Population Research and Policy Review
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11113-021-09636-9

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

The Socioeconomic Attainments of Second-Generation Southeast Asian Americans in the 21st Century: Evidence from the American Community Survey, 2012–2016

Arthur Sakamoto[1] · **John Iceland**[2] · **Thomas Siskar**[2]

Received: 7 March 2020 / Accepted: 4 January 2021

Abstract

Although decades have passed since the initial immigration of Southeast Asians to the U.S. after the Vietnam War, the socioeconomic outcomes of the native-born offspring of Southeast Asian immigrants have not been adequately considered in recent research. We therefore investigate current data on the education, wages, poverty, affluence, and household income of Southeast Asian Americans. The results indicate that the socioeconomic outcomes of native-born Southeast Asian Americans are substantially higher than their immigrant generation. Second-generation Thai and Vietnamese tend to have higher socioeconomic outcomes than whites, while second-generation Cambodians, Hmong and Laotians have lower outcomes than whites. However, none of the five native-born Southeast Asian groups are penalized in terms of wages net of their demographic characteristics. Furthermore, all five of the native-born Southeast Asian groups generally have higher socioeconomic outcomes than African Americans and Hispanics. Whereas prior discussions of Southeast Asian Americans imply that their lower socioeconomic characteristics derive from the intergenerational persistence of minority discrimination in an inherently racialized society, we instead view them as being broadly consistent with assimilation theory which has traditionally been based on a three-generational model.

Keywords Southeast Asian Americans · Second-generation · Immigrant incorporation · Assimilation · Poverty · Educational attainment

✉ Arthur Sakamoto
asakamoto@tamu.edu

John Iceland
jdi10@psu.edu

[1] Department of Sociology, Texas A&M University, 4351 TAMU, College Station, TX 77843-4351, USA

[2] Department of Sociology and Criminology, The Pennsylvania State University, 211 Oswald Tower, University Park, PA 16802, USA

Published online: 23 January 2021

Introduction: Are the Socioeconomic Characteristics of Second-Generation Southeast Asian Americans Really Similar to African Americans?

In contrast to other minority groups, Asian Americans often have socioeconomic outcomes that are on par with, if not higher than whites because Asian Americans are overrepresented in elite universities, professional occupations, lucrative STEM firms, and the economically affluent population (Sakamoto et al. 2009; Kim and Sakamoto 2010; Liu and Xie 2016; Wang et al. 2017; Zhou and Lee 2017; Iceland 2019; Sakamoto and Hsu 2020). These average statistical outcomes are often contrasted, however, with the notable ethnic diversity within the Asian American category (e.g., Kao and Thompson 2003; Sakamoto et al. 2009; Lee and Kye 2016). In particular, Southeast Asian Americans are frequently highlighted as having lower average socioeconomic outcomes that are similar to African Americans and certainly lower than whites (e.g., Bonilla-Silva 2004).

One exemplary textbook on racial/ethnic relations, for example, states that "many among the Vietnamese and other Southeast Asian groups, most of whom have come as political refugees, are severely impoverished" (Marger 2008, p. 279). Many other studies and textbooks similarly emphasize the lower socioeconomic attainments of Southeast Asian Americans (e.g., Kao and Thompson 2003; Wu 2003; Kim 2007; Kim and Mar 2007; Fong 2008; Lee and Zhou 2015; Desmond and Emirbayer 2016). Kao and Thompson's (2003, p. 436) prototypical conclusion is that "Chinese and Koreans outperform whites on a number of measures, but low-achieving Asian American groups, such as Cambodians and Laotians, have outcomes comparable to African Americans."

The underlying theoretical interpretation of these aforementioned studies is not always explicit, but having outcomes "comparable to African Americans" suggests that Southeast Asian Americans experience persistent, intergenerational socioeconomic disadvantage in an inherently racist society that is highly stratified by race/ethnicity (Feagin and Hernan 2000). This systemic racism view in regard to Southeast Asian Americans is more clearly discussed by Bonilla-Silva (2004, p. 933) who groups "Vietnamese Americans, Hmong Americans, Laotian Americans, Cambodian Americans, dark-skinned Latinos, Blacks, New West Indian and African immigrants, and reservation-bound Native Americans" in a "Collective Black" category. The latter faces endemic racial discrimination due to a "pigmentocratic logic" (Bonilla-Silva 2004, p. 931) because "in post-civil rights America, the maintenance of systemic white privilege is accomplished socially, economically, and politically through institutional, covert, and apparently nonracial practices" (Bonilla-Silva 2004, p. 933). According to Bonilla-Silva's (2004, p. 944), "the new racial stratification system will be more effective in maintaining white supremacy…. Whites will still be at the top of the social structure but will face fewer race-based challenges, and racial inequality will remain and may even widen…."

Bonilla-Silva's (2004) view of pervasive discrimination against the "Collective Black" category implies that, like African Americans, Southeast Americans

will have low levels of intergenerational upward mobility and thus their average "steady state" socioeconomic outcomes (Chetty et al. 2020) will be at the bottom of the "racialized hierarchy" (Bonilla-Silva's 2004, p. 939). Lee and Zhou's (2015, p. 11) statement that "Cambodians, Laotians, and Hmong have higher poverty levels and higher high school dropout rates than the national average and even compared to African Americans" seems compatible with Bonilla-Silva's (2004) view because high school dropouts have much lower lifetime earnings and a higher level of intergenerational reproduction of socioeconomic disadvantage (Bloome 2014; Sakamoto et al. 2018). The prior research cited above that emphasizes persistent socioeconomic disadvantage among Southeast Asian Americans (on par with African Americans) appears to be consistent with Bonilla-Silva's (2004, p. 944) description of the "racial stratification system" in the contemporary U.S. which rigidly enforces intergenerational "white supremacy." This perspective seems congruous with such typical descriptions as Wu's (2003, p. 54) assessment that "Vietnamese Americans and other Southeast Asian refugees languish at the bottom of the economic pyramid, along with blacks."

Another relevant view is the "racialized assimilation" perspective provided by Lee and Kye (2016) who emphasize continued racial discrimination against Asian Americans in general. While recognizing that some Asian groups obtain high levels of socioeconomic attainments in terms of at least some bivariate statistics, Lee and Kye (2016) argue that endemic discrimination against Asian Americans nonetheless remains substantial in terms of labor market penalties, residential segregation, social antipathy from whites, hate crimes, anti-immigration attitudes, and major political barriers. In contrast to "those of European descent," Asian Americans are viewed in terms of the "perpetual foreigner stereotype, no matter how long they have been in the United States…and in many cases their loyalty to the United States is questioned" (Lee and Kye 2016, p. 255).

Both Bonilla-Silva's (2004) description of the racial subordination of the "Collective Black" category as well as Lee and Kye's (2016) "racialized assimilation" view seem to be compatible with previous studies of the "model minority myth" (e.g., Chou and Feagin 2015). The latter concurs with Lee and Kye's (2016, p. 255) conclusion that "the persistent image of Asians as a model minority obscures the continuing racial subordination of and discrimination against Asian Americans." Lee and Kye (2016) do not specifically differentiate any particular processes for Southeast Asian Americans but only reiterate that they are definitely included in the generalization that "Asian American men and women do not achieve parity [vis-a-vis whites] in earnings" (Lee and Kye 2016, p. 265).

An alternative and perhaps less popular view (at least for research on Southeast Asian Americans) is discussed by Sakamoto et al. (2009) who emphasize class characteristics, education, socioeconomic background, and generational status as the key determinants of the socioeconomic differentials among Asian Americans. The more demographically oriented approach of Sakamoto et al. (2009) seems compatible with traditional views of assimilation into the mainstream middle-class majority (Alba and Nee 1997; Nee and Holbrow 2013). The socioeconomic background and class resources that immigrants bring when they enter American society affect their initial degree of "structural assimilation" into the major institutions including

schools and occupations (Alba and Nee 1997, p. 829). The second-generation typically then has a higher degree of assimilation in terms of primary group interactions, while more complete acculturation develops in the subsequent third-generation (Alba and Nee 1997; McLemore and Romo 2005). This traditional approach based on a three-generational model for assimilation is consistent with the Sakamoto et al. (2009) summary of generational differentials among Asian Americans.

Although almost never cited in regard to the socioeconomic outcomes of Southeast Asian Americans, a small number of studies report more positive assessments. Portes and Rumbaut (2001) and Bankston (2014) describe the Southeast Asian second-generation as having quite positive attitudes toward schooling. Although not explicitly broken down by generation, Bankston and Hidalgo (2016, p. 145) report statistics indicating that among persons aged 19 to 22, the enrollment of Hmong in higher education is close to the national average. If accurately portraying the socioeconomic circumstances of second-generation Southeast Asian Americans as a whole, these studies seem more compatible with the traditional assimilation approach (emphasizing increased similarity with mainstream society across successive generations) than with the intergenerational racial discrimination associated with the "Collective Black" perspective of Bonilla-Silva (2004).

Research Objectives in Light of the Current State of Demographic Knowledge About Southeast Asian Americans

The main purpose of this analysis is empirical because detailed demographic facts are extremely important for understanding racial/ethnic inequality. We provide up-to-date, nationally representative statistics about the socioeconomic circumstances of *second-generation* Southeast Asian Americans. Our analysis fills an important research gap because most of the prior research cited above suffers from data limitations. Their conclusions are often based on data that are of limited sample size, outdated or not nationally representative. In many of these studies, the first-generation and the second-generation are not disaggregated or their socioeconomic outcomes are implicitly assumed to be identical.

As noted above, *first-generation* Southeast Asian immigrants are certainly of low socioeconomic origins on average (Rumbaut 2006; Sakamoto and Woo 2007). However, mixed and even contradictory assessments may be reported over time when research does not disaggregate between the first-generation versus the second-generation because the socioeconomic (SES) outcomes of the latter typically exceed those of the former (Rumbaut 2006; Takei, Sakamoto and Kim 2013; Lee and Zhou 2015; Chetty et al. 2020). To reiterate, we investigate the SES characteristics of *second-generation* Southeast Asian Americans because their attainments cannot be precisely inferred in studies that do not differentiate this group from their first-generation parents or that do not use nationally representative data.

Our research objective is timely because much of the existent literature is based on older data and limited sample sizes despite the fact that the initial immigration from Southeast Asia occurred nearly a half-century ago. Many second-generation Southeast Asian Americans are now well into adulthood. We provide important

information for assessing the immigrant incorporation of second-generation Southeast Asians Americans by investigating their education, wages, household income, poverty, and affluence in comparison with other native-born groups including whites, blacks, and Hispanics in the twenty-first century. In contrast to Desmond and Emirbayer (2016, p. 140) who reach strong conclusions based on a sample size of 39 from the 1980s, we investigate the most recently available data which provide a larger sample size of adult second-generation Southeast Asian Americans many of whom are now middle-aged employees in the labor force.

We view our analysis as being broadly motivated by the general approach of contemporary assimilation theory (Alba and Nee 1997). Second-generation Southeast Asian Americans are schooled in the U.S. and are subject to racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic (SES) stratification in the U.S. Their SES attainments require investigation in their own right in order to shed light on assimilation processes as well as evolving racial/ethnic inequality. The SES outcomes of the second-generation cannot be accurately portrayed as being identical to those of their parental generation whose circumstances are heavily influenced by stratification and inequality in their countries of origin at the time of their immigration to the U.S. decades ago. Our research focus is relevant to assessing the applicability of the assimilation perspective by ascertaining an array of SES outcomes among second-generation Southeast Asian Americans in comparison to not only their first-generation but also other racial/ethnic categories.

Nonetheless, assimilation theory is only our "working-hypothesis" approach because we recognize that it may not adequately explain the particular case of Southeast Asian Americans. If their second-generation indeed has SES outcomes that are little improved from those of their parents and quite similar to African Americans, then this result would be more consistent with the "Collective Black" perspective of Bonilla-Silva (2004).[1] If the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation Southeast Asian Americans were significantly improved over those of their parents, then the "racialized assimilation" view of Lee and Kye (2016) would nonetheless be pertinent to the extent that the second-generation still faces major racial penalties in the labor market due to racial discrimination preventing "parity in earnings" (Lee and Kye 2016, p. 265).

Historical Context Describes the Initial Demographic Circumstances of Southeast Asian Immigration Which Constitutes the Socioeconomic Background of the Second-Generation

All categorizations are ultimately analytical, and therefore no one definition of "Southeast Asia" is intrinsically real or absolutely correct. For our purposes, we define Southeast Asian Americans as referring to persons residing in the U.S. who state that their ethnic identity is Cambodian, Hmong, Laotian, Thai or Vietnamese

[1] Bonilla-Silva's (2004) "Collective Black" perspective as applied to Southeast Asians is compatible with "downward assimilation" whereby immigrants assimilate into the low-income American underclass (Portes and Zhou 1993).

(hereafter, CHLTV). While other Southeast Asian groups certainly do exist (e.g., Malaysians, Indonesians), we focus on those groups from that geographic region whose initial immigration patterns were directly precipitated by or associated with the Vietnam War [as is common practice among many researchers studying Asian Americans (Kitano and Daniels 1995)].

Before the 1960s, immigration to the U.S. from Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam was trivial, totaling little more than 300 persons (Barringer et al. 1993, pp. 24–25). As the Vietnam War escalated, immigration from those countries increased (Barringer et al. 1993, pp. 24–25). It surged dramatically, however, after the fall of Saigon in 1975 and continued at a high level in the aftermath of the mass exodus of the "boat people" during the military turmoil of the late 1970s and the 1980s (Rumbaut 1995), which included the deurbanization of Cambodia due to forced labor camps in the countryside [sometimes referred to as the "killing fields" (Rumbaut 2006, p. 263)]. These immigration flows to the U.S. were facilitated by the Refugee Act of 1980 and the Orderly Departure Program beginning in 1980 (Rumbaut 2006, p. 266). By 1992, immigration to the U.S. from Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam totaled over 1.25 million (Barringer et al. 1993, pp. 24–26; Rumbaut 1995, p. 241), which is exponentially larger than the initial 300 from before the Vietnam War.

Well over half of these immigrants entered as dispossessed refugees rather than as economic migrants (Rumbaut 1995, p. 241).[2] As described by Rumbaut (1995, p. 232):

> But unlike other Asians, most Indochinese have come as *refugees* rather than as *immigrants*. Unlike post-1965 immigrants from the Philippines, South Korea, China, India, and elsewhere in Asia….the Indochinese have entered outside of regular immigration channels as part of the largest resettlement program in U.S. history, peaking in 1980 and continuing ever since. As refugees from three countries devastated by war and internecine conflicts, they have experienced contexts of exit far more traumatic than practically any other newcomers in recent times….

In general, refugees tend to have lower socioeconomic statuses than immigrants who are admitted for their labor market skills (Kitano and Daniels 1995).

The Orderly Departure Program was substantially scaled back after 1992 and then officially discontinued in 1997. A reduced flow of immigration still arrives to the U.S. from Southeast Asia through the normal channels of immigration law including family reunification (Rumbaut 2006). However, during the first decade of the twenty-first century, the Asian groups with the lowest percentage of newly arrived immigrants are (in order among all Asian groups) the Laotian, Hmong, Cambodian

[2] Some studies focus on immigration from Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam and exclude Thailand. The former three countries were colonized by France and were sometimes referred to as "Indo-China" (Rumbaut 1995, p. 232). Although Thailand was never colonized, we nonetheless include Thai as Southeast Asian Americans because Thailand was involved in the Vietnam War, and the initial significant immigration from Thailand to the U.S. was associated with the Vietnam War. Furthermore, some Cambodian, Hmong, Laotian or Vietnamese Americans were born in refugee camps located in Thailand (Rumbaut 2006, p. 268).

and Vietnamese, while the percentage for Thai is about twice that for the Vietnamese (Ramakrishnan and Ahmad 2014, p. 30).

Some recent research on Asian Americans emphasizes immigrant selectivity, which Zhou and Lee (2017) refer to as "hyper-selectivity." In the case of Southeast Asians, first-generation immigrants are not disproportionately highly educated. As mentioned above in regard to Rumbaut's (1995) discussion, these immigrants are largely a broad group of dispossessed refugees. Our data are unlikely to include a large number of elites from these countries which, in any event, are not known for having high per capita incomes or extensive educational systems. As a rough indicator of selectivity, the educational attainments of the first-generation are considered in our analysis.

Data and Methods

We update prior research by investigating the 5-year, 2012–2016 sample of the American Community Survey (ACS). These data provide a much larger sample size of CHLTV than has been considered in any previous studies. The 1-year ACS files are inadequate for our research concerns because some our demographic groups (e.g., native-born Laotians) are relatively small. We restrict our target population to persons within the poverty universe of the ACS. In doing so, we exclude unrelated individuals under the age of 15 and people in institutionalized group quarters.

A limitation of the ACS is that it provides no information about parental place of birth. The ACS does include a variable about the respondent's place of birth so we can clearly identify the native-born versus the foreign-born. However, without parental place of birth, we cannot distinguish the third-and-higher generation from the second-generation among the native-born. Nonetheless, based on the immigration histories discussed above, we can confidently assert that the vast majority of single-race CHLTV are second-generation in contrast to whites and African Americans (Min 2006; Ramakrishnan and Ahmad 2014).

Dependent Variables

Socioeconomic well-being is inherently multidimensional and thus cannot be fully indicated by any one measure. We therefore analyze five dependent variables that are widely recognized as being intrinsically important socioeconomic outcomes. The first is the highest level of educational attainment completed, which is defined with five categories: less than high school; high school; some college (including associate's degree); bachelor's degree; and a master's, professional, or doctoral degree. This analysis is restricted to respondents who are at least 25 years old, by which age most people typically have completed most of their education.

The second dependent variable is hourly wage, calculated as the individual's earnings divided by her hours worked. The hourly wage is adjusted to 2016 dollars to control for inflation. Following convention, we log this dependent variable to reduce its skew. This part of the analysis is restricted to individuals aged 25 to 64,

with over 500 h worked, not currently enrolled in school, and with positive earnings. The latter restrictions are imposed in order to remove the effects of persons who are not clearly engaged with the labor market because earnings is defined as income obtained from participation in the labor market.

The third dependent variable is poverty status. People are considered poor if their family income falls below the official poverty line as established by the U.S. Census Bureau. The poverty line is characterized by different income thresholds that vary by family size and composition, which differentiate the basic economic needs of a household.

The fourth dependent variable is affluence. Individuals are defined as affluent if their household income is five times or above the poverty line for their household (Farley 1996). While poverty status is a well-known indicator of the level of household income, affluence is not as widely studied. Affluence is increasingly becoming an important indicator to investigate, however, as the poverty rate has remained relatively stagnant in recent decades, while the proportion of high income households is rising especially among Asian Americans and whites—reflective of both growing standards of living and income inequality in the United States (Iceland 2019).

The last dependent variable is household income. It is not adjusted for family size or composition in contrast to poverty and affluence. Household income is measured in terms of the actual dollar amounts which are also adjusted to 2016 dollars to control for inflation. When used as a dependent variable in a multiple regression, household income is logged to reduce the skew. In contrast to the analysis of individual earnings, household incomes of zero or less are included in the analysis. Household incomes of zero or less are reassigned a value of 1 in order to permit logging.

Independent Variables

The main independent variable of theoretical interest is race/ethnicity by generational status. Generational status is determined by whether or not an individual was born in the United States, and if they entered the United States before the age of 12. An individual born outside of the United States is considered first-generation if the person immigrated to the U.S. at the age of 12 or older. A person who entered the United States before the age of 12 and was born in another country is considered 1.5 generation. Everyone who was born in the United States is native-born.

We then created variables for race/ethnicity by generational status. The race/ethnicity variables include Cambodian, Hmong, Thai, Vietnamese, Laotian, white, black, Other Asians, and Hispanics. These are all single-race individuals. All of the individuals who are white, black, or any of the Asian groups are not Hispanic. Other Asians includes all Asians except for the CHLTV groups.[3] Each race/ethnicity was then recoded by generation in the empirical analyses. Hereafter, "whites" refers to native-born non-Hispanic whites, while "Hispanics" refers to native-born Hispanics, and "blacks" (or "African Americans") refers to native-born African Americans.

[3] Persons who identify as both Vietnamese and Chinese were allocated into the Other Asian group on the advice of a reviewer. We also added other multiple-ethnic Asian combinations to Other Asians. Our findings are not sensitive, however, to these allocations.

We include controls for age and age-squared as continuous variables. Additionally we control for variables at the family level, including family size and number of children. Family type is measured in terms of three categories: married couple (as the reference), female-headed households (family households with and without children), and other households. Gender is controlled for in the models specified with a female dichotomous variable although in some analyses we estimate separate models for men and women. We also include dichotomous variables for whether the individual is a military veteran, resides in a metropolitan area, or has a disability. The control for U.S. Census region is inclusive of all nine U.S. Census-designated divisions.

Analytic Strategy

We begin with a descriptive examination of patterns of socioeconomic status by race/ethnicity and generation. We then use a variety of multivariate models to address our research questions. Specifically, we use ordinal logistic regression when education is the dependent variable because it consists of five ordered categories. The hourly wage dependent variable is continuous and is therefore analyzed with standard OLS regression, as is the household income variable. We use logistic regression models for our dichotomous poverty and affluence variables.

As is commonly done, we estimate separate models for men and women for the education and hourly wage dependent variables due to gender interactions in educational and labor force outcomes. We do not include region, metropolitan status, number of children, family size and type in the models with education as the outcome because education might have been completed in the past before the values of those variables were ascertained in the cross-sectional data (Takei et al. 2013). For each dependent variable we estimate two models: one with the race/generational status variables alone, and a second with all of the controls to determine the extent to which they statistically explain some of the bivariate associations.

We focus on the extent to which the CHLTV groups vary from native-born non-Hispanic whites, but also include Hispanics and African Americans (by generation) for a fuller set of comparisons. As described in the background section, we are particularly interested in assessing the extent to which the outcomes of CHLTV groups vary by generational status. Many of the foreign-born of these groups arrived in the United States with relatively low levels of socioeconomic attainment and our analyses reveal the extent to which this relatively low status is maintained across generations.

In supplemental analyses, we restricted the sample to all respondents age 25 to 46, since many of the second-generation CHLTV are still relatively young adults. These results do not substantively differ from the ones shown, as virtually all of the coefficients that are significant with the full sample are significant and in the same direction with the limited sample. These results are available upon request.

Empirical Results

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics by race/ethnicity and generational status. 21.1% of native-born whites have a BA, while another 12.6% have a graduate degree. White immigrants (first-generation and 1.5 generation) tend to have slightly higher levels of education. In contrast, the first-generation of the CHLTV groups, with the exception of the Thai, have considerably lower levels of education. For example, only 5.2% of first-generation Hmong have a BA, while 1.9% have a graduate degree. 60.0% of first-generation Hmong did not complete high school in comparison to 13.8% among first-generation whites.

Considerable educational upgrading across generations is evident, however, for all groups. For most groups, the increase is mainly between the first-generation and the 1.5 generation, with no increase in education, and in fact slightly lower levels, among the native-born (the Thai are once again an exception). This same pattern extends to the Other Asians group—which includes the broad array of ethnicities such as like Chinese and Indian—where there is a higher proportion of those who have a BA or more in the 1.5 generation than in the first-generation, with a modestly lower level among the native-born. Even with this variation, very high levels of education are evident for Other Asians of all generations, as well over half have a BA or more. Blacks and Hispanics of all generations generally have lower levels of education on average (the one exception being 1.5 generation blacks).

The pattern of a substantial increase in socioeconomic status between the first and 1.5- generation among the CHLTV groups, and then a modestly lower increase for the native-born is evident for the other indicators in Table 1 including median household income, percent poor and affluent, and average wages. In comparison with whites, nearly all CHLTV groups have higher levels of poverty, but among native-born Thai and Vietnamese, median household incomes and levels of affluence are greater than among native-born whites. Native-born Thai have slightly higher wages than whites, though native-born Vietnamese have slightly lower wages than whites. Consistent with high levels of education, Other Asians of all generations tend to have higher socioeconomic outcomes than native-born whites, while blacks and Hispanics have lower outcomes.

With regard to the slight generational decline in outcomes between the 1.5 generation and native-born among the CHLTV groups, average age may play a role. Specifically, the native-born in the sample are younger than the 1.5 generation for all groups except among the Thai, and age is positively associated with socioeconomic outcomes. For example, the average age of 1.5 generation Cambodians is 37, compared to 31 among the native-born. These are both considerably younger than the average among native-born whites, which is 53. Thus, age is an important control in our multivariate analyses.

Appendix Tables 6 and 7 show the descriptive statistics for the socioeconomic outcomes separately for men and women, respectively. Overall, the results tend to show the same patterns as in Table 1. Among CHLTV, for both men and women, SES is generally higher among the 1.5 generation than the first-generation,

Table 1 Socioeconomic outcomes by racial/ethnic group and generation, 2012–2016

	Less than high school	High school	Some college	BA	Grad	Median household income	% Poor	% Affluent	Wages	Mean age	Sample size
Whites											
1st generation	13.8	22.3	22.1	21.7	20.2	55,695	12.1	35.8	34.7	54.6	276,946
1.5 generation	7.0	22.5	29.2	24.2	17.1	67,847	7.6	42.4	33.2	50.7	58,609
Native-born	7.5	28.2	30.6	21.1	12.6	60,000	8.6	34.9	28.5	52.6	7,299,481
Cambodians											
1st generation	45.5	25.5	17.7	8.1	3.2	49,047	18.8	15.1	19.5	52.7	4486
1.5 generation	11.5	24.0	36.2	20.7	7.6	74,000	12.8	23.8	23.4	36.5	1485
Native-born	10.2	31.3	33.8	19.8	4.9	62,722	14.0	18.4	19.8	30.9	1186
Hmong											
1st generation	60.0	18.1	14.9	5.2	1.9	43,379	27.4	6.6	17.6	51.3	1978
1.5 generation	7.2	26.1	38.5	21.4	6.9	52,268	17.1	10.3	21.0	35.0	1353
Native-born	7.8	29.2	41.2	17.8	4.0	55,759	15.9	10.6	18.1	30.0	1406
Laotian											
1st generation	42.6	29.0	18.6	7.3	2.5	50,690	13.8	14.4	19.6	53.9	3138
1.5 generation	10.9	31.7	34.4	17.8	5.3	65,858	10.5	20.7	21.9	37.3	1426
Native-born	10.3	31.4	38.0	16.3	4.0	57,650	10.5	18.2	19.3	32.2	906
Thai											
1st generation	20.1	17.9	18.3	27.8	16.0	60,789	14.4	29.9	22.1	50.6	5276
1.5 generation	5.2	20.9	34.5	26.9	12.4	67,847	7.9	35.1	27.1	39.4	549
Native-born	3.7	12.3	30.7	33.2	20.1	80,090	8.4	41.5	30.9	36.5	894
Vietnamese											
1st generation	34.2	24.8	21.5	14.0	5.5	51,735	14.5	20.0	20.9	52.1	40,331
1.5 generation	6.5	13.9	25.6	36.8	17.2	78,986	8.3	40.0	32.6	37.6	7274
Native-born	7.3	13.3	27.7	37.1	14.6	69,872	10.7	36.9	27.3	34.3	5386

Table 1 (continued)

	Less than high school	High school	Some college	BA	Grad	Median household income	% Poor	% Affluent	Wages	Mean age	Sample size
Other Asians											
1st generation	13.9	14.9	16.2	29.8	25.2	72,130	10.5	38.6	33.0	49.7	338,962
1.5 generation	3.5	10.4	25.2	37.9	23.0	86,765	6.3	48.7	36.8	38.7	38,609
Native-born	4.6	15.2	25.5	33.9	20.9	88,614	7.6	46.7	34.0	44.1	94,342
Blacks											
1st generation	17.4	27.2	28.2	16.4	10.9	45,569	16.0	19.3	22.2	48.8	97,072
1.5 generation	6.0	21.8	35.9	23.5	12.8	50,000	12.2	26.3	24.8	38.7	11,502
Native-born	14.6	31.8	34.3	12.3	7.1	35,000	21.4	17.4	20.4	48.7	887,499
Hispanics											
1st generation	51.4	24.8	13.5	7.0	3.2	38,743	22.4	8.4	15.8	47.2	545,296
1.5 generation	25.5	29.2	29.3	11.1	4.9	48,156	15.4	16.5	20.3	39.7	95,732
Native-born	18.2	29.2	33.4	13.1	6.1	46,706	15.5	20.5	21.8	44.0	586,695

Source 2012–2016 American Community Survey. Calculations for blacks, whites, and Asian groups are for people who report that group alone

The calculations for poverty, income, and education are for people aged 25+; earnings and wages are for people aged 25–64 with over 500 h worked, not currently enrolled in school, and positive earnings. Median household income calculated for households. Sample size is full count of group, some categories are restricted to smaller sample

though slightly lower levels among the native-born. This pattern, however, seems to be more common for men than women. For example, the educational levels of CHLTV women tend to be more similar between the 1.5 generation and the native-born than among men, which is reflected in wages as well. Thai and Vietnamese men and women tend to have higher levels of SES than Cambodians, Hmong, and Laotians. Native-born Thai and Vietnamese women also tend to have higher SES than native-born white women, though this is not evident among men, where the results vary somewhat depending on the outcome of interest.

We now turn to our multivariate analyses, where we examine differences in SES after controlling for individual-level and family-level variables. In regard to the descriptive statistics for our control variables, they are shown in Table 2. For the overall sample as a whole, the most populous division is the South Atlantic, and 78% of respondents live in metropolitan areas. Sixteen percent of households have an individual with a disability, another 9% have a veteran, and 60% of households have a married couple.

When broken down by racial/ethnic group, the greater concentration of Asians in the Pacific is evident since that region is home to 47% of Cambodians, 38% of Hmong, 38% of Laotians, 37% of Thai, 44% of Vietnamese, and 42% of Other Asians, but only 13% of whites and 7% of African Americans. Table 4 also shows that Hmong have the largest mean family size (5.4) followed by Cambodians (4.0), Laotians (3.9) and Hispanics (3.8), while it is only 2.6 among whites. Female-headed households are most prevalent among African Americans (26%) and to a somewhat lesser extent Cambodians (16%) and Hispanics (14%), while female-headed households are least prevalent among Other Asians (8%) and whites (8%).

We begin by investigating educational attainment, with separate models by gender controlling for age, disability, and veteran status. These results are shown in Table 3. Native-born Cambodians, Hmong, and Laotians all have lower levels of education than native-born whites of the same gender. However, native-born Thai and Vietnamese have higher levels of education than whites of the same gender. Among most CHLTV groups, the education attainment of the 1.5 generation is higher than the first-generation but only moderately higher than for the native-born, similar to the pattern shown in Table 1. The Thai are an exception, as education increases more steadily across generations.

Other Asians of all generations are much more likely to have higher levels of education than native-born whites, while the opposite is true for blacks and Hispanics. The one exception among the latter groups is that 1.5 generation black women have similar levels of education as native-born white women. Foreign-born whites tend to have higher levels of education than native-born whites, suggestive of highly selective immigration among whites. The addition of the control variables generally does not change the pattern of associations, so for the most part those results affirm the bivariate patterns observed in Table 1. Native-born CHLTV men tend to have higher levels of education than native-born blacks and Hispanics. Among native-born CHLTV women, higher levels of education vis-à-vis blacks and Hispanics is more consistently apparent among the Thai and Vietnamese.

Regarding statistical significance, Table 3 shows the tests at the 0.05 level for the coefficients indicating ethnicity by generational group. A superscript of *a* indicates

Table 2 Descriptive statistics for independent variables

	Total	White	Cambodians	Hmong	Laotians	Thai	Vietnamese	Other Asians	Blacks	Hispanics
Division										
New England	4.8%	5.8%	14.2%	0.8%	5.2%	2.7%	3.7%	3.5%	2.3%	0.4%
Mid-Atlantic	13.4%	13.3%	8.0%	0.7%	2.7%	9.2%	5.4%	18.5%	14.0%	2.5%
East North Central	14.8%	17.3%	5.2%	21.7%	8.8%	8.3%	4.0%	8.3%	13.8%	7.9%
West North Central	6.5%	8.3%	3.7%	27.3%	11.8%	5.2%	4.4%	2.3%	3.3%	2.4%
South Atlantic	20.1%	19.0%	10.6%	7.1%	12.5%	18.4%	14.9%	12.5%	34.9%	6.0%
East South Central	5.9%	6.7%	1.4%	0.3%	4.4%	2.5%	1.8%	1.4%	9.6%	1.2%
West South Central	11.4%	9.6%	6.5%	2.1%	11.0%	8.1%	16.9%	6.9%	13.3%	27.8%
Mountain	7.0%	7.4%	3.7%	2.5%	6.0%	9.0%	4.4%	4.5%	2.0%	12.4%
Pacific	16.1%	12.5%	46.6%	37.6%	37.5%	36.6%	44.4%	42.1%	6.8%	39.6%
Metro	78.3%	72.8%	96.5%	92.2%	91.2%	92.7%	97.0%	95.2%	86.5%	89.1%
Disabled	16.3%	17.3%	14.7%	14.1%	12.8%	7.9%	10.3%	8.6%	19.2%	11.6%
Veteran	9.0%	10.7%	1.6%	2.0%	2.3%	1.8%	1.8%	2.7%	8.9%	3.6%
Family size	2.8	2.6	4.0	5.4	3.9	2.8	3.6	3.3	2.8	3.8
Number of children	0.8	0.7	1.1	2.1	1.1	0.6	1.0	0.9	0.8	1.3
Family type										
Married couple	59.7%	62.9%	57.9%	61.6%	59.5%	62.8%	68.5%	71.6%	38.0%	60.3%
Female-headed	11.1%	8.0%	16.2%	11.3%	11.7%	9.5%	11.3%	8.0%	26.3%	13.8%
Other	29.2%	29.2%	25.9%	27.2%	28.8%	27.7%	20.3%	20.4%	35.6%	25.8%

Source 2012–2016 American Community Survey

All variables restricted to age 25+

Table 3 Ordinal logistic regression of educational attainment by gender, 2012–2016

	Males		Females	
	OR	OR	OR	OR
Native-born Whites (ref.)				
1st gen. White	1.457[abc]	1.456[abc]	0.978[abc]	1.019[abc]
1.5 gen. White	1.383[abc]	1.331[abc]	1.312[abc]	1.234[abc]
1st gen. Cambodian	0.239[abc]	0.239[abc]	0.113[abc]	0.100[abc]
1.5 gen. Cambodian	0.800[abc]	0.717[abc]	0.869[abc]	0.586[ac]
Native-born Cambodian	0.639[abc]	0.568[abc]	0.779[abc]	0.496[ab]
1st gen. Hmong	0.152[abc]	0.155[abc]	0.046[abc]	0.041[abc]
1.5 gen. Hmong	0.888[bc]	0.802[abc]	0.936[bc]	0.619[ac]
Native-born Hmong	0.667[abc]	0.595[abc]	0.852[abc]	0.534[ac]
1st gen. Laotian	0.214[abc]	0.212[abc]	0.128[abc]	0.114[abc]
1.5 gen. Laotian	0.635[abc]	0.569[abc]	0.717[ac]	0.474[ab]
Native-born Laotian	0.603[abc]	0.536[a]	0.729[ac]	0.477[ab]
1st gen. Thai	1.593[abc]	1.525[abc]	0.837[abc]	0.728[abc]
1.5 gen. Thai	1.266[abc]	1.094[bc]	1.349[abc]	0.960[bc]
Native-born Thai	1.996[abc]	1.861[abc]	2.380[abc]	1.624[abc]
1st gen. Vietnamese	0.403[abc]	0.393[abc]	0.230[abc]	0.196[abc]
1.5 gen. Vietnamese	1.714[abc]	1.524[abc]	2.216[abc]	1.540[abc]
Native-born Vietnamese	1.578[abc]	1.426[abc]	2.030[abc]	1.381[abc]
1st gen. other Asians	2.491[abc]	2.384[abc]	1.505[abc]	1.331[abc]
1.5 gen. other Asians	2.423[abc]	2.183[abc]	2.881[abc]	2.081[abc]
Native-born other Asians	2.043[abc]	1.924[abc]	2.210[abc]	1.847[abc]
1st gen. Hispanics	0.111[abc]	0.100[abc]	0.122[abc]	0.095[abc]
1.5 gen. Hispanics	0.338[abc]	0.303[abc]	0.424[abc]	0.297[abc]
Native-born Hispanics	0.492[a]	0.470[ab]	0.562[ab]	0.453[ab]
1st gen. blacks	0.800[abc]	0.746[abc]	0.555[ab]	0.471[abc]
1.5 gen. blacks	1.008[bc]	0.905[abc]	1.432[abc]	1.019[bc]
Native-born blacks	0.496[a]	0.491[ac]	0.644[ac]	0.586[ac]
With controls		X		X
Observations	4,920,636	4,920,636	5,483,184	5,483,184

Source 2012–2016 American Community Survey. Calculations for blacks, whites, and Asian groups are for people who report that group alone. Controls include age, age-squared, disability status, and veteran status

[a] $p < 0.05$ ref. native-born whites

[b] $p < 0.05$ ref. native-born blacks

[c] $p < 0.05$ ref. native-born Hispanics

that the coefficient is statistically significant relative to native-born whites (which is the reference group in Table 3), a superscript of *b* indicates that the coefficient is statistically significant relative to the coefficient for native-born African Americans, and a superscript of *c* indicates that the coefficient is statistically significant relative to the coefficient for native-born Hispanics.

Table 4 Ordinary least squares regression models predicting logged hourly wage by gender, 2012–2016

	Males				Females			
	b	SE	*b*	SE	*b*	SE	*b*	SE
Native-born Whites (ref.)								
1st gen. Whites	0.136	0.004[abc]	− 0.032	0.003[abc]	0.056	0.004[abc]	− 0.059	0.004[abc]
1.5 gen Whites	0.111	0.007[abc]	0.046	0.006[abc]	0.136	0.007[abc]	0.055	0.007[abc]
1st gen. Cambodian	− 0.288	0.021[ab]	− 0.199	0.021[ac]	− 0.381	0.024[abc]	− 0.151	0.025[abc]
1.5 gen. Cambodian	− 0.171	0.032[abc]	− 0.063	0.028[ab]	− 0.069	0.038[bc]	0.004	0.034[b]
Native-born Cambodian	− 0.371	0.035[ac]	− 0.043	0.031[b]	− 0.116	0.039[ab]	0.106	0.037[abc]
1st gen. Hmong	− 0.419	0.029[abc]	− 0.316	0.031[abc]	− 0.418	0.037[abc]	− 0.048	0.032
1.5 gen. Hmong	− 0.293	0.033[a]	− 0.163	0.033[a]	− 0.133	0.033[a]	0.003	0.033[b]
Native-born Hmong	− 0.408	0.028[abc]	− 0.030	0.029[bc]	− 0.222	0.033[a]	0.031	0.028[bc]
1st gen. Laotian	− 0.279	0.021[ab]	− 0.151	0.023[ac]	− 0.298	0.024[abc]	− 0.079	0.022[ac]
1.5 gen. Laotian	− 0.234	0.039[ab]	− 0.092	0.034[ab]	− 0.101	0.032[abc]	0.025	0.027[bc]
Native-born Laotian	− 0.395	0.038[ac]	− 0.02	0.035[bc]	− 0.136	0.039[a]	0.078	0.033[abc]
1st gen. Thai	− 0.238	0.032[ab]	− 0.344	0.029[abc]	− 0.241	0.024[ac]	− 0.271	0.021[abc]
1.5 gen. Thai	− 0.126	0.058[abc]	− 0.120	0.059[a]	0.057	0.054[bc]	0.060	0.050[b]
Native-born Thai	− 0.021	0.049[b]	− 0.028	0.042[b]	0.191	0.042[abc]	0.106	0.037[abc]
1st gen. Vietnamese	− 0.287	0.010[abc]	− 0.268	0.008[abc]	− 0.348	0.009[abc]	− 0.193	0.008[abc]
1.5 gen. Vietnamese	0.027	0.017[bc]	− 0.044	0.015[abc]	0.198	0.018[abc]	0.094	0.015[abc]
Native-born Vietnamese	− 0.112	0.019[abc]	− 0.024	0.017[bc]	0.083	0.023[abc]	0.067	0.020[abc]
1st gen. other Asians	0.098	0.003[abc]	− 0.135	0.003[abc]	0.083	0.003[abc]	− 0.056	0.003[abc]
1.5 gen. other Asians	0.166	0.007[abc]	0.033	0.006[abc]	0.317	0.008[abc]	0.155	0.007[abc]
Native-born other Asians	0.101	0.006[abc]	0.001	0.005[bc]	0.252	0.006[abc]	0.109	0.006[abc]
1st gen. Hispanics	− 0.558	0.002[abc]	− 0.304	0.002[abc]	− 0.527	0.002[abc]	− 0.272	0.002[abc]
1.5 gen. Hispanics	− 0.351	0.004[ac]	− 0.119	0.003[abc]	− 0.239	0.005[abc]	− 0.054	0.005[abc]
Native-born Hispanics	− 0.267	0.002[ab]	− 0.101	0.002[ab]	− 0.170	0.002[ab]	− 0.035	0.002[ab]
1st gen. blacks	− 0.280	0.006[abc]	− 0.281	0.005[abc]	− 0.149	0.005[abc]	− 0.075	0.004[abc]
1.5 gen. blacks	− 0.188	0.013[abc]	− 0.097	0.012[ab]	0.030	0.011[abc]	0.019	0.009[abc]
Native-born blacks	− 0.351	0.002[ac]	− 0.183	0.002[ac]	− 0.194	0.002[ac]	− 0.067	0.002[ac]
With controls			X				X	

Table 4 (continued)

	Males				Females			
	b	SE	*b*	SE	*b*	SE	*b*	SE
Observations	2,863,317		2,863,317		2,524,474		2,524,474	
R^2	0.065		0.281		0.046		0.253	

Source 2012–2016 American Community Survey. Calculations for blacks, whites, and Asian groups are for people who report that group alone. Controls include age, aged squared, disability status, veteran status, education, family size and type, number of children, region, and metro status

[a] $p < 0.05$ ref. native-born whites

[b] $p < 0.05$ ref. native-born blacks

[c] $p < 0.05$ ref. native-born Hispanics

As is evident in Table 3, all of the coefficients for native-born CHLTV men are statistically different from native-born whites. Almost all of the coefficients for native-born CHLTV men are statistically different from native-born blacks and Hispanics as well (the one exception being native-born Laotians in the long model specification). Among women, all of the coefficients for the native-born CHLTV are statistically different from native-born whites. Native-born Cambodian and Laotian women are significantly different from black women but not from Hispanic women, while native-born Hmong women are significantly different from Hispanic women but not black women.

The next set of models investigates logged hourly wage by gender, which are shown in Table 4. Among men, CHLTV generally earn less than native-born white men in models without any control variables. This again reflects the pattern of mean wage across the groups (i.e., bivariate differentials) that are evident in Appendix Table 6. However, once we add controls (model 2), there is no statistically significant difference in hourly wage between any of the native-born CHLTV groups (including the Hmong) and native-born whites. Among the other groups of men, black and Hispanic generational groups have lower wages than white men (i.e., even net of all of the control variables in the final model), while wages among native-born Other Asian men are not significantly different than those for white men. The coefficients for each group of native-born CHLTV men are all statistically different from native-born African American men (i.e., as indicated by the *b* superscripts in Table 4).

Among women, there are many similarities with the results for men, but with a couple of differences as well. Most, though not all, generational groups have lower wages than white women in models without controls. When all controls are added, first-generation CHLTV groups of women still have lower wages than white women, though for many of the 1.5 generation and native-born groups, these differences are not significant, and for some groups, such as native-born Cambodians, Laotians, Thai, and Vietnamese, their wages are higher than among native-born white women. More generally, among Asians of different origins, women are less disadvantaged or more advantaged vis-à-vis native-born whites than respective groups of men. Native-born and 1.5 generation Other Asian

women similarly have higher earnings than native-born white women, while most groups of black and Hispanic women have lower wages than white women, with the exception of 1.5 generation black women who have slightly higher wages than white women.

Finally, we turn to outcomes that depend on income at the family level: poverty, affluence, and family income. These results are shown in Table 5. With regard to poverty, in models without controls, most CHLTV generation groups are more likely to be poor than native-born whites, and many of these relationships persist even with controls. Among the exceptions are 1.5 generation Cambodians, and 1.5 generation and native-born Laotians and Thai, where there is no significant difference in the likelihood of poverty. Further research is needed to assess whether the higher poverty rates of some of the 1.5 generation and native-born groups may be affected by greater family needs due to co-residence with first-generation relatives.

With regard to affluence—defined as having family income that is five times the poverty line or greater—most CHLTV groups are less likely to be affluent than native-born whites, with the same exception of the 1.5 generation and native-born Thai and Vietnamese. All black and Hispanic groups are more likely to be poor and less likely to be affluent than native-born whites, though native-born Other Asians are both more likely to be poor and more likely to be affluent than native-born whites, as are 1.5 generation whites, suggestive of greater variation in family incomes among this broad group. As for household income, all first-generation CHLTV groups (as well as the first-generation of all other race/ethnicities in the table) have lower incomes than native-born whites in models with the full set of controls. However, all but one of the native-born of these groups have household incomes that do not differ significantly from those of native-born whites, and that exception are the native-born Hmong.

Following conventional practice in this literature including the more theoretical references cited earlier, our focus is racial/ethnic differences on average for different SES indicators. Although not widely discussed, demographic groups also sometimes differ in terms of variances (Leicht 2008; Sakamoto et al. 2009, p. 259). For example, the results for model 1 in Table 5 indicate that native-born Vietnamese have 8.9% higher odds of being affluent and approximately 22.6% higher household incomes (although the non-significant findings for this group relative to whites in model 2 indicate that these advantages are statistically explained by the controls). However, native-born Vietnamese also have 27.6% higher odds of being poor according to model 1 in Table 5. These estimates are not contradictory but only indicate that native-born Vietnamese have a high degree of socioeconomic variability compared to whites. By contrast, native-born Thai seem to have less socioeconomic variability compared to whites.

Overall, our summary of these results is that while some of the CHLTV groups lag behind native-born whites with respect to some of the family-level SES indicators, more often than not native-born CHLTV do not significantly differ from whites. This is suggestive of generational upward mobility among CHLTV groups. While the native-born Hmong usually have the lowest family-level SES outcomes among the CHLTV groups, the native-born Hmong also have the youngest average age across all of the groups in our study. Compared to whites, native-born Vietnamese

Table 5 Logistic regression predicting poverty, affluence and household income, 2012–2016

	Poverty		Affluence		Household Income			
	OR	OR	OR	OR	*b*	SE	*b*	SE
Native-born Whites (ref.)								
1st gen. Whites	1.440[abc]	1.874[abc]	1.045[abc]	0.822[abc]	− 0.082	0.005[abc]	− 0.212	0.005[abc]
1.5 gen. Whites	0.87[abc]	1.077[abc]	1.375[abc]	1.128[abc]	0.138	0.008[abc]	− 0.012	0.007[bc]
1st gen. Cambodian	2.410[abc]	1.762[ac]	0.336[abc]	0.545[ac]	− 0.150	0.037[ab]	− 0.178	0.035[ab]
1.5 gen. Cambodian	1.535[abc]	1.230[b]	0.584[abc]	0.733[ab]	0.127	0.043[abc]	− 0.145	0.035[ab]
Native-born Cambodian	1.720[ab]	1.307[ab]	0.419[a]	0.614[a]	0.126	0.041[abc]	− 0.058	0.046[bc]
1st gen. Hmong	3.989[ab]	1.978[ac]	0.131[abc]	0.410[abc]	− 0.195	0.045[ab]	− 0.265	0.037[abc]
1.5 gen. Hmong	2.201[ab]	1.636[a]	0.213[abc]	0.385[abc]	0.045	0.038[bc]	− 0.324	0.040[ac]
Native-born Hmong	2.001[abc]	1.609[a]	0.220[abc]	0.405[abc]	− 0.14	0.107[b]	− 0.492	0.103[ac]
1st gen. Laotian	1.691[abc]	1.252[ab]	0.314[abc]	0.500[abc]	− 0.134	0.036[abc]	− 0.122	0.034[ab]
1.5 gen. Laotian	1.240[bc]	0.893[bc]	0.485[ab]	0.695[a]	0.131	0.041[abc]	− 0.065	0.034[bc]
Native-born Laotian	1.250[bc]	0.881[bc]	0.412[a]	0.681[a]	0.075	0.047[bc]	− 0.034	0.047[bc]
1st gen. Thai	1.686[abc]	2.091[abc]	0.822[abc]	0.590[ac]	− 0.153	0.037[ab]	− 0.314	0.034[ac]
1.5 gen. Thai	0.886[bc]	0.906[b]	1.024[bc]	0.967[bc]	0.207	0.083[abc]	− 0.010	0.070[bc]
Native-born Thai	0.972[bc]	1.041[b]	1.319[abc]	1.115[bc]	0.292	0.078[abc]	0.078	0.073[bc]
1st gen. Vietnamese	1.767[abc]	1.768[ac]	0.468[ab]	0.529[abc]	− 0.065	0.011[abc]	− 0.219	0.010[abc]
1.5 gen. Vietnamese	0.968[bc]	1.246[ab]	1.240[abc]	0.978[bc]	0.287	0.024[abc]	− 0.114	0.023[abc]
Native-born Vietnamese	1.276[abc]	1.454[ab]	1.089[abc]	1.050[bc]	0.226	0.028[abc]	− 0.049	0.026[bc]
1st gen. other Asians	1.225[abc]	2.031[abc]	1.181[abc]	0.721[abc]	0.123	0.005[abc]	− 0.277	0.005[bc]
1.5 gen. other Asians	0.713[abc]	1.060[bc]	1.778[abc]	1.219[abc]	0.441	0.010[abc]	0.008	0.010[bc]
Native-born other Asians	0.870[abc]	1.117[abc]	1.635[abc]	1.283[abc]	0.292	0.008[abc]	0.009	0.008[abc]
1st gen. Hispanics	3.085[abc]	1.856[abc]	0.171[abc]	0.306[abc]	− 0.386	0.003[abc]	− 0.281	0.003[abc]
1.5 gen. Hispanics	1.931[ab]	1.321[abc]	0.366[abc]	0.561[abc]	− 0.122	0.005[abc]	− 0.186	0.005[abc]
Native-born Hispanics	1.937[ab]	1.371[ab]	0.481[ab]	0.686[ab]	− 0.210	0.003[ab]	− 0.170	0.003[ab]

Table 5 (continued)

	Poverty		Affluence		Household Income			
	OR	OR	OR	OR	*b*	SE	*b*	SE
1st gen. blacks	2.000[abc]	1.728[abc]	0.446[abc]	0.497[abc]	− 0.267	0.008[abc]	− 0.321	0.007[abc]
1.5 gen. blacks	1.457[abc]	1.249[abc]	0.671[abc]	0.753[abc]	− 0.080	0.017[abc]	− 0.205	0.016[abc]
Native-born blacks	2.839[ac]	1.791[ac]	0.396[ac]	0.616[ac]	− 0.622	0.003[ac]	− 0.378	0.003[ac]
Female	1.377[abc]	1.380[abc]	0.837[abc]	0.855[abc]	− 0.113	0.001[abc]	− 0.077	0.0013[abc]
With controls		X		X			X	
Observations	10,403,820	10,403,820	10,403,820	10,403,820	10,403,820		10,403,820	

Source 2012–2016 American Community Survey. Calculations for blacks, whites, and Asian groups are for people who report that group alone. Controls include gender, age, aged squared, disability status, veteran status, education, family size and type, number of children, region, and metro status

[a] $p < 0.05$ ref. native-born whites

[b] $p < 0.05$ ref. native-born blacks

[c] $p < 0.05$ ref. native-born Hispanics

have a higher level of socioeconomic variability, while native-born Thai have a lower level of socioeconomic variability.

Discussion: How do Second-Generation Southeast Asian Americans Fare Relative to the SES Characteristics of Which Groups?

We have provided an up-to-date investigation of the socioeconomic characteristics of Southeast Asian Americans. Our results are the most detailed evidence ever obtained on the SES characteristics for this category of Asian Americans. Our analysis is timely in that these recent data provide larger sample sizes including a significant number of older second-generation CHLTV who are particularly pertinent to assimilation theory which has been neglected in prior studies of Southeast Asian Americans.

Our descriptive analyses indicate substantial intergenerational improvements in SES, including higher levels of educational attainment among the native-born CHLTV than blacks and Hispanics.[4] This indicates that contrary to prior claims (e.g., Kim and Mar 2007, p. 181; Lee and Zhou 2015, p. 11), native-born Cambodians, Hmong, and Laotians do not have higher high school dropout rates than African Americans and Hispanics. The high school dropout rates of native-born Cambodians, Hmong, and Laotians are closer to whites (7.5%) than to African Americans and Hispanics. Furthermore, the educational attainment of native-born CHLTV has wage returns similar to whites in the labor market, in contrast to blacks and to a lesser extent Hispanics. In the case of native-born Cambodian, Laotian, Thai, and Vietnamese women, their wage returns to their educational attainment appear to be actually greater than for white women.

Contrary to the conventional wisdom discussed earlier (e.g., Kao and Thompson 2003; Bonilla-Silva 2004; Wu 2003; Lee and Zhou 2015) that has been codified in popular textbooks (e.g., Marger 2008; Desmond and Emirbayer 2016), our descriptive findings indicate that the poverty rate for blacks is significantly greater than for native-born CHLTV. The poverty rate for Hispanics is greater than for native-born Cambodians, Laotians, Thai and Vietnamese, while it is similar to that of native-born Hmong. As noted above, native-born Hmong are considerably less likely than to drop out of high school and are more likely to compete college than Hispanics. The average age of native-born Hispanics is 44.0, while it is only 30.0 among native-born Hmong. As Hmong gain more work experience as they age, the possibility exists that their wages might rise somewhat.[5]

[4] We generally investigate generational change but our results are not equivalent to a family-level intergenerational elasticity (e.g., Chetty et al. 2020) because our data do not refer to offspring linked specifically to their own parents.

[5] Wu (2003, p. 54) refers to the higher poverty rate of Vietnamese Americans compared to blacks based on 1980 data, while Bonilla-Silva (2004, p. 936) concludes that these two groups have similar mean incomes using 1990 data. Table 1 shows, however, that Wu's and Bonilla-Silva's conclusions no longer hold which illustrates how the SES of CHLTV evolves over time (consistent with assimilation theory) and should not be assumed to be static.

Our multivariate analyses indicate that net of controls, native-born Vietnamese and Thai have higher educational attainment than whites, while native-born Cambodian, Hmong and Laotian have lower educational attainment than whites. The educational attainment of native-born Cambodian and Hmong men are greater than the educational attainment of black and Hispanic men. Compared to whites, native-born Thai and native-born Vietnamese have higher household incomes although this advantage is statistically explained by the control variables. Regarding affluence, the percentages for native-born Thai and native-born Vietnamese (41.5% and 36.9%, respectively) exceed that for native-born whites (34.9%). In other words, these two Southeast Asian American groups—whose parents included a significant fraction of disadvantaged refugees—obtained higher percentages of affluence than whites in just one generation. A high level of affluence characterizes native-born Other Asians (46.7%) who are also mostly second-generation.

Overall, these findings do not appear to provide much support for Bonilla-Silva's (2004) view of pervasive discrimination against CHLTV as members of the "Collective Black" category in the "racial stratification system" of the contemporary U.S. which rigidly enforces intergenerational "white supremacy" (Bonilla-Silva 2004, p. 944). Contrary to that categorization, native-born CHLTV typically have higher SES outcomes than African Americans (i.e., higher educational attainment, higher household incomes, and less poverty) and Hispanics. Rather than persistent intergenerational disadvantage, native-born CHLTV consistently have lower poverty rates and higher educational attainment than first-generation CHLTV. Bonilla-Silva (2004, p. 944) asserts that "whites will still be at the top of the social structure," but after one generation, native-born Thai and Vietnamese actually tend to have higher SES outcomes than whites.[6]

We are reluctant to interpret our findings as supporting the "racialized assimilation" perspective discussed by Lee and Kye (2016). While assessing racial attitudes, immigration policies, and political involvement are beyond the scope of our data, our findings on hourly wages provide no evidence that native-born CHLTV face significant labor market penalties (as also argued by the related "model minority myth" literature). As noted above, the educational attainment of native-born CHLTV has wage returns similar to whites in the labor market, in contrast to blacks and Hispanics. If anything, most native-born CHLTV women have slightly higher wages than white women with comparable educational attainment and age.

We believe that our findings are more consistent with assimilation theory which focuses more on generational differentials leading to eventual convergence toward the American mainstream. The SES differentials between native-born CHLTV and whites are generally smaller than the differentials between the former group and their parental generation (i.e., first-generation CHLTV). Given the SES disadvantages that first-generation CHLTV typically have, the intergenerational SES advancement of their native-born is noteworthy. While the socioeconomic outcomes

[6] We are considering Bonilla-Silva's (2004) view only in regard to the SES outcomes for CHLTV. We are not making any assessments about the other hypotheses suggested by his discussion which seemed to be favored by the reviewers.

of native-born Cambodians, Hmong and Laotian still lag behind whites to some degree, our results regarding wages are consistent with the interpretation that these differentials stem more from the SES disadvantages of their first-generation parents than from racial discrimination. Assimilation theory would predict that the SES outcomes for native-born Cambodians, Hmong and Laotian will converge more toward whites in the third-generation.

In regard to the 1.5 generation, their SES outcomes are generally similar to native-born CHLTV as is the case for Other Asians.[7] That is, among the Asian groups, the differences between the 1.5 generation and the native-born are clearly and consistently much smaller than that the differences between the 1.5 generation and the first-generation. We interpret this pattern as reflecting assimilation due to socialization in American society and the limited presence of a third-generation among Asians. Because the Asian population primarily derives from post-1965 immigration, their native-born are primarily second-generation. The patterns among African Americans and Hispanics for their 1.5 generations are a little different because their immigrant histories vary substantially from CHLTV, and because Hispanics and especially African Americans therefore have a larger third-generation than Asians.

Conclusion: What the Textbooks Conclude about Southeast Asian Americans is Often Outdated due to Insufficient Data on the Second-Generation

Many studies and textbooks portray Southeast Asian Americans as being extremely disadvantaged with SES outcomes that are "comparable to African Americans" (Kao and Thompson 2003, p. 436). Kim and Mar (2007, p. 181) assert that "Cambodians, Hmong, and Laotians fare particularly badly, with half failing to earn high school degrees." Desmond and Emirbayer (2016, p. 140) state that "In fact, first-generation Laotian and Cambodian families have a 61% poverty rate…."

These assessments derive from a focus on the SES characteristics of first-generation Southeast Asian Americans in older data. However, adequate time has now passed to more clearly assess the intergenerational mobility of Southeast Asian Americans who initially immigrated to the U.S. during the Vietnam War. Our results indicate that the SES outcomes of second-generation Southeast Asian Americans are substantially higher than their immigrant generation. Compared to whites, second-generation Thai and Vietnamese have higher average SES outcomes. Second-generation Cambodians, Hmong and Laotians have SES characteristics that are similar to, or lower than whites, depending on the outcome and control variables, but generally have attainments that surpass those of blacks and Hispanics.

[7] Some slight differences between the 1.5 and native-born generations are sometimes suggested in regard to educational attainment as shown in Table 5. These differences might be the subject of future research. Some of them may perhaps reflect slightly higher levels of SES background among the most recent Asian immigrants in comparison to the older groups because the latter were mostly refugees. Sakamoto and Woo (2007) provide some relevant evidence for Southeast Asian Americans, but note that variation in the SES backgrounds of first-generation immigrants is a general issue for all racial/ethnic groups.

For example, compared to African Americans and Hispanics, native-born Cambodians, Hmong and Laotians are more likely to complete college and less likely to drop out of high school. Once controlling for key characteristics like age and education, CHLTV have wages that are similar to whites. The poverty rate for blacks is significantly greater than for native-born Cambodians, Laotians, and Hmong. The poverty rate for Hispanics is also greater than for native-born Cambodians and Laotians.

Because our findings suggest that the extremely low SES outcomes for immigrant, first-generation Southeast Asian Americans do not equally apply to *second-generation* Southeast Asian Americans, we interpret these results as being broadly consistent with assimilation theory. The SES upgrading of most second-generation CHLTV is particularly noteworthy because they are younger on average and are still at earlier career stages than whites, blacks and Hispanics. Assimilation theory generally posits that at least three generations are typically required for the assimilation to be mostly completed (McLemore and Romo 2005), and we interpret the improving SES of CHLTV as being broadly in line with that three-generational pattern.[8]

The SES outcomes for the third generations of CHLTV have of course yet to be determined so our assessment may certainly be wrong; continued "regression toward the mean" across the generations is not necessarily sociologically inevitable as illustrated by the case of African Americans. Furthermore, in contrast to older groups of immigrants, the contemporary labor market is characterized by a higher level of overall inequality (Portes and Zhou 1993). Nonetheless, as discussed earlier, our findings on wages indicate similar rates of return to age, education and other demographic characteristics among CHLTV as compared to whites. This suggests that CHLTV may be assimilating into the same level of inequality as whites. The CHLTV may represent a case where the descendants of even disadvantaged immigrants are assimilating into the general mainstream of American society—albeit with its high level of class inequality—as did the Irish and Italians from earlier eras.

Appendix

See Tables 6 and 7.

[8] Our findings on Other Asians are consistent with other evidence suggesting that they achieved or surpassed whites' SES in just a single generation. By that standard, the SES attainments of second-generation Cambodians, Hmong and Laotians are not very outstanding (i.e., fitting the "model minority" label). Nonetheless, their SES attainments do appear to be consistent with the three-generational pattern, and they are not actually as low as for blacks as has been assumed in prior literature.

Table 6 Socioeconomic outcomes by racial/ethnic group and generation, 2012–2016: men

	Less than high school	High school	Some college	BA	Grad	% poor	% affluent	Wages	Mean age	Sample size
Whites										
1st generation	12.5	21.0	20.2	22.2	24.1	10.8	39.1	40.3	53.4	127,162
1.5 generation	7.5	21.6	28.9	24.9	17.2	6.8	44.6	37.1	50.0	28,360
Native-born	8.1	28.4	29.6	21.3	12.7	7.5	37.0	32.3	51.9	3,504,210
Cambodians										
1st generation	37.1	27.1	21.2	10.4	4.3	17.5	16.2	23.1	53.3	1906
1.5 generation	12.6	24.8	35.0	20.3	7.2	10.2	22.8	25.2	36.4	705
Native-born	11.6	32.7	34.6	16.5	4.7	10.7	20.1	19.9	31.4	575
Hmong										
1st generation	46.8	23.4	21.6	5.5	2.8	24.9	6.8	20.7	50.8	964
1.5 generation	8.2	26.0	38.5	20.3	7.0	15.9	9.7	22.0	35.2	684
Native-born	7.2	35.1	39.7	14.7	3.2	14.6	10.1	18.7	29.8	686
Laotian										
1st generation	37.4	29.9	21.7	8.0	3.1	14.6	13.6	21.4	54.6	1541
1.5 generation	10.9	34.2	33.8	16.7	4.4	8.4	20.9	23.3	37.6	678
Native-born	9.2	33.3	43.0	11.7	2.3	7.2	18.2	19.2	31.8	437
Thai										
1st generation	13.8	15.9	19.7	29.8	20.8	16.5	27.6	26.7	50.5	1531
1.5 generation	5.5	20.3	36.3	28.2	9.8	6.5	32.2	27.4	38.9	233
Native-born	3.9	10.6	35.0	34.2	16.4	8.3	41.5	31.9	36.8	445
Vietnamese										
1st generation	29.7	23.5	24.2	15.9	6.7	13.7	20.2	24.3	52.9	18,161
1.5 generation	7.4	14.5	27.9	35.3	14.9	7.8	37.1	33.8	37.8	3684
Native-born	7.0	14.7	31.3	34.6	12.3	10.3	37.0	28.0	34.0	2714

Table 6 (continued)

	Less than high school	High school	Some college	BA	Grad	% poor	% affluent	Wages	Mean age	Sample size
Other Asians										
1st generation	12.0	13.5	14.9	28.3	31.4	9.9	39.7	37.4	49.2	149,204
1.5 generation	3.8	11.6	26.5	36.4	21.6	6.2	47.6	39.4	38.7	18,669
Native-born	4.5	15.8	26.2	33.6	19.9	7.0	47.3	36.2	43.5	46,481
Blacks										
1st generation	15.0	26.5	27.8	17.4	13.4	14.2	21.1	23.8	48.1	44,243
1.5 generation	6.6	26.1	36.1	21.6	9.7	10.0	28.4	25.3	38.7	5023
Native-born	15.8	35.7	32.0	11.2	5.3	18.4	19.8	21.5	48.0	380,546
Hispanics										
1st generation	52.7	25.1	12.7	6.2	3.3	18.5	8.4	17.0	46.0	263,782
1.5 generation	27.7	30.4	27.5	10.3	4.2	12.1	17.3	21.6	39.5	46,073
Native-born	18.9	31.3	32.0	12.3	5.5	12.7	22.0	23.6	43.4	273,953

Source 2012–2016 American Community Survey. Calculations for blacks, whites, and Asian groups are for people who report that group alone

The calculations for poverty, income, and education are for people aged 25+; earnings and wages are for people aged 25–64 with over 500 weeks worked, not currently enrolled in school, and positive earnings. Median household income calculated for households

Table 7 Socioeconomic outcomes by racial/ethnic group and generation, 2012–2016: women

	Less than high school	High school	Some college	BA	Grad	% poor	% affluent	Wages	Mean age	Sample size
Whites										
1st generation	14.9	23.4	23.7	21.2	16.9	13.2	32.9	27.1	55.7	149,784
1.5 generation	6.5	23.4	29.5	23.5	17.1	8.5	40.3	28.4	51.4	30,249
Native-born	7.0	27.9	31.7	20.9	12.5	9.8	32.9	24.0	53.3	3,795,271
Cambodians										
1st generation	51.5	24.4	15.2	6.5	2.5	19.8	14.4	16.1	52.3	2580
1.5 generation	10.6	23.3	37.2	21.0	7.9	15.0	24.6	21.7	36.6	780
Native-born	8.9	30.0	33.1	23.0	5.0	17.0	16.8	19.8	30.5	611
Hmong										
1st generation	71.4	13.5	9.1	4.9	1.1	29.6	6.3	14.7	51.8	1014
1.5 generation	6.1	26.1	38.6	22.4	6.8	18.4	11.0	19.8	34.8	669
Native-born	8.4	23.5	42.6	20.8	4.8	17.1	11.0	17.4	30.2	720
Laotian										
1st generation	47.4	28.2	15.6	6.7	2.1	13.0	15.2	17.3	53.3	1597
1.5 generation	10.8	29.3	34.9	18.7	6.3	12.5	20.4	20.4	37.1	748
Native-born	10.9	29.6	32.7	21.2	5.7	13.9	18.2	19.4	32.7	469
Thai										
1st generation	22.7	18.7	17.7	26.9	14.0	13.6	30.9	19.4	50.6	3745
1.5 generation	5.0	21.4	33.3	26.1	14.2	8.8	37.0	26.7	39.7	316
Native-born	3.4	14.0	26.3	32.3	24.0	8.5	41.5	29.9	36.1	449
Vietnamese										
1st generation	37.9	25.8	19.3	12.5	4.5	15.1	19.8	17.8	51.4	22,170
1.5 generation	5.6	13.2	23.1	38.5	19.6	8.9	43.1	31.1	37.4	3590
Native-born	7.6	11.8	23.9	39.8	16.9	11.1	36.9	26.6	34.6	2672

Table 7 (continued)

	Less than high school	High school	Some college	BA	Grad	% poor	% affluent	Wages	Mean age	Sample size
Other Asians										
1st generation	15.4	16.0	17.3	31.0	20.2	10.9	37.7	27.9	50.1	189,758
1.5 generation	3.2	9.3	24.0	39.2	24.3	6.5	49.8	33.9	38.7	19,940
Native-born	4.6	14.7	24.8	34.1	21.8	8.1	46.1	31.6	44.8	47,861
Blacks										
1st generation	19.4	27.8	28.5	15.5	8.8	17.5	17.7	20.4	49.5	52,829
1.5 generation	5.5	18.2	35.7	25.1	15.5	14.0	24.6	24.3	38.7	6479
Native-born	13.6	28.7	36.2	13.1	8.5	23.7	15.6	19.5	49.2	506,953
Hispanics										
1st generation	50.1	24.6	14.4	7.8	3.2	26.4	8.4	13.7	48.3	281,514
1.5 generation	23.3	28.0	31.2	11.9	5.6	18.7	15.7	18.5	40.0	49,659
Native-born	17.6	27.2	34.6	13.9	6.7	18.1	19.1	19.8	44.5	312,742

Source 2012–2016 American Community Survey. Calculations for blacks, whites, and Asian groups are for people who report that group alone

The calculations for poverty, income, and education are for people aged 25+; earnings and wages are for people aged 25–64 with over 500 weeks worked, not currently enrolled in school, and positive earnings. Median household income calculated for households

Acknowledgements Direct correspondence to Arthur Sakamoto.

References

Alba, R., & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International migration review, 31*(4), 826–874.

Bankston, C. L. (2014). Hmong Americans. In Gale (Ed.), *The Gale encyclopedia of multicultural America* (3rd ed.). Gale. Credo Reference. Retrieved from http://p2048-lib-ezproxy.tamu.edu.srv-proxy1.library.tamu.edu/login?url=https://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/galegale/hmong_americans/0?institutionId=692.

Bankston, C. L., & Hidalgo, D. A. (2016). Waves of war: refugees, immigrants and new Americans from Southeast Asia. In M. Zhou & A. C. Ocampo (Eds.), *Contemporary Asian America: A multidisciplinary reader* (pp. 101–128). New York: New York University Press.

Barringer, H., Gardner, R. W., & Levin, M. J. (1993). *Asians and Pacific Islanders in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bloome, D. (2014). Racial inequality trends and the intergenerational persistence of income and family structure. *American Sociological Review, 79,* 1196–1225.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2004). From bi-racial to tri-racial: Towards a new system of racial stratification in the USA. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 27*(6), 931–950.

Chetty, R., Hendren, N., Jones, M. R., & Porter, S. R. (2020). Race and economic opportunity in the United States: An intergenerational perspective. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 135*(2), 711–783.

Chou, R. S., & Feagin, J. R. (2015). *Myth of the model minority: Asian Americans facing racism*. London: Routledge.

Desmond, M., & Emirbayer, M. (2016). *Race in America*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Farley, R. (1996). *The new American reality: Who we are, how we got here, where we are going*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Feagin, J. R., & Hernan, V. (2000). *White racism: The basics*. London: Routledge.

Fong, T. P. (2008). *The contemporary Asian American experience: Beyond the model minority* (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson.

Iceland, J. (2019). Racial and ethnic inequality in poverty and affluence, 1959–2015. *Population Research and Policy Review, 38*(3), 1–40.

Kao, G., & Thompson, J. S. (2003). Racial and ethnic stratification in educational achievement and attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology, 29,* 417–442.

Kim, N. Y. (2007). Critical thoughts on Asian American assimilation in the whitening literature. *Social Forces, 86,* 565–574.

Kim, M., & Mar, D. (2007). The economic status of Asian Americans. *Race and economic opportunity in the twenty-first century* (pp. 170–206). New York: Routledge.

Kim, C., & Sakamoto, A. (2010). Have Asian American men achieved labor market parity with white men? *American Sociological Review, 75,* 934–957.

Kitano, H. H., & Daniels, R. (1995). *Asian Americans: Emerging minorities*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lee, J. C., & Kye, S. (2016). Racialized assimilation of Asian Americans. *Annual Review of Sociology, 42,* 253–273.

Lee, J., & Zhou, M. (2015). *The Asian American achievement paradox*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Leicht, K. T. (2008). Broken down by race and gender? Sociological explanations of new sources of earnings inequality. *Annual Review of Sociology, 34,* 237–255.

Liu, A., & Xie, Y. (2016). Why do Asian Americans academically outperform whites? The cultural explanation revisited. *Social Science Research, 58,* 210–226.

Marger, M. N. (2008). *Race and ethnic relations: American and global perspectives*. Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.

McLemore, D. S., & Romo, H. D. (2005). *Racial and ethnic relations in America*. New York: Pearson.

Min, P. G. (2006). Asian immigration: History and contemporary trends. In P. G. Min (Ed.), *Asian Americans: Contemporary trends and issues* (2nd ed., pp. 7–31). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Nee, V., & Holbrow, H. (2013). Why Asian Americans are becoming mainstream. *Daedalus, 142*(3), 65–75.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The New Second Generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants among post-1965 immigrant youth. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 530,* 74–96.

Ramakrishnan, K., & Ahmad, F. Z. (2014). *State of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders series: A multifaceted portrait of a growing population.* Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from http://aapidata.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AAPIData-CAP-report.pdf.

Rumbaut, R. G. (1995). Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian Americans. In P. G. Min (Ed.), *Asian Americans: Contemporary trends and issues* (1st ed., pp. 232–270). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rumbaut, R. G. (2006). Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian Americans. In P. G. Min (Ed.), *Asian Americans: Contemporary trends and issues* (2nd ed., pp. 262–289). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Sakamoto, A., Goyette, K., & Kim, C. (2009). Socioeconomic attainments of Asian Americans. *Annual Review of Sociology, 35,* 255–276.

Sakamoto, A., & Hsu, L. (2020). Do second-generation Asian Americans face a systematic disadvantage in occupational attainment? Comment on Tran, Lee and Huang. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 43*(3), 516–532.

Sakamoto, A., Tamborini, C. R., & Kim, C. (2018). Long-term earnings differentials between African American and white men by educational level. *Population Research and Policy Review, 37*(1), 91–116.

Sakamoto, A., & Woo, H. (2007). The socioeconomic attainments of second-generation Cambodian, Hmong, Laotian, and Vietnamese Americans. *Sociological Inquiry, 77,* 44–75.

Takei, I., Sakamoto, A., & Kim, C. (2013). The socioeconomic attainments of non-immigrant Cambodian, Filipino, Hmong, Laotian, Thai, and Vietnamese Americans. *Race and Social Problems, 5,* 198–212.

Wang, S. X., Takei, I., & Sakamoto, A. (2017). Do Asian Americans face labor market discrimination? Accounting for the cost of living among native-born men and women. *Socius, 3,* 1–14.

Wu, F. H. (2003). *Yellow: Race in America beyond black and white*. New York: Basic Books.

Zhou, M., & Lee, J. (2017). Hyper-selectivity and the remaking of culture: Understanding the Asian American achievement paradox. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 8,* 7–15.