Differences in the Labor Market Experiences of Black Immigrants and Black Natives:

The Impact of Migration Selectivity

Tod G. Hamilton
University of Texas at Austin
Department of Sociology
Population Research Center

(Preliminary and Incomplete)

Correspondence can be sent to the author at: Population Research Center, University of Texas at Austin, 1 University Station Stop G1800, Austin TX 78712-0543; email: tod.g.hamilton@prc.utexas.edu.

Abstract

Relative to other immigrant groups—little is known about the labor market outcomes of black immigrants. Additionally, few studies have evaluated the impact of migration selectivity in explaining labor market differences between black immigrants and black natives. This paper uses data on black men from the 2000 U.S. Census and the 2001 to 2007 American Community Survey to estimate wage, employment, and self-employment models to determine if black immigrants have outcomes that resemble those of native blacks (collectively) or native black internal migrants. Results show that both groups of native blacks earn more than most black immigrants and have higher payoffs to education than black immigrants (particularly at high education levels). In contrast, results suggest that black immigrants have a substantial self-employment advantage and a slight employment advantage over black natives (collectively). However, when black immigrants are compared to native black internal migrants, their employment advantage diminishes and the magnitude of their earnings deficit increases. Results show that black immigrants have a persistent self-employment advantage over native blacks (collectively) and native black movers. Consequently, these results suggest that migration selectivity is important in explaining wage and employment differences between black immigrants and black natives. However, migration selectivity plays a limited role in explaining self-employment differences between black immigrants and black natives.

I. Introduction

The labor market outcomes of Mexican immigrants are well documented in the immigration and labor force literatures (Borjas 1985; Bean et al. 1988; Borjas 1986, 1987; Chiquiar and Hanson 2005). In contrast, there has been relatively little research on the labor market experiences of black immigrants. The relative lack of research studying black immigrants is unfortunate for two reasons. First, black immigrants are becoming an increasingly important part of American society (Kent 2007). Second, black immigrants are often touted as a natural comparison group for native blacks. Data from the 2000 U.S. Census show that black immigrants have better social and labor market outcomes than the native born black population. These data and previous empirical studies show that black immigrants are more educated, are more likely to be married, and are more likely to be in the labor force relative to black natives (Butcher 1994; Model 2008). Additionally, before adjusting for socioeconomic characteristics, black immigrants earn more, are more likely to be employed and self-employed than native blacks (Bogan and Darity Jr 2008; Kollehlon and Eule 2003; Kalmijn 1996).

Studies that evaluate the unadjusted differences between black immigrants and black natives conclude that a significant portion of the labor market advantage credited to black immigrants is the result of the superior labor market qualifications of black immigrants. Indeed, controlling for these characteristics erase the earnings advantage of black immigrants over black natives and significantly reduces their employment advantage (Dodoo 1997; Kalmijn 1996; Model 1991, 1995, 2008). However, relative to black natives, black immigrants consistently have higher self-employment rates (Fairlie and Meyer 1996; Bogan and Darity Jr 2008).

Viewed in a broader context, these results are not surprising. The relatively high rates of employment and self-employment among all immigrants are a standard finding in the labor market literature (Borjas 1986; Portes and Zhou 1996; Bates 1999). In spite of this, black immigrants are often viewed as "model minorities" by many scholars and policy makers who suggest that cultural differences in attributes toward work and racism drive labor market differences between black immigrants and natives (Waters 1994, 1999; Glazer and Moynihan 1979) .

The leading attack on the cultural position is rendered by scholars who argue that migration selectivity (or selection bias) generates labor market differences between black immigrants and black natives (Model 2008, 1995; Butcher 1994). The issue of selection bias, which is often overlooked in most studies that evaluate labor market differences between black immigrants and black natives, could drive substantial differences between black immigrants and black natives. No subgroup of immigrants (black or white) is a random sample of their country of origin. For example, relative to individuals that immigrants leave behind in their countries of origin, immigrants are more educated and have better health outcomes (Landale et al. 2000; Feliciano 2005). Moreover, some cohorts of immigrants might be selected on hard to measure characteristics, such as motivation and ambition. As a result, inferences obtained from studies that compare black immigrants to black natives might suffer from selection bias. This selection bias might lead to over (or possible under) estimates of the labor market advantages of black immigrants.

This paper has two goals. First, using data from the 2000 U.S. Census extracted from the Integrated Public Use Micro Series (IPUMS) and the IPUMS samples of the 2001 to 2007 American Community Survey (ACS) for males between the ages of 25 and 62, this paper

evaluates labor market (i.e., employment, earning, and self-employment) differences between black natives and black immigrants. In an effort to account for the unobserved factors that produce migration, this paper applies the selection correction technique developed by Butcher (1994) to control for immigrant selectivity. In her seminal paper, Butcher (1994) used data from the 1980 United States Census of Population to compare the labor market outcomes of black immigrants to U.S. native internal black movers and found that outcomes for the two groups are remarkable similar. She concluded that labor market differences between black immigrants and black natives are the result of migration selectivity rather than culture.

There are several factors that should be considered when evaluating Butcher (1994). First, her results might be unique to labor market conditions in 1979. If this is the case, then Butcher's results might not hold in a more recent period. Second, Butcher only separates the black immigrant population into three major subgroups: Jamaicans, other Caribbean, and Africans. Since 1979, there have been significant increases in the number of black immigrants in the United States from different regions and countries of the world. Furthermore, the mix of countries in which black immigrants emigrate from has also changed dramatically. For example, since 1979, immigration from Africa to the United States has increased substantially. Thus, comparing native black migrants to recent waves of black immigrants from particular regions and major sending countries could highlight whether migration selectivity (internal or international) continues to explain labor market differences between black natives and black immigrants. Evaluating labor market outcomes between different subgroups of black immigrants and black natives might also provide theoretical insights into the relative importance of the dominant theories (i.e. culture, white favoritism, and selectivity) that attempt to explain labor

market differences between the black immigrants and black natives. This paper takes on these considerations.

This paper finds that the labor market experiences of black immigrants closely resemble those of native blacks who migrate within the United States. Results show that black natives receive higher payoffs to education than black immigrants, particularly at high education levels. Black immigrants are also observed to have a persistent self-employment advantage over all subgroups of black natives. These conclusions hold across most subgroups of black immigrants from different regions and countries of the world.

Theoretically, the collective results in this paper suggest that differences between black immigrants and black natives can be attributed to selective migration. This paper finds limited supports for the argument that cultural differences between black immigrants and black natives drive labor market differences between the two groups.

The remainder of this paper will proceed as follows: Section II discusses the background, Section III describes the data, measures, and methods, Section IV presents results, and Section V provides a discussion.

II. Theoretical Background

Researchers in the fields of sociology and economics have proposed several explanations for the observed labor market differences between native blacks and black immigrants. The three primary explanations are cultural differences between the two groups, immigrant selectivity among immigrants, and preferences of employers for certain groups of immigrants.

Cultural Argument

There exist two primary cultural arguments for labor market differences between black immigrants and black natives. The first attributes the success of black immigrants, particularly

West Indian immigrants, to socialization in an all-black society. The second, also motivated by the experiences of West Indian immigrants, suggests that differences in slave histories explain labor market differences between the two groups.

Some scholars attribute the success of West Indian immigrants to growing up in an all-black society. They argue that, compared to African Americans, growing up in a society in which blacks are the dominant race makes West Indian immigrants more ambitious and less willing to accept discrimination or marginalized roles in society (Foner 1985; Glazer and Moynihan 1979; Waters 1994, 1999).

The success of the West Indian population led others, most notably Sowell (1975, 1981, 1983, 1978), to argue that differences in slave histories explain differences in economic success between black immigrants and black natives. One of the focal points of Sowell's argument is that West Indian slaves were given more opportunity to engage in commerce than slaves in the United States before and after slavery ended.

According to Sowell, in the West Indies, it was common for slaves to be given farming land to grow food for subsistence. He argues that, over time, slaves in the West Indies became so efficient at farming these grounds that they were able to generate surplus crops which they were allowed to sell for money. According to Sowell, the opportunity to earn money provided incentive for West Indian slaves to work hard and develop work cultures that are aligned with those of whites. In contrast, Sowell argues that slaves in the United States were given rations by their owners which they used for survival. Consequently, there was little opportunity for the slave population in the United States to engage in commerce and minimal incentive for autonomous work effort.

Sowell argues that these differences in slave histories persisted and were reinforced over time by Jim Crow and discriminatory laws in the United States. This served to alienate African Americans from mainstream values and culture. Consequently, Sowell believes current day differences between African Americans and West Indians are the result of differences in culture and values produced by the different slave regimes.

Kalmijn (1996) evaluates the labor market differences between blacks from the Caribbean and native born blacks and finds mixed support for the argument that cultural differences between foreign born and native born blacks explain labor market differences between the two groups. Using data from the 1990 Census, Kalmijn finds that blacks from the British Caribbean, particularly from the second and later generations, have better labor market experiences than native blacks net of socioeconomic and demographic differences between the two groups. However, Kalmijn finds that blacks from the French and Spanish speaking Caribbean have worse outcomes than African Americans.

Similarly, Dodoo (1997) also provides mixed conclusions about the role of culture in explaining labor market differences between black natives and black immigrants. Dodoo(1997) finds that, after controlling for observed differences, there is no statistically significant difference in earnings between African Americans and African-born blacks. However, he finds that Caribbean immigrants earn 8% more than both African-born and native blacks. This result is also supported by Kollehlon and Eule (2003). Using data from the 1990 U.S. census, they find no statistically significant difference in hourly earnings between African and native black Americans.

Demand Side Argument (White Favoritism)

Demand side arguments suggest that, relative to native blacks, Caribbean blacks have a greater belief that racism can be overcome by hard work and perseverance. This belief generates less hostility between Caribbean workers and white employers vis-à-vis African Americans and white employers. Because of this, over time, white employers begin to favor Caribbean workers over native blacks because they perceive Caribbean workers as more diligent and harder-working than native blacks (Waters 1994, 1999). Consequently, differences in labor market outcomes between native blacks and black immigrants, particularly employment differences, might be due to bias by employers. Counter to this view, scholars such as Arnold (1984) and Grosfoguel (2003) suggest that white employers might favor Caribbean immigrants over African Americans because Caribbean immigrants occupy a higher position in the social hierarchy than African Americans.

Although there is evidence to suggest that Caribbean workers benefit from the positive perceptions of white employers, research suggests that this might not be the case for African immigrants. Although some of Waters' arguments might apply to African immigrants, the literature also suggests that African immigrants bear the burden of a negative bias. This bias results from media portrayal of violence, political unrest, and poverty in Africa that serves to erode the value of African immigrants in the United States labor force (Mpanya 1995; Hawk 1992).

Selectivity Argument

Immigrants are a self-selected group. Many immigrants, including black immigrants, come to the United States to pursue educational advancement and to find better employment opportunities. Therefore, black immigrants might have better labor market success than some

groups of native blacks because of this selection bias. Authors such as Chiswick (1977) and Featherman and Hauser (1978) argue that immigrants have traits, talents, and ambitions that differ significantly from non-migrant individuals in their origin countries that might make black immigrants more successful than black natives in the U.S. labor market.

One avenue in which this selection might be capture is through education. In fact, Feliciano (2005) finds that almost all immigrant groups to the United States are selected on education relative to individuals left behind in their countries of origin. However, the literature on the labor market experiences of immigrants documents that education obtained abroad, particularly from less developed countries, is not perfectly compatible with education obtained in the United States. Indeed, studies in this literature suggest that black immigrants, particularly those from Africa, receive lower returns to education than black natives (Kollehlon and Eule 2003). This phenomena has also been observed among Asian Americans in the United States (Zeng and Xie 2004).

Chiswick (1986) suggests that the pattern of positive selection, both on observed and unobserved characteristics, might not be true for all immigrants who migrated before 1965. After 1965, there were changes in U.S. immigration policy that once favored skilled workers to favoring family reunification. Consequently, since most black immigrants entered the U.S. after 1965, particularly immigrants from the Caribbean, it could be the case that a higher percentage of black immigrants are now entering the United States for non-labor market reasons. Therefore, it is possible for black immigrants to be negatively selected. Similarly, Borjas (1987) argues that immigrants could be positively or negatively selected depending on the distribution of incomes in the immigrant's origin country.

Several empirical studies find support for the selectivity argument. Work by Bogan and Darity Jr, (2008) finds that differences in entrepreneurship between African Americans and black immigrants can be attributed to differences in resources that immigrants bring to the United States that facilitate entrepreneurship. This general result is also supported by Butler and Herring (1991). Model (1995) finds that while Caribbean immigrants have higher labor force participation than native blacks, these immigrants typically earn less than native blacks when they arrive in the United States. However, consistent with selectivity arguments, after 10 years in the U.S., the earnings of these immigrants converge and subsequently surpass those of native blacks. Furthermore, using data from 1980, Butcher (1994) finds that labor market differences between black immigrants and black natives is the result of observed and unobserved factors that are highly correlated with migration.

In light of previous theoretical and empirical contributions, this paper expects to find that most subgroups of black immigrants will have better labor market outcomes than native blacks (collective); however, most subgroups of black immigrants should have similar labor market outcomes as native internal migrants. Together, these results would support selectivity arguments that explain labor market differences between black immigrants and black natives. In contrast, if black immigrants outperform both native black internal migrants and non-migrants, then this would suggest that cultural differences between black immigrants and black natives might explain labor market differences between the two groups.

To test whether white favoritism explains labor market differences between black immigrants and black natives and differences among black immigrants, this study evaluates regional variation among black immigrants. If white employers in the United States exhibit a preference toward Caribbean workers over black natives and other black immigrants, then they

should favor Caribbean workers over native black movers, native black non-movers, and black immigrant from the rest of the world. Given that the primary expectation of this paper is that the observed labor market advantages among black immigrants are driven by selection, this paper expects to find limited support for theories of white favoritism. In particular, the central hypothesis of this paper is that black internal migrants will either have similar or better outcomes than all subgroups of black immigrants. Moreover, this paper expects to find considerable regional and country variation in labor market outcomes among black immigrants. This result would be inconsistent with white favoritism.

III. Data, Measures, and Methods

Data

This paper uses 2000 Census data on males between the ages of 25 and 62 taken from the 5% Integrated Public Use Series (IPUMS) and the IPUMS samples of the 2001 to 2007 American Community Survey (ACS) to evaluate labor market differences between black immigrants and black natives. This paper also extracts a 10% sample of white natives and white immigrants from the 5% IPUMS sample of the 2000 Census and the IPUMS sample of the 2001 to 2007 ACS. These samples exclude individuals who reside in institutions or group quarters, individuals who were born abroad to American parents, individuals who report having a disability that restricts work, and individuals with negative business income, farm, or wage/salary income. This merge dataset contains 419, 003 black natives, and 51, 742 black immigrants[1]. The sample of whites is composed of 476, 315 white natives and 16,863 white immigrants. Since the primary goal of this paper is to study subgroup heterogeneity among black immigrants, the sample of whites will primarily be used for descriptive purposes.

The literature on migration documents that the factors that drive male migration differ significantly from those that drive female migration. Depending on the country of origin, the gender of the primary mover within household varies significantly. For example, among emigrants from the Caribbean, women are often the primary movers. According to the 2000 Census and the 2001 to 2007 American Community Survey, women compose 56 percent of the Caribbean population in the United States. This differential is attributed to several factors: immigration laws that favored nurses and household domestic workers, the matriarchal family structure of the Caribbean, and specific segment of the labor market in the United States that have historically favored female migrants (Model 2008).

Conversely, these same data show that men represent almost 55% of the African immigrants. Accordingly, changes over time in labor market outcomes among black immigrants might be driven by a decline in the labor characteristics of primary migrants, the arrival of secondary migrants that might have different labor market motivations, or changes in immigration policy that impact the gender composition of emigrants. To avoid these confounding effects, this paper focuses exclusively on males.

Measurement

Blacks are separated into two categories: native-born blacks and immigrant blacks. Immigrant blacks are then divided into six regional categories: Caribbean immigrants, Africans, Central Americans, South Americans, Europeans, and a residual category that is composed of immigrants from the rest of the world (other black immigrants) [2]. Additionally, this study also disaggregates immigrants by specific sending countries for countries that have a significant immigrant population within the United States. These countries include Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, Ghana, Nigeria, and Ethiopia. These

sending countries account for roughly 80% of immigrants from the Caribbean and Latin America, and almost 40% of immigrants from Africa. Moreover, collectively, these sending countries represent over 60% of all black immigrants to the United States.

To account for the selection bias associated with migration, black U.S. natives are further separated into two groups, native black movers and native black non-movers. Native blacks that currently reside in a different state from their state of birth are defined as black movers. Non-movers consist of native-born men who reside in their state of birth. It should be noted that non-moving native blacks are more likely to live in the South than native black movers, which may account for some portion of the observed labor market gaps to be shown in the analysis.

The decision to migrate for natives and immigrants is very different. Immigrants incur greater moving costs and have less information about their potential labor market success. Additionally, the group of native black movers is partly composed of individuals who moved with their parents as children. Given these differences, it might be expected that the factors that produce international migration and internal migration would differ. However, differences in migration processes should produce black immigrants who have better observed and unobserved labor market characteristics given a more pronounced influence of selectivity.

To evaluate labor market differences between black immigrants and black natives, three dependent variables are generated. To evaluate employment differences between the two groups, a dichotomous variable is generated that indicates whether or not an individual is employed. This variable is equal to 1 for all individuals who reported positive weeks worked and positive wage/salary income in the year prior to the respective survey and is zero for all others.

The second dependent variable measures differences in weekly earnings between black natives and black immigrants. The preferred income variable for this study would be the sum of

wage/salary income and business income. However, the 2000 Census and 2001 to 2007 American Community survey combines business income with farm income. Consequently, total earnings is generated by summing the wage/salary income of respondents with any positive business or farm income earned by respondents. This total is then divided by the total number of weeks worked by the respondents in the previous year. The earnings variable is designed to capture whether immigrants earn higher wages than natives or whether immigrants are simply employed for more weeks during the year (Butcher, 1994, p. 268).

Butler (2005) suggests that immigrants might respond to difficulties entering the wage salary sector of the labor market by engaging in self-employment. To evaluate differences in self-employment between black immigrants and black natives, this paper uses a self-employment measure ascertained from the "class of worker" variable contained in each census or ACS sample year. This variable identifies whether an individual works for wages or whether an individual is self-employed. The self-employment measure used in this study is equal to 1 for respondents who are identified as self-employed from the "class of worker" variable and zero for all others.

Each dependent variable is regressed on the same set of independent variables. Since education and experience are standard predictors of each outcome (Model 2008; Borjas 1987, 1986), each set of equations includes years of education and predicted experiences[3]. To capture the nonlinear effect of experience, the square root of experience is also included in each model. The labor market literature suggests that married men earn more than non-married men (Correll et al. 2007; Korenman and Neumark 1991). To account for this effect, an indicator variable that identifies whether an individual is married or not is included in each model. Likewise, since some immigrants do not speak English or speak English poorly, each equation also includes an indicator variable that equals 1 if an individual does not speak English or does not speak English

well (Chiswick 1991; Chiswick and Miller 1995). Since a high percentage of black immigrants tend to cluster in particular states within the United States (such as New York), these models also include indicators for state of current residence. Finally, to account for differences in labor market conditions through time, survey year fixed effects are also included in each equation.

Empirical Models

Equations (1) and (2) illustrate the baseline estimation equations in this paper. In these equations, Y_i^* represents the labor market outcome of interest (i.e., log weekly earnings, employment status, and self-employment status). These equations are estimated using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regressions. Since the employment and self-employment measures in this paper are dichotomous variables, estimating OLS regressions result in Linear Probability Models (LPM) of employment and self-employment.

The LPM measures the conditional probability of achieving a particular outcome. In this paper, LPM measures the $P(Y_i^*=1|X)$ where Y_i^* is equal to either being employed or being self-employed. Therefore, the coefficients in the LPM measures the change in the probability of achieving $Y_i^*=1$ when a particular independent variable changes, ceteris paribus. The LPM provides approximately the same marginal effects as the logistic and probit regression models. Additionally, the signs and significant levels are the same in each model; however, because LPM is *linear*, interpreting interaction effects are simple and straight forward. Specifically, coefficients can be summed within a single regression model.

(1)

$$Y_i^* = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Experience_i + \alpha_2 Experience_i^2 + \alpha_3 Education_i + \alpha_4 Blackimmigrant_i + \alpha_5 Blackimmigrant_i * Eduation_i + X_i\delta + T_i\phi + \varepsilon_i$$

(2)

$$Y_i^* = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Experience_i + \alpha_2 Experience_i^2 + \alpha_3 Education_i + \sum_{j=1}^{J-1} \eta_j POB_{ij} + \sum_{j=1}^{J-1} \varphi_j POB_{ij} * Eduation_i + X_i\delta + T_i\phi + \varepsilon_i$$

In Equation (1), *X* represents a vector of social and demographic characteristics. These characteristics include indicator variables for: being married, speaking English poorly, and current region of residence. Additionally, *T* is a vector that identifies the survey year in which an observation is observed. The reference group in this equation is all black natives. Equation (1) also includes an interaction between black immigrant status and education. This interaction accounts for differences in the returns to education between black immigrants and black natives that might be generated by differences in fields of study or differences in the country in which immigrants obtained their education (Zeng and Xie 2004). Consequently, the mean difference between black immigrants and black natives is determined by adding the black immigrant coefficient to the product of the interaction term at the mean years of education for black immigrants.

In Equation (2), the black immigrant indicator is replaced by a set of variables that identify the exact region or country of birth (POB) for the black immigrants. Similarly, the interaction term in Equation (1) between black immigrant status and education is replaced by a set of interactions between years of education and region of birth for black immigrants. These interactions allow the returns to education to vary for black immigrants by region of birth.

(3)

$$Y_i^* = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Experience_i + \alpha_2 Experience_i^2 + \alpha_3 Education_i + \alpha_4 Blackimmigrant_i + \alpha_5 BlackNonmover_i + \alpha_6 BlackMonmover_i * Education_i + \alpha_8 Blackimmigrant_i * Education_i + X_i\delta + T_i\phi + \varepsilon_i$$

(4)

$$Y_i^* = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Experience_i + \alpha_2 Experience^2{}_i + \alpha_3 Education_i + \alpha_4 BlackNonmover_i + \alpha_5 BlackNonmover_i * Education_i + \sum_{j=1}^{J-1} \eta_j POB_{ij} + \sum_{j=1}^{J-1} \varphi_j POB_{ij} * Eduation_i + X_i\delta + T_i\phi + \varepsilon_i$$

In order to evaluate labor market differences between black immigrants and native black internal migrants, Equations (3) and (4) augments Equation (1) and (2) by including dummy variables that indicate whether a black native is a non-internal migrant (i.e., resides in the same state in which he/she was born) and an interaction between native black non-internal-migrant status and education. This interaction term allows the returns to education to vary between native movers and non-movers. Consequently, these models evaluate mean differences between black immigrants, native black non-movers, and native black movers at a given education level. The reference group in these models is native black movers.

IV Results

[Tables 1 and 2 about here]

Descriptive Statistics

Tables 1 and 2 show summary statistics for native and immigrant males in the 2000 IPUMS sample of the United States Census and the 2005 to 2007 American Community Survey, respectively. Table 1 shows that the mean annual earnings of black immigrants in 2000 is approximately $2,000 higher than that of native born blacks. When this comparison is conducted for the sub-samples of native black movers and non-movers, Table 1 shows that native black

movers earn, on average, roughly $8,000 more annually than native black non-movers. In addition, collectively, black immigrants earn, on average, roughly $3,000 less than native black movers. Table 1 also shows that a larger fraction of native black movers are employed compared to native black non-movers. The fraction employed among native black movers is the same (82%) as the fraction employed among black immigrants. Although native black movers earn more than black immigrants, a close comparison of the estimates in Columns 2 and 4 of Table 1 shows that the earnings of black immigrants are more similar to the earnings of native black movers than to any other group in the sample.

Although native black movers and black immigrants have similar employment levels and wages, black immigrants consistently have higher self-employment rates than all subgroups of native blacks. Table 1 shows that 8% of black immigrants report being self-employed. The percent of self-employed black immigrants is three percentage points higher than that of all black natives and native black movers. These descriptive data provide some evidence to support the claim that native migrants are more similar to black immigrants than to native non-movers (Butcher, 1994).

Table 1 also shows that black immigrants and black natives differ along characteristics that could influence labor market performance. Relative to native born blacks, black immigrants have higher educational attainment (12.62 years vs. 13.22 years) and are more likely to be married (47% vs. 55%). Although most of the means in Table 1 show that, collectively, native born blacks are very different from black immigrants in terms of education and percent married, again native black movers appear to closely resemble black immigrants rather than native black non-movers. Columns 2 and 4 show that 53% of black internal migrants are married and 55% of black immigrants are married, respectively. In contrast, Column 3 shows that only 44% of native

non-movers report being married. Similarly, almost 27 percent of black immigrants report having at least a bachelor's degree. This percentage is 7 percentage points higher than native movers and 16 percentage points higher than black non-movers.

Although Table 1 shows that, collectively, black immigrants appear to have better average labor market outcomes and characteristics that produce favorable labor market outcomes than the entire native black population and the subpopulation of black native non-movers, this comparison conceals subgroup heterogeneity among black immigrants. To determine if certain subgroups of black immigrants are driving the differences between black immigrants and black natives, Table 1 provides summary statistics for black natives and black immigrants where black immigrants are separated by region of birth.

Table 1 shows that all subgroups of black immigrants have similar employment levels, but the annual earnings among black immigrants vary significantly by region of origin. Table 1 shows that all subgroups of black immigrants have higher annual earnings than native black non-movers. With the exception of black immigrants from Central America, all subgroups of black immigrants have higher annual earnings than black natives, collectively. These subgroup statistics reveal that the earnings advantage experienced by black immigrants is driven by immigrants from Africa, South America, and Europe. For example, the subgroup of black immigrants with the highest earnings, immigrants from Europe, earned approximately $7,000 more on average than the native born black population, $2,000 more on average than native movers, and $6,000 more on average than the largest subgroup of black immigrants, immigrants from the Caribbean.

Turning to self-employment, Table 1 shows that black immigrants from Africa have the highest fraction of self-employment at 9%. The group with the next highest level of self-

employment is immigrants that compose the residual other category. In spite of the variation in self-employment across immigrant groups, all subgroups of black immigrants have a self-employment percentage that is greater than or equal to any subgroup of black natives.

Table 1 also shows significant variation in demographic and socioeconomic characteristics among black immigrants. Black immigrants from the Caribbean and South America, with an average age of 42, have the highest average age among black immigrants. Black immigrants from the Caribbean and Central America have the lowest levels of education among black immigrants. With the exception of black immigrants from Europe, 46% of whom are married, all subgroups of black immigrants are more likely to be married than black natives, collectively. Moreover, with the exception of immigrants from Africa and Europe, all other subgroups of black immigrants are more likely to be married than native black movers. This difference is substantial given that the percent married among native black movers is 6 percentage points higher than the entire native black population and 9 percentage points higher than black non-movers. Table 2 replicates the summary statistics calculated in Table 1 using data from 2005-2007. Although the absolute magnitudes of the summary statistics in Table 2 are larger, the overall patterns shown in this table are very similar to those presented in Table 1.

The summary statistics presented in this section of the paper provide evidence to suggest that there are demographic differences between native blacks and black immigrants that might cause the two groups to have different labor market outcomes. Additionally, differences between black immigrants and all black natives may be due to cultural or demand side explanations. At the same time, the similarity between black native movers and black immigrants may provide tentative support for migrant selectivity. Indeed, the mover/non-mover differences presented in this section suggest that the differences between black immigrants and black natives are

produced by observed and unobserved factors that influence migration rather than cultural factors among blacks or labor market favoritism on the behalf of whites.

To evaluate the robustness of the internal migrant/non-migrant distinction, Tables and 1 and 2 also show summary statistics for subgroups of native white movers, native white non-movers, and white immigrants. These descriptive statistics show that, like native black movers, white movers are more similar to white immigrants than white non-movers. Thus, these preliminary results suggest that a more appropriate comparison group for any group of immigrants is other migrants in the same ethnic group rather than a collective group of native born individuals.

Multivariate Results

This section presents ordinary least squares and linear probability regression models to analyze adjusted differences in earnings, employment, and self-employment between black immigrants and black natives.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Before estimating Equation (1), which includes an interaction between immigrant status and education, Table 3 shows first evaluates differences between black immigrants and black natives adjusting for a standard set of controls. The sign on the black immigrant variable in the employment model presented in Column 1 of Table 3 is statistically significant; however, the coefficient is small. This coefficient suggests that black immigrants have roughly a 1% greater probability of being employed than black natives after controlling for demographic and socioeconomic characteristics.

Consistent with the unadjusted means presented in the previous section, black immigrants exhibit 3% greater probability of being self-employed than black natives. However, counter to

what might have been expected from the descriptive data, Column 2 of Table 3 shows that black immigrants earn approximately 10% less than black natives. One possible explanation for the lower adjusted earnings for black immigrants is differences in the returns to education. Studies document that education obtained outside the United States may not have the same labor market returns as education obtained in the United States (Kollehlon and Eule 2003; Zeng and Xie 2004). Moreover, the literature on black immigrants suggests that black immigrants and black natives who have similar years of education might have different labor market outcomes because of their chosen field of study. To account for these factors, Columns 4, 5, and 6 show regressions models that allow for different returns to education for black immigrants and black natives. These interaction effects indeed show that black immigrants receive lower returns to education in the models of employment and log weekly earnings. For example, relative to native blacks, Columns 5 shows that black immigrants have returns to education that are 3.6 % lower.

To determine whether immigrants have higher average outcomes in the models that include interactions between immigrant status and education, the partial derivative of each model with respect to immigrant status needs to be evaluated at the mean level of education for black immigrants. This exercise reveals a mixed picture. When years of education are evaluated at 13.43, the mean years of schooling for black immigrants, black immigrants have a statistically significant, albeit small (.01) employment advantage over black natives. Performing this exercise in the earnings model reveals that black natives maintain their earnings advantage over black immigrants when the partial derivatives are evaluated at 13.43.

These results suggest that at low levels of education, black immigrants receive greater returns to education than black natives. However, at some threshold level of education, the returns to education are greater for black natives. To determine the exact crossover point, it is

necessary to find the years of education that make the partial derivatives of each equation with respect to immigrant status equal to zero. In the employment model, at 13.95 years of education, the black immigrant derivative is equal to zero. Consequently, black immigrants with fewer than 13.95 years of education have a higher probability of being employed than black natives. Conversely, black immigrants with more than 13.95 years of education are less likely to be employed than black natives. Similarly, the crossover level of education in the earnings model presented in Column 5 of Table 3 is 10.91. This finding suggests that although black immigrants have much higher levels of education than black natives, the labor market returns to their education is much lower for most of the education distribution.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

Since the descriptive statistics show that black immigrants from different regions of the world have different levels of education and labor market outcomes, Table 4 estimates the models based on Equation (2) to determine whether the patterns observed in Table 3 hold for black immigrants from different regions of the world.

Table 4 shows significant variation in labor market outcomes by region of birth. Column 1 of Table 4 shows that black immigrants differ in employment compared to natives. Immigrants from Africa have a .025 lower probability of being employed than black natives. Table 4 also shows that black immigrants from the Caribbean and Latin America have higher probabilities of being employed than black natives. Column 1 of Table 4 also shows no statistically significant difference in employment between black natives and black immigrants from Europe and black immigrants that compose the residual category.

Column 2 of Table 4 evaluates subgroup heterogeneity in earnings among black immigrants. Column 2 shows that the only subgroups of black immigrants that have higher

average earnings than black natives are immigrants from Europe. European immigrants earn roughly 11% more than black natives. The most disadvantaged group of black immigrants is the subgroup from Africa. African immigrants earn roughly 22 % less, on average, than black natives. Indeed, this earnings disadvantage is larger than any other subgroup of black immigrants.

The self-employment model presented in Column 3 of Table 4 shows that, with the exception of black immigrants from Central America and Europe, all subgroups of black immigrants are more likely to be self-employed than black natives . Column 3 reveals that the subgroup of black immigrants with the largest immigrant/native wage gaps is also the subgroup most likely to be self-employed. African immigrants exhibit almost a .04 greater probability of being self-employed than native blacks.

Columns 4, 5, and 6 of Table 4 add interactions between region of origin and education to the models estimated in Columns 1, 2, and 3. Similar to results discussed previously, differences in returns to education do not consistently explain differences in self-employment between immigrants and natives. Most of the interaction terms in Column 6 are either statistically insignificant or quite minor in magnitude. Indeed, Columns 4 and 5 show similar results as those presented in Table 3. Almost all subgroups of black immigrants have lower returns to education than black natives. However, even after allowing for different slopes, black natives still maintain most of the advantages discussed in Columns 2 and 3 at the mean years of education for each immigrant subgroup. The only subgroups of black immigrants that consistently have similar returns to education as black natives are immigrants from Europe. This suggests that the United States labor market values education obtained in Europe and United States similarly for black men.

Collectively, Tables 3 and 4 show few advantages for black immigrants over black natives. Additionally, the advantages that are experienced by black immigrants are seen mostly in the probability of being employed and for self-employment. Moreover, the labor market advantages are also restricted to certain groups of black immigrants and not to black immigrants in general.

The results in Tables 3 and 4 do not address the issue of selection bias. Black immigrants are not a random sample of their respective home countries; consequently, comparing black immigrants to all black natives biases the labor market comparisons between the two groups. In an effort to account for this selection bias, Tables 5 and 6 evaluate labor market outcomes between black immigrants and two subgroups of black natives – native movers and native non-movers by estimating Equations (3) and (4).

[Insert Table 5 about here]

Consistent with the descriptive statistics, Table 5 shows that black non-movers are less likely to be employed and earn less than black movers, ceteris paribus. However, non-movers are more likely to be self-employed than native movers. This suggests that the factors correlated with migration that produce favorable employment and wage outcomes for black natives do not increase the likelihood of being self-employed.

Column 1 shows no statistically significant difference in the probability of being employed between black immigrants and black native movers. Furthermore, Column 2 shows that black immigrants earn significantly less than native black movers. What is more, the relative earnings deficit experienced by black immigrants increases by almost 40% when the reference group is changed from all native blacks to black movers. This difference holds even when immigrants and natives are allowed to have different returns to education. Columns 4 and 5 show

that the cross-over years of education for black natives to surpass the employment probabilities and earnings of black immigrants is 14 years in the employment model and 10.26 years in the earnings model. Since years of education are truncated between 8 and 19 years, this suggests that, collectively, black immigrants only earn more than black natives at the lowest levels of education and that black immigrants have slightly higher probability of being employed (.008) than black native movers at their mean level of education.

[Insert Table 6 about here]

Table 6 further evaluates differences between black immigrants and black movers by disaggregating black immigrants by region of origin. As discussed in Table 5, Table 6 shows that native black non-movers and most black immigrants are more likely to be self-employed than black native movers. Turning to the employment model, while Column 1 shows that black immigrants from Central America and those from the Caribbean have employment probabilities that are significantly greater than those of native black movers, unlike the results in Table 4, the coefficient on the South American indicator is no longer statistically significant. Likewise, the employment probabilities for Caribbean and Central American reduce by more than .01 point. Similar to Table 4, all other subgroups of black immigrants have employment probabilities that are less than or statistically similar to native black movers.

The earnings model presented in Column 2 of Table 6 shows a consistent and substantial earning advantage for native black movers. Indeed, no subgroups of black immigrants earn significantly more than native black movers. Although black immigrants from Europe have earnings that are statistically similar to black native movers, all other region coefficients in Columns 2 are negative and statistically significant. Allowing for differences in the returns to education in columns 4 through 6 does not erase the results in Columns 1, 2, and 3. That is,

although black immigrants have a persistent self-employment advantage over black natives, black immigrants earn substantially less than black movers and, with the exception of black immigrants from Central American and the Caribbean, black immigrants have lower or similar probabilities of being employed relative to native black movers.

[Insert Table 7 about here]

To determine whether Table 6 conceals subgroup heterogeneity among black immigrants from particular sending countries, Table 7 estimates Equations 3 and 4 using indicators for country and region of origin. Once again, the reference group for these models is native black movers. Column 1 of Table 7 shows that the employment advantage among black immigrants from Central America is driven by migrants from Mexico. Conversely, the employment disadvantage among African immigrants is driven by immigrants from Nigeria, Ethiopia, and immigrants that comprise the residual African category.

The employment results for Caribbean and South American immigrants from Table 6 hold for immigrants from all the major sending countries within these regions. Specifically, although variation exist among the countries, immigrants from all the major sending countries in the Caribbean have a greater probability of being employed relative to native black movers. Likewise, immigrants from Guyana (where most black immigrants from South America hail) and those from other South American countries have similar employment probabilities.

The earnings model in Column 2 of Table 7 shows that while Caribbean immigrants from all countries identified earn less than native black movers, Jamaican immigrants have the highest earnings among Caribbean immigrants. Turning to the earnings results for immigrants from South America, Column 2 shows that black immigrants from Guyana earn more than immigrants from other countries in South America. Similar heterogeneity is observed from immigrants from

Africa. African immigrants from Ghana and Nigeria earn almost 11 percentage points more than immigrants from Ethiopia.

The self-employment model in Column 3 of Table 7 shows that black immigrants from most of the major sending regions are more likely to self-employed relative to native black movers. Columns 4 through 6 show that most black immigrants have lower returns to education than native black movers in the earnings and employment models. However, differences in the returns to education between black immigrants and native blacks do not significantly explain self-employment differences between the two groups.

Discussion

The main results of this paper suggest that black immigrants are more likely to be self-employed than all native blacks (collectively) and the subgroup of native black movers. Analysis of subgroup variation confirms that black immigrants from most of the regions specified in this study are more likely to be self-employed than native black non-movers and movers. However, self-employment is the only outcome in which black immigrants have a consistent and substantial labor market advantage over native blacks. Moreover, the high self-employment rates among black immigrants do not confer them an earnings advantage over black natives. Future work in this area should investigate whether black immigrants use self-employment to adjust to difficulties they might face (i.e. discrimination) entering into the wage/salary sector.

In models of employment and earnings, all black natives, and native black movers in particular, seem to consistently outperform most black immigrants. Indeed, when black immigrants are compared to native black movers, black movers have higher earnings than all subgroups of black immigrants except black immigrants from Europe. Black movers also have a similar employment probability as black immigrants from South America and a higher

probability of being employed than black immigrants from Africa, Europe, and black immigrants that make up the residual category.

From a theoretical perspective, neither the positive cultural factors among black immigrants nor demand theories seem to explain the differences between black immigrants and black natives. If culture was the main explanation, either in the form presented by Sowell (1975, 1978, 1981, and 1983) or in the form presented by Glazer and Moynihan (1963), or Waters (1999), the results in this paper should not reveal the substantial differences between native black non-movers and native black movers. Moreover, the results should not reveal the degree of variation among black immigrants, particularly among immigrants from the same region of the world. Table 7 shows that black immigrants from Jamaica earn significantly less than black immigrants from Trinidad and Tobago. Moreover, black immigrants from Guyana earn more than immigrants from other countries in South America. Likewise, black immigrants from Ghana earn almost 8 percentage points more than immigrants from Ethiopia. Culture does not explain subgroup heterogeneity among black immigrants from the same region of the world nor does white favoritism.

On the other hand, these results provide support that immigrant selectivity, and migrant selectivity more generally, is very important for labor market outcomes among blacks (and perhaps among other race/ethnic groups). Black immigrants who reside in the United States are not a random sample of their countries of origin; however— a random sample of black natives in the United States is representative of the entire population. Consequently, inferences obtained from analyzing black immigrants are not generalizable to black natives. Results in this paper suggest that studies and theories that seek to explain labor market differences (and possible other

socioeconomic differences) between black immigrants and black natives need to account for the fact that the two groups are quite different.

Given these results, some might question whether the experiences of black immigrants say anything at all about the experiences of black natives. Without a doubt, they do. Black immigrants and black natives are phenotypically similar. However, because of the selection associated with migration, relative to black natives, black immigrants have superior labor market characteristics. Yet, the labor market outcomes of black immigrants—even before accounting for the selectivity associated with migration—are not drastically better than native blacks. In fact, for most groups, the earnings of black immigrants are consistently worse than those of native blacks. The premise behind using black immigrants, particularly West Indian immigrants, as a "model minority" for black natives is based on the assumption that if black natives work hard and obtain a good education they could close the labor market gaps between whites and blacks. Given that the labor market outcomes of black natives are substantially worse than those of white natives, the fact that black immigrants have worse outcomes than native blacks casts serious doubt of this assertion. In reality, these results highlight the detrimental effect of having dark skin among all blacks— in spite of work hard and higher levels of well education.

Notes

1. The black sample includes 101 individuals who have a person weight of 0. These individuals will be used to compute descriptive statistics. However, they will not be used to conduct regression analysis. Consequently, the final analytic sample is composed of 418, 908 black natives and 51, 736 black immigrants.

2. The Other Black Immigrants Category is composed of immigrants who were born in a region other than Central America, the Caribbean, Africa, South America, or Europe.

3. Following Funkhouser and Trejo (1995) and LaLonde and Topel (1990) predicted experience is equal to (age - year of education - 6).

References

Arnold, Faye W. 1984. "West Indians and London's Hierarchy of Discrimination." *Ethnic Groups* 6:47-64.

Bates, Timothy. 1999. "Existing Self-Employment: An Analysis of Asian Immigrant-Owned Small Businesses." *Small Business Economics* 13:171-183.

Bean, Frank D., B. Lindsay Lowell, and Lowell J. Taylor. 1988. "Undocumented Mexican Immigrants and the Earnings of Other Workers in the United States." *Demography* 25:35-52.

Bogan, Vicki, and William Darity Jr. 2008. "Culture and entrepreneurship? African American and immigrant self-employment in the United States." *Journal of Socio-Economics* 37:1999-2019.

Borjas, George J. 1985. "Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality, and the Earnings of Immigrants." *Journal of Labor Economics* 3:463-489.

———. 1986. "The Self-Employment Experience of Immigrants." *The Journal of Human Resources* 21:485-506.

———. 1987. "Self-Selection and the Earnings of Immigrants." *The American Economic Review* 77:531-553.

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

Butler, John Sibley, and Cedric Herring. 1991. "Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship in America: Toward an Explanation of Racial and Ethnic Group Variations in Self-Employment." *Sociological Perspectives* 34:79-94.

Chiquiar, Daniel, and GordonÂ H. Hanson. 2005. "International Migration, Selfâ€Selection, and the Distribution of Wages: Evidence from Mexico and the United States." *Journal of Political Economy* 113:239-281.

Chiswick, Barry R. 1977. "Sons of Immigrants: Are They at an Earnings Disadvantage?" *The American Economic Review* 67:376-380.

———. 1986. "Is the New Immigration Less Skilled Than the Old?" *Journal of Labor Economics* 4:168-192.

———. 1991. "Speaking, Reading, and Earnings among Low-Skilled Immigrants." *Journal of Labor Economics* 9:149-170.

Chiswick, Barry R., and Paul W. Miller. 1995. "The Endogeneity between Language and Earnings: International Analyses." *Journal of Labor Economics* 13:246-288.

Correll, ShelleyÂ J., Stephen Benard, and In Paik. 2007. "Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty?" *American Journal of Sociology* 112:1297-1339.

Dodoo, F. Nii-Amoo. 1997. "Assimilation Differences among Africans in America." *Social Forces* 76:527-546.

Fairlie, Robert W., and Bruce D. Meyer. 1996. "Ethnic and Racial Self-Employment Differences and Possible Explanations." *The Journal of Human Resources* 31:757-793.

Featherman, David L., and Robert Mason Hauser. 1978. *Opportunity and change*. New York: Academic Press.

Feliciano, Cynthia. 2005. "Educational Selectivity in U.S. Immigration: How Do Immigrants Compare to Those Left behind?" *Demography* 42:131-152.

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

Funkhouser, Edward, and Stephen J. Trejo. 1995. "The Labor Market Skills of Recent Male Immigrants: Evidence from the Current Population Survey." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 48:792-811.

Glazer, Nathan, and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. 1979. *Beyond the melting pot the Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City*. Cambridge, Mass. [u.a.: MIT Press.

Grosfoguel, Ramon. 2003. "Race and Ethnicity or Racialized Ethnicities?" *Ethnicities* 4.

Hawk, Beverley. 1992. *Africa' Media Image*. New York: Praeger.

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

Kent, M.M. 2007. "Immigration and America' Black Population." *Population Bulletin* 62.

Kollehlon, Konia T., and Edward E. Eule. 2003. "The Socioeconotnic Attainment Patterns of Africans in the United States." *International Migration Review* 37:1163-1190.

Korenman, Sanders, and David Neumark. 1991. "Does Marriage Really Make Men More Productive?" *The Journal of Human Resources* 26:282-307.

LaLonde, Robert J., and Robert H. Topel. 1990. "The Assimilation of Immigrants in the U.S. Labor Markets." *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series* No. 3573.

Landale, Nancy S., R. S. Oropesa, and Bridget K. Gorman. 2000. "Migration and Infant Death: Assimilation or Selective Migration among Puerto Ricans?" *American Sociological Review* 65:888-909.

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

———. 1995. "West Indian Prosperity: Fact or Fiction?" *Social Problems* 42:535-553.

———. 2008. *West Indian Immigrants: A Black Success Story?* New York: Russell Sage Foundation

Mpanya, Mutombo. 1995. "Stereotypes of Hunder in U.S. Hunger Appeals." Pp. in David Shields ed., *The Color of Hunger*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. 1996. "Self-Employment and the Earnings of Immigrants." *American Sociological Review* 61:219-230.

Sowell, Thomas. 1975. *Race and economics*. New York: D. McKay Co.

———. 1978. "Three Black Histories." Pp. 7-64 in Thomas Sowell and Lynn D. Collins eds., *Essays and data on American Ethnic Groups*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute].

———. 1981. *Ethnic America : a history*. New York: Basic Books.

———. 1983. *The economics and politics of race : an international perspective*. New York: W. Morrow.

Waters, Mary C. 1994. "Ethnic and Racial Identities of Second-Generation Black Immigrants in New York City." *International Migration Review* 28:795-820.

———. 1999. *Black identities : West Indian immigrant dreams and American realities*. New York; Cambridge, Mass.: Russell Sage Foundation ; Harvard University Press.

Zeng, Zhen, and Yu Xie. 2004. "Asian-Americans' Earnings Disadvantage Reexamined: The Role of Place of Education." *The American Journal of Sociology* 109:1075-1108.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Black Natives, White Natives, White Immigrants, and Black Immigrants by Region of Birth in 2000, U.S. Men Aged 25-62

	Black Natives and Immigrants										White Natives and Immigrants			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
	All Black Natives	Black Native Movers	Black Native Non-Movers	All Black Immigrants	Central Americans	Caribbeans	Africans	South Americans	Europeans	Other Black Immigrants	All Non-Hispanic White Natives	Non-Hispanic White Native Movers	Non-Hispanic White Native Non-Movers	Non-Hispanic White Immigrants
Number of Observations	222717	77606	145111	22868	1393	12925	6358	1141	498	553	208355	80081	128274	7867
Positive Wages and Salary* (Mean)	32634.22	37409.81	29888.79	34633.60	31805.95	33827.93	36008.36	37815.49	39458.45	33065.63	49254.86	55751.40	45114.44	60355.21
	(72.48)	(136.78)	(81.60)	(243.97)	(1085.66)	(317.16)	(471.05)	(1098.82)	(1840.60)	(1341.02)	(116.78)	(218.27)	(129.63)	(804.98)
Employed (Proportion)	0.78	0.82	0.76	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.84	0.83	0.84	0.82	0.86	0.87	0.85	0.83
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Average Weeks worked last year	37.58	39.92	36.33	40.25	38.28	40.01	41.05	40.78	41.38	39.55	45.55	45.79	45.41	43.70
	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.13)	(0.54)	(0.17)	(0.23)	(0.56)	(0.81)	(0.81)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.18)
Average Positive Weeks Worked	46.42	47.12	46.02	46.59	45.42	46.85	46.24	47.19	47.15	45.85	48.79	48.76	48.81	47.81
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.08)	(0.36)	(0.10)	(0.15)	(0.34)	(0.48)	(0.53)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.12)
Self Employed (Proportion)	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.14	0.13	0.14	0.18
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Age (Mean)	41.28	42.69	40.53	40.91	40.35	41.96	39.28	42.03	36.62	38.08	42.73	43.34	42.34	43.52
	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.27)	(0.09)	(0.11)	(0.29)	(0.33)	(0.39)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.11)
Married (Proportion)	0.47	0.53	0.44	0.55	0.55	0.56	0.51	0.58	0.46	0.53	0.69	0.70	0.69	0.73
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)
Education Mean in Years	12.62	13.05	12.39	13.22	11.74	12.66	14.62	13.09	13.94	13.82	13.58	14.12	13.25	14.21
	(0.00)	(0.01)	0.00	(0.02)	(0.07)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.03)
Less than High School (Proportion)	0.15	0.11	0.17	0.14	0.32	0.17	0.05	0.11	0.04	0.10	0.07	0.05	0.08	0.09
	(0.00)	0.00	0.00	0.00	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
High School Degree (Proportion)	0.41	0.34	0.45	0.31	0.33	0.37	0.18	0.38	0.25	0.25	0.32	0.24	0.37	0.22
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Some College (Proportion)	0.24	0.27	0.22	0.20	0.17	0.20	0.19	0.19	0.29	0.18	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.17
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Associates Degree (Proportion)	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Bachelors (Proportion)	0.10	0.13	0.08	0.15	0.07	0.11	0.25	0.12	0.19	0.25	0.20	0.24	0.17	0.23
	(0.00)	0.00	0.00	0.00	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Masters (Proportion)	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.15	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.10	0.05	0.13
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Graduate (Proportion)	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.10	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.10
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)

Notes: The sample consists of black and white males aged 25-62. The black sample is taken from the 5% IPUMS Sample of the 2000 United States Census of Population. The white sample is generated by taking a 1 and 10 sample of whites from the 5% IPUMS Sample of the 2000 United States Census of Population . The sample excludes individuals that live in institutions or other group quarters, individuals born abroad to American parent, individuals born in U.S. outlying areas, individuals with any type of disability, individuals with negative business income, farm, or wage/salary income. Standard errors are shown in parenthesis. * This wage/salary variable is calculated using only individuals with wage/salaries and weeks worked that are greater than zero.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Black Natives, White Natives, White Immigrants, and Black Immigrants by Region of Birth in 2005-2007, U.S. Men Aged 25-62

	Black Natives and Immigrants										White Natives and Immigrants			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
	All Native Blacks	Black Native Movers	Black Native Non-Movers	All Black Immigrants	Central American	Caribbeans	Africans	South Americans	Europeans	Other Black Immigrants	Hispanic Whites	Non-Hispanic White Native Movers	Non-Hispanic White Non-movers	Non-Hispanic White Immigrants
Number of Observations	129655	46682	82973	20191	873	10399	6933	1002	379	605	138169	54660	83509	5883
Positive Wages and Salary* (Mean)	38731.61	45185.14	34942.26	40379.71	33201.08	39785.23	41287.71	43014.46	53167.83	38391.96	60241.62	68590.77	54698.04	72817.03
	(103.06)	(203.86)	(108.93)	(273.59)	(951.78)	(355.09)	(510.13)	(1279.73)	(2577.64)	(1619.40)	(166.44)	(300.23)	(189.47)	(1067.70)
Employed (Proportion)	0.84	0.87	0.83	0.87	0.88	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.86	0.89	0.87	0.88	0.87	0.84
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Average Weeks worked last year	40.60	42.17	39.72	43.59	43.34	43.66	43.53	43.94	43.20	43.33	45.92	45.95	45.90	44.70
	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.11)	(0.55)	(0.16)	(0.19)	(0.52)	(0.87)	(0.66)	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.20)
Average Positive Weeks Worked	45.99	46.59	45.63	46.89	46.77	47.06	46.49	47.91	47.59	46.73	48.36	48.37	48.36	47.74
	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.39)	(0.11)	(0.14)	(0.33)	(0.56)	(0.47)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.13)
Self Employed (Proportion)	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.15	0.14	0.15	0.21
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)
Age (Mean)	43.05	44.15	42.43	42.79	41.60	43.88	41.59	43.51	40.08	40.10	44.47	45.12	44.04	44.34
	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.36)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.32)	(0.41)	(0.38)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.13)
Married (Proportion)	0.49	0.55	0.46	0.58	0.55	0.59	0.57	0.61	0.52	0.53	0.70	0.71	0.69	0.72
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)
Education Mean in Years	13.03	13.49	12.76	13.58	11.76	13.02	14.61	13.25	14.57	13.93	13.93	14.44	13.59	14.57
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.09)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.03)
Less than High School (Proportion)	0.11	0.07	0.13	0.11	0.34	0.13	0.05	0.10	0.02	0.09	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.06
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
High School Degree (Proportion)	0.40	0.33	0.44	0.31	0.32	0.38	0.19	0.40	0.20	0.26	0.30	0.22	0.36	0.22
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)
Some College (Proportion)	0.24	0.26	0.22	0.18	0.15	0.19	0.17	0.17	0.22	0.17	0.21	0.21	0.22	0.16
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Associates Degree (Proportion)	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.06	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.07
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Bachelors (Proportion)	0.13	0.17	0.10	0.18	0.09	0.13	0.26	0.14	0.25	0.26	0.22	0.27	0.19	0.25
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)
Masters (Proportion)	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.09	0.03	0.05	0.16	0.06	0.12	0.07	0.08	0.12	0.06	0.14
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Graduate (Proportion)	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.08	0.03	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.11
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)

Notes: The sample consists of black and white males aged 25-62. The black sample is taken from the 2005 to 2007 IPUMS samples of the American Community Survey. The white sample is generated by taking a 1 and 10 sample of the 2005 to 2007 IPUMS samples of the American Community Survey. The sample excludes individuals that live in institutions or other group quarters, individuals born abroad to American parent, individuals born in U.S. outlying areas, individuals with any type of disability, individuals with negative business income, farm, or wage/salary income. Standard errors are shown in parenthesis. * This wage/salary variable is calculated using only individuals with wage/salaries and weeks worked that are greater than zero.

Table 3. Determinants of Employment Status, Weekly Earnings, and Self-Employment: Estimated Regression Coefficients for a Pooled Sample of Black Natives and Black Immigrants, U.S. Men Aged 25-62

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Coefficients					
VARIABLES	Whether Employed	Log Weekly Earnings	Self-Employed	Whether Employed	Log Weekly Earnings	Self-Employed
(Reference Group: Black Natives)						
Black Immigrants	0.009***	-0.102***	0.031***	0.307***	0.393***	0.066***
	(0.003)	(0.007)	(0.002)	(0.016)	(0.038)	(0.013)
Education in Years	0.018***	0.113***	0.004***	0.022***	0.120***	0.005***
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Black Immigrant * Education				-0.022***	-0.036***	-0.003***
				(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.001)
Experience in Years	0.006***	0.023***	0.003***	0.006***	0.024***	0.003***
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Experience Squared	-0.000***	-0.000***	-0.000***	-0.000***	-0.000***	-0.000***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Speaks Poor English	0.023**	-0.057***	-0.015**	-0.015	-0.121***	-0.020***
	(0.009)	(0.020)	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.020)	(0.006)
Married	0.081***	0.189***	0.007***	0.080***	0.188***	0.007***
	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.001)
Constant	0.517***	4.311***	-0.063***	0.466***	4.220***	-0.069***
	(0.009)	(0.021)	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.021)	(0.006)
Observations	470644	383778	470644	470644	383778	470644
R-squared	0.058	0.155	0.009	0.060	0.156	0.009

Sources: The sample consists of black men between the ages of 25-62. The black men are taken from the 5% Integrated Public Use Micro Series sample of the 2000 Census and the 2001 to 2007 waves of the American Community Survey. These regressions also include variables that capture current state of residence and survey year indicators. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Coefficients are weighted using person weights. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 4. Determinants of Employment Status, Weekly Earnings, and Self Employment Status: Estimated Regression Coefficients for Blacks Natives, Black Movers, Black Non-movers, and Subgroups of Black Immigrants, U.S. Men, Aged 25-62

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Coefficients					
VARIABLES	Whether Employed	Log Weekly Earnings	Self-Employed	Whether Employed	Log Weekly Earnings	Self-Employed
(Reference Group: Black Natives)						
Central American	0.049***	-0.011	0.012	0.318***	0.467***	0.110**
	(0.012)	(0.025)	(0.009)	(0.058)	(0.122)	(0.050)
Caribbean	0.033***	-0.033***	0.028***	0.341***	0.377***	0.060***
	(0.004)	(0.009)	(0.003)	(0.020)	(0.047)	(0.017)
African	-0.025***	-0.218***	0.036***	0.182***	0.129*	0.115***
	(0.005)	(0.012)	(0.004)	(0.030)	(0.073)	(0.022)
South American	0.029**	-0.028	0.034***	0.304***	0.405***	0.048
	(0.012)	(0.022)	(0.011)	(0.058)	(0.120)	(0.050)
Europe	-0.024	0.111**	0.025	0.170	0.331	-0.042
	(0.016)	(0.045)	(0.016)	(0.106)	(0.316)	(0.103)
Other Black Immigrants	-0.015	-0.151***	0.034**	0.314***	0.254	-0.014
	(0.014)	(0.035)	(0.013)	(0.088)	(0.190)	(0.055)
Education in Years	0.019***	0.115***	0.004***	0.022***	0.120***	0.005***
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Interaction of Education with:						
Central American				-0.021***	-0.038***	-0.008*
				(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.004)
Caribbean				-0.024***	-0.031***	-0.002*
				(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.001)
African				-0.014***	-0.024***	-0.005***
				(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.002)
South American				-0.021***	-0.032***	-0.001
				(0.004)	(0.009)	(0.004)
Europe				-0.014*	-0.015	0.005
				(0.007)	(0.022)	(0.008)
Other Black Immigrants				-0.024***	-0.029**	0.003
				(0.006)	(0.014)	(0.004)
Constant	0.511***	4.290***	-0.062***	0.467***	4.222***	-0.070***
	(0.009)	(0.021)	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.021)	(0.006)
Observations	470644	383778	470644	470644	383778	470644
R-squared	0.059	0.157	0.009	0.060	0.158	0.009

Notes: The sample consists of black men aged 25-62. The sample is taken from the Integrated Public Use Micro Series (IPUMS) 5% samples of the 2000 Census and the 2001 to 2007 waves of the American Community Survey. These regressions also include indicators for survey year, current state of residence, experience, experience squared, marital status, and a variable that captures whether an individual speaks English well. Robust standard errors are used. Coefficients are weighted using person weights.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 5. Determinants of Employment Status, Weekly Earnings, and Self Employment Status: Estimated Regression Coefficients for Blacks Natives Movers, Black Non-movers, and Black Immigrants, U.S. Men Aged 25-62

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Coefficients					
VARIABLES	Whether Employed	Log Weekly Earnings	Self-Employed	Whether Employed	Log Weekly Earnings	Self-Employed
(Reference Group: Native Black Movers)						
Black Non-movers	-0.020***	-0.069***	0.003*	-0.146***	0.096***	0.003
	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.001)	(0.014)	(0.030)	(0.010)
Black Immigrants	-0.003	-0.142***	0.033***	0.210***	0.421***	0.069***
	(0.003)	(0.008)	(0.003)	(0.018)	(0.042)	(0.014)
Black Non-Movers*Education				0.010***	-0.012***	0.000
				(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Black Immigrant*Education				-0.015***	-0.041***	-0.003***
				(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.001)
Education in Years		0.111***	0.004***	0.016***	0.125***	0.005***
		(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Constant	0.542***	4.397***	-0.067***	0.569***	4.208***	-0.073***
	(0.009)	(0.022)	(0.007)	(0.013)	(0.028)	(0.009)
Observations	470644	383778	470644	470644	383778	470644
R-squared	0.058	0.156	0.009	0.061	0.158	0.009

Sources: The sample consists of black men between the ages of 25-62. The black men are taken from the 5% Public Use Sample of the 2000 Census and the 2001 to 2007 waves of the American Community Survey. These regressions also variables that capture experience, experience squared, speaking poor English, marital status, current state of residence indicators, and survey year indicators. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Coefficients are weighted using person weights. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 6. Determinants of Employment Status, Weekly Earnings, and Self-Employment Status: Estimated Regression Coefficients for Black Native Movers, Black Non-movers and Black Immigrants, U.S. Men Aged 25-62

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Coefficients					
VARIABLES	Whether Employed	Log Weekly Earnings	Self-Employed	Whether Employed	Log Weekly Earnings	Self-Employed
(Reference Group: Native Black Movers)						
Black Non-Movers	-0.019***	-0.067***	0.002*	-0.146***	0.094***	0.00302
	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.001)	(0.0139)	(0.030)	(0.010)
Central American	0.038***	-0.052**	0.014	0.221***	0.497***	0.113**
	(0.012)	(0.025)	(0.010)	(0.0587)	(0.124)	(0.050)
Caribbean	0.021***	-0.074***	0.030***	0.245***	0.407***	0.0625***
	(0.004)	(0.009)	(0.003)	(0.0219)	(0.050)	(0.018)
African	-0.036***	-0.254***	0.038***	0.085***	0.158**	0.118***
	(0.005)	(0.013)	(0.004)	(0.031)	(0.075)	(0.023)
South American	0.017	-0.070***	0.036***	0.206***	0.428***	0.0508
	(0.012)	(0.022)	(0.011)	(0.059)	(0.122)	(0.051)
Europe	-0.036**	0.072	0.026*	0.073	0.361	-0.0385
	(0.016)	(0.045)	(0.016)	(0.106)	(0.317)	(0.103)
Other Black Immigrant	-0.026*	-0.188***	0.035***	0.217**	0.286	-0.0107
	(0.014)	(0.035)	(0.013)	(0.088)	(0.191)	(0.055)
Education in Years				0.016***	0.125***	0.005***
				(0.000)	(0.002)	(0.000)
Interaction of Education with:						
Central American				-0.0147***	-0.043***	-0.008*
				(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.004)
Caribbean				-0.0171***	-0.036***	-0.002*
				(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.001)
African				-0.008***	-0.029***	-0.006***
				(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.002)
South American				-0.0141***	-0.037***	-0.001
				(0.004)	(0.010)	(0.003)
Europe				-0.007	-0.021	0.005
				(0.007)	(0.022)	(0.008)
Other Black Immigrant				-0.017***	-0.034**	0.003
				(0.006)	(0.014)	(0.004)
Black Non-Movers				0.010***	-0.012***	-1.47e-05
				(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.000)
Constant	0.535***	4.374***	-0.065***	0.570***	4.211***	-0.074***
	(0.009)	(0.022)	(0.007)	(0.013)	(0.028)	(0.009)
Observations	470644	383778	470644	470644	383778	470644
R-squared	0.059	0.158	0.009	0.061	0.159	0.009

Notes: The sample consists of black men between the ages of 25-62. The sample is taken from the 5% Integrated Public Use Micro Series (IPUMS) samples of the 2000 Census and the IPUMS samples of the 2001 to 2007 waves of the American Community Survey. These regressions also variables that capture experience, experience squared, speaking poor English, marital status, current state of residence indicators, and survey year indicators. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Coefficients are weighted using person weights.*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 7. Determinants of Employment Status, Weekly Earnings, and Self-Employment Status: Estimated Regression Coefficients for Black Natives, Black Movers, Black Non-movers, and Country Subgroups of Black Immigrants, U.S. Men, Ages 25-62

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Coefficients					
VARIABLES	Whether Employed	Log Weekly Earnings	Self-Employed	Whether Employed	Log Weekly Earnings	Self-Employed
(Reference Group: Native Black Movers)						
Black Non-movers	-0.019***	-0.066***	0.002*	-0.146***	0.0936***	0.00303
	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.001)	(0.0139)	(0.0302)	(0.00975)
Mexico	0.072***	-0.136***	0.016	0.168**	0.753***	0.128***
	(0.017)	(0.043)	(0.011)	(0.0745)	(0.201)	(0.0455)
Other Central Americans	0.023	-0.028	0.011	0.224***	0.474***	0.101
	(0.016)	(0.029)	(0.013)	(0.0832)	(0.171)	(0.0798)
Dominican Republic	0.036*	-0.079**	0.044***	0.360***	0.898***	-0.0315
	(0.019)	(0.039)	(0.016)	(0.0866)	(0.214)	(0.0804)
Haiti	0.019***	-0.180***	0.011**	0.299***	0.394***	0.00470
	(0.006)	(0.014)	(0.005)	(0.0318)	(0.0711)	(0.0260)
Jamaica	0.024***	-0.018	0.044***	0.182***	0.420***	0.108***
	(0.006)	(0.014)	(0.005)	(0.0347)	(0.0886)	(0.0318)
Trinidad and Tobago	0.025**	-0.044**	0.031***	0.209***	0.164	0.108**
	(0.010)	(0.021)	(0.008)	(0.0617)	(0.128)	(0.0477)
Other Caribbeans	0.013	-0.025	0.027***	0.252***	0.366***	0.0669
	(0.009)	(0.017)	(0.007)	(0.0488)	(0.101)	(0.0440)
Guyana	0.017	-0.053**	0.036***	0.180**	0.279**	0.0308
	(0.013)	(0.024)	(0.012)	(0.0724)	(0.137)	(0.0651)
Other South Americans	0.020	-0.143***	0.035**	0.283***	0.857***	0.0992*
	(0.021)	(0.048)	(0.016)	(0.0903)	(0.217)	(0.0574)
Europe	-0.035**	0.072	0.026*	0.0737	0.354	-0.0401
	(0.016)	(0.045)	(0.016)	(0.106)	(0.316)	(0.103)
Ghana	0.008	-0.227***	0.007	0.169***	0.0518	0.0439
	(0.011)	(0.024)	(0.008)	(0.0630)	(0.158)	(0.0539)
Nigeria	-0.051***	-0.224***	0.058***	0.115*	0.00730	0.104
	(0.009)	(0.026)	(0.008)	(0.0678)	(0.211)	(0.0643)
Ethiopia	-0.042***	-0.335***	0.069***	0.219***	0.675**	0.136**
	(0.013)	(0.050)	(0.012)	(0.0706)	(0.329)	(0.0624)
Other Africans	-0.038***	-0.257***	0.028***	0.0371	0.175**	0.163***
	(0.006)	(0.016)	(0.005)	(0.0432)	(0.0824)	(0.0297)
Other Black Immigrants	-0.026*	-0.194***	0.034**	0.219**	0.264	-0.0161
	(0.014)	(0.035)	(0.013)	(0.0882)	(0.191)	(0.0550)
education				0.0159***	0.124***	0.00476***
				(0.000768)	(0.00174)	(0.000577)
Interaction of Education with:						
Mexico				-0.00790	-0.0771***	-0.0102***

				(0.00600)	(0.0175)	(0.00384)
Other Central Americans				-0.0155**	-0.0380***	-0.00703
				(0.00644)	(0.0124)	(0.00625)
Dominican Republic				-0.0257***	-0.0770***	0.00640
				(0.00724)	(0.0162)	(0.00682)
Haiti				-0.0213***	-0.0430***	0.000630
				(0.00233)	(0.00529)	(0.00194)
Jamaica				-0.0122***	-0.0331***	-0.00487**
				(0.00252)	(0.00707)	(0.00237)
Trinidad and Tobago				-0.0138***	-0.0154	-0.00581*
				(0.00447)	(0.00960)	(0.00350)
Other Caribbeans				-0.0180***	-0.0290***	-0.00301
				(0.00362)	(0.00763)	(0.00336)
Guyana				-0.0122**	-0.0246**	0.000405
				(0.00532)	(0.0106)	(0.00497)
Other South Americans				-0.0200***	-0.0764***	-0.00489
				(0.00689)	(0.0173)	(0.00425)
Europe				-0.00726	-0.0201	0.00456
				(0.00717)	(0.0220)	(0.00758)
Ghana				-0.0110**	-0.0199*	-0.00260
				(0.00428)	(0.0110)	(0.00378)
Nigeria				-0.0101**	-0.0163	-0.00302
				(0.00422)	(0.0141)	(0.00406)
Ethiopia				-0.0181***	-0.0713***	-0.00469
				(0.00492)	(0.0257)	(0.00446)
Other Africans				-0.00498*	-0.0306***	-0.00954***
				(0.00292)	(0.00573)	(0.00204)
Other Black Immigrants				-0.0172***	-0.0326**	0.00368
				(0.00604)	(0.0142)	(0.00417)
Black Non-movers				0.00977***	-0.0118***	-1.83e-05
				(0.00101)	(0.00224)	(0.000740)
Constant	0.534***	4.375***	-0.065***	0.570***	4.213***	-0.0732***
	(0.009)	(0.022)	(0.007)	(0.0126)	(0.0281)	(0.00889)
Observations	470644	383778	470644	470644	383778	470644
R-squared	0.059	0.159	0.010	0.062	0.160	0.010

Notes: The sample consists of black men between the ages of 25-62. The sample is taken from the 5% Integrated Public Use Micro Series (IPUMS) samples of the 2000 Census and the IPUMS samples of the 2001 to 2007 waves of the American Community Survey. These regressions also variables that capture experience, experience squared, speaking poor English, marital status, current state of residence indicators, and survey year indicators. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Coefficients are weighted using person weights.*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.