Preliminary Draft
Please do not quote or cite without the authors' permission

Exploring the Link between Family Reunification and Remittances: How Do US Immigrant Parents Choose between Sending Remittances to Their Children and Sponsoring Them for Immigration?

Guillermina Jasso
New York University

Mark R. Rosenzweig
Yale University

September 2012

Introduction

There is now a large and growing literature on the important role of networking in facilitating and shaping the composition of migration flows in many contexts. Networking is in fact a formal aspect of US immigration law. At least since the days of the Select Committee on Population of the U.S. House of Representatives (1978) and the U.S. Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy (1979-1981), it has been recognized that under the U.S. immigration system, with its emphasis on family reunification, the US resident sponsor is a pivotal actor (Jasso and Rosenzweig 1987). Indeed, almost all immigrants to the United States are sponsored by particular categories of US relatives and/or employers.[1] Prospective immigrants, no matter how intensely positively motivated, cannot simply sally forth and obtain a green card in the United States. A relative, of a particular kin relationship defined by law, or an employer must sponsor their immigration. A US immigrant or a US citizen ultimately determines who can immigrate to the United States, within the restrictions of the law. The exceptions are winners of the visa lottery and some groups of humanitarian immigrants.[2]

As of the day of obtaining legal permanent resident (LPR) status, US immigrants become eligible to sponsor two types of relatives for LPR: (1) a spouse; and (2) unmarried children of any age. Thus, new immigrants face a choice whether to send remittances to these relatives or instead set in motion the process of petitioning for them as immigrants -- sponsorship – or both. As well, they retain the option of returning to the home country. Later, if an immigrant naturalizes, she becomes eligible to sponsor a substantially enlarged set of relatives: (1) a spouse, without regard to numerical limitations; (2) a parent, without regard to numerical limitations, provided the sponsor is 21 years of age or older; (3) a minor child, without regard to numerical limitations; (4) unmarried children 21 years of age or older; (5) married children, and (6) siblings, provided the sponsor is 21 years of age or older. The latter three categories of immigrants are subject to country-specific numerical limitations.

There is also a vast literature on remittances. What has been almost completely neglected, however, is the possibility that remittance behavior and sponsorship behavior are linked. New immigrants are major sources of remittance flows, but they are also those most likely to assist their relatives and friends to migrate, consistent with the literature on networking. This lack of

[1] In a not insignificant number of cases, employer sponsors are also relatives of the immigrant.

[2] Indeed, it was thinking about the need for a channel of immigration for "independent" immigrants that led the U.S. Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy (1981) to recommend the provision that eventually became the lottery visa program.

integration of the two literatures, on "chain" migration and remittances, is mostly due to lack of data that provide the requisite information. For example, despite the importance of sponsorship in the US immigration system, except for an early heroic effort by the General Accounting Office (1988), no data on sponsors or sponsor behavior were collected systematically until the New Immigrant Survey elicited information on the sponsorship behavior of immigrants a few years after obtaining legal permanent residence in the second round of the survey in 2007-10. And there are still no systematic data on the sponsorship of immigrants by native-born U.S. citizens and U.S. firms.

Accordingly, the established knowledge on formal sponsorship is meager. It includes the following findings. First, in 1985 the U.S. citizen sponsors of foreign-born spouses were approximately 80 percent native-born and 20 percent foreign-born, but by 1996 the proportion foreign-born citizens sponsoring spouses had increased to 45 percent and by 2003 to 53 percent (Jasso and Rosenzweig 1989, 2006; Jasso 2011). Second, in the first ten years after admission to legal permanent residence, immigrants from the 1971 cohort sponsored at rates that varied with their own visa category -- highest among immigrants who had not been sponsored by kin and thus had the most sponsorable relatives (Jasso and Rosenzweig 1986, 1989).[3]

In this paper we explore the relationship between the sponsorship by an immigrant of family members -- family reunification -- and remittances provided to family members using new data from the second round of the New Immigrant Survey (NIS). In this preliminary exploration of preliminary data, we assess to what extent the two behaviors are linked, using, to guide our analysis, a simple model of the household in which an altruistic family selects who among its family members to sponsor (reunifies) and to whom to provide transfers. We exploit three important features of the NIS data: (i) information on all immediate family members of each immigrant, inclusive of their location in the world, their citizenship status, age and education, (ii) information on financial transfers provided by the immigrant to individual family members, and (iii) information on which family members the immigrant has, since the time of immigration, formally petitioned for in order to allow for their immigration. Because the entitlement to reunify

[3]Two other recent papers are notable here. A recent paper by Dimova and Wolff (2009) takes a useful step by noting that remittances and immigration may be linked, as remittances may act as a trigger for immigration. However, the empirical analysis, based on data from Bosnia and Herzogovina, merely shows an association between the receipt of remittances and intentions to migrate among remittance recipients. The NIS first-round data has been used to study remittances (Mickel (2008)), but the relationship with sponsorship as an alternative assistance family mechanism is not considered and information on the characteristics of individual potential recipients -- their schooling and location -- has not been linked to the remittance flows.

depends on the legal status of the immigrant, we also exploit the information on the visa type of the immigrant so that our analysis is informed by the rules and regulations shaping sponsorship behavior. Because of these and other complexities, we focus in this analysis on transfers to and the sponsorship of the immigration of the children of immigrants.

Our findings on transfers conform to those from most of the literature on transfers from migrants -- transfers flow from higher-wage migrants to lower-income recipients. In this case we find that among immigrant's children, the less educated who are resident in low wage (low prices of skill) countries are more likely to receive transfers. One might conclude from this that parents favor their poorest children. However, our estimates on sponsorship are consistent with a model incorporating altruism in which parents maximize the total incomes of their children by bringing those children to the United States who most benefit from the higher prices paid for skill -- those already favored with more schooling. The higher probability of their less-educated children receiving remittances thus represents not favoritism for the poorest family members but the altruistic household redressing inequality among their children brought about by their own immigration and schooling decisions. Thus we find that family reunification is positively selective on skill and negatively selective on the home-country skill price, while remittance behavior is negatively selective on skill and the price of skill in the origin country.

1. Sponsorship in the US Legal Immigration System

To understand the immigrant's choice set in the United States, it is necessary to understand the sponsorship criteria. Accordingly, this section provides a brief description of U.S. law governing immigration.

1.1. The U.S. Immigrant Visa System

As shown in Table 1, the United States admits about a million persons a year to legal permanent residence; these include both new arrivals and persons who are already in the United States with a temporary visa or in undocumented status and adjust to LPR.[4] The system of visa allocation provides numerically unlimited visas to the spouses, minor children, and parents of adult U.S. citizens (a set collectively called "immediate relatives of U.S. citizens"). Numerically limited visas are granted to three main categories of immigrants: (1) family immigrants,

[4] Immigration figures in Table 1 refer to the total, non-IRCA-legalization number of new LPRs. This number was reported as "total non-legalization" in Table 4 of the INS and DHS Yearbooks through the 2004 Yearbook. The Yearbooks for 2005-2010 do not report the non-IRCA-legalization total, but it is possible to obtain it by subtracting the IRCA legalization total from the grand total in Table 7. During the period 1991-2009 IRCA legalizations declined from a high of over a million in 1991 to less than a thousand in every year since 1998, with a low of 8 in 1999 and totals of 188, 217, 93, 116, 83, and 62 in Fiscal Years 2005-2010, respectively (DHS Yearbooks, Table 4 through 2004, Table 7 thereafter).

comprised of the adult children and siblings of U.S. citizens (a set collectively called "close relatives of U.S. citizens" to distinguish them from "immediate relatives of U.S. citizens") and the spouses and children of LPRs; (2) employment immigrants, comprised of five subcategories; and (3) diversity immigrants (winners of the lottery visas designated for persons from countries underrepresented in recent immigration). Two additional categories of LPR visas have subsets of both numerically limited and numerically unlimited type. These are: (4) humanitarian immigrants (including refugees, asylees, and parolees); and (5) legalization immigrants, that is, illegal immigrants who are becoming legal, including registry-provision immigrants (who qualify in virtue of length of illegal residence) and cancellation-of-removal immigrants, plus immigrants targeted by special legalization legislation (such as the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act of 1997, or NACARA).

Illegal persons may also become legal if they qualify for a visa under one of the other categories above. In most visa categories except those for immediate relatives of U.S. citizens (spouse, parent, minor child), visas are awarded not only to the individual qualifying for an immigrant visa – called the principal -- but also to the spouse and minor children who are "accompanying, or following to join" the immigrant principal.

Two sets of immigrants receive conditional visas at LPR. These are (1) spouses of U.S. citizens and of LPRs in marriages of less than two years' duration, and (2) employment-based investor immigrants. The visas are conditional for two years and a special application is made for removal of the conditionality restrictions.

Family immigrants – both the numerically unlimited immediate relatives and the numerically limited close relatives – and employment immigrants require a sponsor. The sponsor is the qualifying relative or employer who provides entitlement to a visa. The sponsor must submit a special petition – Form I-130 for relatives and Form I-140 for workers. Because the large majority of visas are awarded to family and employment immigrants – for example, 66.1 percent and 12.7 percent, respectively, in 2009 – and because the sponsor requirement is waived only in very special cases (such as world-class scientists), the sponsor is a towering presence in the immigration process.

Immigrants must also show that they will not become a public charge. The sponsor of a family immigrant (and of certain employment immigrants, such as those sponsored by a U.S. citizen or LPR relative or by an entity in which such a relative has an ownership interest of 5% or more) must sign a legally enforceable affidavit of support, guaranteeing support until the immigrant becomes a U.S. citizen or is credited with 40 quarters of work.

Many people around the world are ineligible to apply for an immigrant visa, either because they do not qualify under the categories above – for example, do not have access to the

right sponsor – or because they are poor. Persons from the first set may visit or temporarily reside in the United States on a nonimmigrant visa. Those from the second set fall under the public charge ground of ineligibility. Both may be found in the United States as unauthorized migrants.

The process of applying for an immigrant visa is arduous and time-consuming. Persons waiting for numerically limited visas may have to wait many years. The current upper extreme is over 23 years for persons from the Philippines approved for visas as the siblings of U.S. citizens; at the other extreme, visas in some of the employment-based categories (such as that for priority workers, including world-renowned scientists, artists, and executives) are available immediately (U. S. Department of State, "Visa Bulletin," March 2011).

Besides the wait for numerically limited visas, all visa applications take processing time. In general, the visa process lasts from the date when the first application is filed (known in numerically-limited visa cases as the "priority date") to the date that legal permanent residence is granted.

For clarity, we will refer to the sponsor who provides entitlement to a particular visa as the visa sponsor, or simply the sponsor. If the sponsor cannot meet the income requirements for the affidavit of support, a "joint sponsor" may be obtained. In this paper, we restrict focus to the visa sponsor.

1.2. The New Sponsorship Faculties of New Immigrants

1.2.1. Legal Permanent Residents

As noted above, on the day a person becomes a legal permanent resident, he or she becomes eligible to sponsor two types of relatives for LPR: (1) spouse; and (2) unmarried children of any age. Visa categories distinguish between minor children (defined as unmarried children under 21 years of age) and those 21 or older. The spouse and minor children could have acquired LPR at the same time as the immigrant under the provision for accompanying family members unless the immigrant was an immediate relative (such as a parent of a U.S. citizen) for whose family members visas are not available. If they were not included in the original application, they can now be sponsored. Meanwhile, any older unmarried children, who did not qualify for admission as accompanying family members, can now be sponsored.

It is an interesting empirical question what proportion of new LPRs with spouse and minor children do not bring them as accompanying family members. And the reason is also interesting. Immigration researchers speculate that the reason is that the financial requirements impose a limit on the number of persons who can be admitted. Of course, if a new LPR did not meet the financial thresholds for bringing in a spouse or minor children as accompanying family members, it is unlikely that on the date of LPR he or she will suddenly have the requisite

resources for sponsorship. But the resources may be acquired within the next two or three years.

Any over-21 unmarried children sponsored by a new LPR must compete for visas under the Family 2B category. This subcategory is allotted 23 percent of the overall family second preference limitation (which is 114,200 plus visas not used in the family first preference), for approximately 26,266 visas per year. Because the demand outstrips the supply of visas, there are large backlogs. In August 2003 (the midpoint of the seven-month sampling period for NIS-2003), the persons receiving Family 2B visas had been in the visa queue (defined as having a priority date, as discussed above) for at least eight years. Specifically, applicants from Mexico processed in August 2003 had priority dates of 22 November 1991, and applicants from all other countries had priority dates of 15 January 1995.

A new LPR in 2003 with over-21 children would have to decide whether to sponsor these children for Family 2B visas or instead wait to naturalize and then sponsor them as Family 1 (if they are still unmarried) or Family 3, if they have married. Continuing our focus on over-21 unmarried children, the new LPR in 2003 would have known (from the Visa Bulletin) the delays for Family 1. For persons born in all countries except the Philippines, the visa wait would be shortened – for example, the priority dates shift to 15 July 1994 for persons born in Mexico and to 1 Feb 2000 for all other countries, a reduction in visa wait of 3-5 years – but for applicants born in the Philippines, the visa wait actually would increase, by almost six years (priority date of 22 March 1989).

Of course, the new LPR can submit the petition and if the spouse or child has not obtained a visa by the time the LPR naturalizes, the LPR can upgrade the petition. Thus, the decision whether to sponsor immediately requires forecasting changes in visa wait across immigration categories, the children's decision to marry, and the LPR's own intention to naturalize.

New sponsorable relatives may also emerge after immigration. The new LPR, if single, may marry, and if married, may end the marriage and marry again. Thus, a new spouse may be acquired and become sponsorable. In this case, the LPR's decision is whether to sponsor the spouse – in Family 2A, a category notorious for its long waits – or delay sponsorship until after naturalization, when spouses are eligible for visas outside numerical limitations.

What about children born after the parents obtain LPR? If born in the United States, the children are citizens at birth and do not require sponsorship. If born outside the United States, the children receive the humanitarian visa NA3, for which no application is needed. The number of NA3 visas issued each year is small – for example 587 in FY 2009. Not surprisingly, new LPRs who have children tend to have them in the United States (or, put differently, when the stork comes to new LPRs, it tends to find them in the United States).

To summarize, at the time of LPR, the main sponsorable relatives are unmarried children 21 years of age or older, together with younger children and spouses of immigrants barred from bringing them as accompanying family members or who did not meet the financial requirements. New sponsorable relatives acquired will tend to be spouses.

1.2.2. LPRs Who Become Naturalized U. S. Citizens

Most new LPRs become eligible to naturalize after a residency period of five years. A notable exception pertains to new LPRs who are married to U.S. citizens, for whom the residency period is reduced to three years, and military personnel, for whom the requirement is further reduced. At naturalization, the new citizen acquires substantially enlarged sponsorship faculties.

As a U.S. citizen, the now-naturalized LPR can sponsor the following relatives: (1) spouse, without regard to numerical limitations; (2) parent, without regard to numerical limitations, provided the sponsor is 21 years of age or older; (3) minor child, without regard to numerical limitations; (4) unmarried children 21 years of age or older, in the Family 1 category; (5) married children, in the Family 3 category; and (6) siblings, in the Family 4 category, provided the sponsor is 21 years of age or older. The probability that any given new citizen has sponsorable relatives of these various kinds depends on the new citizen's own visa category. To illustrate this we consider one category -- new citizens who obtained LPR as the spouse of a U.S. citizen. Given that in this visa category, the eligibility to naturalize has the shortest waiting period, most of the new citizens in the second round of the NIS are in this category. We consider the circumstances and likelihood of sponsoring relatives of the six types above.

(1) Sponsoring a spouse. The new citizen with a marital (spouse) visa is unlikely to sponsor a new spouse (and indeed there are special requirements for this eventuality).

(2) Sponsoring a parent. This will be a prime category for sponsorship. The focal immigrant's visa does not reveal any additional potential sponsor for the parent.

(3) Sponsoring a minor child. If the minor child is the biological, step, or adoptive child of the sponsor of the focal immigrant, the likelihood of sponsoring a minor child is low. (There are special cases where the sponsor of the focal new citizen cannot sponsor a stepchild – for example, if the marriage took place after the child's 18th birthday). The main sponsorable children are those who are not biological children of the focal new citizen's sponsor, especially if the children were already 18 when their parent married.

(4) Sponsoring an unmarried child 21 years of age or older. As in (3), the main sponsorable children are those who are not biological children of the focal new citizen's sponsor, especially if the children were already 18 when their parent married.

(5) Sponsoring a married child. As in (3) and (4), the main sponsorable children are those who are not biological children of the focal new citizen's sponsor, especially if the children

were already 18 when their parent married.

(6) Sponsoring a sibling. As with sponsoring a parent, this will be a prime category for sponsorship. The focal immigrant's visa does not reveal any additional potential sponsor for the sibling.

Accordingly, the main sponsorable relatives for a new citizen who acquired LPR as the spouse of a U.S. citizen are parents, siblings, and children who are not the biological children of the new citizen's sponsor-spouse (especially if the marriage occurred after the children's 18th birthday).

1.2.3. Summary of Sponsorable Relatives

To further assist in understanding the sponsorable relatives of LPRs and naturalized citizens, Table 2 collects the information discussed above. Panel A focuses on LPRs as of the date of LPR, Panel B highlights the acquisition of spouses with the passage of time, and Panel C focuses on the sponsorable relatives of naturalized citizens who themselves were sponsored by a U.S. citizen spouse. Of course, given the definitions of who may sponsor within the family, a particular person can be potentially sponsored by more than one relative. The last column of Table 2 provides the set of alternative relatives of the immigrant who can also sponsor the sponsorable relatives.[5]

2. A Theoretical Framework

To understand how variation in home country characteristics and the human capital endowments of potential migrants affect the joint decisions by immigrants to act as sponsors and to remit financial transfers within the family context it is useful to set out a simple framework. We begin with a simple model in which there is one parent and one child. We assume that an immigrant parent is altruistic, caring about her own consumption C and the income Y of her adult child who resides in the home country. The utility function of the immigrant parent in family i is

(1) $$V(Y_i, C_i).$$

The earnings or wage W_{ij} of child i in country j who has x_i units of skill is the product of the country-specific price of skill ω_j -- the skill price -- and x_i:

(2) $$W_{ij} = \omega_j x_i,$$

so that the income of the child is given by

(3) $$Y_i = \omega_j x_i + \tau_i,$$

where τ_i = financial transfers to the child from the parent.

The parent can increase the income of the child by providing transfers or by facilitating

---

[5]Of course, immigration law in its infinite intricacies makes many further restrictions. For example, if the sponsorable child was born out of wedlock, eligibility and associated rules for LPR differ by the sponsoring parent's gender.

the migration of the child to the destination country (reunification). If ω_u is the price of skill in the destination country, the income gain G_{ij} to the child from reunifying is given by

(4) $$G_{ij} = (\omega_u - \omega_j)x_i - r_{ij},$$

where r_{ij} = cost of migration from country j for child i. It is clear from (4) that (a) a child with more skill obtains a larger gain from migration than a child with low skill and (b) for given skill, the migration income gain is higher the greater the difference between the home and destination skill prices.

The immigrant parent will compare her utility from reunification to non-reunification, given optimal transfers in either state. The utility from reunification V^R is

(5) $$V(\omega_u x_i + \tau_i^R - r_{ij}, w_i - p(w_i) - \tau_i^R),$$

where τ_i^R= optimal transfers after reunification and p is the cost of reunification borne by the parent, which we assume to be a positive function of the parent wage w_i. This reflects the fact that a major component of the cost of immigration sponsorship is time cost. Parent utility without reunification V^N is

(6) $$V(\omega_j x_i + \tau_i^N - r_{ij}, w_i - \tau_i^N),$$

where τ_i^N= optimal transfers if there is no reunification. The aggregate amount of remittances from the destination country τ_i^N to the home country will thus depend on the decisions by immigrants to reunify.

Parents will petition to reunify with the child if $V^R > V^N$. Assuming, for example, that the cost of reunification to the parent or the child or both has a stochastic component, we can think of any factors that increase V^R relative to V^N as increasing the likelihood of reunification. It is easy to show that:

A. An increase in the skill price at home lowers the probability of reunification. This is because the gain from reunification in (4) is lower. Reunified children will tend to come from low skill price countries.

B. An increase in the skill price at home lowers the level of remittances. This is because the skill price increase child earnings at home and in any altruism model, an increase in a child's earnings lowers the parent's utility gain from transfers. Remittances will be larger to low skill price countries.

C. A child with more skill will be more likely to be reunified. This is because the migration gain is higher for the more skilled. Reunification will be positively-selective with respect to skill from a given home country (skill price the same).

D. A child with more skill will receive less transfers on average. This because the child is more likely to reunify, which produces a large wage gain, and because even if he does not migrate, his earnings are higher than a less skilled child.

E. An increase in the earnings of the parent may increase remittances, especially if a higher parent wage is associated with a decrease the probability of reunification because the time costs of reunification are sufficiently important.

We now consider an immigrant parent with multiple children residing in the home country and consider the within-family reunification/transfer decision. The parent allocates transfers across the children and selects which of the children, if any, will be reunified. To assess the within-family allocation rules, the principal variables of interest are the skill level of the children and any child-specific costs of immigration. Only these matter because the home skill price is typically the same for every child that has not immigrated. Costs borne by the parent to reunify a child may differ by children to the extent that legal restrictions on reunification are attentive to child traits. For example, US immigration law, as noted, favors the reunification of unmarried children. Married children are subject to a smaller supply of visas. We focus here on the skill differences among the children.

The utility function of the parent is now

(7) $$V(\boldsymbol{Y}_{ik}, C_i),$$

where $\boldsymbol{Y}_{ik}$ is the vector of incomes of each of the children indexed by k. To fix ideas, consider a parent with two children, k=1,2. Given the above, the difference in the wage gain from reunification from the same home country j between the two children in family i is

(8) $$\Delta G_{ijk} = (\omega_u - \omega_j)\Delta x_{ik} - \Delta r_{ijk},$$

where Δ is the difference operator. Across the two children, the child with the highest skill level obtains the greater earnings increase from reunification. Thus, it is easy to show that, if only one child is reunified among the group of children, it will be the higher-skill child. Because utility maximization requires that the marginal utilities of the incomes of all of the children be equated, the child who is not reunified, and who thus has lower earnings, receives a higher level of transfers τ_{ik}^{R}. Thus,

E. Among the set of home-country children, those with higher levels of skill will be more likely reunified. Within the family, reunified immigrants are positively selected with respect to skill.

F. Among the set of home-country children, those with higher levels of skill will receive less transfers.

The key point is that altruistic parents will favor the more-educated child in terms of sponsorship, but the less educated child with respect to financial assistance -- transfers are negatively selective and family-based immigration via sponsorship is positively selective if families behave altruistically.

3. The Data

We focus on persons newly admitted to legal permanent residence (LPR) in the United States in 2003, and, using data from Rounds 1 and 2 of the New Immigrant Survey, examine their sponsorship behavior between obtaining LPR and the Round 2 survey and their remittance behavior in the twelve months before the Round 2 survey.

3.1. The New Immigrant Survey

The New Immigrant Survey, the first nationally representative survey of cohorts of new legal permanent residents in the United States, was designed to provide public-use data for addressing key questions about immigration, including questions of selectivity and assimilation. The NIS covers health and health care practices, employment, marriage and fertility, English language skill, sponsorship, naturalization, and other domains affecting the well-being of immigrants and their children as well as their impacts on the native U.S. population. A key feature of the survey is that it includes information on all of the immediate relatives of the respondent immigrants regardless of their location, as reported by the immigrant respondents. A pilot was conducted on the 1996 cohort, and the first full study is on the 2003 cohort.[6]

NIS-2003 Round 1. The sampling frame consists of all new LPRs whose records were compiled in the 7-month period May-November 2003. On average, interviews were conducted approximately four months after admission to LPR; mean (median) time elapsed between LPR and interview was 17 (14) weeks. All respondents were interviewed in the language of their choice -- a total of 95 languages.

The analyses reported in this paper pertain to the Adult Sample of NIS-2003, a probability sample from among all adults (age 18 and older) admitted to LPR during the sampling period. Interviews were completed with 8,573 sampled adults, for a response rate of 68.6 percent, as well as 4,334 spouses. The smaller Child Sample (focused on two types of immigrant children who may not be found in the households of adult immigrants, such as adopted orphans) includes completed interviews with 810 sponsor-parents, for a response rate of 64.8%, and 579 spouses. Additionally, assessments were carried out on children age 3-12 according to an age-eligibility schedule, and up to two children 8-12 in the household were also interviewed.

Thus, at the Round 1 interview, the respondents are starting on the immigrant career, and, as discussed above, face new choices that include not only whether to stay or leave and whether to send remittances but also whether to sponsor the immigration of their kin.

NIS-2003 Round 2. Respondents were re-interviewed in 2007-2010. The interviews,

[6] For overview of the NIS project, see Jasso, Massey, Rosenzweig, and Smith (in press). For data or documentation, see the project website (http://nis.princeton.edu).

besides obtaining information on remittances and extensive updates to the marriage, fertility, employment, earnings, and other sections, also obtained information on naturalization for the subset of respondents known to be already eligible (those married to U.S. citizens) and on sponsorship. In the period from 2003 to 2007-2010, the non-naturalized majority of the sample could sponsor spouses and unmarried children, and the naturalized could sponsor the large set described above, including parents.

In the Adult Sample, interviews were completed with 3,903 sampled immigrants, for a response rate of 45.5 percent, plus 1,555 spouses. Adjusting for the 69 deceased and 48 incapacitated main respondents, the response rate is 46.2 percent. Note, however, that there is a sizable number of partial interviews, which are in the process of being compiled. Thus, for particular topical domains, the effective response rate may be higher.

3.2. NIS Information for Jointly Studying Sponsorship and Remittances

3.2.1. The Set of Relatives

The first requirement for this study is information on all the relatives to whom remittances may be sent and/or who may be sponsored for immigration. Given our focus on the interval between LPR and the Round 2 interviews, we constructed a data base with all the parents and children of the sampled immigrant and spouse at the time of LPR. For each person in this data base, the information obtained by the NIS includes age, sex, marital status, country of birth, country of citizenship, country of current residence, and years of completed schooling. This set of relatives thus comprises all the candidates for remittances and for sponsorship, now or after naturalization.[7]

3.2.2. NIS Information on Remittances to Children

We focus here on financial transfers to the children of immigrants age 17 and over. The questions on remittances to children 17+ begin with the following question: "During the last twelve months, did you (or your spouse) give or send money to any of your children age 17 and over when they were not living with you in the same house?" If the answer is yes, information is obtained on the amount of the remittance, the currency, and its periodicity, separately for each child. In the NIS, all questions about finances were asked of either the main sampled immigrant or the spouse, if the main sampled immigrant was married and designated the spouse as the financially knowledgeable partner. Data were compiled from both the main respondent's and the spouse's responses.

3.2.3. NIS Information on Sponsorship

[7] The NIS also obtained information on siblings (of both respondent and the spouse) but not their country of residence. Given our focus on remittances, we do not use the sibling data here.

The first question in this series asks: "Since you became a legal permanent resident, have you yourself filed a petition to begin the process to bring a relative to live permanently in the United States?" This question is followed by questions on origin country, relationship, and whether the visa process has concluded, then repeated for as many persons as the respondent may be sponsoring. All the information in the master set of relatives can then be associated with each of the sponsored relatives.

3.3. Basic Characteristics of the Respondent Sample

Table 3 reports the visa category composition of the 2003 immigrant cohort sample at both Round 1 and Round 2. The composition at Round 1 is not surprising. As is well known, the largest group of immigrants consists of spouses of U.S. citizens, about one-third of every immigrant cohort. Similarly, parents of U.S. citizens constitute the second largest contingent, with about 12 percent of the cohort. What is worthy of comment, however, is that notwithstanding the sample attrition, the Round 2 visa composition mirrors that in Round 1 almost exactly.

Table 4 reports the composition of the cohort by country of birth. Again, the Round 1 composition mirrors the composition of the immigrant population in 2003 (Fiscal Years 2003 and 2004), and the Round 2 composition mirrors that in Round 1.

As noted above, a longstanding major question involves the sponsorship propensities of immigrants across the visa categories. These data enable a first look. Approximately 4.91 percent of the cohort at Time 1 petitioned for relatives between admission to LPR and Round 2. If those who did not participate in the survey at Round 2 have the same sponsorship propensities as those who did, we may double that figure. Thus, we estimate that approximately ten percent of the 2003 cohort of immigrants petitioned for relatives in the first 4-7 years after admission to LPR.

Of the 3,903 immigrants who completed interviews in Round 2, 432 filed for 648 relatives. The number of relatives petitioned for ranges from one to six per respondent. In this set, 404 immigrants petitioned for 613 directly sponsorable relatives – spouses, children, parents, siblings. The other 35 relatives sponsored by the remaining 28 respondents are a mixture of (1) relatives sponsored by the respondent's spouse (e.g., "spouse's sister"), (2) accompanying family members of the sponsorable relatives (e.g., "daughter-in-law" and "grandchild"), and possibly (3) relatives sponsored as workers (e.g., "former partner").

Table 5 reports the proportions of immigrants in the 2003 cohort who petitioned for relatives between admission to LPR and Round 2, expressed as proportions of the Round 1 sample, by visa type and marital status. Accordingly, doubling them provides a crude estimate of the proportions for the cohort. The figures are remarkably in line with what one would expect,

based on immigration law requirements and constraints, discussed above. Immigrants whose eligibility depended on their being single have the highest rates of sponsoring a spouse – the adult children of U.S. citizens (Fam 1) and the adult children of LPRs (Fam 2), with rates of 5.76 percent and 10.1 percent, respectively (doubling these figures would yield approximately 11 and 20 percent, respectively. The higher rates for Fam 2 may reflect the longer waiting periods for prospective immigrants from most countries (Visa Bulletins, August 2003 and subsequent issues). Similarly, immigrants whose visa category had long waits so that their children aged out of eligibility for derivative visas (e.g., siblings and spouses of siblings) or whose visa category does not provide visas for accompanying children (e.g., parents) have among the highest rates of sponsoring children. Finally, immigrants eligible to naturalize early – spouses of U.S. citizens and some refugees for whom a portion of the time between entering the United States and receiving the green card counts toward the naturalization residency requirement – have the highest rates of sponsoring parents and siblings, categories for which the sponsor must be a citizen, as discussed above.

The sponsorship rates in Table 5 simply provide the total number of relatives of a particular kind who are sponsored by immigrants in a particular visa category, without regard for whether the immigrant has any such sponsorable relatives. Below, we take a sharper look at immigrants who have eligible sponsorable children.

Table 6 reports the sponsorship rates for the top ten origin countries. As shown, immigrants from the Dominican Republic dominate every sponsorship class except siblings (where they register second), for an estimated sponsorship rate of 15.3 percent (which if doubled would be over 30 percent). Vietnam is in second place, at 10 percent. The next closest figures are 8.79 and 7.18 for Colombia and the Philippines, respectively. Mexico, which has the largest number of immigrants, has the lowest total sponsorship rate – 1.89 percent. These country sponsorship rates warrant further study.

3.4. Descriptive Statistics: Sample for Estimation

We will focus our analysis on remittances to and the sponsorship of the children of immigrants. Because the transfer information is for children age 17 and older, we use two samples -- one with immigrants who have noncitizen children of all ages and the other with noncitizen children age 17 and above. Table 7 provides descriptive statistics on the children and immigrants with any children (first column) and with any children above age 16 (second column). Immigrants who have children on average have almost three, with almost two thirds having more than one child. This latter statistic is important, as we will be estimating the within-immigrant (family) relationship between sponsorship and remittances to children; identification of who the immigrant parent selects among her children, net of a parent fixed effect, requires that

there be more than one eligible child. Even in the over-16 sample, more than one third of the immigrant parents have two or more children.

The table also indicates that among parents with children, 13% petitioned for at least one of their children after immigration. Among parents with at least one child over age 16, 16% petitioned for a child to immigrate and over 15% transferred money to at least one child. The mean amount of remittances among parents sending money to a child over 16 was almost $14,000, approximately one third of annual earnings.

Table 8 provides information on the citizenship, age, schooling and residence status of the children of the immigrants just after the immigration of the parents, from the first round data, and on their sponsorship and remittances at the time of the second round. As can be seen, 39 percent of the immigrants' children age 17 and over were living outside the United States just after the parent immigrated. Of those nonresident children, 15% received a financial transfer from the parent immigrant in the year prior to the second round. Of the noncitizen children at the time of parental immigration, who are from 76 to 86 percent of the sample of children, approximately 7% were petitioned for between the first and second rounds of the survey.

3.5. Specification and Further Variable Construction

The dependent variables we use in our empirical analysis are (i) the total amount of financial transfers provided, in the twelve months prior to the second NIS survey round, to children aged over 16 years who were residing outside of the United States at the time of the first round survey, (ii) the probability that an individual child of the immigrant age 17 and over and outside the United States at the time of the first round survey received a financial transfer within a year of the second-round survey, and (iii) the probability a non US-resident child who was not also a US citizen was selected to be reunified with the immigrant parent, as indicated by whether the parent immigrant had filed a petition to bring the child legally to the United States. Consistent with the model, these decision variables are functions of the non-resident child's skill characteristics, immigrant parent earnings and schooling, and the skill price in the home country.

As noted, the first-round data provide the location, citizenship status, schooling and age of all of the immigrant's children. We can also use the first round data to construct home country skill prices that affect the gains from immigration/reunification and the home-country earnings of the children. Almost all prior empirical analyses of international migration or remittances have used GDP per-capita, or in some rare cases, GDP per-worker as the relevant "wage" to assess migration selectivity or remittance motivations. However, GDP and skill prices covary imperfectly. Per-capita GDP varies across countries due to differences in age-composition, in labor force participation rates, and in the average level of skill of the workforce, all of which is irrelevant from the perspective of a decision-maker deciding on the optimal migration/remittance

strategy.

The principal barrier to obtaining skill prices has been the absence of comparable data on the earnings of workers by skill for many countries of the world. To obtain country-specific skill prices we use information on the wages that the first-round NIS respondents, and their spouses, earned in their home country prior to emigrating to the United States based on the retrospective earnings histories. The major advantage of this strategy is that we can estimate skill prices based on wage rate and human capital information collected from a common survey questionnaire for workers from a large number of countries. This contrasts, for example, with wages taken from the Occupational Wages Around the World (OWW) (Freeman and Oostendorp, 2000), based on International Labor Organization (ILO) labor-force surveys, which require major assumptions to attain comparability. These data also do not provide any information on worker schooling, experience or age. The disadvantage of using the NIS is that the immigrants are not a random sample of workers in the home country.

We assume that skill is produced according to a production function that has the form

$$x_{ij} = \mu_{ij} exp(\beta_j S_{ij} + \boldsymbol{I_{ij}\gamma}), \tag{9}$$

where μ_{ij} is an unobserved component of skill for a child (worker) i in j and the $\boldsymbol{I_{ij}}$ are other human capital inputs. Note that the coefficient β_j is not the return to schooling as in the standard Mincer model, but expresses how a unit increase in schooling years augments skill. Replacing (9) in (2) and taking logs, we get

$$log(W_{ijz}) = log\omega_j + \beta_j S_{ij} + \boldsymbol{I_{ijk}\gamma_{jk}} + \boldsymbol{H_{ijn}\delta_n} + Log\ \mu_{ij}. \tag{10}$$

The estimated country-specific intercepts from wage relationship (10) estimated across individual workers from different countries yield directly the (log) skill prices, one for each country represented. With multiple workers for each country, it is also possible to allow the coefficients on schooling and the other human capital variables to vary across countries as well. There are over 4,000 observations on home-country (hourly) wages in the NIS-2003, which also provides as indicators of $\boldsymbol{I}$ prior work experience, age and gender. Using the criterion that there be at least two individuals represented in the data for any country, we obtain estimates of country-specific intercepts (skill price) for 120 countries and country-specific schooling coefficients.[8] We include in the specification, in addition to the skill price, the origin-country per-capita GDP, which may pick up other attributes of the country suc as average wealth. Note that if the skill price and GDP were perfectly correlated we could not identify the effects of the two variables.

Because we have schooling and age for every child of the immigrant parent in the sample

[8]We cannot reject the hypothesis that the schooling intercepts are identical, however. Details of estimation and description of the skill prices by country are presented in Rosenzweig (2008) and Jasso and Rosenzweig (2009).

as well as the log skill price for their country of residence if they are abroad we have the major components of the earnings of the complete set of immigrant children either abroad or in the United States. Because we do not have actual earnings, however, we do not observe μ_{ij}. The model implies that remittances and reunification will be related to μ_{ij} in the same way as for a measure of skill if it is observed by the family. If μ_{ij} is correlated with the observed skill variables such as schooling, we cannot interpret the coefficient on schooling in the remittance or petition equations therefore as the causal effect on either family assistance variable from exogenously increasing the schooling of a child. However, as long as μ_{ij} and the measured skill variables are not strongly negatively correlated, the estimated relationships between the children's schooling variable and the transfer and petition probabilities can still be used to assess the selectivity of reunification and to test the family altruism model.

For the immigrant parent we use direct information on the reported earnings from self-employment, professional practice, tips and wages or salary jobs that is provided by the most financially-knowledgeable person in the immigrant household, and include an indicator variable for those reporting no earnings. In many cases in which the respondent reported having no earnings, a spouse with earnings was co-resident in the household. However, because having a co-resident spouse may reflect a reunification decision strategy, we exclude spouse characteristics from the specification, focusing on the respondent immigrant parent. Similarly, although we know the marital status of children, which is an important direct determinant of sponsorship eligibility, we exclude this variable precisely because the non marriage of a non-resident child may again be the consequence of a reunification strategy. We also include the parent's schooling, age and three major visa categories that were over-sampled in the NIS -- marriage to a US citizen, employment principals and diversity principals.

4. Estimates

a. Remittances. There are 1,322 immigrant parents who have at least one child age 17 and above. The first column of Table 9 reports Tobit estimates of the determinants of the total amounts of financial transfers to children above 16 in this sample, with the derived marginals for the probability of a children being provided a transfer (second column) and the transfer amount, conditional on a transfer being made (third column). These results are consistent with altruistic behavior depicted in the model -- immigrants with children who have higher levels of schooling are less likely to remit to their children and, if they do, the transfer amount is lower. The estimated marginals indicate that a one standard deviation increase in average schooling attainment of the immigrant's children reduces the probability of sending a remittance by 1.6 percentage points, or by 10% and reduces the amount by 4%. Similarly, although the estimate is less precise, for given average schooling, if the children reside in a high skill price country and

thus have higher rewards for their skill, the probability and amount of transfers provided are lower. Because only a fraction of the children reside in the home county, the direct skill price estimate is attenuated in this sample. However, it is notable that the higher the proportion of the immigrant's children resident in the United States, who face a significantly higher skill price, the less likely is the parent to provide a transfer and the lower the levels of transfers.[9] Finally, again consistent with altruism, parents with higher levels of schooling, given their children's characteristics, are more likely to remit and remit more and those with no earnings remit less. The coefficient on actual parental earnings also has a positive sign, but it is not estimated precisely.

We now look at estimates of the probability that an individual child of the immigrant respondent and who is age 17 and above receives a transfer from the parent, based on the subsample of 1,918 children who are neither citizens nor residents of the United States. The first column of Table 10 reports estimates from a specification that includes parental, child and country characteristics, with coefficient standard errors clustered at the country level. While the coefficient estimates conform to the altruism model, and to the immigrant-level coefficient estimates of Table 9 -- child schooling and the log skill price have a negative effect on the probability of the child receiving a transfer and parental schooling has a positive effect -- the coefficients are imprecisely estimated.

In the second column we report estimates that include a country fixed effect. Here the estimate of the effect of parental earnings on the transfer probability is positive and statistically significant, the effect of the parent-immigrant having no earnings is negative and statistically significant, and the child schooling effect is negative and statistically significant, patterns again consistent with altruism. In the last column the estimates reported are from a specification that includes a family fixed effect, in which are impounded all country and parent characteristics, measured or unmeasured. The estimates thus indicate who among of an immigrant's children are more likely to receive a transfer. And the estimates again indicate that among the children, a child with higher schooling attainment is less likely to receive a transfer from the parent compared to her less educated sibling. The negative child schooling effect is statistically significant at the .04 level (one-tail test) and the point estimate indicates that a one-standard deviation increase in schooling decreases the probability of the child receiving a remittance by 30%.

b. Sponsorship. We now use the same specifications and estimation procedures to

[9]When we examine below the sample of individual children, individually distinguished by residence, we will obtain a more precise estimate.

estimate the determinants of the probability that a noncitizen child of an immigrant is sponsored for immigration by the immigrant parents, with initially no age or residence restriction for the children. The first column of Table 11 reports the specification including child, parent and home country characteristics. These estimates also conform to the family altruism model, with parents acting so as to maximize total family income by sponsoring those children with the largest earnings gains from migration: children who are more educated and are resident (if still not in the United States) in lower skill price countries are (marginally) significantly more likely to be sponsored for immigration. Interestingly, male children are more likely to be sponsored than female children. This may reflect the fact that women, who participate less in the labor market, benefit less from moving to a country with a high skill price. The finding does echo the estimates in Tables 9 and 10, which indicated that the female children were more likely to receive remittances.

The set of remittance and sponsorship estimates that include the country skill prices thus suggest that children residing in low skill price countries are the most favored by US immigrants -- they receive more remittances and are more likely to be brought to the United States. But, the education of the children differentiates the mode of parental assistance the children receive -- the more educated are sponsored to reunite with the parent (at least first) and the less educated are more likely to be given financial assistance. Sponsorship bias to the more educated among the children is confirmed in the second and third column estimates in Table 11, which include country and family fixed effects respectively. The point estimates are similar across estimation procedures, more so than for the remittance estimates. They indicate that a one standard deviation increase in the schooling of a child is associated with a 32% fall in the probability of being sponsored.

The estimated income effects are also consistent with the model. The second column estimates of Table 10, which absorb all home country-specific attributes in a fixed effect, indicate that higher-earning and more educated parents are less likely to sponsor a child, and a parent with no earnings is more likely to be a child sponsor. Evidently immigrant parents who do well in the labor market in the United States, given the earlier findings, are more likely to send money abroad but less likely to sponsor their children as immigrants. To further verify this result we substituted the earnings of the immigrant in the first round for second round earnings. The point estimate was very similar (-.0146 versus -.0114 in Table 11) and also highly statistically significant. These point estimates indicate that a $10,000 earnings increase for a immigrant parent would decrease the probability of any child being sponsored by 10.8%.

The estimates for child sponsorship do not restrict the age of the noncitizen child, but the estimates for remittances are obtained for a subsample of children over age 16 (because

information on remittances are restricted to that age group). To check that this difference in samples is not critical for comparing remittance to sponsorship behavior we also estimated the sponsorship equation over the older age group of children. These results are reported in Table 12. While the smaller sample size lowers the precision of the estimates, the estimates are quantitatively similar to those obtained on the less restricted sample. Finally, by estimating separate remittance and sponsorship equations we have implicitly treated financial assistance and sponsorship as if they were mutually exclusive. In fact, in the comparable over-16 sample of immigrant, noncitizen children 13% either received a transfer or were sponsored but less than 2% were in both categories. In part, of course, this reflects the fact that remittances are recorded in the last twelve months while sponsorship refers to the entire period since immigration. We thus are more likely to observe transfers made after sponsorship. This conforms more to the idea of the equilibrium described in the model that non-migrating family members are compensated in money. We are much less likely to observe transfers provided prior to reunification in order to facilitate the migration. Such transfers are likely to be temporary.

Conclusion

Our findings on financial transfers from immigrant parents to their nonresident children conform to those from most of the literature on transfers from migrants -- transfers flow from higher-wage migrants to lower-income recipients. In this case we find that among immigrant's children, the less educated who are resident in low wage (low prices of skill) countries are more likely to receive transfers. One might conclude from this that parents favor their poorest children. However, our estimates on sponsorship are consistent with a model incorporating altruism in which parents maximize the total incomes of their children by bringing those children to the United States who most benefit from the higher prices paid for skill -- those already favored with more schooling. The higher probability of their less-educated children receiving remittances thus represents not favoritism for the poorest family members but the altruistic household redressing inequality among their children brought about by their own immigration and schooling decisions. Thus we find that family reunification is positively selective on skill and negatively selective on the home-country skill price, while remittance behavior is negatively selective on skill and the price of skill in the origin country.

REFERENCES

Dimova, Ralitza, and Francois-Charles Wolff. 2009. "Remittances and Chain Migration: Longitudinal Evidence form Bosnia and Herzegovina." IZA Discussion Paper No. 4083.

Jasso, Guillermina. 2011. "Migration and Stratification." Social Science Research 40:1292-1336. Available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2011.03.007

Jasso, Guillermina, Douglas S. Massey, Mark R. Rosenzweig, and James P. Smith. In press. "The U.S. New Immigrant Survey: Overview and Preliminary Results Based on the New-Immigrant Cohorts of 1996 and 2003." Pp. 29-46 in Beverley Morgan and Ben Nicholson (eds.), Immigration Research and Statistics Service Workshop on Longitudinal Surveys and Cross-Cultural Survey Design: Workshop Proceedings. London, UK: Crown Publishing.

Jasso, Guillermina, and Mark R. Rosenzweig. 1987. "Using National Recording Systems for the Measurement and Analysis of Immigration to the United States." International Migration Review 21:1212-1244.

Jasso, Guillermina, and Mark R. Rosenzweig. 1989. "Sponsors, Sponsorship Rates, and the Immigration Multiplier." International Migration Review 23:856-888.

Jasso, Guillermina, and Mark R. Rosenzweig. 2006. "Characteristics of Immigrants to the United States: 1820-2003." Pp. 328-358 in Reed Ueda (ed.), A Companion to American Immigration. A volume in the series, Blackwell Companions to American History. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Jasso, Guillermina, and Mark R. Rosenzweig. 2009. "Selection Criteria and the Skill Composition of Immigrants: A Comparative Analysis of Australian and U.S. Employment Immigration." Pp. 153-183 in Jagdish Bhagwati and Gordon H. Hanson (eds.), Skilled Immigration Today: Prospects, Problems, and Policies. NY: Oxford.

Mickel, Katherine. 2008. "Remittance Behavior among New U.S. Immigrants." Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, Working Paper No. 19.

Rosenzweig, Mark R. 2008. "Higher Education and International Migration in Asia: Brain Circulation," in Bourgignon, Francois, eds., ABCDE World Bank Conference, Oxford.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics. 2002- . Yearbook of Immigration Statistics. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of State. Various issues. "Visa Bulletin." Posted online.

U.S. General Accounting Office. 1988. Immigration: The Future Flow of Legal Immigration to the United States. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. 1979-2001. Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Table 1
Recent and Current Annual Flows of New Legal Permanent Residents

Fiscal Year(s)	Number
A. Average annual flow	
1991-1995	781,848
1996-2000	771,307
2001-2005	980,344
2006-2010	1,119,735
B. Annual flow	
2006	1,266,047
2007	1,052,322
2008	1,107,010
2009	1,130,735
2010	1,042,563

Notes: Flows of new legal permanent residents (LPR) represent all persons granted legal permanent residence during the period. In most years, over half of all new LPRs are already living in the United States. Figures refer to the total, non-IRCA-legalization number of new LPRs. This number was reported as "total non-legalization" in Table 4 of the INS and DHS Yearbooks through the 2004 Yearbook. The Yearbooks for 2005-2010 do not report the non-IRCA-legalization total, but it is possible to obtain it by subtracting the IRCA legalization total from the grand total in Table 7. During the period 1991-2009 IRCA legalizations declined from a high of over a million in 1991 to less than a thousand in every year since 1998, with a low of 8 in 1999 and totals of 188, 217, 93, 116, 83, and 62 in Fiscal Years 2005-2010, respectively (DHS Yearbooks, Table 4 through 2004, Table 7 thereafter).

Table 2
Sponsorable Relatives and Competing Sponsors,
by Potential Sponsor's Visa Category

Potential Sponsor's Visa Category	Sponsorable Relatives	Alternative Sponsors
A. *Legal Permanent Resident, on the Date of Admission to LPR* LPRs can sponsor spouses and unmarried children.		
Spouse of U.S. citizen	Unmarried children, whose other parent is not the LPR's sponsor and who were over 18 when LPR married, under Fam 2A (<21) or Fam 2B	Children's other parent
Parent of U.S. citizen	Spouse who is not parent of sponsor, under Fam 2A	None
	Unmarried children, under Fam 2A (< 21) or Fam 2B	LPR's sponsor plus other citizen children over 21, under Fam 4
Child of U.S. citizen	Unmarried (little) children, under Fam 2A	Children's other parent
Unmarried child of U.S. citizen (Fam 1)	Unmarried children 21+, under Fam 2B	Children's other parent
Spouse of LPR (Fam 2A)	Unmarried children 21+, whose other parent is not the LPR's sponsor and who were over 18 when LPR married, under Fam 2B	Children's other parent
Unmarried child of LPR (Fam 2B)	Unmarried children 21+, under Fam 2B	Children's other parent
Principal in all other categories (Fam 3, Fam 4, Emp, Div, Ref, etc.)	Unmarried children 21+, children of spouse	Spouse of principal
	Unmarried children 21+, not children of spouse	Children's other parent
Spouse of principal in all other categories (Fam 3, Fam 4, Emp, Div, Ref, etc.)	Unmarried children 21+, children of principal	Principal
	Unmarried children 21+, not children of principal	Children's other parent
B. *All the LPRs may with the passage of time acquire new spouses, who become sponsorable.* Stringent rules for sponsorship of new spouses by LPRs admitted as spouse of U.S. citizen.		

C. *LPR Who Becomes a Naturalized Citizen* U.S. citizens can sponsor spouses, parents, and minor children outside the numerical limitations, plus all other children and siblings in numerically limited categories.		
Spouse of U.S. citizen	Parents	Siblings who are U.S. citizens age 21+
	Children, whose other parent is not the LPR's sponsor and who were over 18 when LPR married, under IR, Fam 1/3	Children's other parent
	Siblings, under Fam 4	Siblings who are U.S. citizens age 21+

Notes: In this table we make the following assumptions:

1. Spouses and minor children of LPR applicants obtain visas as accompanying family members.
2. Citizen sponsors of spouses sponsor their own eligible children.
3. Citizen sponsors of spouses sponsor eligible children of their spouse.
4. LPR sponsors of spouses sponsor their own eligible children.
5. LPR sponsors of spouses sponsor eligible children of their spouse.

If eligible relatives in 1-5 above are not brought in as accompanying family members or not sponsored due to inability to meet the financial requirements, it is unlikely that the requirements would be met on the date of admission to LPR. However, with time in the United States, resources may be accumulated, making it possible to sponsor additional relatives not listed in section A – such as minor children (and, probably rarely, spouses of principals in the categories which permit accompanying spouses, such as Fam3, Fam 4, Emp, Div, Ref).

Table 3
Immigrant Class of Admission: NIS-2003 Rounds 1 and 2

Class of Admission	Round 1	Round 2
Spouse of U.S. citizen	34.1	33.9
Parent of U.S. citizen	11.9	10.2
Minor child of U.S. citizen	3.38	2.72
Adult single child of U.S. citizen	3.28	3.33
Adult married child of U.S. citizen	1.72	1.75
Spouse of adult child of U.S. cit	1.51	1.50
Sibling of U.S. citizen	3.94	3.92
Spouse of sibling of U.S. citizen	2.49	2.75
Spouse of LPR	2.44	2.76
Child of LPR	2.81	3.39
Employment principal	6.02	6.23
Employment spouse	3.63	3.25
Diversity principal	5.53	5.68
Diversity spouse	2.58	2.98
Refugee/asylee/parolee principal	5.35	5.11
Refugee/asylee/parolee spouse	1.22	1.23
Legalization principal	7.98	9.22
Other	.05	.04
Number of Immigrants	8,573	3,903

Note: Percentages based on weighted data to adjust for sampling stratification..

Table 4
Top Ten Countries of Birth NIS-2003 Rounds 1 and 2

Round 1	Round 2
Mexico 17.5	Mexico 18.8
India 7.30	El Salvador 6.87
El Salvador 6.11	India 6.60
Philippines 5.47	Philippines 5.17
China 5.27	China 4.73
Vietnam 3.08	Vietnam 3.24
Guatemala 2.43	Guatemala 2.94
Dominican Republic 2.27	Dominican Republic 2.56
Colombia 2.08	Poland 2.19
Haiti 2.04	Colombia 2.01
N = 8,573	*N* = 3,903

Note: Percentages based on weighted data to adjust for sampling stratification.

Table 5
Percent Who Petitioned for Relatives between Admission to LPR and Round 2,
by Immigrant Class of Admission: NIS-2003 Cohort

Class of Admission	Sponsored Relatives				
	Spouse	Child	Parent	Sibling	All
Spouse of U.S. citizen	0	.0143	.0238	.0100	.0435
Parent of U.S. citizen	.00513	.0503	0	0	.0533
Minor child of U.S. citizen	.00571	0	.00282	0	.00853
Adult single child of U.S. citizen	.0576	.0425	.00247	.00247	.0893
Adult married child of U.S. citizen	.00472	.0528	0	.00699	.0575
Spouse of adult child of U.S. cit	0	.0294	.0128	0	.0423
Sibling of U.S. citizen	.00589	.0655	0	.00205	.0735
Spouse of sibling of U.S. citizen	0	.105	.00481	0	.110
Spouse of LPR	0	.0208	.00505	.00557	.0314
Child of LPR	.101	.0636	.00772	0	.127
Employment principal	.00600	.0131	.00569	.00393	.0259
Employment spouse	0	.00331	0	0	.00331
Diversity principal	.0310	.0234	.00656	.00254	.0538
Diversity spouse	.00527	.0269	.0107	0	.0376
Refugee/asylee/parolee principal	.0107	.0132	.0155	.00919	.0386
Refugee/asylee/parolee spouse	0	.0156	.0335	.0135	.0626
Legalization principal	.0151	.0444	.00171	.00120	0574
Other	0	0	0	0	0
All Immigrants	.00984	.0285	.0113	.00497	.0491

Notes: Percentages based on weighted data to adjust for sampling stratification.

Table 6
Percent Who Petitioned for Relatives between Admission to LPR and Round 2,
by Top Countries of Birth: NIS-2003 Cohort

Class of Admission	Sponsored Relatives				
	Spouse	Child	Parent	Sibling	All
Mexico	.00273	.0131	.00150	.00150	.0189
India	.00778	.0214	.0312	.0217	.0598
El Salvador	.0103	.0555	.00223	.00289	.0651
Philippines	.0133	.0558	.00870	.00219	.0718
China	.0181	.0275	.00921	.00703	.0552
Vietnam	.00653	.0682	.0174	.00801	.100
Guatemala	.0187	.0314	0	0	.0433
Dominican Rep.	.0742	.0849	.0103	.00600	.153
Colombia	.00459	.0262	.0407	.0165	.0879
Haiti	.0261	.0260	.00666	0	.0421
All Immigrants	.00984	.0285	.0113	.00497	.0491

Notes: Percentages based on weighted data to adjust for sampling stratification.

Table 7
Characteristics of Immigrant Respondent at Time of Respondent Immigration and in Second Round, by Sample

Variable/sample	With Any Children	With Any Children 17+
Mean number of children, children>0	2.92	1.45
Percent with 2+ children	64.9	36.2
Mean age	43.3	49.9
Mean years of schooling	11.8	11.0
Percent with US citizen spouse visa	13.9	7.6
Percent employment visa principal	14.5	10.3
Percent diversity visa principal	10.1	8.0
Percent petitioning for a sponsorable child since immigration, by second round	12.6	16.0
Percent sending remittances in last twleve months (second round)	-	15.4
Mean remittances sent in last twelve months (second round), remittances>0	-	$13,608
Mean earnings in last year (second round), earnings>0	$46,187	$37,759

Table 8
Characteristics of Immigrant Respondent's Children at Time of Respondent Immigration

	All Children	Children 17+
Percent not US citizen	75.5	86.2
Percent resident outside of the United States	27.6	38.8
Percent married	24.4	39.7
Mean age	22.8	30.9
Mean years of schooling	7.9	11.4
Percent outside residents received remittance	12.7	14.8
Percent non-citizen children petitioned	6.6	7.2

Table 9
Estimates of the Determinants of the Amounts of Financial Remittances to the Immigrant's Children

Variable	Tobit Coefficients	Probability R>0Marginals	R>0 Value Marginals
Children's characteristics			
Mean schooling	-854.5 (2.09)	-.00433 (2.00)	-140.0 (2.09)
Mean age	-977.5 (1.40)	-.00496 (1.39)	-160.1 (1.42)
Fraction in the US	-16706 (3.87)	-.0847 (4.45)	-2737 (3.38)
Fraction female	34707 (2.48)	.176 (2.14)	5685 (2.47)
Immigrant parent's characteristics			
Schooling	1010 (3.84)	.00512 (4.08)	165.5 (4.06)
Earnings, second round (x 10^{-3})	26.0 (0.77)	.000132 (0.77)	4.26 (0.77)
No earnings, second round	-20190 (3.34)	-.115 (5.17)	-3486 (3.40)
Diversity visa principal	-20736 (3.24)	-.0725 (5.54)	-2940 (3.61)
Employment visa principal	2222 (0.48)	.0117 (0.45)	369.6 (0.47)
US citizen spouse visa	-853.7 (0.17)	-.00427 (0.17)	-139.0 (0.17)
Origin-country characteristics			
Log skill price	-4036 (1.35)	-.0205 (1.47)	-661.1 (1.37)
Log GDP per capita	1644 (0.53)	.00834 (0.55)	269.4 (0.54)
Number of immigrants		1,322	

Absolute values of asymptotic t-ratios in parentheses clustered at the country level. Specifications also includes age and age squared of the immigrant and the number and average age of the children over 16.

Table 10
Determinants of the Providing Financial Remittances to a Nonresident, Noncitizen Immigrant's Child Aged 17+, by Estimation Procedure

Variable	Logit	Conditional Logit, Country FE	Conditional Logit, Family FE
Child's characteristics			
Schooling	-.0234 (0.82)	-.0489 (1.64)	-.141 (1.76)
Age	-.00387 (5.15)	-.00395 (4.98)	-.00368 (3.01)
Female	.137 (0.96)	.115 (0.67)	.330 (1.19)
Immigrant parent's characteristics			
Schooling	.0318 (1.16)	.0287 (1.08)	-
Earnings, second round ($\times 10^{-3}$)	.00379 (1.00)	.0137 (2.55)	-
No earnings, second round	-1.28 (4.09)	-1.061 (4.32)	-
Diversity visa principal	-.190 (0.45)	-.329 (0.77)	-
Employment visa principal	.0715 (0.18)	-.150 (0.30)	-
US citizen spouse visa	-.396 (1.26)	-.590 (1.51)	-
Origin-country characteristics			
Log skill price	-.233 (1.12)	-	-
Log GDP per capita	-.135 (0.68)	-	-
Log population	-.141 (1.98)	-	-
Number of children		1,918	

Absolute values of asymptotic t-ratios in parentheses clustered at the country level in column one.
Specifications without the family fixed effect also include age and age squared of the immigrant.

Table 11
Determinants of the Sponsorship of a Noncitizen Immigrant Child, by Estimation Procedure

Variable	Logit	Conditional Logit, Country FE	Conditional Logit, Family FE
Child's characteristics			
Schooling	.110 (4.32)	.114 (5.41)	.0935 (2.19)
Age	-.0619 (5.83)	-.0700 (4.93)	-.111 (4.64)
Female	-.510 (4.08)	-.525 (3.99)	-.466 (2.40)
Immigrant parent's characteristics			
Schooling	-.0299 (1.24)	-.0248 (1.95)	-
Earnings, second round ($\times 10^{-3}$)	-.00766 (1.59)	-.0114 (2.49)	-
No earnings, second round	-.463 (1.74)	-.480 (2.64)	-
Diversity visa principal	-.122 (0.36)	.793 (2.55)	-
Employment visa principal	-.349 (1.32)	-.364 (1.21)	-
US citizen spouse visa	.254 (0.66)	.337 (1.31)	-
Origin-country characteristics			
Log skill price	-.338 (1.80)	-	-
Log GDP per capita	.0305 (0.14)	-	-
Log population	-.0796 (1.21)	-	-
Number of children		3,559	

Absolute values of asymptotic t-ratios in parentheses clustered at the country level in column one.
Specifications without the family fixed effect also include age and age squared of the immigrant.

Table 12
Determinants of the Sponsorship of a Noncitizen Immigrant Child 17+, by Estimation Procedure

Variable	Logit	Conditional Logit, Country FE	Conditional Logit, Family FE
Child's characteristics			
Schooling	.0952 (3.53)	.0860 (3.38)	.0877 (1.76)
Age	-.0614 (5.24)	-.0719 (4.56)	-.111 (4.31)
Female	-.534 (3.98)	-.543 (3.69)	-.531 (2.51)
Immigrant parent's characteristics			
Schooling	-.0174 (0.87)	-.00333 (0.87)	-
Earnings, second round ($\times 10^{-3}$)	-.00581 (1.27)	-.00998 (1.85)	-
No earnings, second round	-.403 (1.50)	-.417 (2.04)	-
Diversity visa principal	-.277 (0.73)	1.03 (2.58)	-
Employment visa prinipal	-.269 (1.00)	-.304 (0.88)	-
US citizen spouse visa	.330 (0.78)	.705 (2.30)	-
Origin-country characteristics			
Log skill price	-.237 (1.39)	-	-
Log GDP per capita	.0951 (0.44)	-	-
Log population	-.0739 (1.09)	-	-
Number of children		2,912	

Absolute values of asymptotic t-ratios in parentheses clustered at the country level in column one.
Specifications without the family fixed effect also include age and age squared of the immigrant.