Culture matters: America's African Diaspora and labor market outcomes

Patrick Mason

Florida State University

25. May 2009

Culture matters: America's African Diaspora and labor market outcomes

Patrick L. Mason
Professor of Economics &
Director, African American Studies Program
266 Bellamy Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2180
(850) 644-9146
(850) 644 – 4535 (fax)
pmason@fsu.edu

May 25, 2009

Abstract

This paper contrasts the explanatory power of the mono-cultural and diversity models of racial disparity. The mono-cultural model ignores nativity and ethnic differences among African Americans. The diversity model assumes that culture affects both intra- and interracial labor market disparity. The diversity model seeks to enhance our ability to understand the relative merits of culture versus market discrimination as determinants of racial inequality in labor market outcomes. Our results are consistent with the diversity model of racial inequality. Specifically, racial disparity consists of the following outcomes: 1) persistent racial wage and employment effects between both native and immigrant African Americans and whites, 2) limited ethnicity effects among African Americans, 3) diverse employment and wage effects among native and immigrant African Americans, 4) intra-racial wage penalties (premiums) for immigrant (native) African Americans, and 5) evidence of relatively higher unobserved productivity-linked attributes among Caribbean-English immigrants. There are regional and intertemporal variations in these inequalities.

JEL codes: J15, J16, J21, J31, J61, J7, Z13

Key words: racial discrimination, racial inequality, immigration, identity, African American, Caribbean, African Diaspora, wage discrimination, employment discrimination, Hispanic, acting white, multi-racial, skin shade

At the height of the US civil rights movement in the mid-1960s foreign-born persons were less than 1 percent of the African American population (Kent, 2007). The foreign-born share of the African American population increased by a factor of 7 between 1960 and 1980 and this sub-group tripled between 1980 and 2005 (Kent, 2007:4). Today, 12 percent of America's African Diaspora workforce consists of immigrants and 3 percent are Hispanic. African Diasporic diversity varies across national regions: within the Northeast, 31 percent are immigrants and 10 percent are Hispanic; within the West, 13 percent are immigrants and 7 percent are Hispanic; and, within the South and Northcentral regions, 9 percent and 6 percent, respectively, are immigrants and only 2 percent are Hispanic.

This paper examines heterogeneity and labor market inequality among America's African Diaspora and between African Americans and whites. The increase in cultural differences among African Americans provides rich data for appraising the relative importance of acculturation and discrimination for inter- and intra-racial wage and employment disparity. Using 1994-2007 March Current Population Survey data, this paper examines cultural differences and labor market disparity among African Americans and between African Americans and whites. Section I reviews the existing literature on cultural heterogeneity among African Americans and labor market outcomes. Section II presents the empirical model and hypotheses, while section III discusses the data and section IV presents the results. We conclude with a discussion and summary of the results.

I. Literature Review

There are straightforward explanations for why immigrants might be expected to have relatively lower wages and employment rates: difficulties reading, writing, understanding, or speaking English; inferior information regarding labor market opportunities; or, an education that

is inconsistent with American labor market requirements. Sometimes, however, African American immigrants have relatively higher labor market outcomes. The extant literature has argued that this superior market performance may be related to selectivity bias, culture, employer preference for immigrants relative to otherwise identical native workers, or the lateral mobility of immigrants.

Selection bias will raise the labor market attainment of immigrants relative to native African Americans if the immigration process selects in favor of persons who are highly skilled, hardworking, risk-taking, willing to sacrifice to achieve, adaptive, achievement and future oriented, have a great distance to travel to the US, or not likely to quit or give-up when faced with challenges (Butcher, 1994; Dodoo and Takyi, 2002; Model, 2008, 1991; Kalmijm, 1996; Woodbury, 1993; and, Pierre, 2004). Also, the literature sometimes argues that African American immigrants originate from countries where behaviors, values, and actions tend to cultivate higher levels of human capital and so-called soft skills relative to otherwise identical native African Americans (Dodoo and Takyi, 2002; Model, 2008, 1991; Kalmijm, 1996; Woodbury, 1993; and, Pierre, 2004). Thirdly, employers may prefer immigrant blacks to otherwise identical native African American workers because black immigrants are perceived as different from native African Americans (Dodoo and Takyi, 2002; Model, 2008, 1991; Kalmijm, 1996; Woodbury, 1993; and, Pierre, 2004). Finally, it has been argued that immigrants achieve American socioeconomic status that is similar to the level of socioeconomic status they held or would have held in their country of origin (Darity, 1989; Foner, 1979; Pierre, 2004); black immigrants of middle or higher socioeconomic status in their country of origin achieve the same relative status in the US and, thus, some immigrants are more likely to obtain higher

socioeconomic status than native African Americans, who are disproportionately poor and of lower socioeconomic status.

Utilizing the 1980 census and thus referring to 1979 annual income, Woodbury (1993) examines wage differentials by cultural sub-groups among native African American males and native white males 24 – 64 years of age. "West Indians" included "native blacks who identify themselves as having West Indian ancestry." African, European, Asian or Pacific Islander, American Indian, Hispanic, and Non-West Indian Caribbean black sub-groups are analogously defined. Blacks who responded that their ancestry was Canadian or North American were classified as native African Americans. Woodbury includes Virgin Islander ancestry persons as West Indian. Native persons of West Indian ancestry made up only about 0.4 percent of total black male employment in 1980. The other black ancestry subgroups, European, African, and American Indian were 0.90, 0.80, and 0.90 percent of the sample. Blacks with Hispanic ancestry, Caribbean ancestry other than West Indian, Asian and Pacific Islander, as well as individuals who did not respond to the ancestry question are included in the full sample, though they do not have separate wage equations.

In a regression consisting solely of native blacks, Woodbury finds that West Indian blacks earn 8.5 percent more than Afro-Americans (native blacks who do not assert Non-US ancestry), while native African Americans of European ancestry earn 5.7 percent more and native blacks of African ancestry earn 3.3 percent less. Those who failed to respond to the ancestry question earned 4 percent less than Afro-Americans. There are no significant earnings differentials for other African American sub-groups: American Indian, Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islanders, and Caribbean or other West Indian.

Woodbury also provides Blinder-Oaxaca decompositions for alternative African American cultural groups.[1] Using the white coefficients as weights, Woodbury finds earnings penalties of 20 percent, 15 percent, 13 percent, 21 percent, and 18 percent for Afro-Americans, West Indians, Europeans, Africans, and American Indians, respectively. Woodbury concludes that there is evidence that West Indian culture or other unobserved variable(s) does provide a premium for native African Americans of West Indian origin (about 8.5 percent), but if Afro-Americans were to adopt West Indian culture it would improve their wages by no more than 2.5 percent. Further, since West Indian males earn 19 percent less than white males and most of this gap (15 percent) cannot be explained by the observable wage covariates, West Indian males are also subject to wage discrimination in the labor market.

Omitted variable bias may be a factor in Woodbury's regression. His equations do not control for union status, size of firm, socioeconomic status, the tightness of regional labor markets, or technological progress effects on the labor market. Each of these factors influences individual wages and each may have a differential effect on workers living in the South, where 53 percent of Afro-American workers reside but where only 20 percent of West Indian workers reside. Similarly, 38 percent, 37 percent, and 34 percent of African Americans of European, African, and American Indian ancestry, respectively, reside in the South.

Additionally, Woodbury's definition of ancestry likely produces measurement error identifying West Indian (and other sub-group) ancestry: first, immigrants (the most easily identifiable sub-group) are excluded; and, second, the ability or willingness of native African Americans to assert Caribbean, African, other Non-US ancestry may vary by socioeconomic status, for example, individuals of higher educational or income status may be more likely to assert Non-US ancestry. Measurement error may be a source of attenuation bias for the

coefficients on ancestry variables in the African American male regression utilizing all observations.

Model (1991) uses 1980 PUMS files, but selects observations from only six states that contain about 75 percent of all West Indian immigrants: New York, Florida, New Jersey, California, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. West Indian immigrants includes Caribbean Islands (regardless of language), as well as Bermuda, Belize, Guyana, French Guyana, and Surinam. Individuals are 25 – 64 years of age. West Indian women and men have lower unadjusted annual earnings than native African American, foreign-born Non-Hispanic white, and native Non-Hispanic white women and men. After controlling for a common set of wage covariates (as well as occupation and industry controls), Model shows that West Indian men have wage penalties of 4 percent, 22 percent, and 19 percent relative to native African Americans, foreign-born whites, and native whites, respectively. West Indian women earn 6 percent more than otherwise identical native white women, though there is no statistically significant adjusted wage differential relative to native African Americans or foreign-born whites. In their analysis of the 1980 census, Farley and Allen (1989) also find that native- and foreign-born black men, ages 25 – 64, had very similar earnings. After adjusting for education, experience, region and New York City residence, and occupation, Farley and Allen find that both native- and foreign-born black men earn about 20 percent less than otherwise identical white men.

African immigrants have higher average years of education and earnings than both native whites and African Americans (Dodoo, 1997). Yet, adjusting for wage covariates, African immigrants suffer a substantial wage penalty relative to native whites, native African Americans, and other black immigrants (Dodoo and Takyi, 2002). Using the 1990 5-percent Public Use Microdata Sample of the US Census of Population, Dodoo and Takyi (2002) find that for a

sample of 25 – 64 year old white and black male immigrants of African origin with very similar observable wage covariates, white African immigrants enjoy a 24 percent wage premium relative to black African immigrants.[2] Further, their Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition shows that only 47 percent of the white-black gross log wage differential can be accounted for differences in observable characteristics including occupation

Using the 1990 1-percent Public Use Microdata Sample of the US Census of Population, Kalmijn (1996) analyzes a sample of 25 – 64 male black Caribbean immigrants, native blacks who reported Caribbean ancestry, and native African Americans who did not report foreign ancestral origin. French- and Spanish-speaking Caribbean immigrants report lower earnings and lower levels of productivity-linked characteristics than native African Americans. English-speaking Caribbean immigrants have higher hourly earnings ($13.64 versus $12.41) but nearly identical years of schooling (12.1 versus 12.0) relative to native African Americans, but 15.5 percent of the English-speaking Caribbean males have college degrees versus 11.2 percent of native African American males. Given equal years of education, the greater fraction of college graduates among English-speaking Caribbean immigrants implies that there are also relatively more English-speaking Caribbean immigrants at lower levels of education. Kalmijn finds that Spanish- and French-speaking male Caribbean immigrants have hourly earnings penalties of 10 percent and 9 percent, respectively, relative to otherwise identical native African American males, while there is no statistically significant wage difference between English-speaking Caribbean immigrant males and native African American males. But, separating the sample according to states with exceptionally large Caribbean populations (New York, Florida, and Massachusetts) versus the remaining so-called "Non-Caribbean" states, Kalmijn reports larger Spanish- and French-speaking Caribbean wage penalties in "Caribbean" states relative to "Non-

Caribbean" states, for example, 11.7 percent versus 7.9 percent for Spanish-speaking immigrants and 9.2 percent and 4.8 percent for French-speaking immigrants. For English-speaking immigrants, there is a penalty 0.9 percent in the Caribbean states and a premium of 4.5 percent in the Non-Caribbean states.

Kalmijn's most nuanced results show that there are no statistically significant adjusted wage differentials for native men of French-, Spanish-, or English-speaking Caribbean ancestry relative to native African Americans who do not identify foreign-born ancestral origins. Immigrant Spanish-, French-, and English-speaking male Caribbean immigrants have wage penalties of 25 percent, 29 percent, and (insignificant) 6 percent, respectively, relative to their native ancestral group; however, the wages of each immigrant group increases with duration in the US labor market. Specifically, for each decade in the labor market, the wages of Spanish-speaking immigrants increases by 8 percent relative to Spanish-speaking native persons of Caribbean ancestry, the wages of French-speaking immigrants increases by 12 percent relative to French-speaking native persons of Caribbean ancestry, and the wages of English-speaking immigrants increases by 5 percent relative to English-speaking native persons of Caribbean ancestry.

So, according to Kalmijn, if there is linear duration effect, it takes 12, 34, and 21 years, respectively, for English-speaking, Spanish-speaking, and French-speaking male Caribbean immigrants to overtake native African American men. However, given the absence of any statistically significant wage differential between native African American males of Caribbean and "domestic" origin, it may not be appropriate to assume that a linear duration effect, that is, there may be a point where black immigrant men catch up to native black men without overtaking them.

II. Estimation Framework

Consider the standard *mono-culture model* of racial inequality.

(1) $Y = \sum_{k=1}^{K} X_k \beta_k + \delta R + \theta t + \varepsilon,$

where Y is alternatively the natural log of weekly wages, the probability of labor force participation, and probability of employment; X is a vector of wage covariates; t is a linear trend which captures the intertemporal changes in the labor market effects of technological change, governmental policies, etc.; R = 1 if the individual is an African American, but = 0 if the individual is white; and, ε is an error term.

The wage covariates (captured by the vector X) include potential experience and its square; years of education and its square; interaction terms for years of education and experience and years of education and experience squared; union status of job; regional binary variables (Northeast, Northeast, West), where South is the comparison region; marital status binary variables (married, divorced, widowed, separated), where never-married persons are the comparison group; number of unmarried children at home less than 18 years of age; binary variable for whether or not an individual has served in the armed forces; individual/family unearned income ($1,000s); state employment-population rate; binary variable if there is a limitation on the amount or type of work; and, binary variables for small localities (cities with 100,000 or fewer persons) and large cities (metropolitan areas with 5,000,000 or more individuals).

African Americans vary by ethnicity (Spanish-speaking, French-speaking, and English-speaking) and nativity (native African Americans versus self-identified black immigrants with origins in the Caribbean, Africa, South America, Europe, or elsewhere). Collapsing African American ethnicity and nativity into a single binary variable (R) may reduce statistical insight on

the economic relevance of cultural heterogeneity among African Americans and the nature and extent of interracial disparity. Typically, we find that $\hat{\delta} < 0$. If $\hat{\delta}$ is invariant across ethnic and immigrant groups, then $\hat{\delta} < 0$ is not likely explained by unobserved productivity-linked attributes; instead, it is evidence that $\hat{\delta} < 0$ is a pure measure of market discrimination. Suppose however that $\hat{\delta}$ is not invariant with respect to ethnicity and nativity. For example, suppose $\hat{\delta} < 0$ for some African Americans, but $\hat{\delta} = 0$ or $\hat{\delta} > 0$ for other African American cultural groups, then it may be the case that the mono-culture model is picking up spurious correlation. Further, more detailed examination of the characteristics of African American cultural groups with $\hat{\delta} \geq 0$ may yield specific policy suggestions for reducing interracial disparity between African Americans and whites.

Consider the following *diversity model* of racial inequality.

$$(2)\ Y = \sum_{k=1}^{K} X_k \beta_k + \alpha_0 A + \gamma D_e + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n D_n + \theta t + \varepsilon.$$

Cultural differences are captured by the vector **D** = {A, D_e, D_n}, whose elements are defined as follows:

A ≡ binary variable for native African American;

D_e ≡ binary variable for native Hispanic African American;

D_n ≡ binary variables for African American immigrants from Canada, Mexico, Caribbean-English, Caribbean-Spanish, Haiti, South America, Africa, Oceania, Asia, Europe, Elsewhere.

i) Irrelevance of ethnicity

The adjusted wage differential for all native African Americans = α_0. The adjusted wage differential for Hispanic native African Americans = $\alpha_0 + \gamma$. Hence, the hypothesis test for the irrelevance of Hispanic ethnicity is given by

H_0: $\gamma = 0$ and

H_1: $\gamma \neq 0$.

The Hispanic cultural group also consists of several immigrant groups, viz., Caribbean-Spanish, South American, and Mexican immigrants. Additionally, Haitian immigrants represent a French/Creole ethnic group.

ii) Irrelevance of immigrant status

Suppose black immigrants have labor market outcomes that are not dissimilar to the labor market outcomes of Non-Hispanic native whites (the normative group for the US labor market). If so, our null hypothesis is

H_0: $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N = 0$.

iii) Irrelevance of diversity

The mono-culture model collapses all elements of African American cultural heterogeneity into a single binary vector. The mono-culture model is an acceptable specification if the following hypothesis true.

H_0: $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N$ and $\gamma = 0$.

iv) Irrelevance of race

If our model is well specified and there is not market discrimination, then African American binary variables are jointly insignificant.

H_0: $\gamma = \alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N = 0$.

Using ordinary least squares, we first examine weekly wage differentials. Next, using binary logit estimation, we separately examine participation and employment differentials. For both OLS and logit regressions, we estimate separate regressions for men and women, for two periods, and for both national and regional specifications of the equations. The comparative

group consists of native Non-Hispanic whites. All immigrants and Hispanics in the data are African Americans. For the final stage of our examination, we restrict the sample to African Americans and utilize Oaxca-Ransom decompositions to expose the nature and extent of intra-racial inequality.

Separate regressions are estimated for each time period, that is, 1994-2000 and 2001-2007. The ending date for the initial period is the peak year of the business cycle while the starting date for the second period is the trough of the business cycle. Regional differences in labor markets and patterns of racial relations might also affect intra-racial differences in labor market outcomes. In particular, there has been remarkable relative and absolute progress among African Americans in the South. If African Americans of differing cultural groups are not identically distributed across national regions, then we are likely to observe unequal progress for African Americans by ethnicity and nativity.

III. Data

The data are taken from the 1994 – 2007 March files of the Current Population Survey. The weekly wages refer to the average weekly wages for the year prior to the survey. All individuals are 16 – 64 years of age during the wage year. Employment status outcomes include employed, unemployed, and not in the labor force. Potential experience = max{age of individual – years of education – 6, 0}. Self-employment patterns differ across cultural groups. Hence, we do not delete the self-employed, despite the fact that their wages may be difficult to determine precisely even as their employment status is straightforwardly ascertained. All individuals are African Americans and native Non-Hispanic whites. All income data are inflation-adjusted to 2007 dollars using the Consumer Price Index – All Urban Consumers.

Starting in 1994 the CPS continuously includes information on nativity and nativity is

coded in a consistent manner. For 2003 – 2007 individuals may select more than one racial category. In order to maintain consistency with previous surveys and with the prevailing social norms of the immediate post-Jim Crow era, African Americans include all persons who self-identified as "black only" plus any combination of black and other racial or ethnic group.

Persons from the US Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico are considered native African Americans. *Caribbean-English* immigrants include persons from Bermuda, British West Indies, Belize, British Honduras, Antigua & Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, St. Kitts & Nevis, Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, Trinidad & Tobago, Guyana, Surinam, Dutch Guyana, British Virgin Islands, West Indies, not specified, and North America (other than Canada and Mexico). *Caribbean-Spanish* immigrants include Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Cuba, Dominican Republic, South America, not specified, Latin America, and Central America. A small number of immigrants are grouped with the Caribbean-Spanish group, though they did not emigrate from a Hispanic country. These include persons from Dutch West Indies, French West Indies, Guadeloupe, Martinique, and St. Maarten. *European-plus* immigrants of African descent include persons from Western and Eastern Europe, as well as persons from Canada and Oceania (Australia, Fiji, New Zealand, Tonga, Samoa, and other Oceania, unspecified). As such, European-plus immigrants of African descent include a large fraction of persons who are English-speaking and who have been socialized into the work norms of an industrialized economy and the social norms of white (or, at least, non-black) dominated countries. *Haitian* immigrants are analyzed separately. Black immigrants also include persons from Mexico, South America, Africa, Asia, and elsewhere (persons whose origins are not specified).

For the nation as a whole, about 12 percent of the 1994-2000 labor force was foreign-

born. This number grew to nearly 16 percent during 2001-2007. The Hispanic population accounted for a little over 10 percent of the US labor force during 1994-00 and close to 14 percent during 2001-07. The African American labor force followed a similar trend. Hispanics represent about 3 percent of all African Americans (Table 1). By 2001-07, 88 percent of African Americans were natives; hence, the fraction of immigrants has grown from 9 percent in 1994-00 to 12 percent during 2001-07.

[Insert Tables 1, 2, and 3]

Caribbean and Central American immigrants have increased from 5 to 7 percent of the African American labor force during 1994-2007. African immigrants are now more than 3 percent of the African American labor force. English-speaking black immigrants are 4 – 7 percent of the population, but this number excludes English-speaking black immigrants from Panama and Puerto Rico, Hispanic cultures where there are also a substantial fraction of English-speaking individuals.

African Americans are a disproportionately Southern population. During 2001-2007, 18 percent of African Americans lived in the Northcentral states, 18 percent lived in the Northeast, 55 percent lived in the South, and 9 percent lived in the West. Similarly, during 2001-2007 African Americans were 9.4 percent of the Northcentral population, 12.7 percent of the Northeast, 21.9 percent of the South, and 7 percent of the West.

African American ethnic diversity varies strongly by region (Table 2). For 2001-07, the Northeast (31 percent immigrant) and West (13 percent immigrant) are the most diverse, while the Northcentral and Southern regions are the least diverse, 5 and 8 percent immigrant, respectively. Caribbean-English and Caribbean-Spanish African Americans represent about 1/5 of the Northeast African American labor force, while Africans are 4 percent of African

Americans in the Northeast and West. Black Hispanics are 10 and 8 percent of Northeastern and Western African Americans.

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics by nativity and ethnicity.

IV. Results

A. Weekly wage inequality: men

There is no evidence of ethnic wage inequality among African American men. During 1994-00 and 2001-07, native Hispanic African American men received statistically insignificant wage penalties of 4.46 percent and 1.12 percent (Table 4). The wages of native African Americans males were 20 percent (1994-00) and 19 percent (2001-07) lower than the wage of white males.

Nationally, for 1994-00 and 2001-07, the data reject the immigration, diversity, and race hypotheses. During 1994-2007 there are large wage penalties for immigrant males. The wages of Caribbean-English men were 14 percent (1994-00) and 21 percent (2001-07) lower than the wages of otherwise identical native Non-Hispanic white males. African immigrants received penalties of 31 and 35 percent during 1994-2000 and 2001-2007, respectively. Caribbean-Spanish, South American, and Mexican immigrants of African descent received 30, 32, and 22 percent lower wages, respectively, during 2001-2007; these were higher penalties than those received in 1994-00. Haitian men received wage penalties of 43 and 34 percent during 1994-2000 and 2001-2007, respectively. European-plus immigrants earned wages 11 percent and 17 percent lower than otherwise identical whites during 1991-00 and 2001-07, respectively.[3] Asian immigrants had wage differentials of –31 and –19 during the two periods, while immigrants with unidentified national origins, that is, so-called "elsewhere" immigrants, received 24 percent and 30 percent wage penalties during 1991-00 and 2001-07, respectively.

[Insert Tables 4 & 5]

For all regions, for both 1994-00 and 2001-07, the data do not reject the ethnicity hypothesis: Hispanic status does not affect intra-racial disparity among African American men or inter-racial disparity between African American men and native Non-Hispanic white males. (See Table 5 and Appendix Table A5).[4] For all regions, for both 1994-00 and 2001-07, the data reject the immigration status and race hypotheses. Except for the Western region during 1994-00, the data reject the diversity hypothesis. However, during the 1994-00 we cannot reject the null hypothesis of mono-culture disparity. Table 5 shows that for 1994-00 and 2001-07, Northcentral native African Americans received penalties of 18 percent and 21 percent, respectively, with similar penalties in the Northeast (20 percent and 17 percent), South (20 percent and 18 percent), and West (21 percent).

B. Weekly wage inequality: women

There is no statistically significant ethnic inequality among African American women during 1994-00. However, during 2001-07, native Hispanic African American women earned about 5 percent more than the average weekly wage for native African American women (Table 6). Native African American women earned 10 percent less than white women during 1994-00 and 2001-07, while native Hispanic women earned 10 percent and 5 percent less, respectively.

Nationally, for 1994-00 and 2001-07, the data reject the immigration, diversity, and race hypotheses. Caribbean-English and Native African American women received 8 percent and 10 power lower weekly wages (for all of 1994-2007), respectively, than otherwise white women. African immigrants received penalties of 22 percent and 10 percent during 1994-2000 and 2001-2007, respectively. Haitian women received wage penalties of 19 percent during 1994-2000 and 2001-2007.

[Insert Tables 6 & 7]

The data reject the race hypothesis for all regions during 1994-00 and 2001-07, though the data do not reject the ethnicity hypothesis: race influences wage inequality between African Americans and whites, but Hispanic status has no effect on intra-racial wage inequality among African Americans (Table 7).

The data reject the immigration hypothesis for all regions during the 2000s. But, the data do not reject the immigration hypothesis for the Northcentral and Western regions during the 1990s. Additionally, during the 1990s and for the Northcentral and Western regions the data do not reject the diversity hypothesis. Considered separately, none of the individual immigration variables are significant for these regions during 1990s, though more often than not the immigration coefficients are negative. The individual coefficients for native African American women suggest weekly wage penalties of 10 percent (Northcentral) and 7 percent (West).

The seemingly contradictory results between the immigration and diversity tests reflect the large standard errors associated with the immigration coefficients for the Northcentral and Western regions, which carry the smallest fraction of immigrant African Americans.

During 2001-07 the data do not reject the diversity hypothesis for the Northeast. The mono-cultural empirical model is appropriate for women of this region during the most recent period.

C. Employment-status inequality: men

There is no statistically significant male ethnic participation effect for either period (Table 8). Nor is there a significant ethnic employment effect for the 1990s. However, for 2001-07 native Hispanic African American males have a 2.3 percent higher employment rate than

otherwise identical African American males, which suggests an employment rate that is 2.6 percent less than the employment rate of native Non-Hispanic whites.

Considering the male participation rate, the data reject the immigration and race hypotheses for 1994-00, but not the diversity hypothesis. For the 1990s there is no statistically significant difference in the labor force participation of African American males of differing cultural groups: African American males have a labor force participation rate that is about 6 percent lower than the rate of white males.

There are statistically significant race, diversity, and immigrant employment effects for 1994-2000. Native African American males have an employment rate that is 11 percent lower than white males. Among the larger immigrant groups, the employment differentials are -7 percent (Caribbean-English), -10 percent (Caribbean-Hispanic), -6 percent (Haiti), and -9 percent (Africa).

[Insert Table 8]

The participation and employment gaps closed between 1994-00 and 2001-07 (Table 8). For the latter period, there are statistically significant diversity and race effects, but no significant immigrant effects. Hence, during the 2000s African American male immigrants have labor force participation rates that are indistinguishable from white males. Native African American males have a participation rate that is 1 percent lower than white males.

For 2001-07 the male employment rates vary by race, immigration, and diversity among African Americans. There is a 5 percent employment gap for native African American men, though this gap is just 3 percent for Hispanic males. The coefficients are not statistically significant for Caribbean-English, African, or Caribbean-Hispanic males, though there is a 3 percent employment gap for Haitian males.

The participation and employment effects of ethnicity, diversity, race, and immigration status vary across regions and across periods. (See Tables 9 and 10). For 2001-07 the labor force participation rate of Hispanic males is 3 percent higher than the participation rate of native African Americans males (and 2 percent higher than the white participation rate) of the Western region; otherwise, there is no significant ethnic effect for any region or either period (Table 10). During 1994-00 Hispanic males of the South had an employment 6 percent higher than other African Americans (but 3 percent lower than whites); otherwise, there was no ethnic employment effect during the 1990s (Table 9). By 2001-07 the Southern ethnic effect was insignificant, though Hispanic males obtained employment rates 3 percent and 4 percent higher than African Americans (3 percent and 2 percent lower than whites) of the Northeast and West, respectively.

[Insert Tables 9 & 10]

During 1994-00, both native and Caribbean-English African American males living in the South had lower participation rates than white males, 5 percent less and 6 percent less, respectively (Table 9). Both groups of African American men were 9 percent less likely to be employed than otherwise identical white males living in the South. During the same period, native African American males, as well as Caribbean-English, Haitian, and African immigrants males living in the Northeast had participation rates that were 8 percent, 4 percent, 8 percent, and 15 percent lower than white males, respectively (Table 9). These Northeastern African Americans also were less likely to be employed, with penalties of 15 percent (native), 7 percent (Caribbean-English), 15 percent (Haitian), and 12 percent (African). Caribbean-Hispanic immigrants living in the Northeast had a 10 percent lower participation rate and a 12 lower employment rate.

For the Northeast, there are significant immigration, race, and diversity effects during 1994-00 but these effects are insignificant during 2001-07. Similarly, there are significant immigration and race effects within the Western region during 1994-00. Combined with the insignificant diversity effect within the West, the analysis suggests that African American males had a participation rate about 8 percent lower than the participation rate of white males. However, by the 2000s there was no significant immigration, diversity, or race effect for the West. Southern native African American males had 5 percent lower and 1 percent lower participation rates than white males during 1994-00 and 2001-07, respectively; otherwise, there are no immigration or diversity effects. Finally, the data reject the immigration and race hypotheses but not the diversity hypothesis for the Northeast during 1994-00, suggesting that African Americans had a 7 percent lower participation rate relative to white males (Table 9). By 2001-07 the diversity, race, and immigration hypotheses were significant. Native African American males residing in the Northeast had a participation rate 1 percent lower than the rate of white males but nearly all of the individual immigrant group coefficients were small (roughly, plus or minus 1 percent) and insignificant.

Relative employment outcomes improved for African American males during 2001-07. Further, the race hypothesis is rejected for employment for all regions for both periods. There are no immigration employment effects for the South during either period, but the diversity hypothesis is rejected only for 2001-07. Native African American men were 4 percent less likely to be employed than otherwise identical white males living in the South, while Mexican and Caribbean-Spanish origin African American males had 5 percent lower and 4 percent higher employment rates, respectively, than white males (Table 10).

For the Northeast both the diversity and immigration hypotheses are rejected for the 1990s, but only the diversity hypothesis is rejected for the 2000s. Native African Americans had an employment penalty of 15 percent in 1994-00 but just 6 percent during 2001-07. For the three largest immigrant groups, Caribbean-English, Haiti, and Africa, the employment effects were statistically insignificant for 2001-07, though there were penalties of 7 percent, 15 percent, 12 percent, respectively, during 1994-00.

The individual Western and Northcentral immigrant employment effects are nearly uniformly insignificant for all of 1994-2007. However, between the two periods the employment penalty for native African American men declined from 14 percent to 6 percent (West) and from 12 percent to 6 percent (Northcentral).

D. Employment-status inequality: women

Racial differences in female participation and employment gaps closed between 1994-00 and 2001-07 (Table 11). There are statistically significant ethnicity, immigrant, diversity, and race participation effects for 1994-00 but not for 2001-07. There are statistically significant immigrant, diversity, and race participation effects for 1994-00 but not for 2001-07.

For example, during the 1990s the participation and employment rates of native African American women are 1.4 percent less and 4.6 percent less, respectively, than the participation and employment rates for white women. On the other hand, during the 2000s, the participation and employment gaps for native African American women were statistically insignificant and 3 percent. For 1994-00, native Hispanic African American women had participation and employment rates that were 8 percent lower than the rates for native Non-Hispanic African American women, but there is no statistically significant difference for 2001-07.

Among immigrant groups, during 1994-00, Caribbean-English and Haitian women had 5 percent higher and 6 percent higher participation rates, respectively, while Caribbean-Hispanic and African immigrant women had participation rates that were 4 percent lower and 10 percent lower than the participation rate of white women. Nevertheless, during 2001-07 all African American women had labor force participation rates that were statistically indistinguishable from otherwise identical white women. During 1994-00 Caribbean-Hispanic and African women were 7 percent less and 15 percent less likely to be employed than white women, though by 2001-07 these differentials were 6 percent and 3 percent, respectively.

[Insert Table 11]

During 1994-00, native, Caribbean-English, and Haitian African American females living in the South had higher participation rates than white females, viz., 2 percent higher, 7 percent higher, and 9 percent higher, respectively (Table 12). African immigrant women however had a labor force participation rate 16 percent lower than the rate for white women. Caribbean-English women were also 5 percent more likely to be employed, while there was no statistically significant employment effect for Haitian women. Native and African women living in the South were 1.4 percent less likely and 21 percent less likely to be employed. During the same period, native African American and Caribbean-Hispanic females living in the Northeast had participation rates that were 5 percent lower and 8 percent lower than white females, respectively (Table 12). But, Caribbean-English immigrant African American women living in the Northeast had a participation rate 4 percent higher than the rate for otherwise identical white women. Also, Northeast African American women are less likely to be employed, with penalties of 8 percent (native), 10 percent (native Hispanic), 13 percent (Caribbean-Spanish), 6 percent (Haitian), and 13 percent (African).

[Insert Tables 12 and 13]

Except for the Northcentral region, during 2001-07 there is no statistically significant difference in the labor force participation rates of African American and white women (Table 13). We are unable to reject the ethnicity, immigration, diversity, and race hypotheses for the Northeast, South, and West. We cannot reject the ethnicity, immigration, and diversity hypotheses for the labor force participation of Northcentral women. There are modest participation race effects for the Northcentral region: native African American and Haitian immigrant women have labor force participation rates that are 1 percent lower and 3 percent higher than the participation rates of white women.

Relative employment outcomes improved for African American women during 2001-07. Native African American women were 4 percent less likely (Northeast), 5 percent less likely (Northcentral), 2 percent less likely (South), and 3 percent less likely (West) to be employed than otherwise identical white women. Within the South, African immigrant women had a 7 percent lower employment rate than white females. Caribbean-Spanish and Haitian women living in the Northeast had employment rates that were 6 percent lower and 4 percent higher than otherwise identical native Non-Hispanic white women (Table 13).

E. Wage decompositions among African Diaspora

Following Oaxaca and Ransom (1994) we use three equations to decompose intraracial wage differences: a pooled sample of all African Americans, a sub-sample of native African Americans, and a sub-sample of immigrant African Americans.

$\ln W = X\beta + \varepsilon$ (pooled sample of all African Americans)

$\ln W^B = X^B\beta^B + \varepsilon^B$ (native)

$\ln W^I = X^I\beta^I + \varepsilon^I$ (immigrant)

The unadjusted wage differential is decomposed as follows:

$\ln W^N - \ln W^I = \bar{X}^I(\hat{\beta} - \hat{\beta}^I)$ (immigrant disadvantage),

$+ \bar{X}^N(\hat{\beta}^N - \hat{\beta})$ (native advantage), and

$+ (\bar{X}^N - \bar{X}^I)\hat{\beta}$ (characteristics differential).

We focus on two issues regarding wage disparity between native and immigrant African Americans: intra-racial differences in unobserved productivity-linked attributes and intra-racial differences in employer treatment. Differences in unobserved productivity-linked attributes may occur for a variety of reasons, viz., the specific reasons identified in the literature include selection bias in the immigration process, superior wage earning culture among immigrants, and the lateral mobility of immigrants. On the other hand, employers may not regard native and immigrant African Americans as perfect substitutes in the discrimination process and thereby may treat them differently with respect to the wage earning opportunities that are made available to workers.

As an identifying assumption, we assume a positive correlation between observed and unobserved productivity-linked attributes. Suppose residual wage differences are consistent with higher unobserved productivity-linked attributes among immigrant African Americans relative to native African Americans. If so, each element of the identity decomposition, that is, the characteristics, native advantage, and immigrant disadvantage effects should have a negative effect on disparity between native and immigrant persons. For example, if $\ln W^N - \ln W^I < 0$ and this unadjusted differential can be solely explained by differences in observable and unobservable productivity-linked productive attributes, then it must also be the case that the observed characteristics differential $(\bar{X}^N - \bar{X}^I)\hat{\beta} < 0$ and the unobserved differential immigrant disadvantage $\bar{X}^I(\hat{\beta} - \hat{\beta}^I) < 0$ and unobserved native advantage differential $\bar{X}^N(\hat{\beta}^N - \hat{\beta}) < 0$.

Suppose, however, the patterns of residual inequality are the result of differential market discrimination against native and immigrant African Americans. If so, the characteristics effect and immigrant disadvantage effect will have opposite effects on intra-racial disparity. For example, if $\ln W^N - \ln W^I > 0$ the characteristics differential should have a positive effect on disparity between native individuals and immigrant persons; simultaneously, we should observe that the immigrant disadvantage has a negative effect on intra-racial disparity. Relatively greater discrimination against immigrant African Americans will be the case if we observe that characteristic differences have a negative effect on intra-racial inequality while the immigrant disadvantage has a positive effect on intra-racial inequality.

Collectively considered, there is a market premium for native African American males relative to immigrant African American males, but current wage inequality among women is completely explained by differences in covariates (Table 14a). For the 1990s and 2000s immigrant males have 4 percent higher wages than native males; however, the immigrant characteristics advantage rose from 7 percent during 1994-00 to 11 percent during 2001-07, while the market disadvantage for immigrants rose from 3 percent to 6 percent. For the most recent period, higher earnings among immigrant women are completely explained by their higher wage covariates. Immigrant women had 3 percent higher wages during 1994-00 and 4 percent higher wages during 2001-07; however, the characteristics differential declined from 9 percent during 1994-00 to 4 percent during 2001-07 and their market disadvantage, at 4 percent during 1994-00, was eliminated during 2001-07. There were no market advantages for native men and women during the 1990s or 2000s.

By and large, the regional decompositions follow the national the pattern, though there are exceptions. During the 2001-07, there is virtually no unadjusted wage differential between

Northeastern native and immigrant men. However, the characteristics differential is responsible for an 8 percentage point benefit for immigrant males. This differential is counterbalanced by a 3 percent market advantage for native men and a 5 percent market disadvantage for immigrant men. For Northcentral women during 2001-07, native women have weekly wages that are 11 percent higher than immigrant women and this wage differential is close to the 12 percent characteristics differential in favor of native women. Among men and women of the West and for both periods, native African Americans have higher wages than immigrant African Americans and the characteristics differential shows that native workers have higher wage covariates. For the Southern during the 2000s, immigrant women earn 5 percent more than native women but immigrant women also have a 5 percent covariate advantage; immigrant men earn 5 percent more than native men, though they have 13 percent covariate advantage and 7 percent wage disadvantage.

[Insert Tables 14a-14d]

The results for all immigrants collectively considered cloud the analysis of native-immigrant disparity for particular groups of African American immigrants. For example, among Caribbean-English immigrants there is evidence of higher (unobserved) productivity-linked attributes during the 1990s (men and women) and 2000s (women). During 1994-00 and 2001-07, Caribbean-English immigrant males earned 19 percent more than native African American males, while immigrant females earned 16 and 18 percent more, respectively, than native females (Table 14b). For the most part, the higher earnings of Caribbean-English immigrants are due to higher wage-covariates. The wage-covariates of Caribbean-English males raised their earnings by 11 percent during the 1990s and by 18 percent during the 2000s. The wage-covariates of Caribbean-English females raised their earnings by 14 percent during the 1990s and

by 15 percent during the 2000s. There was evidence of a market premium for Caribbean-English males during the 1990s but this is no longer the case during the most recent decade. For Caribbean-English women, a modest market premium of 2 percent during the 1990s has grown to 3 percent during the current period.

Caribbean-English immigrants are concentrated in the Northeast and the South. Both male and female immigrants in the Northeast earn 10 percent more than native persons, up from 9 percent and 3 percent higher earnings, for immigrant men and women, respectively, during 1994-00. However, between the first and second periods the male Caribbean-English immigrant market disadvantage went from a 5 percent premium to a 4 percent penalty. During 2001-07, the relatively more favorable characteristics of male immigrants living in the Northeast should have raised their wages by 15 percent relative to native workers. Nearly all of the Northeastern female wage differential is explained by differences in wage-earning covariates.

The unadjusted wage differential for Caribbean-English immigrants living in the South are large: 33 percent (males, 1990s), 22 percent (males, 2000s), 24 percent (females, 1990s), and 23 percent (females, 2000s). Relatively higher wage-earning covariates account for a substantial portion of the unadjusted differential: 22 percent (males, 1990s), 16 percent (males, 2000s), 17 percent (females, 1990s), and 16 percent (females, 2000s). But, Caribbean-English immigrants living in the South also receive sizable wage premia relative to native Southern African American men and women: 11 percent (males, 1990s), 6 percent (males, 2000s), and 7 percent (females, 1990s and 2000s).

Like Caribbean-English immigrants, male African immigrants have large unadjusted wage differentials relative to native African Americans (Table 14c). Nevertheless, the decompositions also suggest that African male immigrants have both large characteristics effects

and large market penalties. The female unadjusted wage differential also favors African immigrants, but it is not as large and is nearly entirely explained by differences in wage covariates. During 1994-00 and 2001-07, male African immigrants earned 13 percent and 14 percent more than native males, while immigrant females earned roughly the same as native females (Table 14c). The wage-covariates of male African immigrants raised their earnings by 23 percent during the 1990s and by 27 percent during the 2000s. The wage-covariates of female African immigrants raised their earnings by 14 percent during the 1990s and by 2 percent during the 2000s. But, the market treatment disadvantage of male African immigrants reduced their wages by 10 percent and 12 percent, respectively, during the two periods. The market treatment disadvantage for immigrant African American women reduced their earnings by 14 percent during 1994-00 but was eliminated during 2001-07.

African immigrants are concentrated in the Northeast and the South. Male immigrants in the Northeast enjoyed a 10 percent unadjusted wage differential during 2001-07, up from a 5 percent lower wage in 1994-00. Female African immigrants in the Northeast received a 3 percent unadjusted wage differential during 2001-07, up from a 3 percent lower wage in 1994-00. However, between the first and second periods the male African immigrant market disadvantage declined only modestly from 17 percent to 14 percent; simultaneously, their favorable characteristics effect increased from 12 percent to 25 percent. The female Northeastern African immigrant market disadvantage rose from an 8 percent penalty to a 5 percent premium and their characteristics effect declined from a 5 percent benefit to a 2 percent loss.

These are large unadjusted wage differentials for African immigrants living in the South: 25 percent (males, 1990s), 27 percent (males, 2000s), 5 percent (females, 1990s), and 15 percent (females, 2000s). Higher wage-earning covariates more than account for the unadjusted

differential: 30 percent (males, 1990s), 36 percent (males, 2000s), 22 percent (females, 1990s), and 15 percent (females, 2000s). But, African immigrants living in the South also receive sizable market wage penalties relative to native African American men and women: 5 percent (males, 1990s), 9 percent (males, 2000s), and 17 percent (females, 1990s). During 2001-07, all of the Southern female African immigrant unadjusted wage differential is explained by their higher wage-earning covariates.

The unadjusted wage differentials between native African Americans and Haitian immigrants are predominantly explained by the large market penalties received by Haitian immigrants. (See Table 14d). Native African American men earned 13 percent and 3 percent more than Haitian immigrant men during 1994-00 and 2001-07, respectively, versus unadjusted differentials of 13 percent and 8 percent favoring native women. Native African American women have favorable characteristic effects of 3 percent and 2 percent, but it is the large immigrant disadvantages of 9 percent (1994-00) and 6 percent (2001-07) that is responsible for inequality between native and Haitian immigrant women. More dramatically, it is Haitian immigrant males who have favorable characteristic effects of 4 percent and 9 percent, combined with large immigrant disadvantages of 17 percent (1994-00) and 12 percent (2001-07) that is responsible for inequality between native and Haitian immigrant men.

The wage decompositions of the Northeast closely resemble the national patterns, except there is virtually no inequality among women during the most recent period. Haitian immigrant disadvantages are particularly pronounced in the South. Haitian males have moderately higher wage-earning covariates, but they have market wage disadvantages of 23 percent (1994-00) and 18 percent (2001-07) thereby lowering their unadjusted wages by 20 percent and 15 percent, respectively, relative to native males. Haitian women have wages that are 24 percent (1994-00)

and 21 percent (2001-07) lower than those of native African American women. Both characteristics effects (16 percent and 10 percent) and market disadvantages (9 percent and 11 percent) contribute to the lower wages of Haitian women living in the South.

V. Discussion and Summary

Our analysis is consistent with the diversity model of racial inequality. Specifically, racial wage disparity consists of the following outcomes: 1) persistent racial wage and employment effects between both native and immigrant African Americans and whites, 2) limited ethnicity effects among African Americans, 3) diverse employment and wage effects among native and immigrant African Americans, 4) wage penalties (or premiums) for immigrant (or native) African Americans, and 5) evidence of relatively higher unobserved productivity-linked attributes among Caribbean-English immigrants. There is regional variation in these inequalities. Also, our ethnicity results are quite similar to Cotton (1993) who found very similar market treatment for Non-Hispanic and Hispanic black males.

Native African American men and women receive weekly wages that are 19 percent lower and 10 percent lower, respectively, than the weekly wage received by otherwise identical native Non-Hispanic white males and females. The adjusted wage differentials for the three largest groups of immigrant African American males are 21 percent (Caribbean-English), 34 percent (Haiti), and 35 percent (African). Among women immigrants, these differentials are 8 percent (Caribbean-English), 19 percent (Haiti), and 12 percent (African).

Native African American males have a slightly lower (1.1 percent) labor force participation probability than white males, while all African American women have a labor force participation probability that is statistically identical to white women. Native African American men and women have probabilities of employment that are 5 percent lower and 3 percent lower,

respectively, than the probabilities of employment of otherwise identical white males and females. Immigrant African American males have a participation probability that is statistically indistinguishable from white males and among the three largest immigrant groups only Haitian males have a lower employment probability (3 percent).

Collectively considered, the empirical results imply a lower demand for all African American men though the demand is lower for immigrant males than it is for native males. The participation and employment results combined with the wage results also suggest marginal lower supply native African American relative to white males, but greater labor supply for immigrant African American males relative to white males. The evidence suggests similar labor supply curves for African American and white women, while labor demand is lower for African American women relative to white women. Finally, the results indicate a lower demand for all African American women relative to white women though the demand is lower for immigrant African American women than it is for native African American women.

Notes

[1] First, he computes the unexplained wage differential using the coefficients of the earnings process for native white males. Next, Woodbury computes black-white unexplained wage differentials using the coefficients of the earnings process for native African American males with West Indian ancestry. Using the West Indian coefficients as weights, Woodbury finds that Afro-Americans, West Indians, Europeans, Africans, and American Indians earn 17 percent, 15 percent, 14 percent, 14 percent, and 13 percent less, respectively, than otherwise identical white males.

[2] White and black African immigrants have different occupational distributions, despite nearly identical years of schooling. Half of white African immigrants are managers and professionals versus 37 percent of black African immigrants. Eighteen percent of black African immigrants are fabricators and operators versus 8 percent of white African immigrants. Supposing that all of that the occupational differences of white and black immigrants are due solely to taste and not to discrimination, it's still the case that white African immigrants obtain a 19 percent wage premium relative to black African immigrants.

[3] Canadian immigrants are included among the European-plus immigrants and they are specifically identified by their own binary variable. The Canadian immigrant coefficient was a statistically insignificant 11 percent during 1991-00 but a significant 79 percent wage penalty during 2001-2007 (though there were only 25 immigrants in this group during this period).

[4] To economize on space, the hypothesis tests and associated p-values for Tables 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, and 13 are included in the appendix.

Bibliography

Butcher, Kristin F.. (1994). “Black Immigrants in the United States: A Comparison with Native Blacks and Other Immigrants,” Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 47(2) (January):165-284.

Cotton, Jeremiah. (1993). “Color or Culture?: Wage Differences Among Non-Hispanic Black Males, Hispanic Black Males and Hispanic White Males” The Review of Black Political Economy, 21(4) (Spring): 53-68.

Darity, William, Jr.. (1989). “What's Left of the Economic Theory of Discrimination?” in S. Shulman and W. Darity Jr. The Question of Discrimination, Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1989, pp. 335-74.

Darity, William, Jr., David Guilkey, and William Winfrey “Explaining Differences in Economic Performance Among Racial and Ethnic Groups in the USA: The Data Examined” American Journal of Economics and Sociology vol. 55:4, October 1996 pp. 411-426.

Dodoo, F. Nii-Amoo and Baffour K. Takyi. (2002). “Africans in the diaspora: black-white earnings differences among America’s Africans,” Ethnic and Racial Studies, 25(6) (November):913-941.

Dodoo, F. Nii-Amoo. (1997). “Assimilation differences among Africans in America,” Social Forces, 76(2) (December):527-46.

Farley, Reynolds and Walter Allen. (1989). “Race, ancestry, and socioeconomic status: are West Indian blacks more successful?” in The color line and the quality of life in America. New York: Oxford Press, pages 362-407.

Foner, Nancy. (1979). “West Indians in New York City and London: A Comparative Analysis,” International Migration Review, 13(2) (Special Issue: International Migration in Latin America, Summer):284-297

Mason, P. L. (2004). “Annual Income, Hourly Wages, and Identity Formation Among Mexican Americans and other Latinos.” Industrial Relations. 43:4 (October):817-834.

Mason, P., (1997). "Race, Culture, and Skill: Interracial Wage Differences Among African Americans, Latinos, and Whites.” Review of Black Political Economy 25(3) (Winter):5-40.

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

Tyson, Karolyn, William Darity, Jr., and Domini R. Castellino. (2005). “It's Not "A Black Thing": Understanding the Burden of Acting White and Other Dilemmas of High Achievement,” American Sociological Review, 70(4) (August): 582-605.

Table 1. Ethnicity, nationality, and social identity of African Americans: 1994 – 2007

	1994-2000	2001-2007
Native	0.9135	0.8792
Native Hispanic	0.0097	0.0161
Canada	0.0004	0.0004
Mexico	0.0015	0.0050
Caribbean-English	0.0336	0.0399
Caribbean-Spanish	0.0090	0.0069
Haiti	0.0155	0.0199
South America	0.0013	0.0033
Africa	0.0114	0.0250
Oceania	0.0000	0.0000
Asia	0.0019	0.0035
Europe	0.0047	0.0045
Elsewhere	0.0072	0.0081
N	43,254	71,650

Table 2. Ethnicity, nationality, and social identity of African Americans, by region: 1994-2007

1994-2000	Northcentral	Northeast	South	West
Native	0.9741	0.7420	0.9468	0.9153
Native Hispanic	0.0044	0.0314	0.0042	0.0125
Canada	0.0005	0.0006	0.0003	0.0007
Mexico	0.0018	0.0011	0.0010	0.0054
Caribbean-English	0.0045	0.1235	0.0178	0.0158
Caribbean-Spanish	0.0012	0.0336	0.0040	0.0081
Haiti	0.0021	0.0416	0.0136	0.0030
South America	0.0001	0.0049	0.0005	0.0016
Africa	0.0070	0.0222	0.0078	0.0227
Oceania	0.0001	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000
Asia	0.0017	0.0015	0.0014	0.0066
Europe	0.0021	0.0092	0.0033	0.0107
Elsewhere	0.0048	0.0197	0.0036	0.0101
N	7,803	8,695	23,217	3,539
2001-2007	Northcentral	Northeast	South	West
Native	0.9499	0.6907	0.9189	0.8719
Native Hispanic	0.0079	0.0449	0.0074	0.0285
Canada	0.0005	0.0005	0.0002	0.0013
Mexico	0.0031	0.0059	0.0038	0.0147
Caribbean-English	0.0053	0.1387	0.0217	0.0247
Caribbean-Spanish	0.0022	0.0351	0.0057	0.0134
Haiti	0.0034	0.0492	0.0182	0.0035
South America	0.0004	0.0118	0.0015	0.0032
Africa	0.0240	0.0390	0.0185	0.0392
Oceania	0.0000	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000
Asia	0.0023	0.0055	0.0023	0.0090
Europe	0.0030	0.0080	0.0035	0.0061
Elsewhere	0.0060	0.0156	0.0055	0.0132
N	13,065	12,185	40,058	6,342

Table 3. Characteristics of alternative African American ethnic groups: 1994-2007

	Native		Native Hispanic		Canada		Mexico	
	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07
Weekly wage	$587	$656	$555	$648	$398	$717	$410	$466
Northeast	0.1366	0.1343	0.5636	0.4993	0.2491	0.2350	0.1274	0.2112
Northcentral	0.1940	0.1923	0.0820	0.0862	0.2272	0.2144	0.2116	0.1073
West	0.0845	0.0874	0.1094	0.1583	0.1443	0.3020	0.3049	0.2613
South	0.5848	0.5860	0.2449	0.2562	0.3794	0.2486	0.3561	0.4202
Metropolitan area, 5,000,000 or more	0.2541	0.2510	0.5349	0.5319	0.1863	0.5658	0.4482	0.4262
Metropolitan area, 100,000 or less	0.1376	0.1418	0.0415	0.0316	0.0392	0.0000	0.0640	0.0709
Married	0.3677	0.3628	0.3599	0.3604	0.1844	0.3645	0.3874	0.5270
Divorced	0.1194	0.1230	0.0852	0.0708	0.0434	0.1375	0.0502	0.0616
Widowed	0.0204	0.0208	0.0089	0.0121	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0018
Seperated	0.0614	0.0487	0.0578	0.0555	0.0000	0.0000	0.0599	0.0410
Never married	0.4311	0.4448	0.4882	0.5011	0.7722	0.4980	0.5025	0.3686
Years of education	12.71	12.99	12.38	12.79	12.48	14.08	9.00	9.53
Age	36.23	37.72	31.72	32.79	27.63	32.47	30.33	32.95
Fulltime employee	0.7933	0.8143	0.7734	0.8079	0.4097	0.7571	0.8720	0.8887
Limitation on amount or type of work	0.0408	0.0353	0.0323	0.0260	0.0000	0.0104	0.0365	0.0035
Veteran	0.1052	0.0891	0.0600	0.0593	0.0164	0.0081	0.0072	0.0108
Job covered by union	0.1604	0.1455	0.0634	0.1043	0.2617	0.1801	0.0665	0.0915
Firm size, 10 – 24	0.0661	0.0707	0.0800	0.0992	0.1626	0.0913	0.1536	0.1421
Firm size, 25 – 99	0.1092	0.1094	0.1257	0.1391	0.0000	0.1937	0.1953	0.2125
Firm size, 100 – 499	0.1347	0.1312	0.1289	0.1327	0.1629	0.1841	0.2140	0.1229
Firm size, 500 – 999	0.0625	0.0611	0.0762	0.0604	0.0999	0.1269	0.0338	0.0579
Firm size, 1000 or more	0.4823	0.4859	0.4436	0.4306	0.4529	0.2344	0.2286	0.2064
Non-labor income ($1,000s)	2.5150	2.4520	1.6548	1.9429	0.8214	0.2702	1.0025	0.4628
Self-employed	0.0359	0.0406	0.0267	0.0405	0.0164	0.0081	0.0248	0.0330
N	36,073	58,243	708	1,300	20	27	83	379
N (wage)	38,197	61,692	670	1,242	17	25	78	360

Table 3 (continued). Characteristics of alternative African American ethnic groups: 1994-2007

	Caribbean-English		Caribbean-Spanish		Haiti		South America	
	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07
Weekly wage	$670	$761	$591	$575	$517	$617	$506	$565
Northeast	0.6389	0.6208	0.6482	0.5691	0.4679	0.4448	0.6598	0.6393
Northcentral	0.0245	0.0233	0.0237	0.0346	0.0242	0.0300	0.0101	0.0188
West	0.0399	0.0551	0.0765	0.1083	0.0162	0.0156	0.1031	0.0862
South	0.2968	0.3008	0.2516	0.2881	0.4918	0.5096	0.2270	0.2557
Metropolitan area, 5,000,000 or more	0.5952	0.6793	0.6936	0.6600	0.4238	0.5047	0.7479	0.6118
Metropolitan area, 100,000 or less	0.0155	0.0107	0.0068	0.0198	0.0055	0.0158	0.0052	0.0027
Married	0.4491	0.4721	0.4847	0.5084	0.5545	0.5473	0.5072	0.5185
Divorced	0.1152	0.1223	0.1087	0.1078	0.0954	0.0650	0.0874	0.0485
Widowed	0.0219	0.0169	0.0175	0.0151	0.0231	0.0186	0.0000	0.0177
Seperated	0.0667	0.0527	0.0656	0.0461	0.0459	0.0482	0.0535	0.0952
Never married	0.3471	0.3360	0.3236	0.3225	0.2812	0.3208	0.3519	0.3201
Years of education	12.74	13.00	11.60	11.71	11.62	12.32	12.73	12.46
Age	38.79	41.09	38.21	38.23	39.33	40.34	36.52	37.57
Fulltime employee	0.8358	0.8606	0.8368	0.8486	0.8106	0.8198	0.7387	0.8319
Limitation on amount or type of work	0.0243	0.0213	0.0242	0.0281	0.0331	0.0226	0.0252	0.0223
Veteran	0.0438	0.0283	0.0321	0.0321	0.0100	0.0089	0.0104	0.0154
Job covered by union	0.1323	0.1370	0.1003	0.0677	0.1603	0.1619	0.2093	0.1157
Firm size, 10 – 24	0.0824	0.0739	0.0948	0.1006	0.0951	0.0986	0.1454	0.1238
Firm size, 25 – 99	0.1107	0.1087	0.1633	0.1510	0.1469	0.1421	0.1237	0.1060
Firm size, 100 – 499	0.1297	0.1381	0.1393	0.1320	0.2044	0.1899	0.0735	0.1599
Firm size, 500 – 999	0.0701	0.0628	0.0483	0.0541	0.0634	0.0625	0.0894	0.0288
Firm size, 1000 or more	0.4054	0.4150	0.3514	0.3328	0.3096	0.3650	0.2772	0.2304
Non-labor income ($1,000s)	2.6439	2.4085	3.1206	1.3868	1.2445	1.7036	0.6614	2.1360
Self-employed	0.0726	0.0657	0.0341	0.0700	0.0488	0.0314	0.0271	0.0906
N	1,618	2,744	661	877	714	1,275	88	263
N (wage)	1,503	2,569	620	813	668	1,214	82	244

Table 3 (continued). Characteristics of alternative African American ethnic groups: 1994-2007

	African		Oceania		Asian		European		Elsewhere	
	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07
Weekly wage	$708	$759	$631		$625	$733	$607	$799	$614	$657
Northeast	0.3383	0.2800	0.6350	1.0000	0.1332	0.2818	0.3370	0.3205	0.4775	0.3449
Northcentral	0.1111	0.1694	0.3650	0.0000	0.1658	0.1172	0.0785	0.1191	0.1219	0.1307
West	0.1681	0.1402	0.0000	0.0000	0.2951	0.2305	0.1911	0.1221	0.1188	0.1452
South	0.3825	0.4105	0.0000	0.0000	0.4059	0.3706	0.3934	0.4384	0.2818	0.3792
Metropolitan area, 5,000,000 or more	0.5743	0.4009	0.6350	1.0000	0.3754	0.3903	0.4069	0.3593	0.4145	0.4127
Metropolitan area, 100,000 or less	0.0129	0.0321	0.0000	0.0000	0.0448	0.0345	0.0711	0.0703	0.0157	0.0167
Married	0.5290	0.5573	0.6350	1.0000	0.3114	0.5401	0.3209	0.3788	0.4626	0.5044
Divorced	0.0512	0.0829	0.0000	0.0000	0.2148	0.0550	0.0806	0.1121	0.0886	0.0745
Widowed	0.0135	0.0078	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0089	0.0166	0.0164	0.0073	0.0052
Seperated	0.0518	0.0542	0.0000	0.0000	0.0710	0.0212	0.0368	0.0462	0.0530	0.0374
Never married	0.3545	0.2979	0.3650	0.0000	0.4027	0.3748	0.5451	0.4466	0.3885	0.3785
Years of education	14.12	13.86	14.10	13.00	13.70	13.54	13.38	13.51	13.46	13.17
Age	36.12	37.33	32.08	47.00	33.48	36.80	32.23	33.93	36.77	36.82
Fulltime employee	0.7995	0.8375	1.0000	1.0000	0.8863	0.9756	0.7634	0.7792	0.8603	0.8254
Limitation on amount or type of work	0.0137	0.0237	0.0000	0.0000	0.0404	0.0160	0.0531	0.0172	0.0375	0.0152
Veteran	0.0052	0.0109	0.0000	0.0000	0.0309	0.0413	0.0777	0.0588	0.0222	0.0218
Job covered by union	0.2312	0.1157	0.0000	0.0000	0.2795	0.1385	0.1763	0.1475	0.1067	0.1468
Firm size, 10 – 24	0.0832	0.0628	0.0000	0.0000	0.1060	0.0554	0.0999	0.1130	0.0717	0.0608
Firm size, 25 – 99	0.1209	0.1136	0.0000	0.0000	0.0797	0.1275	0.1116	0.0914	0.1257	0.1058
Firm size, 100 – 499	0.1387	0.1475	0.3650	0.0000	0.1861	0.1245	0.0870	0.1160	0.1489	0.1324
Firm size, 500 – 999	0.0605	0.0781	0.0000	0.0000	0.0515	0.0590	0.0837	0.0551	0.0861	0.0843
Firm size, 1000 or more	0.4467	0.4486	0.6350	0.0000	0.3892	0.4194	0.5077	0.4975	0.3882	0.4849
Non-labor income ($1,000s)	3.0325	2.2309	0.1065	0.0000	4.1341	1.5366	3.3466	3.2663	2.3936	1.2131
Self-employed	0.0804	0.0554	0.0000	1.0000	0.0747	0.0803	0.0247	0.0334	0.0537	0.0411
N	494	1,870	2	1	77	246	209	325	383	651
N (wage)	459	1,769	2	0	71	229	204	313	363	628

Table 4. Weekly wage differentials by nativity, ethnicity, and social identity: African American men, 1994-2007

	1994-2000		2001-2007	
N	180,994		250,176	
F-statistic	4,865		6,360	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000	
R^2	0.5118		0.4979	
$\overline{R}^2$	0.5117		0.4978	
	coefficient	p-value	Coefficient	p-value
Native African American	-0.1955	0.0000	-0.1909	0.0000
Native Hispanic	0.0446	0.2980	0.0112	0.6860
Canada	0.1146	0.6060	-0.7943	0.0000
Mexico	-0.1520	0.0720	-0.2163	0.0000
Caribbean-English	-0.1418	0.0000	-0.2070	0.0000
Caribbean-Spanish	-0.2488	0.0000	-0.2995	0.0000
Haiti	-0.4281	0.0000	-0.3384	0.0000
South America	-0.2290	0.0460	-0.3245	0.0000
Africa	-0.3061	0.0000	-0.3471	0.0000
Asia	-0.3103	0.0000	-0.1859	0.0010
European-plus	-0.1083	0.0630	-0.1719	0.0010
Elsewhere	-0.2421	0.0000	-0.3010	0.0000
Hypothesis tests		p-value		p-value
Irrelevance of immigration status				
H_0: $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N = 0$		0.0000		0.0000
Irrelevance of diversity				
H_0: $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N$ and $\gamma = 0$		0.000		0.000
Irrelevance of race				
H_0: $\gamma = \alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N = 0$		0.0000		0.0000

Table 5. African American male weekly wage differentials by Nativity, ethnicity, and region, 1994-2007

	Northcentral				Northeast			
	1994-2000		2001-2007		1994-2000		2001-2007	
N	48,584		70,298		40,392		54,820	
F-statistic	1,579		2,194		1,259		1,569	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000		0.0000		0.0000	
R^2	0.5324		0.5221		0.5291		0.5076	
$\overline{R}^2$	0.5320		0.5219		0.5287		0.5072	
	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value
Native African American	-0.1800	0.0000	-0.2120	0.0000	-0.2001	0.0000	-0.1663	0.0000
Native Hispanic	0.0942	0.5850	0.0859	0.3070	0.0520	0.3410	-0.0024	0.9520
Canada	0.1955	0.7490	n.a.		0.2047	0.6960	0.0937	0.8120
Mexico	-0.4983	0.0020	-0.0273	0.8020	-0.0533	0.7990	-0.3381	0.0000
Caribbean-English	0.0594	0.6730	-0.2432	0.0230	-0.1807	0.0000	-0.2424	0.0000
Caribbean-Spanish	0.0170	0.9640	-0.4128	0.0140	-0.2463	0.0000	-0.3143	0.0000
Haiti	-0.4118	0.0400	-0.2156	0.0870	-0.3964	0.0000	-0.2810	0.0000
South America	n.a.		-0.3479	0.3230	-0.2515	0.0520	-0.3699	0.0000
Africa	-0.3007	0.0020	-0.2642	0.0000	-0.3863	0.0000	-0.3865	0.0000
Asia	-0.5830	0.0070	-0.1378	0.3280	-0.6358	0.0060	-0.2446	0.0150
European-plus	0.1494	0.4670	-0.2529	0.1640	-0.2364	0.0110	-0.0317	0.7160
Elsewhere	-0.3804	0.0020	-0.0450	0.6600	-0.1776	0.0040	-0.4191	0.0000
	South				West			
	1994-2000		2001-2007		1994-2000		2001-2007	
N	55,301		73,841		36,717		51,217	
F-statistic	1,491		1,924		1,011		1,290	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000		0.0000		0.0000	
R^2	0.4926		0.4842		0.4979		0.4756	
$\overline{R}^2$	0.4923		0.4839		0.4974		0.4753	
	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value
Native African American	-0.1970	0.0000	-0.1834	0.0000	-0.2051	0.0000	-0.2094	0.0000
Native Hispanic	0.0793	0.3810	-0.0400	0.4730	0.0039	0.9750	0.0380	0.5860
Canada	-0.0030	0.9920	-2.0825	0.0000	-0.2846	0.7100	0.0203	0.9500
Mexico	-0.0847	0.5690	-0.2477	0.0000	-0.0388	0.8210	-0.0855	0.2640
Caribbean-English	-0.0396	0.4130	-0.1385	0.0000	-0.2214	0.0720	-0.2714	0.0000
Caribbean-Spanish	-0.2607	0.0040	-0.2404	0.0000	-0.2470	0.1250	-0.3969	0.0000
Haiti	-0.4655	0.0000	-0.4050	0.0000	-0.1670	0.5440	0.0450	0.7970
South America	-0.2163	0.3860	-0.2124	0.0690	0.0821	0.8630	-0.4041	0.0340
Africa	-0.2991	0.0000	-0.3144	0.0000	-0.1846	0.0240	-0.5062	0.0000
Asia	0.1201	0.5000	-0.1821	0.0480	-0.3870	0.0020	-0.1874	0.1140
European-plus	-0.0627	0.5250	-0.2598	0.0020	-0.0426	0.7520	-0.1987	0.1390
Elsewhere	-0.2648	0.0030	-0.2802	0.0000	-0.3339	0.0070	-0.3019	0.0000

Table 6. Weekly wage differentials by nativity, ethnicity, and social identity: African American women, 1994-2007

	1994-2000		2001-2007	
N	177,073		249,506	
F-statistic	4,034		5,469	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000	
R^2	0.4705		0.4609	
$\overline{R}^2$	0.4704		0.4608	
	Coefficient	p-value	coefficient	p-value
Native African American	-0.1017	0.0000	-0.1014	0.0000
Native Hispanic	0.0354	0.3950	0.0464	0.0500
Canada	-0.0041	0.9840	0.2975	0.0560
Mexico	0.0565	0.7270	0.1363	0.0160
Caribbean-English	-0.0814	0.0000	-0.0833	0.0000
Caribbean-Spanish	-0.1920	0.0000	-0.1628	0.0000
Haiti	-0.1868	0.0000	-0.1856	0.0000
South America	-0.3237	0.0050	-0.1747	0.0030
Africa	-0.2152	0.0000	-0.1009	0.0000
Asia	-0.0652	0.5490	-0.1190	0.0470
European-plus	-0.0414	0.4860	-0.0463	0.3210
Elsewhere	-0.3174	0.0000	-0.1146	0.0040
Hypothesis tests		p-value		p-value
Irrelevance of immigration status				
H_0: $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N = 0$		0.0000		0.0000
Irrelevance of diversity				
H_0: $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N$ and $\gamma = 0$		0.0001		0.0000
Irrelevance of race				
H_0: $\gamma = \alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N = 0$		0.0000		0.0000

Table 7. Weekly wage differentials by nativity, ethnicity, and region: African American women, 1994-2007

	Northcentral				Northeast			
	1994-2000		2001-2007		1994-2000		2001-2007	
N	47,686		70,096		39,855		55,166	
F-statistic	1,266		1,755		1,060		1,364	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000		0.0000		0.0000	
R^2	0.4890		0.4742		0.4894		0.4711	
$\overline{R}^2$	0.4886		0.4739		0.4889		0.4707	
	coef.	p-value	coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	coef.	p-value
Native African American	-0.1007	0.0000	-0.0873	0.0000	-0.0950	0.0000	-0.0973	0.0000
Native Hispanic	-0.0192	0.8770	0.0479	0.5020	0.0418	0.4400	0.0524	0.1250
Canada	0.0616	0.8770	0.7979	0.0020	0.1443	0.7030	-0.4131	0.1490
Mexico	-0.4205	0.3990	0.1926	0.1700	0.5963	0.4590	0.0235	0.8570
Caribbean-English	-0.1687	0.2780	0.1411	0.2080	-0.1064	0.0000	-0.1262	0.0000
Caribbean-Spanish	-0.0754	0.7370	-0.0909	0.5310	-0.2321	0.0000	-0.1918	0.0000
Haiti	-0.3751	0.1330	-0.2760	0.0800	-0.2336	0.0000	-0.1590	0.0000
South America	0.1648	0.8330	-0.0257	0.9600	-0.2999	0.0320	-0.1271	0.0950
Africa	-0.2138	0.1490	-0.0850	0.1750	-0.1873	0.0090	-0.0666	0.1280
Asia	-0.2388	0.4550	-0.1714	0.3220	-0.0912	0.7340	-0.1029	0.3410
European-plus	0.1154	0.5660	-0.2192	0.0770	-0.0115	0.9090	-0.1652	0.0470
Elsewhere	-0.2294	0.1440	-0.0675	0.5060	-0.3468	0.0000	-0.1516	0.0190
	South				West			
	1994-2000		2001-2007		1994-2000		2001-2007	
N	55,476		76,507		34,056		47,737	
F-statistic	1,251		1,734		802		1,089	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000		0.0000		0.0000	
R^2	0.4483		0.4494		0.4591		0.4511	
$\overline{R}^2$	0.4479		0.4491		0.4585		0.4507	
	coef.	p-value	coef.	p-value	coef.	p-value	coef.	p-value
Native African American	-0.1044	0.0000	-0.1027	0.0000	-0.0747	0.0000	-0.0967	0.0000
Native Hispanic	0.0496	0.5660	0.0517	0.3060	-0.0277	0.8280	-0.0092	0.8670
Canada	-0.3011	0.5170	0.2168	0.6030	-0.0550	0.9080	0.5257	0.1530
Mexico	0.1734	0.5750	0.2778	0.0130	-0.0087	0.9680	0.0967	0.2930
Caribbean-English	-0.0229	0.5710	-0.0288	0.3780	-0.1464	0.1640	-0.1144	0.1220
Caribbean-Spanish	-0.2053	0.0260	-0.1208	0.0540	0.0554	0.7050	-0.2444	0.0120
Haiti	-0.1596	0.0040	-0.2265	0.0000	0.1323	0.5910	0.1171	0.5430
South America	-0.3840	0.1510	-0.2535	0.0180	-0.4491	0.1100	-0.3219	0.1450
Africa	-0.2908	0.0010	-0.0883	0.0290	-0.1532	0.1560	-0.2377	0.0000
Asia	-0.0893	0.5190	-0.1057	0.3220	0.4649	0.2660	-0.1757	0.1380
European-plus	-0.0300	0.7580	-0.0002	0.9970	-0.1829	0.1700	0.2405	0.0870
Elsewhere	-0.4392	0.0000	-0.0536	0.4150	-0.1023	0.4930	-0.3094	0.0090

Table 8. Male laborforce participation and employment probabilities, 1994 – 2007

Participation	**1994-2000**		**2001-2007**	
N	224,599		233,215	
Wald chi2	30,008		12,317	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000	
Pseudo R2	0.3314		0.1864	
	Coefficient	p-value	Coefficient	p-value
Native African American	-0.0628	0.0000	-0.0110	0.0000
Native Hispanic	0.0031	0.8100	0.0060	0.2100
Canada	-0.0555	0.6360		
Mexico	-0.0103	0.8000	0.0250	0.0000
Caribbean-English	-0.0435	0.0010	0.0028	0.5710
Caribbean-Hispanic	-0.0625	0.0080	0.0071	0.3280
Haiti	-0.0255	0.1610	-0.0074	0.4060
South America	-0.0054	0.9030	-0.0004	0.9770
Africa	-0.0925	0.0010	0.0035	0.6480
Asia	-0.1326	0.0600	0.0093	0.4530
Europe	-0.0274	0.4790	0.0113	0.2350
Elsewhere	-0.0340	0.2970	-0.0047	0.6930
Trend	-0.0017	0.0000	0.0004	0.1250
Employment				
N	224,599		233,215	
Wald chi2	32,791		14,377	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000	
Pseudo R2	0.2834		0.1341	
	Coefficient	p-value	Coefficient	p-value
Native African American	-0.1119	0.0000	-0.0494	0.0000
Native Hispanic	0.0124	0.4460	0.0234	0.0010
Canada	-0.0206	0.8650		
Mexico	-0.0002	0.9970	0.0380	0.0010
Caribbean-English	-0.0707	0.0000	-0.0158	0.1080
Caribbean-Hispanic	-0.1029	0.0000	-0.0142	0.3810
Haiti	-0.0647	0.0070	-0.0270	0.0680
South America	0.0043	0.9360	-0.0525	0.1860
Africa	-0.0890	0.0040	-0.0070	0.6050
Asia	-0.1388	0.0660	0.0127	0.5970
Europe	-0.0500	0.2780	-0.0005	0.9840
Elsewhere	-0.0731	0.0660	0.0046	0.7890
Trend	0.0021	0.0000	0.0003	0.4350

	Participation		Employment	
Hypothesis tests	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07
Irrelevance of immigration status				
H_0: $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N = 0$	0.0000	0.3948	0.0000	0.0539
Irrelevance of diversity				
H_0: $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N$ and $\gamma = 0$	0.2985	0.0059	0.0161	0.0000
Irrelevance of race				
H_0: $\gamma = \alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N = 0$	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Table 9. Laborforce participation and employment probabilities by region, men: 1994-2000

Participation	**Northeast**		**Northcentral**		**South**		**West**	
N	50,119		58,495		70,437		45,533	
Wald chi2	7,553		7,088		11,005		4,998	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000		0.0000		0.0000	
Pseudo R2	0.3334		0.3212		0.3547		0.3009	
	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value
Native African American	-0.0813	0.0000	-0.0657	0.0000	-0.0533	0.0000	-0.0819	0.0000
Native Hispanic	0.0168	0.2770	-0.0302	0.5600	0.0215	0.4320	-0.0461	0.3490
Canada	-0.6097	0.1970			0.0496	0.5000		
Mexico	0.0344	0.5900	-0.0467	0.5390	-0.0677	0.4010	0.0399	0.4380
Caribbean-English	-0.0392	0.0190	-0.1053	0.3430	-0.0635	0.0510	0.0179	0.6850
Caribbean-Hispanic	-0.1005	0.0030	0.0191	0.7070	0.0241	0.4240	-0.1344	0.0630
Haiti	-0.0770	0.0160			-0.0021	0.9340	-0.0043	0.9480
South America	-0.0029	0.9600			-0.0204	0.8170		
Africa	-0.1522	0.0010	-0.1391	0.1220	-0.0145	0.7390	-0.0802	0.1950
Asia	0.0680	0.0060	-0.1938	0.0760	-0.1062	0.1430	-0.1993	0.1160
Europe	0.0059	0.8970	-0.1161	0.4500	-0.0664	0.4450	-0.0039	0.9560
Elsewhere	-0.0162	0.6710	-0.2491	0.0400	0.0005	0.9940	-0.0291	0.6910
Trend	-0.0008	0.2980	-0.0020	0.0020	-0.0016	0.0130	-0.0022	0.0100
Employment	**Northeast**		**Northcentral**		**South**		**West**	
N	50,119		58,503		70,437		45,533	
Wald chi2	7,908		7,769		12,049		5,488	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000		0.0000		0.0000	
Pseudo R2	0.2744		0.2680		0.3174		0.2533	
	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value
Native African American	-0.1493	0.0000	-0.1245	0.0000	-0.0927	0.0000	-0.1367	0.0000
Native Hispanic	0.0136	0.5590	-0.0235	0.6890	0.0579	0.0400	0.0265	0.5360
Canada	-0.5212	0.1850			0.0932	0.2340		
Mexico	0.1253	0.0050	-0.0294	0.7280	-0.0335	0.6840	-0.0010	.
Caribbean-English	-0.0745	0.0000	-0.0471	0.6200	-0.0928	0.0190	0.0273	0.6340
Caribbean-Hispanic	-0.1209	0.0010	0.0077	0.9300	-0.0941	0.1630	-0.1585	0.0750
Haiti	-0.1504	0.0000	0.0395	0.6380	-0.0187	0.5580	-0.1076	0.4950
South America	-0.0065	0.9290			0.0188	0.8390		
Africa	-0.1158	0.0240	-0.1771	0.0690	-0.0206	0.6780	-0.0917	0.2330
Asia	-0.0436	0.8090	-0.3974	0.0080	-0.0616	0.4010	-0.1511	0.2000
Europe	-0.0229	0.6950	-0.1390	0.3200	-0.0946	0.2850	0.0103	0.9220
Elsewhere	-0.0740	0.1270	-0.2460	0.0370	-0.0021	0.9810	-0.0810	0.5010
Trend	0.0047	0.0000	0.0012	0.1790	0.0018	0.0350	0.0013	0.2640

Table 10. Laborforce participation and employment probabilities by region, men: 2001-2007

Participation	**Northeast**		**Northcentral**		**South**		**West**	
N	51,242		65,750		68,056		47,986	
Wald chi2	3130.36		3590.78		3876.42		2101.72	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000		0.0000		0.0000	
Pseudo R2	0.2108		0.1848		0.1865		0.1694	
	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value
Native African American	-0.0115	0.0040	-0.0170	0.0000	-0.0077	0.0000	-0.0137	0.0100
Native Hispanic	0.0054	0.4620	0.0076	0.5810	0.0029	0.7730	0.0197	0.0090
Canada								
Mexico	0.0154	0.4620	0.0298	0.0000			0.0168	0.1390
Caribbean-English	0.0018	0.7870	-0.0202	0.5700	0.0069	0.4180	-0.0135	0.6350
Caribbean-Spanish	0.0060	0.5740	-0.0215	0.6150	0.0136	0.2410	0.0065	0.7680
Haiti	-0.0043	0.7250			-0.0135	0.3340	-0.0044	0.8940
South America	-0.0049	0.8080	-0.0210	0.6310	-0.0013	0.9720		
Africa	-0.0042	0.7890	0.0090	0.3660	0.0064	0.6290	0.0021	0.9320
Asia	0.0063	0.8350	-0.0066	0.8280			-0.0053	0.8910
Europe-plus	0.0262	0.0030			-0.0080	0.7260	0.0145	0.3780
Elsewhere	0.0021	0.9080	-0.0895	0.2020	0.0139	0.2890	-0.0092	0.7740
Trend	0.0007	0.1820	-0.0002	0.6340	0.0004	0.3490	0.0009	0.1060
Employment	**Northeast**		**Northcentral**		**South**		**West**	
N	51,242		65,770		68,191		48,001	
Wald chi2	3,318		4,121		4,636		2,581	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000		0.0000		0.0000	
Pseudo R2	0.1376		0.1268		0.1464		0.1268	
	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value
Native African American	-0.0556	0.0000	-0.0580	0.0000	-0.0396	0.0000	-0.0572	0.0000
Native Hispanic	0.0261	0.0270	0.0134	0.5480	0.0198	0.1430	0.0388	0.0110
Canada								
Mexico	0.0704	0.0010	0.0456	0.0730	0.0529	0.0000	-0.0260	0.4930
Caribbean-English	-0.0119	0.3420	-0.1035	0.1880	-0.0157	0.4140	-0.0685	0.2140
Caribbean-Spanish	-0.0519	0.0730	-0.0517	0.5420	0.0350	0.0250	0.0330	0.2700
Haiti	-0.0335	0.1530	-0.0405	0.6520	-0.0270	0.1840	0.0393	0.2710
South America	-0.0313	0.3960	0.0403	0.3170	0.0306	0.4500	-0.4364	0.0350
Africa	0.0051	0.8330	0.0248	0.2230	-0.0269	0.2630	-0.0235	0.5550
Asia	0.0386	0.3300	-0.0272	0.6330	0.0005	0.9920	0.0426	0.2630
Europe-plus	0.0115	0.8300			-0.0231	0.5240	-0.0240	0.7570
Elsewhere	0.0012	0.9700	-0.1598	0.0430	0.0314	0.1440	0.0358	0.2620
Trend	-0.0007	0.4460	-0.0003	0.6520	0.0007	0.2850	0.0017	0.0600

Table 11. Female laborforce participation and employment probabilities, 1994 – 2007

Participation	**1994-00**		**2001-07**	
N	242,886		226,104	
Wald chi2	26,210		9,195	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000	
Pseudo R2	0.1635		0.1007	
	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value
Native African American	-0.0136	0.0000	-0.0017	0.3200
Native Hispanic	-0.0838	0.0000	-0.0010	.
Canada	0.0254	0.8300	0.0234	0.4310
Mexico	0.0086	0.9120	-0.0091	0.6700
Caribbean-English	0.0503	0.0000	0.0083	0.2160
Caribbean-Hispanic	-0.0425	0.0750	-0.0223	0.1840
Haiti	0.0559	0.0050	0.0104	0.3280
South America	-0.0977	0.2060	0.0140	0.4920
Africa	-0.0999	0.0080	-0.0062	0.6210
Asia	-0.2374	0.0050	-0.0187	0.5120
Europe	0.0503	0.2210	-0.0077	0.6630
Elsewhere	-0.0041	0.9100	0.0175	0.1590
Trend	0.0013	0.0130	-0.0001	0.8180
Employment				
N	242,886		226,104	
Wald chi2	26,632		10,223	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000	
Pseudo R2	0.1572		0.0892	
	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value
Native African American	-0.0458	0.0000	-0.0301	0.0000
Native Hispanic	-0.0782	0.0000	0.0102	0.3020
Canada	-0.0612	0.7000	-0.0097	0.8970
Mexico	-0.0269	0.7660	-0.0104	0.6870
Caribbean-English	0.0227	0.1300	-0.0037	0.6880
Caribbean-Hispanic	-0.0733	0.0050	-0.0566	0.0080
Haiti	-0.0135	0.5710	0.0024	0.8610
South America	-0.1132	0.1470	0.0184	0.5000
Africa	-0.1505	0.0000	-0.0309	0.0620
Asia	-0.2255	0.0060	-0.0135	0.6790
Europe	0.0235	0.6060	-0.0352	0.1930
Elsewhere	-0.0590	0.1340	0.0312	0.0430
Trend	0.0035	0.0000	-0.0004	0.3320

	Participation		Employment	
Hypothesis tests	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07
Irrelevance of immigration status				
H_0: $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N = 0$	0.0000	0.6123	0.0000	0.0271
Irrelevance of diversity				
H_0: $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N$ and $\gamma = 0$	0.0000	0.6584	0.0000	0.0091
Irrelevance of race				
H_0: $\gamma = \alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_N = 0$	0.0000	0.6603	0.0000	0.0000

Table 12. Laborforce participation and employment probabilities by region, women: 1994-2000

Participation	**Northeast**		**Northcentral**		**South**		**West**	
N	54,830		62,507		78,582		46,958	
Wald chi2	6,260		6,248		9,707		4,243	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000		0.0000		0.0000	
Pseudo R2	0.1610		0.1562		0.1777		0.1527	
	Coef.	**p-value**	**Coef.**	**p-value**	**Coef.**	**p-value**	**Coef.**	**p-value**
Native African American	-0.0510	0.0000	-0.0477	0.0000	0.0198	0.0000	-0.0297	0.0110
Native Hispanic	-0.1008	0.0000	0.0658	0.1520	0.0168	0.7360	-0.0571	0.4400
Canada					-0.5034	0.0180	0.0343	0.8800
Mexico	-0.0082	0.9730	-0.1073	0.6030	-0.1116	0.5290	0.1422	0.0330
Caribbean-English	0.0380	0.0210	0.1114	0.0730	0.0696	0.0200	0.0503	0.3270
Caribbean-Hispanic	-0.0845	0.0030	0.1835	0.0000	0.0464	0.4550	-0.0767	0.5100
Haiti	0.0268	0.3600	-0.0812	0.7450	0.0886	0.0030	0.2032	0.0000
South America	0.0360	0.6860			-0.3774	0.0060	-0.1606	0.4490
Africa	-0.0763	0.1550	-0.1907	0.1280	-0.1572	0.0330	-0.0273	0.7310
Asia	0.1234	0.2710	-0.4705	0.0030	-0.2541	0.0310	-0.1616	0.3650
Europe	0.0612	0.3640	0.0703	0.5600	0.1604	0.0010	-0.1355	0.2050
Elsewhere	-0.0129	0.7810	0.0178	0.8250	-0.0389	0.6910	0.0847	0.3920
Trend	0.0049	0.0000	0.0003	0.7430	0.0035	0.0000	-0.0057	0.0000
Employment	**Northeast**		**Northcentral**		**South**		**West**	
N	54,830		62,507		78,582		46,956	
Wald chi2	6,332		6,526		9,713		4,264	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000		0.0000		0.0000	
Pseudo R2	0.1542		0.1547		0.1682		0.1444	
	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value
Native African American	-0.0792	0.0000	-0.0814	0.0000	-0.0135	0.0090	-0.0643	0.0000
Native Hispanic	-0.0998	0.0000	0.0949	0.0360	-0.0121	0.8260	-0.0489	0.5090
Canada					-0.4499	0.0330		
Mexico	0.0345	0.8860	-0.2457	0.2070	-0.1535	0.4400	0.1202	0.1960
Caribbean-English	0.0049	0.7910	0.0895	0.2810	0.0531	0.0990	0.0095	0.8910
Caribbean-Hispanic	-0.1265	0.0000	0.2134	0.0000	0.0169	0.8120	-0.0340	0.7680
Haiti	-0.0608	0.0750	-0.0451	0.8540	0.0313	0.3820	0.0715	0.6350
South America	0.0442	0.6300			-0.4055	0.0010	-0.2597	0.1980
Africa	-0.1309	0.0180	-0.2445	0.0450	-0.2118	0.0040	-0.0525	0.5300
Asia	0.1609	0.1450	-0.4311	0.0070	-0.2143	0.0720	-0.2383	0.1800
Europe	0.1062	0.1050	0.1020	0.4210	0.0980	0.1520	-0.2111	0.0610
Elsewhere	-0.0280	0.5460	-0.0397	0.6860	-0.1044	0.2780	-0.1334	0.3070
Trend	0.0072	0.0000	0.0021	0.0580	0.0056	0.0000	-0.0033	0.0190

Table 13. Laborforce participation and employment probabilities by region, women: 2001-2007

Participation	**Northeast**		**Northcentral**		**South**		**West**	
N	49,868		63,677		68,420		44,063	
Wald chi2	2343.01		2607.23		2930.39		1632.47	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000		0.0000		0.0000	
Pseudo R2	0.1166		0.1005		0.0993		0.0977	
	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value
Native African American	-0.0084	0.0560	-0.0112	0.0020	0.0050	0.0340	-0.0047	0.4610
Native Hispanic	0.0020	0.8800	-0.0083	0.7220	-0.0031	0.8860	0.0078	0.7100
Canada							-0.2642	0.3290
Mexico	0.0322	0.2530	-0.0755	0.2630	0.0019	0.9570	-0.0089	0.8220
Caribbean-English	0.0033	0.7000			0.0134	0.3150	0.0013	0.9620
Caribbean-Spanish	-0.0246	0.2120	-0.0745	0.4910	0.0083	0.6890	-0.1166	0.3190
Haiti	0.0274	0.0120	-0.0318	0.5910	-0.0021	0.9070	-0.0160	0.8810
South America	0.0148	0.5530			0.0163	0.6800	-0.0375	0.6910
Africa	-0.0165	0.4510	0.0018	0.9420	-0.0212	0.3830	0.0370	0.1320
Asia	-0.0281	0.5490			-0.0151	0.7530	-0.0457	0.5120
Europe-plus	-0.0219	0.5680	0.0258	0.3940	-0.0133	0.6200	0.0140	0.7730
Elsewhere	0.0008	0.9710	0.0368	0.0230	0.0122	0.6160		
Trend	-0.0004	0.6350	0.0010	0.1010	-0.0004	0.5640	-0.0006	0.4890
Employment	**Northeast**		**Northcentral**		**South**		**West**	
N	49,868		63,677		68,424		44,063	
Wald chi2	2,386		3,050		3,342		1,669	
p-value	0.0000		0.0000		0.0000		0.0000	
Pseudo R2	0.0956		0.0941		0.0914		0.0800	
	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value	Coef.	p-value
Native African American	-0.0417	0.0000	-0.0448	0.0000	-0.0202	0.0000	-0.0282	0.0010
Native Hispanic	0.0171	0.2090	-0.0073	0.7970	0.0149	0.4890	0.0041	0.8700
Canada					-0.4130	0.2450	-0.2480	0.3310
Mexico	0.0196	0.6670	-0.0481	0.4830	0.0212	0.5920	-0.0337	0.5100
Caribbean-English	-0.0075	0.5080			-0.0007	0.9720	-0.0215	0.6300
Caribbean-Spanish	-0.0607	0.0240	-0.1522	0.1920	-0.0309	0.3120	-0.1035	0.3580
Haiti	0.0426	0.0020	-0.0847	0.3930	-0.0301	0.1950	0.0197	0.8550
South America	0.0191	0.5640			0.0109	0.8480	-0.0142	0.9000
Africa	-0.0358	0.2040	0.0016	0.9580	-0.0722	0.0290	0.0367	0.2500
Asia	0.0006	0.9910			0.0085	0.8690	-0.0932	0.2470
Europe-plus	-0.0796	0.1630	0.0030	0.9630	-0.0261	0.4930	0.0124	0.8420
Elsewhere	0.0175	0.4710	0.0528	0.0240	0.0168	0.5880		
Trend	-0.0015	0.1220	0.0002	0.7660	-0.0004	0.6060	0.0000	0.9770

Table 14a. Oaxaca-Ransom wage decomposition:
native African-Americans v. immigrant African Americans

	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07
National	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	15870	26049	20873	35075
Immigrant African Americans (N)	2049	4293	2018	4173
Characteristics	-0.0740	-0.1118	-0.0872	-0.0376
Native advantage	0.0036	0.0098	0.0041	0.0008
Immigrant disadvantage	0.0297	0.0594	0.0438	0.0027
Unadjusted differential	-0.0407	-0.0426	-0.0393	-0.0342
Northeast	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	2475	3343	3402	4830
Immigrant African Americans (N)	1088	1787	1171	1970
Characteristics	-0.0217	-0.0833	0.0108	-0.0153
Native advantage	0.0033	0.0276	0.0151	0.0029
Immigrant disadvantage	0.0071	0.0527	0.0468	0.0028
Unadjusted differential	-0.0113	-0.0030	0.0727	-0.0095
Northcentral	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	3055	5113	4127	6844
Immigrant African Americans (N)	132	456	88	334
Characteristics	-0.1037	-0.0787	-0.1589	0.1218
Native advantage	0.0038	0.0005	0.0017	-0.0004
Immigrant disadvantage	0.0873	-0.0070	0.0434	-0.0090
Unadjusted differential	-0.0126	-0.0852	-0.1137	0.1123
South	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	8900	14907	11786	20447
Immigrant African Americans (N)	669	1599	618	1501
Characteristics	-0.1325	-0.1272	-0.0813	-0.0535
Native advantage	0.0028	0.0085	0.0018	0.0006
Immigrant disadvantage	0.0481	0.0665	0.0404	-0.0006
Unadjusted differential	-0.0817	-0.0522	-0.0390	-0.0535
West	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	1440	2686	1558	2954
Immigrant African Americans (N)	160	451	141	368
Characteristics	0.1419	0.0152	-0.0076	0.0648
Native advantage	0.0027	0.0153	0.0043	0.0012
Immigrant disadvantage	0.0387	0.0810	0.0622	0.0214
Unadjusted differential	0.1833	0.1114	0.0589	0.0874

Table 14b. Oaxaca-Ransom wage decomposition: native African Americans v. Caribbean-English immigrants

	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07
National	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	15870	26049	20873	35075
Caribbean-English Immigrants (N)	654	1129	849	1473
Characteristics	-0.1145	-0.1819	-0.1425	-0.1457
Native advantage	-0.0025	-0.0001	-0.0006	-0.0010
Immigrant disadvantage	-0.0710	-0.0037	-0.0191	-0.0303
Unadjusted differential	-0.1880	-0.1858	-0.1622	-0.1769
Northeast	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	2475	3343	3402	4830
Caribbean-English Immigrants (N)	432	653	551	918
Characteristics	-0.0375	-0.1465	-0.0387	-0.0869
Native advantage	-0.0082	0.0073	0.0013	-0.0018
Immigrant disadvantage	-0.0470	0.0390	0.0082	-0.0123
Unadjusted differential	-0.0927	-0.1002	-0.0293	-0.1010
Northcentral	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	3055	5113	4127	6844
Caribbean-English Immigrants (N)	20	40	16	37
Characteristics	0.0015	-0.3254	-0.0410	-0.0328
Native advantage	-0.0009	0.0000	0.0003	-0.0011
Immigrant disadvantage	-0.0545	-0.0527	-0.0326	-0.1534
Unadjusted differential	-0.0539	-0.3781	-0.0733	-0.1872
South	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	8900	14907	11786	20447
Caribbean-English Immigrants (N)	175	368	244	436
Characteristics	-0.2187	-0.1601	-0.1680	-0.1626
Native advantage	-0.0027	-0.0015	-0.0013	-0.0013
Immigrant disadvantage	-0.1117	-0.0593	-0.0658	-0.0710
Unadjusted differential	-0.3331	-0.2208	-0.2351	-0.2349
West	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	1440	2686	1558	2954
Caribbean-English Immigrants (N)	27	68	38	82
Characteristics	0.1355	-0.0467	0.0797	-0.1104
Native advantage	-0.0003	-0.0008	-0.0001	-0.0002
Immigrant disadvantage	-0.0040	-0.0593	0.0465	0.0057
Unadjusted differential	0.1312	-0.1068	0.1261	-0.1049

Table 14c. Oaxaca-Ransom wage decomposition: native African Americans v. African immigrants

	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07
National	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	15870	26049	20873	35075
African Immigrants (N)	290	1043	169	739
Characteristics	-0.2333	-0.2655	-0.1400	-0.0170
Native advantage	0.0019	0.0050	0.0011	0.0002
Immigrant disadvantage	0.1040	0.1160	0.1420	0.0056
Unadjusted differential	-0.1274	-0.1444	0.0032	-0.0111
Northeast	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	2475	3343	3402	4830
African Immigrants (N)	99	276	67	211
Characteristics	-0.1228	-0.2508	-0.0514	0.0187
Native advantage	0.0066	0.0132	0.0015	-0.0013
Immigrant disadvantage	0.1679	0.1406	0.0811	-0.0458
Unadjusted differential	0.0516	-0.0970	0.0313	-0.0283
Northcentral	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	3055	5113	4127	6844
African Immigrants (N)	41	232	17	133
Characteristics	-0.4444	-0.1253	-0.1245	0.2401
Native advantage	0.0015	0.0022	0.0006	0.0004
Immigrant disadvantage	0.1255	0.0146	0.1710	0.0134
Unadjusted differential	-0.3174	-0.1085	0.0471	0.2539
South	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	8900	14907	11786	20447
African Immigrants (N)	111	410	59	304
Characteristics	-0.2958	-0.3609	-0.2203	-0.1462
Native advantage	0.0011	0.0033	0.0010	0.0001
Immigrant disadvantage	0.0451	0.0893	0.1669	-0.0039
Unadjusted differential	-0.2496	-0.2683	-0.0524	-0.1500
West	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	1440	2686	1558	2954
African Immigrants (N)	39	125	26	91
Characteristics	-0.0743	-0.1778	0.1666	0.1005
Native advantage	0.0003	0.0136	-0.0008	0.0034
Immigrant disadvantage	0.0903	0.2297	-0.0269	0.0868
Unadjusted differential	0.0163	0.0656	0.1388	0.1907

Table 14d. Oaxaca-Ransom wage decomposition: native African Americans v. Haitian immigrants

	1994-00	2001-07	1994-00	2001-07
National	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	15870	26049	20873	35075
Haitian Immigrants (N)	347	617	321	600
Characteristics	-0.0402	-0.0879	0.0324	0.0222
Native advantage	0.0037	0.0033	0.0016	0.0013
Immigrant disadvantage	0.1705	0.1171	0.0941	0.0569
Unadjusted differential	0.1341	0.0325	0.1281	0.0804
Northeast	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	2475	3343	3402	4830
Haitian Immigrants (N)	165	291	179	298
Characteristics	-0.0423	-0.0683	0.0483	-0.0022
Native advantage	0.0068	0.0072	0.0062	0.0009
Immigrant disadvantage	0.1134	0.0784	0.1079	0.0042
Unadjusted differential	0.0779	0.0172	0.1623	0.0029
Northcentral	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	3055	5113	4127	6844
Haitian Immigrants (N)	7	20	5	14
Characteristics	0.0110	-0.3771	-0.6372	-0.2391
Native advantage	0.0003	0.0000	0.0004	0.0005
Immigrant disadvantage	0.1119	-0.0818	0.3362	0.1730
Unadjusted differential	0.1232	-0.4589	-0.3006	-0.0656
South	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	8900	14907	11786	20447
Haitian Immigrants (N)	169	292	129	279
Characteristics	-0.0335	-0.0298	0.1575	0.1004
Native advantage	0.0044	0.0049	0.0010	0.0024
Immigrant disadvantage	0.2268	0.1798	0.0864	0.1082
Unadjusted differential	0.1977	0.1549	0.2448	0.2109
West	Men		Women	
Native African Americans (N)	1440	2686	1558	2954
Haitian Immigrants (N)	6	14	8	9
Characteristics	0.0958	-0.3407	-0.0022	0.3358
Native advantage	-0.0004	-0.0011	-0.0004	-0.0007
Immigrant disadvantage	-0.1734	-0.1842	-0.0102	0.1203
Unadjusted differential	-0.0780	-0.5260	-0.0127	0.4555

Appendix. Tests of hypotheses: alternative model specifications

Table 5. Hypothesis tests: weekly wage differentials by nativity, ethnicity, and region: African American men, 1994-2007

	p-value Northcentral		p-value Northeast		p-value South		p-value West	
Hypothesis test	1994-2000	2001-2007	1994-2000	2001-2007	1994-2000	2001-2007	2001-2007	1994-2000
Immigration	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0016	0.0000
Diversity	0.0000	0.0000	0.0004	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.8606	0.0000
Race	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Table 7. Hypothesis tests: weekly wage differentials by nativity, ethnicity, and region: African American women, 1994-2007

	p-value Northcentral		p-value Northeast		p-value South		p-value West	
Hypothesis test	1994-2000	2001-2007	1994-2000	2001-2007	1994-2000	2001-2007	2001-2007	1994-2000
Immigration	0.4721	0.0322	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3745	0.0000
Diversity	0.8882	0.0238	0.0008	0.1331	0.0182	0.0003	0.8168	0.0010
Race	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Table 9. Hypothesis tests: laborforce participation and employment probabilities by region, men: 1994-2000

Participation	p-value Northcentral	p-value Northeast	p-value South	p-value West
Hypothesis test	1994-2000	1994-2000	1994-2000	1994-2000
Immigration	0.0000	0.0000	0.2860	0.0545
Diversity	0.4261	0.0276	0.4718	0.4388
Race	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Employment	**p-value Northcentral**	**p-value Northeast**	**p-value South**	**p-value West**
Hypothesis test	1994-2000	1994-2000	1994-2000	1994-2000
Immigration	0.0008	0.0000	0.1722	0.2052
Diversity	0.3859	0.0146	0.2219	0.6442
Race	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Table 10. Hypothesis tests: laborforce participation and employment probabilities by region, men: 2001-2007

Participation	p-value Northcentral	p-value Northeast	p-value South	p-value West
Hypothesis test	2001-2007	2001-2007	2001-2007	2001-2007
Immigration	0.0429	0.9661	0.8254	0.9772
Diversity	0.0434	0.6610	0.6810	0.6559
Race	0.0000	0.2229	0.0043	0.2786
Employment	**p-value Northcentral**	**p-value Northeast**	**p-value South**	**p-value West**
Hypothesis test	2001-2007	2001-2007	2001-2007	2001-2007
Immigration	0.0431	0.2267	0.1126	0.0807
Diversity	0.0514	0.0194	0.0039	0.0372
Race	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Table 12. Hypothesis tests: laborforce participation and employment rates by region, women: 1994-2000

Participation	p-value Northcentral	p-value Northeast	p-value South	p-value West
Hypothesis test	1994-2000	1994-2000	1994-2000	1994-2000
Immigration	0.0362	0.0142	0.0000	0.2877
Diversity	0.0479	0.0000	0.0001	0.2637
Race	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0566
Employment	p-value Northcentral	p-value Northeast	p-value South	p-value West
Hypothesis test	1994-2000	1994-2000	1994-2000	1994-2000
Immigration	0.0213	0.0001	0.0008	0.2833
Diversity	0.0347	0.0000	0.0017	0.5901
Race	0.0000	0.0000	0.0002	0.0000

Table 13. Hypothesis tests: laborforce participation and employment rates by region, women: 2001-2007

Participation	p-value Northcentral	p-value Northeast	p-value South	p-value West
Hypothesis test	2001-2007	2001-2007	2001-2007	2001-2007
Immigration	0.4190	0.5022	0.9755	0.6710
Diversity	0.5540	0.4911	0.9796	0.8002
Race	0.0290	0.3193	0.7962	0.7825
Employment	p-value Northcentral	p-value Northeast	p-value South	p-value West
Hypothesis test	2001-2007	2001-2007	2001-2007	2001-2007
Immigration	0.2839	0.0225	0.1752	0.6197
Diversity	0.2876	0.0017	0.6356	0.8877
Race	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0389