

**Intergenerational Progress of Mexican-Origin Workers
in the U.S. Labor Market**

Stephen J. Trejo

Department of Economics
University of Texas
Austin, TX 78712-1173
(512) 475-8512
trejo@eco.utexas.edu

March 2000

Intergenerational Progress of Mexican-Origin Workers in the U.S. Labor Market

Stephen J. Trejo

Abstract

Using unique Current Population Survey data from November 1979 and 1989, this paper compares the wage structure across generations of Mexican-origin men. I find that the sizable earnings advantage U.S.-born Mexican Americans enjoy over Mexican immigrants arises not just from intergenerational improvements in years of schooling and English proficiency, but also from increased returns to human capital for Mexican-origin workers who were born and educated in the United States. Even if we consider immigrants who have worked in the United States for 40 years and who therefore have had ample time for labor market assimilation, my estimates indicate that a discrete jump in earnings and the wage structure occurs between the first and second generations. Progress seems to stall after the second generation, however, as the much more modest gains in schooling and English fluency that occur between the second and third generations do not appear to raise the earnings of Mexican Americans any further.

I. Introduction

Because of the large volume of U.S. immigration from Mexico over the past several decades, most Mexican-origin workers in the United States come from families that have been in this country for no more than two generations. In the national samples of men analyzed below, for example, roughly two-thirds of Mexican ethnics are either immigrants or the sons of immigrants. By way of comparison, only about 10 percent of non-Hispanic whites fit the same description.

Some analysts believe that this high concentration of relatively recent arrivals is the primary reason for the low average earnings of Mexican-origin workers. From the perspective of Chavez (1991), the descendants of Mexican immigrants are enjoying the same kind of intergenerational progress that allowed previous groups of unskilled immigrants, such as the Italians and Irish, to eventually enter the economic mainstream of American society. In contrast, Chapa (1990) sees little evidence that Mexican Americans are making steady progress toward economic parity with Anglos, and he worries about the emergence of a Chicano underclass with many of the same problems faced by inner-city blacks.

In a recent paper (Trejo 1997), I find some empirical support for each side of this debate. On the one hand, as stressed by Chavez (1991), dramatic intergenerational improvements in human capital and earnings occur between Mexican immigrants and their U.S.-born children. Moreover, given their skills, Mexican-American workers enjoy labor market opportunities similar to those of non-Hispanic whites. On the other hand, intergenerational progress stalls after the second generation, leaving third- and higher-generation Mexicans trailing the education and earnings of the average American to an

extent that justifiably concerns Chapa (1990).

To gain a better understanding of some of these issues, the current paper analyzes the labor market progress of Mexican-origin men across generations, using data from the Current Population Survey that is uniquely well-suited for this task. How do the wages and human capital of Mexican workers in the United States compare across generations? What roles do intergenerational changes in human capital and the wage structure play in determining intergenerational differences in earnings? How much of the substantial wage growth for Mexicans that takes place between the first and second generations actually occurs *within* the first generation as Mexican immigrants assimilate in the U.S. labor market? How do the intergenerational patterns for Mexicans compare with those for non-Hispanic whites? These are some of the questions I hope to shed light on.

The next section describes the data I will analyze and some of the basic patterns evident in these data. Section III spells out how I intend to use these data to estimate immigrant earnings assimilation and intergenerational changes in the wage structure, and section IV presents the estimation results. A concluding section summarizes the findings and discusses two issues that complicate interpretation of the results.

II. Data and Basic Patterns

I analyze microdata from the November 1979 and November 1989 Current Population Survey (CPS). In addition to the demographic and labor force information routinely collected in the CPS, these months included supplemental questions about country of birth for the respondent and his parents, and about the respondent's ability to speak English. As a result, these surveys provide the best recent data for studying the

intergenerational progress of Mexican-origin workers in the U.S. labor market.¹

I restrict the analysis to male wage and salary workers aged 18-61. Women are excluded to minimize biases arising from selective labor force participation, and the self-employed cannot be studied because the basic monthly CPS collects no data on their income. Using the information on race and Spanish origin, I identify the two racial/ethnic groups that are included in my study: Mexicans and non-Hispanic whites. Other race and Spanish origin groups are excluded because CPS sample sizes are too small to permit the kind of intergenerational analysis reported below.

From the information on the nativity of each person and his parents, I define three generation categories. The first generation consists of immigrants: foreign-born individuals whose parents were also born outside of the United States. The second generation denotes U.S.-born individuals who have at least one foreign-born parent. The third generation identifies U.S. natives whose parents are also natives.² I exclude from analysis foreign-born individuals who have at least one U.S.-born parent, as well as those who do not report year of arrival in the United States. Also excluded are individuals for whom generation cannot be determined because birthplace data are missing for themselves or either parent. Finally, in order to avoid complications that arise with immigrants who arrived as children, I exclude all foreign-born individuals whose age and

¹ The 1980 and 1990 Censuses dropped the questions about parents' birthplace that were included in earlier Censuses. Starting in January 1994, the CPS now elicits the nativity of each individual and his parents, but information on English language proficiency is not routinely collected.

² Therefore, strictly speaking, the group I will refer to as the third generation actually includes the third and all higher-order generations. For Mexican Americans, this group consists primarily of individuals who are indeed third generation, whereas among non-Hispanic whites most people I refer to as third generation actually belong to higher generations (Borjas 1994, Tables 1 and 2).

arrival cohort imply any possibility that they entered the United States prior to age 16.³

Each month, the CPS collects earnings data only for the quarter of the respondents who are in outgoing rotation groups. For the remainder of the sample, I merged earnings information from the CPS outgoing rotation group files with the November CPS data. In this way, I obtained earnings data for about 90 percent of the workers for whom such data are unavailable in the November surveys.⁴

The data on usual weekly earnings are topcoded at \$999 in the 1979 CPS and \$1,923 in the 1989 CPS. According to the GNP deflator for personal consumption expenditure, the price level rose by 63 percent between November 1979 and November 1989. Therefore, in order to impose the same topcode (in real dollars) across years, I lower the weekly earnings ceiling in the 1989 data to \$1,625 (\$999 inflated from 1979 to 1989 dollars). Hourly earnings are then computed as the ratio of usual weekly earnings to usual weekly hours of work. For 1979, workers with computed hourly wages below \$1 or above \$100 are considered outliers and excluded. For 1989, corresponding wage thresholds of \$1.63 and \$163 are applied so as to be consistent in real terms.⁵

Table 1 reports summary statistics, by ethnicity and generation, for the key

³ Immigrants who arrive as children, and who therefore acquire much of their education and all of their work experience in the United States and who are more likely to speak English fluently, enjoy greater economic success than immigrants who come as adults (Kossoudji 1989; Friedberg 1991; Smith 1991; Allensworth 1997). Given the age and other restrictions typically used to construct analysis samples, the average age at arrival within the extracted subsample of a cohort falls with duration of residence in the United States, because as an immigrant arrival cohort ages, its youngest members enter the sample and its oldest members leave the sample. These factors combine to produce a spurious correlation between immigrant outcomes and duration of U.S. residence.

⁴ The merged earnings data come from the three months immediately following the November surveys. The match keys used to merge these data are rotation group, household identification number, person identification number (or line number), household number (which indicates whether the household occupying a residential unit has changed), sex, race, and age. Because a birthday can take place between survey months, age is allowed to increase by up to one year without invalidating a match. The CPS samples housing units rather than individuals or families, so nonmatches typically occur when people change residences between survey dates.

⁵ Few observations are affected by earnings topcoding or the deletion of wage outliers, so it matters little for the results whether I include or exclude these workers.

variables in my analysis. Sample means from the 1979 data occupy the top panel of the table and the 1989 means are presented in the bottom panel, with standard errors of the means shown in parentheses. The CPS sampling weights were used in these calculations.

To facilitate comparisons across years, the 1979 wage data reported in Table 1 were transformed into 1989 dollars using the GNP deflator. Education represents completed years of schooling. In calculating potential labor market experience, years before age 14 are not counted.⁶ The November CPS questions on English proficiency are the same as those in the 1980 and 1990 Censuses. All respondents were asked whether they “speak a language other than English at home,” and only those who answered affirmatively were asked how well they speak English, with possible responses of “very well,” “well,” “not well,” or “not at all.” For the tabulations reported in Table 1, English monolinguals are presumed to speak English “very well” and are grouped together with bilinguals who indicated the highest level of English proficiency. Finally, for immigrants, I construct a variable measuring years of U.S. residence by assigning midpoints of the arrival year intervals reported in the CPS.⁷

Overall, Mexican-origin men earn much lower wages on average than white men, and this wage deficit grew from 24 percent in 1979 to over 32 percent in 1989.⁸ Although some of the gap is explained by the large proportion of very low-paid immigrants among Mexicans, even U.S.-born Mexican Americans are at a substantial

⁶ In other words, experience is defined as $\text{age} - \max[\text{education} + 6, 14]$.

⁷ For immigrants arriving in the open-ended intervals (“before 1950” in the 1979 CPS and “before 1960” in the 1989 CPS), I set years of U.S. residence equal to 35.

⁸ For expositional convenience, throughout the paper I will treat log wage differences as representing percentage wage differentials, although I recognize that this approximation becomes increasingly inaccurate for log differences on the order of .25 or more in absolute value. In such instances, one can calculate the implied percentage wage differential as $e^x - 1$, where x represents the difference in mean log wages between the relevant groups.

wage disadvantage. In 1989, for example, second-generation Mexicans earned 34 percent less than second-generation whites, and the corresponding wage gap among third-generation men was 24 percent. Previous research consistently shows that most of the wage deficit suffered by Mexican-origin workers can be attributed to low levels of human capital (Gwartney and Long 1978; Reimers 1983; Carlson and Swartz 1988; Carnoy, Daley, and Hinojosa-Ojeda 1993; Trejo 1997), a finding that is not surprising in light of the skill measures presented in Table 1. Mexicans possess much less schooling than whites, are younger, and are more likely to report English language deficiencies. The human capital deficit is most severe for Mexican immigrants, but it remains large even among U.S.-born workers.

Intergenerational comparisons yield different patterns for Mexicans and whites. For whites, earnings do not rise systematically across generations; in fact, average wages are actually lowest for the third generation, but this mainly reflects the relative youth of these workers (Trejo 1996). Conversely, Mexican-origin workers display substantial wage growth of about 30 percent between the first and second generations, a phenomenon that is undoubtedly related to the dramatic intergenerational improvements in educational attainment and English proficiency that take place. Progress appears to stall at this point, with the much more modest gains in schooling and English fluency that occur between the second and third generations unable to raise the average earnings of Mexican Americans any further (although, as with whites, the relative youth of third-generation workers confounds comparisons across generations). Finally, note that linguistic assimilation is completed sooner for whites than for Mexicans. By the second generation, virtually all whites are fluent in English, whereas a surprisingly large fraction (16 percent

in 1979 and 9 percent in 1989) of third-generation Mexicans speak English less than “very well.”

III. Econometric Framework

In order to shed light on the questions about the intergenerational labor market progress of Mexican-origin men posed at the beginning of the paper, I undertake a systematic analysis of the November 1979 and 1989 CPS data described in the preceding section. Within the framework developed by Borjas (1985, 1995) for estimating the effects of arrival cohort and duration of U.S. residence on the earnings of immigrants, I compare wage structures across first-, second-, and third-generation Mexican and white men. This framework exploits the availability of comparable cross-section data from two different points in time.

To understand the essence of the empirical approach, think about estimating separate cross-section wage regressions for every ethnicity/generation group in each survey year. In other words, a wage regression is estimated for Mexican immigrants in the 1979 CPS data, another regression is estimated for Mexican immigrants in the 1989 CPS data, still another regression is estimated for second-generation Mexicans in the 1979 CPS data, and so on, with the twelfth and final regression in this sequence being for third-generation whites in the 1989 CPS data. For U.S.-born workers, these regressions can identify all wage equation parameters of interest, but not so for immigrants. Without strong restrictions, cross-section regressions cannot distinguish immigrant cohort and assimilation effects, because at any given point in time variation across immigrants in years of U.S. residence arises only from differences in year of entry to the United States.

With repeated cross-sections, however, outcomes for immigrant arrival cohorts

can be tracked over time, and the trick then becomes to isolate changes due to assimilation from changes caused by different economic conditions in the survey years being compared (i.e., period effects). The most popular solution to this problem, and the one adopted here, is to estimate period effects from the outcome changes experienced by an appropriate group of native workers. After netting out these estimates of the period effects, remaining changes for immigrant cohorts are attributed to assimilation.⁹

To be explicit, let y_i^{eg} represent the hourly earnings of worker i in ethnic group e and generation g , where e takes on the values m for Mexican and w for white, and g takes on the values 1, 2, and 3 for first, second, and third generations, respectively. Pooling data from the 1979 and 1989 CPS, the log wage equation for Mexican immigrants is

$$(1) \quad \log(y_i^{m1}) = C_i \lambda^{m1} + A_i \delta^{m1} + \pi^m T_i + (1 - T_i) X_i \beta_{79}^{m1} + T_i X_i \beta_{89}^{m1} \\ + (1 - T_i) L_i \theta_{79}^m + T_i L_i \theta_{89}^m + (1 - T_i) Z_i \gamma_{79} + T_i Z_i \gamma_{89} + \varepsilon_i^{m1}.$$

The vector C is a set of dummy variables identifying immigrant arrival cohort, the vector A contains years in the United States and its square, and T is a dummy variable indicating observations from the 1989 survey. The vector X contains potential labor market experience, its square, and, in the extended specification, completed years of schooling. The vector L is a set of dummies indicating self-reported English language proficiency, and the vector Z contains indicators for the month in which the earnings data were collected, metropolitan status, the nine Census divisions, and the states of California and

⁹ A key assumption of this approach is that compositional changes in the subsample of an immigrant cohort observed in the U.S. labor market—such as those caused by emigration, mortality, and labor force entry and exit—do not bias measured outcome changes.

Texas.¹⁰ Finally, ε is a random error term, and the remaining parameters are the objects of estimation.

The analogous equations for second- and third-generation Mexicans are

$$(2) \quad \log(y_i^{m2}) = \alpha^{m2} + \pi^m T_i + (1 - T_i) X_i \beta_{79}^{m2} + T_i X_i \beta_{89}^{m2} \\ + (1 - T_i) L_i \theta_{79}^m + T_i L_i \theta_{89}^m + (1 - T_i) Z_i \gamma_{79} + T_i Z_i \gamma_{89} + \varepsilon_i^{m2},$$

$$(3) \quad \log(y_i^{m3}) = \alpha^{m3} + \pi^m T_i + (1 - T_i) X_i \beta_{79}^{m3} + T_i X_i \beta_{89}^{m3} \\ + (1 - T_i) L_i \theta_{79}^m + T_i L_i \theta_{89}^m + (1 - T_i) Z_i \gamma_{79} + T_i Z_i \gamma_{89} + \varepsilon_i^{m3}.$$

In equations (2) and (3), the α parameters represent generation-specific intercepts, and the arrival cohort and years in the United States variables are excluded because they are not relevant for U.S.-born workers.

To see the identification problem in equation (1), it is easiest to think of C , A , and T as being scalar variables denoting, respectively, year of entry into the United States, years since entry, and survey year. In this case, $C + A = T$, which implies that we cannot estimate the separate effects of these variables without imposing some restriction. An analysis of immigrant earnings must confront the classic problem of identifying cohort, age, and period effects. The identifying restriction imposed in equations (1)-(3) is that the period effect π^m is the same for all three generations of Mexican-origin workers. In essence, the period effect is estimated from U.S.-born workers, and this information is

¹⁰ The earnings data were collected in either November, December, January, or February. The categories for metropolitan status are as follows: central city, elsewhere in a metropolitan statistical area (MSA), not in an MSA, and metropolitan status not identified. I include separate indicators for California and Texas because the Mexican-origin population is heavily concentrated in these two states. In my sample, over two-thirds of U.S.-born Mexicans and an even larger share of Mexican immigrants reside in either California or Texas.

used to identify the cohort and assimilation effects for immigrants.¹¹

Equations (1)-(3) impose additional restrictions as well, but before discussing them, let me write down the wage equations for whites, which are completely symmetric to those for Mexicans:

$$(4) \quad \log(y_i^{w1}) = C_i \lambda^{w1} + A_i \delta^{w1} + \pi^w T_i + (1 - T_i) X_i \beta_{79}^{w1} + T_i X_i \beta_{89}^{w1} \\ + (1 - T_i) L_i \theta_{79}^w + T_i L_i \theta_{89}^w + (1 - T_i) Z_i \gamma_{79} + T_i Z_i \gamma_{89} + \varepsilon_i^{w1},$$

$$(5) \quad \log(y_i^{w2}) = \alpha^{w2} + \pi^w T_i + (1 - T_i) X_i \beta_{79}^{w2} + T_i X_i \beta_{89}^{w2} \\ + (1 - T_i) L_i \theta_{79}^w + T_i L_i \theta_{89}^w + (1 - T_i) Z_i \gamma_{79} + T_i Z_i \gamma_{89} + \varepsilon_i^{w2},$$

$$(6) \quad \log(y_i^{w3}) = \alpha^{w3} + \pi^w T_i + (1 - T_i) X_i \beta_{79}^{w3} + T_i X_i \beta_{89}^{w3} \\ + (1 - T_i) L_i \theta_{79}^w + T_i L_i \theta_{89}^w + (1 - T_i) Z_i \gamma_{79} + T_i Z_i \gamma_{89} + \varepsilon_i^{w3}.$$

Recall the idea introduced earlier of estimating separate wage regressions for every ethnicity/generation group in each survey year. Such an approach is quite general in that it permits all parameters of the wage equation to vary across ethnicity, generation, and survey year; unfortunately, as discussed above, this approach does not provide identification of immigrant cohort and assimilation effects. To identify these effects, equations (1)-(6) assume that the cohort and assimilation parameters do not change over time, and also that the intercepts of the wage equations for first-, second-, and third-generation workers shift across survey years by the same amount.

Note, however, that immigrant cohort and assimilation effects and the period effect common to all generations are allowed to vary by ethnicity. Estimating these

¹¹ It is possible to allow a separate period effect for one of the two U.S.-born generations and still achieve identification. For example, we could restrict the period effect to be the same for first- and second-generation workers but permit it to differ for the third generation. I experimented with generalizations of this kind but could not reject the hypothesis of equal period effects for second- and third-generation workers.

parameters separately for Mexicans and whites is important for at least two reasons. First, these immigrant groups differ tremendously in the kinds of skills they bring to the U.S. labor market (see Table 1), so it is not surprising that previous studies have found distinct cohort and assimilation patterns in the earnings of the two groups (Borjas 1995; Schoeni 1997). Second, the assumption of identical period effects for immigrant and native workers is more tenable within ethnic groups. Over the last two decades, overall earnings inequality and the labor market returns to education and other skill measures have increased in the United States (Murphy and Welch 1992; Juhn, Murphy, and Pierce 1993). If predominantly unskilled Mexican immigrants are compared to more skilled white workers, these changes in the wage structure depress the relative earnings growth of immigrants, possibly resulting in downward-biased estimates of assimilation and distorted estimates of cohort wage differences for Mexican immigrants.¹² In terms of educational attainment and labor market skills, Mexican immigrants are more similar to U.S.-born Mexicans than to whites of any generation (see Table 1), and therefore changes in the wage structure pose less of a problem when comparisons are made within rather than across ethnic groups.

Besides the immigrant cohort and assimilation effects and the generation-specific intercepts, all of the other parameters in equations (1)-(6) are allowed to differ between survey years, with the subscripts 79 and 89 indicating the year of a particular parameter vector. The additional restrictions imposed on the wage equations conserve degrees of freedom. I let the effects of English proficiency vary across ethnic groups and survey

¹² LaLonde and Topel (1992) provide a detailed discussion of this point. See also Reimers (1997) for a general discussion of conceptual issues that arise in estimating immigrant cohort and assimilation effects.

years, but not across generations, because the sample includes a fairly small number of U.S.-born workers who are not fluent in English. The coefficients of the survey month and geographic dummies differ over time but are constrained to be the same for all ethnicity/generation groups, in part because these variables are meant to capture temporal and regional variation in the cost-of-living and labor market conditions that may impact all groups to a similar extent, and also because the regional concentration of the Mexican-origin population and the relatively small Mexican samples in CPS data make it impossible to estimate separate coefficients for Mexicans with any precision.

To provide a brief summary of the foregoing discussion, Table 2 lists the restrictions imposed on the parameters of the wage equations. I estimate these parameters by ordinary least squares, pooling observations on workers from all ethnicity/generation groups in both survey years into a single log wage regression, and imposing the restrictions described in Table 2 by introducing appropriate interaction terms between ethnicity, generation, and survey year dummies and the other explanatory variables. The total sample size for this regression is 43,544 individuals, with the breakdown by ethnic group, generation, and survey year provided in Table 1. Two different regression specifications are estimated. What I refer to as the “base” specification includes all of the regressors listed in Table 2 except for education and the English proficiency dummies. The “extended” specification adds controls for education and English proficiency to the base specification.

IV. Estimation Results

Tables 3 through 7 present the estimation results. The coefficients of the education and experience variables are allowed to vary without restriction across

ethnicity, generation, and survey year. Table 3 reports estimates of these coefficients from the extended specification that utilizes all of the regressors listed in Table 2, including the dummy variables indicating English language proficiency. To facilitate interpretation of the quadratic in experience, Table 3 also reports the implied cumulative returns to the first 10 and 20 years of labor market experience. Standard errors are provided in parentheses.

For every ethnicity/generation group, returns to schooling rose over the 1980s, a pattern consistent with the numerous U.S. studies documenting a steep climb during this decade in the earnings premium associated with formal education (e.g., Levy and Murnane 1992; Murphy and Welch 1992).

For both Mexicans and whites, returns to education are higher for natives than immigrants, a well-known result typically thought to reflect the advantages of U.S. schooling for the U.S. labor market (Chiswick 1978). Borjas (1995) finds the same pattern in 1970-90 Census data. Unlike recent Census data, however, the November CPS data can distinguish second- and third-generation workers, and it is here that an interesting difference emerges between Mexicans and whites. In both 1979 and 1989, returns to education are essentially the same for second- and third-generation whites, whereas the Mexican returns rise for each successive generation, and not until the third generation do returns look similar for Mexicans and whites. For example, among Mexican-origin workers the 1989 returns to education grow from 2.6 percent for immigrants to 5.1 percent for the second generation and 7.7 percent for the third; the corresponding returns for whites are 5.7 percent for immigrants and 7.9 percent for the

second and third generations.¹³

The higher returns to education for white as compared to Mexican immigrants can be attributed to the superior quality of school systems in countries that white immigrants tend to hail from (Bratsberg and Terrell 1997), as well as the fact that many of these countries provide instruction in English. It is less obvious why whites should enjoy higher returns to education than Mexicans among second-generation workers who presumably attended U.S. schools, or why the percentage point improvement in the returns to education for Mexicans is at least as large between the second and third generations as between the first and second. One possible explanation is that, because some Mexican immigrants to the United States return to Mexico for extended periods (Massey et al. 1987; Reyes 1997), U.S.-born children of these immigrants may receive some of their education in Mexican schools. Moreover, the high concentration of Mexican immigrants in agriculture and other seasonal industries increases the chances that second-generation Mexican kids experience frequent moves that disrupt their schooling, even when these moves occur within the United States.¹⁴ Finally, the rural schools available to the U.S.-born children of Mexican immigrant farmworkers may be of lower quality than the urban and suburban schools attended by most third-generation Mexican schoolchildren.

In immigrant wage equations like those estimated here that include both potential experience and years of U.S. residence as explanatory variables, the experience

¹³ In their analysis of the November 1979 CPS data, Neidert and Farley (1985) report a similar pattern for Mexicans whereby the returns to education in terms of occupational status rise across generations.

¹⁴ In their analysis of student data from the National Educational Longitudinal Survey of 1988, Ream and Rumberger (1998) find that second-generation Mexicans change schools more frequently than do third- and higher-

coefficients measure the returns to labor market experience acquired by foreign-born workers *before* they moved to the United States (Chiswick 1978).¹⁵ Consequently, the lower returns to experience for first-generation men evident in Table 3 indicate that job training and work experience accumulated in the home country transfer imperfectly to the U.S. labor market. Among U.S.-born workers, returns to experience are similar for all ethnicity/generation groups, which suggests that by the second generation Mexicans enjoy roughly the same wage growth as whites. By way of contrast, recall that returns to education take three generations to converge. Finally, returns to experience appear to have increased over the 1980s for all three generations of Mexicans, whereas the corresponding returns declined for white immigrants and did not change much for U.S.-born whites.

Table 4 presents the estimated coefficients for the vector of dummy variables indicating English language proficiency, with English monolinguals—presumably the most proficient group—as the reference category.¹⁶ As with the education and experience coefficients just discussed, these coefficients are from the third regression specification that includes all of the regressors listed in Table 2. For Mexicans, the

generation Mexicans, and they also report evidence that such mobility lowers the achievement test scores of second-generation Mexicans.

¹⁵ To see this point, write experience as $EXP = AGE - ED - 6$, where AGE is current age and ED is years of schooling. For immigrants, write years of U.S. residence as $YUS = AGE - ARR$, where ARR represents age upon arrival in the United States. In the wage regressions, the coefficients on experience capture the effect of increasing EXP by one year while holding ED and YUS fixed. Conceptually, this experiment raises AGE and ARR both by exactly one year, which in effect increases by one year the immigrant's experience in his home country labor market (assuming that the immigrant entered the labor force prior to moving to the United States).

¹⁶ Under a human capital interpretation, the coefficients on the English proficiency dummies measure the increase in productivity that accompanies learning to communicate in the dominant language, but other factors probably also contribute to the observed correlation between wages and ability to speak English. For example, the English proficiency coefficients may capture labor market discrimination against workers with foreign accents (Davila, Bohara, and Saenz 1993), an interpretation especially relevant to the wage differential between workers who speak only English and those bilinguals who speak English "very well." Particularly among U.S.-born workers, the English

language dummies show the expected pattern of more negative coefficients for dummies representing lower levels of proficiency in speaking English, and the same pattern holds for whites with the exception of the comparison between those who speak English “not well” and “not at all”.

For immigrants, Table 5 reports the estimated coefficients of the quadratic in years of U.S. residence. These coefficients measure the additional return that the U.S. labor market pays immigrants for U.S. work experience compared to home country work experience.¹⁷ To quantify this immigrant wage growth arising from labor market assimilation, I present the implied cumulative returns to the first 10 and 20 years of U.S. residence. For foreign-born workers, total wage growth in the United States is the sum of the returns to years of U.S. residence and the returns to experience.¹⁸ The bottom rows of Table 5 report this total immigrant wage growth for the first 10 and 20 years in the United States, using 1989 estimates of the returns to experience.¹⁹ Separate estimates are presented for each of the two regression specifications described earlier.

Wage growth associated with assimilation is stronger for Mexicans than whites. Holding total (i.e., U.S. and foreign) work experience fixed, increasing U.S. work experience from 0 to 10 years raises immigrant earnings by 35 percent for Mexicans as compared to 22 percent for whites, according to the base specification that excludes

proficiency coefficients may reflect cognitive ability, student motivation, or school quality, because those who attended U.S. schools and failed to acquire fluency in English are likely to have encountered unusual circumstances.

¹⁷ Referring back to the notation introduced in footnote 15, the regression coefficients on years of U.S. residence measure the effect of increasing *YUS* by one year while holding *EXP* and *ED* fixed. This is accomplished by keeping *AGE* fixed and lowering *ARR* by one year, which transforms a year of home country work experience into a year of U.S. work experience.

¹⁸ Referring back once again to footnote 15, as a U.S. immigrant grows one year older, both *EXP* and *YUS* increase by one year each.

education and the English proficiency dummies. In her analysis of 1980 and 1990 Census data for California and Texas, Reimers (1997) also reports higher returns to years of U.S. residence for Mexicans than for whites. One explanation for this finding is that because many white immigrants speak English and come from industrialized countries with economies similar to the United States, their work experience may transfer more easily to the U.S. labor market, and therefore the returns to U.S. work experience would not exceed the returns to home country work experience by as much for these immigrants. Conversely, differences in language and economic development between the United States and Mexico may create a situation where the U.S. labor market pays Mexican immigrants a substantial premium for U.S. work experience.²⁰ This argument suggests that returns to pre-U.S. experience should be larger for white immigrants than for Mexican immigrants. Looking back at the returns to experience for first-generation workers reported in Table 3, the expected pattern shows up in 1979 but not in 1989.

Making comparisons across the columns of Table 5, for both Mexicans and whites the returns to U.S. residence become smaller after conditioning on education and, most importantly, English proficiency. For example, among Mexican immigrants, the returns to the first 10 years of U.S. residence fall from 35 percent in the base specification to 20 percent in the extended specification. For white immigrants, the corresponding decline in the returns to 10 years of U.S. residence is from 22 percent to 14 percent. The substantial drop in returns to U.S. residence when going from the base specification to the extended

¹⁹ These calculations of total wage growth assume that immigrants arrive in the United States at the beginning of their working lives.

²⁰ See Chiswick (1978) for an initial statement of this general argument and Duleep and Regets (1996) for a recent investigation of its empirical implications.

suggests that improvements in English language skills play an important role in the labor market assimilation of immigrants. Carliner (1996) and Funkhouser (1996) reach a similar conclusion in their analyses of 1980 and 1990 Census data.

By comparing the estimates of total immigrant wage growth reported in the bottom of Table 5 with the returns to experience for second- and third-generation workers presented in Table 3, we learn whether the earnings of Mexican immigrants converge toward the earnings of U.S.-born Mexican Americans as immigrants spend more time in the United States. In the estimation framework employed here, labor market assimilation is measured by the extent to which the U.S. labor market rewards the U.S. work experience of immigrants more than it rewards their home country work experience, and so the presence of assimilation does not necessarily imply earnings convergence, because returns to experience can differ for immigrants and natives (LaLonde and Topel 1992).

These particular estimates show no evidence of life cycle earnings convergence between immigrant and native workers. For the regression specification that includes education and English proficiency and using 1989 estimates of the returns to experience, Table 5 indicates that the wages of Mexican immigrants grow 40 percent during their first 10 years and 59 percent during their first 20 years in the U.S. labor market. The corresponding estimates for second-generation Mexicans in Table 3 imply wage growth of 48 percent over 10 years and 73 percent over 20 years, so the large initial wage gap between first- and second-generation Mexicans actually widens during the first 20 years that immigrants work in the United States. Because returns to experience are similar for second- and third-generation Mexicans, the same lack of convergence emerges from earnings comparisons between the first and third generations. Among whites as well,

U.S.-born workers enjoy greater wage growth than immigrants during the first 20 years of U.S. work experience, although the fact that white immigrants and natives resemble each other rather closely in terms of average earnings and education makes the issue of convergence somewhat less interesting for them.

For immigrants, Table 6 reports estimates of permanent wage differences across arrival cohorts, with the reference group for these comparisons being the cohort of immigrants of the same ethnicity who entered the United States before 1960. Because of the relatively small immigrant samples available in CPS data, I define cohorts more broadly (pre-1960, 1960-69, 1970-79, and 1980-89) than the five-year arrival intervals typically used with Census data.²¹ Even so, the large standard errors indicate that CPS data are far from ideal for analyzing immigrant cohort effects. As a result, for neither Mexicans nor whites can I reject the hypothesis of no wage differences across immigrant cohorts, despite point estimates which suggest wage gaps of 30 percent or more between Mexican immigrants arriving before 1960 and those arriving afterward.

Table 7 and Figure 1 return to the question of how much progress Mexican immigrants make during their lifetimes in reducing their wage deficit relative to U.S.-born Mexican Americans. For each ethnicity/generation group and for both regression specifications, Table 7 presents predicted log wage differentials (relative to third-generation whites) at three points in the life cycle: ages 20, 40, and 60. These calculations use estimated coefficients for 1989 and refer to an individual who entered the labor market at age 18. If an immigrant, the individual is assumed to have arrived in the

²¹ Statistical tests do not reject my aggregation of arrival cohorts, but these tests are not particularly powerful because the cohort effects are estimated imprecisely.

United States at age 20 as part of the 1980-89 cohort. In the extended specification that controls for education and English proficiency, the individual is also assumed to speak only English and have 12 years of schooling. To further illustrate these patterns, Figure 1 displays the corresponding log wage profiles for Mexicans of each generation and for third-generation whites.²²

Using estimated coefficients from the base specification, Mexican immigrants are predicted to earn 55 percent lower wages than third-generation whites at age 20, 59 percent lower wages at age 40, and 53 percent lower wages at age 60. For second-generation Mexicans, the corresponding wage deficits relative to third-generation whites are 25 percent at age 20, 20 percent at age 40, and 41 percent at age 60. Therefore, upon arrival in the United States at age 20, Mexican immigrants are predicted to earn 30 percent less than second-generation Mexicans, with this wage gap widening to 39 percent at age 40 before shrinking to 12 percent at age 60. Analogous comparisons between first- and third-generation Mexicans produce an immigrant wage disadvantage of 31 percent at age 20, 33 percent at age 40, and 42 percent at age 60. These calculations indicate that, over their working lives, Mexican immigrants do not narrow their wage deficits relative to third-generation Mexican Americans or whites, a result that is consistent with previous studies documenting weak U.S. wage growth for immigrants from Mexico (Smith 1991; Borjas 1995; Schoeni 1997). There is some evidence of wage convergence between first- and second-generation Mexicans during the latter half of their careers, but this occurs

²² Note that Table 7 reports predicted log wage *differentials*, relative to third-generation whites, whereas Figure 1 graphs predicted log wages. In addition to the assumptions made for the calculations in Table 7, the predicted wages shown in Figure 1 pertain to an individual who resides in a California central city and whose earnings we observe in the November survey month. Because of the restrictions imposed on the wage regressions, these additional assumptions do not affect the shapes of the wage profiles or the relative locations of the wage profiles for different ethnicity/generation groups.

primarily because of slow wage growth for second-generation Mexicans (relative to either third-generation Mexicans or U.S.-born whites), rather than because of strong wage growth for Mexican immigrants (see the top panel of Figure 1). The relative wages of Mexicans at age 60 are estimated very imprecisely, however, so from these results we cannot draw firm conclusions about what happens at the end of the working life.

Because the low levels of human capital possessed by Mexican-origin workers account for most of their wage deficit relative to white workers, the predicted wage differentials for Mexicans reported in Table 7 shrink in the regression specification that controls for education and English proficiency. For similar reasons, wage differentials between Mexican immigrants and U.S.-born Mexican Americans also narrow in the extended specification. Moreover, wage deficits between Mexican immigrants and either U.S.-born Mexicans or U.S.-born whites widen over the life cycle once education and especially English proficiency are included in the regression (see the bottom panel of Figure 1). This reinforces the inference drawn earlier from Table 5 that a major component of immigrant assimilation in the U.S. labor market involves English language acquisition.

V. Conclusion

Using unique Current Population Survey data from November 1979 and 1989, this paper has compared the wage structure across generations of Mexican-origin men. I find that the sizable earnings advantage U.S.-born Mexican Americans enjoy over Mexican immigrants arises not just from intergenerational improvements in years of schooling and English proficiency, but also from increased returns to human capital for Mexican-origin workers who were born and educated in the United States. Even if we consider

immigrants who have worked in the United States for 40 years and who therefore have had ample time for labor market assimilation, my estimates indicate that a discrete jump in earnings and the wage structure occurs between the first and second generations.

Interestingly, these intergenerational changes in the wage structure take longer to play out for Mexicans than for non-Hispanic whites. The returns to experience are similar for U.S.-born workers regardless of ethnicity (Mexican or white) and generation (second or third and higher), and the returns to education for U.S.-born whites do not vary across generations, but the Mexican returns to education rise for each successive generation, and not until the third generation do they approach the returns of U.S.-born whites.

Let me close with a note of caution about two sources of bias that may affect the intergenerational earnings comparisons reported here. First, Borjas (1993) cautions that cross-sectional comparisons across generations like those described here can be misleading if there are important skill differences between immigrant cohorts and these differences are at least partially transmitted to the U.S.-born children of immigrants. This problem arises because intergenerational comparisons made at a given point in time do a very poor job of matching parents with their children who enter the labor market a couple of decades later. In particular, there is evidence that recent cohorts of Mexican immigrants came to the United States with fewer skills than preceding cohorts (Borjas 1995), which suggests that cross-sectional comparisons between first- and second-generation Mexicans overstate the amount of intergenerational progress, because second-generation Mexicans currently in the labor market inherited their abilities and skills from earlier immigrant cohorts who were more successful than the immigrant cohorts now at work are likely to be. For the same reason, cross-sectional comparisons between second-

and third-generation Mexican Americans may be biased in favor of the third generation, although this presumes that the skill decline observed for postwar cohorts of Mexican immigrants continues back well into the first half of this century.

Second, ethnic identification is to some extent endogenous, especially among people at least one or two generations removed from immigration to the United States.²³ Consequently, the descendants of Mexican immigrants who continue to identify themselves as Mexican-origin in the third and higher generations may be an increasingly select group. In particular, if the most successful Mexicans are more likely to intermarry or for other reasons cease to identify themselves or their children as Hispanic, then available data may understate human capital and earnings gains between the second and third generations. An important question for future research is whether this phenomenon can explain why the economic progress of Mexican Americans appears to stall after the second generation.

²³ Waters (1990) explores this issue for non-Hispanic whites.

References

- Allensworth, Elaine M. "Earnings Mobility of First and '1.5' Generation Mexican-Origin Women and Men: A Comparison with U.S.-Born Mexican Americans and Non-Hispanic Whites." *International Migration Review*, Summer 1997, 31(2), pp. 386-410.
- Borjas, George J. "Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality, and the Earnings of Immigrants." *Journal of Labor Economics*, October 1985, 3(4), pp. 463-89.
- _____. "The Intergenerational Mobility of Immigrants." *Journal of Labor Economics*, January 1993, Part 1, 11(1), pp. 113-35.
- _____. "Immigrant Skills and Ethnic Spillovers." *Journal of Population Economics*, 1994, 7(2), pp. 99-118.
- _____. "Assimilation and Changes in Cohort Quality Revisited: What Happened to Immigrant Earnings in the 1980s?" *Journal of Labor Economics*, April 1995, 13(2), pp. 201-45.
- Bratsberg, Bernt, and Terrell, Dek. "School Quality and Returns to Education of U.S. Immigrants." Manuscript. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University, 1997.
- Carliner, Geoffrey. "The Wages and Language Skills of U.S. Immigrants." Working Paper 5763. Cambridge, MA: NBER, 1996.
- Carlson, Leonard A., and Swartz, Caroline. "The Earnings of Women and Ethnic Minorities, 1959-1979." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, July 1988, 41(4), pp. 530-46.
- Carnoy, Martin; Daley, Hugh M.; and Hinojosa-Ojeda, Raul. "The Changing Economic Position of Latinos in the U.S. Labor Market Since 1939," in Rebecca Morales and Frank Bonilla, eds., *Latinos in a Changing U.S. Economy: Comparative Perspectives on Growing Inequality*. Newbury, CA: Sage Publication, 1993, pp. 28-54.
- Chapa, Jorge. "The Myth of Hispanic Progress: Trends in the Educational and Economic Attainment of Mexican Americans." *Journal of Hispanic Policy*, 1990, 4, pp. 3-18.
- Chavez, Linda. *Out of the Barrio: Toward a New Politics of Hispanic Assimilation*. New York: Basic Books, 1991.
- Chiswick, Barry R. "The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-Born

- Men.” *Journal of Political Economy*, October 1978, 86(5), pp. 897-921.
- Davila, Alberto; Bohara, Alok K.; and Saenz, Rogelio. “Accent Penalties and the Earnings of Mexican Americans.” *Social Science Quarterly*, December 1993, 74(4), pp. 902-16.
- Duleep, Harriet Orcutt, and Regets, Mark C. “The Elusive Concept of Immigrant Quality: Evidence from 1970-1990.” Working Paper PRIP-UI-41. Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 1996.
- Friedberg, Rachel M. “The Labor Market Assimilation of Immigrants in the United States: The Role of Age at Arrival.” Manuscript. Boston, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1991.
- Funkhouser, Edward. “How Much of Immigrant Wage Assimilation is Related to English Language Acquisition?” Manuscript. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California, 1996.
- Gwartney, James D., and Long, James E. “The Relative Earnings of Blacks and Other Minorities.” *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, April 1978, 31(3), pp. 336-46.
- Juhn, Chinhui; Murphy, Kevin M.; and Pierce, Brooks. “Wage Inequality and the Rise in Returns to Skill.” *Journal of Political Economy*, June 1993, 101(3), pp. 410-42.
- Kossoudji, Sherrie A. “Immigrant Worker Assimilation: Is It a Labor Market Phenomenon?” *Journal of Human Resources*, Summer 1989, 24(3), pp. 494-527.
- LaLonde, Robert J., and Topel, Robert H. “The Assimilation of Immigrants in the U.S. Labor Market,” in George J. Borjas and Richard B. Freeman, eds., *Immigration and the Work Force: Economic Consequences for the United States and Source Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992, pp. 67-92.
- Levy, Frank, and Murnane, Richard J. “U.S. Earnings Levels and Earnings Inequality: A Review of Recent Trends and Proposed Explanations.” *Journal of Economic Literature*, September 1992, 30(3), pp. 1333-81.
- Massey, Douglas S.; Alarcon, Rafael; Durand, Jorge; and Gonzalez, Humberto. *Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1987.
- Murphy, Kevin M., and Welch, Finis. “The Structure of Wages.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, February 1992, 107(1), pp. 285-326.
- Neidert, Lisa J., and Farley, Reynolds. “Assimilation in the United States: An Analysis

- of Ethnic and Generation Differences in Status and Achievement.” *American Sociological Review*, December 1985, 50(6), pp. 840-50.
- Ream, Robert K., and Rumberger, Russell W. “On the Move: The Impact of Mobility on the Achievement of Mexican-American and European-American Students.” Manuscript. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California, 1998.
- Reimers, Cordelia W. “Labor Market Discrimination Against Hispanic and Black Men.” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, November 1983, 65(4), pp. 570-79.
- _____. “The Progress of Mexican and Non-Hispanic White Immigrants in California and Texas, 1980 to 1990.” *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 1997, 37(Special Issue), pp. 315-43.
- Reyes, Belinda I. *Dynamics of Immigration: Return Migration to Western Mexico*. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California, 1997.
- Schoeni, Robert F. “New Evidence on the Economic Progress of Foreign-Born Men in the 1970s and 1980s.” *Journal of Human Resources*, Fall 1997, 32(4), pp. 683-740.
- Smith, James P. “Hispanics and the American Dream: An Analysis of Hispanic Male Labor Market Wages 1940-1980.” Manuscript. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1991.
- Trejo, Stephen J. “Obstacles to the Labor Market Progress of California’s Mexican-Origin Workers.” Working Paper, vol. 4, no. 1. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Chicano/Latino Policy Project, July 1996.
- _____. “Why Do Mexican Americans Earn Low Wages?” *Journal of Political Economy*, December 1997, 105(6), pp. 1235-68.
- Waters, Mary C. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990.

Table 1
Means of Key Variables, by Ethnicity, Generation, and Survey Year

Variable	Mexicans, by Generation				Whites, by Generation			
	All	First	Second	Third	All	First	Second	Third
1979								
Log Hourly Earnings	2.215 (.017)	2.000 (.029)	2.321 (.032)	2.291 (.026)	2.459 (.003)	2.558 (.024)	2.576 (.010)	2.442 (.004)
Experience	17.24 (.43)	19.77 (.71)	20.29 (.93)	13.76 (.60)	17.60 (.09)	26.13 (.59)	24.88 (.27)	16.50 (.09)
Education	9.73 (.15)	6.27 (.27)	10.48 (.28)	11.52 (.17)	12.89 (.02)	12.16 (.21)	12.98 (.06)	12.89 (.02)
Speaks English Very Well	.596 (.018)	.098 (.021)	.730 (.032)	.837 (.020)	.990 (.0007)	.577 (.024)	.993 (.002)	.999 (.0002)
Years in U.S.		8.52 (.53)				15.78 (.52)		
Sample Size	717	193	194	330	21,440	412	2,282	18,746
1989								
Log Hourly Earnings	2.094 (.018)	1.926 (.026)	2.224 (.038)	2.165 (.028)	2.417 (.004)	2.561 (.031)	2.559 (.014)	2.404 (.004)
Experience	16.56 (.38)	19.49 (.62)	16.04 (.83)	14.29 (.54)	17.38 (.08)	24.76 (.64)	21.83 (.35)	16.93 (.08)
Education	10.43 (.13)	7.72 (.24)	11.88 (.21)	11.97 (.12)	13.40 (.02)	13.43 (.21)	13.75 (.07)	13.37 (.02)
Speaks English Very Well	.623 (.017)	.128 (.020)	.870 (.025)	.914 (.015)	.994 (.0006)	.678 (.026)	.995 (.002)	.999 (.0002)
Years in U.S.		10.81 (.48)				15.56 (.60)		
Sample Size	808	277	189	342	20,579	331	1,400	18,848

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses. Data are from the November 1979 and November 1989 CPS tapes. The sample includes male wage and salary workers aged 18-61 for whom earnings data are available. Excluded are any immigrants who may have been younger than age 16 when they first arrived in the United States. Hourly earnings are computed as the ratio of usual weekly earnings to usual weekly hours of work. The 1979 earnings data are reported in 1989 dollars to make them comparable with the 1989 earnings data. In tabulating English language proficiency, those who speak only English are presumed to speak English "very well". Sampling weights were used in the calculations.

Table 2
Restrictions Imposed on Wage Equations

Regressor	Coefficients Allowed to Vary Across:		
	Ethnicity	Generation	Survey Year
Immigrant Cohort and Generation Dummies	Yes	Yes*	No
Immigrant Years in U.S. Quadratic	Yes	Yes*	No
1989 Survey Year Dummy	Yes	No	Yes
Experience Quadratic	Yes	Yes	Yes
Education	Yes	Yes	Yes
English Proficiency Dummies	Yes	No	Yes
Survey Month Dummies	No	No	Yes
Geographic Dummies	No	No	Yes

* By construction, the variables indicating the arrival cohort and years of U.S. residence for immigrants do not apply to U.S.-born (i.e., second- and third-generation) workers.

Table 3
Returns to Education and Experience

Variable	Mexicans, by Generation			Whites, by Generation		
	First	Second	Third	First	Second	Third
1979						
Coefficients:						
Education	.010 (.009)	.022 (.009)	.060 (.008)	.024 (.006)	.055 (.003)	.058 (.001)
Experience	.004 (.013)	.044 (.009)	.039 (.007)	.030 (.008)	.044 (.003)	.046 (.001)
Experience ² /100	-.017 (.027)	-.081 (.021)	-.060 (.017)	-.053 (.016)	-.076 (.006)	-.080 (.002)
Cumulative Returns to Experience:						
Ten Years	.019 (.105)	.363 (.067)	.331 (.051)	.244 (.064)	.360 (.021)	.380 (.007)
Twenty Years	.004 (.160)	.563 (.096)	.543 (.073)	.380 (.098)	.569 (.032)	.600 (.010)
1989						
Coefficients:						
Education	.026 (.008)	.051 (.010)	.077 (.009)	.057 (.006)	.079 (.004)	.079 (.001)
Experience	.022 (.011)	.059 (.010)	.054 (.007)	.010 (.090)	.045 (.003)	.053 (.001)
Experience ² /100	-.026 (.024)	-.111 (.024)	-.078 (.019)	-.003 (.019)	-.074 (.008)	-.088 (.002)
Cumulative Returns to Experience:						
Ten Years	.199 (.089)	.477 (.073)	.467 (.055)	.093 (.072)	.380 (.027)	.437 (.007)
Twenty Years	.345 (.135)	.734 (.103)	.778 (.076)	.180 (.111)	.613 (.039)	.699 (.011)

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses. The estimates reported above come from the extended specification that utilizes all of the regressors listed in Table 2, including measures of education and English proficiency.

Table 4
Returns to English Language Proficiency

Language Category	Mexicans		Whites	
	1979	1989	1979	1989
Speaks Only English (reference group)				
Speaks English Very Well	-.042 (.043)	-.087 (.041)	-.054 (.018)	-.070 (.020)
Speaks English Well	-.091 (.060)	-.173 (.060)	-.163 (.045)	-.124 (.049)
Speaks English Not Well	-.170 (.077)	-.275 (.075)	-.318 (.063)	-.271 (.078)
Speaks English Not at All	-.381 (.096)	-.331 (.094)	-.218 (.118)	-.181 (.142)

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses. The estimates reported above come from the extended specification that utilizes all of the regressors listed in Table 2, including measures of education and English proficiency.

Table 5
Immigrant Wage Growth Over the Life Cycle

Variable	Mexicans		Whites	
	Base Specification	Extended Specification	Base Specification	Extended Specification
Coefficients:				
Years in U.S.	.044	.028	.024	.017
	(.012)	(.012)	(.009)	(.009)
(Years in U.S.) ² /100	-.090	-.078	-.016	-.036
	(.043)	(.041)	(.021)	(.020)
Cumulative Returns to Years in U.S.:				
Ten Years	.349	.200	.223	.135
	(.096)	(.094)	(.077)	(.074)
Twenty Years	.519	.243	.414	.200
	(.165)	(.160)	(.127)	(.123)
Cumulative U.S. Wage Growth:				
Ten Years	.416	.399	.397	.228
	(.084)	(.088)	(.070)	(.084)
Twenty Years	.626	.589	.643	.379
	(.149)	(.155)	(.112)	(.134)

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses. Cumulative U.S. wage growth for immigrants is the sum of returns to years in U.S. and returns to experience. The wage growth calculations reported above use 1989 estimates of the returns to experience for immigrants. The base specification includes all of the regressors listed in Table 2 except for education and the English proficiency dummies. The extended specification adds controls for education and English proficiency to the base specification.

Table 6
Log Wage Differentials Between Immigrant Arrival Cohorts

<u>Immigrant Cohort</u>	Mexicans		Whites	
	Base Specification	Extended Specification	Base Specification	Extended Specification
Pre-1960 Arrivals (reference group)				
1960-69 Arrivals	-.292 (.220)	-.317 (.209)	.037 (.087)	.0002 (.081)
1970-79 Arrivals	-.319 (.275)	-.390 (.261)	.083 (.128)	.063 (.119)
1980-89 Arrivals	-.282 (.323)	-.376 (.308)	.185 (.173)	.080 (.168)

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses. The base specification includes all of the regressors listed in Table 2 except for education and the English proficiency dummies. The extended specification adds controls for education and English proficiency to the base specification.

Table 7
 Predicted Log Wage Differentials at Three Points in the Life Cycle
 (Relative to Third-Generation Whites)


Specification/Generation	Mexicans			Whites		
	Age 20	Age 40	Age 60	Age 20	Age 40	Age 60
Base Specification:						
First Generation	-.551 (.073)	-.590 (.114)	-.525 (.432)	.175 (.066)	.115 (.090)	.375 (.201)
Second Generation	-.245 (.055)	-.199 (.051)	-.405 (.119)	.054 (.020)	.061 (.018)	.057 (.031)
Third Generation	-.235 (.045)	-.262 (.038)	-.108 (.116)		reference group	
Extended Specification:						
First Generation	-.136 (.096)	-.196 (.122)	-.387 (.409)	.306 (.070)	.056 (.100)	.204 (.193)
Second Generation	.0002 (.070)	.017 (.056)	-.146 (.126)	.077 (.025)	.002 (.020)	.041 (.029)
Third Generation	-.109 (.049)	-.022 (.043)	.147 (.116)		reference group	

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses. The base specification includes all of the regressors listed in Table 2 except for education and the English proficiency dummies. The extended specification adds controls for education and English proficiency to the base specification. The calculations reported above use estimated coefficients for 1989 and refer to an individual with 12 years of schooling who speaks only English and entered the labor market at age 18. If an immigrant (i.e., first generation), the individual is assumed to have arrived in the United States at age 20 as part of the 1980-89 cohort.

Figure 1

Estimated Wage Profiles for Mexicans and Third-Generation Whites

A. Base Specification



B. Extended Specification

