Intersectionality at Work:

Determinants of Labor Supply among Immigrant Hispanic Women[1]

Chenoa Flippen

Department of Sociology
University of Pennsylvania
3718 Locust Walk
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6298
chenoa@sas.upenn.edu
Phone: 215-898-5534
Fax: 215-898-2124

Abstract

This article borrows from the intersectionality literature to investigate how legal status, labor market position, and family characteristics structure the labor supply of immigrant Hispanic women in Durham, NC, a new immigrant destination. The analysis takes a broad view of labor force participation, analyzing the predictors of whether or not women work; whether and how the barriers to work vary across occupations; and the determinants of variation in hours and weeks worked among the employed. Results highlight that immigrant Hispanic women experience multiple, interrelated constraints on employment owing to their position as low-skill workers in a labor market highly segregated by gender and nativity, to their status as members of a largely undocumented population, and as wives and mothers in an environment characterized by significant work-family conflict.

[1] This research was supported by grant #NR 08052-03 from NINR/NIH.

Latin American immigration to the United States has grown sharply in recent years, with the number of foreign-born Hispanics topping 21 million in 2010. As their numbers have grown the prospects for immigrants' economic incorporation has become an increasingly pressing concern in popular, policy, and academic circles alike. While Hispanic immigration has long been disproportionately male, a growing number of married and unmarried women have entered the U.S. in recent decades. Labor force participation among these women has also risen sharply, with 57.8 percent of foreign-born Hispanic women working for pay in 2004 (King 2011). Indeed, with stagnating male wages in the lower segment of the labor market and the growth of female headed households, women's employment has become a progressively more important determinant of family economic well-being.

In spite of the importance of these trends, we still know relatively little about the social forces shaping employment patterns among immigrant Hispanic women. Most theoretical and empirical examinations of immigrant incorporation into the labor market tend to focus on men, and our understanding of the forces that are unique to Hispanic women remain poorly developed. An important and growing body of work on intersectionality emphasizes that women's outcomes are not a simple extension of the male experience, and that researchers must explicitly consider how the multiple dimensions of stratification are intertwined (Collins 2000). While we have made great strides in articulating how forces such as race, social class, and gender shape outcomes simultaneously, the literature on intersectionality would benefit from greater attention to how nationality and citizenship interact with other dimensions of stratification to shape the economic incorporation of immigrant women.

In this paper, I examine the determinants of multiple facets of labor supply among immigrant Hispanic women in Durham, NC, a new immigrant destination. I examine how women's

position in three different institutional spheres structure their labor force participation: the larger political and legal structure, the economy, and the family. I argue that to fully grasp the employment position of immigrant women, it is necessary to take the broadest view possible of labor force participation, considering the factors that condition both whether women work for pay and, among working women, the number of hours and weeks worked. It is also essential to examine both married and single women, and to consider multiple aspects of immigration status, economic position, and family structure, considering transnational characteristics whenever possible. Results highlight that immigrant Hispanic women face multiple, overlapping disadvantages owing to their position as largely undocumented entrants into the United States, their concentration in low-wage and unstable occupations, and the particular demands associated with family responsibilities in immigrant Hispanic communities.

Theoretical Background

Intersectionality theory marks an important advance in feminist scholarship as it moves away from a strictly gendered analysis to one that accounts for the multiple marginalized locations occupied by women from different class and ethno-racial backgrounds. The main argument is that the lived experience of oppression cannot be neatly separated into those due to gender, on the one hand, and race or ethnicity on the other. Rather, they are inherently and intricately linked and experienced simultaneously (Acker 2006; Belliveau 2012; Collins 2000). Moreover, women's outcomes are structured by the interactions between inequalities in multiple institutions; social class may predominate in the economic sphere but this is also conditioned on and affected by gender inequality in the family sphere.

One way the concept has been invoked is in comparative studies that examine the interaction between such factors as race, gender, and social class. In the field of women's employment patterns, a number of studies document that Hispanic women face considerable disadvantages compared to both non-Hispanic (NH) white men and women *and* Hispanic men (Blau and Kahn 2007; De Jong and Madamba 2001; Hall, Greenman, and Farkas 2010; Huan, Landale, and Leicht 2000). While this research has made important strides in illuminating the source of inequality between Hispanic women and others, studies that include diverse populations necessarily lack the ability to delve more deeply into the forces that are unique to particular groups. Thus, these studies often fail to take nativity into account, and even when they do are extremely limited in the information they have available on the immigration experience itself. As such, our understanding of variation among Hispanic immigrant women remains limited. However, the intersectionality perspective can also be fruitfully applied single group studies, to delve into the ways that multiple institutions interact to shape the conditions of particular disadvantaged groups (Choo and Ferree 2010). The emphasis on how different institutions and spheres of social life simultaneously undermine women's economic position is especially salient to immigrant Hispanics, among whom economic, political, and family characteristics interact to undermine economic incorporation.

U.S. labor market conditions and immigrant women's labor force participation

In recent decades, the United States, like other post-industrial economies, has undergone dramatic transformation of its employment structure. The heightened emphasis on free trade, de-regulation, and flexibility have contributed to rising inequality by skill, and to a substantial erosion of work conditions in the lower segment of the employment hierarchy. Non-standard work arrangements, such as on-call work, temporary help agencies, subcontracting, and part-time

employment have all grown dramatically, both across and within industries, to the serious detriment of wages and job quality (Kalleberg 2011).

The declining fortunes in the low skilled labor market have heightened the demand for immigrant labor. In fact, the share of all workers in the low skill labor market who were foreign born rose from a mere 12 percent in 1980 (Enchautegui 1998) to 50 percent in 2010 (BLS 2011). Within this larger trend, the demand for female immigrant labor in particular has also grown sharply. Globalization contributed to the exodus of U.S. manufacturing employment to low income countries, but also to the downgrading of manufacturing that remained. Characterized by greater instability and lower rates of unionization and wages, these downgraded jobs elevated the demand for female and immigrant manufacturing labor (Myers and Cranford 1998). Likewise, the rise of service work and explosive growth of "caring" jobs in child- and healthcare has also dramatically increased the demand for low-skill immigrant women's labor (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001).

As the concentration of immigrants in the low wage sector grows, the conditions prevalent in that sector will necessarily loom ever larger in their prospects for socioeconomic advancement. Human capital theory posits that the return to education, work experience, and skill raise the opportunity costs for non-work for highly educated and experienced women. They should thus be more likely to work than their less educated and less experienced peers. However, the unique characteristics of the low wage labor market, particularly the segments where immigrant women concentrate, may constrain the role of human capital in shaping employment decisions. Immigrant women are highly segregated in a handful of occupations and industries that are characterized by low wages, small firms, and subcontractors (Catanzarite and Aguilar 2002), and even receive a lower return to skill than other workers (Blau and Kahn 2007).

It is therefore important to evaluate whether and how human capital shapes employment decisions among immigrant Hispanic women, and how aspects of labor market position interact with other institutions to shape employment outcomes.

The legal environment and immigrant women's labor force participation

Immigrant incorporation is also profoundly shaped by the legal and political environment in which they operate. The United States has long sought to limit the employment of unauthorized workers. However, in recent years the consequences of lacking legal authorization to work have grown substantially. The 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) initiated employer sanctions for the hiring of undocumented workers, and the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) heightened these sanctions and devoted considerably more resources to enforcement.

These laws, and the increasingly harsh anti-immigrant sentiment more generally, interact with structural changes in the U.S. labor market to exacerbate the marginalization of immigrant workers. The shift in immigration policy has reverberated through the low wage labor market, transforming industries that rely heavily on immigrant labor. In these sectors, the need to insulate employers from the risks associated with hiring undocumented workers has hastened the shift to subcontracting and other forms of non-standard work arrangements, to the potential detriment of all who work in those fields (Massey and Bartley 2005). Indeed, in the increasingly competitive and bifurcated employment structure of more developed economies, it is increasingly nativity and citizenship that determine the sorting of workers into the worst jobs (Hudson 2007). In 2005 it was estimated that fully 23 percent of all low-skill workers in the United States were undocumented (Capps, Fortuny, and Fix 2007).

While numerous studies have sought to identify the wage penalty associated with undocumented status (Cobb-Clark and Kossoudji 1999; Donato et al. 2008; Flippen 2012; Hall et al. 2010), few, if any, have examined the impact of legal status on women's labor supply. If IRCA and IIRIRA were working as intended, we would expect undocumented women to work at lower rates than their legal resident peers, net of other factors. However, it is critical to consider not only the impact of legal status on women's labor force participation, but also how its influence interacts with structural aspects of the low wage, immigrant labor market. That is, in addition to influencing whether or not immigrant women work, legal status could also shape labor supply indirectly, by funneling women into particular occupations or other employment conditions that undermine their ability to work full time hours, or in jobs with greater stability. A more multi-facetted analysis of the link between legal status and labor supply is thus in order.

The family and immigrant women's labor force participation

And finally, another social institution central to the labor market experiences of immigrant Hispanic women is the family. Economic theory views labor force decisions as part of the allocation of time between work and leisure. Because women bear disproportionate responsibility for family reproduction, the labor supply decisions are also shaped by the demand for non-market household labor. A wide body of research has shown that women with children are less likely to work than those without children (Cohen and Bianchi 1999; Greenless and Saenz 1999; England et al 2004). The relationship between marriage and women's employment is less uniform. On the one hand, if husbands encourage a traditional division of labor marriage could undermine women's paid employment even over and above its association with childbearing. On the other hand, if husbands were to share in childrearing responsibilities, marriage could facilitate women's employment outside the home.

However, in keeping with the importance of intersectionality for understanding the employment outcomes of women of color, there is important ethno-racial variation in the relationship between work and family. While it is important to recognize the tremendous diversity in gender norms and attitudes both within Latin America and the United States, Hispanics are generally thought to be more patriarchal in their family orientations than other groups. For instance, while marriage appears either unrelated or even slightly positively predictive of women's paid employment for NH white and black women (Christopher 1996), the effect is negative among Hispanic women (Kahn and Whittington 1996; Read and Cohen 2007). The effect of childbearing on women's employment is also not always associated with lower labor force participation among Hispanic women, once marriage is taken into account (Omori and Smith 2007; Stier and Tienda 1992).

These studies, while suggestive of important differences between Hispanics and other women, also fail to account for the transnational nature of family in immigrant households. Specifically, many immigrant women from Latin American left children in the care of other relatives in their countries of origin. The growing trend of migrant mothers globally is transforming the boundaries of motherhood in more traditional societies, to increasingly include economic provision for children (Parreñas 2005). Thus, while co-resident children in the United States are likely to present demands on their mothers' time, potentially discouraging market work, non-resident minor children abroad could pose financial demands that encourage women's work. To my knowledge no one has examined this possibility.

Household extension is another critical aspect of family structure that is often theorized to shape women's employment behavior, though the mechanisms through which it operates and even the direction of the effect remain open to debate. On the one hand, household extension,

particularly when it entails non-working women who could substitute for mothers' household labor, could facilitate the employment of women with children. On the other hand, there is evidence to suggest that the presence of additional household members may add to the domestic burden placed on women, thus depressing labor force participation. If other household members contribute economically to the family unit, they may also reduce the economic incentives for women's paid employment. Indeed, much of the current literature finds mixed or no results of extension on Hispanic women's work (Cohen 2002; Tienda and Glass 1985). However, because immigrant women are far more likely to live in extended households than other women, it is important to take this dimension of family structure into account.

And finally, it is essential to recognize that the family does not shape women's employment decisions in a vacuum, but rather its influence interacts with women's position in other social fields, particularly the larger economy. Immigrant women are concentrated in a handful of occupational niches in the United States, and the conflict between work and family is likely to vary among them. In particular, immigrant Hispanic women tend to cluster in cleaning, childcare, laundry, and food preparation, which may offer varying degrees of flexibility in scheduling. It is important to conceive of these decisions, whether or not to work and what kind of job to pursue, as jointly determined to assess the role of human capital, legal status, and family constraints in jointly shaping employment outcomes.

Overall, in spite of the growing importance of women's paid employment to immigrant families' economic security, there remains a paucity of information available on the social forces shaping work patterns among this group. Particularly lacking are studies which take an intersectionality approach, examining the multiple and often overlapping constraints on

employment among immigrant women. This paper draws on original survey data collected in Durham, NC to address these issues. We contribute to the literature on immigrant women's economic incorporation in three principal ways. First, we take an expansive view of women's labor supply. The vast majority of studies on the subject are restricted to analyzing whether or not women work, and neglect considerable variation in the amount of work performed by working women. Here, we model not only whether women were working at the time of survey, but also the number of hours worked in a typical week *and* a measure of employment instability over the previous year. Second, we are able to assess the impact of three different institutional sources of inequality on immigrant Hispanic women's paid work: the larger political sphere, the low wage labor market, and the family. Because our survey was specifically designed to capture the experiences of the immigrant Hispanic population, we have direct data on legal status, aspects of low wage work such as working in for a subcontractor or in segregated Hispanic worksites, and transnational measures of family structure. And finally, we also consider the interaction between these different spheres of disadvantage, considering, for example, whether the human capital, legal status, and family constraints on women's work vary across occupations, and how documentation shapes labor supply both directly and indirectly through its impact on the employment characteristics that structure access to full time and stable work. Taken together, the enhanced survey information and consideration of multiple spheres of influence offer valuable insight into immigrant Hispanic women's labor market incorporation.

Data and methods

The data used in the analysis come from an original, locally representative survey of Hispanic immigrants in the Durham/Chapel Hill, NC metropolitan area (for the sake of

parsimony, referred to as Durham, where the vast majority of respondents live). Durham represents a valuable vantage point to study Hispanic immigrant incorporation. The area has been growing rapidly as part of the national shift in population from Rustbelt to Sunbelt states. The influx of highly educated workers attracted to growing job opportunities in the nearby Research Triangle Park, universities, and other large employers generated intense demand for low-skill service and construction labor. Some employers responded by recruiting Hispanic immigrant laborers from more traditional receiving areas or even directly from Mexico, and a cycle of chain migration began that saw the Hispanic population explode from a mere 1 percent of the total population of Durham in 1990 to nearly 9 percent by 2000 and 11.9 percent by 2007 (Flippen and Parrado 2012; Johnson-Webb 2003).

The precarious position of Hispanic immigrants in Durham presented unique challenges for approximating a locally representative sample. Our study relied on a combination of Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) and targeted random sampling to overcome these difficulties. CBPR is a participatory approach to research that incorporates members of the target community in all phases of the research process (Israel et al. 2005). In our case, a group of 14 community members assisted in the planning phase of the study, survey construction and revision, and devising strategies to boost response rates and data quality. In addition, CBPR members were trained in research methods and conducted all surveys. Finally, through ongoing collaborative meetings, they were also influential in the interpretation of survey results. It is difficult to overstate the wealth of culturally grounded understanding that they brought to project findings.

At the same time, the relatively recent nature of the Hispanic community in Durham rendered simple random sampling prohibitively expensive. We therefore employed targeted

random sampling techniques (Watters and Biernacki 1989). Based on CBPR insights and extensive field work, we identified 49 apartment complexes and blocks that house large numbers of immigrant Hispanics. We then collected a census of all apartments in these areas and randomly selected individual units to be visited by interviewers.[2] Using community members as interviewers helped achieve a refusal rate of only 9 percent, and a response rate, which also discounted randomly selected units in which contact was not made after numerous attempts, of over 72 percent. Data collection proceeded in stages. An initial survey was conducted between 2001 and 2002, during which time 209 women were interviewed. During 2006 and early 2007, an additional 910 women were interviewed, for a total sample size of 1,119 immigrant Hispanics women between the ages of 18 and 49. All interviews were conducted in Spanish, usually in the homes of respondents, with interviewers filling out paper surveys that included a mix of close-ended and open-ended questions. A main advantage of CBPR was the ability to develop a questionnaire specifically tailored to assess the immigration, labor market, and family experiences of Hispanic women in Durham.

Analytic strategy and model specification

The analysis is concerned with multiple aspects of women's labor supply, including whether or not women engage in paid employment, and if so, how much they work. The first step is thus to assess the determinants of women's employment, and whether the constraints imposed by the family on women's market work vary across occupations. We thus model both a dummy indicator of whether or not the respondent was working at the time of survey *and* a second variable that combines labor force participation with type of occupation. The latter is

[2] A comparison of our sample with data from the 2000 Census showed nearly 80 percent of Durham's Hispanics live in areas similar to those in which our targeted samples are located, i.e. in blocks that are 25 to 60 percent Hispanic. Moreover, there were no statistically significant differences between data sources on socio-demographic characteristics such as age, employment status, hourly wages, marital status, and year of arrival (Author YEAR).

comprised of seven categories: not working, working in food preparation, cleaning, childcare, laundry, factory, or other jobs.

Second, because immigrant women often work less than full time we also consider variation in the amount of work performed among working women. I thus model the self-reported number of hours worked during a typical week. In order to flesh out the impact of human capital, immigration, and family characteristics on work hours, I also construct a multinomial variable that includes four mutually exclusive categories: not working, working less than 20 hours a week, working between 20 and 34 hours per week, and working 35 hours a week or more. This provides important insight into whether the barriers to immigrant women's labor force participation produce the largest cleavages between working and non-working women, or whether the main differences are between those who are able to work full time and those who are not. Unfortunately, we did not collect data on the number of hours worked in the first round of surveys, so the sample for these analyses is restricted to the 910 interviewed in the second round of data collection.

The final dependent variable relates to weeks worked. This concept is seldom studied and yet captures a critical aspect of work in immigrant occupational niches, which tend to be highly unstable. To aid in recollection, the survey collected retrospective information separating the prior year into four seasons and asked separately for each season whether there was a period of time that respondents were without work, and if so for how long. This strategy was designed to capture potential seasonal variability in immigrant occupational niches. Responses were then summed to produce a yearly estimate. The survey also included an open-ended question as to the reason for being without work. Responses were coded as those related to childcare (including pregnancy), insufficient labor demand, illness or injury, and other reasons. I therefore

model total weeks out of work during the previous year, total weeks out due to childcare, and total weeks out due to insufficient demand. Together these models gauge immigrant Hispanic women's vulnerability to employment instability and assess the relative importance of family and labor market sources of instability. This information is not available for the entire sample, but rather was only collected in an employment supplement during the second wave. This analysis is thus restricted to the 339 women randomly selected to answer these supplemental questions.

Independent variables include age (and a squared term to capture non-linear effects), educational attainment, and work experience in countries of origin as rough measures of human capital. Educational attainment is measured by a set of dummy variables distinguishing between those with 6 or fewer, 7 to 9, and 10 or more years of completed schooling. These distinctions correspond to primary, secondary, and above secondary education in Mexico. I also include a dummy indicator for whether women had ever worked in their countries of origin. Immigration-related characteristics include a variable capturing the number of years of residence in the Durham area, and English ability, which is measured by a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent reported being able to speak English well or very well (as opposed to "more or less" or not at all). Finally, a dummy variable for undocumented status reflects the response from a direct question on legal status.

As assessing the conflict between work and family is an important aim of the analysis, we also distinguish women according to marital status and presence of children in the household. Specifically, a set of four mutually exclusive dummy variables indicate whether a woman is married and living with children, married and not living with children, unmarried and living with children, or unmarried and not living with children. While these variables capture the daily

demands for women's reproductive labor, the burgeoning literature on transnational families suggests that we should also consider the impact of non-resident children on women's labor supply. We therefore also include a dummy indicator for having minor children (under the age of 18) who reside in their country of origin.

Assessing the impact of household extension on women's labor supply is somewhat complicated. Most studies that have examined the relationship between extension and women's employment focused either on married women or single mothers. Indeed, it is difficult to devise a single measure of extension that does not confound marital status, because there are very few single women living alone in Durham. After experimenting with numerous ways to capture the effect of additional household members on women's work, I report findings for the impact of crowding, defined as more than two persons per bedroom. To ensure that this specification is not inadvertently capturing the effect of larger numbers of children, I also estimate models controlling for marital status and the number of children separately. Results, reported in Appendix A, are substantively identical to those reported below.

And finally, the analysis also includes five mediating employment characteristics on hours and weeks worked among employed women: occupation (described above), firm size (a dummy indicator of whether the respondent was working in a firm with ten or fewer workers at all locations), ethnic concentration (a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent reported working at a majority Hispanic work site), and exposure to nonstandard work arrangements, measured through dummy indicator of working for a subcontractor. These characteristics have been shown to affect employment stability among men (Author YEAR).

The statistical estimation varies according to the distribution of the dependent variables. For the analysis of being employed where the dependent variable is a dummy indicator I estimate

logistic regression models. For the analysis of working in a particular type of occupation or hourly worker category where the dependent variable is composed of seven and four mutually exclusive categories, respectively, I estimate multinomial logit models with the reference category being non-working women. For the model of hours worked per week, which is a continuous variable, I report results from standard OLS models. For the models of variation in weeks without work per year, the large number of cases with zero values warranted negative binomial regression techniques.

Descriptive Results

Table 1 presents descriptive results for the dependent variables in the analysis. Just under 58 percent of the women we interviewed were working for pay at the time of survey, although there was dramatic variation in the extent of engagement with the labor force. While the average number of hours worked per week was just over 35, it ranged from a mere 5 hours to 60 hours per week. Only 68.6 percent of working women reported working full time (at least 35 hours per typical week), while 21.4 percent reported working between 20 and 34 hours, and an additional10 percent reported working fewer than 20 hours per week. Employment instability during the previous year was also common, with over half (50.5 percent) of working women reported at least one non-work spell. Ranging from a few days to the better part of the year, the average working woman spent 8.9 weeks without work. The reasons given for being without work point to the importance of both family and labor market sources of instability. While roughly 5 percent of women listed illness or injury as the primary reason they went without work, over 35 percent listed childrearing obligations. However, and even greater share, 48 percent, attributed their time out of work to insufficient demand for their services.

Table 1 also presents human capital, immigration, and family structure characteristics for the sample. Like other new destinations, the Hispanic immigrant women in Durham are relatively young, averaging 30 years of age. They are also poorly educated, with 43.6 percent not advancing beyond primary school, an additional 26.8 percent completing between seven and nine years of education, and less than one-third (29.6 percent) finishing 10 or more years of schooling. The majority, 58.5 percent, had prior work experience in their countries of origin. Respondents are also very recently arrived, averaging a mere 4.3 years in the Durham area. Reflecting this recent arrival, only 7.1 percent of women reported speaking English well or very well, and the overwhelming majority, 88.3 percent, was undocumented at the time of interview. The family structure of the women in the sample reflects the young age profile and gendered pattern of Latin American-U.S. migration. A full 61.4 percent of the women in the sample were both married and living with children; 19 percent was married but had no co-resident children; nearly 11 percent were currently unmarried but living with children; and a mere 9 percent were neither married nor living with children. Moreover, a full 22.2 percent of women in the sample had at least one minor child residing in their countries of origin. And finally, the pattern of household extension was also typical of new destinations, with high rates of extension and non-family residence-sharing. Nearly 44 percent of women lived in housing units with more than two people per bedroom, our indicator of crowded conditions.

And finally, the employment characteristics of women in the sample are also noteworthy. The occupational concentration of immigrant Hispanic women is extreme, with just over two-thirds working in three areas: cleaning (31.9 percent, which includes private house cleaning and work in hotels or offices), food preparation (29.6 percent), and factory work (11.6 percent). An additional 5.4 and 5.9 percent of women worked in childcare and laundry, respectively. Overall,

a scant 15.6 percent of women worked outside of these Hispanic immigrant niches, in occupations as varied as retail, cosmetology, and construction.

Multivariate Results

While the descriptive statistics described above certainly contribute to the disadvantage of Hispanic immigrant women relative to other groups, there is considerable variation in employment patterns among these women in Durham. The next set of analyses investigates the social forces undergirding this variation.

Model of labor force participation and occupation

Table 2 reports results from binomial and multinomial logit models predicting the odds of working for pay, as well as of being in one of six employment categories relative to not working. Results demonstrate surprisingly modest effects of human capital and immigration characteristics on the labor supply and occupational choices of immigrant Hispanic women. While age is positively associated with employment overall and in most occupations relative to not working, education has virtually no effect. Thus, not only is there no evidence that better educated women face greater opportunity costs for non-work, there also seem to be few human capital requirements for the occupational niches in which immigrant Hispanic women work. The only exception women who did not advance beyond primary school, who are significantly less likely than more educated women to find work outside of immigrant niches. English skills, on the other hand, positively predict both employment overall and in fields that require more interaction with natives, namely childcare and non-niche occupations. The effect of lack of documentation, while negative, is not a significant constraint of women's employment overall. However, there is important variation across occupations as undocumented women were significantly more

likely to work in childcare and significantly less likely to work outside of Hispanic niches and in factory work.

By far the strongest and most consistent predictors of women's work relate to family structure, and, not surprisingly, point to a significant conflict between work and family life among these women. Women who are married and living with children are significantly less likely to work than all other types of women. Unmarried women not living with children are the most likely to work, followed by unmarried women with children and married women without co-resident children. Thus from a simple comparison of the size of the coefficients across categories, it would seem that being married is at least as large an impediment to working as having children, if not larger. Indeed, additional models (see Appendix A) that control for marital status and children separately show that marriage exerts an independent negative effect on working even after accounting for the presence of children. It is important to note, however, that for two occupations, namely childcare and laundry work, there are few differences between married women with children and others with respect to employment probabilities. This suggests that the conflict between work and family is lower in these occupations.

Results also indicate the importance of family structure characteristics that extend beyond marital status and co-resident children. In particular, transnational childrearing also significantly shapes employment decisions among immigrant women. That is, women who have minor children residing in their countries of origin are significantly more likely to work than those who do not, even net of U.S. childrearing responsibilities and marriage. Thus, while the daily needs of caring for the children under their roof impede immigrant women's employment, the financial needs of supporting non-resident children encourage it. This finding adds to a growing literature on transnational families that suggests that migration is expanding the boundaries of motherhood

to include not only caring work but also financial provision (Parreñas 2005). Living arrangements are also important predictors of women's employment, with those living in crowded apartments significantly less likely to work than their peers in less crowded conditions. To ensure that this dimension of living arrangements is more merely picking up on the effect of having a greater number of children, I also estimated models that include controls for number of children in the household. Results (see Appendix A) indicate that the effect of crowding remains even net of number of children present.

Hours worked in a typical week

While models of employment offer tremendous insight into the forces shaping immigrant women's economic incorporation, they fail to address the considerable variation in the extent of market engagement among working women. Accordingly, Table 3 reports results from models predicting hours worked during a typical week among working women. Once again human capital and immigration characteristics explain very little of the variation in work hours among working women. Factors such as age, education, work experience in home countries, and even English skills do not predict hours worked. Women with longer Durham residence, however, do average longer work weeks than more recently arrived women. The opposite is true for undocumented women, who average 3.4 fewer work hours per week than their legal resident peers. However, both of these effects are accounted for by the disadvantaged occupational characteristics of recently arrived and undocumented workers; when we account for occupation, firm size, subcontracting, and working at a Hispanic worksite, these variables no longer significantly predict work hours. Working for a small firm, in particular, is associated with fewer work hours per week, and is also more common among recently arrived and undocumented women. Factory work, in contrast, is associated with longer work hours.

Table 3 also presents results from a multinomial logistic regression distinguishing between non-working women (reference) and women working fewer than 20 hours per week, working between 20 and 34 hours, and working full time (more than 35 hours). This model shows that women working less than 20 hours per week were all but statistically indistinguishable from those who did not work at all. Likewise, while older women and those who are unmarried or without children are more likely to work intermediate hours, relative to not working, there are also modest differences between intermediate hours and non-work. Thus the largest differences are seen between women who work full time and others, rather than between non-working women and others. As in the OLS model, age, time in Durham, and English skills are important determinants of full time work. Likewise, the importance of family constraints on women's labor supply is again evident, as those who are married with children are significantly less likely to work than other women, with the greatest differences being with those who are single and childless. And, while non-resident children do not seem to encourage very low or part time hours, the need to provide for children abroad is associated with higher odds of full time work relative to non-work among these women.

The effect of crowding on work hours is also evident, although the effect is non-linear. That is, while crowding does not predict work hours in the linear model or discourage intermediate hours, it is negatively associated with both very low hours and full time work. While the implications of these patterns are speculative, this is consistent with the idea that for women extension adds to domestic responsibilities, undermining full time work. At the same time, the additional household income brought in by extension may discourage women from pursuing odd jobs with very low hours.

Weeks without work during the previous year

While the number of hours worked per week is an essential aspect of women's labor supply, it is also important to assess the considerable variation in the number of weeks worked over the course of the year. Table 4 presents results from negative binomial regression models predicting the total weeks out of work during the previous year, and the number of weeks without work that were attributed specifically to insufficient demand and family responsibilities[3] separately. With respect to total weeks out of work during the previous year, there are once again few human capital or immigration characteristics that predict this element of labor supply. Thus, in Durham's highly segmented immigrant labor market, better educated working women seem no more insulated from employment instability than their less educated peers, even when we focus on demand-related spells without work. Women who had worked in their countries of origin and with longer residence in Durham, on the other hand, did average significantly less time without work than other women, net of other factors. Both of these characteristics seem to alter the relationship between family constraints and paid work effort, since they are negatively associated with time out of work due to childcare rather than time without work due to insufficient demand. The opposite pattern is evident for legal status, which does not predict time out of work due to childbearing but does significantly increase time out due to lack of work. In fact, undocumented workers average more than four full additional weeks without work than their counterparts with legal authorization to work. Aside from the obvious relationship between the presence of children and time out of work due to childrearing responsibilities, family structure exerts little influence over the number of weeks worked over the course of the year. And finally, work demand seems steadiest in laundry occupations, which is the only occupation

[3] Due to the co-linearity between family structure and time out of work due to childrearing responsibilities and small sample size, this model was restricted to women with children and subcontracting and ethnic concentration were dropped from the model.

to average significantly fewer weeks of non-work than food preparation. Small firms, on the other hand, are associated with greater employment instability and more weeks without work due to low demand.

Conclusions

Immigrant Hispanic women suffer from multiple intersecting disadvantages in the U.S. labor market owing to their severe concentration in a handful of occupations within the low wage sector, over-representation among the millions of undocumented women living in the United States today, and position in relatively traditional families in which women who are married and with children often find it difficult to balance work and family. The main purpose of this paper was to examine in detail how these disadvantages combine to shape the labor supply of immigrant Hispanic women. Drawing on an original survey specifically designed to capture the legal, employment, and family structure characteristics most germane immigrant women, I depart from previous analyses by taking a more expansive view of labor supply, considering not only whether women work, but also in what occupations, as well as variation in the hours and weeks worked among the employed. I also take a transnational view of the family, considering not only the presence of children in the household, but also the impact of non-resident children in respondents' country of origin.

Results demonstrate numerous ways in which Hispanic immigrant women's position in the overall economy constrain their labor supply. In the occupational niches in which immigrant women in Durham concentrate there are few signs that human capital is a significant determinant of labor force participation. While older women are more likely to work and work longer hours than their younger counterparts, education has virtually no effect on employment probabilities or

work effort among the employed. Among human capital and immigration characteristics it is primarily English language ability and time in Durham that shape immigrant women's labor supply. Those with better English skills are more likely to work overall and to work full time, and are also more likely to procure jobs in childcare and non-niche occupations, which entail more interaction with non-immigrants. Women with longer tenures in Durham are also more likely to work, and have greater access to factory employment and longer hours. However, while they also spent less time out of the labor market over the previous year, it is primarily because they spent fewer weeks attending to children rather than because they were more successful at avoiding idleness due to slack labor demand.

The disadvantage associated with immigrant Hispanic women's position in the legal system is also clearly evident. While the laws discouraging unauthorized immigrant women's employment do not seem to work as intended – undocumented women are no less likely to work overall than their legal resident peers – they do significantly shape labor supply via their effect on occupation, other employment conditions, and hours and weeks worked. First, lack of documentation blocks women's entry into factory and non-niche occupations, where pay is often higher and work tends to be more stable (Author YEAR), instead pushing them into childcare. Second, even net of human capital and other immigration characteristics, undocumented women tend to work fewer hours per week, in large part because they are funneled disproportionately into small firms where the opportunity for full time work is limited. And finally, undocumented women also experience greater employment instability and more weeks out of work during the previous year than their legal resident counterparts. Moreover, the impact on weeks without work is evident only for reasons relating to insufficient labor demand, and not to those pertaining to childrearing. These effects on instability hold even over and above the association between

documentation and working in small firms, which is itself associated with greater time out of work due to slack demand. The cost to undocumented women in terms of hours and weeks of work lost is thus sizeable.

And finally, results also demonstrate the profound limits to employment posed by immigrant Hispanic women's family arrangements. Both marriage and childrearing responsibilities exert independent negative effects on women's employment. Indeed, marriage itself seems to be as large if not a larger impediment to work as co-resident children. This finding replicates those of previous studies (Kahn and Whittington 1996) and supports ethnographic work that highlights the cultural prescriptions against married women's work among some immigrant Hispanic women (Menjivar 2000). Married women and those with co-resident children are not only less likely to work, they also work fewer hours per week and experience significant family-related inactivity over the course of the year. It is important to note, however, that the conflict between work and family is not uniform across occupations. Childcare and laundry work, in particular, stand out as posing fewer barriers to work for women who are married and with children.

Results also indicate that the effect of children on women's employment does not end with those who are living in the household. It is important to acknowledge transnational aspects of family and childrearing; women with minor children in their countries of origin are more likely to work than those who do not, even net of household structure in Durham. Likewise, living arrangements also shape women's work trajectories, as women living in crowded conditions are less likely to work overall and also less likely to work very low or full time hours. Taken together, these findings support the need to take a broad view of the family when considering the work experiences of immigrant women.

A number of caveats are in order. First, our relatively small sample size warrants caution when interpreting results. The lack of variation in legal status and English language ability among this recently arrived population prevents strong conclusions about their lack of effect on some employment outcomes. Second, these findings were obtained from a case study of Durham, NC and are not necessarily generalizable to all low-skill Hispanic immigrants living in the United States. However, there is reason to believe that they may be applicable to other new destinations, particularly in the Southeast. While cities like Charlotte, NC and Atlanta, GA, and Durham differ somewhat in their industrial compositions they have all grown dramatically in recent decades in their native populations, with attendant growth in demand for low-skill services and sharp rise in Hispanic immigrant populations after 1990.

In spite of these limitations, these findings demonstrate the utility of intersectionality for understanding immigrant Hispanic women's employment patterns. Their experiences in the labor market cannot be understood without considering the multiple and intersecting sources of disadvantage stemming from their position in a highly segmented labor market, as immigrant and undocumented workers, and in families in which wives and mothers shoulder a disproportionate share of the burden of household reproduction. Given the economic need of the families in which these women are embedded, the sizeable and numerous impediments to stable, full time employment are a cause for serious concern. While employment conditions improve with age and time in the local labor market, the effects are relatively modest and suggest sustained disadvantage over the course of these women's lives.

References

Acker, Joan. 2006. Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & Society* 20: 441-464.

Belliveau, Michele. 2011. Gendered matters: Undocumented Mexican mothers in the current policy context. *Journal of Women and Social Work* 26: 32-46.

Blau, Francine and Lawrence Kahn. 2007. Gender and assimilation among Mexican Americans. In George Borjas (ed) *Mexican Immigration to the United States.* Washington D.C.: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2011. "Employment status of the foreign-born and native-born populations by selected characteristics, 2009-10." Economic Release: Table 1.

Capps, Randy, Karina Fortuny, and Michael Fix. 2007. Trends in the Low-Wage Immigrant Labor Force, 2000–2005. Washington DC: The Urban Institute.

Catanzarite, Lisa and Michael Aguilera. 2002. Working with co-ethnics: Earnings penalties for Latino immigrants at Latino jobsites. *Social Problems* 49: 101-127.

Christopher, Karen. 1996. Explaining the recent employment gap between Black and white women. *Sociological Focus* 29: 263-80.

Choo, Hae Yeon and Myra Marx Ferree. 2010. Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological Theory:* 129-149.

Cobb-Clark, Deborah and Sherrie Kossoudji. 1999. Did legalization matter for women? Amnesty and the wage determinants of formerly unauthorized Latina workers. *Gender Issues:* 3-14.

Cohen, Philip. 2002. Extended households at work: Living arrangements and inequality in single mothers' employment. *Sociological Forum* 17: 445-463.

Cohen, Philip and Suzanne Bianchi. 1999. Marriage, children, and women's employment: What do we know? *Monthly Labor Review* 122: 22-31.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

De Jong, Gordon and Anna Madamba. 2001. A double disadvantage? Minority group, immigrant status, and underemployment in the United States. *Social Science Quarterly* 82: 117-130.

Donato, Katharine, Chizuko Wakabayashi, Shirin Hakimzadeh and Amada Armenta. 2008. Shifts in the Employment Conditions of Mexican Immigrant Men and Women: The effects of U.S. Immigration Policy. *Work and Occupations* 35: 462-495.

Enchautegui, Maria. 1998. Low-Skilled Immigrants and the Changing American Labor Market. *Population and Development Review* 24:811–24.

England, Paula, Carmen Garcia-Beaulieu, and Mary Ross. 2004. Women's employment among Blacks, Whites, and three groups of Latinas: Do more privileged women have higher employment? *Gender & Society* 18: 494-509.

Flippen, Chenoa. 2012. Laboring Underground: The Employment Patterns of Hispanic Immigrant Men in Durham, NC. *Social Problems* 59: 21-42.

Flippen, Chenoa and Emilio Parrado. 2012. The formation and evolution of Hispanic neighborhoods in new destinations: A case study of Durham, NC. *City and Community* 11: 1-30.

Greenlees, Clyde and Rogelio Saenz. 1999. Determinants of employment of recently arrived Mexican immigrant wives. *International Migration Review* 33: 354-377.

Hall, Matthew, Emily Greenman, and George Farkas. 2010. Legal status and wage disparities for Mexican immigrants. *Social Forces* 89: 491-514.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 2001. *Doméstica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in the Shadows of Affluence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hauan, Susan, Nancy Landale, and Kevin Leicht. 2000. Poverty and work effort among urban Latino men. *Work and Occupations* 27: 188-222.

Hudson, Kenneth. 2007. The new labor market segmentation: Labor market dualism in the new economy. *Social Science Research* 36: 286-312.

Israel, Barbara, Eugenia Eng, Amy Schulz, Edith Parker (eds). 2005. *Methods in Community-based Participatory Research for Health*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson-Webb, Karen. 2003. *Recruiting Hispanic Labor: Immigrants in Non-traditional Areas*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.

Kahn, Joan and Leslie Whittington. 1996. The labor supply of Latinas in the USA: Comparing labor force participation, wages, and hours worked with Anglo and Black women. *Population Research and Policy Review:* 15: 45-73.

Kalleberg, Arne. 2011. *Good Jobs, Bad Jobs: The Rise of Polarized and Precarious Employment Systems in the United States, 19702-2000s*. New York: Russell Sage.

King, Mary. 2011. Mexican women and work on both sides of the U.S.-Mexico border. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology:* 615-638.

Massey, Douglas and Katherine Bartley. 2005. The changing legal status distribution of immigrants: A caution. *International Migration Review* 39: 469-484.

Menjivar, Cecilia. 2000. *Fragmented Ties: Salvadoran Immigrant Networks in America.* Berkely, CA: University of California Press.

Myers, Dowell and Cynthia Cranford. 1998. Temporal differentiation in the occupational mobility of immigrant and native-born Latina workers. *American Sociological Review* 63: 68-93.

Omori, Megumi and Danielle Smith. 2010. Working and living: The effects of family responsibilities and characteristics on married women's work hours in the USA. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* :43-55.

Parreñas, Rhacel. 2005. *Children of Global Migration: Transnational Families and Gendered Woes.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Read, Jen'nan and Philip Cohen. 2007. One size fits all? Explaining U.S.-born and immigrant women's employment across 12 ethnic groups. *Social Forces* 85: 1713-1734.

Stier, Haya and Marta Tienda. 1992. Family, work and women: The labor supply of Hispanic immigrant wives. *International Migration Review* 26: 1291-1312.

Tienda, Marta and Jennifer Glass. 1985. Household structure and labor force participation of black, Hispanic, and white mothers. *Demography* 22: 381-394.

Watters, John and Patrick Biernacki. 1989. "Targeted sampling: Options for the study of hidden populations." *Social Problems* 36:416-430.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

	Women		N
Dependent variables			
Working at time of survey	57.9%		1119
Hours worked per week among working (mean)	35.60	(9.7)	910
<20	10.0%		
20-35	21.4%		
35+	68.6%		
Weeks out of work previous year (mean)	8.9%	-(15.0)	339
% experiencing instability	50.5%		
Reasons for weeks out (%)			
Family	31.2%		
Underemployment/lack of demand	54.1%		
Illness	7.3%		
Other	7.3%		
Explanatory variables			
Human capital and immigration characteristics			1119
Age (mean)	29.8%	(7.7)	
Education			
6 years or less	43.6%		
7-9	26.8%		
10 or more	29.6%		
Worked in country of origin	58.5%		
Years in Durham (mean)	4.3	(3.5)	
Good English	7.1%		
Undocumented	88.3%		
Family and household structure			1119
Marriage and childbearing			
Married, living with children	61.4%		
Married, no co-resident children	19.0%		
Unmarried, living with children	10.6%		
Unmarried, no co-resident children	9.0%		
Non-resident minor child in country of origin	22.2%		
Crowded living arrangements	18.1%		
Employment characteristics			1119
Type of Occupation			
Food	29.6%		
Childcare	5.4%		
Cleaning	31.9%		
Laundry	5.9%		
Factory	11.6%		
Non-niche	15.6%		
Subcontractor	8.6%		
Hispanic worksite	41.3%		
Small firm	33.3%		

Table 2. Binomial and multinomial logit models predicting employment, and employment in particular occupation relative to not working

		Working in particular type of occupation (ref=not working)					
	Working	Food	Childcare	Cleaning	Laundry	Factory	Non-niche
Human capital							
Age	0.25 **	0.21 **	0.41 **	0.25 **	0.23	0.23 *	0.32 **
	(0.06)	(0.09)	(0.19)	(0.08)	(0.18)	(0.13)	(0.11)
Age squared	0.00 **	0.00 **	-0.01 *	0.00 **	0.00	0.00 *	0.00 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Education (ref = 10 years or more)							
6 years or less	-0.12	-0.03	-0.68	0.10	-0.12	-0.12	-0.55 *
	(0.16)	(0.22)	(0.44)	(0.23)	(0.41)	(0.32)	(0.29)
7-9 years	-0.07	-0.17	-0.14	0.23	-0.53	-0.11	-0.24
	(0.18)	(0.24)	(0.43)	(0.24)	(0.50)	(0.35)	(0.30)
Worked in Mexico	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.09	-0.25	0.24	-0.08
	(0.14)	(0.18)	(0.36)	(0.18)	(0.35)	(0.28)	(0.24)
Immigration characteristics							
Time in Durham	0.03 *	0.04	-0.09	0.03	0.02	0.09 **	0.05
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Good English	0.64 **	0.42	1.39 **	0.63	-0.81	0.02	1.24 **
	(0.30)	(0.40)	(0.65)	(0.39)	(1.09)	(0.61)	(0.40)
Undocumented	-0.34	-0.20	1.73 *	-0.27	-0.59	-0.70 *	-0.77 **
	(0.23)	(0.31)	(1.07)	(0.29)	(0.55)	(0.38)	(0.33)
Family and household structure							
Marital status (ref = married, with co-resident children)							
Marr., no co-res children	0.57 **	0.53 **	0.26	0.43 *	0.12	0.84 **	1.05 **
	(0.18)	(0.25)	(0.46)	(0.25)	(0.49)	(0.35)	(0.32)
Unmarr., co-res children	1.00 **	1.11 **	-0.82	0.82 **	0.41	1.35 **	1.44 **
	(0.24)	(0.30)	(1.05)	(0.31)	(0.66)	(0.39)	(0.37)
Unmarr., no co-res children	1.79 **	1.89 **	1.20 *	1.75 **	1.37 **	1.50 **	2.23 **
	(0.30)	(0.35)	(0.64)	(0.36)	(0.63)	(0.53)	(0.42)
Minor non-resident children	0.43 **	0.39 *	0.41	0.50 **	0.59	0.56 *	0.18
	(0.17)	(0.22)	(0.42)	(0.22)	(0.41)	(0.31)	(0.30)
Crowded living arrangements	-0.51 **	-0.30 *	-0.29	-0.60 **	-0.97 **	-0.39	-0.76 **
	(0.13)	(0.18)	(0.36)	(0.18)	(0.38)	(0.26)	(0.25)
Intercept	-4.01 **	-4.47 **	-11.12 **	-5.58 **	-5.21 *	-6.00 **	-6.69 **
	(1.02)	(1.37)	(3.18)	(1.39)	(2.84)	(2.09)	(1.80)
Chi-square	145.52 **			227.94 **			

** p<0.05 * p<0.10

Table 3. Models of hours worked per week among working women

	OLS of hours worked				Multinomial reg. (ref=not working)					
	Model 1		Model 2		<20 hours		20-34 hours		35+ hours	
Human capital										
Age	0.13	(0.44)	0.08	(0.41)	0.18	(0.13)	0.36	(0.11) **	0.22	(0.08) **
Age sq	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00) **	0.00	(0.00) **
Education (ref = 10 years or more)										
6 years or less	-0.54	(1.13)	-0.15	(1.05)	0.18	(0.34)	-0.28	(0.28)	-0.23	(0.20)
7-9 years	-0.01	(1.26)	0.36	(1.17)	-0.17	(0.39)	-0.48	(0.31)	-0.21	(0.22)
Worked in country of origin	-0.28	(0.95)	-0.76	(0.89)	0.06	(0.28)	-0.41	(0.23) *	0.04	(0.17)
Immigration characteristics										
Time in Durham	0.23	(0.12) *	0.17	(0.12)	-0.04	(0.04)	0.00	(0.03)	0.07	(0.02) **
Good English	-0.71	(1.79)	-0.46	(1.68)	0.51	(0.69)	0.37	(0.50)	0.66	(0.36) *
Undocumented	-3.36	(1.50) **	-2.22	(1.40)	1.19	(0.77)	-0.25	(0.40)	-0.32	(0.29)
Family and household structure										
Marital status (ref = married, with co-resident children)										
Married, no co-res children	2.97	(1.27) **	2.07	(1.19) *	-0.09	(0.39)	0.80	(0.31) **	0.68	(0.22) **
Unmarried, co-res children	3.75	(1.37) **	2.73	(1.27) **	-0.26	(0.65)	1.25	(0.39) **	1.39	(0.29) **
Unmarried, no co-res children	3.65	(1.51) **	3.20	(1.40) **	0.81	(0.58)	1.95	(0.45) **	1.95	(0.36) **
Non-resident children	0.60	(1.08)	0.50	(1.03)	0.26	(0.34)	0.16	(0.29)	0.55	(0.20) **
Crowded	0.50	(0.96)	0.41	(0.91)	-0.57	(0.28) **	-0.27	(0.23)	-0.47	(0.16) **
Employment characteristics										
Occupation (ref = food preparation)										
Childcare			2.05	(1.94)						
Cleaning			-1.07	(1.05)						
Laundry			1.01	(1.97)						
Factory			3.32	(1.52) **						
Non-niche			-0.10	(1.56)						
Labor market position										
Subcontractor			-0.51	(1.23)						
Hispanic worksite			0.84	(0.94)						
Small firm			-2.25	(0.96) **						
Intercept	34.51	(7.28) **	35.61	(6.84) **	-6.06	(2.21) **	-7.11	(1.78) **	-4.06	(1.22) **
N	542									
R squared	0.040		0.056		0.077					

** p<0.05 * p<0.10

Table 4. Negative Binomial models of weeks out of the labor force previous year

	Weeks out - any reason		Weeks out - slack demand		Weeks out - childcare	
Human capital						
Age	-0.24	(0.16)	-0.28	(0.32)	0.17	(0.58)
Age sq	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.00)	0.00	(0.01)
Education (ref = 10 years or more)						
6 years or less	-0.06	(0.43)	-0.56	(0.76)	-0.22	(1.80)
7-9 years	0.20	(0.49)	0.18	(0.75)	-0.45	(2.12)
Worked in country of origin	-0.75	(0.38) **	-0.83	(0.65)	-2.77	(1.51) *
Immigration characteristics						
Time in Durham	-0.14	(0.05) **	0.00	(0.09)	-0.57	(0.24) **
Good English	0.03	(0.75)	-2.23	(1.62)	-0.10	(3.50)
Undocumented	0.24	(0.59)	4.34	(1.49) **	1.91	(3.00)
Family/household structure						
Marital status (ref = married, with co-resident children)					-1.08	(1.72)
Married, no co-res children	-0.90	(0.58)	0.92	(1.25)	-	-
Unmarried, co-res children	0.00	(0.59)	-0.83	(0.99)	-	-
Unmarried, no co-res children	-0.91	(0.65)	-0.94	(1.10)	-	-
Non-resident children	0.52	(0.41)	1.06	(0.77)	-0.36	(1.23)
Crowded	0.21	(0.35)	-0.42	(0.57)	-1.11	(1.38)
Employment characteristics						
Occupation (ref = food preparation)						
Childcare	-0.98	(0.75)	0.07	(1.08)	-1.49	(2.75)
Cleaning	-0.49	(0.47)	-0.56	(0.71)	1.12	(1.59)
Laundry	-2.88	(0.84) **	-3.52	(1.56) **	-2.88	(2.56)
Factory	0.57	(0.60)	0.42	(1.14)	1.42	(1.95)
Non-niche	0.65	(0.64)	-0.47	(0.99)	-0.38	(1.91)
Labor market position						
Subcontractor	-0.04	(0.55)	0.43	(0.92)	-	-
Hispanic worksite	0.52	(0.39)	0.04	(0.74)	-	-
Small firm	0.71	(0.40) *	0.91	(0.50) *	-0.14	(1.59)
Intercept	6.12	(2.77) **	0.86	(5.43)	3.54	(10.74)
Pseudo R2	0.025		0.038		0.040	

** p<0.05 * p<0.10

Appendix A. Binomial logit model predicting employment: Alternative specification of family and household structure

Human capital		
Age	0.25	(0.06) **
Age squared	0.00	(0.00) **
Education (ref = 10 years or more)		
6 years or less	-0.13	(0.16)
7-9 years	-0.08	(0.18)
Worked in Mexico	0.03	(0.14)
Immigration characteristics		
Time in Durham	0.03	(0.02)
Good English	0.62	(0.30) **
Undocumented	-0.31	(0.23)
Family and household structure		
Married	-1.10	(0.20) **
# Co-resident children (ref-none)		
One	-0.31	(0.18) *
Two	-0.66	(0.21) **
Three or more	-0.67	(0.26) **
Minor non-resident children	0.42	(0.17) **
Crowded living arrangements	-0.49	(0.14) **
Intercept	-2.45	(0.99) **
Chi-square	143.43 **	

** p<0.05 * p<0.10