

“SCHOOL OR WORK” OR “SCHOOL AND WORK”? ENROLLMENT AND INTERGENERATIONAL VARIATION IN WORK ACTIVITY AMONG MEXICAN-ORIGIN ADOLESCENTS

James D. Bachmeier

Frank D. Bean

University of California, Irvine

September 2008

ABSTRACT

This paper compares patterns of school enrollment, labor force participation and work intensity among four generational groups of Mexican-origin adolescents with those of 3rd-and-later generation non-Latino white and black adolescents. Consistent with perspectives viewing the school and work orientations of early-generation Mexican-origin youths as influenced by the countervailing pressures of a labor migrant culture on the one hand, and immigrant optimism on the other, I find that school enrollment and labor force participation tend to be more mutually exclusive among these youths, as compared with later-generation Mexicans, whites, and blacks. Early-generation Mexican-origin youth are less likely to pursue school and labor force participation simultaneously. Those not enrolled in school tend to participate in the labor force to a greater extent, and work more intensively than their later-generation counterparts. By contrast, those enrolled in school are less likely to participate in the labor force, and work less intensively. I argue that these findings carry implications for contemporary perspectives of immigrant incorporation and for research on racial/ethnic differences in adolescent school enrollment and labor force participation.

This extended abstract was prepared for submission to the 2009 annual meetings of the Population Association of America, in Detroit, MI, April 20-May 2, 2009. Please direct questions or comments to James D. Bachmeier, jbachmei@uci.edu

INTRODUCTION

While research examining the intersection of youth employment and schooling continues to debate the extent to which adolescent work activity is complementary (or deleterious) to development and academic pursuits, two findings are relatively clear. First, most American adolescents work at some point before leaving high school (Lee and Staff 2007). Second, under certain conditions and insofar as schooling is not too intensive, early work experience can enhance, both directly and indirectly, social and economic outcomes later in the life-course (Mortimer 2003). Thus, it is normative for adolescents to work while in school and work *can* serve as a complement to schooling and development.

Research seeking to understand the determinants of adolescent employment and work intensity, how work and work intensity during the school years shapes subsequent life outcomes, and how these effects vary with social background factors has relied heavily on longitudinal survey data (e.g., Lee and Staff 2007; Warren and Lee 2003). These data sources tend to have relatively small sample sizes compared to larger cross-sectional census surveys. One significant implication of this has been that for the most part, this research has been unable to examine whether dynamics related to immigration have any effect on adolescent employment, schooling and their interaction (for a recent exception, see Perreira et al. 2007). Instead, most analyses using longitudinal data are forced to group minorities into, at best, large pan-ethnic groupings. This ignores both considerable national-origins diversity within pan-ethnic groups, but also, and arguably more importantly, differences in school and work orientations that might exist between the different generations of immigrant-origin youth (Portes and Rumbaut 2006).

In this paper I use 2000 Census data to examine how school enrollment shapes labor force participation and work intensity among four generational groups of Mexican-origin

adolescent boys and girls. I also analyze how the relationship between schooling and work among Mexican-origin youth changes over time, and whether it converges to patterns exhibited by 3rd and later generation non-Latino white and black adolescents.

It would be difficult to overstate the importance of understanding the relationship between schooling and work among Mexican-origin youths in the United States. Mexican immigrants and their offspring constitute the overwhelming majority of immigrant ethnic groups and thereby represent America's fastest growing minority. Furthermore, Mexican-origin children are primarily the descendants of labor migrants who arrive in the U.S. with strikingly low levels of education, relative to native-born persons, and who constitute a disproportionate share of the unauthorized immigrant population. These facts have led to growing concerns among researchers and policy makers that the obstacles to socio-economic attainment facing their parents may prevent Mexican-origin children from eventually joining the mainstream of American society (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Portes and Zhou 1993).

BACKGROUND

Labor Migrant Work Culture, Immigrant Optimism, and the Bifurcation of School and Work.

To derive a set of hypotheses pertaining to the varying influence of school enrollment on labor force participation and work intensity among Mexican-origin youth, I conceive of Mexican labor migrants as representing a working class culture with orientations to work and schooling that are distinct from the orientations of the mainstream, middle-class culture of the United States (Lareau 2003). Naturally, as the children of labor migrants, early-generation Mexican-origin children are reared in communities in which intensive work, especially among men, is highly valued. Students of the dynamics of Mexican migration have found evidence of a “culture” of labor migration in Mexican sending communities in which boys especially, come to

view labor migration to the U.S. as a normative stage in the life-course and fully expect to emigrate for work (Kandel and Massey 2002). Furthermore, labor migrants residing abroad are heralded for their work by residents who remain in the sending communities, reinforcing this cultural orientation toward work (Massey et al. 1987; Smith 2005). The tendency of Mexican immigrants to be oriented toward work, rather than school, is further exacerbated by the fact that public education in Mexico typically does not extend beyond the 8th grade.

This culture of work among the immigrant generation is likely to have a strong influence on the orientations of early-generation Mexican-origin youths as well, leading a substantial number, especially boys, to leave school early in favor of intense work. However, Kao and Tienda (1995) have pointed to “immigrant optimism” as a process among children of low-skilled migrants that may run counter to the tendency to focus exclusively on work at young ages, and encourage a more exclusive focus on school. The immigrant optimism perspective suggests that the children of labor migrants may be instilled with a strong commitment to academic achievement resulting from the recognition and appreciation for their parents’ sacrifices. Thus, these seemingly countervailing processes could lead to a bifurcation of school and work orientations among early generation Mexican-origin youths, even within the same family, with some youths responding to the influences of labor migrant culture and devoting themselves exclusively to work, while others, motivated by immigrant optimism, concentrate exclusively on school. This pattern of a working-class, bifurcated orientation to work and school is distinct from the orientations among the mainstream American middle-class which tends to view school and certain types and amounts of work as complementary to one another (Mortimer 2003).

Hypothesis 1: Intergenerational Patterns of School Enrollment and Labor Force Participation.

First, insofar as the tendency in a culture of labor migration is to view school and work as mutually exclusive activities, then in generations of Mexican-origin youth closer to the immigrant generation, one would expect to find fewer youths pursuing both simultaneously, relative to later generation Mexican-origin groups, as well as to other 3rd-and-later generation groups. In other words, patterns of school and work bifurcation should be stronger among early-generation Mexican-origin youths, and wane as generational time increases. Second, by the same logic, even if fewer early generation Mexican-origin youths worked, it is expected that those who do work, do so more intensively than other groups, but only among those not enrolled in school. Third, these patterns are likely to be stronger for boys than for girls, and indeed, may only hold for boys, given the traditionally patriarchal work and family arrangements among Mexican immigrants.

Hypothesis 2: The Nature of Convergence with Native-Born Groups: Assimilation into the Mainstream or “Underclass”?

Recent reformulations of the classic assimilation model, particularly those stressing the likelihood of “delayed” assimilation (Brown and Bean 2006; Bean and Stevens 2003) for Mexicans owing to their low-levels of human capital and disproportionate tendency to be unauthorized, nonetheless, would predict the eventual convergence of school-work patterns among Mexican-origin youth with those exhibited by the native-born majority (i.e. 3rd+ generation non-Hispanic whites). More specifically, insofar as the normative trend among youths in the mainstream of society is to enroll in school at relatively high rates and to display high rates of labor force participation with low work intensity, 3rd+ generation Mexican-origin youth should display convergence toward this tendency.

In stark contrast to the assimilation perspective, the theory of segmented assimilation would predict that as youths are increasingly removed from the labor migrant generation, the

perception of discrimination and opportunity blockage will instill an oppositional outlook in youth that is inimical to both schooling and labor force attachment (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Portes and Zhou 1993). Thus, segmented assimilation theory suggests that as Mexican-origin youth become increasingly removed from the labor migrant culture in later generations, their school and work orientations will converge not with those of the mainstream majority but rather with those exhibited by groups often associated with the inner-city minority “underclass” (i.e., 3rd+ generation blacks). Thus, youth idleness, neither working nor attending school, should increase across generations, all else being equal. In addition, segmented assimilation theory predicts that among those Mexican youth remaining in school, levels of labor force participation and work intensity will converge with those of blacks, rather than of whites, all else equal.

DATA AND METHODS

I use data from the 5% sample of the 2000 Census IPUMs (Ruggles et al. 2004). The primary motivation in employing this data source is that it provides a large enough sample to undertake the inter-generational analysis that is of primary interest here. The analytical sample is restricted to adolescents, ages 16-17, who have not yet graduated high school and are living with at least one parent. 16-17 year-olds are the target age group because they can legally work, and thus report work-activity in the Census; are of an age when they can legally decide to leave school; and are more likely to be residing in the home of their parent(s) than are young people at or above age 18. Also, though presenting issues of selectivity (blacks and 3rd generation Mexicans are more likely to be institutionalized, and therefore less likely to be included in the sample) restricting the sample to those adolescents living with at least one parent allows one to examine the role of parental educational attainment and other parental characteristics on their children’s school enrollment and labor market activity. Furthermore, it also allows one to

disaggregate the 2nd generation of Mexican-origin adolescents from the 3rd+ based on the determination of parents' place of birth.

The key dependent variables of interest are labor force participation and work intensity. Labor force participation is measured with a binary indicator coded "1" if youths report participation in the labor force, regardless of their employment status. Work intensity is approximated with two measures, but can only be measured among those reporting work activity in the year prior to the Census. The two measures are the number of weeks worked during 1999 and the usual number of hours worked per week during that year. Given that the distribution of the "hours-worked" measure is heavily influenced by a small percentage of youths reporting a very large number of hours worked, this variable is logged in multivariate models.

Key independent variables are school enrollment and generation and racial ethnic group. School enrollment is operationalized by a measure of *non-enrollment*, which is coded "1" for youths indicating that they were not enrolled in school at the time of the census. Patterns of labor force participation, work intensity, and their interaction with school enrollment are examined across the following six generational and racial/ethnic groups: (1) 1.5 generation Mexican (2) 1.75 generation Mexican (3) 2nd generation Mexican (4) 3rd+ generation Mexican (5) 3rd+ generation non-Latino white (6) 3rd+ generation non-Latino black. Generational status is determined by appending nativity information of the parent(s) to the census records of the youths included in the sample. 1.5 generation youths are those born in Mexico to Mexican-born parents, and immigrating to the U.S. between the ages of 6 and 12. 1.75 generation youths are those immigrating prior to the age of 6. 2nd generation youths are those born in the U.S. to Mexican-born parents. 3rd+ generation youths are those born in the U.S. to native-born parents. Generational status is determined based on the nativity of the mother, except in families in which

the youths' mother is not present, in which case, father's nativity is used to determine generational status. Because of the anticipated gender differences, analyses are carried out separately for boys and girls.

In multivariate analyses, I also control for a number of background factors that have been shown to affect labor force participation and school enrollment. These include age, English-proficiency, family SES, family size and structure, and residence in a metropolitan area. A description of sample means and standard deviations of all variables used in the analyses are presented in Table 1.

FINDINGS

Given the 20-page limitation for ASA paper submissions, the following represents an abbreviated discussion of the findings. In the interest of meeting the page limitation, I have replaced a nuanced discussion of the results presented in the following tables, with a relatively brief outline of the overall patterns, and their significance in relation to the hypotheses posited above.

Table 2 presents zero-order comparisons of labor-force participation and school enrollment across groups for boys and girls separately. The results in this table provide preliminary evidence in support of the labor migrant culture perspective stressing the bifurcation of school and work orientations among early-early generation Mexican-origin youth. Among boys, 1.5 and 1.75 generation Mexicans are both the most likely to be working exclusively (not enrolled, but in the labor force) and attending school exclusively (enrolled, but not in the labor force). Among both boys and girls of Mexican-origin, the tendency to mix work and school increases with generational time, but fails to reach the levels exhibited by 3rd+ generation whites. 3rd+ generation Mexican boys mix school and labor force participation to a greater extent than do

their 3rd+ generation non-Latino black counterparts, but among girls, there is no corresponding difference.

Table 3 examines zero-order differences in work intensity across groups of boys and girls. Again, this table provides initial support for the tendency of a labor migrant culture to view work and school as mutually exclusive pursuits, demonstrating that while relatively fewer early-generation Mexican-origin youths worked in 1999, those who did worked more intensively than their later-generation counterparts. This pattern holds for both boys and girls, though more strongly among the former.

Table 4 presents odds-ratios from logistic regression equations predicting labor force participation among boys and girls respectively. Early-generation Mexican-origin youths are the least likely to participate in the labor force, but the relative odds (in relation to 3rd+ whites) of labor force participation increases with generational time. Nonetheless, large differences among Mexican-origin youth and black youth, relative to whites, persist for both boys and girls, even after adjusting for school non-enrollment (Model 3) and important background factors (Model 4).

Tables 5 and 6 examine differences in work intensity among those youths indicating that they worked in 1999, for both boys and girls, respectively. Among boys (Table 5), early generation Mexican-origin youth do not significantly differ from white youths in the number of weeks worked during 1999. And early-generation Mexican-origin boys work significantly more hours, on average, than both white and black youths, but after controlling for school enrollment and other factors, (Model 4 under “Hours Worked”), the difference is only significant among 1.5 generation Mexicans. Table 6 presents a similar pattern of work intensity for girls, as for boys,

except that all Mexican origin girls worked significantly fewer weeks than white girls, all else equal.

Table 7 examines the extent to which school enrollment interacts with generational and racial/ethnic background to influence labor force participation. This table presents strong evidence in support of the bifurcated orientation to work and schooling among the children of labor migrants. Mexican-origin boys *not* enrolled in school are substantially and significantly more likely to participate in the workforce relative to 3rd+ generation white boys. 1.5 generation boys not enrolled in school are two times more likely to be in the labor force; 1.75 generation boys are 1.75 times more likely; 2nd generation Mexican-boys are 1.7 times more likely, and 3rd+ generation youths 1.74 times more likely than white youths to be in the labor force, all else equal. By contrast, 3rd+ generation black boys not enrolled in school are *less* likely than their white counterparts to be in the labor force. On the other hand, Mexican-origin boys who are enrolled in school are *less* likely to be in the labor force than 3rd+ generation whites. The magnitude of the difference, as expected from the labor migrant cultural perspective, decreases with generational time. While 1.5 generation boys enrolled in school are only 46% as likely to be in the labor force as 3rd+ whites, this difference increases to 47% among the 1.75 generation, 58% among the 2nd generation, and 67% among 3rd+ generation Mexican-origin boys. By comparison, 3rd+generation black boys who are enrolled in school are only 60% as likely as their white counterparts to be in the labor force, all else equal. As anticipated, this pattern does not hold among girls.

Finally, Table 8 presents the interaction of school enrollment and generational and racial/ethnic background in determining work intensity among boys and girls. Again, among boys not enrolled in school, Mexican-origin youths who worked during 1999 worked

significantly more weeks and hours than 3rd+ whites, all else equal. Differences in work intensity among the non-enrolled were largest among early-generation Mexican-origin youths and generally decreased with generational time. Again, this pattern does not hold among girls.

DISCUSSION

The results presented above are consistent with the notion that Mexican-origin youth, especially boys, carry a bifurcated, either-or, orientation to school enrollment and labor force participation into adolescence which I argue, stems from the countervailing tendencies of the high value placed on work among labor migrant cultures on the one hand, and the immigrant optimism prioritize achievement in school, on the other. Early generation Mexican-origin youth tend to devote themselves to either school, or work, but not both. Those who are not enrolled in school are more likely than their 3rd-and-later generation counterparts to participate in the labor force, and to work more intensively. By contrast, early-generation Mexican-origin youth who *are* enrolled in school, tend to participate in the labor force *less* than their 3rd+ generation counterparts, and to work less intensively. It is possible that this bifurcated orientation to work and schooling serves as a survival strategy employed uniquely among labor migrant families. Having certain adolescent family members, most likely boys, enter the labor force for intensive work, while other youths in the family devote their energies exclusively to school may serve as a form of investment strategy. Intensive adolescent work brings much needed income into the family for the short-term, while a focus on academic achievement among other family members invests in the potential for larger economic gain in the longer term. Whether this is the dynamic driving the school-work bifurcation described above deserves the attention of future research.

These findings also carry implications for perspectives of immigrant incorporation, in that they appear to lend greater (albeit tentative) support for the assimilation perspective than for

predictions of “underclass” assimilation posed by the theory of segmented assimilation. This conclusion is drawn from the fact that patterns of school enrollment and labor force participation among later-generation Mexican-origin youth tend to converge more with those exhibited by 3rd+ generation whites, than with 3rd+ black youth.

REFERENCES

- Bean, Frank D., and Gillian Stevens, 2003. *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- Lareau, Annette. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Race, Class, and Family Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kao, Grace, and Marta Tienda. 1995. "Optimism and Achievement: The Educational Performance of Immigrant Youth." *Social Science Quarterly* 76:1-19.
- Lee, Jennifer C., and Jeremy Staff. 2007. "When Work Matters: The Varying Impact of Work Intensity on High School Dropout." *Sociology of Education* 80(April):158-178.
- Massey, Douglas S., Rafael Alarcon, Jorge Durand and Humberto Gonzalez. 1987. *Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mortimer, Jeylan T. 2003. *Working and Growing Up in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Perreira, Krista M., Kathleen Mullan Harris and Dohoon Lee. 2007. "Immigrant Youth in the Labor Market." *Work and Occupations* 34(1):5-34.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Ruben G. Rumbaut. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén G. Rumbaut, *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. 3rd edition, revised, expanded, and updated. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006
- Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants among Post-1965 Immigrant Youth." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530:74-96.
- Smith, Robert C. 2005. *Mexican New York: Transnational Lives of New Immigrants*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- John Robert Warren & Jennifer C. Lee. 2003. "The Impact of Adolescent Employment on High School Dropout: Differences by Individual and Labor Market Characteristics." *Social Science Research* 32: 98-128.

TABLES

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent and Independent Variables (N=302,808)

	Mean (S.D.)
<u>School Enrollment</u>	
Enrolled in School	0.963
<u>Labor Force Participation</u>	
In Labor Force	0.397
<u>Generations and Race/Ethnicity</u>	
1.5 Mexican	0.011
1.75 Mexican	0.008
2nd Mexican	0.030
3rd+ Mexican	0.042
3rd + Black	0.141
3rd+ White	0.766
<u>Work Intensity</u>	
Worked in 1999	0.461
Weeks Worked in 1999 ^a	23.090 (16.148)
Hours Worked in 1999 (logged) ^a	5.682 (1.019)
<u>Gender</u>	
Male	0.516
<u>Age</u>	
Age 16	0.518
<u>English Language Proficiency</u>	
Limited English Proficient	0.012
<u>Parental Educational Attainment</u>	
Less than High School	0.111
High School Diploma / GED	0.245
Some College	0.337
Bachelor's Degree	0.175
Graduate/Professional Degree	0.132
<u>Family SES</u>	
Per Capita Family Income (logged)	9.397 (1.167)
<u>Family Size/Structure</u>	
Number of Siblings in HH	1.336 (1.198)
Both Parents Present	0.717
Mother only	0.225
Father only	0.058
<u>Context</u>	
Lives in Urban Area	0.717

a. Among those who worked at least one week in 1999

Table 2. School-Work Status of 16-17 Year-Old Boys and Girls by Generation and Race/Ethnic Group, 2000

<i>Boys</i>												
	<u>1.5, Mexican</u>		<u>1.75, Mexican</u>		<u>2nd, Mexican</u>		<u>3rd+, Mexican</u>		<u>3rd+, NH-White</u>		<u>3rd+, NH-Black</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<i>Enrolled in School</i>												
In Labor Force	377	20.1	261	20.5	1,220	25.7	1,939	30.0	47,653	39.6	5,942	27.8
Not In Labor Force	1,283	68.4	904	71.0	3,246	68.4	4,154	64.4	68,203	56.7	14,397	67.4
<i>Not Enrolled in School</i>												
In Labor Force	123	6.6	52	4.1	147	3.1	197	3.1	2,604	2.2	385	1.8
Not In Labor Force	93	5.0	57	4.5	133	2.8	164	2.5	1,778	1.5	648	3.0
Total	1,876	100.0	1,274	100.0	4,746	100.0	6,454	100.0	120,238	100.0	21,372	100.0
<i>Girls</i>												
	<u>1.5, Mexican</u>		<u>1.75, Mexican</u>		<u>2nd, Mexican</u>		<u>3rd+, Mexican</u>		<u>3rd+, NH-White</u>		<u>3rd+, NH-Black</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
<i>Enrolled in School</i>												
In Labor Force	296	18.5	233	20.0	1,087	25.0	1,932	30.1	46,962	42.0	6,543	30.3
Not In Labor Force	1,157	72.2	869	74.5	3,064	70.4	4,177	65.1	61,599	55.1	14,184	65.8
<i>Not Enrolled in School</i>												
In Labor Force	51	3.2	18	1.5	69	1.6	118	1.8	1,641	1.5	344	1.6
Not In Labor Force	99	6.2	46	3.9	133	3.1	187	2.9	1,694	1.5	501	2.3
Total	1,603	100.0	1,166	100.0	4,353	100.0	6,414	100.0	111,896	100.0	21,572	100.0

Table 3. Employment and Work Intensity among 16-17 Year Old Boys and Girls by Generational and Race/Ethnic Group, 2000

	<i>Boys</i>				
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Worked in 1999</u>			
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Mean Weeks</u>	<u>Mean Hours</u>	<u>Hours/Weeks</u>
1.5 Mexican	1,877	23.6	24.3	728.7	30.0
1.75 Mexican	1,274	24.1	22.8	632.7	27.7
2nd Mexican	4,746	27.3	20.3	530.4	26.1
3rd+ Mexican	6,455	33.7	20.6	483.7	23.5
3rd+ Non-Hispanic White	120,237	51.3	23.1	454.9	19.7
3rd+ Non-Hispanic Black	21,373	30.5	19.2	439.9	22.9
	<i>Girls</i>				
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Worked in 1999</u>			
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Mean Weeks</u>	<u>Mean Hours</u>	<u>Hours/Weeks</u>
1.5 Mexican	1,603	21.5	22.5	598.9	26.6
1.75 Mexican	1,165	18.9	20.3	510.7	25.2
2nd Mexican	4,352	26.2	20.2	460.3	22.8
3rd+ Mexican	6,414	32.6	20.9	437.9	21.0
3rd+ Non-Hispanic White	111,897	50.3	24.1	427.0	17.7
3rd+ Non-Hispanic Black	21,483	32.7	20.5	447.8	21.8

Table 4. Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models of Labor Force Participation among 16-17 Year-Olds

	<i>Boys</i>				<i>Girls</i>			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4 ^a	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4 ^a
Mexican 1.5	0.507 ***		0.473 ***	0.521 ***	0.359 ***		0.351 ***	0.401 ***
Mexican 1.75	0.464 ***		0.444 ***	0.506 ***	0.355 ***		0.352 ***	0.407 ***
Mexican 2nd	0.563 ***		0.551 ***	0.595 ***	0.470 ***		0.467 ***	0.511 ***
Mexican 3rd+	0.689 ***		0.677 ***	0.679 ***	0.611 ***		0.607 ***	0.593 ***
Non-Hispanic Black 3rd+	0.586 ***		0.578 ***	0.592 ***	0.602 ***		0.599 ***	0.596 ***
Non-Hispanic White 3rd+	1.000		1.000	1.000	1.000		1.000	1.000
<i>School Enrollment</i>								
Not Enrolled		1.968 ***	2.096 ***	2.000 ***		1.314 ***	1.398 ***	1.363 ***
-2*log-likelihood	206,906.41	207,975.09	206,093.46	202,189.88	195,993.48	198,053.05	195,865.43	191,393.56
Cox & Snell Psuedo-R ²	0.011	0.004	0.016	0.041	0.015	0.001	0.015	0.045
Nagelkerke Psuedo-R ²	0.015	0.006	0.022	0.055	0.020	0.001	0.021	0.061

*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; + $p < .10$.

a. Model adjusts for differences in age, English-proficiency, Family SES, family size and structure, and context

Table 5. OLS Regression Coefficients for Weeks and Hours Worked among 16-17 Year-Old Boys Who Worked in 1999

	<i>Weeks Worked During 1999</i>				<i>Hours Worked During 1999 (logged)</i>			
	Model 1	Model2	Model 3	Model 4 ^a	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4 ^a
(Constant)	23.123 ***	22.603 ***	23.036 ***	9.937 ***	5.713 ***	5.688 ***	5.695 ***	4.919 ***
<i>Generation and Race/Ethnicity</i>								
Mexican 1.5	1.180		0.740	-0.086	0.343 ***		0.253 ***	0.158 **
Mexican 1.75	-0.285		-0.554	-1.078	0.197 ***		0.142 *	0.069
Mexican 2nd	-2.784 ***		-2.890 ***	-3.616 ***	0.067 *		0.045	-0.043
Mexican 3rd+	-2.537 ***		-2.604 ***	-3.006 ***	-0.010		-0.024	-0.063 **
Non-Hispanic Black 3rd+	-3.420 ***		-3.432 ***	-3.232 ***	-0.102 ***		-0.105 ***	-0.109 ***
Non-Hispanic White 3rd+	--		--	--	--		--	--
<i>School Enrollment</i>								
Not Enrolled		2.228 ***	2.331 ***	1.341 ***		0.487 ***	0.478 ***	0.376 ***
Adjusted R ²	0.001	0.005	0.005	0.035	0.009	0.002	0.010	0.050

****p*<.001; ***p*<.01; **p*<.05; +*p*<.10.

a. Model adjusts for differences in age, English-proficiency, Family SES, family size and structure, and context

Table 6. OLS Regression Coefficients for Weeks and Hours Worked among 16-17 Year-Old Girls Who Worked in 1999

	<i>Weeks Worked During 1999</i>				<i>Hours Worked During 1999 (logged)</i>			
	Model 1	Model2	Model 3	Model 4 ^a	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4 ^a
(Constant)	24.083 ***	23.534 ***	24.085 ***	8.988 ***	5.651 ***	5.644 ***	5.642 ***	4.796 ***
<i>Generation and Race/Ethnicity</i>								
Mexican 1.5	-1.828 *		-1.822 *	-2.693 **	0.328 ***		0.300 ***	0.192 ***
Mexican 1.75	-3.819 ***		-3.817 ***	-4.485 ***	0.124 +		0.113	0.012
Mexican 2nd	-3.875 ***		-3.875 ***	-4.822 ***	0.038		0.035	-0.084 **
Mexican 3rd+	-3.236 ***		-3.234 ***	-3.809 ***	0.002		-0.004	-0.060 **
Non-Hispanic Black 3rd+	-3.539 ***		-3.537 ***	-3.554 ***	0.003		-0.001	-0.034 *
Non-Hispanic White 3rd+	--		--	--	--		--	--
<i>School Enrollment</i>								
Not Enrolled		-0.319	-0.082	-0.774 *		0.328 ***	0.324 ***	0.238 ***
Adjusted R ²	0.000	0.006	0.006	0.040	0.003	0.001	0.004	0.046

****p*<.001; ***p*<.01; **p*<.05; +*p*<.10.

a. Model adjusts for differences in age, English-proficiency, Family SES, family size and structure, and context

Table 7. Net Differences in Labor Force Participation among Mexican-Origin and Black Adolescents, 16-17 Years Old, Relative to 3rd+ Generation Non-Hispanic Whites

	<i>Boys</i>	
	Not Enrolled	Enrolled
	<u>Odds Ratio</u>	<u>Odds Ratio</u>
Mexican 1.5	2.040 ***	0.463 ***
Mexican 1.75	1.745 **	0.471 ***
Mexican 2nd	1.680 **	0.578 ***
Mexican 3rd+	1.744 *	0.667 ***
Non-Hispanic Black 3rd+	0.844 ***	0.603 ***

	<i>Girls</i>	
	Not Enrolled	Enrolled
	<u>Odds Ratio</u>	<u>Odds Ratio</u>
Mexican 1.5	0.763 *	0.383 ***
Mexican 1.75	0.582	0.405 ***
Mexican 2nd	0.757	0.508 ***
Mexican 3rd+	1.178	0.592 ***
Non-Hispanic Black 3rd+	0.916 *	0.591 ***

*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; + $p < .10$.

Table 8. Net Differences in the Relationship between Non-Enrollment Work Intensity among Mexican-Origin and Black Adolescents, 16-17 Years Old, Relative to 3rd+ Generation Non-Hispanic Whites

	<i>Boys</i>			
	<i>Logged Hours Worked in 1999</i>		<i>Weeks Worked in 1999</i>	
	Not Enrolled	Enrolled	Not Enrolled	Enrolled
	<u>B</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>B</u>
Mexican 1.5	1.139 ***	-0.017	10.886 ***	-2.901 **
Mexican 1.75	0.938 ***	-0.021	8.508 ***	-2.613 *
Mexican 2nd	0.573 **	-0.068 *	3.468 ***	-4.221 ***
Mexican 3rd+	0.654 ***	-0.090 ***	3.561 ***	-3.425 ***
Non-Hispanic Black 3rd+	0.024 **	-0.100 ***	-3.437	-3.220 ***

	<i>Boys</i>			
	<i>Logged Hours Worked in 1999</i>		<i>Weeks Worked in 1999</i>	
	Not Enrolled	Enrolled	Not Enrolled	Enrolled
	<u>B</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>B</u>
Mexican 1.5	0.138 *	0.849 **	-3.519 ***	2.961 **
Mexican 1.75	-0.003	0.486	-4.451 ***	-5.818
Mexican 2nd	-0.090 **	0.322	-4.942 ***	-2.725
Mexican 3rd+	-0.065 **	0.289	-3.902 ***	-2.822
Non-Hispanic Black 3rd+	-0.026 +	0.048 **	-3.545 ***	-4.750

****p*<.001; ***p*<.01; **p*<.05; +*p*<.10.