ABSTRACT

Title of Document: Asians in the United States Labor Market:
                            'Winners' or 'Losers'?

                            Veena S. Kulkarni, Ph.D., 2008

Directed By: Professor Suzanne M. Bianchi
                            Department of Sociology

This dissertation examines employment, earnings, and income of the six major foreign and native born Asian groups, namely, Asian Indians, Chinese, Filipinos, Japanese, Koreans, and the Vietnamese for the year 2000. The dissertation makes three contributions. First, it provides an updated analysis of employment and earning attainments of Asian *individuals* disaggregated by countries of origin, gender, and nativity status using the latest available and most suitable data. Second, it explores the use of a non-parametric technique, namely reweighting, to assess the earning gaps between Asians and whites. Third, it analyzes intergroup variations in *household* income, inclination to pool resources, and factors associated with the likelihood of forming nuclear living arrangements.

Descriptive statistics document the high average levels of employment, earnings, and human capital attainments for Asian men and women relative to whites. There are, however, notable subgroup differences: foreign born Chinese, Koreans, Vietnamese, and native born Vietnamese have below average attainment. The estimates from the multivariate framework, on the contrary, indicate a relative Asian earning disadvantage. The multivariate and reweighting analyses show that foreign born Asian men and women experience greater disadvantage relative to whites than the native born Asian men and

women. The gender comparisons indicate that being native born as compared to being foreign born is more beneficial for Asian women than men in the labor market, with native born Asian women experiencing higher earnings than white women. Additionally, there is evidence of a 'glass ceiling' among Asian men.

With regard to the household level analysis, the descriptive associations show that the economic position of Asian relative to white households depend on the specific measure of household income employed. Asian households experience similar or higher levels of total household income and income per labor hour employed but lower levels of per capita income than white households. The results also suggest a higher inclination to pool resources among the foreign born relative to the native born Asian and white households. Intergroup comparisons indicate that the foreign born Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese households have a greater tendency to share and pool resources than the foreign born Indians and the Japanese. Multivariate analyses point towards a positive relationship between the householder's earnings, education, and length of stay and the likelihood of living in nuclear relative to nonnuclear living arrangements. The overall findings from this dissertation suggest that - at both the individual and household levels, the differences between the foreign born and the native born Asian groups are more significant than the intergroup variations among Asians.

Asians in the United States Labor Market: 'Winners' or 'Losers'?

By

Veena S. Kulkarni

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2008

Advisory Committee:
Professor Suzanne M. Bianchi, Chair
Professor John Iceland
Professor Dae Young Kim
Professor John P. Robinson
Professor Larry H. Shinagawa

To my father for teaching me the value and fun of intellectual curiosity

And

To my mother for being an exemplar of endurance

Acknowledgements

The opening sentence of the first lesson in my middle school Sanskrit course was, *aacharya devo bhav*, meaning 'let thy teacher be God unto you' - teacher is the personification of God, someone who not just guides in the journey towards the completion of the task at hand but also in the larger intellectual world. The significance of this exhortation was best felt in my dissertation writing stage. I am therefore, deeply grateful to my dissertation advisor, Professor Suzanne Bianchi for her holistic mentorship in teaching me the process of conducting meaningful and analytically rigorous research. This doctoral work could not have come to a successful completion without her constant support and guidance. All the deficiencies are entirely my responsibility.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge the special role that Professor Sonal Desai has played in my Ph.D endeavor. I wouldn't have availed the opportunity to explore and experience the graduate program at the University of Maryland had it not been for her 'effort'in convincing me of its worthwhileness when I first came in contact with her in India.

I would also like to acknowledge with gratitude the technical support provided by the Maryland Population Research Center (MPRC). The computing and data programming help of Bandy and Yeats at the MPRC immensely facilitated the large scale data computation work that my research entailed.

I very much appreciate and cherish my twin sister Vani's invaluable and constant concern and involvement, both as a sibling and as a fellow graduate student. To my younger sister Varsha, whose vivaciousness and humor immensely helped ease the periods of stress.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendix Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

One of the hallmarks of recent trends in international migration to the United States is the rise in the number of people coming from Asian countries. The share of Asians in the immigrant population has increased from 11 to 30 percent between 1960 and 2000. This trend is likely to continue with 30 percent growth in the foreign born Asian population between 1990 and 2000 and foreign born Asians constituting 23.4 percent of the foreign born population in 2006 (Martin and Midgley 2003; American Community Survey Data 2006). Asians have therefore become a group of substantial size in recent years with increasing numbers from China, India, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and Vietnam. Women (immigrants) comprise a substantial proportion of these increasing numbers. Further, with the implementation of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1965, there are more people entering for family reunification purposes (Jasso and Rosenzweig 1986, 1990; Duleep and Regets 1996).

In line with the economic focus adopted by most of the contemporary literature on immigration (Bean and Stevens 2003), this dissertation investigates the labor market experiences of the six major foreign and native born Asian groups, namely, Asian Indians, Chinese, Filipinos, Japanese, Koreans, and the Vietnamese. Despite the recognition of the heterogeneity among these Asian subgroups, there is no comprehensive, updated analysis of Asian immigrant economic experience by country of origin, gender, and nativity status at the individual or the household levels. The present study aims to fill this gap in the literature.

Why study the economic outcome of men, women, and households of Asian origin relative to whites?

Apart from their rising numbers, there are a number of noteworthy characteristics of Asians that make them a worthwhile group to study.

First, there is a considerable amount of heterogeneity in the socioeconomic statuses across the various Asian groups. The few studies that compare immigrants from the six major Asian sending countries with one another and with whites find that Asian immigrants experience high average socioeconomic levels but with noteworthy intergroup variations in earnings as well as patterns of employment (Hirschman and Wong 1984; Barringer, Takeuchi and Xenos 1990; Iceland 1999; Sakamoto and Xie 2005). The label of 'model minority' accorded to the aggregated Asian community may not be applicable to all the six groups equally. A more appropriate characterization for the group appears to be, one of a 'high average and a large dispersion' (Zeng and Xie 2004, page 1076).

Additionally, the relationship between the standard human capital, assimilation, and the demographic variables and the economic outcomes also varies among the Asians subgroups. For instance, limited English language ability is not necessarily related to low employment levels across the groups. Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans have been able to establish 'ethnic economies' where both the employees and employers belong to the same ethnic community and therefore lack of host country language skill is not so detrimental (Bonacich and Modell 1980; Light and Karageorgis 1980; Light and Bonacich 1988; Zhou and Logan 1989; Schoeni 1998). Also, studies have documented notable differentials in the incidence of adopting self-employment as a means of livelihood

among the various groups. Chinese and Koreans consistently experience higher self-employment rates than Asian Indians or Filipinos (Nee and Wong 1985; Hirschman and Wong 1986; Sanchirico 1991; Zhou 1992). Self employment is an intriguing form of labor market engagement since it has been shown to be both a safety net for those with low human capital as well as an escape from discrimination for those with high human capital (Raijman and Tienda 1999). The six groups, therefore, vary with regard to both the processes and outcomes of labor market participation.

Further, the debate as to whether the individual Asian groups are disadvantaged in the U.S. labor market is very much alive. Some findings suggest that native born Asians are not disadvantaged, suggesting that everything else being equal, being non-white is not of consequence (Chiswick 1983; Nee and Sanders 1985; Iceland 1999; Sakamoto et.al 2000, Sakamoto and Furuichi 2002). Lower outcomes of the foreign born can be explained by their 'non-native' rather than 'non-white' status. This viewpoint is challenged however by those who argue that there exists unexplained (Asian-white) outcome gaps and that there is a 'glass ceiling' for Asians (Wong 1980; Hisrchman and Wong 1984; Hurh and Kim 1989; Feagin and Feagin 1993; Waters and Eschbach 1995). The contention is that a disadvantage (relative to the majority group) will exist owing to the persistence of racial discrimination in the U.S. labor market. The limited research there is on Asians evaluating the 'glass ceiling' suggests greater disadvantage experienced by the Asians relative to whites in the top than in the middle earning brackets (Duleep and Sanders 1992; Tang 1993; Kim and Lewis 1994; Tang 2000).

Second, considering, that both the extent of migration and skill selection of immigrants are associated with level of economic and political development of the source

nations, the set of the six study countries provide an interesting mix. There exists theoretical as well as empirical evidence showing that the more developed the source country is, the better economically integrated are its people in the U.S. labor market (Chiswick 1978b, 1979; Borjas 1987, 1988; Jasso and Rosenzweig 1990; Freidberg 2000). They have better than average human capital (such as educational attainments and familiarity with the language of the destination country) and better transferability of skills and hence better subsequent rewards relative to migrants from poor countries The experiences of some of the Asian groups corroborates the above thesis while it does not in the case of others. For instance, the recent decreasing rates of immigration from Japan may be attributable to the fact of Japan is an economic superpower (Massey 1988). Indians, on the other hand, provide a contrary example to the expected relationship between the level of development of the source country and the economic incorporation of its people. India is one of the poorer countries in the group but foreign and native born Indians are performing at levels comparable to their counterparts from more developed countries of Asia (Barringer, Takeuchi and Xenos 1990; Xie and Goyette 2004). The latter is plausibly a reflection of the 'selection bias' among Indian immigrants (Feliciano 2005); disproportionately upper class Indians migrate to the U.S.

Considering the relationship between the political condition of the source country and the skill selection of the immigrants, refugees are less favorably selected than those who migrate to take advantage of economic opportunities in the destination country. Following, the above reasoning, immigrants from Vietnam should perform less favorably than other groups because a large majority entered as refugees in the 1970s after the end of the U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War. The few past studies that focus on

4

Vietnamese as a separate group indeed find higher rates of unemployment and lower earnings among the Vietnamese than the other Asian groups (Barringer, Takeuchi and Xenos 1990; Lee and Edmonston 1994; Schoeni 1998; Xie and Goyette 2004) [1].

Third, the evaluation of economic outcomes of Asian women in a comparative perspective deserves further inquiry. Not only do women immigrants constitute a noteworthy share of the entire immigrant population but their labor force participation and human capital endowments are comparable to their male counterparts for a majority of the groups. Previous research reports mixed findings on the relative position of Asian women relative to their native born non-Hispanic white counterparts. There is evidence of narrowing of the Asian –white gap, particularly among the native born women. Some research indicates high attainments for Asians (Wong and Hirschman 1983; Schoeni 1998) while others contend the high attainments get mitigated once detailed occupational placements and 'glass ceiling' are taken into account (Woo 1985; Fernandez 1998). There is no updated analysis that assesses the relationship between the economic outcomes and the other standard variables (human capital, assimilation factors and personal characteristics) for the women belonging to the six Asian subgroups using the latest available data set.

Finally, the unit of analysis in most of the immigration research has been at the level of the individual and not household. In particular, there is not much systematic investigation of the household level well being and living arrangements of Asians (Gibson 1988; Jensen 1991; Kibria 1993; Lessinger 1995 Bianchi and He 1997; Foner

---

[1] There are however studies which report contrary findings. Borjas (1989) provides an explanation for such (contrary) results in terms of income maximization hypothesis. Change/s in political regime/s of the immigrants' source countries results in the devaluing of skills and therefore their worsening off. However, their ability becomes valuable again once they migrate to a market economy, thus in some ways rendering the distinction between 'economic' and 'non –economic' migrants redundant.

1997). Empirical evidence in the context of Hispanics indicates that immigrant households show a greater tendency to pool resources and share extended living arrangements to maximize economic well being and overcome the initial labor market adjustment hurdles (Tienda and Angel 1982; Burr and Mutchler 1993; Perez 1986; Glick et.al 1997; Glick 1999; Tienda and Raijman 2000). Asians' increasing proportion of the U.S. population combined with the perceptions that they are economically successful and that many enter the U.S. on the basis of the family reunification criteria makes a study of the living arrangements of Asians uniquely different from a study of Hispanics.

The goal of the present research is to examine employment, earnings, and income of people of Asian descent at two levels: the individual and the household employing the latest available data set. The study addresses two analytically distinct but related questions, each assessing the broad theme of the economic performance of Asians in the U.S.

> 1) What is the association between human capital factors (quantity and quality of education, English language ability, work experience), occupation, type of work, assimilation assets (duration of stay in the U.S., or nativity status) and demographic attributes (region of residence, marital status, presence of children below the age of 5) with employment prospects and earnings of foreign and native born Asian Indians (hereafter Indians), Chinese, Filipinos, Japanese, Koreans and Vietnamese men and women? Do associations vary across groups and how do they compare with those of native born non-Hispanic whites (hereafter whites)?
>
> 2) Are there intergroup differences in the extent of resource sharing and pooling at the level of household among the Asian subgroups? What are the factors

associated with the likelihood of choosing nuclear versus nonnuclear living arrangements and do these differ from whites?

The research contributes to the literature on the intergroup differences in U.S. labor market in the following ways. First, it provides an updated and comprehensive assessment of the economic outcomes of men and women belonging to the six major Asian sending countries using the latest available data set. Second, it explores the use of a non-parametric technique in assessing intergroup differences in earnings. Third, it examines the relationship between household income and living arrangements, a subject that has not received much attention in the context of Asians. This helps shed light on the thesis of the 'declining significance of race' – the relative roles of nativity and non-white statuses.

Conceptualization, Data, and Methods

I employ human capital, and assimilation perspectives to select predictors of labor market outcomes and explain intergroup differences. I draw upon the gender and household related perspectives as well to motivate the examination of the attainments of female Asian immigrants as well as male Asian immigrants and to justify the focus on the household level analysis in addition to the individual level of analysis.

Most of the pioneering and significant research on group differences relies on the human capital perspective, predicting positive relationship between the quantity and quality of human capital endowments and economic outcomes (Chiswick 1978a; Borjas 1985; Lalonde and Topel 1992; Friedberg 2000). The framework seems appropriate in the case of Asians since Asians have high levels of human capital and superior labor

market outcomes. It however does not explain group differences and Asian –white gaps satisfactorily.

The assimilation perspective goes beyond the human capital by accounting for the larger structural context of the host country. The theory argues that as the length of the stay in the host country increases, immigrants improve their labor market performance but the extent of that improvement depends on the salience of race and the specific macro level factors to which the different groups are exposed. The varying structural contexts, such as the existence of ethnic enclaves for the Chinese, and the Koreans, targeted refugee programs for the Vietnamese, Japanese multinationals hiring Japanese nationals at managerial positions, and so forth make it difficult to predict a similar pace of socioeconomic assimilation across the six groups.

The gender related theories explaining immigrant women's labor market performance argue that gender norms existing in the majority of the sending countries tend to be such as to motivate migration of women as 'secondary' workers. Thus immigrant women may have lower human capital investment than immigrant men. Women's domestic responsibilities also lead to lack of timely adaptation to the host country's labor market conditions and therefore intermittent attachments to the labor force. The cultural assimilation in the context of Asian immigrants points toward higher labor participation rates of women as the duration of stay in the U.S. becomes longer. However, the major Asian groups belong to societies with varying gender norms particularly about appropriate roles for women, and hence women's rates of 'assimilation' into the U.S. labor market expectedly differ across Asian groups.

The household perspective posits that the foreign born adopt larger households and extended living arrangements to take advantage of the economies of scale and maximize the income levels. Since most of the Asian immigrant subgroups come to the U.S. for economic stability and mobility and are admitted on the basis of the family reunification criteria, indulging in more resource sharing and pooling are economic adaptations that facilitate upward mobility. With the increase in the time spent in the country, a higher individual level of economic security is achieved and therefore there is less reliance on resource pooling with members outside of the immediate family. However, a substantial proportion of the Asian population comes with high skill levels and therefore the necessity to reside in larger households for economic reasons is not the same across groups. Also, norms of filial obligation that may influence living arrangements differ across groups.

I use the one percent and five percent state samples of the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) of the 2000 Census. Despite the limitations posed by the cross sectional nature of the data and by the lack of retrospective information on education, and work history (especially that prior to migration), and on detailed immigrant (visa) status (Jasso et.al 2000), this is the only data set that provides enough observations in each of the specific Asian immigrant subgroups to enable disaggregated analyses.

For the individual level of analysis, the universe consists of all non – institutionalized men and women between the ages of 25 and 65 born in China, India, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Vietnam or the U.S. and who self identify themselves as Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese or white. For the household level of analysis, the sample includes households where the householder reports his/her

ethnicity as Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese or white and is born in India, China, Philippines, Japan, Korea, Vietnam or the United States.

The statistical tools that I employ for the analyses include probit, ordinary least square, and logistic regressions. Further, in case of the individual level analyses, I use a non-parametric, reweighting procedure to decompose the Asian –white earning gap. The reweighting technique helps address the question; if the white population had the productivity characteristics of Asians, what would the earnings of whites be? Answering this question helps address the question of whether there are unexplained differences in earnings between Whites and Asians that suggest the possibility of discrimination against Asian immigrant in the U.S. labor market.

Chapter Layout

The dissertation proceeds as follows. The subsequent chapter provides an overview of the historical context as well as the contemporary (post 1965) experience of the Asian immigration to the U.S. Chapter 3 reviews the theoretical and empirical literature on socioeconomic attainments of Asians in the U.S. and lays out the conceptual framework. Chapter 4 describes the data, sample, variables and the statistical methodology employed for the study. The results from the analyses are presented in the next three chapters. Chapters 5 and 6 present the findings from the individual level analyses – conducted on the samples of men and women respectively. The central concern addressed in Chapters 5 and 6 is whether foreign birth and non-white ethnicity of Asian men or women disadvantage them relative to whites. Chapter 7 moves the analyses to the household level. I examine the relationship between household economic well being and household structure of Asian and white households in a comparative

framework. The final chapter summarizes the central findings of the dissertation, discusses the potential significance of the findings, states the limitations and outlines future research directions.

Chapter 2

Historical and Cotemporary Contexts of Asian Immigration to the United States

There is noteworthy heterogeneity among foreign born Asians[2], even though they are often classified as a unified group distinct from the native born whites and from the other minority groups such as the Hispanics in the United States. Knowledge of the differences and the similarities in the historical experiences of the groups potentially aids in situating one group vis-a –vis another with regard to their present socioeconomic position[3].

Asian immigration to the U.S. spans two centuries and displays diverse trends and patterns. Contemporary research on Asian migration tends to consider two broad periods, as demarcated by the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act (Xie and Goyette 2004). The 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act, considered one of most liberal immigration laws, abolished the national origin criterion. The Act has been extremely instrumental in the growth in the Asian population in the past few decades. The period prior to 1965 is characterized both by a U.S. economy 'hungry for low wage labor' as well as by 'racial conflicts' between Asians and whites (Xie and Goyette 2004, page 1). The post 1965

---

[2] I use foreign born and immigrants interchangeably even though, the two may not always coincide. Further, both the terms are distinct from the category, 'Asian American' which is commonly used in the literature. 'Asian American' is a contemporary post- Civil rights term for those of Asian descent who are living in the U.S. Thus, 'Asian American' includes both foreign born as well as U.S. born Asians. The Asian settlers of late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were often characterized as 'Asiatics' or 'Orientals' by the dominant U.S. society and such a characterization was resented by those of Asian descent. In the 1960s, college students with an Asian ancestry, inspired by the civil rights struggle of other groups organized the Asian American movement as a means of political empowerment and mobilization. Rejecting the then common term, 'Oriental', they coined Asian American, a term that has since gained currency (Kibria 1998).

[3] Yet another reason to understand the historical experiences of the various groups is with respect to the question of ethnic identity. How are foreign born Asians or for that matter native born Asians categorized in this multi-ethnic American society? (Waters 1990; Waters and Eschbach 1995; Cornell and Hartmann 1998; Kibria 1998). This question is however not a focus of the present research.

period is characterized by both a U.S. economy with a demand for skilled labor and an image of Asian Americans as a 'model minority'.

This chapter presents a brief description of the historical and contemporary experience of the six major Asian immigrant groups that I study in this dissertation.

Pre -1965 Experience

Recent archaeological evidence traces Asian migration to the U.S. as early as the fifth century when Buddhist missionaries from China visited the West coast of the U.S. There is also some evidence that the Spanish brought some Chinese ship builders to Baja California as early as 1571 (Fong 2002).

The first significant wave of Asian migration occurred between 1848 and 1924 when hundreds and thousands of people from China, India, Korea, Japan and the Philippines came to the United States in response to the California gold rush. Immigrants were searching for a better life (Fong 2002) and were responding to the image of America as 'The Promised Land[4]'.

Immigrants from Asia came through San Francisco rather than Ellis Island, and were detained in barracks on Angel Island, near San Francisco's Alcatraz prison (Kitano and Daniels 2001). Anti –Asian laws and sentiments existed for a long time, certainly until the end of the Second World War and perhaps as some experts argue, continued into the Cold War era of the 1950s and 1960s.

Chinese

The Chinese were the first Asian group to arrive in significant numbers with the large scale immigration beginning in 1852 when 52,000 Chinese came that year alone

---

[4] I borrow the phrase 'The Promised Land' from the title of an autobiographical book by Mary Antin (1938), a Russian Jew who migrates to the U.S. in late nineteenth century with her family and writes her and her family's immigration experience.

(Fong 2002). The first stop over for the Chinese as for some subsequent Asian groups was Hawaii and not California. Workers from China were imported to work on the sugar plantations. The Chinese workers were preferred over the native Hawaiian workers by the plantation owners because the Chinese workers were viewed as more hard working, disciplined and efficient, than the native Hawaiians. In fact, one of the white supervisors in 1838, wrote to the owner of the plantation that 'A colony of the Chinese would, probably, put the plantation in order' (Takaki 1989, page 11). In addition to sugar plantation and rail road workers, there were merchants from China who migrated as well.

As early as 1870, the Chinese were 9 percent of California's population and 25 percent of the state's work force. Most of the Chinese, came as 'sojourners', expecting to work for some time, earn money and then go back home (Bonacich 1973). This 'sojourner' image has been attributed by scholars as the reason for the unwillingness on part of Chinese to assimilate and as contributing to discrimination and exclusion of the Chinese (Kitano and Daniels 2001). Others argue that the 'sojourner' image was not unique to the Chinese but also applied to many Europeans groups (Wong 1980) or that the Chinese were not 'sojourners' (Wong 1985).

The push factors for the Chinese were high taxes imposed by the Qing government to pay the Western imperialist powers engaged in the Opium Wars. The people of Guangdong (Kwangtung province) were most severely affected by these hardships and consequently most of the Chinese migrants to Hawaii and the U.S. were from Guangdong. The pull factors were equally important. As soon as these migrants arrived in the U.S., they realized that there was not only gold in California (called as *Gam Saan* or Gold Mountain), but there were also opportunities for employment. The stories

of such opportunities and those of the success of many migrants were carried to the villages by the return migrants reinforcing the motivation to emigrate.

Almost all the Chinese migrants were men. In 1852, 11,787 Cantonese Chinese were in the U.S., only seven of whom were women (Mattaei and Amott 2004). The reasons for such gender biased immigration patterns are overwhelmingly cultural. Women across all classes were considered inferior and were expected to remain at home and attend to family and domestic responsibilities. This is not to deny certain class differences which could theoretically affect the mobility of women such as the foot binding practice. Women belonging to higher social status had their feet bound which prevented them from migrating. While women belonging to lower classes did not have their feet bound, the stringent social norms confined them to family and farm work. Combined with these factors was the fact that the Chinese peasant culture was familistic with a patriarchal lineage and there was an equal division of property and land among all the adult sons. Thus sons moving to the U.S. would keep their wives and children in China to share the responsibility of caring for their parents as well as the ancestral property and they sent money back. This created what Evelyn Nakano Glenn calls the 'split household family system' (Mattaei and Amott 2004, page 277). Some families remained split for many generations. The other reason for leaving the women behind was that travel was expensive. Moreover, men expected to return after making money.

The presence of Chinese laborers in California and Hawaii aroused great anti-Chinese sentiment during the period between 1850 and 1900 which resulted in the passing of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882. The Act barred the immigration of Chinese laborers for ten years. The act was renewed in 1892 for another ten year period

and reenacted without temporal limits in 1902 (Kitano and Daniels 2001). This act substantially curtailed immigration from China (Hirschman and Wong 1986) including that of women since they were considered laborers too. However, officials, merchants, teachers, students, travelers and students of Chinese American citizens were still allowed to enter although subject to considerable harassment (Lyman 1974). The Chinese Exclusion Act was finally repealed in 1943 and Chinese immigration rose to modest levels in the late 1940s and 1950s (Nee and Nee 1972).

Japanese

The Japanese were the second Asian immigrant group in the United States, but their experiences were different from those of the Chinese.

Japan initiated an era of isolation in 1639 which continued until the 1870s. In 1868, the Hawaiian consul general in Japan secretly recruited and transported 148 workers to Hawaii. In 1884, the Japanese government allowed Hawaiian planters to recruit contract laborers. This new policy led to a massive migration from Japan. The factors were again both push as well as pull. The imposition of taxes and deflationary policies by the Meiji government caused a lot of financial hardship to the farmers. The financially distressed farmers saw emigration to Hawaii and the U.S. as a refuge. They saw themselves as *dekaseginin* – laborers working temporarily in a foreign country. The higher wages in Hawaii plantations was the primary attraction. Beginning, in the 1890s, the Japanese began migrating to the U.S. mainland as well, replacing Chinese immigration as a source of cheap labor, since the immigration of the latter group had declined. American wages, a dollar a day which converted to more than two yen, were perceived to be very high. As of 1880, there were 148 Japanese in the U.S. mainland.

Between 1885 and 1924, 200,000 Japanese came to Hawaii and 180,000 to the U.S. mainland (Takaki 1989).

There were noteworthy differences between the characteristics and the experiences of the Chinese and the Japanese. Due to Japan's system of compulsory education, Japanese migrants were more literate and better educated. In addition, even though the Japanese were poor, they came with more money than their Chinese and European counterparts (Takaki 1989). The second difference, particularly with respect to the Chinese is that the Japanese were able to establish an economic niche in agriculture. By 1919, although, the Japanese controlled only about one percent of the agricultural land, the corresponding dollar volume was ten percent (Fong 2002). Another difference between the Chinese and the Japanese was the emergence of Japan as an international power relative to China resulting from the victory in the Russo –Japanese War (1904-05).

The Japanese inheritance system, the Meiji's government's policies of emphasis on education, and structural changes in the Japanese economy resulted in a much greater percentage of female migration among the Japanese relative to the Chinese. As a consequence of the shift of the Japanese economy towards greater capitalism Japanese women were not confined to farms but rather were working in textile industries, construction and coal mines.

As early as 1905, women comprised more than 22 percent of the Japanese population in Hawaii and about 7 percent on the mainland. Of the women who entered the U.S. between 1909 and 1920, over half of the estimated 23000 were 'picture brides'. 'Picture brides' refers to those women who were married to men in the U.S. and saw their husbands for the first time only upon their arrival in the U.S. Women agreed to become

picture brides for more than one reason. Some did so because refusal would mean offending the elders and not following the Japanese tradition of arranged marriage. Others resorted to it to help their families financially. Japanese women played a critical role in the entry of Japanese men into U.S. agriculture. The unpaid family work of women, men, and children 'allowed *Issei*[5] truck framers to compete effectively with white farmers, enabling them to gain a dominant share of the produce market' (Matthaei and Amott, page 283). Apart from contributing to agricultural labor, Japanese women worked in small businesses and as domestic servants.

Despite the favorable position of the Japanese relative to the Chinese, the Japanese were perceived as a source of unfair competition and therefore discrimination against them also existed. Immigration from Japan was restricted by the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907-1908. This agreement stopped the immigration of Japanese laborers but allowed Japanese non laborer and women to enter the U.S. Thus, unlike the Chinese, the Japanese were able to start their families and increase their population in the U.S. (Fong 2002). For the next fifteen years, Japanese immigration mainly consisted of 'picture brides' and of those whose kin were already in the U.S. Movement from Japan was further restricted by the Immigration Act of 1924. The Immigration and the Nationality Act of 1952 (also called as McCarran-Walter Act) restored a moderate flow of Japanese to the U.S. in the mid-1950s by permitting immigration outside the quota system for immediate relatives of U.S. citizens and in other selected cases. (See Table 1.1)

---

[5] *Issei* is the Japanese name for the first generation immigrants.

Filipinos

The third significant Asian stream of immigration to the U.S. was from the Philippines. The Filipinos differed from the rest of the Asian groups with respect to the fact that most of them came from a territory of the U.S. They were more American in their culture and way of living. Most of them had received American education, had proficiency in written and spoken English and were in contact with the European culture through the church (Takaki 1989).

Even though the major immigration wave from the Philippines began after the United States gained possession of the Philippines following the Spanish –American War in 1898 (Fong 2002), the first permanent settlement of the Filipinos dates back to the late 18th century with evidence of Filipinos establishing villages outside of New Orleans as early as 1763 (Agbayani-Siewert and Revilla 1995). In the early 20th century, the migration of Filipinos was to Hawaii to work on the sugar cane plantations (Sharma 1984) and then to the mainland U.S. in the 1920s. Although, there was also some migration of Filipino women as 'war brides'[6] of Spanish –American war veterans, the first major wave began in 1903 (Agbayani-Siewert and Revilla 1995). It was not however till 1923 that there was a migration of large number of Filipinos to the mainland either from Hawaii or from the Philippines directly (Burma 1951). This second wave consisted mainly of men who were either students or laborers. By 1930, some 110,000 Filipinos had come to Hawaii and another 40,000 to the U.S. mainland. Some of them, possibly a few thousand were *pensionados*, or government sponsored students but the majority were from poor and uneducated farming households.

---

[6] 'War brides' refers to women who are married to men in the U.S. armed forces.

The gender imbalance in the Filipino migration was as conspicuous as it was for the rest of the Asian migrant communities. For instance, in one of the ships carrying people to America in 1929 the ratio of men to women was 150 to 1 (Takaki 1989). In 1930, the male/ female ratio was 14 to 1. The gender imbalance was greater in the U.S. mainland than in Hawaii. This difference to some extent can be explained by the difference in the labor conditions existing in the two regions. Migrants experienced greater job stability in Hawaii as opposed to the mainland, and hence there was a greater tendency among the men in Hawaii to bring their wives than among those in the mainland. In addition, the plantation owners in Hawaii felt that married men were more steady workers than unmarried men. However, these employers were an exception since generally, employers preferred single men (Matthaei and Amott 2004).

The gender composition of Filipino migrants was not however entirely determined by the needs of the employers. It was also dependent upon Filipino cultural traditions that were influenced by the Spanish and Catholic practices and norms. Women were not supposed to travel much and certainly not without being accompanied by husbands and/or fathers. Also, Filipino men expected to return and did not see themselves as permanent residents.

The World War II however changed the pattern of Filipino migration with respect to gender. During the war, many Filipinos were drafted, even though it was primarily as stewards on the warships. Many of them applied for citizenship in the U.S., which they got as a result of the 1942 Act of Congress that permitted foreign residents to naturalize. Then the 1947- amended War Brides Act allowed Filipino-American men who served as citizens in the military to bring their wives as citizens too. There was thus a flow of

Filipino immigrant women who worked in agriculture or canneries or as domestic servants in cities or in family businesses (Matthaei and Amott 2004).

Apart from the pull factors of job opportunities and high wages (relative to that available in the home country), there were strong push factors too. With the invasion of the Philippines by the U.S., small and middle level Filipino farmers started losing their lands to the elites. In addition, the farmers also encountered personal abuse from these elites.

Even though until 1935, Filipinos could travel to the U.S. without visas as U.S. nationals, anti-Filipino sentiment was rampant. This was reflected in the fact that although the Filipinos were the only Asian country that was not prohibited from entering the U.S. under the 1924 National Origins Act, the Tydings- McDuffie Act of 1934 placed an 'alien' status on Filipinos, restricting Filipino immigration to fifty persons per year (Hirschman and Wong 1986). The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 however led to a significant increase in the Filipino population in the U.S.

Koreans

Koreans slightly pre-dated the Filipinos but arrived in much smaller numbers. Korean political exiles have been living in the U.S. since 1885.The first significant wave, albeit not very high in volume, came to Hawaii between 1903 and 1905 and the second one was after the Korean War (1950-53) (Kitano and Daniels 2001). Between 1903-1905, over 7000 Koreans were recruited for plantation labor work in Hawaii, but after Japan established a protectorate over Korea in 1905 immigration from Korea stopped. There were therefore relatively few Koreans in the U.S. mainland between 1905 and 1940. They included workers who migrated from Hawaii, a few Korean 'picture brides', a small

number of American born Koreans and roughly 900 students many of whom fled their home country because of their opposition to the Japanese rule (Fong 2002). The second wave (1951-1964) was a heterogeneous group consisting of wives of American servicemen, war orphans and students (Kitano and Daniels 2001).

The early Korean migrants like the rest of the Asian groups were young and predominantly male. But unlike the Chinese and Japanese migrants, Koreans came from diverse walks of life. They were farmers, laborers, government clerks, students, policemen, miners, domestic servants and even Buddhist monks. Those Koreans who got themselves converted to Christianity also migrated as American missionaries. Most of them were from urban rather than rural areas. Also, in terms of educational attainments, with a near seventy percent literacy level, Koreans resembled the Japanese more than the Chinese (Takaki 1989).

A combination of both economic and political factors propelled migration from Korea. Famine and drought inflicted great economic hardship in Korea. In addition, the Japanese imperialism was cruel on the Korean citizens. The attraction of the plantation work in Hawaii and later on in the U.S. mainland was perceived as an opportunity to escape from poverty as well as from Japanese oppression. Hawaii and the U.S. were described as a 'land of gold' and a 'land of dreams' (Takaki 1989, page 56).

Korean migration included women; of all the adult Koreans who entered between 1903 and 1906, nearly 10 percent were women. There were a couple of factors that encouraged migration of Korean women. Stable employment and housing on the plantations assured Korean men of the possibility of a family life. Additionally, most of Korean men were not certain of returning to Korea because of the Japanese colonial rule.

Korean women (like Japanese women) came as 'picture brides'. The interesting fact of this arrangement is that Koreans relied on Japanese agents to make the required arrangements for the transfer of these 'picture brides'. Thus most of the Korean 'picture brides' arrived in the U.S. on Japanese passports (Takaki 1989).

Indians

Although Indians did not emigrate to the U.S. in large numbers until 1904, they arrived in North America as early as 1750[7] (Sheth 1995). During the period between 1820 and 1870, 196 Indians (mainly from the north Indian state of Punjab), came to the U.S. at various places. Indian merchants were seen in Philadelphia in 1889 (Jensen 1988). The first significant flow occurred between 1904 and 1911 when around 6000 arrived in the U.S. The period of Indian immigration was short since the Congress started placing restrictions in 1909 and eight years later banned migration from India.

Unlike the other Asian groups, Indians did not work in Hawaii prior to entering the U.S. mainland. They instead worked in California agriculture. In 1907, Fred Lockley in his interview of many Indian migrants found that practically all of them were married with families back in India. They had an literacy rate of only 53 percent and they had worked as agricultural and non agricultural unskilled workers and had come in small groups, usually from the north Indian state of Punjab in groups of people from their villages (*pind*) (Takaki 1989).

The movement of Indians to the U.S. was conditioned by the British colonialism in India. The British instituted changes in the land tenure system than put the small and

---

[7] There is documentation that a man from the city of Madras, present day Chennai, may have been the first Indian to travel to the U.S. around 1750. A group of 200 *Parsis* (belonging to the Zoroastrian faith) merchants emigrated from Bombay. Also, isolated people were brought to the U.S. as indentured servants by captains of merchant marine ships New England (Chandrashekar 1982; Jensen 1988).

marginal farmers in an extremely vulnerable situation. Many of them had to mortgage or sell their lands to repay their debts. A prolonged series of famines from 1899 and 1902 worsened the situation of the farmers with most of the cattle being decimated. Most of the Indians then left India not only for the U.S. but also to places like Uganda, British West Indies, Mauritius, British Guyana and Canada. Like the rest of the Asian groups, Indians thought of themselves as temporary migrants (Takaki 1989).

The flow of Indian immigrants was overwhelmingly male dominated, perhaps more disproportionately male than the rest of the Asian groups, with less than one percent women. Also, about eighty to ninety percent of Indians belonged to the Sikh faith, though they were collectively labeled 'Hindoos' along with the rest of the Indian immigrants (Takaki 1989). The early Indian immigrants can be subdivided into; a) farmers and laborers and b) middle class students, elites and refugees (Sheth 1995). Immigration restrictions after the 1924 National Origins Act and their exaggerated male/female ratio prevented Indians from becoming a conspicuous immigrant group prior to 1965.

Vietnamese

Unlike the rest of the five study groups described above, the Vietnamese do not have a history of several generations in the U.S. Very few Vietnamese migrated before 1965, the first recorded Vietnamese immigration to the U.S. having occurred in 1952, when eight immigrants were admitted (Rumbaut 1995). All the present Vietnamese population in the U.S. entered after 1970, primarily as a consequence of the U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War.

Though the historical contexts and the volume of immigration varied across the different groups, the pre-1965 phase of immigration was one characterized by low socioeconomic status of immigrants and discrimination against them.

Post 1965 Experience and the 'Model Minority' Image

One of the most important pieces of legislation in the arena of U.S. immigration laws, as mentioned before, was the Immigration Control and Reform Act (IRCA) in 1965. This act, whose passage was influenced by the civil rights movement of the 1960s, along with its Constitutional amendment substantially, increased the token quotas established after World War II to allow the Eastern Hemisphere a maximum of 20,000 per country and set a ceiling of 170,000. The act created a seven point preference system that serves as a general guideline for issuance of visas; '1) unmarried children of U.S. citizens who are at least 21 years of age; 2)spouses and unmarried children of permanent resident aliens; 3)members of professions, scientists and artists of exceptional ability; 4) married children of U.S. citizens; 5)brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens who are atleast 21 years of age 6)skilled or unskilled workers who are in short supply and 7)non – preference applicants' (Fong 2002, page 26). These provisions increased immigration (to the U.S.) from many parts of the world including Asia. The emigration from Asia has been large greater in volume and greater than anticipated by the U.S. policy makers. The push factors such as lack of economic opportunities and of chances for upward mobility seem to be central driving forces for the inflow of people from the Asian countries (with the exception of Japan) since the 1970s (Min 2005). Although the primary goal of the 1965 Immigration Reform and Control Act was to encourage family reunification, a

higher percentage of Asian immigrants entered the U.S. in professional and occupational categories than as family members (Min 2005).

The seemingly uniform admission criteria did not prevent the differences in the socioeconomic profiles (of the entrants) shaped by the historical experiences, as well as the current development levels of their source countries. For example, because of formal negotiations articulated in the 'Gentlemen's Agreement', in the early part of the 20th century, the growth and establishment of Japanese families was much greater than for the rest of the Asian groups. Also, Japan's rise to an economic super power influenced both the quality and quantity of (Japanese) immigrants.

The post -1965 Chinese immigrant stream is characterized by higher rates of family relative to individual immigration and by notable level of (within group) disparity in the socioeconomic attainments. In the 1970s, over 70 percent of the Chinese were admitted under the family reunification criteria. Although this proportion has declined since, it remains considerable. The earnings and the occupational distribution of the Chinese immigrants are bi-polar. A significant percentage of high earning Chinese professionals coexists with a high percentage of immigrants engaged in low end service, business, and self –employment activities. The ethnic enclaves, Chinatowns, exist in almost all the major cities of the U.S., providing employment opportunities for low skilled immigrants. It may be noted that the quantity and quality of the flow of Chinese immigrants (after 1965) has also been influenced by the emigration and economic policies of the Chinese government. The Chinese government relaxed its restrictions on emigration of its nationals to the U.S. in 1978 and launched economic reforms in 1984.

These steps resulted in increase in both family related and professional migration from China (Min 2005).

In the case of the post 1965 Filipino immigration, unlike the trend for other Asian countries, a large number of women migrated as wives of U.S. servicewomen and in response to the large labor shortage of medical professionals, nurses in particular (Amott and Matthaei 1991). The reason for this kind of flow can be attributed to the related issues of political ties between the Philippines and the U.S. and English language ability of Filipino women. The latter advantage was also enjoyed by elite Indians and India's newly gained independence (from British rule) gave an opportunity for professional Indians to exploit their language advantage. The high average socioeconomic position of Indians in the U.S. is attributable to their high levels of education and their employment in professional occupations (Xie and Goyette 2004). However, there is also a significant percentage of the Indian population at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder, working as taxi drivers, owners of small businesses and the like. In particular, the taxi drivers in the Northeast region of the U.S. have formed a kind of an ethnic niche, with the overwhelming majority hailing from the north Indian state of Punjab and belonging to the Sikh religion. This movement can be traced to the history of Indian immigration to the U.S. as described in the previous section. Interestingly, the historical presence of Indian Sikhs in California's agriculture continues with the Indian Sikhs being, currently, one of the most active groups producing cling peaches in the Marysville/Yuba City area of Northern California (Fong 2002).

The migration pattern from Korea after 1965 represents a mix of professional, student, and family migration. Among the professionals, those with a medical

background constituted the largest share of the immigrant flow in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Family migration includes the entry of Korean wives of the U.S. servicemen stationed in Korea and that occurred in notable volume in the period from 1975 to 1989. The Korean migration flow has reduced noticeably since the 1990s because of the rising living standards and better political environment in Korea. The quality of migrants has also accordingly shifted from middle class professional entrants in the 1970s to those belonging to the lower socioeconomic strata in the recent years.

A constant feature of Korean immigrants has been the high rates of self-employment relative to other Asian groups and whites. The Korean population is the only Asian group among the six groups presently considered, that figures in the list of nine 'most highly entrepreneurial immigrant groups' in the 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses. (page 239, Min 2005). Additionally, the self-employment rate for Koreans is expected to be under-estimated to a greater extent than that for other groups. This is so because most Koreans work in family businesses and the labor input of all the contributors is not likely to be reported. The major business types run by Koreans comprise grocery/green grocery retail, fish retail, manufactured goods including garments, liquor, dry cleaning, manicure services. The reasons identified for the high rates of self –employment is the inability to procure white collared jobs in the mainstream labor market. Poor English language skills and often a lack of recognition of Korean certificates hamper the chances for Koreans to get jobs commensurate to their educational degrees. The Korean concentration in self-employed small businesses has been a subject of inter-ethnic tension and hostility (with blacks, Hispanics), especially in the immigrant gateway cities such as Los Angeles and New York City.

The Vietnamese post -1965 migration, as mentioned earlier, is of a very different nature, most of it being 'involuntary' and 'non economic'. The majority of the Vietnamese[8] entered the U.S. outside of the regular immigration channels as part of the largest refugee settlement program in U.S. history which peaked in 1980 but has continued ever since. About 130,000 refugees, nearly all from South Vietnam, were resettled in the U.S. during 1975.They were first sent to four government centers; Camp Pendleton in California, Fort Indiantown Gap in Pennsylvania, Fort Chaffee in Arkansas and Eglin Airforce Base in Florida. The new entrants were interviewed by voluntary agencies and matched with sponsors that included individuals, church groups and other organizations. The U.S. government's refugee placement policy was to disperse the refugee population to all the fifty states to minimize their possible negative impact. Despite the government's policy of ensuring dispersal, areas of Vietnamese concentration began to emerge. By 1980, only 45 percent of refugees lived in the state to which they were originally sent, and the proportion of the refugee population living in California had doubled from 20 to 40 percent. After California, as per the 1990 Census, the Vietnamese were most concentrated in Texas.

The different context of the Vietnamese immigration has a bearing on their demographic and socioeconomic profiles. Foreign born Vietnamese at the time of their entry were much younger than the rest of the groups of Asian origin, and that is reflected in their higher level of fertility. Hence, despite the recency of their arrival, the proportion native born is relatively high among them.

---

[8] Vietnamese refugees are part of the larger group, called Indochinese refugees. Indochinese includes people from Cambodia and Laos.

The Vietnamese tend to diverge from the other Asian groups with regard to their employment patterns and incomes too. The 1990 Census shows that employed Vietnamese were twice as likely to have jobs as operators and laborers and their levels of self employment, family income, per capita income and rates of home ownership were significantly lower than among other Asian groups. One fourth of Vietnamese fell below the federal poverty line and received welfare assistance as per the 1990 Census (Rumbaut 2000). This statistic should not be taken to rule out the economic progress of the Vietnamese group over time. Some of specialized surveys on Vietnamese and other Indo-Chinese refugees indicate that these groups are experiencing more economic progress over time- higher levels of self-employment, rising incomes, and lower welfare dependency rates (Rumbaut 2000). The present project will help in revisiting this progress relative to other Asian groups for a more recent time period.

Notwithstanding the exact pattern of migration from the various countries, the numerical trend of Asian immigration shows that Asians have taken advantage of every aspect of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1965[9]. The proportion of Asians (as a percentage of all immigrants in the U.S.) increased from 6.1 percent between 1951 to 1960 to 30.9 percent in the 1990s (Fong 2002). This growth in the foreign born Asian population is reflected in the classification of the racial categories in the U.S. census. The 2000 Census, with all the major Asian groups listed specifically[10] as a distinct racial

---

[9] The Vietnamese however may not fall in this category of entering the U.S. either for family reunification and/or to seek economic opportunities, since most of them came to the U.S. as part of the international resettlement effort of people who faced persecution in their home countries. The U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War made the flow of the refugee population from Vietnam particularly prominent.
[10] This expansion of 'boundaries' has invoked resentment by those Asian American community leaders who feel that abandoning an 'umbrella' category such as Asian and Pacific Islander would mean a loss of the sense of a collectivity. The 1980 Census lists both the 'umbrella' category, Asian Pacific Islander category

category, is in sharp contrast to the 1950 U.S. Census classification when three Asian nationalities were listed; Chinese, Filipino and Japanese (Kibria 1998).

Despite the intergroup disparities, the post-1965 Asian immigration has been more middle class, educated, and more often involves entering the U.S. as family units than earlier immigration from Asia, lending credibility to the image of Asians as a 'model minority'[11] : 'a group that is culturally programmed for economic success' (Kibria 1998 , page 945). The success of Asians in education and professional occupations has been widely acknowledged and publicized (Sakamoto and Xie 2005). Asian American values have been perceived as compatible with the Protestant work ethic (Xie and Goyette 2004).

The contested image of 'model minority' however cannot be ignored. It is argued that such an image masks the diversity in socioeconomic attainments, and in educational and labor-hour inputs (to achieve economic parity with the native born white population) within the Asian immigrants, and hides discrimination that the groups continue to suffer (Hirschman and Wong 1984; Hurh and Kim 1989; Ong and Hee 1994).

Socioeconomic Profile of the Source Countries

The socioeconomic condition of a country arguably impacts the (economic) performance of its natives in the destination country (Tubergen and Werfhorst 2007). Table 2.1 provides a summary picture of the socioeconomic standing of all the six source countries, as well as that of the destination country, the U.S. as of 2000-2005. It is

---

as well as the specific ethnic groups (Espiritu 1992). The 2000 Census has an umbrella category, 'other Asian and Pacific Islander' which does not include any of the six study groups except the Filipinos.

[11] The phrase 'model minority', coined by sociologist, William Peterson in 1966, gained popularity since the publication of a story headlined, 'Asian Americans: A 'Model Minority'' in *Newsweek* in 1982 (Kitano and Daniels 2001).

evident from the presented statistic that the countries are an interesting mix with regard to their socioeconomic profile. (See Table 2.1).

Table 2.1 about here

The per capita income of Japan is not only the highest but also is very close to that of the U.S., the destination country. Additionally, Japan outperforms the U.S. with respect to the other socioeconomic and demographic indicators. Such high levels of socioeconomic development probably explain the low levels of recent Japanese immigration to the U.S. Among the six sending countries, the Japanese share (in the U.S. population) is the lowest (0.3 percent) while that of Chinese is the highest (0.9 percent) as of year 2000.

India and Vietnam clearly stand out as poor countries in the group with their per capita gross national income notably lower than the rest. With regard to demographic indicators such as life expectancy and infant mortality, India performs worse than Vietnam. Though, India's per capita gross national income is higher than that of Vietnam. Similarly, U.S. per capita gross national income is nearly three times that of Korea's, yet Korea's statistics on indicators such as life expectancy, infant and under 5 mortality rates are better than that for the U.S.

The Philippines has the highest percentage of people living below poverty (37), despite a higher level of per capita gross national income than India and Vietnam, implying a high incidence of inequality. The analysis in the subsequent chapters will help to assess the extent to which the correlation between the development of the sending country and the performance of its natives in the U.S. varies across the different Asian countries.

Discussion

Though, the presence of Asians in the U.S. dates back to the middle of eighteenth century, their visibility in the socioeconomic arena emerged only after the post -1965 wave of immigration. The positive image of Asians must be tempered by the recognition of the substantial variations across the (Asian) ethnic groups with regard to major demographic and socioeconomic indicators. These variations result from a host of factors such as varying immigration histories (in the U.S.) and different socioeconomic and political position of the source countries. Any attempt to understand the disparity in the economic performance of Asian immigrants must be informed by historical immigration pattern.

Predictions about the continued flow from the major Asian countries as well as the economic well being of the Asian immigrants to the U.S. cannot be made with certainty. With regard to the economic performance, there are many possible scenarios; full assimilation into the American economy; increasing disparity between foreign born and native born Asians; increasing segmentation within and across the various groups. Macro level factors like increasing globalization, transfer of labor intensive and skill intensive jobs to some of the Asian countries (outsourcing), high growth rates experienced by some of the large sized Asian nations such as China and India make conjectures about the economic assimilation of Asian immigrants even more difficult.

Chapter 3

Review of the Literature and Analytical Conceptualization

This chapter begins with the discussion of the major theoretical perspectives that guide the empirical research on the economic experiences of foreign and native born Asians. I then review the literature on the specific topics of returns to human capital/skills, discrimination and the glass ceiling, women's labor market outcomes, and household level economic outcomes. The chapter concludes with laying out the research goals and the hypotheses pursued in the present study.

Theoretical Perspectives

Traditionally, the economic experience of immigrants has been situated in the micro-economic **human capital framework**. The micro-economic human capital approach, argues that individuals are rational actors and the positive decision to migrate is based on an expected positive net return from migrating. International migration is conceptualized as a form of investment in human capital (Sjaastad 1962). Individuals choose to move to a place where the returns on their educational attainment and skills are maximized[12]. They incur certain costs which include both the material cost of travel, effort involved in learning a new language and new skills, adaptation to an alien labor market and the psychological cost of homesickness, and distance from loved ones, among others (Todaro and Maruszko 1987). Thus, individuals estimate the costs and benefits of moving to international locations and migrate to where the expected discounted net returns are greatest over some time horizon (Borjas 1989 and 1990).

---

[12] The application of neo-classical micro economic theory to international migration is an extension to what was originally conceived to explain internal migration (Lewis 1954; Ranis and Fei 1961; Lee 1966).

Additionally, the human capital framework accounts for factors operating at the macro level such as economic development of the source country, level of income inequality in the source country, and immigration policies in the destination country. These factors affect the skill composition of the immigrants. For instance, it is argued, there is greater skill transferability to the host country for migrants originating in rich rather than poor countries. Migrants from rich countries therefore experience economic integration more easily and quickly as compared to migrants entering from poor countries (Friedberg 2000; Tubergen, Mass and Flap 2004). It is not just the origin country that matters but also the place where the human capital/skills have been acquired[13]. Human capital such as education acquired in the destination country vis-a vis that obtained in the source country is better rewarded in the labor market (Zeng and Xie 2004).

The human capital theory has been questioned by sociologists on the grounds that the individualistic approach of the human capital framework ignores the structural context of immigration. The **assimilation perspective** instead conceptualizes the economic outcomes of immigrants as an individual attainment process within a structural context. The conception of assimilation as used by sociologists argues for both convergence of socioeconomic attainment and equality of treatment of the foreign born relative to the native born as length of stay in the U.S. increases (Alba and Nee 2003).

The assimilation framework is employed by economists as well, though with a different conceptualization than among sociologists. Economists assess assimilation by

---

[13] An innovation in the human capital model to understand immigrant earnings growth is Immigrant Human Capital Investment (IHCI) model. The basic idea that the IHCI model entails is that of an inverse relationship between earnings at arrival and the earnings growth rate. The initial stock of human capital with which a foreign born arrives, may not be fully valued in the destination country and this initial stock of human capital enters as a parameter in the production function for the new human capital. So a person who lacks U.S. specific skills would not only earn less but is also likely to have greater difficulty in acquiring U.S. specific human capital (Duleep and Regets 1994, 1999, 2002).

skill assimilation while sociologists are more concerned about social and cultural assimilation. The basic tenet of assimilation perspective in economics and sociology is that recent immigrants are likely to have less of the characteristics associated with higher earnings. As time passes, immigrants gain knowledge of the opportunities, acquire skills and job specific training that is valued in the host country and hence build their human capital over time. Native born individuals with foreign born parents, on the other hand, are expected to be at par with native born individuals with native born parents.

While, there is a near consensus among scholars that length of stay in the country is critical for assimilation, there is a debate about how and to what extent assimilation happens with the increase in the duration of stay in the host country. Milton Gordon's (1964) pioneering work predicted a 'straight line assimilation' process where social and cultural assimilation will lead to economic assimilation[14]. Recent assimilationist theorists have challenged the 'straight line assimilation' theory contending that complete assimilation with the majority group will not take place and even if it does, it may only be so for segments of the immigrant population (Portes and Zhou 1993; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Zhou 1999).

It was not until the 1970s that the **gender dimension** of immigration began to be investigated[15]. Scholarly contributions have found that a longer stay in the country leads to higher rates of labor force participation among women reflecting either 'cultural assimilation' (Reimers 1984) or 'skill assimilation' (Chiswick 1980) or both. A period of

---

[14] Another concept distinct from assimilation in Gordon's (1964) scheme is that of acculturation. Alba and Nee (2003) provide a comprehensive treatment of Gordon's conceptualization of acculturation. I do not go into the details of this distinction as that is the beyond the scope of the current project.

[15] Most of this work according to some experts treats gender as a variable rather than as a distinct theoretical concept (Pessar 1999). Thus most of the investigations ask whether women are 'tied movers' and/or 'secondary earners' rather than contextualizing female migration in the larger framework of the gender relations in the wider communities and families that the women are a part of.

assimilation can be expected to be particularly important for people who are coming from culturally diverse settings relative to the host country (Duleep and Sanders 1993). According to the cultural hypothesis, group variations in female labor participation may persist in the host country even after controlling for all the measurable characteristics. Family attributes like marital status and presence of young children influence women's more than men's labor force participation. The influence varies with cultural norms and values.

Another significant development in the larger migration literature has been that of a shift from conceptualizing the international migration[16] decision as a product of the isolated individual's rational economic behavior to viewing it as a product of the decisions and behavior at the **level of the household**, 'within larger units of interrelated people, typically families or households…' (Massey 1999, page 36; Stark and Taylor 1989, 1991; Stark 1991)[17]. Scholarly work in this area emphasizes the significance of the household and kinship networks in the host country. Thus, households garner social and financial capital to enable some of their members to go abroad (Tienda 1980; Pessar 1982; Massey and Espana 1987; Boyd 1989) and also to play a role in maximizing economic gains and/or minimizing risk in the host country. A household can be thought of as an economy that nurtures the twin objectives of maximizing benefits and minimizing risks and accordingly adopts 'strategies' that aid in attainment of those two

---

[16] The role of family and kinship ties on migrant adaptation began with a focus on internal rather than international migration (Tilly and Brown 1967). (See Tienda 1980 for a review of the early work on this subject).

[17] In this context, it may be mentioned that another major approach that has been employed to understand economic outcomes of international migrants is that of a combination of the structural (policies, programs in the sending and receiving countries, relative position of the sending and receiving countries in the world economy) and household factors (Gurak and Kritz 1996; Perez 1986; Pessar 1982; Portes and Bach 1985)

goals for its members. Extended living arrangements may facilitate resource pooling. There are economies of scale in larger households.

Early research on immigrant households sought to understand the relative economic deprivation of female headed households (Tienda and Angel 1982; Reimers 1984; Tienda and Glass 1985). The traditional view of 'structural assimilation' argues that reliance on the 'kin network' is greater among those who belong to low income households (Tilly and Brown 1967). According to Tienda (1980), 'immigrants who are better off economically or whose occupational skills free them from the need for assistance will be less familistic than those who are in modest circumstances' (Tienda 1980, page 388)[18]. Additionally, doubling up in households is a potential response to deal with the plausible disorganizing consequences of international migration, adjustment to the new labor market environment, lack of knowledge of the host society and the economy.

These significant theoretical developments have been tested by a sizable empirical literature. Although each of these theoretical perspectives individually contributes to the understanding of the immigrant economic outcomes, more recently a more holistic approach, a 'synthetic theoretical account' has been proposed (Massey et.al 1993; Massey 1999). It is opined that a more useful framework is one that combines the cost-benefit calculations at the levels of the individual and household and highlights the socioeconomic and structural context within which decisions are made.

---

[18] The conceptual underpinning of such inquiries is to examine the relative motivations to adopt extended living arrangement – cultural inclination or economic compulsion.

Labor Market Outcomes: Empirical Research

Thematically, empirical research on the labor market experiences[19] of Asian immigrants falls into three categories; **a)** evaluating the labor market and other socioeconomic experiences and therefore the quality of immigrants; **b)** assessing the extent of and impediments to socioeconomic assimilation[20] and **c)** examining the existence of discrimination and measuring it in institutions such as education and the labor market. While all the three themes are inter-related and applicable to the foreign born as well as the native born individuals, it appears that the studies on socioeconomic attainments and 'quality' have focused more on the foreign born than the native born[21]. Those assessing assimilation and discrimination have tended to target the native born population to a greater extent. This dichotomy is not entirely unfounded. The concern for the foreign born relates to whether they will socio-economically assimilate and contribute to the host country, if admitted. In case of the native born Asians, the concern is whether this group that legally enjoys the citizenship rights similar to the white majority population experiences equality with the majority.

Considering, that most of the migration from Asia is for the purposes of economic mobility, the attention given to examining upward mobility among the foreign born with time in the U.S. is not surprising. Moreover, the level of socioeconomic attainments of

---

[19] Since other subject areas such as fiscal impact of immigration or issues of ethnic identity are beyond the scope of the present research, the review provided here accordingly does not examine any of that. See Borjas (1994) for an insightful review on the cost-benefits of immigration. Waters and Eschbach (1995) provide an excellent overview of the issues of identity related to the incorporation of immigrant minorities in the mainstream economy, society, and culture. An in-depth analysis of the subject of ethnic identity in the specific context of Asians can be found in Kibria (1998,2002).

[20] The meaning and implications of assimilation as is evident from the theoretical review in the previous section is a contested terrain. For the present purposes assimilation in conceptual terms refers to skill assimilation such as employability, comparability of earnings with the majority group, increase in English language ability etc.

[21] It may be noted that most of the earlier studies do not distinguish clearly the native born from the foreign born.

migrants reflects on the quality of the entrants, an issue that has been of longstanding concern among policy makers and the public.

The research questions for the native born, a population that did not decide to move to a 'foreign' land, are different. The question that is of greatest relevance is whether this population group that is 'outwardly' distinguishable from the white majority is socio-economically assimilated? Apart from testing whether the assimilation that is predicted to take place across generations is occurring, the native born population also provides an analytical handle to test the thesis of the 'declining significance of race'. If indeed the role of the ascribed characteristics such as race/ethnicity is diminishing, then the expectation is that the native born, without the structural disadvantage of foreign birth, will experience a smaller or nonexistent gap vis-à-vis the white majority, than the foreign born first generation in the U.S.

Research on labor market outcomes of Asians either compares Asians as a group with other immigrants or with whites or assesses the intergroup differences among the various Asian immigrant groups and with the majority population. While earlier studies tended to be more focused on examining the experiences of immigrants relative to the white population more recent work includes inter-immigrant group differences. The present study falls in the latter line of research ((Chiswick 1978a; Hirschman and Wong 1984; Borjas 1985; Barringer, Takeuchi and Xenos 1990; Iceland 1999; Sakamoto and Xie 2005). I focus on differences among Asian groups in returns to human capital/skills, discrimination, women's labor market experiences, and household level income maximizing strategies.

Economic Outcomes and Human Capital/Skills

The contemporary body of the scholarship on intergroup labor market comparisons owes its origin to Chiswick's (1978a) paper which considered three Asian groups, Chinese, Filipino, and Japanese. Using the 1970 Census data and focusing on men, Chiswick (1978a) argued that given that the foreign born are positively self-selected, they are able to overcome the initial earnings disadvantage as their duration in the host country increases and within 10-15 years of stay are able to attain parity with the white population. In a subsequent paper on native born Asian men disaggregated by ethnicity, namely Chinese, Filipino, and Japanese, Chiswick (1983) finds no evidence of an unexplained Asian-white gap.

Chiswick's early papers reflect the concern with quality of immigrants that still pervades the literature on immigrant socioeconomic experiences today. A major objection to Chiswick's findings was put forward by George Borjas[22]. Borjas argued that cross-sectional studies such as Chiswick's (1978a, 1979, 1983) are not appropriate to measure wage convergence and therefore immigrant quality since such studies tend to overestimate the effect of years-since-migration if the immigrant cohort quality is declining.

---

[22] Borjas' (1985, 1995) work argues that Chiswick's (1978) prediction that earnings will converge within 10-15 years is an overestimation since there has been a secular decline in immigrant cohort quality that cross-sectional analyses are not able to capture. LaLonde and Topel's (1991,1992) work is an attempt to reconcile the apparently conflicting findings from the research by Chiswick (1978, 1979, 1983) and Borjas (1985, 1995). LaLonde and Topel (1991) make a distinction between wage convergence and assimilation. They opine that even though wage convergence may not happen for immigrants, there is a strong evidence of assimilation indicated by the positive and large coefficient of the duration of stay variable. More recent work testing the wage convergence uses a variety of data sets; longitudinal data from the census (Duleep and Regets 1996) or successive matched years Current Population Survey (Duleep and Regets 1997) or Social Security Administration data matched with the Current Population Survey data (Duleep and Dowhan 2002) or Survey of Income and Program Participation data matched with Social Security Administration data and the Current Population Survey data (Lubotsky 2000) elicits mixed evidence on wage convergence.

In spite of the criticism of Chiswick's (1978a, 1983) work, scholarly research relying on cross-sectional data continues in both economics and sociology. Notable is a paper by Schoeni (1997) that employs cross-sectional census data for the years 1970, 1980, and 1990 to examine intergroup variations and change in the attainments of Asian men. Schoeni (1997) considers men from China, Japan, and Korea. His analyses show that although Chinese, Japanese, and Korean men begin at low levels, they have much steeper wage growth as compared to Mexicans and Central Americans.

In the sociological literature, a parallel to Chiswick's work (1978a, 1983) can be found in Hirschman and Wong's (1984) paper. Hirschman and Wong (1984) examine the economic performance of Chinese, Filipino, and Japanese populations in comparison with Hispanic and black populations emphasizing the assimilation framework to a greater extent than typically is done in the economics literature. The authors contend that although Asians experience a high socioeconomic status, they do so because of their 'overachievement' in education, therefore implying that discrimination might be still operative in the case of Asians and resonating with the statement made by Tobin (1967) that 'minorities are first to be fired and last to be hired.' This interpretation triggered substantial interest in testing whether Asians are discriminated against and whether the label of 'model minority' was capturing the reality of Asian American economic experiences. Hurh and Kim's (1989) investigation on the 'success' image of Asians concludes that the image is largely a 'myth' since it masks labor market disadvantages in the forms of underemployment and social segregation. Barringer et.al (1990) echo the views expressed by Hirschman and Wong (1984) as well as those by Hurh and Kim (1989). Barringer et.al (1990), using the 1990 Census data find that, except for the

Japanese, none of the Asian groups attain equity with whites after accounting for all the relevant controls. Unlike the research by Hirschman and Wong (1984) as well as Hurh and Kim (1989), Barringer et.al (1990) make a clear distinction between the foreign and native born and also evaluates men and women separately.

Apart from education, the skill that has received considerable attention is the acquisition of English language ability/proficiency. Research indicates indisputable benefit to the knowledge of and fluency in the English language (See McManus, Gould and Welch 1983; Kossoudji 1988; Chiswick and Miller 1998; Carliner 2000; Bleakley and Chin 2004 among others). The decennial census data indicate that immigrants in the United States who are proficient earn 15 to 20 percent more than immigrants who have not mastered the English language.

The literature on human capital and skill acquisition ties in with the selection argument that has found prominence in historical and contemporary studies explaining labor market outcomes and intergroup differences (Ravenstein 1885; Lee 1966; Chiswick 1978a, 1978b; Borjas 1987, 1999). The contention is that immigrants are positively selected on both their observed characteristics and on the non-observed attributes like ability and motivation. One of the recent empirical investigations shows that the entrants from the six Asian countries, China, India, Japan, Korea, Philippines and Vietnam, are indeed positively select on education (Feliciano 2005).

Discrimination and the 'Glass Ceiling'

The underlying objective of the majority of evaluations of intergroup differences is to assess the existence and extent of labor market discrimination. There is disagreement with regard to whether Asians are discriminated against. This debate, in the sociological

literature, seems to have been triggered by the thesis of the 'declining significance of race' put forward by William Julius Wilson (1980). The question that is being asked is whether the significance of ascribed characteristics such as race has declined in the U.S. labor market? If indeed there is such a decline then the native born minority non-white population should be at par with whites, once the difference in the productivity related characteristics are taken into account.

There is one school of thought arguing that immigrants are not particularly disadvantaged (Chiswick 1983; Nee and Sanders 1985; Iceland 1999; Sakamoto et.al 2000, Sakamoto and Furuichi 2002). These studies test the thesis of discrimination by comparing native born Asians with whites. The Japanese American experience is often cited as an instance of the declining disadvantage after controls for education, experience, region, urban status. The occupational attainment of Japanese seems to have not only achieved parity but even surpassed that of whites. A similar conclusion seems to apply for native born Chinese American men (Chiswick 1983; Sakamoto et.al 1998; Iceland 1999). More recently, Sakamoto et.al (2000), using the census data from 1950 and 1990, show that the significance of race has been declining for the two Asian groups that they consider in their study, namely Chinese Americans and Japanese Americans.

The second school of thought argues that Asians continue to experience earnings disadvantage[23] because of racial discrimination even when they are native born or have lived in the U.S. for a long time (Wong 1980; Hisrchman and Wong 1984; Hurh and Kim 1989; Feagin and Feagin 1993; Waters and Eschbach 1995). The evidence of the positive selection on the nonobservable factors such as ability, motivation, and on the existence of

---

[23] A perusal of the empirical literature seems to indicate the following difference between the conceptualizations of disadvantage and discrimination. While disadvantage is structural, related to the status of foreign birth, discrimination is an empirical concept.

a 'glass ceiling' supports this viewpoint of the continued disadvantage of Asians in the U.S.

The evidence on the intergenerational transmission of status for the second generation population in general is mixed too with some of it indicating improved education and earning attainments for the second generation as compared to the parent generation while some contend that there is intergenerational decline in attainments. The proponents of the 'second generation decline' thesis argue that factors such as the resilient nature of race and the post-industrial information based economy make it difficult for second generation children to overcome the disadvantages posed by low socioeconomic status of their parents.

One parameter that is being increasingly explored in an attempt to resolve the disagreement on whether there is labor market discrimination is discerning the role of the place of acquisition of human capital (home country versus the U.S.) in labor market outcomes. If differential returns to education exist for immigrants, are they due to discrimination or due to difference in the place of having acquired education? While reliable data on place of education is scant, the most noteworthy evidence in the context of Asians in this regard is provided by Zeng and Xie (2004). Employing specialized data sets, Zeng and Xie (2004) demonstrate that education received in the U.S. is rewarded better than that attained in the country of origin for foreign born Asians. This is in line with the findings of previous studies in the context of the U.S. and other countries as well for groups other than Asians (Schonei 1997; Friedberg 2000 among others).

Another dimension that is being explored to assess possible discrimination is to examine the gaps not at the center of the earnings distribution but at higher levels of

earnings and occupations. Such research is limited for Asians (Tang 1993, Kim and Lewis 1994; Tang 2000), but Duleep and Sanders (1992), using the 1980 Census data, find that although on average Chinese, Japanese, and Korean Americans earn more than whites, highly educated Asian American men earn less than white men after adjusting for industry and occupation. Another study by Fernandez (1998) examines the existence of a 'glass ceiling' for foreign and native born Asian Indian men and women in the San Francisco bay area. The results show that Indian men and women experience a 'net disadvantage' in rising to management levels.

Methodologically, non-parametric techniques are increasingly being used in place of regression standardization to understand the intergroup earning gaps. The rationale provided is that regression procedures that impose a linear structure on the relationship between earnings and the variables that predict earnings, bias the estimation of the wage gap. A recent paper by Black et.al (2006) using non-parametric techniques shows that the unexplained Asian –white wage gap for males is partly unexplained due to the measurement error in the education variable and partly because of the variations in 'pre-market' factors such as differences in formal education and English language ability.

Women in the Labor Market

The study of immigration has largely been a study of men. There has been however a spurt of research on the subject of gender in international migration since the late 1980s. (See Curran et.al 2006 and Donato et.al 2006 for an exhaustive review).

Empirical research on Asian women perhaps owes its origin to the Wong and Hirschman (1983) paper. Wong and Hirschman (1983) explain high labor force participation and earnings of the three groups of Asian women, Chinese, Japanese and

Filipino women, relative to white women by their higher educational attainments, residence in regions with greater job opportunities and higher pay and their greater tendency to work full time. They also find differences by nativity status with Chinese and Japanese native born women doing better than white women. The same is not true of native born Filipino women, although foreign born Filipino women do better the white women. They do not find support for socioeconomic discrimination that can be attributed to Asian women's minority status but do find evidence consistent with gender discrimination.

Woo (1985), in her follow up research, argues that the lack of discrimination against Asian women because of their Asian descent cannot be completely denied. She demonstrates that women of Asian origin are disproportionately represented in low rung professional and clerical jobs and engaged in occupations that are not commensurate with their education. Woo also argues that the distinction between foreign and native born Asian American women is very critical and is often not emphasized enough. Carslon and Swartz (1988) examine progress of Asians between 1970 and 1980 and show that after controlling for human capital factors, Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino women earn less than white women. However their study does not distinguish between foreign and native born Asians. Another piece of work conducted in San Francisco-San Jose area does distinguish between foreign born and native born women and finds that the return to education for Asian women is higher than for white women (Cabezas and Kawaguchi 1988). Barringer, Takeuchi and Xenos (1990), in yet another contribution that analytically examines the labor force performance of women of Asian descent, show that intergroup differences between the sexes for the majority of groups is significant with

women belonging to all the Asian groups experiencing lower earning attainments than their male counterparts. The authors do not make an Asian women –white women comparison.

More contemporary evidence on Asian women disaggregated by countries of origin continues to indicate intergroup variations as well as inconclusive assessments as to whether discrimination exists or not. Schoeni's (1998) study considers Japanese, Koreans, Chinese, Filipinos, IndoChinese and Vietnamese and uses the 1970, 1980 and 1990 Census. The analyses indicate that women born in Japan, Korea, China, and the Philippines have improved wages as well as unemployment rates over the period between 1970 and 1990 relative to the native born. Mar's (2000) study indicates the earnings disadvantage for both foreign and native born Asian women has declined over the period of 1960-1990. Using the 1960 to 1990 Census data and conducting a disaggregated analyses on six groups, Japanese, Chinese, and Filipino foreign and native born, the author shows that on average, native born Asian women experienced substantial earnings advantage relative to their male counterparts in the 1970s but the gains were not that steady in the 1980s and 1990s. Also, the relative position of foreign born Asian women improved but not as much as that of their native born peers relative to foreign and native born Asian men. Greenman and Xie (2005)[24], in an exploration of the interaction between gender and race/ethnicity on earnings using the 2000 Census data, find a positive interaction between being female and being non-white for all the Asian groups

---

[24] It may be noted that although Greenman and Xie's (2005) work as well as that by Carslon and Swartz (1988), Cabezas and Kawaguchi (1988), Mar's (2000) compare the labor market performance of minority women disaggregated by ethnicity that includes Asians with their native born peers, the central objective of these studies is to examine the difference in gender gap relative to racial gap. In other words, the question of interest is whether gender trumps race -whether being a woman or being a non-white more critical in the labor market? There is some work examining gender differences in educational and occupational outcomes of the native born in San Deigo area and does not include comparison with whites (Feliciano and Rumbaut 2005).

considered in their study (Chinese, Filipinos, Japanese, Indians, Koreans and Vietnamese).

Some of the less extensive investigations of immigrant women that focus on a specific profession/occupation such as scientists or managers indicate unequal opportunities. Goyette and Xie (1999) in their research on scientists show that immigrant scientists are less likely to be employed though once employed, there are not likely to earn less. The authors do not identify immigrant women by their country of origin. Fernandez's (1998) inquiry on the existence of a 'glass ceiling' for college educated Asian Indian women in the San Francisco bay area using the 1990 Census data shows that foreign and native born Asian Indian women relative to white women experience disadvantage both in terms of the likelihood of becoming managers as well as in their earnings once they do acquire the position of managers.

Household Level Studies

Empirically, evidence shows immigrant households tend to be larger, have multiple earners and 'indulge' in greater resource sharing – physical and financial (Tienda 1980; Tienda and Angel 1982; Reimers 1985; Perez 1986; Chavez 1990; Burr and Mutchler 1993; Glick et.al 1997; Glick 1999, Tienda and Raijman 2000). Most of this research has been on Hispanic immigrants however. Research on Asian households is limited.

In one of the very few contemporary studies that include Asians as an immigrant group, Jensen (1991) demonstrates the role of earnings other than that of the head of the household in ameliorating the poverty of the households. Drawing a comparison between native white, black, Hispanic, Asian, and native 'other' race groups with foreign black,

foreign Hispanic, foreign Asian, and foreign 'other' race groups, Jensen (1991) shows that the contribution of 'secondary earners' (earners other than the household head) in lifting households out of poverty is greater for immigrants than for natives. However, the same cannot be said for the immigrant Asian households relative to native Asian families. The reason for Asians being an exception is because of the very high average secondary earnings among the native Asians. He further disaggregates Asians into Chinese and Japanese and finds that Chinese families benefit more from 'secondary earners' than do native born whites.

Summary

The review of the significant contributions in the area of socioeconomic experiences of Asians in the U.S. suggests the following. The socioeconomic progress of post -1965 Asian immigrants has followed a near linear and upward sloping curve. Because of the high average attainment levels, they are portrayed as one of the most successful minority groups in the U.S. The heterogeneity among the Asian subgroups has also been a persistent theme in this portrayal   of socioeconomic progress.

Research finds notable intergroup dispersion in the distribution of socioeconomic indicators, yet there is a lack of consensus concerning the explanations and the implications of that dispersion. The positive coefficient of the duration of stay variable in cross- sectional studies is perceived by some scholars as an indication of positive assimilation and ultimately, of convergence of Asian wages with white wages. It also bolsters the 'claim' of no discrimination against Asians. Even when wage convergence does not take place, some argue that lack of wage convergence is not the result of labor market discrimination but rather due to a decline in immigrant cohort quality. Others

disagree and argue that there is persistent discrimination that is both overt ('glass ceiling', lower returns on the education and other productivity related characteristics) and covert ('exclusion' from privileges, alienation) and forms that still prevents complete socioeconomic assimilation. Additionally, there is a disagreement at both the conceptual and methodological levels, on how to perceive and measure discrimination.

There appears to be some agreement that a) the Asian –white gap in economic outcomes has been declining over the years for men as well as for women and that b) data paucity on critical variables such as quality of education does not allow conclusive findings. The recognition of the relationship between household structure, composition and the socioeconomic characteristics of the household members with the household's economic position is growing. Overall, there seems to be an increasing skepticism towards the 'model minority' image of Asians.

Study Goals

The existing body of scholarship immensely enhances our knowledge about the relative socioeconomic position of Asians in the U.S. Yet what is missing is an updated comprehensive picture of attainments and outcomes at the individual and household level for foreign and native born Asians from the six major sending countries (China, India, Japan, Korea, Philippines and Vietnam) and employing the latest available data. The present research attempts to fill that lacuna in the literature.

The central goal of this dissertation is to analyze the intergroup differences in the economic outcomes of Asians and white individuals and households. It employs the human capital and assimilation framework to identify important covariates of economic outcomes and to understand the relationship between these covariates and the economic

outcomes and foreign and native born Asian ethnicity. Also, given that the theoretical and empirical literature indicate the immigration experience of women is different from that of men, I undertake a separate analysis for women. Further, in recognition of the growing interest in understanding immigrant economic experiences as function of not only the individual level characteristics but also those of the household in which the immigrant is located, this research examines relative household economic well being and living arrangements of Asians and whites.

The broad questions at the ***individual*** *level* are;

1) What are the disparities and similarities in employment and earnings of men and women aged 25 to 65 who are foreign or native born Chinese, Filipino, Indian, Japanese, Korean and Vietnamese relative to one another and to whites in year 2000?

2) To what extent are these intergroup similarities and differences in labor force outcomes explained by the differences in human capital characteristics, assimilation factors and demographic attributes?

3) To what extent are these intergroup similarities and differences in labor force outcomes associated with nativity status?

At the level of the ***household***, following questions are investigated;

1) What is the economic position of the Chinese, Filipino, Indian, Japanese, Korean and Vietnamese households relative to one another and to whites? Does the relative position depend on the type of the measure of household well being?

2) Are there intergroup differences in the extent of resource sharing and pooling?

3) What are the factors associated with the likelihood of adopting nuclear living arrangements? Do these associations vary across groups?

Hypotheses

  I formulate the following set of hypotheses at the individual and household levels.

Individual

Hypothesis 1. Human capital characteristics are associated with employment and earnings outcomes

1. Higher education leads to greater chances of employment and higher earnings of native and foreign born Asians and whites.

2. Foreign and native born Asians with similar educational levels have the same chances of employment and earnings.

3. Education in the U.S. leads to higher returns vis-à-vis education obtained outside of the U.S.

4. Foreign born Asians with better English language ability experience greater chances of employment and higher earnings relative to those with lower language ability.

5. Greater potential years of work experience is associated with higher earnings.

Hypothesis 2. Assimilation characteristics are associated with employment and earning attainments.

1. A longer period of stay for immigrants should make them look similar to whites in terms of economic experiences.

2. Native born Asians have similar employment and earnings outcomes as whites.

Hypothesis 3. Demographic attributes relate to economic outcomes of employment and earnings.

1. Married persons experience higher employment rates and higher earnings than unmarried persons.

2. Metro residence is associated with better economic outcomes than non-metro residence.

Hypothesis 4. The Asian –white earning gap can be completely explained by the human capital, assimilation, and demographic characteristics.

1. Asian and white individuals with the same human capital, assimilation, and demographic characteristics experience equal earnings.

2. The Asian –white earning gap does not vary by the nativity status of the Asians.

Household

Hypothesis 5. Household economic position is dependent on the measure of household income employed.

1. Households with similar levels of aggregate household income vary with regard to per

capita and per hourly income.

2. There is greater extent of resource sharing and pooling among the foreign born relative to

the native born households.

Hypothesis 6. Household structure is correlated with household income, and human capital and assimilation characteristics of the householder.

1. The incidence of living in a nuclear household is lower at higher levels of household income for foreign and native born Asians and whites.

2. The likelihood of living in a nuclear household increases with the increase in the human capital of the householder for foreign and native born Asians and whites.

3. The likelihood of living in a nuclear household is greater as the householder's length of stay increases for the foreign born Asians.

Chapter 4

Data and Methods

This chapter describes the data, unit of analysis and the samples I use. It also details the measurement and operationalization of the variables and the empirical strategy adopted for the analyses.

Data

The data sets that I employ for my analyses are the one percent and five percent state samples of the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) of the 2000 Census (Ruggles et.al 2004). The census IPUMS is the only data set that provides large enough sample sizes to enable intergroup comparisons among Asian sub groups, especially for groups such as native born Indians, Koreans, and the Vietnamese that comprise a relatively small share of the total population.

I use the one percent sample to obtain the sample of whites and the five percent sample for the sample of six Asian subgroups. The five percent state sample provides one with enough observations in each of the specific Asian subgroup to enable a disaggregated analysis (by Asian sub group and gender). Additionally, I combine the 1 and 5 percent samples in the case of the six Asian groups to expand the sample size. This is a routine strategy adopted by researchers using the IPUMS data set. The one and five percent samples are drawn independently of one another in the IPUMS data and therefore combining the two data sets is permissible. I adjust the sample weights in both the individual and household level data sets to account for the pooling.

Unit of Analysis

The research questions, as stated in the previous chapter, are addressed at two levels; individual and household. The individual level component comprises undertaking separate analyses for the samples of men and women.

I would like to discuss in brief, the employment of household as a unit of analysis. In studying household economic well being, prior research examining living arrangements in general and for immigrant groups in particular varies with respect to the unit of analysis. Some analyses employed household (Angel and Tienda 1982; Tienda and Angel 1982; Bianchi and He 1997), others the family (Jensen 1991), individual household members (Reimers 1985; Duleep and Sanders 1993), and some a Minimum Household Unit (MHU henceforth) (Glick et.al 1997; Glick 1999). MHU is the smallest unit that can potentially reside independently of others (Ermisch and Overton 1985) and includes unit householder, spouse (if present) and single dependent children. With MHU as the unit, there is a possibility of more than one MHU per census enumerated household (Glick et.al 1997). I employ *household* as the unit of analysis since it entails, in my opinion, a more straightforward definition of who lives together and who are available to pool resources.

Sample

For the individual level analysis of employment, I include all non – institutionalized men and women in the age group of 25-65[25] who are not enrolled in school and are born in China, Philippines, India, Japan, Korea, Vietnam or the U.S. and

---

[25] In the literature, there is a variation in the age group selected for examining the economic outcomes. The sample age ranges from 16 to 64 (Chiquiar and Hanson 2002), 20-64 (Koussoudji 1988), 25 to 44 (Zeng and Xie 2004), 25 to 54 (Tubergen, Mass and Flap 2004), 25 to 60 (Duleep and Dowhan 2002), 25 to 64 (Barringer et.al 1990; Chiswick 1978a, Chiswick and Miller 1999, Dodoo 1997; Hirschman and Wong 1984; Zhou and Logan 1989), 25 to 65 (Duleep and Sanders 1993; Friedberg 2000), 20 to 64 (Green 1999).

who self identify themselves as Chinese, Filipino, Indian, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese or white respectively and reside in one of the 50 states or the District of Columbia in 1999. For the (ordinary least square) regression with log of hourly annual earnings as the dependent variable, the sample is restricted to all those who are employed and report positive hourly annual earnings during the year 1999. I delete the observations who report zero or negative earnings. The sample for the hourly earning regression analyses is thus a subset of that for the employment analyses. The individual level descriptive and multivariate evaluations are conducted separately for men and women.

For the household level analysis, the sample is constructed along similar lines based on the ethnicity and nativity status of the householder. The age restriction of 25-65 years for the householder is not applied however. The householder can be of any age and can also be in school. The sample for the household level analyses therefore is composed of householders born in China, Philippines, India, Japan, Korea, Vietnam or in the U.S. and who self identify themselves as Chinese, Filipino, Indian, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese or white respectively and the households reside in either of the 50 states or the District of Columbia in 1999. For the analysis of household income, only households with positive income are included.

Variables

Weight

There are two weight variables, PERWT and HHWT provided in the IPUMS data set, depending on whether the analyses is to be conducted at the individual or the household level respectively. I generate new weight variables at the individual and household levels to adjust for the pooling of the one and five percent samples;

Weight variable at the individual level = 1/6 * PERWT (from one percent sample)
+ 5/6 (from five percent sample) * PERWT

Weight variable at the household level = 1/6 * (from one percent sample) HHWT
+ 5/6 * (from five percent sample) HHWT

Dependent Variables: Individual Level Analyses

I focus on two dependent variables in the individual level analyses; the probability of employment and earnings. These are two principal indicators of individual labor market outcomes (Raijman and Tienda 1999). While employment is an indicator of the capability to secure paid work in the host country, earnings is considered the key measure of the performance in the labor market.

The IPUMS variable, EMPSTAT indicates whether or not the person was part of the labor force (working or seeking work) and if so, if he/she is currently employed or not. Census classifies employed persons as 'employers', self-employed persons', 'employees' and 'unpaid family workers'. An employed person is anyone who worked at least one hour for pay or profit during the reference week which is the week previous to the date of survey[26]. The reference period for ascertaining earnings is however the year previous to the date of the survey. Earnings refers to the sum of wage income, non farm self employment income and farm self employment income accrued to an (employed) individual in the previous calendar year. Since my objective in the present analysis is to predict earnings, for those who are employed, I correct for this discrepancy in the reference period between employment and earnings by modifying the measurement of the employment variable. An individual is coded as employed if he/she worked for one or

---

[26] The question asked in the census is; 'last week did this person do any work for either pay or profit? Mark 'X' the 'Yes' box even if the person worked only 1 hour or helped without pay in a family business or farm for 15 hours or more or was on active duty in the Armed forces'.

more weeks in the previous year and had positive earnings in the previous year. By restricting the measure of employment to those with positive earnings, I am excluding unpaid workers. There is however, negligible number of men and women who report a positive number of usual weekly work hours but negative or zero earnings.

Likelihood of employment

1 = employed, worked for one or more weeks and has positive earnings during the previous

calendar year, that is during 1999

0 = not employed, has worked for zero weeks and/or has zero or negative earnings in

1999

Log of Hourly Earnings

I make the following transformations to the earnings variable; a) I construct an hourly rather than annual earnings variable[27] and b) I convert earnings into the logarithmic form as is the common practice to correct for the skew in the earnings variable. IPUMS gives information on number of weeks worked in the last year (WKSWORK1) and the usual hours worked per week (UHRSWORK) during the last year. I generate my dependent variable, 'hourly income earned' [28]in the following way;

Hourly Earned Income = Income earned (INCEARN) / WKSWORK1 * UHRSWORK

---

[27] Immigrants may have higher earnings because they work longer hours.

[28] It may be noted that consideration of hourly earnings (for the year 1999) as a dependent variable renders length of employment to be a redundant factor. The latter may, however matter if those who are full time-year round employed are a positively select group with better returns for similar attributes relative to those who are not full time-year round employed. In the present case, the intergroup variation with respect to the annual number of weeks and the number of usual hours per week worked for men and women, especially for men is not substantial (see Appendix Table 5.1A and 5.1B and Appendix Table 6.1A and 6.1B). It is therefore not critical to take into account the length of employment in terms of full time year round or non-full time year round employment.

Hence, by construction, I exclude those who have zero number of weeks worked and zero number of usual hours worked per week during the previous year. I subsequently do a log transformation of the generated variable, 'Hourly Earned Income'.

Dependent Variables: Household Level Analyses

The central dependent variables for the household level analyses are; household income; likelihood of living in a nuclear in contrast to a nonnuclear household. I choose household income over earnings since income is a more comprehensive measure of household well being. There are negligible differences between household income and earnings for the overwhelming proportion of the population considered.

I use three variants of household income, namely a) total household income; b) per capita household income; c) income per household labor hour employed. In the regression analyses, I use the logarithmic transformation of all the three measures of household income.

Total household income of a household is the sum of the income of all the members who as per the information provided in the data belong to that household as of the date of the census. **Per capita household income** is computed by dividing the total household income by household size, considering only those observations, which have a value greater than 0 for household income. **Income per household labor hour employed** is the total household income divided by the total annual household labor market hours, again deleting observations with a negative or 0 value recorded for their household income. The annual number of total household labor market hours is computed by a) multiplying the annual number of weeks worked with the number of

hours worked per week during the previous year for each household member and summing them.

Likelihood of living in a nuclear household

1 = if household is nuclear

0 = otherwise

Independent Variables: Individual Level Analyses

Ethnicity and Nativity Statuses

Ethnicity is defined by the person's place of birth and age of entry to the U.S., in addition to the self –reported response to the question on race in the census data. A caveat may be in order here. Ethnic and racial identities are conceptually distinct from one another (Alba 1990; Waters 1990; Gallagher 2003). However, delving into the details of that distinction is beyond the scope of this research project and I therefore choose to identify the six Asian groups and whites as distinct ethnic groups.

I conceptualize nativity status in the following way. Native born Asians implies both those who are born in the U.S. as well as those who are born in their (Asian) home country and came to the U.S. at age 12 or below. The latter have been assigned the name of 1.5 generation[29]. Scholars argue that the cultural and educational assimilation process for those who come at age 13 or older is different for those who come at younger ages (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Kasinitz et al. 2008). Those who enter at age 12 or below are highly likely to receive U.S. based high school or higher degree and develop English language fluency, two variables that previous scholarship have deemed to be significantly associated with labor market outcomes. My operationalization of the nativity status is therefore, as follows. If a person is born in any of the six Asian countries, entered the

---

[29] The nomenclature, 1.5 generation has gained popularity recently (Portes and Rumbaut 2001).

U.S. at the age of 12 or younger and identifies himself/herself as one of six Asians ethnicities, the individual is categorized as native born. On the other hand, if a person is born in any of the six Asian countries and has entered the U.S. at age 13 or older, and identifies himself/herself as one of six Asians ethnicities, he/she is considered as foreign born[30]. The reference category for ethnicity is white and for the nativity status is native born.

Human capital - My conceptualization of human capital is similar to that commonly employed in the literature; years of education, potential years of work experience, and English language ability.

1. Educational attainment – While years of education is key to explaining immigrant economic experience, interest in the educational attainments of immigrants is further generated by the fact that many recent immigrants have little education (Bean and Bell –Rose 2003) and are therefore experiencing low wage growth[31] (Chiswick 1986; Duleep and Regets 1996; Duleep and Dowhan 2002). While the concentration of highly educated persons among immigrants is the same as among the natives, the number of foreign born with low educational attainment has increased, relative to natives. Given that the educational impacts on employment and earnings are enormous, it is imperative to investigate the educational distribution patterns of men and women belonging in the six Asian nationalities.

---

[30] Immigrants and foreign born are legally different categories. In the context of the present analyses, I use the terms foreign born and native born respectively to distinguish the Asian population that is Asia born from the one which is U.S. born.

[31] This trend has been attributed to the shifting of the entry criteria from national origins quota to family reunification with the implementation of the Immigration Reform Control Act in 1965.

The variable, EDUC99 in the IPUMS indicates the respondent's highest level of educational attainment. Persons, who are educated in a system other than the U.S., were asked to estimate the equivalent of their educational attainment in the U.S. educational system. EDUC99 is an ordinal variable with the categories; 'not applicable', 'no school completed', 'nursery school', 'kindergarten', '1st -4th grade', '5th -8th grade', '9th grade', '10th grade', '11th grade', '12th grade, no diploma', 'high school graduate or GED', 'some college, no degree', 'associate degree, occupational program', 'associate degree, academic program', 'bachelor's degree', 'master's degree', 'professional degree', 'doctorate degree '. Since the present analysis consists of men and women aged between 25 and 65 years, there are no observations in the 'not applicable' category.

Based on the frequency distribution of the variable, EDUC99 and on the findings from studies examining the relationship between educations and earnings, I decide on the following recodes; 'Less than college degree', 'College education', and 'Masters/Professional/Doctorate degree'. 'Masters/Professional/Doctorate' is the reference category.

Previous research indicates a non linear relationship within an educational attainment category and earnings (Zeng and Xie 2004). I use the spline function of education to account for that non-linearity. In order to generate the **spline** function, I break the variable, years of education into three segments; 0-12, 13-16, and more than 16 years of education. The comparison of the coefficients across the three segments tells how the association between an additional year of education within each segment and earnings varies across segments. For example, the comparison of the coefficients for 0-12 and 13-16 years of education tells how the correlation between an additional year of

schooling and earnings for an individual falling in 0-12 years of education category compares with the corresponding correlation for an individual who belongs to the category, 13-16 years of education.

For the spline measure of educational attainment[32], I use the variable -years of education. Since years of education is not directly available from the 2000 Census data, I rely on the variable EDUC99 which gives the highest level of educational attainment by categories. The educational categories provided by the variable, EDUC99 are fortunately fairly detailed though for higher levels of education like doctorate degree, the approximation may be more problematic.

Following the basic framework of past studies (Kalmijn 1996; Dodoo 1997), I approximate the years of education in the following manner;

0 years = no school, nursery school and kindergarten
2.5 years = grades 1 to 4
6.5 years = grades 5 to 8
9 years = grade 9
10 years = grade 10
11 years = grade 11
12 years = 12th grade, no diploma and high school graduate
13 years = some college, no degree and associate degree, occupational program
14.5 years = associate degree, academic program
16 years = bachelor's degree
18 years = master's degree
22 years = professional, doctorate degree

I generate three spline functions; 0-12 years of education, 13-16 years of education, and more than 16 years of education, to coincide with the recoded educational categories

Whether received any education in the U.S. – Considering that there is an increasing emphasis on the role of the place of acquiring human capital on immigrants'

---

[32] Note the spline transformation of the education variable is used in the individual men earning regressions.

economic performance in the host country, I include an indicator with respect to whether all or part of an individual's education was acquired in the U.S. (Zeng and Xie 2004; Dodoo 1997). It may be noted that such a variable, assumes uninterrupted education after the age of six and is therefore crude. The inaccuracy, is, especially anticipated to be substantial in the case of high levels of academic degrees like a doctorate where taking breaks from school are more common. Further, this inaccuracy, if anything is expected to bias the estimate of the percentage of foreign born receiving education in the U.S. downwards.

The information on whether the foreign born received any education in the U.S. is indicated by the categorical variable created by using the variables, age of entry to the U.S. and the years of education. It is applicable only for the foreign born population. Age of entry to the U.S. is calculated by subtracting the person's years of stay in the U.S. from his/her current age.

1 = received education in the U.S., if;

Total years of education +6 > Age at entry

0 = did not receive education in the U.S., if

Total years of education +6   < = Age at entry

2. Year/s of potential work experience – Unfortunately, the census does not ask any question about the length of the time spent in the labor market by an individual. Thus I use an approximation which is similar to one that is most common in the literature. The approximation is age minus years of schooling that a person has completed minus 6. It may be noted that this approximation is more problematic for women than men because women are less likely to have a continuous association with the labor market. The work

experience coefficient in case of women therefore captures both the effects of education as well as the depreciation of skills that occurs during the periods when one is out of the labor force (Mincer and Polachek 1974). To account for this approximation, experts have suggested including variables such as number of children ever born, number of young children and martial status in the earnings equation of women (Oaxaca 1973; Gramm 1975; Smith 1976).

Years of education, a constituent of the variable 'work experience' is an approximation too as it is not directly available for the year 2000. I use the procedure described above to approximate the years of education from the variable EDUC99.

Years of potential work experience is hence calculated as;

Years of potential work experience = Age –Years of schooling - 6

Non –U.S. year/s of potential work experience – Similar to educational attainments, work experience acquired in the destination country has also been documented to be more useful in upward occupational and earnings mobility. I therefore construct a variable indicating the potential total number of years of work experience acquired outside of the U.S.[33] It may be noted that like the variable, 'whether acquired education in the U.S', this too is a crude measure as it assumes uninterrupted transition from school to work place (Mincer 1974). A further approximation in the case of the foreign born is caused by the lack of information on the place where the non U.S. work experience is acquired. Work experience gained in a developed country such as Canada or the UK is more likely to be rewarded better in the U.S. than work experience gained in the home country for all the study groups except perhaps for the Japanese. However, this

---

[33] The variables indicating acquisition of education and years of work experience in the U.S., English language ability, length of stay in the U.S. are apparently applicable to the foreign born Asian population only.

shortcoming may not be of great magnitude, since visa restrictions in the majority of the developed countries do not allow a free flow of labor from the Asian nations.

I construct a variable that measures the years of potential work experience outside of the U.S. using the information on total years of work experience (generated above) and the person's duration of stay in the U.S. This variable, similar to whether acquired education in the U.S., applies only to the foreign born population. Empirically, it is possible that this experience has been acquired in a country other than the foreign born person's home country.

Years of potential work experience acquired outside of the U.S. = Total years of potential work experience – Total years of stay in the U.S.

3. English language ability – I include English language ability as one of the components of the human capital. There is evidence of a notable variation in the English language ability of the six foreign born Asian groups. Work experience or rather potential work experience is a commonly used independent variable that is supposed to affect all the labor market outcomes that are being considered here, though perhaps earnings more than labor force participation. The rationale for the relationship is that the greater number of years in the labor force, the greater the knowledge of the labor market strategies, acquisition of the firm specific skills and so forth.

The variable, SPEAKENG indicates both whether a respondent is able to speak English and whether he/she is able to speak English well. The information is self

reported[34]. The response categories are; 'yes, speaks only English'; 'yes, speaks very well'; 'yes, speaks well'; 'yes, but not well'; 'does not speak English'.

On the basis of the frequency distribution (for the variable SPEAKENG), I decide to collapse the five categories of speaks English into three by combining the categories as follows are; (1) 'Speaks no English', (2) 'Speaks English well or not well' and (3) 'Speaks only English or speaks very well'. The reference category is 'Speaks only English or speaks very well'. Although the information on this variable is available for the foreign as well as the native born population, I conceptualize this characteristic only for the foreign born since over 95 percent of the native born population reports to belonging to the category, 'Speaks only English or Speaks very well'.

Occupation and Type of Work
Occupation – In addition to the above independent variables, I include occupational attainments of foreign and native born Asians relative to whites as a right hand side variable. Although occupation is recognized as one of the central indicators of socioeconomic well being by economists as well as sociologists, economists tend to refrain from using the occupation as an independent variable in the regression analyses of earnings (Chiswick 1978a, 1983; Schoeni 1997). Sociological studies[35] however employ occupation as an explanatory variable to a greater extent (Hirschman and Wong 1984; Barringer et.al 1990). I follow the practice of incorporating occupation on the right hand

---

[34] Studies indicate self-reported English language ability as a robust measure and is therefore widely used. See Rivers, Robinson, & Martin (forthcoming) for an assessment of the validity of such measures in survey research.
[35] However, in the view of some recent work in sociological/demographic literature, controlling for occupation is not appropriate. Structural variables such as occupation, industrial sector as per this view affects the accurate estimation of the minority effects.

side since occupational segregation among Asian immigrants is noticeable (Iceland 1999) and therefore controlling for it appears to be necessary.

There are two variables recorded in IPUMS that provide information on occupation in the 2000 Census. They are OCC and OCCSOC. The variable OCC provides a numeric occupational classification that is nearly identical to the OCCSOC scheme. The OCCSOC scheme follows the 1998 Occupational Classification system (IPUMS 2004). It therefore seems that the choice of the variable (between OCC and OCCSOC) is not critical. I choose the variable, OCC to generate a recoded occupation variable. I generate seven major occupation categories; 1) Business/managerial/professional; 2) Service; 3) Sales; 4) Office and administrative support; 5) Farming, fishing, forestry; 6)Construction, extraction, maintenance; 7) Production, transportation, material. The reference category is 'Business/managerial/professional'.

Type of work – I also include the indicator of whether the person is self-employed or a wage/ salary earner as one of the independent variables at the individual level. Past research documents note-worthy differences in self-employment rates between the foreign and native born population groups as well as within the foreign born, with some groups such as Chinese, Koreans reporting high rates of self-employment relative to some others such as Indians.

This variable 'type of work', is derived from the variable, CLASSWKD. I collapse this multi-category variable into a dichotomous one; a) wage/salary earner b) self-employed. The reference category is wage/salary earner.

Assimilation Variable

Duration of stay – The indicator of assimilation includes length of stay (in the U.S.). Citizenship status can be considered as yet another indicator of assimilation. Length of stay is highly correlated with citizenship status. Acquisition of citizenship status raises the chances of employment and higher earnings, the latter because of the enhanced bargaining power of citizens relative to noncitizens. Methodologically, multicollnearity between length of stay and citizenship status does not allow me to use length of stay and citizenship simultaneously. The theoretical and empirical significance of the duration of stay variable motivates me to choose it over citizenship status. The high correlation between the two variables implies that part of the association of the number of years of stay in the U.S. with the outcome variables for the foreign born can be explained by citizenship status. [36]

There are three variables that give information about the length of stay; YRIMMIG (gives the year in which a foreign-born person first entered the United States), YRSUSA1, a continuous variable (gives the number of years in the U.S. and is derived from YRIMMIG) and YRSUSA2, a categorical variable (gives the number of years in the U.S. in intervals and is derived from YRSUSA1). The census question asked to get the response to this variable is 'when did this person come to live in the United States?'[37]. I use the categorical variable YRSUSA2[38]. The original categories in case of

---

[36] The variables indicating acquisition of education and years of work experience in the U.S., English language ability, length of stay in the U.S. are apparently applicable to the foreign born Asian population only.

[37] Information so obtained may be ambiguous though depending on when the person perceives himself/ herself to have come to live. The ambiguity gets enhanced where the levels of return migration and multiple entries are high (Redstone and Massey 2004). This may not be so much a characteristic of the immigrant groups considered in this case, yet the imperfection of the measure (of duration of stay) cannot be ruled out. Despite the shortcomings, I use the variable, YRSUSA1 and its variants owing to the lack of a better indicator.

YRSUSA2 are; 'not applicable', 'zero to five years', 'six to ten years', 'eleven to fifteen years' and 'sixteen to twenty years' and 'twenty one and more years'. The category 'not applicable' applies to the native born.

I collapse the categories into 3 by combining a)'zero to five years' with 'six to ten years' ; b) 'eleven to fifteen years' with 'sixteen to twenty years'; and c) 'twenty one and more years' and 'not applicable'. Hence the 3 categories I employ are; a) less than 10 years of stay; b) More than 10 but less than 20 years of stay; c) 20 or more years of stay. The last category serves as the reference category.

Demographic Characteristics

The demographic attributes considered in this research are region of residence, metro/non-metro residence, marital status, and number of children below the age of five years.

1. Region of residence – Regional concentration[39], is potentially an indication of assimilation particularly so in the case of Asians as they are historically known to be concentrated in the western region of the country. Dummy variables indicating the various regions therefore help control for systematic biases in region based employment opportunities and earning levels.

Information on the region of residence is provided by the variable, REGION in the IPUMS data. The five major categories that the variable has are; 'Northeast', 'Midwest', 'South', 'West' and 'State unknown'. Each of these categories has further been divided into sub-regions in the Census 2000 data. I use the above mentioned major

---

[38] In tabulations using the alternative variables, YRSUSA1 and YRSUSA2, I get better results using the categorical version, YRSUSA2.

[39] It may be noted that research with a specific focus on spatial assimilation tends to use smaller units such as Metropolitan Statistical Area for the analysis.

categories for my analysis but with the following modifications. There are no observations in 'state unknown' category for my sample, hence I drop that category. I choose to sub-divide the region 'West' into 'Rest of the West' and 'Pacific region'. 'Pacific region' consists of the states of Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington. The rationale for doing so is that the very high concentration and a distinct historical context of Asian population in most of the states comprising the 'Pacific region' does not make it appropriate to combine it with the larger 'West' region. The categories that I use are therefore; 1)Northeast; 2)Midwest; 3)South; 4)Rest of the West 5)Pacific region. Pacific region serves as the omitted category in the regression analyses.

2. Metro residence – Previous work shows metro residence as correlated with employment prospects and therefore earnings. Descriptive distributions exhibit a high metro residence for Asians, particularly for the foreign born as opposed to the native born population.

The variable indicating whether the individual or household is residing in metro area is provided by the variable METRO. I generate a binary variable with the categories being; 1) metro residence and 2) non-metro residence. The reference category is non-metro residence.

3. Marital status – Marital status as the literature informs, is significantly associated with a worker's employment and earnings. There is evidence that for the 'same level of schooling and place of residence', married men experience higher earnings as married men tend to have higher labor force participation rates, invest more in human capital and have better health than men who are not married (Chiswick 1978; Waite 1995). Also,

there is evidence of employers having a preference for married men[40] (Roos 1990). Despite the endogeneity[41] between marital status and number of children with level of education and subsequently earnings, I include marital status as an independent variable. In the case of women too, both the general theoretical literature on labor force participation and the inter-personal network theories of immigration emphasize the association between marital status ('marriage matters', Waite 1995, page 483) and the labor force outcomes of employment and earnings.

Each person's current marital status is indicated by the variable, MARST. The original categories are; 'single'; 'married with spouse present'; 'married with spouse absent'; 'separated'; 'divorced' and 'widowed'. I recategorize the variable in the following manner; 'married' and 'single'. The category 'married' corresponds with 'married, spouse present' in the original categorization. The original categories of 'married, spouse absent', 'divorced' and 'widowed' and 'single' are added to obtain the category, 'single'. 'Married, spouse present' is the reference category.

4. Presence of children below the age of five – Apart from marital status, scholars (Budig and England 2001) have identified the presence of children ('wage penalty' attributable to becoming mothers) to be statistically significantly correlated with employment and earnings.

NCHLT5 gives the number of children that age five or below and are the person's own children living with him or her in the same household. It may be noted that this

---

[40] Gender specialists have argued that there is a gender difference in the preference by marital status. While married men are preferred by employers, same is not the case with married women.
[41] A pioneering work on immigrant earnings relative to native born done by an economist, models marital status as an independent variable (Chiswick 1978).

variable is used as a dichotomous one; a) children below age 5 and b) no children below age 5. 'No children below age 5' serves as the reference category.

Independent Variables: Household Level Analyses

In case of the analyses at the level of the household, I include the human capital, assimilation, and demographic attributes listed above for the head of the household. Apart from the individual level attributes, a host of household level characteristics such as total annual number of household work hours, household size, household structure, ethnic homogeneity, and region of residence are taken into account as explanatory variables in the multivariate framework.

Following the standard practice in the literature, a household's ethnic and nativity status is identified by the person who reports himself/herself as the householder. Further, the criteria used for the nuclear and nonnuclear categorization is driven by the relationship to the householder. In other words, the relationship of a particular household member with the householder determines whether the person is a nuclear or a nonnuclear member.

The ethnic and nativity status identity of the household is identified from that of the householder. The basis for defining the ethnic and nativity status of the householders is same that adopted for men and women in the individual level analyses. The measurement of the human capital, assimilation, and demographic characteristics of the householder coincides with the individual level analyses. I therefore do not restate them[42].

In the following lines, I list the variables that have been additionally used for conducting the analyses at the household level.

---

[42] I do not include occupational and type of work characteristics of the householder.

Log of hourly earnings of the householder

This objective of including this variable is to capture the economic dimension of the household in the regression with the likelihood of living in nuclear household. It is derived in the exact similar fashion as is done at the individual level.

Annual total number of household work hours

Annual total number of work hours is calculated by adding the number of hours put by all the household members belonging to a household in 1999. The work hours for each member is arrived at in a similar way as mentioned before using the variables; number of weeks worked (WKSWORK1) and the usual hours worked per week (UHRSWORK) during the preceding year.

Household size

Household size of a household, a continuous variable, is computed by adding the number of members who reported as belonging to that household.

Household type

This variable has 2 categories; nuclear and nonnuclear for the regression analyses undertaken for the universe of all households. The nuclear household serves as the reference category. The typology has been created in the following way[43];

a) nuclear – a household including a householder, spouse and/or single dependent unmarried children of age 24 or below but no other individuals.

b) nonnuclear – the residual category, a households that does not classify as nuclear is categorized as nonnuclear.

---

[43] There can expectedly be other criteria than the one used above to categorize nuclear-nonnuclear types of household extension.

The above classification is based on the degree of extension and the categories are mutually exclusive. It may be noted that not all studies use age 24 as the cut-off (Angel and Tienda 1982). My choice of age 24 as the cut-off is both to be in line with some recent work (Glick et.al 1997) and to account for intergroup differences, particularly so for the foreign born, in whether age 18 is the benchmark of reaching adulthood.

Ethnic homogeneity

The two categories of this dichotomous variable are a) ethnically homogenous and b) multi-ethnic. Multi-ethnic households are those that have one or more member whose ethnicity status is not the same as that of the householder. The reference category is ethnically homogenous households.

A catalogue of the description of the dependent and independent variables is presented in Appendix Table 4.1.

Analyses Strategy and Techniques

I conduct descriptive as well as regression analyses. I present the statistical profile of the men and women belonging to the seven ethnic groups both by themselves and in comparison to one another. The regression analyses help predict the dependent variables based on the observed values of the various independent variables (Allison 1999).

For the descriptives, I present the univariate distribution of the variables and in few instances, the bivariate statistics between the dependent and the independent variables. In addition, the summary statistics of the independent and the dependent variables used in the regression analyses are provided separately for the individual –men, and women and household levels.

Multivariate Regression

I adopt a combination of statistical techniques to conduct the multivariate regression analyses at the individual (men and women) and household levels; probit, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS henceforth) and logistic regression. The probit technique is used to predict the probability of employment at the individual level. OLS regression methodology is used to predict hourly earnings at the individual level and the three measures of household income at the level of the household. I employ the binary logistic technique at the household level to predict the likelihood of adopting a nuclear in contrast to a nonnuclear household for the sample of all households.

The estimates of the employment and the earnings equations for the analyses on women warrant some further description. The literature examining women's earnings particularly that of minorities is concerned with the discrepancy between the offered (observed) wages and the reservation wages and therefore the women who choose to work are a select group. The contention is that not accounting for that discrepancy and therefore the selection effect leads to a bias in the earnings estimates [44]. A very widely used technique to correct for such a selection bias is the Heckman selection procedure, named after James Heckman who put forward the technique[45]. The Heckman procedure can be conducted by either the maximum likelihood method or the two- step procedure, both of which produce efficient estimates. I adopt the maximum likelihood method even though the latter is computationally more efficient. I do this because the two step

---

[44] Econometrically, the bias is similar to the one that arises when there is an omitted variable, that is the error term and the explanatory variable are related. In this case, of the problem of sample selection, the data are missing on the dependent variable instead of the data missing on some explanatory variables as with the standard omitted variable bias problem (Heckman 1979, Winship and Mare 1992).

[45] The wide usage of the technique is not without the increasing recognition of its shortcomings. Even small misspecification/s of the model can lead to large biases in the estimation and therefore make the robustness of the estimation questionable (Blau and Beller 1992; Winship and Mare 1992).

procedure does not allow the use of weights (STATA manual, page 68-69). I present the results for the employment and the earnings regressions separately even though the maximum likelihood method jointly estimates the employment probability and earnings. The exclusion restriction in the selection equation is what has been commonly used in the literature, the binary indicator variable namely, presence of young (in this case below age 5) children.

The basic analytic strategy applicable to both the individual and household level of analyses is the following. The regression analyses, for probit, OLS, and logistic procedures, moves through a set of models at the individual levels. The different specifications assess a) the change in the correlation of the central variable of interest, ethnicity from its bi-variate association with the left hand side variable to the multivariate one on the addition of the other explanatory variables and b) the stability of the coefficients.

First the multivariate analyses is conducted for the pooled samples of; a) the six foreign born Asian and white groups and b) six native born Asian and white groups. The next step at the individual level is to examine the role of nativity for each of the six Asian groups. I conduct the disaggregated analyses on the six pooled (foreign and native born) Asian samples, nativity status being the central variable of interest. At the level of the household, I run the disaggregated analysis to estimate the likelihood of the household to be nuclear on six foreign-born Asian and seven (six Asian + white) native born groups. To evaluate the economic outcomes of the aggregate Asian ethnicity relative to whites, I replicate these regressions with the foreign born and native born Asians as an aggregate group rather than as the six separate groups.

An alternative to conducting the disaggregated analyses for the six Asian (foreign and native born pooled samples) or for the 13 groups is to introduce the interaction term between ethnicity and nativity status or ethnicity and education (or accordingly whichever is the variable of interest). The coefficients on the interaction terms would tell us the average difference between belonging to a particular ethnicity and nativity status or belonging to a particular educational category (or whichever is the variable of interest) relative to the reference category. I choose the splitting of the samples by ethnicity and/or nativity status instead, for the both individual and household level analyses in the interest of simplicity. Additionally, disaggregated analyses enable a comparison of several variables simultaneously. I employ the Chow test statistic to examine the statistically significant difference between samples for the estimates of interest.

All the descriptive and regression analyses are weighted. In case of the multiple regressions, the (STATA) robust command is used to correct for the possible heteroschedasticity.

Decomposition: Reweighting

An relatively new technique to decompose the earning gaps at the individual (men and women levels) is a form of non-parametric method called reweighting, It basically entails reweighting the distribution of the comparison group, white, in such a way that the distribution of all the explanatory variables of the resultant white synthetic population is coincident with the observed distribution of the explanatory variables for the (Asian) minority groups. The advantage of this procedure, is that unlike the linear regression decomposition, it does not assume a specific functional form of the relationship between the right hand side variables and the outcome variable. Additionally, the reweighting

procedure allows estimates of the intergroup differences in the dependent variable at various points in the distribution and not merely at the center of the distribution. I choose to evaluate the earning gaps at three levels; mean, median, and 90th percentile. I consider an existence of earnings gap at the 90th percentile as evidence for a 'glass ceiling'.

Following the above reweighting procedure in the present case means that the distribution of the human capital (educational attainments, years of work experience, English language ability, acquired U.S. college education), occupational (occupational category and type of work), assimilation (duration of stay or nativity status), and demographic (region of residence, whether residing in the metro area and marital status) characteristics of Asian men or women is imposed upon the white men or women population. Subsequent earning distribution obtained for the white population answers the question; what would be the earnings of the white population if they follow the distribution of the explanatory variables observed by the Asian groups. The gap between the new (after reweighting) earnings with the actual earnings of the whites would be an estimate of the unexplained portion of the earning gap.

The subsequent three chapters present the empirical results emerging from the analyses at the individual and household levels. The next two chapters focus on individual level investigations, on men and women respectively. Chapter 7 presents the household level assessment.

Chapter 5

Employment and Earnings: Men

The central question addressed in this chapter is: how do foreign and native born Chinese, Filipino, Indian, Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese men aged 25-65 fare with regard to employment and hourly earnings relative to white men? The analyses proceed in three steps. First, I present the weighted descriptive distributions of the dependent and the independent variables by ethnicity and nativity status. Second, I employ multivariate regression analyses to assess the intergroup variation in the relationship between the independent variables and probability of employment and logarithm of hourly earnings. Third, I explore the use of non-parametric weights as a technique to understand the intergroup earning gaps. For the purposes of the OLS regressions, the standard human capital function that includes assimilation and demographic variables is adopted.

Employment and Hourly Earnings

Table 5.1 presents employment rates and hourly earnings of Asian men -both in absolute terms and relative to whites. The employment rates for Asian men regardless of their nativity status are comparable to those of the whites. Chinese (87.8 percent), Korean (88 percent), and Vietnamese (86.6 percent) men experience marginally lower employment rates than whites (88.7 percent) whereas all the native born Asian groups demonstrate a slightly higher employment rate when compared to whites (90 percent or above). The percentage employed of the foreign and native born Asian men as an aggregate group is again a little higher than that for whites. Within the Asian population, the native born groups consistently experience a slightly higher employment rate (2-3 percentage points) as compared to their foreign born counterparts with Indians and

Japanese being the two exceptions. Foreign born Indians and Japanese experience marginally higher employment rate than their native born population groups. Intergroup variation with respect to the number of weeks and number of usual hours worked per week is minimal. (See columns 5 and 6, Table 5.1).

Table 5.1 about here

The hourly earning comparisons reveal that nativity status is a critical factor for all the Asian groups. Native born men enjoy higher levels of hourly earnings as compared to the foreign born men. The Indian and the Japanese men are again an exception to this pattern. Foreign born Indians and Japanese earn more than their native born counterparts. Foreign born Indians and the Japanese are also the only two foreign born groups that experience a median hourly earning[46] advantage relative to whites. All the other foreign born groups have median hourly earnings less than whites. (See column 6, Table 5.1).

In contrast, the native born Asian groups with the exceptions of the Filipinos and the Vietnamese, experience median hourly earnings ratio greater than one. This suggests that native born Chinese, Indians, Japanese, and Koreans earn more than the reference group, white males (See column 6, Table 5.1). In the case of the native born Filipinos and Vietnamese, the hourly earning gap relative to whites is not substantial. The geometric mean hourly earnings ratios match closely the median hourly earnings ratios. (See column 7, Table 5.1)[47].

Beginning with the pioneering work by Chiswick (1978a), the human capital variables have consistently emerged as critical in studies that examine the economic

---

[46] I present median instead of mean hourly earning ratios since median is a more commonly used measure of central tendency when presenting earnings distribution.

[47] Geometric mean hourly earnings ratios are provided because it is the geometric (and not arithmetic) mean that becomes relevant when the logarithmic transformation of the earnings is taken.

outcomes for immigrants. Table 5.2 describes education, potential years of work experience, and English language ability of each of the Asian groups.

Education

Within the foreign born Asian group, a relatively large percentage of Chinese (52.8), Filipino (55.4), Korean (48.8) and Vietnamese (81.2) men have less than a college degree. The proportion of foreign born men possessing a masters/professional/doctorate degree is the highest for the Indians (48.2 percent) followed by the Chinese (33.0 percent), Japanese (24.3 percent), Korean (19.6), Filipino (7.6 percent) and Vietnamese (5.2 percent).

Table 5.2 about here

Overall the foreign born Asian population men are better educated than white men, a fact corroborated with the statistics relating to the educational attainments of the aggregate foreign born Asian group. The foreign born Asian–white subgroup comparisons also depict higher educational attainment for the foreign born Asians relative to whites except for the Vietnamese. Although the percentage of (foreign born) Chinese with a college degree is lower than that for whites, the same is not the case with the proportion with a masters/professional/doctorate degree. The percentage of foreign born Chinese men possessing masters/professional/doctorate degree in 2000 is three times higher than that for whites.

The native born Asian population too is better educated than their white counterparts both among the individual Asian subgroups as well as among the aggregate native born Asian population. Further native born Vietnamese, unlike the foreign born Vietnamese experience higher educational attainments than whites.

In addition to the quantity dimension of educational attainments there have been attempts (Chiswick 1978a; Schoeni 1997; Friedberg 2000; Zeng and Xie 2004) to employ some kind of proxy for the quality of education to get a more complete picture of the relationship between education and economic outcomes. In the context of the foreign born, a commonly used proxy (for quality of education) in the literature has been the place of having received the education (in the current analyses, U.S. versus outside the U.S.). The statistic presented in column 5, of Table 5.2 indicates that the percentage of foreign born men who are likely to have received a college or a higher degree in the U.S. ranges between 9.7 (for Filipinos) and 28.6 (for Indians). The percentage of Japanese men (11.8 percent) who are likely to seek a college or higher degree in the U.S. is higher than that for Vietnamese (10.6 percent) but lower than for the Chinese (16.8 percent), Koreans (13.6 percent), and Indians (28.6 percent). A lower percentage figure for Japanese (relative to Chinese, Indians, and Koreans) can perhaps be explained by their lesser need to rely on a U.S. college degree to ensure skill transferability in the U.S. labor market. As an aggregate group, 16.6 percent of foreign born Asians are estimated to have received a college or higher degree in the U.S.

It may be noted that I employ a spline transformation of the education variable in place of dummies in the earning regression specification that does not account for the place of acquisition of education. The three splines that that I use match with the educational categories discussed above; 1-12 years of education, 13 –16 years of education, more than 16 years of education. The intergroup patterns observed for mean years of education are similar to those with respect to the educational dummies. (See column 6, Table 5.2)

Potential years of work experience and English language ability

The distribution of potential years of work experience (column 7, Table 5.2) shows that among the foreign born population, Indians have the lowest years of work experience while the Vietnamese have the highest. This is reflective of the age and the recency of immigration – foreign born Vietnamese are older, having much higher percentage migrating in the 1970s relative to the other groups who migrated recently. Except for the Indians and Japanese, foreign born Asians have a greater number of potential years of work experience than whites. All the native born Asian groups have lower potential years of work experience than their corresponding foreign born groups. Also, native born Asians have lower potential years of work experience than their white peers. This is largely a function of the relatively young age of the native born Asians, given the recency of the major Asian immigration stream to the U.S.

English language proficiency has convincingly been identified as yet another foreign born specific human capital variable that is important. The percentage of foreign born Chinese men who speak no English is the highest at 12.4 and is notably higher than that for the Japanese (0.6), Koreans (2.6) and Vietnamese (3.9). The proportion of Chinese men who speak English only or very well is however comparable to what it is for the Japanese, Koreans, and the Vietnamese. (See column 10, Table 5.2). The groups with the greatest English facility are Filipinos and Indians. There is a negligible percent of Filipinos and Indians who cannot speak the language and the percentages who speak English only or very well (64.7 percent of Filipino and 78.3 percent of Indians) is quite high. On average, for the aggregated Asian population, nearly 50 percent of the foreign born report speaking English only or very well.

Occupation and Type of work

The occupational distribution across the major occupational categories is presented in Table 5.3. The intergroup comparisons within the foreign born Asian population indicate that; a) the percentage of population occupied in service and sales occupations ranges between 20 and 30 percent for all the groups except for the Indians (see columns 2 and 3, Table 5.3) and b) nearly 70 percent of Indians and 63.2 percent of the Japanese work in professional/managerial/business occupations. (See column 8, Table 5.3).

Table 5.3 about here

The proportion of the native born population in sales and service kinds of jobs is lower than among the foreign born population except for the Indians and the Vietnamese. In the case of Indians, the proportion of the native born population working in sales and service is greater than that for the foreign born, while this proportion is the same for the foreign and native born Vietnamese. The percentage of the native born population engaged in business/managerial/professional occupations is higher than among foreign born counterparts for all Asian groups except for the Indians and the Japanese.

The Asian-white comparisons show that the percentage of native born Asians engaged in service and sales occupations is comparable to that of whites. With the exception of foreign born Vietnamese, there is an equivalent or higher percentage of foreign and native born Asians relative to whites in business/managerial/professional occupations.

In the case of the foreign born, a considerable body of work examining the association between self-employment and earnings attainment indicates a positive relationship between the two. In the foreign born population, self –employment rates are

the highest for Korean (35.2 percent) and the lowest for Filipino (6.6) men. The self –

employment rates for the rest of the four Asian groups is around 13 percent. All the

native born groups consistently show lower self-employment rates compared to their

foreign born counterparts. Whites experience higher self –employment rates (14.1

percent) compared to all foreign and native born Asian groups except the foreign born

Koreans. (See column 10, Table 5.3).

Assimilation and Demographic Characteristics

Table 5.4 displays data on duration of stay, an indicator of assimilation as well as

on residential patterns and marital status. Though theoretically, the assimilation process is

applicable to the entire population of Asian descent, the variable to measure assimilation

'duration of stay (in the U.S.)', is applicable only to the foreign born. The population of

foreign born Indian and Japanese men has lived in the U.S. for a relatively shorter period

with 51.7 and 61.0 percent of them respectively having lived in the U.S. for less than 10

years. The corresponding percentages are lower for the Chinese (44.3), Filipinos (31.6),

Koreans (33.4) and the Vietnamese (41.0).   (See column 2, Table 5.4). Foreign born

Filipinos have been in the U.S. the longest, with nearly one third of them having lived

here for more than 20 years.

Table 5.4 about here

Geographic residence is related to economic outcomes since living in the South

and in rural (non-metro) areas is related to lower outcomes. With the exception of foreign

and native born Indians, more than a third of foreign and native born Asian population is

concentrated in the Pacific region (which includes the states of Alaska, California,

Hawaii, Oregon, Washington) irrespective of nativity status. The foreign and native born

Asian concentration in the Pacific region is in contrast with that of the whites with 13 percent (of white population) living in the Pacific region.

Among the foreign born, the proportion of Filipino men living in the Pacific region is 63.8. The corresponding percentages for the foreign born Japanese, Koreans, and Vietnamese are nearly 45 percent. Foreign born Indians appear to be the most spatially dispersed group among the foreign born with a quarter of them living in the South and nearly one third in the Northeast.

The native born, on average, are geographically as concentrated or more concentrated than the foreign born. The percentage of native born Chinese, Filipino, Indian, and Japanese population groups residing in the Pacific region is greater than that for their foreign born peers. In case of the Japanese, this percentage of native born Japanese living in the Pacific (83) is almost double that of the foreign born (44).

As far as metro residence is concerned, all the Asian groups, foreign as well as native, are overwhelmingly concentrated in metropolitan areas. Nearly 90 percent or more of all foreign and native born Asians reside in the metro areas compared to 54 percent of the whites. (See column 10, Table 5.4).

The final column of Table 5.4 shows the percentage of men who are married and living with a spouse among each group. Past work shows married men tend to have higher labor force participation rates and earnings. The majority of foreign born Asian men aged 25-65 are married and living with their spouse. The percentages are lowest for the foreign born Japanese (68.1) and Vietnamese (67.7) and are the highest for the Chinese (78.0) and the Koreans (81.1).

Nativity contrasts are evident with the percentage of native born men being married lower than that for their foreign born counterparts. Part of this can be explained by the compositional differences between the foreign and the native born population. The average age of the native born Asian men is lower than that of the foreign born Asian men as indicated by the statistics for years of work experience in Table 5.2 (column 7).

In sum, the above descriptive analyses indicate that foreign and native born Asian groups relative to whites experience a mix of favorable and not so favorable characteristics with respect to their probability of employment and likelihood of high earnings. On average foreign born Asians seem to be better endowed than whites when considering educational attainments except for the Chinese and Vietnamese. While the Vietnamese seem to have a lower average educational attainment, Chinese show a wider dispersion. In case of the foreign born Filipinos, a relatively low percentage of population has received higher education but the group's greater number of years of work experience, longer stay in the U.S., and greater English language proficiency may offset it's higher education disadvantage.

Foreign born Japanese experience higher level of earnings relative to other Asian groups and whites. One of the explanations for the higher earnings of the foreign born Japanese (as seen in Table 5.1) can be found in the high percentage of them who are college graduates, but why their earnings are higher than foreign born Indians nevertheless remains intriguing. A higher percentage of foreign born Indians possess a masters/doctorate/professional degree, have acquired a college or higher degree in the U.S., speak only English or very well, all the characteristics that have been found to be positively associated with the labor market outcomes of employment and earnings. I

discuss the explanations offered by past research on the relatively better performance of Japanese later.

In the case of the native born Asians, the favorable characteristics of higher percentage of them in business/managerial/professional operations; of nearly all of them speaking only English or very well, of residing in the Pacific region and in metro areas coexist with the not so favorable characteristics of a higher percentage of them being unmarried, and being younger than the foreign born for most groups. Multivariate analyses therefore, are essential to account for which favorable factors are offset by which of the disadvantages for each group relative to whites.

Multivariate Analyses

For the multivariate analyses, the following analytic strategy is adopted. First the analyses are conducted for the pooled samples of; a) foreign born Asian men and white men and b) native born Asian men and white men[48]. In both the above pooled regressions white men is the reference category.

The coefficient for ethnicity is of particular interest both within as well as across each of the above two regressions. A comparison across the two pooled regressions informs us as to whether nativity differences are statistically significant. To examine whether these differences are significant, I conduct the Chow test of statistical significance across regression models that do not use the same samples.

Since one of the goals of the present analyses is to examine the association of nativity status with employment chances and earnings, the next set of regressions comprise separate multivariate models for each of the six foreign and native Asian pooled

---

[48] In the interest of brevity, I henceforth refer to the first pooled sample as foreign born sample even though it includes white men population as the comparison group and second pooled sample as native born sample.

samples. Such analyses disaggregated by ethnicity help us understand the correlation of nativity status with economic outcomes for each of the six Asian groups. Further, the Chow test is repeated to examine whether the apparent variations in the coefficients for the different ethnicity–nativity categories are statistically significant or not.

As a reminder, I use the probit model to predict the probability of employment and OLS regression to predict hourly earnings. Since the interpretation of the probit coefficients is not straightforward, I choose to present the marginal effects on the response probabilities. In other words, I report the change in probability (in getting employed in this case) with an increment in each independent continuous variable and the discrete change (from 0 to 1) in the dummy variables. The interpretation of the marginal effects is therefore parallel to the interpretation of the OLS coefficients.

Further, owing to the large sample sizes, the coefficients associated with the majority of the variables are statistically significant at the confidence coefficient of 0.95 or higher. The discussion will therefore be geared towards the direction and the magnitude of the coefficients in the case of the significant coefficients.

In both the employment and the earning equations, stepwise regression models[49] are run. The first specification shows the bi-variate association between the probability of employment/logarithm of hourly earnings with ethnicity. The next model includes the human capital, assimilation, and the demographic characteristics. The subsequent models adjust for having received college or a higher degree in the U.S. in the case of the foreign born Asian population. The ethnic group that serves as the reference category in all the analyses is whites. The estimates of the employment and earnings regressions on the

---

[49] The models are nested for the native born sample. In case of the foreign born sample, Models 1 and 2 are nested. Model 3 as is explained later uses a different measure of educational attainment than the one used in Model 2 and therefore is not nested.

pooled samples are respectively presented in tables 5.5 and 5.6. The tables are divided in panels, A for the foreign born and B for the native born. Appendix tables 5.1A and 5.1B provide the summary statistics for the dependent and independent variables.

Employment

Table 5.5 presents the marginal effects (and robust standard error)[50] from the probit estimates of employment for the pooled samples of a) foreign born Asian and white men and b) native born Asian and white men. The central findings from Table 5.5 are as follows.

Model 1 shows the bi-variate association between ethnicity and likelihood of employment. Foreign born Filipino, Indian, and Japanese men have a (statistically) significantly greater chance than white men of being employed. The estimates show that the probability of holding a job is 0.9, 4.6, and 4.4 percent greater for Filipinos, Indians, and Japanese respectively than for whites. The Chinese, Koreans, and Vietnamese either experience no statistically significant difference or a disadvantage. (See column 2, Table 5.5).

In the full model, Model 2, the employment probabilities for all the foreign born Asian groups (except Koreans), relative to whites, become positive with the magnitude of the marginal effects ranging between 2 and nearly 4 percent. In Model 3, the adjustment for whether college or higher education was received in the U.S. increases the probability of employment for all the foreign born Asian groups without changing the relative position (when compared to Model 2) of the groups vis-a vis whites. The consistent increase in the coefficients on ethnicity across all the foreign born groups reinforces the

---

[50] Note that in order to have two significant digits for the marginal effects and one significant digit for the standard error, the numbers in Table 5.5 often have more than two decimal points.

positive relationship between acquisition of human capital in the U.S. with the probability of employment.

In contrast, the employment prospects of the native born Asian population do not appear to be that positive upon including the control variables. In the bivariate case (in Model 1, column 5, Table 5.5) all the Asian groups experience higher probabilities of getting hired than whites. In the full model (Model 2, column 6, Table 5.5) all the Asian groups except for the Chinese and the Japanese have a lower probability of acquiring employment than whites. While the probability of being employed for the Chinese is not significantly different from that for the white men, the Japanese experience a 1.3 percent greater chance of being employed in comparison to the whites[51].

I conduct the Chow test to examine whether the ethnicity estimates obtained in Model 2, for the sample of six foreign born Asian (including white as the reference) and the sample of six native born Asian (including white as the reference) are statistically significantly different from one another. The Chow test statistics show that the marginal effects of the six foreign born Asian groups (column 3, Panel A, Table 5.5) are statistically significantly different from their native born counterparts (column 6, Panel B, Table 5.5) for all the six Asian groups. Hence, though both the extent of advantage for the foreign born and the disadvantage for the native born is not high, the foreign born Asian population, on average, experiences a greater chance of employment relative to the native born (Asian) population.

---

[51] The full model, Model 2 in Panel B, Table 5.5 is comparable to the analyses done by Chiswick (1983)[51] with the three native born Asian groups; Chinese, Filipino, and the Japanese. Using the 1970 Census data, Chiswick finds that the Japanese work for a statistically significant greater number of weeks while the number of weeks of work of the Filipinos and Chinese are not statistically significant as compared to those of whites. I replicate the regression analysis (not reported here) and find the results are similar except for the Filipinos. In year 1999, unlike in 1969, the Filipinos work statistically significant fewer number of weeks suggesting that the native born Filipino men's employment situation has worsened relative to that of their white counterparts over the three decade period (between 1969 and 1999).

Table 5.5 about here

Relative to having a masters/professional/doctorate degree, the probability of employment is (2.9 percent) lower for a person who does not have a college degree. The same cannot be said for someone who has a college education. College education relative to having a masters or higher/professional degree raises the probability of employment by nearly 1 percent. (See columns 3 and 6, Table 5.5). This estimate is not as counter-intuitive as it appears to be. Men with masters/professional/doctorate degree are in all probability targeting a job market that is more competitive (relative to that available for college degree holders) and therefore experience a lower likelihood of employment Not having acquired a college/higher degree in the U.S. versus outside of the U.S. is associated with 6.1 percent lower probability of employment (Model 2).

The other two human capital characteristics, years of work experience and English language ability (in case of the foreign born), behave as expected. Not speaking English at all or not speaking English very well, relative to speaking English only or very well reduces the chance of employment by about 5 -6 percent and nearly 3 percent respectively in the population of foreign born Asian men (see columns 3 and 4, Table 5.5). Longer duration of stay in the U.S. enhances the chances of finding jobs in the U.S. labor market.

The coefficient for the region of residence indicates that both foreign as well as native born people living in regions other than the Pacific[52] experience greater chances of being employed. The greatest advantage is enjoyed by people living in the Midwest with 2.7 percent higher probability of employment relative to those living in the Pacific.

---

[52] As a reminder, the Pacific region, wherever referred to, includes the states of Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington.

Similarly, metropolitan residence raises the probability of employment relative to living in a non metropolitan area by about 2 percent in both the samples. Married men with spouse present, experience an 11 percent greater chance of employment both among the foreign as well as the native born population.

Earnings

Do higher employment probabilities of all the foreign born Asian groups relative to their native born counterparts and to whites translate into an earnings advantage too when examined in a multiple regression framework? The estimates (standard error) from the earnings regression are presented in Table 5.6.

Model 1 shows that foreign born Asian groups with the exceptions of the Indians and the Japanese experience an earning disadvantage relative to the whites. The most disadvantaged group (Model 1, column 2, Panel A, Table 5.6) is the Vietnamese. The Japanese (coefficient 0.44) and Indians (coefficient 0.30) earn 55 and 35 percent more respectively than the whites (Model 1, column 2, Panel A, Table 5.6).

In model 2, the full model, the advantage of Indians disappears and the disadvantage of other groups is enhanced except for that of the Vietnamese. The Japanese coefficient continues to be positive (see columns 2 and 3, Panel A, Table 5.6). In Model 3 (see column 4, Panel A, Table 5.6), the spline function for the variable, years of education, is replaced by the variable of whether education was received in the U.S. The estimates (in Model 3) show disadvantage of all the groups except for the Indians and the Japanese and an increase in the magnitude of the positive Japanese coefficient. In the case of the Indians, after accounting for the place of education, there is a slight advantage with India born Indian men earning 5 percent more than whites. Given that the positive

self-selection of the foreign born population has been well documented in the literature (Feliciano 2005), it is probable that the foreign born Asians who receive college or higher degrees in the U.S. on average receive those degrees from prestigious institutions to a greater extent than whites. Also, there is evidence that foreign born Asians who come to the U.S. for higher education are disproportionately concentrated in disciplines such as engineering that are financially remunerative (Tang 2000; National Science Foundation 2007).

The earning experience of the native born Asian sample relative to whites is not the same as that of the foreign born Asians. The native born Asians, barring the Filipinos and Vietnamese, earn more than white men (Model 1, column 5, Panel B, Table 5.6). The full specification (Model 2, column 5, Panel B, Table 5.6) shows that the Filipino and the Japanese earn less while the earnings of the rest of the groups are not statistically significantly different from whites. The estimates for all the groups except for the Filipinos and Vietnamese change between the Model 1 and Model 2, from being positive and statistically significant to either becoming negative or non-significant. The change in the case of the Chinese and the Japanese seems to be most noticeable. For the Chinese, the statistically significant advantage of 27 percent in Model 1 changes to no statistically significant difference relative to whites. In the case of the Japanese an earning advantage vis-à-vis whites in Model 1 transforms to a disadvantage in the model with controls, Model 2. (See columns 5 and 6, Panel B, Table 5.6)

The Chow tests of the differences between the foreign born and native born are all significant at confidence coefficient of 0.95. When place of education is not taken into account all foreign born Asian groups experience an earnings disadvantage compared to

native born Asians except for the Japanese. The only foreign born group whose relative position changes when accounting for U.S. education is the Indians. Foreign born Indians, subsequent to the accounting for place of education, experience a slight advantage compared to their native born peers.

Table 5.6 about here

The estimates for the three (years of education) splines are positive for the foreign and the native born samples. This indicates that within each of the years of educational attainment category, an additional year of schooling is associated with higher earnings. Further, the coefficients of the splines among the foreign and the native born groups are similar. The coefficient of the category, '13-16 years of education' is the higher than that that of 'more than 16 years of education' within the foreign and native born samples. This suggests that an additional year of schooling for individuals with 13-16 years of education is associated with higher earnings relative to those with more than 16 years of schooling. This conforms to the previously discussed results indicating that college relative to higher than college education correlates with greater chances of employment for the foreign and the native born samples.

English language ability, non-U.S. years of work experience, and whether the foreign born individual received U.S. education, all have the expected associations with the logarithm of hourly earnings for the foreign born (see columns 3 and 4, Panel A, Table 5.6). The disadvantages of not knowing English are high with the estimates being -0.27 for someone who does not speak English at all and -0.10 for someone who speaks English well or not well relative to someone who speaks English only or very well. This implies that the person who does not speak at all and the person who speaks not well or

well earns 23.7 and 9.6 percent less respectively than a person who speaks English only or very well. The disadvantage associated with poor language proficiency exists even after the place of having received the highest degree is taken into account, with those not speaking English at all, being at a considerable disadvantage. (See column 4, Panel A, Table 5.6).This may be partly due to the endogenity between English language ability and the acquisition of a college or higher degree in the U.S. Those with better language ability are more likely to enroll in school as well as more likely to experience further improvement in their language ability[53].

The coefficients pertaining to the demographic factors, region of residence and marital status, confirm previous research findings for both the foreign and native born samples. Earnings are higher in the Pacific region, higher in the metro regions and higher for those who are married. Men living in the region, 'Rest of the West' experience the greatest disadvantage relative to those living in the Pacific region. Living in the metro region relative to not living in the metro region is positively correlated with earnings.

Role of Nativity Status

Since the evaluation of the role of foreign birth is one of the primary objectives of these analyses, I run the regressions separately on the sample of each of the six Asian groups. The analytic sample for each of the groups consists of the foreign and native born men belonging to the respective Asian ethnicity with nativity status as one of the variables. The estimates for the variable, 'nativity status' emerging from those regressions can be found in Table 5.7. The estimates for all the right hand side variables modeled are displayed in Appendix Table 5.2.

---

[53]This endogenity does not seem to lead to serious identification issue going by the fact that there are analyses that use U.S. education acquisition and English language ability simultaneously (Dodoo 1997). Further, the variable of interest in this analysis is ethnicity.

Table 5.7 about here

Except for the Chinese and the Filipinos, foreign born Asian groups do not experience a disadvantage when compared to their native born counterparts. Foreign born Indians, Japanese, and Vietnamese earn statistically significantly more than their native born counterparts as indicated by the statistical significance of the dummy variable of nativity status[54]. In the case of the Koreans, the dummy variable denoting nativity status is not statistically significant suggesting that there is no statistically significant difference between the earnings of the foreign born from those of the native born. (See column 6, Table 5.7). When looking at the aggregate Asian category however, being foreign born Asian is correlated with statistically significantly lower earnings relative to being native born[55].

Reweighting

The reweighted earning distribution obtained for the white male population answers the question; what would be the earnings of white men if they had the distribution on the explanatory variables of men belonging to the six Asian groups? The gap between the new (after reweighting) white earnings with the observed (actual) earnings of the Asians is an estimate of the 'unexplained' portion of the Asian –white earning gap. The explanatory variables remain the same as those in the regression analyses: human capital (educational attainments, years of work experience, English

---

[54] In an alternative specification (not reported) which accounts for the place of acquisition of education, the estimates show the foreign birth disadvantage lowers for the groups which indicate lower earnings for their foreign born relative to the native born groups. Conversely, the advantage of being foreign born increases for those groups which experience higher earnings for their foreign as compared to the native born members.

[55] The estimates of the aggregate Asian category show that the relative (to white) disadvantage of foreign born Asian is greater than that of the native born. The results from the regression analyses using Asian as an aggregate group appear in Appendix Table 5.3 through 5.5.

language ability, acquired U.S. college education), occupational (occupational category and type of work), assimilation (duration of stay or nativity status), and demographic (region of residence, whether residing in the metro area and marital status) characteristics.

The results of the reweighting procedure are presented in Table 5.8. As the reweighting procedure allows the estimation of the dependent variable at various points in the distribution, I choose to present the estimates at the median, mean, and 90th percentile. Columns 2-4 portray the observed hourly earnings at mean, median, and at the level of the 90th percentile. The subsequent three columns, 5 through 7 present the reweighted white earnings. For example, Column 5 shows the mean hourly earnings of the white population if it was assigned the characteristic of the respective Asian ethnicity and nativity. Thus, if white men are assigned the characteristics of a foreign born Chinese man, mean hourly earnings of the white man would be $40.2 rather than $25.01, the actual (observed) mean earnings of the white men. To take another illustration, if a white man had the average human capital, assimilation, and demographic characteristics of a native born Vietnamese man, then a white man would be expected to receive a mean hourly earning of $22.65, a median of $17.32 and 90th percentile earning of $45.19. The corresponding observed hourly earnings of white men when following the white men's distribution are $25.01, $17.26, and $40.0.

Table 5.8 about here

The highlights of the reweighting procedure are as follows. First, except for the Japanese (and Filipinos when the mean level of earnings is considered), the ratio of observed Asian to reweighted white earnings of all the foreign born groups is lower than

1 (see columns 8 through 10). This suggests that foreign born Asian men earn less that what native born white men would earn if they (white) had the same distribution of human capital, assimilation, and demographic attributes as Asian men.

Second, in the case of the native born Asian-white comparison, the Asian-white earnings ratio is less than one for the majority of the groups at the mean and median levels of hourly earning. Native born Chinese and Japanese appear to be exceptions to the above pattern (see columns 8 and 9 and the rows corresponding to native born, Table 5.8). This again suggests that white men are less accomplished than their Asian peers, on average, and this factor needs to be taken into account. Once it is, at the same levels of endowments as Asian men, white men would earn more than what (native born) Asian men do. Hence foreign and native born Asian men earn lower than white men at the same level of productive characteristics, this (Asian –white) gap is greater for the foreign than the native born.

Finally, the foreign born Asian-white earning ratio is more unfavorable at the 90th percentile of the hourly earning distribution compared to the mean or median earning levels for some of the groups such as Filipinos, Indians, and Koreans. Some of the native born Asian groups like Filipinos, Indians, and the Japanese experience greater disadvantage at the higher relative to lower levels of earnings (see columns 8 through 10, Table 5.9). This pattern of the distribution of intergroup earning gaps might indicate the presence of a 'glass ceiling' for these subgroups of Asian men.

Discussion

Descriptively, Asian men on average experience high socioeconomic status relative to white men as of year 2000. At the same time the heterogeneity that has been

observed within (foreign versus native born) and between Asian groups, in earlier pieces of scholarship is evident from the statistic presented in this study.

The regression analyses indicate a) an employment advantage for foreign born men relative to whites and b) that native born Asian men experience lower likelihood of employment. In the case of earnings however the relative Asian –white position reverses with a) a disadvantage for foreign born men relative to whites and b) an advantage or no statistically significant difference of native born Asian men with reference to whites.

The factors contributing to the employment chances of the various Asian ethnicities, particularly for the foreign born may vary among groups. The advantage of some of the groups such as the Chinese and the Vietnamese after the controls may be an illustration of the well argued existence of a secondary labor market and ethnic enclaves (Zhou and Logan 1989; Rumbaut 2000). In case of the Koreans, similar employment rates as those of whites seen in the bi-variate and multivariate specifications (Models 1 and 2, Panel A, Table 5.5) can perhaps be explained by their high self –employment rates (column Table 5.3). In the case of the Indians, the high employment rates may be due to their overrepresentation in disciplines and professions that provide greater employment opportunities (Xie and Goyette 2003). High rates of Japanese employment are usually attributed to the Japanese multi-nationals who hire Japanese from Japan in managerial positions (Fang 1996).

Foreign born Asian men face an earnings disadvantage relative to whites. The discrepancy in the earnings results between the descriptive and the regression analyses validates the 'overachievement hypotheses' that contends that a large part of the observed Asian advantage in earnings is owing to their extra ordinary educational attainments

relative to whites (Hirschman and Wong 1984; Barringer, Takeuchi and Xenos 1990). The unfavorable estimates for earnings get mitigated to an extent, upon accounting for whether an individual received a college degree in the U.S. This confirms the increasing recognition of the significance of the place of acquisition of human capital. The lack of complete information on the kind of education suggests the earning disadvantage evident in the regression analyses as a conservative one.

The Japanese are an exception not only because they experience an earning advantage but also because that they are not the most advantaged group with regard to their skill set. Their educational attainments as well as English language ability, two crucial variables, are lower than among Indians. Additionally, the percentage of foreign born Japanese who have received a college or a higher degree from the U.S. is the lowest among all groups. The factors that have been documented to explain the foreign born Japanese employment advantage may help explain the earning advantage as well. Japanese multi-national companies hire their own nationals in the U.S. at managerial positions. The other favorable factors are the high perception of the Japanese work ethics by U.S. employers, and perhaps greater skill transferability for the Japanese. (Chiswick 1978a, 1979; Borjas 1987, 1988; Jasso and Rosenzweig 1990;Freidberg 2000).

The two groups that are somewhat of a surprise and call for discussion are the Koreans and the Vietnamese. The economic outcomes of Koreans are comparable to the relative worse off Asian groups such as the Chinese or the Vietnamese. This is unexpected given that the majority of the Koreans are economic migrants and Korea is a high income country in the World Bank's ranking of countries as per its Gross National Income. This requires a greater investigation of the quality of education, occupational

niches etc. which the census data do not allow. Also, in case of the Koreans, the lower than expected earnings may be owing to the under reporting of earnings by the self – employed, who constitute nearly 33 percent of all economically active foreign born Korean men aged 25-65 (see Table 5.3).

The Vietnamese are the not the worst performing, contrary to what is expected given their refugee status and that Vietnam is not a country that is socioeconomically well developed which limits their skill transfer to the U.S. A few conjectures that can be made to explain the unexpected pattern are as follows. Most of the Vietnamese who came to the U.S. immediately after the end of the U.S. –Vietnam War in 1975, were an elite group of people. In addition, there is evidence of substantial socioeconomic progress of the Vietnamese in the decade of 1990s (Rumbaut 2000) suggesting the success of the refugee policies.

The analyses of the nativity status variable addresses the larger question of whether it is the ethnicity status of being an Asian that contributes to the disadvantage (Hirschman and Wong 1984) or the nativity status of being foreign born that is responsible for the lower socioeconomic status of this (Asian) minority group (Iceland 1999; Sakamoto et.al 2000; Sakamoto and Furuichi 2002). Following the latter strand of argument, native born Asian men should not be disadvantaged. With the exceptions of native born Filipinos and Japanese, none of the Asian groups experience a statistically significant disadvantage in the multivariate regression analyses. These results combined with positive assimilation coefficient observed for foreign born groups support the argument that foreign birth instead of non-white ethnicity may be more 'critical'.

The results from the reweighting procedure show the earnings disadvantage to be greater for the foreign than the native born Asians, relative to whites. Additionally, the above technique provides insights on the possible existence of a 'glass ceiling' for some of the groups, and the possibility of labor market discrimination at higher attainment levels. Notably, the group that is most well accomplished (with respect to skills), the foreign born Indians, seem to experience this barrier of a glass ceiling the most. Foreign born Indians in the 90th percentile earn only 69 percent of what a comparably endowed white counterpart would.

In sum, these analyses indicate that the foreign birth may be greater factor than non-white status with respect to labor market outcomes. This resonates with the thesis of the 'declining significance of race'. However, number of factors such as the role of the source country, evidence of the possible existence of 'glass ceiling', high positive selection of the foreign born on the unobserved factors such as skill, motivation, lack of information on the quality of education of the foreign and the native born, do not allow for a definitive statement about the role of race/ethnic discrimination.

Chapter 6

Employment and Earnings: Women

The present chapter undertakes the analyses of the labor market outcomes of foreign and native born Asian women. I use descriptive and multiple regression frameworks, parallel to that analyses conducted for men in the preceding chapter. The question that is addressed is; how do foreign and native born Asian women fare relative to white women with regard to central labor market outcomes?

The chapter is organized as follows. The first section provides a descriptive summary of the means and the percentage distributions of the dependent variables, probability of employment and natural logarithm of hourly earnings and the independent variables that are used in the multivariate analyses. Section 2 presents the estimation of employment and earnings equations. It is further divided into three sub-sections. The first two sub-sections focus on the foreign and native born samples separately. The third sub-section presents the estimates from the pooled samples of the foreign and the native born. The purpose of conducting analyses with the pooled samples is to examine the role of nativity. The third section of the chapter presents the distribution of the hourly earnings by ethnicity and nativity, derived by employing a non –parametric estimation technique. The final section summarizes the main findings.

Descriptive Findings

Table 6.1 shows employment and earnings of Asian and white women. The statistics indicate a less favorable position for the foreign born Asians relative to whites. The same cannot be said for the native born Asians. Foreign born Asian women, barring Filipinos, experience lower employment rates (ranging between 51.3 percent for the

Japanese to 70.1 percent for the Chinese) than white women (with an employment rate of 76.1 percent). In the case of native born women, except for the Vietnamese with an employment rate of 70.7 percent, rates for Asian groups hover between 79 to 82 percent, higher than that for the whites. Further, the pattern for the number of weeks and hours weeks worked mirrors that of employment. Apart from the foreign born Filipinos, all the other foreign born Asian groups of women work fewer weeks and hours in the labor market. Native born Asian women, again with the exception of weeks worked per year by Vietnamese women, have greater labor market involvement than white women.

Native born Asian women consistently 'outperform' the foreign born with respect to employment rates as well as labor market hours and weeks of employment. Filipino women are an exception to this with both foreign and native born Filipino women experiencing remarkably high and similar rates of employment, annual number of weeks, and weekly hours.

Table 6.1 about here

With regard to earnings, foreign born Filipinos, Indians, and Japanese women earn more than white women as reflected by the median[56] hourly earning ratios. There is near parity in the case of the (foreign born) Chinese and the Korean women (column 8, Table 6.1). Foreign born Vietnamese women earn about 20 percent less (earnings ratio of 0.81) than white women. The foreign born Indians and the Japanese (with a median hourly earnings ratio of 1.23 and 1.10 respectively) experience higher hourly earnings despite working the lowest number of hours (columns 5 and 6, Table 6.1). The higher

---

[56] I present median in place of mean hourly earnings ratios since median is the preferred measure than mean when evaluating earning distributions.

hourly earnings can perhaps, instead be explained by the better socioeconomic attainments of the Indian and Japanese women, as evident from the next table.

The median hourly earnings ratios (column 8, Table 6.1) indicate that native born Asian women earn more than their white counterparts for all groups except the Vietnamese, though the Vietnamese ratio of 0.95 is close to parity. Foreign and native born Asian women as aggregate groups earn more than whites, as indicated by the median earnings ratios of 1.35 (for foreign born) and 1.53 (for native born). The Asian – white relative position portrayed by the geometric mean[57] earnings ratios coincides with that shown by the median hourly earning ratios; except for the foreign born Vietnamese, all are near parity or significantly above one. (See columns 8 and 9, Table 6.1).

Within Asian groups, the native born are clearly in a better position than the foreign born. The foreign –native gap is the narrowest for the Filipinos (earnings ratio of 1.13 versus 1.14) followed by Indians (earnings ratio of 1.23 versus 1.31) and is greatest for the Chinese (earnings ratio of 0.96 versus 1.51).

The subsequent three tables (Table 6.2 through 6.4) describe the background characteristics that may help 'explain' the variation in employment and hourly earnings of groups of Asian women. Table 6.2 contains distributions on human capital characteristics – education, potential years of work experience, and English language ability. All foreign born Asian women barring the Vietnamese are better educated than the whites. The percentage of college graduates among the foreign born Filipinos and Indians is 43.7 and 34.6 percent respectively and is much higher than the corresponding figure of 18 percent for whites (See column 3, Table 6.2). Among the foreign born,

---

[57] Since geometric and not arithmetic mean is generated when the dependent variable is in logarithmic form, I present geometric mean earning ratios in addition to the median.

Indian women (31.5 percent) followed by the Chinese (20.1 percent) have the highest percentages of masters/professional/doctorate degree holders.

Table 6.2 about here

With respect to acquisition of the college or higher degree from the U.S, nearly one fifth of the population in all the groups except the Vietnamese are estimated to have obtained a college or a higher degree from the U.S. (See column 5, Table 6.2). The proportion, in the case of Filipinos and Koreans is even higher.

The educational attainments of native born women are also higher than whites. All the native born Asian minorities (again leaving out the Vietnamese) have a higher proportion of their population with a college degree than whites. The percentage of college graduates among the native born Chinese (41.9 percent) is more than twice that of whites (18 percent). Japanese with (36.9 percent) and Koreans with (34.9 percent) follow. Indians are the group with the highest percentage (31.9 percent) possessing a masters/professional/doctorate degree, among the native born. This is followed by Koreans (26.3 percent) and Chinese (24.8 percent). (See column 4, Table 6.2). The corresponding figures for the rest of the Asian groups (excluding Vietnamese) are also greater than for the whites (9.3 percent). The percentage point gap between Vietnamese and whites with regard to masters/professional/doctorate degree holders is minimal, 0.5 points. (See column 4, Table 6.2).

Within Asian comparisons reveal that the foreign born have less education than the native born for all the groups with the exception of the Filipinos and Indians. The foreign –native educational differential is highest for the Chinese followed by the Koreans. (See columns 2-4, Table 6.2). The proportion of foreign born Chinese with less

than a college degree (60.9 percent) is nearly twice that of the native born Chinese (33.3 percent). The same is true with regard to having a college degree: 41.9 percent of native born Chinese compared to 19 percent of foreign born Chinese have a college degree.

Mean potential years of work experience[58] indicate the foreign born Chinese to be most 'experienced' (25.1 years of work experience), and foreign born Indians to be the least experienced (18.5 years of work experience). White women's potential years of work experience (24.6 years) are similar to Chinese. As far as the foreign –native born minority comparison is concerned, the native born Asians, with the exception of the Japanese have lower years of work experience than their foreign born counterparts. This is because the native born are a young group given the recency of the Asian immigration stream. The native born Indians and Koreans are particularly young groups as indicated by years of potential work experience which is highly correlated with age.

With regards to English language proficiency, foreign born Chinese, with 14.4 percent not being able to speak English are the least proficient. The corresponding figure for the Vietnamese is 8.5 percent, the next least proficient group. (See column 8, Table 6.2). Foreign born Filipinos and Indians are the most proficient with 71.4 and 67.8 percent respectively speaking English only or very well'. (See column 9, Table 6.2).

Table 6.3 displays the occupational distribution of Asian and white groups. It also provides data on the percentage of wage/salary earners and the self-employed. The occupational pattern of foreign born Asian women does not differ much from that of the whites. The occupations with the highest concentration for all the foreign born Asians as

---

[58] Potential years of work experience reflects age and educational attainments as potential years of work experience = age – years of education –6. It should be noted that this proxy for potential years of work experience is a poor one for women because they more often than men take time out of their labor force for child rearing.

well as for the whites are; service, sales, office and administrative support and professional/managerial/business occupations with some minor variations in the specific distributions. The percentage of foreign born Vietnamese (20.6), Filipinos (17.8), and Korean (16.1) engaged in 'service' occupation is greater than that for the whites however. The percentage of whites working in office and administrative support is 22.1, higher than among all the foreign born Asian groups. Among the foreign born, the percentage of Indians engaged in professional/managerial/business occupation is the highest (41.5) followed by Filipinos (36.7). The corresponding percentage of whites (33.3) is lower than that for foreign born Filipinos and Indians, but higher than that for the other foreign born Asian groups. (See column 8, Table 6.3).

Table 6.3 about here

A noteworthy characteristic of the native born Asian–white comparison is a significantly higher percentage of native born Asians (except the Vietnamese) engaged in professional/managerial/business occupations relative to whites. This proportion is the highest for native born Koreans (55.5 percent) closely followed by the Chinese (54.8 percent) and the Indians (53.4 percent). The corresponding percentage for the whites (33.3 percent) is much lower (See column 8, Table 6.3). While a higher proportion of the foreign born Asians (with the exception of Indians) is engaged in the occupation category 'service' relative to their native born peers, the opposite is true with regard to the occupation category, 'office and administrative support'.

Wage/salary workers (and not self-employed) constitute the bulk of the working population for foreign and native born Asians as well as whites. Foreign born Korean women can be considered an exception in this context with 22.3 percent of them working

as self –employed, substantially higher than the other (foreign and native born) Asian groups and the whites (See column 10, Table 6.3).

Table 6.4 portrays the statistic on length of stay, regional residence, and marital status for the six foreign and native born Asian and white groups. With respect to the length of stay, the major measure of assimilation for the foreign born, Indians are the newest arrivals and Koreans appear to have been in the U.S. for the longest time. Nearly 50 percent of Indians have lived in the U.S. for a period less than 10 years (see column 2, Table 6.4) while a close to 70 percent of (foreign born) Koreans have lived in the U.S. for more than 10 years. (See columns 3 and 4, Table 6.4). Next to Koreans, foreign born Filipinos have been in the U.S. the longest.

Table 6.4 about here

As noted for men, foreign born Asian women except for the Indians are concentrated in the Pacific region (ranging between 57.5 percent for the Filipinos to 37.6 percent for the Chinese) whereas only 12.3 percent of the whites reside in the Pacific region. Among the native born Asian population, the concentration in the Pacific is also apparent. There are 83.1 percent of native born Japanese living in the Pacific area compared to 47.9 of foreign born Japanese and 12.3 percent whites. (See column 9, Table 6.4).

With regard to marital status, there is a greater incidence of marriage among the foreign born Asian population relative to the whites. Native born Asian women are closer to the white women in this respect. One of the reasons for a lower incidence of marriage among the native born Asian population may be their relatively younger age distribution.

Multivariate Analyses

The multivariate analyses examine the degree to which ethnicity, human capital, assimilation, and demographic characteristics 'explain' the disparities in employment and hourly earnings. The primary goal here is to assess the (Asian) minority - white variation in the probability of employment and earnings after controlling for the human capital, assimilation, and the demographic characteristics. The results also show the extent to which the selected independent variables are associated with the two dependent variables.

As a reminder, I use probit and OLS models to predict women's employment and earnings equations respectively and apply the Heckman selection correction to the earnings estimation. The exclusion restriction is presence of children below the age of 5 years.

The discussion of the results in each subsection is organized as follows. I first discuss the outcomes from the probit regression with employment as the dependent variable followed by the description of the earnings regressions. Two multivariate models are run,[59] which are not nested. The two specifications vary with regard to the education variable. The first multivariate model controls for education without distinguishing the place of its acquisition, the second model accounts for whether college or higher degrees were attained in the U.S. Thus, the second specification is pertinent only for the foreign born population. I divide the tables presenting the estimates from employment and earning regressions vertically into two panels, representing the estimates for the foreign born in panel A and for the native born Asian population in panel B. The reference

---

[59] I do not present the regression results from the bi-variate relationship between ethnicity and probability of employment or with earnings because the selection adjustment using the Heckman technique requires an exclusion restriction in the selection equation.

category remains white throughout. The summary statistics of the dependent and the independent variables can be found in Appendix Tables 6.1A and 6.1B.

Employment

Table 6.5 presents the results from the probit regressions using the maximum likelihood procedure combined with the Heckman selection technique. To ease the interpretation I choose to present marginal effects instead of probit coefficients. Marginal effects measure the change in probability (of employment in this case) with an increment in a continuous independent variable and the discrete change (from 0 to 1) in the case of dummy variable. This characteristic of marginal effects makes their interpretation parallel to that of OLS coefficients - percentage change in the probability of employment when continuous variables change by one unit and accordingly, the dummy variables change from 0 to 1.

Three of the six Asian groups experience a lower probability of employment compared with whites whereas the other three groups have a greater likelihood of employment. Foreign born Indians, Japanese, and Koreans are 19.1 percent, 23.1 percent and 11.3 percent less likely to be employed. Chinese, Filipino, and the Vietnamese are 1.2 percent, 5.1 percent and 3.4 percent more likely to be employed relative to whites (see column 2, Table 6.5). In the subsequent model (Model 2, column 3) that accounts for whether a college degree was acquired in the U.S., the estimates do not change in direction. The relative (to white) disadvantage of the Chinese, Indians, and the Vietnamese is smaller but all these three groups still have a lower likelihood of employment than whites. The Asian- white employment probabilities of the other three groups, Filipinos, Japanese and the Koreans are higher than those seen in Model 1. These

variations in the coefficients emphasize the significance of the place of acquisition of human capital.

The native born Asian –white comparison displayed in Model 1, column 4 of Table 6.5 , indicate that after adjusting for all the independent variables, there is no statistically significant difference between the employment probability of the Chinese and the whites but native born Filipinos and Japanese experience a 2.8 and 5.5 percent higher chance of employment. Indians, Koreans and Vietnamese show a 9, 7.6 and 8.4 percent lower probability of employment relative to whites. (See column 4, Table 6.5). Thus, while Indians and Koreans have a lower probability of employment regardless of their nativity status, the same cannot be said for the Japanese and the Vietnamese. Foreign born Japanese have a lower likelihood of employment whereas native born Japanese are more likely to be employed relative to whites. Just the opposite is true for the Vietnamese.

Table 6.5 about here

As expected, more education is associated with a greater probability of employment for both the foreign and the native born population. Women without a college degree and those with a college degree experience 11 and 7 percent lower likelihood of employment respectively relative to women with a masters/professional/doctorate degree. Having less than a college degree and a college or higher degree acquired outside of the U.S. is associated with lower employment chances compared to the acquisition of college or higher education in the U.S. for the foreign born Asian women. The disadvantage of not having a college degree (7.5 percent) is lower than that of having a college or higher degree outside of the U.S. (13.1 percent) relative

to possessing college or higher degree in the U.S. (See column 3, Panel A, Table 6.5). This somewhat unexpected finding may be explained by the greater degree of job selectiveness by people who have a college or higher degree outside of the U.S. (as compared to non-college degree holders). College degree holders may be less willing to work in low paid ethnic enclave kind of jobs that on the other hand are attractive options for less educated people.

The other human capital factors; years of work experience (for both foreign and native born population), years of non-U.S. work experience and English language ability (for only foreign born population) are statistically significant and for the most part behave in the expected direction in both the specifications for the foreign born and for the native born. Years of work experience acquired outside of the U.S. has a positive association with the probability of employment. The disadvantage of not knowing/low proficiency in English (applicable to only the foreign born population) may be greater in the model that accounts for the place of obtaining a college a higher degree (See columns 2 and 3, Panel A, Table 6.5). This may suggest that people who have had a U.S. education (college or higher) are competing for jobs that require better language skills.

The coefficients pertaining to demographic characteristics are similar across the groups (Model 1 and 2 for foreign born). Living in the Midwest increases the chances of finding employment while residence in the southern region is a disadvantage relative to living in the Pacific, though the disadvantage is marginal. Given the spatial concentration of Asians in the Pacific region, the greatest probability of employment experienced by those residing in the Midwest region may be a reflection of willingness to migrate. Metro

residence is associated with a slightly higher probability of employment (0.08 percent) for the foreign and native born population.

The family status related factors are similar for the foreign and native born Asian population. Single women have a 7 percent higher chance of being employed and having a child below the age of five years significantly reduces employment chances by more than 19 percent. (See Table 6.5).

Earnings

How do the earnings of foreign and native born Asian women compare with white women? Table 6.6 reports the estimates from the earnings regressions. The results in Table 6.6 show that all the foreign born Asian women are at a disadvantage relative to white women after adjustment for all the central socioeconomic characteristics. The disadvantage is the greatest for Chinese (coefficient -0.12) followed by the Indians (coefficient -0.07) and Vietnamese (coefficient -0.06). The gap between the earnings of Filipino (coefficient -0.02) and white women is the narrowest. (See column 2, Table 6.6).

As far as the native born Asian population is concerned, none of the groups are at a disadvantage and Chinese (coefficient 0.08), Japanese (coefficient 0.05) and Koreans (coefficient 0.07) earn more than whites once all the human capital, assimilation, and demographic characteristics have been controlled for (See column 4, Table 6.6).

Native born Chinese, Japanese, and Korean women experience an earning advantage as compared to their white counterparts and the foreign born Chinese, Japanese, and Korean women do not experience the corresponding advantage (relative to white women). Also, the Chow test statistic shows that the difference between the six

foreign and native born ethnicity coefficients (comparing columns 2 and 4, Table 6.6) are statistically significant.

The use of an education variable that accounts for the place of acquisition of college or higher degree changes the statistical significance of ethnicity. In Model 2, except for the Chinese and the Vietnamese, the earnings of the rest of the four Asian groups are no longer statistically significantly different from that of the native born whites. This suggests that acquisition of college or higher education in the U.S. may be critical to eliminating the disadvantage of being foreign born for the Filipino, Indian, Japanese and Korean relative to white women. (See column 3, Table 6.6). While this confirms the increasing recognition of the place of acquisition of human capital for Asians, it does not tell the complete story of the Asian- white earnings differential. Lack of information on the quality (mainly in terms of the institution) and on the nature of education (primarily the discipline) hampers this depiction.

Table 6.6 about here

The other human capital variables – years of work experience, years of non-U.S. work experience and English language ability (the last two variables applicable for only the foreign born population) are statistically significant for foreign as well as native born population relative to whites. English language ability is substantially associated with earnings while the same cannot be said for the variables, years of entire work experience and years of non-U.S. work experience.

Occupationally, engagement in managerial/professional occupation relative to other occupations is most remunerative for both the foreign and native born population. A comparison of the coefficients related to the various occupational categories between the

two specifications for the foreign born Asian population relative to whites and between nativity status do not show substantial differences. The same is true for the self-employed versus being a wage/salary earner.

The estimates of the demographic variables are statistically significant and stable across the two models in Table 6.6. Regionally, residing in the Pacific region is most beneficial and so is living in metropolitan areas. Single women earn more than married women with a coefficient being a positive 0.02 regardless of the specification or the nativity status. (See columns 2, 3, and 4, Table 6.6).

Finally, the merit of adjusting for the selection bias is evident in the statistical significance of the lambda in Table 6.6[60]. The sign of the lambda (coefficient of the inverse Mills ratio) for both the foreign born Asian- white and native born Asian –white comparison is positive (see columns 2 through 4, Table 6.6) suggesting that the women who end up participating in the labor market receive a positive return on their unobserved characteristics.

Role of Nativity Status

Table 6.7 displays the nativity estimates emerging from the employment and earnings regressions[61] on the disaggregated Asian ethnicity samples. Nativity status emerges to be significant variable in the case of employment as well as hourly earning estimation equations. Foreign born women except the Vietnamese experience a lower

---

[60] Although the statistical significance of lambda (inverse Mills ratio) is informative of the merit of the selection bias, I nevertheless run the regressions without adjusting for the sake of comparison. That comparison between the unadjusted and selection adjusted earnings estimates for the foreign and native born Asian samples with reference to whites are presented in Appendix Table 6.2.

[61] Appendix Tables 6.3 and 6.4 present the full regression models run for the employment and the earnings analyses respectively for the six pooled (foreign and native born) samples of the Asian groups. Appendix Tables 6.5 through 6.7 present the employment and earning estimates for the aggregate foreign and native born Asian ethnicity relative to the whites.

likelihood of employment than their native born peers. The disadvantage is particularly high for the Japanese followed by the Indians. Foreign born Japanese have a 42 percent lower chance of being employed relative to their native born counterparts. In case of Indians, this figure at 20.6 percent is high too. (See columns 4 and 5, Panel A, Table 6.7). Thus, nativity gap in case of the probability of employment is highest for the Indians and the Japanese, the two groups that among the foreign born emerge high performers from the descriptive as well as multivariate analyses.

Table 6.7 about here

The foreign born are also disadvantaged with respect to earnings. All the foreign born groups earn statistically significantly less than their native born peers after controlling for the key socioeconomic factors. (See Panel B, Table 6.7). The disadvantage for all the groups appears to be substantial. The nativity gap is the lowest for the Filipinos relative to the five other Asian groups. (See Panel B, Table 6.7). The Chow test statistic to examine if the nativity coefficient for the six Asian groups is statistically significantly different from one another depicts that it is indeed so. The analysis for the aggregated Asian group yields similar results. Foreign born Asians as a group experience a 12.9 percent lower probability of employment and 21 percent lower earnings when compared to their native born counterparts. (See columns 2 and 3, Appendix Table 6.6).

Reweighting

Following the reweighting procedure[62] to assess the Asian-white hourly earning gaps in the present case means that the distribution of the human capital (educational

---

[62] As the reweighting procedure does not assume any structure to the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, it is contended by some scholars to be a more reliable methodology to estimate earning gaps. Some more discussion on the comparison between regression standardization and reweighting techniques is provided in Chapter 4, 'Data and Methods'.

attainments, years of work experience, English language ability, acquired U.S. college education), occupational (occupational category and type of work), assimilation (duration of stay or nativity status), and demographic (region of residence, whether residing in the metro area and marital status) characteristics of Asian women is imposed upon the white population. The subsequent earning distribution obtained for the white population answers the question: what would be the earnings of the white women if they had the distribution on the explanatory variables observed for the Asian groups? The gap between the new (reweighted) earnings of the whites with their actual (observed) earnings would be an estimate of the unexplained portion of the earning gap.

The results of the reweighting procedure are presented in Table 6.8. As mentioned before, the reweighting procedure allows the estimation of the hourly earnings at various points in the distribution. Similar to the case with the male sample, I choose to present the estimates at the mean, 50th percentile (median), and 90th percentile. Columns 2-4 portray the observed hourly earnings at mean, median, and at the level of the 90th percentile. The subsequent three columns, 5 through 7 present the reweighted white earnings. For example, Column 5 shows the mean hourly earnings of the white population if it was assigned the characteristic of the respective Asian ethnicity and nativity. Thus, if white women are assigned the characteristics of a foreign born Chinese woman, mean hourly earnings of the white woman would be $24.01 rather than $17.56, the actual (observed) mean earnings of the white women. To take another illustration, if a white woman had the average human capital, assimilation, and demographic characteristics of a native born Vietnamese woman, then a white woman would be expected to receive a mean hourly earning of $20.06, a median of $13.46 and 90th percentile earning of $32.78.The

corresponding observed hourly earnings of white women when following the white women's distribution are $17.56, $12.74, and $28.85.

The usefulness of deriving this new reweighted earnings distribution for the white women lies in being able to provide a measure of the discrepancy between the observed earnings of the minority (Asian) population and the earnings of the majority (white population) if the majority was endowed with the minority characteristics. Consequently, columns 8 through 10 display the ratio of the observed Asian to the (reweighted) white earnings. To elaborate with an example, the figure of 0.75 presented in column 8 (Table 6.8) against foreign born Chinese women is the ratio of the observed mean hourly earnings of a foreign born Chinese woman to that of a white woman who has the same level of the selected endowments as a foreign born Chinese woman. A deviation from one is suggestive of the role of factors that cannot be explained in the standard earnings estimation framework. Further, a ratio of less than 1 implies that the observed earnings of the Asian woman is lower than what she would have earned if she 'changed' herself to white with the level of her other observed characteristics remained unchanged.

Table 6.8 about here

The central findings of Table 6.8 are as follows. Among the foreign born, all groups except Filipinos, experience a ratio of less than 1 at the mean, median, and 90th percentile levels. It seems that foreign born Asian ethnicity affects the Chinese (ratio of 0.75, 0.60, and 0.85 at mean, median, and 90th percentile levels) and the Vietnamese (ratio of 0.79, 0.65, and 0.77 at mean, median, and 90th percentile levels) the most. The Indians, Japanese and Koreans, though at a numerical disadvantage, are yet substantively almost at par with the whites.

In contrast to the foreign born Chinese, the native born Chinese are earning more than what the white women would earn if the white women had the native born Chinese woman's characteristics. Native born Japanese follow a pattern similar to the native born Chinese. Native born Vietnamese are still at a disadvantage though the deficiency is lower than what it is for the foreign born Vietnamese. Nativity plays a noteworthy role with the native born experiencing more equitable earning distributions relative to whites than their foreign born peers.

The ratios at the 90th percentile indicate the following. Among the foreign born, all the groups except the Filipinos earn less than white women. The foreign born Asian – white gap is not large though except for the Chinese (ratio of 0.85) and the Vietnamese (ratio of 0.77). Native born Asian women are more favorably placed since three (Chinese, Filipino, and Japanese) of the six groups earn more or are parity with white women. Also, the native born Asian-white gap for the other three groups is not that high (See column 10, Table 6.8).

Foreign born Chinese, Indian, and Koreans experience higher earning ratios at the 90th as compared to the corresponding mean and the median of the earnings distribution. In case of the other groups, the decline in the ratios between mean, median, and the 90th percentile is marginal. In the case of the native born, the Indians, Japanese, and the Koreans show a decline in the earnings ratios from mean/median to the 90th percentile levels. For the other three groups the ratios at the 90th percentile are higher relative to the mean/median levels or remain the same. Overall, there is not a strong indication of the

accumulation of disadvantage at the 90th percentile relative to the mean or median levels of earnings for foreign and native born Asian women[63].

Discussion

In line with the findings from the prior research in this area, (Wong and Hirschman 1983; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1988; Schoeni 1998), these analyses paint a positive picture of the labor market outcomes for Asian women relative to white women. Descriptively, foreign and native born Asian women enjoy higher levels of socioeconomic attainments. There is a notable difference in the economic outcomes by nativity status, though, with the native born better positioned than the foreign born.

The multivariate analyses show that the Chinese, Filipino, and Vietnamese women experience a high probability of employment. Relative (to white) employment chances for the foreign born improve when accounted for whether acquired education in the U.S. but the negative coefficients for Indians, Koreans, and the Japanese remains. In case of the native born, the multivariate framework estimates Filipino and Japanese women to be having a statistically significantly higher employment rates.

With respect to earnings, the regression results reveal a greater disadvantage for the foreign as compared to the native born women. Unlike the native born Chinese, Japanese and Korean women who experience a distinct advantage relative to whites, there are no foreign born groups that experience higher earnings than white women. Receiving a college or a higher degree in the U.S., though, compensates for the disadvantage associated with being foreign born. Yet foreign born Chinese and Vietnamese women continue to earn less than their white counterparts.

---

[63] One limitation of this analysis is that the comparison group is white women. The picture may change substantially when the comparison of foreign and native born Asian women is with white men.

The reweighting analyses indicate the existence of Asian –white earning gap (favoring whites) that cannot be explained by the standard set of productive characteristics, thus providing evidence for the possible existence of discrimination. These gaps again exist to a larger extent for the foreign born than the native born. Additionally, the relative Asian to white disadvantage seems to be more at the level of the mean and median earnings than at the 90th percentile. This appears to be more true for the foreign compared to the native born. The earnings ratios therefore, do not support the existence of a 'glass ceiling'.

Gender comparisons, as per the results in the previous chapter, indicate that the nativity 'benefit', that is the positive attribute of being native born, seems to be more prominent in the case of Asian women than men. This may be a reflection of better economic assimilation of the foreign born men than women relative to their respective native born counterparts. Unlike the case for foreign born men, gender norms in the sending countries 'encourage' women to enter more as 'secondary earners'. Data limitations with regard to the detailed educational and occupational distributions apart from the existence of the various unobservable factors such as motivation, cultural values, of the various population groups hinder better comprehension of the intergroup comparisons and therefore contribute to the tentativeness of the findings.

Chapter 7

Household Income and Household Extension

The analyses presented in the previous chapters confirm the association between individual-level human capital factors and the employment and earning attainments of Asian men and women relative to each other and to their white counterparts. This chapter moves to household as the unit of analysis. I describe the income attainments and prevalence of nonnuclear living arrangements of Asian relative to white households. I also investigate the association between nonnuclear living arrangements and household economic well being and the factors associated with forming nuclear households. The goal is to provide evidence about whether extended living arrangements[64] serve as a compensatory/coping strategy for dealing with temporarily/ chronically low earnings or enhancing income levels of household members.

The data analyses are presented in two parts. First, I present descriptive statistics on economic position of households, and living arrangements. Second, regression analyses examine the association between household structure and household income and the factors correlated with the likelihood of forming a nuclear household.

Descriptive Findings

Household, Per Capita, and Per Household Labor Hour Employed Income

Table 7.1 provides a tabulation of the median household income, capita income, and income per household labor hour employed for the six (major) Asian groups and whites. Median household income indicates the overall position of Asian households,

---

[64] I use the terms extended and nonnuclear living arrangements interchangeably. Hence in the present context, extended household implies nonnuclear household.

median per capita[65] and income per labor hour employed assess the economic position of the Asian groups by controlling for household size and labor market input hours. The latter two measures assess whether resource sharing and labor hour pooling change the relative position of the Asian ethnic subgroups. Table 7.1 is divided into two panels with the top panel A providing the absolute income values and bottom panel B providing the income ratios of the Asian subgroup to whites[66].

<center>Table 7.1 about here</center>

Asian groups with the exception of Koreans experience higher median household income levels than whites. The situation changes quite substantially when household size is taken into account. All Asian groups except the Japanese, experience lower median per capita income levels than whites. Per capita income is lowest for the Vietnamese at $13,250 compared to $20,125 for whites. Such a change may be an indication of the difference in the extent of resource sharing among the Asian groups as compared to the white households. More people share the household income in Asian than white households, with the exception of the Japanese.

Income per labor hour employed shown in the last column of Table 7.1 shows that Asian households are not particularly disadvantaged on this measure. Except for the Koreans and the Vietnamese, all the other groups experience greater earnings per labor market hour than whites.

Income ratios of Asians to whites are presented in the bottom panel of Table 7.1. The comparisons between the (income) ratios for household and per capita income levels

---

[65] Usually per capita income computed in such contexts uses mean instead of median, I use the median to adjust for the skewness. The regression analyses use mean and the distribution of the mean levels of income with the standard deviations for all the three dependent variables can be found in Appendix Table 7.1A and 7.1B.
[66] The ratio of less than one indicates a white advantage.

indicate the following. For Chinese, Filipinos, and Indians, the ratios go from well above one on household income to below one on per capita income. The decline is the steepest for Indians who have 50 percent more household income than whites but about 94 percent of white per capita income. The Korean and Vietnamese household income ratios are 0.93 and 1.03 whereas the per capita income ratios drop considerably to 0.78 and 0.66 respectively. (See Panel B, columns 4 and 5, Table 7.1). The Japanese, the only group that is mainly native born, is the exception with household income 23 percent higher and per capita income of 32 percent higher than whites.

The income per labor hour employed ratios are higher than the per capita income ratios for all the Asian groups. The same is not true of the comparison between ratios of income per labor hour employed and household income. All Asian groups with the exceptions of Japanese and Koreans show lower labor hour employed income ratios (relative to household income ratios). This pattern suggests that while earners in Asian households may not necessarily experience low hourly earnings, Asian households are larger and have greater resource pooling than white households.

Table 7.2 demonstrates the difference across nativity status with respect to median household income, median per capita income, and income per labor hour employed. Foreign born Asian groups, except for the Koreans, experience either similar or higher household income relative to whites. The native born Asian –white comparison shows that all the native born Asian households are at an advantage relative to whites. The foreign-native born Asian comparisons reveal the following. Native born Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Vietnamese households experience higher levels of household income relative to their foreign born counterparts. The income levels of native born

Filipinos and Indians are however lower as compared that of the foreign born Filipinos and Indian households. (See columns 2 and 3, Panel A, Table 7.2).

Table 7.2 about here

Median per capita income for the foreign born Asian groups, with the exception of the Indians and the Japanese, is lower than among whites. An opposite pattern exists for the native born Asian groups. All native born Asian groups have the same or higher per capita income levels than white households. Additionally, native born Asians experience higher levels of per capita income than their foreign born counterparts. The foreign –native born Asian gap in per capita income is the greatest for the Chinese with per capita income level of a native born Chinese household ($30,000) being nearly double of that of the foreign born household ($15,143). The (foreign –native born Asian) gap in per capita income is narrowest in case of the Indians, where median per capita income is almost the same for the two groups. (See columns 4 and 5, Panel A, Table 7.2)

Foreign born Filipinos, Indians, and Japanese households show higher income per labor hour employed than whites. The labor hour income ratios are lower than one for the other three foreign born groups – Chinese, Koreans, and Vietnamese. The relative labor market return is the lowest for foreign born Vietnamese (ratio of 0.80) households and marginally lower (than whites) for the Chinese (ratio of 0.97). (See column 6, Panel B, Table 7.2).

The two native born Asian households that experience lower (than whites) median income per labor hour employed are Filipinos and Vietnamese. The gaps are however small with the income ratios being 0.98 and 0.95. The rest of the native born Asian groups indicate similar or higher median income per labor hour employed as compared to

whites. Native born Chinese and Japanese are the most advantaged relative to whites with the income ratio of 1.35 each. (See column 7, Panel B, Table 7.2).

Native born status appears to play a favorable role with respect to the measure, income labor hour employed for the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Vietnamese. The same does not hold for the Filipinos and Indians. The median income labor hour employed for the native born Filipino and Indian household is lower relative to their foreign born counterparts. In the Indian case, the foreign –native born gap is considerable. Foreign born Indian households display hourly earning of one-third more than their native born counterparts. (See column 7, Panel A, Table 7.2).

Median household size, Hours Worked, and Householder's Contribution to Total Household Income and Hours

Table 7.3 provides the distribution of the median household size, hours worked[67], and householder's contribution to the annual total household labor hours and to the annual household income. The statistics in columns 2-5 of Table 7.3 document the greater number of people sharing household income and the greater pooling of labor market hours, in Asian compared to white households and more so for the foreign than the native born Asians.

Table 7.3 about here

All the foreign born Asians groups except for the Japanese have a household size larger than whites (columns 2 and 3 Panel B of Table 7.3). Foreign born Filipino and Vietnamese households have the highest household size among all the groups. Native born Asians have household sizes more similar to whites than the foreign born. Native

---

[67] Household size and annual household hours worked are respectively the denominators used in the computation of per capita income and labor hour employed income presented in the previous two tables.

born Asian households are therefore smaller than foreign born households. Native born Filipinos and Vietnamese again have higher household sizes relative to the rest of the native born Asian groups and whites, albeit lower than their foreign born counterparts.

In terms of the labor hour inputs (columns 4 and 5), all the foreign and native born Asian households barring the Japanese devote greater number of hours to the labor market than do whites. Native born Japanese are almost equal to the whites while foreign born Japanese put in 76 percent of the hours allocated by the whites to the labor market. Again, except for the Japanese and (slightly) the Koreans, foreign born Asian households spend a greater number of hours in the labor market than their native born counterparts (columns 4 and 5, Panel A, Table 7.3).

Columns 6 through 9 document the share of hours and income that come from the householder. Three foreign born groups have a lower percentage of labor hours and income from householder than that of whites: Chinese, Filipinos, and Vietnamese. Foreign born Indian householders, relative to whites, put in a slightly greater number of labor hours but make a 2 percentage point lower contribution to household income (than whites). Foreign born Japanese householders are an exception contributing more hours and earnings, than the white householders. Native born Asian households are more similar to whites than their foreign born counterparts, with the exceptions of Filipinos and Vietnamese. The contribution of native born Filipino and Vietnamese householder (in household income) are respectively 8 and 7 percentage points lower than that of a white householder. (See column 9, Panel A, Table 7.3).

Household Type (Nuclear versus Nonnuclear)

The statistics shown in tables 7.1 through 7.3 point in the direction of greater income pooling in terms of both labor hours employed and income for some Asian households as compared to whites. Pooling is also greater for the foreign born than the native born. What is the extent of extension of Asian households relative to whites and does that extension vary by nativity status? Table 7.4 provides the percentage of breakdown by household type (nuclear versus nonnuclear) for Asian households for the six Asian foreign and native born Asian groups and whites. With the exception of the foreign born Japanese, all the Asian households are more likely to be nonnuclear than whites households. For some of the groups such as the Filipinos and Vietnamese, the Asian –white gap in percent nuclear is quite substantial.

Table 7.4 about here

The nativity comparisons are somewhat counter-intuitive to what one would have expected based on the association between nativity status and resource pooling seen in tables 7.1 through 7.3. Only the foreign born Chinese, and Filipino households show a significantly higher incidence of nonnuclear households among the foreign born as compared to their native born counterparts. Foreign born Asians have a greater propensity to pool labor hours as well as income from multiple family members, yet they may not necessarily live in extended households to a noticeably greater extent than the native born.

Household Type and Income

Table 7.5 further attempts to assess the correlation between household structure and well being by presenting the ratios of income in nonnuclear households to that in

nuclear households for the six foreign and native born Asian and white groups. A ratio of greater than one suggests that income in nonnuclear households is more than that in nuclear households for the particular ethnic group. Columns 2 through 4 of Table 7.5 display the (nonnuclear-nuclear household) income ratios[68] for the three measures of household well being; household income, per capita income and labor hour employed income.

<center>Table 7.5 about here</center>

Foreign born Asian –white comparison indicates the following. Nonnuclear relative to nuclear household arrangement means more household income for all groups, including whites with the exception of the foreign born Japanese. For some groups – Chinese, Filipinos, Koreans and the Vietnamese, the household advantage of nonnuclear living arrangement is considerably greater among the foreign than the native born.

Per capita income in nonnuclear relative to nuclear households is lower for all the foreign born Asian groups (except Koreans and the Vietnamese) and whites. Lower (relative to white who have a ratio of 0.85) nonnuclear-nuclear household income ratios for the foreign born Indians (0.72) and Japanese (0.76) implies that nonnuclear households for the two foreign born Asian groups comprise non-earning members to a greater extent than is the case for whites.

With regard to the measure, income per labor hour employed, the disadvantage of nonnuclear (as compared to nuclear) residence, relative to whites, is greater for the foreign and native born Chinese, foreign born Indians, and foreign born Japanese. This

---

[68] An income ratio of greater than one implies that income in nonnuclear household is greater than income in nuclear household.

suggests that there are larger number of low earners in the foreign born Chinese, Indians, and Japanese nonnuclear households as compared to their white counterparts.

The foreign –native born Asian comparison shows that the nonnuclear living arrangement is more advantageous in terms of household income and per capita income for the foreign than the native born. In case of income per labor hour employed, except for the Indians and the Japanese, nonnuclear households are also more advantageous for the foreign than their native born counterparts.

The following main points emerge from tables 7.1 through 7.5. The advantage experienced in aggregate median household income by the Asian groups, relative to whites, switches to a disadvantage when median per capita income is considered as a measure. This implies that the aggregate household income is shared by more members in an Asian than in a white household. There is again a switch in the relative ratios from an Asian disadvantage (for per capita income) to an advantage when per labor hour employed income is considered. This switch can be taken as an indication that even though there are more people partaking in the household income pool, the working members of an Asian household are not necessarily earning lower wages/salaries than average white earners. Having relatively high earners in Asian households would be consistent with the high levels of human capital among earners in Asian subgroups that were observed in the individual level analyses.

In sum, the descriptive results are indicative of the following: a) with the exception of the Japanese, Asian households demonstrate a higher degree of income pooling and sharing than whites; b) there are nativity differences with foreign born exhibiting a greater tendency to adopt nonnuclear living arrangements. However, groups

that exhibit a lower percentage of nuclear household residence in their foreign born population like the Filipinos and Vietnamese do so in their native born population as well and c) there are differences among groups in the likelihood of household extension with some groups such as foreign born Chinese, Filipinos, Vietnamese showing a greater degree of extension than their counterpart Indians and the Japanese.

Multivariate Findings

In the light of these patterns, the multivariate analyses are conducted with two objectives; a)to ascertain whether household living arrangements (nuclear/nonnuclear) 'matter' for household income, per capita income, and income per labor hour employed after controlling for the householder's human capital, assimilation and demographic characteristics and b)to investigate intergroup differences and similarities in the factors that are correlated with the likelihood of nuclear households.

Household Income and Ethnicity and Household Type

Table 7.6 provides estimates of the covariates for each of the three dependent variables (in their logarithmic form); household income, per capita income, income per labor hour employed. The table is divided into two panels, A and B to represent the estimates for the foreign and the native born Asian samples respectively. White comprise the reference category in the foreign and native born pooled regression samples.

The subsequent paragraphs describe the major findings that emerge from Table 7.6. Before proceeding, I would like to note that since ethnicity and household type (nuclear/nonnuclear) are the central independent variables, the discussion in the following paragraphs will focus on those two variables for all the three outcomes.

The comparisons for the ethnicity coefficients across the three dependent variables indicate the following. First, all the foreign born groups, except for the Indians and the Japanese experience lower household income relative to whites net of other factors. The household income and income per labor hour employed of foreign born Indians is not statistically significantly different from whites but foreign born Indian households experience a disadvantage when per capita income is employed as a measure of household well being. Foreign born Japanese households experience a consistent advantage, relative to whites, across the three income measures.

Second, the foreign born Asian comparisons indicate that Koreans and Vietnamese households have considerably lower per capita income levels compared to whites net of other factors. The results for the dependent variable, log of income per labor hour employed follow a similar pattern to that of per capita income levels. All the foreign born groups excepting the Indians and Japanese, experience lower levels of income per labor hour employed. Foreign born Chinese with a coefficient of -0.22 are the most disadvantaged of the Asian groups, relative to the whites.

Third, the native born Asian –white estimates presented in Panel B of Table 7.6 indicate that unlike the case of the foreign born Asians, the relative native born Asian (to white) position is not consistently disadvantaged across the three income measures. The contrasting Asian-white position by nativity status is perhaps most evident with respect to per capita income. While five of the six foreign born Asian groups experience a statistically significant and in most cases considerably lower per capita income than whites, the situation is opposite in case of the native born. Except for the Filipinos, the

rest of the native born Asian groups show higher (than white) per capita income levels in the multivariate framework.

<div align="center">Table 7.6 about here</div>

Living in nonnuclear households is associated with higher household income but with lower per capita and labor hour employed income. The magnitude as well as the direction of the estimates associated with living in nonnuclear households is remarkably similar for the foreign and the native born population.

The coefficients associated with the other co-variates are in the expected direction. Educational attainments of the householder are statistically significant with reasonably high magnitudes. Regardless of the nativity status, female headed households and multi-ethnic households have lower household income relative to male headed and ethnically homogenous households respectively. A test of significance (Chow test) to assess if the difference between the coefficients associated with multi-ethnic households for foreign and native born is statistically significant. Native born households experience a greater income disadvantage than foreign born when they live in multi-ethnic households.

Likelihood of Forming Nuclear Living Arrangement

Table 7.7 presents the odds ratio for the analysis of the likelihood of forming nuclear households for the thirteen groups –six each foreign and native born Asian and white groups. The dependent variable is a dichotomy, nuclear (coded 1) versus nonnuclear (coded 0) and thus measures the likelihood of living in nuclear families[69]. The

---

[69] This is at variance with what is used by other researchers. But since moving towards nuclear family is expected to be an indication of assimilation, I use this version. It may be mentioned here that in the previous OLS regressions on household income measures (Table 7.6), the omitted category used for the right hand side variable, 'household type', is nuclear.

log odds of greater than 1 therefore imply a higher likelihood of living in a nuclear as opposed to a nonnuclear household, and vice-versa in the situation of log odds being less than 1. The right hand side variables in Table 7.7 include a combination of indicators that represent the economic (householder's annual hourly income), human capital, and assimilation (householder's nativity status, householder's duration of stay if foreign born) characteristics of the householder.

Table 7.7 about here

In addition to the comparison of the respective coefficients within each model, a way to assess the relative roles of the various covariates would be to compare the estimates of variables such as education across each of the independent samples. The latter can be done using Chow test technique. Thus for instance, if the coefficient relating to the education of the householder is greater in case of the foreign born Chinese than it is for the foreign born Koreans (after the controls), it may suggest the existence of some other explanatory factors in case of Koreans, which are omitted in the regression model.

The following are the highlights of the regressions. First, the signs of the coefficients are similar for all the groups regardless of the ethnicity and nativity. This indicates that the direction of the relationship between the independent variables with the likelihood of extending is similar for all the groups.

Second, householder's annual hourly income is positively associated with the likelihood of nuclear residence for all the groups except foreign and native born Koreans and Vietnamese and native born Filipinos and Indians. This suggests that for the rest of the groups, the higher the householder's annual income, the higher is the likelihood of living in nuclear relative to nonnuclear households. For foreign and native born Koreans

and Vietnamese and native born Filipinos and Indians, householder's hourly earnings are not statistically significantly associated with the likelihood of forming nuclear households.

Third, greater human capital of the householder is associated with a greater likelihood of living in nuclear families. The magnitude of the association varies across groups though. For instance, college educated foreign born Chinese and native born Vietnamese householder experiences 41 percent and 49 lower chances of living in nuclear household relative to a masters/professional/doctorate degree holder householder. In contrast, for the foreign born Filipinos, the education of the householder is not statistically significant (See Table 7.7).

Fourth, for all the foreign born groups, longer duration of stay in the country is associated with the greater likelihood of living in nuclear households but the relationship between length of stay and likelihood of living in nuclear households is not monotonic. Short term (less than 10 years of stay) Chinese, Indian, and Japanese immigrants are more likely to live in nuclear households. Households, with the exception of the Japanese, that have lived in the U.S. for 20 or more years are more likely to live in nuclear than nonnuclear households. The latter suggests a pattern of convergence towards nuclear household arrangement for the majority of the foreign born groups as their length of stay in the U.S. increases.

Fifth, multi-ethnic households, regardless of the ethnicity and nativity statuses are less likely to be nuclear relative to ethnically homogenous households. This may be due to multi-ethnic households being comprised of young unmarried people who are students or are in search of jobs/stable jobs and living together. Finally, female headship has been

identified as a measure of economic deprivation and has been shown to be associated with greater likelihood of extended living arrangements in the context of black women. However, the estimates show that female headship is positively associated with the likelihood of living in nuclear households. Female headed foreign born Chinese (odds ratio of 1.12), Korean (odds ratio of 1.60) and Vietnamese households (odds ratio of 1.34) are 12, 60, and 34 percent respectively more likely to live in nuclear families. Considering that a substantial percentage of householders in the above groups are not married (See Appendix Table 7.1 A), it is very likely that most of these households are headed by single women. Further, female headship is related to significantly higher odds of nuclear household formation for all the native born groups, Chinese (1.28), Filipino (1.17), Indians (1.35), Japanese (1.20), Koreans (1.45), Vietnamese (1.27) and whites (1.22). This finding corresponds to earlier research (Santi 1990).

Discussion

The goal of the present research is to examine the income attainments of the Asian households relative to one another and to whites and to assess whether there are significant inter –group differences in the extent of resource sharing and pooling. Additionally, I explore factors correlated with the likelihood of adopting nuclear living arrangement for the various groups.

Higher (than white) total household income is observed for the foreign and native born Asian households for the majority of the groups. Native born Asians are favorably placed relative to their foreign born counterparts (with the exceptions of Indians and Filipinos) and whites on all the 3 income measures. The descriptive findings point towards a greater inclination of Asians- foreign and native, with respect to pooling of

economic resources -both input (market hours) and output (income). This inclination is higher among groups that are disproportionately foreign born such as the Chinese, Koreans, and the Vietnamese relative to those that are not like the Japanese.

There are variations within the same nativity status too[70]. These variations are starker among the foreign than the native born. Foreign born Chinese, Filipinos, and Vietnamese show a greater degree of extension than their Indian and Japanese counterparts. Indians in particular, constitute an exception. Although a high proportion of the Indian householders are foreign born, Indian households display lower inclination to pool income as compared to the Chinese, Koreans, or the Vietnamese. This variation may be explained by the greater human capital endowments of the Indian householders than the other foreign born Asian householders.

The multivariate results indicate that the relative nuclear/nonnuclear residence advantage depends on the measure of household well being that is employed. Nonnuclear residence for the foreign born households is less beneficial than the native born when median per capita household income is considered. This suggests that there are more non income contributing members in a foreign born Asian relative to a native born Asian or white household. Additionally, the householder's human capital characteristics are positively associated with the household well being for all the groups.

Human capital and assimilation characteristics of the householder are significant in predicting the likelihood of forming nuclear households. Higher education is positively associated with nuclear as opposed to nonnuclear residence. Higher earnings of the householder is also correlated with a higher chance of forming nuclear households, more

---

[70] It needs to be noted that the age and demographic compositional differentials between the various Asian groups further makes it difficult to make conclusive observations on intergroup differences. Extension, multi-generational in particular is a function of the age of the householder.

so for the foreign than the native born. The exceptions among the foreign born are Koreans and Vietnamese, the two groups for which the correlation between householder's earnings and likelihood of forming nuclear households is not statistically significant. A greater inclination to form nuclear living arrangements is observed for the foreign born with the increase in the length of stay in the U.S.

Overall, foreign and native born Asian households are favorably positioned relative to whites with respect to total household income and income per labor hour employed. There appears to be a greater extent of resource pooling to attain high aggregate household income levels among the Asians as compared to whites, more so for the foreign than the native born. The tendency to form nuclear households rises with the increases in the human capital, earnings, and duration of the stay of the householder for the foreign and the native born Asian households.

Chapter 8

Conclusion

"The chance to create meaningful immigration reform legislation was lost the moment the bill emerged from its closed-door meeting with an immediate path to amnesty for anywhere between 12 million to 20 million illegal immigrants", Senator James M. Inhofe quoted in *The New York Times*, June 9, 2007. The focus on specifics such as whether to grant amnesty to illegal migrants and/or to secure borders with Mexico in the popular policy discourse is understandable. It nonetheless echoes the concern of immigration experts of over reliance on the assumption of immigration as a 'social problem' and on the short-term patterns of immigration. The longer term outcomes relating to productivity, socioeconomic experiences, inter-generational mobility, concern all kinds of immigrants –legal or illegal. This dissertation project is an endeavor to assess the socioeconomic attainments of people of Asian descent, a group that is overwhelmingly legal and by virtue of its achievements has earned the positive images of 'model minority' and 'honorary whites'.

The discussion in this concluding chapter summarizes the central findings and discusses the empirical, methodological, and policy related significance of the findings (and in the process attempts to enable the reader to situate the study in the context of current discourse on labor market experiences of immigrants in general and of Asians in particular). I also note the limitations and provide possible areas of continuation of the research.

Main Findings

Before listing the main findings, I restate the research questions that guided this study;

1) What is the association between human capital factors (quantity and quality of education, English language ability, work experience), occupation, type of work, assimilation assets (duration of stay in the U.S., or nativity status) and demographic attributes (region of residence, marital status, presence of children below the age of five) with employment prospects and earnings of foreign and native born Chinese, Filipinos, Indians, Japanese, Koreans and Vietnamese men and women? Do associations vary across groups and how do they compare with those of whites?

2) Are there intergroup differences in the extent of resource sharing and pooling at the level of household? What are the factors associated with the likelihood of choosing nuclear households by the Asian groups and whites?

The next few paragraphs summarize the findings that emerge by addressing the above research questions.

The statistics on socioeconomic indicators of Asian men and women for the year 2000 indicate a continuation of the trend of high levels of achievements, on average, relative to whites, albeit with notable intergroup heterogeneity. This pattern of simultaneous existence of a 'high average and a large dispersion' (Zeng and Xie 2004, page 1076) is in line with the observations made in the previous studies for earlier time periods (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1988; Xie and Goyette 2004; Min 2005). The exceptions to the superior Asian positioning are foreign born Chinese, Koreans,

Vietnamese, and native born Vietnamese. The within group heterogeneity is substantial. Foreign born Chinese immigrants experience the highest extent of within group variance as compared to the other groups.

In the multivariate framework, the employment advantage of the foreign born Asian men does not translate into an earnings advantage, relative to whites. This is not true for the native born Asian men though. Additionally, on average, native born Asian men experience lower levels of employment and less earnings compared to white men.

In the case of women, overall the regression results do not suggest much difference between the employment probabilities of foreign and native born women. The difference in case of earnings is noticeable though. All the foreign born women earn less than whites while none of the native born women groups experience lower earnings relative to white, with some of the (native born) groups, Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans earning more than whites.

The native born status appears to be more favorable to Asian women than men. All the native born Asian women with a minor exception of Vietnamese 'outperform' their white peers. The same is not the case with men. However, a commonality between foreign born Asian men and women is the positive association between U.S. based college or higher education with earnings.

The reweighting analyses to decompose the Asian-white earnings gap shows the difference for the majority of the groups to be negative at the mean, median, and 90th percentile levels for men and women. The earning gap is lower for the native than the foreign born. The results provide support for the 'glass ceiling' phenomenon for some groups of Asian men, more for the foreign than the native born. The gender comparison

in this context reveals that unlike the case for men, the disadvantage does not accentuate at the higher levels of earning for women. Women experience higher gaps at the mean and median levels of earnings than at the level of the 90th percentile. The estimates of disadvantage may be conservative though, not accounting for the quality of education.

Asian households are at par or better than whites, when measured by total household income. The Asian-white relative position depends on the measure of household well-being that is employed. Asian households experience higher (than whites) levels of aggregate household and income per labor hour employed but lower levels of median per capita income. This pattern holds more for the foreign than the native born Asian households.

Foreign born Asian groups seem to have a greater tendency to pool resources than the native born groups, including whites. Further, among the foreign born, Chinese, Koreans, and the Vietnamese show a greater inclination to extend than the other three foreign born groups. There is a positive relationship between the householder's human capital and earning endowments and the inclination to form nuclear living arrangements for all the groups. Also, over time a tendency to reside in nuclear households is observed for foreign born Asians.

The individual and household levels of analyses depict the foreign born Japanese to be an exception to the average pattern of foreign born Asian experience. At the individual men level, foreign born Japanese men are the only group experiencing an earning advantage (relative to whites). The advantage exists despite not having the best educational or English language attainments. Additionally, the estimate of the foreign born Japanese to have received a college or higher degree from the U.S. is not the highest

among the foreign born groups. With regard to percentage of nuclear households and marital characteristics of the householder, foreign born Japanese are closer to whites than to their other foreign born counterparts.

Significance of the Findings

Although immigration is a multi-faceted experience, the economic aspect has captured the most attention in the literature on inter-immigrant group experiences. Economic variables are more tangible and therefore easier to measure. They may also be more important since the opportunities for socioeconomic constitute the initial pull factor for prospective immigrants, particularly for the entrants from the developing world. The other factors (cultural and demographic) invariably follow once the decision to make the move has been made. This research by conducting an updated analyses of labor market experiences of six major Asian group disaggregated by the nativity status at individual and household levels, contributes to the empirical literature on immigrant outcomes in general, and on Asian attainments in particular. In that sense, the present work is part of the genre of research spanning three decades beginning with the seminal work by Chiswick (1978a, 1983) that attempts to examine the existence and extent of intergroup differentials.

Empirical and Methodological Significance

'Ethnicity matters, and it matters for a very long time', as per George Borjas (1999, page 144) and it does seem to matter for the specific Asian groups. The images of 'model minority' and 'honorary whites' that motivated early research on labor market outcomes of Asians *prima facie* appear to be appropriate. Yet, similar to the existing work on this subject, my results demonstrate the necessity to go beyond the surface.

Almost the entire Asian advantage for all the male groups and the majority of the female groups disappears on including the controls for education and other human capital characteristics. Such estimates discernibly provide support to the 'education overachievement' thesis put forward by pioneering study on Asians by Hirschman and Wong (1984),who used the 1960 and 1970 Census and 1976 Survey of Income and Education (SIE) data.

These results also provide some input to the fundamental question relating to the disadvantage of being non-white in the U.S. labor market, triggered substantially by the publication of *The Declining Significance of Race* by Wilson (1980). However, the opinions in this context are divided. While one of the deficiencies of most research is lack of a clear distinction on the lines of nativity status, the findings by those who do make that distinction are not conclusive. The studies arguing that non-white status is not a marker of labor market outcomes and that the so called achieved characteristics such as human capital are, base their argument on the assessment of native born non-whites. What follows from such argument is that, the disadvantage of the foreign born non-whites can be explained by their foreign birth rather than their racial/ethnic attribute.

The findings from this study offer partial support for the above thesis and more so for women than men. While only two of the native born groups of men experience a marginal earning disadvantage relative to whites, there are no (native born) women groups that earn less than their white peers in the multivariate framework. The situation for both foreign born Asian men and women is the opposite (of the native born). These observations can be synthesized with the 'education overachievement' thesis in the following way. Native born Asian men and women experience high levels of earnings

because their returns from the high educational levels are not necessarily lower than what they would be for whites. However, it is necessary to note that these estimates do not account for the details of educational attainment in terms of institutions and disciplines. Additionally, the unexplained earning gap relative to the whites at higher levels of earnings for the native born, makes one skeptical of the complete validity of the thesis of the non-significance of being a non-white in the labor market.

The analyses by making the distinction according to the place of acquisition of education and work experience are empirically and theoretically in line with the recent research work displaying a significant correlation between place of acquisition of education and earnings. Although the proxy variable employed in this study to measure the role of where education is obtained (based on the limited information available in the Census data) is a crude one, the statistical significance and the direction of it cannot be dismissed. Additionally, the measure of positive association may be a conservative estimate, considering the lack of controls measuring the characteristics of education in terms of discipline and institution. There is evidence of foreign born Asian concentration in remunerative programs and professions, such as engineering (Tang 2000; Min 2005; Bhattacharjee 2006, 2007; National Science Foundation 2007).

The use of non-parametric technique as a methodology to decompose earning gaps, helps provide new insights into group differences. The non-parametric technique, by not assuming a linear structure as in regression decomposition enables an intuitive evaluation of the earnings gap at various points in the earnings distribution, which is not possible using the OLS regression decomposition method. The unfavorable earnings gap

at higher levels of earnings for some groups of Asian men indicates a plausible existence of a 'glass ceiling' documented by earlier research.

The differential between foreign born-native born experiences between men and women raises a point of the intersections between gender and nativity statuses. Foreign born Asian men are better accomplished than their native born peers on average. The corresponding comparison for women is in the reverse direction. Additionally, the native born Asian –white gap is more favorable to (native born) Asian men than it is for women. A plausible explanation of the varied male-female experience may have to do with culture. Foreign born Asian women may constitute the 'secondary earner' work force to a greater extent than among the native born Asians. International comparative literature on gender inequalities points towards stringent gender norms in the sending Asian countries relative to the U.S. It is very likely that foreign born Asian men and women continue to follow these stricter norms more than their native born counterparts. Also, although there is evidence of the trend changing, the male migration is qualitatively different than the female one. Asian men, to a greater extent migrate to study and/or work than women. This implies that men are more select on the standard human capital as well as on the unmeasured characteristics of ability and motivation for the labor market success than women.

Despite the increasing recognition of the shortcomings of the focus on the individual, there has been no research examining economic well-being at the household level for Asians in the 2000 Census data. The household component of my analyses strengthens the theoretical and empirical usefulness of including household level analyses for reflecting a more complete picture of the immigrant experience.

The exceptional experience of foreign born Japanese on all the fronts brings to the fore the significance of the sending country characteristics. As mentioned earlier, Japanese unlike the other foreign born Asian men experience an earning advantage in spite of not being the most accomplished of the groups in terms of human capital. Factors that have been documented to help explain the Japanese advantage are the hiring of their own nationals by the Japanese multi-nationals in the U.S. into managerial positions, better perception of the Japanese work ethic by U.S. employers, greater skill transferability by the Japanese owing to Japan's level of economic development being similar to the U.S. and higher value placed on the education acquired in Japan (Chiswick 1978a, 1979; Borjas 1987, 1988; Jasso and Rosenzweig 1990;Fang 1996; Freidberg 2000). It will be worthwhile to see if a similar effect will be visible for Korean nationals in the near future given increasing Korean multi-nationals. Also, rapidly (economically) growing countries like China and India may provide good case studies to evaluate this phenomenon. There are already some signs of the possibility of testing that this in the Indian case with Indian based software companies such as Infosys establishing its offices in the U.S and hiring Indian nationals.

Policy Implications

The (policy) linkages of this study may not seem that direct, given that the focus is neither on the assessment of the fiscal impact of immigration nor on a group who are 'contentious' for a specific reason. The policy implications of the findings of this project are therefore generic and applicable more to the foreign born than the native born immigrant population. Before delving into the details, I would like to make a couple of observations; a) the U.S. public, policy makers and politicians recognize the possible

positive and adverse impacts of immigration and b) the U.S. government has the tradition of passing legislation that is effective in altering the volume and composition of immigration in the direction that is thought to be best suited for the U.S. society in general and the economy in particular.

The two major concerns about immigration that can be identified since the U.S. was founded are; the extent of immigrant assimilation and the 'quality' of immigrants. While immigrant assimilation is a long term process and is multi-faceted, quality of immigrants overwhelmingly implies economic outcomes. The question then is who should invest in immigrant quality – the receiving country or the sending country? This question is particularly pertinent for the foreign born. Asian immigration is positively select in terms of human capital and labor market skills, implying that the migrating population is better endowed than the population that does not migrate. It is also very likely that the higher education obtained in the home country is state subsidized - especially in countries such as China and India. In almost all these sending Asian countries better suitability to the U.S. labor market would call for enhancing English language skills, since English is not the native language in any of the sending Asian countries[71]. Hence, apart from increasing educational attainments in terms of

---

[71] As a side note on India as a sending country, the high proportion of foreign born Indian men and women reporting English fluency English as compared to the other Asian groups is not representative of the average level of the language ability in India. Fluency in English language is a skill confined to a small minority constituting the educationally and economically upper class strata of the Indian society. The status and use of English as an official language reflects more the lack of consensus on the acceptance of Hindi as the national language, (with more than a dozen languages listed as national languages by the Indian Constitution) than the high prevalence of the facility with the language. Knowledge and proficiency of English language, based on my field work experience in the rural regions of several states in India, is one of the most desired aspirations of school going children and their parents. My anticipation is that this is likely to grow as India becomes an increasingly active participant in the global economy.

diploma/degrees, there is evidence of increasing English emphasis[72], equally in the education system and the public in all the Asian countries including Japan. This potentially raises another relevant debate confined to the sender countries: whether the national governments in these countries should subsidize English language promotion programs, or support such programs, when they are not publicly funded? Such programs embody potential conflict with reflecting nationalist sentiments, narrowing social inequality and other related goals. The education and skills acquired in the home country facilitate chances of attaining education and/or better labor market outcomes in the U.S. Looked at this way, it seems that investment made by a developing country is benefiting the U.S. This is not to deny the likely welfare maximization that takes place at the individual migrant level and the possible tangible and intangible benefits to the sending country through remittances, dissemination of ideas.

Leaving aside the aspects of cost –benefits of educational investment in the context of sending –receiving country dynamics, a more direct question is: whether explicit policies be put in place to treat the foreign born who receive education in the U.S. at par with the native born for the various post- school training and/or labor market options? While undoubtedly U.S. education greatly and positively affect the available opportunity set (for the foreign born), there are constraints that the foreign birth status poses. There are fewer jobs, more restrictions and a stricter time line for the foreign born relative to the native born. These constraints lead the foreign born to compete for choices that are otherwise coveted but extremely competitive such as seeking admissions/jobs in prestigious educational institutions/companies. In these settings they have the greater

---

[72] Part of the increasing English emphasis is related to increasing globalization, English language being perceived and rightfully so as a skill necessary to make the national human capital resources competitive internationally.

ability to navigate through the earlier mentioned structural restrictions. The experiences for those who 'make it' as well as for those who do not is a reflection of the larger structural situation, exemplifying the concept of sociological imagination put forth by Mills (1959). Having acknowledged this connection between the private and public, there is likely to be some disconnect too. While this 'extra mile' treaded by those who succeed, is rewarding at the individual level, it may not be recognized to the same extent at the macro level. With reference to this and already mentioned constraints, the question arises about whether the government is willing to provide some form of 'insurance' for foreign born U.S. educated people who have proven to be competitive by the domestic criteria? Efforts in this direction include the Bush government creating an annual quota of 20,000 H1-B visas[73] exclusively for people with masters or a higher degree acquired in the U.S. While this move in principle recognizes the government's needs to overcome the legal restrictions, in logistic terms it seems inadequate both in content and in the number, with the quota size falling short of the number of applicants[74].

A corollary to the above would be whether the (developed) destination country should make its immigration liberal enough to grant visas based only on 'willingness' as opposed to 'willingness and ability' to migrate? One perspective on this, based on the European and more recent Japanese migration experience to the U.S., is that emigration from a developing country over a period helps develop efficient labor market structures, institutions, and reduce international wage gaps in the (sending) developing country.

---

[73] H1-B visas grant the foreign born persons the legal status to work in the U.S. These visas are usually sponsored by the employers, on the justification that it is not possible to find a native born person with equivalent skill/s that the particular job requires.
[74] These legislations providing additional visas can be seen as facilitating brain drain from the sending country. However, the argument here is being made in the context of the potential 'benefit' to the U.S. of high human capital foreign born persons.

These changes result in the (developing) sending country become internationally integrated and therefore being transformed from a net labor-exporter to a net importer of labor (Massey 1999). Following this perspective, the U.S. immigration laws could be more encouraging of Asian or for that matter Latin American immigration. That said, U.S. immigration policies seem more symbolic and flexible than those of the other major immigrant receiving countries such as Australia, and Canada. Both Australia and Canada follow a point system whereby points are assigned according to measured human capital attributes like education, and English language ability. Applicants who make the cut-off are admitted and subsequently their path to permanent residency is guaranteed and rapid. This system exemplifies the stress on quality of immigrants. Given that the average levels of human capital endowments of Asian immigrants, the latter may stand to benefit should such a system be instituted in the U.S as well. Such legislation may be objectionable, and though it has been/is being debated in the Congress, it is unlikely to pass through in the foreseeable future.

Overall against the backdrop of rising globalization, the future, it appears, may witness increases in the flow of Asian immigrants, a continued assimilation of high human capital (Asian) immigrants, and an increase in restrictive immigration policies.

Limitations and Areas of Future Research

There are limitations to this study that call for exercising caution while interpreting the results. One major limitation which pertains to all cross-sectional studies of this kind –is the inability to establish causality. Although the coefficients for many of the predictor variables are statistically significant with reasonably high magnitude, it is not possible to establish for instance, the causal relationship between education and

earnings or between the residence in the Pacific region and earnings. Is it that high earnings have led to higher education? This question becomes especially important when examining the earnings of the native born Asians who very likely are born to well educated foreign born parents. In the case of residential patterns being correlated with employment and earnings, it is not possible to completely understand these associations without knowing the related mobility strategies, ethnic niches, community structures and the like.

Further lack of information on the quality of education (institutions/discipline), place of acquisition of education, and employment history makes it difficult to obtain a complete assessment of the relationship between earnings and human capital for the foreign as well as the native born. A recent study using a specialized data set for the New York City metropolitan area, shows that the difference in the earnings among the second generation Chinese youth is almost entirely explained by the prestige of U.S. college institutions attended rather than by the level of education acquired (Kim and Kulkarni forthcoming).

My regression estimates show that the disadvantage of being foreign born does not get eliminated in the multivariate framework; one is tempted to attribute that to discrimination. But the question is whether segregation comes into play more prominently than discrimination? Are some industries more receptive to Asians and therefore leading to their Asian concentration? Making conclusions based on the limited number of measured characteristics may lead to an inaccurate picture of the inter-ethnic group dynamics in the labor market.

Another major constraints posed by the 2000 Census data is the lack of information on the process of visa transitions. Difficulty in obtaining a valid visa at the right time may make the participation in the country's labor market impossible and/or result in job choices that are not commensurate with one's qualifications. Visa status can be considered a structural factor and not necessarily related to employers' discriminatory/non-discriminatory practices. In fact there are numerous instances of employers working with the foreign born employees to facilitate to acquire the requisite visa. A recent New York Times article (Robert Pear, The New York Times, June 25, 2007) reported on the appeal of companies like Google, IBM to the government to expand substantially the permanent residence and H1-B visas to enable 'high tech companies to hire larger number of well-educated, foreign-born professionals …..to succeed in the global economy'. Lack of information on the so called structural parameters such as visa status plausibly leads to measurement error in statistical evaluation of discrimination. Additionally, lack of such information hampers a conclusive assessment of claims that a decline in immigrant quality is attributable to increasing entry under the auspices of family reunification visa criteria.

Given these limitations, this research should be viewed as a snapshot comparative picture of the Asian experience in the U.S. labor market, employing the best suited and latest available data set. The study provides a base to investigate new areas of inquiry that have emerged from the research analyses. Some of follow up investigations that need attention, given the changing size and the contexts of immigrant population, are the following.

Assimilation of the post 1965 Asian immigration stream

As an extension of the current work, cohort analyses of Asian immigrants for men and women separately by pooling the data from 1970 through 2000 Census would contribute to the arguments relating to declining immigrant cohort quality and convergence of earnings. One issue involves the relative appropriateness of using occupation versus earnings as an indicator of economic assimilation, a contentious issue between sociologists and economists.

Immigrant skill assimilation

One variable of interest is the acquisition of host country specific skills, such as language attainment. Previous research is limited by not distinguishing between assimilation and cohort effects, by focusing on one immigrant group or by being based on older data sets. Analyses using data across several years will allow disentangling of the assimilation and cohort effects. Additionally, the focus on major ethnic groups will help assess the differential assimilation rates among the groups.

Pre-1965 and post-1965 Asian immigration

The post-1965 Asian immigration is characterized by entry of both high skilled human capital migrants as well as low skilled persons admitted under the family reunification criterion. It will, therefore be, interesting to compare contemporary Asian immigrants with those at the beginning of the last century when educational attainments were universally much lower and the United States economy was heavily manufacturing based and therefore more labor intensive.

Relevance of permanent residency status for the foreign born

Technically, a foreign born person is an immigrant only when he/she is granted a permanent residency status. The implications of possessing a permanent residency status go beyond the legal aspects and determine the opportunities that are available. The status of permanent residency is therefore granted after much scrutiny and reflects the policies of the host country. The comparison of the findings have with those of the recently released New Immigrant Survey will potentially bring to light the difference between an average foreign born person and someone who has a permanent residence.

Gender and race/ethnicity intersection – does gender trump race/ethnicity?

The question of intersections in the U.S. labor market has been of long standing interest to social scientists. In the case of foreign born non-white women–an additional jeopardy is contributed by the foreign birth status. Thus, investigations are needed that go beyond the non-white women-white women comparison to include women (white and non-white) and white and non-white men in the same framework. The existing literature leans toward projecting gender as having a more significant association with labor market outcomes than non-white or foreign birth status. Does the 2000 Census produces similar results?

Migrant and Non-migrant differences

As mentioned earlier, one of the cogent theses in the international migration literature is that immigrants, particularly those moving from developing to developed countries are a positively select group. Thus, it is reasonable to expect the variations in attainments, as well as in behavior, between those who move and those who decide to stay back in the home country. These differences may be all the more pronounced in indicators like

female labor force participation, since the gender roles tend to be a product of both economic and cultural factors.

Employing mixed methods

While one of the most worthy merits of analyzing quantitative data using statistical techniques, as done in the present research, lies in being able to make generalizable observations, some shortcomings (of the quantitative methodology) must not be overlooked. These limitations of large scale data sets are in the inability to capture perceptions and/or transitions, both of which are critical issues pertaining to immigrant population. Census data do not provide information on the existence of a possible sense of alienation, informal social networks, the nuances of the assimilation process, education and work history, visa status transitions and the like. Census data therefore need to be complemented with findings with insights drawn from qualitative techniques such as semi-structured interviews.

There is a growing and vibrant interest in the sub-field of international migration in the disciplines of Sociology, Demography, and Economics. The increasing size and changing contexts of immigration more than ever necessitate disaggregated analyses integrating micro and macro level variables to help address the enduring subject of the intersections between race, ethnicity, gender, and nativity in the United States labor market. While data availability may continue to constrain research in the near future, the good news is that increasing interest in immigration issues among academics and policy makers is likely to facilitate expansion of new and comprehensive data collection endeavors such as the New Immigrant Survey. These new data could lead to more

informed policy decisions that reflect a move beyond myopic perspectives and on the short term solutions such as granting amnesty to illegal aliens.

Tables

Table 2.1. Select Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics of the Six Sending Asian Countries and the Receiving Country

Country/Characteristic	China	India	Japan	Korea	Philippines	United States	Vietnam
Socioeconomic							
GNI * per capita (in U.S. $)	1,740	730	38,950	15,840	1,320	43,560	620
National poverty rate 2002/03 (percentage)	5	29	n.a	n.a	37	n.a	29
Value added in agriculture (as percentage of GDP*)	13	18	2	3	14	1	21
Adult literacy rate (percentage of ages 15 and older)	91	61	n.a	n.a	93	n.a	90
Adult male literacy rate 2002/03 (percentage of ages 15 and older)	95	68	n.a	n.a	93	n.a	94
Adult female literacy rate 2002/03 (percentage of ages 15 and older)	87	45	n.a	n.a	93	n.a	87
Primary school completion rate (percentage of primary school age group)	98	89	100	104	97	n.a	94
Ratio of female to male in primary and secondary school (percentage)	98	87	98	87	106	109	94
Demographic							
Life expectancy at birth (years)	72	64	82	78	71	78	71
Fertility rate (births per woman)	1.8	2.8	1.3	1.1	3.2	2.1	1.8
Infant mortality rate (per 1000 live births)	23	56	3	5	25	6	16
Under five mortality rate (per 1000)	27	74	4	5	33	7	19
Share (foreign + U.S. born) in the U.S. population 2000	0.9	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.7	n.a	0.4

Note : n.a. = means that the data are not available or aggregates cannot be calculated because of missing data.

 * GNI per capita is the gross national income (GNI) divided by the mid-year population. GNI is the gross domestic product (GDP)
   plus net receipts of primary income (employee compensation and property income) from abroad.

**GDP stands for Gross Domestic Product and 'is the sum of all the value added by all the resident producers plus any product taxes
   (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of the output.' (World Bank).

Sources : *The Little Data Book 2007* , The World Bank.

        Xie, Yu and Kimberly A. Goyette. 2004. *A Demographic Portrait of Asian Americans* , Population Reference Bureau and
        Russell Sage Foundation : Washington, D.C. and New York.

Ethnicity/Nativity	Unweighted Sample Size		Percent Employed	Number of weeks	Number of usual hours per week worked	Hourly Earnings (in U.S. $1999)		
	All	Reporting Positive Hourly Earnings in 1999				Mean	Relative to White	
							Median	Geometric Mean
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Chinese								
Foreign born	14,222	12,423	87.8	40.89	38.56	25.7(337.75)	0.87	0.84
Native born	5,088	4,672	92.0	44.84	41.56	32.58 (70.37)	1.30	1.27
Filipino								
Foreign born	17,271	15,427	89.6	41.89	37.33	23.81 (92.55)	0.94	0.94
Native born	6,127	5,539	91.0	43.17	38.57	21.72 (28.01)	0.98	0.97
Indian								
Foreign born	18,442	17,146	93.3	44.7	41.67	33.87 (57.93)	1.50	1.35
Native born	1,887	1,710	90.7	43.25	42.79	28.25 (33.86)	1.14	1.14
Japanese								
Foreign born	3,320	3,096	93.1	44.12	43.81	45.94 (127.75)	1.53	1.55
Native born	7,324	6,561	90.2	44.15	39.65	27.99 (49.27)	1.24	1.20
Korean								
Foreign born	8,039	7,057	88.0	41.36	41.27	28.34 (153.48)	0.91	0.94
Native born	1,836	1,656	90.2	42.98	42.37	26.52 (38.79)	1.06	1.06
Vietnamese								
Foreign born	13,016	11,180	86.6	42.91	36.69	20.16 (47.38)	0.77	0.78
Native born	1,988	1,802	90.8	42.91	39.6	23.91 (55.35)	0.98	0.95
Asian								
Foreign born	74,310	66,329	89.7	42.32	39.29	27.76 (167.24)	1.01	1.01
Native born	24,250	21,940	90.9	43.71	40.25	26.98 (49.56)	1.12	1.11
White								
Native born	528,009	465,419	88.7	42.96	39.88	24.84 (101.22)	1.00	1.00

Note : The base for the figures indicating percent employed in column 4 constitutes weighted sample sizes of all men
   aged 25-65 belonging to the respective ethnicity and nativity category.
   The figures in brackets indicate the standard deviation.
   White refers to native born non-Hispanic whites all through.

Table 5.2 Weighted Distribution of Human Capital Characteristics of Men by Ethnicity and Nativity
(Universe includes Non-Institutionalized Men Aged 25-65)

Ethnicity/Nativity	Less than college degree (%)	College degree (%)	Masters/ Professional/ Doctorate(%)	College or higher education from the US (%)	Mean years of education	Mean years of work experience	Mean years of non U.S. work experience	Speaks no English (%)	Speak only English or very well (%)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Chinese									
Foreign born	52.8	14.2	33.0	16.8	13.82	24.7	11.2	12.4	31.6
Native born	36.0	38.5	25.4	n.a.	15.56	18.6	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Filipino									
Foreign born	55.4	37.0	7.6	9.7	14.11	25.1	8.7	0.3	64.7
Native born	65.5	26.7	7.8	n.a.	13.84	16.6	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Indian									
Foreign born	21.8	30.0	48.2	28.6	16.63	18.0	5.8	0.5	78.3
Native born	34.9	30.6	34.6	n.a.	15.91	11.3	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Japanese									
Foreign born	30.3	45.4	24.3	11.8	15.74	20.4	9.4	0.6	36.6
Native born	50.0	33.5	16.5	n.a.	14.87	23.7	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Korean									
Foreign born	48.8	31.5	19.6	13.6	14.74	24.4	9.5	2.6	25.8
Native born	39.9	36.7	23.5	n.a.	15.51	11.7	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Vietnamese									
Foreign born	81.2	13.6	5.2	10.6	11.69	24.8	10.8	3.9	21.2
Native born	56.6	32.2	11.2	n.a.	14.09	10.9	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Asian									
Foreign born	48.9	26.5	24.6	16.6	14.4	22.9	8.9	3.6	48.8
Native born	49.4	32.8	17.8	n.a.	14.8	17.8	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
White									
Native born	70.1	19.2	10.8	n.a.	13.6	23.9	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Note : Years of work experience where ever referred to implies potential years of work experience.   n.a. = not applicable.

Table 5.3 Weighted Percentage Distribution by Major Occupational and Type of Work Categories for Men by Ethnicity and Nativity
(Universe includes Non-Institutionalized Men Aged 25-65)

Ethnicity/Nativity	Service	Sales	Office and administrative support	Farming/ Fishing/ Forestry	Construction/ Extraction/ Maintenance	Production/ Transportation/ Material	Professional/ Managerial/ Business	Wage/ Salary earner	Self - employed
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Chinese									
Foreign born	22.1	6.6	4.0	0.1	5.0	11.3	44.3	86.6	13.4
Native born	7.3	9.4	9.0	0.1	5.3	7.6	56.8	87.4	12.6
Filipino									
Foreign born	16.4	5.4	13.9	0.9	9.1	18.6	30.6	93.4	6.6
Native born	12.0	8.2	11.5	0.5	11.9	13.3	37.8	95.1	4.9
Indian									
Foreign born	3.3	9.2	4.4	0.2	2.0	9.7	68.1	87.1	12.9
Native born	5.5	9.9	6.0	0.5	4.6	8.7	60.2	89.2	10.8
Japanese									
Foreign born	10.7	10.2	5.5	0.1	2.4	4.3	63.2	86.7	13.4
Native born	8.3	10.1	7.7	0.6	11.4	9.3	47.7	87.2	12.9
Korean									
Foreign born	8.5	21.1	4.3	0.1	9.1	14.4	36.4	64.8	35.2
Native born	7.4	13.2	6.5	0.0	5.6	7.7	54.9	85.2	13.8
Vietnamese									
Foreign born	14.3	5.6	4.9	1.1	10.4	33.6	21.9	87.4	12.7
Native born	10.3	9.6	8.2	0.6	9.2	13.6	44.1	90.6	9.4
Asian									
Foreign born	12.7	8.5	6.6	0.5	6.4	16.4	43.4	86.0	14.0
Native born	8.9	9.7	8.7	0.4	9.0	10.1	48.5	88.6	10.4
White									
Native born	8.2	10.0	5.8	0.7	17.4	18.8	33.0	85.9	14.1

Table 5.4 Weighted Percentage Distribution of Assimilation and Demographic Characteristics of Men by Ethnicity and Nativity
(Universe includes Non-Institutionalized Men Aged 25-65)

Ethnicity/Nativity	Duration of Stay			Region of Residence						Married
	Less than 10 years	More than 10 and less than 20 years	More than 20 years	Northeast	Midwest	South	Rest of the West	Pacific	Metro	(with spouse present)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Chinese										
Foreign born	44.3	36.6	19.1	38.3	9.8	14.9	2.3	34.8	96.0	78.0
Native born	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	22.8	7.2	10.6	3.6	55.8	95.9	53.8
Filipino										
Foreign born	31.6	36.9	31.5	12.5	8.1	12.2	3.4	63.8	93.2	72.8
Native born	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	7.7	7.4	11.1	4.8	69.1	88.9	49.2
Indian										
Foreign born	51.7	28.8	19.6	31.8	18.9	25.1	2.3	22.0	94.6	78.2
Native born	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	30.1	16.4	25.1	3.9	24.5	92.8	48.8
Japanese										
Foreign born	61.0	17.7	21.4	23.4	13.9	15.5	3.3	44.0	96.7	68.1
Native born	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	3.3	4.1	4.8	4.9	83.0	87.1	57.6
Korean										
Foreign born	33.4	39.9	26.7	25.3	8.7	19.0	2.7	44.3	96.7	81.1
Native born	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	20.8	12.3	18.1	5.0	43.9	93.9	45.4
Vietnamese										
Foreign born	41.0	38.6	20.5	10.4	10.1	31.3	3.2	45.1	95.2	67.7
Native born	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	9.2	10.0	31.7	4.7	44.5	94.3	32.3
Asian										
Foreign born	42.6	34.5	23.2	23.9	11.9	20.2	2.8	41.2	94.8	75.0
Native born	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	12.7	7.7	12.6	4.5	62.6	91.1	51.5
White										
Native born	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	19.2	26.2	34.8	6.9	13.0	53.9	66.2

Note : Pacific region comprises the states of Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon and Washington.
   n.a. = not applicable.

Table 5.5 Marginal Effects (Standard Error) from the Probit Estimates Predicting Probability of Employment for Foreign Born Asian and Native Born Asian by Asian Ethnicity and White Men (Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Men Aged 25-65)

Variable	Panel A : Foreign Born			Panel B : Native Born	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Ethnicity					
Chinese	-0.0092 +	0.034 **	0.041 **	0.033 **	-0.0016
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.01)
Filipino	0.0090 **	0.026 **	0.036 **	0.023 **	-0.0079 +
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.00)
Indian	0.046 **	0.0201 **	0.035 **	0.021 *	-0.049 **
	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Japanese	0.044 **	0.038 **	0.051 **	0.015 **	0.013 **
	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Korean	-0.0064 +	0.009	0.023 **	0.015 +	-0.055 **
	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Vietnamese	-0.0204 **	0.032 **	0.034 **	0.02 *	-0.037 **
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.007)	(0.009)
Education category					
Less than college degree		-0.029 **	n.a		-0.030 **
		(0.001)			(0.001)
College education		0.0099 **	n.a		0.0104 **
		(0.002)			(0.002)
Education category accounting for U.S. college degree					
Less than college degree		n.a.	-0.035 **		n.a.
			(0.001)		
College or higher degree not acquired in the U.S.		n.a.	-0.061 **		n.a.
			(0.004)		
Work experience					
Years of work experience		0.003 **	0.003 **		0.0031 **
		(0.0002)	(0.0002)		(0.0002)
Square of years of work experience		-0.00018 **	-0.0002 **		-0.00017 **
		(0.00)	(0.00)		(0.00)
English language ability					
Speaks no English		-0.051 **	-0.063 **		n.a.
		(0.011)	(0.01)		
Speaks English well or not well		-0.027 **	-0.029 **		n.a.
		(0.004)	(0.004)		
Duration of stay					
Less than 10 years of stay		-0.073 **	-0.065 **		n.a.
		(0.01)	(0.01)		
More than 10 but less than 20 years		-0.022 **	-0.022 **		n.a.
		(0.01)	(0.01)		
Region of /urban residence					
Northeast		0.013 **	0.013 **		0.013 **
		(0.001)	(0.001)		(0.001)
Midwest		0.027 **	0.027 **		0.027 **
		(0.001)	(0.001)		(0.001)
South		0.0047 **	0.0048 **		0.004 **
		(0.001)	(0.001)		(0.001)
Rest of the West		0.013 **	0.013 **		0.012 **
		(0.002)	(0.002)		(0.002)
Metro		0.0204 **	0.0203 **		0.020 **
		(0.001)	(0.001)		(0.001)
Marital status					
Single		-0.11 **	-0.11 **		-0.11 **
		(0.001)	(0.001)		(0.001)
Number of observations (Degrees of freedom)	602,160 (6)	602,160 (20)	602,160 (20)	552,104 (6)	552,104 (16)
Adjusted Log likelihood	-212485.06	-176943.97	-176920.15	-19493.68	-161990.4
Adjusted R-square	0.00	0.17	0.17	0	0.17

Robust standard errors in brackets.   + p <=0.10 ; * p <= 0.05; ** p <= 0.01 (two-tailed)   n.a. = not applicable/excluded

Omitted categories : White ; Masters/Professional/Doctorate; College or higher degree acquired in the U.S.; Speaks only English or very well;

20 or more years of stay ; Pacific region of residence; Non-metro residence; and Married, spouse present.

Table 5.6 OLS Estimates (Standard Error) with Logarithm of Hourly Earnings as the Dependent Variable for Foreign Born Asian and Native Born Asian by Asian Ethnicity and White Men (Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Men Aged 25-65 Reporting Positive Earnings)

	Panel A : Foreign Born			Panel B : Native Born	
	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 1**	**Model 2**
(1)	**(2)**	**(3)**	**(4)**	**(5)**	**(6)**
Ethnicity					
Chinese	-0.18 **	-0.27 **	-0.21 **	0.24 **	0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Filipino	-0.06 **	-0.19 **	-0.14 **	-0.03 **	-0.04 **
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Indian	0.30 **	-0.03 **	0.05 **	0.13 **	0.02
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Japanese	0.44 **	0.21 **	0.28 **	0.18 **	-0.02 *
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Korean	-0.06 **	-0.20 **	-0.13 **	0.06 *	-0.04
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Vietnamese	-0.24 **	-0.13 **	-0.14 **	-0.05 *	-0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Education splines					
0-12 years of education		0.03 **	n.a		0.04 **
		(0.001)			(0.001)
13-16 years of education		0.09 **	n.a		0.09 **
		(0.001)			(0.001)
More than 16 years of education		0.06 **	n.a		0.06 **
		(0.001)			(0.001)
Education category accounting for U.S. college degree					
Less than college degree		n.a	-0.36 **		n.a
			(0.003)		
College or higher degree not acquired in the U.S.		n.a	-0.09 **		n.a
			(0.01)		
Work experience					
Years of work experience		0.04 **	0.04 **		0.03 **
		(0.001)	(0.001)		(0.00)
Square of years of work experience		-0.001 **	-0.001 **		-0.001 **
		(0.00)	(0.00)		(0.00)
Non -U.S. years of work experience					
Non-U.S. years of work experience		-0.01 **	-0.01 **		n.a
		(0.001)	(0.001)		
Square of years of non-U.S. work experience		0.00 **	0.00 **		n.a
		(0.00)	(0.00)		
English language ability					
Speaks no English		-0.27 **	-0.44 **		n.a
		(0.03)	(0.03)		
Speaks English well or not well		-0.10 **	-0.14 **		n.a
		(0.01)	(0.01)		

Continued

Table 5.6 continued

(1)	Panel A : Foreign Born			Panel B : Native Born	
	Model 1 (2)	Model 2 (3)	Model 3 (4)	Model 1 (5)	Model 2 (6)
Type of occupation					
Service		** -0.35 (0.004)	-0.40 ** (0.004)		** -0.34 (0.01)
Sales		** -0.11 (0.004)	-0.15 ** (0.004)		** -0.10 (0.004)
Office and administrative support		** -0.26 (0.01)	-0.29 ** (0.01)		** -0.26 (0.01)
Farming, fishing, forestry		** -0.45 (0.02)	-0.53 ** (0.02)		** -0.45 (0.02)
Construction, extraction, maintenance		** -0.16 (0.004)	-0.21 ** (0.004)		** -0.15 (0.004)
Production, transportation, material		** -0.22 (0.004)	-0.27 ** (0.003)		** -0.21 (0.004)
Type of work					
Self-employed		** -0.14 (0.01)	-0.13 ** (0.01)		** -0.14 (0.01)
Region of /urban residence					
Northeast		* -0.01 (0.004)	-0.01 ** (0.004)		-0.01 (0.004)
Midwest		** -0.07 (0.004)	-0.07 ** (0.004)		** -0.07 (0.004)
South		** -0.10 (0.004)	-0.11 ** (0.004)		** -0.10 (0.004)
Rest of the West		** -0.12 (0.01)	-0.12 ** (0.01)		** -0.12 (0.01)
Metro		** 0.16 (0.002)	0.17 ** (0.002)		** 0.16 (0.002)
Marital status					
Single		** -0.21 (0.002)	-0.22 ** (0.002)		** -0.21 (0.002)
Constant	2.85 ** (0.001)	** 2.10 (0.02)	2.92 (0.01)	** 2.85 (0.001)	** 2.02 (0.02)
Number of observations (Degrees of Freedom)	531,616 (6)	531,616 (28)	531,616 (28)	487,229 (6)	487,229 (24)
Adjusted R square	0	0.20	0.18	0	0.20

Robust standard errors in brackets.   + p <=0.10 ; * p <= 0.05; ** p <= 0.01 (two-tailed)   n.a. = not applicable/excluded

Omitted categories : White ; College or higher degree acquired in the U.S.; Speaks only English or very well; Business/Managerial/Professional;
Wage/Salary earner; Pacific region of residence; Non-metro residence; and Married, spouse present.

170

Table 5.7 OLS Estimates (Standard Error) Relating to Nativity Status with Logarithm of Hourly Earnings as the Dependent Variable for Foreign and Native Born Asian Men Pooled by Ethnicity (Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Men Aged 25-65 Reporting Positive Earnings)

Variable (1)	Chinese (2)	Filipino (3)	Indian (4)	Japanese (5)	Korean (6)	Vietnamese (7)	Asian (8)
Nativity status							
Foreign born	-0.18 **	-0.12 **	0.05 *	0.20 **	-0.04	0.05 +	-0.06 **
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.24)	(0.01)
Constant	2.76 **	2.72 **	2.98 **	2.08 **	2.59 **	2.66 **	2.69 **
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.15)	(0.12)	(0.06)	(0.02)
Number of observations (Degrees of freedom)	17,092 (23)	20,964 (23)	18,854 (23)	9,656 (23)	8,712 (23)	12,981 (23)	88,259 (23)
Adjusted R square	0.35	0.18	0.27	0.19	0.12	0.24	0.25

Robust standard errors in brackets.

 + p <=0.10 ; * p <= 0.05; ** p <= 0.01 (two-tailed)

Controlled for years and square of years of work experience, non -U.S. years of work experience, square of non-U.S. years of work expereince,

English language ability, type of occupation, type of work, region of residence, and marital status.

Omitted category : Native born

Table 5.8 Distribution of Hourly Earnings (in U.S. $ at 1999 prices) using Non-Parametric Weights for Men, by Ethnicity and Nativity

Ethnicity/Nativity	Observed			Reweighted (White earnings as per Asian Characteristics)			Earnings Ratio (Observed Asian/Reweighted White)		
	Mean	Median	90th Percentile	Mean	Median	90th Percentile	Mean (col.2/col.5)	Median (col.3/col.6)	90th Percentile (col.4/col.7)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Chinese									
Foreign born	26.34	15	42.22	40.20	28.85	57.70	0.66	0.52	0.73
Native born	33.1	23.1	50.50	32.14	23.10	48.10	1.03	1.00	1.05
Filipino									
Foreign born	23.74	16.20	35.58	23.20	19.13	38.46	1.02	0.85	0.93
Native born	21.83	16.83	35	23.25	19.17	38.46	0.94	0.88	0.91
Indian									
Foreign born	33.73	25.38	56.10	41.43	28.85	81.73	0.81	0.88	0.69
Native born	26.15	18.10	45.38	26.91	17.75	51.53	0.97	1.02	0.88
Japanese									
Foreign born	41.80	25.64	86.86	33.19	24.52	57.69	1.26	1.05	1.51
Native born	28.10	21.30	44.76	27.26	21.63	46	1.03	0.98	0.97
Korean									
Foreign born	28.73	16	48.10	31.68	22.35	58.13	0.91	0.72	0.83
Native born	24.60	17.5	43.75	25.54	19.23	44.87	0.96	0.91	0.98
Vietnamese									
Foreign born	20.89	13.70	33.50	30.75	20.83	43.27	0.68	0.66	0.77
Native born	18.87	14.42	38.46	22.65	17.32	45.19	0.83	0.83	0.85
Asian									
Foreign born	27.65	17.31	45.79	29.49	20.19	48.10	0.94	0.86	0.95
Native born	27.72	20.04	44.56	26.65	19.40	43.75	1.04	1.03	1.02
White									
Native born	25.01	17.26	40	25.01	17.26	40	1	1	1

Table 6.1 Unweighted Sample Sizes, Weighted Percent Employed, Annual Weeks and Hours Worked and Mean and Relative Median and (Geometric) Mean Hourly Earnings for Women by Ethnicity and Nativity

Ethnicity/Nativity	Unweighted Sample Size		Percent Employed	Number of weeks	Number of usual hours per week worked	Hourly Earnings (in U.S. $1999)		
	All	Reporting Positive Hourly Earnings in 1999				Mean	Relative to White	
							Median	Geometric Mean
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Chinese								
Foreign born	16,216	11,294	70.1	31.3	28.3	18.29 (33.90)	0.96	0.95
Native born	4,332	3,564	82.2	38.4	33.5	24.03 (22.09)	1.51	1.48
Filipino								
Foreign born	28,923	23,734	82.3	38.0	32.7	20.81 (42.64)	1.13	1.16
Native born	3,704	3,047	82.3	38.2	32.7	53.80 (1803. 69)	1.14	1.15
Indian								
Foreign born	15,815	9,851	62.2	27.7	24.6	22.98 (38.97)	1.23	1.24
Native born	971	753	78.6	35.3	33.6	23.28 (34.33)	1.31	1.29
Japanese								
Foreign born	6,147	3,278	51.3	22.6	19.5	19.27 (25.59)	1.10	1.10
Native born	6,814	5,598	82.5	39.0	32.7	24.77 (195.64)	1.38	1.36
Korean								
Foreign born	13,635	8,400	61.5	28.0	25.5	18.74 (30.84)	0.94	0.97
Native born	733	608	78.8	35.7	32.9	27.60 (122.85)	1.32	1.38
Vietnamese								
Foreign born	15,186	10,598	71.0	32.3	27.9	15.40 (41.24)	0.81	0.85
Native born	241	173	70.7	31.7	29.1	18.04 (26.42)	0.95	0.98
Asian								
Foreign born	95,922	67,155	70.0	31.3	28.3	19.51 (38.46)	1.35	1.05
Native born	16,795	13,743	81.8	38.4	33.5	30.84 (850.35)	1.53	1.33
White								
Native born	538,886	409,572	76.1	34.9	28.8	17.58 (53.37)	1.00	1.00

Note: White refers to native born non-Hispanic whites all through.   * The figures in brackets indicate standard deviation.

Table 6.2 Weighted Distribution of Human Capital Characteristics of Women by Ethnicity and Nativity
(Universe includes Non-Institutionalized Women Aged 25-65)

Ethnicity/Nativity	Less than college degree (%)	College degree (%)	Masters/ Professional/ Doctorate(%)	College or higher education from the U.S. (%)	Mean years of work experience	Mean years of non U.S. work experience	Speaks no English (%)	Speak only English or very well (%)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Chinese								
Foreign born	60.9	19.0	20.1	18.4	25.1	11.6	14.4	28.1
Native born	33.3	41.9	24.8	n.a	19.0	n.a	0.1	93.9
Filipino								
Foreign born	48.7	43.7	7.7	26.2	23.7	7.0	0.3	71.4
Native born	63.7	28.3	8.0	n.a	17.9	n.a	0.0	96.3
Indian								
Foreign born	34.0	34.6	31.5	20.5	18.5	5.9	2.7	67.8
Native born	36.9	31.2	31.9	n.a	12.3	n.a	0.1	94.4
Japanese								
Foreign born	61.4	29.1	9.5	19.4	23.3	7.2	1.3	44.6
Native born	47.9	36.9	15.2	n.a	24.6	n.a	0.0	97.4
Korean								
Foreign born	63.3	28.8	8.0	26.1	23.9	7.4	4.0	32.6
Native born	38.8	34.9	26.3	n.a	14.2	n.a	0.3	93.7
Vietnamese								
Foreign born	84.2	12.1	3.8	11.3	24.6	10.5	8.5	25.0
Native born	76.3	14.9	8.8	n.a	21.1	n.a	1.5	80.2
Asian								
Foreign born	56.8	29.8	13.5	15.6	23.2	8.2	5.0	48.7
Native born	46.7	35.6	17.7	n.a	20.4	n.a	0.1	95.6
White								
Native born	72.7	18.0	9.3	n.a	24.6	n.a	0.1	98.9

Note : Years of work experience where ever referred to implies potential years of work experience.   n.a. = not applicable

Table 6.3 Weighted Percentage Distribution by Major Occupational and Type of Work Categories for Wome by Ethnicity and Nativity
(Universe includes Non-Institutionalized Women Aged 25-65)

Ethnicity/Nativity	Service	Sales	Office and administrative support	Farming/ Fishing/ Forestry	Construction/ Extraction/ Maintenance	Production/ Transportation/ Material	Professional/ Managerial/ Business	Wage/ Salary earner	Self - employed
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Chinese									
Foreign born	13.3	7.0	9.0	0.2	0.4	17.3	32.5	91.0	9.0
Native born	6.0	7.7	17.3	0.0	0.4	2.8	54.8	91.9	8.1
Filipino									
Foreign born	17.8	7.4	17.3	0.5	0.5	8.9	36.7	95.2	4.9
Native born	11.1	9.1	25.0	0.2	0.7	4.1	39.3	94.7	5.3
Indian									
Foreign born	5.6	7.3	10.7	0.3	0.3	6.9	41.5	91.5	8.5
Native born	8.0	7.5	12.0	0.0	0.3	4.8	53.4	93.7	6.3
Japanese									
Foreign born	11.9	8.7	13.0	0.2	0.5	4.2	26.3	87.6	12.4
Native born	6.4	7.1	26.4	0.2	0.4	2.1	46.8	93.0	7.0
Korean									
Foreign born	16.1	14.9	9.5	0.2	0.2	10.8	21.7	77.7	22.3
Native born	8.5	6.7	13.3	0.1	0.2	3.0	55.5	94.7	5.3
Vietnamese									
Foreign born	20.6	5.7	8.8	0.3	0.9	25.6	17.3	88.1	11.9
Native born	12.8	10.9	13.3	1.2	0.4	13.7	27.1	94.0	88.1
Asian									
Foreign born	14.8	8.2	12.0	0.3	0.5	12.6	30.9	90.0	10.0
Native born	7.6	7.7	22.0	0.1	0.4	3.1	47.9	93.2	6.8
White									
Native born	12.6	9.6	22.1	0.2	0.7	6.4	33.3	8.7	8.7

Note : The base for the occupational distribution is the entire population of the particular ethnicity and nativity and not the employed population.

Ethnicity/Nativity	Duration of Stay			Region of Residence						Married
	Less than 10 years	More than 10 and less than 20 years	More than 20 years	Northeast	Midwest	South	Rest of the West	Pacific	Metro	(with spou present)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Chinese										
Foreign born	49.6	33.3	19.8	36.4	9.2	14.3	2.5	37.6	97.6	77.2
Native born	n.a	n.a	n.a	21.4	6.1	10.5	3.3	58.7	95.7	60.8
Filipino										
Foreign born	31.3	34.6	34.1	13.0	9.4	15.7	4.4	57.5	93.1	69.1
Native born	n.a	n.a	n.a	7.6	6.9	13.2	4.7	67.6	87.2	59.3
Indian										
Foreign born	49.7	27.8	22.5	31.8	18.6	25.9	2.2	21.5	95.9	86.7
Native born	n.a	n.a	n.a	30.2	15.2	28.6	3.6	22.5	92.4	52.8
Japanese										
Foreign born	44.6	19.4	36.0	17.3	11.6	18.2	5.0	47.9	92.2	76.7
Native born	n.a	n.a	n.a	3.2	4.7	4.4	4.6	83.1	87.8	64.8
Korean										
Foreign born	30.5	33.1	36.4	21.8	10.7	23.2	4.1	40.1	94.7	75.0
Native born	n.a	n.a	n.a	21.8	14.6	16.3	5.2	42.1	90.7	46.1
Vietnamese										
Foreign born	44.7	30.4	24.9	10.0	9.3	30.6	4.0	46.2	96.8	68.2
Native born	n.a	n.a	n.a	10.5	10.4	34.1	3.7	41.4	91.2	49.5
Asian										
Foreign born	40.0	31.4	28.6	21.4	11.3	20.8	3.6	43.0	95.1	74.7
Native born	n.a	n.a	n.a	11.6	6.8	10.4	4.2	67.0	90.2	60.7
White										
Native born	n.a	n.a	n.a	19.8	26.3	35.0	6.7	12.3	53.9	67.4

n.a = not applicable

Table 6.5 Marginal Effects from the Probit Estimates (Standard Error) with Predicting Probability of Employment for Foreign Born Asian and Native Born Asian by Asian Ethnicity and White Women (Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Women Aged 25-65)

(1)	Panel A : Foreign Born		Panel B : Native Born
	Model 1 (2)	Model 2 (3)	Model 1 (4)
Ethnicity			
Chinese	0.012 *	0.048 **	-0.003
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Filipino	0.051 **	0.085 **	0.028 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)
Indian	-0.191 **	-0.118 **	-0.090 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)
Japanese	-0.231 **	-0.181 **	0.055 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Korean	-0.113 **	-0.072 **	-0.076 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)
Vietnamese	0.034 **	0.05 **	-0.084 *
	(0.06)	(0.01)	(0.04)
Education			
Less than college degree	-0.112 **	n.a	-0.113 **
	(0.02)		(0.00)
College education	-0.068 **	n.a	-0.069 **
	(0.00)		(0.00)
Education accounting for U.S. college degree			
Less than college degree	n.a	-0.075 **	n.a
		(0.00)	
College or higher degree not acquired in the U.S.	n.a	-0.131 **	n.a
		(0.01)	
Work experience			
Years of work experience	0.004 **	0.004 **	0.004 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Square of years of work experience	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	-0.00 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Non -U.S. years of work experience			
Non-U.S. years of work experience	0.001 *	0.001 **	n.a
	(0.00)	(0.00)	
Square of years of non-U.S. work experience	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	n.a
	(0.00)	(0.00)	
English language ability			
Speaks no English	-0.189 **	-0.213 **	n.a
	(0.01)	(0.01)	
Speaks English well or not well	-0.092 **	-0.096 **	n.a
	(0.01)	(0.01)	
Region of /urban residence			
Northeast	0.013 **	0.015 **	0.014 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Midwest	0.048 **	0.049 **	0.050 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
South	-0.005 *	-0.004 *	-0.005 *
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Rest of the West	0.011 **	0.011 **	0.011 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Non metro residence	0.008 **	0.008 **	0.008 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Marital status			
Single	0.068 **	0.068 **	0.067 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Children below age five			
Children below age five	-0.191 **	-0.193 **	-0.195 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Number of observations (Degrees of freedom)	589,313 (21)	589,313 (21)	526,793 (17)
Wald Chi-square	46362.67 **	46168.16 **	40983.14 **

** p <= 0.01 ; * p < =0.05 ; +p <= 0.10   The figures in brackets denote robust standard error. n.a = not applicable/excluded

Reference category; White; Masters/Professional/Doctorate; U.S. college degree or higher; Speaks only English or very well;

Pacific /not in metro area; Married, spouse present; No children below the age of 5.

Table 6.6 Sample Selection Adjusted OLS Estimates (Standard Error) with Logarithm of Hourly Earnings as the Dependent Variable for Foreign Born Asian and Native Born Asian and White Women (Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Women Aged 25-65 Reporting Positive Earnings)

Variable	Panel A : Foreign Born		Panel B : Native Born
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Ethnicity			
Chinese	-0.12 **	-0.07 **	0.08 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Filipino	-0.02 **	0.01	0.02
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Indian	-0.07 **	-0.01	0.02
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.03)
Japanese	-0.03 +	0.002	0.05 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Korean	-0.04 **	-0.01	0.07 *
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.03)
Vietnamese	-0.06 **	-0.04 **	-0.04
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.06)
Education			
Less than college degree	-0.48 **	n.a	-0.48
	(0.00)		(0.00)
College education	-0.19 **	n.a	-0.19
	(0.00)		(0.00)
Education accounting for US college degree			
Less than college degree	n.a	-0.35 **	n.a
		(0.00)	
College or higher degree not acquired in the U.S.	n.a	-0.10 **	n.a
		(0.01)	
Work experience			
Years of work experience	0.02 **	0.02 **	0.02 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Square of years of work experience	-0.00 **	-0.0004 **	-0.000 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Non -U.S. years of work experience			
Non-U.S. years of work experience	-0.01 **	-0.01 **	n.a
	(0.00)	(0.00)	
Square of years of non-U.S. work experience	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	n.a
	(0.00)	(0.00)	
English language ability			
Speaks no English	-0.36 **	-0.39 **	n.a
	(0.02)	(0.02)	
Speaks English well or not well	-0.11 **	-0.12 **	n.a
	(0.01)	(0.01)	

Continued

Table 6.6 continued

| Variable | Panel A : Foreign Born | | Panel B : Native Born |
| | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 1 |
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Type of occupation			
Service	-0.48 **	-0.49 **	-0.47 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Sales	-0.27 ***	-0.28 **	-0.26 **
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Office and administrative support	-0.20 **	-0.21 **	-0.20 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Farming, fishing, forestry	-0.58 **	-0.59 **	-0.58 **
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Construction, extraction, maintenance	-0.08 **	-0.10 **	-0.08 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Production, transportation, material	-0.32 **	-0.33 **	-0.31 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.05)
Type of work			
Self-employed	-0.19 **	-0.18 **	-0.19 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Region of /urban residence			
Northeast	-0.02 **	-0.02 **	-0.02 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Midwest	-0.10 **	-0.10 **	-0.11 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
South	-0.12 **	-0.11 **	-0.12 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Rest of the West	-0.12 **	-0.12 **	-0.12 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Non metro residence	0.17 **	0.17 **	0.17 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Marital status			
Single	0.02 **	0.02 **	0.02 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Constant	2.84 **	2.72 **	2.84 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Number of observations (Degrees of freedom)	493,859	493,859 (27)	445,953 (23)
Lambda	0.07 **	0.06 **	0.07 **

** p <= 0.01; * p < =0.05 ; +p <= 0.10

The figures in brackets denote robust standard error.

 n.a = not applicable/excluded

Reference category; White; Masters/Professional/Doctorate; U.S. college degree or higher; Speaks only English or very well;
                Business/Managerial/Financial; Self -employed; Pacific reagion of residence; Non-metro residence;
                Married, spouse present.

Table 6.7 Marginal Effects from the Probit Estimates (Standard Error) Predicting Probability of Employment and OLS Estimates on Logarithm of Hourly Earnings on Nativity Status for Asian Women by Ethnicity (Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Women Aged 25-65)

Variable (1)	Chinese (2)	Filipino (3)	Indian (4)	Japanese (5)	Korean (6)	Vietnamese (7)
Panel A: Marginal Effects on Probabilty of Employment						
Nativity status						
Foreign born	-0.085 **	-0.034 **	-0.206 **	-0.421 **	-0.212 **	0.046
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Number of observations (Degrees of freedom)	17,798 (16)	27,230 (16)	14,174 (16)	11,783 (16)	12,063 (16)	12,900 (16)
Log likelihood	-9540.4801	-11843.202	-8381.7583	-5780.4581	-7287.1456	-6904.4457
Adjusted R square	0.09	0.07	0.10	0.22	0.09	0.11
Panel B: OLS Estimates on Log of Hourly Earnings						
Nativity status						
Foreign born	-0.29 **	-0.16 **	-0.28 **	-0.19 **	-0.27 **	-0.24 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.02)
Constant	2.97 **	2.93 **	2.89 **	2.73 **	2.87 **	2.91 **
	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.10)	(0.04)
Number of observations (Degrees of freedom)	17,798 (22)	27,230 (22)	14,174 (22)	11,783 (22)	12,063 (22)	95,948 (22)
Lambda	0.43 **	0.32 **	0.43 **	0.04 **	0.16 **	0.31 **

** p <= 0.01 ; * p < =0.05 ; +p <= 0.10

The figures in brackets denote robust standard error.

Reference category; Native born

Controlled for years and square of years of work experience, non -U.S. years of work experience, square of non-U.S. years of work expereince,

English language ability, region of residence, marital status, presence of children below age 5.

Additional controls - type of occupation, and type of work in the log hourly earning regressions.

Table 6.8 Distribution of Hourly Earnings (in U.S. $ at 1999 prices) using Non-Parametric Weights for Women, by Ethnicity and Nativity
(Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Women Aged 25-65 Reporting Positive Earnings)

Ethnicity/Nativity	Observed			Reweighted (White earnings as per Asian Characteristics)			Earnings Ratio (Observed Asian/Reweighted White)		
	Mean	Median	90th Percentile	Mean	Median	90th Percentile	Mean (col.2/col.5)	Median (col.3/col.6)	90th Percentile (col.4/col.7)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Chinese									
Foreign born	18.12	12.22	32.5	24.01	20.35	38.46	0.75	0.60	0.85
Native born	24.10	19.23	41.02	22.36	18.46	37.83	1.08	1.04	1.08
Filipino									
Foreign born	20.85	14.42	34	20.30	16.83	33.65	1.03	0.86	1.01
Native born	54.46	14.42	29.33	68.87	13.90	29.33	0.79	1.04	1.00
Indian									
Foreign born	22.89	15.73	38.94	24.02	19.23	39.81	0.95	0.82	0.98
Native born	23.34	16.67	38.46	24.09	16.28	40.82	0.97	1.02	0.94
Japanese									
Foreign born	19.80	13.96	34.05	19.91	15.56	35.77	0.99	0.90	0.95
Native born	24.78	17.62	34.71	21.62	16.35	34.10	1.15	1.08	1.02
Korean									
Foreign born	18.70	12.01	33.33	21.24	15.21	36.06	0.88	0.79	0.92
Native born	27.75	16.83	40.87	26.49	17.65	43.75	1.05	0.95	0.93
Vietnamese									
Foreign born	15.45	10.26	26.44	19.44	15.87	34.13	0.79	0.65	0.77
Native born	17.38	12.14	30	20.06	13.46	32.78	0.87	0.90	0.92
White									
Native born	17.56	12.74	28.85	17.56	12.74	28.85	1.00	1.00	1.00
Asian									
Foreign born	19.50	13.10	33.65	20.38	15.77	34.32	0.96	0.83	0.98
Native born	30.91	17.21	36.11	23.90	15.24	34.02	1.29	1.13	1.06

Table 7.1 Unweighted Number of Observations and Percent Foreign Born Asian, Weighted Median Household Income, Per Capita Income, and Income Per Household Labor Hour Employed (in 1999$) and Income Proportions Relative to White by Ethnicity and Nativity

Ethnicity	Unweighted N	Percent Foreign Born Householders (Unweighted)	Median Household Income	Median Per Capita Income	Median Income Per Household Labor Hour Employed
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Panel A					
Chinese	26,984	71.8	50,000	18,727	18.6
Filipino	26,240	83.2	61,700	18,950	17.8
Indian	21,862	87.8	69,400	18,950	24.0
Japanese	18,638	33.7	55,500	26,500	23.0
Korean	14,809	81.7	42,000	15,767	16.0
Vietnamese	15,599	86.2	46,600	13,250	14.0
White	793,541	n.a	45,030	20,125	17.2
Panel B *Relative to White*					
Chinese	n.a	n.a	1.11	0.93	1.08
Filipino	n.a	n.a	1.37	0.94	1.04
Indian	n.a	n.a	1.54	0.94	1.40
Japanese	n.a	n.a	1.23	1.32	1.34
Korean	n.a	n.a	0.93	0.78	0.93
Vietnamese	n.a	n.a	1.03	0.66	0.82
White	n.a	n.a	1	1	1

For the sake of brevity, income per household labor hour employed will be called as income per labor hour employed in all the tables.

Ethnicity	Median Household Income		Median Per Capita Income		Median Income Per Labor Hour Employed	
	Foreign born	Native born	Foreign born	Native born	Foreign born	Native born
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Panel A						
Chinese	44,650	63,300	15,143	30,000	16.65	23.13
Filipino	64,000	50,400	18,680	20,150	18.08	16.83
Indian	71,020	48,300	25,275	25,500	24.79	18.22
Japanese	48,000	59,790	24,500	27,350	22.44	23.08
Korean	41,000	46,000	14,575	23,867	15.62	17.31
Vietnamese	46,000	50,000	12,500	20,050	13.67	16.35
White	n.a	45,030	n.a	20,125	n.a	17.15
Panel B *Relative to White*						
Chinese	0.99	1.41	0.75	1.49	0.97	1.35
Filipino	1.42	1.12	0.93	1.00	1.05	0.98
Indian	1.58	1.07	1.26	1.27	1.45	1.06
Japanese	1.07	1.33	1.22	1.36	1.31	1.35
Korean	0.91	1.02	0.72	1.19	0.91	1.01
Vietnamese	1.02	1.11	0.62	1.00	0.80	0.95
White	n.a	1	n.a	1	n.a	1

n.a = not applicable

Table 7.3 Weighted Median Household Size, Total Number of Household Labor Hours Employed, and Proportion of Annual Household Labor Hours Contributed by the Householder and the Proportions Relative to White by Ethnicity and Nativity

Ethnicity	Median Household Size		Total Number of Annual Household Labor Hours Employed		Householder's Share (in percentage) to Annual Total Household Labor Hours		Householder's Share (in percentage) to Annual Household Income	
	Foreign born	Native born	Foreign born	Native born	Foreign born	Native born	Foreign born	Native born
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Panel A								
Chinese	3.03	2.42	2,903	2,733	58	67	65	73
Filipino	3.61	2.91	3,640	3,154	53	63	58	67
Indian	3.15	2.23	3,222	2,665	69	74	73	75
Japanese	2.10	2.34	1,897	2,441	80	63	84	73
Korean	2.90	2.29	2,661	2,699	66	70	71	73
Vietnamese	3.91	2.73	3,533	3,136	54	65	59	68
White	n.a	2.44	n.a	2,503	n.a	67	n.a	75
Panel B *Relative to White**								
Chinese	1.24	0.99	1.16	1.09	-9	0	-10	-2
Filipino	1.48	1.19	1.45	1.26	-14	-4	-17	-8
Indian	1.29	0.91	1.29	1.06	2	7	-2	0
Japanese	0.86	0.96	0.76	0.98	13	-4	9	-2
Korean	1.19	0.94	1.06	1.08	-1	3	-4	-2
Vietnamese	1.60	1.12	1.41	1.25	-13	-2	-16	-7
White	n.a	1	n. a	1	n.a	0	n.a	0

Note : White refers to native born non-Hispanic white in all the tables.   n.a = not applicable

* Columns 2 to 5 refer to the Asian/white ratios whereas figures in columns 6 to 9 have been computed by subtracting the white percentage share from the Asian.

Table 7.4 Percentage Distribution (Weighted) of Household Type by Ethnicity and Nativity

Ethnicity/Household Type	Percentage Distribution by Household Type		Percentage Distribution in each Household Type by Nativity Status		
	Foreign Born	Native Born	Foreign Born	Native Born	All
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Chinese					
Nuclear	68.42	73.69	70.63	29.37	100 (18,903)
Nonnuclear	31.58	26.31	75.66	24.34	100(8,081)
All	100 (19,374)	100 (7,610)	n.a	n.a	n.a
Filipino					
Nuclear	56.63	65.69	81.1	18.9	100 (15,175)
Nonnuclear	43.37	34.17	80.13	19.87	100(11,893)
All	100 (21,820)	100 (4,420)	n.a	n.a	n.a
Indian					
Nuclear	75.29	72.05	88.06	11.94	100 (16,305)
Nonnuclear	24.71	27.95	86.19	13.81	100 (4,802)
All	100 (19,203)	100 (2,659)	n.a	n.a	n.a
Japanese					
Nuclear	83.67	74.85	61.78	38.22	100 (14,448)
Nonnuclear	16.33	25.15	73.56	26.44	100 (1,042)
All	100 (6,282)	100 (21,820)	n.a	n.a	n.a
Korean					
Nuclear	75.07	67.42	82.86	17.74	100 (10,904)
Nonnuclear	24.93	32.58	76.87	23.13	100 (3,024)
All	100 (12,095)	100 (2,174)	n.a	n.a	n.a
Vietnamese					
Nuclear	57.52	58.61	84.45	14.55	100 (8,911)
Nonnuclear	42.48	41.39	86	14	100 (5,769)
All	100 (13,438)	100 (2,161)	n.a	n.a	n.a
White					
Nuclear	n.a	81.55	n.a	100	100 (650,252)
Nonnuclear	n.a	18.45	n.a	100	100 (143,289)
All	n.a	100 (793,541)	n.a	n.a	n.a

n.a = not applicable

The figures in the brackets indicate unweighted N.

Table 7.5 Income Ratios of Nonnuclear by Nuclear Household by Ethnicity and Nativity

Ethnicity	Income Ratios of Nonnuclear relative to Nuclear Household*		
	Median Household Income	Median Per Capita Income	Income Per Household Labor Hour Employed
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Chinese			
Foreign born	1.43	0.84	0.82
Native born	1.12	0.73	0.79
Filipino			
Foreign born	1.39	0.86	0.92
Native born	1.20	0.80	0.91
Indian			
Foreign born	1.14	0.72	0.79
Native born	1.12	0.59	1.14
Japanese			
Foreign born	0.99	0.76	0.73
Native born	1.34	0.85	0.93
Korean			
Foreign born	1.52	1.04	0.99
Native born	1.10	0.72	0.81
Vietnamese			
Foreign born	1.55	1.07	0.95
Native born	1.15	0.68	0.85
White			
Native born	1.19	0.85	0.87

* The income ratios have been computed in the following way;

    Income in nonnuclear household /Income in nuclear household

Table 7.6 Unstandardized OLS Coefficients (Standard Error) from Regression of Log Household Income, Log Per Capita Income, and Log Income Per Labor Hour Employed for Asian and White Households by Nativity and Asian Ethnicity (Universe includes all Households that Report Positive Household Income in 1999)

Variable	Panel A : Foreign Born			Panel B : Native Born		
	Household Income	Per Capita Income	Labor Hour Employed Income	Household Income	Per Capita Income	Labor Hour Employed Income
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Ethnicity						
Chinese	-0.22 **	-0.21 **	-0.22 **	0.02 *	0.08 **	0.04 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Filipino	-0.10 **	-0.19 **	-0.13 **	-0.02 **	-0.01	-0.02 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Indian	-0.01	-0.04 **	-0.01	-0.11 **	0.04 +	-0.03 +
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Japanese	0.13 **	0.22 **	0.20 **	0.04 **	0.08 **	-0.00
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Korean	-0.25 **	-0.26 **	-0.18 **	-0.04 **	0.08 **	-0.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Vietnamese	-0.12 **	-0.26 **	-0.12 **	-0.00	0.06 **	0.03 +
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Household type						
Nonnuclear	0.12 **	-0.41 **	-0.10 **	0.13 **	-0.41 **	-0.10 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Annual total number of work hours	0.00 **	0.00 **	n.a.	0.00 **	0.00 **	n.a.
	(0.00)	(0.00)		(0.00)	(0.00)	
Square of annual total number of work hours	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	n.a.	-0.00 **	0.00 **	n.a.
	(0.00)	(0.00)		(0.00)	(0.00)	
Education[a]						
Less than college degree	0.47 **	0.55 **	0.44 **	0.48 **	0.56 **	0.45 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
College education	0.71 **	0.80 **	0.70 **	0.71 **	0.80 **	0.70 **
	(0.00)	(0.00	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Work experience[a]						
Years of work experience	0.02 **	0.02 **	0.01 **	0.02 **	0.03 **	0.01 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Square of years of work experience	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	-0.00 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
English language ability[a]						
Speaks no English	-0.53 **	-0.71 **	-0.56 **	n.a.	n.a	n.a
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)			
Speaks English not well or well	-0.21 **	-0.27 **	-0.18 **	n.a.	n.a	n.a
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)			
Duration of stay[a]						
Ten or less years	-0.13 **	-0.10 **	-0.05 **	n.a.	n.a	n.a
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)			
More than 10 and less than 20 years	-0.08 **	-0.13 **	-0.04 **	n.a.	n.a	n.a
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)			

Continued

Table 7.6 continued

Variable	Panel A : Foreign Born			Panel B : Native Born		
	Household Income	Per Capita Income	Labor Hour Employed Income	Household Income	Per Capita Income	Labor Hour Employed Income
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Region of /urban residence						
Northeast	-0.04 **	-0.04 **	-0.04 **	-0.04 **	-0.05 **	-0.05 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Midwest	-0.08 **	-0.08 **	-0.12 **	-0.09 **	-0.09 **	-0.12 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
South	-0.11 **	-0.09 **	-0.14 **	-0.12 **	-0.10 **	-0.14 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Rest of the West	-0.10 **	-0.10 **	-0.12 **	-0.11 **	-0.11 **	-0.13 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)
Metro	0.20 **	0.21 **	0.18 **	0.20 **	0.21 **	0.18 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Single[a]	-0.33 **	0.39 **	-0.12 **	-0.34 **	0.39 **	-0.12 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Multi-ethnic	-0.03 **	-0.12 **	-0.02 **	-0.05 **	-0.15 **	-0.04 **
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)
Female headed	-0.13 **	-0.20 **	-0.08 **	-0.13 **	-0.20 **	-0.08 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Household size	0.01 **	n.a.	-0.01 **	0.01 **	n.a.	-0.00 *
	(0.00)		(0.00)	(0.00)		(0.00)
Constant	9.37 **	8.32 **	2.51 **	9.32 **	8.26 **	2.47 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Observations (Degrees of freedom)	874,831 (25)	874,831 (24	706,598 (24)	819,072 (21)	819,072 (20)	654,145 (20)
Adjusted R-squared	0.49	0.31	0.22	0.67	0.31	0.23

+ p <=0.10 ; * p <= 0.05; ** p <= 0.01 (two-tailed)

Robust standard errors in brackets.

 n.a. = not applicable/ excluded

Note : Household size and annual total household work hours are not included in the regressions on per capita income and labor hour
   employed income respectively.

   [a]The characteristics are of the householder.

Omitted categories : White; Nuclear; Masters/Professional/Doctorate; College or higher degree acquired in the U.S.; Speaks only

                  English or very well; 20 or more years of stay; Married, spouse present; Ethnically homogenous; and Male headed.

Table 7.7 Odds Ratio from Logistic Regression Contrasting the Likelihood that a Household is Nuclear by Ethnicity and Nativity
(Universe includes all Households that Report Positive Household Income in 1999)

	Chinese		Filipino		Indian		Japanese	
Variable	Foreign Born	Native Born	Foreign Born	Native Born	Foreign Born	Native Born	Foreign Born	Native Born
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Log of annual hourly earnings (in 1999 US $)[a]	1.12 **	1.16 **	1.07 **	0.99	1.20 **	1.04	1.12 +	1.11 *
	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.05)
Education[a]								
Less than college degree	0.41 **	0.41 **	1.04	0.45 **	0.48 **	0.33 **	0.49 **	0.58 **
	(0.27)	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.05)
College education	0.59 **	0.76 **	1.04	0.68 **	0.63 **	0.53 **	0.74 +	0.72 **
	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.09)	(0.03)	(0.07)	(0.12)	(0.06)
Work experience[a]								
Years of work experience	1.03 **	1.07 **	1.00	1.07 **	1.05 **	1.06 **	1.06 **	1.02 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Square of years of work experience	1.00 **	0.10 **	1.00 **	1.00 **	1.00 **	1.00 *	1.00 **	1.00 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
English language ability[a]								
Speaks no English	0.68 **	n.a.	1.03	n.a.	0.56 +	n.a.	1.39	n.a.
	(0.05)		(0.46)		(0.19)		(1.17)	
Speaks English not well or well	0.82 **	n.a.	0.85 **	n.a.	0.87 *	n.a.	0.85	n.a.
	(0.04)		(0.03)		(0.05)		(0.1)	
Duration of stay[a]								
Ten or less years	1.27 **	n.a.	0.94	n.a.	1.87 **	n.a.	2.26 **	n.a.
	(005)		(0.05)		(0.14)		(0.45)	
More than 10 and less than 20 years	0.82 **	n.a.	0.87 **	n.a.	1.02	n.a.	1.74 **	n.a.
	(0.04)		(0.04)		(0.07)		(0.33)	
Region of /urban residence								
Northeast	1.14 *	0.90	1.42 **	1.31 *	1.05	1.12	1.03	1.66 **
	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.15)	(0.06)	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.25)
Midwest	1.58 **	1.89 **	1.79 **	1.78 **	1.28 **	1.66 **	1.62 **	2.07 **
	(0.12)	(0.27)	(0.12)	(0.22)	(0.08)	(0.28)	(0.30)	(0.31)
South	1.46 **	2.04 **	2.08 **	2.15 **	1.22 **	1.27	1.72 **	1.92 **
	(0.09)	(0.24)	(0.11)	(0.21)	(0.07)	(0.19)	(0.28)	(0.26)
Rest of the West	2.04 **	2.35 **	1.97 **	1.50 **	1.48 **	1.44	1.38	1.53 **
	(0.28)	(0.43)	(0.18)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.45)	(0.36)	(0.21)
Metro	1.00	0.66 **	0.89 +	0.91	1.02	1.11	0.63 *	0.90
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.06)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.26)	(0.12)	(0.08)
Single[a]	0.49 **	0.19 **	0.51 **	0.20 **	0.30 **	0.22 **	0.23 **	0.27 **
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.17)	(0.01)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.02)
Multi-ethnic	0.38 **	0.20 **	0.74 **	0.36 **	0.86 +	0.17 **	0.13 **	0.30 **
	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.07)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Female headed	1.12 +	1.28 **	1.02	1.17 *	1.57 **	1.35 **	1.33 *	1.20 **
	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.15)	(0.17)	(0.08)
Observations (Degrees of freedom)	14, 144 (17)	6,031 (13)	18,091 (17)	6,026 (13)	17,691 (17)	2,323 (13)	4,374 (17)	8,170 (13)
-2 Log Likelihood	-8087.22	-2082.7	-11787.02	-3291.9	-8908.46	-1108	-1364.14	-4012.21
Adjusted R-squared	0.08	0.18	0.04	0.14	0.08	0.18	0.2	0.1

Continued

Table 7.7 continued

Variable	Korean		Vietnamese		White
	Foreign Born (10)	Native Born (11)	Foreign Born (12)	Native Born (13)	Native Born (14)
Log of annual hourly earnings (in 1999 US $)[a]	0.98	0.90	0.99	1.04	1.08 **
	(0.03)	(0.08)	(0.03)	(0.09)	(0.00)
Education[a]					
Less than college degree	0.75 **	0.42 **	0.77 *	0.27 **	0.60 **
	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.05)	(0.01)
College education	0.76 **	0.68 *	0.83	0.51 **	0.93 **
	(0.06)	(0.11)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.02)
Work experience[a]					
Years of work experience	1.03 *	1.07 **	1.06 **	1.09 **	1.04 **
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.00)
Square of years of work experience	1.00 **	1.00 **	1.00 **	1.00 **	1.00 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
English language ability[a]					
Speaks no English	1.12	n.a.	1.33 +	n.a.	n.a.
	(0.24)		(0.23)		
Speaks English not well or well	0.90	n.a.	0.83 **	n.a.	n.a.
	(0.06)		(0.05)		
Duration of stay[a]					
Ten or less years	0.94	n.a.	0.59 **	n.a.	n.a.
	(0.08)		(0.04)		
More than 10 and less than 20 years	0.72 **	n.a.	0.79 **	n.a.	n.a.
	(0.05)		(0.05)		
Region of /urban residence					
Northeast	0.82 **	1.20	1.16 *	1.52 *	1.02 +
	(0.05)	(0.17)	(0.09)	(0.29)	(0.01)
Midwest	1.33 **	1.74 **	1.32 **	2.02 **	1.32 **
	(0.13)	(0.32)	(0.11)	(0.41)	(0.02)
South	1.15 +	1.43 *	1.33 **	1.47 **	1.19 **
	(0.09)	(0.23)	(0.07)	(0.19)	(0.01)
Rest of the West	1.42 *	2.15 **	1.40 **	1.29	1.11 **
	(0.24)	(0.54)	(0.17)	(0.35)	(0.02)
Metro	0.51 **	0.82	0.76 *	0.70	0.89 **
	(0.08)	(0.17)	(0.08)	(0.17)	(0.01)
Single[a]	0.39 **	0.10 **	0.33 **	0.21	0.21 **
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.00)
Multi-ethnic	0.44 **	0.13 **	0.80 **	0.38 **	0.31 **
	(0.05)	(0.02)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.01)
Female headed	1.60 **	1.45 **	1.34 **	1.27 *	1.22 **
	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.09)	(0.15)	(0.01)
Observations (Degrees of freedom)	8,988 (17)	2,308 (13)	10,826 (17)	1,963 (13)	571,789 (13)
-2 Log Likelihood	-4801.71	-1094	-6881.67	-1124.47	-245600.01
Adjusted R-squared	0.05	0.24	0.06	0.15	0.11

+ p <=0.10 ; * p <= 0.05; ** p <= 0.01 (two-tailed)

Robust standard errors in brackets.

n.a. = not applicable

Omitted categories : White; Nuclear; Masters/Professional/Doctorate; College or higher degree acquired in the U.S.;

Speaks only English or very well; 20 or more years of stay; Pacific region of residence; Non-metro residence; Married, spouse present; Multi-ethnic; and Male headed.

[a]The characteristics are of the householder.

Appendix Table 4.1 Description of the Variables Employed for the Individual and Household Level Analyses

VARIABLE	LABEL /DESCRIPTION	MEASUREMENT	SOURCE VARIABLE	REMARKS
DEPENDENT VARIABLES : Individual Level				
EMPLOYED	Employment Status (in 1999)	1= Employed 0 = Otherwise – not employed	WKSWORK1 INCEARN	1 = if WKSWORK1 > 0 and INCEARN > 0 0 = otherwise
LOGHOURLYINCEARNP	Log of hourly income earned (in 1999)	Any positive value	INCEARN UHRSWORK WKSWORK1	Log of hourly income earned = log (INCEARN/UHRSWORK *WKSWORK1)
DEPENDENT VARIABLES : Household Level				
LOGINCOMEP	Log of (total) household income (in 1999)	Any positive value	HHINCOME INCTOT	Log of (total) household income =log (HHINCOME Or Sum of INCTOT of all household members)
LOGPCINCOMEP	Log of per capita household income (in 1999)	Any positive value	HHINCOME INCTOT HHSIZE	PCINCOMEP = HHINCOME/HHSIZE Log of (total) per capita household income =log (PCINCOMEP)
LOGPERLABORHOURINCOME	Log of per labor hour employed income (in 1999)	Any positive value	HHINCOME INCTOT UHRSWORK WKSWORK1	PERLABORHOURINCOME = HHINCOME/ Total household annual labor hours Log of (total) household income = log (PERLABORHOURINCOME) Total household annual labor hours = sum of (UHRSWORK * WKSWORK1) for all household members
NUCLEAR	Whether living in a nuclear or a nonnuclear household	1 = Living in a nuclear household 0 = Otherwise –living in a nonnuclear	RELATED AGE	Nuclear = 1 if Nuclear = 1 Nonnuclear = 1 if Nuclear = 0 Reference category – Nonnuclear

191

		household		
WEIGHT VARIABLES : Individual and Household Levels				
NEWWEIGHT	Weight variable for the individual level analyses	0 to maximum	PERWT	NEWWEIGHT = 1/6 * PERWT + 5/6 * PERWT if ethnicity is Asian NEWWEIGHT = PERWT if ethnicity is white
NEWWEIGHT	Weight variable for the household level analyses	0 to maximum	HHWT	NEWWEIGHT = 1/6 * HHWT + 5/6 * HHWT if ethnicity is Asian NEWWEIGHT = HHWT if ethnicity is white
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES : Individual and Household Levels				
ETHNIC and IMMIGRANT STATUS				
ETHNICITY	Ethnic affiliation of the a) men or women for the individual level analyses; b) householder for the household level analyses	Chinese Filipino Asian Indian (Indian) Japanese Korean Vietnamese Native born non-Hispanic White (White)	RACED BPLD	Chinese =1 if RACED =400 and BPLD = 50000 Filipino = 1 if RACED = 600 and BPLD = 51500 Indian = 1 if RACED = 610 and BPLD = 52100 Japanese =1 if RACED = 500 and BPLD = 50100 Korean = 1 if RACED = 620 and BPLD = 50200 Vietnamese= 1 if RACED = 640 and BPLD = 51800 White = 1if RACED = 100 and BPLD >=100 and <=12091 Reference category –White
NATIVITY	Nativity status of the a) men or women for the individual level analyses; b) householder for the household level analyses	Foreign born Native born	BPLD AGE YRSUSA1	Foreign born = 1 if BPLD = 50000 or 51500 or 52100 or 50100 or 50200 or 51800 and Age of entry > 12 Native born = 1 if BPLD >=100 and <=12091 OR BPLD = 50000 or 51500 or 52100 or 50100 or 50200 or 51800 and Age of entry <= 12 Age of entry = Age –YRSUSA1

				Reference category – Native born
HUMAN CAPITAL VARIABLES				
EDUCAT EDUCAT_H	Educational attainment of a) men or women for the individual level analyses; b) householder for the household level analyses	0 =Not applicable 1= No school completed 2 =Nursery school 3= Kindergarten 4= 1st -4th grade 5= 5th -8th grade 6= 9th grade 7= 10th grade 8 = 11th grade 9 =12th grade, no diploma 10= High school graduate or GED 11=Some college, no degree 12=Associate degree, occupational program 13= Associate degree, academic program 14 = Bachelor's degree 15 = Master's degree 16 =Professional degree 17 =Doctorate degree	EDUC99 RELATED MARST SEX	EDUC99 Recoded as; 1= No school completed 2= Less than 12th grade and 12th grade, no diploma 3 = High school graduate or GED 4 = Some college, no degree, associate degree, occupational and academic program 5 = Bachelor's degree 6 = Master's degree and above (There are no cases in the 'not applicable' category) RELATED –Applicable for household level analyses Householder = 1 if RELATED = 101 Reference category-Masters/Professional/Doctorate degree
EDUCYRS	Years of education received	0 to 22	EDUC99	0 years = no school, nursery school and kindergarten 2.5 years = grades 1 to 4 6.5 years = grades 5 to 8 9 years = grade 9 10 years = grade 10 11 years = grade 11 12 years = 12th grade, no diploma and high school graduate 13 years = some college, no degree and associate degree, occupational program

				14.5 years = associate degree, academic program 16 years = bachelor's degree 18 years = master's degree 22 years = professional, doctorate degree
USEDUC USEDUC_H	Received education in the U.S. a) men or women for the individual level analyses; b) householder for the household level analyses	0 =Not received any education in the U.S. 1 =Received education in the U.S.	EDUC99 AGE YRSUSA1 RELATED	Total years of education derived from the variable EDUC99 in the following way; 0 years = no school, nursery school and kindergarten 2.5 years = grades 1 to 4 6.5 years = grades 5 to 8 9 years = grade 9 10 years = grade 10 11 years = grade 11 12 years = 12th grade, no diploma and high school graduate 13 years = some college, no degree and associate degree, occupational program 14.5 years = associate degree, academic program 16 years = bachelor's degree 18 years = master's degree 22 years = professional, doctorate degree RELATED –Applicable for household level analyses REALTED, MARST, and SEX to identify householder, Householder = 1 if RELATED = 101 Age of entry = Age –YRSUSA1 1 = Received education in US if

				Total years of education +6 > Age at entry 0 = Not received education in US if Total years of education +6 <= Age at entry Reference category –Not received education in the US
WORKEXYRS WORKEXYRS_H	Potential work experience in years of a) men or women for the individual level analyses; b) householder for the household level analyses	0 to maximum	EDUC99 AGE RELATED	Potential years of work experience = Age – total years of education - 6 (Total years of education is derived as given above)
WORKEXYRSSQ WORKEXYRSSQ_H	Square of potential work experience in years for a) men or women for the individual level analyses; b) householder for the household level analyses	0 to maximum	EDUC99 AGE RELATED	Square of potential years of work experience = potential years of work experience * potential years of work experience
NONUSWORKEXYRS	Potential years of work experience in years received outside of the U.S. for men or women for the individual level analyses	0 to maximum	EDUC99 AGE YRSUSA1	Potential years of work experience outside of the US = Total years of work experience – total years of stay in the US (Total years of work experience is derived as stated above)
NONUSWORKEXYRSSQ	Square of potential years of work experience in years received outside of the U.S. for men or women for the individual level	0 to maximum	EDUC99 AGE YRSUSA1	Square of potential years of work experience outside of the US = potential years of work experience outside of the US * potential years of work experience outside of the US

		analyses		
ENGLISH ENGLISH_H	English language ability of a) men or women for the individual level analyses b) householder for the all household level analyses	SPEAKENG 0 =Not applicable 1= Does not speak English 2 =Speaks English 3= Speaks only English 4= Speaks English very well 5=Speaks English well 6 =Speaks English, but not well 7 = Unknown 8 = Illegible 9 =Blank	SPEAKENG RELATED MARST SEX	SPEAKENG recoded as 1= Does not speak English 2 =Speaks only English or very well 3= Speaks English well or not well *Note* : There were no cases in the 0, 7, 8 and 9 categories for the original variable Reference Category = Speaks only English or very well
ANNUALTOTAL	Annual total number of work hours put in by all household members for the household level analyses	Any value	UHRSWORK WKSWORK1 RELATED	Constructed by adding the total annual number of work hours of all the household members in the for the household level analyses.
OCCUPATION and WORK VARIABLES				
NEWOCC	Occupation of men or women in the individual level analyses	OCC 1-354= Managerial/Business/ Professional 360 - 465 = Service 470 - 496 = Sales 500-593 = Office and administrative support 600 - 613 = Farming, fishing, forestry 620 -762 = Construction, extraction, maintenance 770 - 975 = Production, transportation, material	OCC	NEWOCC recoded as Managerial/Business/Professional Service Sales Office and administrative support Farming, fishing, forestry Construction, extraction, maintenance Production, transportation, material Reference category- Managerial/ Business/Professional

WORKTYPE	Type of work in terms of whether self-employed or wage/salary earner of men and women in the individual level analyses	CLASSWKD 10-14 = Self-employed 20-29 = Wage/Salary worker	CLASSWKD	Self-employed = 1 if CLASSWKD =10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 Wage/salary earner = 1 if CLASSWKD >=20 or <=29 Reference category – Wage/Salary earner
ASSIMILATION VARIABLES				

DURATION
DURATION_H
	Duration of stay of a) men or women for the individual level analyses; b) householder for the household level analyses	YRSUSA2
		  0= Not applicable
		  1 = 0-5 years
		  2= 6-10 years
		  3= 11-15 years
		  4= 16-20 years
		  5= 21 years or above
		  9 =Missing
			YRSUSA2
			RELATED
				YRSUSA2 recoded as
				  1 =0-5 years
				  2= 6-10 years
				  3= 11-15 years
				  4=Not applicable and 16 or above years
				
				Note: There were none 'missing' and 'not applicable' category applies to the native born.
				
				Reference category- Not applicable and 16 or above years of years

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES				
NEWREGION	Region of residence	Northeast 11=New England Division 12=Middle Atlantic Division 13= Mixed Northeast Division Midwest 21 =East North Central Division 22 =West North Central Division 23 =Mixed Midwestern Division South 31 =South Atlantic Division	REGION	Northeast =1 if REGION = 11 or 12 or 13 Midwest = 1 if REGION = 21 or 22 or 23 South = 1 if REGION = 31 or 32 or 33 Rest of the West = 1 if REGION = 41 or 43 Pacific = 1 if REGION = 42 State unknown = 1 if REGION =91,92 97, 99 East South Central Division

		32= East South Central Division 33= West South Central Division 34=Mixed Southern Divisions West 41=Mountain Division 42=Pacific Division 43=Mixed Western Division State Unknown = 91, 92, 97, 99 East South Central Division		Reference category – Pacific (includes the states of Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, Washington) Note: There are no observations in the category; 'State Unknown'.
NEWMETRO	Metro or non-metro region of residence	1 = Not in metro area Metro area 2 = Central city 3= Outside central city 4 = Central city status unknown	METRO	Non-metro residence = 1 if METRO = 1 Metro residence = 1 if METRO = 2 or 3 or 4 Reference category – Non-metro residence
MARSTATUS MARSTATUS_H	Marital status a) men or women for the individual level analyses; b) householder for the household level analyses	1= Single 2= Married with spouse present 3=Married with spouse absent 4 =Separated 5 = Divorced 6 = Widowed	MARST RELATED	Married = 1 if MARST > 1 Single = 1 if MARST = 1 Includes the categories 'single' 'married with spouse absent', 'separated', 'divorced' and 'widowed' Reference category – Married

SEX_H	Sex of the householder for the household level analyses	SEX
		  1= Male
		  2 = Female
		
		RELATED
		  1 = Householder
			SEX
			RELATED
				Male headed = 1 if SEX = 1 and RELATED = 1
				Female headed =1 if SEX = 2 and RELATED = 1
				
				Reference category – Male headed

CHILDUNDERFIVE	Presence of children below age 5 for a)women in the	0 = No children below the age of 5 Codes 1 to 8 = 1 to 8	NCHLT5	NCHLT5 recoded as: CHILDUNDERFIVE =0 if NCHLT5 = 0

		children below the age of 5 9 = 9 or more children below the age of 5		CHILDUNDERFIVE =1 if NCHLT5 > 0 Reference category – No children below the age of 5
	individual level analyses; b)householder for the household level analyses			
NUCLEAR	Whether living in a nuclear or a nonnuclear household	1 = Living in a nuclear household 0 = Otherwise –living in a nonnuclear household	RELATED AGE	Nuclear = 1 if Nuclear = 1 Nonnuclear = 1 if Nuclear = 0 Reference category – Nuclear
HHSIZE	Household size	Any positive value		Constructed by adding the number of persons in the household
SAMERACE	Ethnic homogeneity	1 = Householder and the rest of the household members are of the same race 0 = Otherwise	RELATED RACED	1 = Ethnically homogenous; householder and the rest of the household members are of the same race 0 = Otherwise, Multi-ethnic Reference category – Ethnically homogenous

Variable	Chinese N= 14,222	Filipino N=17,271	Indian N=18,442	Japanese N=3,320	Korean N=8,039	Vietnamese N=13,016	Asian N = 74,130
Dependent variables							
Employed * (in 1999)	87.7 (12,423)	89.3(15,427)	93.0 (17,146)	93.3 (3,096)	87.8 (7,057)	85.9(11,180)	89.65 (66,329)
Hourly earnings (in 1999 U.S. $)	25.7(337.75)	23.81 (92.55)	33.87 (57.93)	45.94 (127.75)	28.34 (153.48)	20.16 (47.38)	27.76 (167.24)
Number of weeks worked** (in 1999)	40.89 (18.27)	41.89 (17.51)	44.70 (15.07)	44.12 (15.04)	41.36 (17.88)	42.91 (16.87)	42.32 (17.29)
Number of usual hours worked in a week** (in 1999)	38.56 (18.24)	37.33 (15.64)	41.67 (15.42)	43.81 (16.59)	41.27 (20.51)	36.69 (16.47)	39.29 (17.20)
Independent variables							
Mean years of education	13.82 (5.82)	14.11 (3.17)	16.63 (3.61)	15.74 (3.12)	14.74 (3.53)	11.69 (4.36)	14.4 (4.47)
Education categories							
Less than college degree	52.8	55.4	21.8	30.3	48.8	56.6	48.9
College education	14.2	37.0	30.0	45.4	31.5	32.2	26.5
Masters/Professional/Doctorate (Omitted category)	33.0	7.6	48.2	24.3	19.6	11.2	24.6
Education accounting for U.S. college degree							
Less than college degree	52.8	55.4	21.8	30.3	48.8	81.2	48.9
College or higher degree not acquired in the U.S.	30.4	34.9	49.6	58.0	37.6	8.2	34.5
College or higher degree acquired in the U.S. (Omitted category)	16.8	9.7	28.6	11.8	13.6	10.6	16.6
Years of work experience							
Mean years of work experience	24.7 (13.02)	25.13 (10.65)	18.0 (11.5)	20.42 (10.48)	24.36 (10.89)	24.81 (11.30)	22.9 (11.87)
Mean square of years of work experience	778.11 (712.32)	745.10 (567.17)	456.20 (501.49)	526.94 (481.41)	711.69 (565.88)	743.06 (627.33)	663.42 (604.12)
Non -U.S. years of work experience							
Mean non-U.S. years of work experience	11.2 (12.29)	8.7 (10.45)	5.8 (9.5)	9.4 (9.22)	9.5 (10.51)	10.8 (12.69)	8.9 (11.16)
Mean square of years of non-U.S. work experience	275.87 (424.23)	184.15 (328.60)	124.50 (275.63)	173.92 (250.57)	200.62 (294.83)	276.72 (429.67)	203.96 (355.51)
English language ability							
Speaks no English	12.4	0.3	0.5	0.6	2.6	3.9	3.6
Speaks English well or not well	56.0	35.0	21.2	62.8	71.6	74.9	47.7
Speaks only English or very well (Omitted category)	31.6	64.7	78.3	36.6	25.8	21.2	48.8
Type of occupation							
Business/Managerial/Professional (Omitted category)	44.3	30.6	68.1	63.2	36.4	21.9	43.4
Service	22.1	16.4	3.3	10.7	8.5	14.3	12.7
Sales	6.6	5.4	9.2	10.2	21.1	5.6	8.5
Office and administrative support	4.0	13.9	4.4	5.5	4.3	4.9	6.6
Farming, fishing, forestry	0.1	0.9	0.2	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.5
Construction, extraction, maintenance	5.0	9.1	2.0	2.4	9.1	10.4	6.4
Production, transportation, material	11.3	18.6	9.7	4.3	14.4	33.6	16.4
Type of work							
Self-employed	13.4	6.6	12.9	13.4	35.2	12.7	14.0
Wage/Salary earner (Omitted category)	86.6	93.4	87.1	86.7	64.8	87.4	86.0

Continued

200

Appendix Table 5.1A continued

Variable	Chinese N= 14,222	Filipino N=17,271	Indian N=18,442	Japanese N=3,320	Korean N=8,039	Vietnamese N=13,016	Asian N = 74,130
Duration of stay							
Less than 10 years of stay	44.3	31.6	51.7	61.0	33.4	41.0	42.4
More than 10 but less than 20 years	36.6	36.9	28.8	17.7	39.9	38.6	34.5
20 or more number of years (Omitted category)	19.1	31.5	19.6	21.4	26.7	20.5	23.2
Region of /urban residence							
Northeast	38.3	12.5	31.8	23.4	25.3	10.4	23.9
Midwest	9.8	8.1	18.9	13.9	8.7	10.1	11.9
South	14.9	12.2	25.1	15.5	19.0	31.3	20.2
Rest of the West	2.3	3.4	2.3	3.3	2.7	3.2	2.8
Pacific (Omitted category)	34.8	63.8	22.0	44.0	44.3	45.1	41.2
Metro (Omitted category)	96.0	93.2	94.6	93.2	96.7	95.2	94.8
Non metro	3.9	6.8	5.4	6.8	3.3	4.8	5.2
Marital status							
Single	22.0	27.2	21.8	31.9	18.9	32.3	25.0
Married, spouse present (Omitted category)	78.0	72.8	78.2	68.1	81.1	67.7	75.0

Note : N = unweighted number of observations.

  * The figures in brackets indicate the unweighted N.

 ** Variables employed in generating the dependent variable, hourly earnings.

   The figures in brackets for the continuous variables indicate the standard deviation.

Appendix Table 5.1B Weighted Means (Standard Deviation) and Percentage Distributions of the Dependent and Independent Variables for the Native Born Men by Asian Ethnicity and Asian as a group and White Men (Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Men Aged 25-65)

Variable	Chinese N= 5,088	Filipino N=6,127	Indian N=1,887	Japanese N=7,324	Korean N=1,836	Vietnamese N=1,988	Asian N = 24,250	White N=528,009
Dependent variables								
Employed * (in 1999)	92.0 (4,672)	91.0 (5,539)	90.7 (1,170)	90.2 (6,561)	90.2 (1,656)	90.8 (1,802)	90.87 (21,940)	88.7 (465,419)
Hourly earnings (in 1999 U.S. $)	32.58 (70.37)	21.72 (28.01)	28.25 (33.86)	27.99 (49.27)	26.52 (38.79)	23.91 (55.35)	26.98 (49.56)	24.84 (101.22)
Number of weeks worked** (in 1999)	44.84 (15.89)	43.17 (16.80)	43.25 (16.87)	44.15 (16.51)	42.98 (16.90)	42.91 (16.87)	43.71 (16.55)	42.96 (17.56)
Number of usual hours worked** (in 1999)	41.56 (16.69)	38.57 (15.64)	42.79 (19.25)	39.65 (16.53)	42.37 (18.86)	39.60 (16.50)	40.25 (16.84)	39.88 (17.44)
Independent variables								
Mean years of education	15.56 (3.58)	13.84 (2.86)	15.91 (4.08)	14.87 (2.98)	15.51 (3.38)	14.09 (3.50)	14.8 (3.35)	13.6 (3.02)
Education categories								
Less than college degree	36.04	65.54	34.89	50	39.86	56.6	49.4	70.1
College education	38.54	26.65	30.57	33.47	36.69	32.19	32.76	19.15
Masters/Professional/Doctorate (Omitted category)	25.42	7.82	34.55	16.53	23.45	11.21	17.84	10.75
Years of work experience								
Mean years of work experience	18.6 (11.03)	16.6 (10.16)	11.3 (9.62)	23.7 (10.93)	11.7 (8.41)	10.9 (6.93)	17.8 (11.2)	23.9 (11.23)
Mean square of years of work experience	467.51 (488.70)	378.27 (452.41)	220.63 (372.07)	683.53 (552.57)	208.70 (321.01)	166.88 (265.29)	442.44 (499.50)	698.28 (582.30)
Type of occupation								
Business/Managerial/Professional (Omitted category)	56.83	37.81	60.21	47.72	54.92	44.08	48.49	32.99
Service	7.33	11.96	5.45	8.29	7.44	10.25	8.86	8.22
Sales	9.44	8.17	9.85	10.08	13.21	9.58	9.65	9.97
Office and administrative support	9.02	11.48	5.98	7.7	6.46	8.17	8.72	5.76
Farming, fishing, forestry	0.12	0.5	0.51	0.63	0.04	0.56	0.43	0.73
Construction, extraction, maintenance	5.28	11.94	4.58	11.43	5.57	9.15	9.03	17.41
Production, transportation, material	7.64	13.34	8.7	9.25	7.68	13.58	10.12	18.81
Type of work								
Self-employed	12.63	4.9	10.79	12.85	13.76	9.44	10.44	14.1
Wage/Salary earner (Omitted category)	87.37	95.1	89.21	87.15	86.24	90.56	89.56	85.9

Continued

202

Appendix Table 5.1B continued

Variable	Chinese N= 5,088	Filipino N=6,127	Indian N=1,887	Japanese N=7,324	Korean N=1,836	Vietnamese N=1,988	Asian N = 24,250	White N=528,009
Region of /urban residence								
Northeast	22.83	7.7	30.12	3.32	20.82	9.24	12.65	19.24
Midwest	7.19	7.41	16.35	4.07	12.27	9.95	7.72	26.16
South	10.57	11.07	25.08	4.77	18.08	31.67	12.57	34.76
Rest of the West	3.59	4.76	3.92	4.86	4.98	4.69	4.48	6.88
Pacific (Omitted category)	55.82	69.06	24.53	82.98	43.85	44.45	62.57	12.96
Metro (Omitted category)	95.93	88.86	92.82	87.12	93.92	94.33	91.05	53.87
Non metro	4.07	11.14	7.18	12.88	6.08	5.67	8.95	46.13
Marital status								
Single	46.17	50.83	51.18	42.42	54.56	60.62	48.53	33.76
Married, spouse present (Omitted category)	53.83	49.17	48.82	57.58	45.44	39.38	51.47	66.24

Note : N = unweighted number of observations.

    * The figures in brackets indicate the unweighted N.

    ** Variables employed in generating the dependent variable, hourly earnings.

    The figures in brackets for the continuous variables indicate the standard deviation.

Appendix Table 5.2 OLS Estimates (Standard Error) with Logarithm of Hourly Earnings as the Dependent Variable
for Foreign and Native Born Asian Men Pooled by Ethnicity
(Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Men Aged 25-65 Reporting Positive Earnings)

Variable (1)	Chinese (2)	Filipino (3)	Indian (4)	Japanese (5)	Korean (6)	Vietnamese (7)	Asian (8)
Nativity status							
Foreign born	-0.18 **	-0.12 **	0.05 *	0.20 **	-0.04	0.05 +	-0.06 **
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.24)	(0.01)
Education splines							
0-12 years of education	0.01 *	0.004	-0.01 +	0.02	-0.01	-0.004 +	0.01 **
	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.002)	(0.001)
13-16 years of education	0.10 **	0.04 **	0.09 **	0.09 **	0.05 **	0.09 **	0.08 **
	(0.01)	(0.003)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.002)
More than 16 years of education	0.04 **	0.07 **	0.03 **	0.03 **	0.04 **	0.03 **	0.04 **
	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.002)
Work experience							
Years of work experience	0.03 **	0.02 **	0.02 **	0.05 **	0.03 **	0.02 **	0.02 **
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.001)
Square of years of work experience	0 **	0 **	0.00 **	-0.001 **	0 **	0 **	0.00 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Non -U.S. years of work experience							
Non-U.S. years of work experience	-0.01 **	-0.004 **	-0.01 **	0.002 +	-0.01 **	-0.01 **	-0.004 **
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.00)
Square of years of non-U.S. work experience	0	0.00 **	0.00 **	0.00 **	0.00	0.00 **	0.00 +
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
English language ability							
Speaks no English	-0.38 **	-0.41 **	0.09	-0.26	-0.12	-0.16 **	-0.40 **
	(0.03)	(0.13)	(0.10)	(0.17)	(0.07)	(0.04)	(0.02)
Speaks English well or not well	-0.21 **	-0.06 **	-0.13 **	0.04	-0.15 **	-0.07 **	-0.14 **
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Type of occupation							
Service	-0.52 **	-0.49 **	-0.58 **	-0.42 **	-0.41 **	-0.57 **	-0.57 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Sales	-0.29 **	-0.34 **	-0.54 **	-0.16 **	-0.36 **	-0.40 **	-0.38 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.01)
Office and administrative support	-0.24 **	-0.33 **	-0.46 **	-0.25 **	-0.27 **	-0.33 **	-0.36 **
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.01)
Farming, fishing, forestry	-0.40 *	-0.55 **	-0.77 **	-0.6 **	0.08	-0.43 **	-0.51 **
	(0.17)	(0.05)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.28)	(0.06)	(0.04)
Construction, extraction, maintenance	-0.23 **	-0.21 **	-0.27 **	-0.14 **	-0.05	-0.24 **	-0.23 **
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Production, transportation, material	-0.34 **	-0.33 **	-0.54 **	-0.34 **	-0.37 **	-0.29 **	-0.39 **
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Type of work							
Self-employed	-0.12 **	-0.02	-0.02	-0.15 **	0.01	-0.10 **	-0.07 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)

Continued

204

Appendix Table 5.2 continued

Variable	Chinese	Filipino	Indian	Japanese	Korean	Vietnamese	Asian
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Region of /urban residence							
Northeast	-0.18 **	0.04 **	-0.09 **	0.14 **	0.01	0.01	-0.06 **
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Midwest	-0.19 **	0.02	-0.11 **	0.05	-0.003	0.04 +	-0.04 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.01)
South	-0.18 **	-0.05 **	-0.13 **	-0.05	-0.02	-0.06 **	-0.09 **
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Rest of the West	-0.07 +	-0.02	-0.14 **	-0.08 *	-0.06	-0.03	-0.06 **
	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.01)
Metro	0.01	0.02	0.05 *	0.15 **	0.11 *	0.06 *	0.04 **
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.01)
Marital status							
Single	-0.12 **	-0.13 **	-0.14 **	-0.20 **	-0.10 **	-0.12 **	-0.13 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Foreign born	-0.18 **	-0.12 **	0.05 *	0.20 **	-0.04	0.05 +	-0.06 **
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.24)	(0.01)
Constant	2.76 **	2.72 **	2.98 **	2.08 **	2.59 **	2.66 **	2.69 **
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.15)	(0.12)	(0.06)	(0.02)
Number of observations (Degrees of freedom)	17,092 (23)	20,964 (23)	18,854 (23)	9,656 (23)	8,712 (23)	12,981 (23)	88,259 (23)
Adjusted R square	0.35	0.18	0.27	0.19	0.12	0.24	0.25

+ $p <= 0.10$; * $p <= 0.05$; ** $p <= 0.01$ (two-tailed)

Robust standard errors in brackets.

Omitted categories :Native born; Speaks only English or very well; Business/Managerial/Professional; Wage/Salary Earner; Pacific region of residence; Non-metro residence; Married, spouse present; and Native born.

Appendix Table 5.3 Marginal Effects (Standard Error) from the Probit Estimates Predicting Probability of Employment for
Foreign Born Asian and Native Born Asian and White Men
(Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Men Aged 25-65)

Variable	Panel A : Foreign Born			Panel B : Native Born	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Ethnicity					
Asian	0.0098 **	0.026 **	0.036 **	0.022 **	-0.007 **
	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Education category					
Less than college degree		-0.029 **	n.a		n.a
		(0.001)			
College education		0.0099 **	n.a		n.a
		(0.002)			
Education category accounting for U.S. college degree					
Less than college degree		n.a	-0.035 **		-0.029 **
			(0.001)		(0.001)
College or higher degree not acquired in the U.S.		n.a	-0.0602 **		0.0104 **
			(0.004)		(0.002)
Work experience					
Years of work experience		0.00301 **	0.003 **		0.0031 **
		(0.0002)	(0.001)		(0.0002)
Square of years of work experience		-0.0002 **	-0.0002 **		-0.0002 **
		(0.00)	(0.00)		(0.00)
English language ability					
Speaks no English		-0.044 **	-0.059 **		n.a
		(0.01)	(0.01)		
Speaks English well or not well		-0.026 **	-0.029 **		n.a
		(0.004)	(0.004)		
Duration of stay					
Less than 10 years of stay		-0.072 **	-0.064 **		n.a
		(0.01)	(0.006)		
More than 10 but less than 20 years		-0.022 **	-0.022 **		n.a
		(0.01)	(0.006)		
Region of /urban residence					
Northeast		0.013 **	0.013 **		0.012 **
		(0.001)	(0.001)		(0.001)
Midwest		0.027 **	0.027 **		0.026 **
		(0.001)	(0.001)		(0.001)
South		0.0046 **	0.005 **		0.0038 **
		(0.001)	(0.001)		(0.001)
Rest of the West		0.013 **	0.013 **		0.012 **
		(0.002)	(0.002)		(0.002)
Metro		0.0204 **	0.0203 **		0.019 **
		(0.001)	(0.001)		(0.01)
Marital status					
Single		-0.11 **	-0.11 **		-0.11 **
		(0.001)	(0.001)		(0.001)
Number of observations (Degrees of freedom)	602,160 (1)	602,160 (15)	602,160 (15)	552,104 (1)	552,104 (11)
Adjusted Log likelihood	-212541.84	-176955.56	-176928.52	-194945	-162002
Adjusted R-square	0	0.17	0.17	0	0.17

+ p <=0.10 ; * p <= 0.05; ** p <= 0.01 (two-tailed)

Robust standard errors in brackets.

 n.a. = not applicable/excluded

Omitted categories : White ; Masters/professional/doctorate; College or higher degree acquired in the U.S.; Speaks only English or very well;
        20 or more years of stay ; Pacific region of residence; Non-metro residence; and Married, spouse present.

Appendix Table 5.4 OLS Estimates (Standard Error) with Logarithm of Hourly Earnings as the Dependent Variable for Foreign Born Asian and Native Born Asian and White Men (Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Men Aged 25-65 Reporting Positive Earnings)

Variable	Panel A : Foreign Born			Panel B : Native Born	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Ethnicity					
Asian	0.01 **	-0.12 **	-0.08 **	0.11 **	-0.02 **
	(0.004)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Education splines					
0-12 years of education		0.03 **	n.a		0.04 **
		(0.001)			(0.001)
13-16 years of education		0.09 **	n.a		0.09 **
		(0.001)			(0.001)
More than 16 years of education		0.06 **	n.a		0.06 **
		(0.001)			(0.001)
Education category accounting for U.S. college degree					
Less than college degree		n.a	-0.36 **		0.03 **
			(0.003)		(0.00)
College or higher degree not acquired in the U.S.		n.a	-0.04 **		-0.001 **
			(0.01)		(0.00)
Work experience					
Years of work experience		0.04 **	0.04 **		n.a
		(0.001)	(0.001)		
Square of years of work experience		-0.001 **	-0.001 **		n.a
		(0.00)	(0.00)		
Non -U.S. years of work experience					
Non-U.S. years of work experience		-0.01 **	-0.01 **		n.a
		(0.001)	(0.001)		
Square of years of non-U.S. work experience		0.00 **	0.00 **		n.a
		(0.00)	(0.00)		
English language ability					
Speaks no English		-0.35 **	-0.51 **		n.a
		(0.03)	(0.03)		
Speaks English well or not well		-0.11 **	-0.15 **		n.a
		(0.01)	(0.01)		
Type of occupation					
Service		-0.35 **	-0.40 **		-0.34 **
		(0.004)	(0.004)		(0.01)
Sales		-0.11 **	-0.15 **		-0.10 **
		(0.004)	(0.004)		(0.004)
Office and administrative support		-0.26 **	-0.29 **		-0.26 **
		(0.01)	(0.01)		(0.01)
Farming, fishing, forestry		-0.45 **	-0.53 **		-0.45 **
		(0.02)	(0.02)		(0.02)
Construction, extraction, maintenance		-0.16 **	-0.21		-0.15 **
		(0.004)	(0.004)		(0.004)
Production, transportation, material		-0.22 **	-0.28 **		-0.21 **
		(0.004)	(0.003)		(0.004)
Type of work					
Self-employed		-0.14 **	-0.13 **		-0.14 **
		(0.01)	(0.01)		(0.01)
Region of /urban residence					
Northeast		-0.01 +	-0.01 **		-0.01
		(0.004)	(0.004)		(0.004)
Midwest		-0.07 **	-0.07 **		-0.07 **
		(0.004)	(0.004)		(0.004)
South		-0.10 **	-0.11		-0.10 **
		(0.004)	(0.004)		(0.004)
Rest of the West		-0.12 **	-0.12 **		-0.12 **
		(0.01)	(0.01)		(0.01)
Metro		0.16 **	0.17 **		0.16 **
		(0.002)	(0.002)		(0.002)
Marital status					
Single		-0.21 **	-0.22 **		-0.21 **
		(0.002)	(0.002)		(0.002)
Constant	2.85 **	2.07 **	2.92 **	2.85 **	2.02 **
	(0.001)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.001)	(0.02)
Number of observations (Degrees of Freedom)	531,616 (23)	531,616 (23)	531,616 (23)	487,229 (1)	487,229 (19)
Adjusted R square	0	0.2	0.18	0	0.2

+ p <=0.10 ; * p <= 0.05; ** p <= 0.01 (two-tailed)

Robust standard errors in brackets.

n.a. = not applicable/excluded

Omitted categories : White; College or higher degree acquired in the U.S.; Speaks only English or very well; Business/Managerial/Professional; Wage/Salary earner; Pacific region of residence; Non-metro residence; and Married,spouse present.

Appendix Table 5.5 OLS Estimates (Standard Error) with Logarithm of Hourly Earnings as the Dependent Variable for the Foreign Born and Native Born Asian and Native Born White Men (Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Men Aged 25-65 Reporting Positive Earnings)

Variable	Foreign Born Asian	Native Born Asian	Native Born White
(1)	**(2)**	**(3)**	**(4)**
Education category			
Less than college degree	-0.43 **	-0.50	-0.48 **
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)
College education	-0.19 **	-0.22 **	-0.18 **
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Work experience			
Years of work experience	0.01 **	0.03 **	0.03 **
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.00)
Square of years of work experience	0.00 **	-0.001 **	-0.001 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
English language ability			
Speaks no English	-0.37 **	n.a	n.a
	(0.02)		
Speaks English well or not well	-0.11 **	n.a	n.a
	(0.01)		
Type of occupation			
Service	-0.63 **	-0.41 **	-0.37 **
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Sales	-0.44 **	-0.2 **	-0.12 **
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Office and administrative support	-0.37 **	-0.28 **	-0.27 **
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Farming, fishing, forestry	-0.54 **	-0.63 **	-0.51 **
	(0.06)	(0.08)	(0.02)
Construction, extraction, maintenance	-0.28 **	-0.14 **	-0.19 **
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.004)
Production, transportation, material	-0.41 **	-0.31 **	-0.26 **
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.004)
Type of work			
Self-employed	-0.06 **	-0.09 **	-0.13 **
	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.01)
Duration of stay			
Less than 10 years of stay	-0.27 **	n.a	n.a
	(0.01)		
More than 10 but less than 20 years	-0.19 **	n.a	n.a
	(0.01)		
Region of /urban residence			
Northeast	-0.07 **	0.01	-0.02 **
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.004)
Midwest	-0.03 *	-0.08 **	-0.07 **
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.004)
South	-0.08 **	-0.11 **	-0.11 **
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.004)
Rest of the West	-0.05 **	-0.05 *	-0.12 **
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.01)
Metro	0.02	0.13 **	0.17 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.002)
Marital status			
Single	-0.11 **	-0.19 **	-0.22 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.003)
	3.62 **	3.10 **	3.02 **
Constant	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.01)
Number of observations (Degrees of freedom)	66,323 (21)	21,936 (17)	465,293 (17)
Adjusted R square	0.28	0.19	0.19

+ p <=0.10 ; * p <= 0.05; ** p <= 0.01 (two-tailed)

Robust standard errors in brackets.

n.a. = not applicable/excluded

Omitted categories : White; Speaks only English or very well; Business/Managerial/Professional; Wage/Salary earner;

20 or more years of stay; Pacific region of residence; Non-metro residence; and Married, spouse present.

Variable	Chinese N = 16,216	Filipino N =28, 923	Indian N = 15,815	Japanese N = 6,147	Korean N = 13,635	Vietnamese N = 15,186	Asian N = 95,922
Dependent variables							
Employed * (in 1999)	70.01 (11,294)	82.30 (23,374)	62.26 (9,851)	52.83 (3,278)	61.67 (8,400)	70.66 (10,598)	70.10 (67,155)
Hourly earnings (in 1999 U.S. $)	18.29 (33.90)	20.81 (42.64)	22.98 (38.97)	19.27 (25.59)	18.74 (30.84)	15.40 (41.24)	19.51 (38.46)
Geometric mean hourly earnings (in 1999 U.S. $)	12.17	14.88	15.84	14.02	12.43	10.84	13.44
Number of weeks worked** (in 1999)	31.20 (22.96)	37.96 (20.45)	27.86 (23.87)	23.33 (23.91)	28.01 (23.86)	32.22 (22.98)	31.81 (23.10)
Number of usual hours worked in a week** (in 1999)	28.24 (20.96)	32.66 (17.73)	24.67 (21.17)	20.14 (21.19)	25.48 (22.70)	27.78 (20.15)	27.94 (20.58)
Independent variables							
Education categories							
Less than college degree	61.10	49.01	33.87	61.11	63.42	84.17	56.89
College education	18.95	43.43	34.59	29.26	28.42	12.11	29.73
Masters/Professional/Doctorate (Omitted category)	19.95	7.56	31.53	9.63	8.16	3.72	13.38
Education accounting for U.S. college degree							
Less than college degree	61.10	49.01	33.87	61.11	63.42	84.17	56.89
College or higher degree not acquired in the U.S.	24.8	37.09	38.95	26.36	22.73	4.55	27.42
College or higher degree acquired in the U.S. (Omitted category)	14.10	13.90	27.18	12.53	13.85	11.28	15.69
Years of work experience							
Mean years of work experience	25.13 (13.43)	23.73 (11.0)	18.44 (12.33)	23.20 (12.47)	23.84 (11.79)	24.63 (12.73)	23.20 (12.36)
Mean square of years of work experience	812.03 (750.72)	684.28 (577.28)	491.85 (578.82)	693.72 (658.78)	707.45 (619.90)	768.87 (704.91)	690.70 (650.29)
Non -U.S. years of work experience							
Mean non-U.S. years of work experience	11.56 (13.33)	6.89 (11.85)	5.90 (11.80)	6.53 (10.34)	7.25 (12.23)	10.59 (14.96)	8.13 (12.79)
Mean square of years of non-U.S. work experience	311.44 (463.79)	187.76 (337.56)	174.00 (367.15)	149.60 (220.31)	202.36 (311.04)	336.0 (475.27)	229.64 (387.69)
English language ability							
Speaks no English	14.31	0.25	2.53	1.35	4.03	8.50	4.96
Speaks English well or not well	57.54	28.23	29.59	52.05	63.14	66.57	46.07
Speaks only English or very well (Omitted category)	28.16	71.52	67.88	46.60	32.83	24.93	48.97
Type of occupation							
Business/Managerial/Professional (Omitted category)	32.34	36.64	41.60	26.94	22.13	17.12	30.97
Service	13.18	17.70	5.55	11.81	15.98	20.55	14.68
Sales	7.07	7.50	7.29	8.89	14.90	5.69	8.26
Office and administrative support	9.07	17.35	10.76	13.70	9.40	8.78	12.08
Farming, fishing, forestry	0.14	0.49	0.29	0.18	0.19	0.28	0.30
Construction, extraction, maintenance	0.36	0.45	0.28	0.45	0.44	0.85	0.47
Production, transportation, material	17.21	8.93	6.87	4.05	10.72	25.57	12.56
Type of work							
Self-employed	8.84	4.93	8.65	12.14	22.22	12.12	10.00
Wage/Salary earner (Omitted category)	91.16	95.07	91.35	87.86	77.78	87.88	90.00

Continued

Appendix Table 6.1A continued

Variable	Chinese	Filipino	Indian	Japanese	Korean	Vietnamese	Asian
	N = 16,216	N =28, 923	N = 15,815	N = 6,147	N = 13,635	N = 15,186	N = 95,922
Duration of stay							
Less than 10 years of stay	46.59	30.96	49.88	43.65	30.16	44.94	39.76
More than 10 but less than 20 years	33.37	34.53	27.54	18.83	33.23	30.39	31.30
20 or more number of years (Omitted category)	20.04	34.51	22.58	37.52	36.61	24.66	28.94
Region of /urban residence							
Northeast	36.55	12.92	32.00	17.23	21.56	10.13	21.29
Midwest	9.26	9.41	18.62	11.56	10.62	9.28	11.24
South	14.20	15.62	25.75	18.24	23.24	30.84	20.76
Rest of the West	2.55	4.42	2.14	5.01	4.09	3.85	3.61
Pacific (Omitted category)	37.44	57.64	21.49	47.95	40.48	45.90	43.09
Metro (Omitted category)	96.42	91.52	94.67	90.58	93.29	95.46	93.71
Non metro	3.58	8.48	5.33	9.42	6.71	4.54	6.29
Marital status							
Single	23.06	31.22	13.44	23.85	25.26	31.95	25.58
Married, spouse present (Omitted category)	76.94	68.78	86.56	76.15	74.74	49.74	74.42
Presence of children below age 5							
No child/ren below age 5 (Omitted category)	82.89	84.07	74.68	82.84	85.23	80.58	35.85
Have child/ren below age 5	17.11	15.93	25.32	17.16	14.77	19.42	64.15

Note : N = unweighted number of observations.

* The figures in brackets indicate the unweighted N.

** Variables employed in generating the dependent variable, hourly earnings.

The figures in brackets for the continuous variables indicate the standard deviation.

Appendix Table 6.1B Weighted Means (Standard Deviation) and Percentage Distributions of the Dependent and Independent Variables for the Native Born Women by Asian Ethnicity and Asian as a group and White (Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Women Aged 25-65)

Variable	Chinese N = 4,332	Filipino N = 3,704	Indian N = 971	Japanese N = 6,814	Korean N = 773	Vietnamese N = 241	Asian N= 16,835	White N = 538,886
Dependent variables								
Employed * (in 1999)	82.09 (3,564)	81.99 (3,047)	77.84 (753)	82.52 (5,598)	78.61 (608)	70.62 (173)	(13,743)	76.59 (409,762)
Mean hourly earnings (in 1999 U.S. $)	24.03 (22.09)	53.80 (1803. 69)	23.28 (34.33)	24.77 (195.64)	27.60 (122.85)	18.04 (26.42)	30.84 (850.35)	17.58 (53.37)
Geometric mean hourly earnings (in 1999 U.S. $)	18.97	14.65	16.44	17.36	17.6	12.54	17.02	12.79
Number of weeks worked** (in 1999)	38.35 (20.37)	38.08 (20.45)	35.00 (21.69)	38.96 (20.16)	35.62 (21.53)	31.54 (23.07)	39.0 (20.56)	35.09 (21.95)
Number of usual hours worked** (in 1999)	33.45 (19.03)	32.59 (18.24)	33.23 (21.50)	32.69 (18.00)	32.91 (20.95)	29.04 (21.61)	32.86 (18.77)	29.00 (18.82)
Independent variables								
Education categories								
Less than college degree	33.42	63.66	37.86	47.97	39.20	76.14	46.89	71.93
College education	41.79	28.42	30.79	36.85	34.71	15.14	35.53	18.60
Masters/Professional/Doctorate (Omitted category)	24.79	7.92	31.35	15.19	26.09	8.73	17.59	9.46
Years of work experience								
Mean years of work experience	19.01 (11.22)	17.79 (11.26)	12.53 (11.21)	24.55 (11.04)	14.33 (12.27)	21.01 (11.91)	20.33 (11.85)	24.16 (11.40)
Mean square of years of work experience	487.56 (496.21)	443.11 (518.81)	282.37 (449.84)	724.78 (572.66)	355.77 (537.07)	582.90 (587.42)	553.66 (553.09)	713.96 (590.69)
Type of occupation								
Business/Managerial/Professional (Omitted category)	54.70	39.21	52.51	46.82	55.15	26.79	47.71	34.16
Service	6.01	11.13	8.01	6.38	8.57	12.67	7.61	12.63
Sales	7.65	9.15	7.44	7.13	6.61	10.79	7.75	9.50
Office and administrative support	17.32	24.70	11.84	26.38	13.17	13.63	21.89	21.92
Farming, fishing, forestry	0.03	0.22	0	0.15	0.11	1.23	0.14	0.21
Construction, extraction, maintenance	0.36	0.72	0.27	0.39	0.21	0.35	0.43	0.72
Production, transportation, material	2.77	4.14	5.04	2.12	3.35	13.85	3.15	6.31
Type of work								
Self-employed	8.07	5.19	6.42	7.03	5.27	5.97	6.77	8.50
Wage/Salary earner (Omitted category)	91.93	94.81	93.58	92.97	94.73	94.03	93.23	91.50

Continued

211

Appendix Table 6.1B continued

Variable	Chinese N = 4,332	Filipino N = 3,704	Indian N = 971	Japanese N = 6,814	Korean N = 773	Vietnamese N = 241	Asian N= 16,835	White N = 538,886
Region of /urban residence								
Northeast	21.44	7.54	31.02	3.16	21.95	10.36	11.69	19.75
Midwest	6.09	6.94	15.09	4.73	14.46	10.25	6.76	26.19
South	10.50	13.07	28.30	4.46	16.33	34.17	10.42	34.77
Rest of the West	3.28	4.74	3.49	4.55	5.14	3.63	4.21	6.76
Pacific (Omitted category)	58.70	67.72	22.10	83.10	42.12	41.59	66.93	12.52
Metro (Omitted category)	95.66	87.33	92.50	87.79	90.77	91.31	90.26	54.23
Non metro	4.34	12.67	7.50	12.21	9.23	8.69	9.74	45.77
Marital status								
Single	39.76	41.16	48.10	35.49	54.94	50.26	39.79	33.37
Married, spouse present (Omitted category)	60.24	58.84	51.90	64.51	45.06	49.74	60.21	66.63
Presence of children below age 5								
No child/ren below age 5 (Omitted category)	83.87	78.6	81.95	88.24	84.84	83.48	45.88	86.22
Have child/ren below age 5	16.13	21.4	18.05	11.76	15.16	16.52	54.12	13.78

Note : N = unweighted number of observations.

   * The figures in brackets indicate the unweighted N.

   ** Variables employed in generating the dependent variable, hourly earnings.

    The figures in brackets for the continuous variables indicate the standard deviation.

Appendix Table 6.2 Comparison of the Unadjusted and Sample Selection Adjusted OLS (Standard Error) Estimates for Logarithm of Hourly Earnings as the Dependent Variable for Foreign Born Asians and Native Born Asians and Whites (Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Women Aged 25-65 Reporting Positive Earnings)

Variable	Panel A : Foreign Born		Panel B : Native Born	
	Unadjusted	Adjusted	Unadjusted	Adjusted
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Ethnicity				
Chinese	-0.12 **	-0.121 **	-0.085 **	0.084 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Filipino	-0.023 *	-0.018 **	0.020	0.020
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Indian	-0.058 **	-0.074 **	-0.026	0.022
	0.01	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Japanese	-0.012	-0.032 +	0.045 **	0.05 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Korean	-0.027 +	-0.037 **	0.077 **	0.074 *
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Vietnamese	-0.027 +	-0.055 **	-0.034	-0.041
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Education category				
Less than college degree	-0.467 **	-0.477 **	-0.469 **	-0.479
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
College education	-0.183 **	-0.188 **	-0.182 **	-0.187
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)
Work experience				
Years of work experience	0.022 **	0.024 **	0.018 **	0.019 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Square of years of work experience	-0.00 **	-0.000 **	-0.00 **	-0.000 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Non -U.S. years of work experience				
Non-U.S. years of work experience	-0.005 **	-0.005 **	n.a	n.a
	(0.00)	(0.00)		
Square of years of non-U.S. work experience	0.00 **	-0.00 **	n.a	n.a
	(0.00)	(0.00)		
English language ability				
Speaks no English	-0.340 **	-0.361 **	n.a	n.a
	(0.02)	(0.02)		
Speaks English well or not well	-0.104 **	-0.112 **	n.a	n.a
	(0.01)	(0.01)		
Type of occupation				
Service	-0.476 **	-0.476 **	-0.473 **	-0.474 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Sales	-0.265 **	-0.266 **	-0.259 **	-0.259 **
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Office and administrative support	-0.200 **	-0.20 **	-0.196 **	-0.196 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Farming, fishing, forestry	-0.574 **	-0.575 **	-0.575 **	-0.576 **
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Construction, extraction, maintenance	-0.084 **	-0.084 **	-0.078 **	-0.078 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Production, transportation, material	-0.319 **	-0.319 **	-0.310 **	-0.309 **
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.05)
Type of work				
Self-employed	-0.186 **	-0.186 **	-0.189 **	-0.189
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)

Continued

Appendix Table 6.2 continued

Variable	Panel A : Foreign Born		Panel B : Native Born	
	Unadjusted	Adjusted	Unadjusted	Adjusted
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Region /urban residence				
Northeast	-0.021 **	-0.020 **	-0.023 **	-0.021
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Midwest	-0.108 **	-0.103 **	-0.110 **	-0.105
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
South	-0.116 **	-0.116 **	-0.117 **	-0.118
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Rest of the West	-0.117 **	-0.116 **	-0.120 **	-0.119
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Metro	0.170 **	0.167 **	0.167 **	0.168
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Marital status				
Single	0.012 **	0.020 **	0.011 **	0.020
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Constant	2.84 **	2.84 **	2.862 **	2.838
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Number of observations (Degrees of Freedom)	440,609 (27	493,859 (27)	398,879 (23)	445,953 (23)
Lambda	n.a	0.067 **	n.a	0.068 **
Adjusted R square	0.647	n.a	0.642	n.a

** p <= 0.01 ; * p < =0.05 ; +p <= 0.10
The figures in brackets denote robust standard error.
 n.a = not applicable

Reference category; White; Masters/Professional/Doctorate; U.S. college degree or higher; Speaks only English
            or very well; Pacific region of residence; Non-metro residence; Married, spouse present;
             No children below the age of 5.

Appendix Table 6.3 Marginal Effects from the Probit Estimates (Standard Error) Predicting Probability of Employment
for Asian Women by Ethnicity
(Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Women Aged 25-65)

Variable	Chinese	Filipino	Indian	Japanese	Korean	Vietnamese
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Nativity status						
Foreign born	-0.085 **	-0.034 **	-0.206 **	-0.421 **	-0.212 **	0.046
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Education category						
Less than college degree	-0.149 **	-0.046 **	-0.086 **	-0.101 **	0.004	-0.099 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)
College education	-0.167 **	0.019 +	-0.078 **	-0.080 **	-0.060 **	-0.014
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)
Work experience						
Years of work experience	0.007 **	0.008 **	0.028 **	0.02 **	0.02 **	0.008 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.00)
Square of years of work experience	-0.00 **	-0.000 **	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	-0.00 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Non -U.S. years of work experience						
Non-U.S. years of work experience	-0.003 **	-0.003 **	-0.013 **	-0.012 **	-0.012 **	-0.003 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Square of years of non-U.S. work experience	-0.00 *	-0.00	0.00 **	-0.00	0.00 **	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
English language ability						
Speaks no English	-0.047 **	-0.135 *	-0.185 **	-0.244 **	-0.158 **	-0.233 **
	(0.02)	(0.07)	(0.04)	(0.08)	(0.03)	(0.02)
Speaks English well or not well	-0.041 **	-0.023 **	-0.058 **	-0.117 **	-0.060 **	-0.020
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Region of /urban residence						
Northeast	-0.014	-0.007	0.017	-0.066 **	0.032 *	-0.018
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)
Midwest	-0.002	-0.002	0.03 *	-0.088 **	0.02	0.098 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
South	-0.038 **	-0.021 **	0.008	-0.07 **	-0.01	0.082 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Rest of the West	-0.039 **	-0.029 *	0.016	-0.025	0.070 **	0.073 **
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Metro	0.009	0.022 *	0.024	0.008	0.075 **	0.026
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)
Marital status						
Single	0.033 **	0.025 **	0.135 **	0.141 **	0.123 **	0.011
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Children below age five						
Children below age five	-0.136 **	-0.113 **	-0.130 **	-0.257 **	-0.208 **	0.167 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Number of observations (Degrees of freedom)	17,798 (16)	27,230 (16)	14,174 (16)	11,783 (16)	12,063 (16)	12,900 (16)
Log likelihood	-9540.4801	-11843.202	-8381.7583	-5780.4581	-7287.1456	-6904.4457
Adjusted R square	0.09	0.07	0.10	0.22	0.09	0.11

** p <= 0.01 ; * p < =0.05 ; +p <= 0.10
 The figures in brackets denote robust standard error.

Reference category; Native born; Masters/Professional/Doctorate; Speaks only English or very well; Pacific region of residence;
Non-metro residence; Married, spouse present; No children below the age of 5.

Appendix Table 6.4 Sample Selection Adjusted OLS Estimates (Standard Error) with Logarithm of Hourly Earnings as the Dependent Variable for Asian Women by Ethnicity
(Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Women Aged 25-65 Reporting Positive Earnings)

Variable	Chinese	Filipino	Indian	Japanese	Korean	Vietnamese
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Nativity status						
Foreign born	-0.29 **	-0.16 **	-0.28 **	-0.19 **	-0.27 **	-0.24 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.02)
Education category						
Less than college degree	-0.50 **	-0.38 **	-0.32 **	-0.37 **	-0.27 **	-0.38 **
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.01)
College education	-0.29 **	-0.15 **	-0.20 **	-0.16 **	-0.12 **	-0.17 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.01)
Work experience						
Years of work experience	0.03 **	0.03 **	0.03 **	0.03 **	0.03 **	0.03 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.04)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)
Square of years of work experience	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	-0.000 **	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	-0.001 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Non -U.S. years of work experience						
Non-U.S. years of work experience	-0.01 **	-0.01 **	-0.02 **	-0.01 **	-0.01 **	-0.01 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.00)
Square of years of non-U.S. work experience	0.00 **	-0.00	-0.00 **	0.00 *	0.00	0.00 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
English language ability						
Speaks no English	-0.37 **	0.06	-0.33 **	-0.15	-0.12 +	-0.39 **
	(0.03)	(0.22)	(0.10)	(0.19)	(0.07)	(0.03)
Speaks English well or not well	-0.15 **	-0.06 **	-0.20 **	-0.36	-0.07 *	-0.13 **
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.01)
Type of occupation						
Service	-051 **	-0.55 **	-0.65 **	-0.38 **	-0.51 **	-0.55 **
	(0.03)	(0.07	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.01)
Sales	-0.37 **	-0.56 **	-0.65 **	-0.28 **	-0.45 **	-0.47 **
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.01)
Office and administrative support	-0.27 **	-0.37 **	-0.48 **	-0.22 **	-0.27 **	-0.34 **
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.01)
Farming, fishing, forestry	-0.50 **	-0.71 **	-0.77 **	-0.59 **	-0.30 *	-0.64 **
	(0.11)	(0.06)	(0.09)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.04)
Construction, extraction, maintenance	-0.11	-0.32 **	-0.27 *	-0.14	-0.35 **	-0.27 **
	(0.09)	(0.06)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.10)	(0.03)
Production, transportation, material	-0.61 **	-0.52 **	-0.57 **	-0.42 **	-0.46 **	0.52 **
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.01)
Type of work						
Self-employed	-0.18 **	-0.13 **	-0.03	-0.18 **	-0.06 +	-0.13 **
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.02)
Region of /urban residence						
Northeast	-0.08 **	0.13 **	0.04 +	0.07 +	-0.03	-0.01
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.01)
Midwest	-0.10 **	-0.031	-0.04	-0.10 **	-0.08 *	-0.07 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.01)
South	-0.18 **	-0.11 **	-0.14 **	-0.10 **	-0.12 **	-0.12 **
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.01)
Rest of the West	-0.09 *	-0.08 **	0.02	-0.15 **	-0.11 *	-0.07 **
	(0.05)	(0.02)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.02)
Metro	0.20 **	0.08 **	0.10 *	0.20 **	0.18 **	0.13 **
	(0.05)	(0.02)	(0.43)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.01)
Marital status						
Single	0.04 *	0.02	0.01	0.05 **	0.01	0.05 **
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.01)
	2.97 **	2.93 **	2.89 **	2.73 **	2.87 **	2.91 **
Constant	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.10)	(0.04)
Number of observations (Degrees of freedom)	17,798 (22)	27,230 (22)	14,174 (22)	11,783 (22)	12,063 (22)	95,948 (22)
Lambda	0.43 **	0.32 **	0.43 **	0.04 **	0.16 **	0.31 **

** p <= 0.01 ; * p < =0.05 ; +p <= 0.10
The figures in brackets denote robust standard error.

Reference category; Native born; Masters/Professional/Doctorate; Speaks only English or very well;, Business/Managerial/Professional;

Self-employed; Pacific region of residence; Non -metro region of residence; Married, spouse present.

Marginal Effects from the Probit Estimates (Standard Error) Predicting Probability of Employment for Foreign Born Asian and Native Born Asian and White Women (Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Women Aged 25-65 Reporting Positive Earnings)

Variable	Panel A : Foreign Born		Panel B : Native Born
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Ethnicity			
Asian	-0.045 **	0.002	0.018 **
	(0.05)	(0.01)	(0.00)
Education category			
Less than college degree	-0.11 **	n.a	-0.11 **
	(0.00)		(0.00)
College education	-0.067 **	n.a	-0.068 ***
	(0.00)		(0.00)
Education category accounting for U.S. college degree			
Less than college degree	n.a	-0.08 **	n.a
		(0.00)	
College or higher degree not acquired in the U.S.	n.a	-0.139 **	n.a
		(0.01)	
Work experience			
Years of work experience	0.004 **	0.004 **	0.004 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Square of years of work experience	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	-0.00 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Non -U.S. years of work experience			
Non-U.S. years of work experience	-0.001 *	0.001 **	n.a
	(0.00)	(0.00)	
Square of years of non-U.S. work experience	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	n.a
	(0.00)	(0.00)	
English language ability			
Speaks no English	-0.163 **	-0.196 **	n.a
	(0.01)	(0.01)	
Speaks English well or not well	-0.091 **	-0.099 **	n.a
	(0.01)	(0.01)	
Region of /urban residence			
Northeast	0.01 **	0.012 **	0.014 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Midwest	0.046 **	0.047 **	0.049 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
South	-0.008 **	-0.007 **	-0.005 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Rest of the West	0.009 **	0.009 **	0.011 **
	(0.00)	(0.003)	(0.00)
Metro	0.008 **	0.008 **	0.008 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Marital status			
Single	0.07 **	0.069 **	0.067 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Children below age five			
Children below age five	-0.190 **	-0.192 **	-0.195 **
	(0.002)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Number of observations (Degrees of freedom)	589,313 (16)	589,313 (16)	526,793 (12)
Log likelihood	-295347.21	-295493.59	-262384.32
Adjusted R-square	0.09	0.09	0.09

** p <= 0.01 ; * p < =0.05 ; + p <= 0.10
The figures in brackets denote robust standard error.
 n.a = not applicable/excluded

Reference category; White; Masters/Professional/Doctorate; U.S. college degree or higher; Speaks only English or very well; Pacific region of residence; Non-metro residence; Married, spouse present; No children below the age of 5.

Appendix Table 6.6 Sample Selection Adjusted OLS Estimates (Standard Error) with Logarithm of Hourly Earnings as the Dependent Variable for Foreign Born Asian and Native Born Asian and White Women (Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Women Aged 25-65 Reporting Positive Earnings)

| Variable | Panel A : Foreign Born | | Panel B : Native Born |
| | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 1 |
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Ethnicity			
Asian	-0.06 **	-0.02 *	0.05 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Education category			
Less than college degree	-0.48 **	n.a	-0.48 **
	(0.004)		(0.00)
College education	-0.19 **	n.a	-0.19 **
	(0.00)		(0.01)
Education category accounting for U.S. college degree			
Less than college degree	n.a	-0.35 **	n.a
		(0.00)	
College or higher degree not acquired in the U.S.	n.a	-0.09 **	n.a
		(0.01)	
Work experience			
Years of work experience	0.02 **	0.02 **	0.02 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Square of years of work experience	-0.00 **	-0.00 **	-0.00 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Non -US years of work experience			
Non-U.S. years of work experience	-0.01 **	-0.01 **	n.a
	(0.00)	(0.00)	
Square of years of non-U.S. work experience	0.00 **	0.00 **	n.a
	(0.00)	(0.00)	
English language ability			
Speaks no English	-0.40 **	-0.42 **	n.a
	(0.02)	(0.02)	
Speaks English well or not well	-0.12 **	-0.13 **	n.a
	(0.01)	(0.01)	
Type of occupation			
Service	-0.48 **	-0.49 **	-0.47 **
	(0.00)	(0.004)	(0.00)
Sales	-0.27 **	-0.28 **	-0.26 **
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Office and administrative support	-0.20 **	-0.21 **	-0.20 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Farming, fishing, forestry	-0.57 **	-0.59 **	-0.58 **
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Construction, extraction, maintenance	-0.08 **	-0.10 **	-0.08 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Production, transportation, material	-0.32 **	-0.33 **	-0.31 **
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)
Type of work			
Self-employed	-0.19 **	-0.18 **	-0.19 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Region /urban residence			
Northeast	-0.02 **	-0.02 **	-0.02 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Midwest	-0.10 **	-0.103 **	-0.11 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
South	-0.117 **	-0.12 **	-0.12 **
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Rest of the West	-0.12 **	-0.12 **	-0.12 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Metro	0.17 **	0.17 **	0.17 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Marital status			
Single	0.02 **	0.02 **	0.02 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Constant	(0.01) **	2.72	2.84
Number of observations (Degrees of Freedom)	589,313 (22)	589,313 (22)	526,793
Lambda	0.07 **	0.064	0.07
Adjusted Log likelihood	-0.00	-0.00	-1390.00

** p <= 0.01 ; * p < =0.05 ; + p <= 0.10

The figures in brackets denote robust standard error.

n.a = not applicable/excluded

Reference category; White; Masters/Professional/Doctorate; U.S. college degree or higher; Speaks only English or very well; Pacific region of residence; Non-metro residence; Married, spouse present; No children below the age of 5.

Appendix Table 6.7 Marginal Effects from the Probit Estimates Predicting Probability of Employment and Sample Selection Adjusted OLS Estimates (Standard Error) with Logarithm of Hourly Earnings as the Dependent Variable for the Pooled Sample of Foreign and Native Born Asian Women
(Universe Includes Non-Institutionalized Women Aged 25-65)

Variable	Marginal Effects	Logarithm of Hourly Earnings
(1)	(2)	(3)
Nativity		
Foreign born	-0.129 **	-0.24 **
	(0.00)	(0.03)
Education category		
Less than college degree	-0.066 **	-0.38 **
	(0.00)	(0.01)
College education	-0.045 **	-0.17 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)
Work experience		
Years of work experience	0.018 **	0.03 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)
Square of years of work experience	-0.00 **	-0.001 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)
Non -U.S. years of work experience		
Non-U.S. years of work experience	-0.01 **	-0.13 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)
Square of years of non-U.S. work experience	0.00 **	0.00 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)
English language ability		
Speaks no English	-0.117 **	-0.39 **
	(0.01)	(0.03)
Speaks English well or not well	-0.066 **	-0.13 **
	(0.00)	(0.01)
Type of occupation		
Service	n.a	-0.55 **
		(0.01)
Sales	n.a	-0.47 **
		(0.01)
Office and administrative support	n.a	-0.34 **
		(0.01)
Farming, fishing, forestry	n.a	-0.64 **
		(0.04)
Construction, extraction, maintenance	n.a	-0.27 **
		(0.03)
Production, transportation, material	n.a	-0.52 **
		(0.01)
Type of work		
Self-employed	n.a	-0.13 **
		(0.02)
Region or /urban residence		
Northeast	-0.027 **	-0.01
	(0.00)	(0.01)
Midwest	-0.013 *	-0.07 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)
South	-0.021 **	-0.12 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)
Rest of the West	-0.004	-0.07 **
	(0.01)	(0.02)
Metro	0.023 **	0.13 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)
Marital status		
Single	0.084 **	0.05 **
	(0.00)	(0.01)
Children below age five		
Children below age five	-0.138 **	n.a
	(0.01)	
Constant	n.a	2.91
Number of observations (Degrees of freedom)	95,948 (16)	95,948 (22)
Lambda	n.a	0.31 **
Log likelihood	-52269.91	n.a
Adjusted R square	0.09	n.a

** p <= 0.01 ; * p < =0.05 ; + p <= 0.10

The figures in brackets denote robust standard error.

n.a = not applicable/excluded

Reference category; White; Masters/Professional/Doctorate; U.S. college degree or higher; Speaks only English or very well;
               Pacific region of residence; Non-metro residence; Married, spouse present; No children below the age of 5.

Appendix Table 7.1A Weighted Means and Percentage Distributions of the Dependent and Independent Variables for the Foreign Born Households by Asian Ethnicity

Variable	Chinese	Filipino	Indian	Japanese	Korean	Vietnamese
	N= 19,374	N = 21,820	N = 19,203	N = 6,282	N = 12,095	N = 13,438
Annual household income	62171.09 (64949.65)	75484.07 (59256.72)	94184.11 (88795.11)	71146.45 (76809.42)	59087.99 (67394.98)	58646.79 (53996.81)
Annual per capita household income	23719.58 (26730.59)	24523.28 (23874.85)	35009.04 (36557.81)	36774.66 (45131.79)	21881.67 (27887.52)	16984.31 (17960.37)
Annual income per labor hour employed	31.19 (509.89)	26.79 (123.82)	32.63 (55.32)	41.78 (128.01)	26.97 (183.43)	20.73 (74.02)
Household type						
Nuclear (Omitted)*	68.42	56.63	75.29	83.67	75.07	57.52
Nonnuclear	31.58	43.37	24.71	16.33	24.93	42.48
Annual total number of work hours	2902.80 (2344.73)	3640.06 (2267.34)	3222.34 (1810.81)	1896.84 (1633.10)	2660.50 (2192.42)	3532.69 (2433.79)
Square of annual total number of work hours	13,923,659 (24,125,292	18,390,607 (24,073,697)	13,662,317 (16,652,417)	6,264,574 (9,757,512)	11,884,559 (17,440,965)	18,402,774 (25,504,197)
Education[a]						
Less than college degree	50.76	49.57	19.69	48.27	51.83	80.85
College education	15.74	40.47	30.69	33.34	28.38	13.54
Masters/Professional/Doctorate (Omitted)	33.5	9.96	49.62	18.39	19.8	5.62
Education after accounting for U.S. education[a]						
Less than college degree	50.76	49.57	19.69	48.27	51.83	80.85
College or higher degree not acquired in the U.S.	17.14	10.85	31.45	11.43	12.25	10.18
College or higher degree acquired in the U.S. (Omitt	32.1	40.3	39.59	40.3	35.93	8.97
Work experience[a]						
Years of work experience	29.76 (19.44)	28.94 (14.33)	18.10 (12.46)	23.74 (17.14)	26.97 (15.57)	28.05 (13.63)
Square of years of work experience	1263.72 (1416.97)	1042.71 (1021.72)	481.89 (584.70)	857.56 (1050.62)	969.76 (1046.85)	972.77 (916.77)
English language ability[a]						
Speaks no English	11.5	0.18	0.39	0.69	4.27	4.77
Speaks English well or not well	56.18	30.53	19.17	60.02	69.1	72.92
Speaks only English or very well (Omitted)	32.12	69.29	80.45	39.29	26.63	22.31
Duration of stay[a]						
Ten or less years	40.28	24.48	50.5	54.46	35.15	37.94
More than 10 and less than 20 years	31.84	35.7	28.04	13.59	34.48	38.15
20 or more years (Omitted)	27.88	39.82	21.46	31.96	30.37	23.9

Continued

Variable	Chinese	Filipino	Indian	Japanese	Korean	Vietnamese
	N= 19,374	N = 21,820	N = 19,203	N = 6,282	N = 12,095	N = 13,438
Region of /urban residence						
Northeast	33.93	13.22	30.73	20.47	23.2	10.22
Midwest	10.23	8.91	19.8	12.72	10.93	9.93
South	15.46	13.58	25.81	15.26	19.59	30.32
Rest of the West	2.53	3.65	2.53	4.7	3.02	3.48
Pacific (Omitted)	37.86	60.64	21.13	46.85	43.26	46.05
Metro	95.92	93.29	94.18	91.37	92.74	95.38
Nonmetro (Omitted)	4.08	6.71	5.82	8.63	7.26	4.62
Marital status [a]						
Married, spouse present (Omitted)	70.44	66.63	77.87	42.99	66.2	68.57
Single	29.56	33.37	22.13	57.01	33.8	31.43
Ethnic homogeneity						
Same ethnicity (Omitted)	96.41	88.14	94.21	86.07	94.83	97.27
Multi-ethnic	3.59	11.86	5.79	13.93	5.17	2.73
Sex of the householder						
Female headed	24.25	32.13	10.41	40.41	28.57	22.05
Male headed (Omitted)	75.75	67.87	89.59	59.59	71.43	77.95
Household size	3.02 (1.62)	3.61 (1.93)	3.15 (1.51)	2.10 (1.22)	2.90 (1.40)	3.91 (1.88)

Note : The sample for household income statistic is households reporting positive household income.

N = unweighted sample size

[a] The characteristics are of the householder.

Standard deviation provided for continuous variables in brackets.

* In case of the logistic regression with likelihood of a nuclear living arrangement as the dependent variable, nonnuclear is the omitted category.

Appendix Table 7.1B Weighted Means and Percentage Distributions of the Dependent and Independent Variables for the Native Born Households by Asian Ethnicity and White

Variable	Chinese N= 7,610	Filipino N = 6,841	Indian N = 2,659	Japanese N = 12,356	Korean N = 2,714	Vietnamese N = 2,161	White N = 793,541
Household income	83567.34 (78681.21)	60822.22 (50255.11)	59213.20 (66750.66)	73551.25 (61893.15)	64097.14 (71839.12)	45866.67 (47783.84)	60411.81 (61549.90)
Annual per capita household income	39235.43 (38755.16)	25825.28 (23392.84)	34487.39 (36497.59)	34921.38 (30999.27)	31758.35 (33291.52)	27584.79 (27004.51)	28117.24 (30275.50)
Annual income per labor hour employed	43.40 (385.61)	23.50 (77.97)	26.55 (78.10)	49.51 (512.69)	31.92 (354.84)	22.01 (26.91)	37.30 (461.84)
Household type							
Nuclear (Omitted)*	73.69	65.83	72.05	74.85	67.42	58.61	81.55
Nonnuclear	26.31	34.17	27.95	25.15	32.58	41.39	18.45
Annual total number of work hours	2733.10 (1928.11)	3154.30 (1836.51)	2665.29 (1877.70)	2441.38 (1970.41)	2699.27 (1844.08)	3136.08 (2079.27)	2502.71(1899.96)
Square of annual total number of work hours	11,186,926 (14,144,547	13,322,087 (15,432,162)	10,628,169 (14,578,218	9,841,480 (13,271,159)	10,685,473 (13,607,867)	14,156,366(21,197,664)	9,873,426 (12,084,828)
Education[a]							
Less than college degree	38.86	64.65	32.19	58.13	51.83	80.85	72.35
College education	37.06	27.06	35.17	27.44	28.38	13.54	17.47
Masters/Professional/Doctorate (Omitted)	24.09	8.3	32.64	14.42	19.8	5.62	10.19
Work experience[a]							
Years of work experience	22.80 (18.34)	17.27 (14.03)	8.91 (10.96)	34.59 (19.24)	10.99 (12.34)	9.14 (7.97)	31.20 (18.26)
Square of years of work experience	856.22 (1186.02)	495.15 (796.66)	199.47 (508.96)	1566.58 (1458.94)	272.93 (659.38)	147.11 (330.55)	1306.72 (1329.09)

Appendix Table 7.1B continued

Variable	Chinese N= 7,610	Filipino N = 6,841	Indian N = 2,659	Japanese N = 12,356	Korean N = 2,714	Vietnamese N = 2,161	White N = 793,541
Region of /urban residence							
Northeast	20.55	7.82	27.39	3.23	21.09	9.39	19.24
Midwest	7.09	8.34	18.48	4.41	14.12	9.9	26.42
South	10.86	13.68	27.68	4.14	17.61	33.99	34.91
Rest of the West	3.51	5.29	3.06	4.89	5.06	4.86	6.85
Pacific (Omitted)	58	64.87	23.39	83.33	42.11	41.87	12.59
Metro	95.67	89.09	93.37	91.37	92.74	94.11	53.54
Nonmetro (Omitted)	4.33	10.91	6.63	8.63	7.26	5.89	46.46
Married[a]							
Married, spouse present (Omitted)	47.31	49.38	37.05	53.31	36.78	40.21	55.83
Single	52.69	50.62	62.95	46.69	63.22	59.79	44.17
Ethnic homogeneity							
Same ethnicity (Omitted)	72.11	60.42	75.72	73.51	69.09	76.8	97.27
Multi-ethnic	29.89	39.58	24.28	26.49	30.91	23.2	2.73
Sex of the householder							
Female headed	32.09	32.37	37.86	30.65	40.41	34.3	32.5
Male headed (Omitted)	67.91	67.63	62.14	69.35	59.59	65.7	67.5
Household size	2.42 (1.41)	2.91 (1.65)	2.23 (1.39)	2.34 (1.30)	2.29 (1.27)	2.73 (1.56)	2.44 (1.34)

Note : The sample for household income statistic is households reporting positive household income.

   N = unweighted sample size

   [a] The characteristics are of the householder.
   Standard deviation provided for continuous variables in brackets.

 * In case of the logistic regression with likelihood of a nuclear living arrangement as the dependent variable,
   nonnuclear is the omitted category.

References

Agbayani –Siewert, Pauline and Linda Revilla. 1995. 'Filipino Americans', in *Asian Americans: Contemporary Trends and Issues* edited by Pyong Gap Min, pages 134-168, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Alba, Richard D.1990. *Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Alba, Richard D., John R. Logan and Kyle Crowder. 1997. White Ethnic Neighborhoods: The Greater New York Region: 1980-1990, *Social Forces*, Volume 75, Number 3, pages 883-912.

Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Migration*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Allison, Paul D.1999. *Multiple Regression: A Primer*, Pine Forge Press.

Amott, Teresa L. and Julie A. Matthaei. 1991. *Race, Gender and Work: A Multicultural History of Women in the United States*, Boston, Massachusetts: South End Press.

Angel, Roland and Marta Tienda. 1982. 'Determinants of Extended Household Structure: Cultural Patterns or Economic Need?' *American Journal of Sociology*, Volume 7, Number 6, pages 1360-1383.

Antin, Mary 1938. *The Promised Land*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press.

Barringer, Herbert R., David T. Takeuchi, and Peter Xenos.1990. 'Education, Occupational Prestige, Income of Asian Americans', *Sociology of Education*, Volume 63, Number 1,pages 27-43.

Bean, Frank D. and Gillian Stevens. 2003. *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bhattacharjee, Yudhijit.2006. 'Congress Weighs Steps to Retain Foreign Talent', *Science*, Volume 312, Number 5771, page 177.

Bhattacharjee, Yudhijit. 2007. 'Study Finds Foreign High Tech Workers Earn Less', *Science*, Volume 316, Number 5822, page 184.

Bianchi, Suzanne M. and Wan He. 1997. 'Work and Family Strategies for Economic Success Among Asian Americans', Paper presented at American Sociological Association Meetings, Toronto.

Black, Dan, Amelia Haviland, Seth Sanders, and Lowell Taylor. 2002. 'Why do Minority

Men Earn Less? A Study of Wage Differentials among the Highly Educated', *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Volume 88, Number 1, pages 300-313.

Blau, Francine D. and Andrea H. Beller.1992.'Black -White Earnings Over the 1970s and 1980s: Gender Differences in Trends', *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Volume 74, Number 2, pages 276-286.

Bleakley, Hoyt and Aimee Chin. 2004. 'Language Skills and Earnings: Evidence from Childhood Immigrants', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Volume 86, Number 2, pages 481–96.

Borjas, George J. 1985. 'Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality and the Earnings of Immigrants', *Journal of Labor Economics*, Volume 3, Number 4, pages 463-489.

Borjas, George J. 1987. 'Immigrants, Minorities and Labor Market Competition', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Volume 40, Number 3, pages 382-392.

Borjas, George J. 1988. *International Differences in the Labor Market Performance of Immigrants*, Kalamazoo, Michigan: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Borjas, George J. 1989. Economic Theory and International Migration, *International Migration Review*, Volume 23, Number 4, pages 457-485.

Borjas, George J. 1990. *Friends or Strangers: The Impact of Immigration on the US Economy*, New York: Basic Books.

Borjas, George J. 1994. 'The Economics of Immigration', *Journal of Economic Literature*, Volume 32, Number 4, pages 1667-1717

Borjas, George J. 1995. 'The Economic Benefits from Immigration', *The Journal of Economic Perspective*, Volume 9, Number 2, pages 3-22.

Borjas, George J. 1999. *Heaven's Door: Immigration Policy and the American Economy,* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Boyd, Monica. 1989. 'Family and Personal Networks in International Migration: Recent Developments and New Agenda', *International Migration Review*, Volume 23, Number 3, pages 638-670.

Bonacich, Edna. 1973. 'A Theory of Middlemen Minorities', *American Sociological Review*, Volume 38, Number 3, pages 583-594

Bonacich, Edna and John Modell. 1980. *The Economic Basis of Ethnic Solidarity: Small Business in the Japanese American Community*, Berkeley: University of California.

Budig, Michelle J. and Paula England. 2001. 'The Wage Penalty for Motherhood', *American Sociological Review*, Volume 66, Number 2, pages 204-225.

Burr, Jeffery and Jan E. Mutchler. 1993. 'Ethnic Living Arrangements: Cultural Convergence or Cultural Manifestation?', *Social Forces*, Volume 72, Number 1, pages 169-179.

Burma, John H. 1951. 'Background on the Current Situation of Filipino-Americans', *Social Forces*, Volume 30, pages 42-48.

Cabezas, Amado and Gary Kawaguchi. 1988. 'Empirical Evidence for Continuing Asian American Inequality: The Human Capital Model and Labor Market Segmentation' in Gari Y. Okihiro, Shirley Hune, Arthur A. Hansen and John M. Liu edited *Reflections on Shattered Windows: Promises and Prospects for Asian American Studies*, Pullman, Washington: Washington State University Press, pages 144-164.

Carliner, Geoffery. 2000. 'The Language Ability of US Immigrants: Assimilation and Cohort Effects', *International Migration Review*, Volume 34, Number 1, pages 158-182.

Carlson, Leonard A. and Caroline Swartz.1988. 'The Earnings of Women and Ethnic Minorities, 1959-1979', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Volume 41, Number 4, pages 530-546.

Chandrashekar, S. 1982. 'Some Statistics on Asian Indian Immigration to the United States of America' in S. Chandrashekar edited *From India to America: A Brief History of Immigration, Problems of Discrimination, Admission and Assimilation*, pages 86-93, La Jolla, California: Population Review.

Chavez, L.R. 1990. 'Coresidence and Resistances: Strategies for Survival among Undocumented Mexicans and Central Americans in the US', *Urban Anthropology*, Volume 19, Numbers 1-2, pages 31-61.

Chiswick, Barry R. 1978a. 'The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign – Born Men', *Journal of Political Economy*, Volume 86, Number 5, pages 897-921.

Chiswick, Barry R. 1978b. 'A Longitudinal Analysis of the Occupational Mobility of Immigrants', *Monthly Labor Review*, Volume 101, Number 3, pages 29-31

Chiswick, Barry R. 1979. 'The Economic Progress of Immigrants: Some Apparently Universal Patterns' in *Contemporary Economic Problems* edited by W. Fellner (pages 357-399), Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute

Chiswick, Barry R. 1980. An Analysis of the Economic Progress and Impact of

Immigrants, NITS Number PB80-200454, Washington, D.C.: National Technical Information Service.

Chiswick, Barry R. 1983. 'An Analysis of the Earnings and Employment of Asian American Men', *Journal of Labor Economics,* Volume 1, Number 2, pages 197-218.

Chiswick, Barry R. and Paul W. Miller. 1998. 'English Language Fluency among Immigrants in the United States', *Research in Labor Economics*, Volume 17, pages 151-200.

Chiquiar, Daniel and Gordon H. Hanson. 2002. *International Migration, Self Selection and the Distribution of Wages: Evidence from Mexico and the United States*, National Bureau of Economic Research, October.

Cornell, Stephen and Douglas Hartmann. 1998. *Ethnicity and Race: Making Identities in a Changing World*, Pine Forge Press.

Curran, Sara R., Steven Shafer, Katherine M. Donato and Filiz Garip.2006. 'Mapping Gender and Migration in Sociological Scholarship: Is it Segregation or Integration?', International *Migration Review*, Volume 40, Number 1, pages 199-223.

Donato, Katherine M., Donna Gabaccia, Jennifer Holdaway and Martin Manalansan and Patricia Pessar.2006. 'A Glass Half Full? Gender in Migration Studies', *International Migration Review*, Volume 40, Number 1, pages 3-26.

Duleep, Harriet Orcutt and Daniel J. Dowhan. 2002. 'Insights from Longitudinal Data on the Earnings Growth of US Foreign Born Men', *Demography*, Volume 39, Number 3, pages 485-506.

Duleep, Harriet Orcutt and Mark C. Regets.1996. 'Earnings of Convergence: Does it Matter Where Come From or Why?', *Canadian Journal of Economics*, Volume 29, Special Issue.

Duleep, Harriet. Orcutt and Mark C. Regets. 1994. *The Elusive Concept of Immigrant Quality*, Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Duleep, Harriet Orcutt and Mark C. Regets.1997. Measuring Immigrant Wage Growth Using Matched CPS Files, *Demography*, Volume 34, Number 2, pages 239-249.

Duleep, Harriet Orcutt and Mark C. Regets.1999. Immigrants and Human -Capital Investment, *American Economic Review*, Volume 89, Number 2, pages 186-191.

Duleep, Harriet Orcutt and Mark C. Regets.2002. The Elusive Concept of Immigrant Quality: Evidence from 1970 to 1990, IZA Discussion Paper 631, Bonn, Germany

:Institute for the Study of Labor.

Duleep, Harriet Orcutt and Seth Sanders.1992. Discrimination at the Top: American – Born Asian and White Men, *Industrial Relations*, Fall, pages 416-432.

Duleep, Harriet Orcutt and Seth Sanders. 1993. 'The Decision to Work by Married Immigrant Women', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Volume 46, Number 4, July, pages 677-690.

Dodoo, Francis Nii-Amoo. 1997. 'Assimilation Differences among Africans in America', *Social Forces*, Volume 76, Number 2, pages 527-546.

Ermisch, J.F. and Elizabeth Overton. 1985. Minimal Household Units: A New Approach to the Analysis of Household Formation. *Population Studies*, Volume 39, Number 1, pages 33-54.

Espiritu, Yen Le. 1992. *Asian American Panethnicity –Bridging Institutions and Identities*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fang, Di. 1996. 'Japan's Growing Economic Activities and the Attainment Patterns of Foreign Born Japanese Workers in the United States, 1979 to 1989', *International Migration Review*, Volume 30, Number 2, pages 511-534.

Feagin , Joe R. and Clariece B. Feagin. 1993. *Racial and Ethnic Relations*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Feliciano, Cynthia. 2005. 'Educational Selectivity in US Immigration: How do Immigrants Compare to those Left Behind?', *Demography*, Volume 42, Number 1, pages 131-152.

Feliciano, Cynthia and Ruben Rumbaut. 2005. Gendered Paths: Educational and Occupational Expectations and Outcomes among Adult Children of Immigrants, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Volume 28, Number 6, pages 1087-1118.

Fernandez, Marilyn.1998. 'Asian Indian Americans in the Bay Area and the Glass Ceiling', *Sociological Perspectives*, Volume 41, Number 1, pages 119-149.

Foner, Nancy. 1997. 'The Immigrant Family: Cultural Legacies and Cultural Changes', *International Migration Review*, Volume 31, Number 4, pages 961-974.

Fong, Timothy P. 2002. *The Contemporary Asian American Experience: Beyond the Model Minority*, New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Friedberg, Rachel M. 2000. 'You Can't Take it With You? Immigrant Assimilation and the Probability of Human Capital', *Journal of Labor Economics*, Volume 18, Number 2, pages 221-252.

Gallagher, Charles A. 2003. 'Miscounting Race: Explaining Misperceptions in Racial Group Size', *Sociological Perspectives*, Volume 46, No. 3, pages 381-396.

Gibson, Margaret.1988. *Accommodation without Assimilation: Sikh Immigrants in an American High School*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Glick, J ennifer E., Frank D. Bean and Jennifer V. W. Van Hook. 1997. 'Immigration and Changing Patterns of Extended Family Household Structure in the Unites States: 1970-1990', *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Volume 59, Number 1, pages 177-191.

Glick, Jennifer E. 1999. 'Economic Support from and to Extended Kin: A Comparison of Mexican Americans and Mexican Immigrants', *International Migration Review*, Volume 33, Number 3, pages 745-765.

Gordon, Milton. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Goyette, Kimberly and Yu Xie. 1999. 'The Intersection of Immigration and Gender: Labor Force Outcomes of Immigrant Women Scientists', *Social Science Quarterly*, Volume 80, Number 2, pages 395-408.

Gramm, Wendy L. 1975. 'Household Utility Maximization and the Working Wife', *American Economic Review*, Volume 65, Number 1, pages 90-100.

Green, David A. 1999.'Immigrant Occupational Attainment: Assimilation and Mobility over Time', *Journal of Labor Economics*, Volume 17, Number 1, pages 49-79.

Greenman, Emily and Yu Xie. 2005. 'Double Jeopardy or Compensating Disadvantage: The Interaction Effect of Gender and Race on Earnings in the U.S.', paper presented at the Population Association of America, March 31-April 2, 2005, Philadelphia.

Gurak, Douglas T. and Mary M. Kirtz. 1996. 'Social Context, Household Composition and Employment among Migrant and Nonmigrant Dominican Women', *International Migration Review*, Volume 30, Number 2, pages 399-422.

Heckman, James J. 1979. 'Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error', *Econometrica*, Volume 47, Number 1, pages 153-161.

Hirschman, Charles and Morrison G. Wong. 1984. Socioeconomic Gains of Asian – Americans, Blacks and Hispanics - 1960-1976, *American Journal of Sociology*, Volume 90, Number 3, pages 584-607.

Hirschman, Charles and Morrison G. Wong. 1986. 'The Extraordinary Educational

Attainment of Asian Americans: A Search for Historical Evidence and Explanations', *Social Forces*, Volume 65, Number 1, pages 1-27.

Hurh, Won Moo. 1998. *The Korean Americans*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998.

Hurh, Won Moo, and Kwang Chun Kim. 1989. 'The Success image of Asian –Americans –Its Validity, and its Practical and Theoretical Implications', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Volume 12, Number 4, pages 512-538.

Iceland, John. 1999. 'Earnings Returns to Occupational Status: Are Asian Americans Disadvantaged?' *Social Science Research*, Volume 28, pages 45-65.

Jasso, Guillermina and Mark R. Rosenzweig. 1986. 'Family Reunification and the Immigration Multiplier: US Immigration Law, Origin-Country Conditions, and the Reproduction of Immigrants', *Demography*, Volume 23, Number 3, pages 291-311.

Jasso, Guillermina and Mark R. Rosenzweig. 1990. *The New Chosen People: Immigrants to the United States*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Jasso, Guillermina, Douglas S. Massey, Mark R. Rosenzweig, and James P. Smith. 2000. 'The New Immigrant Survey Pilot (NIS-P): Overview and New Findings about US Legal Immigrants at Admission', *Demography*, Volume 37, Number 1, pages 127-138.

Jensen, Joan M. 1988. *Passage from India*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Jensen, Leif. 1991. 'Secondary Earner Strategies and Family Poverty: Immigrant –Native Differentials, 1960-1980', *International Migration Review*, Volume 25, Number 1, pages 113-140.

Kalmijn, Matthijs. 1996. 'The Socioeconomic Assimilation of Caribbean American Blacks', *Social Forces*, Volume 74, pages 911-930.

Kasinitz, Philip, John H. Mollenkopf, Mary C. Waters and Jennifer Holdaway. 2008. *Inheriting the City: The Children of Immigrants Come of Age*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 432 pages.

Kibria, Nazli. 1993. *Family Tightrope: The Changing Lives of Vietnamese Americans*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kibria, Nazli. 1998.'The Contested Meanings of 'Asian American' : Racial Dilemmas in the Contemporary US', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Volume 21, Number 5, pages 939-958.

Kibria, Nazli. 2002. *Becoming Asian American: Identities of Second Generation Chinese*

and Korean Americans. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kim, Dae Young and Veena Kulkarni. Forthcoming. 'The Role of Father's Education on Intergenerational Educational and Occupational Mobility: The Case of Second Generation Chinese Americans in New York', *Sociological Forum*.

Kim, P.S. and G.B. Lewis. 1994. 'Asian Americans in the Public Service: Success, Diversity, and Discrimination', *Public Administration Review*, Volume 54, Number 3, pages 285-290.

Kitano, Harry H.L. and Roger Daniels. 2001. *Asian Americans: Emerging Minorities*, New Jersey: Prentice –Hall Inc., Third Edition.

Kossoudji, Sherrie A.1988. 'English Language Ability and the Labor Market Opportunities of Hispanic and East Asian Immigrant Men', *Journal of Labor Economics*, Volume 6, Number 2, pages 205-288.

LaLonde, Robert J. and Robert H Topel. 1991. 'Immigrants in the American Labor Market: Quality, Assimilation and Distributional Effects', *American Economic Review and Proceedings*, Volume 2, Number 81, pages 297-302.

LaLonde, Robert J. and Robert H. Topel. 1992. 'The Assimilation of Immigrants in the US Labor Market', in *The Immigration and Work Force* edited by George J. Borjas and Richard B. Freeman. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lee, S.M. and Barry Edmonston. (edited). 1994. 'The Socioeconomic Status and Integration of Immigrants in *Immigration and ethnicity: The Integration of America's Newest Arrivals* edited by Barry Edmonston and Jeffery Passel, Washington, D.C.: urban Institute Press.

Lee, Everett S. 1966. 'A Theory of Migration', *Demography*, Volume 3, Number 1, pages 47-57.

Lessinger, Johanna. 1995. *From the Ganges to the Hudson: Indian Immigrants in New York City*, Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Lewis, W. Arthur. 1954. 'Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour', *Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies*, Volume 22, pages 139-191.

Light, Ivan H. and Edna Bonacich. 1988. *Immigrant Entrepreneurs: Koreans in Los Angeles, 1965-82*, Berkeley : University of California Press.

Light, Ivan H. and Stravos Karageorgis. 1980. 'Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of an Urban Enclave', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Volume 16, Number 4, pages 742-743.

Lubotsky, Darren. 2000. *Chutes or Ladders? A Longitudinal Analysis of Immigrant Earnings*, Mimeo, Princeton, N.J: Research Program in Development Studies, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs

Mar, Don. 2000. Four Decades of Asian American Women's Earnings: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipino Women's Earnings 1960-1990, *Contemporary Economic Policy*, Volume 18, Number 2, pages 228-237.

Martin, Philip and Elizabeth Midgley. 2003. 'Immigration: Shaping and Reshaping America', *Population Bulletin*, Volume 58, Number 2, June.

Massey, Douglas S. 1988. 'Economic Development and International Migration in Comparative Perspective', *Population and Development Review*, Volume 14, Number 3, pages 383-413.

Massey, Douglas S. 1999. 'Why does Immigration Occur? A Theoretical Synthesis' in *Handbook of International Migration*, edited by Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasnitz, and Josh Dewind (pages 34-52), New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Massey, Douglas S., Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouaouci, Adela Pellegrino, J., Edward Taylor. 1993. Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal, *Population and Development Review*, Volume 19, Number 3, pages 431-466.

Massey, Douglas S. and F. Garcia Espana.1987. The Social Process of International Migration, *Science*, Volume 237, Number 4816, pages 733-738.

Matthaei, Julie A. and Teresa L. Amott. 2004. 'Race, Gender and Work: The History of Asian and Asian American Women' in Charles A. Gallagher edited *Rethinking the Color Line: Findings in Race and Ethnicity*, New York: McGraw Hill, pages 274-289.

McManus, Walter, William Gould, and Finis Welch.1983. 'Earnings of Hispanic Men: The Role of English Language Proficiency', *Journal of Labor Economics*, Volume 1, Number 2, pages 110-130.

Mills, C. Wrights.1959. *The Sociological Imagination*, New York: Oxford University Press, pages 234.

Min, Pyong Gap. 2005. *Asian Americans: Contemporary Trends and Issues*, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Second Edition.

Mincer, Jacob. 1974. *Schooling, Experience and Earnings*, New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Mincer, Jacob and Solomon Polacheck . 1974.'Family Investments in Human Capital :

Earnings of Women', *Journal of Political Economy*, Volume 82, Number 2, (March/April) pages   S76-S108.

National Sceince Foundation. 2007. 'Why did they come to the United States: A Profile of the Immigrant Scientists and Engineers', *Infobrief*, NSF 07-324, June, Arlington, Virginia: National Science Foundation.

Nee, Victor and Brett deBarry Nee. 1972. *Longtime Californ': A Documentary Study of an American Chinatown*, Pantheon.

Nee, Victor and Herbert Y. Wong.1985. 'Asian American Socioeconomic Achievement: The Strength of Family Bond', *Sociological Perspectives*, Volume 28, pages 281-306.

Nee, Victor and Jimmy Sanders. 1985. 'The Road to Parity: Determinants of Socioeconomic Attainments of Asian Americans', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Volume 8, pages 75-93.

The New York Times. 2007. 'The Failure of Leadership', Editorial, June 9.

Oaxaca, Roland. 1973. 'Sex Discrimination in Wages', in *Discrimination and Labor Markets* edited by Orley Ashenfelter and Albert Rees, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Ong, Paul and Suzanne Hee. 1994. 'Economic Diversity' in *The State of Asian Pacific America: Economic Diversity, Issues, and Policies*, Los Angeles, California: Asian Pacific American Public Policy Institute, pages 31-56.

Pear, Robert. 2007. 'White House Report Lauds Immigrants' Positive Effects', *The New York Times*, June 20.

Perez, Lisandro. 1986. 'Immigrant Economic Adjustment and Family Organization: The Cuban Success Story Reexamined', *International Migration Review*, Volume 20, Number 1, pages 4-20.

Pessar, Patricia. 1982. 'The Role of Households in International Migration and the Case of US –Bound Migration from the Dominican Republic', *International Migration Review*, Volume 16, Number 2, pages 342-364.

Pessar, Patricia R. 1999. 'The Role of Gender, Households, and Social Networks in the Migration Process : A Review and Appraisal' in *The Handbook of International Migration*, edited by Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind (pages 34-52) New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Portes, Alejandro and Robert L. Bach. 1985. *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States,* Berkeley : University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro and Ruben G. Rumbaut.2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro and John Walton. 1981. *Labor, Class and the International System*, New York: Academic Press.

Portes, Alejandro and Julia Sensenbrenner.1993. 'Embeddedness and Immigration: Notes on Social Determinants of Economic Action', *American Journal of Sociology*, Volume 98, Number 6 pages 1320-1350.

Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1993. 'The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variance', *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Volume 530, pages 74-96.

Raijman, Rebeca and Marta Tienda. 1999. 'Immigrants' Socio-Economic Progress Post – 1965: Forging Mobility or Survival' in *Handbook of International Migration*, edited by Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasnitz, and Josh Dewind (pages 239- 256), New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Ranis, Gustav and John C.H. Fei. 1961. 'A Theory of Economic Development', *American Economic Review,* Volume 51, pages 533 -565.

Ravenstein, E. G. 1885. 'The Laws of Migration', *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, Volume 48, Number 2, pages 167-235.

Redstone, Ilana and Douglas S. Massey.2004. 'Coming to Stay: An Analysis of the US Census Question on Immigrants' Year of Arrival', *Demography*, Volume 41, Number 4, pages 721-738.

Reimers Cordelia W. 1984. 'Sources of the Family Income Differentials among Hispanics, Blacks and White Non-Hispanics', *The American Journal of Sociology*, Volume 89, Number 4, January, pages 889-903.

Reimers Cordelia W. 1985. 'Cultural Differences in Labor Force Participation Among Married Women', *The American Economic Review*, Volume 75, Number 2, pages 251-255.

Rivers, William R., John R. Robinson and Steven P. Martin. Forthcoming. 'Self-rated Measures of Language Proficiency: National-normed Evidence from the General Social Survey', *Language Assessment Quarterly*.

Roos, Patricia A. 1990. Review of Revolving doors: Sex Segregation and Women's Careers by Jerry Jacobs. *American Journal of Sociology*, Volume 95, Number 5, pages 1315-1316.

Ruggles, Steven, Matthew Sobek, Trent Alexander, Catherine A. Fitch, Ronald Goeken, Patricia Kelly Hall, Miriam King, and Chad Ronnander. 2004. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 3.0* [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis, MN:Minnesota Population Center [producer and distributor].

Rumbaut, Ruben G. 1995. 'Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian Americans' in *Asian Americans: Contemporary Trends and Issues* edited by Pyong Gap Min, pages 232-270, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Rumbaut, Ruben G. 2000. 'Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian Americans' in *Contemporary Asian America: A Multidisciplinary Reader* edited by Min Zhou and James V. Gatewood, pages 175-206, New York: New York University Press.

Sakamoto, Arthur, Jeng Liu, and Jessie M. Tzeng. 1998. 'The Declining Significance of Race Among Chinese and Japanese American Men', *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* Volume 16, pages 225-246.

Sakamoto,Arthur , Huei-Hsia Wu, and Jessie M. Tzeng. 2000. 'The Declining Significance of Race among American Men during the Latter Half of the 20th Century', *Demography*, Volume 37, Number 1, pages 41-51.

Sakamato, Arthur and Satomi Furuichi. 2002. 'The Wages of US Born Asian Americans at the End of the 20th Century', *Asian American Policy Review*, Volume 10, pages 17-30.

Sakamoto, Arthur and Yu Xie. 2005. 'The Socioeconomic Attainments of Asian Americans', in *Asian Americans: Contemporary Trends and Issues* edited by Pyong Gap Min, pages 54-77, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Second Edition.

Sanchirico, Andrew. 1991. 'The Importance of Small-Business Ownership in Chinese American Educational Achievement', *Sociology of Education,* Volume 64, pages 293—304.

Sjaastad, Larry A. 1962. 'The Costs and Returns of Human Migration', *Journal of Political Economy*, Volume 70, Number 5, pages S80- S93.

Schoeni, Robert F.1997. 'New Evidence on the Economic Progress of Foreign Born Men in the 1970s and 1980s', *Journal of Human Resources*, Volume 32, Number 4, pages 683-740.

Schoeni, Robert F.1998. 'Labor Market Outcomes of Immigrant Women in the United States: 1970 to 1990', *International Migration Review*, Volume 32, Number 1, pages 57-77.

Sheth, Manju. 1995. 'Asian Indian Americans' in *Asian Americans: Contemporary*

Trends and Issues edited by Pyong Gap Min, pages 169-198, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Smith, Sharon P. 1976. 'Government and Wage Differentials by Sex', *Journal of Human Resources*, Volume 11, Number 1, pages 3-7.

Stata Corp. Stata Statistical Software, Release 8.0 2003, College Station, TX: Stata Corporation.

Stark, Oded. 1991. *The Migration of Labor*, Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

Stark, Oded and Edward J. Taylor. 1989. 'Relative Deprivation and International Migration, *Demography*, Volume 26, Number1, pages 1-14.

Stark, Oded and Edward J. Taylor. 1991. 'Relative Deprivation and Migration: theory, Evidence, and Policy Implications' in *Determinants of Emigration from Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean*, edited by Serigo Diaz-Briquets and Sidney Weintrub (pages 121-144), Boulder, Colorado: Westview.

Takaki, R. 1989. *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans*, New York: Penguin.

Tang, Joyce. 1993. *The Career Attainment of Caucasian and Asian Americans*, New York: Penguin Books.

Tang, Joyce. 2000. *Doing Engineering: The Career Attainment and Mobility of Caucasian, Black and Asian American Engineers*, Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

Tienda, Marta.1980. 'Familism and Structural assimilation of Mexican Immigrants in the United States', *International Migration Review*, Volume 14, Number 3, Autumn, pages 383-408.

Tienda, Marta and Roland Angel. 1982. Headship and Household Composition among Blacks, Hispanics and other Whites, *Social Forces*, Volume 61, Number 2, pages 508-531.

Tienda, Marta and J. Glass 1985. 'Household Structure and Labor Force Participation of Black, Hispanic and White Mothers*, Demography*, Volume 22, Number 3, pages 381-394.

Tienda, Marta and Rebeca Raijman. 2000. 'Immigrants' Income Packaging and Invisible Labor Force Activity', Social *Science Quarterly*, Volume 81, Number 1, pages 291-310.

Tilly, Charles and Brown 1967. 'On Uprooting, Kinship and the Auspices of Migration',

International Journal of Comparative Sociology, Volume 8, pages 139-164.

Tobin, James.1967. 'On Improving the Economic Status of the Negro' in *The Negro American*, edited by Talcott Parsons and Kenneth B. Clark, pages 451-471, Boston: Beacon.

Todaro, Michael P., and L. Maruszko. 1987. 'Illegal Migration and US Immigration Reform: A Conceptual Framework, Population and Development Review, Volume 13, Number 1,pages 101-114.

Tubergen, Frank van, Inke Mass and Henk Flap.2004. The Economic Incorporation of Immigrants in 18 Western Societies: Origin, Destination and Community Effects, *American Sociological Review*, Volume 69, Number 5, pages 704-727.

Tubergen, Frank van and Herman van de Werfhorst. 2007. 'Postmigration Investments in Education: A Study of Immigrants in the Netherlands', *Demography*, Volume 44, Number 4,   pages 883-898.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. 1988. *The Economic Status of Americans of Asian Descent: An*
Exploratory Investigation, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

United States Census Bureau. 2006. *American Community Survey Data 2006,* United States Census Bureau, Maryland.

Waite, Linda. 1995.'Does Marriage Matter?', *Demography*, Volume 32, Number 4, pages 483-507.

Waters, Mary C. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Waters, Mary C. and Karl Eschbach. 1995. 'Immigration and Ethnic and Racial Inequality in the United States', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Volume 21, pages 419-446.

Wilson, William Julius. 1980. *The Declining Significance of Race*, Second edition, Chicago Press: University of Chicago Press.

Winship, Christopher and Robert D. Mare.1992. 'Models for Sample Selection Bias', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Volume 18, pages 327-350.

Woo, D. 1985. 'The Socioeconomic Status of Asian American Women in the Labor Force: An Alternate View', *Sociological Perspective*, Volume 27, Number 3, 307-338.

Wong, Eugene F. 1985. Asian American Middlemen Minority Theory: The Framework

of an American Myth, *Journal of Ethnic Studies*, Volume 13, pages 51-88.

Wong, Morrison G. 1980. 'Changes in Socioeconomic Status of the Chinese Male Population in the United States from 1960-1970', *International Migration Review*, Volume 14, Number 4, 511-524.

Wong, Morrison G. and Charles Hirschman. 1983. 'Labor Force Participation and Socioeconomic Attainment of Asian American Women', *Sociological Perspective*, Volume 26, Number 4, pages 3-46.

The World Bank. 2007. *The Little Data Book 2007*, Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Xie, Yu and Kimberly A. Goyette. 2003. 'Social Mobility and the Educational Choices of Asian Americans', *Social Science Research*, Volume 32, pages 467-498.

Xie, Yu and Kimberly A. Goyette. 2004. *A Demographic Portrait of Asian Americans*, Population Reference Bureau and Russell Sage Foundation: Washington, D.C. and New York.

Zeng, Zhen and Yu Xie. 2004. 'Asian Americans' Earnings Disadvantage Reexamined : The Role of Place of Education', *American Journal of Sociology*, Volume 109, Number 5, pages 1075- 1108.

Zhou, Min. 1992. *Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of an Urban Enclave*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pages 275.

Zhou, Min. 1999. 'Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies and Recent Research on the New Second Generation', in the *Handbook of International Migration* edited by Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind, (pages 196-211) New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Zhou, Min and John R. Logan. 1989. 'Returns on Human Capital in Ethnic Enclaves: New York's Chinatown', *American Sociological Review*, Volume 54, Number 5, pages 809-820.