



IZA DP No. 3301

Mexican Immigrants, the Labor Market and the Current Population Survey: Seasonality Effects, Framing Effects, and Sensitivity of Results

Fernando A. Lozano
Todd Sorensen

January 2008

Mexican Immigrants, the Labor Market and the Current Population Survey: Seasonality Effects, Framing Effects, and Sensitivity of Results

Fernando A. Lozano

Pomona College

Todd Sorensen

*University of California, Riverside
and IZA*

Discussion Paper No. 3301

January 2008

IZA

P.O. Box 7240
53072 Bonn
Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0

Fax: +49-228-3894-180

E-mail: iza@iza.org

Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but the institute itself takes no institutional policy positions.

The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) in Bonn is a local and virtual international research center and a place of communication between science, politics and business. IZA is an independent nonprofit organization supported by Deutsche Post World Net. The center is associated with the University of Bonn and offers a stimulating research environment through its international network, workshops and conferences, data service, project support, research visits and doctoral program. IZA engages in (i) original and internationally competitive research in all fields of labor economics, (ii) development of policy concepts, and (iii) dissemination of research results and concepts to the interested public.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ABSTRACT

Mexican Immigrants, the Labor Market and the Current Population Survey: Seasonality Effects, Framing Effects, and Sensitivity of Results^{*}

In this paper we compare estimates of immigrants' labor supply assimilation profiles using the Current Population Survey Annual Demographic Files (March ADS) and the Current Population Survey Outgoing Rotation Groups (ORGs). We use a measure that is seemingly consistent across both surveys: *usual weekly hours of work in the main job*. Our results indicate that the two surveys produce dramatically different estimates of the change in average hours of work as immigrants' years in the United States increase: estimates from the March ADS predict much steeper hour's assimilation profiles than do estimates obtained from the ORGs. We argue that these differences stem from two separate factors that differentiate the data. First, the ADS and ORG frame the usual hours worked question differently. Also, differences in the timing of the surveys may produce seasonality effects that differentially affect the composition of recent and earlier migrants, thereby changing assimilation profiles.

JEL Classification: J16, J22

Keywords: immigration, March CPS, CPS outgoing rotations, hours of work

Corresponding author:

Todd Sorensen
Department of Economics
University of California, Riverside
4128 Sproul Hall
Riverside, CA 92521-0427
USA
E-mail: todd.sorensen@ucr.edu

^{*} We are grateful to Gordon Hanson for providing us with monthly data on Border Patrol Apprehensions.

1. Introduction

The stock of Mexican migrants living in the United States is both large and growing. By 2000, these 9.2 million Mexican immigrants comprised 29.3% of the entire foreign born population in the United States, over one-third of the foreign born male workforce, and 5% of the total population of the United States (Borjas and Katz, 2007). Of particular interest to academics and policymakers are recent migrants. As of early 2007, there were an estimated 7 million Mexican immigrants who had entered the U.S. since 1990 (Pew Hispanic Center, 2007).

Attitudes towards these recent immigrants, as well as the labor market outcomes for these immigrants, will ultimately depend upon their patterns of assimilation. These recent migrants are also increasingly likely to settle in areas that, until recently, have had little to no foreign born population (Card and Lewis, 2005). Unsurprisingly, there is considerable concern regarding issues of assimilation in these previously homogenous areas.

In order to efficiently conduct policy, it is necessary to properly estimate Mexican immigrants' labor market performance and associated patterns of assimilation. In this paper, we examine how differences across data sets may affect estimates. Using data from the Outgoing Rotations Groups (ORG) and the March Annual Demographic Files (ADS) of the Current Population Survey (CPS), we examine one outcome variable that is seemingly consistent across both products: the usual hours worked in the main job by Mexican migrants to the U.S. We particularly pay attention to how the length of the work week changes as workers' tenure in the U.S. increases. We find that there are significant and important differences in these measures, depending upon which CPS product is used:

the ADS which is collected mainly in March, or the ORG which is collected throughout the year. As hourly wages are computed in both surveys using the usual hours worked in the main job variable that we consider, these findings have important implications for researchers studying wage assimilation profiles as well.

The ADS and ORG have been used extensively by social scientists to evaluate the labor market outcomes of immigrants. For example the ADS is used in Blau and Kahn (2005), Card (2005), Duncan and Trejo (2005), among many others. The ORG has been widely used as well, for example by Card (1990) or Lozano (2007). While differences in these surveys in measuring immigrant outcomes have yet to be documented, researchers have extensively documented that there exist differences in estimates produced by the two datasets when analyzing the distribution of earnings of the U.S. population (Lemieux 2006 and Autor et al 2007). Therefore, it seems equally important to analyze whether, and how, estimates of immigrant's outcomes differ across surveys, in particular for immigrants from Mexico. We can do this since the question asking usual hours of work in the main job is seemingly consistent across surveys¹, the only difference is that usual hours in the ADS refers to the main job last year, while in the CPS ORG to the main job at the time of the survey. Still, averages from year $t+1$ in the ADS must equal averages from year t in the CPS ORG.

Our results suggest that there is a strong cyclical component to the length of the work week for Mexican immigrants. Additionally, this cycle is much more pronounced for recent immigrants from Mexico than for earlier Mexican migrants. This leads to

¹ The ADS question is asked to all respondents who held a job in the previous year (WORKYN=1) and is "*In the weeks that ... worked how many hours did ... usually work per week?*" while in the ORG the question is asked to everybody with a job (lfsr=1 or lfsr=2) and the question is "*How many hours per week does...USUALLY work at this job?*"

estimates of hours assimilation profiles taken from the ADS data, which is collected mostly in March, that differ from those taken from the ORG, which includes data from throughout the year (conditional upon cohort of arrival). As hourly wages are computed using usual hours in these datasets, this result implies that estimates of wage assimilation profiles obtained from the two datasets differ as well.

We believe that differences between the ADS and ORG surveys result from two separate sources: differences in the framing of the questions asked by the two surveys (i.e. reported “hours usually worked” in the main job for the ORG versus reported “hours in the typical week during the preceding year” for the ADS), and seasonality related differences.² The presence of these two sources is evidenced by the fact that estimates from the two surveys still differ even when using only the ORG surveys collected during February, March and April (better replicating the ADS sample, and reflecting economic conditions in the months in which the March ADS is collected).

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the data, questions asked therein and the main differences between the surveys, Section 3 estimates immigrants’ assimilation effects using Borjas’ (1985, 1995) synthetic cohorts approach, Section 4 discusses possible explanations for the different results in the two surveys, and Section 5 concludes.

² While the ADS question refers specifically to the previous year, it is not hard to believe that recall error issues may lead the survey respondents to give answers that may be more reflective of hours recently worked than of the true average length of the work week in the prior year.

2. Data

The CPS survey is collected from a representative sample of households in the United States on a monthly basis³. Each monthly sample is divided into eight different rotations, and each rotation is representative of the United States. Each rotation group is surveyed for four consecutive months, taken out of the sample for eight months, and then returned to the sample for four final months. In the fourth and eight months a special labor market supplement is asked of all adults above 16 years of age. This survey is known as the Outgoing Rotation Survey.⁴ The rotations are illustrated in an example for 2007 shown in Table 1. The columns represent the month of the survey, and the rows represent the different rotations surveyed in those months. For example, we see that the May 2007 survey includes rotations that first started in February, March, April and May of both 2006 and 2007. As the February 2007 rotation was in its 4th survey month and the February 2006 rotation was in its 8th and final survey month, these were the rotations to which the ORG labor market supplement was administered.

The Annual Demographic Survey is a special supplement to the CPS. It contains a battery of questions regarding the respondent's income in the prior year. The purpose of collecting the supplement data in March is motivated by the belief that annual income information will be most accurate during March, as that is when most households prepare their income taxes; though it is not intuitively obvious that any similar argument could be made about the number of hours worked. The ADS for year t includes all rotations that are in the March sample in year t . It also includes all Hispanic households in the previous November sample and in the 1st and 5th rotation in following April sample. In addition the

³ The survey is collected on the week containing the 19th of each month and the reference week contains the 12th of each month.

⁴ In this paper we use the CPS ORG collection prepared by the National Bureau of Economic Research.

ADS includes all non-Hispanic non-White households who are in the following rotations: the 1st, 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th rotation of the previous November sample and the 1st and 5th rotation of the following April sample. The ADS also includes non-Hispanic White households with children 18 years of age or younger who are in the 1st, 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th rotation of the previous November sample and the 1st and 5th rotation of the following April sample. Importantly, the samples added are completely independent to the March sample, and in total the March ADS includes 18 rotations of Hispanic households, 15 rotations each of non-Hispanic non-White and non-Hispanic White with children 18 or under, and 8 rotations of all other households. The ADS is administered to the households from the March and April sample in the respective months. To the Hispanic households from the November sample, the survey is administered in March, and to the non-Hispanic households from the November sample the survey is administered either in February or April.⁵

Our data is taken from years 1994 to 2006, and includes all men age 25-64 in both surveys. We chose to exclude women from this sample in order to focus on the issues related to survey differences without at the same time trying to tackle issues related with the labor supply of women, which is highly sensitive to family arrangements, either due to tied migrants (Mincer, 1978) or to family labor supply (Baker and Benjamin, 1998). To properly analyze the assimilation of Mexican migrants, we exclude from the sample those who came to the United States before their 16th birthday as well as non-Mexican immigrants. When presenting estimates of assimilation, our reference group is U.S. born non-Hispanic males.

⁵ Current Population Survey (2002) “Technical Paper 63RV. Design and Methodology” accessed on January 16, 2008 from <http://www.census.gov/apsd/techdoc/cps/cps-main.html>.

Table 2 presents basic summary statistics across different demographic groups of the sample in both surveys -- note that the number of observations in the ORG is more than twice that of the ADS. Also note that the key demographic characteristics -- proportion immigrant and age -- across samples do not differ. Perhaps one exception, the individuals observed in the ORG are slightly more likely to be high school dropouts than observations from the ADS. Examining hours worked per week for immigrants in the United States, we find no significant difference between the two surveys -- at least when using disaggregated data.

We see a somewhat different picture once we disaggregate the data by immigrants' tenure in the U.S. In Figure 1 we graph the average hours worked in each quarter in year t (Feb(t)-Apr(t); May(t)-July(t); Aug(t)-Oct(t); Nov(t)-Jan($t+1$)). The top panel represents immigrants who have less than 5 years of labor market experience in the U.S. while the bottom are those with 6 or more years of experience. Three things are clearly seen from the figure: (1) there is a seasonal pattern in hours worked, (2) this seasonal pattern is more pronounced for recent migrants than it is for earlier migrants, (3) troughs in the cycle are likely to occur in March. In fact, among the 22 cycles presented in the two graphs, the March observation represented either the trough or the second lowest point in the cycle 18 times.

Table 3 presents this disaggregated data at a monthly frequency and computes the difference in hours worked by recent and earlier immigrants. Here we see not only the seasonal nature of the length of the work week for recent immigrants, but it also becomes clear that the difference in the length of the work week based on tenure in the U.S. is greatest in the Spring months, especially in March.

The evidence presented in Figure 1 and Table 3 are at the very least casual evidence that the use of the March conducted ADS may not produce consistent estimates of assimilation profiles: with troughs more likely in March, the ADS will underestimate the average hours of work for Mexican immigrants in the United States, compared to estimates from data collected continuously during the year. With deeper troughs for recent migrants, data from March will also overstate the differences between recent and earlier immigrants -- overestimating assimilation rates. In the next section we conduct a more formal analysis to see if this issue with the data indeed effects assimilation profile estimates.

3. Analysis of Hours Assimilation Profiles

Turning our attention to assimilation profiles, in Table 4 we present mean hours of work by Mexican immigrants across categories of tenure in the United States. These means are computed from three samples of data: the ORG for all months, the ORG for only February, March and April (“March ORG” henceforth), and the ADS, conducted primarily in March.

In all three cases, natives work longer hours than immigrants, though this gap narrows as immigrants’ tenure in the U.S. increase. A raw estimate of the assimilation profile is the change in weekly hours of work between the most recent and the earliest immigrants. This estimate is positive and significant in all three cases. However, it is much higher for the ADS and March ORG than it is for the full sample of the ORG; consistent with the seasonality issues discussed in the previous section.

It is well known that a changes-in-cross-sectional approach to estimating an assimilation profile is confounded with entry year cohort quality heterogeneity (Borjas 1985, 1995). To control for cohort heterogeneity we use Borjas' well known synthetic cohort technique. In what follows, we compute a within cohort estimator (cohort fixed-effects) where we estimate the following ordinary least square regression:

$$(h_{i,t}^C - \bar{h}_t^C) = \alpha + \sum_{J=1}^4 \beta_J (Y_{i,t,J}^C - \bar{Y}_{t,J}^C) + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

Where the superscript C represents one of six arrival cohorts: before 1985, 1985-1989, 1990-1994, 1995-1999, and after 2000. The estimate of each β_J shows how migrants assimilate as they pass from one tenure category to another. In the response variable: $h_{i,t}^C$ represents the weekly hours of work for observation i in year t who arrived in cohort C and \bar{h}_t^C represents the average weekly hours of work of all men in cohort C in year t . The variable $Y_{i,t,J}^C$ has a value of one if the observation i in year t from cohort C has been in the United States for J years – J is an indicator for either 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-19 years and 20+ years. The corresponding cohort average is represented by $\bar{Y}_{t,J}^C$.

Figure 2 shows the coefficients of years in the U.S. on hours of work per week, conditional upon arrival cohort -- they are relative to native workers. The magnitude of the coefficients differs across surveys. The ORG sample yields a negative and marginally significant result, suggesting that immigrants may not be assimilating in the dimension of hours. Both the March ORG and ADS samples yield higher results of this coefficient. Consistent with the seasonality effect; the March ORG gives a positive but insignificant result, while the ADS sample produces a positive and significant estimate. As seasonality effects cannot explain differences between these two estimates – the estimates between

the CSP ORG and its March sub-sample are not statistically significant -- these results also suggest that there may be a framing effect in how the questions are asked in the two surveys.

Table 5 presents the hours of work predicted using the above estimates of each data sample; Figure 3 represents this graphically for the ORG and for the ADS. From Table 5 and Figure 3, we can again see that the ADS gives steeper estimates of assimilation profiles than do the other data sets. In fact, after conditioning upon cohort, only the ADS predicts assimilation; the ORG dataset shows a mild divergence between immigrant hours and natives' hours. There are two further points worth noting: first, the assimilation profiles from the ADS are statistically significantly greater than the assimilation profiles from the ORG; second, the predicted differences are greater among earlier immigrants than among recent one, suggesting that cohort effects do matter. Still, it is not clear to us why the differences in the conditional estimates are greatest among earlier immigrants. One possible answer is based on Redstone and Massey's (2004) argument that immigrants' answer to the question "*When did you first come to live to the United States*" varies across different immigrants, particularly those who are most likely to transition many times between the United States and Mexico.

4. Possible Sources of Differences in Estimates

The previous section exposes an important caveat to researchers using only ADS data to study migration: the ADS shows evidence of assimilation, the ORG does not. While a thorough explanation for the cause of this difference is beyond the scope of this paper, it is informative to discuss some of the peculiarities that may have lead to our finding.

After conditioning upon cohort, it seems that this difference stems not from seasonality effects alone (as evidenced by differences in estimates between the full set of ORGs and the ORGs from only the spring), but also from differences in the survey questions asked (as evidenced by the differences in estimates between the March ADS and ORGs at the same time of the year).

As we argued before, part of the difference is likely due to the different time reference of the question between surveys, where the question in the March CPS refers to “usual hours last year” and the question in the ORG refers to “usual hours” this year. Again, this difference seems to be particularly sensitive for recent immigrants who have no hours of work in the previous year – since they arguably were outside the U.S. -- but positive hours of work this year.

Below we discuss a number of peculiarities related to data gathered in March. While there does not seem to be a pure seasonality effect, considering these issues may shed some light upon how the differences in survey questions asked in the ADS and ORGs may interact with seasonality effects to produce different estimates of the assimilation profiles.

Table 6 presents additional demographic data on migrants appearing in the three samples. One fact that comes to immediate attention is that the total years of “U.S. Experience” is higher in March, suggesting that we see less recent immigrants in the sample. Figure 4 as well shows that the percent of the U.S. population that is comprised of recent immigrants from Mexico dips in March.

Clearly, changes in the relative stocks of recent and earlier immigrants are not sufficient to generate the differences in mean hours worked by these two groups.

However, the presence of a relatively larger stock of earlier migrants in March brings attention to issues related to cyclical migration (Massey, Durand, and Malone, 2002). If cyclical migration patterns change the tenure composition of the stock of migrants in the U.S., it is reasonable to question whether migration patterns may also change the composition of migrants *within* each tenure category.

From Figure 5, which shows monthly total number of Border Patrol apprehensions on the southern U.S. border (Hanson and Spilembergo, 1999), it is clear that there is a large increase in the number of migrants crossing into the U.S. starting early each year, peaking in March, and continuing for a couple of months thereafter. This is more evidence that seasonal compositional changes in the type of migrant crossing into the U.S. would likely lead to significantly different composition of migrants in March, compared to other months.

Finally, in Table 7, we see that recent migrants (0-5 years in the U.S.) show the biggest seasonal difference in employment rates at -2.7 percentage points difference between the March ADS and the ORGs. In contrast, the differences for those in the U.S. 6-10 years, 11-20 years and more than 20 years are, respectively -1.2 percentage points, .5 percentage points, and 1.6 percentage points. Future work will pursue a more in depth study of the possible causes for the “March effect” that we have demonstrated.

5. Summary

In this paper we have compared estimates of immigrant’s labor market assimilation across two seemingly equivalent surveys. We first find much stronger seasonality in hours worked by new immigrants than for earlier immigrants. As expected, this causes

estimates of assimilation profiles to be dependent upon the season of the data used to estimate the profile. In particular, the use of the Annual Demographic Survey provides evidence that immigrants are assimilating in the length of their work week, while the Current Population Survey Outgoing Rotation Groups do not. Apart from seasonality, there may be other factors which lead to this difference; this is evidenced by the fact that the differences in estimates between the two surveys attenuate when we limit the Outgoing Rotation Groups to only the months of February, March, and April. Future work will focus on examining whether the “March Effect” has significant effects on estimates of *earnings* assimilation profiles, and a broader exploration of the causes of the peculiarity of the March data.

Bibliography

- Autor, David H., Lawrence F. Katz and Melissa S. Kearney (2006). "The Polarization of the U.S. Labor Market", NBER Working Paper 11986.
- Baker, Michael and Dwayne Benjamin (1997). "The Role of the Family in Immigrants' Labor-Market Activity: An Evaluation of Alternative Explanations", *The American Economic Review*, 87(4), Sep 1997: 705-727.
- Baker, Michael and Dwayne Benjamin (1997). "The Role of the Family in Immigrants' Labor-Market Activity: An Evaluation of Alternative Explanations", *The American Economic Review*, 87(4), Sep 1997: 705-727.
- Blau Francine D., Lawrence M. Kahn (2005). "Gender and Assimilation Among Mexican Americans" NBER Working Paper 11512.
- Borjas, George J (1985). "Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality, and the Earnings of Immigrants." *Journal of Labor Economics*, 3(4), October 1985: pp. 463-489.
- Borjas, George J (1995). "Assimilation and Changes in Cohort Quality Revisited: What Happened to Immigrant Earnings in the 1980s?" *Journal of Labor Economics*, 13(2), April 1995: 201-245.
- Borjas, George J. and Lawrence F Katz (2007). "The Evolution of the Mexican-Born Workforce in the United States." In *Mexican Immigration to the United States*, George J. Borjas eds. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago: 2007.
- Card, David (1990). "The Impact of the Mariel Boatlift on the Miami Labor Market" *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 43, No. 2. (Jan., 1990), pp. 245-257.
- Card, David (2005). "Is New Immigration Really So Bad? NBER Working Paper 11547.
- Card, David and Ethan G Lewis (2007). "The Diffusion of Mexican Immigrants during the 1990s: Explanations and Impacts." In *Mexican Immigration to the United States*, George J. Borjas eds. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago: 2007.
- Duncan, Brian and Stephen Trejo (2005). "Ethnic Identification, Intermarriage, and Unmeasured Progress by Mexican Americans", NBER Working Paper 11423.
- Hanson, Gordon (2007). Border Patrol Dataset available at:
<http://irpshome.ucsd.edu/faculty/gohanson/data.htm>
- Hanson, Gordon and Antonio Spilembergo (1999). "Illegal Immigration, Border Enforcement, and Relative Wages: Evidence from Apprehensions at the U.S.-Mexico Border", *American Economic Review* 89(5), Dec 1999: 1337-1357.

Lemieux, Thomas (2006). "Increasing Residual Wage Inequality: Composition Effects, Noisy Data, or Rising Demand for Skill?", *American Economic Review* 96(3), June 2006: 461-98.

Lozano, Fernando (2007). "Coming to Work? The Hours of Work of Mexican and Central American Immigrants in America." Working Paper.

Massey, Douglas S.; Jorge Durand, and Nolan J. Malone (2002). *Beyond Smoke and Mirrors: Mexican Immigration in an Era of economic Integration*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York: 2002.

Mincer, Jacob (1978). "Family Migration Decisions", *Journal of Political Economy*, 86, 1978: 749-773.

Pew Hispanic Center (2007). "Indicators of Recent Migration Flows from Mexico."

Figure 1:




Figure 2:




Figure 3:




Figure 4:




Figure 5:




Table 1: Outgoing Rotation GroupsEntry of Rotation by Month and Year			2007 Survey Month											
Rotation	Year	Month	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
1	2005	Oct	S8											
2	2005	Nov	S7	S8										
3	2005	Dec	S6	S7	S8									
4	2006	Jan	S5	S6	S7	S8								
5	2006	Feb	Off	S5	S6	S7	S8							
6	2006	March	Off	Off	S5	S6	S7	S8						
7	2006	April	Off	Off	Off	S5	S6	S7	S8					
8	2006	May	Off	Off	Off	Off	S5	S6	S7	S8				
9	2006	June	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	S5	S6	S7	S8			
10	2006	July	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	S5	S6	S7	S8		
11	2006	Aug	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	S5	S6	S7	S8	
12	2006	Sep	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	S5	S6	S7	S8
13	2006	Oct	S4	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	S5	S6	S7
14	2006	Nov	S3	S4	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	S5	S6
15	2006	Dec	S2	S3	S4	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	S5
16	2007	Jan	S1	S2	S3	S4	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off
17	2007	Feb		S1	S2	S3	S4	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off
18	2007	March			S1	S2	S3	S4	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off
19	2007	April				S1	S2	S3	S4	Off	Off	Off	Off	Off
20	2007	May					S1	S2	S3	S4	Off	Off	Off	Off
21	2007	June						S1	S2	S3	S4	Off	Off	Off
22	2007	July							S1	S2	S3	S4	Off	Off
23	2007	Aug								S1	S2	S3	S4	Off
24	2007	Sep									S1	S2	S3	S4
25	2007	Oct										S1	S2	S3
26	2007	Nov											S1	S2
27	2007	Dec												S1

Table 2: Basic Demographic Characteristics

	A) Using ORG		B) Using March ADS	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Natives	Mexican Immigrants	Natives	Mexican Immigrants
All males in the sample				
Proportion	0.951	0.049	0.955	0.045
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Employed	0.801	0.862	0.818	0.859
	(0.000)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)
Age	42.758	37.619	42.945	37.795
	(0.011)	(0.050)	(0.017)	(0.060)
High School Dropouts	0.098	0.652	0.087	0.612
	(0.000)	(0.002)	(0.000)	(0.003)
High School Graduates	0.336	0.220	0.344	0.251
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.003)
Some College	0.274	0.084	0.271	0.088
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
College Graduates	0.293	0.044	0.298	0.049
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
	879,394	37,745	416,695	26,574
Only Employed Males				
Usual Hours Worked	42.985	41.021	44.316	41.572
	(0.010)	(0.036)	(0.017)	(0.052)
Weekly Earnings	699.895	372.571	751.709	382.295
	(0.513)	(1.231)	(1.591)	(2.762)
Observations	704,714	32,687	345,037	23,086

Sample: All males in the CPS Outgoing Rotations and in the March Supplements age 25-64 (1994-2006). Standard errors in parenthesis.

Table 3: Usual Average Hours of Work of Mexican Immigrant by Calendar Month

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Raw Averages			Conditional on Arrival Cohort		
Immigrant Category	Recent 0-5 Years	Earlier 6+ Years	Difference	Recent 0-5 Years	Earlier 6+ Years	Difference
January	40.447	40.648	0.201	39.716	40.235	0.519
Feb	40.202	40.991	0.789	39.71	40.597	0.887
March	40.448	41.155	0.707	39.846	40.764	0.918
April	40.406	41.108	0.702	39.819	40.702	0.883
May	40.686	40.984	0.298	40.117	40.588	0.471
June	41.27	41.269	-0.001	40.768	40.878	0.11
July	41.417	41.578	0.161	40.82	41.182	0.362
August	41.253	41.282	0.029	40.658	40.889	0.231
September	40.313	41.065	0.752	39.685	40.678	0.993
October	41.253	41.177	-0.076	40.586	40.771	0.185
November	40.718	40.94	0.222	40.038	40.525	0.487
December	40.298	40.601	0.303	39.673	40.196	0.523

Sample: All males in the CPS Outgoing Rotations age 25-64.

Table 4. Years in the United States and Hours of Work

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	CPS ORG	CPS Spring ORG	March ADS
(1) Natives	42.985	42.884	44.316
	(0.010)	(0.020)	(0.017)
(2) 0-5 Years	40.755	40.356	41.182
	(0.096)	(0.212)	(0.148)
(3) 6-10 Years	40.771	40.649	41.108
	(0.082)	(0.169)	(0.118)
(4) 11-20 Years	41.045	40.990	41.592
	(0.059)	(0.121)	(0.080)
(5) 20 Years	41.301	41.477	42.017
	(0.068)	(0.134)	(0.098)
Difference (5)-(2)	0.546*	1.121*	0.835*
	(0.117)	(0.251)	(0.177)
Observations	37,744	9,199	26,574

Sample: All employed immigrant males in the CPS Outgoing Rotations and March Supplements ages 25-64 (1994-2006)

**Table 5. Years in the United States and Hours of Work
(Conditional on Arrival Cohort)**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	CPS ORG	CPS Spring ORG	March ADS
(1) Natives	42.971	42.868	44.317
	(0.012)	(0.024)	(0.022)
(2) 0-5 Years	41.694	41.431	41.318
	(0.217)	(0.462)	(0.338)
(3) 6-10 Years	41.231	41.192	41.051
	(0.166)	(0.352)	(0.265)
(4) 11-20 Years	41.151	41.083	41.534
	(0.095)	(0.191)	(0.144)
(5) 20 Years	41.288	41.464	42.018
	(0.073)	(0.145)	(0.110)
Difference (5)-(2)	-0.406	0.033	0.700*
	(0.232)	(0.490)	(0.360)
Observations	730,007	182,306	364,512

Sample: All employed males in the CPS Outgoing Rotations and March Supplements ages 25-64 (1994-2006)

Table 6: Characteristics of Mexican Immigrant Sample

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	CPS ORG	CPS ORG March Only	March ADS
Year Arrived	1984.85	1984.35	1984.56
	(0.054)	(0.109)	(0.065)
Age Arrived	21.622	21.209	21.495
	(0.049)	(0.099)	(0.059)
US Experience	15.996	16.469	16.300
	(0.051)	(0.102)	(0.062)
0-5 Years in US	0.150	0.125	0.143
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
6-10 Years in US	0.186	0.191	0.182
	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.002)
11-20 Years in US	0.357	0.360	0.357
	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.003)
20+ Years in US	0.307	0.323	0.318
	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.003)
Observations	37,744	9,199	26,574

Sample: All males in the CPS Outgoing Rotations and in the March Supplements age 25-64 (1994-2006).

Table 7: Years in the United States for Employed and Unemployed Mexican Immigrants

	CPS ORG		March ADS	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Employed	Not Employed	Employed	Not Employed
Proportion	0.862	0.138	0.859	0.141
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Year Arrived	1985.394	1981.462	1984.920	1982.366
	(0.057)	(0.168)	(0.068)	(0.200)
US Experience	15.518	18.971	16.004	18.099
	(0.053)	(0.162)	(0.064)	(0.192)
0-5 Years	0.885	0.115	0.858	0.142
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.006)	(0.006)
6-10 Years	0.889	0.111	0.879	0.121
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)
11-20 Years	0.886	0.114	0.881	0.119
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
20+ Years	0.806	0.194	0.822	0.178
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Observations	32,687	5,057	23,086	3,488

Sample: All employed immigrant males in the CPS Outgoing Rotations and March Supplements ages 25-64 (1994-2006)