

Labor Force Participation and the Decision to Work Full Time: A Focus on the Female African Immigrant

Introduction

The foreign born share of the United States population has increased dramatically over the last thirty years. Between 1970 and 2000, immigrants went from 4.73% of the population to 11.1% (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1973) (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2001). Not only has the total number of immigrants in the United States increased, but the ethnic composition has also changed, especially since the inception of the Diversity Visa (DV) lottery in 1995. Before the DV, the majority of immigration was due to family reunification, therefore only those from countries that were already represented in the United States had a chance to come to this country.

It has been estimated that the diversity visas accounted for nearly one-half of the increase in immigration from Africa between the 1980s and 1990s (Lobo, 2006). Though the lottery was originally designed to increase the number of Irish immigrants, it unintentionally benefited those from African countries because visas provided through the DV are drawn from countries with low rates of immigration to the U.S. The African population in the United States is very small (out of the 28.4 million foreign born in the United States in 2000, 1.6 million were from Africa and areas other than Latin America, Asia, Europe, and Northern America) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001), and accordingly, seven of the top ten 2008 and 2009 DV receiving countries were African (U.S. Bureau of Consular Affairs).

Due to this change in immigration policy, blacks have become an increasingly important part of US immigration flows with 9.57% of all persons obtaining legal

permanent residence in the United States in 2008 from Africa (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2008). With this new wave of immigration, it is not surprising that by 2005, black immigrants made up 8% of the total black population (Malone et al., 2000). African Americans are no longer solely the descendants of slaves but the research so far does not reflect this change.

With most research on immigrants focusing on men, the gender distribution of immigrants in the United States is another aspect of the new wave of immigration that is neglected in the literature. The pervasive assumption is that international migration is dominated by the young economically motivated males, but during the last half century, the traditional working age immigrant male has accounted for only a third of all immigration to the United States (Houston, 1984). Because there is a dearth of information about African women in the United States, it is tempting to apply the work patterns of African men in the U.S. to their female counterparts. However, there are a variety of cultural factors, such as tastes regarding family structure and women's roles in market versus home work (Antecol, 2000) that would affect labor force participation of African women. The labor force participation (LFP) of female immigrants may differ from that of male immigrants for three reasons: First, there may be cultural barriers to work for women where the origin countries traditionally do not have women working for pay. Second, married women may be secondary workers who find work immediately after arriving in the United States. These jobs may have little potential for growth, but often have high initial wages so their husbands can make an investment in their future. When immigrant families adopt family investment strategy, wives may have the opposite working pattern of their husbands; working less the longer they are in the United States.

Lastly, immigrant women in the United States may lack human capital, particularly where female education rates in the origin country are low (Baker & Benjamin, 1997).

Immigrant women's lack of human capital in the form of work experience in the new country coupled with possible financial strain are the reasons why 58% of recent immigrants in Canada aged 25 to 44 (compared to 42% of the general population) were working part time or part of the year, a work arrangement that has become more common since 1990 (Badets & Howatson-Leo, 1999). The same pattern has been found in the United States; Mexican women were found to have twice the rate of full year part time work than white women, and almost five times that of men (De Anda, 2000).

Despite the changes in the composition of the black population and the large percentage of female immigrants, few studies examine the labor force participation of non-Hispanic black immigrant women. This paper compares the labor force participation, and likelihood of working full time, of black Sub-Saharan African women to black Caribbean immigrants, Hispanic immigrant women, native born black non-Hispanic women, and native born white non-Hispanic women. Though this paper focuses on a minority group (African women), I chose to broaden the comparison beyond blacks in the United States. Rather than comparing the immigrant groups to native born blacks who have lower labor force participation rates than whites (Browne, 1997), whites are used as the comparison group so that the labor force participation rates of immigrant women can be understood in the general American rather than minority context.

Along with comparing ethnic groups in the United States, I also look specifically at the labor force participation among African immigrants, comparing LFP and likelihood of working full time by area of Africa. Clark et al. found that women in Africa were more

likely than women elsewhere to be acknowledged participants in the labor force in 1980; however, the study also found that women in countries with an Islamic tradition were less likely to be in the labor force (Clark et al., 1991). By treating African and Islamic tradition as mutually exclusive categories, this study neglects a crucial area of distinction between sub-Saharan African nations. For example, southern Africa may have different LFP for women than countries in the horn of Africa where there is a substantial Islamic influence because of their proximity to the Middle East.

As evidence suggests that source country female LFP influences immigrant women's labor supply (Antecol, 2000), the variation in female LFP in African nations (ranging from 24.9 in Namibia to 54.8 in Benin (ILO, Various Years)) will be echoed in the employment choices of immigrant women. These are distinctions that are not often found because of the tendency for researchers to combine all African groups for analyses and are of the type that I aim to find here by dividing Africa into regions.

Methods

I use data from the 1% Public Use Micro Samples (PUMS) sample of the 2000 US census to assess explanations for female employment put forth by Read and Cohen (Read & Cohen, 2007) in their study of how well conventional explanations of female employment applied to different ethnic groups of women. Although Read and Cohen studied 12 ethnic groups, none of those groups were black and I am expanding their study to determine the effect of human capital, family conditions, family structure, and cultural characteristics on the LFP of this growing immigrant group.

A broad conception of human capital is any form of investment that increases a person's well-being stemming from an increase in a person's productivity in market or

nonmarket work (Jacobsen, 2007). Human capital is increased through education or work experience that can increase productivity and, consequently, earnings profiles. Education is one of the most important investments someone can make in order to increase their productivity, and it is used here to measure human capital. Educational attainment increases employment for all native and immigrant groups (England et al., 2004) as it does for women in general (Devereux, 2004). Immigrants from Africa are, on average, highly educated even though Africans in Africa have low average educational levels (Matoo et al., 2008), which would suggest that African women would have high likelihood of labor force participation and full time employment in the United States.

Family conditions, measured here by marital status, number of own children in the household, and the number of children under five in the household, play an important role in a woman's decision to work and, if they work, to work full time. Women with more children or with preschool aged children are more likely to experience conflicts with employment (Cohen and Bianchi, 1999). The number of children under five years old is especially important because each child younger than 6 years old is associated with seven fewer weeks of employment per year (England et al., 2004). Closely related to family conditions is family structure, measured here as the number of adults living in the household. Women who live in extended households are more likely than women who do not live with co-resident adults to be in the labor force (Rosenbaum, 1995).

Household financial resources have also been found to play a role in female LFP. If income effects are stronger for immigrant women, the more money coming into the household (more household financial resources), the less likely they will be to work. While marriage has never been a significant deterrent to employment for U.S. born black

women, it has been suggested that, in general, marriage may deter women's employment because it offers an alternative source of financial support (Reid, 2002). Non-personal income is used here as a proxy for household financial resources and is defined as the total household income minus the total personal income earned by the woman.

Lastly, and possibly, most importantly, cultural assimilation can play a role in an immigrant woman's decision to work. Cultural assimilation is measured here through English ability and number of years the woman has lived in the United States. New immigrants lack network connections, English speaking skills, and/or country specific experiences helpful in getting jobs (England et al., 2004). While this would imply that immigrant women work more the longer they are in the United States (assuming language ability increases with time in the new country), labor force participation of immigrant women in Canada was actually found to decline with years in Canada (Baker & Benjamin, 1997).

Variable Definitions and Data Restrictions

I study African and the Caribbean immigrants who classify themselves as "black" and "other". The racial classification of "other" is included because Africans' racial identity as black has been shown to increase with longer residence in the United States (Phinney & Onwughalu, 1996) which could lead those who have only been in the United States for a short time to choose "other" as the racial category that best describes them.

The data set is restricted to adult working age women; that is, those between the ages of 18 and 65. I exclude all those who were not native born non-Hispanic blacks or whites, black immigrants from Africa or the Caribbean, or Hispanic immigrants. I use

logistic regression, comparing all groups, and then investigating differences between women from different areas within Africa.

In the analysis comparing women from different regions of Sub-Saharan Africa, I divided the continent into West Africa, East Africa, the horn of Africa (Ethiopia, Eritrea, Djibouti, and Somalia) Southern Africa, the African Islands, and Central Africa. The differences in socioeconomic attainment found between these groups (Kenyan men had higher annual earnings than Ethiopian men (Kollehlon & Eule, 2003), two countries representing East Africa and the horn of Africa respectively) along with the cultural factors that affect women's decisions to work led to the differentiation of the horn and the rest of East Africa. The horn of Africa stands apart culturally because Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Somalia had much more contact with the Middle East and Mediterranean Europe because of their proximity to the Red Sea. They also have a colonial experience that sets them apart from the rest of Africa: Ethiopia is the only country in Africa to never be colonized and the horn was the only area of Africa where Italy was a significant colonial presence.

Results

Tables 1 through 3 present summary statistics for all groups with table 1 focusing on household characteristics, table 2, measures of human capital, and table 3 labor force participation. Although black immigrants comprise a very small portion of the total population of women (1.23%), African immigrant women are 1.8% of the total black population and Caribbean immigrant women 7.15%, making the female immigrant portion of the black population in the US 9.04%. With the exception of Caribbean women, immigrant women are younger than both groups of native born. African women

are youngest, a finding that is expected considering that most immigrants are young adults and Africans have a short history of immigrating to the United States. It is only recently, since the diversity visa began, that Africans began to move to the United States en masse.

In addition to being younger, immigrants also differ from the native born population in family characteristics. A larger proportion of each immigrant group has children when compared to the native born African Americans and whites. Immigrants also have more children and more children under 5 than native born blacks and whites. Although Hispanic immigrants are, on average, 5 years younger than whites, approximately the same proportion of women from each ethnic group is married. Blacks, both foreign and native born, have the lowest marriage rates, but African and Caribbean women are much more likely than native born black women to be married and have lower rates of divorce.

Human capital characteristics (found in Table 2) also show important differences between the five ethnic groups. Very few Americans have less than a 9th grade education due to mandatory school attendance for minors. Among immigrants, African women have the lowest proportion with less than 9th grade education, and, accordingly, have the highest proportion of women with at least some college education (56.38%), leaving them second only to whites.

While African women have the most education of all immigrants, they have spent the least amount of time in the United States. Though one would assume that English ability would improve over time in the United States, Africans have the largest proportion (89.46%) speaking English well, very well, or only English. One reason African and Caribbean women (81.3 at least speaking English well) are more likely than Hispanics to

speak English well may be that the largest proportion of African women in the U.S. are from Nigeria and the largest proportion of Caribbean women are Jamaican, both former British colonies where English is widely spoken.

Just as African women were second to native born whites in proportion with at least some college education, they are also second to whites in labor force participation rates, but followed very closely by native black and Caribbean women (Table 3). Though African women are well represented in the labor force, they are second to last in mean number of weeks worked and mean number of usual hours worked per week, suggesting that African women have relatively high rates of part time employment, which they do.

Tables 4-7 repeat the analyses in tables 1-3 respectively, but focus only on African women, dividing the continent into west, east, horn, southern, islands, and central. By dividing the continent, we see that there is wide variation in African populations with West African women making up half of the female African population in the United States, and therefore driving the results found in tables 1-3. West African women are among the oldest (second only to women from African islands) (Table 4). While, as a group, African women are second only to foreign born Hispanics in the proportion with children, broken down, East Africans followed by women from Southern Africa and the horn of Africa have the lowest proportion with children of any ethnic group, African or not. Two of those three groups (East and Southern African women) also have the highest proportions of never married/single. Even though East Africans have the highest proportion single, they have the highest mean non-personal income in the household which may mean these groups have a propensity to live in an extended family household or live with a partner rather than live alone.

Table 5 shows human capital characteristics of African women. Though African women, on average, have the second highest proportion with at least some college education and the highest proportion of any ethnic group with at least 4 years of college, there is a wide range of education levels within Africans. Women from the horn of Africa have lower proportions with at least some college than any ethnic group except foreign born Hispanics and women from the islands have lowest proportion with at least some college education of any ethnic group.

It seems that it is West, East, and Southern African women who bring up the educational levels of the group. These groups of women are all from areas of Africa that had a significant British colonial presence, which explains why they have the highest levels of English ability of African women. The outliers amongst African women are women from the horn of Africa and those from the African islands; almost a quarter of each group does not speak English or speaks English, but not well.

Along with having one of the lowest levels of English ability, women from the horn have the lowest rate of labor force participation of any African women and lower than all other ethnic groups except Hispanic women. Of the women who do work, West African women work the most weeks per year and hours per week of any other African group and are second overall only to native born whites. However, women from the African islands follow closely behind West African women in these areas and actually surpass them in the percent working full time leading all ethnic groups.

Regression

Tables 7-10 present the results (odds ratios) of four logistic models of labor force participation that include different explanatory variables. The likelihood of labor force

participation was investigated in tables 7 and 9 for all ethnic groups and for different regions of Africa respectively. The likelihood of full time employment among all ethnic groups and among African women is shown in tables 8 and 10. Model 1 includes only ethnicity and model 2 has ethnicity and demographic characteristics (including family characteristics and family structure). The third model adds human capital characteristics, and the fourth, household financial characteristics. A fifth model with residential characteristics (not shown) was added to the analysis but had no effect on any of the regression analyses. All of the tables present odds ratios. In tables 7 and 8, the large sample sizes increase the precision of the statistical coefficients and therefore, most coefficients are statistically significant. For this reason, I identify coefficients that are *not* significant.

In the first model of table 7 I find that all groups are less likely than whites to work. With the addition of demographic characteristics of the woman in model 2, labor force participation rates of native born blacks and all immigrants drop slightly relative to whites with the odds ratio for Africans gaining significance at the 0.001 level. Africans still lead all non-whites, but they are more closely followed by Caribbean immigrants with only a 1% difference between the two groups in comparison to whites. As there is very little change in the odds ratios, demographic characteristics seem to play very little role in the labor force participation despite the differences between the groups.

Model 3 shows an increase in relative labor force participation of native born blacks and foreign born Hispanics, but another drop for both black immigrant groups relative to whites. While the drop for Africans and Caribbeans is almost equivalent, the reasons for the drops are different. While their English ability is similar (with 8% more African

immigrants at least speaking English well), African immigrants are the most highly educated ethnic group. With education controlled, African women have a larger drop, because education is a more powerful determining factor in their decision to work. Number of years in the United States also plays a role in the decrease in labor force participation rates between models 2 and 3. Length of time spent in the US is associated with increasing likelihood of employment with each additional year lived in the United States accounting for a 2% increase in the likelihood of employment. Because Africans have spent the least amount of time in the United States, their probability of working would be smaller than ethnic groups, like Hispanics, who have spent more time on average in the United States.

Model 4 adds non-personal income, the variable representing household financial resources. While its odds ratio shows a neutral effect on the likelihood of working, the likelihood of labor force participation relative to whites dropped 9 and 7 percentage points for African and Caribbean women respectively. This would point to the family investment model of female immigrant working; once non-earned income is controlled, their likelihood of work decreases.

Table 8 presents the likelihood of full time employment, conditional on being employed, for all ethnic groups. In model 1, native born blacks and all immigrant groups are more likely than whites to work full time, but Africans were the least likely of those groups to work full time compared to whites and Caribbeans most likely. In model 2, when demographic characteristics are added to the analysis, likelihood of full time work relative to whites increases for all groups, with the highest increase for Hispanics and Caribbeans. The number of children may make a difference for likelihood of part time

work (with each additional child, a woman is 15% less likely to work full time) because day care centers charge per child; the more children a woman has, the more money they would pay to day care centers increasing the opportunity cost of full time work. As in analysis of labor force participation, women who are divorced have the highest odds ratio compared to whites and those who are married with their spouse absent, the lowest. The effect of age is larger in working full time than it was in the decision to work at all, with older women more likely to work full time.

The third model of table eight has both expected and surprising results. The more education a woman has, the more likely she is to work full time. From a human capital perspective this makes sense because the more education a woman has, the greater the opportunity cost of staying home. However, those who do not speak English are more likely than any other group to be employed full time. Although one would assume that those who speak English well would be better able to get a full time job, it also means that they have more work alternatives with better pay and more scheduling options. Those who do not speak English well have fewer work opportunities which could limit their scheduling options when they do work.

In the fourth model, non-personal income has an almost neutral effect on full time employment ($OR=0.997$), but decreases the importance of education (for all levels of education) in determining the likelihood of full time work and the importance of marital status. Those who are married with spouse absent are more likely to work once non-personal income is added to the analysis, but the odds ratios of all other categories decreases with the addition of non-personal income. Women who have husbands that left the household to work receive additional income from their husbands without the added

expenses of another person living in the house, which could explain why they are less likely to work until non-personal income is added to the analysis.

Tables 9 and 10 look specifically at labor force participation and full time work of African immigrants, comparing women from different areas of Africa. Since African immigrants are a much smaller group than the full sample, the stars in these tables signify significance. Table 9 presents labor force participation, and in model 1, women from West Africa are the most likely to work, followed by Southern African women. The difference in labor force participation between the Horn of Africa and the rest of East Africa compared to West Africa validates the decision to separate these two areas for the analysis.

Model 2 gives very similar results as model 2 of table 7 with the number of children under age 5 having a negative effect on likelihood of labor force participation, age having a positive effect and the same pattern for marital status. Number of adults in the household has a smaller negative effect on labor force participation of Africans than in table 7. When human capital characteristics are added to the analysis, women from the horn of Africa have the largest increase in labor force participation rates though it loses some significance. This suggests that education and English ability are extremely important in the decision to work for women from the horn of Africa. The addition of household financial resources does not affect the odds ratios for any other variables and is not significant.

Of those who work, the probability of working full time is highest for women from the Islands, but Central Africans and women from the horn of Africa are most likely to work full time after West Africans, though only the odds ratio for East Africans was

significant. In model two, even that significance disappears, suggesting that culture is not a significant predictor of full time employment once African women are working. Age is again significant (older women are more likely to work full time), but it is the only variable that is significant until model 3. Single women were significantly less likely to work full time than those who were married with their spouse present, which is, almost, the opposite finding from table 5 where the odds ratio was 0.97. In the last model, the additions to the model do not have significance, nor does it change the significance level of any of the preceding variables.

Discussion

Though black women have the highest labor force participation rates of all women (Rosenbaum & Gilbertson, 1995) little is known about the labor force participation rates of black immigrant women. In this paper, I addressed five of the six explanations put forth by Read and Cohen to determine how immigrant women make the choice to work. When comparing all ethnic groups included in the study, ethnicity or cultural factors, not family conditions, family structure, and demographic characteristics, are the most important predictors of a women's decision to work. In the comparison of all ethnic groups, the odds ratios remain almost static through the four models despite the addition of variables that usually have an effect on labor force participation.

Human capital does have some impact on the labor force participation of Africans. Africans are the most educated ethnic group and education is positively correlated with being in the labor force, the likelihood of African women working decreased after education was added to the analysis in table 7. These results show that one of the most important factors in the African woman's decision to work is her level of education. A

double negative effect on the earnings of specific immigrant groups has been found, particularly for those who are highly educated (Beach & Worswick, 1993) and African bachelor degree holders are less likely to enter a skilled job than similarly skilled counterparts (Matoo et al., 2008). In this paper, the double negative case has not been found; however, education has been found to be a more useful predictor of women's employment within groups rather than when comparing groups (Read & Cohen, 2007). In order to investigate the truth of this last statement, we turn to the comparison within Africa.

Education actually has a significantly positive effect on the likelihood of joining the labor force, with the largest effect seen in women from the Horn of Africa. Traditionally, women from the horn do not work in the home country (Ethiopia, for example, has a 39.25% labor force participation gender gap (Antecol, 2000)), which could explain their low labor force participation rate in the United States as over half of the overall variation in the gender gap across home country groups within the United States has been attributed to the labor force participation rates in the home country (Anetcol, 2000). Women with higher levels of education are the women who work in the horn despite traditional patterns of female work. They are the ones who defy tradition by working, and this pattern seems to continue in the United States given the huge impact education has on the labor force participation rates of women from the horn. The difference in the effect of education in the two analyses of labor force participation shows the danger of making assumptions based on a continent rather than smaller groups of ethnicities. In this study, when comparing all ethnic groups, Africans have high labor force participation, but this rate may be pulled up by the labor force participation of West

African women who make up 49% of Africans in the sample and work more than any other African group. They may have an advantage in finding work in the United States because more of these countries are former British colonies where English is more widely spoken.

Three additional differences between the full comparison and the African comparison of labor force participation are in the importance of family size, non-personal income, and cultural assimilation. Family size has a more negative effect on the likelihood of African women working than it does in the model that includes all ethnic groups. When comparing all ethnicities, the addition of household financial resources dramatically increased the likelihood of women working if they were married (spouse absent). Cultural assimilation, measured by the number of years lived in the United States, has no effect on the likelihood of labor force participation with an insignificant odds ratio of 1.00, but among African immigrants it has a strongly positive effect. This is the opposite finding of Baker and Benjamin, and Pedraza (Baker & Benjamin, 1997) (Pedraza, 1991). Here, I find that women are more likely to work, the longer they are in the United States, but they are less likely to work full time.

While Africans led all other ethnic groups in labor force participation compared to whites in the first model of table 4, in the first model comparing likelihood of full time work, Caribbean women led the group, 68% more likely than whites to work full time if they worked and Caribbean women were also most likely to work full time regardless of the controls included. The patterns for likelihood of full time work are very similar when comparing all ethnic groups and comparing within Africa. Though ethnicity is significant in labor force participation, cultural factors are not (though the odds ratios

vary only slightly between models). The only variables that are significant in this analysis are age, (women are more likely to work full time the older they are) and marital status (single women are 40% less likely than married women with a spouse present to work full time).

Overall, cultural factors do seem to play a role in determining the labor force participation rates of African women, but not the likelihood of working full time. Though the family investment model has been proposed to explain the work patterns of immigrant women, this analysis does not correspond with this hypothesis. Older women are more likely to work and more likely to work full time and the greater number of years African women are in the United States, the more likely they are to work full time. Rather than household resources, human capital and family characteristics seem to determine the decision to work full time.

Table 1:

| Household Characteristics | | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Native born non- Hispanic Whites | Native born non- Hispanic Blacks | Foreign Born Hispanics | Black African Immigrants | Black Caribbean Immigrants |
| Number in Sample | 603,697 | 94,141 | 47,655 | 1,850 | 7,394 |
| Mean Age | 41 | 39 | 36 | 35 | 39 |
| Mean Number of adults in household | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| % with children | 46.41 | 52.86 | 64.55 | 53.35 | 59.86 |
| Mean number of own children in household | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.48 | 1.20 | 1.23 |
| Mean number of own children under 5 in household | 0.18 | 0.19 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.21 |
| Marital Status | | | | | |
| % Married, Spouse Present | 61.28 | 29.80 | 59.22 | 46.05 | 39.15 |
| % Married, Spouse Absent | 1.45 | 3.57 | 4.79 | 7.62 | 7.11 |
| % Separated | 2.03 | 6.67 | 5.22 | 5.51 | 7.97 |
| % Divorced | 12.88 | 14.13 | 6.52 | 7.41 | 12.44 |
| % Widowed | 3.19 | 5.16 | 2.90 | 2.81 | 3.25 |
| % Never Married/Single | 19.17 | 40.68 | 21.35 | 30.59 | 30.08 |
| Mean Non- Personal Income | \$45,807 | \$24,740 | \$38,358 | \$35,148 | \$32,677 |

Table 2:

| Human Capital | | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Native born non- Hispanic Whites | Native born non- Hispanic Blacks | Foreign Born Hispanics | Black African Immigrants | Black Caribbean Immigrants |
| Educational Attainment | | | | | |
| No schooling/pre- school | 0.33% | 0.85% | 8.24% | 3.51% | 2.92% |
| Less than 9 th grade | 1.53% | 2.52% | 27.68% | 4.54% | 9.35% |
| 9 th -12 th grade | 39.54% | 50.01% | 41.38% | 35.57% | 45.67% |
| 1-3 years college | 34.09% | 32.91% | 15.15% | 31.68% | 27.91% |
| 4+ years college | 24.51% | 13.70% | 7.54% | 24.70% | 14.15% |
| Years in the US mean | n/a | n/a | 14.76 | 9.87 | 16.18 |
| English Ability | | | | | |
| Does not speak English | 0.01% | 0% | 20.95% | 1.57% | 6.06% |
| Speaks English, but not well | 0.30% | 0.36% | 27.03% | 8.97% | 12.65% |
| Speaks English well | 0.40% | 0.49% | 19.50% | 18.05% | 13.93% |
| Speaks English very well | 2.75% | 2.16% | 24.14% | 52.27% | 19.98% |
| Speaks only English | 96.54% | 96.99% | 8.38% | 19.14% | 47.39% |

Table 3:

| Labor Force Participation | | | | | |
|--|---|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Native born non- Hispanic Whites | Native born non- Hispanic Blacks | Foreign Born Hispanics | Black African Immigrants | Black Caribbean Immigrants |
| % in the Labor Force | 71.20 | 67.45 | 51.59 | 68.70 | 67.14 |
| Mean Number of Weeks Worked Last Year | 34.31 | 31.51 | 23.77 | 30.07 | 32.27 |
| Mean Number of Usual Hours Worked per Week | 28.38 | 27.65 | 21.72 | 26.14 | 27.92 |
| % Full Time (>35 hours per week) | 71.85 | 79.42 | 77.23 | 75.53 | 81.05 |

Table 4:

| Household Characteristics (African) | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | West Africa | East Africa (excluding the horn) | Horn of Africa | Southern Africa | African Islands | Central Africa |
| Number in Sample | 903 | 188 | 405 | 65 | 102 | 187 |
| Mean Age | 36 | 31 | 34 | 34 | 39 | 34 |
| Mean Number of adults in household | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| % with children | 57.14 | 39.16 | 45.93 | 46.15 | 71.43 | 43.32 |
| Mean number of own children in household | 1.26 | 0.87 | 1.11 | 0.91 | 1.63 | 1.25 |
| Mean number of own children under 5 in household | 0.36 | 0.24 | 0.32 | 0.18 | 0.36 | 0.36 |
| Marital Status | | | | | | |
| % Married, Spouse Present | 48.62% | 41.49% | 42.96% | 36.92% | 49.02% | 46.52% |
| % Married, Spouse Absent | 9.30% | 2.66% | 6.91% | 3.08% | 5.88% | 8.56% |
| % Separated | 5.54% | 4.79% | 5.43% | 4.62% | 8.82% | 4.81% |
| % Divorced | 7.53% | 3.72% | 9.88% | 7.69% | 9.80% | 3.74% |
| % Widowed | 2.66% | 1.06% | 3.70% | 3.08 | 3.92% | 2.67% |
| % Never Married/Single | 26.36% | 46.28% | 31.11% | 44.62% | 22.55% | 33.69% |
| Mean Non-Personal Income | \$37,377 | \$41,078 | \$30,806 | \$31,765 | \$32,792 | \$30,544 |

Table 5:

| Human Capital (African) | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | West Africa | East Africa (excluding the horn) | Horn of Africa | Southern Africa | African Islands | Central Africa |
| Educational Attainment | | | | | | |
| No schooling/pre-school | 2.21% | 2.13% | 6.17% | 1.54% | 8.82% | 3.21% |
| Less than 9 th grade | 2.77% | 0% | 7.90% | 3.08% | 15.69% | 4.81% |
| 9 th -12 th grade | 29.35% | 24.47% | 47.16% | 21.54% | 54.90% | 45.99% |
| 1-3 years college | 35.22% | 38.83% | 24.94% | 38.46% | 10.78% | 31.02% |
| 4+ years college | 30.45% | 34.57% | 13.83% | 35.38% | 9.80% | 14.97% |
| Years in the US mean | 10.59 | 6.60 | 8.72 | 8.97 | 15.90 | 9.18 |
| English Ability | | | | | | |
| Does not speak English | 0.66% | 1.60% | 2.96% | 0% | 4.90% | 1.60% |
| Speaks English, but not well | 3.88% | 4.26% | 19.51% | 4.62% | 19.61% | 11.23% |
| Speaks English well | 12.29% | 16.49% | 29.88% | 9.23% | 32.35% | 17.11% |
| Speaks English very well | 58.25% | 63.30% | 40.99% | 58.46% | 33.33% | 44.92% |
| Speaks only English | 24.92% | 14.36% | 6.67% | 27.69% | 9.80% | 25.13% |

Table 6:

| Labor Force Participation (African) | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | West Africa | East Africa (Excluding the horn) | Horn of Africa | Southern Africa | African Islands | Central Africa |
| % in the Labor Force | 75.42% | 64.89% | 59.51% | 66.15% | 63.73% | 63.64% |
| Mean Number of Weeks Worked Last Year | 32.59 | 27.02 | 27.75 | 26.72 | 31.45 | 26.40 |
| Mean Number of Usual Hours Worked per Week | 28.68 | 23.13 | 24.09 | 21.91 | 27.28 | 22.25 |
| % Full Time (>35 hours per week) | 78.02% | 68.0% | 72.22% | 67.50% | 87.50% | 71.79% |

Table 7:

| Labor Force Participation (OR) | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| Race/Immigrant | | | | |
| Native Born White, Non-Hispanic | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| Native Born Black, Non-Hispanic | 0.84 | 0.79 | 0.85 | 0.81 |
| Foreign Born Hispanic | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.57 | 0.52 |
| Foreign Born Black African | 0.88* | 0.83 | 0.79 | 0.70 |
| Foreign Born Black Caribbean | 0.83 | 0.81 | 0.76 | 0.69 |
| Age | | | | |
| Age | ---- | 1.21 | 1.18 | 1.17 |
| Age Squared | ---- | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Number of Adults in Household | ---- | 0.93 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Number of Children | | | | |
| Total Number of Children | ---- | 0.88 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Number of Children under Age 5 | ---- | 0.66 | 0.63 | 0.61 |
| Marital Status | | | | |
| Married, Spouse Present | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| Married, Spouse Absent | ---- | 0.77 | 0.85 | 1.01** |
| Separated | ---- | 1.11 | 1.27 | 1.19 |
| Divorced | ---- | 1.58 | 1.67 | 1.52 |
| Widowed | ---- | 0.88 | 0.99** | 0.89 |
| Single/Never Married | ---- | 1.19 | 1.21 | 1.21 |
| English Ability | | | | |
| No English | ---- | ---- | --- | --- |
| Speaks English, but not well | ---- | ---- | 1.00** | 1.01** |
| Speaks English well | ---- | ---- | 1.05** | 1.07 |
| Speaks English very well | ---- | ---- | 1.15 | 1.16 |
| Speaks only English | ---- | ---- | 1.23 | 1.23 |
| Education | | | | |
| No school/Pre-school | ---- | ---- | --- | --- |
| Less than 9 th grade | ---- | ---- | 1.22 | 1.16 |
| 9 th to 12 th grade | ---- | ---- | 2.23 | 2.13 |
| 1-3 years College | ---- | ---- | 3.60 | 3.59 |
| 4+ years College | ---- | ---- | 5.12 | 5.31 |
| Years Lived in the United States | ---- | ---- | 1.02 | 1.02 |
| Non-Personal Income (In Thousands) | ---- | ---- | ---- | 1.00 |
| **p>0.05 *p>0.01 | | | | |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.0083 | 0.0677 | 0.089 | 0.098 |
| N = 754,737 | | | | |

Table 8:

| Full Time Employment (OR) | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| Race/Immigrant | | | | |
| Native Born White, Non-Hispanic | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| Native Born Black, Non-Hispanic | 1.51 | 1.71 | 1.74 | 1.67 |
| Foreign Born Hispanic | 1.33 | 1.79 | 1.90 | 1.76 |
| Foreign Born Black African | 1.21 | 1.41 | 1.49 | 1.40 |
| Foreign Born Black Caribbean | 1.68 | 1.94 | 2.08 | 1.92 |
| Age | | | | |
| Age | ---- | 1.31 | 1.30 | 1.28 |
| Age Squared | ---- | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Number of Adults in the Household | ---- | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.92 |
| Number of Children | | | | |
| Total Number of Children | ---- | 0.74 | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| Number of Children under Age 5 | ---- | 1.09 | 1.07 | 1.01** |
| Marital Status | | | | |
| Married, Spouse Present | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| Married, Spouse Absent | ---- | 0.89 | 0.90 | 1.14 |
| Separated | ---- | 1.29 | 1.32 | 1.20 |
| Divorced | ---- | 1.74 | 1.77 | 1.59 |
| Widowed | ---- | 1.22 | 1.24 | 1.10 |
| Single/Never Married | ---- | 0.99** | 0.99** | 0.95 |
| English Ability | | | | |
| No English | ---- | ---- | --- | --- |
| Speaks English, but not well | ---- | ---- | 0.77 | 0.78 |
| Speaks English well | ---- | ---- | 0.67 | 0.68 |
| Speaks English very well | ---- | ---- | 0.71 | 0.73 |
| Speaks only English | ---- | ---- | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Education | | | | |
| No school/Pre-school | | | --- | --- |
| Less than 9 th grade | | | 1.29 | 1.17* |
| 9 th to 12 th grade | | | 1.38 | 1.26 |
| 1-3 years College | | | 1.29 | 1.24 |
| 4+ years College | | | 1.65 | 1.62 |
| Years Lived in the United States | ---- | ---- | 0.997** | 0.999** |
| Non-Personal Income (In Thousands) | ---- | ---- | ---- | 0.997 |
| **p>0.05 *p>0.01 | | | | |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.0035 | 0.0596 | 0.0611 | 0.0612 |
| N = 571,185 | | | | |

Table 9:

| Labor Force Participation - Africans (OR) | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| Region of Africa | | | | |
| West Africa | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| East Africa (not including the horn) | 0.60** | 0.56** | 0.59** | 0.58** |
| Horn of Africa | 0.48*** | 0.46*** | 0.64** | 0.65* |
| Southern Africa | 0.64** | 0.57 | 0.60 | 0.63 |
| African Islands | 0.57** | 0.61 | 0.82 | 0.79 |
| Central Africa | 0.57*** | 0.55** | 0.66* | 0.66* |
| Age | | | | |
| Age | ---- | 1.25*** | 1.18*** | 1.19*** |
| Age Squared | ---- | 1.00*** | 1.00*** | 1.00*** |
| Number of Adults in Household | ---- | 0.88*** | 0.90** | 0.91* |
| Number of Children | | | | |
| Total Number of Children | ---- | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| Number of Children under Age 5 | ---- | 0.64*** | 0.65*** | 0.66*** |
| Marital Status | | | | |
| Married, Spouse Present | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| Married, Spouse Absent | ---- | 0.97 | 1.25 | 1.20 |
| Separated | ---- | 1.48 | 1.57 | 1.51 |
| Divorced | ---- | 1.85* | 2.01* | 2.04* |
| Widowed | ---- | 0.49* | 0.62 | 0.54 |
| Single/Never Married | ---- | 1.43* | 1.38 | 1.37 |
| English Ability | | | | |
| No English | ---- | ---- | --- | --- |
| Speaks English, but not well | ---- | ---- | 1.65 | 1.65 |
| Speaks English well | ---- | ---- | 4.28* | 4.29* |
| Speaks English very well | ---- | ---- | 3.42 | 3.44 |
| Speaks only English | ---- | ---- | 3.45 | 3.52 |
| Education | | | | |
| No school/Pre-school | | | --- | --- |
| Less than 9 th grade | | | 1.08 | 1.08 |
| 9 th to 12 th grade | | | 2.10* | 2.08* |
| 1-3 years College | | | 3.32** | 3.28** |
| 4+ years College | | | 3.48** | 3.44** |
| Years Lived in the United States | ---- | ---- | 1.03** | 1.03** |
| Non-Personal Income (In Thousands) | ---- | ---- | ---- | 0.999 |
| *p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001 | | | | |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.0173 | 0.0762 | 0.1232 | 0.1259 |
| N = 1,850 | | | | |

Table 10:

| Full Time Employment - Africans (OR) | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| Region of Africa | | | | |
| West Africa | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| East Africa (not including the horn) | 0.60* | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.81 |
| Horn of Africa | 0.73 | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.78 |
| Southern Africa | 0.59 | 0.62 | 0.58 | 0.52 |
| African Islands | 1.97 | 1.95 | 1.71 | 2.06 |
| Central Africa | 0.72 | 0.84 | 0.82 | 0.81 |
| Age | | | | |
| Age | ---- | 1.23*** | 1.21*** | 1.18** |
| Age Squared | ---- | 1.00*** | 1.00** | 1.00** |
| Number of Adults in Household | ---- | 0.99 | 0.98 | 0.96 |
| Number of Children | | | | |
| Total Number of Children | ---- | 0.92 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Number of Children under Age 5 | ---- | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| Marital Status | | | | |
| Married, Spouse Present | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| Married, Spouse Absent | ---- | 0.60 | 0.59 | 0.62 |
| Separated | ---- | 0.71 | 0.72 | 0.71 |
| Divorced | ---- | 1.17 | 1.11 | 1.10 |
| Widowed | ---- | 0.68 | 0.65 | 0.82 |
| Single/Never Married | ---- | 0.68 | 0.63* | 0.62* |
| English Ability | | | | |
| No English | ---- | ---- | --- | --- |
| Speaks English, but not well | ---- | ---- | 1.23 | 1.34 |
| Speaks English well | ---- | ---- | 0.81 | 0.94 |
| Speaks English very well | ---- | ---- | 1.34 | 1.50 |
| Speaks only English | ---- | ---- | 1.24 | 1.39 |
| Education | | | | |
| No school/Pre-school | ---- | ---- | --- | --- |
| Less than 9 th grade | ---- | ---- | 0.65 | 0.65 |
| 9 th to 12 th grade | ---- | ---- | 0.58 | 0.59 |
| 1-3 years College | ---- | ---- | 0.27 | 0.28 |
| 4+ years College | ---- | ---- | 0.63 | 0.67 |
| Years Lived in the United States | ---- | ---- | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Non-Personal Income (In Thousands) | ---- | ---- | ---- | 0.999 |
| *p<0.05 **p<0.01 ***p<0.001 | | | | |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.0110 | 0.0502 | 0.0773 | 0.0695 |
| N = 1,320 | | | | |

Reference List

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

Badets, J. and L. Howatson-Leo (1999). Recent Immigrants in the Workforce. Canadian Social Trends Catalogue No. 11-008.

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.

Beach, C.M. and C. Worswick (1993). "Is there a Double-Negative Effect on the Earnings of Immigrant Women." Canadian Public Policy 19(1):36-53.

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).

Browne, I. (1997). "Explaining the Black-White Gap in Labor Force Participation among Women Heading Households." American Sociological Review 62(2):236-252/

Clark, R., T.W. Ramsey, et al. (1991). "Culture, Gender, and Labor Force Participation: A Cross-National Study." Gender and Society 5(1): 47-66.

Cohen, P.N., S.M. Bianchi. (1999). "Marriage, Children, and Women's Employment: What do we Know?" Monthly Labor Review 122(12): 22-31

De Anda, R.M. (2000). "Mexican-Origin Women's Employment Instability." Sociological Perspectives 43(3): 421-437.

Devereux, P.J. (2004). "Changes in Relative Wages and Family Labor Supply." The Journal of Human Resources 39(3): 696-722.

England, P., C. Garcia-Beaulieu, et al. (2004). "Women's Employment among Blacks, Whites, and Three Groups of Latinas: Do More Privileged Women Have Higher Employment?" Gender and Society 18(4):494-509.

Heim, M. and N. Austin (1996). "Fertility of Immigrant Women in California." Population and Environment 17(5):391-407

Houston, M.F. (1984). "Female Predominance of Immigration to the United States since 1930: A First Look." International Migration Review 18:908-963

ILO (Various Years). ILO Yearbook of Labour Statistics.

Jacobsen, J.P. (2007). Chapter 7: Causes of Earnings Differences: Human Capital. The Economics of Gender. Malden, MA, Blackwell Publishing: 222.

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

Lobo, A.P. (2006). "Unintended Consequences: Liberalized U.S. Immigration Law and the African Brain Drain." The New African Diaspora in North America. K. Kohnadu-Agyemang, B.K. Takyi and J.A. Arthur. New York, Lexington Books: 189-195.

Lundberg, S. and E. Rose (2000). "Parenthood and the Earnings of Married Men and Women." Labour Economics 7:689-710.

Malone, N., K.F. Baluja, et al. (2003) The Foreign-Born Population: 2000. Census 2000 Brief. Washington, DC, US Census Bureau.

Matoo, A., I.C. Neagu, et al. (2008) "Brain Waste? Educated Immigrants in the US Labor Market." Journal of Development Economics 87:255-269.

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

Phinney, J.S. and M. Onwughalu (1996). "Racial Identity and Perception of American Ideals among African American and African Students in the United States." International Journal of Intercultural Relations 20(2):127-140.

Raijman, R. and M. Semyonov (1997) "Gender, Ethnicity, and Immigration: Double Disadvantage and Triple Disadvantage among Recent Immigrant Women in the Israeli Labor Market." Gender and Society 11:108-125.

Read, J.G. and P.N. Cohen (2007). "One Size Fits All? Explaining U.S.-born and Immigrant Women's Employment Across 12 Ethnic Groups." Social Forces 85(4):1713-1734.

Reid, L.L. (2002). "Occupational Segregation, Human Capital, and Motherhood: Black Women's Higher Exit Rates from Full Time Employment." Gender and Society 16(5); 728-747.

Schmitt, J. and J. Wadsworth (2007). "Changes in the Relative Economic Performance of Immigrants to Great Britain and the United States, 1980-2000." British Journal of Industrial Relations 45(4):659-686.

U.S. Department of Commerce (1973). "1970 Census of Population."

U.S. Department of Commerce (2001). "2000 Census of Population."

U.S. Department of State Bureau of Consular Affairs. DV Program. 2008.

Rebbeca Tesfai

U.S. Department of Commerce. Profile of the Foreign Born Population in the United States: 2000. 2001

United States. Department of Homeland Security. Yearbook of Immigration Statistics: 2008. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Office of Immigration Statistics, 2009.