

Unwelcome Immigrants: The Labor Market Experiences of 1980 (Mariel) Cuban and Haitian Refugees in South Florida

Author(s): Alejandro Portes and Alex Stepick

Source: *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 50, No. 4 (Aug., 1985), pp. 493-514

Published by: American Sociological Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2095435>

Accessed: 18-01-2018 18:50 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



American Sociological Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Sociological Review*

- Critique. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Pullum, Thomas
1975 *Measuring Occupational Inheritance*. New York: Elsevier.
- Scoville, James G.
1969 *The Job Content of the U.S. Economy, 1940–1970*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A.
1927 *Social Mobility*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Tolbert, Charles M., II
1982 "Industrial segmentation and men's career mobility." *American Sociological Review* 47:457–77.
- Tyree, Andrea
1973 "Mobility ratios and association in mobility tables." *Population Studies* 27:577–88.
- Vanneman, Reeve
1977 "The occupational composition of American classes: results from cluster analysis." *American Journal of Sociology* 82:783–807.
- Weber, Max
1946 *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds. and trans.). New York: Basic Books.
- 1978 "Status groups and classes." In Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich (eds.), *Economy and Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

UNWELCOME IMMIGRANTS: THE LABOR MARKET EXPERIENCES OF 1980 (MARIEL) CUBAN AND HAITIAN REFUGEES IN SOUTH FLORIDA*

ALEJANDRO PORTES

Johns Hopkins University

ALEX STEPICK

Florida International University

This article examines the situation of two recently arrived and disadvantaged immigrant groups in the context of two competing theoretical traditions: classical assimilation and recent labor market segmentation theories. Predictions of both concerning U.S. labor market entry of foreign minorities and determinants of subsequent mobility are tested on the basis of representative surveys. Most are disconfirmed. The analysis supports the hypothesis of heterogeneous modes of incorporation into the labor market, including substantial numbers of refugees who remain outside of it. Sizable proportions have only managed to find fringe employment in an emerging informal economy in South Florida. Among Cubans, employment in the ethnic enclave is associated with positive returns comparable to those of entry into the "primary" labor market. Haitians lack an enclave option and thus cluster into secondary and informal employment, although most remain without work. Determinants of these various situations are examined on the basis of multivariate logistic regressions. Implications of results for immigration theory and policy are discussed.

This paper examines the extent of differentiation in labor market situations of two recent immigrant groups: 1980 Cuban refugees, the so-called Mariel exodus, and Haitian refugees arriving at the same time. Both groups represent recent trends in U.S.-bound immigration and can be fruitfully compared with the experi-

ences of earlier groups as well as with general theories of the role of immigrants in the American labor market. Until recently, the common image of recent immigrants among social scientists as well as among the public at large was one of a fairly homogenous group. Contributing to that image was an abundant literature on the history and adaptation experiences of turn-of-the-century immigrants. Although scholarly and journalistic accounts of the Italians, the Poles, the Irish, the Greeks, and others obviously differed in detail, they sounded a similar underlying theme.

Turn-of-the-century immigrants arriving in U.S. shores in search of work were described as finding it in menial, low-paid occupations in industry, canal and railroad building, and the like. They formed tightly knit communities for

* Direct all correspondence to: Alejandro Portes, Department of Sociology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218.

The data on which this paper is based were collected with the support of grant #SES-8215567 from the National Science Foundation. The analysis was conducted while the senior author was a visiting research fellow at the University of California-San Diego. We thank Karl Alexander and anonymous referees for their comments on an earlier version.

self-protection and support and then gradually started moving into the mainstream of society, a painful process completed only after several generations (Handlin, 1951; Warner and Srole, 1945; Child, 1943). The basic contours of these histories were so similar as to enable later writers to portray immigrant adaptation as a uniform charted path in which newcomers took their place at the end of the labor market queue and proceeded to improve slowly, but predictably, their employment and social situations (Sowell, 1981).

Recent structuralist theories of immigration and ethnicity also support the notion of a uniform entry point and labor market position among recent arrivals. Differences between classic assimilationist and current structural theorists center on whether there is indeed "queuing" and thus eventual mobility of foreign minorities (Petersen, 1971; Lieberman, 1980; Sowell, 1981; Alba, 1985), or whether they remain confined to the bottom jobs or the lower tier of a segmented labor market (Bonacich and Cheng, 1984; Piore, 1979). Both positions agree, however, that at entry, immigrants tend to have three characteristics in common: first, they are channeled into menial low-paid jobs; second, they represent a pliable and frequently exploited labor pool; third, their chances for mobility are restricted and dependent on language acquisition and learning of the host culture.

The basic notion of a uniform entry point stands alongside a rapidly accumulating research literature which points exactly in the opposite direction. Several studies have documented the existence of "entrepreneurial" minorities and of economic-enclave construction among recent immigrant groups (Light, 1979, 1980; Kim, 1981; Wilson and Martin, 1982; Wilson and Portes, 1980). Although many of these immigrants may spell a tour of duty at the worst jobs, they often move quickly into self-employment through the support of preexisting ethnic networks. A second and perhaps more significant instance is provided by studies of professional and technical immigration. Although the literature on the "brain drain" is sparse, it documents the presence in the United States of thousands of immigrants whose entry-point positions were neither menial nor lowly paid and who attain even more desirable jobs in a relatively short period of time (Glasser and Habers, 1974; Stevens et al., 1978).¹

¹ A case in point is Indian immigration. Seventy-seven percent of the 206,000 first-generation Indians counted by the 1980 Census had been in the country less than 10 years. Despite their recency, median Indian household income in 1980 was \$25,644, well

A third example is provided by the increasing number of political refugees and asylees arriving in recent years. The status of refugee is not associated with a uniform mode of entry into the American labor market. Occupational entry points of political refugees may range from the conventional low-wage menial jobs depicted in the assimilation literature to self-employment or high professional occupations. More importantly, recent refugees have the option *not* to enter the labor market at all, remaining dependent instead on federal and state assistance. This option is made possible by provisions of the 1980 Refugee Act, which conferred distinct benefits to individuals admitted to the United States under this status.²

Immigration thus seems to be moving away from the uniform flow of unskilled menial labor posited by theorists of multiple and opposite persuasions. Instead, it appears to be turning into an increasingly diversified process with immigrants found at many levels of the occupational structure, including a significant number outside of it. The groups which are the subject of this study are, however, among those who because of a uniquely disadvantaged position may be expected to follow a uniform adaptation path—one starting at the very bottom of the labor market. Examining the extent to which there is internal differentiation within them provides a test of the alternative views of basic occupational homogeneity versus different modes of labor market entry. The background to immigration of each group and their subsequent precarious occupational situation are described in the next sections, following details of data collection.

SAMPLES

Data for this study come from samples of Cubans arriving in the United States from the port of Mariel in 1980 and of Haitians coming by boat about the same time. Surveys of both refugee groups living in South Florida in late

above the national figure and approximately \$11,000 above the median for the entire foreign-born population. This position of privilege is closely associated with the fact that 66 percent of the Indian-born population had completed four or more years of college and that 43 percent were employed in professional specialty occupations in the United States (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1984).

² Results of a survey conducted by the U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement in 1982 indicated that 24.1 percent of Indochinese refugees were unemployed, twice the national figure, and that 47 percent of refugee households received cash assistance at the time, the figure increasing with household size and number of children (Bach et al., 1984).

1983 and 1984 were conducted on the basis of stratified multi-stage area samples. The sampling strata for the Cuban survey are political divisions within Dade County—the cities of Miami, Miami Beach, Hialeah, and unincorporated Dade County divisions. Strata in the Haitian survey are localities in three adjacent counties known to contain the majority of this group in the region—the cities of Miami and Ft. Lauderdale and the town of Belle Glade.

Within each stratum, areas of high concentration of the respective groups were delimited and blocks within them were designated as primary sampling units. For Cubans, delimited areas are census tracts where 50 percent or more of the population is of Cuban origin, except Miami Beach, where the universe includes the three census tracts with the highest Cuban concentration, none of which exceeds 50 percent. Recent Haitian refugees cluster even more than Cubans, and several prior studies had already defined their primary areas of concentration (BSRI, 1983; Stepick, 1984). In Miami, this area is known as Little Haiti and encompasses seven census tracts in the northeast quadrant of the city; in Ft. Lauderdale, the Haitian neighborhood comprises 28 adjacent city blocks; in Belle Glade, it clusters in the town's two poorest tracts.

Within each delimited area, blocks were assigned unique four-digit identifiers and selected through a simple random-sample procedure. Within blocks, the probability of selection was fixed at one, making all eligible households in selected blocks fall into the sample. The universes were defined as households containing at least one eligible respondent, that is, a Cuban or Haitian immigrant between the ages of 18 and 60 who arrived in the United States in 1980 or after.³ Within each selected unit, an eligible individual was interviewed and was asked to furnish information about him- or herself and about other household members.

Samples are not self-weighting since a fixed number of interviews were assigned a priori to each stratum to insure sufficient representation. Original target samples were 500 from each universe; weighted samples, adjusting for unequal probabilities of selection, are 499 Haitians and 520 Cubans. Parameter estimates presented below are computed on the basis of these weighted samples. Data from these samples are statistically representative of the universe of households containing at least one adult refugee in the areas of concentration of the respective populations in South Florida.

Excluded are the estimated one-fourth of Mariel refugees who were resettled and remain outside of the Miami SMSA (Clark et al., 1981; Boswell and Curtis, 1984: Ch. 3) and an unknown number of post-1980 Haitian refugees who settled elsewhere. There is agreement, however, among researchers familiar with this group that Little Haiti is the principal point of concentration of recent Haitian refugees and that Belle Glade and Ft. Lauderdale are the main secondary concentrations in the immediate vicinity of the Miami SMSA (Stepick, 1985; BSRI, 1983).

BACKGROUND TO IMMIGRATION

Together the Cuban and Haitian inflows of 1980 added approximately 140,000 people to immigration to the United States. Although this number probably represents no more than 10 percent of the combined total of legal and undocumented immigrants during that year (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1984), it had an enormous impact because of the manner of its arrival and the publicity surrounding it. The image of thousands of ragged refugees arriving in overloaded boats from Mariel and of desperately poor Haitians coming aboard barely seaworthy craft had a profound effect on the American public mind. A reluctant U.S. government refused to grant the new arrivals political asylum, admitting them only on a temporary basis as "entrants, status pending."

The histories and general characteristics of each immigration have been described in detail elsewhere (Bach, 1984; Pedraza-Bailey, 1985; Miller, 1984). For our purposes, what is important are those aspects which made their reception and settlement so difficult and which lead to the expectation of a common and disadvantaged employment situation. Between the months of April and October of 1980, 124,779 Cubans arrived in the United States, more than in the preceding eight years. During May 1980 alone, more refugees arrived than in 1962, the previous record year of Cuban immigration. This unexpected exodus had its origin in the decision of the Cuban government to permit the departure of disaffected and other "undesirable" elements from the Island. Calling the departees "scum," the Cuban government proceeded to insure that the label would stick by deliberately placing aboard the boats hundreds of individuals with criminal records, mental patients, and social deviants (Clark et al., 1981). Haitian emigration was not a government-sponsored initiative, but one promoted by private entrepreneurs offering sea transport for profit. Haitian boat arrivals had been detected by the Immigration and Natu-

³ All Cuban respondents arrived during the Mariel exodus of 1980; Haitian respondents arrived in 1980, 1981 or 1982, the majority during the first year.

ralization Service (INS) previously, but they did not exceed an average of 3000 per year. In 1980, however, the number swelled to over 15,000. Although still a manageable flow, it took place closely after the Mariel boatlift, the two becoming one in the public mind.

Coming in the midst of an economic recession, Mariel Cubans and Haitian boatpeople found employment opportunities highly restricted, and confronted widespread hostility among domestic minorities with whom they were to compete in the labor market. The very negative images diffused by the press and the media aggravated their situation. In particular, wide publicity was given to the undesirables arriving aboard the Mariel flotilla, despite the fact that subsequent research showed that hardened criminals, mental patients, and other deviants did not exceed 5 percent of this population (Bach et al., 1981; Boswell and Curtis, 1984). Although never mentioned explicitly, the fact that Haitian arrivals were uniformly black and that the proportion of blacks among Mariel entrants was several times greater than among earlier Cuban cohorts also seemed to contribute significantly to a less-than-favorable reception (Bach et al., 1981; Portes et al., 1981).

Policies of the federal government toward the two new immigrant groups concentrated on stopping the inflows and easing the situation in the most heavily impacted communities. The Carter administration pressured the Cuban government to close Mariel and finally succeeded in October 1980. Simultaneously, a maritime interdiction program was initiated to turn back Haitian refugees at sea. At about the same time, the Federal Emergency Management Agency removed processing of new Cuban entrants from Miami and reorganized it in military camps in the North. Harsh conditions in the camps gave rise to a series of riots during the Spring of 1981. In Miami, INS kept a substantial number of Haitians in detention and concentrated on demonstrating the economic motives of their migration and, hence, their ineligibility for political asylum. Several hundred Haitians were repatriated until litigation before the courts slowed the process (Stepick, 1982).

The federal government's refusal to grant either group political asylum deprived them of benefits under the new 1980 Refugee Act. Although subsequent congressional action alleviated this situation, emergency aid was limited and most of it lapsed by 1983. Lacking either jobs or government assistance, many refugees were compelled to rely on private charity or to invent jobs in a burgeoning "informal" economy in Miami.

The events of 1980 represented not only a

remarkable episode in American immigration history, but they also left behind thousands of newcomers whose social and economic adaptation was most problematic. These were unwelcome immigrants, wanted apparently by no one and often lacking even families to receive them. Unlike Indochinese refugees arriving at the same time and whose resettlement was sponsored and guided from the start by the federal government, 1980 entrants had little access to any of the set paths of early adaptation. This situation did not augur well for their future. The next sections report on the actual events that followed these 1980 migrations and on the situation of both refugee groups after four years in the United States.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

The beginning of the Mariel exodus dovetailed with the end of field work for the 1980 Census. As a result, figures reported by the census on the foreign-born Cuban and Haitian population exclude the more recent arrivals. Although this has been a cause of concern for state and local agencies, it has the fortuitous consequence of permitting a clear-cut comparison between the pre-1980 refugee communities and those arriving in 1980.

Table 1 presents comparisons of our two refugee samples with state and national figures over the range of variables available for the foreign-born in the census. Although national data offer an informative point of reference, the more pertinent comparison is with Florida because of the concentration of both groups in that state. The pattern of results in Table 1 is not identical for both refugee groups, but there are significant similarities.⁴ They both have

⁴ Means and standard deviations are computed on the basis of weighted samples adjusted for unequal probabilities of selection within strata. A stratified cluster sample design renders the usual formula for the variance of the mean inappropriate since stratification reduces between-group variance among strata and clustering reduces the number of independent sampling units. The latter effect is the more serious since it can lead to an underestimation of the variance computed on the assumption of simple random sampling. In this case, the appropriate formula for the variance of the mean within each stratum is:

$$\text{Est } \sigma_{\bar{x}_c} = (1-f) \frac{1}{m} \left[\frac{1}{m-1} \sum \left(\frac{N_i}{N} \right)^2 (X_i - \bar{X}_c)^2 \right]$$

Where: (1-f) is the correction for a finite population;
m is the number of clusters;

$\left(\frac{N_i}{N} \right)^2$ is the square of the relative weight of
N each unequal cluster;

$(X_i - \bar{X}_c)^2$ is the covariation within each
cluster, c. (Kish, 1967: Ch. 6).

Table 1. Cuban and Haitian Immigrants in the United States and Florida, 1980

Variables	Cubans			Haitians		
	U.S. ^a	Florida ^a	1980 ^b Entrants	U.S. ^a	Florida ^a	1980 ^b Entrants
Median Age	40.3	41.2	37.0*	28.9	29.4	29.0
Average Persons per Household	3.04	3.07	3.07	3.49	3.51	3.09*
Percent High School Graduates (Persons 25 years of age or over)	40.2	38.6	24.8*	55.9	27.2	4.9*
Percent with Four Years of College or More (Persons 25 years of age or over)	10.3	10.0	7.6	9.5	4.5	0.0*
Percent who Report Speaking English Well or Very Well (Persons 18 years of age or over)	36.1	32.1	10.6*	66.5	51.2	17.8*
Percent Black	2.3	1.4	11.8*	96.6	95.4	90.2*
Mean Number of Workers per Family	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.5	2.1
Percent Unemployed (Persons 16 years of age or over)	8.4	7.9	26.8*	13.3	13.4	58.5*
Percent Unemployed, Males (16 years of age or over)	6.8	6.3	25.8*	12.3	11.7	38.8*
Mean Weeks of Unemployment in the Preceding Year (Persons 16 years of age or over)	14.3	13.8	21.7*	18.0	16.9	25.0*
Percent Managers and Professional Specialty Occupations (Civilian Labor Force)	10.7	11.1	10.0	7.5	3.9	1.1*
Median Household Income (1979 dollars)	15,161	11,786	9,433*	13,243	8,223	5,521*
Percent of Families below Poverty Level ^c	20.5	22.0	26.0	25.6	39.2	61.0*

^a Foreign born, arrived between 1970 and 1980.

^b Significance tests compare entrant sample with Florida 1980 Census.

^c Percent of households below the federal poverty level for a household of three, 1983.

* $p < .01$.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Detailed Population Characteristics, United States Summary*, Series PC80-1-D1-A, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1984. Table 255. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Detailed Population Characteristics, Florida*, Series PC80-DO11, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, October 1983. Table 196.

much lower levels of education on the average and report much less knowledge of English than the respective pre-1980 resident populations. Although pre-1980 Haitians in Florida had much lower proportions of high school and college graduates than the same group

nation-wide, the proportion among post-1980 refugees is still lower. In 1984, the rate of unemployment among our respondents was three to four times greater than comparable state figures in 1980, whether total or male unemployment rates are considered. Average weeks of unemployment in the preceding year for the refugees came close to doubling the 1980 figures. Not surprisingly, median household incomes in constant dollars are significantly lower among 1980-81 refugees than among earlier arrivals.

On the average, Cubans are much older than Haitians, both before and after 1980, but within the Cuban population the 1980 refugees are much younger. In agreement with prior studies (Bach et al., 1981; Clark et al., 1981), the proportion of blacks and mulattoes among Cuban respondents is approximately eight times the figure reported for the pre-1980 Cuban population, although it still hovers at about one-tenth of the sample. Without significant exception, these results confirm the characterization

It is not possible with the data at hand to estimate variances in this manner because individual cases were coded into unique strata but not clusters (city blocks). The effect of clustering, however, is directly proportional to the average size of the clusters. In our case, average cluster sizes (N/m) are small; 2.7 in the Cuban sample and 2.84 in the Haitian. To minimize the probability of a type II error, however, we assumed a positive intraclass correlation (ρ) of 4. Estimated variances are computed as:

$$\text{Est. } \sigma = [1 + \rho(m-1)] \sigma_{sr},$$

where σ_{sr} is the variance computed on the assumption of simple random sampling. Under this conservative assumption, estimated variances are thus: 1.68 σ_{sr} for the Cuban sample and 1.74 σ_{sr} for the Haitian. Tests of significance reported in Table 1 are based on these figures.

Table 2. Labor Market Characteristics of Cuban and Haitian Entrants, 1983

	Cubans		Haitians	
	Self (N = 520) %	Spouse (N = 304) %	Self (N = 499) %	Spouse (N = 250) %
<i>Total Samples^a</i>				
Out of the Job Market	13.1	14.9	4.5	3.0
Unemployed, Looking for Work	26.8	19.0	58.5	32.9
<i>Employed Subsamples</i>				
Underemployed ^b	7.8	12.0	17.5	13.2
Self-employed	15.2	12.9	0.5	1.3
<i>Occupation, Employed Subsamples</i>				
Managers, Professional Specialty, Technicians	12.9	10.0	1.1	0.0
White Collar and Sales	16.7	18.5	5.5	3.3
Craftsmen and Repair Workers	28.3	28.3	9.8	17.2
Operatives and Laborers, except Farm	22.6	25.9	42.2	43.3
Farm Laborers	4.1	4.8	22.7	20.0
Servants and Unskilled Service Workers	15.4	12.4	18.7	16.2

^a Percentages do not add to 100 because categories are not mutually exclusive.

^b Thirty hours per week of work or less.

of recent Cuban and Haitian refugees as heavily disadvantaged groups even relative to their respective immigrant communities.

To begin the analysis of possible differences within this apparently hopeless situation, we examined the distribution of respondents and their spouses over a series of employment characteristics. Results are presented in Table 2. The main finding here is that the modal form of incorporation of these groups to the American labor market is no incorporation at all. Thirty-nine percent of Cuban respondents and fully 63 percent of Haitians are without work; among their spouses, the figures are somewhat lower but still sizable. These data also show that their situation is, for the most part, involuntary: in each group, those looking for work exceed those who have voluntarily withdrawn from the labor market. This pattern is considerably more marked among Haitians than Cubans.

The next row of Table 2 adds to this picture the proportion of the underemployed, defined as those working less than thirty hours per week.⁵ With the addition of this category, the proportion of those whose employment situation is problematic (unemployed and underemployed) comes to about one-third of economically active Cubans, one-half of Haitian spouses, and two-thirds of Haitian respondents.

The bottom rows of Table 2 begin to introduce some variation in this dismal landscape.

⁵ Although no data are available on this point, we assume that to a large extent underemployment is also involuntary. This follows from the low reported proportions of voluntary unemployment, especially among Haitians, and the low income levels in both samples.

Three years after arrival, about 15 percent of employed Cuban respondents and their spouses had started their own businesses. Although the meaning of "self-employment" among these groups is somewhat problematic, as will be seen below, the figures at least suggest the start of some independent entrepreneurship. In this respect, as well as in the occupational distributions of the employed, the two refugee groups differ sharply. There are hardly any self-employed among the Haitians, and the occupations of those who have found jobs concentrate in the bottom categories: servants and unskilled service laborers, farm workers, and semi-skilled operatives. In contrast, there are sizable proportions of Cuban refugees in the top three occupational categories, particularly craftsmen and skilled workers. The 13 percent of Cuban respondents in professional and technical occupations is actually higher than among the pre-1980 Cuban-born population. A closer examination of this group reveals, however, that it concentrates in lower-level professional occupations, such as school teachers and draftsmen.

Although these results begin to show some occupational differentiation, they do not suffice to dispel the image of groups who, if different from the popular view of immigrants, are so only by being in a still more precarious situation. If patterned differences in labor market entrance exist within these groups, we must probe for them further. For this, it will be necessary to seek guidance from theories in this area.

LABOR MARKET SECTORS

A central debate in the field of stratification focuses on whether the labor market should be

conceived as a single, unified entity or whether it should be seen as segmented into various sectors (Edwards, 1975; Tolbert et al., 1980; Hodson and Kaufman, 1982; Baron and Bielby, 1984). Although the debate continues and evidence accumulates on both sides of the issue, there is little doubt that the weight of empirical results leans in the direction of some form of market segmentation (Kalleberg et al., 1981; Hodson, 1984). Our purpose here is not to test this theory anew with immigrant samples, but rather to draw from it and from related sources, ideas relevant to our research problem.

Recent studies have attempted to break down the configurations characterizing discrete labor markets and examine the latter's continuous components and their consequences (Wallace and Kalleberg, 1981). Despite these efforts, the principal thrust of the segmentation perspective continues to be the assertion of a dual labor market, each sector separated from the other by a coherent set of characteristics. The descriptions of primary and secondary labor markets are quite familiar by now and require no repetition. As far as immigrant workers are concerned, the general expectation stemming from this theory is that those who manage to gain access to the primary sector will enjoy better working conditions and remunerations than those confined to jobs in the secondary sector. The latter should comprise, however, the vast majority of these groups (Piore, 1979; Edwards, 1979: Ch. 10).

An unsolved debate within this general perspective is whether labor markets should be conceptualized and measured at the level of entire industries (Tolbert et al., 1980) or individual firms (Hodson, 1984). For our purposes, however, it would make little sense to rely on an industry-wide classification for two reasons. First, the local labor market in South Florida is characterized by a predominance of relatively small firms, and there is likely to be considerable error in assigning local firms to sectors on the basis of national averages. Second, we have data on individual firms, provided directly by respondents and hence do not need to rely on approximations.

For reasons to be explained below, the primary and secondary sectors are defined as composed of firms outside the Miami ethnic economy, that is, companies whose owners or top executives are native whites, plus public-sector agencies. Size of firms will be employed as the primary stratifying variable. Around 1980, the 32,000 companies with paid employees in Dade County (Miami SMSA) averaged 14 workers per firm (Jorge and Moncarz, 1982). Relative to this average, firms with over 100 employees can be considered quite large

and hence more likely to reproduce the characteristics associated with primary markets.

The primary-secondary division does not exhaust, however, the potential modes of labor market entry available to new immigrants. The same segmentation literature has branched out into distinctions of "tiers" within the primary sector (Piore, 1975) and a division between occupational and firm labor markets within the same upper segment (Althausen and Kalleberg, 1981). For immigrant workers, however, a more pertinent literature is that which identifies ethnic economies or "enclaves" as a distinct labor market sector. Enclaves are formed by clusters of immigrant-owned enterprises which tend to hire recent arrivals from the same nationality. Although similar in outward appearance to other small firms, they possess certain characteristics which open significant mobility opportunities for immigrant workers.

As described in several recent studies (Wilson and Martin, 1982; Wilson and Portes, 1980; Waldinger, 1985; Bonacich and Modell, 1980), the primary characteristic of ethnic economies is the use of a common cultural bond for economic survival and advancement. The principle of ethnic solidarity requires that recent arrivals spell a tour of duty at menial low-wage jobs. The cheapness of their labor is a central factor allowing fledgling immigrant enterprises to compete and survive (Grasmuck, 1984; Nee and Nee, 1973). The same principle requires, however, that employers promote their workers as new positions become open within their firms or support their eventual move into self-employment.

In Miami, the possibility of entry into an enclave labor market is limited to Cuban-owned firms. In 1983 there were almost no known Haitian enterprises in the area, but Cuban firms with paid employees exceeded an estimated three thousand (Diaz-Briquets, 1984; Jorge and Moncarz, 1982). For our analysis, participation in the enclave sector will be operationally defined as employment in Cuban-owned firms plus self-employment, with exceptions to be indicated below. Almost no Haitian respondent was self-employed or employed by a co-national. Those working for Cuban firms were tentatively classified as enclave participants, leaving for the analysis to clarify their actual situation.

Hypothesizing that primary, secondary, and enclave sectors are potentially distinct modes of labor market entry is justified by a prior research literature which has documented their existence as well as the position of ethnic minorities in them (Edwards, 1975; Bonacich, 1972; Waldinger, 1985; Wilson and Martin, 1982). In our case, however, the picture is rendered more complex by the apparent

emergence of an "informal sector" in Miami. Informal activities are those which employ labor on a noncontractual basis and in terms which generally violate tax, wage, and fair labor laws. Payment of subminimum wages and nonpayment of taxes and benefits confer on these activities a distinct competitive advantage, reinforced in turn by the absence of covenants protecting employees from arbitrary dismissal.

Although relatively absent from the sociological literature, several recent studies have documented the proliferation of informal activities in metropolitan areas like New York (Sassen-Koob, 1984), San Diego (Fernandez-Kelly and Garcia, 1985), and the San Francisco Bay Area (Castells, 1984). Examples of these activities include sweatshop production of apparel and electronics components (Morales, 1983; Marshall, 1983; Saxenian, 1983); unregulated piece-rate homework in the garment and footwear industries (NACLA, 1979; Mazur, 1979) and off-the-books labor in restaurants, hotels, and cleaning services (Morales and Mines, 1985; Sassen-Koob, 1984). Also included are unprotected domestic servants and itinerant self-employed workers such as odd-jobbers and street vendors.

The largely illegal labor practices in the informal sector are different from those that prevail in the secondary and enclave labor markets. The latter are composed of small, but established and state-regulated enterprises that pay low, but still legal wages. A major difference among the three sectors appears to be the sources of their labor force. The secondary sector is described as dominated by blacks, women, and other domestic minorities (Edwards, 1979: Ch. 10; Berrera, 1980; Doeringer and Piore, 1971); the enclave sector employs mostly legal immigrants; the informal economy, on the other hand, seems to draw primarily from recent undocumented immigrants (Wells, 1984; Grasmuck, 1984; Sassen-Koob, 1984).

Although not undocumented, the tenuous legal status of post-1980 Cuban and Haitian refugees and their consequent lack of government protection makes it likely that many would seek employment in the informal sector, if such an alternative were available. Consequently, we hypothesize the existence of four distinct labor market situations among employed respondents in our samples. Although the first three can be readily identified, the very illegality of much informal employment renders it difficult to tap on the basis of direct survey questions. For this reason, we must approach its definition indirectly through several indicators. In our data, labor market sectors can be empirically defined as follows:

Secondary: all employed workers, except those below.

Primary: public-sector employees and workers in firms employing more than 100 workers, minus those below.

Enclave: workers in Cuban-owned firms, regardless of size, plus the self-employed who meet at least one of these criteria: (a) having paid employees; (b) being engaged in professional practice; (c) having a regular, established place of business.

Informal: (a) workers paid in cash or without tax deductions; (b) domestic servants and kindred; (c) the itinerant self-employed, such as odd-jobbers and street vendors; (d) workers whose hourly wages are below 80 percent of the legal minimum.⁶

Table 3 presents the distribution of employed respondents and their spouses over these four sectors. As shown in the table, rates of participation in the primary sector, as defined, are uniformly the lowest at about one-tenth for all four groups. At the opposite extreme, the informal sector comprises about one-third of every group. Two additional results of this initial classification deserve mention: (1) excluding the primary sector, Cuban workers distribute themselves about evenly among the other three labor markets, while Haitians concentrate overwhelmingly in the secondary; (2) enclave firms predictably hire many more Cubans than Haitians, but the number of the latter employed in this sector is not insignificant.

Identifying these four sectors on the basis of arbitrary indicators does not prove that significant differences exist among them. Although the distribution by sectors appears reasonable, this division may be artifactual and does not disprove the hypothesis of a single labor market and an homogenous mode of entry. The next logical step is to examine whether significant differences exist and whether they accord with theoretical expectations. The literature on dual labor markets, as well as those on ethnic enclaves and the informal economy, lead us to expect systematic variation in the sexual and racial composition of the various sectors, as well as in such variables as knowledge of English, information about the host society, income, length of unemployment, satisfaction and opportunities in the current job, and welfare dependence.

To test this hypothesis, we employ discriminant analysis (Van de Geer, 1971:243-72). This procedure allows the specification of a

⁶ The hourly wage cutting point is arbitrary. It is more strict than the legal minimum wage itself to insure that only flagrant violations are included.

Table 3. Labor Market Sectors, Employed Cuban and Haitian Entrants, 1983

Labor Market Sector ^a	Cubans		Haitians	
	Self (N = 331)	Spouse (N = 218)	Self (N = 186)	Spouse (N = 123)
A. Primary	12.8	11.5	10.6	8.3
B. Secondary	24.9	29.7	47.7	53.7
C. Enclave	30.9	28.1	8.3	7.5
D. Informal	31.4	30.7	33.4	30.5

^a See text for definitions.

nominal reference variable which is used to extract whatever significant functions exist in a set of independent variables. The maximum number of functions is one fewer than the number of subpopulations. If fewer than the maximum possible number of discriminant functions are significant, then some of the populations are not empirically distinguishable from each other, at least in regard to the variables included in the analysis. A shortcoming of discriminant analysis is the assumption of a multivariate normal distribution (M.N.D.), seldom met by sociological data (Fienberg, 1980:106–109). In the absence of a fully satisfactory solution, we replicated the analysis through a series of maximum-likelihood logistic regressions which do not depend on M.N.D.

The number of sub-groups and the broad range of possible differences among them suggest that we cast our net fairly wide. Our original analysis included a set of twenty-five variables, but results presented below include only those which yielded at least one significant discriminant-function coefficient. Six of these variables are background characteristics or indicators of early reception in the United States: age; sex; education; number of relatives in the United States and help received from them; and confinement to a detention camp upon arrival. A second set taps various contemporary social characteristics, including marital status, knowledge of English, ethnic social relations, opportunities to meet Anglo-Americans, and experiences of discrimination by them. The rest of the variables are indicators of present occupational and economic situation, including objective variables such as length of U.S. unemployment, time in current job, monthly household income, and length of welfare aid and subjective self-reports, such as perceived opportunities in the present job.⁷

⁷ AGE and education (EDUC) are coded in years. KIN is the number of respondent's relatives living in the United States, and KINHELP is the aid received from them at the moment of arrival, coded as a dichotomy and in agreement with its label. CAMP is 1 if the respondent was interned in a detention camp at arrival and 0 if released directly into the community. MARSTAT is the respondent's marital status, coded 1 if married, including common-law unions,

Results of this analysis are presented in Table 4. Included are standardized discriminant-function coefficients and group centroids. Wilks λ is transformed into χ^2 and probability levels are presented. The complementary maximum likelihood analysis was performed by fitting equations to binomial dependent variables corresponding to each of the significant discriminant functions. With some exceptions, results replicated those of the previous analysis, including a close fit between logit and unstandardized canonical discriminant-function coefficients. Since, for our purposes, relative rather than absolute order of magnitude is most important, the table presents standardized canonical-function coefficients. Those flagged as significant, however, are restricted to variables meeting minimum statistical criteria in both analyses.⁸

and 0 otherwise. ENGLISH is the score on an 8-point scale of English comprehension developed for use with immigrant samples (Portes and Bach, 1985: Ch. 3); standardized item alpha reliability is .94 for the Cuban sample and .90 for the Haitian.

The following social and economic characteristics are dummy variables coded in agreement with their labels: predominantly intraethnic social relations (ETHSOC); opportunities to meet with Anglo-Americans (ANGLO); discrimination by Anglos experienced by respondent or his family (EXPDIS); current employment in manufacturing (MANUF); opportunities to advance in present job (OPPORT); and employment in more than one occupation (TWOJOB). The remaining variables are indicators of employment and economic situation: UNEMPL is length of past unemployment in the United States in months; JOBTIME is tenure in the present job, also in months; HINCOME is household income in dollars per month; TIMEAID is total number of months of private or public welfare aid since arrival.

⁸ Significant standardized coefficients are those exceeding 1.65 of their respective standard errors in both the discriminant and logistic regression analyses. Binomial dependent variables for the latter were as follows:

Function I: Primary and Enclave (Cubans) over Informal; Secondary excluded.

Function II (Cubans only): Enclave over Primary and Secondary; Informal excluded;

Function III: Primary over Secondary; Enclave (Cubans) and Informal excluded.

These results are available upon request.

Table 4. Discriminant Analysis of Labor Market Sectors: Cuban and Haitian Entrants

Variables ^a	Cubans (N = 331)			Haitians (N = 186)	
	I	II	III	I	II
AGE	.026*	-.204	.067	.009	-.131
SEX	-.104	.047	-.225*	-.046	-.251*
EDUC	-.061	-.400*	-.235*	.131	.116
CAMP	.290*	.527*	.134	.430*	-.181
KIN	-.125	.250	-.315*	.441*	.149
KINHELP	.157	.035	.131	-.007	-.441*
MARSTAT	.245*	.281*	-.082	.147	.415*
ENGLISH	-.030	.008	-.473*	.252	-.472*
ETHSOC	.046	.305*	.073	.038	.102
ANGLO	.067	-.410*	.077	-.138	-.088
EXPDIS	-.225*	.093	-.210	-.157	.077
UNEMPL	.106	.051	.602*	.132	.311*
MANUF	.317*	-.364*	.055	.009	.049
JOBTIME	.114**	.036	-.257*	.187	-.018
OPPORT	.486*	-.038	-.033	.056	-.094
TWOJOB	.071	.349*	-.084	-.406*	.107
WORKERS	.236*	-.036	-.062	.092	-.236
HINCOME	.357*	.030	.268	.725*	-.043
TIMEAID	-.228**	-.203	.004	-.223*	-.030
Eigenvalue	.409	.175	.119	.427	.288
Percent of Variance	58.25	24.86	16.86	59.68	40.32
Canonical Correlation ^b	.539	.387	.326	.547	.473
χ^2	191.25 p<.001	85.08 p<.02	34.93 p<.07	101.97 p<.001	42.44 p<.03
<i>Group Centroids</i>					
Primary	.728	-.659	-.586	1.098	-1.236
Secondary	.025	-.381	.499	.280	.398
Enclave	.547	.499	.016	—	—
Informal	-.892	.079	-.181	-.876	-.297

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.^a See footnote 7 for definition of variables.^b Figures are standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients.

The analysis yields three significant discriminant functions in the Cuban sample. Canonical correlations represent the association between each discriminant function and the $m-1$ set of dummy variables representing the m different subgroups. The first canonical correlation is of moderate size and the second and third are modest, but not insignificant. The nature of the three discriminant functions can be gleaned from the standardized canonical coefficients. Disregarding signs for the moment, the first and most important function is defined by age, marital status, camp internment at arrival, experiences of discrimination, and a set of economic variables including employment in manufacture, opportunities in current employment, number of household workers, household income, and welfare dependence. The second discriminant function is defined by education, camp internment at arrival, marital status, ethnicity of social relations, opportunities to interact with Anglos, number of jobs, and industrial employment. The third

function is defined by sex, number of kin in the United States, knowledge of English, length of unemployment, and time in present job.

For our purposes, the most telling results are the group centroids, for they bear directly on the hypothesis above. The significant χ^2 for the first function is due mostly to distance in the reduced function space between the primary and the informal sectors. The secondary group falls almost in the middle, while the enclave group is close to the primary sector. This result clearly supports the distinctness of the informal sector as one mode of labor market incorporation and its position at the opposite extreme of those employment situations which appear most desirable. The latter are defined by the primary and enclave groups which converge on the positive side of the function space.

Looking now at the direction of coefficients, informal-sector membership is associated with a greater presence of younger and single individuals, more frequent experiences of dis-

crimination, and less time spent in camps at arrival. Economic variables may be used to describe the opposite situation exemplified by the primary and enclave sectors. These variables are associated with industrial employment, greater opportunities in the present job, higher income, greater number of household workers, and less welfare dependence. Clearly, this first function is indicative of aspects and correlates of successful economic adaptation, at least during the first years in the United States.

The second discriminant function rearranges the groups differently. In this case, the significant difference in the reduced-function space is that between the enclave on the one hand, and the primary and secondary sectors on the other. The fact that the enclave and primary groups occupy opposite extremes indicates that, although sharing in the characteristics of relatively favorable economic adaptation reflected in the first function, they are still distinct in terms of the social aspects of their respective employment situations. Predictably, enclave-sector membership is associated with greater in-group social relations and lesser opportunities to interact with Anglos. Relative to participants in the two-tiered open labor market, enclave-group members are also less educated and less likely to be employed in industry; they are, however, more likely to be married, to have spent time in camps, and to hold more than one job.

The third function shows another facet of the differences between these groups. In this instance, it is the opposition between the primary and the secondary sectors which defines the principal polarity. This result supports the assertion of different employment situations among these refugees along the upper and lower tiers of the open (nonethnic) labor market. Predictably, secondary-sector membership is associated with a predominance of females, longer spells of unemployment, and less stable job tenure; it is also related to lesser knowledge of English and a weaker network of kin in the United States.

Taken as a whole, this analysis challenges the view that recent refugees are confined to a homogeneous niche in the American labor market. Despite a common unfavorable reception and a difficult early resettlement period, significant differences developed in their employment situation and its correlates. The analysis indicates that the background, social experiences, and economic situation of Cuban refugees can separate those in each tier of the open segmented labor market along one axis, both groups from participants in the enclave economy along a second, and each from confinement into the informal sector in a third.

These conclusions must be modified immediately, however, in the light of results obtained for the Haitian sample. An initial analysis which reproduced the one just described yielded only two significant discriminant functions. Inspection of the group centroids indicated that the sectors which failed to differentiate were the enclave and the secondary. Results in Table 4 are based on reclassifying the Haitian sample, eliminating the enclave sector, and redistributing its members to the remaining criteria. As expected, the bulk of this group fell in the secondary sector.

It is unnecessary to discuss Haitian results in detail since they reproduce those already described among Cubans for the first and third discriminant functions. Although the cluster of significant canonical coefficients varies somewhat, the pattern of group centroids is unmistakably the same. The primary and informal sectors are again at opposite extremes of the first function. In this instance, the informal group is characterized by a weaker network of kin and, as in the case of Cubans, briefer camp internment at arrival. Economic variables also define the opposite extreme of the function space: primary-sector membership is again associated with higher household income and less welfare dependence, as well as with less propensity to rely on more than one job. The second discriminant function again rearranges groups in a way that highlights the contrast between primary and secondary sectors. As among Cubans, the secondary sector is associated with a predominance of females, longer unemployment, and lesser knowledge of English. Among Haitians, singles predominate in this sector, as well as those who received little help from kin at arrival.

The fact that similar discriminant functions are identifiable in the two samples provides clear evidence of the differences that they reflect. The missing discriminant function in the Haitian sample is precisely that which separated the enclave from both segments of the open labor market among Cubans. This absence indicates that employment in an ethnic-enclave economy does not have the same consequences for all groups. The distinct characteristics associated with participation in the enclave sector do not appear to extend beyond those of the same nationality as the firm owners. For Haitian refugees, employment in the Cuban enclave is no different, at least in terms of these variables, from participation in the secondary labor market.⁹

⁹ Our findings are subject to the objection that one of the exogenous variables, monthly household income, is partially contaminated by the use of sub-minimum wages as a criterion for classification of the

This analysis has demonstrated the existence of significant differences across labor market sectors, but it has failed to clarify what these differences mean in terms of either the refugees' backgrounds or their present situation. Having established that different modes of labor market entry exist, we must also clarify how immigrants get into them and with what consequences. Table 5 presents a preliminary overview of the relevant data, reserving for the next section a systematic analysis of causal determinants.

Reading across rows, age, sex, race, and marital status all vary significantly in the Cuban sample. The unemployed are younger, on the average, and more often single than others. Blacks and women are also overrepresented in this category, but both are underrepresented in the enclave. Informal workers are also more likely to be black and single, although the percentage of females in this sector is not higher than in the secondary sector. Among Haitians, race is too homogenous a trait to register significant differences, and so is age, given the youth of the entire sample. Females are again overrepresented among the unemployed and underrepresented in the primary sector.

Education in the home country, education acquired in the United States, and knowledge of English do not vary much across labor market sectors, nor between the employed and the unemployed in the Cuban sample. This result suggests that entry into better employment situations is more dependent on ascriptive factors and social networks than on individual qualifications in this group. Among Haitians, however, both education at arrival and knowledge of English are significantly related to employment in general and to primary-sector entry, in particular.

The bottom rows of Table 5 reveal the most poignant differences among sectors in terms of average economic condition. The general pattern for both samples is that respondents who gained access to the primary sector have experienced the least unemployment, are least likely to receive welfare assistance, and have the highest individual and household incomes. Among Cubans, those working in the enclave come next in terms of favorable economic circumstances, surpassing, albeit by an insignificant margin, average income in the primary sector. The obverse of this picture is the condition of the unemployed and the informally

employed, who show consistently the longest periods of unemployment, higher levels of welfare dependence, and lowest incomes. Their dire economic straits are illustrated by the fact that average *household* incomes for the unemployed in both samples were below the 1983 federal poverty level for individuals.

DETERMINANTS OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND INFORMAL EMPLOYMENT

The preceding analysis has established two facts: first, that significant differences in modes of incorporation exist within immigrant groups who, in all appearance, should be confined to a uniform position at the bottom of the labor market. Second, that the major cleavage in employment situations in terms of their consequences is between refugees who have entered one or another sector of the legal, contractually regulated labor market and those who find themselves outside of it, either because they cannot find jobs or because the only ones available to them are in the informal economy. In this section, we turn to the issue of causal determinants of this major cleavage, drawing potential explanations from three different theoretical perspectives.

As dependent variables for this analysis, we selected three dummy variables constructed by dividing successively narrower segments of each sample. The total samples were first divided into employed and unemployed; the same was done with economically active respondents, after eliminating the voluntarily unemployed; the employed subsamples were divided, in turn, into formally and informally employed. In every case, the category of interest—unemployed or informal—was coded 1.

Among possible explanations of these situations, perhaps the most generally accepted is that stemming from the human capital perspective (Mincer, 1974). As applied to ethnic minorities' labor force participation, this perspective predicts differential outcomes essentially as a function of individual skills and abilities (Borjas, 1982). The latter make individuals more or less desirable to employers which, in turn, conditions their opportunities in the labor market. Although human capital analyses often leave marginal room for contextual variables such as "employer discrimination," their basic thrust is to model labor market outcomes as functions of the workers' own abilities (Chiswick, 1978). As indicators of this perspective, we selected the following variables: education at arrival (EDUC); occupational background in the home country (OCCUP); work experience (WORKEXP);

informal sector. We replicated the analysis after eliminating respondents whose *only* reason for inclusion in the informal sector was very low wages. Since these represent a small group in both samples, it is not surprising that results did not differ significantly from those reported above.

Table 5. Breakdown of Background and Economic Variables by Labor Market Sectors

Variables	Cubans					Haitians					
	Primary (N = 42)	Secondary (N = 83)	Enclave (N = 104)	Informal (N = 102)	Unemployed (N = 189)	p	Primary (N = 20)	Secondary (N = 105)	Informal (N = 61)	Unemployed (N = 312)	p
Mean Age	40.6	39.9	38.4	38.8	35.4	.001	30.2	32.9	33.8	31.3	n.s.
Percent Female	38.1	30.6	20.0	30.3	53.4	.001	8.3	30.1	37.7	77.4	.00
Percent Black	7.1	10.3	5.2	15.7	15.1	.07	95.0	86.0	89.0	85.2	n.s.
Percent Married	71.4	65.6	79.2	54.6	46.3	.001	25.0	61.1	35.7	49.8	.001
Education at Arrival (Years)	10.1	9.5	8.9	8.7	8.6	n.s.	6.2	5.1	5.0	4.2	.03
Education in U.S. (Months)	3.4	6.3	4.6	4.2	5.4	n.s.	5.3	4.6	4.2	4.2	n.s.
Average Knowledge of English ^a	2.0	2.6	2.0	1.8	2.0	n.s.	4.7	2.2	2.4	1.6	.001
Average Months of Unemployment	2.8	8.1	5.5	5.7	18.8	.001	8.8	9.2	11.0	22.2	.001
Percent Employed in Industry	53.0	36.3	33.2	19.0	—	.01	19.1	17.9	16.3	—	n.s.
Percent Receiving Welfare ^b	3.5	17.2	8.9	23.0	51.0	.001	10.2	9.5	16.6	39.5	.001
Average Monthly Income	872	780	883	580	—	.001	692	602	430	—	.01
Average Household Income	1411	1195	1392	872	401	.001	1052	860	689	310	.001

^a Scores in the Knowledge of English scale. See footnote 7.

^b See footnote 7 for definition of WELFARE.

size of place of birth (URBAN) as an indicator of urban origins and experience; knowledge of ENGLISH; information about U.S. society (KNOWUS); and education in the United States (USEDUC).¹⁰

Other theorists of labor force participation have repeatedly called attention to ascriptive differences in participation and related outcomes which persist even after controlling for all relevant human capital variables. Such is the case, for example, with significant differences between sexes and between races, each documented by an extensive research literature (Duncan, 1968; Lieberman, 1980; Rosenfeld, 1980; Treiman and Roos, 1984). A third perspective has focused primarily on immigrant minorities, emphasizing the importance of contextual variables as determinants of employment situation, net of individual-level characteristics (Piore, 1979; Marshall, 1983; Wilson and Portes, 1980). Although these last two perspectives do not deny the significance of human capital, they focus on other factors which like gender and skin color and, in the case of immigrants, their mode of reception in the host society can decisively affect labor market outcomes. To test these hypotheses, we selected the following variables: SEX; RACE; marital status (MARSTAT); help received from relatives after arrival (KINHELP); internment in a detention camp at arrival (CAMP); and predominant ethnicity of the U.S. neighborhood where respondents have mostly lived (NEIGHBOR).¹¹

Each dependent variable was regressed on all predictors. Since endogenous variables are dichotomies, OLS will not do because their measure violates by definition the assumption of homoscedasticity and would probably misspecify the true probability function. Probit and logistic regression obviate the difficulties

created by OLS in this situation, although each presents other difficulties, such as the assumption that individual probabilities can be derived exactly from the maximum likelihood function (Hanushek and Jackson, 1977:203). Despite these problems, we opted for logistic regression.

The first column of each panel of Table 6 presents full regressions of each dependent variable in both samples. In each, the logarithm of the probability of being unemployed or informally employed is expressed as a linear function of a constant and the set of human capital, ascriptive, and contextual factors listed above. Our interest in this analysis is to identify the most significant predictors. The magnitude of coefficients and, in particular, the associated t-values must be interpreted, however, with caution. Inspection of the correlation matrix in both samples reveals sizable intercorrelations, especially in the subset of education and knowledge variables. These correlations suggest multicollinearity. A summary indicator of multicollinearity is provided by the determinant of the correlation matrix among exogenous variables. This statistic is bounded by 0 (perfect linear relationship between two or more variables) and 1 (perfect independence) (Farrar and Glauber, 1967). The determinants in this case are .089 in the Cuban sample and .134 in the Haitian, figures which again support the hypothesis of multicollinearity.

If this is the case, it is not possible to arrive at a parsimonious model of significant effects based on the t-values alone since the latter may be negatively affected by high intercorrelations among predictors. In the absence of a standard solution to this problem, we proceeded to fit a series of models, checking for suppression effects and drastic changes in the magnitudes of coefficients as variables were added or subtracted. With a few exceptions, this analysis confirmed the overall pattern of the full models, showing a few variables to have reliable effects and most to be unstable predictors. Final models with insignificant effects deleted are presented in columns 2 of each panel of Table 6.

Logit coefficients express the incremental effect of exogenous variables on the logarithm of the probability ratio corresponding to each endogenous variable. To facilitate their interpretation, we also computed net changes in actual probabilities, ΔP , associated with effects of each exogenous variable:

$$\Delta P = \exp(L_1) / [1 + \exp(L_1)] - \exp(L_0) / [1 + \exp(L_0)],$$

where $L_0 = \text{Log} [P/(1-P)]$, the logit of the odds-ratio at the sample mean; $L_1 = L_0 + B_j$, the logit after the unit change in X_j (Petersen,

¹⁰ URBAN is a 7-point scale ranging from "less than 10,000" to "1 million or more." OCCUP are scores in Treiman's (1977) occupational prestige scale, selected because of its cross-national comparability. WORKEXP is defined as age minus education minus 6. KNOWUS is an 8-point scale of information about U.S. society developed for use with immigrant groups; items range from knowledge of political figures to various tax and credit matters (Portes and Bach, 1985: Ch. 3); standardized alpha reliability is the same for both samples (.73). USEDUC is total months of courses of education taken since arrival.

¹¹ RACE is coded 1 for whites, 0 for blacks and mulattoes. NEIGHBOR is 1 if most residents in the neighborhood where respondent has lived are of the same group (Cubans or Haitians) and 0 otherwise. All other variables were defined previously.

Table 6. Regressions Describing Effects of Various Characteristics on the Log-Odds of Unemployment and Informal Employment

Exogenous Variables	I ^b (Unemployed, Total Sample) Logit Coefficients ^d			A. Cubans II ^b (Unemployed, Labor Force) Logit Coefficients			III ^c (Informally Employed) Logit Coefficients		
	1.	2.	3. ΔP	1.	2.	3. ΔP	1.	2.	3. ΔP
<i>ASCRPTIVE</i>									
SEX	-.463 (4.16)	-.454 (4.30)	-.103	296 (2.12)	-.259 (2.15)	-.051	-.011 (.074)		
RACE	.026 (.17)			-.084 (.53)			-.246 (1.17)		
<i>HUMAN CAPITAL</i>									
EDUC	-.033 (1.71)			-.028 (1.33)			-.020 (.81)		
WORKEXP	-.013 (2.44)	-.013 (2.56)	-.004	-.015 (2.47)	-.012 (2.48)	-.004	-.009 (1.22)		
URBAN	.043 (1.44)			.070 (2.01)	.070 (2.02)	.014	.006 (.16)		
OCCUP	.001 (.55)			.001 (.71)			-.005 (.92)		
USEDUC	.004 (.49)			-.001 (.08)			-.001 (.10)		
ENGLISH	.006 (.24)			.017 (.61)			-.014 (.42)		
KNOWUS	-.074 (2.51)	-.068 (2.60)	-.020	-.060 (1.82)	-.062 (2.18)	-.011	-.082 (2.21)	-.107 (3.28)	-.024
<i>CONTEXTUAL</i>									
MARSTAT	-.368 (3.60)	-.370 (3.72)	-.083	-.444 (3.87)	-.450 (4.06)	-.083	-.301 (2.21)	-.319 (2.39)	-.063
CAMP	.027 (.25)			.038 (.31)			-.182 (1.25)		
KINHELP	-.329 (3.11)	-.355 (3.48)	-.081	-.321 (2.68)	-.357 (3.13)	-.072	-.130 (.96)		
NEIGHBOR	-.130 (.78)			-.053 (.28)			-.515 (2.48)	-.479 (2.39)	-.091
P	.399			.293			.314		
N	520			468			331		
<i>B. Haitians</i>									
Exogenous Variables	I ^b (Unemployed, Total Sample) Logit Coefficients ^d			II ^b (Unemployed, Labor Force) Logit Coefficients			III ^c (Informally Employed) Logit Coefficients		
	1.	2.	3. ΔP	1.	2.	3. ΔP	1.	2.	3. ΔP
<i>ASCRPTIVE</i>									
SEX	-1.070 (9.15)	-1.101 (10.09)	.271	-1.060 (8.94)	-1.806 (9.84)	-.262	-.083 (.39)		
RACE	.006 (.04)			-.011 (.07)			.005 (.02)		
<i>HUMAN CAPITAL</i>									
EDUC	-.015 (.77)			-.021 (1.02)			.008 (.26)		
WORKEXP	-.007 (1.14)			-.009 (1.36)			.015 (1.41)		
URBAN	.106 (2.57)	.102 (2.56)	.023	.112 (2.64)	.103 (2.58)	.024	.070 (.97)		
OCCUP	-.015 (1.40)			-.011 (1.56)			-.016 (2.40)	-.103 (2.33)	-.004
USEDUC	.001 (.05)			.001 (.05)			-.013 (.74)		
ENGLISH	-.026 (.81)			-.023 (.71)			-.020 (.41)		
KNOWUS	.011 (.26)			.019 (.43)			.031 (.46)		

Table 6. *Continued*

EXOGENOUS VARIABLES ^a	I ^b (Unemployed, Total Sample) Logit Coefficients ^d			B. Haitians II ^b (Unemployed, Labor Force) Logit Coefficients			III ^c (Informally Employed) Logit Coefficients		
	1.	2.	3. ΔP	1.	2.	3. ΔP	1.	2.	3. ΔP
CONTEXTUAL									
MARSTAT	-.062 (.56)			-.042 (.38)			-.430 (2.35)	-.361 (2.17)	-.073
CAMP	.001 (.01)			.019 (.16)			.096 (1.45)		
KINHELP	-.102 (.93)			-.120 (1.07)			.312 (1.54)		
NEIGHBOR	-.050 (.45)			-.048 (.42)			-.330 (1.83)	-.252 (1.77)	-.053
P	.630			.611			.334		
N	499			478			186		

^a See footnotes 7, 10, 11 for definition of variables.
^b Unemployed coded 1, others 0.
^c Informally coded 1, others 0.
^d t-values in parentheses.

1985). Probability changes are presented in columns 3 of the respective panels of Table 6.

Unemployment, whether total or among the economically active, is dependent on almost the same set of variables in each sample. This result reflects the fact that unemployment in both groups is mostly involuntary. The set of predictors varies significantly, however, between samples. Comparing Cuban and Haitian regressions, the single most significant finding is the very strong effect of sex on employment status. This result cannot be attributed to gender differences in education and other human capital variables, since the latter are controlled. Net of them, the disadvantage of women with respect to men is reflected in a 10 percent greater probability of unemployment in the Cuban sample and a full 27 percent in the Haitian.

When only those in the labor force are considered, the gender effect in the Cuban sample is halved while in the Haitian it remains essentially the same. This finding indicates that the substantial rates of unemployment found in both groups but especially among Haitians are due, to a large extent, to the difficulties of refugee women in gaining access to even the most modest jobs, regardless of their qualifications.

The human capital hypothesis is supported in the Cuban, but not the Haitian sample by the significant effects of work experience and knowledge of U.S. society. However, neither is very sizable in absolute terms. Next to sex, the two strongest effects on unemployment among Cubans correspond to contextual variables. Aid from relatives at the time of arrival reduces the likelihood of unemployment four

years later by 8 percent on the average; being married has a similar absolute effect.

Net of sex, the only reliable effect in the Haitian sample is that of place of birth and it is counterintuitive. Urban origin, instead of reducing the likelihood of unemployment, increases it. A unit change in the 7-point scale for size of place of birth reduces the probability of finding employment by 2 percent. The fact that this is not a random effect is demonstrated by its persistence in multiple models fitted to the Haitian data. In addition, it is also present in the Cuban sample, where a unit increase in urban origin decreases the probability of employment by 1.4 percent among the economically active.

Additional analyses did not provide evidence of significant interaction effects in either sample. There are several results in these regressions, however, which require elucidation, and perhaps none as much as the urban-origin effect. Reasons why urban-born refugees should find themselves at a disadvantage relative to those born in small towns and rural places are not readily apparent. A possible explanation lies in the higher occupational and income aspirations among those coming from the larger cities. Finding that they cannot meet these aspirations, they may opt to remain unemployed until better opportunities come along. A second explanation is based on different levels of social support. Urban life is more "anomic" and less conducive to organized migration, which relies on established networks in places of destination. If this is the case, we may have misspecified the equation by including help from relatives as a predictor, but not their number or that of close friends.

Table 7. Regressions Describing Effects of Urban Origin and Places of Settlement on Unemployment^a

Exogenous Variables	Cubans			Haitians		
	1. Logit Coefficient	2. t-value	3. ΔP	1. Logit Coefficient	2. t-value	3. ΔP
SEX	-.291	2.34	-.063	-1.032	9.14	-.205
WORKEXP	-.012	2.33	-.003			
URBAN	.062	1.66	—	.074	1.69	—
KNOWUS	-.068	2.32	-.012			
MARSTAT	-.446	3.96	-.013			
KINHELP	-.343	2.93	-.080			
BEACH ^b	.236	1.42	—			
HIALEAH	-.121	.79	—			
DADE ^c	-.805	2.48	-.192			
LAUD ^d				-.686	4.70	-.158
BELLE ^e				-.498	3.64	-.110
P	.293			.611		
N	468			478		

^a Unemployed coded 1, employed 0. Economically active samples.

^b Miami Beach coded 1, others 0.

^c Unincorporated Dade County coded 1, others 0.

^d Fort Lauderdale coded 1, others 0.

^e Town of Belle Glade coded 1, others 0.

We tested each of these interpretations by adding the relevant independent variables, but found support for neither. Introduction of these predictors leaves the effects of urban origins essentially unaltered.

The above explanations would seem to exhaust possible ones, except that we also found a high correlation between places of birth and places of destination. Urban refugees, particularly those coming from the capital cities, evince a clear preference for settling in the city of Miami and, among Cubans, in Miami Beach. It is possible that the clear preference of urbanites to remain in core urban settings decreases their chances for employment since economic competition in these areas is greatest. Table 7 presents results of introducing in the unemployment equations dummy variables representing respondents' principal places of settlement since arrival. To avoid redundancy, only results for the involuntarily unemployed are presented. In both samples, city of Miami is the omitted category. Relative to it, residence in three out of four outlying areas significantly decreases the probability of unemployment, while residence in Miami Beach is not statistically different from residence in the core city. Effects of urban origin drop to insignificance in both samples. Based on these results, these puzzling effects can be attributed to a combination of preferences among individuals born in the larger cities for resettling in central urban places plus an unanticipated contextual effect, namely, apparent differences in employment opportunities for refugees in various areas of settlement. Judging by the size of the coefficients,

places of settlement can have a strong impact on immigrants' employment situation.

The third panel of Table 6 shows that entry in the informal sector as opposed to more regular forms of employment is a function of a different set of predictors. There are three reliable effects in each regression, and two are common to both samples. Marriage increases the probability of regular employment by approximately 6 percent on the average in each sample. Settling in neighborhoods where most residents are of the same nationality also increases significantly the probability of regular employment in both groups. The third effect corresponds to a human capital variable, but it is not the same across samples. Among Haitians, a unit change in background occupational status reduces the probability of informal employment by approximately half a percent. Among Cubans, a unit increase in the knowledge-of-U.S. scale reduces that probability by 2.5 percent.¹²

¹² This last result may be challenged, however, on the grounds that the causal effect actually runs in the opposite direction. Since variables were measured at the same time, it is possible that level of information does not reduce the probability of informal employment but that the latter reduces information. As seen above, KNOWUS is also a significant predictor of unemployment and the same argument may be applied to that effect. If the argument is correct, however, there should be a negative relationship between length of unemployment or length of informal employment and level of information. The argument posits essentially a "negative" socialization effect (Hyman, 1967): the longer the respondent has experienced either situation, the lower should be his/her level of information. We tested this alterna-

Effects of marital status and neighborhood of residence require clarification. It is not immediately obvious, for example, why marriage should reduce the probability of informal employment. This effect can be interpreted as a contextual one, due to the intervening influence of other omitted variables. It can also be interpreted as an irreducible ascriptive effect which is due to employer preferences and other intangible advantages in the labor market. The neighborhood effect is clearly a contextual one, but it is not obvious why co-ethnic neighborhoods should decrease rather than increase the probability of informal employment.

An initial interpretation of both effects is based on differential levels of social support. Married refugees tend to have large networks of kin and friends since they can add to their own those of their spouses. The same is true for refugees living in mostly ethnic neighborhoods. Larger and more supportive networks may facilitate entry into regular employment, avoiding bottom jobs in the informal sector. To test this interpretation, we selected three variables: total number of relatives, constructed as the sum of relatives of self and spouse living in the same city; total number of friends in the city; and help received after arrival (MOSHELP), coded 1 if most came from relatives and friends and 0 if most came from other sources.

A second interpretation of the marriage effect is based on the objective need of married refugees to find better-paid jobs in order to support their families. This need would spur them to avoid the informal sector and seek regular employment. If this interpretation is correct, number of children living with the respondent should increase the need for regular employment, while number of other family workers contributing to the household budget should decrease it.

A final explanation of both the marriage and neighborhood effects is a residential one. Married refugees may settle more frequently in areas where employment opportunities are better, while singles may tend to prefer the central city, where they are more restricted. The ethnic-neighborhood effect may also be due to concentration in areas where opportunities for regular employment are more favorable. If this interpretation is correct, the neigh-

tive interpretation and found no support for it. Relationships are not negatively monotonic as predicted, but follow an erratic pattern. Regardless of whether each employment situation is of recent date or goes back to the time of arrival, levels of information are uniformly low and do not change predictably with time. Based on these results, we conclude that the knowledge effects on both dependent variables are not mispecified.

borhood effect would be spurious. To test this last interpretation, we employ the same set of residential dummy variables introduced above.

Table 8 presents results of this final analysis. For brevity, insignificant effects are deleted although results are based on all predictors. As figures show, none of the above interpretations receives support in either sample. The original marriage and neighborhood effects remain intact in both instances. Among Haitians none of the variables representing social support, economic need, or place of settlement has a reliable effect on informal employment. Among Cubans, the analysis uncovers two additional significant effects. Contrary to the economic-need argument, number of other family workers *decreases* the probability of informal employment by about 7 percent; early help from kin and friends has a similar effect. Both of these are contextual effects which provide some additional support for the importance of such variables in determining employment situation, although they fail to account for the original effects.

Marital status and ethnic-neighborhood effects are thus neither spurious nor interpretable as a consequence of the above set of intervening variables.¹³ Based on these results, we conclude that marriage represents in this instance a quasi-ascriptive characteristic, akin to sex, whose effects probably inhere in employer preferences and other external factors and not in personal need or social networks. Similarly, ethnicity of neighborhood is interpretable as a broad contextual variable whose effects are irreducible to the immediate circle of kin and friends or the help they may provide.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper started with the common view of immigrants as a fairly homogeneous category and the presumption that newcomers arriving under unfavorable circumstances would be channeled to low-paid jobs at the bottom of the labor market. This view, based on the histories of earlier European immigrations, is applied by extension to those occurring at present. Contrary to it, our analysis uncovered significant differences in labor market situations among groups who, because of their modest background and unfavorable reception, could be expected to best fulfill that prediction. The very difficult conditions confronted by recent Cuban and Haitian refugees are reflected less

¹³ A similar analysis of the effect of marital status on unemployment in the Cuban sample yielded identical results. As in the case of informal employment, other potential explanatory factors failed to reduce the original effect.

Table 8. Logistic Regressions Describing Effects of Original Predictors and Additional Variables on Informal Employment

Exogenous Variables ^a	Cubans ^b			Haitians ^b		
	1. Logit Coefficient	2. t-value	3. ΔP	1. Logit Coefficient	2. t-value	3. ΔP
OCCUP	—	—	—	-.012	2.10	-.003
KNOWUS	-.100	2.81	-.024	—	—	—
MARSTAT	-.549	2.59	-.104	-.332	1.97	-.072
NEIGHBOR	-.542	2.59	-.100	-.259	1.82	-.054
WORKERS	-.285	2.03	-.062	—	—	—
MOSHELP	-.332	2.39	-.071	—	—	—
P	.314			.334		
N	331			186		

^a See footnotes 7, 10, 11 and text for definition of variables.

^b Informal employment coded 1, regular employment, 0.

in their uniform entry into minimally paid jobs than in the absence of any entry at all. The large numbers of both groups who were unemployed in 1983 faced one of the most precarious situations of any minority in the country since they also lacked sustained government assistance, due to their irregular legal status.

These alarming circumstances are not the entire story, however, because a substantial number of both groups managed to find some form of employment. Theories of labor market segmentation would predict the wholesale entry of such immigrants into the lower tier or secondary labor market. Contrary to this prediction, we found considerable heterogeneity in labor market situations. Refugees employed in the secondary sector are flanked, on one side, by those who gained access to more favorable employment circumstances in the primary labor market and, among Cubans, in the ethnic enclave; on the other side, are those relegated to the informal economy.

The empirical identification of an enclave sector which employs approximately a third of working Cuban refugees and the favorable circumstances surrounding their employment only confirm results of prior research. What is unanticipated in these results is that an enclave mode of incorporation is available only to immigrants of the same nationality as the firm owners. For others, in this case Haitian refugees, employment in the enclave is indistinct from entry into the secondary labor market.

The existence of an unregulated sector of the South Florida economy is confirmed by other independent evidence. Although research on the informal economy is difficult because of the illegal character of many of these activities, individuals familiar with local labor conditions confirmed their widespread character. During the summer of 1983, we conducted a series of open-ended interviews with labor leaders, labor researchers, and entrepreneurs in Miami in conjunction with the beginning of the sur-

veys. Several of these informants were able to confirm independently facts which point toward an expanding informal sector.¹⁴ Informants indicated that recent Cuban and Haitian refugees did not enter a well-established informal economy, but that their presence stimulated its development. Their precarious situation, often approaching destitution, compelled many to avail themselves of any income-earning opportunities. Entrepreneurs, especially owners of highly competitive firms, took advantage of the opportunity. These reports coincide with the survey findings in pointing toward a substantial number of recent refugees employed in this manner and to the highly unfavorable wage and work conditions attached to this mode of employment.

Given the very difficult initial situation of these refugees, an appropriate question is why more of them did not find themselves unemployed or employed in the informal sector. The analysis of this question produced two major findings. First, certain human capital variables significantly affect employment opportunities in both samples. Occupational-status background, work experience, and knowledge of U.S. society all reduced the probability of unemployment or informal employment. The latter variable, in particular, consistently improved labor market prospects among Cubans. Second, major factors affecting employment in both groups are related less

¹⁴ Among these facts is the drop of unionized labor from 90 to less than 10 percent of construction starts in the Miami SMSA because of the proliferation of firms hiring nonunion labor, often on an informal basis. Similarly, the garment industry, centered in Hialeah, has been rapidly decentralized through a putting-out system which distributes cloth to immigrant seamstresses working at home for a piece rate. Under-the-counter hiring practices, without employee benefits or tax deductions, have also become common in other small businesses such as restaurants and motels.

to human capital than to certain ascriptive and contextual characteristics. Among them, sex differences and marital status are major ones whose effects proved irreducible to individual abilities or to the support of social networks. Help from relatives improved employment possibilities among Cubans, while residence in a predominantly ethnic neighborhood reduced the probability of informal employment among both groups. Finally, an analysis of the anomalous effect of urban origins indicated that places of settlement in the United States can also condition the probability of escaping unemployment. In synthesis, results showed that it is not how much education Cuban and Haitian refugees brought or how much English they learned, but where they settled, whether they were male and married, and how much support they extracted from their kin networks which determined their chances for entry into some form of regular employment.

Once stated, the fact that there are significant labor market differences even among the most downtrodden groups seems obvious. Yet the thrust of popular and scholarly rhetoric has generally gone in the opposite direction. As a noted scholar in this field states:

As one moves from one country to another and reads through historical descriptions, one even begins to believe that there is something in common among jobs held by migrants . . . The jobs tend to be unskilled, generally but not always low paying, and to carry or connote inferior social status; they often involve hard or unpleasant working conditions and considerable insecurity; they seldom offer chances of advancement toward better paying, more attractive job opportunities. (Piore, 1979:17)

There is much truth to this description, but it is by no means the whole story. Results presented above show that even among the most unfortunate new immigrants, there can be significant differences in modes of incorporation into the American labor market and that such differences do not occur at random, but are explainable through a patterned set of factors. Our results do not warrant much optimism as to the collective future of recent Cuban and Haitian refugees, but indicate that, in their case as well as others, research should move beyond blanket generalizations to understand the plurality of situations confronted by each foreign minority.

REFERENCES

Alba, Richard D.
1985 Italian Americans: Into the Twilight of

- Ethnicity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Althausen, Robert P. and Arne L. Kalleberg
1981 "Firms, occupations, and the structure of labor markets: a conceptual analysis." Pp. 119-49 in Ivar Berg (ed.), *Sociological Perspectives on Labor Markets*. New York: Academic.
- Bach, Robert L.
1984 "Socialist construction and Cuban emigration: explorations into Mariel." Paper presented at the Conference on Cuban-American Studies: Status and Future. Cambridge, MA, May (mimeo).
- Bach, Robert L., Jennifer B. Bach and Timothy Triplett
1981 "The flotilla 'entrants': latest and most controversial." *Cuban Studies* 11:29-48.
- Bach, Robert L., Linda W. Gordon, David W. Haines and David R. Howell
1984 "The economic adjustment of Southeast Asian refugees in the U.S." Pp. 51-56 in *United Nations Commission for Refugees, World Refugee Survey 1983*. Geneva: United Nations.
- Baron, James N. and William T. Bielby
1984 "The organization of work in a segmented economy." *American Sociological Review* 49:454-73.
- Barrera, Mario
1980 *Race and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- Bonacich, Edna
1972 "A theory of ethnic antagonism: the split labor market." *American Sociological Review* 37:547-49.
- Bonacich, Edna and Lucie Cheng
1984 "A theoretical orientation to international labor migration." Pp. 1-56 in Lucie Cheng and Edna Bonacich (eds.), *Labor Immigration under Capitalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bonacich, Edna and John Modell
1980 *The Economic Basis of Ethnic Solidarity, Small Business in the Japanese-American Community*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Borjas, George P.
1982 "The earnings of male Hispanic immigrants in the United States." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 35:343-53.
- Boswell, Thomas D. and James R. Curtis
1984 *The Cuban-American Experience*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.
- BSRI
1983 *Demography, Social Status, Housing, and Social Needs of the Haitian Population of Edison-Little River*. Report prepared for the Metro-Dade Government and the City of Miami by the Behavioral Science Research Institute. Miami (mimeo).
- Castells, Manuel
1984 "Towards the informational city? High technology, economic change, and spatial structure." Working Paper #430, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California, Berkeley.

- Child, Irving L.
1943 *Italian or American? The Second Generation in Conflict*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Chiswick, Barry R.
1978 "The effect of Americanization on the earnings of foreign-born men." *Journal of Political Economy* 86:897-921.
- Clark, Juan M., Jose I. Lasaga and Rose S. Reque
1981 *The 1980 Mariel Exodus: An Assessment and Prospect*. Washington, D.C.: Council for Inter-American Security.
- Diaz-Briquets, Sergio
1984 "Cuban-owned businesses in the United States." *Cuban Studies* 14:57-64.
- Doeringer, Peter and Michael Piore
1971 *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Duncan, Otis D.
1968 "Inheritance of poverty or inheritance of race?" Pp. 85-110 in Daniel P. Moynihan (ed.), *On Understanding Poverty: Perspectives from the Social Sciences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Edwards, Richard C.
1975 "The social relations of production in the firm and labor market structure." Pp. 3-26 in Richard C. Edwards, Michael Reich, and David M. Gordon (eds.), *Labor Market Segmentation*, Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
1979 *Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Basic Books.
- Farrar, D. E. and R. R. Glauber
1967 "Multicollinearity in regression analysis: the problem revisited." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 49:92-107.
- Fernandez-Kelly, Maria Patricia and Ana Garcia
1985 "Advanced technology, regional development, and women's employment in Southern California." Discussion paper, Center for U.S.-Mexico Studies, University of California, San Diego.
- Fienberg, Stephen E.
1980 *The Analysis of Cross-Classified Categorical Data*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Glasser, William A. and Christopher Habers
1974 "The migration and return of professionals." *International Migration Review* 8:227-44.
- Grasmuck, Sherri
1984 "Immigration, ethnic stratification, and native working class discipline: comparisons of documented and undocumented Dominicans." *International Migration Review* 18:692-713.
- Handlin, Oscar
1951 *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that Made the American People*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Hanushek, Eric and John E. Jackson
1977 *Statistical Methods for Social Scientists*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hodson, Randy
1984 "Companies, industries, and the measurement of economic segmentation." *American Sociological Review* 49:335-48.
- Hodson, Randy and Robert L. Kaufman
1982 "Economic dualism: a critical review." *American Sociological Review* 47:729-39.
- Hyman, Herbert
1967 *Survey Design and Analysis*. New York: Free Press.
- Jorge, Antonio and Raul Moncarz
1982 "The future of Hispanic market: the Cuban entrepreneur and the economic development of the Miami SMSA." Discussion paper in Economics and Banking, International Banking Center, Florida International University.
- Kalleberg, Arne L., Michael Wallace and Robert P. Althausen
1981 "Economic segmentation, worker power, and income attainment." *American Journal of Sociology* 87:651-83.
- Kim, Ilsoo
1981 *New Urban Immigrants: The Korean Community in New York*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kish, Leslie
1967 *Survey Sampling*. New York: Wiley.
- Liebersohn, Stanley
1980 *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Light, H. Ivan
1979 "Disadvantaged minorities in self-employment." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 20:31-45.
1980 "Asian enterprise in America: Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans in small business." Pp. 33-57 in Scott Cummings (ed.), *Self-Help in Urban America*. New York: Kenikat.
- Marshall, Adriana
1983 "Immigration in a surplus-worker labor market: the case of New York." *Occasional Papers Series #39*, Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, New York University.
- Mazur, Jan
1979 "The return of the sweatshop." *The New Leader* (August):7-10.
- Mincer, Jacob
1974 *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Miller, Jake C.
1984 *The Plight of Haitian Refugees*. New York: Praeger.
- Morales, Rick
1983 "Undocumented workers in a changing automobile industry." *Proceedings of the Conference on Contemporary Production: Capital Mobility and Labor Migration*. Center for U.S.-Mexico Studies, University of California, San Diego.
- Morales, Rick and Richard Mines
1985 "San Diego's full-service restaurants: a view from the back-of-the-house." Research Report, Center for U.S.-Mexico Studies, University of California, San Diego.
- Nee, Victor and Brett de Bary Nee
1973 *Longtime Californ': A Documentary His-*

- tory of an American Chinatown. New York: Pantheon.
- NACLA
 1979 "Undocumented immigrant workers in New York City." *NACLA Report on the Americas* 13:2-46.
- Pedraza-Bailey, Silvia
 1985 *Political and Economic Migrants in America: Cubans and Mexicans*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Petersen, Trond
 1985 "A comment on presenting results from logit and probit models." *American Sociological Review* 50:130-31.
- Petersen, William
 1971 *Japanese Americans, Oppression and Success*. New York: Random House.
- Piore, Michael J.
 1975 "Notes for a theory of labor market stratification." Pp. 125-71 in Richard C. Edwards, Michael Reich and David M. Gordon (eds.), *Labor Market Segmentation*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
 1979 *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor and Industrial Societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Portes, Alejandro and Robert L. Bach
 1985 *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, Alejandro, Juan M. Clark and Manuel M. Lopez
 1981 "Six years later, a profile of the process of incorporation of Cuban exiles in the United States: 1973-1979." *Cuban Studies* 11:1-24.
- Rosenfeld, Rachel
 1980 "Race and sex differences in career dynamics." *American Sociological Review* 45:583-609.
- Sassen-Koob, Saskia
 1984 "The new labor demand in global cities." Pp. 139-71 in Michael P. Smith (ed.), *Cities in Transformation*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Saxenian, Annalee
 1983 "The urban contradictions of Silicon Valley: regional growth and the restructuring of the semiconductor industry." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 7:237-62.
- Sowell, Thomas
 1981 *Ethnic America: A History*. New York: Basic Books.
- Stepick, Alex
 1982 "Haitian refugees in the U.S." *Minority Rights Group Report #52*. London: MRG.
 1984 "Haitians released from Krome: their prospects for adaptation and integration in South Florida." *Occasional Papers Series, Dialogue #24*, Latin American and Caribbean Center, Florida International University.
- 1985 "Haitians in Miami, an assessment of their background and potential." Research Report, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Florida International University.
- Stevens, Rosemary, Louis W. Goodman and Stephen Mick
 1978 *The Alien Doctors, Foreign Medical Graduates in American Hospitals*. New York: Wiley.
- Tolbert, Charles M., II, Patrick M. Horan and E. M. Beck
 1980 "The structure of economic segmentation: a dual economy approach." *American Journal of Sociology* 85:1095-1116.
- Treiman, Donald J.
 1977 *Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- Treiman, Donald J. and Patricia A. Roos
 1984 "Sex and earnings in industrial society: a nine-nation comparison." *American Journal of Sociology* 89:612-50.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census
 1984 "Socio-economic characteristics of U.S. foreign-born population." Release #CB84-179, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce (mimeo).
- U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service
 1984 *1980 Annual Report*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Van de Geer, John P.
 1971 *Introduction to Multivariate Analysis for the Social Sciences*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Waldinger, Roger
 1985 "Immigration and industrial change in New York City's apparel industry." Pp. 323-49 in Marta Tienda and George Borjas (eds.), *Hispanics in the U.S. Economy*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wallace, Michael and Arne L. Kalleberg
 1981 "Economic organization of firms and labor market consequences: toward a specification of dual economy theory." Pp. 77-117 in Ivar Berg (ed.), *Sociological Perspectives on Labor Markets*. New York: Academic Press.
- Warner, W. Lloyd and Leo Srole
 1945 *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Wells, Miriam
 1984 "The resurgence of sharecropping." *American Journal of Sociology* 90:1-19.
- Wilson, Kenneth and W. Allen Martin
 1982 "Ethnic enclaves: a comparison of the Cuban and black economies in Miami." *American Journal of Sociology* 88:135-60.
- Wilson, Kenneth L. and Alejandro Portes
 1980 "Immigrant enclaves: an analysis of the labor market experiences of Cubans in Miami." *American Journal of Sociology* 86:295-319.