

Patterns of Post-1965 Immigration and Racial and Ethnic Diversity in the United States

Prepared for Presentation at Tung-Hai University, Taiwan

Pyong Gap Min
Distinguished Professor of Sociology
Queens College and The Graduate Center of CUNY
Director of The Research Center for Korean Community

October 28, 2010

1. Two Mass Migration Periods in the US

a. Heavily Protestant country... Before 1880

b. First mass migration period... 1880-1930

- Mainly from Eastern and Southern European countries
- Heavily non-Protestant (Catholic, Jewish & Eastern Orthodox)
- Mostly farming background (illiterate)

c. Huge drop in immigration... 1930-1964

- 1924 National Origins Quota System
- The Great Depression
- WWII

1. Two Mass Migration Periods in the US

d. Second mass migration period... 1965-present

- Predominantly from Third world countries (Latin America, Asia & Middle East, and the Caribbean)
- Heavily non-white
- Majority Catholic with many non-Judeo-Christian groups
- Socio-economically polarized with Asians & Middle Easterners highly educated and Latinos and Caribbeans having working-class backgrounds

1. Two Mass Migration Periods in the US

TABLE I: Immigration to the United States by Decade, Region, and Race, 1941-2000

Decade	Total N (in 1,000s)	Region of Origin (%)						Year	% Foreign Born	% White
		Northern and Western Europe	Southern and Eastern Europe	Canada and Newfoundland	Total White	Latin American and Caribbean Islands	Asia and The Middle East			
1841-1850	1,713	93.0	0.3	2.4	95.7	1.2	0.0	1850	9.7	84.3
1851-1860	2,598	93.6	0.8	2.3	96.7	0.6	1.6	1860	13.1	85.6
1861-1870	2,315	87.8	1.5	6.7	96.0	0.6	2.8	1870	14.0	87.1
1871-1880	2,812	73.6	7.7	13.6	94.9	0.7	4.4	1880	13.3	86.5
1881-1890	5,247	72.0	18.2	7.5	97.7	0.7	1.3	1890	14.7	87.5
1891-1900	3,688	44.6	51.9	0.1	96.6	1.0	2.0	1900	13.6	87.9
1901-1910	8,795	21.7	69.9	2.0	93.6	2.1	3.7	1910	14.6	88.9
1911-1920	5,736	25.3	50.0	12.9	88.2	6.0	4.3	1920	13.1	89.7
1921-1930	4,107	32.5	27.5	22.2	82.2	14.4	2.7	1930	11.5	89.8
1931-1940	528	38.7	27.2	20.5	86.4	9.7	3.0	1940	8.6	89.8
1941-1950	1,035	49.9	10.1	16.6	76.6	17.7	3.1	1950	6.9	89.3
1951-1960	2,515	38.2	14.5	15.0	67.7	24.6	6.1	1960	5.4	88.6
1961-1970	3,322	18.3	15.5	12.4	46.2	39.3	12.9	1970	4.7	87.6
1971-1980	4,493	11.6	10.0	23.8	45.4	40.3	35.3	1980	6.2	79.6
1981-1990	7,338	4.6	5.2	1.8	11.6	46.8	38.0	1990	8.0	75.6
1991-2000	9,095	4.3	10.6	2.1	17.0	47.2	30.7	2000	11.0	70.0

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census (1960), Series A 9-22, A 34-50, C 23-38, and C 228-295; (1975), Series A 9-22, A 44-50, C 23-28 and C 228-295; (1983a); table 39; (1983b); table 253; (1993a); table 25; (1993b); table 143. U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (1950-1978, 1979-2000).

2. Major Immigrant Groups & Their Settlement Patterns in the 2nd Mass Migration Period

a. Latinos

- Mexicans – California
- Dominicans – New York City
- Cubans – Miami
- Colombians – New York City
- Salvadoreans – Los Angeles
- Ecuadoreans – New York City

b. Asians

- Filipinos – California
- Indians – New York and California
- Chinese – California and New York
- Vietnamese – California
- Koreans – California and New York
- Taiwanese – California and New York
- Pakistanis – New York City

2. Major Immigrant Groups & Their Settlement Patterns in the 2nd Mass Migration Period

c. Caribbean Blacks

- Jamaicans – New York City
- Haitians – New York City
- Guyanese – New York City
- Trinidadians – New York City

d. Whites

- Canadians
- Immigrants from the former Soviet Union (heavily Jewish) – New York City
- Immigrants from Eastern European countries – New York City
- Italians & Germans – New York City

2. Major Immigrant Groups & Their Settlement Patterns in the 2nd Mass Migration Period

e. Middle Easterners

- Iranians – Los Angeles
- Iraqis – Detroit
- Lebanese – Detroit
- Israelis – New York City
- Syrians
- Egyptians

2. Major Immigrant Groups & Their Settlement Patterns in the 2nd Mass Migration Period

TABLE 2. STATES OF PRINCIPAL SETTLEMENT OF THE TWELVE LARGEST IMMIGRANT GROUPS, 2000

Country of Birth	N	% of total immigrants	States of principal settlement					
			<i>First</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Third</i>	<i>%</i>
Mexico	9,163,463	29.4	California	42.8	Texas	20.4	Illinois	6.7
Philippines	1,374,231	4.4	California	48.5	New York	5.2	New Jersey	5.0
India	1,027,144	3.3	California	19.5	New Jersey	11.7	New York	11.5
China	997,301	3.2	California	33.2	New York	23.4	New Jersey	4.1
Vietnam	991,995	3.2	California	42.5	Texas	10.9	Washington	4.1
Cuba	872,716	2.8	Florida	73.5	New Jersey	6.4	California	4.7
Korea	870,542	2.8	California	31.3	New York	11.6	New Jersey	5.9
Canada	820,713	2.6	California	17.6	Florida	11.8	New York	6.8
El Salvador	815,571	2.6	California	44.0	Texas	12.2	New York	9.2
Germany	705,110	2.3	California	14.1	New York	9.8	Florida	9.2
Dominican Republic	685,952	2.2	New York	59.4	New Jersey	12.8	Florida	9.3
Former USSR ^b	618,302	2.0	New York	29.3	California	16.1	Illinois	6.0
Total foreign-born	31,133,481	100.0	California	28.5	New York	12.4	Texas	9.3
Total native-born	250,288,425	100.0	California	10.0	Texas	7.2	New York	6.0

SOURCE: 2000 Census, 5% Public Use Microdata Sample.

^a Immigrants from mainland China only.

^b Immigrants from Russia and Ukraine.

3. Increase in Minority Populations Between 1970 and 2008

- Minority members becoming the majority of the population in more than 50% of the 100 largest cities
- Implications for public education, local politics and popular culture
- US becoming more multicultural
- Big increase in intermarriage

TABLE 3. United States - Race and Hispanic Origin: 1970 to 2008

	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian and Pacific Islander	American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Other Non-Hispanic Race (including Multi-racial)	Other Hispanic Race (including Multi-racial)
1970	83.1%	4.6%	10.9%	0.7%	-	-	0.5%	0.1%
1980	79.7%	4.0%	11.5%	1.6%	0.6%	-	0.1%	2.4%
1990	75.6%	5.1%	11.7%	2.8%	0.7%	-	0.1%	3.8%
2000	69.1%	6.5%	12.1%	3.6%	0.7%	0.1%	1.8%	6.1%
2008	65.4%	10.1%	12.1%	4.4%	0.7%	0.1%	1.9%	5.3%
...								
2050	53.0%	25.0%	14.0%	8.0%				

Sources: ^aU.S. Census Bureau Summary Files

^bU.S. Census Bureau, 2008 American Community Survey

4. Religious Backgrounds of Major Immigrant Groups

a. Latinos heavily Catholic with a significant Protestant population

b. Asians with multiple religious backgrounds

- Filipinos heavily Catholic
- Indians – predominantly Hindu but also Christian, Muslim & Sikh
- Chinese – 2/3 no religion, with some Buddhist & Christian backgrounds
- Koreans – majority Protestant with significant Catholic and Buddhist populations
- Vietnamese – significant Buddhist and Catholic populations
- Taiwanese – majority with no religion, with some Buddhist and Christian populations
- Pakistani – predominantly Muslim

4. Religious Backgrounds of Major Immigrant Groups

c. Middle Easterners – majority Muslim with Christian and Jewish populations

d. Whites – Jewish, Catholic, Eastern Orthodox and Protestant

e. Caribbeans – majority Protestant (particularly Jamaicans) with significant Catholic populations

4. Religious Backgrounds of Major Immigrant Groups

TABLE 4: RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE BY NATIVITY: U.S. NATIVE- AND FOREIGN-BORN POPULATION IN 1996 AND NIS-P 1996 IMMIGRANTS

Religious Preference	Native Born, GSS 1996	Foreign born, GSS 1996	NIS-P 1996 Immigrants
Jewish	2.1	2.7	2.6
Catholic	22.7	40.3	41.9
Orthodox	-	-	4.2
Protestant	59.4	26.6	18.6
Other	4.1	16.9	16.7
No religion	11.6	14.5	15.0
No response	0.1	0.0	1.2
Total	100	100	100
N	2,655	238	976

Note: All estimates are for persons aged 18 and older. Estimates are based on weighted data. Column percentages sum to 100.

5. Educational Attainments of Immigrants

TABLE 5: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF PRINCIPAL FOREIGN NATIONALITIES IN 2000

Country of Birth	% College Graduates ^a	% High School Graduates ^a
Total native-born	24.4	83.3
Total foreign-born	24.1	61.8
Above US Average		
India	69.1	88.2
Taiwan	66.7	93.6
Nigeria	57.8	93.5
Iran	50.6	86.4
Pakistan	50.5	81.5
Hong Kong	50.4	84.4
Former Soviet Union	47.3	84.0
Philippines	45.7	86.8
Korea	42.9	86.1
Japan	42.7	90.6
China	41.6	68.4
Near US Average		
United Kingdom	36.6	90.2
Canada	33.6	82.5
Brazil	32.2	79.9
Germany	26.8	83.5
Ireland	23.6	78.4
Peru	23.1	80.4
Poland	22.1	73.1
Colombia	21.8	72.0
Greece	19.8	59.1
Vietnam	19.2	61.6
Cuba	18.7	59.0
Jamaica	17.8	72.1
Below US Average		
Italy	13.9	54.0
Haiti	13.7	62.3
Ecuador	12.8	61.4
Cambodia	10.4	48.5
Dominican Republic	9.5	48.1
Honduras	8.1	43.7
Portugal	7.8	44.2
Laos	7.6	47.2
Guatemala	6.1	36.9
El Salvador	5.0	34.7
Mexico	4.2	29.7

SOURCE: 2000 US Census, 5% Public Use Microdata Sample.

^aPersons age twenty-five or older.

- Asians and Middle Easterners well above the US average
- Europeans similar to US average
- Caribbeans and Latinos below average
- Service-related jobs in post-industrial America polarized in pay and status
- Highly educated Asians and Middle Easterners advantaged in the American economy
- Latinos, especially Mexicans, subject to exploitation

6. Economic Conditions of Major Immigrant Groups

TABLE 6: MEDIAN ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND POVERTY RATES OF PRINCIPAL IMMIGRANT NATIONALITIES AND REGIONS OF ORIGIN, 1999

Region/country of birth	Income	
	Median household income (\$)	Poverty rate ^a (%)
Total native-born	49,298	15.1
Total foreign-born	44,999	20.1
Asia	57,002	15.5
Europe, Canada, and Australia	51,004	12.9
Africa	46,067	19.8
Latin America and Caribbean	38,914	25.1
Above \$55,000		
Philippines	70,003	7.4
India	70,002	10.0
Taiwan	65,138	17.3
Hong Kong	64,998	13.6
United Kingdom	62,240	8.4
Between \$44,000 and \$55,000		
Japan	54,117	18.8
Vietnam	53,993	16.3
China	51,025	16.6
Poland	50,006	10.2
Germany	49,813	11.2
Italy	49,122	9.9
Korea	49,005	17.7
Peru	48,644	14.1
Jamaica	47,991	14.9
Below \$44,000		
Columbia	43,242	20.3
El Salvador	41,992	21.8
Former Soviet Union	40,978	23.1
Cuba	40,005	18.2
Haiti	39,981	22.2
Mexico	36,004	28.9
Dominican Republic	34,311	29.3

SOURCE: 2000 US Census, 5% Public Use Microdata Sample.

^aPercentage of persons below the federal poverty line.

7. English-Speaking Ability Among Major Immigrant Groups

TABLE 7: ENGLISH-SPEAKING ABILITY OF IMMIGRANTS FROM NON-ENGLISH-SPEAKING COUNTRIES, 2000

Country of birth	Immigrants age 5 or older who speak non-English language at home (N)	English proficiency ^a		Linguistically isolated households ^b (%)
		Speaks English very well (%)	Speaks English not well or at all (%)	
Nigeria	104,952	86	3	5
Germany	416,018	81	3	6
India	918,696	70	10	12
Philippines	1,201,153	64	8	11
Arab Middle East	469,491	58	16	20
Iran	261,928	57	18	19
Italy	376,461	49	19	19
Haiti	393,497	44	2	26
Taiwan	304,686	42	18	32
Poland	408,249	42	23	32
Russia	293,508	42	26	35
Nicaragua	211,142	40	35	27
Japan	280,721	36	25	34
Cuba	813,604	36	44	39
Colombia	477,077	35	36	34
Korea	726,950	32	35	36
Dominican Republic	641,188	30	45	37
China	927,634	29	43	44
Vietnam	935,412	27	38	44
Mexico	8,488,805	24	53	43
Foreign-born ^c				
Arrived 1990-2000	11,167,607	31	44	44
Arrived 1980-1989	7,181,433	39	33	30
Arrive before 1980	6,804,915	48	25	18

SOURCE: 2000 US Census, 5% Public Use Microdata Sample.

aBased on the response to a census question on English-speaking ability asked of persons who spoke a language other than English at home.

bDefined as a household in which no person age fourteen or older speaks English only or very well.

cTotals exclude immigrants from English-speaking countries and those who speak English only.

8. Advantages of Bilingual Children of Immigrants

TABLE 8: FLUENT BILINGUALISM AS AN INDICATOR OF SELECTIVE ACCULTURATION IN ADOLESCENCE
Family and Psychosocial Effects

		<u>Language Adaptation in 1992</u>		p
		Fluent Bilinguals	English Monolinguals	
Outcomes in 1996	Mean score			
	Net effect			
Family conflict	Mean score	46.1	53	0.01
	Net effect	-0.171 (-4.1)		0.001
Family solidarity	Mean score	30.1	27.6	0.01
	Net effect	0.223(5.4)		0.001
Self-esteem	Mean score	3.58	3.44	0.01
	Net effect	0.133(6.3)		0.001
Educational aspirations	Mean score	75.4	69.9	0.01
	Net effect	0.461 (2.6)		0.05
N		1,011	2,065	

- Lower family conflict
- More family solidarity
- Higher self-esteem
- Greater educational aspirations
- Higher grades
- Lower juvenile delinquencies
- Better health conditions

9. Concluding Remarks

- a. Post-1965 immigration has changed the American face
- b. US far more diverse and far more multicultural
- c. But, it hasn't changed Blacks' position; actually they may be more worse off than before
- d. Asians have improved a lot, but Blacks and Latinos suffer from poverty
- e. Children of immigrants who maintain their ethnic traditions and language are more successful in school and do better in the job market than those highly assimilated