International Journal of Urban and Regional Research Volume 24.3 September 2000

The Ethnic and Gender Division of Labor Compared Among Immigrants to Los Angeles*

RICHARD WRIGHT AND MARK ELLIS

In the 1980s, the Los Angeles' labor market grew by over 35% by adding 1.8 million new jobs to the metropolitan economy. Immigrants filled many of these places: between 1985 and 1990, for example, almost 400,000 foreign-born new arrivals joined the Los Angeles' workforce. This number more than matches New York's and dominates the next highest ranked metropolitan area in the United States. Los Angeles' new immigrant workers, as elsewhere, joined a metropolitan area segregated to varying degrees at home and at work along the lines of class, race, ethnicity, nativity and gender. In this paper, we center attention on some of the mechanisms that drive social differentiation in paid employment.

The production and reconstruction of the division of labor involves a complex set of interlinked demand and supply side forces. On the demand side, we know that employers critically shape the division of labor by deliberately recruiting based on ethnicity (e.g. Bailey and Waldinger, 1991; Waldinger, 1996a) and gender (e.g. Powell, 1993). On the supply side — the focus of this analysis — one perspective that begins to sort out processes separates explanations based on individual human capital attributes from those associated with social capital. Although certain immigrant groups can effectively use previous training and previously acquired skills to enter and advance in the labor market, among the foreign-born in contemporary Los Angeles, social capital explanations go further in unpacking large-scale patterns in the industrial division of labor (Ellis and Wright, 1999). Building directly on such research outcomes, the analysis of foreign-born job specialization reported here specifically compares immigrant occupational divisions of labor in three ways. For six of the most important foreign-born groups entering Los Angeles in the late 1980s, we weigh the relative importance of nativity, time of arrival and gender in the allocation of workers to jobs.

The general outline of the role of social capital in immigrant entry into a labor market is by now well known. A large and growing literature documents how many immigrant workers gain toeholds in occupational niches. Through family relationships and acquaintances based on place-of-birth ties at the local, regional or national scale, other immigrants use these networks to gain a place in a metropolitan economy. What is less well known is how time of arrival and place of birth interact with gender to construct lines of difference in occupation choice. Our study of the division of labor among immigrants offers a new analysis of the ethnic division of labor and occupational sex segregation.

* Direct correspondence with Richard Wright. Thanks go to John Campbell, Kim England, Christina Gomez and Deborah King for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper. The National Science Foundation (Grant no. SBR-9310647) supported this research.

Related historical, archival or ethnographic scholarly work tends to rely on case studies of individual immigrant groups. In contrast, we sacrifice the depth of a case study of one immigrant group for a broader and comparative analysis of several. In providing an original broad-brush rendition of the gendered construction of the occupational patterns of several different foreign-born groups, our investigation adds to the literature on ethnic networks and ethnic enclaves, as well as research concerned with sex segregation and the sex typing of occupations.

Immigrants and the Los Angeles labor market

Circumstances of arrival, skills, race, education, ethnicity, class and gender interact to create a heterogeneity of immigrant employment experience in the United States (e.g. Portes and Rumbaut, 1996). In Los Angeles in the 1980s, however, previous research makes clear that generally speaking, many of the foreign-born shared an important attribute: they disproportionately gained employment relative to the native born (e.g. Ong and Valenzuela, 1996; Scott, 1996; Wright and Ellis, 1997). Some of these jobs provided the opportunity for upward mobility and a dignified standard of living; many others, however, offered only poor pay and tedious, hard, unstable work (e.g. Lopez *et al*., 1996; Ortiz, 1996). Nevertheless, immigrants not only held 'comparative advantage' in sectors of growth, but they also even gained employment in stagnant and unstable parts of the economy (Wright and Ellis, 1997).

Immigrants leveraged relative labor market advantage in Los Angeles in a particular way. Modest educational levels and relatively poor English language skills explain why some groups take up certain occupations in Los Angeles (e.g. Lopez *et al*., 1996). Research now strongly suggests that ethnic forms of social capital, as much as and perhaps more than forms of human capital, also provided an important means by which many immigrants sorted into particular lines of work (Ellis and Wright, 1999). Ellis and Wright's findings indicated that what they identified as 'ethnic resources' went farther than skills (measured by years of education) in explaining the sorting of recent arrivals to the Los Angeles economy into different industrial sectors. The fact that post-1965 immigration policy continues to center on 'family reunification' offers another piece of evidence in favor of considering the influence of social capital-based systems of labor market entry and incorporation.

The theoretical basis for these empirical observations is strong. Granovetter (1974) put the operation of networks front and center in our understanding of how people get jobs. Theories of immigration and settlement often feature the vital role networks play in the process of migration itself (e.g. Piore, 1979; Hugo, 1981; Boyd, 1989; Gurak and Caces, 1992; Singer and Massey, 1998) and in the formation of ethnic enclave economies and ethnic employment niches in the destination (e.g. Wilson and Portes, 1980; Portes, 1987; Light and Bonacich, 1988; Portes and Jensen, 1989; Waldinger, 1993; 1996a). New arrivals use contacts with family and friends in the ethnic group to find work, thereby channeling into the same businesses and occupations of earlier co-ethnic arrivals and reforming the ethnic division of labor. Similar processes help sustain ethnic neighborhoods as networks and often simultaneously provide newcomers with information on both housing and jobs.

Once in the country, different forms of social structures affect economic action in US immigrant communities. Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993), for instance, identify two sources of social capital — bounded solidarity and enforceable trust — to amplify this idea. Such forms of capital grow from social forces such as outside discrimination based on phenotype or cultural difference, the need for preservation of an autonomous cultural repertoire, blockage of social and economic opportunities, and community monitoring and sanctioning. Confrontation with nativists may activate 'dormant feelings of

nationality among immigrants … where none existed before' (Portes and Sensenbrenner, 1993: 1328). In the same vein, such discrimination may stimulate pan-ethnic solidarities such that Chinese-Americans, for example, may become, in Eric Liu's elegant phrasing, 'accidentally Asian' (Liu, 1998).

Portes and Sensenbrenner's remarks specifically address economic outcomes and social action across different immigrant groups. Recent research by Grasmuck and Grosfoguel (1997) now makes the case that social capital in immigrant communities is also gendered. Similarly, we interpret Portes and Sensenbrenner's (1993) observations about blockage of opportunity or preservation of cultural traditions as operating differently for men and women among foreign-born groups. Women and men tend to access different networks for finding work in the United States or obtain differential information from networks because of gender typing of jobs.

Just as social capital in an ethnic residential community is gendered, women do not always tap the same migration information systems as men and often possess inferior financial resources for moving. Studies of migration and settlement demonstrate the pervasiveness of difference by gender in immigrant networking. Thus women frequently do not migrate in tandem with male partners and fashion migration patterns distinct from men — both in the timing and directionality of the flow (e.g. Morokvasic, 1983; Simon and Brettel, 1986; Pedraza, 1991; Tienda and Booth, 1991; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994; Ellis *et al*., 1996; Pessar, 1999). Gendered obligations often make it more difficult for women to migrate than men or require that they move for reasons other than employment (e.g. Donato, 1992; Bailey and Ellis, 1993; Ellis *et al*., 1996; Pessar, 1999).

A considerable body of evidence now also addresses gender divisions of labor, which informs us of the patterns of, and the reasons behind, why women and men frequently work in different jobs in the paid labor force (e.g. Jacobs and Lim, 1992; Reskin, 1993; Dubeck and Borman, 1996; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1997; Blau *et al*., 1998; Weeden, 1998). Hanson and Pratt (1995: 3) observe that, although sex-based segregation has declined slightly since the turn of the century, the tendency for women to hold different occupations from men is 'remarkably persistent'. For example, in 1940, 80% of white women would have had to switch occupations in order to have the same occupational distribution as men. In 1988 this proportion had dropped to about 60% and the decline in occupational sex segregation appeared to have slowed.[1]

Despite this scholarship on occupational sex segregation and the engendering of the immigration and migration literature (e.g. Ellis *et al*., 1996; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1997; Mahler, 1999; Pessar, 1999), the literature on ethnic enclaves and ethnic niches does not foreground gender divisions within ethnic groups. Jiobu's (1988) focus on 'ethnic hegemony' provides a particularly apposite example indicative of this tendency, but the trend is widespread (e.g. Wilson and Martin, 1982; Zhou and Logan, 1989; Bailey and Waldinger, 1991; Wright and Ellis, 1997). Recently this has begun to change (e.g. Gilbertson, 1995; Grasmuck and Grosfoguel, 1997; Hiebert, 1999; Hagan, 1998; Barot *et al*., 1999). Studies of the gender dimensions of ethnic employment niches to date, however, remain generally case based. Few studies systematically inspect differences in the division of labor by nativity across a metropolitan economy.

The nearest collection of research reports related to our aim of analyzing gender divisions of labor by group are those that contrast gender and racial/ethnic occupational segregation for the US as a whole (e.g. Lieberson and Waters, 1988; King, 1992; Reskin and Cassirer, 1996). For example, in 1988 black-white same-sex occupational segregation indices for the United States as a whole were 31.8 for men and 29.2 for women — about

1 Black men and women exhibit a similar trend (King, 1992). Also, note that these percentages are derived from indices of dissimilarity calculated over 159 occupations. The indices of dissimilarity in this paper are calculated over 14 occupations and thus are not directly comparable because of the sensitivity of the measure to the number of categories.

half of the levels of sex segregation within either of these two racial groups (King, 1992). Analysis of sex segregation among multiple ethnic groups finds a similar pattern outside the black-white dichotomy. Among a sample of American-born ethnic groups, the occupational division of labor among women compared to men, was generally more dissimilar from the expected distribution based on education (Lieberson and Waters, 1988). In other words, factors other than human capital may account more for the occupations held by women than those held by men. In their analysis of 26 race-ethnic groups, Reskin and Cassirer (1996) found men are more likely to work in the same jobs as men of other groups than in the jobs held by women of their own group. Reskin and Cassirer (1996: 241) go on to argue that 'gender remains the primary basis by which workers are sorted into occupations'. Moreover, evidence exists that same-sex occupational profiles across racial groups have grown more similar in recent decades, suggesting that gender has become more important, relatively speaking, than race in determining occupation (Albelda, 1986).

None of these studies systematically inspect differences in the division of labor by sex and nativity across a metropolitan economy. The research reported here hones in on some of the mechanisms that form the basis of the durability of occupational sex segregation by comparing the occupational profiles of immigrant women and men in Los Angeles for two successive cohorts of entry into the United States. Our method involves comparisons of occupational profiles between groups by sex using segregation indices. We conduct the analysis on the Los Angeles Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA) for the late 1980s, a place that has experienced dramatic change in its ethnic make-up recently because of immigration (e.g. Waldinger and Bozorgmehr, 1996).

We pay particular attention to time of arrival in our study of divisions of labor among immigrant women and men. By comparing the occupational profiles of recently arrived immigrants and the resident foreign-born, we begin to assess the strength of the networks that link new arrivals to settled members of the same ethnic group (Ellis and Wright, 1999). Although indexes of dissimilarity reflect a gendered and ethnicized labor market of employer preferences and discrimination, they also provide a proxy for network strength. In general, the smaller the difference between the occupational profiles of two groups, the larger the network strength. Differentiating immigrants by gender and ethnicity means we can try to calibrate network strength in both of these dimensions.

Several possibilities present themselves. Ethnicity could be the dominant axis of difference among immigrants. Here, men and women of each group would tend to work in the same occupations. Alternatively, ethnicity and gender could interact such that men and women of each immigrant group develop their own niches distinct from those of men and women of any other group. Another possibility is that gender could override ethnicity wherein women from different immigrant groups gravitate to work in the same occupations as women from other groups. This result would accord with previous findings on race/ethnic and gender divisions of labor (King, 1992; Reskin and Cassirer, 1996) and would suggest that exclusive, or even primary, emphasis on ethnicity as the key to comprehending occupational profiles in immigrant society is misplaced. Finally, because we differentiate recent immigrants from those who arrived earlier, our data show if ethnicity becomes more or less important than gender in its effect on occupational segregation after the period of initial settlement.

Data and methods

We use 1990 Public Use Micro Sample (PUMS) data (US Bureau of the Census, 1993) to match the occupational allocations of the newest entrants (i.e. those arriving from another country in the five-year period preceding the 1990 census) with those of already settled members of the same and other groups. We do this across a set of 14 broadly defined

occupations by sex. Situating the analysis at this scale of disaggregation allows insight into some of the main occupational dynamics by ethnicity and sex for the whole regional economy for the six most numerous immigrant groups. A finer-scaled disaggregation would permit a more nuanced analysis, but creates sample-size problems. For example, when performing the pilot study, zero counts increased considerably when we doubled the number of occupations or immigrant groups. The pilot research also revealed that the results were insensitive to marginal changes in the number of occupations.

Our occupational groups capture broad differences in types of employment. We structured them to illuminate variability in immigrant employment rather than aggregate employment; thus some categories have small percentages of total employment but large proportions of male or female immigrant employment, particularly recent arrivals (see Table 1). For example, at one end of the occupational spectrum we define five categories to identify machine operators, construction, food preparation, manual farm and forestry work, and private household services. Together, private household services and manual farm and forestry work total less than 3% of all jobs in Los Angeles. They are, however, important occupations for recent immigrants, especially women — 10% of recent immigrant women in the labor force hold jobs in private household services and 20% are manual farm and forestry workers (see Table 1). We define four categories to represent blue-collar jobs that generally require some skills and experience and which yield modest wages: mechanics and repair services, precision production and craft occupations, transportation operators, and protective services (i.e. police, firefighters, corrections officers). Jobs in these sectors tend to be held by men, both native and foreign-born. We separated a distinct category for administrative support jobs — a category that accounts for 17% of all jobs but skewed overwhelmingly toward women who are long-term residents. Four categories round out the list, each with substantial percentages of native-born and immigrant workers of both sexes: technicians, sales workers, managers and professionals.

Contrasting the employment patterns of recent arrivals with comparison groups of the resident foreign-born allows us to gauge the concentration of new immigrants in the same occupations as their co-ethnics already at work in the Los Angeles CMSA labor market. Thus, our analysis allows us to identify some differences by occupational niche: notably, the relative strength of ethnic networks and the relative importance of gender, in hiring newcomers. Our data source allows us to analyze paid work only. We therefore only tangentially speak to the interactions of labor market (re)composition and changes in the domestic sphere.

We focus principally on two categories of worker. The first we refer to as 'resident immigrants'. These workers were born outside the US and its territories and were resident in Los Angeles on 1 April 1985 and 1990. The second we describe as a 'recent immigrant' worker — someone born outside the US (but not to a US parent) who lived abroad on 1 April 1985, came to stay in the US between 1985 and 1990, and lived and worked in Los Angeles on 1 April 1990.[2] Early in the analysis we compare the occupational distribution of these two groups with that of the whole population of workers in Los Angeles. Thus 'total' employment refers to all workers in the paid labor force counted by the census.

We restrict ourselves to the six largest immigrant groups (Mexicans, Salvadorans, Filipinos, Guatemalans, South Koreans and Chinese). Each of these groups added more

2 Most definitions of recent immigrants include all those who came to stay in the five-year period before the census. Ellis and Wright (1998) suggest the added restriction that recent immigrants had also to be outside the US on 1 April 1985. Accordingly, we exclude those foreign-born workers resident elsewhere in the US in 1985 and living and working in Los Angeles in 1990. Classifying foreign-born internal migrants in the US as either internal migrants or immigrants is not straightforward because in many respects they are both. We decided to treat them as a distinct migrant group requiring separate analysis beyond the scope of the present paper.

than 10,000 recent migrants to the workforce of the Los Angeles CMSA between 1985 and 1990; sufficient numbers to permit an occupational analysis by sex of the regional economy. Migrants from Mexico dominate this flow with over 180,000 new arrivals in the workforce in those five years, but substantial flows of workers also occurred from Central America and East and South East Asia. Together, these six groups comprise about 72% of the immigrants who arrived in Los Angeles and took jobs there between 1985 and 1990. The employment profiles of men and women in each of these immigrant groups across 14 occupations captures details about occupational variation while generating only a handful of zero counts.

We use a quotient, Q, to highlight relative overrepresentation of group employment in an occupation (Model, 1993; Waldinger, 1996a; Ellis and Wright, 1999).

$$Q = (Eij/E.j)/(Ei./E..)$$

where Eij is the number of workers in ethnic group i in occupation j, E.j is the total number of workers in occupation j, Ei. is the total number of workers in group i in the regional economy, and E.. is the total of all workers in the regional economy. After experimentation we determined 'overrepresentation' to occur when a group's percentage of employment in an occupation exceeds 1.2 times its percentage share of the total workforce. Higher levels identified too few concentrations to highlight distinctive occupational patterns for some groups; lower levels identified too many sectors to distinguish occupational profiles from one another. For example, 9.71% of all workers are classified as involved in food preparation and related employment in Los Angeles, whereas 20.38% of recent immigrant women work in that sector. The ratio of these two percentages exceeds 1.2, and we therefore consider this an employment concentration for recent immigrant women (see Table 1).

As we highlight differences by occupation, we also measure the overall difference in occupational profiles between groups using the index of dissimilarity. This index ranges between 0 and 100 and measures the percentage share of either group of workers who would have to be removed without replacement for the two occupational distributions to be identical (Cortese *et al*., 1976; Watts, 1998).[3] We expect to find relatively low indices of dissimilarity between the occupational distribution of newcomers and resident co-ethnics. As gender also acts on occupational structure, then indices of dissimilarity should be lowest between newcomers and co-ethnic residents of the same sex. If migrant-resident employment differences are lower within gender categories than within ethnic groups, then gender may be as, if not more, relevant to sector of employment as ethnicity.

The ethnic and gender division of labor compared

Table 1 displays the occupational division of labor for all workers in 1990 in Los Angeles, for all men and women, for the resident foreign-born by sex, and recent immigrants by sex. Shaded boxes indicate occupational concentration. As the last row of the table also provides the total number of workers in each of the main categories, we see that the foreign-born (both resident and newly arrived) make up slightly more than 30% of the workforce of the metropolitan area ([1,862,000 + 392,000]/7,370,000). Switching attention to the top rows, the table reveals a relatively even distribution (at least in these aggregate terms) in managerial, professional, technical and sales occupations for all workers. The absence of shading in all those rows also signals not only a lack of concentration of the foreign-born in such work but further indicates that the foreign-born tend to be relatively underrepresented as managers, professionals etc. This occurs because

3 The index is $\Sigma_i|X_i - Y_i|/2$, where X_i is the percentage of group X employed in sector i and Y_i is the percentage of group Y employed in sector i.

Table 1 *The occupational distribution of native and foreign-born workers by percentage in the Los Angeles CMSA, 1990, by sex*[a]

	Total 1990	Total 1990 Men	Total 1990 Women	Total Resident Foreign-born[b]	Resident Foreign-born Men	Resident Foreign-born Women	Total Recent Immigrants[c]	Recent Immigrant Men	Recent Immigrant Women
Managers	14.18	14.37	13.95	9.95	10.08	9.75	10.27	9.56	11.62
Professionals	13.61	12.42	15.17	8.48	7.54	9.87	5.72	5.35	6.43
Technicians	3.31	3.42	3.17	2.80	2.79	2.80	2.16	2.06	2.34
Sales	12.06	11.54	12.74	9.90	9.13	11.05	8.56	7.36	10.84
Admin. support	16.65	7.76	28.32	12.39	6.63	20.96	7.97	5.09	13.45
Private house services	0.84	0.08	1.84	1.73	0.12	4.12	3.54	0.31	9.70
Protective services	1.63	2.41	0.59	0.70	1.02	0.22	0.52	0.74	0.10
Food prep. etc.	9.71	7.91	12.06	13.18	11.44	15.75	18.00	16.75	20.38
Farm/forest manual	1.60	2.39	0.56	3.08	4.43	1.09	4.04	5.61	1.03
Mechanics/repair	3.25	5.45	0.37	3.38	5.46	0.28	2.78	4.10	0.26
Construction	4.46	7.63	0.31	4.45	7.22	0.32	5.73	8.57	0.32
Precision	3.86	5.18	2.13	6.05	7.27	4.24	4.15	4.52	3.43
Machine operators	7.24	7.82	6.48	14.87	13.95	16.25	15.47	14.66	17.01
Transport operators	7.59	11.61	2.31	9.05	12.92	3.29	11.11	15.32	3.09
Number (in millions)	7.37	4.183	3.187	1.862	1.112	0.749	0.392	0.257	0.135

[a] Highlighted numbers indicate an employment concentration — where group employment in a sector is at least 120% of the group's share of the total workforce.
[b] Foreign-born workers resident in Los Angeles in 1985 and 1990.
[c] Immigrants, came to stay between 1985 and 1990, and abroad in 1985.

a preponderance of the foreign-born in Los Angeles lack enough formal education (human capital) that would help qualify them for such work (Waldinger and Bozorgmehr, 1996; Ellis and Wright, 1999).

This table reveals a clear division of labor between men and women, typical of most places in advanced capitalist economies. Male-dominated occupations in Los Angeles, irrespective of nativity or time in the United States, include manual agricultural work, construction, mechanics and repair, and transport operators (column 2). Women are overrepresented in private household services, food preparation and administrative support (column 3). These patterns of concentration, however, vary by nativity and time in the United States. The employment specializations of recent immigrants differ from those of all workers and of the resident foreign-born in some important ways. Recent immigrant men (column 7) share an employment concentration with all resident foreign-born workers (column 4) in agriculture, construction, mechanics and repair, and machine operators. Resident foreign-born men (column 5), however, concentrate more in precision occupations, whereas newly arrived men are more likely to take up work in food preparation.

Foreign-born women, and most notably those new to the country, take jobs disproportionately in domestic service (columns 6 and 9). Less than 1% of the total workforce have a job in this occupational grouping, compared to over 4% of resident foreign-born women and almost 10% of recently arrived women. Foreign-born women also concentrate in machine operator occupations. Overall, Table 1 contains less shading for women than men, meaning that men tend to specialize more in particular occupations than do women.

Table 1 can only sketch the most basic outline of the occupational architecture of the Los Angeles metropolitan area by sex and time of arrival. Table 2 adds a little more detail by systematically quantifying differences between the overall occupational distributions of recent immigrants and residents using the index of dissimilarity. To aid interpretation, we divide the table into two main sections. The numbers in the box report dissimilarity indices for between-sex comparisons. The numbers outside the box report three matched dissimilarity indices for women to women and men to men comparisons.

Table 2 provides several impressions of the degrees of occupational segregation by place of birth and sex in Los Angeles in 1990. The table shows that the range of dissimilarity values for between-sex comparisons (29.21 to 45.17 — those within the box) barely overlaps with the range of dissimilarity indices for within-sex comparisons (11.13 to 29.26). The ratio of between-sex and same-sex indices ranges between 1.5 and 2.6. This accords with calculations of the same ratio in other studies comparing the effects of sex and race on occupational distributions (Reskin and Cassirer, 1996). In other words, even using 14 aggregated occupations, these data highlight the relative dominance of sex over nativity as an axis of division in the labor market. The dissimilarity indices disclose a much closer alignment of occupational profiles for women/women and men/men comparisons than comparisons of women to men, regardless of nativity.

Table 2 confirms our earlier observation that women are less concentrated in occupational niches than men. For example, the data reveal that it would require over 29% of recent immigrant women to change jobs to match the occupational distribution of all women in the workforce. In comparison, only about 23% of the percentage of newly arrived immigrant men (relative to all employed men) would have to shift occupations for the two employment distributions to be identical. Simply put, newly arrived immigrant men are more likely to work in male-dominated sectors than newly arrived women are likely to work in female-dominated sectors. This pattern recurs for both the resident foreign-born and total (19.38 versus 15.15) and recently arrived immigrants and the resident foreign-born (12.83 versus 11.13).

The dissimilarity indices in Table 2 offer more information about the dynamics of occupational segregation between native and foreign-born women and men. The greatest

Table 2 *Dissimilarity indices among the occupational distribution of total workforce, the resident foreign-born and recent immigrants by sex, Los Angeles CMSA, 1990*

	All Women	Resident Foreign-born Women	Recent Immigrant Women	All Men	Resident Foreign-born Men	Recent Immigrant Men
All Women	—					
Resident Foreign-born Women	19.38	—				
Recent Immigrant Women	29.26	12.83	—			
All Men	30.41	33.51	36.97	—		
Resident Foreign-born Men	39.51	29.21	31.65	15.15	—	
Recent Immigrant Men	45.17	30.42	30.64	23.77	11.13	—

difference in occupational distribution occurs between all women and recent immigrant men (45.17). This difference, however, moderates with time in the Los Angeles labor market: 39% of resident foreign-born men would have to change occupations for their occupational distribution to resemble that of all women. When factoring in native-born men, this proportion drops to about 30%. Length-of-residence also affects same-sex levels of occupational segregation. Comparing recent immigrant women with all women produces an index of dissimilarity of 29.26%, whereas the level of segregation between resident foreign-born women and all women is only 19%. For recent immigrant men compared with all men, the index of dissimilarity is 24%, but between resident foreign-born men and all men it is only 15%.

Generally, Table 2 identifies a crude gradient from the lower left corner toward the main diagonal. Occupational segregation is greatest between men and women, particularly between recent immigrant men and women. Segregation levels diminish considerably for same-sex comparisons. The diminution of occupational segregation with length of residence, both same-sex and between sexes, implies that immigrants' occupational patterns become more like those of other workers in Los Angeles the longer they work there. In other words, these data offer some evidence for immigrant assimilation into Los Angeles' occupational structure over time.

Although the information in Table 2 displays some interesting patterns of occupational segregation, it does not shed any light on the role of gender and ethnicity within national origin groups. Previous research demonstrates the role of ethnicity in linking new immigrants to jobs (e.g. Portes and Jensen, 1989; Waldinger, 1996a; Hagan, 1998). Table 3 allows us to assess how much these ethnic effects interact with and are possibly even dominated by gender within national origin groups. Table 3 lists the occupational profiles of the major immigrant populations subdivided by sex and broad categories of time in the United States. As in Table 1, shaded cells indicate employment concentrations relative to the aggregate profile for Los Angeles. Note how the shaded boxes often, but not always, occur in lateral pairs. Recent women immigrants from South Korea, for instance, disproportionately cluster in machine operator occupations, as do women born in South Korea who arrived in the United States before 1985. In other words, new immigrants take up jobs in approximately the same sectors as resident co-ethnics of the same sex. This highlights the gendered nature of ethnic job focusing, and the table offers abundant evidence of this phenomenon for all six groups.

In some groups, men and women tend to converge on the same occupations; in others, channeling is clearly more gendered. Immigrants from the Philippines, for example, display a concentration of employment in 'administrative support' and Koreans in 'sales'. These occupational concentrations occur for both men and women regardless of

Table 3 *The sectoral distribution of recent immigrants and the resident foreign-born by sex for Los Angeles, 1990*

	Resident Mexican Women	Recent Mexican Immigrant Women	Resident Mexican Men	Recent Mexican Immigrant Men	Resident Salvadoran Woman	Recent Salvadoran Immigrant Women	Resident Salvadoran Men	Recent Salvadoran Immigrant Men	Resident Filipinas	Recent Filipina Immigrants	Resident Filipinos	Recent Filipino Immigrants
Number	270,258	49,583	523,099	130,491	52,387	10,701	64,516	16,305	61,115	13,403	50,874	12,577
Managers	5.63	11.04	4.59	5.80	4.33	10.56	5.91	6.48	11.53	9.72	15.54	9.07
Professionals	3.96	1.01	1.81	1.31	2.43	1.39	2.27	1.05	22.69	12.44	13.44	5.61
Technicians	1.10	0.48	1.04	0.53	1.58	0.44	1.76	0.16	7.69	7.66	8.86	7.59
Sales	8.73	7.93	4.63	3.23	8.40	6.24	7.08	4.37	8.61	13.51	8.91	8.21
Admin. support	15.65	5.66	4.49	2.42	11.06	2.78	6.87	4.23	31.68	33.87	19.28	23.38
Private house services	3.88	10.15	0.11	0.21	16.74	26.25	0.16	1.10	0.67	1.67	0.09	0.31
Protective services	0.22	0.06	0.63	0.14	0.24	0.00	1.13	0.75	0.23	0.25	2.91	5.17
Food prep. etc.	17.77	26.20	14.42	21.51	24.75	21.54	15.76	19.04	9.20	11.98	7.66	12.19
Farm/forest manual	2.46	2.25	7.52	9.30	0.61	0.41	2.62	3.47	0.05	0.13	0.52	0.80
Mechanics/repair	0.32	0.40	5.62	3.56	0.38	0.17	6.40	4.67	0.09	0.21	4.18	3.41
Construction	0.51	0.38	8.83	10.37	0.45	0.54	9.32	12.69	0.03	0.00	2.52	0.73
Precision	5.92	3.53	8.33	4.49	3.77	3.07	6.04	4.80	2.41	2.82	4.47	4.25
Machine operators	28.17	25.95	20.18	18.26	22.02	21.99	17.25	16.39	4.39	4.45	6.56	8.13
Transport operators	5.68	4.96	17.78	18.85	3.23	4.61	17.43	20.82	0.74	1.28	5.07	11.16
Resident-recent immigrant dissimilarity index, by gender	20.19		12.78		17.21		12.39		12.12		19.06	
Male-female recent immigrant dissimilarity index		35.48				39.83				24.69		
Male-female resident dissimilarity index			33.61				36.01				23.78	

Table 3 *continued*

	Resident Guatemalan Women	Recent Guatemalan Immigrant Women	Resident Guatemalan Men	Recent Guatemalan Immigrant Men	Resident Korean Woman	Recent Korean Immigrant Women	Resident Korean Men	Recent Korean Immigrant Men	Resident Chinese Women	Recent Chinese Immigrant Women	Resident Chinese Men	Recent Chinese Immigrant Men
Number	23,458	7,633	32,567	12,124	28,797	6,395	35,317	9,672	26,646	6,763	31,117	7,530
Managers	5.91	4.82	4.73	7.15	12.82	10.84	19.50	20.23	19.08	12.20	21.59	17.90
Professionals	3.01	2.00	1.90	2.02	12.49	7.68	12.15	6.13	14.14	14.64	22.48	18.67
Technicians	1.40	0.75	0.93	0.82	2.35	0.64	3.62	1.28	4.85	3.52	4.70	7.73
Sales	6.93	5.63	4.74	4.20	26.87	26.38	28.70	27.93	14.26	13.19	16.56	12.07
Admin. support	12.07	4.70	6.43	4.14	18.69	16.62	6.23	4.96	25.66	16.66	6.04	7.58
Private house services	20.97	34.10	0.18	0.62	0.36	1.30	0.05	0.16	1.43	2.29	0.35	0.41
Protective services	0.06	0.00	1.47	0.24	0.07	0.00	0.35	1.39	0.21	0.00	0.24	0.31
Food prep. etc.	23.83	26.82	15.11	19.47	10.38	15.82	4.46	8.80	8.52	11.78	13.17	18.61
Farm/forest manual	0.19	0.00	2.03	3.24	0.16	0.00	0.89	0.33	0.00	0.43	0.43	0.00
Mechanics/repair	0.21	0.00	7.86	6.82	0.16	0.00	4.20	4.19	0.00	0.00	2.23	2.32
Construction	0.27	0.00	11.66	11.09	0.61	0.96	6.62	9.59	0.18	0.00	1.85	1.71
Precision	4.18	2.58	7.75	3.68	3.14	3.92	4.08	4.14	1.70	3.24	3.96	2.50
Machine operators	17.14	17.58	16.70	21.81	10.28	13.45	5.83	5.52	9.20	19.28	3.29	6.59
Transport operators	3.85	1.01	18.52	14.70	1.61	2.38	3.33	5.36	0.77	2.77	3.10	3.60
Resident-recent immigrant dissimilarity index, by gender	16.57		13.67		11.45		11.28		18.66		14.02	
Male-female recent immigrant dissimilarity index		42.83				29.30				25.94		
Male-female resident dissimilarity index			40.54				23.48				26.75	

length of residence. Immigrant men and women from China, however, exhibit occupational profiles more distinct from each other: Chinese men concentrate in managerial and professional occupations, whereas Chinese women have a more diffuse distribution. More generally, the occupational contours of the three Asian groups are quite distinct from each other and show variable amounts of sex segregation within groups. The occupational profiles of Mexicans, Salvadorans and Guatemalans resemble each other but differ from the pattern of any Asian group. Moreover, the occupational distribution of immigrants from Mexico and Central America is strongly segregated. The men tend to work in construction, mechanical and repair occupations, agricultural work and food preparation; the women in private household services, food preparation and as machine operators.

Table 3 includes summary measures of the level of occupational segregation by both nativity and sex. The first row of the lower section of the table reports, using the index of dissimilarity, the degree to which new immigrants work in the same sectors as their foreign-born counterparts of the same sex. To illustrate, the occupational profile of recently arrived Mexican men more closely resembles the profile of Mexican men who arrived earlier (12.78) than it does recently arrived Mexican women (35.48). Likewise, recently arrived Mexican women are more likely to find work alongside resident Mexican women (20.19) than in the same occupations as recently arrived Mexican men. With the exception of women from the Philippines, recently arrived men are more likely than recently arrived immigrant women to cluster with co-ethnics of the same sex. The occupational profile of Filipinas, however, is quite distinctive. Both resident and recently arrived women from the Philippines disproportionately cluster in 'administrative support' types of occupations (which includes health-related jobs such as nurses and medical technicians). No other group of foreign-born women displays such concentration in one occupational niche.

With the exception of Chinese immigrants, the differences between the occupational profiles of women and men diminish with time in the country. As a case in point, the level of sex segregation between recent Guatemalan immigrants (42.83) is greater than that between Guatemalans who arrived in the US before 1985 (40.54). Admittedly, these changes are relatively small, but they are systematic except for the Chinese. In sum, foreign-born men and women enter different occupations in Los Angeles. The differences in these profiles, with one exception, diminish slightly over the time period under investigation.

Table 3 emphasizes intra-ethnic occupational segregation by sex and time of arrival. Containing 144 indices of dissimilarity, Table 4 yields considerable information about not only intra-ethnic occupational segmentation, but also interethnic occupational segmentation by time of arrival and sex. To facilitate interpretation, sex and time of arrival subdivide the table into four quadrants to separate dissimilarity indices. The numbers in bold on the main diagonal of the full table describe the degree of segregation between recent arrivals and residents of the same nativity group and sex. The bold numbers on the two off-diagonals summarize the occupational segregation between immigrant cohorts of the same nativity group but different sex. Any entry shaded gray ranks among the lowest 20% of dissimilarity scores in the table.

Given the importance of gender in the results reported so far, we would expect the dissimilarity indices on the main diagonal to contain the lowest values. With only one exception, this holds true. For instance, recent immigrant women from South Korea obtain work in occupations more like those of previously arrived immigrant women from South Korea than those of any other nativity group. Newly arrived Salvadoran men are the exception: their occupational profile is slightly more like that of resident Guatemalan-born men than resident Salvadoran-born men, but the difference is small. Even in this case, the same-sex segregation level (12.39) is lower than the degree of between-sex (same group) segregation (40.65).

Table 4 *Dissimilarity indices for recent immigrants and the resident foreign-born, by sex, by nativity*

		Resident Immigrants											
		Men						Women					
		Mexicans	Salvadorans	Filipinos	Guatemalans	Koreans	Chinese	Mexicans	Salvadorans	Filipinas	Guatemalans	Koreans	Chinese
Recent Immigrants													
Men	Mexicans	**12.78**	15.96	56.11	16.66	57.74	58.31	**37.01**	39.59	69.45	39.10	60.07	65.98
	Salvadorans	14.50	**12.39**	51.89	11.36	53.91	55.08	35.32	**40.65**	65.91	39.01	56.93	62.04
	Filipinos	42.03	34.16	**19.06**	38.97	44.24	39.90	33.04	43.07	**28.69**	41.30	31.49	29.07
	Guatemalans	13.41	12.79	51.15	**13.67**	52.38	53.32	30.13	34.00	63.92	**37.43**	54.89	60.48
	Koreans	45.53	39.55	32.28	43.28	**11.28**	26.88	50.27	55.72	50.60	54.73	**27.70**	37.23
	Chinese	51.88	43.17	22.06	48.96	27.52	**14.02**	41.08	43.28	28.42	42.93	30.40	**25.08**
Women	Mexicans	**38.55**	35.11	49.73	40.04	54.95	49.16	**20.19**	15.46	56.25	20.79	47.34	52.02
	Salvadorans	42.65	**41.26**	55.47	45.12	60.72	54.47	31.09	**17.21**	61.01	16.04	52.00	56.78
	Filipinas	62.19	54.82	**25.10**	59.96	41.11	33.28	42.16	49.41	**12.12**	48.07	23.62	16.73
	Guatemalans	48.03	45.33	64.20	**47.61**	68.16	61.68	39.27	19.92	64.68	**16.57**	57.48	60.47
	Koreans	48.59	40.59	33.74	45.55	**30.62**	34.16	28.00	35.97	38.18	34.30	**11.45**	28.30
	Chinese	45.83	40.50	24.53	46.19	35.94	**28.56**	25.14	32.41	26.59	33.28	17.17	**18.66**

We can see this more clearly by contrasting values on the main diagonal of the table with those on the two off-diagonals (in the bottom left and top right quadrants). Recently arrived women workers from El Salvador have an occupational profile far more similar to resident women workers from El Salvador than resident men born in that country (17.21 and 41.26). Considering all six groups of immigrants, the degree of difference varies with nativity, but the direction of difference is consistent and clear. Nativity matters in determining the occupational concentration of immigrant workers, but sex matters more.

Broadening the discussion to consider interethnic occupational profile difference by sex and nativity re-emphasizes this finding. The pattern of the lowest 20% of dissimilarity index scores is unmistakable. Twenty-six of the twenty-nine shaded boxes are in the top left or bottom right quadrants of the matrix. Were nativity to rival sex in importance, we would expect that the off-diagonal dissimilarity values (those along the minor diagonals of the top right and bottom left quadrants) would rank among the lowest 20% of dissimilarity indices, yet only two of the twelve do so.

The data in this table also suggest that within ethnic groups, men tend to channel slightly more than do women. The average score on the diagonal in the upper left quadrant is 13.9; in the lower right quadrant it is 16. If we compare the average dissimilarity index, however, for all men to men (all scores in the upper left quadrant) and all women to women (all scores in the lower right quadrant) comparisons, we find no difference. The average index in both quadrants of the table is 34. This average is significantly lower ($p < .01$) than the mean index in the other two quadrants of the table where the mean dissimilarity index comparing recent immigrant women with resident immigrant men is 44 and the mean dissimilarity index of recent immigrant men with resident immigrant women is 45.

Although mean occupational segregation levels are lower for same-sex than between-sex pairs, standard deviations are higher for the between-sex quadrants of the table. The standard deviations of values in the upper left quadrant and lower right quadrant are 16.9 and 16.2 respectively. This compares with 12.9 and 11.2 for the indices in the upper right and lower left portions of the table. In other words, although we find the lowest dissimilarity indices when making same-sex comparisons (e.g. resident Korean women immigrants and recent immigrant Chinese-born women [17.17]), some of the largest differences occur in the same region of the matrix (e.g. recent immigrant women from Guatemala and resident Filipinas [64.68]). Gender, then, may be a more important axis of difference than ethnicity among immigrants in the labor market; but that does not preclude substantial interethnic difference in occupational specialization among workers of the same sex.

Discussion and conclusions

Patterns of work specialization are central to the broader spectrum of separation and difference in any society. The ideas that ethnic queues and ethnic networks route immigrant workers into certain jobs carry key assumptions about work and gender divisions of labor (within and beyond the workplace). This paper finds that a focus on ethnicity as the key division of labor among immigrants compared to natives, while very important, tends to occlude analysis of significant gender differences within (and between) ethnic groups. We suggest that the interest in immigrant employment as determined by ethnic resources has really been about immigrant men (cf. Grasmuck and Grosfoguel, 1997). In mitigation, men do outnumber women in the labor force and this is true of all the immigrant groups studied in this investigation (see Table 3). Nevertheless, the debate over ethnic queues, niches and enclaves frequently focuses explicitly or implicitly on men rather than women.

We find large differences in occupational profile by sex and a systematic dominance of sex over nativity in the allocation of recent arrivals to jobs. Among all the forces operating to sift labor into distinct lines of work, we therefore suspect that the social networks that provide immigrant women and men (of the same migrant cohort and the same national origin) information on jobs are but distantly related. These findings emerge from an analysis based on a relatively coarse set of 14 occupational categories; more detailed job categories would be likely to bring the gender division of labor within national origin groups into even sharper focus than revealed here.

A conclusion that women and men probably have different access to general and specific resources for finding work is unsurprising. The gender division of labor is well documented and, as noted earlier, temporally resilient (e.g. Hanson and Pratt, 1995). Nevertheless, we stress caution in reaching the simple conclusion that ethnicity matters less than gender in the labor market. Immigrant women are more likely to funnel into occupations where other immigrant women work, regardless of nativity, than into jobs beside co-ethnic men; but it is also the case that some of the largest interethnic differences in occupational distributions occur among workers of the same sex. Thus we prefer to describe our findings as evidence for a broad division of labor between immigrant women and men within which there is a substantial degree of ethnic specialization among workers of the same sex.

Our data point to substantial interethnic variation in the gender division of labor within groups. In some groups (Guatemalans, Mexicans and Salvadorans) ethnic resources seem sharply divided along gender lines, as shown by the distinctive occupational profiles for women and men. In other occupational distributions, women and men of the same ethnic group are more likely to work alongside each other (Filipinas/os, Chinese and Koreans), intimating that networks are probably less gender exclusive. That said, although we show that Filipino women and men are more likely to work along side each other than, say, Guatemalan women and men, this does not mean that wage inequality or more general discrimination in the labor market is less of an issue for Filipinas. Overall, in the context of the 14 occupations we used to frame this study, immigrant men had more occupational niches — measured as the number of sectors in which they had an occupational concentration — than did immigrant women. As such, our results stand in contrast to those of Lieberson and Waters (1988: 133) who found the reverse. Their work, however, examined only European immigrants and was conducted for the United States as a whole. Thus gender differences in the degree of occupational specialization are not universal; we suspect that they depend on the place and the particular groups under investigation.

The notion that place makes for difference in immigrant employment patterns needs more attention. Some existing research is suggestive of place effects. For example, Ettlinger and Kwon (1994) detail differences in occupational profile and industrial employment between New York and Los Angles for different Asian immigrant groups; Gurak and Kritz (1992) argue that social context rather than cultural differences account for differences in understanding Dominican and Colombian women's employment patterns; and Di Leonardo (1984) found that Italian immigrants on the West Coast possessed an entrepreneurial class and a different tradition of work than Thernstrom (1973) in his research on Bostonian Italians.

Generally, patterns of employment for immigrants will vary according to local labor market conditions (Waldinger, 1996b; Wright and Ellis, 1997). These regional circumstances are likely to interact with the way in which immigrants use networks to find jobs. In buoyant, growing economies, such as Los Angeles in the 1980s, immigrants may rely less on ethnic networks because of the numerous employment opportunities in the region than in places like New York, which experienced relatively slow job growth in the late 1980s. The local environment may also affect the way in which gender and ethnicity combine to influence occupational outcomes. Rapid employment growth may

bring more women into the labor force attracted by new job opportunities and higher wages. This could reduce the intra-ethnic same-sex job channeling of women if these jobs occur outside existing occupational employment concentrations.

Richard Wright (Richard.wright@dartmouth.edu), Department of Geography, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755-3571 and **Mark Ellis** (ellism@u.washington.edu), Department of Geography, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-3550, USA.

References

Albelda, R.P. (1986) Occupational segregation by race and gender, 1958–81. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 39, 404–11.

Bailey, A.J. and M. Ellis (1993) Going home: the migration of Puerto Rican-born women from the United States to Puerto Rico. *The Professional Geographer* 45, 148–58.

Bailey, T. and R. Waldinger (1991) Primary, secondary, and enclave markets, a training systems approach. *American Sociological Review* 56, 432–55.

Barot, R., H. Bradley and S. Fenton (eds.) (1999) *Ethnicity, gender and social change*. Macmillan, London.

Blau, F.D., P. Simpson and D. Anderson (1998) Continuing progress? Trends in occupational segregation in the United States over the 1970s and 1980s. *Feminist Economics* 4, 29–71.

Boyd, M. (1989) Family and personal networks in international migration: recent developments and new agendas. *International Migration Review* 23, 638–70.

Cortese, C.F., R.F. Falk and J.K. Cohen (1976) Further considerations on the methodological analysis of segregation indices. *American Sociological Review* 41, 630–7.

di Leonardo, M. (1984) *Varieties of ethnic experience: kinship, class and gender among California Italian-Americans*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

Donato, K. (1992) Understanding US immigration, why some countries send women and others send men. In D. Gabaccia (ed.), *Seeking common ground: multidisciplinary studies of immigrant women in the United States*, Praeger, Westport, CT.

Dubeck, P.J. and K. Borman (1996) *Women and work: a handbook*. Garland, New York.

Ellis, M., D. Conway and A. Bailey (1996) The circular migration of Puerto Rican women: towards a gendered explanation. *International Migration* 34, 31–64.

—— and R. Wright (1998) When immigrants are not migrants: counting new arrivals using the US Census. *International Migration Review* 32, 127–44.

—— and —— (1999) The industrial division of labor among immigrants and internal migrants to the Los Angeles economy. *International Migration Review* 33, 26–54.

Ettlinger, N. and S-C. Kwon. (1994) A comparative assessment of the role of immigrants in US urban labor markets: a case study of Asians in New York and Los Angeles. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 85, 417–33.

Gilbertson, G.A. (1995) Women's labor and enclave employment: the case of Dominican and Colombian Women in New York City. *International Migration Review* 2, 657–70.

Granovetter, M. (1974) *Getting a job: a study in contacts and careers*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Grasmuck, S. and R. Grosfoguel (1997) Geopolitics, economic niches, and gendered social capital among recent Caribbean immigrants in New York City. *Sociological Perspectives* 40, 339–63.

Gurak, D.T. and F. Caces (1992) Migration networks and the shaping of migration systems. In M.M. Kritz, L.L. Lim and H. Zlotnik (eds.), *International migration systems: a global approach*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

—— and M. Kritz (1992) Context vs. culture: household composition and employment among Dominican and Colombian women. *Population and Development Program*, Working Papers Series 93-07, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.

Hagan, J.M. (1998) Social networks, gender, and immigrant incorporation: resources and constraints. *American Sociological Review* 63, 55–67.

Hanson, S. and G. Pratt (1995) *Gender, work, and space*. Routledge, London and New York.

Hiebert, D. (1999) Local geographies of labor market segmentation: Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver, 1991. *Economic Geography* 75, 339–69.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (1994) *Gendered transitions: Mexican experiences of immigration*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
—— (1997) Working without papers in the United States: toward an integration of legal status in frameworks of race, class, and gender. In E. Higginbotham and M. Romero (eds.), *Women and work: exploring race, ethnicity, and class*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
Hugo, G.J. (1981) Village community ties, village norms, and ethnic and social networks: a review of evidence from the third world. In G.F. DeJong and R.W. Gardner (eds.), *Migration decision making: multidisciplinary approaches to microlevel studies in developing countries*, Pergamon Press, New York.
Jacobs, J.A. and S.T. Lim (1992) Trends in occupational and industrial sex segregation in 56 countries, 1960–1980. *Work and Occupations* 19, 450–86.
Jiobu, R.M. (1988) Ethnic hegemony and the Japanese of California. *American Sociological Review* 53, 353–67.
King, M.C. (1992) Occupational segregation by race and gender, 1940–1980. *Monthly Labor Review* 115.4, 30–7.
Lieberson, S. and M. Waters (1988) *From many strands: ethnic and racial groups in contemporary America*. Russell Sage, New York.
Light, I. and E. Bonacich (1988) *Ethnic entrepreneurs: Koreans in Los Angeles, 1965–83*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
Lopez, D.E., E. Popkin and E. Telles (1996) Central Americans: at the bottom, struggling to get ahead. In R. Waldinger and M. Bozorgmehr (eds.), *Ethnic Los Angeles*, Russell Sage, New York.
Liu, E. (1998) *The accidental Asian*. Random House, New York.
Mahler, S. (1999) Engendering transnational migration: a case study of Salvadorans. *The American Behavioral Scientist* 42, 690–719.
Model, S. (1993) The ethnic niche and the structure of opportunity, immigrants and minorities in New York City. In M.B. Katz (ed.), *The underclass debate*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
Morokvasic, M. (1983) Women in migration: beyond the reductionist outlook. In A. Phizacklea (ed.), *One way ticket: migration and female labour*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London and Boston.
Ong, P. and A. Valenzuela (1996) The labor market: immigrant effects and racial disparities. In R. Waldinger and M. Bozorgmehr (eds.), *Ethnic Los Angeles*, Russell Sage, New York.
Ortiz, V. (1996) The Mexican-origin population, permanent working class or emergent middle class? In R. Waldinger and M. Bozorgmehr (eds.), *Ethnic Los Angeles*, Russell Sage, New York.
Pedraza, S. (1991) Women and migration: the social consequences of gender. *Annual Review of Sociology* 17, 303–25.
Pessar, P.R. (1999) Engendering migration studies: the case of new immigrants in the United States. *American Behavioral Scientist* 42.2, 577–600.
Piore, M.J. (1979) *Birds of passage: migrant labor and industrial societies*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York.
Portes, A. (1987) The social origins of the Cuban enclave economy of Miami. *Sociological Perspectives* 30, 340–72.
—— and L. Jensen (1989) The enclave and the entrants: patterns of ethnic enterprise in Miami before and after Mariel. *American Sociological Review* 54, 929–49.
—— and J. Sensenbrenner (1993) Embeddedness and immigration: notes on the social determinants of economic action. *American Journal of Sociology* 98, 1320–50.
—— and R. Rumbaut (1996) *Immigrant America: a portrait*. 2nd edn., University of California Press, Berkeley.
Powell, G. (1993) *Women and men in management*. 2nd edn., Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
Reskin, B. (1993) Sex segregation in the workplace. *Annual Review of Sociology* 19, 241–70.
—— and N. Cassirer (1996) Occupational segregation by gender, race, and ethnicity. *Sociological Focus* 29, 231–43.
Scott, A.J. (1996) The manufacturing economy: ethnic and gender divisions of labor. In R. Waldinger and M. Bozorgmehr (eds.), *Ethnic Los Angeles*, Russell Sage, New York.
Simon, R.J. and C.B. Brettell (eds.) (1986) *International migration: the female experience*. Rowman & Allanheld, Totowa, NJ.

Singer, A. and D.S. Massey (1998) The social process of undocumented border crossing among Mexican migrants. *International Migration Review* 32, 561–92.
Thernstrom, S. (1973) *The other Bostonians: poverty and progress in the American metropolis, 1880–1970*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
Tienda, M. and K. Booth (1991) Gender, migration, and social change. *International Sociology* 6, 51–72.
US Bureau of the Census (1993) *1990 Census of population public-use micro data sample*. Government Printing Office, Washington DC.
Waldinger, R. (1993) The ethnic enclave debate revisited. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 17, 444–52.
—— (1996a) *Still the promised city? African Americans and new immigrants in postindustrial New York*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
—— (1996b) From Ellis Island to LAX: immigrant prospects in the American city. *International Migration Review* 30, 1078–86.
—— and M. Bozorgmehr (1996) *Ethnic Los Angeles*. Russell Sage, New York.
Watts, M. (1998) Occupational gender segregation: index measurement and econometric modeling. *Demography* 35, 489–96.
Weeden, K.A. (1998) Revisiting occupational sex segregation in the United States 1910–1990: results from a log-linear approach. *Demography* 35, 475–87.
Wilson, K. and W.A. Martin (1982) Ethnic enclaves: a comparison of the Cuban and black economies of Miami. *American Journal of Sociology* 88, 135–60.
Wilson, F. and A. Portes (1980) Immigrant enclaves: an analysis of the labor market experiences of Cubans in Miami. *American Journal of Sociology* 86, 295–319.
Wright, R. and M. Ellis (1997) Nativity, ethnicity, and the evolution of the intra-urban division of labor in Los Angeles. *Urban Geography* 18, 243–63.
Zhou, M. and J.R. Logan (1989) Returns on human capital in ethnic enclaves: New York City Chinatown. *American Sociological Review* 54, 809–20.