

The Effect of Child Gender on Parents' Labor Supply: Responses among Natives, Immigrants, and Racial and Ethnic Subgroups

Sabrina Wulff Pabilonia

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics
2 Massachusetts Ave., NE Rm. 2180
Washington, DC 20212
Pabilonia.Sabrina@bls.gov

Jennifer Ward-Batts

Department of Economics
Wayne State University
656 W Kirby, 2074 FAB
Detroit, MI 48202
Ward-Batts@wayne.edu

March 26, 2010

Abstract:

This paper examines whether the differential labor supply response of mothers and fathers by child gender varies between immigrants and natives and over racial and ethnic subgroups using the 1990–2000 Census and 1994–2009 March CPS supplement. We find that immigrants worked fewer weeks and hours per year if they had a son rather than a daughter. However, even the effect of having a son versus a daughter varies by whether or not the parents emigrated from an Asian country or another part of the world. We also find evidence in the CPS that the effect of child gender on men's labor supply is different for different racial groups, suggesting that son preference may be persistent even when the economic rationale for son preference no longer exists.

Keywords: child gender, son preference, immigrant, culture, Asian
JEL codes: J61, J16, J15, J13

* All views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. The authors are grateful to Kristin Butcher, Kristin Mammen, Melinda Morrill Sandler, Jay Stewart, and Steve Stillman for helpful comments.

I. Introduction

There has long existed a tradition of son preference in many Asian countries. Recently, research has shown some differential responses of parents to child gender in more developed countries as well. For example, research on U.S. parents has shown that child gender affects many aspects of parents' behavior, including parents' labor supply (Lundberg and Rose 2002, Lundberg 2005), marital stability (Dahl and Moretti 2008, Lundberg and Rose 2003), and time spent with children (Yeung, et al. 2001, Lundberg, Pabilonia, and Ward-Batts 2008). Using the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), Lundberg and Rose (2002) found that white fathers' labor supply and wage rates increase more in response to having sons versus daughters while Lundberg (2005) found that non-black, non-Hispanic fathers of young sons in the NLSY79 work less than fathers of young daughters if their wives are college-educated.

In this paper, we further examine parental labor supply responses to child gender in the U.S., by allowing for differences in the response to child gender among parents who are native born versus first-generation or second-generation immigrants, or a member of various race and ethnic groups. In the next section, we discuss some theoretical rationales as to why we might expect differential responses to child gender in general, as well as differentially among groups. In section three, we present our data and methodology. In section four, we present our results. We summarize our findings in section five.

II. Background and Theoretical Motivation

Even in more developed countries, such as the U.S., fathers are found to have a preference for sons over daughters. In a Gallup poll asking parents which gender they would prefer if they could have only one child, 45 percent of fathers say they prefer a son while only 19

percent prefer a daughter (Lyons 2003). While the question wording has changed over time, a similar poll has shown a preference for boys for the past 60 years. Dahl and Moretti (2008) find that couples with two girls are more likely to have a third child than couples with two boys, suggesting a preference for sons. They also find evidence that having a son increases the propensity for couples to marry and to remain married. Lundberg and Rose (2003) find that the pre-marital birth of a son generates higher propensity to marry the biological father than does the birth of a daughter.¹

Sons may increase the benefits to marriage for various reasons. If fathers desire time spent with sons, and mothers are more likely than fathers to have custody of children outside of marriage, then marriage gives fathers greater access to their sons. Different child production functions for boys versus girls can provide an alternate explanation: If boys need more father time than girls, then both mothers and fathers may have greater desire to raise sons within marriage compared to girls. In either case, if sons increase marital stability, then we would expect that parents may respond by increasing specialization in marriage, i.e. fathers working more and mothers working less (unless the wife is the primary earner). If fathers enjoy spending time with sons, then they may consequently work less due to a simple time substitution.

Another child-production-function argument is that boys require more time inputs overall than do girls. If this is true, then total parent labor supply may decrease more after the birth of a boy than a girl. This does not, however, generate a particular prediction about labor supply of either parent separately. Therefore, the magnitude and direction of any effect of child gender on labor market outcomes is an empirical question.

¹ In contrast, Leigh (2009) does not find similar effects of sons on marriage in Australia.

These rationales may affect parental behavior in the general population. However, there may be additional motivations for further (or different) responses to child gender among parents in various immigrant or racial/ethnic groups. We argue that these motivations are due to cultural differences.

Here, we assume that culture is a set of somewhat fixed preferences, social norms, and behaviors that are commonly shared among people from a country or region.² It is well known that some Asian countries have a strong son preference. Many of these countries (e.g., China, India) have a patrilocal system of residence after marriage, in which the bride moves to live with or near her husband's family. After marriage, she may have little contact with her own family of origin. Furthermore, sons are typically expected to provide old-age security, adding to the rationale for viewing sons as assets and daughters as liabilities.

A dowry system is also commonly used in some Asian countries, where the net dowry paid by the bride's family to the groom or his family is positive. There are various interpretations of a positive net dowry. In any case, this may represent a larger cost to families having a daughter than those having a son. If preference for sons becomes part of culture and is persistent even after individual migrate to the U.S., then we may expect to observe labor supply after the birth of a daughter relative to the birth of a son. While conditions in the U.S. are very different from their home country, including much better labor market opportunities for females and a public pension system, persistent adherence to the dowry system among immigrants may also result in real cost differences in raising daughters versus sons.³ Indeed, Almond and Edlund

² See Antecol (2000, 2001) for an examination of labor force behavior of female immigrants that is attributable to culture.

³ We have not found formal data or academic literature on the use of a dowry among U.S. immigrants; however, we have anecdotal reports that some, particularly from India, are still using a dowry, even after moving to the U.S.

(2008), document an increase in the male/female ratio among U.S. second- and later-born children to parents of Asian descent, which suggests the use of sex-selection abortion in births following the first birth.

Hiedemann and Joesch (2005) provide an excellent review of the child gender literature through the lens of race and ethnicity. They find different effects of child gender on divorce, fertility and non-relative childcare by race⁴, but do not find any evidence in the literature of differences by race in fathers' labor market outcomes. They conclude that more research on differences by race is necessary.

Using the 1994–2006 March Current Population (CPS) Supplements, Pabilonia and Ward-Batts (2007) found some differential behavior among first-generation immigrants relative to natives, and specifically whether the parent emigrated from an Asian country, but even stronger evidence of differential effects by race. Specifically, Asian men and “other race” men worked less relative to white men in response to having a male child relative to a female child. This paper extends that analysis by examining the differential labor supply response of mothers and fathers by child gender using several large nationally representative samples. We will also examine whether the differing results from the PSID and NLSY79, found by Lundberg and Rose (2002) and Lundberg (2005), are due to sample composition in a later draft of this paper. In the present draft of this paper, we use the 5% sample of the 1990 and 2000 Census,⁵ and the 1994–2009 March CPS. Results from Census data may differ over time due to changes in the pool of immigrants, the length of time immigrants have been in the U.S., and changes in the labor supply behavior in the immigrant's country of origin. Another possible difference between groups in

⁴ For example, Hiedemann and Joesch, (2005) find that infant and toddler sons are more likely than daughters to attend non-relative care if their mothers are black.

⁵ Births in the NLSY79 occurred mostly in the 1980s so the sample should be more similar to the 1990 Census, although the 1990 Census will still include a newer wave of immigrants.

the 1990 versus 2000 Census data is that their race may be classified differently due to the ability to indicate multiple races in 2000, but not in 1990.⁶ Given the significant findings for Asians, regardless of nativity, in Pablonia and Ward-Batts (2007), we also herein further our examination of immigrants in the CPS by looking at labor supply effects by child gender for second-generation immigrants. If son preference is the only explanation for differences in parental behavior, then immigrant status should magnify any effects of having a son on parents' labor supply. We would expect that any son preference effect would be smaller among second- and later-generation immigrants who have had more time to assimilate than among first-generation immigrants. If culture is persistent, then a tradition of son preference may persist even when the economic factors that generated such a preference no longer apply. If this is the case, we would expect to find similar effects of child gender within immigrant groups, regardless of country of birth, but differences across these groups. However, if differential parental labor supply behavior by child gender is due solely to differences in child production functions, then we expect that having sons rather than daughters would have a similar effect upon the parents' labor supply for both U.S.-born and immigrant parents, given the greater likelihood of similar adult outcomes in the U.S. than in developing countries.

III. Data and Methodology

⁶ We classify those indicating two or more races in 2000 as mixed race, a category we do not have in 1990. 3.6% of immigrants in our sample fall into this race category, while less than 1% of the native-born sample does.

We use both the 1990 and 2000 Census five percent samples and the 1994–2009 March CPS Supplements.⁷ In a future draft of the paper, we will include the 1980 Census. We examine the civilian labor supply behavior of married individuals aged 20–64 with only one child under age three in single-family households.⁸ Therefore, the mothers and fathers that we examine are from the same households; however, we analyze their behavior separately.⁹ We exclude families where one or both spouses is/are a farm worker, lives on a farm or in group housing, or is/are enrolled in school.¹⁰

We estimate reduced-form labor supply regressions using three different labor supply measures: hours worked last week (actual hours for 1990 Census and CPS, but usual hours for 2000 Census), weeks worked last year, and annual hours worked last year. Annual hours worked last calendar year are weeks worked last year multiplied by usual hours worked each week last year. For weeks worked last year and annual hours last year in all of our samples, as well as for usual weekly hours last year in the 2000 Census data, we examine the behavior in the previous calendar year of parents who currently have a child aged one or two. By excluding parents with infants, we avoid analyzing parental labor supply that occurred (at least partly) prior to the birth of the child.

⁷ The analysis for the CPS is for 1994 and after because information on country of birth was collected beginning in 1994. The Census data was taken from IPUMS files, which are located at <http://usa.ipums.org/usa/>, and the CPS data was from Unicon's CPS Utilities.

⁸ We exclude younger parents aged 18 and 19 to exclude those who have a teenage pregnancy.

⁹ Much of the literature on married couple labor supply assumes a secondary earner model. In this draft, we do not assume the wife takes the husband's earnings as given. We include only household unearned income for both spouses. We do not have convincing exclusion restrictions available in the data that would allow us to estimate a joint model. In a later draft, we can include information on whether our results for wives would differ if we imposed the secondary earner model.

¹⁰ In the CPS, we exclude the following 2002 Census occupation codes: 6040 and 6050. In the Census, we exclude the following 1990 Census occupation codes: 479, 483, 484, and 488.

Our main variables of interest are the gender of the parent's first (and only) child and child gender interacted with different measures of the respondent's immigrant status, and then alternatively, interacted with racial and Hispanic ethnicity group. Immigrant status is defined as being born outside of the 50 U.S. States. Thus, we include those born in U.S. territories, such as Puerto Rico and Guam, as immigrants. The respondent's degree of assimilation may correspond to whether they attended high school in the U.S. or the length of time spent in the U.S. Therefore, we also estimate specifications that include measures for whether the respondent moved to the U.S. before or after turning age 18.¹¹ We also allow for the possibility that Asian immigrants have a different effect of son compared to other groups. We define Asian immigrants as those who were born in Asia, including both southeast and southwest Asia.¹² We control for race and ethnicity using five mutually-exclusive categorical variables: white, black, Asian including Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Native American/Alaskan/other race, and Hispanic.¹³ In the 1996–2002 CPS, the Census recoded “other race” variables across the four race variables. Thus, there is likely measurement error in our race variables, which would bias our differential effects for Asian if it is not randomly assigned. Thus, when we look at differential racial effects, we also estimate a specification on data from the 2003–2009 CPS where “other race” can be grouped separately from Asian.

In addition, each model includes the usual demographic and human capital controls: age (and its square), spouse's age (and its square), family non-labor income, dummy variables for

¹¹ Because respondents in some years were allowed to report an interval over which they entered the U.S. (varying from 1 to 10 years depending upon the survey year), we also include an indicator for the age of entry is ambiguous and set the other age of entry variables at zero. For the 2000 Census, respondents specified the exact year of entry.

¹² These countries include Bangladesh, Myanmar, Cambodia, China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, South Korea, Laos, Malaysia, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, Taiwan, Thailand, Vietnam, and Asia, not specified.

¹³ If an individual is Hispanic, their race categorical variables are coded as 0.

age of child, own education, spouse's education, geographic region, and, for CPS only, year in the sample (1990 and 2000 Census are analyzed separately). Family non-labor income in the CPS is converted to 1984-based real dollars using the CPI-U. All analyses are weighted. We report standard errors for the CPS regression analyses that correct for households that are sampled in consecutive March samples.

The sample size for the 1990 Census for the hours worked last week sample includes 95,365 mothers and 95,365 fathers. For hours last year and weeks last year, the sample includes 64,442 mothers and 64,442 fathers. Due to a lower birth rate in the late 1990s than in the late 1980s, our sample of parents with a young child in the 2000 Census is slightly smaller, even though the population grew over that decade (see Statistical Abstract for the U.S. 2008). In the 2000 Census data, we use labor supply variables solely from the previous year. For that sample, we have 54,120 mothers and 54,120 fathers. For the pooled 1994–2009 CPS sample, we have 20,929 mothers and 20,929 fathers in the actual hours worked last week sample. For the hours worked last year and weeks worked last year in the CPS samples, there are 13,808 mothers and 13,808 fathers.

Table 1 reports summary statistics for the hours worked last week sample and for the mean of weeks worked last year and annual hours where the sample size is reduced. On average, women with young children work about half as much as men with young children. Fathers are about 2 years older on average than mothers. Mothers and fathers have similar distributions across race and ethnicity categories as well as across educational attainment categories. Between 1990 and 2000, there is a six percent increase in the number of first-generation immigrants with one child under the age of three, which is also a six percentage point increase in our sample of

parents comprised of this group.¹⁴ Fifty-one to fifty-two percent of first-born children are boys, which is not statistically different from an expected child gender ratio of 1.05 males for every female if child gender is random. In addition, we did not find that the child gender ratio for immigrant parents or Asian immigrant parents was significantly different than the expected male to female ratio. Therefore, we conclude that there is no significant sex selection occurring in these samples for first births and the gender of the first-born child can be treated as exogenous in our regression analysis.

IV. Results

A. Effects of Child Gender on Labor Supply for Immigrants Versus U.S.-born

Table 2 presents OLS regression estimates of weeks worked per year, annual hours worked, and hours worked last week in the 1990 Census for fathers and mothers respectively. In the first specification, we do not allow for differences between natives and immigrants. In the second specification, we allow for differences between U.S.-born and first-generation immigrants, both in levels of the outcome and in the response to having a son rather than a daughter. In the third specification, we allow for immigrants who entered the U.S. at different ages to differ both in the level of the outcome, as well as in their response to having a son rather than a daughter. In 1990 Census data, the year of immigration is given as a range of years. Depending on the specific range of years and current age, we know whether most immigrants arrived in the U.S. prior to reaching age 18 versus at age 18 or older. However, for some, we do not know whether they were yet age 18 at the time of entry, but just that they were within a few years of age 18 (within 5 years for most of these) at the time of entry. Therefore, we also include

¹⁴ First-generation Hispanic immigrants also increased from about 3.4% to 6.6% of our sample of parents between 1990 and 2000 Censuses.

a separate category for those whose age at entry is ambiguous, as well as an interaction of that variable with son. Finally, in the fourth specification, we allow for differences between Asian immigrants and other immigrants. Similarly, Table 3 presents results using the 2000 Census.¹⁵ In the 2000 Census data, the specific year of immigration is known, so the ambiguous age at entry indicator is not required in estimates for 2000.

We find that fathers worked more weeks if they had a son rather than a daughter in 1990, which is consistent with Lundberg and Rose (2002). However, the magnitude of the effect is very small. In 1990, when we allow for immigrants who entered at different ages to have different effects, we find that both immigrant mothers and fathers who entered the U.S. when they were less than age 18 (our omitted entry-age category) worked fewer weeks relative to natives in response to having a son rather than a daughter. The estimated difference is just under one week for fathers and just over 2 weeks for mothers. However, there is no significant child gender effect for those who entered as adults, or for those whose entry age is ambiguous.

In 1990, we find that immigrant fathers worked fewer hours in the last year if they had a son rather than a daughter, relative to natives. In Appendix Tables A1 and A2, we present p-values of joint tests for the effects of child gender on labor supply. We find that the sum of the son and immigrant-son interaction coefficients is negative and statistically significant, indicating that immigrant fathers with a son worked fewer hours in the last year than immigrant fathers with a daughter. However, when we allow for age-of-entry effects, we see that immigrants who entered the U.S. at or after age 18 have a significant interaction effect with son which offsets this decrease in hours. Similarly, when we allow for differential effects for Asian immigrants, we find that Asian immigrant fathers have a similar positive effect for son which more than offsets

¹⁵ A full set of regression estimates are available upon request.

the negative son effect associated with immigrants on average. However, the positive total effect of son for Asian immigrants is not statistically significant. When we allow for age of entry effects for mothers, we find that immigrant mothers with a son who entered the U.S. before they reached age 18 (our omitted entry-age category) worked fewer hours the previous year than those in the same group with a daughter, relative to natives. However, this result does not hold for immigrants who entered the U.S. as an adult. Furthermore, the sum of the son and immigrant-son coefficients is not statistically different from zero, so we do not have strong evidence that these immigrant mothers with a son worked more than immigrant mothers with a daughter.

In 2000, we find that Asian immigrant fathers who had a son worked about a week less than Asian immigrant fathers who had a daughter. We do not find any significant differential effects of a son on parents' annual hours worked in the 2000 Census data. We do find that the usual weekly hours reported for the previous year are significantly less for fathers with a son relative to those with a daughter in 2000. However, we do not find any significant differences in the response to child gender between natives and immigrants for this variable in 2000.

In Table 4, we repeat the analyses from Tables 2 and 3, but omit couples in which one partner is an immigrant and the other is a native. This reduces our sample size slightly to 60,207 for weeks and annual hours in 1990, 89,075 for hours last week in 1990, and 49,524 for all labor supply variables in 2000. Generally, we find similar estimates to those from Tables 2 and 3, with slight variations in magnitude and level of statistical significance. In particular, for annual hours in the 1990 data, we find larger son effects for immigrant fathers and for the offsetting effect for immigrants who entered as adults.

We present OLS regression estimates of weeks worked per year, annual hours worked, and hours worked last week in the CPS for fathers and mothers in Tables 5–7, respectively.¹⁶ In the first specification for each outcome, we do not allow for differences between U.S.-born and immigrant parents. In the second specification, we allow for differences between those born in the U.S. and first-generation immigrants, both in levels of the outcome and in the response to having a son rather than a daughter. In the third specification, we allow for different immigrant effects based upon age of entry in the U.S (equal to or greater than age 18). In the CPS, immigrants were asked to report their arrival year in the U.S. over an interval, which varied from 3 to 10 years in length. Thus, it is impossible to determine the age of entrance for all immigrants. Therefore, we control for whether age of entry is ambiguous and its interaction with son. In the fourth specification, we allow for differences among U.S.-born, first-generation immigrants and second-generation immigrants. In the fifth specification, we allow for differences between Asian immigrants and other immigrants. In the final specification, we allow for differences among U.S.-born, first- and second-generation Asian immigrants, and first- and second-generation non-Asian immigrants.

In the CPS, we do not find any differences in parents' labor supply behavior by child gender for those parents born in the U.S. First-generation non-Asian immigrant fathers who had a son rather than a daughter worked one week less per year relative to U.S.-born fathers. We repeated our analyses excluding parents who were part of an immigrant–U.S.-born couple. This reduces the sample size slightly to 13,129 for weeks and annual hours and 19,811 for hours last week. The effects for weeks and annual hours are stronger in magnitude and more estimates are statistically significant (Table 8). We find that immigrant fathers who had a son worked one week and 56 hours less per year than immigrant fathers who had a daughter. In addition, we find

¹⁶ We also estimated censored regression models for mothers. Results are similar and thus not reported.

that first generation non-Asian immigrant fathers who had a son rather than a daughter worked 1.5 weeks and 75 hours less per year relative to U.S.-born fathers. We also find that U.S.-born mothers who had a son rather than a daughter worked 35 more hours last year.

We also estimated a specification where we defined immigrant as being a first- or second-generation immigrant who is also married to a first- or second-generation immigrant (see Appendix Table A3 for results) and we excluded those immigrants who are not married to a first- or second-generation immigrant from the sample. We find negative effects of having a son rather than a daughter on weeks worked and annual hours worked last year for immigrant fathers.

We also find that second-generation Asian immigrant fathers with a son rather than a daughter worked about 8.5 more hours in the previous week (Table 7, column 6). This is almost entirely offset by a decrease in second-generation Asian immigrant mother's work hours the previous week if they had a son rather than a daughter. These latter results suggest that sons increase the traditional gender specialization within Asian families – with fathers working more and mothers working less.

B. Effects of Child Gender on Labor Supply By Racial and Ethnic Groups

Because we find some evidence that a cultural preference for sons may be persistent, we next explore the possible differences between racial and ethnic groups within the U.S.. For each outcome, we first include a son dummy and interactions of this variable with race indicators for Black, Asian, and other (non-white) race as well as for Hispanic ethnicity. We add an immigrant indicator in the second specification. Finally, we add an immigrant-son interaction in the third specification.

Tables 9 and 10 present results from 1990 and 2000 Census data respectively. We find significant effects of having a son rather than a daughter in this specification: fathers work

slightly more weeks in the year in 1990 and fewer annual hours and usual weekly hours in 2000. We also find a negative significant effect on annual hours for immigrant fathers with a son relative to those with a daughter in 1990. The only significant differential son effects by race that we find are negative effects on hours last week in 1990 among our “other race” category, which includes Native Americans and Alaskan Natives.

However, in CPS data, we find that Asian mothers with a son worked 2.5 to 4 fewer hours per week than those with a daughter (Table 11), depending upon the specification. This is consistent with the previous result for second-generation Asian immigrant women. We also find that immigrant mothers with a son worked a few more hours per week (last week) than those with a daughter, regardless of race. We find no significant child gender differences between racial or ethnic groups for mothers in either weeks or hours worked. However, we find that, compared to non-Hispanic white men, men in the “other race” category worked fewer hours last year if they had a son rather than a daughter. This result is robust to the addition of the immigrant dummy and the immigrant-son interaction. In Table 12, we estimate similar specifications on a restricted sample for years 2003–2009 to examine whether measurement error in our Asian variable in the preceding years may bias our results. Indeed, we find much stronger and significant negative effects of having a son rather than a daughter on annual hours worked by Asian fathers.

V. Conclusion

We find some evidence that there are differential child gender effects on parents’ labor force behavior between immigrants and natives – immigrants work fewer weeks and hours per year if they have a son rather than a daughter. However, the effect of having a son versus a

daughter varies by whether or not the parents emigrated from an Asian country versus another part of the world. We also find evidence in the CPS that the effect of child gender on men's labor supply is different among racial groups, suggesting that son preference may be persistent even when the economic rationale for son preference no longer exists. Asian men and particularly men in the "other race" category work less relative to non-Hispanic white men if they have a son rather than a daughter. This suggests that there may be a decline in specialization within marriage for these groups relative to non-Hispanic whites when the couple has a son rather than a daughter. It could be attributable to men's greater desire to spend more time with sons, especially young sons. However, it could also mean that sons require father's time more than daughters do.

We find some contrast in results from the Census data relative to those from the CPS. These differences require further investigation into possible differences in the composition of the sample of parents, as well as variable definition differences. We hope to report further on these issues in a future draft.

References

- Almond, Douglas and Edlund, Lena. "Son-biased Sex Ratios in the 2000 United States Census." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2008.
- Antecol, Heather. "An Examination of Cross-Country Differences in the Gender Gap in Labor Force Participation Rates," Labour Economics, July 2000, 7(4): 409-26.
- Antecol, Heather. "Why is there Inter-Ethnic Variation in the Gender Wage Gap? The Role of Cultural Factors," Journal of Human Resources, Winter 2001, 36(1): 119-43.
- Dahl, Gordon B. and Enrico Moretti. "The Demand for Sons." Review of Economic Studies 75, 4 (October 2008): 1085-1120.
- Hiedemann, Bridget, Joesch, Jutta M., and Rose, Elaina. "More Daughters in Child Care? Child Gender and the Use of Nonrelative Child Care Arrangements." Social Science Quarterly, 2004, 85(1): 154-68.
- Hiedemann, Bridget and Joesch, Jutta M. "Whose Sons and Daughters are Treated Differently? (Re)Examining the Child Gender Literature through the Lens of Race and Ethnicity." Seattle Journal for Social Justice, 2005, 4(1): 119-46.
- Leigh, Andrew. "Does Child Gender Affect Marital Status? Evidence from Australia." Journal of Population Economics (2009) 22: 351-66.
- Lundberg, Shelly. "The Division of Labor by New Parents: Does Child Gender Matter?" IZA DP No. 1787, 2005.
- Lundberg, Shelly, Pabilonia, Sabrina Wulff and Ward-Batts, Jennifer. "Time Allocation of Parents and Investments in Sons and Daughters." Unpublished paper, 2008.
- Lundberg, Shelly J. and Rose, Elaina. "The Effect of Sons and Daughters on Men's Labor Supply and Wages." Review of Economics and Statistics, 2002, 84(2), pp. 251-68.
- Lundberg, Shelly J. and Rose, Elaina. "Child Gender and the Transition to Marriage." Demography, 2003, 40(2), pp. 333-50.
- Lyons, Linda. "Oh, Boy: Americans Still Prefer Sons." Gallup <http://www.gallup.com/poll/9310/Oh-Boy-Americans-Still-Prefer-Sons.aspx>, 2003.
- Pabilonia, Sabrina W. and Ward-Batts, Jennifer. "The Effect of Child Gender on Parents' Labor Supply: An Examination of Natives, Immigrants, and their Children." American Economic Review, 2007, 97(2): 402-6.
- U.S. Census Bureau. Statistical Abstract for the United States, 2008, www.census.gov/compendia/stab/tables/08s0077.pdf

Table 1: Summary Statistics

Variable	1990 Census				2000 Census				1994–2009 CPS			
	Household-level variables		Household-level variables		Household-level variables		Household-level variables		Household-level variables		Household-level variables	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Son	0.51		0.51		0.51		0.52		0.52			
Child age one	0.39		0.35		0.35		0.35		0.35			
Child age two	0.29		0.27		0.27		0.28		0.28			
Non-labor income	1,746		5,878		3,140		13,246		1,516		5,222	
	Mothers		Fathers		Mothers		Fathers		Mothers		Fathers	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Hours last week (Census 2000 Usual hours)	20.49	19.38	43.35	15.40	28.03	20.15	44.53	12.18	20.80	24.70	40.84	20.77
Weeks last year	30.47	21.94	48.02	10.30	31.51	22.48	48.00	10.89	32.48	35.03	48.88	15.25
Hours last year	1098.43	910.40	2177.26	682.66	1135.53	1045.94	2202.11	700.24	1179.04	1455.03	2188.43	991.77
First-generation immigrant	0.09		0.09		0.16		0.16		0.18		0.18	
US entry age >=18	0.04		0.04		0.10		0.10		0.12		0.11	
US entry age<18	0.03		0.03		0.06		0.06		0.06		0.06	
Asian immigrant	0.03		0.03		0.05		0.04		0.06		0.05	
Black	0.04		0.04		0.05		0.05		0.05		0.06	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.03		0.03		0.06		0.05		0.07		0.06	
Other race	0.01		0.01		0.01		0.01		0.01		0.01	
Hispanic	0.07		0.06		0.12		0.12		0.11		0.11	
Age	28.38	5.01	30.86	5.87	30.07	5.65	32.40	6.39	29.88	7.05	32.26	8.13
<u>Education</u>												
High School	0.33		0.33		0.32		0.36		0.22		0.25	
Some college	0.33		0.29		0.24		0.22		0.26		0.26	
College Degree	0.29		0.31		0.38		0.35		0.31		0.28	
Advanced Degree									0.15		0.15	
N	95,365		95,365		54,120		54,120		20,929		20,929	

Note: Survey weights used. Family non-labor income in the CPS is reported in 1984 dollars. Non-labor income in Census data is in nominal dollars.

Table 2. Differential Effects of Child Gender on Parental Labor Supply for Immigrants versus U.S.-born (1990 Census)

<i>A. Weeks Last Year</i>		Fathers				Mothers			
Son	0.15*	0.19**	0.19**	0.19**	-0.06	0.05	0.04	0.05	
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.19)	
Immigrant*son		-0.39	-0.94*	-0.72		-0.99	-2.20**	-1.07	
		(0.37)	(0.52)	(0.44)		(0.66)	(1.02)	(0.77)	
US entry age ≥ 18 *son			1.18				1.79		
			(0.77)				(1.37)		
Asian immigrant *son				1.26				0.26	
				(0.78)				(1.41)	
Immigrant		-0.77***	0.80**	-0.57*		-4.26***	1.37*	-4.14***	
		(0.30)	(0.36)	(0.33)		(0.53)	(0.75)	(0.58)	
US entry age ≥ 18			-3.53***				-11.71***		
			(0.57)				(1.00)		
Asian immigrant				-1.04				-0.79	
				(0.72)				(1.34)	
R-squared	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	
<i>B. Annual Hours Last Year</i>									
		Fathers				Mothers			
Son	0.68	5.42	5.41	5.41	0.30	4.16	4.15	4.18	
	(5.75)	(5.89)	(5.89)	(5.89)	(7.65)	(7.97)	(7.97)	(7.97)	
Immigrant*son		-47.73**	-106.13***	-69.48***		-36.17	-89.60**	-37.31	
		(23.01)	(36.62)	(26.68)		(27.62)	(42.28)	(31.23)	
US entry age ≥ 18 *son			103.91**				89.78		
			(48.88)				(57.09)		
Asian immigrant *son				84.44*				3.29	
				(50.01)				(60.69)	
Immigrant		-13.43	85.45***	0.72		-135.28***	75.86**	-139.52***	
		(18.76)	(28.24)	(20.61)		(22.17)	(31.63)	(23.86)	
US entry age ≥ 18			-212.07***				-447.06***		
			(37.72)				(41.49)		
Asian immigrant				-73.18				39.08	
				(46.76)				(58.34)	
R-squared	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	

Table 2. Cont'd: Differential Effects of Child Gender on Parental Labor Supply for Immigrants versus U.S.-born (1990 Census)

<i>C. Hours Last Week</i>					Mothers			
Son	-0.13 (0.11)	-0.13 (0.11)	-0.13 (0.11)	-0.13 (0.11)	-0.00 (0.13)	-0.01 (0.14)	-0.01 (0.14)	-0.01 (0.14)
Immigrant*son		-0.05 (0.39)	-0.31 (0.61)	-0.35 (0.46)		0.06 (0.48)	-0.21 (0.76)	0.07 (0.54)
US entry age ≥ 18 *son			-0.01 (0.83)				0.31 (1.00)	
Asian immigrant *son				1.18 (0.84)				-0.06 (1.03)
Immigrant		0.15 (0.32)	0.85* (0.46)	0.33 (0.35)		-2.87*** (0.38)	0.42 (0.56)	-3.00*** (0.41)
US entry age ≥ 18			-1.21** (0.61)				-7.15*** (0.72)	
Asian immigrant				-0.93 (0.80)				1.06 (1.00)
R-squared	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06

Notes: Sample sizes are 64,442 for weeks and annual hours and 95,365 for hours worked last week. Standard errors are in parentheses. Survey weights are used. Significance levels: ** = 5%; * = 10%. Control variables include race, Hispanic ethnicity, age of child, quadratic in age of respondent and spouse, family non-labor income, region, education categories for respondent and spouse, and a constant. In the specifications with age of entry, we also control for ambiguous age of entry and its interaction with son.

Table 3. Differential Effects of Child Gender on Parental Labor Supply for Immigrants versus U.S.-born (2000 Census)

<i>A. Weeks Last Year</i>	Fathers				Mothers			
Son	-0.02 (0.10)	0.01 (0.10)	0.02 (0.10)	0.01 (0.10)	0.00 (0.21)	0.09 (0.22)	0.10 (0.22)	0.09 (0.22)
Immigrant*son		-0.22 (0.34)	0.39 (0.49)	0.09 (0.41)		-0.46 (0.58)	0.08 (0.91)	-0.61 (0.68)
US entry age ≥ 18 *son			-0.90 (0.64)				-0.84 (1.10)	
Asian immigrant *son				-1.07 (0.67)				0.47 (1.16)
Immigrant		-1.20*** (0.28)	-0.07 (0.36)	-1.34*** (0.31)		-7.86*** (0.49)	-2.87*** (0.68)	-7.67*** (0.53)
US entry age ≥ 18			-1.87*** (0.45)				-8.20*** (0.79)	
Asian immigrant				0.32 (0.70)				-1.22 (1.21)
R-squared	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.08
<i>B. Annual Hours Last Year</i>								
	Fathers				Mothers			
Son	-7.37 (6.48)	-10.38 (6.81)	-10.37 (6.81)	-10.45 (6.81)	-3.68 (8.69)	-2.26 (9.39)	-2.17 (9.39)	-2.28 (9.39)
Immigrant*son		19.86 (20.15)	28.06 (29.51)	32.59 (23.83)		-5.54 (24.08)	-3.51 (37.92)	-19.34 (28.01)
US entry age ≥ 18 *son			-10.65 (37.88)				-3.04 (45.74)	
Asian immigrant *son				-43.07 (40.83)				43.39 (48.45)
Immigrant		-83.03*** (16.79)	-2.96 (22.40)	-80.30*** (18.36)		-288.31*** (20.19)	-89.50*** (28.50)	-276.00*** (21.98)
US entry age ≥ 18			-131.99*** (27.07)				-326.15*** (32.87)	
Asian immigrant				-72.32* (43.89)				-66.77 (51.08)
R-squared	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07

Table 3. Cont'd: Differential Effects of Child Gender on Parental Labor Supply for Immigrants versus U.S.-born (2000 Census)

C. Usual Weekly Hours Last Year

	Fathers				Mothers			
Son	-0.21*	-0.26**	-0.26**	-0.26**	-0.06	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00
	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)
Immigrant*son		0.35	0.31	0.49		-0.25	-0.31	-0.66
		(0.35)	(0.52)	(0.42)		(0.50)	(0.76)	(0.58)
US entry age ≥ 18 *son			0.08				0.09	
			(0.67)				(0.94)	
Asian immigrant *son				-0.47				1.28
				(0.71)				(1.01)
Immigrant		-0.76**	0.29	-0.70**		-5.88***	-1.50***	-5.61***
		(0.30)	(0.40)	(0.33)		(0.41)	(0.57)	(0.45)
US entry age ≥ 18			-1.71***				-7.18***	
			(0.48)				(0.68)	
Asian immigrant				-1.09				-1.14
				(0.78)				(1.02)
R-squared	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06

Notes: Sample sizes are 54,120 for weeks, annual hours and usual weekly hours last year. Standard errors are in parentheses. Survey weights are used. Significance levels: ** = 5%; * = 10%. Control variables include race, Hispanic ethnicity, age of child, quadratic in age of respondent and spouse, family non-labor income, region, education categories for respondent and spouse, and a constant.

Table 4. Effects of Child Gender for Two-Immigrant Parent Families versus Native Parent Families (1990 & 2000 Census)

A. 1990: Weeks Last Year

	Fathers			Mothers		
Son	0.19** (0.09)	0.19** (0.09)	0.19** (0.09)	0.03 (0.19)	0.03 (0.19)	0.03 (0.19)
Immigrant*son	-0.03 (0.50)	-1.50 (1.02)	-0.47 (0.64)	-0.89 (0.82)	-2.59* (1.54)	-0.81 (0.99)
US entry age ≥18*son		2.30* (1.21)			2.27 (1.87)	
Asian immigrant *son			1.28 (0.98)			-0.22 (1.71)
Immigrant	-1.47*** (0.44)	0.81 (0.73)	-1.12** (0.50)	-5.90*** (0.69)	1.18 (1.17)	-5.77*** (0.77)
US entry age ≥18		-4.09*** (0.89)			-11.93*** (1.38)	
Asian immigrant			-1.68* (0.98)			-1.21 (1.66)
R-squared	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07

B. 1990: Annual Hours Last Year

	Fathers			Mothers		
Son	6.25 (6.00)	6.25 (6.00)	6.23 (6.00)	2.91 (8.13)	2.89 (8.13)	2.92 (8.13)
Immigrant*son	-27.45 (29.44)	-183.89*** (62.02)	-51.59 (36.44)	-29.38 (34.41)	-116.13* (63.15)	-30.00 (40.01)
US entry age ≥18*son		222.47*** (72.35)			128.14* (77.27)	
Asian immigrant *son			70.67 (60.05)			1.88 (73.24)
Immigrant	-65.23** (25.75)	101.17** (50.53)	-48.00* (29.09)	-172.48*** (28.91)	104.72** (49.21)	-175.30*** (31.45)
US entry age ≥18		-272.70*** (57.19)			-476.28*** (57.52)	
Asian immigrant			-75.94 (59.48)			22.64 (72.47)
R-squared	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06

Table 4. Effects of Child Gender for Two-Immigrant Parent Families versus Native Parent Families (1990 & 2000 Census)

C. 1990: Hours Last Week

	Fathers			Mothers		
Son	-0.14 (0.11)	-0.14 (0.11)	-0.14 (0.11)	-0.02 (0.14)	-0.02 (0.14)	-0.02 (0.14)
Immigrant*son	0.07 (0.49)	-0.69 (1.01)	-0.32 (0.61)	-0.12 (0.59)	-0.05 (1.15)	-0.50 (0.70)
US entry age ≥ 18 *son		0.82 (1.19)			-0.04 (1.38)	
Asian immigrant *son			1.11 (0.99)			1.10 (1.26)
Immigrant	0.09 (0.42)	1.22 (0.76)	0.38 (0.48)	-3.49*** (0.50)	0.46 (0.86)	-3.41*** (0.55)
US entry age ≥ 18		-1.69* (0.87)			-7.15*** (1.00)	
Asian immigrant			-1.36 (1.02)			0.29 (1.25)
R-squared	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.06

D. 2000: Weeks Last Year

	Fathers			Mothers		
Son	0.01 (0.11)	0.01 (0.11)	0.01 (0.11)	0.17 (0.23)	0.17 (0.23)	0.17 (0.23)
Immigrant*son	-0.44 (0.41)	0.79 (0.70)	-0.17 (0.52)	-0.86 (0.67)	-1.09 (1.20)	-1.19 (0.81)
US entry age ≥ 18 *son		-1.68** (0.84)			0.26 (1.39)	
Asian immigrant *son			-0.79 (0.77)			0.93 (1.34)
Immigrant	-1.61*** (0.36)	-0.68 (0.54)	-1.74*** (0.41)	-9.74*** (0.59)	-3.82*** (0.91)	-9.56*** (0.65)
US entry age ≥ 18		-1.31** (0.59)			-8.27*** (1.00)	
Asian immigrant			0.28 (0.90)			-0.52 (1.46)
R-squared	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.08	0.09	0.08

Table 4. Effects of Child Gender for Two-Immigrant Parent Families versus Native Parent Families (1990 & 2000 Census)

<i>E. 2000: Annual Hours Last Year</i>						
	Fathers			Mothers		
Son	-9.93 (6.96)	-9.93 (6.96)	-10.01 (6.96)	1.12 (9.62)	1.17 (9.62)	1.10 (9.62)
Immigrant*son	13.72 (23.73)	41.10 (40.16)	20.49 (29.80)	-25.71 (27.56)	-69.39 (48.98)	-51.18 (32.68)
US entry age ≥18*son		-34.86 (48.10)			58.30 (56.76)	
Asian immigrant *son			-17.64 (46.22)			72.82 (55.19)
Immigrant	-110.03*** (21.32)	-26.81 (32.30)	-106.02*** (23.77)	-346.28*** (24.36)	-98.02*** (37.74)	-328.89*** (26.65)
US entry age ≥18		-118.60*** (35.04)			-347.14*** (40.93)	
Asian immigrant			-66.62 (53.59)			-71.51 (61.37)
R-squared	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.07
<i>F. 2000: Usual Weekly Hours Last Year</i>						
	Fathers			Mothers		
Son	-0.26** (0.12)	-0.26** (0.12)	-0.26** (0.12)	0.06 (0.19)	0.06 (0.19)	0.06 (0.19)
Immigrant*son	0.32 (0.42)	0.31 (0.70)	0.38 (0.53)	-0.68 (0.58)	-1.41 (1.03)	-1.25* (0.70)
US entry age ≥18*son		0.07 (0.85)			0.96 (1.20)	
Asian immigrant *son			-0.14 (0.80)			1.63 (1.18)
Immigrant	-1.05*** (0.37)	0.21 (0.56)	-0.99** (0.42)	-7.27*** (0.51)	-1.91** (0.78)	-6.88*** (0.56)
US entry age ≥18		-1.80*** (0.62)			-7.49*** (0.87)	
Asian immigrant			-0.82 (0.94)			-1.60 (1.24)
R-squared	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.06

Notes: Census 1990 sample sizes are 60,207 for weeks and annual hours and 89,075 for hours worked last week. Census 2000 sample sizes are 49,524 for weeks, annual hours and usual weekly hours last year. Standard errors are in parentheses. Survey weights are used.

Significance levels: ** = 5%; * = 10%. Control variables include race, Hispanic ethnicity, age of child, quadratic in age of respondent and spouse, family non-labor income, region, education categories for respondent and spouse, and a constant. In the specifications with age of entry in 1990, we also control for ambiguous age of entry and its interaction with son.

Table 5. Differential Effects of Child Gender on Weeks Worked Last Year for Immigrants versus U.S.-born (1994–2009 CPS)

	Fathers						Mothers					
Son	0.08 (0.21)	0.26 (0.22)	0.26 (0.22)	0.29 (0.23)	0.27 (0.22)	0.28 (0.23)	0.38 (0.46)	0.37 (0.50)	0.37 (0.50)	0.37 (0.51)	0.37 (0.50)	0.42 (0.52)
Immigrant*son		-0.92 (0.59)	-0.27 (0.76)	-0.94 (0.59)	-1.05 (0.61)	-1.03* (0.64)		-0.11 (1.21)	0.10 (1.96)	0.12 (1.21)	0.71 (1.35)	0.60 (1.37)
US entry age ≥18*son			-0.94 (1.07)						-0.07 (2.32)			
2 nd gen. immigrant*son				-0.55 (1.05)		-0.63 (1.01)				0.39 (2.31)		1.10 (2.30)
Asian immigrant *son					0.45 (1.42)	0.43 (1.41)					-1.99 (2.52)	-1.94 (2.51)
2 nd gen. Asian immigrant *son						1.36 (2.32)						-8.56* (4.83)
Immigrant		-0.55 (0.47)	0.19 (0.59)	-0.50 (0.47)	-0.27 (0.49)	-0.38 (0.50)	-9.34*** (1.00)	-3.11** (1.49)	-9.13*** (1.01)	-9.38*** (1.08)		-9.36*** (1.10)
US entry age ≥18			-1.50 (0.75)						-10.16*** (1.66)			
2 nd gen. immigrant				0.75 (0.75)		0.77 (0.67)				2.81 (1.64)		2.52 (1.66)
Asian immigrant					-1.76 (1.26)	-1.77 (1.30)					-0.97 (2.31)	-1.31 (2.44)
2 nd gen. Asian immigrant						-0.64 (1.95)						2.01 (3.23)
R-squared	0.044	0.045	0.047	0.045	0.045	0.046	0.098	0.112	0.120	0.113	0.112	0.113
P-value for joint significance of interaction effects			0.288	0.262	0.214	0.474		1.00	0.983	0.720		0.428

Notes: Sample sizes are 13,808 fathers and 13,808 mothers. Standard errors are in parentheses. Survey weights are used. Significance levels: ** = 5%; * = 10%. Control variables include race, Hispanic ethnicity, age of child, quadratic in age of respondent and spouse, family non-labor income, region, year, education categories for respondent and spouse, and a constant. In the specifications with age of entry, we also control for ambiguous age of entry and its interaction with son.

Table 6. Differential Effects of Child Gender on Annual Hours for Immigrants versus U.S.-born (1994–2009 CPS)

	Fathers						Mothers					
Son	4.73 (13.34)	15.23 (14.77)	15.28 (14.77)	14.20 (15.08)	16.09 (14.76)	15.38 (15.10)	29.94 (19.17)	32.60 (21.15)	32.78 (21.14)	32.92 (21.67)	32.68 (21.15)	34.89 (21.71)
Immigrant*son		-51.18 (34.31)	-20.47 (48.47)	-50.13 (34.44)	-54.80 (37.16)	-48.85 (38.42)		-11.98 (48.58)	-43.75 (79.64)	-11.21 (48.80)	17.72 (53.71)	12.32 (54.81)
US entry age ≥18*son			-39.30 (62.83)					44.05 (93.69)				
2 nd gen. immigrant*son				31.54 (75.24)		38.75 (75.25)			19.98 (98.98)			62.73 (99.58)
Asian immigrant *son					9.22 (75.77)	6.22 (75.66)					-97.36 (101.57)	-94.78 (101.46)
2 nd gen. Asian immigrant *son						51.24 (170.26)						-425.82** (208.85)
Immigrant	-59.85* (29.40)	1.44 (36.91)	-57.45* (29.50)	-35.64 (31.83)	-40.43 (32.53)		-340.67*** (40.82)	-87.90 (61.48)	-336.47*** (41.16)	-346.19*** (43.43)	-347.96*** (44.42)	
US entry age ≥18			-118.66** (46.10)					-411.24*** (68.04)				
2 nd gen. immigrant				27.39 (51.75)		7.45 (51.31)			51.67 (70.87)			22.75 (71.71)
Asian immigrant					-167.14** (70.15)	-120.70 (74.29)					-20.98 (99.29)	-11.01 (104.96)
2 nd gen. Asian immigrant						144.03 (120.39)						225.09 (151.62)
R-squared	0.053	0.054	0.057	0.055	0.055	0.056	0.090	0.101	0.108	0.101	0.101	0.102
P-value for joint significance of interaction effects			0.191	0.298	0.2926	0.664			0.958	0.950	0.266	0.2659

Notes: Sample sizes are 13,808 fathers and 13,808 mothers. Standard errors are in parentheses. Survey weights are used. Significance levels: ** = 5%; * = 10%. Control variables include race, Hispanic ethnicity, age of child, quadratic in age of respondent and spouse, family non-labor income, region, year, education categories for respondent and spouse, and a constant. In the specifications with age of entry, we also control for ambiguous age of entry and its interaction with son.

Table 7. Differential Effects of Child Gender on Hours Worked Last Week for Immigrants versus U.S.-born (1994–2009 CPS)

	Fathers						Mothers					
Son	0.09 (0.28)	0.20 (0.31)	0.21 (0.31)	0.15 (0.32)	0.21 (0.31)	0.11 (0.32)	0.18 (0.33)	0.11 (0.36)	0.12 (0.36)	0.11 (0.37)	0.11 (0.36)	0.17 (0.37)
Immigrant*son		-0.52 (0.72)	0.09 (1.13)	-0.47 (0.72)	-0.61 (0.80)	-0.40 (0.83)		0.46 (0.83)	0.80 (1.41)	0.47 (0.84)	1.07 (0.92)	0.83 (0.94)
US entry age ≥ 18 *son			-0.81 (1.38)						-0.61 (1.63)			
2 nd gen. immigrant*son				1.40 (1.50)		0.79 (1.52)				0.12 (1.74)		1.04 (1.76)
Asian immigrant *son					0.36 (1.51)	0.30 (1.51)					-2.04 (1.75)	-1.95 (1.76)
2 nd gen. Asian immigrant *son						8.59** (3.42)						-8.14** (3.41)
Immigrant	-1.90*** (0.62)	-1.11 (0.91)	-2.00*** (0.63)	-1.64** (0.68)	-1.81*** (0.69)		-5.98*** (0.71)	-1.69 (1.108)	-5.98*** (0.71)	-6.54*** (0.76)	-6.56*** (0.78)	
US entry age ≥ 18			-1.47 (1.05)					-6.94*** (1.19)				
2 nd gen. immigrant				-1.57 (1.03)		-1.47 (1.04)				-0.06 (1.21)		-0.71 (1.23)
Asian immigrant					-1.88 (1.42)	-1.49 (1.49)					2.87 (1.76)	3.13 (1.86)
2 nd gen. Asian immigrant						-1.05 (2.27)						4.91** (2.44)
R-squared	0.034	0.039	0.040	0.039	0.039	0.040	0.073	0.080	0.085	0.080	0.080	0.080
P-value for joint significance of interaction effects			0.655	0.490	0.741	0.111			0.885	0.857	0.390	0.126

Notes: Sample sizes are 20,929 fathers and 20,929 mothers. Standard errors are in parentheses. Survey weights are used. Significance levels: ** = 5%; * = 10%. Control variables include race, Hispanic ethnicity, age of child, quadratic in age of respondent and spouse, family non-labor income, region, year, education categories for respondent and spouse, and a constant. In the specifications with age of entry, we also control for ambiguous age of entry and its interaction with son.

Table 8. Effects of Child Gender for Two-Immigrant Parent Families versus Native Parent Families^a (1994–2009 CPS)

	Weeks worked last year			Annual hours			Hours last week		
Fathers	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Son	0.24 (0.23)	0.24 (0.23)	0.24 (0.22)	14.39 (15.08)	14.40 (15.07)	15.06 (15.07)	0.06 (0.32)	0.06 (0.32)	0.07 (0.32)
Immigrant*son	-1.32** (0.64)	0.003 (0.91)	-1.48** (0.68)	-72.34** (36.16)	-25.57 (52.57)	-75.29* (39.12)	-0.75 (0.75)	0.70 (1.26)	-0.84 (0.85)
US entry age ≥18*son		-1.84 (1.20)			-60.76 (66.87)			-1.83 (1.50)	
Asian immigrant *son			0.50 (1.49)			7.24 (78.81)			0.31 (1.57)
Immigrant	-0.48 (0.52)	-0.31 (0.70)	-0.20 (0.53)	-80.52*** (31.34)	-35.73** (40.25)	-59.42 (33.76)	-1.85*** (0.66)	-1.40 (1.03)	-1.55** (0.71)
US entry age ≥18		-0.57 (0.81)			-85.03 (48.09)			-0.99 (1.14)	
Asian immigrant			-1.60 (1.34)			-134.19** (74.61)			-2.05 (1.53)
R-squared	0.046	0.048	0.046	0.055	0.056	0.055	0.039	0.040	0.039
P-value for joint significance of interaction effects		0.079	0.075		0.116	0.114		0.171	0.588
Mothers									
Son	0.45 (0.51)	0.46 (0.51)	0.46 (0.51)	35.63* (21.55)	35.94* (21.54)	35.74* (21.55)	0.23 (0.37)	0.23 (0.37)	0.23 (0.37)
Immigrant*son	0.42 (1.27)	-0.29 (2.13)	1.04 (1.43)	2.77 (51.22)	-50.61 (87.28)	34.21 (56.67)	0.28 (0.88)	0.28 (1.59)	0.88 (0.98)
US entry age ≥18*son		0.87 (2.51)			68.14 (101.47)			-0.18 (1.80)	
Asian immigrant *son			-2.01 (2.66)			-100.90 (107.33)			-1.94 (1.85)
Immigrant	-10.54*** (1.08)	-2.88* (1.65)	-10.62 (1.17)	-389.58*** (44.18)	-81.48 (68.35)	-396.41*** (46.81)	-6.49*** (0.77)	-1.53 (1.23)	-7.08*** (0.82)
US entry age ≥18		-12.02*** (1.81)			-481.70*** (74.33)			-7.52*** (1.32)	
Asian immigrant			-0.73 (2.47)			-14.92 (107.18)			2.94 (1.89)
R-squared	0.113	0.123	0.114	0.102	0.110	0.102	0.080	0.085	0.080
P-value for joint significance of interaction effects		0.981	0.687		0.921	0.630		0.982	0.516

^a Sample excludes married couples where one is U.S. born and the other is a first-generation immigrant. Sample sizes are 13,129 for weeks and annual hours and 19,811 for hours worked last week.

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. Survey weights used. Significant levels: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Control variables include race/ethnicity, age of child, quadratic in age of respondent and spouse, family non-labor income, region, year, education categories of respondent and spouse, and a constant. In the specifications with age of entry, we also control for ambiguous age of entry and its interaction with son.

Table 9. Differential Effects of Child Gender by Race and Ethnicity (1990 Census)

<i>Fathers</i>	<i>Weeks Last Year</i>			<i>Annual Hours</i>			<i>Hours Last Week</i>		
Son	0.21** (0.09)	0.21** (0.09)	0.23*** (0.09)	4.53 (6.02)	4.56 (6.02)	6.89 (6.06)	-0.14 (0.11)	-0.14 (0.11)	-0.13 (0.11)
Black *son	-0.36 (0.55)	-0.36 (0.55)	-0.33 (0.55)	-12.37 (29.67)	-12.61 (29.66)	-9.11 (29.66)	0.47 (0.57)	0.47 (0.57)	0.48 (0.57)
Asian *son	0.38 (0.61)	0.38 (0.61)	0.74 (0.70)	12.12 (38.89)	12.09 (38.89)	56.91 (43.99)	0.40 (0.67)	0.40 (0.67)	0.52 (0.77)
Native Amer/Alaskan or Other race *son	-1.25 (1.79)	-1.29 (1.79)	-1.28 (1.79)	-127.30 (98.92)	-128.83 (98.90)	-127.38 (98.87)	-3.44* (1.89)	-3.44* (1.89)	-3.43* (1.89)
Hispanic *son	-0.60 (0.45)	-0.61 (0.45)	-0.41 (0.48)	-41.67 (26.94)	-41.83 (26.95)	-16.64 (29.21)	-0.19 (0.46)	-0.19 (0.46)	-0.12 (0.50)
Immigrant*son			-0.46 (0.45)			-57.24** (27.62)			-0.15 (0.49)
Immigrant		-0.97*** (0.23)	-0.74** (0.32)		-38.11*** (13.94)	-8.68 (20.10)		0.12 (0.25)	0.19 (0.35)
R-squared	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04

<i>Mothers</i>	<i>Weeks Last Year</i>			<i>Annual Hours</i>			<i>Hours Last Week</i>		
Son	0.06 (0.20)	0.06 (0.20)	0.09 (0.20)	5.25 (8.24)	5.40 (8.23)	5.95 (8.30)	0.02 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)	0.01 (0.14)
Black *son	-0.08 (0.85)	-0.04 (0.85)	0.00 (0.85)	10.86 (36.59)	12.14 (36.60)	13.14 (36.61)	-0.09 (0.68)	-0.07 (0.68)	-0.08 (0.68)
Asian *son	-1.15 (1.11)	-1.18 (1.10)	-0.68 (1.27)	-41.08 (47.96)	-41.77 (47.79)	-29.09 (54.25)	0.37 (0.82)	0.34 (0.82)	0.21 (0.94)
Native Amer/Alaskan or Other race *son	-2.09 (2.65)	-2.03 (2.65)	-2.01 (2.65)	-104.47 (125.23)	-102.41 (124.53)	-101.84 (124.54)	1.01 (1.83)	1.01 (1.83)	1.00 (1.83)
Hispanic *son	-0.94 (0.76)	-0.86 (0.75)	-0.60 (0.83)	-49.81 (30.95)	-47.25 (30.81)	-40.56 (34.28)	-0.51 (0.55)	-0.49 (0.54)	-0.56 (0.60)
Immigrant*son			-0.62 (0.81)			-15.72 (33.71)			0.16 (0.58)
Immigrant	(0.76)	(0.75)	(0.83)		-153.97*** (17.08)	-145.78*** (24.12)		-2.84*** (0.30)	-2.92*** (0.42)
R-squared	(2.65)	(2.65)	(2.65)	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06

Notes: Sample sizes are 64,442 for weeks and annual hours and 95,365 for hours worked last week. Standard errors are in parentheses. Survey weights are used. Significance levels: ** = 5%; * = 10%. Control variables include race, Hispanic ethnicity, age of child, quadratic in age of respondent and spouse, family non-labor income, region, education categories for respondent and spouse, and a constant.

Table 10. Differential Effects of Child Gender by Race and Ethnicity (2000 Census)

Fathers	Weeks Last Year			Annual Hours			Usual Weekly Hours Last Year		
Son	0.01 (0.10)	0.01 (0.10)	0.02 (0.10)	-10.50 (6.92)	-10.44 (6.92)	-11.55* (6.99)	-0.22* (0.12)	-0.22* (0.12)	-0.24* (0.12)
Black *son	-0.29 (0.61)	-0.25 (0.61)	-0.23 (0.61)	1.40 (33.76)	3.36 (33.74)	1.63 (33.81)	-0.46 (0.59)	-0.45 (0.59)	-0.48 (0.59)
Asian *son	-0.74 (0.52)	-0.76 (0.52)	-0.59 (0.64)	-10.22 (33.48)	-11.52 (33.45)	-27.51 (40.31)	0.12 (0.58)	0.11 (0.58)	-0.23 (0.70)
Native Amer/Alaskan or Other race *son	-1.87 (1.84)	-1.93 (1.85)	-1.92 (1.85)	-13.66 (105.21)	-17.22 (105.88)	-18.83 (106.03)	1.02 (1.78)	1.00 (1.78)	0.96 (1.79)
Hispanic *son	0.32 (0.43)	0.34 (0.43)	0.45 (0.47)	33.66 (24.51)	34.91 (24.47)	25.02 (27.69)	0.22 (0.44)	0.23 (0.44)	0.02 (0.49)
Immigrant*son			-0.21 (0.43)			19.07 (26.18)			0.40 (0.46)
Immigrant		-1.32*** (0.22)	-1.21*** (0.31)		-73.04*** (13.42)	-82.86*** (18.86)		-0.57** (0.24)	-0.78** (0.34)
R-squared	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03

Mothers	Weeks Last Year			Annual Hours			Usual Weekly Hours Last Year		
Son	0.04 (0.23)	0.04 (0.23)	0.10 (0.23)	-4.50 (9.74)	-4.25 (9.71)	-3.21 (9.85)	-0.07 (0.19)	-0.07 (0.19)	-0.04 (0.19)
Black *son	-0.45 (0.94)	-0.26 (0.94)	-0.17 (0.94)	23.32 (41.40)	30.46 (41.47)	32.12 (41.49)	0.68 (0.78)	0.83 (0.78)	0.88 (0.78)
Asian *son	0.83 (0.96)	0.67 (0.95)	1.46 (1.13)	52.74 (40.59)	47.25 (40.19)	62.68 (47.88)	1.23 (0.84)	1.12 (0.83)	1.56 (0.98)
Native Amer/Alaskan or Other race *son	-2.61 (2.65)	-2.24 (2.66)	-2.16 (2.66)	-13.90 (113.02)	-0.81 (113.04)	0.82 (113.08)	2.17 (2.41)	2.44 (2.39)	2.49 (2.39)
Hispanic *son	-0.41 (0.69)	-0.37 (0.68)	0.11 (0.78)	-29.86 (28.54)	-28.32 (28.15)	-18.93 (32.53)	-0.89 (0.59)	-0.85 (0.58)	-0.58 (0.66)
Immigrant*son			-0.95 (0.75)			-18.54 (31.32)			-0.53 (0.63)
Immigrant		-8.09*** (0.38)	-7.60*** (0.54)		-291.05*** (15.97)	-281.48*** (22.79)		-6.00*** (0.32)	-5.73*** (0.46)
R-squared	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.06

Notes: Sample sizes are 54,120 for weeks, annual hours and usual weekly hours last year. Standard errors are in parentheses. Survey weights are used. Significance levels: ** = 5%; * = 10%. Control variables include race, Hispanic ethnicity, age of child, quadratic in age of respondent and spouse, family non-labor income, region, education categories for respondent and spouse, and a constant.

Table 11. Differential Effects of Child Gender by Race and Ethnicity (1994–2009 CPS)

	Weeks last year			Annual hours			Hours worked last week		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Fathers									
Son	0.21 (0.22)	0.22 (0.22)	0.29 (0.22)	20.53 (15.48)	21.22 (15.48)	23.41 (15.63)	0.08 (0.32)	0.09 (0.32)	0.15 (0.33)
Black * son	-0.63 (1.17)	-0.67 (1.17)	-0.53 (1.18)	-57.18 (63.24)	-60.77 (63.30)	-56.72 (63.70)	1.01 (1.46)	0.96 (1.46)	1.08 (1.47)
Asian * son	-1.27 (1.22)	-1.18 (1.21)	-0.34 (1.29)	-95.98 (65.41)	-88.77 (65.04)	-64.26 (72.76)	-0.17 (1.24)	-0.02 (1.24)	0.67 (1.41)
Other race * son	-2.82 (1.78)	-2.86 (1.78)	-2.87 (1.79)	-282.60** (113.65)	-285.82** (113.56)	-286.01** (113.53)	-3.82 (2.93)	-3.80 (2.92)	-3.80 (2.92)
Hispanic * son	0.10 (0.61)	0.10 (0.61)	0.72 (0.74)	-32.80 (34.02)	-32.83 (34.07)	-14.70 (43.72)	-0.00 (0.75)	0.00 (0.75)	0.50 (0.93)
Immigrant * son			-1.10 (0.71)			-32.12 (44.72)			-0.90 (0.94)
Immigrant		-1.02*** (0.36)	-0.45 (0.53)		-86.23*** (22.83)	-69.69** (33.29)		-2.17*** (0.48)	-1.71** (0.71)
R-squared	0.044	0.045	0.045	0.053	0.055	0.055	0.038	0.039	0.039
P-value for joint significance of interactions	0.4234	0.4296	0.2848	0.0600	0.0607	0.1082	0.6911	0.7046	0.6822
Mothers									
Son	0.49 (0.53)	0.52 (0.53)	0.42 (0.53)	39.58* (22.17)	40.95* (22.12)	37.10* (22.45)	0.42 (0.38)	0.43 (0.38)	0.30 (0.39)
Black * son	1.18 (2.12)	0.22 (2.10)	-0.02 (2.10)	46.43 (91.30)	10.60 (90.22)	1.66 (90.32)	-0.29 (1.62)	-0.65 (1.61)	-0.94 (1.62)
Asian * son	-2.96 (2.10)	-2.83 (2.08)	-4.16* (2.38)	-138.68 (84.46)	-133.63 (83.71)	-182.87* (95.64)	-2.72* (1.42)	-2.64* (1.42)	-4.28*** (1.63)
Other race * son	5.13 (4.44)	4.70 (4.34)	4.57 (4.34)	84.06 (191.76)	67.97 (188.37)	63.34 (188.10)	-3.62 (3.73)	-3.41 (3.67)	-3.55 (3.66)
Hispanic * son	-0.14 (1.31)	0.02 (1.29)	-0.92 (1.54)	-28.01 (53.00)	-22.34 (52.18)	-56.99 (62.74)	-0.14 (0.89)	0.04 (0.88)	-1.08 (1.07)
Immigrant * son			1.66 (1.53)			61.45 (61.92)			2.07* (1.07)
Immigrant		-9.27*** (0.79)	-10.11*** (1.10)		-345.94*** (31.87)	-377.16*** (45.44)		-5.74*** (0.55)	-6.78*** (0.78)
R-squared	0.098	0.111	0.111	0.090	0.101	0.101	0.073	0.080	0.080
P-value for joint significance of interactions	0.4315	0.5321	0.3605	0.4773	0.1104	0.4122	0.3438	0.3540	0.1345

Notes: Sample sizes are 13,808 for weeks and annual hours and 20,929 for hours worked last week. Standard errors are in parentheses. Survey weights used. Significant levels: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Control variables include age of child, quadratic in age of respondent and spouse, family non-labor income, region, year, education categories of respondent and spouse, and a constant.

Table 12. Differential Effects of Child Gender by Race and Ethnicity (2003–2009 CPS)

	Weeks last year			Annual hours			Hours worked last week		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Fathers									
Son	-0.17 (0.30)	-0.16 (0.30)	-0.09 (0.30)	4.42 (20.15)	5.38 (20.11)	7.46 (20.47)	-0.27 (0.45)	-0.27 (0.45)	-0.19 (0.45)
Black * son	-0.46 (1.91)	-0.47 (1.91)	-0.33 (1.93)	-59.27 (94.40)	-60.55 (94.62)	-56.10 (95.62)	-0.61 (2.16)	-0.57 (2.17)	-0.39 (2.19)
Asian * son	-2.45 (1.66)	-2.30 (1.65)	-1.65 (1.74)	-150.07* (84.62)	-137.41 (83.97)	-117.46 (93.34)	-0.28 (1.51)	-0.03 (1.50)	0.78 (1.80)
Other race * son	-2.34 (1.76)	-2.40 (1.76)	-2.41 (1.76)	-260.25** (127.27)	-265.68** (125.71)	-265.95** (125.62)	-1.91 (2.95)	-1.92 (2.95)	-1.93 (2.95)
Hispanic * son	-0.36 (0.92)	-0.43 (0.98)	0.06 (1.13)	-33.70 (49.44)	-39.84 (49.78)	-24.73 (61.41)	0.84 (1.10)	0.75 (1.10)	1.32 (1.35)
Immigrant * son			-0.78 (0.75)		-107.16*** (30.15)	-93.34** (39.06)			-1.07 (1.30)
Immigrant		-1.23** (0.54)	-0.87 (1.03)			-26.78 (57.60)		-2.21*** (0.68)	-1.67* (0.96)
R-squared	0.045	0.046	0.046	0.057	0.060	0.060	0.043	0.044	0.044
P-value for joint significance of interaction terms	0.4135	0.4258	0.5866	0.1137	0.1152	0.1876	0.8734	0.9042	0.8957
Mothers									
Son	-0.17 (0.72)	-0.10 (0.72)	-0.23 (0.73)	23.49 (29.94)	26.17 (29.83)	21.60 (30.34)	0.91* (0.52)	0.92* (0.52)	0.84 (0.53)
Black * son	1.82 (3.26)	1.20 (3.19)	0.91 (3.20)	39.86 (138.79)	16.27 (136.55)	6.10 (137.19)	1.55 (2.19)	1.40 (2.14)	1.24 (2.15)
Asian * son	-0.51 (2.64)	-0.28 (2.59)	-1.59 (2.93)	-53.14 (107.20)	-44.36 (105.28)	-90.86 (120.04)	-2.92* (1.76)	-2.61 (1.75)	-3.44* (2.04)
Other race * son	9.43* (5.39)	8.39 (5.34)	8.20 (5.34)	230.11 (240.45)	190.67 (239.77)	184.07 (239.48)	-0.10 (4.41)	-0.26 (4.41)	-0.34 (4.40)
Hispanic * son	0.45 (1.87)	0.86 (1.84)	-0.10 (2.15)	-11.23 (75.12)	4.13 (73.66)	-29.79 (87.54)	-0.38 (1.26)	0.06 (1.23)	-0.52 (1.46)
Immigrant * son			1.74 (2.01)			61.91 (81.99)			1.10 (1.40)
Immigrant		-10.51*** (1.03)	-11.41*** (1.44)		-398.07*** (41.94)	-430.17*** (59.32)		-6.85*** (0.73)	-7.41*** (1.02)
R-squared	0.098	0.118	0.118	0.088	0.105	0.105	0.074	0.086	0.086
P-value for joint significance of interaction terms	0.4893	0.6005	0.5837	0.8602	0.9315	0.8693	0.4820	0.5828	0.6204

Notes: Sample sizes are 7,288 for weeks and annual hours and 10,949 for hours worked last week. Standard errors are in parentheses. Survey weights are used. Significant levels: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Control variables include age of child, quadratic in age of respondent and spouse, family non-labor income, region, year, education categories of respondent and spouse, and a constant.

Appendix Table A1. P-values for joint tests of effects of child gender on labor supply

	<i>Weeks</i>	<i>Annual hours</i>	<i>Hours</i>
Panel A. Census1990			
<i>Fathers</i>			
Son + immigrant*son	0.5768	0.0571	0.635
Son + immigrant*son + Age entry \geq 18*son	0.4522	0.9229	0.4348
Son + immigrant*son + Asian immigrant*son	0.2624	0.6336	0.3237
<i>Son + Asian*son</i>	0.3294	0.6649	0.6947
<i>Son + Other race*son</i>	0.5590	0.2137	0.0577
<i>Mothers</i>			
Son + immigrant*son	0.1355	0.2262	0.9120
Son + immigrant*son + Age entry \geq 18*son	0.6942	0.9119	0.8857
Son + immigrant*son + Asian immigrant*son	0.5200	0.5708	0.9927
<i>Son + Asian</i>	0.3173	0.4483	0.6323
<i>Son + Other race</i>	0.4411	0.4272	0.5713
Panel B. Census2000			
<i>Fathers</i>			
Son + immigrant*son	0.5313	0.6168	
Son + immigrant*son + Age entry \geq 18*son	0.2327	0.7757	
Son + immigrant*son + Asian immigrant*son	0.0712	0.5362	
<i>Son + Asian*son</i>	0.1538	0.5272	
<i>Son + Other race*son</i>	0.3106	0.8180	
<i>Mothers</i>			
Son + immigrant*son	0.4929	0.7253	
Son + immigrant*son + Age entry \geq 18*son	0.3190	0.7484	
Son + immigrant*son + Asian immigrant*son	0.9630	0.5923	
<i>Son + Asian</i>	0.3548	0.2209	
<i>Son + Other race</i>	0.3307	0.8702	
Panel C. CPS			
<i>Fathers</i>			
Son + immigrant*son	0.2325	0.2456	0.6207
Son + immigrant*son + Age entry \geq 18*son	0.2256	0.2986	0.5456
Son + 2 nd generation immigrant	0.7948	0.5347	0.2901
Son + immigrant*son + Asian immigrant*son	0.8004	0.6633	0.9717
Son + 2 nd gen.*son + 2 nd gen Asian *son	0.6742	0.5527	0.0066
<i>Son + Asian</i>	0.3771	0.2350	0.9453
<i>Son + Other race</i>	0.1395	0.0200	0.1990
<i>Mothers</i>			
Son + immigrant*son	0.6699	0.6378	0.4435
Son + immigrant*son + Age entry \geq 18*son	0.7635	0.5379	0.7251
Son + 2 nd generation immigrant	0.7407	0.5909	0.8570
Son + immigrant*son + Asian immigrant*son	0.6760	0.5968	0.5742
Son + 2 nd gen.*son + 2 nd gen Asian *son	0.1652	0.1325	0.0495
<i>Son + Asian</i>	0.2238	0.2510	0.0933
<i>Son + Other race</i>	0.2023	0.5606	0.3888
Panel D. CPS (Table 8)			
<i>Fathers</i>			
Son + immigrant*son	0.0923	0.0604	0.4184
Son + immigrant*son + Age entry \geq 18*son	0.1085	0.1543	0.4233
Son + immigrant*son + Asian immigrant*son	0.7573	0.6433	0.7899
<i>Mothers</i>			
Son + immigrant*son	0.8723	0.8790	0.5282
Son + immigrant*son + Age entry \geq 18*son	0.9516	0.8178	0.7219
Son + immigrant*son + Asian immigrant*son	0.4591	0.4072	0.6046

Notes: The immigrant tests come from the first specification that allows these particular specifications. Race interaction tests are based upon specifications without controls for immigrant status.

Appendix Table A2. P-Values for joint tests of differential child gender effects on labor supply between groups

	<i>Weeks</i>	<i>Annual hours</i>	<i>Hours last week</i>
Panel A. Census1990			
<i>Fathers</i>			
Immigrants who enter as adults = U.S. born	0.6788	0.9470	0.5832
Asian immigrants = U.S. born	0.4104	0.7287	0.2494
<i>Asian = Other race</i>	0.3860	0.1882	0.0548
<i>Asian = Non-Hispanic Whites (t-test)</i>	0.531	0.755	0.553
<i>Mothers</i>			
Asian immigrants = U.S. born	0.5012	0.5229	0.9882
Immigrants who enter as adults = U.S. born	0.6653	0.9964	0.8811
<i>Asian = Other race</i>	0.7423	0.6351	0.7469
<i>Asian = Non-Hispanic Whites</i>	0.300	0.392	0.654
Panel B. Census 2000			
<i>Fathers</i>			
Immigrants who enter as adults = U.S. born	0.2327	0.4968	
Asian immigrants = U.S. born	0.0721	0.5362	
<i>Asian = Other race</i>	0.5536	0.9750	
<i>Asian = Non-Hispanic Whites (t-test)</i>	0.159	0.760	
<i>Mothers</i>			
Asian immigrants = U.S. born	0.8896	0.5643	
Immigrants who enter as adults = U.S. born	0.2791	0.8199	
<i>Asian = Other race</i>	0.2204	0.5764	
<i>Asian = Non-Hispanic Whites</i>	0.390	0.194	
Panel C. CPS			
<i>Fathers</i>			
Immigrants who enter as adults = U.S. born	0.1362	0.1866	0.4273
Asian immigrants = U.S. born	0.6490	0.5108	0.8497
2 nd generation Asian = U.S. born	0.7656	0.6153	0.0079
<i>Asian = Other race</i>	0.4673	0.1495	0.2460
<i>Asian = Non-Hispanic Whites (t-test)</i>	0.2981	0.1423	0.8933
<i>Mothers</i>			
Immigrants who enter as adults = U.S. born	0.9811	0.9958	0.8417
Asian immigrants = U.S. born	0.5674	0.3827	0.5361
2 nd generation Asian = U.S. born	0.1463	0.0998	0.0469
<i>Asian = Other race</i>	0.0950	0.2804	0.8194
<i>Asian = Non-Hispanic Whites</i>	0.1589	0.1006	0.0559

Notes: Race interaction tests are based upon specifications without controls for immigrant status.

Appendix Table A3. Effects of Child Gender for 1st or 2nd Generation Immigrant Parents Families versus Native Parent Families^a (1994–2009 CPS)

	Weeks worked last year	Annual hours
Fathers		
Son	0.18 (0.22)	10.98 (14.87)
1 st or 2 nd generation immigrant*son	-1.16* (0.68)	-62.63* (37.96)
1 st or 2 nd generation immigrant	-0.22 (0.54)	-87.34*** (32.89)
R-squared	0.045	0.054
Mothers		
Son	0.50 (0.50)	36.43* (21.28)
1 st or 2 nd generation immigrant*son	0.15 (1.36)	1.12 (53.73)
1 st or 2 nd generation immigrant	-910.13*** (1.14)	-372.09*** (45.06)
R-squared	0.112	0.100

^a Sample excludes married couples where one is U.S. born and the other is a first-generation immigrant. Sample sizes are 13,174 fathers and 13,174 mothers.

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. Survey weights used. Significant levels: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Control variables include race/ethnicity, age of child, quadratic in age of respondent and spouse, family non-labor income, region, year, education categories of respondent and spouse, and a constant.