

MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR
SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY
WORKING PAPERS



MAX-PLANCK-GESELLSCHAFT

WORKING PAPER No. 175

KERSTIN LUECK

SOCIOECONOMIC
SUCCESS OF ASIAN
IMMIGRANTS IN THE
UNITED STATES

Halle/Saale 2016
ISSN 1615-4568

Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, PO Box 110351,
06017 Halle/Saale, Phone: +49 (0)345 2927-0, Fax: +49 (0)345 2927-402,
<http://www.eth.mpg.de>, e-mail: workingpaper@eth.mpg.de

Socioeconomic Success of Asian Immigrants in the United States¹

*Kerstin Lueck*²

Abstract

It was the aim of this study to explore the effects of social, cultural, and transnational factors on the socioeconomic success of Asian immigrants in the United States. The participants in this study were 1371 Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipinos, and other Asian immigrants who were interviewed with computer-assisted software in Mandarin, Cantonese, Tagalog, Vietnamese, and English. The subcategory 'other Asians' consisted of Koreans, Japanese, Asian Indians, and individuals of other Asian backgrounds.

Results showed that Chinese had a 56% higher probability of success than other Asians. Men had an approximately 49% higher probability of success than women due to gender hierarchies and disparities. Socioeconomic success increases for every unit increase in English language proficiency, native language proficiency, social networks, and parental education. Asians who migrated to the United States between the ages of 18 and 34 have an approximately 102% higher chance of success than a person who migrated after the age of 35.

¹ I would like to thank Charlotte Bruckermann (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle/Saale, Germany), Lenora Timm (University of California, USA), and Nina Glick Schiller (University of Manchester, UK) for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

² Corresponding author: Kerstin Lueck is an associate at the Department 'Integration and Conflict' of the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, P.O. Box 110357, 06017 Halle, Germany; lueck@eth.mpg.de

Introduction

In recent years there has been a significant increase in immigration from Asian countries to the United States. Between 2000 and 2015 Asian immigrant populations in the United States grew faster than any other migrant group (Zong and Batalova 2016). This increase has stimulated a growing number of researchers to focus on Asian immigrants although research on Latino migrant populations is still dominating the field of migration studies in the United States, especially when it comes to socioeconomic success.

Sakamoto et al. (2009) defined socioeconomic success as ranked values of societal rewards including constructs and indicators such as income, wealth, educational attainment, and occupational status. They further discussed the impact of the majority-minority paradigm, which asserts that racial and ethnic minorities have lower rates of socioeconomic success due to discrimination. They contrast this with the finding that Asian immigrants and Asian Americans not only have high educational achievements but also tend to have approximate parity with the white majority in most areas of the labor market (Sakamoto et al. 2009; Sakamoto, Chiu and Wang 2016). They relate these outcomes to improved economic and social opportunities for Asian Americans and Asian immigrants and to a more multicultural ethos within society. However, they also note the rising significance of national origin, transnationalism, and socioeconomic variability within the racial group of Asian. Yet, national and sociocultural differences with regard to socioeconomic success have hardly received any attention in previous research. Indeed, research studies were usually based on generalizations of Asian immigrants and their high achievements, which is not only misleading but also damaging to groups that are extremely disadvantaged (Kao and Thompson 2003). As pointed out by Kim and Mar (2007: 181), “socioeconomic outcomes vary tremendously by ancestry”.

Furthermore, previous quantitative studies did not focus on native language proficiency and transnational networks as predictors of socioeconomic success of Asian immigrants despite the fact that the majority of Asian immigrants in the United States is foreign-born. Therefore, it is the aim of the study to analyze the impact of major predictors of socioeconomic success of Asian immigrants that have not been addressed in nationally representative studies in the United States, such as the role of the native language and transnational factors as well as predictors that have received some attention in previous research such as the role of gender, English language proficiency, and parental education.

I first review relevant literature on socioeconomic success. I then describe the settings of the current study, the participants, and the methods of data collection and analysis. Socioeconomic success is coded and measured by taking into consideration education, assets, and finances in the country of origin and the United States, profession and placement within the segmented labor market, and poverty levels. Factors that impact socioeconomic success are analyzed and discussed.

Predictors of Socioeconomic Success

Empirically, it is the aim of this study to estimate the effects of transnational, linguistic, generational, social, and gender-related factors on socioeconomic success of Asian immigrants in the United States. Much of the current research about socioeconomic attainments relates to Asian immigrants and Asian Americans as a broadly defined racial group, thereby potentially concealing

important variations. However, immigrants' characteristics and socioeconomic success tend to significantly differ by region of origin (Camarota 2005; Sakamoto et al. 2009). Hence, studies of socioeconomic success of immigrants ought to attend to variations at the national but also transnational level. Migrants of the first generation often maintain social networks with people of common ancestry in their country of origin and they also establish networks in their new country (Glick Schiller 2013). Furthermore, migrants may "build transnational social fields and these fields may extend across generations. These networks may or may not draw on common ancestry as a domain of interconnection" (Glick Schiller 2013: 26).

Besides national origin and transnational issues, generational factors seem to have an important impact on socioeconomic success. *Segmented Assimilation Theory* provides the most suitable framework for understanding the impact of generational factors. According to Zhou (1997, 2014), segmented assimilation provides three possible outcomes for immigrants and their offspring: The first one

"replicates the time-honored portrayal of growing acculturation and parallel integration into the white middle class; a second leads straight into the opposite direction to permanent poverty and assimilation into the underclass; still a third associates rapid economic advancements with deliberate preservation of the immigrant community's values and tight solidarity" (Zhou 1997: 975).

Using the *Segmented Assimilation Hypothesis*, many researchers (Portes and Zhou 1993; Rumbaut and Portes 2001; Portes, Fernandez-Kelly and Haller 2005) argue that the children of immigrants are at high risk for downward mobility into a new rainbow underclass. However, this risk is highly linked to the social backgrounds of later generation immigrants and the background of their parents (Zhou 2014). Studies show that the offspring of middle and upper class immigrants will move ahead, using their cultural capital and resources provided by their parents (Portes and Zhou 1993; Rumbaut and Portes 2001; Portes and Rumbaut 2006). However, children of low-skilled immigrants face more socioeconomic barriers such as high poverty rates and low levels of education and income, which are major risk factors for downward assimilation (Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, and Haller 2005).

Borjas (1993) also found in his analysis of census data that the income potential of the second generation was strongly affected by the socioeconomic status of their parents in the country of origin and argued that immigration policy affects the economic potential not only of first generation immigrants but that of their children. In a later summary of research on immigration and social mobility, Borjas (2006) found that the increase in relative wages between first and second generation immigrants rises only about 5-10% and that the average age-adjusted relative wage for both has been falling in recent years. However, Pastor (2001) argues that poverty rates are significantly reduced by the age of immigration, with rates of recent immigrants three times that of those suffered by households headed by U.S.-born individuals and these findings are also supported by other researchers (Lee 2014). But Pastor (2001) also refers to the misconception of the media that assumes a correlation between immigrant status and poverty, failing to recognize the strong work ethic, attachment to the labor market, and increasing success despite hardships, especially among the first generation. He further analyzed data for public assistance of low-income households and found the lowest rates among long-term first generation immigrants and the highest rates for U.S.-born householders and most recent immigrants. Nevertheless, it is a fallacy to simply

assume a correlation between a most recent migration status and low socioeconomic capital. Indeed, Waldinger and Gilbertson (1994) point out that while in the early 20th century immigrant groups worked mostly in the low-skilled segments of the labor market, late 20th century immigrants were highly diverse in the degree of human capital they possessed at the time of immigration. While a high proportion of immigrants entered with low skills and low education levels in former times, more recent immigrants also entered with higher skills and higher education levels than the majority of native-born whites.

Feliciano (2006) analyzed data from international studies, the *U.S. Census*, and the *Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study* and found that both parental and group pre-migration educational status affect the educational and economic attainment of immigrants. Furthermore, a study by Zhou and Bankston (1998) showed that for Vietnamese immigrants in the Versailles neighborhood in New Orleans adherence to family traditions, strong social networks and ethnic involvement all had positive effects on academic expectations and socioeconomic attainment. In particular, immigrant success can be explained by the fact that both parents and also members of the wider community required their children to go beyond academic demands at school to ensure economic upward mobility (Zhou 2014). In addition, Rumbaut (1990) observed that they also tried to delay acculturation in order to ensure success. Gans (1992) questions whether delayed acculturation works in all instances but presents major aspects that contribute to immigrant success, including the finding that migrants must be able to cope with countervailing pressures and must resist a one-way assimilation into the American culture.

A few studies focused on the impact of gender and English language proficiency on the socioeconomic success of immigrants and ethnic minorities. Regarding gender, researchers (Kim and Zhao 2014; Salaff and Greve 2003; Segura 1989; Waldinger and Feliciano 2004) found that the labor market and also socioeconomic opportunities are highly segmented with only a very few promotional opportunities available for women. They criticized the fact that major work is mostly applied to men and that there is hardly any attention to gendered inequalities within migrant and ethnic groups. In fact, gender structures heavily impact adversarial relationships at work and in school. Kim and Zhao (2014) also provided evidence that Asian immigrant women are more likely to be unemployed and they are also less likely to obtain positions as supervisors. Especially Asian American women who immigrated after high school are highly disadvantaged, even if they hold the highest degree from a United States institution. Regarding language, previous research found that immigrants who are proficient in English have higher rates of socioeconomic success, including higher earnings (Borjas 1994; Chiswick and Miller 2012; Grenier 1984; Lee, Zhou and Kim 2013; McManus et al. 1983). Grenier (1984) showed that immigrants who could not speak English faced a 17% wage penalty.

Methods of Data Collection and Analysis

Data were derived from the National Latino and Asian American Study (NLAAS). The NLAAS core sampling procedure included a nationally representative sample of Asian immigrants and Asian Americans who resided in the U.S. states and Washington, D.C. The NLAAS dataset had one of the most comprehensive designs ever developed (Alegría et al. 2004; Lueck and Wilson 2010, 2011). Below is a description of the sample, procedures, and the measures of this study.

Sample and Participants

Within the NLAAS dataset there was a nationally representative sample of 1371 Asian immigrant household heads who were employed in the United States labor market. In particular, the sample consisted of 405 Chinese, 341 Filipinos, 318 Vietnamese, and 307 other Asians. The subcategory ‘other Asians’ consisted of Koreans, Japanese, Asian Indians, and individuals of other Asian backgrounds. Among the study participants there were 639 women and 732 men. Among them were 199 immigrants who were 35 years or older when they came to the United States, 611 immigrants were 18 to 34 years old, 91 immigrants were 13–17 years old and 164 immigrants were younger than 12 years when they came to the United States. The remaining 306 participants were second generation immigrants. All participants were recruited between May 2002 and November 2003 as part of the larger survey.

Procedures

The NLAAS instruments were available in Cantonese, Mandarin, Tagalog, Vietnamese, and English. They were translated using standard translation as well as back-translation techniques. All participants received an introductory letter and the study brochure in their preferred language. Those who gave their consent to take part in the study were screened and interviewed by professionals who had cultural and linguistic backgrounds similar to those of the sample population. Interviews were conducted with computer-assisted interviewing software in the preferred language of the participants. Face-to-face interviews with the participants were administered. Exceptions were made when respondents specifically requested a telephone interview or when face-to-face interviewing was prohibitive. As a measure of quality control in this study, a randomly selected sample of participants with completed interviews was contacted to validate the data.

Written consent was obtained for all study participants, protocols, and procedures. Human subject approval was given by Harvard University, the University of Michigan, and the University of Washington.

Socioeconomic Success

The construct *Socioeconomic Success* (SES) was defined by taking into consideration education, occupation and placement within the segmented labor market, financial assets in the country of origin and the United States, and poverty index for all participants. It is presented in the table below (*Table 1*).

Variable in Survey	Coding
DM1_14: What is the highest grade of school or year of college you completed? [4-17]	2-8.5 (weighted by 0.5 in index)
OCC28MOG: Occupation-Bureau Labor Stats	Labor Market Segments and Professions 8: Capital-Intensive Segment II -corp/manager 6: Capital-Intensive Segment I -professional -assoc professional 4: Service Segment -office clerk -customer service clerk

	-other service worker 2. Labor-Intensive Segment - worker in industry and farm (blue collar tasks) - other low-skilled labor intensive jobs
FN12: Suppose you sell everything you own -1: would still owe money in the country of origin and the US (cars, houses, land, etc.) and you use the money to pay all your debts (credit cards, mortgage, etc.), would you still have any money left over after paying your debts? (Your best estimate is fine.)	0: don't owe/own anything 1: debts equal assets 2: money left over
FN14: In general, would you say you have <u>more money</u> than you need, <u>just enough</u> for your needs, or <u>not enough</u> to meet your needs?	10: more than enough 0: just enough -10: not enough
POVIND: poverty index= income/poverty threshold, Rounded to nearest and top coded at 17	0-17

Table 1: SES Construct

Predictors

As predictors of SES, several single variables of interest were selected as well as indices or constructs as weighted sums of ordinal survey questions. The single variable predictors included national origin (NAT), current age (AGE), gender (GEN), and age at immigration (AGEIMM). The multivariable predictor constructs included native language proficiency (NLP), English language proficiency (ELP), social networks (SNT), and parental education (ParEd). Cronbach alphas for all multivariable predictors were determined. They ranged between 0.9613 and 0.7827.

The single variables and the multivariable constructs are presented in *Tables 2* and *3* below. Regarding some of the survey constructs, differences had to be applied prior to data analysis in order to give the construct the right direction. Multivariable predictor constructs were used to allow for a qualitatively and quantitatively most suitable predictor representation. This was necessary for comprehensive predictors such as social networks and language proficiency.

Construct	Interview Question	Response Coding
National origin NAT	RANCEST	1: Vietnamese 2: Filipino 3: Chinese 4: Other Asian
Current Age AGE	AGE	20-67
Gender GEN	Gender	0: man 1: woman
Age at Immigration AGEIMM	AGEIMMG5CAT	0: US born 1: < 12 yrs old 2: 13-17 3: 18-34 4: 35+

Table 2: Single variable Predictor Construct

Construct	Interview Questions	Coding/ ranked responses
<p>Native Language Proficiency NLP</p> <p>NLP=LP5a+LP5b+LP5c</p> <p>Cronbach's α = 0.9374</p>	<p>LP5a: How well do you speak in your native language?</p> <p>LP5b: How well do you read in your native language?</p> <p>LP5c: How well do you write in your native language?</p>	<p>1: poor</p> <p>2: fair</p> <p>3: good</p> <p>4: excellent</p>
<p>English Language Proficiency ELP</p> <p>ELP= LP5d+LP5e+LP5f</p> <p>Cronbach's α = 0.9613</p>	<p>LP5a: How well do you speak in English?</p> <p>LP5b: How well do you read in English?</p> <p>LP5c: How well do you write in English?</p>	<p>1: poor</p> <p>2: fair</p> <p>3: good</p> <p>4: excellent</p>
<p>Social Networks SNT</p> <p>SNS=SN1+SN2+SN3+SN4+SN5+SN6+SN7+SN8+SN9+SN10+SN12+SN13</p> <p>Cronbach's α = 0.7827</p>	<p>SN1: How often do you talk on the phone or get together with family or relatives who do not live with you?</p> <p>SN6: How often do you talk on the phone or get together with friends?</p>	<p>0: Less than once a month</p> <p>1: Once a month</p> <p>2: A few times a month</p> <p>3: A few times a week</p> <p>4: Most every day</p>
	<p>SN2: How much can you rely on relatives who do not live with you for help if you have a serious problem?</p> <p>SN3: How much can you open up to relatives who do not live with you if you need to talk about your worries</p> <p>SN7: How much can you rely on your friends for help if you have a serious problem?</p> <p>SN8: How much can you open up to your friends if you need to talk about your worries?</p>	<p>0: Not at all</p> <p>1: A little</p> <p>2: Some</p> <p>3: A lot</p>
	<p>SN4: How often do your relatives or children make too many demands on you?</p> <p>SN5: How often do your family or relatives argue with you?</p> <p>SN9: How often do your friends make too many demands on you?</p> <p>SN10: How often do your friends argue with you?</p>	<p>0: Often</p> <p>1: Sometimes</p> <p>2: Rarely</p> <p>3: Never</p>
	<p>SN12: When you have a problem or worry, how often do you let your (husband/wife/partner) know about it?</p> <p>SN13: When you have a problem or worry, how often do you let someone (else) know about it?</p>	<p>1: Never</p> <p>2: Rarely</p> <p>3: Sometimes</p> <p>4: Most of the time</p> <p>5: Always</p>
<p>Parental Education ParEd</p> <p>(DM1_12a+DM1_13a)/2</p> <p>Cronbach's α = 0.8089</p>	<p>DM1_12a: How many years of school did [(your father/he)] complete?</p> <p>DM1_13a: How many years of school did [(your mother/she)] complete?</p>	<p>4: 4 or less</p> <p>:</p> <p>:</p> <p>17: 17+</p>

Table 3: Multivariable Predictor Constructs

Statistical Approaches and Methods

Summary statistics are shown in *Table 4* below.

Variable	Minimum	Mean	Maximum	Std Dev
SES	-8.00	38.61	78.50	15.97
ELP	3.00	8.38	12.00	3.09
NLP	3.00	8.63	12.00	3.22
SNT	13.00	29.08	43.00	5.14
AGE	20.00	39.63	67.00	11.82
GEN	0.00	0.52	1.00	0.50
AGEIMM	0.00	2.24	4.00	1.44
NAT	1.00	2.48	4.00	1.09
ParEd	4.00	10.73	17.00	3.93
Success	0.00	0.68	1.00	0.47

Table 4: Means and Standard Deviation for Asians

A logistic regression model for socioeconomic success was fit. As predictor variables single variables and multivariable constructs were used. All composite indices were treated as continuous variables in the logistic regression. To take into consideration a possible nonlinear dependency with respect to age, the variable AGE was included in quadratic form ($AGE^2=AGE*AGE$). The SES construct included education, occupation and labor market placement, finances, and poverty index. Socioeconomic success was defined to be a SES score above average.

Multiple Imputation by Chained Equations (MICE) of the Missing Data

The data set contained missing values that were applicable to this study and were missing at random. Out of nine single and multiple variable constructs, two constructs had a few missing data. These constructs included English language proficiency (ELP) and parental education (ParEd). These data were imputed by using *Multiple Imputation by Chained Equations (MICE)*. Using multiple imputations rather than single imputations takes into consideration statistical uncertainty in the imputations and the chained equations approach is also very flexible and can be applied to impute variables of varying types, such as binary variables and continuous variables, as well as complexities such as survey skip patterns (Azur et al. 2011; Romaniuk et al. 2014). The approaches taken in this study were as follows: First, a simple imputation was conducted for every applicable value that was missing at random. Second, the mean imputations for one variable were set back to missing. Third, the observed values from the variable in step 2 were regressed with regard to the other variables in the imputation model. Fourth, the missing values for x were replaced with imputations from the regression model. Fifth, these processes (as applicable in x) were repeated for each variable that had missing data and were repeated for a number of cycles, with the imputations being updated at each cycle. At the end of these cycles the final imputations were retained, resulting in one imputed dataset. Overall, ten cycles were performed.

Findings and Discussion

Statistical Findings

The final model of the predictors of socioeconomic success (SES) included national origin (NAT), gender (GEN), parental education (ParEd), social networks (SNT), age at immigration (AGEIMM), English language proficiency (ELP), and native language proficiency (NLP). The complete model with the estimates of the coefficients for each predictor variable is shown in *Table 5*. The odds ratios are shown in *Table 6*.

Parameter	DF	Estimate	Standard Error	Wald Chi-Square	Pr > ChiSq
Intercept	1	-4.6694	0.4961	88.6007	<.0001
ELP	1	0.1959	0.0251	61.0518	<.0001
NLP	1	0.0656	0.0222	8.7392	0.0031
SNT	1	0.0228	0.0111	4.2275	0.0398
GEN 0	1	0.2007	0.0526	14.5681	0.0001
NAT 1	1	-0.2247	0.0961	5.4664	0.0194
NAT 2	1	-0.2485	0.0979	5.1012	0.0293
NAT 3	1	0.4093	0.0900	20.6887	<.0001
AGEIMM 3	1	0.7246	0.1124	41.5692	<.0001
ParEd	1	0.0535	0.0148	12.9917	0.0003

Table 5: Analysis of Maximum Likelihood Estimates: Socioeconomic Success of Asians

Effect	Point Estimate	95% Wald Confidence Limits	
ELP	1.216	1.158	1.278
NLP	1.068	1.022	1.115
SNT	1.023	1.001	1.045
GEN 0 vs 1	1.494	1.216	1.836
NAT 1 vs 4	0.828	0.598	1.146
NAT 2 vs 4	0.894	0.657	1.216
NAT 3 vs 4	1.561	1.142	2.134
AGEIMM 3 vs 4	2.027	1.532	2.682
ParEd	1.055	1.025	1.086

Table 6: Odds Ratio Estimates

The results show that for every unit increase in *English language proficiency* socioeconomic success increases by about 22% on average for Asian immigrants, increases by about 6.8% for every unit increase in the *native language proficiency* score, by 2.3% for a unit increase in the *social network* score, and by 5.5% for every unit increase in the *parental education* index. Asian men have an approximately 49% higher probability of success than Asian women. Vietnamese have only about 83% and Filipinos have only 89% the probability of success compared to other Asians. Chinese have about a 56% greater probability of success than other Asians. A person who

immigrated between the ages of 18 and 34 has an approximately 102% higher chance of success than a person who immigrated after age 35.

The Importance of National Origin

Results show that Vietnamese have only about 83% and Filipinos have only about 89% the probability of success than other Asians, while Chinese have an approximately 56% higher probability of success than other Asians. There is no prior nationally representative research to support these findings because previous studies usually applied to racial groups (e.g. Asian Americans in general), were conducted in English only, and excluded non-English speakers. It is highly problematic to exclusively use English instruments despite the fact that the majority of Asian immigrants in the United States is foreign-born and many do not speak English well or have not acquired English at all. Furthermore, while the focus on Asian Americans in general can be important when it comes to pan-Asian collective action, it may be a problem when it comes to the needs of highly disadvantaged Asian immigrant groups in the United States. However, while the NLAAS study presents data on Chinese, Filipino, and Vietnamese immigrants, it still puts together Koreans, Japanese, Asian Indians, and individuals of other Asian background as one category for statistical purposes. This is a shortcoming. More precise data on the different other Asian groups with a stronger focus on both national origin and also ethnicity would give room for further innovative research.

Transnationalism

Previous quantitative studies also did not consider transnationalism. This study shows that the invocation of social networks and diverse languages make reference to variables that draw from the connection that migrants maintain across borders. Likewise, not only the predictors but also socioeconomic success itself was measured within a transnational frame because debt, poverty, financial support, and education draw from a transnational framework (i.e. the country of origin and the United States) or a transnational social field, which extends over immigrant generations.

Native and English Language Proficiencies

Findings indicate that English language proficiency, native language proficiency, parental education, and social networks have a significant impact on socioeconomic success. The results on English language proficiency are well-supported by previous research. However, native language proficiency has not received attention in previous studies due to the status of minority languages in the United States. There are still strong demands for linguistic and cultural assimilation in the U.S., which is reflected in all areas of society. However, it is a major problem that the high cultural capital brought into this country in the form of linguistic diversity is often lost through these demands of linguistic assimilation and homogeneity.

This study shows that proficiencies in both the native language and English have a positive impact on socioeconomic attainment of Asian immigrants. Indeed, high levels of English language proficiency and native language proficiency represent higher cultural capital, which leads to higher socioeconomic success. The native language is especially of importance for generation 1.5 and the second generation because it allows immigrant parents to transfer education and skills to their children. As Wong Fillmore (1991) points out, if the younger generation does not speak the native language well, parents face difficulties in monitoring their children's achievement, they cannot

directly impact their cultural capital development, and they cannot transmit educational and socioeconomic advantages. Usually “[s]tudents from the cultured classes are those best prepared (...) to adapt themselves to a system of diffuse, implicit requirements” (Bourdieu and Passeron 1979: 75), but this is not the case when there are linguistic barriers in society that undermine these cultural advantages. Indeed, cultural participation is a key aspect in the reproduction of both educational and occupational advantages (Bourdieu and Passeron 1979; Bourdieu 1986).

The importance of the native language as a form of capital must be also viewed on the macro level. Many Asian economies show rapid developments and the knowledge of Asian languages in an age of globalization and interdependence is crucial. Thus, linguistic diversity is not the problem here as it includes English in addition to other languages, but the limited notion of a single language may hinder the socioeconomic success of immigrant populations and ethnic minorities in the United States. As Rumbaut, Massey and Bean (2006: 459) state “language fluency is an asset and that knowledge of the foreign tongue represents a valuable resource in a global economy (...) [Hence] efforts to maintain this part of their cultural heritage and pass it on to their children should not be discouraged”. However, strong structural support is needed to promote the native language besides English in American society because of United States policies and regulations that still have the aim to extinguish native languages (Lueck and Wilson 2011; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Rumbaut, Massey and Bean 2006).

The Role of Gender

The findings of this study show that men had a 49% higher probability of success than women. This is due to the fact that states (e.g. countries of origin and the United States as the receiving country) but also communities enact gender hierarchies and disparities.

Gender disparities in socioeconomic success against migrant women have had a long history. Early European immigrants were already patriarchally organized, and women mostly worked at home and therefore were largely invisible (White and Mullen 2016). Today both men and women work but poor migrant women work predominantly in the lowest levels of the labor-intensive markets. They face gender hierarchies in society and in their ethnic groups (Gans 1992). Kim and Zhou (2014) found that even highly educated Asian American women were disadvantaged in the U.S. labor market when it comes to employment, annual earnings, and the number of people supervised. They argued that in contrast to men, labor market success and socioeconomic attainments of Asian immigrant women in the United States were affected by strict cultural norms and by their immigration status (Kim and Zhao 2014).

Age of Migration and Segmented Assimilation

Findings indicate that a person who immigrated between the ages of 18 and 34 has an approximately 102% higher chance of success than a person who immigrated after age 35. Especially the first generation is more likely to have a stronger work ethic and attachment to the labor market, which may contribute to increased success. However, there seems to be a tipping point within the first generation when it comes to success. This tipping point is associated with age. In particular, this study shows that younger first generation immigrants are significantly more successful than middle-aged and older first generation immigrants. Earlier research found that socioeconomic success increases with age of immigration (Alba and Nee 2003; Farley and Alba 2002; Oropesa and Landale 1997; Sakamoto et al. 2009; Sakamoto and Woo 2007; White and

Mullen 2016) whereby U.S.-born Asians are most successful. In this study, significant differences were only observed within the first generation whereby younger immigrants have a significantly higher probability of socioeconomic success. This result partly supports Zhou's (1997, 2014) acculturation theory and provides evidence for economic upward mobility rather than a downward assimilation for younger migrants within the first generation. This can be explained by the fact that younger first generation immigrants have the highest probability to acculturate into U.S. society by facilitating both their ethnic and new culture.

However, not just age of migration, but the length of time spent in the United States is of importance for the first generation, especially given the centrality of English skills to occupational status and income levels.

Nationally Representative Study

This is the first nationally representative study on the effects of national, transnational, social, and linguistic factors on socioeconomic success among Asian immigrants and Asian Americans in the United States. Results indicate that a focus on national origin and transnationalism is indeed of high importance when it comes to socioeconomic success and adds significantly to the previous literature. Although structural and cultural shifts in the United States have contributed to a decrease in racial inequality (Sakamoto, Chiu and Wang 2016), there are still major differences in socioeconomic success between the different Asian groups in the United States. Hence, rather than paying attention to race only, there also needs to be a focus on the country of origin and the receiving country (e.g. transnational issues and differences).

This study also went beyond typical racial binaries in United States migration research. There is usually a comparison between white populations (i.e. Hispanic and non-Hispanic whites), blacks (i.e. African Americans and African migrants), and Asian populations (i.e. Asian Americans and Asian migrant populations). These racial meta-identities do not allow for variations and a precise focus on differences and disparities within a racial group. This may in turn not allow for affirmative action for certain Asian groups that face higher levels of inequality.

Comprehensive Methods

The methods of data collection and analysis further contributed to the strength of this study. Indeed, the NLAAS dataset had one of the most comprehensive designs ever developed (Alegría et al. 2004; Lueck and Wilson 2010, 2011). Furthermore, the study participants were screened and interviewed by professionals who had cultural and linguistic backgrounds similar to those of the sample immigrant population, adding a cultural perspective and understanding. All interviews were conducted with computer-assisted interviewing software in the preferred language of the participants and as a measure of quality control in this study, a randomly selected sample of participants with completed interviews was contacted to validate the data. The high importance of data validation has been emphasized in previous research (Bryman 2012; Gravetter and Forzano 2015).

Future Research

Future quantitative and qualitative research on ethnic and social factors that influence socioeconomic success can build on this study. It is crucial to provide a better understanding of the current Asian immigrant population in the United States and their advancements in socioeconomic success. Furthermore, as argued by Baker et al. (2008), it is also important to work within the boundaries of quantitative and qualitative approaches. In particular, “qualitative findings can be quantified, and quantitative findings need to be interpreted in the light of existing theories” (ibid.: 296).

References

- Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: assimilation and contemporary immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Alegría, Margarita, David Takeuchi, Glorisa Canino et al. 2004. Considering Context, Place and Culture: the national Latino and Asian American study. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research* 13(4): 208–220.
- Azur, Melissa, Elizabeth Stuart, Constantine Frangakis and Philip Leaf. 2011. Multiple Imputation by Chained Equations. What is it and how does it work? *International Journal of Methods of Psychiatric Research* 20(1): 40–49.
- Baker, Paul, Costas Gabrielatos, Majid Khosravini, Michal Krzyżanowski, Tony McEnery and Ruth Wodak. 2008. A Useful Methodological Synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse & Society* 19(3): 273–306.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. The Forms of Capital. In: John Richardson (ed.). *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood, pp. 183–198.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1979. *The Inheritors*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Borjas, George. 1993. The Intergenerational Mobility of Immigrants. *Journal of Labor Economics* 11(1): 113–135.
- Borjas, George. 1994. The Economics of Immigration. *Journal of Economic Literature* 32(4): 1667–1717.
- Borjas, George. 2006. Native Internal Migration and the Labor Market Impact of Immigration. *Journal of Human Resources* 41(1): 221–258.
- Bryman, Alan. 2012. *Social Research Methods*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Camarota, Steve. 2005. *Immigrants at Mid-Decade: a snapshot of America's foreign-born population in 2005*. Washington, DC: Center for Immigrant Studies.
- Chiswick, Barry and Paul Miller. 2012. Negative and Positive Assimilation, Skills Transferability, and Linguistic Distance. *Journal of Human Capital* 6(1): 35–55.
- Farley, Reynolds and Richard Alba. 2002. The New Second Generation in the United States. *International Migration Review* 36(2): 669–701.
- Feliciano, Cynthia. 2006. Beyond the Family: the influence of premigration group status on the educational expectations of immigrants' children. *Sociology of Education* 79: 281–303.
- Gans, Herbert. 1992. Second-generation Decline: scenarios for the economic and ethnic futures of the post-1965 Asian immigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15(2): 173–192.
- Glick Schiller, Nina. 2013. The Transnational Migration Paradigm. Global perspectives on migration research. In: Dirk Halm and Zeynep Sezgin (eds.). *Migration and Organized Civil Society: rethinking national policy*. London: Routledge, pp. 25–43.
- Gravetter, Frederick and Lori-Ann Forzano. 2015. *Research Methods for Behavioral Sciences*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

- Grenier, Gilles. 1984. The Effects of Language Characteristics on the Wages of Hispanic American Males. *Human Research* 19(1): 35–52.
- Kao, Grace and Jennifer Thompson. 2003. Racial and Ethnic Stratification in Educational Achievement and Attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 417–442.
- Kim, ChangHwan and Yang Zhao. 2014. Are Asian American Women Advantaged? Labor Market Performance of College Educated Female Workers. *Social Forces* 93: 623–652.
- Kim, Marlene and Don Mar. 2007. The Economic Status of Asian Americans. In: Marlene Kim (ed.). *Meta-ethnicity and Economic Opportunity in the 21st Century*. London: Routledge, pp. 148–184.
- Lee, Sharon. 2014. Poverty and the U.S. Asian Population. In: Franklin Ng. (ed.). *Asian American Issues Relating to Labor, Economics, and Socioeconomic Status*. New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 207–228.
- Lee, Sungkyu, Huiquan Zhou and Youngmi Kim. 2013. Labor Force Participation among Asian Immigrant Women: findings from the 2007 American Community Survey. *International Journal of Social Welfare* 23(3): 296–308.
- Lueck, Kerstin and Machel Wilson. 2010. Acculturative Stress in Asian Immigrants: the impact of social and linguistic factors. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 34(1): 47–57.
- Lueck, Kerstin and Machel Wilson. 2011. Acculturative Stress in Latino Immigrants: the impact of social, sociopsychological and migration-related factors. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 35(2):186–195.
- McManus, Walter, William Gould and Finis Welch. 1983. Earnings of Hispanic Men: the role of English language proficiency. *Journal of Labor Economics* 1(2): 101–130.
- Oropesa, R. Salvador and Nancy Landale. 1997. In Search of the New Second Generation: alternative strategies for identifying second generation children and understanding their acquisition of English. *Sociological Perspectives* 40: 429–455.
- Pastor, Manuel. 2001. Economics and Ethnicity: poverty, meta-ethnicity, and immigration in Los Angeles County. In: M. Lopez-Garza and D.R. Diaz (eds.). *Asian and Latino Immigrants in a Restructured Economy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 141–168.
- Portes, Alejandro, Patricia Fernandez-Kelly and William Haller. 2005. Segmented Assimilation on the Ground: the new second generation in early adulthood. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(6): 1000–1040.
- Portes, Alejandro and Ruben Rumbaut. 2006. *Immigrant America: a Portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1993. The New Second Generation: segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 530: 74–96.
- Romaniuk, Helena, George Patton and John Carlin. 2014. Multiple Imputation in a Longitudinal Cohort Study: a case study of sensitivity to imputation methods. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 180(9): 920–932.
- Rumbaut, Ruben. 1990. *Immigrant Students in California Public Schools: a summary of current knowledge*. Johns Hopkins University Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Rumbaut, Ruben, Douglas Massey and Frank Bean. 2006. Linguistic Life Expectancies: immigrant language in Southern California. *Population and Development Review* 32(3): 447–460.
- Rumbaut, Ruben and Alejandro Portes. 2001. *Ethnicities: children of immigrants in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sakamoto, Arthur, Chi-Tsun Chiu and Sharron Xuanren Wang. 2016. The Life Satisfaction of Asian Americans. Evidence from the US General Social Survey, 1972 to 2010. *Sociology Mind* 6: 40–52.
- Sakamoto, Arthur and Hyeyoung Woo. 2007. The Socioeconomic Attainments of Second-generation Cambodian, Hmong, Laotian, and Vietnamese Americans. *Sociological Inquiry* 77: 44–75.
- Sakamoto, Arthur, Kimberly Goyette and ChangHwang Kim 2009. Socioeconomic Attainment of Asian Americans. *Annual Review of Sociology* 35: 255–276.
- Salaff, Arent and Janet Greve. 2003. Gendered Structural Barriers to Job Attainment for Skilled Chinese Emigrants in Canada. *International Journal of Population Geography* 9: 443–456.
- Segura, Denise. 1989. Chicana and Mexican Immigrant Women at Work: the impact of class, meta-ethnicity, and gender on occupational mobility. *Gender and Society* 3(1): 37–52.
- Waldinger, Roger and Cythia Feliciano. 2004. Will the Second Generation Experience Downward Assimilation? Segmented assimilation re-assessed. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27: 376–402.
- Waldinger, Roger and Greta Gilbertson. 1994. Immigrants' Process: ethnic and gender differences among US immigrants in the 1980s. *Sociological Perspectives* 37: 431–444.
- White, Michael and Erica Mullen. 2016. Socioeconomic Attainment in the Ellis Island Era. *Social Science History* 40(1): 147–181.
- Wong Fillmore, Lily. 1991. When Learning a Second Language Means Losing the First. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 6: 323–346.
- Zhou, Min. 1997. Segmented Assimilation: issues, controversies, and recent research on the new second generation. *International Migration Review* 31(4): 975–1008.
- Zhou, Min. 2014. Segmented Assimilation and Socioeconomic Integration of Chinese Immigrant children in the USA. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 7(37): 1172–1183.
- Zhou, Min and Bankston, Carl. 1998. *Growing up American: How Vietnamese children adapt to life in the United States*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Zong, Jie and Batalova, Jeanne. 2016. *Asian Immigrants in the United States*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.