Labor Market Outcomes of Black African Immigrants in the United States: A Comparison with US and Caribbean born Blacks

Rebbeca Tesfai

Population Studies Center, University of Pennsylvania, 239 McNeil Building, 3718 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, PA 19104, rtesfai@sas.upenn.edu

Introduction

Sowell's assertion that the economic success of black Caribbean immigrants in the United States relative to US born blacks was due to cultural attributes (Sowell 1978) inspired numerous studies investigating the labor market outcomes of black immigrants in the United States. Scholarly debates over black immigrant social mobility have since focused on determining whether the wage advantage of black Caribbean immigrants relative to US born blacks extends to black African immigrants, and testing the cultural explanation for a black immigrant wage advantage relative to US born blacks. While a great deal of research has been conducted on the subject of black immigrant labor market outcomes, there has been no consensus on whether black immigrants from all source countries earn more than US born blacks or the causes for immigrant wage advantages when found.

Though Sowell found a Caribbean wage advantage, others investigating the wages of black immigrants find that black immigrants actually earn less than US born blacks after controlling for socio-demographic and human capital characteristics (Dodoo 1991; Model 1991; Butcher 1994; Model 1995). Although the methods and data used in these studies varied, with some concentrating on African and Caribbean men (Dodoo 1991; Butcher 1994) and others on Caribbean men and women (Model 1991; Model 1995), they use the same data set (the 1980 census) to study individuals with positive earnings who were either in the labor force (Model 1991) or currently employed (Dodoo 1991; Butcher 1994; Model 1995), and reached the same conclusion of an immigrant annual (Dodoo 1991; Model 1991; Butcher 1994; Model 1995) or weekly (Butcher 1994) income *dis*advantage. Research using the 1990 and/or 2000 censuses (Darity Jr., Guilkey et al. 1996; Kalmijn 1996; Dodoo 1997; Corra and Kimuna 2009), in contrast, finds that black immigrants' hourly earnings (adjusted for human capital) are at least as

high as US born blacks; however, the estimates of the wage advantage vary between studies. Employed African men with positive earnings have been found to have earnings equivalent to US born blacks, with Caribbean men earning more than both US and African born black men (Dodoo 1997); in Corra and Kimuna's complementary research on African women, the earnings of African women were equal to US born black women in 1990, but significantly lower than US born black women in 2000 (Corra and Kimuna 2009). In regards to the Caribbean immigrant wage advantage, the same study finds that the earnings of French and British Caribbean women were higher than US born blacks and Africans in 1990, but in 2000 all Caribbean groups earned significantly less than US born blacks with the exception of British Caribbean women for whom there was no significant difference in wages from US born blacks (Corra and Kimuna 2009). Studies of wage differences between US and Caribbean born black men and women with positive earnings also find a Caribbean wage advantage in the aggregate (Darity Jr., Guilkey et al. 1996; Kalmijn 1996). When Caribbean immigrants are divided into linguistic groups, however, West Indian (Darity Jr., Guilkey et al. 1996) and British Caribbean immigrants (Kalmijn 1996; Corra and Kimuna 2009) were the only Caribbean groups to have a wage advantage, a result at odds with Corra and Kimuna's finding, using the same data-set, that French Caribbean women also had a wage advantage relative to US born blacks.

It would be easy to attribute the differences in findings between earlier and later studies to changes in the immigrant population over time, however, given that the wage patterns found in studies utilizing the 1990 and/or 2000 censuses are inconsistent, there may be alternative explanations for the differences between studies using the 1980, and 1990 and 2000 censuses. In addition, as there is no consensus on whether all Caribbean immigrants earn more than US born blacks or whether African earnings are equal to or lower than US blacks, it is not surprising that

there is no agreement on the explanations of wage differences when they are observed. The following section will discuss why there are inconsistencies in (1) the wage differences findings and (2) the explanations given when wage differences are found among blacks (culture, treatment by whites, selection, and human capital), followed by the goals of this study and hypotheses to be tested.

Background

Wage Differences among Blacks

A possible explanation for the discrepancies in wage differentials is that previous studies have not corrected for non-random selection into the labor force. Very few researchers have addressed selectivity issues in their analyses of wage differences (Reimers 1983; Dustmann and Schmidt 2000), but, those that have, find that the differentials estimated using selectivity corrected wage equations differ from uncorrected wage equations (Dustmann and Schmidt 2000). Controlling for selectivity into the labor force should have a similar effect on the earnings equations specifically comparing US and foreign born blacks because of the marked variation in the likelihood of employment among blacks. African blacks are less likely to be in the labor force than US born blacks (Butcher 1994; Mason 2009), which may be determined, in part, by differences in how US and African born blacks are selected into the labor market.

Just as there are differences between US and foreign born blacks in the probability of labor force participation among blacks, so too are there differences in the number of hours worked. Research investigating differences among blacks in number of hours worked consistently find that, on average, African men and women work more hours than US born blacks (Dodoo 1997; Kposowa 2002; Kollehlon and Eule 2003) and Caribbean men work more hours per year than

US born black men, but fewer than African immigrant men (Dodoo 1997). Given the systematic differences in number of hours worked among blacks, failing to distinguish between part and full time employees may prove to be an especially important problem for previous research on earnings differences among blacks in the United States since immigrant women have been found to be more likely than the native born to work full time (Dustmann and Schmidt 2000) and a larger proportion of black immigrant men work full time than US born blacks[1].

Though previous research has investigated the effect of the probability of employment on earnings, no research has focused on how selection into full time employment can affect the estimates of hourly earnings differentials between US and foreign born blacks: an important omission given that previous work has not only documented differences between US and foreign born blacks in number of hours worked, but also in their employment patterns. 44% of Africans, for example, are in professional, managerial, or technical occupations (compared to only 34% of all immigrants (Lobo 2001) and 23% of US born non-Hispanic blacks[2]), approximately 70% of which are scheduled as full time[3]. The differences in employment patterns may play a role in the discrepancy between studies investigating pay differentials among blacks in the United States as pay gaps can be affected by an hourly wage penalty for part time work regardless of occupational category (Blau and Kahn 2000; Bardasi and Gornick 2008). When observed worker and job related differences are accounted for, there is an 18% wage difference between part and full time work (Bardasi and Gornick 2008) (a 19% and 26% wage penalty for women and men respectively (Blank 1990)). Given the differences in probability of labor force participation and factors playing a role in the decision to work full time, it is extremely likely that there are

[1] Author's calculations
[2] Author's calculations
[3] Author's calculations

differences in the selection into full time jobs, which can therefore be expected to substantially affect the wage comparison between immigrants and natives (Dustmann and Schmidt 2000).

Along with general differences in work hours and probability of employment and full time employment among blacks, the inclusion of women in recent studies makes the differentiation between full and part time workers in black immigrant earnings research particularly important. Women were included in Model, Darity et al, and Corra and Kimuna's studies, all of which make direct comparisons between the earnings of foreign born black men and women relative to US born blacks (Model 1995; Darity Jr., Guilkey et al. 1996; Corra and Kimuna 2009). However, comparing the wages of men and women in this way is not a comparison of two similar populations as women are more likely than men to choose to work part time with 25.6% of women (compared to 10.8% of men) working part time and women constituting 67.4% of the part time work force (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2004). Foreign born women in particular may be more likely to work part time because of different migration patterns than men (Pedraza 1991; Ho 1999), the use of family investment strategies where women initially take jobs with little advancement opportunity in order to finance their husbands' human capital investments but then reduce their hours as their husbands' earn more (Baker and Benjamin 1997), or cultural norms regarding women in the labor force (Reimers 1985; Antecol 2000). Studies investigating the labor market outcomes of married immigrants found that immigrants work fewer hours than the native born (Blau, Kahn et al. 2003; Blau, Kahn et al. 2008) with women from low female labor supply source countries never quite catching up with the native born (Blau, Kahn et al. 2008). This is an important factor to consider in investigations of the wage gap between US and foreign born blacks because, with the exception of Jamaica, black immigrant women from major African and Caribbean sending countries come from countries with high gender gaps in labor

force participation rates in the home country (Antecol 2000) and therefore may work fewer hours or be less likely to work full time than US born black women, work patterns that would lead to lower wages.

Despite the work pattern differences between US and foreign born blacks and between immigrant men and women, studies have directly compared earnings of US and foreign born blacks and of immigrant men and women without differentiating between full and part time employees. Controlling for labor supply differences in the form of selection into full time employment allows a more accurate comparison when determining wage differences between groups than is done in research to date. Lack of differentiation between full and part time employees may have led researchers to find a wage advantage where one does not exist, and failure to account for this may have led to the explanation of illusory wage differentials.

Causes of Wage Differences

Wage differences between Africans and US born blacks have generally been attributed to differences in human capital because any significant wage advantage found disappears after the inclusion of human capital characteristics in the regression analysis (Dodoo 1997), while the explanations given for a Caribbean wage advantage has ranged from culture (Sowell 1978), differential treatment by whites (Dodoo 1997), immigration selectivity (Butcher 1994; Model 1995), a combination of selectivity and differential treatment by whites (Kalmijn 1996), and a combination of human capital and differential treatment by whites (Darity Jr., Guilkey et al. 1996). A factor that may play a role in the differences between the findings of studies of the black immigrant wage advantage is the lack of differentiation between immigrant groups. In many studies, Caribbean immigrants have been divided into groups based on their former

colonizer, finding that black Caribbean immigrants from former British colonies experience a wage advantage relative to US born blacks (Butcher 1994; Kalmijn 1996; Corra and Kimuna 2009) because coming from a country where English is an official language has a large positive association with labor supply on arrival (Chiswick and Miller 2002; Blau, Kahn et al. 2008) and because of British cultural cache in the United States. The same level of disaggregation, however, has not been applied to Africans despite the possibility that Africans from former British colonies also benefit from a wage advantage relative to US born blacks due to British culture and coming from a country where English is widely spoken, characteristics that African immigrants from other linguistic backgrounds do not share. Differentiating between linguistic groups may allow for a more reasonable and consistent use of the following explanations for any wage differential observed.

Culture

Cultural distinction theory posits that Caribbean blacks have greater motivation for achievement and a stronger work ethic than US born blacks (Kalmijn 1996) partly because of favorable socialization in their home country (Corra and Kimuna 2009) where slave experiences were different and blacks have held more influential jobs and are less affected by white racism (Model 1995). It can be argued that black Africans also possess cultural values and distinctive experiences that may enhance their socioeconomic attainment relative to US born blacks as they too have been socialized in a society where they are in the racial majority, lack a history of slavery and post slavery experiences, as well as have a large number of successful black role models (Kollehlon and Eule 2003).

Recent work has consistently found that, despite the positive aspects of being socialized in a majority black society, these cultural traits do not lead to a wage advantage for foreign born blacks. Corra and Kimuna's analysis of the earnings attainment for black immigrant women and US born black women found that the divergence of African culture from western culture may actually lead to an earnings *dis*advantage for Africans relative to US born blacks after controlling for socio-demographic and human capital characteristics (Corra and Kimuna 2009). In Dodoo's investigation of the earnings attainment of male African and Caribbean immigrants and US born blacks, the author argues that the "superior cultural traits" of black Caribbean immigrants may, in actuality, reflect differential acceptance by whites (Dodoo 1997).

Research since Sowell, which has not replicated the finding that culture is the main reason for black immigrant economic success in the United States, has differentiated between Caribbean linguistic groups, but has not done the same for linguistic groups of African immigrants. Culture cannot be dismissed as an explanation of wage differences if it is not accurately or consistently identified. Africans from former British colonies may share the positive attributes of British Caribbean immigrants in the United States, and analyses that differentiate between groups of African countries may find that Africans from former British colonies actually have earnings at least equivalent to British Caribbean immigrants because they too come from countries where English is widely spoken and receive the benefit of British cultural cache in the United States.

Treatment by Whites

Foner's qualitative study of the significance of race among Jamaicans in New York City and London found treatment by whites in the workplace to be important in that whites and employers are said to have a favorable perception of immigrants as having a good work ethic, especially

compared to US born blacks (Foner 1985). White employers state that they believe blacks lack a work ethic and sufficient skills for employment, with these negative beliefs leading to a reluctance to hire blacks though, when asked specifically about their own experiences employing blacks, employers have positive views of black work ethic (Thomas 2003). Even if hired, negative stereotypes about a group's abilities and potential can undermine the performance of members of that group (Steele 1997; Aronson, Lustina et al. 1999), which may lead to slower workplace promotion and lower average wages for blacks. These barriers to employment and advancement however, are not the same for all blacks; white employers frequently report different perceptions of US and Caribbean born blacks. Most typically, white employers state that Caribbean immigrants are ambitious and hard working while US born blacks are troublesome (Deaux, Bikmen et al. 2007). Because of the positive opinions of white employers, Caribbean born blacks may, in addition to being more likely to be hired and promoted, experience a stereotype lift: a boost in performance by members of a group who are not negatively stereotyped themselves, but are aware of the negative stereotypes associated with comparison groups (Walton and Cohen 2003) because they are conscious of differential treatment by whites and take pains to differentiate themselves from US born blacks (Foner 1985).

In contrast to the consistent findings of qualitative analysis, quantitative findings of favorable treatment by whites in the workplace have been mixed. Butcher finds that treatment by whites does not provide an advantage on the labor market and may actually be a disadvantage because black immigrants receive lower returns to education than other groups (Butcher 1994). Dodoo also found that treatment by whites is associated with a wage disadvantage, but only for African immigrants because of unfavorable stereotypes about Africans (Dodoo 1997). Dodoo

did find, however, that treatment by whites was an advantage for black Caribbean immigrants (Dodoo 1997), but when Caribbean immigrants were disaggregated into linguistic groups, Caribbean immigrants as a black success story only applies to British Caribbean immigrants and their wage advantage was most likely attributable to a combination of favorable treatment by whites and migration selectivity (Kalmijn 1996). Here again, is reason to differentiate between African linguistic groups, as British heritage seems to be associated with not only the culture of the immigrants, but the way their new country receives them. Negative stereotypes about Africans may have less of an effect on British Africans than other linguistic groups given they share the linguistic and British heritage that seem to give British Caribbean immigrants an advantage in the US labor market.

Selective Migration

Selective migration focuses on economic migrants, stating that economically motivated immigrants are self selected for positive traits (Model 1995) with a greater likelihood for success in the labor market of their new country (Corra and Kimuna 2009). Selective migration is an especially important factor in the analysis of labor market outcomes of black immigrants in the United States as the majority of African and Caribbean immigrants are economic migrants and Africans are one of the most highly educated ethnic groups in the United States. Among recent immigrants, selectivity is actually likely to be less pronounced among those from the Caribbean than Africa (Elo, Mehta et al. 2008) because over 80% of recent immigrants from Haiti and the English speaking Caribbean came to the United States through family reunification (Kent 2007), a group that, at the time of immigration, have skills and earnings levels significantly lower than employment based immigrants (Jasso and Rosenzweig 1995). More than 1/5 of recent, legal African immigrants on the other hand, entered the United States with diversity visas (Kent

2007): a visa lottery which gives immigration opportunities to those from countries with historically low rates of immigration to the United States, and is the primary vehicle for the increased outflow of skilled Africans to the United States (Lobo 2001). Given their higher skill and education levels, Africans are more positively selected for economic success in the United States than Caribbean born blacks and US born blacks.

Though most studies agree on the effect of selectivity on the labor force participation and earnings of black immigrants to the United States, when women are added to the analysis, it is important to consider how the migration patterns of Caribbean and African immigrant women affects their selectivity relative to men of the same ethnic group. Unlike Caribbean immigrants, a substantial proportion (nearly 30%) of sub-Saharan African immigrants to the United States between 2000 and 2006 entered the country as refugees and Africans accounted for more than ½ of refugee admissions in 2004 (Kent 2007), a group where women and children make up the majority. Refugees, as political migrants, are less selected by occupational ability than economically driven immigration (Kalmijn 1996). Because their migration is less selective than economic migrants, it has been assumed that they work less and earn less than economic migrants; however, an empirical analysis found that, though refugee immigrants earn 6% less than economic immigrants immediately after migration, over time, refugees significantly outperform economic immigrants in terms of earnings mostly due to greater annual hours worked, associated with refugees' higher rates of human capital accumulation relative to economic immigrants (Cortes 2004).

The immigration patterns of Africans in the United States suggest that both men and women are a group selected for positive traits that will aid them in succeeding in the United States labor market. As refugees, African women may earn higher wages than economic immigrants, and

African men may be selected on human capital characteristics which, in the aggregate, may explain at least some of their economic success in the US.

Human Capital

Human capital characteristics, some of the measured characteristics which select immigrants, are characteristics for which black immigrants surpass US born blacks. Corra and Kimuna found that, though African immigrants have a human capital advantage due to selective migration, this does not translate to larger, more significant earnings advantages over US born blacks or Caribbean born blacks. The authors hypothesize that the divergence of African from western cultures may be a plausible explanation for the earnings disadvantage of Africans relative to US born blacks since African immigrants are the only group for which the interaction between immigration status and college degree had a significant negative association with earnings even after controlling for possession of a foreign degree (Corra and Kimuna 2009). Unlike Corra and Kimuna, both Darity et al. and Dodoo found that higher levels of human capital do account for the higher wages of black immigrants relative to US born blacks (Darity Jr., Guilkey et al. 1996; Dodoo 1997). Considering African immigrants are more highly selected on human capital characteristics, it is possible that the majority of their economic success in the United States is due to their human capital characteristics, or to other, unobserved characteristics (such as ability and motivation) that also select immigrants.

Goals and Hypotheses

In this paper I investigate whether there are differences in both the probability of working full time and hourly wages among blacks in the United States, as well as in the explanations for any differences found. Unlike previous research, I analyze wages after controlling for the effects

of selection into full time work, and not only distinguish between Caribbean immigrants by categories of former colonial heritage, but do so for African immigrants as well. With these changes in the sample selection and definition, I hypothesize that:

1. African immigrants of both genders have an earnings advantage, in the aggregate, over US and Caribbean born blacks once the effects of part time work on hourly wages are controlled due to immigration selectivity (women) and a combination of immigration selectivity and human capital (men).
2. The earnings advantage of immigrants from former British colonies in the Caribbean and Africa are not decreased by controls for English speaking ability, implying that culture rather than language account for the differential.

Data and Methods

This analysis uses data from the 5% Public Use Micro Samples (PUMS) of the 2000 United States census (Ruggles, Alexander et al 2010) which includes both male and female civilians who are not self employed, between the ages of 25 and 59, and either non-Hispanic blacks born in one of the 50 states or Washington D.C. or non-Hispanic black African or Caribbean immigrants. The self employed have been excluded from this analysis because, though the self employed also work full time, the distinction between wages and returns to human capital investments are less straightforward for this group. Though the 2000 census allows individuals to choose a multiracial identity, I use the "racesingd" variable to define race in this analysis. "Racesingd" is a bridged race variable that uses the modified regression method[4] to determine

[4] The bridging equation in the modified regression method uses individual and regional information about multiple race respondents to assign each person four weights, each of which represents the predicted probability that the person would have for reporting American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, and White. The weights are then used for fractional assignment of race; the single race variable provides the race with the highest

the probability of a single race response for each multiple race respondent in the 2000 US census and then assigns a single race to each individual based on these probabilities (Liebler and Halpern-Manners 2008). The selection criteria results in a sample of 680,599.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variable in the analysis of probability of full time employment is a dummy variable which defines full time employment as working at least 35 hours per week at least 48 weeks per year. To provide estimates of the wage differences among blacks in the United States, the dependent variable in the wage analysis is defined as the natural log of the hourly wage. The hourly wage is calculated using the 2000 census variable for total individual income earned from wages. Since income from wages is a year-long estimate, I define the hourly wage as the yearly income from wages divided by number of weeks worked per year, then again by the usual number of hours worked per week. Both dependent variables are regressed on the same set of independent variables.

Independent Variables

The main explanatory variable is group origin, with black immigrants divided into groups based on nativity and linguistic heritage. Both African and Caribbean immigrants are divided into categories of British, French, and all other linguistic background. In addition to ethnic origin, I include regional and metropolitan area status variables to control for variations in wages that are caused by cost of living differences. Aside from regional variation in wages, both labor force participation and wages can vary based on human capital and household characteristics.

---

probability. Liebler, C. and A. Halpern-Manners (2008). "Response Data: A Bridging Method for Public-Use MicroData." Demography **45**(1): 143-155.

Human Capital

Two of the most important investments in human capital are work experience and education. Potential labor force experience is measured using the Mincer experience measure (age minus years of education minus 6) and number of years of education is measured as grade level for those with a high school education or less and 12 plus number of years of college for those with at least some college education. Masters degree holders are defined as having 18 years of education, professional degree holders as 19 years of education, and PhD holders as 22.

Though education is an important factor in labor market outcomes, there is more to education than simply level of education completed. For the foreign born, country of education may be an important factor in determining quality of education. US employers may be more uncertain about the value of foreign degrees, making the possession of an American degree an advantage on the labor market. Census respondents are not asked where they completed their education; therefore I estimate country of education by calculating the age at immigration and comparing that to the estimated age at which each individual completed their education[5]. If immigration age is greater than the age of education completion, I assume that education was completed outside of the United States.

Another human capital factor that may affect whether immigrants are employed full time, as well as their wages, is English ability. English ability is a dummy variable where those who are both foreign born and do not speak English at least very well are coded as 1. Like country of education completion and English ability, number of years lived in the United States is an important aspect of human capital for the foreign born. I include number of years foreign born

[5] Age at immigration is estimated by subtracting years spent in the United States from age. I add the number of years of education to 6 in order to estimate age of education (assuming that an individual will complete kindergarten at age 6). Country of education is then estimated by comparing these two ages.

individuals have lived in the United States as a measure of human capital. Individuals born in the United States are coded as zero.

Household

I control for household factors that can affect an individual's selection into the labor force and economic outcomes by including marital status and number of own children present in the household. I also include number of young children (under 5) in the household because, for women specifically, the number of children under six years old is especially important as each child is associated with seven fewer weeks of employment per year (England 2005) and the presence of preschool children is also negatively associated with the labor force participation of immigrant women (Duleep and Sanders 1993). In the wage equations, these factors will affect experience accumulated which plays a role in the wages earned.

Statistical Models

In order to determine differences in the probability of working full time among blacks in the United States, I use logistic regression analysis to estimate differences in the probability of being employed full time, then analyze how socio-demographic, human capital, and regional characteristics affect these differentials (Tables 4 and 5). I then use ordinary least squares regression with a Heckman selection model to analyze overall wage differentials of workers by nativity where the identifying selecting characteristic is whether an individual is employed full time (Tables 6 and 7). This method requires two steps, the first of which is determining the probability of full time employment which is estimated from a probit regression with the equation:

$$I_i = Y_i\alpha+\mu_i.$$

I_i is an indicator function dependent on Y_i which represents the characteristics that influence selection into full time employment (metropolitan unemployment rate in 1999 and the regional, household, and human capital characteristics defined above); μ_i, a standard normal variate, and α (a vector of parameters to be estimated). Step two of this method uses a consistent estimator of α (α') to evaluate the expected wage under the assumption that the error terms in both the probit and wage equations have a bivariate normal distribution. Hourly wages are estimated with the following wage equation where β is a vector of the parameters to be estimated and λ_i is the inverse Mills' ratio:

$$\log w_i = X_i\beta + \sigma_{eu}\lambda_i$$

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Tables 1 and 2 provide descriptive statistics for demographic and human capital characteristics by ethnicity and nativity. Though Africans (both male and female) on average are slightly younger than both US born blacks and Caribbean immigrants, based on the average number of years lived in the United States, they migrate at older ages than Caribbean immigrants. Age at immigration suggests that, with the exception of French Caribbean men, more Caribbean immigrants come to the United States for education than African immigrants, which is confirmed in that a larger proportion of Caribbean immigrants completed their education in the United States than African immigrants. Although a smaller percentage of African than Caribbean immigrants have completed their education in the United States, a larger proportion of African men, regardless of linguistic heritage have completed at least some college than both US born blacks and Caribbean immigrants. Among women, more British and French

Caribbean immigrant women have completed at least some college than French or other African immigrants, while British African women, like their male counterparts, have the highest proportion with at least some college.

Occupation and wage characteristics by ethnicity and nativity (Table 3) shows that, though Caribbean immigrants have been found to work fewer hours than African immigrants (Dodoo 1997), a larger proportion of both male and female Caribbean immigrants work full time than African immigrants. Even though more Caribbean immigrants work full time, consistent with Dodoo's finding, African men (but not women) work more hours per week, on average, than Caribbean immigrants. Related to hours worked per week and full time employment is the occupational sector in which individuals work, and nearly half of British African men and women work in management/professional occupations. These occupation and wage characteristics highlight the importance of differentiating between African linguistic groups in that, though a larger proportion of Africans work in professional occupations than other immigrant groups (Lobo 2001), the data suggests that this is predominantly due to the occupational characteristics of British Africans who comprise just over half of the adult black African immigrant population in the United States. Working in professional and management occupations seems to be an advantage for British African men who have the highest average wages of all ethnic/linguistic groups. British African women do not have the same level of wage advantage as their male counterparts, which may be because there is less variation in the occupational characteristics among women than among men.

Regression Analyses

Full Time Employment

Tables 4 and 5 present the logistic regression determining the effect of ethnicity on probability of full time employment of men and women respectively. Model 1 of Table 4 shows that all black immigrant men are significantly more likely than US born black men to work full time before including independent variables in the analysis. These results show that, for men, the likelihood of working full time is associated more with linguistic heritage than region of origin; those from former British colonies are more likely to work full time relative to US born blacks than individuals from former French colonies, who are more likely to work full time than individuals from countries formerly colonized by other countries. With family characteristics added in model 2, black immigrants are still more likely to work full time than US born blacks, though all odds ratios decrease with the inclusion of these variables.

The decrease in odds ratios between models 2 and 3 show that human capital characteristics are key factors in the probability of black immigrant men working full time relative to US born black men. All immigrant groups drop from being between 35% (British Caribbean) and 13% (French Caribbean) more likely than US born blacks to work full time in model 2 to being 18% (British Caribbean) to 42% (British African) less likely than US born blacks to work full time. The importance of human capital in causing this drop in odds ratio is largely determined by educational attainment; each decrease in level of education is associated with an approximately 25% corresponding decrease in likelihood of full time employment relative to those with four or more years of college. Overall, the largest drop in odds ratios occurs for British Africans, who, of all foreign blacks, have the highest levels of education. Because the odds ratio of British

African men drops so precipitously it is clear that attainment of education is strongly associated with the likelihood of this group working full time.

Model 1 of Table 5 shows that, though black immigrant men are all more likely to work full time than US born black men before including other independent variables, the same is not true for black immigrant women. The results for women also diverge from those for men in that region of birth proves to be more important than linguistic heritage, with all Caribbean immigrants at least as likely as US born blacks to work full time and all African immigrants (with the exception of French Africans) significantly less likely than US born blacks to work full time. Only half of the ethnicity odds ratios are significant and of these, only British Caribbean women are significantly more likely than US born black women to work full time.

With the addition of family characteristics in model 2, the values of the odds ratios undergo very little change. Unlike the male regression, but consistent with previous research (Duleep and Sanders 1993; England 2005), number of children under 5 has a significantly negative effect on probability of full time employment for women. Marital status also has an effect on probability of working full time with only those that are divorced significantly more likely than those married with spouse present to work full time. As in Table 4, human capital characteristics, added in the final model, are extremely important in determining the probability of full time employment, causing ethnicity odds ratios to decrease by nearly half for all groups with British Caribbean women having the highest and British African women the lowest probability of working full time relative to US born blacks: the same pattern found in the last model of the male regression. Of the human capital characteristics, education (both attainment level and country of completion) seems to play the largest role in the likelihood of women working full time. Foreign education in particular, has a much larger odds ratio in the female wage regression than the male

wage regression, with women educated outside of the United States almost 50% more likely to work full time than those educated in the United States.

Wages

Tables 6 and 7 present the effect of ethnicity on hourly wages using a regression with a Heckman selection based on likelihood of full time employment. Model 1 of Table 6 shows that no foreign born group earns significantly higher wages than US born blacks and only British African and Other Caribbean immigrants earn wages at par with US born blacks. This finding is at odds with other research using the 2000 census which finds an initial immigrant wage advantage and suggests that selection into full time employment plays a significant role in the wage differences among blacks.

Household characteristics are added to the regression analysis in model 2 and do very little to change the wage differences observed in model 1, even though number of children under age 5 and all categories within the marital status variable are significant. The only significant change between models 1 and 2 is that the wage difference between British African men and US born blacks gains significance with British Africans earning 3% lower wages than US born blacks[6]. It is only when human capital characteristics are added to the regression analysis that there is a large change in the ethnicity coefficients. The wage difference between US born blacks and all groups other than British Africans declines with the inclusion of human capital characteristics with the French Caribbean coefficient undergoing the largest change (from an 18% hourly wage disadvantage to a 10% hourly wage disadvantage) and a change from a significant wage

[6] Wage differences are defined as β*100. Multiplied by 100, natural log differences between groups are equivalent to symmetric percent differences in regression analyses Cole, T. J. (2000). "Sympercents: Symmetric Percentage Differences on the 100 $\log_e$ Scale Simplify the Presentation of log Transformed Data." Statistics in Medicine **19**: 3109-3125.

disadvantage to no significant difference in wages between US born blacks and British Caribbean immigrants. The increase in the wage disadvantage of British Africans is expected after controlling for human capital as they have high levels of human capital relative to all other groups included in the analysis.

The first model of Table 7 shows that the wage differences among black women are very similar to that of black men with the exception of British African women's wages being significantly lower than US born blacks. Like the regression determining the likelihood of women's full time employment (Table 5), the addition of household characteristics in Model 2 makes little to no difference in women's wages. Human capital characteristics added in the final model, on the other hand, does. Like the male regression, British Caribbean women lose their wage disadvantage with the inclusion of human capital characteristics. Unlike the male wage regression, however, British Africans lose their wage disadvantage relative to US born blacks as well. Given that the two groups with the best English skills both lose their wage disadvantage, English ability is unlikely to be the cause of the overall ethnicity coefficient decline, and the small negative coefficient for English ability reaffirms that theory. The effect of human capital is largely determined by educational attainment, with those with less than four or more years of college earning at least 18% less than those with at least a college degree.

Table 8 presents the wage equations for both genders without accounting for selection into full time employment in order to determine whether 1) I could replicate the results of previous research and 2) accounting for selection into full time employment made a significant difference in the wage equation results. With the exception of the finding of significantly lower wages for both British and Other African men, these findings are very similar to that of previous work. This difference in the findings of African earnings may be due, in part, to a change in the African

population between 1990 and 2000 due to the increase in migration after the Immigration Act of 1990 which included the DV program and an increase in employment visas (Lobo 2001).

Controlling for selection into full time employment seems to increase the wage differences between black immigrants and US born blacks, leaving all black immigrants at a larger wage disadvantage relative to US born blacks. This finding, along with the highly significant Mills lambdas in both Tables 6 and 7, show that selection into full time employment plays a significant role and plays an extremely important role when determining the wage differences among blacks in the United States. Not accounting for selection into full time employment may have played a part in the inconsistent findings of wage equations of previous research.

Discussion

Limitations and Robustness Checks

Foreign Education

Determining levels of human capital for the foreign born necessitated the identification of those who completed their education outside of the United States. In calculating this variable, I implicitly assume that age of education attainment does not vary between countries. This may be problematic, however, if repeating a grade or a late start to education is more common in other countries than it is in the United States. The final model of the both the logistic and OLS regressions were rerun adding five years to the average age of education. The results of this and the following robustness checks are presented in the Appendix. In Appendices 1 and 2, the analyses shows that adding five years to the average age of educational attainment makes almost no difference in the size of the odds ratios for most of the independent variables included in the logistic regression. Adding five years to the average age of educational attainment does however

slightly increase the likelihood of full time employment for both men and women of all ethnic groups.

In the wage robustness check (Appendices 3 and 4), the opposite pattern was found in that, instead of the addition of five years to the average age of education completion causing an increase in the coefficients, there was a decrease in the coefficients for both the male and female regressions. However, here again, the difference between the final models of Tables 6 and 7 and the wage equations with an increased average age of education completion is quite small. These results suggest that the assumption of little variance in the age of education attainment between countries is a reasonable one.

Years lived in the United States

Years lived in the United States has been identified as an imperfect measure of time spent in the United States because choosing one year to define arrival when there are numerous entries and exits will either over or understate the total amount of time an immigrant has spent in the United States (Redstone and Massey 2004). Number of years lived in the United States is an accurate measure for those who are in the United States on their first trip, which is most likely for Africans due to the distance and expense of entry and exit. It may, however, be problematic to assume that the census measure of years lived in the United States is an accurate measure of time spent in the United States for Caribbean immigrants due to the proximity of the sending countries to the United States and the resulting increased possibility for multiple entries to and exits from the United States.

I repeated the analysis of the final model of both the logistic and OLS regressions with the US experience variable measured as years in the US both adding and subtracting five years from

the years in the United States variable. Because this variable is used to compute foreign education, foreign education may also change in these analyses. In the analyses determining likelihood of full time employment (Appendices 1 and 2), there is little change in either the male or female regression analyses and the same is true for the wage equations (Appendices 3 and 4). Given the proximity of the Caribbean to the United States, one would expect that changing the definition of years lived in the United States would have more of an effect on the wage difference between US and Caribbean born blacks compared to US and African born blacks, but this is not the case. The higher levels of human capital of African groups may counteract the effect of years lived in the United States on likelihood of working full time and wages.

Conclusion

The questions of whether and why black immigrants earn higher wages than US born blacks have been under discussion since the 1970s with no discernible consensus on the answers. This study highlights how samples have been defined as a possible reason for the lack of agreement in previous research. The sample chosen for this analysis differs from previous samples by defining both African and Caribbean immigrants by linguistic heritage and using full time employment as one of the selection criteria in the wage equation. With these changes in the sample, I find that selection into full time employment is a key determinant in wage differences among blacks in the United States.

Research using the 2000 census has found that foreign born blacks earn wages at least as high as US born blacks with no significant difference between African and US born blacks and British Caribbean immigrants earning higher wages than US born blacks. Consistent with previous work, in the wage regression without Heckman selection (Table 8), I too found that

British Caribbean men earn higher wages than US born black men. However, unlike Dodoo, I found that British African men alone have earnings equivalent to US born blacks, but that is only before household and human capital characteristics are added to the analysis (not shown).

The wage regressions in Tables 6 and 7, which accounted for selection into full time employment finds that all groups of African men as well as French Caribbean men earn significantly lower hourly wages than US born blacks, groups that also had the lowest probability of working full time relative to US born blacks in the final model of Table 4. Given these results and that when I apply the same model as prior studies in Table 8 I replicate the results of previous research, this clearly shows that selection into full time employment is the cause of the difference between the male wage findings in this paper and that of previous research.

Contrary to my hypothesis, neither human capital nor culture explains the wage difference among black men. Although British African men have the highest levels of human capital, even before adding human capital characteristics to the analysis, the earnings of British African men are significantly lower than US born blacks. Corra and Kimuna hypothesized that the divergence of African from western cultures may explain the earnings disadvantage of Africans relative to US born blacks, the only group for which the interaction between ethnicity and college degree had a significant negative association with earnings even after controlling for possession of a foreign degree (Corra and Kimuna 2009). In order to test whether the interaction between ethnicity and college degree has a significant negative association for African men as well, I ran the wage regressions with Heckman selection but changed the definition of education to a dummy variable measuring whether or not respondents have a college degree and included a variable interacting college degree and ethnicity to match Corra and Kimuna's wage analyses

(not shown). I find that, among men, Corra and Kimuna's finding holds in that the interaction between ethnicity and college degree has a significant negative association with earnings for British and Other African immigrants. Rather than providing more evidence for the cultural explanation of the African wage disadvantage alone, these results may point to African men's lower earnings possibly due to negative treatment by whites in the workplace due to unfavorable stereotypes about African men based on the perceived divergence of African and western culture (Dodoo 1997).

In regards to women, running the final model of Table 7 without selection for full time employment gives findings consistent with Corra and Kimuna's work in that African women earn significantly lower wages than US born blacks and there is no significant difference between the hourly wages of British Caribbean women and US born black women. A larger proportion of Caribbean women of all linguistic backgrounds work full time than both US born blacks and African born black women which is the reason why, in wage analyses that do not select for full time employment, these women earn significantly more than US and African black women. After human capital characteristics are added to the wage regression, there is no significant difference between the wages of US born blacks and both British African, and British Caribbean immigrant women, as well as Caribbean immigrants from non-British or French backgrounds, but French and other African groups as well as French Caribbean immigrants earn significantly less than US born blacks.

Consistent with my second hypothesis, the cultural explanation may be most useful in explaining the remaining wage differences among black women after accounting for selection into full time employment since the groups that are most likely to share cultural advantages

(British African and Caribbean immigrants) are the only groups with extremely small non-significant wage difference from US born blacks.

Social networks may play a role in the employment and wages of black immigrant women. Immigrants from former British colonies may be more likely to have a large social network due to their English ability and cultural similarities to the United States. This possible larger social network may be due to higher rates of inter-marriage with the US-born. It has been suggested that one of the gains of US and foreign born intermarriage is the broadening of a social network through increased contacts which increases immigrant employment probabilities (Furtado and Theodoropoulos 2010); increasing employment probabilities plays a role in the economic assimilation of immigrant women in the United States. Future research on the wages of black immigrant women should explore female immigrants' family backgrounds and social networks in order to better understand whether social networks play a role in the earnings of black immigrant women in the United States and whether British African and Caribbean immigrants are more likely to inter-marry or benefit from inter-marriage due to their cultural similarities with the US born.

References

Antecol, H. (2000). "An Examination of Cross-Country Differences in the Gender Gap in Labor Force Participation Rates." Labour Economics **7**: 409-426.

Aronson, J., M. J. Lustina, et al. (1999). "When White Men Can't Do Math: Necessary and Sufficient Factors in Stereotype Threat." Journal of Experimental Social Psychology **35**: 29-46.

Baker, M. and D. Benjamin (1997). "The Role of the Family in Immigrants' Labor-Market Activity: An Evaluation of Alternative Explanations." The American Economic Review **87**(4): 705-727.

Bardasi, E. and J. C. Gornick (2008). "Working for Less? Women's Part-Time Wage Penalties Across Countries." Feminist Economics **14**(1): 37-72.

Blank, R. M. (1990). Are Part-Time Jobs Bad Jobs? A Future of Lousy Jobs? The Changing Structure of U.S. Wages. G. Burtless. Washington, D.C., Brookings Institution**:** 123-155.

Blau, F. D. and L. M. Kahn (2000). "Gender Differences in Pay." Journal of Economic Perspectives **14**(4): 75-99.

Blau, F. D., L. M. Kahn, et al. (2003). "The Role of the Family in Immigrants' Labor-Market Activity: An Evaluation of Alternative Explanations: Comment." The American Economic Review **93**(1): 429-447.

Blau, F. D., L. M. Kahn, et al. (2008). "Gender, source country characteristics and labor market assimilation among immigrants, 1980-2000." NBER Working Paper Series **J16, J22, J24, J61**(14387).

Butcher, K. F. (1994). "Black Immigrants in the United States: A Comparison with Native Blacks and other Immigrants." Industrial and Labor Relations Review **47**(2): 265-284.

Chiswick, B. R. and P. W. Miller (2002). "Immigrant Earnings: Language Skills, Linguistic Concentrations and the Business Cycle." Journal of Population Economics **15**(1): 31-57.

Cole, T. J. (2000). "Sympercents: Symmetric Percentage Differences on the 100 $\log_e$ Scale Simplify the Presentation of log Transformed Data." Statistics in Medicine **19**: 3109-3125.

Corra, M. K. and S. R. Kimuna (2009). "Double Jeopardy? Female African and Caribbean Immigrants in the United States." Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies **35**(6): 1015-1035.

Cortes, K. E. (2004). "Are Refugees Different from Economic Immigrants? Some Empirical Evidence on the Heterogeneity of Immigrant Groups in the United States." The Review of Economics and Statistics **86**(2): 465-480.

Darity Jr., W., D. K. Guilkey, et al. (1996). "Explaining Differences in Economic Performance among Racial and Ethnic Groups in the USA: The Data Examined." American Journal of Economics and Sociology **55**(4): 411-425.

Deaux, K., N. Bikmen, et al. (2007). "Becoming American: Stereotype Threat Effects in Afro-Caribbean Immigrant Groups." Social Psychology Quarterly **70**(4): 384-404.

Dodoo, F. N.-A. (1991). "Earnings Differences among Blacks in America." Social Science Research **20**: 93-108.

Dodoo, F. N.-A. (1997). "Assimilation Differences among Africans in America." Social Forces **76**(2): 527-546.

Duleep, H. O. and S. Sanders (1993). "The Decision to Work by Married Immigrant Women." Industrial and Labor Relations Review **46**(4): 677-690.

Dustmann, C. and C. M. Schmidt (2000). "The Wage Performance of Immigrant Women: Full-Time Jobs, Part-Time Jobs, and the Role of Selection." IZA Discussion Paper **233**.

Elo, I., N. Mehta, et al. (2008). "Health of Native-born and Foreign-born Black Residents in the United States: Evidence from the 2000 Census of Population and the National Health Interview Survey." PARC Working Paper Series **4**.

England, P. (2005). "Gender Inequality in Labor Markets: The Role of Motherhood and Segregation." Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society **12**(2): 264-288.

Foner, N. (1985). "Race and Color: Jamaican Migrants in London and New York City." International Migration Review **19**(4): 708-727.

Furtado, D. and N. Theodoropoulos (2010). "Why Does Intermarriage Increase Immigrant Employment? The Role of Networks." IZA Discussion Paper Series(5080).

Ho, C. G. T. (1999). "Caribbean Transnationalism as a Gendered Process." Latin American Perspectives **36**(5): 34-54.

Jasso, G. and M. R. Rosenzweig (1995). "Do Immigrants Screened for Skills do Better than Family Reunification Immigrants?" International Migration Review **29**(1): 85-111.

Kalmijn, M. (1996). "The Socioeconomic Assimilation of Caribbean American Blacks." Social Forces **74**(3): 911-930.

Kent, M. M. (2007). "Immigration and America's Black Population." Population Bulletin **62**(4): 1 - 16.

Kollehlon, K. T. and E. E. Eule (2003). "The Socioeconomic Attainment Patterns of Africans in the United States." International Migration Review **37**(4): 1163-1190.

Kposowa, A. J. (2002). "Human Capital and the Performance of African Immigrants in the U.S. Labor Market." The Western Journal of Black Studies **26**(3): 175-183.

Liebler, C. and A. Halpern-Manners (2008). "Response Data: A Bridging Method for Public-Use MicroData." Demography **45**(1): 143-155.

Lobo, A. P. (2001). "U.S. Diversity Visas are Attracting Africa's Best and Brightest." Population Today **29**(5): 1-2.

Mason, P. L. (2009). "Culture Matters: America's African Diaspora and Labor Market Outcomes." JEL?

Model, S. (1991). "Caribbean Immigrants: A Black Success Story?" International Migration Review **25**(2): 248-276.

Model, S. (1995). "West Indian Propserity: Fact or Fiction?" Social Problems **42**(4): 535-553.

Pedraza, S. (1991). "Women and Migration: The Social Consequences of Gender." Annual Review of Sociology **17**: 303-325.

Redstone, I. and D. S. Massey (2004). "Coming to Stay: An Analysis of the U.S. Census Question on Immigrants' Year of Arrival." Demography **41**(4): 721-738.

Reimers, C. W. (1983). "Labor Market Discrimination Against Hispanic and Black Men." The Review of Economics and Statistics **65**(4): 570-579.

Reimers, C. W. (1985). "Cultural Differences in Labor Force Participation among Married women." The American Economic Review **75(**2): 251-255.

Sowell, T. (1978). Three Black Histories. Essays and Data on American Ethnic Groups. Washington, D.C., The Urban Institute**:** 7-57.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2004) National Compensation Survey: Employee Benefits in Private Industry in the United States, March 2003.

Steele, C. M. (1997). "Threat in the Air: How Stereotypes Shape Intellectual Identity and Performance." American Psychologist **52**(6): 613-628.

Thomas, W. F. (2003). "The Meaning of Race to Employers: A Dynamic Qualitative Perspective." The Sociological Quarterly **44**(2): 227-242.

Walton, G. M. and G. L. Cohen (2003). "Stereotype Lift." Journal of Experimental Social Psychology **39**: 456-457.

Table 1.	**Demographic and Human Capital Characteristics: Men 24-59**						
	US born black	British African	French African	Other African	British Caribbean	French Caribbean	Other Caribbean
Mean Age	40	40	38	38	41	41	43
Mean Family Size	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.2	3.8	3.0
% with Children	36.8	46.2	42.7	38.8	49.7	53.5	43.8
Mean Number of Children in the Household	0.7	1.1	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.3	0.9
Mean Number of Years in the United States	n/a	12.1	11.4	10.7	17.4	15.7	19.3
Marital Status (%)							
Married, Spouse Present	40.7	51.9	47.4	45.3	53.7	53.5	49.2
Married, Spouse Absent	7.1	11.1	11.7	10.9	6.2	9.3	8.4
Separated	5.7	6.1	4.3	5.5	5.3	4.7	6.0
Divorced	12.5	8.5	6.5	7.3	9.4	7.4	9.2
Widowed	1.4	0.6	0.8	0.5	0.8	1.0	0.8
Never Married/Single	32.6	21.9	29.2	30.5	24.6	24.2	26.5
English Ability (%)	n/a						
Speaks English at least very well		87.7	59.7	66.5	97.9	51.4	88,1
Speaks English well or Not well/ No English		12.3	40.3	33.5	2.1	48.6	11.9
Education (%)							
Less than 9^{th} Grade	4.3	1.3	9.8	5.1	6.6	11.5	10.0
9^{th}-12^{th} Grade	55.5	17.8	27.2	29.8	49.3	46.7	49.7
1-3 Years College	28.2	25.2	26.4	31.4	27.8	26.7	23.5
4+ Years College	12.0	55.8	36.6	33.7	16.4	15.1	16.8
Educated in the U.S. (%)	n/a	31.6	24.3	23.9	37.1	27.8	38.3
Metropolitan Area (%)							
Metro	78,2	96.2	96.9	96.6	96.1	98.2	92.4
Rural	16.9	2.4	1.8	2.6	2.6	1.2	5.1
Undefined	4.9	1.4	1.2	0.8	1.2	0.5	2.4
Region (%)							
Northeast	13.4	29.6	47.4	27.1	57.2	44.0	51.4
Midwest	17.6	14.1	10.8	15.5	3.3	1.5	2.7
South	59.0	43.2	33.5	38.1	35.4	52.8	38.1
West	10.1	13.2	8.2	19.3	4.0	1.7	7.8
N	283,085	4,381	489	3,449	9,645	5,891	370

Table 2.	**Demographic and Human Capital Characteristics: Women 24-59**						
	US born black	British African	French African	Other African	British Caribbean	French Caribbean	Other Caribbean
Mean Age	41	38	37	37	41	41	42
Mean Family Size	3.1	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.3	4.0	3.2
% with Children	60.2	61.9	65.7	56.9	62.9	69.8	58.4
Mean Number of Children in the Household	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.6	1.2
Mean Number of Years in the United States	n/a	10.5	11.5	10.3	17.6	15.6	20.1
Marital Status (%)							
Married, Spouse Present	34.1	55.3	53.0	47.6	41.7	48.4	40.1
Married, Spouse Absent	3.3	9.0	6.0	7.5	5.7	6.6	5.3
Separated	8.0	6.8	4.7	7.2	8.2	7.8	7.9
Divorced	17.0	7.8	9.6	9.7	13.4	11.4	13.2
Widowed	4.3	2.7	1.1	3.9	2.6	3.2	2.4
Never Married/Single	33.3	18.5	25.6	24.2	28.3	22.6	31.1
English Ability (%)	n/a						
Speaks English at least very well		83.0	55.0	62.0	98.6	47.5	91.7
Speaks English well or Not well/ No English		17.0	45.1	38.0	1.4	52.5	8.3
Education (%)							
Less than 9^{th} Grade	2.8	3.6	13.5	9.7	4.1	13.7	6.6
9^{th}-12^{th} Grade	47.9	26.3	35.2	38.0	42.3	26.1	42.6
1-3 Years College	33.5	32.9	21.2	30.2	32.6	47.7	31.1
4+ Years College	15.7	37.2	30.2	22.1	21.0	12.5	19.6
Educated in the U.S. (%)	n/a	25.7	29.8	25.0	41.4	30.0	47.6
Metropolitan Area (%)							
Metro	80.7	96.8	98.9	97.6	98.2	98.8	97.2
Rural	15.1	2.2	0.8	1.7	1.0	0.7	1.3
Undefined	4.3	1.1	0.3	0.7	0.8	0.4	1.5
Region (%)							
Northeast	13.4	31.3	55.5	24.9	60.7	49.7	62.7
Midwest	17.3	12.0	8.0	14.8	2.6	1.3	1.9
South	60.5	44.4	31.0	40.2	33.7	47.8	30.7
West	8.9	12.3	5.5	20.2	3.0	1.3	4.7
N	346,260	3,447	364	2,998	13,166	6,585	469

Table 3.	**Occupation and Wage Characteristics: Men and Wom 24-59**						
	US born black	British African	French African	Other African	British Caribbean	French Caribbean	Other Caribbean
Men							
% Employed Full Time	54.8	64.0	61.8	59.4	65.6	62.5	60.3
Hours Worked per Week	32.2	37.6	35.7	35.5	36.0	34.8	33.6
Occupational Category (%)							
Management/Professional	17.4	45.0	29.7	28.7	23.2	17.3	23.7
Service	18.2	16.3	16.0	18.2	17.3	27.7	17.3
Sales	5.3	7.3	8.1	10.0	6.6	5.9	5.8
Office	10.0	9.4	12.4	11.1	10.1	7.7	8.2
Farming/Fishing/Forestry/Labor/ Production/Transportation	49.0	22.0	33.8	32.1	42.8	41.4	45.0
Mean Income from Wages	23,580	32,962	26,738	25,274	29,933	24,102	27,369
Women							
% Employed Full Time	49.8	47.2	47.5	44.4	57.6	50.7	51.8
Hours Worked per Week	29.8	30.5	29.1	27.7	32.4	29.6	30.4
Occupational Category (%)							
Management/Professional	29.0	44.3	34.0	28.7	35.2	23.4	38.3
Service	23.4	27.9	24.8	31.1	31.5	45.6	23.9
Sales	8.1	8.0	6.9	12.5	7.1	6.4	5.6
Office	24.3	14.6	16.0	18.2	21.9	13.0	24.2
Farming/Fishing/Forestry/Labor/ Production/Transportation	15.3	5.3	18.3	9.7	4.3	11.7	8.1
Mean Income from Wages	19,228	21,998	18,198	17,019	24,430	17,712	24,531

Table 4.	**Effect of Ethnicity on Probability of Full Time Employment (Men 24-59)**					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Odds Ratio	*SE*	*Odds Ratio*	*SE*	*Odds Ratio*	*SE*
Ethnicity (US black)						
British African	1.42**	0.05	1.29**	0.04	0.58**	0.03
French African	1.32**	0.12	1.27*	0.13	0.70**	0.08
Other African	1.17**	0.04	1.15**	0.04	0.61**	0.03
British Caribbean	1.56**	0.03	1.35**	0.03	0.82**	0.04
French Caribbean	1.29**	0.04	1.13**	0.03	0.70**	0.04
Other Caribbean	1.25**	0.13	1.15	0.13	0.71**	0.09
Number of Children			1.08**	0.005	1.08**	0.01
Number of Children<5			1.11**	0.01	0.98	0.01
Marital Status						
Married, Spouse Absent			0.20**	0.003	0.20**	0.003
Separated			0.42**	0.01	0.45**	0.01
Divorced			0.51**	0.01	0.53**	0.01
Widowed			0.27**	0.01	0.34**	0.01
Never Married/Single			0.37**	0.004	0.35**	0.004
English Ability (Very Well/English Only)						
Speaks English well, not well, or no English					1.03	0.04
Education (4+ Years College)						
1-3 Years College					0.74**	0.01
9th-12th Grade					0.44**	0.01
<9th Grade					0.25**	0.01
Foreign Education					1.25**	0.04
Estimated Years of Work Experience					1.01**	0.002
Estimated Years of Work Experience^2					1.00**	0.00004
Years Lived in the United States					1.02**	0.002
Metro Area (Metro)						
Rural	0.63**	0.01	0.66**	0.01	0.76**	0.01
Unidentified Metro Area	0.66**	0.01	0.68**	0.01	0.76**	0.01
Region (Northeast)						
Midwest	1.00	0.01	0.95**	0.01	0.93**	0.01
South	1.34**	0.01	1.19**	9.91	1.21**	0.01
West	1.09**	0.02	1.03*	0.02	0.92**	0.01
N	307,310		307,310		306,793	
R^2	0.009		0.068		0.096	

** = p<0.01 * = p<0.05

Table 5.	**Effect of Ethnicity on Probability of Full Time Employment (Women 24-59)**					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Odds Ratio	*SE*	*Odds Ratio*	*SE*	*Odds Ratio*	*SE*
Ethnicity (US black)						
British African	0.87**	0.03	0.90**	0.03	0.40**	0.02
French African	0.88	0.09	0.88	0.09	0.49**	0.06
Other African	0.78**	0.03	0.81**	0.03	0.44**	0.02
British Caribbean	1.32**	0.02	1.31**	0.02	0.59**	0.03
French Caribbean	0.98	0.02	0.99	0.03	0.58**	0.03
Other Caribbean	1.05	0.10	1.04	0.10	0.45**	0.05
Number of Children			0.97**	0.003	0.97**	0.003
Number of Children<5			0.83**	0.01	0.75**	0.01
Marital Status						
Married, Spouse Absent			0.55**	0.01	0.60**	0.01
Separated			0.74**	0.01	0.83**	0.01
Divorced			1.07**	0.01	1.11**	0.01
Widowed			0.53**	0.01	0.72**	0.03
Never Married/Single			0.79**	0.01	0.80**	0.01
English Ability (Very Well/English Only)						
Speaks English well, not well, or no English					0.88**	0.03
Education (4+ Years College)						
1-3 Years College					0.83**	0.01
9th-12th Grade					0.44**	0.005
<9th Grade					0.20**	0.01
Foreign Education					1.46**	0.05
Estimated Years of Work Experience					1.03**	0.002
Estimated Years of Work Experience^2					1.00**	0.00004
Years Lived in the United States					1.03**	0.002
Metro Area (Metro)						
Rural	0.68**	0.01	0.68**	0.01	0.79**	0.01
Unidentified Metro Area	0.73**	0.01	0.73**	0.01	0.83**	0.01
Region (Northeast)						
Midwest	0.98	0.01	0.96**	0.01	0.95**	0.01
South	1.14**	0.01	1.11**	0.01	1.12**	0.01
West	0.95**	0.01	0.92**	0.01	0.84**	0.01
N	373,289		373,289		372,670	
R^2	0.004		0.012		0.048	

** = p<0.01 * = p<0.05

Table 6.	**Effect of Ethnicity on Natural Log of Hourly Wages (Men 24-59)**					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Coef	*SE*	*Coef*	*SE*	*Coef*	*SE*
Ethnicity (US black)						
British African	-0.01	0.01	-0.03*	0.01	-0.05**	0.02
French African	-0.15**	0.03	-0.16**	0.04	-0.09**	0.03
Other African	-0.16**	0.01	-0.17**	0.01	-0.10**	0.02
British Caribbean	-0.03**	0.01	-0.04**	0.01	0.01	0.02
French Caribbean	-0.18**	0.01	-0.18**	0.01	-0.10**	0.02
Other Caribbean	-0.05	0.04	-0.06	0.04	-0.02	0.04
Number of Children			-0.02**	0.002	0.001	0.002
Number of Children<5			-0.06**	0.005	-0.003	0.004
Marital Status						
Married, Spouse Absent			0.22**	0.01	0.02	0.02
Separated			0.02*	0.01	-0.06**	0.01
Divorced			0.04**	0.01	-0.05**	0.01
Widowed			0.20**	0.02	-0.04	0.02
Never Married/Single			-0.0004**	0.004	-0.05**	0.01
English Ability (Very Well/English Only)						
Speaks English well, not well, or no English					-0.06**	0.01
Education (4+ Years College)						
1-3 Years College					-0.30**	0.005
9th-12th Grade					-0.43**	0.01
<9th Grade					-0.50**	0.02
Foreign Education					-0.10**	0.01
Estimated Years of Work Experience					0.02**	0.001
Estimated Years of Work Experience^2					-0.0001**	0.00002
Years Lived in the United States					0.002**	0.001
Metro Area (Metro)$^+$						
Rural	---		---		---	
Unidentified Metro Area	---		---		---	
Region (Northeast)						
Midwest	-0.04**	0.01	-0.04**	0.01	-0.04**	0.01
South	-0.21**	0.005	-0.23**	0.01	-0.18**	0.004
West	0.005**	0.01	0.001	0.01	-0.01*	0.01
Uncensored N	140,060		140,060		140,060	
Wald Chi^2	3448.37		3598.65		16,283.42	
Prob>Chi^2	0.00		0.00		0.00	
Rho	-0.94		-1.03		-0.60	
Mills Lambda (SE)	-0.70** (0.01)		-0.86** (0.01)		-0.34** (0.03)	

** = p<0.01, * = p<0.05, $^+$ = Omitted due to collinearity

Table 7.	**Effect of Ethnicity on Natural Log of Hourly Wages (Women 24-59)**					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Coef	*SE*	*Coef*	*SE*	*Coef*	*SE*
Ethnicity (US black)						
British African	-0.06**	0.02	-0.08**	0.02	-0.04	0.02
French African	-0.23**	0.05	-0.24**	0.05	-0.17**	0.05
Other African	-0.17**	0.02	-0.18**	0.02	-0.09**	0.02
British Caribbean	-0.04**	0.01	-0.05**	0.01	0.003	0.02
French Caribbean	-0.13**	0.01	-0.13**	0.01	-0.07**	0.02
Other Caribbean	-0.03	0.04	-0.04**	0.04	0.0005	0.04
Number of Children			-0.04**	0.002	-0.02**	0.002
Number of Children<5			0.07**	0.01	0.12**	0.01
Marital Status						
Married, Spouse Absent			0.04**	0.01	0.08**	0.01
Separated			-0.06**	0.01	-0.04**	0.01
Divorced			-0.06**	0.01	-0.06**	0.01
Widowed			0.12**	0.01	0.04**	0.01
Never Married/Single			-0.09**	0.01	-0.01	0.01
English Ability (Very Well/English Only)						
Speaks English well, not well, or no English					-0.02	0.02
Education (4+ Years College)						
1-3 Years College					-0.31**	0.01
9th-12th Grade					-0.31**	0.02
<9th Grade					-0.18**	0.04
Foreign Education					-0.08**	0.01
Estimated Years of Work Experience					0.01**	0.001
Estimated Years of Work Experience^2					-0.00003	0.00003
Years Lived in the United States					-0.001	0.001
Metro Area (Metro)$^+$						
Rural	---		---		---	
Unidentified Metro Area	---		---		---	
Region (Northeast)						
Midwest	-0.11**	0.01	-0.10**	0.01	-0.09**	0.01
South	-0.25**	0.01	-0.26**	0.01	-0.24**	0.01
West	0.02**	0.01	0.02*	0.01	0.02**	0.01
Unobserved N	156,806		156,806		156,806	
Wald Chi^2	3,329.89		4,131.61		10,758.06	
Prob>Chi^2	0.00		0.00		0.00	
Rho	-1.06		-1.07		-1.05	
Mills Lambda (SE)	-0.96** (0.01)		-0.98** (0.01)		-0.87** (0.05)	

** = p<0.01, * = p<0.05, $^+$ = Omitted due to collinearity

Table 8.	**Model 3 of Wage Regressions without Heckman Selection**			
	Men		Women	
	Coef.	*SE*	*Coef*	*SE*
Ethnicity (US black)				
British African	-0.04*	0.02	-0.03	0.02
French African	-0.05	0.04	-0.11*	0.04
Other African	-0.07**	0.02	-0.08**	0.02
British Caribbean	0.03*	0.02	-0.02	0.02
French Caribbean	-0.07**	0.02	-0.10**	0.02
Other Caribbean	0.02	0.04	-0.08*	0.04
Number of Children	0.01**	0.002	-0.03**	0.001
Number of Children<5	-0.01**	0.003	0.01**	0.003
Marital Status				
Married, Spouse Absent	-0.24**	0.01	-0.11**	0.01
Separated	-0.18**	0.01	-0.09**	0.005
Divorced	-0.13**	0.005	-0.02**	0.004
Widowed	-0.22**	0.01	-0.07**	0.01
Never Married/Single	-0.20**	0.004	-0.09**	0.003
English Ability (Very Well/English Only)				
Speaks English well, not well, or no English	-0.06**	0.01	-0.05**	0.01
Education (4+ Years College)				
1-3 Years College	-0.33**	0.004	-0.41**	0.004
9th-12th Grade	-0.52**	0.004	-0.62**	0.004
<9th Grade	-0.69**	0.01	-0.79**	0.01
Foreign Education	-0.09**	0.01	-0.05**	0.01
Estimated Years of Work Experience	0.01**	0.001	0.02**	0.001
Estimated Years of Work Experience^2	-0.0001**	0.0001	-0.0003**	0.00001
Years Lived in the United States	0.003**	0.001	0.01**	0.001
Metro Area (Metro)				
Rural	-0.12**	0.004	-0.17**	0.004
Unidentified Metro Area	-0.09**	0.01	-0.14**	0.01
Region (Northeast)				
Midwest	-0.07**	0.005	-0.11**	0.004
South	-0.14**	0.004	-0.19**	0.004
West	-0.04**	0.01	-0.06**	0.01
N	236,434		286,492	
R^2	0.130		0.156	

** = p<0.01, * = p<0.05

Appendices

Appendix 1.	**Probability of Full Time Employment Robustness Checks - Men**							
	Table 4, Model 3		**Foreign Education**		**Years in the US+5**		**Years in the US-5**	
	Odds Ratio	*SE*	*Odds Ratio*	*SE*	*Odds Ratio*	*SE*	*Odds Ratio*	*SE*
Ethnicity (US black)								
British African	0.58**	0.03	0.64**	0.03	0.57**	0.03	0.60**	0.03
French African	0.70**	0.08	0.77*	0.08	0.69**	0.08	0.72**	0.08
Other African	0.61**	0.03	0.68**	0.03	0.61**	0.03	0.64**	0.04
British Caribbean	0.82**	0.04	0.89*	0.04	0.80**	0.04	0.87**	0.05
French Caribbean	0.70**	0.04	0.77**	0.04	0.69**	004	0.74**	0.04
Other Caribbean	0.71**	0.09	0.78*	0.10	0.70**	0.09	0.74*	0.09
Number of Children	1.08**	0.01	1.08**	0.01	1.08**	0.01	1.08**	0.01
Number of Children<5	0.98	0.01	0.98	0.01	0.98	0.01	0.98	0.01
Marital Status								
Married, Spouse Absent	0.20**	0.003	0.20**	0.003	0.20**	0.003	0.20**	0.003
Separated	0.45**	0.01	0.45**	0.01	0.44**	0.01	0.45**	0.01
Divorced	0.53**	0.01	0.53**	0.01	0.53**	0.01	0.53**	0.01
Widowed	0.34**	0.01	0.34**	0.01	0.34**	0.01	0.34**	0.01
Never Married/Single	0.35**	0.004	0.35**	0.004	0.35**	0.004	0.35**	0.004
English Ability (Very Well/English Only)								
Speaks English well, not well, or no English	1.03	0.04	1.03**	0.04	1.03	0.01	1.04	0.04
Education (4+ Years College)								
1-3 Years College	0.74**	0.01	0.74**	0.01	0.74**	0.01	0.74**	0.01
9th-12th Grade	0.44**	0.01	0.44**	0.01	0.44**	0.01	0.44**	0.01
<9th Grade	0.25**	0.01	0.25**	0.01	0.25**	0.01	0.25**	0.01
Foreign Education	1.25**	0.04	1.18**	0.04	1.18**	0.04	1.30**	0.06
Estimated Years of Work Experience	1.01**	0.002	1.01**	0.002	1.01**	0.002	1.01**	0.002
Estimated Years of Work Experience^2	1.00**	0.00004	1.00**	0.00004	1.00**	0.00004	1.00**	0.00004
Years Lived in the United States	1.02**	0.002	1.02**	0.002	1.02**	0.002	1.02**	0.002
Metro Area (Metro)								
Rural	0.76**	0.01	0.76**	0.01	0.76**	0.01	0.76**	0.01
Unidentified Metro Area	0.76**	0.01	0.76**	0.01	0.76**	0.01	0.76**	0.01
Region (Northeast)								
Midwest	0.93**	0.01	0.93**	0.01	0.93**	0.01	0.93**	0.01
South	1.21**	0.01	1.21**	0.01	1.21**	0.01	1.21**	0.01
West	0.92**	0.01	0.92**	0.01	0.92**	0.01	0.92**	0.01
Uncensored N	306,793		306,793		306,793		306,793	
Pseudo R^2	0.096		0.096		0.096		0.096	

** = p<0.01, * = p<0.05

Appendix 2.	**Probability of Full Time Employment Robustness Checks - Women**							
	Table 5, Model 3		**Foreign Education**		**Years in the US+5**		**Years in the US-5**	
	Odds Ratio	*SE*	*Odds Ratio*	*SE*	*Odds Ratio*	*SE*	*Odds Ratio*	*SE*
Ethnicity (US black)								
British African	0.40**	0.02	0.44**	0.02	0.37**	0.02	0.43**	0.02
French African	0.49**	0.06	0.54**	0.06	0.46*	0.05	0.52**	0.06
Other African	0.44**	0.02	0.49**	0.06	0.41**	0.02	0.47**	0.03
British Caribbean	0.59**	0.03	0.63**	0.03	0.54**	0.03	0.64**	0.03
French Caribbean	0.58**	0.03	0.63**	0.03	0.53**	0.03	0.63**	0.03
Other Caribbean	0.45**	0.05	0.48**	0.05	0.41**	0.04	0.49**	0.05
Number of Children	0.97**	0.003	0.97**	0.003	0.97**	0.04	0.97**	0.003
Number of Children<5	0.75**	0.01	0.75**	0.01	0.75**	0.01	0.75**	0.01
Marital Status								
Married, Spouse Absent	0.60**	0.01	0.60**	0.01	0.60**	0.01	0.60**	0.01
Separated	0.83**	0.01	0.83**	0.01	0.83**	0.01	0.83**	0.01
Divorced	1.11**	0.01	1.11**	0.01	1.11**	0.01	1.11**	0.01
Widowed	0.72**	0.03	0.72**	0.01	0.72**	0.01	0.72**	0.01
Never Married/Single	0.80**	0.01	0.80**	0.01	0.80**	0.01	0.80**	0.01
English Ability (Very Well/English Only)								
Speaks English well, not well, or no English	0.88**	0.03	0.88**	0.01	0.88**	0.03	0.90*	0.04
Education (4+ Years College)								
1-3 Years College	0.83**	0.01	0.83**	0.01	0.83**	0.01	0.83**	0.01
9th-12th Grade	0.44**	0.005	0.45**	0.005	0.45**	0.005	0.45**	0.005
<9th Grade	0.20**	0.01	0.20**	0.01	0.20**	0.01	0.20**	0.01
Foreign Education	1.46**	0.05	1.44**	0.04	1.44**	0.04	1.52**	0.06
Estimated Years of Work Experience	1.03**	0.002	1.03**	0.002	1.03**	0.002	1.03**	0.002
Estimated Years of Work Experience^2	1.00**	0.00004	1.00**	0.00004	1.00**	0.00004	1.00**	0.00004
Years Lived in the United States	1.03**	0.002	1.03**	0.002	1.03**	0.002	1.03**	0.002
Metro Area (Metro)								
Rural	0.79**	0.01	0.79**	0.01	0.79**	0.01	0.79**	0.01
Unidentified Metro Area	0.83**	0.01	0.83**	0.01	0.83**	0.01	0.83**	0.01
Region (Northeast)								
Midwest	0.95**	0.01	0.95**	0.01	0.95**	0.01	0.95**	0.01
South	1.12**	0.01	1.12**	0.01	1.12**	0.01	1.12**	0.01
West	0.84**	0.01	0.84**	0.01	0.84**	0.01	0.84**	0.01
N	372,670		372,670		372,670		372,670	
Pseudo R^2	0.048		0.048		0.048		0.048	

** = p<0.01, * = p<0.05

Appendix 3.	**Wage Robustness Checks - Men**							
	Table 6, Model 3		**Foreign Education**		**Years in the US+5**		**Years in the US-5**	
	Coef	*SE*	*Coef*	*SE*	*Coef*	*SE*	*Coef*	*SE*
Ethnicity (US black)								
British African	-0.05**	0.02	-0.08**	0.01	-0.10**	0.02	-0.03	0.02
French African	-0.09**	0.03	-0.12**	0.03	-0.14**	0.03	-0.07*	0.03
Other African	-0.10**	0.02	-0.13**	0.02	-0.15**	0.02	-0.08**	0.02
British Caribbean	0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02
French Caribbean	-0.10**	0.02	-0.13**	0.02	-0.15**	0.02	-0.09**	0.02
Other Caribbean	-0.02	0.04	-0.04	0.04	-0.06	0.04	-0.01	0.04
Number of Children	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002
Number of Children<5	-0.003	0.004	-0.002	0.004	-0.002	0.004	-0.002	0.004
Marital Status								
Married, Spouse Absent	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
Separated	-0.06**	0.01	-0.06**	0.01	-0.06**	0.02	-0.07**	0.02
Divorced	-0.05**	0.01	-0.05**	0.01	-0.05**	0.01	-0.05**	0.01
Widowed	-0.04	0.02	-0.04	0.02	-0.04	0.02	-0.04*	0.02
Never Married/Single	-0.05**	0.01	-0.05**	0.01	-0.05**	0.01	-0.06**	0.01
English Ability (Very Well/English Only)								
Speaks English well, not well, or no English	-0.06**	0.01	-0.06**	0.01	-0.06**	0.01	-0.08**	0.01
Education (4+ Years College)								
1-3 Years College	-0.30**	0.005	-0.30**	0.01	-0.30**	0.01	-0.30**	0.01
9th-12th Grade	-0.43**	0.01	-0.43**	0.01	-0.43**	0.01	-0.43**	0.01
<9th Grade	-0.50**	0.02	-0.50**	0.02	-0.50**	0.02	-0.51**	0.02
Foreign Education	-0.10**	0.01	-0.10**	0.01	0.09**	0.01	-0.09**	0.01
Estimated Years of Work Experience	0.02**	0.001	0.02**	0.001	0.02**	0.001	0.02**	0.001
Estimated Years of Work Experience^2	-0.0001**	0.00002	-0.0001**	0.00002	-0.0001**	0.00002	-0.0001**	0.00002
Years Lived in the United States	0.002**	0.001	0.002**	0.001	0.002**	0.001	0.002**	0.001
Metro Area (Metro)$^+$								
Rural	---		---		---		---	
Unidentified Metro Area	---		---		---		---	
Region (Northeast)								
Midwest	-0.04**	0.01	-0.04**	0.01	-0.04**	0.01	-0.04**	0.01
South	-0.18**	0.004	-0.18**	0.005	-0.18**	0.005	-0.18**	0.005
West	-0.01*	0.01	-0.01*	0.02	-0.01*	0.02	-0.01*	0.01
Uncensored N	140,060		140,060		140,060		140,060	
Wald Chi^2	16,283.42		16,273.87		16,278.99		16,301.38	
Prob>Chi^2	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	
Rho	-0.60		-0.60		-0.60		-0.58	
Mills Lambda (SE)	-0.34** (0.03)		-0.35** (0.03)		-0.35** (0.03)		-0.33** (0.03)	

** = p<0.01, * = p<0.05, $^+$ = Omitted due to collinearity

Appendix 4.	**Wage Robustness Checks - Women**							
	Table 7, Model 3		**Foreign Education**		**Years in the US+5**		**Years in the US-5**	
	Coef	*SE*	*Coef*	*SE*	*Coef*	*SE*	*Coef*	*SE*
Ethnicity (US black)								
British African	-0.04	0.02	-0.05*	0.02	-0.07**	0.02	-0.02	0.02
French African	-0.17**	0.05	-0.18**	0.05	-0.21**	0.05	-0.15**	0.05
Other African	-0.09**	0.02	-0.09**	0.02	-0.12**	0.02	-0.07**	0.02
British Caribbean	0.003	0.02	0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02
French Caribbean	-0.07**	0.02	-0.06**	0.02	-0.10**	0.03	-0.07**	0.02
Other Caribbean	0.0005	0.04	0.01	0.04	-0.03	0.04	-0.005	0.04
Number of Children	-0.02**	0.002	-0.02**	0.002	-0.02**	0.002	-0.02**	0.04
Number of Children<5	0.12**	0.01	0.12**	0.002	0.12**	0.01	0.12**	0.01
Marital Status								
Married, Spouse Absent	0.08**	0.01	0.08**	0.01	0.08**	0.01	0.07**	0.01
Separated	-0.04**	0.01	-0.04**	0.01	-0.04**	0.01	-0.04**	0.01
Divorced	-0.06**	0.01	-0.06**	0.01	-0.06**	0.01	-0.06**	0.01
Widowed	0.04**	0.01	0.04**	0.01	0.04**	0.01	0.04**	0.01
Never Married/Single	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01*	0.01
English Ability (Very Well/English Only)								
Speaks English well, not well, or no English	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.04*	0.02
Education (4+ Years College)								
1-3 Years College	-0.31**	0.01	-0.31**	0.01	-0.31**	0.01	-0.31**	0.01
9th-12th Grade	-0.31**	0.02	-0.31**	0.02	-0.31**	0.02	-0.32**	0.02
<9th Grade	-0.18**	0.04	-0.18**	0.04	-0.18**	0.04	-0.19**	0.04
Foreign Education	-0.08**	0.01	-0.11**	0.01	-0.09**	0.01	-0.06**	0.02
Estimated Years of Work Experience	0.01**	0.001	0.01**	0.001	0.01**	0.001	0.01**	0.001
Estimated Years of Work Experience^2	-0.00003	0.00003	-0.00003	0.00003	-0.00003	0.00003	-0.00004	0.00003
Years Lived in the United States	-0.001	0.001	-0.001	0.001	0.0004	0.001	-0.001	0.001
Metro Area (Metro)$^+$								
Rural	---		---		---		---	
Unidentified Metro Area	---		---		---		---	
Region (Northeast)								
Midwest	-0.09**	0.01	-0.09**	0.01	-0.09**	0.01	-0.09**	0.01
South	-0.24**	0.01	-0.24**	0.01	-0.24**	0.01	-0.24**	0.01
West	0.02**	0.01	0.02**	0.01	0.02**	0.01	0.02**	0.01
Uncensored N	156,806		156,806		156,806		156,806	
Wald Chi^2	10,758.06		10,832.21		10,779.44		10,873.63	
Prob>Chi^2	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	
Rho	-1.05		-1.05		-1.05		-1.04	
Mills Lambda (SE)	-0.87** (0.05)		-0.87** (0.05)		-0.87** (0.05)		-0.87** (0.05)	

** = p<0.01, * = p<0.05, $^+$ = Omitted due to collinearity