not negative intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites. Although the independent variables in this study can demonstrate a positive likelihood towards intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites or a negative likelihood towards intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites, there is no such thing as negative intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites.

Findings

This study seeks to better understand how the nativity status of Mexican-origin parents affects intermarriage incorporation among their second-generation children. Odds ratios derived from logistic regression analysis are used to study these effects. The analysis is limited to the Mexican-origin second generation; because this group has at least one parent that is foreign-born, and therefore allows for a better analysis on the effect of parental nativity status on intermarriage participation among their children.

Table 4.1, or the summary statistics table, demonstrates that the sample size of the Mexican-origin second generation that are married is 219, of which 128, or 58 percent, are women and 91, or 42 percent, are men. The average age of respondents is 30.3 years and at least 16 percent received a Bachelor of Arts degree. On average about 29 percent of respondents have parents that engaged in cross-nativity marriage. The correlation table, or table 4.2, demonstrates both the positive and negative effects the independent variables have on intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites among the Mexican-origin second generation. It demonstrates that the following variables are positively related to the dependent variable intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites: Parental Cross-nativity (respondents with one parent that is native-born and one parent that is foreign-born), Mother Foreign-born/Father Native-born, English (grew up speaking only English in the household), Age, B.A. Degree, Mother High School Graduate, Mother Some College, Father High School Graduate, and Father Some College. The results also demonstrate that the following variables are negatively related to intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites: Father Foreign-born/Mother Native-born, Both Parents Foreign-born, and Female. As was demonstrated in the first chapter, the reason why the variable Female appears to be negatively correlated with the dependent variable intermarriage with a non-Hispanic white spouse, despite the fact that third-generation Mexican-origin women intermarry at much larger rates compared third-generation Mexican-origin men, is because among the second generation of Mexican-origin, women intermarry with non-Hispanic white spouses at a lower rate compared to men. Table 2.1 demonstrates that second-generation Mexican-origin men intermarry with non-Hispanic whites at a rate of 13.2 percent, while second-

generation Mexican-origin women intermarry with non-Hispanic whites at a rate of 8.6 percent.

As mentioned, logistic regression analysis is used in order to better analyze and understand the effect cross-nativity among Mexican-origin parents, one parent that is foreign-born and one parent that is native-born, has on intermarriage among their second-generation children. The reference group consists of respondents whose parents are both foreign-born. The first model in table 4.3 demonstrates that the children of mixed-nativity (cross-nativity) parents of Mexican-origin are more likely to intermarry compared to children whose parents are both foreign-born. Without controls, respondents whose parents are of mixed-nativity are 2.02 times more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites, compared to respondents whose parents are foreign-born. The odds ratio of 2.02 is significant at the ten percent level when a one-tail test of significance is used. The second model adds Age, Female, English (grew up speaking English in the household), B.A. Degree, Mother High School Graduate, Mother Some College, Father High School Graduate, and Father Some College as control variables. Even with controls respondents whose parents are of mixed-nativity are 26 percent more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to respondents whose parents are both foreign-born. It appears that the significance found in this variable before controls may be partly explained by the variable B.A. degree and Mother High School Graduate. Respondents with a B.A. degree are 3.78 times more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to the reference group and this variable is significant at the five percent level. Respondents whose mothers graduated from high school are 2.87

times more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites, and this result is significant at the five percent level.

The results presented in table 4.4 demonstrate the effect parental cross-nativity has on intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites among the Mexican-origin second generation by gender. Models 1 and 3 demonstrate results without control variables. Second-generation women of Mexican-origin whose parents are of mixed-nativity are more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to second-generation Mexican-origin men. Without controls women whose parents are of mixed-nativity are 3.48 times more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to respondents whose parents are foreign-born. This result is significant at the ten percent level. Without controls, men whose parents are of mixed-nativity are 15 percent more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to respondents whose parents are both foreign-born. These results demonstrate that without controls, second-generation Mexican-origin women whose parents are of mixed-nativity are three times more likely than men to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites. When the control variables Age, Female, English (grew up speaking English in the household), B.A. degree, Mother High School Graduate, Mother Some College, Father High School Graduate, and Father Some College are added to the logistic regression model pertaining to women, it appears that the variable B.A. degree explains the significance found in the result related to parental cross-nativity. Second-generation Mexican-origin women who received a B.A. degree are 13.71 times more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to the reference group. This result is highly significant at the one percent level.

Results presented in table 4.5 highlight the role that parent's gender and nativity status have on the effect of intermarriage participation with non-Hispanic whites among their second-generation Mexican-origin children. Respondents whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born, or whose fathers are foreign-born and mothers are native-born, are compared to respondents whose parents are both foreign-born (reference group). The first model demonstrates results without controls. Respondents whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born are 3.97 times more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to respondents whose parents are both foreign-born. This result is highly significant at the one percent level. Respondents whose fathers are foreign-born and mothers are native-born report an odds ratio of .683. These results indicate that the odds of participating in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites are almost 6 times greater for respondents whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born compared to respondents whose mothers are native-born and fathers are foreign-born.

When control variables are added in the second model, the odds of intermarriage participation with non-Hispanic whites among respondents whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born still remains higher compared to the odds of intermarriage participation among respondents whose mothers are native-born and fathers are foreign-born. Respondents whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born are 2.35 times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to the reference group. This result is significant at the ten percent level with a one-tail test. The results report an odds ratio of .524 for respondents whose mothers are native-born and fathers are foreign-born. These results indicate that even with controls the odds of

intermarriage participation for respondents whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born are 4.5 times higher compared to the odds of intermarriage participation for respondents whose mothers are native-born and fathers are foreign-born.

The findings demonstrate that parent's gender and nativity status, especially mother's gender and nativity status, have an effect on intermarriage participation with non-Hispanic whites among the Mexican-origin second generation. Now we look at logistic regression models by respondent's gender. Table 4.6 demonstrates once again that respondents whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born are more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to respondents whose mothers are native-born and fathers are foreign-born, and shows that there are differences between men and women. Without controls (models 1 and 3), second-generation Mexican-origin men whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born are 2.75 times more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to respondents whose parents are both foreign-born. Without controls, second-generation Mexican-origin women whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born are 5.8 times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to respondents whose parents are both foreign-born. This finding related to Mexican-origin second-generation women is significant at the five percent level, and is also double the odds experienced by Mexican-origin men. There are no cases of second-generation Mexican-origin men, whose fathers are foreign-born and mothers are native-born, that have participated in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites, and in the case of women, they are 1.93 times more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to respondents whose parents are foreign-born.

What is important to note about these findings is that foreign-born mothers are greatly affecting intermarriage participation with non-Hispanic whites among their children, and in particular among their daughters. With control variables added in models 2 and 4, the odds of daughters whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born participating in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites is still almost double that of their sons. Even though B.A. degree seems to explain the significance found in the odds of intermarriage participation among second-generation Mexican-origin women whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born, they are still 2.8 times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to second-generation Mexican-origin women whose parents are both foreign-born. The odds ratio for second-generation Mexican-origin men whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born is 1.53. Mexican-origin second-generation women with a B.A. degree are 13.26 times more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to the reference group and this variable is highly significant at the one percent level. As mentioned, attaining a B.A. degree seems to explain the significance found in the mother foreign-born/father native-born odds ratio for second-generation Mexican-origin women.

Discussion/Conclusion

The results show that even while controlling for education, Mexican-origin parental cross-nativity increases the likelihood of intermarriage incorporation among their second-generation children. Respondents who have one native-born parent and one foreign-born parent are 26 percent more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to respondents whose parents are both foreign-born. This result demonstrates

that having a native-born parent, implying greater length of time spent in the host society, and greater exposure and familiarity with institutions and mainstream language, norms, values, behaviors, and characteristics, which increases cultural capital and access to diverse social networks, can facilitate intermarriage incorporation among their children.

What is extremely fascinating about the findings is how the respondent's gender and parent's gender affects the likelihood of intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites among the second generation. Although Perlmann and Waters (2004) found that 2.5-generation men intermarry with spouses with no Hispanic origins at higher rates compared to 2.5-generation women, this IIMMLA data study finds that daughters are more likely to be intermarried with non-Hispanic whites. Even while controlling for education, the odds ratio for female respondents whose parents are of mixed-nativity (2.61) participating in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites is four times greater than that of male respondents (.630). Education greatly explains the effect parental cross-nativity has on intermarriage participation with non-Hispanic whites among women.

Also, unlike the Perlmann and Waters (2004) intermarriage study, this IIMMLA data research on Mexican-origin intermarriage finds that foreign-born mothers greatly affect intermarriage incorporation among their children, and especially among their daughters. Even while controlling for education, respondents whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born are still 2.35 times more likely to intermarry with the non-Hispanic white majority group compared to respondents whose parents are both foreign-born. Looking at the results by respondent's gender we can see that even while controlling for education Mexican-origin women whose mothers are foreign-born and fathers are native-born are still 2.8 times more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to

Mexican-origin women whose parents are both foreign-born. As mentioned their likelihood to intermarry is almost double that of the case of Mexican-origin men (odds ratio of 1.5). In these results, it is evident once again that education is playing a large role in explaining the significance of the effect foreign-born mothers have on their daughters' likelihood to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites. These results are consistent with other research that found the importance of Mexican-origin mothers in the incorporation process of their children. Bean and Brown et al. (2011) found that Mexican-origin unauthorized mothers affect the educational attainment of their children. The children of Mexican-origin unauthorized mothers averaged two years less education compared to the children of documented mothers (the highest educational losses in their study) (Bean and Brown et al. 2011: 372). The Mexican-origin children of naturalized mothers are more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites, and this research demonstrates that Mexican-origin foreign-born mothers increase the likelihood of intermarriage incorporation among their daughters. This research supports the idea that Mexican-origin mothers are important socializing agents that can affect the intermarriage incorporation of their daughters.

Arguably, Mexican-origin foreign-born mothers that married a native-born Mexican-origin spouse are more inclined towards incorporation compared to Mexican-origin native-born mothers that married a foreign-born Mexican-origin spouse. Mexican-origin native-born women that marry a foreign-born co-ethnic are possibly more tied to the old country and are more traditional, while Mexican-origin foreign-born women that marry a native-born co-ethnic are possibly more tied to the new country, less traditional, and more inclined to move towards incorporation. Since mothers are such important socializing

agents for their children, and in particular their daughters (Gandara 1982; Gil and Vasquez 1996; Adams and Coltrane et al. 2007; Coltrane and Adams 2008), it can be argued that Mexican-origin foreign-born mothers that married Mexican-origin native-born spouses are more inclined towards incorporation, and may socialize their daughters to continue with this trend toward incorporation, in the form of encouraging nontraditional roles and encouraging them to pursue educational goals (Gandara 1982; Zhou and Bankston 1998; Bean and Brown 2015). Bean and Brown (2015) argue that second-generation Mexican-origin women are attaining more education compared to Mexican-origin men, because educational activity is seen by their parents as something that keeps their daughters safe, which Zhou and Bankston (1998) found in their research about Vietnamese immigrants and their children. Bean and Brown (2015) also argue that Mexican-origin second-generation women are attaining more education, because they are not expected to forgo school to work for their family's financial security as Mexican-origin men are expected to. Women with mixed-nativity parents are more exposed to mainstream American society compared to women whose parents are foreign-born, because of their father's native-born status. This factor, along with their greater educational attainment which further exposes them to the mainstream and increases opportunity for contact with the majority group, and their possible desire to distance themselves from the great family obligations placed on women in traditional Mexican-origin households, all may be contributing factors that increase their likelihood to intermarry with the non-Hispanic white majority group.

Overall, these findings demonstrate that nativity, which implies greater length of time and exposure to American mainstream society, can facilitate intermarriage incorporation among the Mexican-origin second generation, and especially among women.

Mexican-origin children whose parents are of mixed-nativity are more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to the children of Mexican-origin foreign-born parents, with the daughters of foreign-born mothers and native-born fathers demonstrating the highest likelihood of intermarriage participation with the non-Hispanic white majority group. The intermarriage results in this study do not demonstrate evidence of ethnic disadvantage, because we see that nativity increases the likelihood of intermarriage incorporation among the second generation. Co-ethnic marriages between a Mexican-origin native-born person and a Mexican-origin foreign-born person do not seem to hinder intermarriage incorporation among their children as was feared by Macias (2006).

Table 4.1 Summary Statistics for the Married Mexican-origin Second Generation

Variables	**N=219**	**Mean**	**Std. Dev.**	**Min**	**Max**
Mother Foreign-born and Father Native-born		0.14	0.34	0	1
Father Foreign-born and Mother Native-born		0.16	0.36	0	1
Parental Cross-nativity		0.29	0.46	0	1
Intermarried		0.14	0.34	0	1
Female		0.58	0.49	0	1
English (grew up speaking only English in the household)		0.07	0.26	0	1
Age		30.28	5.18	20	40
B.A. Degree		0.16	0.37	0	1
Mother High School Graduate		0.27	0.44	0	1
Mother Some College		0.09	0.28	0	1
Father High School Graduate		0.22	0.41	0	1
Father Some College		0.08	0.27	0	1

Table 4.2 Correlation Table for the Married Mexican-origin Second Generation

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
A. Non-Hispanic White Spouse	1.00												
B. Parental Cross-nativity	0.11	1.00											
C. Mother Foreign-born and Father Native-born	0.21	0.62	1.00										
D. Father Foreign-born and Mother Native-born	-0.06	0.67	-0.17	1.00									
E. Both Foreign-born	-0.08	-0.93	-0.58	-0.62	1.00								
F. Female	-0.07	-0.03	-0.04	0.00	-0.03	1.00							
G. English*	0.08	0.24	0.30	0.03	-0.26	-0.01	1.00						
H. Age	0.18	0.22	0.18	0.10	-0.23	-0.13	0.20	1.00					
I. B.A. Degree	0.21	-0.04	0.07	-0.12	0.02	-0.13	-0.08	0.03	1.00				
J. Mother High School Graduate	0.16	0.13	0.03	0.14	-0.11	-0.11	0.03	0.04	0.09	1.00			
K. Mother Some College	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.05	-0.06	0.00	0.04	0.02	-0.01	-0.19	1.00		
L. Father High School Graduate	0.07	0.15	0.14	0.05	-0.10	-0.20	0.06	0.10	0.09	0.15	0.11	1.00	
M. Father Some College	0.12	0.08	0.13	-0.03	-0.09	-0.03	0.05	0.02	0.06	0.05	0.09	-0.15	1.00

*Respondent grew up speaking only English in the household

Table 4.3 Odds Ratios for Parental Cross-nativity and the Likelihood of Intermarriage with Non-Hispanic Whites among the Mexican-origin Second Generation

	Non-Hispanic White Spouse	
VARIABLES	Model 1	Model 2
Both Parents Foreign-born (ref.)	--	--
Parental Cross-nativity	2.02	1.26
Age		1.12**
Female		0.92
English		1.37
B.A. Degree		3.78**
Mother High School Graduate		2.87**
Mother Some College		2.34
Father High School Graduate		1.24
Father Some College		2.45
Observations	219	219

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

Table 4.4 Odds Ratios for Parental Cross-nativity and the Likelihood of Intermarriage with Non-Hispanic Whites among the Mexican-origin Second Generation by Gender

	Non-Hispanic White Spouse			
	Men		*Women*	
VARIABLES	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Both Parents Foreign-born (ref.)	--	--	--	--
Parental Cross-nativity	1.15	0.63	3.48*	2.61
Age		1.15		1.13*
English		0.89		1.40
B.A. Degree		1.62		13.71***
Mother High School Graduate		4.08*		2.24
Mother Some College		4.71		0.84
Father High School Graduate		0.62		3.04
Father Some College		3.17		2.61
Observations	91	91	128	128

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

Table 4.5 Odds Ratios for Parents' Nativity Status and Gender and the Likelihood of Intermarriage with Non-Hispanic Whites among the Mexican-origin Second Generation

	Non-Hispanic White Spouse	
VARIABLES	Model 1	Model 2
Both Parents Foreign-born (ref.)	--	--
Mother Foreign-born and Father Native-born	3.97***	2.35
Father Foreign-born and Mother Native-born	0.68	0.52
Age		1.11**
Female		0.97
English (grew up speaking only English in the household)		1.04
B.A. Degree		3.34**
Mother High School Graduate		3.20**
Mother Some College		2.43
Father High School Graduate		1.14
Father Some College		2.09
Observations	219	219

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

Table 4.6 Odds Ratios for Parents' Nativity Status and Gender and the Likelihood of Intermarriage with Non-Hispanic Whites among the Mexican-origin Second Generation by Respondent's Gender

	Non-Hispanic White Spouse			
	Men		*Women*	
VARIABLES	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Both Parents Foreign-born (ref.)	--	--	--	--
Mother Foreign-born Father Native-born	2.75	1.53	5.80**	2.82
Father Foreign-born Mother Native-born	-	-	1.93	2.39
Age		1.12		1.13*
English		0.57		1.37
B.A. Degree		1.46		13.26***
Mother High School Graduate		4.51*		2.27
Mother Some College		4.00		0.87
Father High School Graduate		0.60		2.92
Father Some College		2.79		2.55
Observations	77	77	128	128

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

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The extent of incorporation among the Mexican-origin population in American society is widely debated. Many social scientists are concerned about the incorporation prospects of Mexican-origin immigrants and their descendants due to their low levels of education, low skill sets, the unauthorized migration status experienced by many first-generation immigrants, their large population size, and also due to the fact that the Mexican-origin population comes from Latin-America and not from Europe as the last wave of immigrants did. By focusing on intermarriage, an act that demonstrates the weakening of social boundaries between racial/ethnic groups, contact and similarity between groups, and a key aspect of incorporation, across many generations, this dissertation examined what accounts for the variation in the rate of intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white majority group across generations of the Mexican-origin population? By analyzing factors that impede or facilitate intermarriage incorporation among the Mexican-origin population, we are left with a better understanding of how the Mexican-origin population is incorporating in American society. The overall findings of this study demonstrate that the Mexican-origin population is demonstrating signs of intermarriage incorporation with the non-Hispanic white majority group, but is affected by factors such as generation, parental migration status, parental cross-nativity, respondent's gender, mother's migration status, and mother's nativity status.

Data from the 2004 Immigration and Intergenerational Mobility in Metropolitan Los Angeles (IIMMLA) survey were used for this study. What is unique about the IIMMLA

data set is that it allows for the isolation of the third generation from the fourth-plus generation, which allows for a more comprehensive analysis on the effect generation has on intermarriage among the Mexican-origin population in Los Angeles. As mentioned, analyzing IIMMLA data pertaining to the Los Angeles metropolitan area was ideal for studying the dynamics of intermarriage and incorporation among the Mexican-origin population, because group size may affect intermarriage rates and the Mexican-origin population is quite large in this region. Focusing on one region allows for the controlling of group size. According to estimates from Rand California Population and Demographic Statistics in the year 2004, of the 5,219,251 individuals that were between the ages of 20 to 39 and lived in the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura, 48.5 percent of them were of Hispanic origin and 31.8 percent were non-Hispanic white. Although these figures do not indicate the exact percentage of individuals that were of Mexican-origin it is safe to assume that they made up the majority in the Hispanic category. This demographic situation increases the chances of Mexican-origin individuals to find a marriage partner from to the same racial/ethnic group or Latino pan-ethnic group. As a result, studying intermarriage and incorporation in the Los Angeles metropolitan area among the Mexican-origin population not only allowed us to analyze intermarriage rates associated with group size, but also allowed us to determine if intermarriage rates among the Mexican-origin population are being affected by factors other than group size. Consequently studying intermarriage among the Mexican-origin population in the Los Angeles metropolitan area allowed us to see whether or not intermarriage occurs as a result of chance alone. It is worth noting that the Mexican-origin population is demonstrating positive signs of intermarriage incorporation with the non-

Hispanic white majority group despite the fact that there is plenty of opportunity to marry co-ethnics, since the Mexican-origin population and Latino-origin population are large in the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

Chapter 2 looked at the overall level of intermarriage participation experienced by the Mexican-origin population. The paper focused on intermarriage patterns with the non-Hispanic white population since most intermarriage occurs with this group and intermarriage with the majority group demonstrates sociocultural incorporation (Gordon, 1964; Grebler, Moore and Guzman, 1970; Murguía, 1982; Lieberson and Waters, 1988; Kalmijn, 1998; Feliciano, 2001; Rosenfeld, 2002; Bean and Stevens, 2003; Alba and Nee, 2003; Lee and Bean, 2010). Generational and gender differences in intermarriage participation among the Mexican-origin population were looked at in order to better understand who intermarries and what could help explain intermarriage. The data in this study suggest that generation does explain the odds of intermarriage between the Mexican-origin population and the majority non-Hispanic white population. This study also found that in the case of Mexican-origin women, education attenuates, but does not eliminate the generation effect on intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites, and found that in the case of Mexican-origin men generational differences in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites are explained by education. Similar to previous studies, this analysis also found that third-generation Mexican-American women are the most likely to intermarry, but this current research finds that the intermarriage difference between third-generation Mexican-American men and women is statistically significant, so third-generation Mexican-American women are significantly more likely to intermarry with non-Hispanic whites compared to third-generation Mexican-American men. The significant gender

differences in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites among third-generation Mexican-origin men and third-generation Mexican-origin women may be due to the great demands that are placed on women to fulfill family obligations in traditional Mexican-origin households. Overall, the results suggest that in the case of intermarriage the Mexican-origin population is demonstrating a pattern of delayed incorporation and is not demonstrating a strong pattern of ethnic disadvantage. Delayed incorporation theory explains that third-generation Mexican Americans are less burdened by financial constraints, because their parents were born in the United States, and as a result their parents are possibly in more financially stable situations, have more access to retirement and pension plans, and have more access to health care services. This situation allows the third generation to more fully incorporate, because they have more opportunity to pursue higher education and spatially assimilate, which in turn may increase contact and intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white majority group.

Chapter 3 focused on how parental migration status in the Mexican-origin population affects intermarriage incorporation among their 1.5-generation and second-generation children. This study analyzed whether parental migration status is a factor that may impede intermarriage incorporation among their children, and analyzed if the effect works through education. Previous research has not addressed this inquiry. The findings suggest that Mexican-origin parental migration status affects intermarriage incorporation among their children by increasing the likelihood of intermarriage incorporation if parents are naturalized and decreasing the likelihood of intermarriage incorporation if at least one parent is unauthorized/unknown. The major finding in this study is that the children of naturalized mothers are more likely to participate in

intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white majority group compared to children with at least one parent that is unauthorized/unknown. The higher likelihood of intermarriage participation among the children of naturalized mothers compared to the children of unauthorized/unknown parent(s) is consistent with the finding in the Bean and Brown et al. (2011) study which demonstrated that the children of unauthorized mothers average two years less education compared to the children of authorized mothers. The highest educational losses found in their study. Previous research on intermarriage has demonstrated that attaining more education increases the chances of exogamy (Lieberson & Waters 1988; Kalmijn 1993, 1998; Qian, 1997). The findings in this study demonstrate that the children of naturalized mothers are in a position to make the most gains in terms of intermarriage incorporation, because they also make the most gains in terms of education. Even though overall the Mexican-origin population demonstrates positive signs of intermarriage incorporation, the results of this study indicate that parental migration status matters and affects intermarriage incorporation among their children, which provides support for the delayed incorporation perspective. Parental unauthorized/unknown migration status places their descendants at risk of experiencing a delayed incorporation process.

Chapter 4 looked at the affect parental cross-nativity, marriages between one Mexican-origin native-born parent and one Mexican-origin foreign-born parent, has on intermarriage incorporation among their second-generation children, in order to see if parental cross-nativity is a factor that facilitates intermarriage incorporation. The results of this study demonstrate that the Mexican-origin children of mixed-nativity parents are more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to the

children of Mexican-origin foreign-born parents. The daughters of foreign-born mothers and native-born fathers demonstrate the highest likelihood of intermarriage participation with the non-Hispanic white majority group. The findings demonstrate that nativity, which implies greater length of time and exposure to American mainstream society, can facilitate intermarriage incorporation among the Mexican-origin second generation, and especially among women. This study argues that Mexican-origin foreign-born mothers married to Mexican-origin native-born fathers are arguably more inclined towards incorporation, and because mothers are important socializing agents, they may socialize their daughters towards incorporation via educational aspirations (a known factor that increases intermarriage participation), which along with the benefits of exposure to mainstream American society gained from their native-born status and the native-born status of their fathers, and daughters' desires to distance themselves from the great family obligations placed on women in traditional Mexican-origin households, may all be contributing factors that lead to increases in intermarriage participation with the non-Hispanic white majority group among daughters.

The most important policy implication that comes from this dissertation is that parental migration status matters for the incorporation prospects of the Mexican-origin population. Not only is parental migration status affecting socioeconomic attainment and incorporation via educational outcomes among the second generation, but parental migration status is also affecting sociocultural incorporation by affecting intermarriage incorporation. Mexican-origin individuals (1.5 generation and second generation) with parents that are naturalized are more likely to participate in intermarriage with non-Hispanic whites compared to respondents with one or both parents that are

unauthorized/unknown. Respondents with naturalized mothers are the most likely to participate in intermarriage with the non-Hispanic white majority group compared to respondents with one or both parents that are unauthorized/unknown. Since unauthorized/unknown parental migration status negatively affects education and intermarriage incorporation outcomes among the offspring of Mexican-origin immigrants, immigration policies must change in the United States in order to provide the unauthorized/unknown Mexican-origin immigrant population a path towards naturalization. Not granting Mexican-origin unauthorized/unknown immigrants a path towards naturalization places their descendants at risk of delaying their incorporation process in the United States. Allowing access to naturalization for the Mexican-origin unauthorized/unknown population would prevent delays in the incorporation trajectories of their descendants. Although this study only focused on the Mexican-origin immigrant population, it is within the best interest of the United States to provide a path to naturalization for all unauthorized immigrants.

REFERENCES

Abrego, Leisy J. 2006. "I Can't Go to College Because I don't Have Papers': Incorporation Patterns of Latino Undocumented Youth." *Latino Studies* 4(3): 212-231

Abrego, Leisy J. and Roberto G. Gonzales. 2010. "Blocked Paths, Uncertain Futures: The Postsecondary Education and Labor Market Prospects of Undocumented Latino Youth." *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk* 15: 144-157.

Abrego, Leisy J. and Shannon Gleeson. 2014. "Workers, Families, and Immigration Policies." Pp. 209-228 in *Undecided Nation: Political Gridlock and the Immigration Crisis,* edited by T. Payan and E. de la Garza. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Adams, Michele, Scott Coltrane, and Ross D. Parke. 2007. "Cross-ethnic Applicability of the Gender-Based Attitudes Towards Marriage and Child Rearing Scales." *Sex Roles* 56(5-6): 325-339.

Agius Vallejo, Jody. 2009. "Brown Picket Fences: The Immigrant Narrative and 'Giving Back' Among the Mexican-Origin Middle Class." *Ethnicities* 9(5): 5-31.

Alba, Richard D. and Reid M. Golden. 1986. "Patterns of Ethnic Marriage in the United States." *Social Forces* 65: 202-223.

Alba, Richard D. 1995. "Assimilation's Quiet Tide." *The Public Interest* Spring 1995: 3-18.

Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Alba, Richard and Tariqul Islam. 2009. "The Case of the Disappearing Mexican Americans: An Ethnic-Identity Mystery." *Population Research and Policy Review* 28: 109-121.

Anderson, Robert N. and Rogelio Saenz. 1994. "Structural Determinants of Mexican American Intermarriage, 1975-1980." *Social Science Quarterly* 75(2): 414-430.

Bailey, Martha J. and Susan M. Dynarski. 2011. "Inequality in Postsecondary Education." Pp. 117-131 in G. J. Duncan and R.J. Murnane (eds.), *Whither Opportunity? Rising Inequality, Schools, and Children's Life Chances*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bean, Frank D. and Marta Tienda. 1987. *The Hispanic Population of the United States.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bean, Frank D. and Gillian Stevens. 2003. *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bean, Frank D. and Susan Brown. 2006. "New Immigrants New Models of Assimilation." The New Second Generation, Migration Information Source. Migration Policy Institute. Washington, D.C.

Bean, Frank D. and Susan Brown et al. 2006. "How Pathways to Legal Status and Citizenship Relate to Economic Attainment Among the Children of Mexican Immigrants." Immigration and Intergenerational Mobility in Metropolitan Los Angeles (IIMMLA) Study.

Bean, Frank D. and Mark A. Leach and Susan Brown et al. 2011. "The Educational Legacy of Unauthorized Migration: Comparisons across U.S. Immigrant Groups in How Parents' Status Affects Their Offspring." *International Migration Review* 45(2): 348-385.

Bean, Frank D. and Susan Brown. 2015. *Parents Without Papers: The Progress and Pitfalls of Mexican American Integration.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Brown, Susan. 2007. "Delayed Spatial Assimilation: Multigenerational Incorporation of the Mexican-Origin Population in Los Angeles." *City & Community* 6(3): 193-209.

Buchmann, Claudia and Thomas A. DiPrete. 2006. "The Growing Female Advantage in College Completion: The Role of Family Background and Academic Achievement." *American Sociological Review* 71(4): 515-541.

Chavez, Leo R. 1998. *Shadowed Lives Undocumented Immigrants in American Society.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Coltrane, Scott and Michele Adams. 2008. *Gender and Families,* second edition. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Davis, Kingsley. 1941. "Intermarriage in Cast Societies." *American Anthropologist* 43(3): 376-395.

DiPrete, Thomas A. and Claudia Buchmann. 2006. "Gender-specific Trends in the Value of Education and the Emerging Gender Gap in College Completion." *Demography* 43(1): 1-24.

DiPrete, Thomas A. and Claudia Buchmann. 2013. *The Rise of Women: The Growing Gender Gap in Education and What it Means for American Schools.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

DiPrete, Thomas A. and Claudia Buchmann. 2014. "Gender Disparities in Educational Attainment in the New Century: Trends, Causes, and Consequences." Pp. 375-414 in J. R. Logan (ed.), *Diversity and Disparities: America Enters a New Century*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Dreby, Joanna. 2010. *Divided by Borders: Mexican Migrants and their Children.* Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Duncan, Brian V. and Stephen J. Trejo. 2011. "Intermarriage and the Intergenerational Transmission of Ethnic Identity and Human Capital for Mexican Americans." *Journal of Labor Economics* 29(2): 195-227.

Feliciano, Cynthia. 2001. "Assimilation or enduring racial boundaries? Generational differences in intermarriage among Asians and Latinos in the United States." *Race & Society* 4: 27-45.
Gandara, Patricia. 1982. "Passing Through the Eye of the Needle: High-Achieving Chicanas." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 4(2): 167-179.

Gans, Herbert J. 1979. "Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2(1): 1-20.

Gil, Rosa Maria and Carmen Inoa Vazquez. 1996. *The Maria Paradox; How Latinas Can Merge Old World Traditions with New World Self-Esteem.* New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Gonzales, Roberto G. 2011. "Learning to Be Illegal: Undocumented Youth and Shifting Legal Contexts in the Transition to Adulthood." *American Sociological Review* 76(4): 602-619.

Gonzales, Roberto G. and Leo R. Chavez. 2012. "Awakening to a Nightmare: Abjectivity and Illegality in the Lives of Undocumented 1.5 Generation Latino Immigrants in the United States." *Current Anthropology* 53(3): 255-281.

Gordon, Milton M. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore and Ralph C. Guzmán. 1970. *The Mexican-American People, the Nation's Second Largest Minority*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 1994. *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration.* Berkeley: University of California.

Huntington, Samuel P. 2004. "The Hispanic Challenge." *Foreign Policy*, March 04. Retrieved December 12, 2012
(http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2004/03/01/the_hispanic_challenge)

Jiménez, Tomás R. 2010. *Replenished Ethnicity: Mexican Americans, Immigration, and Identity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Kalmijn, Matthijs. 1993. "Trends in Black/White Intermarriage." *Social Forces* 72(1): 119-146.

Kalmijn, Matthijs. 1998. "Intermarriage and Homogamy: Causes, Patterns, Trends." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 395-421.

Kalmijn, Matthijs and Frank Van Tubergen. 2010. "A Comparative Perspective on Intermarriage: Explaining Differences among National-origin Groups in the United States." *Demography* 47(2): 459-479.

Kennedy, Ruby Jo Reeves. 1944. "Single or Triple Melting-Pot? Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1940." *The American Journal of Sociology* 49(4): 331-339.

Krogstad, Jens M. and Jeffrey S. Passel. 2015. "5 Facts about Illegal Immigration in the U.S." Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center.

Lee, Jennifer and Frank D. Bean. 2010. *The Diversity Paradox: Immigration and the Color Line in 21st Century America*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lieberson, Stanley and Mary C. Waters. 1988. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Macias, Thomas. 2006. *Mestizo in America: Generations of Mexican Ethnicity in the Suburban Southwest*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Martin, Joann. 1990. "Motherhood and Power: The Production of a Women's Culture of Politics in a Mexican Community." *American Ethnologist* 17(3): 470-490.

Menjívar, Cecilia. 2000. *Fragmented Ties: Salvadoran Immigrant Networks in America.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press

Menjívar, Cecilia and Leisy J. Abrego. 2009. "Parents and Children Across Borders: Legal Instability and Intergenerational Relations in Guatemalan and Salvadoran Families." Pp. 160-189 in N. Foner (ed.), *Across Generations: Immigrant Families in America.* New York: New York University Press.

Mittelbach, Frank G., and Joan W. Moore. 1968. "Ethnic Endogamy-the Case of Mexican Americans." *The American Journal of Sociology* 74(1): 50-62.

Moran, Rachel F. 2001. *Interracial Intimacy: The Regulation of Race & Romance*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Murguía, Edward. 1982. *Chicano Intermarriage: A Theoretical and Empirical Study.* San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press.

Murguía, Edward and Ralph B. Cazares. 1982. "Intermarriage of Mexican Americans." *Marriage & Family Review* 5(1): 91-100.

Park, Robert E. and Ernest W. Burgess. 1921. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Passel, Jeffrey S., Cohn, D'Vera, and Ana Gonzalez-Barrera. 2012. "Net Migration from Mexico Falls to Zero—and Perhaps Less." Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center

Patterson, Orlando. 1997. *The Ordeal of Integration: Progress and Resentment in America's "Racial" Crises*. Washington, D.C.: Counterpoint.

Perlmann, Joel and Roger Waldinger. 1997. "Second Generation Decline? Immigrant Children, Past and Present: A Redonsideration." *International Migration Review* 31(4): 893-922.

Perlmann, Joel and Mary C. Waters. 2004. "Intermarriage Then and Now: Race, Generation, and the Changing Meaning of Marriage." Pp. 262-277 in *Not Just Black and White*, edited by N. Foner and G. M. Fredrickson. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Qian, Zhenchao. 1997. "Breaking the Racial Barriers: Variations in Interracial Marriage Between 1980 and 1990." *Demography* 34(2): 263-276.

Qian, Zhenchao and Daniel T. Lichter. 2001. "Measuring Marital Assimilation: Intermarriage among Natives and Immigrants." *Social Science Research* 30: 289-312.

Qian, Zhenchao and Daniel T. Lichter. 2007. "Social Boundaries and Marital Assimilation: Interpreting Trends in Racial and Ethnic Intermarriage." *American Sociological Review* 72: 68-94.

Rosenfeld, Michael J. 2002. "Measures of Assimilation in the Marriage Market: Mexican Americans 1970-1990." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64(1): 152-162.

Rosenfeld, Michael J. 2005. "A Critique of Exchange Theory in Mate Selection." *American Journal of Sociology* 110: 1284–1325.

Rumbaut, Rubén. 1997. "Assimilation and its Discontents: Between Rhetoric and Reality." *International Migration Review* 31(4): 923-960.

Sandefur, Gary D. and Trudy McKinnell. 1986. "American Indian Intermarriage." *Social Science Research* 15:347–71.

Schoen, Robert and Lawrence E. Cohen. 1980. "Ethnic Endogamy Among Mexican American Grooms: A Reanalysis of Generational and Occupational Effects." *The American Journal of Sociology* 86(2): 359-366.

Suarez-Orozco, Carola, Hirokazu Yoshikawa, Robert T. Teranishi, and Marcelo M. Suarez-Orozco. 2011. "Growing up in the Shadows: The Developmental Implications of Unauthorized Status." *Harvard Educational Review* 81(3): 438-473.
Telles, Edward, and Vilma Ortiz. 2008. *Generations of Exclusion*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Terrazas, Aaron. 2010. "Mexican Immigrants in the United States." US in Focus, Migration Information Source. Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute.

Terriquez, Veronica. 2014. "Trapped in the Working Class? Prospects for the Intergenerational (Im)Mobility of Latino Youth." *Sociological Inquiry* 84(3): 382-411.

Vasquez, Jessica M. 2011. *Mexican Americans Across Generations: Immigrant Families, Racial Realities.* New York, NY: New York University Press.

Waldinger, Roger, Nelson Lim, and David Cort. 2007. "Bad Jobs, Good Jobs, No Jobs? The Employment Experience of the Mexican American Second Generation." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33(1): 1-35.

Wojtkiewica, Roger A. and Katharine M. Donato. 1995. "Hispanic Educational Attainment: The Effects of Family Background and Nativity." *Social Forces* 74(2): 559-574.

Yoshikawa, Hirokazu. 2011. *Immigrants Raising Citizens: Undocumented Parents and Their Young Children.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Zhou, Min and John R. Logan. 1991. "In and Out of Chinatown: Residential Mobility and Segregation of New York City's Chinese." *Social Forces* 70(2): 387-407.

Zhou, Min and Alejandro Portes. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530: 74-96.

Zhou, Min and Carl L. Bankston III. 1998. *Growing Up American. How Vietnamese Children Adapt to Life in the United States.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.