Household Income and Structure for Asians in the United States, 2000

One of the notable consequences of the 1965 Immigration Reform Control Act has been the increase in the number of foreign born entrants under the criterion of family reunification. This is particularly true for the Asian population, an overwhelming majority of who are admitted legally. This trend has provoked fears regarding the possible decline in immigrant quality and hence in the socio-economic well being of immigrants. However these concerns have not been addressed adequately since research on the economic experiences of immigrants, has tended to concentrate at the level of the individual. This is despite the growing recognition that individual human capital endowments may not be able to fully capture the (economic) outcomes of immigrants. This paper seeks to address the questions; what is the incidence of extended living arrangement and whether extended living arrangement is associated with better household economic well being for people of Asian descent.

A household can be thought of an economy that nurtures the twin objectives of maximizing benefits and minimizing risks and accordingly adopts 'strategies' that aid in attainment of those two goals for its members. Extended living arrangements may facilitate resource pooling. There are economies of scale in larger households. Doubling up in households is a potential response to deal with the plausible disorganizing consequences of international migration, adjustment to the new labor market environment, lack of knowledge of the host society and the economy. Apart from the economic considerations, cultural arguments are that certain groups prefer living in non-nuclear household settings and would therefore do so regardless of the economic position. Empirically, there is evidence of immigrant households tending to be larger, having multiple earners and 'indulging' in greater resource sharing – physical and financial (Tienda 1980; Tienda and Angel 1982; Reimers 1985; Perez 1986; Chavez 1990; Burr and Mutchler 1993; Glick et.al 1997; Glick 1999, Tienda and Raijman 2000).

There is however not much systematic evidence investigating the subject of living arrangements of Asians (Gibson 1988; Jensen 1991; Kibria 1993; Lessinger 1995 Bianchi and He

1997; Foner 1997). Asian's increasing proportions in the US population combined with the perception of that they are economically successful and that many enter the US on the basis of the family reunification criteria makes a study of the living arrangements of Asians imperative and timely.

The specific objectives that are pursued in the present paper are two fold. The first one is to provide a descriptive analyses of Asian households by their ethnicity and nativity status with respect to characteristics that are measured at the household level such as household income, the type of household living arrangement and racial heterogeneity as well as variables that are measured at the level of the individual such as the human capital attributes of the householder. The second goal is to assess the extent to which household extension plays a role in predicting household income. This will provide evidence about whether extended family arrangements are adopted as a compensatory/coping strategy for dealing with temporarily or chronically low earnings or enhancing income levels of some household members.

The data analyses are presented in two parts. First, descriptive baseline information about the groups by ethnicity and household type are presented. This includes the pattern of living arrangements, economic position by household structure, human capital characteristics of the householder. Reliable statistical analyses on Asians are relatively lacking as compared to that done for other ethnic/racial groups and the deficiency is especially noticeable at the level of households (Sakamoto and Xie 2005). Second, regression analyses are conducted to examine a) whether household structure is statistically significantly related to household income and b) the factors that are associated with the likelihood of extension.

I identify a set of independent variables based on theoretical considerations and previous empirical research, that, when held constant would help explaining group-specific effects. If group specific differences remain, then one can attribute them to genuine differences across the

groups[1]. I conduct the regressions; a) first on the pooled samples of foreign and native born separately with ethnicity as an independent variable and b) second on each of the 13 samples of foreign and native born Asian groups and native born non-Hispanic whites.

UNIT OF ANALYSIS: MHU vs Household

Prior research examining living arrangements in general and immigrant groups in particular varies with respect to what has been employed as the unit of analysis. Some analyses employed household (Angel and Tienda 1982; Tienda and Angel 1982; Bianchi and He 1997), others the family (Jensen 1991), individual (Reimers 1985; Duleep and Sanders 1993), and some a Minimum Household Unit (MHU henceforth) (Glick et.al 1997; Glick 1999). MHU is the smallest unit that can potentially reside independently of others (Ermisch and Overton 1985) and includes unit householder, spouse (if present) and single dependent children. With MHU as the unit, there is a possibility of more than one MHU per census enumerated household (Glick et.al 1997).

I employ *household* as the unit of analysis since it entails, in my opinion, a more straightforward definition of who lives together and who are available to pool resources.

Following the standard practice in the literature, a households' ethnic and nativity status is identified by the person who reports himself/herself as the householder in case of both the sample of all households as well as the sample of married couple households. The following living arrangements are categorized;

a) nuclear – a household including a householder, spouse and/or single dependent unmarried children of age 24 or below but no other individuals.
b) vertically extended household - a household with a householder, spouse, single dependent children of age 24 or below and at least one child of the householder aged above 24 or

[1] Another reason for group differences to remain after introducing the controls is that due the presence of omitted variables.

one relative of the householder who is the parent or parent-in –law or grandparent or grand parent in law or grandchild.

c) horizontally extended household – a household with a householder, spouse, single dependent children of age 24 or below and at least one relative of the householder who is a sibling, cousin, aunt, uncle, or any other relative of the householder

d) (other) extended household including non relatives – a household with a householder, spouse, single dependent children of age 24 or below and at least one non relative of the householder

The above categorization is based on the degree of extension and the categories are mutually exclusive. Households are categorized by the greatest degree of extension represented. Thus, household category (d) trumps (c) which in turn supersedes (b) and (b) supersedes (a). For instance, a household comprising vertically or horizontally extended relatives as well as non –relatives will be classified as 'extended household including non relatives'. It may be noted that not all studies use age 24 as the cut-off (Angel and Tienda 1982). My choice of age 24 as the cut-off is both to be in line with some recent work (Glick et.al 1997) and to account for inter-group differences, particularly so for the foreign born, in the perception that may not necessarily consider 18 years as the benchmark of reaching adulthood. Log of household income and likelihood of extension are the dependent variables.

Preliminary Descriptive Findings

Household Level Income and Household Type

Previous empirical research demonstrates that the major Asian groups are equally or better positioned than native born non-Hispanic whites. Table 1 by providing a tabulation of the median household income levels for the six Asian and native born non-Hispanic white[2] groups examines Asian groups' economic well being at the household level for the year 2000. The two additional income measures considered are median household, median per capita, and income per

[2] The ethnic group white and native born non-Hispanic white are used interchangeably.

household hour. While the median household income indicates the overall household economic position, median per capita[3] and income per household hour assess the economic position of the Asian groups by controlling for household size and input hours. The latter two measures therefore descriptively tell us whether resource sharing and labor hour pooling changes the relative positions between the ethnic groups. Table 1 is divided into 2 panels with the first panel providing the absolute income values and the second one provides the income ratios[4].

Table 1 about here

The distribution of relative ratios pertaining to the median household income indicates that all Asian groups with the exception of Koreans experience higher median household income levels than the native born non-Hispanic whites. The situation changes quite substantially when median per capita income is taken into account. All the Asian groups with the exception of Japanese are performing worse than the native born non-Hispanic whites. The decline is most noticeable for the Vietnamese. Such a change can be perceived as an indication of the difference in the extent of resource sharing among the Asian groups, barring the Japanese, as compared to the white households. There are clearly more people who share the household income in Asian households, with the exception of the Japanese, than native born non-Hispanic white ones.

The next column, income per household hour (column 6, Panel B) shows that the income ratios improve for all the Asian groups when compared to those related to median per capita income. This improvement in income ratios pertaining to income per household hour relative to median per capita income indicates that Asians are not particularly at a disadvantage as far as per labor hour earning of the Asians is concerned. In fact, except for the Koreans and Vietnamese, all the other groups experience greater labor hour earnings than native born non-Hispanic whites.

[3] Usually per capita income computed in such contexts uses mean instead of median, I use the median to adjust for the skewness.

[4] Income ratios wherever computed use native born non-Hispanic white in the denominator. Thus a ratio of less than one indicates a white advantage.

Among all the three income ratios considered in Table 1 (columns 4-6), the Asian –white disparity is greatest in median per capita income followed by median household income and then income per household hour with the exception of the Japanese to some extent. This pattern suggests that Asians on an average may not need to put in more market hours to reach parity with the native born non-Hispanic whites (barring the Koreans and the Vietnamese). The higher household income (as compared to the native born non-Hispanic whites) however, is owing to a greater extent of resource pooling by the various household members and not solely due to the higher hourly earnings of the householder.

One of the perspectives ala immigrant assimilation theory, that is commonly examined while studying economic well being at the level of households is whether patterns vary by nativity status. Does the extent of resource sharing vary by nativity status? The descriptive association seen between nativity status (column 3, Panel A) and relative income ratios (columns 4-6, Panel B) indicates that the group that is overwhelmingly native born, the Japanese, show a different pattern as compared to the rest of the Asian groups that are majority foreign born. All the Asian groups with the exception of the Japanese show lower relative median per capita income ratios as compared to median household income ratios suggesting that there are on an average relatively fewer people in a Japanese household who share the resources. This is quite in contrast with even the highest performing group, Indians who have overwhelmingly (87.8%) foreign born householders. The median household income of Indians is the highest among all the groups that are being considered but their position does not remain at the top when considering median per capita income.

The next table, Table 2, too demonstrates the difference across nativity status with respect to all the income measures. The median per capita income is lower than median household income for all the foreign born groups, barring the Japanese while reverse is the case for the native born groups with the exceptions of the Vietnamese and the Filipinos. Income per

household hour is higher for the native born than the foreign born Asians excluding the cases of the Indians and the Filipinos.

Table 2 about here

It needs to be seen whether these descriptive correlations between nativity status of the householder and the extent of resource pooling is borne out in the regression analyses as well.

Table 1 and 2 show that the relative (to native born non-Hispanic whites) economic well being of the Asian households can vary depending on the particular income measure that is being employed; household income, per capita income, hourly income. Table 3 provides the distribution of the ethnic groups by the type of living arrangement, 'household type'. The variable, 'household type' as mentioned earlier is a 4–category variable and is a measure of household extension. Table 4 provides a distribution of the household income by household type.

A perusal of columns 2 and 3 of Table 3 indicates the following. First, the distribution by household type does not vary substantively among the Asian groups but for the Filipinos and the Vietnamese, both of whom show a lower nuclear household residence than the rest. Second, all the Asian groups except for the foreign born Japanese have a lower incidence of nuclear family residence than the native born non-Hispanic whites. Third, the percentage of households living in nuclear family arrangement is lower for the native born as compared to the foreign born for the three of the six Asian groups namely, the Indians, Japanese and the Koreans. The difference in the nuclear family residence across nativity status for the Asians is within the range of 1 to 5 percentage points though. Hence, groups such as the Filipinos and the Vietnamese which exhibit the lowest incidence of nuclear household residence in the foreign born category (56.6 and 57.5 percent respectively), do that in case of the native born (65.7 and 58.6 percent) as well. The Japanese are somewhat of an exception to this with the difference being nearly 10 percentage points with a higher percentage of the foreign born (83.7) as compared to the native born (74.9) in nuclear households.

Table 3 about here

Fourth, the discrepancy in the type of living arrangement by nativity status is noticeable to a greater extent in the incidence of vertically extended and extended households including non-relatives as compared to the nuclear ones. All the foreign born groups experience a 2-3 times greater percentage of vertically extended household living arrangement after excluding the Japanese. Accordingly, the incidence of extended households including non-relatives is much greater among the native born as compared to the foreign born.

The tabulations presented in columns 4-6 confirm the higher share of extended households that include non-relatives for the native born Asians relative to the foreign born. Even though the percentages presented are a function of the sample sizes in the foreign vs native born categories within an Asian group, yet within column comparisons reveal that native born groups experience a lower incidence of vertically extended and a higher incidence of extended including non-relatives living arrangements when compared to the foreign born.

The next table (Table 4) in an attempt to examine the existence of a descriptive association between household extension and economic well being presents relative (to native born non-Hispanic whites) income ratios for the 3 income measures; household income, per capita income, and income per household hour by household extension (nuclear vs non nuclear) and nativity status. The two questions that will be addressed are; a) does household extension suggest better household economic well being? In other words, are non-nuclear households better off than nuclear households? and b) what is the difference across nativity status as far as the relationship between household extension and economic well being is concerned?

It may be noted that for the purpose of this table and the rest of the analyses, I collapse the 4 category living arrangement variable into a 2 category one – nuclear vs. non-nuclear. I do that since the primary objective is to study the relationship between household extension and economic well being by adopting the nuclear type living arrangement as the benchmark, the 'ideal type' category.

When considering median household income as the measure, non-nuclear residence (in terms of higher median household income) is beneficial to all the groups including native born non-Hispanic whites. However the benefit is much lower for the native born groups as compared to their foreign born counterparts with the exception of the Japanese. Among the foreign born, the positive effect of non nuclear living arrangement measured in terms of the percentage difference between non-nuclear and nuclear households is the highest for the Vietnamese (55.21), followed by the Korean (52.21), and the Chinese (43.08).

However, reverse is the case when considering median per capita income and income per household hour as the measures of economic well being for all the groups. Living in non nuclear settings is no longer beneficial. This suggests that even though the aggregate household income of a non nuclear household (as compared to a nuclear household) is much greater, the individual level well being is not equally higher in a non nuclear than a nuclear household. There are more number of people sharing the household income pie than the number who are contributing to it for all the groups.

With median per capita income as the measure, the advantage of living in non nuclear households is greater for the native born groups as compared to the foreign born with the exception of the Japanese. This suggests that non nuclear households in case of the foreign born imply more income pooling. Foreign born living together contribute to total household income which may not be necessarily the case with the native born. The contribution may not be so much or by all the members to raise the individual economic well being (measured by median per capita income), nevertheless it is to a greater extent to what is seen in a native born household.

Table 4 about here

When considering income per household hour as a measure, living in non nuclear households is again not an advantage for any group except for the native born Indians. This suggests that people in non nuclear households do not experience high hourly earnings. The within group nativity comparison indicates that the disadvantage is greater for the native born

than the foreign born households with the exception of the Japanese (and the native born Indians in whose case living in non nuclear households is advantageous). The nativity difference for some of the groups such as the Koreans and the Vietnamese is pretty substantial (between 10 and 15 percentage points). This kind of pattern suggests that the hourly earning endowment of the members of a non nuclear household is greater in a foreign born than a native born household.

The following main points emerge from the tables 1 through 4. The advantage experienced in aggregate median household income by the Asian groups, relative to native born non-Hispanic whites, switches to a disadvantage when median per capita income is considered as a measure. This implies that (than native born non-Hispanic white) the aggregate household income is shared by more members in an Asian than a white household. There is again a switch in the relative ratios from an Asian disadvantage to an advantage when income per household hour is considered. This switch can be taken as an indication that even though there are more people partaking in the household income pool, the working members of an Asian household are not necessarily earning lower wages/salaries than average native born non-Hispanic white earners. Japanese are largely an exception to this pattern. Japanese is also the only Asian group that is overwhelmingly native born among all the Asian groups and therefore 'provoking' an exploration of the role of nativity status in household extension.

There is a difference in the living arrangements by nativity status. While, the foreign born population has a greater percentage of vertically extended households than the native born, it has a lower percentage of horizontally extended households (including non-relatives). Once again, the Japanese are a 'deviant'. The exceptional behavior of the foreign and native born Japanese population as compared to the rest of the Asian population is probably due to factors such as high levels of economic development of the source country, a much longer history of immigration and a much older immigrant population etc.

There is not much difference in the incidence of nuclear households across nativity status. Groups that exhibit lower percentage of nuclear household residence in their foreign born

population like the Filipinos and Vietnamese do so in their native born population as well. Further, household extension does seem to be more beneficial in enhancing household income for the foreign born than the native born.

The data portray that the hourly earnings of members of a non –nuclear household are lower than that of a nuclear household suggesting that one of the reasons for extension is economic. And the comparisons across nativity status (with hourly earnings as an indicator) show that the economic motivation to adopt non-nuclear living arrangement is greater among the native than the foreign born.

Characteristics of Nuclear Householder and Nuclear Household

Keeping in mind the present objective of assessing the relationship between economic well being and household extension, the next table, Table 5, presents the percentages and means of the (independent) variables that have been seen to be associated with income outcomes by ethnicity, nativity status, and household type.

The percentage distribution of human capital characteristics show that both for the foreign and native born groups, nuclear household residence is associated with superior human capital attributes. In the foreign born population, of all the householders who speak only English or very well and received a college or a higher degree from the US, more than 75 and 60 percent of them respectively are residing in nuclear households (with the exceptions of the Filipinos and the Vietnamese).

Table 5 about here

One factor that has been of substantial theoretical and empirical interest in the immigration literature is length of stay and the role that it plays in determining immigrant's economic success. The conceptual framework and the supporting empirical evidence suggest that greater duration in the US should be associated with increasing socio-economic assimilation on part of the immigrants which would in this case suggest adoption of a nuclear living arrangement. Though theoretically, the process of assimilation applies to native born Asians too, the variable

'duration of stay' which is used to measure assimilation is available for only the foreign born householder. The distribution indicates that majority of all the householders who have been in the US for 20 or more years live in nuclear as opposed to non nuclear households. The percentage for the Filipinos is somewhat lower than the rest with 55.7 percent of all householders who have lived in the US for 20 or more years residing in nuclear households.

In case of the association between multi-racial households and nuclear household residence, it appears that the foreign born Indians are an exception. Bulk of the married household heads live in nuclear households for both the foreign and native born groups. Of all the households that are multi-racial, 71.6 percent of foreign born Indians living in nuclear households. For rest of the groups, foreign and native born alike, the percentages hover between 45 and 56, with little higher percentages for native born Japanese (66.1) and foreign born Koreans (59.3).

As evident from the data presented in Table 5, there is not much difference by nativity status with respect to the human capital, assimilation/demographic characteristics of the householders living in nuclear vs non nuclear households among the Asian groups. However the same cannot be said with respect to the Asian-white comparison excluding the Japanese. The human capital characteristics of the nuclear white households in this regard is much superior to that of the Asians. Of all the native born non- Hispanic white college graduates householders, 85.1 percent of whites reside in nuclear households and that is 10 -15 percentage points higher than the Asian groups (excluding the Japanese). In case of occupational characteristic too, of all the householders who hold managerial/professional occupations, a higher percentage of whites than other Asians live in nuclear households.

The descriptive results are broadly indicative of; a) there are differences between the Asian and the native born non-Hispanic white households in the extent of income pooling and sharing; b) there are nativity differences with foreign born exhibiting a greater tendency to adopt extended living arrangement and the differences in the type of living arrangement (vertically

extended vs horizontally extended excluding non-relatives); c) there are differences between groups belonging to the same nativity status with some groups such as foreign born Chinese, Filipinos, Vietnamese showing a greater degree of extension than their counterpart Indians and the Japanese and d) the adopted pattern of living arrangement (nuclear vs non nuclear) is related to the human capital characteristics as well as the length of stay in the receiving country (in case of foreign born households).

Preliminary Findings from the Multivariate Analysis

In the light of these patterns, as a next step in the analyses multi-variate regressions are conducted with two fold objectives. The first is whether household living arrangements (nuclear/non nuclear) 'matter' after controlling for the householder's human capital and other household level characteristics for the foreign and native born Asians and native born non-Hispanic whites? The second goal is to investigate inter-group differences and similarities in the relationship between likelihood of extension and householder's earnings after instituting the relevant controls.

The two dependent variables accordingly considered are; a) logarithm of household income and b) likelihood of living in a nuclear in contrast to a non nuclear household. The second dependent variable apart from assessing inter-group differences potentially measures the relative roles of the economic vis-à-vis cultural factors for the various groups.

The preliminary results as evident from Table 6 with logarithm of household income as the dependent variable indicate that type of household is a statistically significant variable in all the models with sufficiently large coefficients for both the foreign and native born samples. It appears that living in non –nuclear households is consistently positively associated with household income. There is not much difference in the coefficient associated with the household type variable in the full model between the foreign and native born samples. However, a Chow test to see the statistical difference in the coefficient associated with household type in the foreign

and native born regressions shows that the gap albeit small is statistically significant with the coefficient being higher for the foreign as compared to the native born.

What varies more substantially across nativity status (than household type) is the ethnicity coefficient. In the foreign born category, in the full model, Model 3, except for the Japanese, all the other ethnic groups are at a relative disadvantage or are not statistically significantly different when compared to native born non-Hispanic whites. In case of the native born households the full model indicates the relative advantage of the Chinese and the Japanese households. In case of some of the groups the difference across the nativity status is quite a bit. An eyeballing of the ethnicity coefficients between the Models 3 in Panel A (foreign born) and Panel B (native born) shows a substantial difference between the foreign and the native born for some of the groups. For instance, foreign birth of the householder is a much greater disadvantage for a Chinese than a Filipino household. Another example of a contrasting experience by nativity status is that for the Indians. Native born Indians are one of the worst performing groups among all the US born Asians while there is no statistically significant difference between foreign born Indians and native born non-Hispanic whites.

With the addition of the various human capital and assimilation characteristics of the householder as well as the household level factors in Model 3, the positive coefficient of non nuclear residence declines in magnitude from 0.22 to 0.13 suggesting that some of the advantage of non nuclear households can be explained by the differences in the human capital and other characteristics of the householder living in a nuclear and a non nuclear household.

The overall evidence stemming from the above preliminary analysis, albeit suggestive, is pointing towards a statistically significant association between extended household structure and the contribution to household income (by the residing members), to a larger extent for the foreign born than the native born households. Household extension hence seems to serve an economic purpose. The next of analyses seeks to explore the inter-group differences in the role of cultural factors in adopting extended households.

Economic versus cultural argument

One of the preoccupations of scholars studying group differences in patterns of living arrangement is to assess what 'motivates' a particular living arrangement – economic need versus cultural preference? The existing evidence which is overwhelmingly in the context of Hispanic population is mixed. The results indicate that apart from the economic motivation, cultural norms favoring extended households do operate but data limitations and compositional differences between the various comparison groups constrain making any conclusive statements about the role of culture preference versus economic compulsion (Tienda and Angel 1982; Angel and Tienda 1982, Burr and Mutchler 1993).

The present analyses for Asians too suffers from some similar data difficulties apart from the more theoretical issue of how does one measure culture and therefore the analyses in this regard are at best suggestive.

The descriptive results in the earlier section do lend some support to the economic argument. There is a lower incidence of extension in case of foreign born Indian and Japanese households that experience high levels of socio-economic status of the householders. On the other hand, Chinese and Vietnamese households show a considerable degree of extension. Cultural argument comes into play to some extent in case of the foreign born Filipinos whose human capital attainments are not that low, yet exhibit a high degree of extension.

The results from the regression analyses on the foreign and native born pooled samples are not sufficient to suggest any patterns. Not only do the household structure variables emerge significant after including all the relevant controls for both the samples, there is not much difference in their magnitude. The estimates from the separate regressions for the 6 Asian groups (foreign and native born separately) and native born non-Hispanic whites, it seems are more informative in this regard despite the compositional disparities between the comparison groups as acknowledged earlier. Foreign born Indians and Japanese do not show a statistically significant association with the type of household and household income. The positive and reasonably high

coefficients of household structure variable for the native born Japanese and non-Hispanic whites denies the so called cultural affinity of immigrant households to extend relative to native born. And if cultural and economic arguments are considered antithetical to each other (though they are not necessarily so), then the estimates underscore the role of extension as a mechanism to alleviate poverty or raise well being.

To gain further insight into this debate, I conduct additional descriptive as well as multi-variate analyses. The (binary) logistic regression technique with the following dependent variable is conducted;

1 = living in a nuclear household

0 = not living in a nuclear household

The independent variables included in the design of the analysis include both the a) economic argument – reflected by household income and education of the householder and b) cultural argument- reflected in the duration of stay variable. Previous work has used ethnicity and immigrant/foreign born status as indicators of culture (Tienda and Angel 1982; Angel and Tienda 1982). I in addition, also employ duration of stay to tap the cultural preference, the argument being foreign born households 'should' make a transition towards nuclear households as length of stay in the US increases.

References

Angel, Roland and Marta Tienda. 1982. 'Determinants of Extended Household Structure: Cultural Patterns or Economic Need?' *American Journal of Sociology*, Volume 87, Number 6, pages 1360-1383.

Bianchi, Suzanne M. and Wan He. 1997. 'Work and Family Strategies for Economic Success Among Asian Americans', Paper presented at American Sociological Association Meetings, Toronto.

Chavez, L.R. 1990. 'Coresidence and Resistances: Strategies for Survival among Undocumented Mexicans and Central Americans in the US', *Urban Anthropology*, Volume 19, Numbers 1-2, pages 31-61.

Burr, Jeffery and Jan E. Mutchler. 1993. 'Ethnic Living Arrangements: Cultural Convergence or Cultural Manifestation?', *Social Forces*, Volume 72, Number 1, pages 169-179.

Duleep, Harriet Orcutt and Seth Sanders. 1993. 'The Decision to Work by Married Immigrant Women', *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Volume 46, Number 4, July, pages 677-690.

Ermisch, J.F. and Elizabeth Overton. 1985. Minimal Household Units: A New Approach to the Analysis of Household Formation. *Population Studies*, Volume 39, Number 1, pages 33-54.

Foner, Nancy. 1997. 'The Immigrant Family: Cultural Legacies and Cultural Changes', *International Migration Review*, Volume 31, Number 4, pages 961-974.

Glick, J ennifer E., Frank D. Bean and Jennifer V. W. Van Hook. 1997. 'Immigration and Changing Patterns of Extended Family Household Structure in the Unites States: 1970-1990', *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Volume 59, Number 1, pages 177-191.

Glick, Jennifer E. 1999. 'Economic Support from and to Extended Kin: A Comparison of Mexican Americans and Mexican Immigrants', *International Migration Review*, Volume 33, Number 3, pages 745-765.

Gibson, Margaret.1988. *Accommodation without Assimilation: Sikh Immigrants in an American High School*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Kibria, Nazli. 1993. *Family Tightrope: The Changing Lives of Vietnamese Americans*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lessinger, Johanna. 1995. *From the Ganges to the Hudson: Indian Immigrants in New York City*, Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Perez, Lisandro. 1986. 'Immigrant Economic Adjustment and Family Organization: The Cuban Success Story Reexamined', *International Migration Review*, Volume 20, Number 1, pages 4-20.

Reimers Cordelia W. 1985. 'Cultural Differences in Labor Force Participation Among Married Women', *The American Economic Review*, Volume 75, Number 2, pages 251-255

Tienda, Marta.1980. 'Familism and Structural assimilation of Mexican Immigrants in the United States', *International Migration Review*, Volume 14, Number 3, Autumn, pages 383-408.

Tienda, Marta and Roland Angel. 1982. Headship and Household Composition among Blacks, Hispanics and other Whites, *Social Forces*, Volume 61, Number 2, pages 508-531.

Tienda, Marta and Rebeca Raijman. 2000. 'Immigrants' Income Packaging and Invisible Labor Force Activity', Social *Science Quarterly*, Volume 81, Number 1, pages 291-310.

Sakamoto, Arthur and Yu Xie. 2005. 'The Socioeconomic Attainments of Asian Americans', in *Asian Americans: Contemporary Trends and Issues* edited by Pyong Gap Min, pages 54-77, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Second Edition, pages .

Stier, Haya. 1991. 'Immigrant Women Go to Work : Analysis of Immigrant Wives' Labor Supply for Six Asian Groups', *Social Science Quarterly*, Volume 72, Number 1, pages 67-82.

Table 1. Unweighted Number of Observations and Percent Foreign Born Asian, Weighted Median Household Income, Per Capita Income, and Income Per Household Hour and Proportions Relative to White by Ethnicity and Nativity

Ethnicity	Unweighted N	Percent Foreign Born Householders (Unweighted)	Median Household Income (in 1999 $)	Median Per Capita Income (in 1999 $)	Income Per Household Hour (in 1999 $)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Panel A					
Chinese	26,984	71.8	50,000	18,727	18.6
Filipino	26,240	83.2	61,700	18,950	17.8
Indian	21,862	87.8	69,400	18,950	24.0
Japanese	18,638	33.7	55,500	26,500	23.0
Korean	14,809	81.7	42,000	15,767	16.0
Vietnamese	15,599	86.2	46,600	13,250	14.0
White	793,541	n.a	45,030	20,125	17.2
Panel B *Relative to White*					
Chinese	n.a	n.a	1.11	0.93	1.08
Filipino	n.a	n.a	1.37	0.94	1.04
Indian	n.a	n.a	1.54	0.94	1.40
Japanese	n.a	n.a	1.23	1.32	1.34
Korean	n.a	n.a	0.93	0.78	0.93
Vietnamese	n.a	n.a	1.03	0.66	0.82
White	n.a	n.a	1	1	1

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

Table 2. Weighted Median Household Income, Per Capita Income and Income Per Household Hour and Proportions Relative to White by Ethnicity and Nativity

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

Note : White refers to native born non-Hispanic white in all the tables.

Table 3. Percentage Distribution (Weighted) by Household Type, Ethnicity, and Nativity

Ethnicity/Household Type	Percentage Distribution by Household Type		Percentage Distribution in each Household Type by Nativity Status		
	Foreign Born	Native Born	Foreign Born	Native Born	All
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Chinese					
Nuclear	68.42	73.69	70.63	29.37	100 (18,903)
Vertically extended	17.89	8.80	84.04	15.96	100 (4,214)
Horizontally extended	5.43	4.50	75.75	24.25	100 (1,388)
Extended including non -relatives	8.26	13.01	62.18	37.82	100 (2,479)
All	100 (19,374)	100 (7,610)	n.a	n.a	n.a
Filipino					
Nuclear	56.63	65.69	81.1	18.9	100 (15,175)
Vertically extended	21.23	9.08	92.08	7.92	100 (5,138)
Horizontally extended	10.79	5.92	90.07	9.93	100 (2,632)
Extended including non -relatives	11.35	19.31	74.52	25.48	100 (3,295)
All	100 (21,820)	100 (4,420)	n.a	n.a	n.a
Indian					
Nuclear	75.29	72.05	88.06	11.94	100 (16,305)
Vertically extended	11.80	4.31	95.08	4.92	100 (2,462)
Horizontally extended	5.18	6.00	85.92	14.08	100 (1,187)
Extended including non -relatives	7.73	17.65	75.57	24.43	100 (1,908)
All	100 (19,203)	100 (2,659)	n.a	n.a	n.a
Japanese					
Nuclear	83.67	74.85	61.78	38.22	100 (14,448)
Vertically extended	5.93	14.20	81.22	18.78	100 (2,247)
Horizontally extended	0.94	3.06	85.44	14.56	100 (454)
Extended including non -relatives	9.46	7.89	39.89	60.11	100 (1,489)
All	100 (6,282)	100 (21,820)	n.a	n.a	n.a
Korean					
Nuclear	75.07	67.42	82.86	17.74	100 (10,904)
Vertically extended	13.88	5.59	91.51	8.49	100 (1,895)
Horizontally extended	4.97	6.27	77.49	22.51	100 (765)
Extended including non -relatives	6.08	20.72	56.04	43.96	100 (1,245)
All	100 (12,095)	100 (2,174)	n.a	n.a	n.a
Vietnamese					
Nuclear	57.52	58.61	84.45	14.55	100 (8,911)
Vertically extended	19.38	5.86	95.19	4.81	100 (2,775)
Horizontally extended	12.10	13.89	83.91	16.09	100 (1,948)
Extended including non -relatives	10.99	21.64	75.25	24.75	100 (1,965)
All	100 (13,438)	100 (2,161)	n.a	n.a	n.a
White					
Nuclear	n.a	81.55	n.a	100	100 (650,252)
Vertically extended	n.a	7.50	n.a	100	100 (60,596)
Horizontally extended	n.a	1.80	n.a	100	100 (14,127)
Extended including non -relatives	n.a	9.15	n.a	100	100 (68,476)
All	n.a	100 (793,541)	n.a	n.a	n.a

n.a = not applicable

Table 4. Percentage Difference in Median Household Income, Per Capita Income, and Income Per Household Hour between Non-nuclear and Nuclear Households

Ethnicity	Percentage Difference between Non-nuclear households over Nuclear Households*		
	Median Household Income	Median Per Capita Income	Income Per Household Hour
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Chinese			
Foreign born	43.08	-16.18	-17.78
Native born	12.20	-27.09	-20.53
Filipino			
Foreign born	38.91	-13.75	-7.69
Native born	19.78	-20.45	-9.23
Indian			
Foreign born	14.29	-28.18	-20.91
Native born	12.00	-41.14	14.35
Japanese			
Foreign born	-1.04	-23.53	-27.20
Native born	34.04	-14.80	-7.21
Korean			
Foreign born	52.21	4.35	-0.93
Native born	10.00	-28.30	-18.75
Vietnamese			
Foreign born	55.20	6.63	-4.93
Native born	14.96	-31.67	-15.01
White			
Native born	19.27	-14.51	-12.64

* The percentage difference have been computed in the following way;
Income of Non nuclear household - Income of Nuclear household/ Income of Nuclear household * 100

Table 5. Weighted Percentage Distribution of Human Capital, Occupational, Assimilation and Demographic Characteristics of the Nuclear Type Householder by Ethnicity, Nativity

Characteristics of householders living in	Chinese		Filipino		Indian		Japanese		Korean		Vietnamese		White
nuclear households (in percentage)*	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Native
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Human Capital and Occupational													
College graduates	67.9	74.8	59.2	69.8	73.3	71.3	88.9	78.6	74.8	69.7	62.8	63.8	85.1
Speak only English or very well	75.8	n.a	59.0	n.a	77.2	n.a	82.6	n.a	76.78	n.a	62.51	n.a	n.a
Received a college or a higher degree from the US	76.5	n.a	53.6	n.a	62.4	n.a	76.9	n.a	72.3	n.a	55.92	n.a	n.a
Employed in managerial/professional occupations	75.8	77.2	62.0	69.2	79.6	76.5	90.0	79.2	78.5	70.9	62.7	63.7	84.3
Assimilation and Demographic													
Stayed 20 or more years	64.5	n.a	55.7	n.a	72.3	n.a	86.7	n.a	72.41	n.a	60.37	n.a	n.a
Residing in metro region	68.2	31.77	56.4	43.57	75.3	72.19	83.7	74.78	74.66	67.6	57.24	58.33	80.36
Residing in the pacific region	65.2	73.0	51.0	62.9	73.0	67.9	80.6	73.5	74.6	65.1	55.4	53.7	78.3
Married	71.3	84.8	61.3	79.9	80.2	86.3	93.3	80.5	78.6	87.9	63.9	78.7	89.7
Male	69.2	76.6	59.1	68.9	75.8	73.5	88.8	76.6	75.8	71.1	59.3	61.4	84.1
Multi-racial	46.9	59.2	50.9	56.1	71.6	48.5	52.4	66.1	59.3	46.8	53.6	45.4	59.5
Total number of households (unweighted)	19,374	7,610	21,820	4,420	19,203	2,659	6,282	21,820	12,095	2,174	13,438	2,161	793,541

* The base is all householders with the specific human capital or assimilation/demographic characteristics. For example, 67.9 percent of all householders who are college graduates are living in nuclear households. The residual, 32.1 percent of college graduates live in non nuclear households.

Table 6.Unstandardized OLS Coefficients (Standard Error) from Regression of Log Household Income for Asian and White Households by Nativity and Asian Ethnicity (Universe includes all Households that Report Positive Household Income in 1999)

	Panel A : Foreign Born				Panel B : Native Born		
Variable	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**
(1)	**(2)**	**(3)**	**(4)**	**(5)**	**(6)**	**(7)**	**(8)**
Ethnicity							
Chinese	-0.05 **	-0.08 **	-0.21 **	-0.11 **	0.28 **	0.27 **	0.02
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Filipino	0.33 **	0.27 **	-0.10 **	-0.05 **	0.05 **	0.03 **	-0.05
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Indian	0.47 **	0.45 **	-0.01	0.11 **	-0.06 *	-0.08 +	-0.11
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Japanese	0.00	0.01	0.13 **	0.21 **	0.25 **	0.24 **	0.04
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Korean	-0.14 **	-0.15 **	-0.25 **	-0.17 **	-0.01 **	-0.04 **	-0.04
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Vietnamese	-0.02 *	-0.07 **	-0.11 **	-0.09 **	-0.05 +	-0.00 **	0.00
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.04)
Household type							
Non nuclear		0.22 **	0.13 **	0.13 **		0.19 **	0.14
		(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)		(0.04)	(0.00)
Education[a]							
Less than college degree			0.47 **	n.a.			0.48
			(0.00)				(0.00)
College education			0.71 **	n.a.			0.71
			(0.00)				(0.00)
Education after accounting for US education[a]							
Less than college degree				-0.57 **			n.a.
				(0.00)			
College or higher degree not acquired in the US				-0.18 **			n.a.
				(0.01)			
English language ability[a]							
Speaks no English			-0.53 **	-0.61 **			n.a.
			(0.01)	(0.01)			
Speaks English not well or well			-0.21 **	-0.24 **			n.a.
			(0.01)	(0.01)			
Duration of stay[a]							
Ten or less years			-0.14 **	-0.10 **			n.a.
			(0.01)	(0.01)			
More than 10 and less than 20 years			-0.07 **	-0.07 **			n.a.
			(0.01)	(0.01)			
Married[a]			-0.34 **	-0.35 **			-0.36
			(0.00)	(0.00)			(0.00)
Ethnic homogeneity			-0.03 **	-0.03 **			-0.05
			(0.00)	(0.00)			(0.00)
Female headed			-0.13 **	-0.13 **			-0.13
			(0.00)	(0.00)			(0.00)
Constant	10.63 **	10.59 **	9.39 **	9.96 **	10.63 **	10.59 **	9.34
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)
Observations (Degrees of freedom)	874,831 (6)	874,831 (7)	874,831 (24)	874,831 (24)	816,676 (	816,676 (7)	816,676 (2
R-squared	0.01	0.02	0.49	0.49	0	0.01	0.49

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

Note : Controlled for annual total household work hours and its square, years of work experience of the householder and its square, household's region and metro/non metro residence.

Omitted categories : White , Nuclear , Masters/professional/doctorate , College or higher degree acquired in the US, Speaks only English or very well, 20 or more years of stay, single, multi-ethnic, and male headed. [a]The characteristics are of the householder.