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Abstract

This study was designed to examine the existence of differential returns to social and demographic characteristics on occupational status among whites and Asian American males aged 25-64 years old. The human capital, assimilation and segmented theories of occupational attainment provided the framework for investigating the occupational differentials of each of the six major groups of Asian Americans with whites.

Using data drawn from the 1 percent sample of the 1980 Census, Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS), it was found that Asian Americans are economically assimilated. Findings attesting to this fact are as follows: first, the occupational distribution of the Asian Americans shows a high concentration on the white collar occupations rather than blue collar occupations; second, the occupational distribution of the majority of Asian Americans is very similar to whites; third, results of the regression analyses show that returns to the sociodemographic characteristics between whites and the majority of the Asian groups were very similar especially in education and core/periphery characteristics. But despite these similarities with whites and thus obvious assimilation of Asian Americans there were notable systematic differences found among cohort groups within sub-Asian groups in the rate of assimilation into the majority socioeconomic system. For example, a high degree of
structural assimilation was observed among the following cohort groups: foreign born Asian Indians, native born Chinese, the before 1965 cohort group of Koreans and the Japanese who came after 1965.
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This study investigates the occupational attainments of Asian American racial groups in 1980. It focuses on the six largest Asian American populations, the Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos, Koreans, Asian Indians, and Vietnamese, and compares the occupational attainments of these racial groups to each other and to the white American population. The study's goals are: first, to describe and document the occupational attainments of the various Asian American populations as of 1980 and second, to investigate the role of social and demographic factors which affect occupational comparisons between the different racial groups and the majority white population.

The study of the occupational variations among racial groups in the United States is relevant for understanding not only the dynamics of racial inequality but also the assimilation process of various racial groups in the United States. In fact, there are two important studies that use both empirical research and existing theory to argue that occupation is "the most adequate single indicator of position in a complex stratification system" (Haug, 1977; Treiman, 1977). Because occupation is considered the most important dimension of socioeconomic status, the existence of racial differences in occupational distributions is an
important indicator of the degree of racial inequality and a useful measure of the assimilation experienced by a group. Moreover, studies of this nature could provide information to assist policy makers in formulating policies to improve the socioeconomic status of particular racial groups. For the past two decades, almost half of the migrants to the United States, as documented below, have come from Asia. The recent arrivals of these new waves of Asian migrants have raised concerns over the ability of these groups to be assimilated economically into United States society (Petersen, 1971; Sowell, 1978; Body, 1971; Cheng, 1984; Chiswick, 1983; 1980; 1979). The present study is conducted to address this research issue.

The study is organized into five chapters. The present chapter provides literature pertinent to the study. The topics addressed include: (a) recent trends in the growth of United States population of Asian origin. (b) the socioeconomic status of Asian Americans, and (c) socioeconomic differentials between Asians and other racial groups. The chapter then provides discussion of the general limitations of these research efforts and how the present study will overcome some of these and thus add to our understanding of the assimilation process of Asian Americans. The second chapter expands on previous research by identifying relevant theories concerning the socioeconomic attainment process and isolating relevant
control variables and hypotheses. It includes a discussion of the implications of these theories for the present study and the conceptualization into a model of the identified variables. In addition, the unmeasured variables are also enumerated and briefly discussed. The third chapter of the study describes the data to be used, their advantages and limitations, the sample, the dependent variable and the operational definitions of the variables. The results and analyses based on the statistical analysis of differentiation (index of dissimilarity, regression analysis, decomposition analysis) are presented in Chapter Four. Included in this chapter is a brief description of the statistical measures and the rationale for employing them. The last chapter is entitled "Conclusions, Summary and Discussion", elaborates on the overall significance of the findings.

Growth of Asian American Population

The size of Asian population in the United States has increased dramatically during the past decade and a half from 0.8% of the United States population in 1970 to 2.1% in 1985 (Gardner et al., 1985). This represents a 162% increase from 1970 to 1985. Immigration is the major source for the population growth of Asian Americans. For 1985, it has been estimated that 48% of the total legal migrants came from Asia compared with fewer than 6% in 1965 (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1985). Based on
these figures, demographers have projected that by the year 2050, Asians will be 6.4% of the American population, the same share that Hispanics represented in 1980 (Bouvier and Agresta, 1985). Primarily because of high immigration rates, Asians are now considered the nation's fastest growing minority and, as a result, they will constitute an important part of United States population in the future. **Socioeconomic Characteristics of Asian Americans**

Along with the dramatic increase in the size of Asian Americans, there has been a rapid change in their composition. This is a direct result of changes in United States immigration law (Keeley, 1975a; 1974; 1971; Boyd, 1974; 1971). Following the immigration Act of 1965, there were three notable changes in the sociodemographic characteristics of Asian American population. First, as a consequence of high immigration rates, the proportion of foreign-born Asian Americans increased dramatically. Recent statistics reveal that only 41% of the total Asian population were born in the United States, with the Japanese having the largest group of native-born (70%). About 37% of the Chinese, 35% of the Filipinos, and less than 10% of the Vietnamese are native-born (Gardner, et al., 1985). Because there may be an important difference between the native born and foreign born, Asians should be differentiated according to their nativity status either as native born or foreign born. Second, most researchers have reported that the
socioeconomic attainments of the "after 1965 migrants" of Asian origin have been equal to or have actually exceeded those of whites (Lyman, 1974; Petersen, 1971; 1966; Kuo, 1979; Hosokawa, 1969; Hsu, 1971; Sung, 1967). Past studies on Chinese and Japanese show that they even rank higher than other ethnic groups in education, occupation, and income (Sowell, 1978; Petersen, 1971; Schmid and Nobbe, 1965; Massey, 1980; Varon, 1967; Kitano, 1974). Third, the proportion of professionals for some Asian groups has also risen sharply. Prior to the enactment of the 1965 Act, fewer than 20% of all adult immigrants reported having held professional-level occupations in their country of origin. However, after 1965, between one-fourth and one-third of all immigrants were reported to have held such jobs in their home countries (Keeley, 1975). The most dramatic shift was among Filipino migrants with a shift from 15% to 47% in the professional category with a corresponding decline among service workers (Hirschman and Wong, 1981). Asian Indian immigrants likewise reached a high of 90% professional in 1969-1970 (Wong and Hirschman, 1983).

Because of these significant changes in the sociodemographic characteristics of recent immigrants to America most Asian American groups have achieved upward mobility and have been considered hard working "model minorities" (see for example, Time, 1985; U. S. News and World Report, 1984; Newsweek, 1984a, U.S. Commission and

The aggregate data on income, occupation and education of Asian Americans reported by the United States Bureau of the Census in 1980 further indicates that Asians' economic progress in the 1970s continued until the late 1970s. From these data, the median income of the total Asian population was computed to be $22,700. This figure not only exceeded the median for American families in general ($19,917) but also the level reported for whites ($20,000). Among these Asian groups, only the Vietnamese average ($12,840) fell below the income of the total United States population. However, per capita household income data show that only the Japanese, Chinese and Asian Indians are better off than the total United States population. It can be inferred that the median income levels of Asians are high only because the incomes of all persons in the household are accounted for, which further implies that there are more workers per family in Asian households when compared to the total American population. The same table also shows the proportion of families for each group that earn an annual income of $50,000 or more. There are more families among the Asians -- Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, and Asian Indian, in
Table 1. Income-related characteristics of the Asian racial groups in the U.S. and total U.S. populations, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Total U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median family income</td>
<td>$27,354</td>
<td>$22,559</td>
<td>$23,687</td>
<td>$20,459</td>
<td>$24,993</td>
<td>$12,840</td>
<td>$19,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita income</td>
<td>$9,068</td>
<td>$7,476</td>
<td>$6,915</td>
<td>$5,544</td>
<td>$8,667</td>
<td>$3,382</td>
<td>$7,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of all families below the poverty level</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of all persons below 75 percent of the poverty level</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of all persons below 200 percent of the poverty level</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of all families with annual incomes exceeding $50,000</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median income of all males 15 years and over with income</td>
<td>$15,026</td>
<td>$10,797</td>
<td>$10,749</td>
<td>$11,970</td>
<td>$15,799</td>
<td>$7,262</td>
<td>$12,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median income of all females 15 years and over with income</td>
<td>$7,410</td>
<td>$6,064</td>
<td>$8,253</td>
<td>$6,077</td>
<td>$6,073</td>
<td>$4,694</td>
<td>$5,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median income of married-couple families with own children under 6 years of age</td>
<td>$25,926</td>
<td>$23,329</td>
<td>$24,391</td>
<td>$20,697</td>
<td>$26,283</td>
<td>$13,209</td>
<td>$19,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

this income category than for the total United States population.

The relatively higher incomes of Asian Americans is at least partly due to the higher proportion of professionals within these groups (twice as high when compared to other immigrant groups, Time, 1985). For example, 44.2% of Asian Indians are professionals (Table 2). Table 2 also shows that all Asian groups are well represented not only among professionals but also in the executive category. To approximate the composition of Asians in high status white collar jobs, those that occupy executive and professional jobs were added. More than half (56.1%) of the Asian Indians hold executive and professional jobs while 38.8% of the Chinese and 32.8% of the Japanese are in the same occupational categories. The Filipinos, Korean, and Vietnamese on the other hand, are composed of 31.0%, 28.6% and 21.3% professionals and executives respectively. Two other types of occupations where Asians predominate are administrative and service occupations.

As shown in Table 3, the Asians' higher levels of occupational status also reflect their high levels of educational attainment. In 1980, the median years of school completed ranged from 16.1 (Asian Indian) to 12.4 (Vietnamese) as compared to 12.5 for the total general American population (Gardner et al., 1985). This is largely due to the higher percentages of Asian Americans who have
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Total U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All employed persons 16 and over</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive, administrative, and managerial occupations</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, specialty and technical occupations</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales occupations</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support occupations, including clerical</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, forestry, and fishing occupations</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision production, craft, and repair occupations</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators and fabricators</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Years of school completed by all persons 25 years old and over in the Asian racial groups in the U.S. and total U.S. populations, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of School Completed</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Total U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All persons 25 years old and over</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years or less</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4 years of high school</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 years of college</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more years of college</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduates</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median years of school completed</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The size and growth of the Asian population and their socioeconomic gains have been alluded to by a number of authors but few have adequately explained the reasons behind the success of these groups. Some studies have attempted to explain Asians' progress by focusing on the attitudinal, cultural and behavioral aspects of Asian Americans within the context of American society, i.e., the perseverance and ambition of Asians, the strength of oriental culture -- its adaptability, its stable family system, its emphasis on industriousness and personal responsibility, etc. (Caudill and DeVos, 1956; Schwartz, 1971; Coleman et al., 1966; Sue and Frank, 1973). However, most empirical studies in the 1970s and 1980s have found little support for such a cultural interpretation (Featherman, 1971; Lieberson, 1980; Steinberg, 1981). An alternative conceptual framework suggests that to succeed or be rewarded has little to do with cultural attributes but more with the opportunities or "economic niches" within the occupational structure of the host society. In most social systems, minority groups are found to occupy the lowest status positions (Portes, 1981). Under certain circumstances, some minorities like the Jews and Asians in the United States are observed to have achieved a higher "occupational niche". These occupations are considered "middle level" positions because they do not necessarily compete with the dominant group. For this reason they have been labelled "middlemen minorities"
(Blalock, 1967; Bonacich, 1982). This conceptualization of the role of Asians in the market system of American society has been supported by many studies (Loewen, 1971; Wong, 1977; Light, 1976; Kitano, 1974; Wilson and Portes, 1980 and Bonacich and Modell, 1980).

The major point of these studies is that Asian Americans are either "model minorities" or "middlemen minorities". They are called "model minorities" because they seem to have gained socioeconomic parity with the white population. One the other hand, they are called "middlemen minorities" because they have achieved the middle level of occupations, not generally occupied by other minorities. Although these explanations are not necessarily conflicting in terms of explaining Asians' economic gains, it still remains unclear whether their economic achievements are comparable to whites or only with other minorities on an individual level of comparison (this point will be elaborated in Chapter Four). Other socioeconomic comparisons that are yet to be strongly established are those between native born and foreign born, between foreign borns of different periods of arrivals and between these groups and whites.

Previous Research on Socioeconomic Differentials

Studies on socioeconomic differentials have been done in the past. A number of these studies have compared Asians' socioeconomic status with other minorities and with
the majority whites. In these studies the SES of Asian Americans have been compared to the Cubans, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and Blacks (Gwartney and Long, 1978); to Blacks and Chicanos (Jibou, 1976); to Blacks, Mexicans and Puerto Ricans (Katzman, 1971); to Anglos, Hispanics and Blacks (Hirschman and Wong, 1984; 1981; Sengal, 1985; Chiswick, 1979, 1980, 1982) and to immigrants of European descent and Spanish ancestries (Niedert and Farley, 1985). The majority of these studies employed multivariate measures to determine the factors that influence socioeconomic inequalities among racial groups being compared. The sources of data were primarily the Public Use Samples from 1960 to 1970, compiled by the United States Bureau of the Census. These studies have demonstrated an advantage in socioeconomic status (SES) for the Asian group. The best predictor found in all these studies with regards to the "successful minorities image" is a very high level of educational attainment among Asian Americans. Studies on the labor force participation rates of Asians have also revealed significantly higher labor force participation rates and lower unemployment rates for Asians when compared to whites (Li, 1980). However, the apparent success of this racial group is more a current phenomenon than a past one. Data from the 1950 census show that this same racial group was under-represented in the professions, was underemployed and underpaid (Katzman, 1971).
Too, most of these studies have remained more descriptive than theoretical and have devoted more attention to documenting the size and extent of differentiation among racial groups than to explaining them. For example, there has been little empirical work on occupational differentials between Asians and the majority white population while a considerable amount of work has been completed on occupational differentials between blacks and whites (Hare, 1965; Siegel, 1965; Johnson and Sell, 1975; Fossett, Galle and Kelly, 1983; Turner, 1951; Semyonov, Hoyt and Scott, 1984; Glenn, 1964; Bahr and Gibbs, 1966, Spillerman and Miller, 1976; Frisbie and Niedert, 1977; Wilcox and Roof, 1978). Likewise, there exists a considerable literature reporting Anglo advantage in earnings and occupations over comparable defined Mexican Americans (Grebler et al., 1970; Browning and McLemore, 1964; Poston and Alvirez, 1976; 1973). When compared to studies on socioeconomic differentials (includes occupation, education and income), studies on occupational differentials consider detailed examination of all occupational categories. Thus such studies have contributed conclusive results on assimilation of minorities in the American social system.

**Summary of Significance of the Research**

The study specifically deals with racial differentials in occupational attainments. Furthermore, it extended previous research in several ways: First, it updates the
results of earlier studies by employing data from the 1980 census. Second, individual level analysis eliminates certain problems commonly encountered when using group data. (a common problem called "aggregate bias" occurs when estimates of individual parameters are derived from aggregate data using the general linear model, i.e., ordinary least squares (see Blalock, 1964; Hannan, 1971; Hannan and Benstein, 1974). But the most important reason is the fact that individual level data are usually richer than aggregate data, permitting estimation of more elaborate models, and thus are to be preferred when available (Hanushek and Jackson, 1977:179). Furthermore, individual level data allow detailed study of relationships among the variables. Third, where previous studies provided analyses of only three major Asian American groups (Japanese, Chinese, Filipino), this study examined a total of six, adding Korean, Asian Indian and Vietnamese. Fourth, with the 1980 Census, it is possible to separate Asian groups not only by their nativity status (native or foreign born) but also by their years of arrival in the United States. This is particularly significant since almost half of Asian Americans are foreign born. The migration period of the Asian foreign borns is characterized into two periods: the old wave of migrants who came before 1965 and the so-called new wave of Asian migrants who came after 1965. Thus there are two distinct groups is documented in this study. This
further allows investigation of occupational differentials by nativity and by migration statuses. The inclusion of occupational differentials among foreign-borns according to their periods of migration will be useful in understanding the process of assimilation exemplified by the experiences of Asian Americans. Fifth, one component of the investigation is to determine the differences in the rate at which each distinct group of Asians convert their sociodemographic characteristics into occupational status, particularly educational attainment, a key factor identified in the occupational status attainment of Asian Americans. Sixth, unlike the previous studies where Duncan's socioeconomic index scores were used, this study used the updated index scores by Ford and Gehret, 1985 (see discussion in Chapter Three). And finally, an examination of the detailed occupational attainments contributes to a structural explanation for the assimilation process of Asians. According to Gordon (1964), structural assimilation is the key dimension in the assimilation process, for when a minority race participates in large numbers in primary group relations and enters fully into the societal network of groups and institutions, other forms of assimilation will be greatly facilitated. Specifically, Gordon meant that structural assimilation is the full integration of immigrants into the "social cliques, clubs, and institutions of the core society that leads to warm, intimate and
personal primary relationships." On the other hand, Frisbie and Bean (1978) view structural assimilation as incorporation within the political and economic structure. They defined it as "the degree to which sub-population acquired the political and economic characteristics of the general population". Structural assimilation thus can be viewed into two types -- the primary and secondary. Gordon defines structural assimilation as primary, which is penetration to primary group institutions (i.e., friendship and cliques) while Frisbie and Bean's definition is secondary structural assimilation because the concern is more in the penetration to the society's secondary organizations like the occupational, educational and political life of the core society. Since this study is primarily an investigation of occupational attainment, it therefore aims to contribute to the additional understanding of the secondary structural assimilation of minorities through the economic characteristics of Asians in the American society.
CHAPTER TWO
Theoretical Models of Occupational Attainment

Theories of occupational differentials among immigrants are useful for hypotheses-testing and in the selection and control of variables. Furthermore, these theories provide an explanation for the determinants of racial differences in occupational attainment. A brief discussion of four of the dominant models of occupational differentials that are relevant for the present analysis follows. These include the human capital model, the status attainment model, the assimilation model and the segmented labor market theories.

Human Capital Model

Most studies focusing on economic returns for minority workers and immigrants in general have employed the economist point of view called the human capital approach (e.g., Lansing and Mueller, 1967; Lansing and Morgan, 1967; Wertheimer, 1970; Kiker and Traynham, 1977; Faber, 1978; Lichter, 1981; Gwartney and Long, 1978; Wilson, 1985). These include the well-known and widely cited studies of labor market experiences of recent United States immigrants by Chiswick (1980; 1979; 1978). In all these studies, the emphasis is on individual "investments" in such things as formal schooling, on-the-job-training, and migration to different regions. They are called investments because they are intended to increase the human capital and thus the earnings capacity of the individual worker in the future.
In other words, these investments become the resources of the individual or are regarded as his stock of human capital (Schultz, 1961; Becker, 1964; Mincer, 1974; 1970; 1958; 1957).

The general hypothesis derived from this perspective is that a person with higher self investment (e.g., educational attainment and longer job experience in the labor force) is likely to receive more in terms of earnings and/or higher occupational status than those with lower self investment (educational attainment and little or no job experience). Thus, it is assumed that education and training are positively associated with income and occupational status.

The dependent variable employed in these studies is typically earnings. It is usually "explained" by social background variables – years of schooling completed, number of years of work experience, and if individuals are migrants, the number of years of residence in a new country is often included to indirectly measure proficiency in language. The latter is assumed to be an important prerequisite in seeking employment of any nature. Earning profiles or occupational careers are therefore important variables on which data are needed in order to apply the human capital theory.

In sum, human capital theory suggests that the differential placement of individuals in the socioeconomic
order is a reflection of the individual characteristics brought into the market-place by the worker.

**Status Attainment**

The dominant sociological approach to occupational achievement is found in status attainment theory. Like the human capital theory of the economists, the individual is the focus, but unlike the human capital theory where the concern is the variation in individual "investments", status attainment theory looks upon a variety of individual characteristics as "personal resources", i.e., education, family background, age, sex, race, etc. (Sorenson, 1975). Studies using this approach aim to test or verify that the achievement process is dependent upon these characteristics (Berg, 1970; Jencks et al., 1979, 1972).

Human capital and status attainment theories are quite compatible. Both theories are based on a meritocratic assumption that education is the most likely path to social mobility. Moreover, proponents of these theories are likely to conclude that education determines how individuals will fare in the labor market. The assumption therefore is that individual attributes determine occupational outcomes. Thus, the interpretation of findings based from these two theories requires the assumption of labor market homogeneity for the population under study (i.e., the absence of sectoral differentiation) where earnings returns are estimated basically from individual characteristics such as
schooling, social background and work experience. In sum, the status attainment and human capital theories assume that the economic returns to individual characteristics is "uniform across structural settings" (Horan, 1980).

**Assimilation Model**

The assimilation perspective has been the theoretical bedrock of sociological research in race and ethnicity. A considerable amount of literature that has employed the assimilation perspective attests to this fact (Lieberson, 1963; Taeuber and Taeuber, 1965; Duncan and Duncan, 1968; Neidert and Farley, 1985; Eisenstadt, 1953; Featherman, 1971; Hirschman, 1975; Hogan and Featherman, 1977; Matras and Weintraub, 1977; Teinda, 1982; Li, 1980, Schmid and Nobbe, 1965).

Assimilation as used in these studies means "a natural evolutionary process that as time passed would yield an inevitable outcome" (Frisbie and Bean, 1978). The outcomes are either to become alike with the majority group in cultural patterns such as language behavior and values or to become incorporated with the majority, the consequence of which is full integration.

The origins of the assimilationist perspective can be traced back to Robert Park's theory of a "race relations cycle" (Park and Burgess, 1921). His four-stage irreversible unilinear model starts with contact, then moves to competition, accommodation, and ultimately to
assimilation. Often it is described as a very optimistic model because it assumes Anglo-conformity to be the end product of assimilation and it accepts American society as a just society which offers all citizens equality of opportunity (Geschwender, 1978).

Gordon, 1964; 1975, on the other hand, provides a clearer exposition of the process of assimilation. He identified seven (7) dimensions of assimilation, namely (1) cultural (acculturation), (2) structural, (3) marital (amalgamation), (4) identificational, (5) attitude receptional (absence of prejudice), (6) behavioral receptional (absence of discrimination) and (7) civic (absence of value and power conflict). His assessment of American ethnicity was that cultural assimilation is achieved first and may continue indefinitely while structural assimilation moves more slowly and only by a few initially. It is also to his credit that the assimilation perspective has gradually come to be understood as multidimensional and probabilistic that is, it suggests that minorities will gradually be absorbed into the dominant society as they shed their traditional values and embrace the cultures of the majority.

Complete assimilation is however unlikely to happen because of factors that inhibit minorities from abandoning their own culture. It is also inhibited by the majority’s resistance to absorbing the migrants. Thus, in the standard
assimilation model, discrimination is assumed and is rarely the subject of much theoretical discussion (Hirschman, 1983).

The hypothesis derived from the assimilation perspective is straightforward. An inverse relationship is posited between the degree of assimilation and time of arrival of the country of destination. In other words, the more recent the immigration period of the particular foreign-born group, the more distant are the social and economic characteristics of that group from those of the native population. The earlier the period of immigration, the more similar the characteristics. Hence, the most important variable explaining the degree of assimilation of minority groups is length of residence in the host society which invariably pertains to the years since migration, and generational status.

Compared to human capital and status attainment models where emphasis is given to the variety of personal and social characteristics that the individual brings to the labor market, the assimilationist perspective views the duration of residence as a critical determinant of socioeconomic attainment. This is specifically applied to migrant groups when their skills and training acquired in their country of origin are oftentimes not immediately transferrable. Absorption in the labor market of their host country necessitates acquisition of new information,
credentials and marketable skills which certainly requires some period of time (Chiswick, 1982; 1980; 1979). The contention is supported by the experiences of the Korean and Filipino professionals who given admission preference by the United States immigration because of their skills, found after entry that they could not take licensing examinations for reason like language problem, requirement to complete additional training in the United States, etc. (Boyd, 1974).

In other words, human capital and status attainment emphasize variation in the individual's investments and characteristics whereas in assimilationist perspective, individual characteristics and investments are not explicitly related to socioeconomic attainment but are assumed to facilitate the integration of the individual to his host society. For example, it is frequently mentioned in the assimilationist perspective that educated migrants find themselves generally acceptable to dominant group members and that education enables migrants to overcome language and cultural barriers thus facilitating their advancement in other aspects, i.e., economic (Alba and Chamlin, 1983:242). Thus, the assimilationist perspective extends the application of the status attainment and human capital theories to immigrant groups. Another good example of a theory that applies both the status attainment and the assimilation theory is spatial assimilation. The contention of the theory is that, "as social status rises, minorities
attempt to convert their socioeconomic achievements into an improved spatial position, which usually implies assimilation with majority members" (Massey and Denton, 1985). Therefore an important outcome of socioeconomic advancement for minorities is residential integration (a form of assimilation) within the mainstream society.

**Segmented Labor Market Theories**

The individualistic explanation of occupational outcomes provided by the above neoclassical economic status attainment models has been rejected by recent approaches to stratification research. The contention is that the characteristics of firms and industries where individuals work are more important determinants of their income than the characteristics that the individuals bring to the labor market (Jacobs, 1982; White, 1970; Boudon, 1974; Burawoy, 1977; Hodson, 1980; Horan, 1980; 1978; Wright et al., 1977). This argument is found in the dual economy theory, the structuralist theory, and the segmented labor market theory. Whereas, the neoclassical economic and status attainment approaches validate functionalist conception of unidimensional and consensual evaluation of occupation thus, advocating a homogeneous labor market, these latter theories are based on Marx' conception of "capitalist dynamism and concentration" which disclaims the existence of homogeneous labor markets. Instead, they suggest that economy and labor is dual in structure such that, the core and the periphery
sectors of the economy correspond to the two separate labor markets, a primary labor market and a secondary labor market. Within each sector, "the employers and the workers face fundamentally different conditions and operate according to fundamentally different rules" (Beck et al., 1978:706). Hence, economic returns (earnings and occupations) of individuals depend not only on their human capital (such as education) but whether they are placed in the core and periphery of the economic structure. Hence, in the dual economy theory, it is assumed that the sectoral placement of a worker may condition the income returns of individual characteristics such as education, sex, race, and age (Bibb and Form, 1977; Beck et al., 1978a, Averitt, 1968; Bluestone et al., 1973).

These theorists further argued that the core sector is dominated by a small group of monopolistic firms and industries who have the power over the resources (Baron and Bielby, 1984). Implied is that immigrants have uniform labor market position at the time of arrival, a notion that is partially accepted by the classical assimilationist perspective.

From the above cited studies, it is evident that a significant proportion of recent sociological literature emphasizes these theories. There are, however a considerable number of issues raised by these theories, especially on their heterogeneous labor market proposition.
For example, Beck et al., (1978) did a separate regression on earnings in the core and periphery sectors to estimate the costs and benefits of sectoral locations for workers. The procedure they used in identifying the heterogeneity in labor market proposition with heterogeneity in regression slopes is questionable on the grounds that they fail to provide a theoretical rationale for the influence of heterogeneity in the earnings process (Hauser, 1980:704). The proponents themselves find ambiguities in their definitions of their theoretical models, i.e., the economy and labor market sectors are generally defined as contrasting characteristics rather than as theoretically broad relationships (Hodson and Kaufman, 1982; 1981). In addition, there seems to be no consensus among them with regards to what level of analysis will be used. Averitt (1968), for example regards economic size not industrial location as the crucial aspect of economic segmentation while Hodson and Kaufman (1984; 1982) focus on company as the measurement level of economic structure as opposed to industry. Other researchers, like O’Connor (1973) prefer the term monopoly and competition instead of core and peripheral as labels for the different sectors. There are also others who have argued for more than two sectors (see Loveridge and Mok, 1979). Stinchombe (1979) for one suggested that two labor markets cannot sufficiently provide an explicit conceptualization of the attainment process.
This is particularly true in the advanced stage of industrial capitalism wherein labor market is not simply based on "capital layout and degree monopolization" as suggested by the dual market theory, but includes the "interplay between technical and administrative imperatives on the one hand, and relations among people, positions, and objects within the workplace on the other" (Baron and Bielby, 1984). To incorporate the organization of work argued by Baron and Bielby, Stinchcombe (1979) introduced seven industrial labor markets namely the primary, classically capitalism, small skilled, engineering, petty bourgeois, professional and bureaucratic. Labor market segments as defined by Stinchcombe, are bounded areas within labor markets such as people within them hardly compete with people outside them. His categories of labor markets do not only "look different but also function differently". For example, in terms of promotions and hiring, those industries with bureaucratic organizations of labor usually promote from within. By contrast, professional industries practice few promotions from within and do a great deal of hiring from without. Although Stinchcombe's classification scheme is supposedly a refinement of the supposedly too simple core and periphery dichotomy of labor markets, it offers very specific descriptions for each of the classifications, and as a result some industries cannot fall into any of the given categories.
Nonetheless, this structuralism in stratification research strives to show that the distribution of socioeconomic benefits to individual workers depends upon the opportunity structures of the labor market. Furthermore, the identification of the structural aspect of the socioeconomic order provides an essential element in understanding the process of discrimination against minority groups. Theorists in this tradition argue that many workers, especially minorities, are almost isolated or confined in the peripheral sector of the economy (Ng, 1977; Beck et al., 1980; Tienda and Niedert, 1980; Tolbert et al., 1980). One reason that was given is the proximity of the minority ghettoes to the periphery sectors (Hodson and Kaufman, 1982). Their initial employment in the periphery sector contributes even further to their inability to gain employment in the core sector. Those who manage to get into the core sector experience even greater discrimination for it is hypothesized that discrimination increases with monopoly, with power, with size and with profitability (Kaufman, 1986). Hence, segmented labor market perspective provides a more explicit explanation to discrimination whereas in the assimilationist perspective, group differentials due to discrimination are taken for granted or ignored because of the assumption that the differences between minority and majority groups will disappear through time (Hirschman and Wong, 1984). Thus, an empirical issue
which has a bearing on these recent theories (structural, segmented, and sectoral) and assimilation theory is centered on whether there is actually mobility for foreign immigrants (Petersen, 1971; Lieberson, 1980; Sowell, 1980; Alba, 1985) or whether they remain confined to the bottom jobs or the lower tier of a segmented labor market (Bonacich and Cheng, 1984).

Status attainment, on the other hand, while not always advocating an assimilationist stance, accounts for differentials into two sources - human capital differences and discrimination. But discrimination in the status attainment approach is regarded as a residual (using regression standardization procedure) and therefore unexplainable by the status attainment model (see for example a study done by Poston, Alvirez and Tienda, 1976). Since discrimination is not possibly explained using the status attainment approach, discrimination is not often included by those who use this as the model of socioeconomic attainment.

With the segmented labor market approaches this empirical gap can be remedied but using solely these approaches to explain racial socioeconomic inequalities is limited because it reduces explanation to one single factor, labor segmentation. In this investigation, the proposed occupational attainment model incorporates the ideas from the human capital, status attainment, assimilationist
perspective and labor market segmentation thus advocating an eclectic approach in predicting occupational attainment of minority groups.

**Implications of the Theories of Occupational Attainment**

The variables for predicting socioeconomic attainment have been explicitly articulated by the above reviewed theories. Each theoretical model espoused certain determinants for occupational attainment. In the human capital and status attainment models, education is the key element to occupational achievement. This implies that the better jobs go to the better educated. In the investment mechanism of these neoclassical models the achievement process is clearly an age-dependent process. Moreover, age can be used as a proxy for work experience and is thought to reflect investments acquired through on-the-job training. Thus, according to these models, occupational variations among groups being compared is due to differences in educational attainments (an achieved characteristic) and to age (an ascribed characteristic). Figure One presents the hypothesized neoclassical model of occupational attainment.
Taking into account the differences in age-education composition, the assimilation variable (length of residence) was added to the occupational attainment model of the foreign-born Asian Americans. Unlike the age variable, which is an ascribed characteristic, length of residence is a descriptive variable that indicates when a voluntary effort to move has occurred. Controlling for age and education isolates the function of length of residence in the United States to occupational attainment.

Figure Two presents the influence of this assimilation variable (holding age-education variables constant) to occupational attainment.

In addition to the neoclassical variables (age-education) and assimilation variables (length of residence), it is hypothesized that labor market positions of
individuals have an important effect on occupational attainment so that the question asked is: Is there a difference in occupational attainment between majority population (white) and the minorities (Asian Americans) within these labor markets? The figure below includes the industrial sector as an additional explanation for occupational attainment net of the effects of neoclassical and assimilation variable, it is therefore assumed that the groups being compared are equivalent in human capital characteristics thus avoiding confounding effects of the labor market processes which occur prior to labor market entry. Thus, the third model satisfies both the functionalist conception of unidimensional conception of labor market and the Marxist conception of a heterogeneous labor market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>education</th>
<th>experience</th>
<th>length of residence</th>
<th>industrial sector</th>
<th>occupational attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 3. Model of hypothesized influences of sectoral variables on occupational attainment.

Other Predictive Variables of Socioeconomic Attainment

Other factors of relevance to socioeconomic attainment not measured in the study are as follows:

Income attainment -- income is the total earnings from all sources in 1979. It is not included in the present analysis (although like education it is an important
determinant of occupational status) to avoid multicollinearily effects on the results. Income or earnings are quantifiable and often used by economist in their analysis. In this study, it is assumed that income is highly correlated with occupation, which has long been empirically established (in fact economists usually omit occupation from their income equations, maintaining that both measures are the same thing).

Social origin -- It is commonly held that ethnic and racial minorities differ with respect to the rate of upward social mobility between generations (Duncan and Duncan, 1968; Taeuber and Taeuber, 1968). Social origin is indicated by Duncan and Duncan (1968) as school years completed by the head of the family as well as the socioeconomic status score of head of the family. Ideally, these variables should be taken into account. Studies have shown that the influence of origin (social or national) on occupational achievement can operate either by way of an effect on educational achievement which, in turn, influences occupational success or directly without mediation by schooling. There is, however, strong evidence that the impact of social origin on occupational achievement occurs primarily through social differentials in schooling and education in occupational achievement (Duncan et al., 1972; Featherman and Hauser, 1978). Therefore,
occupational difference is more directly attributed to differentials in educational attainment.

School quality -- While it is undoubtedly true that minorities attain relatively inferior education, this argument can be overstressed. According to Duncan (1969), the inferior quality of schooling is in a way built into educational attainment. One cannot proceed to the next grade level, for example, if he fails to master tasks at the preceding level. Thus, quantity of schooling of the individual best approximates his quality of schooling. Another reason to downplay the importance of quality of schooling is the reported achievements of Asians mainly through their educational attainments.
CHAPTER THREE
Methods and Data

Description of the Data

The empirical basis of the study is the 1980 United Stated Census one-in-100 public use sample (Public-Use Microdata Files (PUMS), Bureau of the Census, 1983). Compared to the summary data found in the census printed reports, where the basic unit of analysis is often a specific geographic area, in the microdata, the basic unit is the individual or the household. The PUMS files consist of nearly all of the detailed information from the long form sample questionnaire in the census. These data are specifically appropriate for the present study since they focuses on the comparison of the individuals according to a variety of census variables (i.e., detailed occupations and a variety of characteristics, such as age, race, etc.).

There are three independently drawn PUMS samples named as "A", "B", and "C". The B sample contains one percent, i.e., one household for every one-hundred households in the nation, the C sample is a one in one-thousand sample while the A sample is a five percent sample containing over one-fourth of the households that received the long-form census questionnaire. Each of these samples feature a different geographical scheme: the B sample identified 282 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA) of 100,000 or more inhabitants, the A sample identified every state and most
individual counties with 100,000 or more inhabitants and the C sample identified twenty-seven (27) states and District of Columbia.

Although the three microdata files differ in terms of sample size and geographical scheme, they all contain the same information: 503 occupational categories, age by single years up to 90, income to $10 intervals up to $75,000 and so forth. Furthermore, the sampling procedure was the same for all the files, in that each obtained through a systematic sampling procedure. This stratification scheme was intended to improve the reliability of the five percent, one percent, and 0.1 percent samples by defining the strata of households with nearly homogeneous characteristics.

Of these three microdata files, sample B was selected for this study for its geographical scheme. In the 1980 census, 98 percent of Asians were reported residing in SMSAs. Aside from describing a total of one percent households in the nation, the B sample is considered appropriate enough to estimate the data that would have been obtained from a complete count.

While it is true that microdata samples have some limitations (i.e., small geographic areas are not identified) they have the advantage of being tabulated similar to data from a sample survey. Moreover, the PUMS offers the following advantages over independent surveys: first, it is much more inexpensive to procure PUMS data;
second, the data are as accurate if not more accurate because of the precision in census data collection and third, the samples are more often larger with respect to geographical coverage.

The Sample Size

The number of total subjects in the study was 370,800 with the breakdown by races as shown in Table Four. From the published materials of the Census Bureau, it was computed that from the total 3,300,044 Asians counted in 1980, about 24 percent in the 25-64 age category are males. From this group, a sample of one percent (one in every 100 persons) was taken. See the last column of Table Four.

Dependent Variable: Socioeconomic Status

Measurement of individual social status is not something new. There have been long and continuous interest in this area partly because occupation has been accepted as an important criterion in describing the social stratification structure. The importance of occupation as an indicator of socioeconomic status brought about the development of indices of occupational status and prestige (Haug, 1977; Treiman, 1977). In the United States, for example, the scaling of occupations has been approached in various ways. The North-Hatt scale, also known as NORC survey in 1947 was based entirely on prestige evaluations of occupations. Later on Duncan (1961) provided a more systematic approach to the construction of occupational
Table 4. Samples by Race: 1980 Sample B (Public-Use Microdata Samples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males (25-64)</th>
<th>Sample B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White*</td>
<td>189,035,012</td>
<td>44,567,831</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>716,331</td>
<td>183,455</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>812,178</td>
<td>216,762</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>781,894</td>
<td>167,188</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>357,393</td>
<td>67,975</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>387,223</td>
<td>103,263</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>245,025</td>
<td>49,645</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal (Asian) 3,300,044 788,288 24 7,162

TOTAL 192,335,056 45,356,119 370,800

*excludes those of Spanish origin or descent

scales. Duncan was the first to use index scores to replace the discrete occupational categories used in the original NORC sample. Since then, the numerical scores were used to evaluate the positions of occupations in the social order (Reiss, 1961). Unlike the North-Hatt scale, which is based on subjective criterion, i.e., prestige, the criterion developed by Duncan was based on a combination of prestige and socioeconomic dimensions like education and income. While Duncan’s SEI was gaining popularity, the Census Bureau’s staff (Nam, Glick, Stockwell, and Powers), argued for using a more objective, socioeconomic basis for their computation which they eventually developed and later became known as occupational status scores (Nam and Powers, 1983). The status scores developed by the census bureau staff are based on objective criteria (education, income and occupation). At this point it is quite relevant to distinguish between occupational status used by the census bureau and occupational prestige. Occupational status refers to the "objective socioeconomic conditions associated with holding a particular occupation" (Nam and Powers, 1983:47). The determinants of occupational status are essentially education and income (Pavalko, 1971; Reiss, 1961). Occupational prestige on the other hand, refers to the "subjective evaluations people have of the social standing of an occupation" (Nam and Powers, 1983:48). Its dimensions are assigned by the public on the basis of a
number of occupational attributes like the intellectual and training requirements of the work, the interpersonal relations provided by the work and the intrinsic nature of the work, i.e., how honorable and moral the work is and what it contributes to humanity (Garbin and Bates, 1961). The present study used the concept defined for occupational status rather than occupational prestige, since the index scale used in the study, (described below) was based entirely on census information and purposely constructed to update the work of Nam, Powers, and colleagues rather than Duncan's (Ford and Gehret, 1985:2).

Since the occupational structure is expected to change from time to time as new technologies are introduced, some occupations in the process become obsolete and new types of occupations are created to meet the changing needs of industry. Thus, the occupational classification used by the Census Bureau has been revised in each census year. In the 1980 Census, for example, the classification used is substantially different from the past such that index scores need to be updated to fit the present occupational classification scheme developed in the 1980 census.

Ford and Gehret (1985) have recently developed occupational scores based on the Public-Use Samples of the 1980 Census. Status scores are separately estimated for the total population, the male population, the female population, and female full-time employed population.
Scores were computed for the experienced civilian labor force age 16 years and over by estimating the median income in the year preceding the census and the completed median year of schooling for each occupation. Occupational differences of the seven racial groups in the study were based on these status scores reported by Ford and Gehret (see appendix).

Dependent Variable: Major Occupational Categories

Occupation has been asked in each census since 1850. In 1980, the United States Bureau of the Census defined occupation as the "kind of work the person is doing at a job or business during the reference week or, if not at work, at the most recent job or business if employed since 1975" (1983:30). The occupation data were collected from the responses to the item number 29 for all employed persons, 16 years old and over, excluding persons in the armed forces. Item 29 was worded as follows:

Occupation

a. What kind of work was this person doing?

(For example: Registered nurse, personnel manager, supervisor of order department, gasoline engine assembler, grinder operator)

b. What were this person's most important activities or duties?
For example: Patient care, directing hiring policies, supervising order clerks, assembling engines, operating grinding mill)

Answers of the respondents to 29a and 29b were combined and assigned a code to correspond one of the 503 listed occupations. As a consequence of emerging newer industries and a labor market that is becoming more complex, the following categories found in the 1980 census differ from those in the previous censuses.

Managerial and professional specialty occupations:
  Executive, administrative, and managerial occupations
  Professional specialty occupations

Technical, sales, and administrative support occupations:
  Technicians and related support occupations
  Sales occupations
  Administrative support occupations including clerical

Service occupations:
  Private household occupations
  Protective service occupations
  Service occupations, except protective and household

Farming, forestry and fishing occupations

Precision productions, craft and repair occupations

Operators, fabricators, and laborers:
  Machine operators, assemblers and inspectors
  Transportation and material moving occupations
  Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers and laborers

Furthermore, although not explicitly used as categories in the study, blue and white collar occupations were incorporated in the description of the occupational
attainments of the various racial groups. From the above categories, those white collar occupations are the first two top occupational categories while the blue collar occupations are the last two categories. The white/blue collar dichotomy is another way of describing the degree of occupational concentration in each racial group.

Operationalization of Variables

**Race** - The data on race is derived from answers to question number four of the 1980 census long-form questionnaire. It reflects self-identification by the respondents and it does not connote a clear-cut definition by biological stock. In this study, seven categories of race are used in the analysis: Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, Asian Indian, Vietnamese, and white. In the case of the white group, Spanish/Hispanic origin or descent are excluded. This question is asked in item number seven on the same questionnaire form.

**Sex** - This study on occupational attainment is based solely on the male population in the sample. The inclusion of only the males is not expected to bias the assignment of socioeconomic status scores mainly because the index scale (Ford and Gehret, 1985) to be used in the study lists a separate status score for males and females for every specific occupation in the 1980 census (in this study the male status score will be employed). The Ford and Gehret scale, therefore took into consideration sexual difference
in occupational status. This was an important theoretical and methodological issue in the 1970s because occupational status scores were then mainly derived from male incumbents alone (Powers and Holmberg, 1978). This was based on the assumption that the social status of the family is traditionally reflected from the occupation of the husband and that of the wife, if ever employed, only serves to supplement the family income. This may not be true as it once was owing to an increase in the number of single parents and dual earner families in the eighties. More women are in the labor force compared to in the past. However; it seems that this still holds true for Asian American women, who have been found in the 1980 census to be more married than single or separated (60 percent - 72 percent) and continue to concentrate in traditionally female occupations like elementary or secondary school teachers and nursing (Woo, 1985:328; Wong and Hirschman, 1983). These authors have concluded that Asian American women have much less variance in their occupations compared to their male counterparts. However, when Asian American women were compared to Anglo women on labor force participation rate, occupational attainment and annual income, they were found to be superior in all these three economic variables because of "their superior educational qualifications, their residence in higher paying regions and their higher propensity to work full-time" (Wong and Hirschman, 1983).
Such preliminary findings on the socioeconomic status of Asian women indicate that the image of Asian American as successful minorities may be partly attributed to the active participation of Asian women in the United States labor market. However, there seems to be sufficient evidence to support this contention which implies a need to do further studies on Asian women in the United States. Thus, the significance of doing a study on Asian American women cannot be ignored. This study, however, pertains to Asian American males only. The non-inclusion of females was merely to set a realistic limit to the scope of the study.

**Age** - The age range 25-64 is used in the analysis. This was determined with the notion that age is a proxy to work experience. The assumption is that by age 25, individuals have finished schooling and are likely to be committed to the labor force. The upper boundary of age 64 was specified on the same assumption that labor force participation is likely to end by this age.

**Education** - In this study, educational attainment will be treated as a continuous variable to capture all the variance for each grade level, thus eliciting detailed explanation for the dependent variable.

**Nativity Status** - It is commonly held that the rate of assimilation among and within racial groups differs between generations. In the 1970 census, generational data is normally inferred from the birthplace of the parents and
from the birth place of the individual respondent. In the 1980 census, the birth place of parents was deleted so that only first generation migrants can be identified from the individual's place of birth. In other words, the generational data from this study is limited to the individual's nativity status. Two categories are coded for nativity status. These are:

0 -- for those born in the United States or outlying areas or born abroad of native parents.

1 -- individuals identifying their country of birth other than that of the United States are classified under this category, i.e., first generation immigrants.

Migration status -- The year of immigration is considered by some to be the key aspect of the stratification process (Chiswick, 1980; Wong and Hirschman, 1983). The operational definition of this variable partly depends on the historical perspective of Asian immigration to the United States. A brief account of the most important events in the east to west migration follows.

While Asian migration to the United States dates back as early as 1820, it was only in the twentieth century that Asians have been a significant part of the flow of immigrants to the United States. From 1820 until 1984, (a total of 165 years of Asian immigration to the United States), the United States has been the host country of
about three million immigrants from six Asian countries (see Table Five).

As indicated in Table Five, Asian immigration to the United States can be categorized into two waves: the old and the new. The old wave migrants came sometime between 1820 to 1960 while the new wave migrants arrive after 1965. The first of the old wave of Asian migrants to arrive in large numbers are the Chinese. Historians have found it difficult to ascertain the exact year when the first Chinese came to the United States. Nonetheless, the American Immigration Commission recorded 1820 as the year of arrival of the first group of Chinese to the United States (Tung, 1974). It was the need for cheap labor, first in California and then in the sugar plantation of Hawaii that brought the first group of Chinese to the United States. The Chinese were essentially "sojourners" who eventually became immigrants (Barth, 1964). They have occupied the sojourner status because unlike the migrants before them, they had left their wives and family behind so that the purpose of their coming was to earn enough money to leave. As a consequence of the absence of women, the men did the laundries which eventually became a profitable enterprise (Lyman, 1977). Large numbers of Chinese arrived in the early 1840s but it was in 1852 when Chinese immigration to the West coast jumped tenfold from 2,716 in 1811 to 20,026 (Boswell, 1986). This was during the California gold rush
Table 5. Immigrants by country of birth: 1820–1984 (in thousands. For years ending June 30 except, beginning 1977, ending September 30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China including Taiwan</td>
<td>398.9</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>202.5</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>871.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>279.1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>426.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>360.2</td>
<td>130.4</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>652.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>272.0</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>445.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>176.8</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>304.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>179.7</td>
<td>165.7</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>389.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(150.3)*</td>
<td>(159.5)*</td>
<td>(34.3)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>678.0</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>308.3</td>
<td>1239.1</td>
<td>579.7</td>
<td>177.8</td>
<td>3089.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Immigrants who were allowed to enter U.S. under Indochina refugees act of October 1977.
where they were mainly hired as contract laborers or "coolies". Since they accepted lower wages and worked harder, they were preferred over other groups of workers. As the demand for them became greater, antagonism against them also became prevalent which eventually led to their deportation through a law known as the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882 (Bonacich, 1973). Because the Act prohibited the immigration of all Chinese laborers for the next ten years after its enactment, it consequently reduced the number of Chinese, especially the unskilled Chinese laborers (Boyd, 1971b; 1971a; Bennett, 1963:13).

Meanwhile, the Japanese began arriving in the 1880s. They migrated mainly into two areas. First in Hawaii as agricultural workers and then followed by movement into California where they worked as laborers on the railroads, in the canneries, in logging, in the mine, meat packing, and salt industries (Kitano, 1969). Compared to the Chinese, the Japanese saw more opportunities in agriculture and also in self employment and non-industrial family businesses. In spite of their initial success in running their businesses inexpensively and efficiently, the majority were at one time oriented toward returning to their homeland. Their disillusionment stemmed from the growing hostility against them in the form of denial of citizenship, exclusion effort and laws prohibiting their ownership of land (Ogawa, 1971). This anti-Asian sentiment was embodied in the Gentlemen's
Agreement in 1908. In this agreement, Japan was to undertake control over the immigration of laborers in the United States by issuing passports for travel to the United States only to those of its laborers who were former residents thereof, to parents, wives, or children of residents of the United States, and to agriculturists (Hirschman and Wong, 1981; Lyman, 1977). Hostility against them continued during World War II when they were evacuated and incarcerated.

In spite of deliberate exclusion of Chinese and Japanese through these legislative Acts, the Chinese still numbered a total high of about 400,000 between 1820 to 1950 while the Japanese counted to about 300,000 during the same period. Other Asian groups were not counted probably because their number in the United States was insignificant at that time.

Still part of the "old wave" are the first group of Filipino migrants. This group of Spanish speaking Asians of Malay descent came in the early 1920s (Handlin, 1980). Initially classified as American nationals until they were restricted similar to the Chinese and the Japanese, by the passage of the Tydings-McDuffie Act, better known as the Filipino Exclusion Act in 1934 (Daniels and Kitano, 1970:66). These first arrivals were predominantly single men and consisted primarily of agricultural workers while the second group of heavy filipino migration, occurring
after 1965 was made up of people with wider range of skills and interests (Melendy, 1976). During the 1961-1970 decade, Filipino migrants numbered to about 100,000. Ever since this period, the Philippines led all Asian countries in the number of new immigrants, and since 1970 it has led all other nations except Mexico (United States Commission of Immigration and Naturalization, 1973).

The year 1965, marked the opening of the door to a new wave of Asian migrants. A new law was passed to eliminate almost 80 years of an exclusionary policy toward Asia. In brief, the law known as the 1965 Immigration Act (Public Law 89-236) replaced the National Origins Quota System (Immigration and nationality Act of 1952). The old system fixed a "quota of one-sixth of one percent of the inhabitants of the United States in 1920 attributable by national origin to each area" (Tomasi and Keely, 1975). To put it simply, the act established quotas of 20,000 immigrants per year for each country in both the Eastern and Western hemispheres. In the new system, the major determining factor for admission were family reunification and possession of needed talents and skills (see appendix A for the comparison of the preference systems between the two laws). Mainly because of the revised preference system, many more Asians were eligible to enter the United States. There was a notable increase of the "old wave" of Asian immigrants (i.e., Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos) but also
a "new wave" of Asians from countries like Korea and India. Korean immigrants, for example, resulted in an impressive eightfold increase in a period of ten years from 35,000 in 1970 to 272,000 in 1980. Although a majority of the Koreans came after the liberalized immigration law of 1965, there were two smaller groups of Koreans who came prior to 1965. The first one, numbering about 7,000 came between 1903 to 1905 to work in the Hawaiian Sugar Plantation. They were recruited to replace the Chinese who were excluded by the 1882 Legislative Act (Sunoo and Sunoo, 1977). The early group of Korean migrants also suffered some set backs, not directly from the Americans but from the Japanese who prohibited their immigration to the United States in 1905 (Houchins and Houchins, 19765:135). In 1958, another group of Korean migrants came. This time they were not laborers but were war brides or refugees of the Korean war. Their entry to the United States was granted through the passage of the 1953 Refugee Relief Act (Parillo, 1985).

Considered another group of recent Asian migrants are the Asian Indians, who like the Koreans, have increased tremendously in number after 1965. Of the total 304,000 who came during the 165 year period, from 1820 to 1984, 95 percent came after 1965. Thus, only a small group of about 7,000 came in the early twentieth century. This early group of migrants were described as poorly educated, agricultural laborers who migrated to the West and settled in the rural
regions in Washington and California. Although the Indians, like the Koreans, were less directly subjected to discrimination and prejudice, they were still affected by the anti-Asian attitude that prevails between 1908 to 1920, so that about 2,000 of the 7,000 Indians left the country (Hess, 1974).

Although both the "before 1965" and the "after 1965" migrants were stimulated partly by the labor needs in the United States and partly by the desire of the migrants to seek greener pastures, they are however, two distinguishable groups. Majority of the "before 1965" migrants (old wave) have something in common regardless of the country of origin. They were mostly unskilled laborers while those who came "after 1965" (new wave) are typically highly skilled professionals. In other words, they are better trained and educated than their predecessors.

In 1975, the Vietnam war came to an end. This event brought another group of Asians in the United States, the Vietnamese. Nearly 90 percent of them were admitted as refugees under the Indo-Chinese Refugees Act of October, 1977 (see Table Five). Unlike the other group of Asians, the Vietnamese migrated for political rather than economic reasons. Evidently, the Vietnamese also came in two waves but compared to the early migrant of other Asian groups who were described as less educated, the Vietnamese who came during the first wave, the period between 1975-1977 were
found to have middle class backgrounds, well-educated, with marketable skills and nearly half spoke English (U.S. News and World Report, 1975). The second wave of migrants were known as the "boat people" were generally the opposite, mainly farmers, fisherman and laborers (Garnder et al., 1985).

It is true that the different period of arrivals of the six major groups of Asians means different histories are involved but the year 1965 is a common and significant event for all the groups. In the subsequent years after 1965, there was not only an increase in the number of "old wave" Asian immigrants (i.e., Chinese, Japanese and Filipinos) but also a significant migration of "new wave" Asians from other countries such as Korea, India and Vietnam. Summing up the Asian population reported in Table Five from 1961 to 1984 reveals that close to two million, that is nearly three-fourths of the present Asian population came during this period.

From the preceding historical background of Asian immigration to the United States which includes an era of job hostility (before 1965) and an era of job mobility (after 1965), the foreign born population were grouped as to whether they came before the 1965 period or after 1965. The 1980 Census Bureau have listed six classifications of foreign borns by their period of arrival as follows:
1  -- those who came to the United States between 1975-1980;
2  -- those who came to the United States between 1970-1974;
3  -- those who came to the United States between 1965-1969;
4  -- those who came to the United States between 1960-1964;
5  -- those who came to the United States between 1950-1959;
6  -- those who came to the United States before 1950.
The above classification was collapsed into two periods, those in categories one through three are called the after 1965 migrants and those in categories four through six are called before 1965 migrants.

**Industrial Sector**

In recognition of the limitations of purely individualistic explanations of socioeconomic attainment provided by the status attainment and the human capital tradition, a measure of industrial sector is added to the analysis in the study. Based specifically on the dual economy perspective, the 1980 census industry classification are assigned either the core or the periphery. This sectoral dichotomy used in the analysis is adopted from Tolbert, et al., 1980, who patterned their classification after Bluestone and colleagues (1973). The crucial variable in the analysis is the distinction between the core and periphery sectors. The core firms are characterized by oligopolistic system of production (Baran and Sweezy, 1966), large economic scales (high levels of productivity, profits, concentration, and unionization).
These attributes are closely linked with higher wages, good working conditions and adequate fringe benefits. In contrast, peripheral industries are characterized by small firm size, labor intensity, low profits, lack of unionization, low wages and operating in a more or less open, competitive capitalistic environment (Averitt, 1968).

In the words of Bluestone et al. (1973:28-29) the characteristics of these two sectors of the labor market are as follows:

"The core economy includes those industries that comprise the muscle of American economic and political power . . . Entrenched in durable manufacturing, the construction trades and to a lesser extent, the extraction industries, the firms in the core economy are noted for high productivity, high profits, intensive utilization of capital, high incidence of monopoly elements, and a high degree of unionization. What follows normally from such characteristics are high wages. The automobile, steel, rubber, aluminum, aerospace, and petroleum industries are ranking members of this part of the economy. Workers who are able to secure employment in these industries are, in most cases assured of relatively high wages and better than average working conditions and fringe benefits . . . Beyond the fringes of the core economy lies a set of industries that lack almost all the advantages normally found in center firms. Concentrated in agriculture, nondurable manufacturing, retail trade, and sub-professional services, and peripheral industries are noted for their small firm size, labor intensity, low profits, low productivity, intensive product competition, lack of unionization, and low wages. Unlike core sector industries, the periphery lacks the assets, size, and political power to take advantage of economies of scale or to spend large sums on research and development.

The coding scheme followed in the analysis is included in the appendix."
CHAPTER FOUR

Results and Analysis

This chapter includes the results based on the following analyses: (1) the description of the occupational distribution by racial group, by nativity status and by migration status; (2) the difference in occupational distribution of the following comparative groups; (a) between whites and each of the subgroups of Asians; (b) between whites and each of the four cohort groups found within each subgroup of Asians; (c) between native and foreign born within each subgroup of Asians and (d) between the before 1965 and the after 1965 migrants within each subgroup of Asians; (3) the regression coefficients of occupational status on the independent variables by racial groups and the decomposition of the occupational differences by "rates" and "composition" between whites and each Asian group as well as between Japanese and each of the remaining five Asian groups and (4) the regression coefficients of occupational status on the independent variables by nativity status and migration status.

Occupational Distribution and Assimilation

The sole dependent variable of the study is occupation, but because there are 503 occupations identified in the 1980 Census, interpretation can be problematic. In this study, occupation is grouped into six categories following the 1980
Census Bureau's classification. The detailed categories under each occupational grouping were described earlier in Chapter Three. Of the six occupational categories given by the Census Bureau, the first two occupational classifications, the Managerial and Professional Specialty occupations and the Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support occupations are referred to as white collar occupations while the last two classifications, the Precision Production and Crafts occupations and the Operators, Fabricators, and Laborers occupations are named blue collar occupations. The other classification that did not fall on either of the two are the Service occupations and the "Farming, Fishing and Forestry occupations. In other words, occupational description was done based on the six occupational classifications and although not explicitly shown, four of the above six classifications were termed as white and blue collar occupations. The description is basically the composition (frequency and percentage) of these groups in each of the occupational categories. Moreover, the composition of each Asian population per occupational category were compared to the corresponding white population. This is in keeping with the assimilation notion, that the closer the Asian population is to the standard, the more assimilated they have become. Assimilation as defined by Gordon (1964) is either cultural or structural. To reiterate what was emphasized earlier in
the previous chapters, this study defines assimilation in terms of secondary structural assimilation.

**Occupational Distribution by Racial Group**

The occupational composition of each of the seven racial groups in the study is shown in Table Six. The first category is the Managerial and Professional Specialty occupations. These occupations are generally the highest paid and the most prestigious occupations. They are distinguished from other occupations mainly because the skill of the professionals is based on systematic, theoretical knowledge not merely on training in particular techniques or skills. About 37.37 percent of Asians (see last column) were found in this occupational category with the following distribution by subgroups: 57.92 percent Asian Indians, about 38 percent Chinese and Japanese, 35.61 percent Koreans, 26.87 percent Filipinos and 17.40 percent Vietnamese. The whites in this category comprise 27.36 percent of their group. Thus the Asian proportion in this category is about ten percent more than that of the whites.

Considered as white collar occupations but of lower ranking than the previous classification are the Technical, Sales and Administrative Support occupations. At least twenty percent to twenty-four percent of the Asians are found in these types of occupations compared to about eighteen percent of whites.
Table 6. Frequency and Percentage Distribution According to Occupational Categories of a 1% Sample of Asian and White Males Aged 25-64 years old, 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Total Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and Professional Specialty</td>
<td>115,312</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical, Sales and Administrative Support</td>
<td>79,151</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>28,247</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Forestry and Fishing</td>
<td>16,609</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Production Craft and Repair</td>
<td>95,316</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators, Fabricators and Laborers</td>
<td>86,806</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employed</td>
<td>421,441</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>25,068</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number in Labor Force</td>
<td>446,509</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>7163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: Number of occupations in parentheses. *the unemployed are those in armed forces, last worked in 1975, not in labor force or no civilian work experience since 1975.
The percentages for the Managerial and Professional, Specialty occupations and the Technical, Sales and Administrative Support occupations were added to obtain the white collar composition for each racial group. About 46 percent of the whites and 59.25 percent of the Asians are in white collar occupations. From among the Asian groups, Asian Indians have the greatest proportion in this group (79.60 percent), while the least represented Asian group is the Vietnamese with only 38.9 percent. Thus, more Asians are found in white collar jobs than whites. In fact, all the subgroups of Asians except the Vietnamese outnumbered the proportion of whites in white collar occupations. The higher level of occupational attainment of the Asians is a consequence of the selective immigration -- a product of the reform 1965 Immigration Act (Wong and Hirschman, 1983). Most of those who came were professional workers with university level of education (Hirschman and Wong, 1981; Nee and Sanders, 1985).

The third occupational classification is the Service occupations. There are about as many whites as there are Asians classified within this occupational category, which is no more than twelve percent service workers for any racial group. The Chinese were however found to deviate from the typical twelve percent composition. At least 23.08 percent of the Chinese population were found to be service workers. In 1900, the Chinese population are rarely found
in other occupations except in agriculture or in domestic and personal services like laundry workers (Hirschman and Wong, 1986). Through the years the percentage of workers in these occupations declined not only for the Chinese but it applies to all American workers in general (Ritzer and Walczak, 1986:20-26) but compared to other workers, at least a fifth of the Chinese workers in the 1980 remained as service workers. Why do they remain as service workers? Reasons such as, being a traditional occupation of the Chinese, they have gained the skill of the trade and those who have moved up as owners of these laundry places hired their own countrymen to work for them.

If there are few service workers among the racial groups in the study, even fewer are found in Farming, Forestry and Fishing occupations. Other racial groups are rarely found in this occupational category. The early Asian migrants first began work as agriculturists. Aside from the Chinese who were later on excluded by the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882, the Japanese who in 1900 were mostly farm laborers (at least two thirds). However, by 1930 only a third of them remained as farm laborers (Hirschman and Wong, 1986). Filipinos, on the other hand, were actually recruited primarily to farm in the sugar cane plantations in Hawaii. As evident from this result, nearly nobody was counted in this occupational category. This, in fact is part of the changing occupational structure occurring in the
post-industrial society. The demands are different from the past and as a consequence, workers try to meet these changing needs.

Blue collar occupations in this study are those in the Precision Production, Crafts and Repair occupations and those who work as Operators, Fabricators and Laborers. Of these two occupations, more Asians are found in the former (more skilled) category than in the latter. Take for example, the Japanese wherein about eighteen percent are in Precision Production, Craft and Repairs occupations while only 8.49 percent work as Operators, Fabricators, and Laborers. Filipino blue collar workers are equally found in both categories, about sixteen percent in each category. The Vietnamese are the exception since more are in the lower type of blue collar occupations (32.28 percent) than in the Precision Production, Craft and Repairs occupations (14.55 percent).

Comparing the distribution of blue collar workers between whites and the total Asian population reveals that there are 43.2 percent whites and 25.06 percent Asians. The Asian group with the highest percentage of blue collar workers are the Vietnamese with 46.83 percent compared to whites. The Asian groups that are least likely to be blue collar workers are the Asian Indians and the Chinese. Only about sixteen percent of each of these groups are in blue collar occupations. The Chinese however are not only
concentrated in professional categories but they are also over-represented in the service occupations.

In summary, the occupational distribution of the different racial groups indicates that more than one-half of the Asian population are white collar workers and only a fourth are in blue collar occupations. On the other hand, the white population has equal number of white and blue collar workers, 46.6 percent and 43.2 percent respectively, an indication of a nearly bimodal occupational distribution for the whites. Among the Asians, the Asian Indians are mostly white collar workers while the Vietnamese are mostly blue collar workers. Similar to the Asian Indians, the Chinese are rarely found in blue collar type of occupations but a good portion of the Chinese population are found to be service workers. Farming, Forestry and Fishing occupations are found to be the diminishing occupational category for all the workers. Farming has been the chief occupation of the less educated early migrants but with the increasing years of education coupled with less demand for this occupation, there was also a corresponding decrease in this occupational category.

The Unemployed and Self-Employed

Since the labor force does not only consist of the employed sector of the population but also the unemployed as well, the figures at the bottom of the table show the distribution of the total employed in comparison to the
total unemployed for each of the seven racial groups. Nearly all the individuals in each racial group are in the employed labor force (about 95 percent). Two Asian groups (Vietnamese and the Filipinos), however, have relatively high unemployment compared to other racial groups. About twelve percent of the Filipinos and fifteen percent of the Vietnamese population are unemployed. An important part of the Immigration Reform Act of 1965 aside from scarce occupational skills is family reunification. Filipinos who were part of the old wave of migrants are less educated than those who came later. Their parents and kin may likely be from a poor background and when these kin petition to come to the United States, most of them lack the skills that are demanded in the United States labor market and thus end up as unemployed. A study has been done to document the fact that during the period of 1971 to 1984 Philippine immigrants entering under the family preference categories nearly doubled from 8200 in 1971 to 16,050 in 1984. These are usually parents, spouses and unmarried children under 21 years of age (DeJong et al., 1986). The study did not include the demographic and occupational characteristics of these groups of migrants but since the family reunification provisions do not depend on qualifications, skills, and training, those admitted under this provision would likely have some difficulty in getting a job compared to those who gained admission by occupational preference. It is
therefore deduced from this finding that high unemployment for the Filipinos may be due to an increasing number of immigrants coming under the family reunification provision. In the case of Vietnamese, they are entirely a foreign born group and their status as refugees makes them less able to transfer their skills for the simple reason that the technology and the economic system in their country of origin is entirely different from that of the United States (Chiswick, 1979).

In Table Seven, the unemployed sector for each subgroup of Asians are shown according to their nativity status that is, whether they are native born or foreign born. For all the subgroup of Asians, the unemployed are more likely to be foreign born than native born except for the Japanese population where the proportion of unemployed native borns exceeds that of the foreign borns.

The labor force incorporates those who are self employed. It is of interest to know the composition of self employment of the Asian group in the study. Asians, in particular Chinese, Japanese and Koreans have been known to concentrate in self-employment and non-industrial family businesses. Having experienced some hostility and discrimination in the past, minorities are likely to form their own economic enclave which is not only a source of livelihood for the beginning entrepreneurs but serve to provide temporary jobs for the newly arrived immigrants.
Table 7. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Self-Employed Native and Foreign born Asian American Males Aged 25-64 years old, 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Native Born</th>
<th>75-80</th>
<th>74-70</th>
<th>69-65</th>
<th>64-60</th>
<th>59-55</th>
<th>Foreign Born Before 1950</th>
<th>Total Native and Foreign Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>80.63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.93</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50.52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lyman, 1974; Wilson and Portes, 1980; Light, 1984). In these studies the same three groups were more engaged in self-employment compared to the rest of the Asians. The most highly represented are the Koreans, composing 16.16 percent, followed by the Japanese population with about eleven percent in self-employment and Chinese about ten percent. The data in Table Seven also show Filipinos and Vietnamese who were reported to have the highest unemployment were also the ones least engaged in self-employment. Self-employed Filipinos comprised only 2.74 percent while 4.27 percent of the Vietnamese are self employed.

The same table, shows a breakdown of self-employed Asian groups according to their nativity status. A comparison of the native and foreign borns is useful in determining which of the two groups are more likely engaged in self employment. Of the native born Japanese, eighty percent are more likely self employed than their foreign born counterparts while the obverse is true for other Asian groups in the study. Of the foreign borns, it is the most recent arrivals, those who cam between 1970 and 1980 are likely to be self employed. The language problem and inability to transfer the skills learned from country of origin to country of destination prevents the new migrants from getting a job in the host country, thus, self
employment is an alternative resort to outside employment (Boyd, 1974; Gwartney and Long, 1978; Light, 1984).

**Occupational Distribution by Nativity Status**

While the results in Table Six showed how the various Asian groups in the study compared to the whites in their occupational distribution. In the following occupational description, the occupations of the native born and foreign born of each major group of Asians are compared. The assimilation of the non-native populations (foreign born) for each racial group depends on the degree of similarity they have with the native born population. According to Table Eight, both native born and foreign born Asians are concentrated in the first two occupational categories, and thus, are white collar workers. There are slightly more foreign born than native born in white collar occupations for almost all the racial groups. The Chinese population are the only Asian group whose native born (69.71 percent) in white collar occupations exceed that of the foreign born (55.74 percent). Having been in the United States longer than most other Asian groups, they have the advantage of having an older and larger native population, such that the skills and training that they have acquired (presumably white collar ones) were acquired in the United States which eliminates problems associated with transferability of skills. The foreign born Chinese, in white collar occupations are to some extent large. The great difference
Table 8. Frequency and Percentage Distribution According to Occupational Categories of Native and Foreign Born Asian American Males Aged 25-64 years old, 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Foreign</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial &amp; Professional Specialty</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>36.57</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>45.69</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>43.57</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>37.28</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>28.97</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Forestry and Fishing</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Production, Craft and Repair</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>20.96</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators, Fabricators, and Laborers</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employed</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>96.11</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>93.46</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>95.82</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>94.72</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>96.20</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>86.50</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.08</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>32.47</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.06</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>95.92</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>96.90</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.30</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>84.51</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between the native and foreign born is found in the Service occupations (about eight percent of the native born and 27.45 percent of the foreign born). The relatively small number of native born Chinese in the service sector suggests greater socioeconomic assimilation as compared to the foreign born. Aside from the Chinese, other differences between native and foreign born found among the Asian groups are: (1) More native born Japanese than foreign born are in Precision Production, Craft and Repairs (9.41 percent vs. 20.96 percent). (2) The proportion of native born Filipinos in Operators, Fabricators and Laborers is greater (23.10 percent) than the foreign born (14.57 percent). This is also found to be true when native and foreign born Koreans are compared in this category (twenty percent vs. 13.70 percent). (3) It is also observed that the proportion of native born Asian Indian population in blue collar type of work is greater than the foreign born Asian Indians. Because the Vietnamese native born are too few, comparison with the foreign born population is not appropriate.

Comparisons of the occupational distribution of the native and foreign born in each major group of Asians show that in general the foreign born are placed in better occupations than their native born counterparts. This is partly because of the racial discrimination experienced by the different Asian groups prior to 1965 i.e., Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, Gentlemen's Agreement in 1908; the
Filipino Exclusion Act of 1934, motivated the foreign borns to increase their resources and also partly because of the selective character of the subsequent immigration policy (Hirschman and Wong, 1986).

Occupational Distribution by Migration Status

The occupational composition of the foreign borns in each of the subgroups of Asians is described according to whether they arrived before 1965 or after 1965. Table Nine shows the occupational distribution of foreign borns by period of arrival.

About fifty percent of the Japanese who came after 1965 are in the Managerial and Professional Specialty occupations compared to only thirty-five percent of those who came before 1965. Those who came at an earlier period retained some of the traditional occupations like Farming, Forestry and Fishing but those engage in these occupations decrease in the later period. While in the case of the rest of the Asian groups more executives and professionals are found among the before 1965 foreign born cohorts than the after 1965 foreign born cohorts (i.e., Chinese, Koreans, and Asian Indians). The difference between the before and the after 1965 foreign born migrants is especially large for the Koreans wherein seventy percent of the before 1965 are managers and professionals while only thirty-three percent of the after 1965 Koreans are engaged in these occupations. Why do foreign born Koreans differ in this category? With
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th></th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B65</td>
<td>A65</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>B65</td>
<td>A65</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and Professional Specialty</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.35</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>49.45</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>43.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical, Sales and Administrative Support</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.21</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Fishing and Forestry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Production Craft and Repair</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators, Fabricators and Laborers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employed</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>94.29</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>93.18</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>95.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: *the unemployed are those in armed forces, last worked in 1975, not in labor force or no civilian work experience since 1975.*
Table 9, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Korean A65</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th>Asian Indian A65</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th>Vietnamese A65</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>33.26</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71.76</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>57.32</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>22.32</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>95.78</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94.45</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>97.16</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: Count | Z: Percentage
the piece of information regarding the relatively large self employment (see Table Seven) especially those who arrived between 1970-1980, it can be deduced that the disparity of the two groups lies partly in self employment. If the Chinese population are known as laundry workers, the Koreans are famous as the green grocers of New York City and Los Angeles. For instance, Koreans operate about 1,000 of New York City's 1,200 independent grocery stores (Greenwald, 1985:75). The difference in proportion between the before and after 1965 is very small for all Asian groups when it comes to the Technical, Sales and Administrative Support occupations. The after 1965 cohort group are proportionately more than the before 1965 in this occupational category. In the 1970 census, there was a dramatic increase in the proportion of Asian professionals but their earnings were considerably below that of older migrants (Hirschman and Wong, 1981:508-509). In this study, it has been shown that the before 1965 migrants were more represented in the Professional category while the after 1965 are more concentrated in the Technical occupations. Does this mean the after 1965 cohort are underemployed? Some evidence of underemployment of newly arrived immigrants have been reported like for example, Asian American physicians, pharmacists and nurses in California frequently worked as interns, assistants and laboratory technicians (Cheng 1984:9-10). But in most of the remaining
occupational categories the composition of the before and
after 1965 foreign borns for the rest of the occupational
categories is more similar than different except in a few
cases like: (1) the Japanese foreign born population who
are engaged in farming, fishing and forestry are those who
came before 1965 rather than those who came after 1965; (2)
there are about nineteen percent Koreans who came after 1965
who are engaged in precision production, crafts and repair
as opposed to only five percent in this category among the
before 1965 foreign born Koreans; (3) with regards to those
who are in operators, fabricators and laborers, a smaller
proportion of the after 1965 foreign born Japanese are in
this occupation compared to the before 1965 arrivals while
in the case of the Koreans more of the after 1965 cohort
group are engaged in these occupations than the before 1965
cohort group. Another pertinent fact shown in Table Nine is
that the proportion of the unemployed foreign borns is
almost equal for both those who came before and after 1965
except for Koreans and Asian Indians. Dividing the foreign
borns according to their period of arrival has revealed few
differences in occupational distribution which make these
two migrant groups comparable in occupational attainment
although the presence of some systematic differences is
present due to reasons like keeping up with traditional
occupations (i.e., Trade and Commerce for Koreans, Farming,
Forestry and Fishing for the Japanese, Service occupations
for the Chinese, possibility of underemployment; selective admission, and consequences of historical job racism).

Summary of Findings: Occupational Distribution

The results shown in Tables Six, Eight and Nine are graphically presented in Figures Four, Five and Six. As shown from these graphs, the proportion of the Asians found in white collar occupations is larger than those in the blue collar occupations. Most notable is the very high proportion of white collar workers among the Asian Indians. An obvious similarity in occupational patterns is that of whites and the Filipinos (Figure One). Blue collar occupations however are more likely among the Vietnamese.

Those in the labor force can be divided into employed or unemployed. More were found to be unemployed among the Filipinos and the Vietnamese. The Asian group with the smallest proportion of unemployed and the biggest proportion of self employed population are the Koreans.

When each Asian sub-population was categorized into native and foreign born, it was observed in most Asian groups (except Chinese) that foreign born rather than native born are more likely to be in white collar occupations. A good proportion of the foreign born Chinese are in Service occupations (see Figure Two). Nativity comparison excludes the Vietnamese because of small number of native born.

In general, differences in period of entry among the foreign born Asians have very little effect on their
Figure 4. Occupational distribution of employed Asians and white males aged 25-64 years old, 1980
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Figure 5. Occupational distribution of employed Asian males aged 25-64 years old by nativity status, 1980
Figure 6. Occupational distribution of employed Asian males aged 25-64 years old by immigration status, 1980
occupational distribution except for the Koreans, the before 1965 foreign born Korean migrants are highly-represented in the most prestigious occupations, close to three-fourths of this population (see Figure Three) while those who came after 1965 in the same population comprised only thirty-three percent of the population. Because of the similarity in occupational patterns between the two components of foreign born it is likely that the sociodemographic characteristics of these two are also similar.

It seems that the occupational patterns of the Asian American groups were found to reflect, to a substantial degree their respective histories of immigration to the United States and the circumstances and events for their arrival. This was shown in this study when the Asian groups were desegregated by nativity and among immigrants by their period of arrival.

Occupational Differentiation and Assimilation

The previous analyses have described the occupational distribution of the various racial and cohort groups. To complement these results, occupational differentiation between groups was also compared. The strategy used to accomplish this objective was to compute the index of dissimilarity (D), a measurement popularized by Duncan (1969).

The index is a gross measure of differentiation which has a value ranging from 0 to a value approaching 100. The
higher the value the greater the occupational differentiation. In addition to being a measure of differentiation, D indicates the degree of segregation of one racial group in reference to another racial group on occupational distributions. Thus the result derived from D can be interpreted as the minimum percentage of one sub-population that must change occupational composition in order to achieve an occupational distribution that is proportionately identical to the other sub-population.

There are however certain limitations in using D. Previous research using D had been considered inadequate mainly because D does not show the hierarchial nature of occupational groupings and also fails to indicate the direction or magnitude of advantage of one group (Lieberson, 1975; Fossett and South, 1983). Interpretation is even made more difficult in the determination of what is a "large" or "small" value, like for example, whether an index of dissimilarity between fifteen to eighteen points a large or small value. In most cases, the assessment of magnitude is dependent upon the degree of variation of the indices reported. But in spite of these limitations D provides a nominal description of occupational differentiation of the different comparative groups in the study. Moreover, the values derived from D are interpreted as the degree of assimilation of one sub-group with another sub-group.
In this study, therefore, differentiation means the amount of assimilation that had occurred for one group relative to another group. Comparisons in this study are between two groups with different demographic characteristics (race, nativity status and migration status). The following formula given by Duncan and Duncan, 1955 was used to compute the $D$:

$$D = 100 * \frac{1}{2} \sum \text{Abs} W_i - A_i$$

where, Abs is the absolute value function;

\[ \sum \] is the summation sign;

$W_i$ is the occupational data for the whites and $A_i$ is the occupational data for the total Asians which was substituted by the following notations:

$J_i$ for the Japanese sample; $C_i$ for the Chinese sample;

$K_i$ for the Korean sample; $A_i$ for the Asian Indian sample and $V_i$ for the Vietnamese sample. The four cohort groups within each sub group of Asians are represented as follows: $N_i$ for the native born population; $F_i$ for the foreign born population; $B_{65i}$ for the foreign born migrants who came before 1965 and the $A_{65i}$ was used for the foreign born migrants who came after 1965.

Three sets of comparisons were done in the study. These are as follows: (1) between whites and each of the six major groups of Asians; (2) between whites and each of the four cohort groups namely native born, foreign born,
before 1965 and after 1965 within each of the six Asian groups; (3) between native born and foreign born and between the before 1965 and after 1965 in each of the six major groups of Asians. In the first set of comparisons, the aim is to find out whether race is a factor for occupational difference. In the second set of comparisons, the rationale lies on the fact that Asian Americans are considered migrant groups, and subdividing each of the Asian group in the study into four cohort groups according to whether they are native born or foreign born (nativity status) or as to whether they immigrated before 1965 or after 1965 (migration status) is an explicit way of showing whether length of stay contributes to occupational difference. The third group of comparisons, the D's are the occupational differences between two cohort groups within each racial group. Thus, instead of being differentiated with whites, the comparison is between native born and foreign born and between the before 1965 migrant group and the after 1965 migrant group. The purpose for doing such comparisons is to find out whether variations in length of residence in the United States result to a difference in the occupational distribution.

1. Whites and the Asian Americans

   In Table 10, the comparisons of the overall occupational distribution of each Asian group were compared with whites using the D which gives the amount of change (in
Table 10. Percentage Differences in the Major Occupational Categories and Index of Dissimilarity for White and Asian American males, Aged 25-64 years old, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Total Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and Professional Specialty</td>
<td>-9.74</td>
<td>-11.38</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-8.24</td>
<td>-30.56</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>-10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical, Sales and Administrative Support</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>-5.42</td>
<td>-5.44</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>-2.74</td>
<td>-3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-16.38</td>
<td>-5.46</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>-5.64</td>
<td>-5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Forestry and Fishing</td>
<td>-3.64</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Production, Craft and Repairs</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>8.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Index of Dissimilarity with Whites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Total Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>29.22</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>33.44</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percentage) needed by an Asian group to have an occupational distribution that is identical to that of the whites. In addition to the D's shown at the bottom row of Table 10, the percentage differences between whites and each Asian group for each group in each of the six major occupational categories are shown. Figures with negative signs indicate that the composition of the particular Asian group in that specific occupational category is bigger than that of the whites. The percentage differences shown for each occupational category in each pair of white and Asian groups explain much of the variations in the D's.

In general, occupational differentiation between the total Asian population (6 sub groups of Asians) and whites, showed an index value of 18.93 percent, the percentage needed to equal the occupational distribution of the two populations. Of the six sub groups of Asians, three of them showed small differences. These sub-groups are Filipinos, Koreans, and Japanese. Compared with Japanese, it is 16.37 percent; with Koreans, it is 14.34 percent, even more trivial is the differences found with Filipinos (10.88 percent).

Because of the small D's found for the three (Filipino, Koreans and Japanese) of the six Asian groups, structural assimilation seems to have occurred for them. Filipinos were the closest to the whites in occupational distribution. They are the only group aside from the Vietnamese where
whites are proportionately larger in the managerial and professional specialty occupations. But when it comes to the second-ranked occupations they are one of the two Asians who are proportionately larger than the whites. Koreans, like the Filipinos showed very little difference with whites except in the top-ranked occupations. Differences for the Japanese and whites lies on both the top-ranked and bottom-ranked occupational categories.

Larger D values were found between whites and the Asian Indians, whites and Chinese and whites and Vietnamese. This suggests dissimilarity in occupational distribution for these paired groups. The largest D for Asians and white comparison is 33.44 found between Asian Indians and whites. Thus, Asian Indians clearly have much different occupations than the white males. The second to the largest D was that between Chinese and whites. Chinese need to change about 29 percent to have similar occupational distribution with whites. On the other hand, a change of about 20 percent is what the Vietnamese needed to be at par with whites.

Asian Indians and white differences are concentrated mainly on the first occupational category, the Managerial and Professional Specialty occupations (-30.56) which also means a larger proportion of Asian Indians are found in this category compared to the white population. The whites in comparison to the Asian Indians are more frequently found in blue collar occupations. The obvious reason then, is that
Asian Indians outnumbered whites in the top occupational category. This is a case wherein the majority population have been outperformed by the minority group. Can it then be justifiable to say that Asian Indians are not assimilated simply because they are overachievers? Such phenomenon cannot be founded in the assimilation theory because compared to the other Asian groups, the Asian Indians are part of the new wave of Asian migrants which means that the influx of the Asian Indian population in the country is fairly recent. Seemingly therefore, the explanation lies on the human capital investments that these groups bring into the United States labor market.

The occupational composition of the Chinese as shown in Table Six is 38.75 percent in the Managerial and Professional Specialty and about 23 percent in Service occupations. More than sixty percent are in these occupations alone. The whites, on the other hand comprise a total of only thirty-four percent for both occupational categories. Therefore the Chinese are proportionately larger in the Managerial and Professional Specialty occupations and especially so in the Service occupations, a combination of both high and low prestige jobs. These are the occupations that the Chinese need to redistribute to become more similar to whites' occupational distribution.

Opposite to the Asian Indians are the Vietnamese because a great portion of the Vietnamese population are in
Operators, Fabricators and Laborers so that in comparison with whites less are found in the top occupations. Their occupational distribution also set them apart with other Asian groups. Being the latest Asian migrant group, the Vietnamese find themselves at a disadvantage for reasons like lack of marketable skills that are in demand in the United States labor market. Except for the first wave of 1975-1977, they were mostly "less educated, fisherfolk, and laborers speaking little English" (Garnder et al., 1985). But regardless of what reasons, a D value of twenty between whites and Vietnamese can still be regarded as small.

Overall, the differences in the percentage distribution by occupational categories indicates that the majority of the Asian Americans in 1980 work as managers, professionals and executives. In sum, differences in occupational distribution found between Asian groups and whites is a result of Asians being proportionately greater in higher level of occupations than the whites. As suggested from these findings, assimilation and differentiation cannot be used interchangeably; that is, the more different the less assimilated is not always the case.

2. Whites and the Cohort Groups of Asians

Unlike the indices of dissimilarity in Table Ten where Asian groups were differentiated from whites, those reported in Table Eleven are between whites and each of the four cohort groups within each sub group of Asians. In the
above occupational differentiation by race, the six Asian
groups ranked in comparison with whites from the least
different to the most different as follows: Filipinos,
Japanese, Vietnamese, Chinese and Asian Indians. This base
information leads to another inquiry as to which cohort
group within each Asian group is most similar or different
from whites in occupational distribution. The D’s reported
at the bottom row of Table Eleven show more variation. A
high value of 50.56 percent was calculated between native
born Vietnamese and white. Compared to their foreign born
counterparts only 19.84 percent is required for the foreign
born to achieve a closer occupational distribution with
whites. The occupational distribution of the foreign born
Vietnamese is therefore much closer with whites than the
native born. However caution must be applied in making
conclusions for this particular group. Since they are the
newest migrants to arrive to the United States, the majority
of them are foreign born thus results derived from dividing
Vietnamese by nativity status is not relevant because of too
few cases of native samples. It can be gleaned from this
information that when the native born are excluded, the
difference in occupational distribution between foreign born
Vietnamese and whites (D=19) is similar to the difference
between the total Vietnamese population and whites (D=20)
which suggests that the Vietnamese population is composed
mainly of foreign born.
Table 11. Percentage Differences in the Major Occupational Categories and Index of Dissimilarity of White, Native/Foreign Born Asian Americans, Before 1965 and After 1965 Foreign Born Asian American Males, Aged 25-64 Years Old, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty</td>
<td>-15.80</td>
<td>-7.62</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical, Sales and Administrative Support</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>-4.34</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-3.60</td>
<td>-5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-5.12</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3.68</td>
<td>-5.82</td>
<td>-6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Forestry, Fishing</td>
<td>-4.92</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Production Crafts and Repair</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators, Fabricators and Laborers</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2.50</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>8.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Dissimilarity With Whites</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>19.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.41</td>
<td>29.90</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nativity</td>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>Nativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>Before 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-8.74</td>
<td>-8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-7.88</td>
<td>-5.28</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>17.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>15.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>44.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The foreign born being closer to whites in occupational distribution than the native born is distinctive for the Vietnamese population alone. An inspection of the D's for both foreign born and native born for the other Asian groups showed that in all cases, the native born are closer to the whites in occupational distribution, an indication that the longer one stays in the host country, the more they become alike with the host population. However, the dissimilarity between the foreign borns and whites is because the former actually outperformed the whites in the top-ranked occupational categories. This is best illustrated by the foreign born component of the Asian Indian population. The Asian Indian who migrated before 1965 outranked the whites in the Managerial and Professional Specialty occupations and they are the foreign born group that are least found as Operators, Fabricators and Laborers.

Similar to the foreign born Asian Indians who came before 1965 are the foreign born Koreans who came at the same period (before 1965). Similarity is not only in the amount of percentage change needed (forty-four percent) to have equal distribution with whites but similarity is also found in the percentage differences that both had with whites on the different occupational categories. The after 1965 migrant group of Koreans are closer to the whites' (12.80 percent) so that the total foreign borns of the Korean population is not very dissimilar (14.91 percent)
with the whites. This is in spite of the fact that there is a big gap between Koreans who migrated before 1965 and the whites occupational distribution. Implied from this findings is that the native born Koreans are far more similar to whites with only an 8.59 percent change needed to make the occupational distribution of the two groups equal. Composition of the two groups is especially similar in the top-ranked occupations (0.70 percent) and in the blue collar occupations (0.72 percent and 0.58 percent).

In the case of the Filipino population, variation in the indices of dissimilarity for the different cohort groups is less pronounced (eleven percent and thirteen percent) an indication that the different cohort groups representing roughly the difference in length of stay do not differ in their occupational distribution thus all the cohort groups have similar standing when compared to the white's occupational distribution.

The Chinese is another Asian group where the native born component (25.77 percent) approximates the occupational distribution of the foreign born component (30.66 percent). The foreign born need to change about five percent more than the native born to achieve equality in occupational distribution with whites.

Unlike the Filipinos and the Chinese groups, where indices of dissimilarity are more or less similar, the D's reported for the four cohort groups within the Japanese
population vary. The native born Japanese are very much like the native born Korean wherein both groups differ with whites by about eight percent. Similarity of the native born Japanese and whites occupational distribution is obvious on the following categories: in Technical, Sales and Administrative Support (1.86 percent), the Service occupations (0.76 percent) and in the blue collar occupations (1.64 percent and 0.34 percent) respectively. Between the two components of foreign born, the before 1965 migrants have 19.91 percent difference with whites while those who came after 1965 need 33.41 percent change to be equal with whites. In other words, here is another case (in addition to Koreans) where the foreign born of different periods of arrival are different in occupational distribution. But in the case of the Japanese, the after 1965 rather than the before 1965 are more different with whites. More Japanese in this cohort group are found in the white collar occupation, about twenty-four percent more than the whites while the latter are about twenty-nine percent more in the blue collar occupations. The Japanese latest immigrants (the after 1965) in particular are better off than those who came before them because they are likely employed by "multinational conglomerates", which means that they do not have to compete with whites for lucrative jobs (Nee and Sanders, 1985).
The above occupational differentiation between cohort groups and whites provided important information regarding the impact of length of stay on occupational distribution. The findings in this section show that in all cases except the Vietnamese, the native born population were more similar to the occupational distribution of the whites than foreign born. Differentiation by migration status (foreign born components) showed inconsistent results. The occupational distribution of the before 1965 Koreans and Asian Indians were more different from that of the whites. In the case of the Japanese, it is the after 1965 migrant group who were found to be more different with whites. Filipinos and Chinese were the two Asian groups where foreign born are more alike with respect to that of the whites.

In sum, cohort group comparisons with whites identified systematic differences. Native born Asian Americans work in much the same occupations as whites. The foreign borns are differentiated with whites because they are holding occupations of higher status, for example the before 1965 foreign born migrants in the Korean and Asian Indian population and the after 1965 foreign born migrants in the Japanese population.

3. Intercohort differences in occupational distribution

The above comparisons showed how much each of the cohort groups within each sub-group of Asians differed with whites in occupational distribution. The relative
differences found for each cohort group with white which is the common comparative group, tells more or less how each group would differ in their occupational distribution. The following indices explicitly report the differences between cohort groups that would further facilitate interpretation. Comparison was made by nativity status (between native or foreign born) and by migration status (between the foreign born who came before or after 1965). In each respective comparison, the native born and the before 1965 foreign born group serve as the standard population (see Table Twelve).

The highest D value computed was 44.94, the percentage change needed for foreign born Vietnamese to be alike in occupational distribution with native born. The high D value reported for this pair, reiterates what was said earlier, is more because the Vietnamese population is predominantly foreign born and there are few cases of native born. The lowest D value computed was 6.46 percent found between the before and after 1965 foreign Filipino migrants. The difference in occupational distribution between Chinese foreign born who came in two different periods is also small (9.78 percent). In general, the occupational distribution between foreign born groups of different migration periods were found to be more similar than that of those between Asians of two different nativity status. The exception was Koreans, wherein a 37.45 percent change is needed for the after 1965 to equal the occupational distribution of the
Table 12. Percentage Differences of Major Occupational Categories and Index of Dissimilarity of Asian American Males, aged 25-64 years old by their Nativity Status (native born vs. foreign born) and by their migration status (before 1965 and after 1965), 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference in Nativity Migration</td>
<td>Difference in Migration</td>
<td>Difference in Nativity Migration</td>
<td>Difference in Migration</td>
<td>Difference in Nativity Migration</td>
<td>Difference in Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and Professional Specialty</td>
<td>-11.12</td>
<td>-14.10</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>-10.20</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>37.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical, Sales and Administrative Support</td>
<td>-2.74</td>
<td>-2.60</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>-2.24</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-18.74</td>
<td>-4.36</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Forestry and Fishing</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision Production, Craft and Repair</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators, Fabricators and Laborers</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-3.22</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>-3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Dissimilarity</td>
<td>19.87</td>
<td>16.69</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
before 1965 foreign born Korean migrants. This rather big "D" value is traced from the bigger proportion of the before 1965 foreign born migrants in the highest occupational category. More of the after 1965 foreign born Koreans are found in the Service occupations and in blue collar occupations. The explanation for this as stated in the previous section is due to self employment or commercial trade occupations. Other than the difference found between foreign born in the Korean population, most of the occupational difference found were between native and foreign born which is of course due to higher occupational status of the foreign born. The foreign born Asian Americans in general therefore did not only exceed white but also the proportions for the native born workers in their respective groups.

Unlike the native born where their citizenship has been ascribed to them at birth, the foreign born have to work their way into the United States to achieve their citizenship. The foreign born not only have the credentials but also they possess the motivation to succeed. This has been the standard explanation for the relatively socioeconomic gains of foreign born (Chiswick, 1979; United States Department of Labor, 1979).
Summary of Findings: Differences in Occupational Distribution

The indices of dissimilarity as measure of differentiation has several limitations, one of which is that it does not show directional differences. This limitation, was compensated here by reporting the differences in the percentage distribution between groups in each of the occupational category. There are a total of thirty-one paired groups, nineteen of which were comparisons made with whites. Among all these comparisons, it can be generally stated that the occupational distribution of the Filipinos is the closest to that of the whites. The historical background of the Asians in the United States has documented that Filipinos are part of both old and the new wave of Asian migrants. Subdividing the Filipinos into four cohort groups by their migration and the nativity status revealed that the occupational distribution of the different cohort groups are much alike and therefore when compared to that of white, each cohort group nearly approximates the whites' occupational distribution. The Filipinos are one of the few Asian groups that can communicate fairly well in English, the language is used as the medium of instruction. The ability to communicate in English minimizes problems often associated with newly arrived migrants and allows them to match the status of the native born and the whites. English fluency is essential for access to several types of
jobs in the United States (Tienda, 1982). Filipino migrants being more fluent than the other groups of Asian migrants in English is however a hypothetical statement that needs to be proven.

Japanese and the Chinese are the earliest Asian migrants to come to the United States. Their occupational distribution in 1980 show that a disproportionate amount of their population are clearly in the first top two in the occupational ladder. In addition, nearly a fifth part of the Chinese male population remain as service workers while about eighteen percent of the Japanese population works in Precision Production, Crafts and Repairs. Because more whites are in the latter occupations than in the Service occupations, the Japanese occupational distribution is closer to that of the whites' than it is with Chinese. Occupational differentiation by cohort groups shows that Japanese have more variation in occupational distribution within cohort groups. The native born Japanese have similar occupational distribution with whites while the Japanese who came after 1965 are the most different. The after 1965 compared to the native born are less engaged in Farming, Forestry and Fishing and in Blue Collar occupations and instead, they have moved to more Technical and Professional jobs. The Chinese occupational distribution by cohort groups showed that the native born Chinese are also the least different from the whites in occupational structure
because fewer are engaged in Service occupations and more are in the Managerial, Professional and Technical jobs. While this is true for foreign born Chinese especially those who came before 1965, they were also numerous in service type jobs. As a consequence, there is more similarity in occupational distribution between the two sub-groups of foreign born rather than between Chinese of different nativity status.

The Koreans are mostly part of the new wave. Their occupational distribution in relation to the whites is similar. Both the native and foreign born are quite alike in occupational distribution in relation to the whites. The occupational distribution of the before 1965 migrant group was however found to be different from that of other cohort groups and that of the whites because nearly seventy percent of the before 1965 group are in the managerial and professional occupations.

The Asian Indians are clearly a different group from the rest of the Asians. The foreign born, in particular occupy the most prestigious occupations. In comparison with whites, foreign born Asian Indian's are located in higher occupational levels. The before 1965 foreign born group shows a high concentration of managers and professionals. As part of the new wave group, the Asian Indians have proven that length of stay is not a prerequisite for economic gains but more important is the competence and skills they bring
to the labor market. In addition, the Asian Indians like the Filipinos are proficient in English, another plus in their favor.

Unlike the majority of the Asian Americans where they came voluntarily and for economic reasons, the Vietnamese, the most recent Asians to arrive in America, came for a different reason and from different circumstances. They were more political migrants who came to America involuntarily. Moreover, their employment pattern which is in fact also that of the foreign born is inferior when compared to other Asian groups and to whites.

As shown from the above results, heterogeneity in occupational characteristics was not only by race but by nativity and migration status as well. Two consistent findings were found: first, the native borns for all the Asian groups with the exception of the Vietnamese have similar occupational distribution compared to the white majority. The occupational similarity of the native born and white may be interpreted as a sign that the native born have adapted the values and cultural norms of the white majority and second, the foreign born were found different to that of the whites because they were predominantly found in top-ranked occupations which dispelled the common notion that recent immigrants are found only in the lowest jobs.
Returns to Independent Variables

The preceding sections described and differentiated the occupational composition of the different racial groups in the study. The Asian population have somewhat higher occupational distribution than the whites. Of equal importance if not more so, is to find out whether the Asian populations with similar demographical characteristics with whites receive comparable returns in occupational status. This section reports the findings of the returns on occupational status to three groups of independent variables. These three groups of independent variables are presented in three models based upon the theoretical framework outlined in Chapter Two. The first model is the human capital model with experience (age) and education as the variables. The second model is referred to as the assimilation model, and length of stay is the variable added to the human capital variables. The sectoral model is the third model which includes the core-peripheral dichotomy of industries. In each model, the occupational differentials between whites and each sub-group of Asians were evaluated with partial regression coefficients and by decomposition analysis. The basic regression equation that was followed was:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (X_1) + \beta_2 (X_2) \beta_3 (X_3) + \beta_4 (X_4) \]

where:

\[ Y = \text{occupational status} \]
\[ \beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4 = \text{parameters estimated from the data} \]
\[ X_1 = \text{age (experience)}; \]
\[ X_2 = \text{education}; \]
\[ X_3 = \text{length of residence and} \]
\[ X_4 = \text{industrial sector} \]

The occupations of the individuals in the sample were assigned status scores according to the Ford and Gehret scale. The linear regression procedure was then performed separately by racial group. For each of the six major groups in the study, the regression procedure was also done separately for each nativity status (native and foreign born) and migration status (before and 1965). See Table 22. The partial regression coefficients or the slopes (the b's) obtained on the four independent variables for each racial groups were compared at .01, .05 and .10 levels of significance. The coefficients provided a way of assessing the degree to which a racial group is able to convert its age (experience), education, length of stay and sectoral characteristics into occupational status. The obtained regression coefficients were used for cross-racial comparison. A problem encountered was multicollinearity, a common problem in dealing with social science data, where the independent variables are normally intercorrelated. When this condition becomes too extreme, serious estimation arise resulting in large variance of the partial regression coefficients. In the preliminary analysis, the variables
nativity status and length of residence showed multicollinearity. A solution carried out was to combine both variables. It was called length of residence. This procedure was recommended by Lewis-Beck (1980:61).

1. Means of Independent Variables

Table Thirteen presents the standard deviations and the mean values of the relevant characteristics of the racial groups in the study. Mean age for the seven groups in the study ranged from thirty-six years old (Asian Indian and Vietnamese) to forty-two years old (Japanese and whites). The computed mean age for the total Asian population is 39.80. Since age is used in the study as a proxy for work experience, the older a person is, the longer is his work experience and the higher should be his occupational status. One observation from the mean ages of the Asian groups is that the earlier group of Asian migrants (Japanese and Chinese) seem to be a considerably older populations than those more recent migrants. However the standard deviations computed for the later migrants are smaller (S=8.20 for Asian Indians: s=9.21 and s=9.92 for Koreans and Vietnamese respectively) compared to the earlier migrant group whose standard deviation ranged from 10.15 for Filipinos to 11.93 for the Japanese.

The average educational attainment of Asians is higher than that of whites. This is true of each Asian group with the exception of the Vietnamese. The mean educational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>White Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Japanese Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Chinese Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Filipino Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>42.24</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>363638</td>
<td>42.13</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>40.42</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>39.72</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>363638</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity Status</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core/Periphery</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>343660</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>54.63</td>
<td>27.76</td>
<td>363056</td>
<td>58.23</td>
<td>27.24</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>56.03</td>
<td>31.78</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>51.70</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Total Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>36.71</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>36.62</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.43</td>
<td>26.95</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>72.16</td>
<td>25.84</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>44.71</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13, continued
attainment of white men is 14.69 which is slightly higher than that of the Vietnamese (14.06). Asians as a whole had an average schooling of about sixteen years, much higher than that of the whites. Among all Asians, the Asian Indians have the highest mean level of educational attainment (18.40 years). The standard deviations suggest that the racial groups are less heterogeneous in educational attainment. The highest being only 5.31 computed for the Chinese and the lowest is 3.19 found for the Japanese. An important cause of Asian American educational attainment has been the selective effects of United States Immigration laws that emphasize qualifications, skills and training. In addition, it can be speculated, especially for the case of Asian Indians, that most of them came with a student visa to do graduate work. Those who have excellent academic performance manage to compete and if successful they stay for reasons like better opportunity for professional growth. If this conjecture is true, then the high level of educational attainment becomes an incidental screening process to extract the cream of the crop which consequently results in an increase in high-skilled migrants (this is aside from the common fact that most of the Asian Indians came after 1965). Such an interpretation given to Japanese success is from Caudill, 1952; Caudill and DeVos, 1956. They showed that the American middle class and the Japanese put high value on education. But cultural value as an
explanation for educational attainment is hard to measure and therefore has constantly been challenged (Featherman, 1971; Stryker, 1984).

Asians were further described according to their nativity and length of residence. The nativity status was coded as 0 for native-born and 1 for foreign born. The mean nativity status for the total Asian population is .70, meaning 70 percent of the Asian population is foreign born. An exception to this is the Japanese population, 77 percent of which is native born. This confirms the fact that the majority of Asian Americans are fairly newcomers. Similar to the nativity status variable, the length of residence also refers to both native and foreign born Asians, but unlike the former, the latter differentiates the foreign born by the year of immigration. It is therefore not a dichotomous variable, but was coded from six periods of migration as follows: 1 for those who came between 1975-1980; 2 was assigned for the 1970-1974 arrivals; 3 for those who migrated between 1965-1969; 4 for the 1960-1964 arrivals; 5 for the 1950-1959 migrants; 6 for those who came before 1950 and 7 for native born. With this coding scheme, a low mean score indicates recency of arrival to the United States. The results show that the Japanese have the highest mean score (5.92) indicating large early migrants and native born population. The lowest reported mean score was 1.55 obtained by the Vietnamese. As opposed to the Japanese, the
majority of the Vietnamese came only during the 1975-1980 period. Aside from being the latest Asian to migrate to the United States, Vietnamese admission to the United States was politically motivated while the rest of the Asian groups came mainly for economic reasons. As suggested from the standard deviations, small variance is found in this variable. It is not evident from the means but the data also shows that the heaviest influx to the United States came during the 1970-1974 period. Asians are considered to be the fastest growing minority group (Agresta and Bouvier, 1985). These data support this contention; eighty-two percent of Asians have arrived since 1965.

The next variable considered is industry. Treated as a dummy variable, 0 was assigned for core industries and 1 for peripheral industries. The classification of industries is based on Tolbert et al. (1980). The Asian population is equally distributed between core and peripheral industry as indicated by the obtained mean of .46. Two Asian groups, Filipinos and Vietnamese, are most likely to be employed in the core sectors (means of .30 and .33 respectively). The whites on the other hand, had a mean distribution of .36. Thus, the Vietnamese and the Filipinos are the closest to the whites. The mean scores obtained by each group in this variable may be compared to their respective occupational status scores. One might expect that those who are most likely to be in the core sectors (Filipinos, Vietnamese, and
whites) should have higher mean occupational status scores than those racial groups who are most likely to be in the peripheral sectors. The results, however, showed the opposite. The Asian Indians, for example, obtained a mean score of 72.16 on occupational status and yet nearly half of the Asian Indian population in the sample are working in industries classified as peripheral. On the other hand, the lowest mean occupational status score reported was that of the Vietnamese, a majority of whom are more likely in the core sector than in the periphery. In the classification scheme that is being used in the study, much of the professional and related services are classified as periphery, i.e., hospitals, nursing and personal care services, elementary and secondary schools including colleges and universities. Since it has been known that the Asian Indians are mostly professionals, they are most likely placed in this sector. The Vietnamese are found to be concentrated among the last two categories listed, Precision Production, Crafts and Repair and Operators, Fabricators and Laborers. These blue collar occupations are mostly located in the core industries like mining, construction, manufacturing durable and nondurable goods, also transportation, communications, and other public utilities. Also, the Vietnamese mean educational attainment is almost equal to that of the whites, but the latter obtained a mean occupational status score of 54.63 while the Vietnamese had
a mean of only 44.71. A similar disparity was also found between whites and Filipinos. Compared to whites, the Filipinos have higher mean educational attainment, but whites have higher mean score in occupational status. Relative to whites, Filipinos and Vietnamese are more likely to be in occupations not commensurate to their educational attainment, an indication of lower occupational return to education for these two Asian groups.

It is frequently mentioned in the literature that education is a "powerful assimilative force" (Caudill and DeVos, 1965). This is because those who are educated are presumed to be more readily acceptable to the dominant group and also because being educated minimizes cultural and language problems that may be encountered. Education then becomes an important determinant of occupation, the theoretical concept underlying both the status attainment and the human capital theories. The educational advantage of Asians should be expected to be an important factor in their occupational attainment, thus their assimilation too. The following analyses will shed more light on these findings.

**Returns to Human Capital**

Table Fourteen reports results from the regression of occupational status on age and education for each of the racial groups. The Japanese are the Asians who benefit the most in terms of converting their experience (age) into
Table 14. Partial b Regression Coefficients and Standard Errors (b) for the Effect of Human Capital Variables on Occupational Status for White and Asian American males aged 25-64 years, 1980. (standard errors in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Capital Variable</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Total Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.241*</td>
<td>0.232*</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-0.107***</td>
<td>-0.211**</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.057**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
<td>(0.064)</td>
<td>(0.107)</td>
<td>(0.082)</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>-1.084*</td>
<td>-2.741*</td>
<td>-2.287*</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>-3.681*</td>
<td>-1.126*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.879)</td>
<td>(0.353)</td>
<td>(0.709)</td>
<td>(0.968)</td>
<td>(0.636)</td>
<td>(0.774)</td>
<td>(0.232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Squared</td>
<td>0.149*</td>
<td>0.126*</td>
<td>0.194*</td>
<td>0.243*</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
<td>0.142*</td>
<td>0.279*</td>
<td>0.190*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>363,638</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>7,162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rates of return to education on mean within each group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Total Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the mean of Total Asian Group (16.08)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Total Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates significance at .01 level
**indicates significance at .05 level
***indicates significance at .10 level
occupational status. The white returns to experience are only slightly higher. The effect of experience is in the opposite direction for Koreans, that is, as they become older, their occupational status tends to decrease (the sign is opposite for Asian Indians as well, but that coefficient is not statistically discernable from zero). Likewise, experience does not have a significant effect on occupational status of the Vietnamese or Chinese. The regression coefficients for education show that all the racial groups significantly convert their educational attainment to occupational status. Since the best fitting curve for education was the standard form, education and education squared, partial derivatives were computed to determine the returns to each additional year of schooling, using the formula:

$$\partial \text{occup} / \partial \text{ed} = y/y_{\text{ed}}.$$

This technique allows for the nonlinear effects of education on occupation, by including the coefficients of both education and education squared. As shown from the results at the bottom of Table Fourteen, the effect for each racial group was a change of four or five points in occupational status per additional year of schooling. A partial derivative can be straightforwardly interpreted as a rate of return that each group gets from schooling, but it must be evaluated at some specific point in the distribution and choice of this point can influence the interpretation. In
this study returns reported were based on two different points; the first row is based on the respective means of each group while the second row is based on the mean of the total Asian population. Computed either way, the returns show little variation among the different racial groups. Each racial group adds four or five points in occupational status for every additional year of education, as do whites. In other words, none among the different racial groups can be considered more effective than others in converting their educational attainment into occupational status. It appears therefore from these results that a substantial share of Asian Americans economic success arises from their above average educational achievement not from a superior return to education. As reported above, Asians have higher mean educational attainment than whites. Similar findings have been reported in earlier studies (Chiswick 1979; Gwartney and Long, 1978; Hirschman and Wong, 1979).

In sum, regressing experience and education on occupational status for each racial group reveals that of the two variables under the human capital model, education was found to be a better predictor than experience. Experience does not have a significant effect on three groups of Asians, mainly the Chinese, Asian Indians, and the Vietnamese.

The regression results show the varying effects of human capital variables on each of the racial groups. The
analysis was further expanded by decomposition technique. This was done by separating and estimating a means or composition component by weighing the differences in composition by a set of regression coefficients and estimating the slopes or rates of components by weighing the differences in coefficients by a set of composition (means). Since the whites serve as the standard population, the weights assigned were from that of the whites. Four components were drawn from this procedure. The first component is the intercept component reflecting the difference in the intercepts of whites and a sub-group of Asian. This is essentially the residual whose values is uniform over all variables. The second component is the difference in rates or coefficients between whites and an Asian sub-group in their ability to convert a demographic characteristic into occupational status. In other words, the rate component indicates the amount by which the racial group in occupational status would change if returns to predictor variables (human capital, length of stay and core/periphery) were identical to both populations. (i.e., Japanese occupational status would change by fifteen points more than whites because of returns to human capital). Inferences concerning discrimination can be made from this component. Tienda et al. (1987) have called this the discrimination component. The third component is the difference in characteristics or composition which
represents the amount by which racial gap in occupational status would change (increase or decrease) by assigning the mean values of the white characteristics to each sub-group of Asian while statistically controlling the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. This was done in the study by weighing the difference in mean values by the partial slopes (coefficients) of the sub-group of Asian for each of the predictor variable. The fourth component is called the interaction component which is interpreted as the effect of jointly changing both the mean and regression coefficient over the effects of changing them one at a time (Iams and Thornton, 1975:344).

The analysis in this study focuses on the second and the third components and therefore specifically aim to find out which of the two components (rate or composition) would produce more changes in occupational status for the Asian group in question, relative to whites. Following Iams and Thornton (1975), the following formula was calculated:

\[(X_w - Y_a) = (\beta_0 w - \beta_0 a) + \sum \alpha (\beta_i w - \beta_i a) + \sum \beta_i (X_i w - X_i a) + \sum (X_i w - X_i a) (\beta_i w - \beta_i a)\]

where the subscripts w and a refer to white and Asian respectively. The first right hand term shows the portion of that total difference (\(Y_w - Y_a\)) that is due to difference in intercept between whites and a particular Asian group; the second term is the contribution of the difference in rates of returns; the third term is the contribution in
compositional differences; and the last term of the equation is the position due to interaction effects.

The primary interest in this section of the study is the difference due to human capital differences between whites and each of the Asian racial groups as shown in column three of Table Fifteen. The Japanese and the Asian Indians are the only two Asian groups whose returns to human capital characteristics are greater than whites (as indicated by the negative components -15.51 and -3.45 respectively). Compared to the remaining four major Asian groups, whites are better but the differences are small. Only a 9.00 difference was found between Filipinos and whites. The biggest occupational difference was found for the Vietnamese where a 34.47 difference was computed. The total Asian population differs with whites by 6.73.

The second panel of the Table shows the components (rates or composition) of the occupational differences due to human capital. Because Japanese and Asian Indians are better than whites in converting their human capital characteristics, the data for these particular groups are interpreted separately from the rest of the comparisons. The negative figures correspond to the disadvantage of whites. Results show that the Japanese edge over whites is more from education than from experience. In both rates and composition returns, Japanese are higher than whites, about 10 points higher in rates of returns and six points higher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Due to Intercept Difference Coefficient</th>
<th>Due to Human Capital Difference Coefficient</th>
<th>Total Differences Coefficient</th>
<th>Human Capital Differences, in Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>-15.51</td>
<td>-3.71</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>-17.06</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>-5.86</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>-28.89</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>-2.74</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As. Indian</td>
<td>-14.03</td>
<td>-3.45</td>
<td>-17.48</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>-24.08</td>
<td>34.47</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Asian</td>
<td>-9.51</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>-2.78</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in composition returns. As far as experience is concerned, whites have the advantage by less than one point. Similarly, Asian Indians do better than whites in education than in experience. But unlike the Japanese, who got better returns in rates and composition, the Asian Indians advantage over whites is solely attributable to composition in education. Rates of returns to education of whites are ten points higher compared to the Asian Indians while in composition, Asian Indian are better than whites by fifteen points. In addition to lower rates of returns in education, the Asian Indians are also inferior to whites in experience by ten points but because of extremely higher composition, Asian Indians had a higher overall return to human capital characteristics.

A quick inspection of the results between the occupational differences due to human capital between whites and the remaining groups of Asians (Chinese, Filipinos, Koreans and Vietnamese) show that whites have higher total rates of returns while each of the compared Asian groups have higher total composition returns with the exception of the Vietnamese. It goes to show then that when occupational difference due to human capital are separated from those due to differences in the intercepts, the whites showed an advantage in providing higher rates to human capital characteristics. The Asians (not included are Japanese and
Vietnamese) in turn produce higher composition returns. This is of course due to more years of schooling.

The findings suggest that the higher composition returns of Asians do not make them at par with whites except when composition characteristics are extremely high, as in the case of the Asian Indians. The occupational differences between whites and the majority of the Asian groups lies mainly in the difference in rates in human capital characteristics which implies that given the same compositional characteristics, say for example with Chinese, Filipinos and Koreans, the whites would likely receive higher rewards. In other words, educational composition of these Asian groups has not been translated into commensurate occupational position as the whites. The Japanese are the only Asian group that outperformed whites in both rates and compositional returns and seemingly about the only Asian group that has received full structural economic assimilation by this measure.

Returns to the Assimilation Variables

The assimilation model of occupational attainment hypothesizes that aside from education, the length of residence of migrants is a key variable in their incorporation into the dominant society. Length of residence has been coded one through seven. Codes one through six represent the foreign born population wherein code one stands for the group who arrive the latest and code
six for the group who came the earliest. The native born population was coded seven. Thus in the second model our primary concern is to determine the effects of length of residence variable on the occupational status of Asian groups. The results provide comparisons on how each of the Asian groups convert their length of residence into occupational status while controlling for the human capital variables. In our preliminary analysis, assimilation includes two variables -- nativity and length of residence, but because of multicollinearity, the dichotomous variable, nativity, was deleted. Furthermore, this model enables us to compare the results of two equations which actually correspond to two questions. In the human capital variables equation, the question is, what are the returns to human capital for each of the racial groups? In the present equation, the answer that is being sought is what are the occupational status returns to length of residence net of human capital characteristics?

Table Sixteen shows that human capital variables continue to have a significant impact on occupational status, net of length of residence. Note that experience (age) has a negative effect on occupational status for four of the six Asian groups (though it is only statistically significant for two groups). Length of residence significantly contributes to the occupational attainment of at least three of the six major groups: Chinese, Filipino
Table 16. Partial b regression coefficients and standard errors (b) for the effects of human capital variables and length of residence variable on occupational status for Asian American Males Aged 25-64 years old, 1980. (Standard errors in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Total Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.246*</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>-0.120***</td>
<td>-0.275*</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.064)</td>
<td>(0.110)</td>
<td>(0.087)</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>-1.326*</td>
<td>-3.098*</td>
<td>-2.353*</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-3.692*</td>
<td>-1.448*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.881)</td>
<td>(0.349)</td>
<td>(0.705)</td>
<td>(0.964)</td>
<td>(0.637)</td>
<td>(0.774)</td>
<td>(0.233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Squared</td>
<td>0.123*</td>
<td>0.199*</td>
<td>0.263*</td>
<td>0.200*</td>
<td>0.140*</td>
<td>0.270*</td>
<td>0.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
<td>-0.358</td>
<td>1.863*</td>
<td>1.581*</td>
<td>1.660*</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>1.655</td>
<td>1.133*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.283)</td>
<td>(0.220)</td>
<td>(0.292)</td>
<td>(0.656)</td>
<td>(0.408)</td>
<td>(1.563)</td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>7,162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rates of return to education based on mean within each group:
- 5.10
- 4.87
- 5.14
- 3.92
- 5.02
- 3.85
- 5.07

Based on mean of Total Asian (16.08):
- 5.14
- 5.07
- 5.32
- 3.77
- 4.38
- 4.89
- 0

*Indicates significance at .01 level
**Indicates significance at .05 level
***Indicates significance at .10 level
and Korean. Although significant effects were not found for Japanese, Asian Indians and Vietnamese, length of residence was found to be significant for the total Asian population. Because length of residence was not significant for three migrant groups in the study it can be implied that length of stay in the United States experience is not as important a variable as education. Our findings do not necessarily run counter to Chiswick, (1979) who emphasizes the importance of length of residence as a venue for the immigrant to gain knowledge of the American culture, learn the language, and modify his or her skills accordingly. That is, in assimilation theory, the migrant undergoes "Americanization" or skill adjustment, thus improving his economic stability.

The findings presented here show that length of residence can become irrelevant to both the oldest group of migrants (Japanese) and to the newcomers (Asian Indians and Koreans), that is, at the extremes.

As shown in Table Seventeen the total difference due to human capital and assimilation variables was computed for each of the racial groups in the study. For each of the variables, the purpose is to know whether "rates" produce more occupational difference than "composition" or vice versa. Unlike the previous decomposition analysis where whites serve as the reference group, in this analysis, whites cannot be the comparison group because length of residence was not defined for this group and instead the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Due to Intercept Difference Coefficient</th>
<th>Due to Human Capital and Length of Residence Difference Coefficient</th>
<th>Total Difference Coefficient</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Composition Interaction</th>
<th>Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>-25.77</td>
<td>28.06</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21.55</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Length of Res.</td>
<td>-8.04</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>-4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>-3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>-9.09</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Length of Res.</td>
<td>-5.27</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>-3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>-3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>-39.15</td>
<td>40.09</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>28.08</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Length of Res.</td>
<td>-4.60</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>-8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43.77</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>-7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>-23.69</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>-13.81</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>-10.12</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Length of Res.</td>
<td>-3.17</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>-5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>-5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>-31.56</td>
<td>45.65</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>33.99</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Length of Res.</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>-9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>-4.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Japanese were the base population for the five major Asian groups. Three reasons justify this choice: First, along with Chinese, the Japanese are among the first group of Asians to arrive in the United States. Second, unlike the Chinese, the Japanese population is composed mainly of native born. Following the contention of the assimilationist perspective, it is presumed that length of stay and a large native-born population are associated with a degree of assimilation. Hence, the Japanese would have acquired characteristics similar to the majority population (Featherman and Hauser, 1979:444). Thirdly, the Japanese, as reported above and shown in Table Fifteen, have received greater returns on human capital characteristics than whites.

With the above argument, of all Asians, the Japanese most nearly approximate the whites. In the decomposition analysis shown in Table Seventeen the occupational differences due to the influence of the human capital and length of residence between the Japanese and the remaining Asian groups were computed. None of the Asians being compared has higher returns than the Japanese. However, there is very small occupational difference found between Japanese and the Asian Indians (9.88). A 16.02 difference was found between Japanese and the Filipinos. The Vietnamese were found to be the most dissimilar to the Japanese, a coefficient difference of 45.65. This is
practically how these Asian groups stand when compared to the whites. The components of these differences show that the Japanese produce higher rates than any of the Asian groups. All of the Asians, as a matter of fact, gain higher rates of returns in length of residence (as shown by the negative results). The total returns (rates, composition and interaction) show that the Asian Indians are the least different compared to the Japanese, and the only Asian group that surpasses the Japanese (-7.0) in the total composition returns. The composition difference was also found to be very small for the rest of the Asian group.

The difference in occupational attainment between the Japanese and the rest of the Asian population groups is therefore solely attributed to the differential rates of returns to human capital characteristics rather than variation due to length of residence.

Compared to the whites, on the differences in occupation due to human capital characteristics, (Table Fifteen), the Asians are not as different as when they are compared to the Japanese on the differences due to both human capital characteristics and length of residence (Table Seventeen). It has been known that these differences in occupation are not due to length of residence but due to better rates of returns in human capital characteristics compared to the Japanese. This implies that the five major groups of Asians are closer to being assimilated with whites.
than with the Japanese. This is expected because the Japanese have surpassed the whites in getting higher returns for their human capital characteristics.

Returns to Industrial Sector

In the second model, length of residence was added to determine their effect net of human capital. In the third model, the sectoral variable was added to find out whether sectoral characteristics make a difference in the occupational attainment of Asians net of the other variables.

Table Eighteen summarizes the results of the regressions for this occupational model by racial groups. Comparing the coefficients of the different racial groups shows that for both Japanese and Chinese there is a substantial decrease in occupational status from being in the peripheral sector (-14.353 and -14.671 respectively). This may be explained by the type of occupations in which they are engaged. It can be that the number of Japanese engaging in the Farming, Forestry and Fishing occupations are relatively large compared to other Asian groups, while a good portion of the Chinese population is still found in the service occupations. This is the most probable reason why the occupational status of these two Asian American groups have been so much affected by their being in the peripheral sector of the economy. Among the Asian groups, it is the Koreans and the Asian Indians who were least likely to be
Table 18. Partial b regression coefficients and standard errors (b) for the effects of human capital, length of residence and core-periphery sector variables on occupational status for white and Asian American males, aged 25-64 years old. 1980. (standard errors in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Asian Indian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Total Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.238*</td>
<td>0.252*</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>-0.105***</td>
<td>-0.282*</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
<td>(0.087)</td>
<td>(0.127)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.240*</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>-1.414*</td>
<td>-3.444*</td>
<td>-2.348*</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td>-3.771*</td>
<td>-1.691*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.653)</td>
<td>(0.838)</td>
<td>(0.335)</td>
<td>(0.697)</td>
<td>(0.961)</td>
<td>(0.634)</td>
<td>(0.767)</td>
<td>(0.228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Squared</td>
<td>0.160*</td>
<td>0.129*</td>
<td>0.106*</td>
<td>0.279*</td>
<td>0.199*</td>
<td>0.161*</td>
<td>0.282*</td>
<td>0.201*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
<td>-0.721*</td>
<td>1.364*</td>
<td>1.501*</td>
<td>1.555*</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>1.720</td>
<td>0.930*</td>
<td>0.930*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.270)</td>
<td>(0.263)</td>
<td>(0.287)</td>
<td>(0.655)</td>
<td>(0.489)</td>
<td>(1.549)</td>
<td>(0.116)</td>
<td>(0.116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.073)</td>
<td>(1.083)</td>
<td>(1.139)</td>
<td>(1.252)</td>
<td>(1.929)</td>
<td>(1.281)</td>
<td>(2.322)</td>
<td>(0.536)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>353,656</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>7162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates significance at .01 level
**indicates significance at .05 level
***indicates significance at .10 level
affected by being in the peripheral sector. Both groups decrease their occupational status by about four points. The high level of educational attainment of these groups may have probably compensated for their being in the inferior sector of the industry. Killingsworth (1983:257) emphasizes the importance of the implication of labor market segmentation on individuals of different skills. His is based on the consequence to earnings where he said that "a low-skilled individual who works in the secondary sector will usually get a lower wage than he would get were he employed in the primary sector. High-skilled employees, on the other hand, will generally earn about the same in either sector." Based from this explanation, Koreans and Asian Indians are less penalized for being in the peripheral sector because they are highly-skilled. The Vietnamese and the whites are alike in the effect of sectoral characteristics on their occupational status. The Vietnamese have lower occupational distribution and are in the core sector of the economy. Their being there, following Killingsworth's justification, is more to their advantage than if they were placed in the periphery sector. The Filipinos receive less than eight points for being in the peripheral sector. A notable observation is that the older Asian migrants are more affected by being in the peripheral sector compared to the later migrant groups. In general, the effect of being in the peripheral sector is
more severe for Asians (-10.05) than for whites (-6.78).

But as noted, there is within-group variation. The Asian
groups that were most affected by being in the peripheral
sector were the Japanese and the Chinese. The Asian Indians
and the Koreans, on the other hand, were least affected,
even less so than whites. Despite racial variations in the
size of the effect of economic sector on occupational
attainment, our findings support the notion that sectoral
placement significantly affects occupational attainment.
Thus the human capital and status attainment approaches to
stratification can not sufficiently explain the processes of
occupational attainment. The organization of work and
industry are also important in assessing occupational
attainment.

With the inclusion of core-periphery in the third
model, two separate component analyses were computed: one
is to differentiate each Asian group with whites and two to
differentiate them with Japaneses.

Table Nineteen shows the decomposition analysis that
differentiates each Asian group with whites. The
coefficient of differences due to human capital and core-
periphery are shown in column three of Table Nineteen.

Given an identical returns as whites, Japanese and
Asian Indians are shown to have higher occupational status
than whites. One can recall that these same Asian groups
exceeded whites in occupational status after accounting for
differences due to human capital (see Table Fifteen) but it is worth noting that when both core-periphery and human capital differences are accounted for, the resulting differences between whites and each of these Asian groups became smaller. For instance, Japanese and whites differ by -15.51 due to human capital, and this difference became -7.63 when both human capital and core-periphery were accounted for, while the differences between whites and Asian Indians were from -3.45 (human capital) to -1.94 (human capital and core-periphery). The opposite was found between whites and the remaining Asian groups. The differences became larger when occupational status was differentiated by both human capital and core-periphery variables than when occupational status was differentiated on only human capital variables (See Table Fifteen). With smaller differences for Japanese and Asian Indians and bigger differences for Chinese, Filipinos, Koreans (negligible difference found for the Vietnamese) it can be gleaned that the advantage of whites over the total Asian population has increased when core-periphery variables were added to the analysis. The small advantage of the Japanese over the whites lies mainly in better rates and compositional returns in education while the Asian indians have better composition returns in education and slightly higher rates in core-periphery variables. On the other hand, the whites advantage over the remaining Asian groups
Table 19. Decomposition of Components of White-Asian Americans Occupational Differences Due to Returns in Human Capital and Core-Peripheral Differences, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Age Difference</th>
<th>Education Difference</th>
<th>Core-Peripheral Difference</th>
<th>Total Difference</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>-7.63</td>
<td>-3.95</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>-32.15</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>-7.55</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>8.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>-30.49</td>
<td>27.72</td>
<td>-2.77</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>18.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As. Indian</td>
<td>-15.48</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>17.42</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>10.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>-24.06</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>27.77</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Asian</td>
<td>-15.22</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is solely due to higher rates of returns. Differences in composition returns were small, in fact, some Asian groups (Filipinos and Koreans) are higher than whites on this component specifically on education but not on core-periphery and experience. The difference between whites and the total Asian population was also found to be small (12.55). The white population has in general improved their occupational status when core/periphery was added to the human capital variables. They generally have produced higher rates and composition in both variables with only a few exceptions.

The occupational differentiation between Japanese and each of the Asian groups due to human capital, length of residence and core-periphery variables is shown in Table Twenty.

Assuming that the five Asian groups have identical returns to these characteristics, it was found that none among the Asians being compared is better than the Japanese. Asian Indians and Filipinos are the closest to the Japanese with 0.85 and 7.98 differences respectively. Also shown in Table Twenty are the distribution of the components of differences into rates and composition. In general, Japanese produced higher rates and composition than any of the compared Asian group. There are, however, some exceptions. For instance, Asian Indians show higher compositional returns; rates in length of residence as well
as core-periphery are higher for all groups; Koreans and Asian Indians produce higher compositional returns in human capital characteristics (age and education). In other words, Japanese have significantly higher rates on the human capital characteristics and for this sole reason they have enjoyed better occupational status compared to their Asian counterparts. It is implied from these findings that the amount of human capital investment that one brings to the labor market is of less value compared to the degree of conversion one gets in their human capital. The meritocratic assumption of the human capital and status attainment that higher investment equals higher returns is not directly relational. Factors like placement in the core-periphery sector in which discrimination may be a covert element revealed occupational differentiation of the different racial groups in the study.

The decomposition analyses strongly suggest that Asians have increased their gap in occupational attainment with whites with the addition of core/periphery variables as in the case of the Chinese and the Filipinos. The rate of returns of Koreans, Asian Indians and Vietnamese in core-periphery is slightly higher than whites but better returns to human capital characteristics of the whites remains the main factor for their having better occupational attainment. Similarly the edge of the Japanese over the other Asians is not better returns to length of residence, not better
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>12.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>26.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
<td>-7.34</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>-4.37</td>
<td>-9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Periphery</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30.42</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>-3.38</td>
<td>32.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
<td>-6.19</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>-4.69</td>
<td>-8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Periphery</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>-4.61</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>21.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>22.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
<td>-5.19</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>-9.29</td>
<td>-8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Periphery</td>
<td>-5.20</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35.21</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>-7.90</td>
<td>31.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aus. Indian</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>-9.97</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
<td>-3.60</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>-5.71</td>
<td>-6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Periphery</td>
<td>-4.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>-7.50</td>
<td>-5.52</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>30.66</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>39.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
<td>-2.84</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>-6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Periphery</td>
<td>-2.80</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>-4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30.47</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>-7.72</td>
<td>35.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
returns to core/periphery variables but a factor of better returns to human capital characteristics.

Summary and Conclusions: Returns to the Independent Variables

Our analysis was designed to examine the existence of differential returns to occupational attainment among whites and Asian Americans as well as Japanese and the remaining Asian groups and to explore the factors associated with these differential rates of returns. By regressing the seven racial groups' occupational attainment on education, age, length of residence, and core/periphery, we found the following variables that are significant for each racial group: Education was found to be significant for all racial groups: experience (age) is significant for whites, Japanese, Filipino and Koreans but not for Chinese, Asian Indians and Vietnamese; length of residence net of human capital characteristics was a significant factor for Chinese, Filipinos and Koreans; net of human capital characteristics and core/periphery, length of residence became a significant factor for the Japanese as well; length of residence, however remained insignificant for Asian Indians and Vietnamese; core/periphery net of all the variables was found significant for all racial groups including whites. Our findings strongly suggest that education and core-periphery are the two factors that significantly affect occupational status.
The actual occupational differentiation between whites and each of the Asian groups was shown using the decomposition approach. Whites have produced higher rates of returns to human capital characteristics than the majority of the Asians. Japanese and Asian Indians were the only Asian groups that surpassed the whites in occupational status if returns to human capital characteristics are made identical to whites. Each of the Asian groups were also differentiated from the Japanese. None of the Asians when compared with returns made by the Japanese is better because of the same advantage that the whites had over the majority of Asians, which is higher rates of returns in human capital characteristics.

The above findings therefore led to a conclusion that the most settled of the Asian population were the Japanese and the Asian Indians. The former is part of the old wave of migrant groups while the majority of the latter population came after the reform of 1965. Although these two groups differ according to their migration period, it only indicates that two different factors are working favorably for each group. The high rate of return in education is the main contributory factor for the occupational achievement of the Japanese while in the case of the Asian Indians, it is their impressive levels of educational attainment. Therefore high compositional returns puts the latter in a better occupational status than
whites, considering the fact that they are largely foreign born and are a relatively younger group (less work experience). To be at par with the Japanese, the Asian Indians, however, need more years of work experience and better rate of return in education.

The most disadvantaged group is the Vietnamese. It is not because they have the disadvantage of having the shortest stay in the United States but it is more because they have less human capital investment.

Thus, in response to the questions raised earlier, it was found that occupational differences between whites and each of the Asian American population group (except Japanese and Asian Indians) are due mainly to higher rates of return for whites in human capital characteristics. Past studies have attributed Asian American's success to their high levels of education; the present findings show that in spite of the continuing achievement of the majority of Asians in educational attainment, they still tend to receive lower rates of return compared to the whites, thus lower occupational status. In order to compensate for the lower rates of return to human capital characteristics Asians must have exceedingly high compositional returns to human capital and core/periphery as exemplified and found in this study by the Asian Indians. So far, the only Asian group that has achieved parity with whites in terms of rates of return in human capital are the Japanese. In fact, not only did the
Japanese exceed the other Asian minorities but also they were slightly higher than whites in occupational status. The Japanese seem to be the only Asian that deserve the "ideal minority image". However, if assimilation means the existence of similarities in economic characteristics between minorities and whites, then assimilation must indeed have occurred to the majority of the Asian groups considering the small occupational differences (controlling for human capital and core/periphery) found between each Asian group and whites.

A schematic presentation of the results of the regression analyses is shown below:

Figure 7: Effects of human capital variables, length of residence and core-periphery sector variables on occupational status.
Returns to the Independent Variables by Nativity and Migration Statuses

The preceding regression analyses did not take into consideration the migration and nativity statuses of the Asian population. In the following analyses each of the sub-Asian groups was subdivided according to their nativity status (whether native born or foreign born) and their migration status (whether they immigrated before or after 1965). Regressing occupational status on the human capital and core/periphery variables for each of the cohort groups aims to determine whether differences in length of stay produce differential rates of returns to human capital and core/periphery characteristics.

Occupational Status Mean Scores

The means of these cohort groups are shown in Table Twenty-One. Comparison by nativity status shows that the foreign born in all the sub-groups of Asians (with the exception of the Chinese) have a higher mean occupational status compared to their native born counterparts, further evidence of the impact of the 1965 Act. The largest difference in mean occupational status scores was found between the native and foreign born Asian Indians, where about fifteen points difference in mean scores was obtained. The foreign born Chinese were higher by eleven points. As observed from the occupational distribution of these cohort groups, the native born Chinese population has been moving
away from the service occupations toward professional type occupations, whereas a proportionate number of foreign born Chinese are still found in the service occupations (see Chapter Four, Table Eight). Thus, length of stay seems to be an important factor in determining the occupational attainment of the Chinese.

The categories before 1965 and after 1965 cohort groups differentiate the length of stay of the foreign borns. Table Twenty-One shows that in almost all the groups, the before 1965 cohort groups have higher mean occupational status scores compared to the after 1965 cohort groups. The superiority of the before 1965 group is especially prominent in the Korean population. The obtained mean was 75.51 for the before 1965 group as compared to only 55.95 for the after 1965 cohort group. However the Japanese population who came before 1965 on the top-ranked occupations (see Table Nine and Figure Six) is an indication of their high occupational status. In much of the preceding discussion, the effects of the 1965 Immigration Act on the occupational composition of the Asian migrants have been overemphasized such that it can be interpreted that positive selection must have occurred only to the after 1965 arrivals. The high occupational status of the before 1965 arrivals show that they were also as favorably selected and that the fact that they have the advantage of having a longer stay gives them a slight edge in comparison to their after 1965 counterparts.
Table 21. Mean Occupational Status of Asian American Males aged 25-64 years old by nativity (native/foreign born) and Migration (before or after 1965) Statuses, 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Occupational Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPANESE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Born</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>57.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>61.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated before 1965</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>54.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated after 1965</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>64.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINESE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Born</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>64.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>53.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated before 1965</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>58.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated after 1965</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>51.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILIPINO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Born</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>47.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>52.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated before 1965</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>53.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated after 1965</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>52.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Born</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>57.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated before 1965</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated after 1965</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>55.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN INDIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Born</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>72.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated before 1965</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated after 1965</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>72.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIETNAMESE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Born</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>44.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated before 1965</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated after 1965</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>44.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In sum, a quick inspection of the mean scores obtained for each of the cohort group show that the difference in status scores of the before 1965 and after 1965 (except Koreans) are not as much salient as the differences between cohort groups of different nativity status, an indication that the foreign borns in general, regardless of their period of arrival and nationality (except Chinese) have higher occupational status than the native born.

Returns to Human Captial and Core/Periphery Characteristics

The rates at which each of the cohort groups convert their human capital and core/periphery characteristics are shown in Table Twenty-two, all models were shown to demonstrate whether rates of returns on occupational status would vary depending upon the variables that were held constant. In models two and four the variables "education squared" was added to show non-linear effects of education. In models one and two, the effect of human capital characteristics on occupational status was obtained, while in models three and four, the effect of core/periphery characteristics on occupational status was determined while holding the human capital variables constant.

a. Japanese

Although the mean occupational status of the Japanese foreign born was found to be higher than the native born group, the latter group have a slight edge (the difference is less than one status point) in
converting their educational attainment into occupational status. The foreign born, however, get higher returns to their experience than the native born after controlling for education and core/periphery characteristics (.38 vs. .23).

The before 1965 have almost the same rate (-13.546 and -13.551) of converting their core/periphery characteristics as the native born population. The before 1965 cohort group converts their educational attainment one status point higher than the after 1965 group, whereas, in experience, the after 1965 benefit more than the before 1965.

In all the models, shown in Table Twenty-two all the different cohort groups significantly convert the human capital and core/periphery characteristics into occupational status except in models two and four where education does not show significance in occupational status for the Japanese population who came before 1965.

b. The Chinese

The same observation was found for the Chinese population wherein the native born population are more likely to convert their educational attainment into occupational status than the foreign born counterparts. Experience has been found to be significant for both the native born and the foreign born who came after
Table 22. Partial b regression coefficients and standard errors for the effects of human capital variables and core/periphery variables on occupational status for Asian American males aged 25-64 years old by nativity and migration status, 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Populations</th>
<th>Model 1 Age</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Model 2 Age</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Model 3 Industry</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAPANESE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Born (N=1364)</td>
<td>0.232*</td>
<td>5.142*</td>
<td>0.225*</td>
<td>1.593</td>
<td>0.116*</td>
<td>0.242*</td>
<td>4.975*</td>
<td>-13.472*</td>
<td>0.236*</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>-13.566*</td>
<td>0.122*</td>
<td>-13.546*</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td>(0.057) (1.125) (0.036) (0.054) (0.129) (1.221) (0.054) (1.074) (0.036) (1.215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born (N=372)</td>
<td>0.401*</td>
<td>4.297*</td>
<td>0.361*</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.122*</td>
<td>0.402*</td>
<td>3.929*</td>
<td>-17.613*</td>
<td>0.367*</td>
<td>0.509*</td>
<td>-17.510*</td>
<td>0.117*</td>
<td>-17.508*</td>
<td>(0.130)</td>
<td>(0.130) (1.426) (0.046) (0.126) (0.362) (2.438) (0.126) (1.384) (0.045) (2.438)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated Before 1965 (N=99)</td>
<td>0.516**</td>
<td>4.717*</td>
<td>0.492**</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>0.118*</td>
<td>0.482**</td>
<td>4.261*</td>
<td>-13.519*</td>
<td>0.450**</td>
<td>0.771*</td>
<td>-13.551*</td>
<td>0.118*</td>
<td>-13.550*</td>
<td>(0.220)</td>
<td>(0.220) (2.573) (0.084) (0.215) (0.650) (5.286) (0.214) (2.507) (0.082) (5.257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated After 1965 (N=273)</td>
<td>0.671*</td>
<td>3.830*</td>
<td>0.613*</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.117**</td>
<td>0.656*</td>
<td>3.480*</td>
<td>-18.198*</td>
<td>0.602*</td>
<td>0.329*</td>
<td>-18.076*</td>
<td>0.109**</td>
<td>-18.076*</td>
<td>(0.197)</td>
<td>(0.197) (1.786) (0.059) (0.182) (0.453) (2.714) (0.183) (1.655) (0.055) (2.700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINESE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Born (N=436)</td>
<td>0.239*</td>
<td>4.521*</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>1.075*</td>
<td>0.122*</td>
<td>0.182**</td>
<td>4.139*</td>
<td>-12.345*</td>
<td>0.209**</td>
<td>0.573*</td>
<td>-12.488*</td>
<td>0.126*</td>
<td>-12.488*</td>
<td>(0.093)</td>
<td>(0.092) (1.055) (0.036) (0.090) (0.304) (2.065) (0.089) (1.015) (0.034) (2.016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born (N=1435)</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>3.468*</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-1.669*</td>
<td>0.214*</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>3.007*</td>
<td>-17.464*</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-1.661*</td>
<td>-15.416*</td>
<td>0.196*</td>
<td>-15.416*</td>
<td>(0.068)</td>
<td>(0.063) (0.306) (0.152) (0.064) (0.129) (1.443) (0.061) (0.370) (0.014) (1.305)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated Before 1965 (N=609)</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>3.255*</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>-0.965*</td>
<td>0.178*</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>2.899*</td>
<td>-13.073*</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>-1.103***</td>
<td>-11.961*</td>
<td>0.168*</td>
<td>-11.961*</td>
<td>(0.131)</td>
<td>(0.125) (0.654) (0.025) (0.128) (0.233) (2.640) (0.121) (0.637) (0.025) (2.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated After 1965 (N=1032)</td>
<td>-0.170**</td>
<td>3.452*</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>-2.025*</td>
<td>0.229*</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>2.994*</td>
<td>-18.811**</td>
<td>-0.140***</td>
<td>-1.916*</td>
<td>-16.372*</td>
<td>0.206**</td>
<td>-16.372*</td>
<td>(0.085)</td>
<td>(0.156) (0.079) (0.472) (0.048) (0.080) (0.155) (1.708) (0.075) (0.450) (0.017) (1.622)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significance at .01 level
**Indicates significance at .05 level
***Indicates significance at .10 level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native Born (N=277)</th>
<th>Foreign Born (N=1070)</th>
<th>Immigrated Before 1965 (N=197)</th>
<th>Immigrated After 1965 (N=873)</th>
<th>Immigrated Before 1965 (N=673)</th>
<th>Immigrated After 1965 (N=499)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KOREAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Born (N=30)</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>3.372**</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>-13.883</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>-13.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.188)</td>
<td>(1.591)</td>
<td>(0.326)</td>
<td>(17.099)</td>
<td>(0.509)</td>
<td>(17.153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born (N=480)</td>
<td>-0.224**</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>-0.260**</td>
<td>-2.348**</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>-2.233**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
<td>(0.275)</td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
<td>(0.963)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated Before 1965 (N=94)</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>2.352**</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>10.578</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>10.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.394)</td>
<td>(1.142)</td>
<td>(0.470)</td>
<td>(10.876)</td>
<td>(0.467)</td>
<td>(10.873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated After 1965 (N=99)</td>
<td>-0.305**</td>
<td>3.142</td>
<td>-0.303**</td>
<td>-2.403**</td>
<td>0.206**</td>
<td>-2.386**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.124)</td>
<td>(0.290)</td>
<td>(0.121)</td>
<td>(1.013)</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(1.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 22, Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASIAN INDIAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Born (N=36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>2.907*</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>-4.203***</td>
<td>0.334*</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>2.916*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.428)</td>
<td>(6.860)</td>
<td>(6.431)</td>
<td>(2.296)</td>
<td>(0.102)</td>
<td>(0.419)</td>
<td>(0.838)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born (N=905)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>4.229*</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.298</td>
<td>0.190*</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>4.166*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td>(0.168)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.691)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.086)</td>
<td>(0.169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated Before 1965 (N=465)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>3.789*</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>3.340</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>3.729*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.233)</td>
<td>(0.487)</td>
<td>(0.226)</td>
<td>(2.769)</td>
<td>(0.088)</td>
<td>(0.223)</td>
<td>(0.490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated After 1965 (N=400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>4.239*</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.136*</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>4.178*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.098)</td>
<td>(0.179)</td>
<td>(0.096)</td>
<td>(0.717)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.097)</td>
<td>(0.180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIETNAMESE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Born (N=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.216</td>
<td>3.955</td>
<td>3.168</td>
<td>109.753</td>
<td>-4.873</td>
<td>1.582</td>
<td>1.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.525)</td>
<td>(5.065)</td>
<td>(5.617)</td>
<td>(28.583)</td>
<td>(1.314)</td>
<td>(5.330)</td>
<td>(1.132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born (N=310)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>2.602*</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-3.711*</td>
<td>0.279*</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>2.471*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.143)</td>
<td>(0.302)</td>
<td>(0.129)</td>
<td>(0.774)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.142)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1965. However, in the latter group, experience has a negative effect on occupational status (-.18). The data in Table Fourteen tells us that experience is not a significant factor in the occupational attainment of the total Chinese population. Grouping the total Chinese population into four cohort groups reveals that the non-significant value of experience does not apply to all the cohort groups within the total Chinese population.

As far as the core/periphery characteristics are concerned, all the cohort groups decrease their occupational statuses by being in the periphery. However the native born and the foreign born who came before 1965 are less affected by being in the periphery (-12.488 and -11.961 respectively) than the total foreign born (-15.416) and the foreign born who came after 1965 (-16.372).

c. The Filipinos

Unlike the Chinese and the Japanese, the native born and the foreign born in the Filipino population were found to have almost equal returns in the human capital characteristics. The foreign born are however more able to convert their core/periphery characteristics into occupational status than the native born (-8.240 vs. -11.230).
Differences in the returns by foreign group comparison were also mainly found in the core/periphery characteristics. A decrease of seven status points is observed for the after 1965 group while a decrease of ten status points for the before 1965 group.

d. The Koreans

Cohort group comparisons in the Korean population show that only the total foreign born and the after 1965 arrivals significantly convert human capital and core/periphery characteristics into occupational status. The total foreign born and the after 1965 cohort groups receive less than four or five status points for being in the periphery which means these groups receive relatively high returns while for an additional year of schooling, each group receives an increment of three status points.

e. The Asian Indians

In the case of the Asian Indians, experience (age) was not found to be significant in all the cohort groups on all the four models. Moreover, the total foreign born Asian Indians and the after 1965 arrivals are the only two cohort groups who were able to convert their characteristics into occupational status. The after 1965 cohort groups were found to have the highest returns in both educational attainment and core/periphery characteristic, about four additional
status points for every year of schooling and only less than three status points for being in the peripheral sector.

f. The Vietnamese

The Vietnamese population is grouped into two cohorts -- the native and the foreign born (all the foreign born in the Vietnamese sample came after 1965). Both the native and foreign born do not significantly convert their experience (age) into occupational status, while the educational attainment and core/periphery characteristics were significant for the foreign born group only. For every additional year of schooling, the foreign born increase their occupational status by two points. The foreign born Vietnamese population were also found to be less severely penalized in being in the periphery sector (−5.857) than their native born counterparts (−23.532).

**Summary of Findings: Returns to Independent Variables by Migration and Nativity Statuses**

The findings show that in general, all the cohort groups found within the old wave of Asian immigrants i.e., Japanese, Chinese and Filipinos, receive significant returns to their human capital and core/periphery characteristics while among the more recent Asian groups, i.e., Koreans, Asian Indians and the Vietnamese, significant returns to their characteristics were only found in two cohort groups
the total foreign born population and those who came after 1965. See illustration below:

Native Born and Before 1965
Japanese Education Core/Periphery
Chinese Education Core/Periphery
Filipino Experience

Foreign Born and After 1965
Japanese Education Core/Periphery
Chinese Education Core/Periphery
Filipino Experience
Korean
Asian Indian Education Core/Periphery

Figure 8. Effects of human capital variable and core/periphery sector variable on occupational status by nativity and migration statuses.

In brief, the effect of length of stay on the returns to human capital and core/periphery characteristics seemingly appear to be related to whether the Asian group in question was part of the old wave or the new wave. This suggests the importance of inclusion of some specific factors related to the historical conditions of each subgroup of Asians such as the year of arrivals of the first group of immigrants for each nationality, the way each group was received by the majority population during the earlier years of immigration, how they made a living as well as
their residential concentration in the United States, and perhaps the educational and economic background of these immigrants before they immigrated to the United States. These and many other characteristics may or may not fall under any specific sociological theory but are indicative of the occupational differentials of the Asian minorities in the United States.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions and Discussion

This chapter includes a brief summary of the results found in the study, some conclusions from these findings and the limitations of the study. Also covered in this chapter is a discussion of the theoretical implications of the study.

Summary of Findings

Occupational differences by race, nativity status, and migration status were assumed here to be an indicator of the variation in the degree of structural assimilation of the Asian Americans. Interracial and intercohort comparisons were (1) on occupational distribution, and (2) on the returns to three sets of independent variables theoretically derived from neoclassical economic theory, the assimilation perspective, and segmented labor market theory. In addition, the effects of these sets of variables on racial differences in occupational status were summarized using a decomposition technique.

The occupational composition of the Asian Americans (see Tables Six, Eight and Nine) shows that a disproportionate number of Asian Americans were found to be executives, managers and professionals, hence the difference found in occupational distribution between whites and the Asian Americans is partially due to the fact that a majority of Asian Americans, particularly foreign born, are placed in
a higher rung of the occupational ladder than the whites (see Tables Ten, Eleven, and Twelve).

Among all the Asian groups, the Vietnamese are most concentrated in the blue collar occupations (especially in industrial operatives). They are a distinct group mainly because their coming was politically rather than economically motivated. Furthermore, they are the latest group of Asians to arrive in the United States. Late arrival is in itself a handicap because it usually limits opportunities to achieve socioeconomic status. As claimed by the segmented labor market theory, those who arrive late often start at the bottom of the social ladder. In contrast, groups who arrive first can be expected to control social and economic resources. Furthermore, change in the occupational structure from agricultural to technological is another explanation. In addition to being the most recent Asian group, almost no adult Vietnamese are United States born and the foreign born population is also very young which means most of them are still in school, a further indication that the present disadvantage of the Vietnamese could be temporary. Therefore, an upward trend in the Vietnamese occupational structure is likely. Briefly, the reason for the poor performance of the Vietnamese is the circumstances underlying their admission to the United States. Consequently, the modest returns to sociodemographic characteristics received by the Vietnamese
compared to the other racial groups are to be interpreted in this light.

With the Vietnamese as the only exception, the Asian American population has high occupational attainment. There are, however, important variations in the returns to characteristics (human capital, length of residence, and sector) among racial groups, nativity groups and migration groups on occupational attainment.

Racial group comparisons show that the Japanese and whites are best able to convert their human capital characteristics into occupational status. The Koreans and the Asian Indians, on the other hand, receive more returns to their core/periphery characteristics. In other words, these two groups are less penalized being in the peripheral sector.

Comparison by nativity status showed that the native borns of the early Asian migrant groups convert their characteristics to occupational status significantly more than their foreign born counterparts. In contrast, only the foreign born of the later Asian migrant groups are successful in converting their characteristics into occupational attainment.

Likewise, the foreign born were grouped by their period of arrival. Those who came after 1965 were generally found to have a higher returns to education and core/periphery characteristics than those who came at an earlier period.
(before 1965) which means these characteristics are an important mechanism for status attainment among the after 1965 arrivals. The findings in the study show that the before 1965 are more highly concentrated in white collar occupations (see Table Nine and Figure Six) and have higher mean occupational status (see Table Twenty-one). However, if the after 1965 group continues to have higher returns to their characteristics, they may in the future be likely to match the occupational attainment of the before 1965 groups.

The decomposition analysis reported in Tables Fifteen, Nineteen and Twenty revealed that the Japanese and the Asian Indians were the only Asians who exceeded the white rates of returns to human capital investments.

In a broader sense, however, the results and analysis in the study support the view that Asian Americans as a group are on the road to becoming structurally assimilated in the United States. This conclusion is based on the obvious fact that the occupational attainment of the Asian American population is comparatively high, even though the majority have lower rates of return to human capital investments compared to whites. The Vietnamese males were below the other racial groups in their occupational attainments.

Evidently, therefore, the traditional image of immigrants as being poor and unskilled workers making fresh starts in America is not applicable to most Asian American
immigrants because of their achievement in occupational status. Reasons enumerated in the study (see Chapter Four) for the occupational achievements of Asian Americans can be summed up by saying that the Asian Americans are a highly motivated group. Two sources of motivation may have provided the Asian Americans the desire to succeed. First, discrimination of years past which gave Asian Americans strong motivations for mobility (extrinsic motivation). Discrimination can operate in two ways. It can both inhibit mobility or motivate mobility. It is argued here that the latter works for the Asian Americans. Take for instance the exclusion of the early Asian immigrants from the labor unions, a form of discrimination that promoted self employment and ethnic enterprise. The experiences of their forefathers provided a lesson for the new generation of Asian Americans who were observed to be less satisfied in staying in the ethnic enclave (Nee and Sanders, 1985). Instead they pursued a different venue for mobility. The new generation of Asian Americans have used education as an instrument to safeguard themselves from discrimination and persecution. They pursue major courses that can be achieved on the basis of merit like engineering, medicine, pharmacy and dentistry (Lyman, 1977:279-281). These courses can give them the option to have their own private practice, and, if employed by the city or the state, protection against discrimination by the state is sort of guaranteed. Second,
as a result of their being economic rather than political migrants, (except for the Vietnamese) and their being selected under a productivity criterion, they have the innate motivation and ability to succeed more than their countrymen who chose to stay behind (intrinsic motivation). As Chiswick (1980) puts it: "international migrants typically have greater innate ability, greater motivation for personal economic advancement and are more willing to sacrifice current consumption to make investments that may increase future consumption." Those who were part of the old wave migrants would have had the first extrinsic type of motivation and those who came after the enactment of the Immigration Reform Act of 1965 would have the intrinsic type of motivation or the combination of both.

The Japanese and the Asian Indians best exemplify the above sources of motivations. For instance, the Japanese, the Asian group that has lived in the United States the longest have also a long line of discrimination experiences. Two occasions of overt discrimination were often documented: first, during the passage of the Gentlemen's Agreement in 1908 and the second time when they were incarcerated into camps during World War II merely because of their ancestry. Furthermore, they were excluded from labor unions (another form of discrimination) which consequently led them to avoid blue collar work (Bonacich and Modell, 1980:77). Their sources of motivation are therefore more of the first type.
The Asian Indians, on the other hand, like the majority of Asian Americans came on a voluntary basis for the purpose of seeking greener pastures. Their kind of motivation falls under the second type. The end product is achievement in occupational status that is apparently higher than that of whites.

The Japanese are more effective in converting their characteristics into occupational status than the whites as shown in Table Fifteen. The Asian Indians have in turn lower returns especially in educational attainment than whites but they have compensated these because of extremely high levels of educational attainment. (See Figure Four). By comparison to the Japanese, the Asian Indians have not really overcome the barriers of racial prejudice and discrimination but they have overachieved relative to whites.

In addition to what has been discussed above, the study of Asian Americans as a racial minority in the United States involves several other considerations. The first is the unique historical experiences of each racial group. In other words, whether they were part of the old wave or the new wave made a difference in occupational attainment. This means identifying Asian Americans by their country of origin does not take care of the heterogeneous characteristics of this group. As observed in this study, there are important differences in occupational attainment between the foreign
born and the native born Asian Americans. This was also found to be true between foreign born who came at different periods. Factors indicating historical experiences is particularly relevant among groups with large numbers of foreign borns like the Koreans, Asian Indians and Vietnamese. Hence, any conclusions regarding Asian Americans as a group should be applied selectively by their racial affiliation, by their nativity status and by their migration status. As shown from the results of this study, the occupational status of Asian Americans who are native and foreign born as well as those foreign borns who came at two different periods are somewhat different occupational status. Many of these differences are not only due to differential rates in converting their characteristics into occupational status but also because factors related to occupational status differ by racial group, by nativity group and by migration group. The following findings from the study illustrates this argument. For example, Japanese, native born Chinese, and Filipinos significantly convert all the three sets of characteristics (from the three theoretical models) into occupational status. However, to foreign born Chinese and native born Koreans, experience is irrelevant to their occupational attainment. On the other hand, the Asian Indians and Vietnamese, regardless of their nativity and migration statuses, significantly convert only two characteristics, education
and core/periphery into occupational status. In sum, certain factors can be irrelevant in predicting the occupational status of some cohort groups within the six major groups of Asian Americans.

**Limitations of the Study**

The conclusions that were derived from this study are subject to the following limitations: First, the findings are based on comparison of whites and Asian American males aged 25-64 years old. Thus, conclusions pertain only to this age cohort of both groups. Second, because the size of the native born group is smaller than those foreign born among the newer migrant groups like the Koreans, Asian Indians and Vietnamese, the interpretations of the comparisons between the native and foreign born for this new wave of Asian migrants must take into account that these groups are mostly foreign born. It is likely that the native born of these groups are still in school and have not yet entered the labor market in large numbers. Thus future comparisons on nativity status could yield different results. Third, age may be a poor proxy for the male work experience given that the Asians, particularly foreign born immigrants labor force participation varies as they gained newer skills and experience; Fourth, the selective effect of the United States Immigration Law of 1965 has been "the explanation" for the occupational achievements of the more recent Asian immigrants but no reference has been made to
those who came, not because of the productivity criterion, but for family reunification. It is not known whether the human capital theory advanced by Chiswick will work for them too. That is, after some length of stay, will they be like the foreign born who were selected by the productivity criterion? Moreover, it is also equally relevant to know the possible consequences of the increase in the use of family reunification to gain legal admission to the United States. Could this portend a decline in occupational levels of the Asian Americans? This possibility was offered as an explanation for relatively high unemployment of Filipino male immigrants. In sum, the after 1965 immigrants in the study were assumed to have been admitted under the productivity criterion. In future research, the after 1965 immigrants need to be identified according to admission preference in the United States. Fifth so far, most of the recent research has been focused on the effect on the new immigrants of the receiving country and this study is not an exception. There is, a scarcity of research that looks into the effect of these immigrants on the country of origin. Studies of "brain drain" and like terms have been done in the past but have become sparse through the years. If more immigrants will come because of family reunification preferences, the brain drain issue may no longer be relevant.
Theoretical Implications of the Study

On the basis of these findings, and keeping in mind the limitations of the study, the following theoretical implications are drawn about Asian Americans and their assimilation process in the United States.

Although in this study the assimilation perspective serves as the main theoretical framework in explaining the occupational attainment of Asian Americans in the United States, the hypotheses and the methods followed in the study are representative of various ideas taken from neoclassical economic theory and segmented labor market theory, so that the assimilation of the Asian Americans is actually explained by a combination of these theories. In other words, there were certain findings that were anomalous in the assimilation framework and the explanations for them were sought from the neoclassical and the segmented labor market theories. For example, an important finding in this study was the fact that length of residence was not a significant factor in the occupational attainment of the Asian Indians and the Vietnamese. This implies that if assimilation means the longer one stays the more opportunities to achieve better occupational status, then this cannot be uniformly applied to all Asian immigrant groups. Further analysis shows that the four cohort groups (representing differential length of stay) within each sub-group of Asians differentially convert their human capital
and core/periphery characteristics into occupational status. For example, only the native born who belong to the old wave group significantly convert their characteristics. However, all foreign born who came after 1965 (old and new) do as well in converting their human capital and core/periphery characteristics. In other words, longer stays in the host country can even be a disadvantage, as in the case of the native born Koreans, Asian Indians and the Vietnamese.

The above findings suggest that the length of stay is not the only variable affecting the occupational status of the racial groups in the study, thus considerations were given to the different individual characteristics each worker brought to the market place and their placement in the sectoral economy.

An assumption of the assimilation perspectives is that over time, the culture from the country of origin will disappear resulting in a society bound by one culture. The similarity of the occupational structure of the Asian Americans and the whites strongly indicates structural assimilation but whether they have been culturally assimilated is another question. It can be argued, however, that the similarity in occupational status meant similarity in interests, ambitions and values which is equivalent to being culturally assimilated. The fundamental issue is to understand the structural conditions that may give rise to the understanding of cultural assimilation. This study has
taken one step in this direction. But to deal adequately with this question would require an in-depth historical study. For good examples of this sort of study, see Lieberson (1980) and Bonacich and Modell, (1980). Ideally, therefore explanations of the occupational attainment of Asian Americans should include both the cultural and structural explanations.

Core/periphery characteristic has been found to be an important variable in explaining the occupational status of the racial groups in the study. In fact, it was found to be highly significant in predicting occupational status of all racial groups (see Table Fourteen), but, like the assimilation perspective, there are also discrepancies in characterizing the industrial placement of the Asian American workers into core and periphery. It has been argued by the proponents of the segmented labor market theory that recent migrants are usually placed in the periphery, but the presence of the Vietnamese in the core sector of the labor market belies this argument. As reported in Table Eighteen, Vietnamese and whites have similar placement in economic sectors. Related to this argument is why the more recent migrants, i.e., Koreans, Asian Indians and Vietnamese, are least penalized from being in the periphery sector compared to the older migrant groups like Japanese and Chinese. It is likely that Asian Americans who are professionals, technicians, etc. are
neither in the core nor in the peripheral sector of the economy but are confined in the semi-periphery sector. The point being advanced here is that the two labor market category is too simplistic, and thus may distort the complex reality of Asian American labor market experiences. Furthermore, the mere fact that many of the Chinese, Koreans, and Japanese were found in the study to be engaged in self-employment implies the existence of an enclave economy, a category that is not incorporated in either the core or the periphery. This is in support of Wilson and Portes (1980) who pointed out that an immigrant economy must be seen as distinct from both the primary and secondary labor markets. Moreover, the theoretical propositions advanced by Blalock (1964), Kitano (1974), and Bonacich (1972) on middleman minority are pertinent here. According to these scholars, the Asian Americans occupy an intermediate rather than low status position. Again, the label "middleman minority" should be selectively applied to certain groups of Asian Americans like the Japanese, Chinese and the Koreans who have been historically concentrated in small businesses, which in turn gave them two advantages, first, by getting higher returns on their human capital investments, and second, by saving themselves from directly competing with the whites on highly skilled jobs. However, the extent of small business outside of the enclave economy is still an empirical issue that requires further research.
Another label given to Asian Americans that has been popularized (mainly by the mass media) is "model minority". This label has never really been clearly defined. If it means that they have overcome the barriers of racial prejudice and discrimination then model minority is not an appropriate label for all Asian Americans. In this study, the Japanese are the only Asian American that would qualify to have for this label since they are the only group who were found to be more effective than whites in converting their characteristics into occupational status. Compared to whites, the majority of Asian Americans achieve lower rates in converting their human capital characteristics into occupational status, an indication that there are other institutional or structural factors operating to lower the rates of returns of Asian Americans. Hurh and Kim (1986), have actually rejected the success or model image and considered it more of a "myth rather than a reality". From their analysis, they have argued that Asian Americans suffer from earnings inequality vis-a-vis whites. Asian Americans are then in fact underemployed and socially segregated. As a result, the model image builds up "false consciousness" among Asian Americans and promotes "institutional racism". The findings in the study have shown that five out of six major groups of Asian Americans in the study do not have an apparent occupational disadvantage compared to the whites. While it is true that the majority were found less efficient
in converting rates of returns to human capital investments compared to whites. They offset this by their high levels of educational attainment coupled with high returns to their core/periphery characteristic. The study neither challenges or confirms Hurh and Kim's study since the study is on occupational differentials not earnings differentials. It was cited here as a cautionary measure that the achievement of Asian Americans in occupations may not necessarily encompass success in all areas of socioeconomic attainment.

All the above arguments and explanations lead to the point that perhaps the most important finding of the study is the role of education in the occupational achievement of Asian Americans. Both education and experience have been used in the study as the major type of investment in human capital. The regression results show that education is an important determinant of the occupational attainment of Asian Americans. In spite of the fact that their returns to this human capital characteristic are lower than whites, they still have relatively high occupational status because their investments in human capital in terms of formal education were high. Experience, on the other hand, was found to benefit whites and Japanese only. It is still unclear why experience had no impact on the occupational status of most of the Asian groups. Of the human capital investments used in the study, educational attainment, rather than experience determines occupational attainment.
This finding provides support to previous studies where education was found to play the key role in the occupational mobility of Asian immigrants. It further implies that the high levels of educational attainment of Asians can compensate for their lack of experience and shorter stay in the United States.

In sum, while the data examined here indicate that Asian Americans are on the road to becoming economically assimilated, there are differences among the races and cohort groups within each sub-group of Asian Americans, in the rate of assimilation into the majority socioeconomic system. Differential rates of assimilation are due to two things: differences in characteristics affecting occupational status and differential rates in converting these characteristics.

Above and beyond what has been discussed, caution must be applied regarding the occupational achievement of Asian Americans. The empirical patterns and trends revealed in the study do not generally refer to the Asian American population but are in reference to specific cohort groups within each major group of Asian Americans. It is implied that the variation of assimilation has a lot to do not only with the characteristics associated with human capital, assimilation and location in the economy but also due to differences in historical conditions. For instance, Vietnamese have been handicapped in the assimilation process
mainly by their recent arrival in the country, while other factors including those of historical circumstances contributed to the high degree of structural assimilation of the following cohort groups: foreign born Asian Indians, native born Chinese, the before 1965 cohort group of Koreans and the Japanese who came after 1965.

Furthermore, an understanding of the assimilation process of the Asian Americans is just the beginning. Subsequent studies should deal more on the analysis pertaining to the contribution of these minorities to the majority population. The openness of the American opportunity structure can truly be tested once the majority population begin to recognize the benefits from the minority group activities and achievements. As a final note, assimilation need not be Americanization, but a process of discovering a "new American".
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Appendices
### Appendix A

**PREFERENCE SYSTEMS***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (McCarren-Walter Act)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. First preference: Highly skilled immigrants whose services are urgently needed in the United States and the spouse and children of such immigrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 percent plus any not required for second and third preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 percent plus any not required for first and third preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Third preference: Spouse and unmarried sons and daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 percent plus any not required for first or second preference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 percent of numbers not required for first three preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nonpreference: Applicants not entitled to one of the above preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 percent of numbers not required for first three preferences, plus any not required for fourth preference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigration Act of 1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. First preference: Unmarried sons and daughters of United States citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 20 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Second preference: Spouse and unmarried sons and daughters of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 percent plus any not required for first preference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Third preference: Members of the professions and scientists and artists of exceptional ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 10 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 percent plus any not required for first three preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fifth preference: Brothers and sisters of United States citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 percent plus any not required for first four preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sixth preference: Skilled and unskilled workers in occupations for which labor is in short supply in the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 10 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Seventh preference: Refugees to whom conditional entry or adjustment of status may be granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 6 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nonpreference: Any applicant not entitled to one of the above preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any numbers not required for preference applicants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B
CLASSIFICATION OF INDUSTRIAL LABOR MARKETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1980 Census Industrial Classification</th>
<th>1980 Census Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>040-050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Nondurable Goods</td>
<td>100-130, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142, 160-211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Durable Goods</td>
<td>250-382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Communications and Other</td>
<td>400, 410-422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities</td>
<td>440-462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade Durable Goods</td>
<td>511-512, 530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade Nondurable Goods</td>
<td>541, 550, 560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate</td>
<td>700-711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Related Services</td>
<td>840-841, 860, 862, 871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>880-892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>900-932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries</td>
<td>010-031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Nondurable Goods</td>
<td>132, 141, 150-152, 212-220, 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Durable Goods</td>
<td>230-242, 390-392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Communications, and Other</td>
<td>401-402, 432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities</td>
<td>470-472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wholesale Trade Durable Goods

Wholesale Trade Nondurable Goods

Retail Trade

Real Estate, Including Real Estate - Insurance Law Officers

Business and Repair Services

Personal Services

Entertainment and Recreation Services

Professional and Related Services

500-510, 521-522, 531-532

540, 542, 551-552, 561-571

580-691

712

721-760

761-791

800-802

831-832, 842-852, 861, 870, 872
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