

# Interethnic Disparity Across Census Divisions, 1980–90

---

William Darity, Jr.  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

and

William Winfrey  
Old Dominion University

A persistent attribute of ethnically plural societies, such as the United States, is a high degree of intergroup inequality. The national decennial censuses for 1980 and 1990 are of special value in the exploration of such disparities. In both censuses respondents were asked questions that establish their self-identification with respect to both race and ancestry. The answers enable researchers to sketch in substantial detail the extent of intergroup inequality in late 20th century America. Policymakers will be better able to confront the question of how fine the identification should be of groups that may be targeted for assistance and the extent to which such targeting should be primarily space specific or group specific.

Reynolds Farley (1989, 1990) was the first scholar to provide a summary of the 1980 census data with respect to race and ancestry, in a comprehensive report and in a shorter paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Economic Association in December 1989. By using the 1-percent Public Use Micro Sample, we reproduce a set of the categories presented by Farley for 1980 and present for the first time summary statistics for the same categories for 1990 on the U.S. population with employment. Tables 1 and 2 provide the displays of these indicators for 47 mutually exclusive racial and ethnic groups for each of the census years.<sup>1</sup>

Table 1 shows that for the United States as a whole in 1980, 6.3 percent of the population was foreign born, 2.5 percent had immigrated within the past 10 years, the average per capita income in current dollars was \$7,167, 19.2 percent could be classified as affluent, 12.3 percent could be classified as poor, 50.2 percent could be classified as middle class, 26.2 percent of employed men 25 to 54 years of age held professional/managerial jobs, and 23.4 percent of women in the same age group held comparable jobs.

The first line of Table 2 documents the parallel configuration for the United States as a whole in 1990: 8.7 percent of the population was foreign born, 3.7 percent immigrated within the previous decade, the average per capita income in current dollars was \$13,934, 22.8 percent could be classified as affluent, 13.1 percent could be classified as poor, 45.7 percent could be classified as middle class, 25.6 percent of males ages 25 to 54 held professional/managerial jobs, and 28.9 percent of females in the same age range held professional/managerial jobs.<sup>2</sup>

Taking these national averages as norms makes it possible to determine which groups have profiles of economic achievement above or below the mean for the overall population. We focus initially on four indicators: per capita income, the poverty rate, the proportion of males with professional/managerial employment, and the proportion of females with comparable jobs.<sup>3</sup>

Note also that in Tables 1 and 2, the first 12 ethnic groups are Hispanic or nonwhite. The remaining groups, starting with those that, somewhat peculiarly, identify their ancestry as "American," are racially self-identified as white. Therefore, American natives, listed among the first 12 groups, are racially self-identified as nonwhite, but persons reporting themselves to be of American Indian ancestry, listed among the latter 35 groups, are racially self-identified as white and ethnically self-identified as non-Hispanic.

The group self-identified as racially white and ancestrally Russian had the highest estimated income of all groups in the study in both years. Their mean per capita income of \$11,451 in 1980 was 160 percent of the national average. A mere 7 percent of this group's members had incomes below the poverty line, while 57 percent of adult males and 44.7 percent of adult females held professional/managerial jobs. The Russian ethnic group's mean per capita income of \$27,391 in 1990 was close to 200 percent of the national average. Fewer than 6 percent of this group's members had sub-poverty level incomes, and 54.3 percent of its adult males and 52.1 percent of its adult females were employed in professional/managerial jobs.

The Russian ancestry population overlaps strongly with the Jewish-American population. In an earlier investigation Erich Rosenthal (1975) concluded that at least two-thirds of Jewish Americans are enumerated in decennial censuses as persons of Russian ancestry. Indeed the 1980 and 1990 census results for persons of Russian ancestry are reinforced by the results of the General Social Survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center in Chicago between 1977 and 1982, which asked direct questions about religious affiliation. The uppermost group over the interval, based on household income measured in constant 1967 dollars, were American Jews (Tyree, 1991).

Other exceptionally affluent groups in both censuses include those of Rumanian, Austrian, and Lithuanian ancestries. It is noteworthy that virtually all of the white racial groups were at or above the national mean in both census years as well.<sup>4</sup> There were only three exceptions—those reporting themselves to be of American, American Indian, and Portuguese ancestries.

We speculate that those whites who report themselves as being of American ancestry are disproportionately an Appalachian population. While 31 and 34 percent of the U.S. population resided in the South in 1980 and 1990, respectively, close to 50 percent and close to 60 percent of "American" Americans resided in the South in each of the respective census years. The economic profile of American Indians is superior to that of native Americans—although not far superior—but the differential may have to do with the economic experience of a phenotypically white, predominantly nonreservation population versus that of a phenotypically nonwhite, predominantly reservation population.

And the data on Portuguese ancestry whites may be clouded by the possibility that a significant portion of this group consists of persons of Cape Verdean descent who phenotypically appear to be black but often report themselves to be racially white. The Cape Verdean descent population is concentrated heavily in the Boston-New Bedford-Providence metropolplex. We find in both census years that more than 50 percent of those persons reporting themselves to be of Portuguese ancestry were located in the Northeast

region of the United States, whereas they represented slightly more than 20 percent of the general population.

The lowest incomes and highest poverty rates in both 1980 and 1990 were concentrated among Hispanic and nonwhite groups—those of Puerto Rican, Mexican, African (black), Vietnamese, and native American ancestries. The lowest poverty rates in 1980 were concentrated among persons of Ukrainian, Slovak, Lithuanian, and Austrian ancestries. The former two groups did not display the highest incomes, because high proportions of their populations were concentrated in the middle class, rather than in the affluent category. The lowest poverty rates in 1990 were recorded among Russian, Slovak, Swiss, and Lithuanian ancestry groups.

The highest incomes and lowest poverty rates among nonwhites could be found among persons of Japanese and Asian Indian ancestries. These two groups had average incomes that were 132 percent and 114 percent of the national mean in 1980 and 145 percent and 119 percent of the national mean in 1990. The ethnic Chinese, among nonwhite groups, also had incomes above the national mean in both 1980 and 1990. Ethnic Filipinos, while possessing a mean per capita income below the national average, had one of the lowest poverty rates among nonwhites in both census years.

The Asian Indian, Japanese, and Chinese ancestry groups also had unusually high rates of professional/managerial employment for both males and females in both years. Males of Korean ancestry also had a high percentage of individuals in professional/managerial occupations.

In 1980, ethnic groups in which the percentage of males in professional/managerial employment was less than or equal to that of women in the same ethnic group—for example, Mexican, Puerto Rican, American native, African, Filipino, and American Indian ancestry groups—tended to have mean per capita incomes below the national average. In 1990 no such rule of thumb remained applicable. As can be seen from the last two columns of Table 2, in the aggregate women had surpassed men in terms of the proportion working in professional/managerial jobs; indeed for most of the *white* ethnic groups, the female proportion exceeded that of the male.

The highest rates of immigration were concentrated among members of the nonwhite population, particularly those persons of Asian origin. Specifically, although the 1990 census indicates that the rates dropped off for most groups, Asian Indians, Chinese, Filipinos, Koreans, and Vietnamese all had very high rates of immigration. While the Vietnamese remained among the poorest members of the United States population, a rise in their relative per capita income, a fall in their poverty rate, and the increased incidence of professional/managerial employment suggest that their economic profile has been on the upswing. The upward trend in indicators for the Vietnamese contrasts sharply with the patterns for persons of African, Puerto Rican, and Mexican descent.

Indeed, one of the most striking features of the data in Tables 1 and 2 is the high degree of stability in the relative economic status of each of the ethnic groups over the decade. In the section that follows, we will examine whether similar stability is evident for a selected subset of ethnic groups when we disaggregate by region.

## Inequality Across Census Divisions

The information in Tables 1 and 2 consists of aggregate data for ethnic groups at the national level. We now examine, for a selected subset of ethnic groups, the variation in their economic experiences across nine standard census divisions. The groups we will consider

in depth are those of Irish, Polish, Mexican, Chinese, African (black), Japanese, Russian, and Vietnamese ancestries. The States included in each of the nine census divisions appear in Table 3.<sup>5</sup> We use the census divisions because those are the lowest levels of aggregation that enable us to have meaningful cell sizes for all eight ethnic groups.<sup>6</sup>

The eight groups examined more closely here include three European ancestry groups, one Hispanic group, blacks, and two groups of Asian ancestry. These groups were chosen with an eye toward the interest in their economic experiences expressed in the popular print media. Four groups have experienced a significant flow of new immigrants: the Chinese, Vietnamese, Japanese, and Mexicans. One of the groups was the most affluent in both years (Russian), one was the poorest in 1980 (Vietnamese), and two were close to the national mean in both years (Irish and Polish).<sup>7</sup> Among the eight groups, those of African and Irish ancestries were the most numerous at the national level, while the Japanese and Vietnamese were the least numerous.<sup>8</sup>

Tables 4 through 9 provide comparative data on the eight ethnic groups in terms of labor market outcomes.<sup>9</sup> Table 4 provides estimates of the proportion of adult males in each of the ethnic groups, by census divisions, who had positive earnings in 1980 and 1990. Table 5 provides data on mean adult male earnings in current dollars for each of the eight ethnic groups in each division in each of the census years. Table 6 presents our calculations of the ratio of mean male earnings for each ethnic group to the mean adult earnings for all males in each census division in 1980 and 1990. Tables 7 through 9 present parallel information for women.

In 1980 only two of the eight ethnic groups consistently had proportions of males with positive earnings under 90 percent of the divisional average: African and Vietnamese ancestry males. This pattern persists in 1990, although there is evidence of a decline in the proportion of black males with positive earnings and an increase in the proportion of Vietnamese males with positive earnings.

By 1990 there were five census divisions in which the proportion of Vietnamese males with positive earnings exceeded 90 percent. Of these, the East North Central and the South Atlantic divisions were the two in which Vietnamese males displayed the highest percentage of positive earners. Generally there was a marked jump in the presence of male positive earners among the Vietnamese in virtually all regions, especially in New England, the Middle Atlantic States, and the East and West North Central States.

Only in the East South Central and Mountain regions did the proportion of male Vietnamese positive earners appear to fall. For Vietnamese women, only the East South Central region displays a fall in the proportion of positive earners between 1980 and 1990. However, the absolute number of observations—34 in 1980 and 52 in 1990—is so low for this division that we are not confident there actually was a drop in the proportion of positive earners for either sex (see note 5).

Indeed the overall percentage of women with positive earnings in all eight ethnic groups was higher in 1990 than in 1980. At the divisional level, other than the instance of the East South Central division for Vietnamese women, the only evidence of a drop in the proportion of positive earners occurs for Japanese women in the Middle Atlantic, East North Central, and East South Central regions. But the drop for the East South Central region, from 52.9 percent to 20 percent, seems implausibly large and is probably an artifact of the small number of observations. In 1980 there were only 33 observations for the Japanese in the East South Central division; in 1990 there were 68 observations.

Table 6 displays the ratio of mean earnings for males from each group to mean earnings for all males in the division, among males with positive earnings. Japanese and Russian ancestry males had marked improvements in their relative earnings position between 1980 and 1990, an improvement that is evident in *all* divisions. In 1990 both groups did exceptionally well relative to other men in the East South Central division. This was also the division in which men experienced the greatest relative improvement in their earnings, with each group more than doubling its earnings ratio in comparison with 1980.

The East South Central division is characterized by the lowest mean years of college for all males (1.3 years in 1980 and 1.2 years in 1990; see Tables 10 and 11). Japanese males in the division experienced a sharp rise in mean years of college between 1980 (2.2 years) and 1990 (4.4 years), which may explain their rise in relative earnings (see Tables 22 and 23).<sup>10</sup> However, the same argument does not readily explain the relative improvement in earnings for Russian males in the division. In 1980 the number of mean male years of college for those of Russian ancestry was 4.1, whereas a decade later it was 4.0 years (see Tables 24 and 25).

Irish, Polish, and Chinese males also had improvements in relative earnings in the aggregate, with some minor variation at the divisional level. For example, in the ubiquitous East South Central region, the earnings ratio for Irish males fell from 1.08 to 1.05 between 1980 and 1990 but rose dramatically from 1.34 to 1.52 for Polish males. In all other divisions, the ratio for Irish males remained stable or rose. The only region in which there was evidence of a drop in the ratio for Polish males was the East North Central division, while sharp increases were recorded in the three western regions, the West South Central, Mountain, and Pacific divisions. Chinese males experienced relative increases in their earnings in all divisions except the West North Central and the South Atlantic; indeed the decline in the West North Central division—the Frostbelt States—was substantial.

Two groups show evidence of a deterioration in relative earnings: Mexican and African ancestry males. The sharpest decline for Mexican men occurred in the Middle Atlantic division, but there were also sharp drops in the western States in which the Mexican population is disproportionately concentrated. Only in the East South Central region was there an increase in their earnings ratio. Black males experienced a drop in their relative earnings in all divisions except for the Mountain and Pacific.

Vietnamese males had the lowest earnings ratio in the aggregate and in virtually all divisions in 1980. The upward shift in their relative position, noted above, is again apparent in the data for 1990. Indeed, Vietnamese males' relative earnings ratio superseded that of both Mexican and African ancestry males by 1990.

Among women with earnings, the strongest pattern of increase in relative earnings took place for women of Russian ancestry. In seven out of the nine divisions, their earnings ratio rose between 1980 and 1990; the only exceptions were the West North Central and East South Central divisions. For the remaining female groups, other than Vietnamese women, there was a high degree of stability across the decade, with some evidence of an upward trend for Irish, Polish, and Japanese women and a downward trend for Mexican, African, and Chinese women. The extraordinarily low ratios for Japanese women in both years in the East South Central division probably is an artifact of the small number of observations of women with positive earnings in the region (see note 5).

Black females, who were above the national mean in earnings in 1980, fell below it in 1990; moreover, they experienced a decline in relative earnings in all nine census divisions. Mexican females experienced a rise in the earnings ratio in three divisions: the Middle Atlantic, West North Central, and East South Central.

Vietnamese women, on the other hand, displayed a dramatic rise in relative earnings similar to that of the men in their ethnic group. Evidence of a rise in the earnings ratio is apparent in all divisions.

Tables 10 and 11 provide summary statistics on several economic indicators at the level of the nine census divisions for 1980 and 1990. The remaining tables provide summary statistics on the same variables for each ethnic group in each year at the division level as well. We will highlight some of the results that we find to be most striking.

The Irish ancestry population is closest to the mean for each division for more of the indicators than any other group. In particular the employment pattern for men and women of Irish descent very closely mimics national and divisional averages in 1980. Between 1980 and 1990 there is striking evidence of a doubling in the female self-employment rate for Irish women across all census divisions, and it also doubles for all women (see Tables 10 to 13).

The Polish population experienced a significant increase in immigration across the decade. Relative mean per capita income fell in the West North Central region, the only one in which there was a decline in the proportion of males holding professional/managerial jobs. The Polish population also experienced a rather sharp redistribution in its presence across census divisions. While more than one-third of the ethnic group was located in the Middle Atlantic and East North Central States in 1980, more than 60 percent were located in the same set of States by 1990. Polish males experienced startlingly low rates of unemployment in the East South Central and West South Central States in 1990 (see Tables 14 and 15).

In 1980 more than 80 percent of the Mexican ancestry population was located in States in three western divisions (West South Central, Mountain, and Pacific); by 1990 the proportion located in the same States had risen to close to 90 percent.<sup>11</sup> The only other region with a significant proportion of the Mexican ancestry population is the East North Central.

The small Mexican population located in New England is very different from those located elsewhere. Although its profile generally is not above the division mean, the group is better educated than the Mexican ancestry population in the other eight divisions. In fact, by 1990 women of Mexican descent had higher mean years of college than all women in New England. Males in New England have a comparatively high rate of self-employment, much higher than in other divisions, especially the three western divisions in which most persons of Mexican ancestry live (see Tables 16 and 17).

The Chinese ancestry population has a high variance in economic outcomes across regions. The variance is especially notable in poverty rates and the percentage of self-employed males. The zero male unemployment rate in the East South Central and Mountain regions in 1980 may be due exclusively to the limited number of observations (24 in the former and 37 in the latter). However, in 1980 the zero male unemployment rate in New England was estimated on the basis of 62 observations and in the East North Central division on the basis of 129 observations.

In 1990 the number of observations for each division is higher. The male unemployment rate in New England rises to 2.9 percent, based upon 171 observations. The unusually low male unemployment rate in the East North Central division is replicated in 1990; the estimated rate of 0.9 percent was derived on the basis of 211 observations. The 1990 estimate of the male unemployment rate was 2.3 percent in the East South Central division and 0 percent in the Mountain region. These estimates were based upon 43 and 86 observations,

respectively. Suffice it to say, Chinese males experienced a very low incidence of unemployment, in some States approaching zero. Chinese females also have very low rates of unemployment, although not quite as low as those of Chinese men.

The African ancestry population shows marked evidence of a deterioration in its relative status. Perhaps the most dramatic indicator is the drop in the percentage of black children living with both parents in all divisions between 1980 and 1990, although the percentage already was alarmingly low in 1980. By 1990 the percentage had fallen below 40 percent in four of the nine divisions. In contrast, in one division we estimate that 100 percent of Russian children are in two-parent families (see Table 25).

The sharp decline in the proportion of African ancestry children living with both parents is associated with the surge in female-headed households among black families, a surge that has escalated from the late 1960s to the present. None of the other ethnic groups display such a low percentage of children in two-parent homes, even those that present similarly low levels of relative male earnings or group mean per capita income in some divisions, for example, the Mexican and Vietnamese ancestry groups.

Blacks also have the highest ratio of women to men among all eight of the groups being considered here. The raw ratio of women to men among blacks, comparatively low as it is, may not capture adequately the substantive availability of black males as marital partners for black women. Marriageability can involve consideration of the labor market status of males. Matters become even bleaker when the labor market status of black males is taken into account.

Data from the Current Population Survey for 1985 indicate that the ratio of unmarried males to unmarried females ages 14 and over among blacks was .48, while it was .68 for whites. But if the Male Marriage Pool Index introduced by Wilson and Neckerman (1986)—the ratio of all employed males to all females—is utilized, the ratio for blacks falls to .46, while it barely dips to .66 for whites (see Darity and Myers, forthcoming). Finally, the Darity-Myers (forthcoming) measure—the ratio of unmarried males in the labor force or in school to all unmarried females—leads the number to plunge to .32 for blacks while it falls only to .48 for whites.

Although the proportion of black females with professional/managerial employment stayed the same or rose in every division over the course of the decade, there were some divisions where the proportion actually fell for black males. The aggregate rise in the black poverty rate went hand-in-hand with a rise in the black poverty rate in most of the census divisions. Black unemployment rates are comparatively high, and self-employment rates comparatively low. Even the mean years of college for black males fell in most divisions between 1980 and 1990 (see Tables 20 and 21).<sup>12</sup>

The Japanese and Russian populations display the opposite pattern. Both groups are highly educated, experience remarkably low rates of unemployment for the most part, and have low poverty rates in both years in all divisions. The Russian ancestry population, unlike the Japanese, displays very high comparative rates of self-employment, as high as any other ethnic group in the United States for both gender groups. These are two of America's most successful groups economically, and that success is evident both at the aggregate national level and at the more disaggregative regional level.

Finally, we consider the Vietnamese population, a population that is, on average, very poor but seems to have been on a trajectory toward relative improvement of its economic status. This is a very young population on average, although the mean age rose about 3 years between 1980 and 1990. It is also a population heavily concentrated on the West

Coast. In 1980, 40 percent of the Vietnamese were in the Pacific region; by 1990 the proportion was well over 50 percent. Virtually all economically salient statistics rose for this group in all divisions between 1980 and 1990, for example, relative mean per capita income, relative earnings, self-employment rates, and the proportions of both gender groups that held professional/managerial jobs.

Only two major categories of economic indicators showed evidence of decline. One was the unemployment rate for both gender groups. Second, and more surprising, mean male years of college remained unchanged or *fell* in most divisions, despite the evidence of a comparative improvement in labor market outcomes and despite the rise in the average age of the Vietnamese population. This finding suggests that the Vietnamese immigrants who entered the United States during the decade were less well educated than previous entrants, rendering paradoxical the direction of change in group economic performance.

## Conclusions

Three of the eight groups had an economic profile below the national mean in 1980. Two of them, the Mexican and African ancestry groups, fell further behind in relative status in 1990, not only at the national level but also at the census division levels, particularly in those census divisions in which they are most heavily concentrated. The third group, the Vietnamese, displayed a rise in relative status, in spite of a less gilded immigration and an accompanying decline in their relative level of higher education. They are among America's poorest ethnic groups.

The remaining five groups had an economic profile close to or above the national mean in 1980. Typically their relative positions tended to be even higher in 1990: dramatically so for the Russian and Japanese ancestry groups, more mildly so for the Irish, Polish, and Chinese ancestry groups.

Finding a causal explanation for these patterns is beyond the scope of this article. Elsewhere one author (Darity, 1989) has proposed a "lateral mobility," rather than upward mobility, phenomenon, as a hypothesis that explains the long-term status of American ethnic groups. The hypothesis proposes that ethnic groups, over time, generally replicate the *relative* class status that they possessed in their historic country of origin.<sup>13</sup> For example, Kiyoshi Ikeda (1973) has said that it is important to distinguish between immigrants from Japan itself and migrants of Japanese ancestry from Hawaii. He observed that the greater economic achievement of the former and their descendants was due to their superior relative class status in their site of origin. Ikeda (p. 498) points out that immigrants from mainland Japan came from more affluent districts, had higher socioeconomic status, higher literacy levels, and a lower likelihood of coming from "peasant-agriculturalist households" than Hawaiian-Japanese migrants. Furthermore, the Japanese government screened its emigrants to improve the odds of their success in the United States (Ikeda, p. 498).

We are unable to address the hypothesis comprehensively in this article since our database constitutes only two near points in a time series and does not incorporate information about the immigrant generations for several groups—for example, the Irish, Polish, and Russian—whose large immigrations to the United States occurred at the close of the 19th and the start of the 20th centuries. Moreover, groups that have "settled" into upper class status may become more or less upper class over time, while groups that have "settled" into lower class status may become more or less lower class over time.

Immigration continues to be a potential source of social tension in the United States. The technical skill requirements of 21st century labor markets frequently are invoked as a justification for uplift of the poorer minorities of color in the United States. But to the extent that persons with the requisite skills can be imported from other parts of the world, the pressure to improve the education and training of America's dispossessed is reduced. Hence African Americans, Puerto Rican Americans, and Mexican Americans, in particular, have sound reasons for a lack of enthusiasm for an open immigration policy toward peoples from societies with high levels of technical skills, such as those of Eastern Europe.<sup>14</sup>

Still, we are able to render at least two major preliminary conclusions. First, in examining these eight groups, we find that there really are no significant differences in their relative status across space. With few exceptions, concern about groups that display relative deprivation at the national level can justify group-specific policies, regardless of their location. Second, discernible movements in relative status for all of the groups across census divisions between 1980 and 1990 cannot be explained readily by discernible movements in their productivity-linked characteristics. The conventional story of human capital as education or schooling is not enough. The underlying dynamics of comparative ethnic economic success and failure in the United States are far more complex and subtle.

## Authors

*William Darity, Jr., is the Boshamer Professor of Economics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. William Winfrey is a visiting assistant professor of economics at Old Dominion University. The authors are grateful to Lawrence Katz and James R. Follain for their valuable comments and suggestions.*

## Notes

1. The groups were generated based upon census respondents' *first* answer to the ancestry question, although respondents could list more than one ethnic origin. We have found in a preliminary investigation that the first answer is the more salient correlate with a variety of economic characteristics.
2. Persons classified as poor are those whose incomes fall below the poverty line. Our operational definition of the "affluent" is the group whose members have incomes at least five times the poverty line; our operational definition of the "middle class" is the group of persons with incomes ranging between two and five times the poverty line.
3. Our estimates of mean per capita income in 1980 are lower than Farley's (1989, 1990). His are calculated on the basis of only the adult population, persons 25 to 54 years of age, whereas we calculated mean per capita income on the basis of all age groups.
4. The standard deviations for all of the indicators for the white ethnic minorities are lower than the standard deviations for all of the indicators for the nonwhite ethnic minorities.
5. For the four groups that constitute 1 percent or less of the overall U.S. population (the Chinese, Japanese, Russian, and Vietnamese ancestry groups), the cell sizes of the divisions in which they are sparsely represented become quite small. For example, for the Vietnamese in the East South Central census division, there are only 34 observations in 1980 and only 7 males and 8 females with positive earnings. In such instances, inferences about the characteristics of members of the group within the census division must be made with extreme caution.
6. For the less numerous groups, e.g., the Vietnamese and Japanese, the cell sizes at the census division level in certain regions become very small in any case.
7. In 1980 the Vietnamese population in the United States had a mean per capita income of \$3,713, slightly more than half the national average. Only the Puerto Rican population, with a mean per capita income of \$3,905, also had an average below \$4,000. By 1990 the Vietnamese mean per capita income of \$9,131 had risen to 66 percent of the national average. In 1980 the Vietnamese poverty rate of 37.5 percent was the highest in the United States; by 1990 it had fallen to 25.8 percent, still relatively high but not the highest.
8. One limitation of the census data is that it does not permit the Irish sample to be partitioned between Irish Catholics and Irish Protestants. Andrew Greeley (1981) has demonstrated that Irish Catholics are well above the mean for most white Americans with respect to income, schooling, and occupational status. Greeley (1981, p. 4) calls the Irish Catholics in the United States "the most affluent gentile ethnic group in America." The inability to distinguish between Irish Catholics and Protestants in U.S.

Census data led Thomas Sowell (1981), according to Greeley (1981), to err in his negative assessment of the long-term economic performance of Irish Americans. Tyree's (1991) findings using the General Social Survey, a survey that, unlike the decennial census, asks direct questions about religious affiliation, are consistent with Greeley's claim. Tyree also reports, based upon the same data source, that black Catholics also do better economically than black Protestants. So much for Max Weber's (1930) famous hypothesis.

9. As we are concerned with the *relative* status of the groups in each year and across the decade by division, we do not adjust earnings and income data for cost-of-living variations. In addition, we are not aware that consumer price indexes are available at the census division level.
10. The change is probably attributable primarily to immigration into the region. The percentage of foreign-born Japanese in the East South Central division in 1980 was 51.5 percent and the percentage of the group that had immigrated since 1970 was 18.2 percent (see Table 22); by 1990 the percentage of foreign-born Japanese in East South Central had risen to 77.3 percent, and 52 percent of the group had immigrated since 1980 (see Table 23). However, it should be noted that the raw number of observations for the Japanese in this division in 1980 was only 33, or 0.4 percent of the Japanese sample. In 1990 it was more than twice as high, at 75, or 0.9 percent of the Japanese sample. Three-quarters of the Japanese ancestry population is concentrated in the Pacific division.
11. Texas in the West South Central division, New Mexico and Arizona in the Mountain division, and California in the Pacific division.
12. Sowell (1981) has argued that the relative economic success of West Indian blacks undermines claims that racial discrimination is an important factor in explaining the economic disadvantage of blacks in the United States. Sowell argues that there are West Indian cultural traits that lead to greater economic achievement. Census data allow researchers to distinguish West Indian ancestry blacks from native blacks and to address Sowell's assertion. Stephen Woodbury (1992) has used the 1980 census to examine differences in economic performance between black men of West Indian ancestry and other black men. Woodbury finds that indeed black men of West Indian ancestry earn \$3,000 more than other black men, but the gap can be explained wholly by schooling and labor market experience. Nevertheless, West Indian black men earned about \$2,500 less than the mean for all white males and less than 40 percent of the disparity is attributable to differences in own characteristics. The remaining 63 percent of the gross wage gap must be due to discrimination or a *disadvantageous* West Indian culture. The latter potential inference is ironic, given Sowell's position on the source of the intraracial disparity.
13. Tyree's (1991) research and Lieberman's (1980) research are suggestive of the "lateral mobility" phenomenon as well.
14. The United Nations (1990, p. 137) has estimated that in the interval 1970–87 there were at least 100 scientists and technicians per 1,000 persons in Eastern European countries, ranging from 101 per 1,000 in former East Germany to 251 per 1,000 in Hungary. This contrasts with a mere 55 per 1,000 in the United States as a whole.

**Table 1**  
 Summary statistics from the 1980 census data, selected categories

Ethnic group	Percent of population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100	6.3	2.5	\$7,167	19.2	12.3	50.2	26.2	23.4
Cuban	0.3	77.4	20.5	6,416	16.1	13.3	52.1	24.1	16.4
Mexican	3.9	25.9	14.9	4,309	6.3	23.2	41.4	10.4	10.5
Puerto Rican	0.8	3.0	1.3	3,905	5.1	35.9	33.5	12.1	13.1
Other Spanish	1.4	40.4	23.3	5,611	11.8	18.5	47.0	20.1	15.4
American natives	0.6	0.2	0.1	4,579	8.1	28.0	38.0	16.7	17.7
Asian Indians	0.1	71.0	55.4	8,147	27.7	8.7	50.3	58.7	38.0
Africans (blacks)	11.5	2.8	0.2	4,535	7.7	29.6	37.3	12.7	17.1
Chinese	0.4	64.5	40.1	7,368	24.9	11.9	46.6	41.6	27.4
Filipino	0.3	65.6	42.5	6,583	17.3	6.9	60.6	26.7	29.9
Japanese	0.3	28.8	13.9	9,477	36.2	6.7	48.5	40.6	29.9
Korean	0.2	82.2	70.6	6,309	17.1	10.0	52.3	35.5	16.6
Vietnamese	0.1	90.5	89.0	3,713	6.4	37.5	36.0	16.8	11.4
American	5.0	0.3	0.1	6,293	14.3	12.7	50.8	17.1	16.4
American Indian	1.0	0.3	0.1	5,828	11.3	14.8	51.8	13.2	14.1
Armenian	0.1	40.0	22.7	8,273	28.0	10.3	47.8	35.6	28.1
Austrian	0.3	15.4	7.6	10,387	35.4	6.1	46.4	47.5	39.3
Belgian	0.1	12.6	2.2	7,906	23.2	7.7	54.1	33.8	22.4
Canadian	0.1	32.8	8.2	8,575	25.7	7.3	50.6	38.7	25.0
Croatian	0.1	12.4	2.8	8,438	26.9	5.4	53.8	36.1	26.0
Czech	0.4	6.0	0.6	8,399	25.4	6.8	54.3	33.1	28.7
Danish	0.4	4.9	0.8	8,337	24.7	6.5	53.2	32.7	30.1
Dutch	1.5	3.8	0.5	7,429	19.6	8.9	53.7	27.5	21.4
English	15.6	2.1	0.4	7,986	23.1	9.1	51.1	30.4	26.8
Finnish	0.2	6.5	0.9	7,722	21.5	8.5	55.0	29.4	27.6
French	3.1	3.5	0.6	7,352	19.4	9.0	54.2	25.3	22.8
French-Canadian	0.3	10.9	1.1	7,382	18.8	7.1	56.1	24.0	23.9
German	14.2	3.9	0.3	7,877	22.2	7.5	55.0	28.2	25.0
Greek	0.4	28.6	8.9	7,922	23.9	8.2	51.9	33.7	25.1
Hungarian	0.5	13.5	1.4	8,857	27.2	7.0	52.5	34.4	28.1
Irish	8.2	1.7	0.2	7,585	21.4	8.9	53.3	27.6	24.9
Italian	4.2	9.1	1.2	7,723	22.6	7.0	55.8	29.9	23.1
Lebanese	0.1	19.9	11.9	8,275	25.0	8.8	52.3	37.6	31.7
Lithuanian	0.2	9.7	0.5	9,244	29.9	6.2	51.5	39.5	35.0
Norwegian	1.0	3.1	0.3	8,117	23.8	7.3	54.0	31.5	26.9
Polish	2.7	7.3	0.9	8,243	24.8	6.5	55.0	30.5	25.4
Portuguese	0.3	26.9	11.6	6,833	15.7	7.9	56.6	17.8	14.2
Rumanian	0.1	22.5	8.1	10,414	37.0	7.3	43.1	47.5	37.4
Russian	1.0	12.0	2.7	11,451	41.6	6.9	41.3	56.9	44.7
Scandinavian	0.2	2.0	0.2	8,228	26.1	6.7	53.0	37.8	36.6
Scots-Irish	2.2	0.9	0.1	8,855	27.6	6.3	52.2	35.3	32.0
Scottish	1.2	7.0	0.9	9,120	29.5	6.7	50.3	38.1	31.8
Slovak	0.2	5.0	0.2	8,046	24.2	5.1	57.8	26.3	25.4
Swedish	1.2	3.3	0.4	8,535	26.2	6.8	53.2	35.3	30.4
Swiss	0.2	6.8	14.0	8,722	31.4	7.1	49.0	34.5	34.2
Ukrainian	0.2	20.8	2.1	8,778	28.0	5.7	53.0	34.6	31.0
Welsh	0.4	2.3	0.4	8,744	27.4	6.1	53.1	37.8	32.5
Yugoslavian	0.2	21.6	6.4	8,613	28.1	6.6	54.2	30.3	25.2

Table 2

Summary statistics from the 1990 census data, selected categories

Ethnic group	Percent of population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100	8.7	3.7	\$13,934	22.8	13.1	45.7	25.6	28.9
Cuban	0.4	73.5	19.4	12,845	20.0	15.2	47.7	24.1	25.8
Mexican	5.3	34.0	17.1	7,518	7.1	27.2	35.6	9.9	15.2
Puerto Rican	0.9	4.4	14.8	8,514	10.1	31.3	26.7	14.8	20.9
Other Spanish	1.9	54.8	32.1	10,048	12.5	20.9	41.3	16.6	17.8
American natives	0.8	0.2	0.1	8,145	8.5	31.4	33.6	15.1	20.6
Asian Indians	0.2	77.0	45.0	16,554	34.2	9.6	43.4	50.6	35.8
Africans (blacks)	10.2	4.2	0.2	8,620	10.1	30.6	35.7	14.1	20.3
Chinese	0.6	70.0	40.0	14,852	20.9	13.1	39.7	40.9	33.0
Filipino	0.5	69.3	34.5	13,602	26.6	6.6	53.1	23.9	32.0
Japanese	0.3	33.2	17.6	20,247	45.8	7.2	40.1	43.9	37.6
Korean	0.3	81.7	48.7	12,871	23.0	13.8	46.1	33.6	21.0
Vietnamese	0.2	81.5	51.1	9,131	13.8	25.8	38.3	20.2	16.5
American	5.0	0.5	0.1	11,321	14.8	15.4	46.9	14.7	19.4
American Indian	1.3	0.6	0.2	10,321	12.3	18.0	45.4	14.0	18.2
Armenian	0.1	45.0	23.4	16,887	33.8	12.4	38.9	40.3	35.4
Austrian	0.2	12.0	8.7	24,075	44.5	4.7	40.3	46.5	47.2
Belgian	0.1	10.4	1.4	16,017	30.1	6.7	49.1	28.6	34.0
Canadian	0.1	36.4	9.1	17,986	33.4	8.2	44.7	36.1	37.3
Croatian	0.2	8.0	0.9	15,174	25.6	8.1	49.7	26.2	26.8
Czech	0.5	4.9	0.8	15,901	26.7	7.8	49.7	31.5	34.8
Danish	0.4	4.2	0.8	16,201	28.5	6.3	49.7	33.6	34.8
Dutch	1.5	3.9	0.7	14,292	22.7	8.8	50.1	26.6	28.3
English	9.4	3.3	0.7	17,377	31.5	6.9	47.0	34.4	36.8
Finnish	0.2	5.4	1.1	14,757	25.0	8.8	48.9	28.3	36.3
French	2.5	3.1	0.7	14,693	24.1	9.7	49.5	25.4	28.4
French-Canadian	0.7	7.8	1.0	14,948	25.5	7.6	51.9	25.7	27.4
German	18.8	2.3	0.3	14,983	25.0	7.9	51.9	27.0	30.4
Greek	0.4	22.1	3.0	17,691	33.6	7.3	47.0	34.9	36.4
Hungarian	0.4	13.4	1.6	18,820	35.1	6.9	45.1	35.2	38.9
Irish	9.1	1.6	0.3	15,485	27.2	8.9	48.1	27.5	31.8
Italian	4.4	6.0	0.4	16,859	32.7	6.7	48.0	31.9	32.3
Lebanese	0.1	24.7	10.4	16,907	30.4	10.6	46.2	40.3	37.0
Lithuanian	0.2	6.6	0.5	19,979	37.0	5.9	44.3	40.5	41.4
Norwegian	1.0	2.6	0.4	15,662	26.2	7.6	50.0	29.2	32.2
Polish	2.5	6.1	1.7	16,809	31.3	6.7	48.7	31.6	33.1
Portuguese	0.3	24.8	5.9	14,293	25.0	7.4	51.2	18.2	24.9
Rumanian	0.1	26.0	14.0	21,050	40.3	8.5	40.0	45.8	47.1
Russian	1.0	9.6	3.3	27,391	54.0	5.5	32.0	54.3	52.1
Scandinavian	0.2	2.0	0.2	15,990	27.0	8.0	50.0	37.7	38.7
Scots-Irish	1.8	1.3	0.1	17,298	31.1	6.4	48.6	35.2	37.7
Scottish	1.3	5.3	0.8	18,330	33.8	6.0	47.2	37.5	40.4
Slovak	0.5	3.8	0.4	16,345	29.5	5.8	50.1	33.1	34.8
Swedish	1.2	2.5	0.5	16,725	30.2	7.0	48.3	32.0	35.1
Swiss	0.3	6.6	17.6	17,777	28.1	5.7	48.1	36.8	39.0
Ukrainian	0.2	17.7	2.4	18,183	33.0	6.7	47.8	38.1	39.9
Welsh	0.4	2.3	0.6	17,586	32.5	6.2	47.8	39.7	40.4
Yugoslavian	0.1	21.9	4.0	17,046	29.9	7.2	50.1	30.5	34.2

**Table 3**  
Census divisions

<b>Division</b>		
1. New England	Maine New Hampshire Vermont	Massachusetts Rhode Island Connecticut
2. Middle Atlantic	New York New Jersey	Pennsylvania
3. East North Central	Ohio Indiana Illinois	Michigan Wisconsin
4. West North Central	Minnesota Iowa Missouri North Dakota	South Dakota Nebraska Kansas
5. South Atlantic	Delaware Maryland District of Columbia Virginia West Virginia	North Carolina South Carolina Georgia Florida
6. East South Central	Kentucky Tennessee	Alabama Mississippi
7. West South Central	Arkansas Louisiana	Oklahoma Texas
8. Mountain	Montana Idaho Wyoming Colorado	New Mexico Arizona Utah Nevada
9. Pacific	Washington Oregon California	Alaska Hawaii

Table 4

Percentage of males ages 25 to 54 with positive earnings, selected ethnic groups

	All groups	Irish	Polish	Mexican	Chinese	African American (blacks)	Japanese	Russian	Vietnamese
<b>1980</b>									
U.S. total	93.3	95.0	95.3	91.1	92.1	83.4	93.6	96.3	75.5
New England	94.6	95.7	94.9	95.2	91.9	85.1	100.0	96.2	53.3
Middle Atlantic	92.4	94.8	94.1	90.7	90.9	80.8	93.1	96.5	78.8
East North Central	94.1	95.0	96.3	91.4	95.3	81.1	92.5	97.5	80.8
West North Central	95.3	96.3	98.5	90.6	95.5	84.8	75.0	98.1	72.0
South Atlantic	92.6	94.2	93.7	90.7	84.8	85.4	89.7	95.7	92.7
East South Central	91.4	93.3	96.4	83.8	87.5	82.7	100.0	81.9	85.7
West South Central	93.2	95.3	96.2	92.1	87.1	83.6	87.5	98.0	85.5
Mountain	95.0	96.6	95.8	91.3	91.9	87.2	93.9	96.9	83.3
Pacific	93.3	94.8	95.6	90.5	93.7	84.4	93.9	95.5	66.7
<b>1990</b>									
U.S. total	92.5	94.4	95.3	90.0	89.7	82.0	93.9	95.4	83.7
New England	94.2	94.6	96.4	87.3	90.1	86.5	87.9	96.7	85.7
Middle Atlantic	92.3	95.2	94.4	88.4	91.5	80.4	93.0	94.9	91.4
East North Central	93.0	94.2	94.9	91.9	85.3	77.4	91.0	97.3	94.1
West North Central	94.5	94.9	96.5	92.6	77.8	81.7	87.5	95.3	90.9
South Atlantic	92.6	94.4	96.4	94.0	90.5	85.3	95.2	95.3	92.6
East South Central	90.1	91.7	94.9	96.9	93.0	80.0	90.0	97.2	81.8
West South Central	91.3	94.3	97.0	89.5	88.2	79.1	97.1	95.5	91.5
Mountain	93.8	95.1	95.8	91.1	87.2	86.0	89.5	95.4	75.7
Pacific	92.2	94.3	95.9	89.5	89.8	83.3	94.5	94.8	78.7

**Table 5**  
**Mean adult male earnings of selected ethnic groups**

	All groups	Irish	Polish	Mexican	Chinese	African American (blacks)	Japanese	Russian	Vietnamese
<b>1980</b>									
U.S. total	\$16,863	\$17,918	\$18,927	\$11,735	\$15,586	\$10,572	\$18,945	\$25,161	\$8,087
New England	16,854	17,623	17,232	15,211	13,051	11,587	18,176	24,668	3,613
Middle Atlantic	17,126	19,050	18,171	14,508	13,411	10,753	25,699	25,394	8,348
East North Central	18,239	18,994	19,749	13,388	15,609	12,121	20,760	26,320	5,980
West North Central	16,259	17,000	17,952	12,145	14,000	11,511	11,360	21,609	9,974
South Atlantic	15,340	16,320	19,051	10,550	14,686	9,716	15,975	26,743	9,002
East South Central	14,126	15,232	18,937	9,414	15,792	8,399	12,646	14,413	12,336
West South Central	16,594	17,573	19,763	11,157	15,726	10,305	14,657	26,097	9,546
Mountain	16,765	17,281	17,547	12,234	11,743	11,208	15,492	21,830	5,487
Pacific	17,845	19,053	20,651	11,831	17,071	12,007	18,604	24,474	7,496
<b>1990</b>									
U.S. total	\$28,537	\$31,336	\$34,258	\$17,341	\$28,667	\$17,253	\$38,546	\$53,692	\$20,058
New England	33,379	34,680	36,151	30,143	26,325	21,870	45,638	55,112	18,715
Middle Atlantic	31,635	35,287	34,775	16,772	26,388	19,522	58,304	54,921	26,510
East North Central	29,020	31,088	32,220	19,669	29,534	18,196	49,626	56,454	21,827
West North Central	25,763	27,396	27,320	18,994	17,260	15,947	23,320	49,055	27,599
South Atlantic	27,322	30,191	35,240	17,186	25,336	16,920	39,668	53,665	23,108
East South Central	23,545	24,812	35,820	20,478	28,614	13,144	44,990	51,668	27,183
West South Central	25,188	28,668	33,934	15,172	28,200	14,395	43,791	49,707	20,946
Mountain	26,386	27,720	32,430	17,171	26,415	18,588	30,727	38,636	13,434
Pacific	30,539	32,243	40,342	18,340	30,655	21,501	35,778	53,530	19,065

Table 6

Ratio of group mean earnings to division mean earnings, selected ethnic groups, males

	All groups	Irish	Polish	Mexican	Chinese	African American (blacks)	Japanese	Russian	Vietnamese
<b>1980</b>									
U.S. total	1.00	1.06	1.10	0.70	0.92	0.63	1.12	1.49	0.48
New England	1.00	1.05	1.02	0.90	0.77	0.69	1.08	1.46	0.21
Middle Atlantic	1.00	1.12	1.06	0.85	0.78	0.63	1.50	1.48	0.49
East North Central	1.00	1.04	1.08	0.73	0.86	0.66	1.14	1.44	0.33
West North Central	1.00	1.05	1.10	0.75	0.86	0.71	0.70	1.33	0.61
South Atlantic	1.00	1.06	1.24	0.69	0.96	0.63	1.04	1.74	0.59
East South Central	1.00	1.08	1.34	0.67	1.12	0.59	0.90	1.02	0.87
West South Central	1.00	1.06	1.19	0.67	0.95	0.62	0.88	1.57	0.58
Mountain	1.00	1.03	1.05	0.73	0.70	0.69	0.92	1.30	0.33
Pacific	1.00	1.07	1.16	0.66	0.96	0.67	1.04	1.37	0.42
<b>1990</b>									
U.S. total	1.00	1.10	1.20	0.61	1.00	0.60	1.35	1.88	0.70
New England	1.00	1.04	1.08	0.90	0.79	0.66	1.37	1.65	0.56
Middle Atlantic	1.00	1.12	1.10	0.53	0.83	0.62	1.84	1.74	0.84
East North Central	1.00	1.07	1.11	0.68	1.02	0.63	1.71	1.95	0.75
West North Central	1.00	1.06	1.06	0.74	0.67	0.62	0.91	1.90	0.68
South Atlantic	1.00	1.29	1.29	0.63	0.93	0.62	1.45	1.96	0.85
East South Central	1.00	1.05	1.52	0.87	1.22	0.56	1.91	2.17	1.15
West South Central	1.00	1.14	1.35	0.60	1.12	0.57	1.74	1.97	0.83
Mountain	1.00	1.05	1.23	0.65	1.00	0.70	1.16	1.46	0.51
Pacific	1.00	1.12	1.32	0.60	1.00	0.70	1.17	1.75	0.62

Table 7

Percentage of females ages 25 to 54 with positive earnings,  
selected ethnic groups

	All groups	Irish	Polish	Mexican	Chinese	African American (blacks)	Japanese	Russian	Vietnamese
<b>1980</b>									
U.S. total	66.9	66.7	68.1	58.9	72.8	69.1	67.1	71.6	55.2
New England	70.5	69.9	75.0	66.7	73.0	73.7	58.3	78.0	50.0
Middle Atlantic	63.1	63.4	64.2	56.5	76.9	65.6	48.6	67.7	56.3
East North Central	65.4	64.1	67.9	56.9	63.6	65.1	54.8	71.5	51.5
West North Central	68.6	69.6	66.4	67.6	61.5	75.0	65.6	77.3	45.0
South Atlantic	69.6	68.7	72.2	68.4	64.4	72.6	44.6	73.6	61.4
East South Central	61.5	64.9	70.0	59.1	45.0	68.3	52.9	71.4	62.5
West South Central	65.7	65.6	70.3	56.9	75.9	69.8	38.2	74.4	57.7
Mountain	68.3	71.5	77.3	58.7	68.4	75.8	74.3	73.3	57.1
Pacific	69.0	69.9	71.4	60.3	74.0	69.9	72.9	75.2	52.8
<b>1990</b>									
U.S. total	77.0	79.1	80.1	65.4	75.6	74.9	72.5	81.9	64.1
New England	81.7	82.2	84.8	73.2	82.7	78.8	62.2	84.4	68.9
Middle Atlantic	75.1	78.4	78.7	73.7	74.9	74.5	45.2	80.5	70.2
East North Central	76.7	77.6	78.5	66.9	82.0	69.0	50.9	81.9	71.4
West North Central	81.2	81.2	81.7	76.5	66.0	75.8	70.8	85.0	74.1
South Atlantic	79.6	80.3	83.3	73.4	78.4	79.5	52.3	85.9	73.5
East South Central	73.6	75.9	82.3	74.2	53.8	71.8	20.0	65.8	42.9
West South Central	73.3	75.2	80.0	62.8	69.7	71.7	64.5	80.2	71.7
Mountain	78.7	83.3	79.8	69.7	76.8	78.5	79.2	87.8	78.6
Pacific	76.1	80.3	81.6	65.2	76.5	74.6	79.9	79.5	57.3

**Table 8**  
**Mean adult female earnings of selected ethnic groups**

	All groups	Irish	Polish	Mexican	Chinese	African American (blacks)	Japanese	Russian	Vietnamese
<b>1980</b>									
U.S. total	\$5,581	\$5,527	\$6,050	\$3,969	\$6,996	\$5,905	\$6,954	\$7,376	\$3,796
New England	5,642	5,794	6,286	6,085	6,919	6,254	3,520	6,981	2,339
Middle Atlantic	5,575	5,494	5,763	4,785	6,353	6,301	5,045	7,548	3,841
East North Central	5,551	5,237	6,058	4,348	5,670	6,397	4,563	6,753	3,559
West North Central	5,050	5,090	4,989	4,416	4,259	6,447	5,738	7,740	2,972
South Atlantic	5,770	5,670	6,749	4,614	5,601	5,821	2,971	7,166	4,411
East South Central	4,660	4,788	5,983	2,901	5,510	4,553	3,964	6,071	2,748
West South Central	5,191	5,151	5,459	3,397	5,738	5,056	2,502	8,084	3,944
Mountain	5,345	5,646	6,132	4,030	5,941	6,176	6,275	6,171	4,434
Pacific	6,369	6,517	6,858	4,286	7,907	6,967	8,057	7,923	3,588
<b>1990</b>									
U.S. total	\$13,016	\$13,896	\$15,185	\$8,454	\$15,582	\$12,105	\$16,346	\$20,990	\$11,033
New England	15,598	16,579	17,065	13,797	18,239	15,893	10,224	21,665	10,984
Middle Atlantic	14,204	15,479	15,543	12,660	15,910	14,823	10,055	22,617	17,551
East North Central	12,073	12,278	13,278	9,141	12,703	11,917	10,879	17,043	10,022
West North Central	11,536	11,695	12,371	10,179	9,440	11,789	10,064	15,809	9,966
South Atlantic	13,476	13,945	16,683	9,327	14,371	12,109	9,078	21,809	13,906
East South Central	10,237	11,105	12,994	8,196	10,504	8,691	2,202	13,145	8,119
West South Central	11,152	11,703	15,479	7,229	13,947	9,611	12,906	21,729	11,235
Mountain	11,854	12,855	13,417	8,647	14,318	13,399	16,457	14,976	11,002
Pacific	14,724	16,440	19,500	8,986	16,191	15,265	18,714	20,904	9,905

Table 9

Ratio of group mean earnings to division mean earnings,  
selected ethnic groups, females

	All groups	Irish	Polish	Mexican	Chinese	African American (blacks)	Japanese	Russian	Vietnamese
<b>1980</b>									
U.S. total	1.00	0.99	1.08	0.71	1.25	1.06	1.25	1.32	0.68
New England	1.00	1.03	1.11	1.08	1.23	1.11	0.62	1.24	0.41
Middle Atlantic	1.00	0.99	1.03	0.86	1.14	1.13	0.90	1.35	0.69
East North Central	1.00	0.94	1.09	0.78	1.02	1.15	0.82	1.22	0.64
West North Central	1.00	1.01	0.99	0.87	0.84	1.28	1.14	1.53	0.59
South Atlantic	1.00	0.98	1.17	0.80	0.97	1.01	0.51	1.24	0.76
East South Central	1.00	1.02	1.28	0.62	1.18	0.98	0.85	1.30	0.59
West South Central	1.00	0.99	1.24	0.65	1.11	0.97	0.48	1.56	0.76
Mountain	1.00	1.06	1.15	0.75	1.11	1.16	1.17	1.15	0.83
Pacific	1.00	1.02	1.02	0.67	1.24	1.09	1.27	1.24	0.56
<b>1990</b>									
U.S. total	1.00	1.07	1.17	0.65	1.20	0.93	1.26	1.61	0.85
New England	1.00	1.06	1.09	0.88	1.17	1.02	0.66	1.39	0.70
Middle Atlantic	1.00	1.09	1.09	0.89	1.12	1.04	0.70	1.59	1.24
East North Central	1.00	1.02	1.10	0.76	1.05	0.99	0.90	1.41	0.83
West North Central	1.00	1.01	1.07	0.88	0.82	1.02	0.87	1.37	0.86
South Atlantic	1.00	1.03	1.24	0.69	1.06	0.90	0.67	1.62	1.03
East South Central	1.00	1.09	1.27	0.80	1.03	0.85	0.22	1.28	0.79
West South Central	1.00	1.05	1.39	0.65	1.25	0.86	1.16	1.95	1.01
Mountain	1.00	1.08	1.32	0.73	1.21	1.13	1.39	1.26	0.93
Pacific	1.00	1.12	1.32	0.61	1.10	1.04	1.27	1.42	0.67

**Table 10**  
 Summary statistics from the 1980 census data  
 according to division, selected categories

Division	Percent of population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	6.3	2.5	\$7,167	19.3	12.3	50.2	26.3	23.4
New England	5.4	7.8	2.1	7,381	19.8	9.6	53.7	31.7	26.4
Middle Atlantic	16.2	9.7	3.3	7,350	20.3	11.6	51.3	28.2	24.9
East North Central	17.5	4.3	1.4	7,487	21.3	10.2	53.0	24.1	21.7
West North Central	6.5	1.8	0.6	6,791	15.8	11.5	52.4	24.1	22.1
South Atlantic	15.8	4.8	1.8	6,830	17.2	13.9	48.7	25.7	23.5
East South Central	5.7	1.0	0.4	5,745	12.0	19.0	44.8	20.7	20.0
West South Central	10.2	4.1	2.1	6,705	17.1	15.5	46.9	24.0	22.2
Mountain	5.0	4.2	1.7	7,026	18.0	11.9	51.0	27.6	24.2
Pacific	14.1	12.99	6.4	7,986	24.2	10.8	48.6	29.2	24.7

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	51.5	33.4	79.7	1.7	4.5	10.0	1.2	3.4	3.2
New England	52.1	34.7	81.1	2.0	3.8	10.1	1.4	3.0	3.1
Middle Atlantic	52.4	34.9	77.6	1.8	5.1	8.6	1.2	3.7	2.4
East North Central	51.5	33.1	80.6	1.5	6.4	8.8	1.1	4.1	2.7
West North Central	51.3	34.3	85.5	1.6	4.1	11.8	1.1	2.6	4.1
South Atlantic	51.8	33.9	76.8	1.6	3.3	9.3	1.1	3.2	2.8
East South Central	51.7	33.0	79.6	1.3	5.1	9.7	0.9	4.2	2.5
West South Central	51.1	32.1	80.6	1.7	2.8	11.0	1.1	2.4	3.4
Mountain	50.3	31.4	83.5	2.0	4.0	11.7	1.4	2.7	4.6
Pacific	50.7	32.9	78.7	2.1	4.8	11.9	1.5	3.7	4.4

**Table 11**  
 Summary statistics from the 1990 census data  
 according to division, selected categories

Division	Percent of population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	8.6	3.7	\$13,933	22.8	13.2	45.7	25.6	28.9
New England	5.3	9.4	3.3	16,912	32.7	8.2	46.5	30.9	34.3
Middle Atlantic	15.4	11.8	4.4	15,576	28.0	10.5	46.3	27.7	30.7
East North Central	16.7	4.3	1.4	13,527	21.4	11.7	49.8	23.5	26.4
West North Central	6.9	2.1	0.8	12,330	16.8	12.4	49.5	22.5	26.9
South Atlantic	17.4	7.4	3.1	14,050	22.6	13.0	45.9	25.9	29.1
East South Central	5.9	1.4	0.5	11,004	14.8	19.8	43.0	20.6	24.2
West South Central	11.0	7.0	3.2	11,733	17.2	19.4	41.5	23.3	27.7
Mountain	5.6	6.0	2.4	12,608	18.5	14.2	45.8	26.3	28.6
Pacific	15.7	19.3	9.4	15,461	27.3	12.3	42.8	27.7	30.7

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	51.5	35.1	75.8	1.6	4.6	11.2	1.4	3.8	5.9
New England	51.8	35.9	78.6	2.0	5.1	12.8	1.8	3.5	6.6
Middle Atlantic	52.1	36.3	76.8	1.7	4.8	10.5	1.5	3.7	4.9
East North Central	51.6	35.1	77.7	1.4	5.0	9.9	1.3	3.9	5.3
West North Central	51.4	36.0	82.0	1.5	4.2	12.9	1.3	3.1	7.8
South Atlantic	51.9	36.1	71.8	1.5	3.4	10.3	1.4	3.5	5.3
East South Central	52.4	35.2	71.9	1.2	4.7	10.3	1.1	4.5	4.5
West South Central	51.4	33.8	74.3	1.4	5.3	11.5	1.2	4.5	5.7
Mountain	50.7	33.4	77.9	1.7	4.6	12.1	1.4	3.8	7.6
Pacific	50.4	33.8	75.2	1.8	4.8	12.5	1.5	3.9	7.4

Table 12

Summary statistics from the 1980 census data, Irish ancestry

Division	Percent of Irish population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	1.7	0.1	\$7,585	21.4	8.8	53.3	27.6	24.9
New England	9.1	2.7	0.1	7,575	22.1	7.3	55.1	34.5	29.4
Middle Atlantic	19.8	3.2	0.2	7,707	22.7	7.3	55.8	30.2	27.6
East North Central	15.7	1.5	0.1	7,840	23.5	8.0	54.0	25.0	23.0
West North Central	6.3	0.6	0.2	6,872	15.7	10.7	53.6	25.3	22.4
South Atlantic	13.9	1.2	0.2	7,339	19.1	9.6	53.2	27.3	24.3
East South Central	6.2	0.3	0.0	6,282	13.7	12.9	50.0	20.9	19.0
West South Central	9.5	0.5	0.2	7,359	19.6	11.0	51.0	24.5	22.3
Mountain	9.7	1.3	0.3	7,553	20.2	9.3	53.5	27.7	24.4
Pacific	11.6	2.2	0.3	8,660	27.8	8.0	50.0	30.0	26.9

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	52.9	34.8	84.3	1.8	4.5	9.6	1.2	3.2	3.1
New England	53.6	34.3	84.7	2.2	5.0	8.3	1.5	2.4	1.9
Middle Atlantic	53.9	34.6	85.5	1.9	4.4	7.1	1.2	3.1	1.9
East North Central	52.8	33.9	84.7	1.6	6.4	7.9	1.0	3.9	2.5
West North Central	53.2	35.7	85.2	1.7	4.5	11.6	1.1	2.9	4.1
South Atlantic	52.9	35.3	83.4	1.7	3.2	10.1	1.1	3.1	2.9
East South Central	53.3	36.0	86.6	1.3	4.0	11.8	0.7	4.0	3.7
West South Central	51.7	36.0	85.4	1.6	3.1	12.5	1.0	2.1	4.0
Mountain	50.8	33.7	84.7	2.0	4.3	11.1	1.4	2.8	5.1
Pacific	52.2	34.9	79.6	2.2	5.1	12.1	1.5	3.8	4.9

**Table 13**  
**Summary statistics from the 1990 census data, Irish ancestry**

Division	Percent of Irish population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	1.6	0.3	\$15,485	27.2	0.9	48.1	27.5	31.8
New England	8.8	2.4	0.5	17,884	36.9	0.5	47.4	32.9	39.0
Middle Atlantic	18.5	2.4	0.4	17,191	34.1	0.6	47.5	28.9	34.3
East North Central	15.3	1.0	0.1	14,503	23.9	1.0	50.5	25.2	27.1
West North Central	6.3	0.7	0.1	12,976	18.6	1.1	49.1	24.3	27.9
South Atlantic	17.0	1.6	0.4	15,546	26.4	8.7	49.0	27.6	32.1
East South Central	7.3	0.4	0.2	12,337	17.6	12.4	48.8	20.0	27.3
West South Central	10.7	1.0	0.2	13,498	20.9	12.3	47.0	26.0	30.4
Mountain	4.7	1.5	0.2	13,763	21.2	10.0	48.9	27.3	30.7
Pacific	11.5	2.5	0.4	18,070	33.5	7.6	44.7	30.5	34.4

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	53.2	36.9	81.5	1.7	4.0	11.5	1.5	3.2	6.0
New England	52.5	35.1	84.5	2.1	5.0	12.0	2.0	3.6	5.5
Middle Atlantic	53.6	35.9	83.0	1.8	3.9	9.4	1.6	3.0	4.6
East North Central	53.5	36.3	81.2	1.5	4.7	9.9	1.3	3.2	5.5
West North Central	53.5	37.8	80.9	1.5	3.7	12.9	1.3	3.0	7.3
South Atlantic	53.4	37.6	80.8	1.6	2.6	11.2	1.4	3.0	6.2
East South Central	53.4	39.1	83.2	1.2	4.5	11.2	1.1	3.7	5.2
West South Central	52.8	38.7	82.2	1.5	4.0	13.6	1.2	3.3	6.2
Mountain	52.2	35.7	89.6	1.8	4.3	12.5	1.5	4.2	7.8
Pacific	52.6	37.0	77.4	7.9	4.2	14.1	1.7	2.8	7.9

Table 14

Summary statistics from the 1980 census data, Polish ancestry

Division	Percent of Polish population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	1.7	0.2	\$7,586	21.4	8.9	53.3	27.6	24.9
New England	9.1	2.7	0.1	7,575	22.1	7.3	55.1	34.5	29.4
Middle Atlantic	19.8	3.2	0.2	7,707	22.7	7.3	55.8	30.2	27.6
East North Central	15.7	1.5	0.1	7,840	23.5	8.0	54.0	25.0	23.0
West North Central	6.3	0.6	0.1	6,872	15.7	10.7	53.6	25.3	22.4
South Atlantic	13.9	1.2	1.6	7,339	19.1	9.6	53.2	27.3	24.3
East South Central	6.2	0.3	0.0	6,282	13.7	12.9	50.0	20.9	19.0
West South Central	9.5	0.6	0.2	7,859	19.6	11.0	51.0	24.5	22.3
Mountain	9.6	1.3	0.3	7,553	20.2	9.3	53.5	27.7	24.4
Pacific	11.6	2.2	0.3	8,668	27.8	8.0	50.0	30.0	26.9

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	52.9	34.8	84.3	1.8	4.5	9.7	1.2	3.2	3.1
New England	53.6	34.3	84.7	2.2	5.0	8.3	1.5	2.4	1.9
Middle Atlantic	53.9	34.6	85.5	1.9	4.5	7.1	1.2	3.2	1.9
East North Central	52.8	33.9	84.7	1.6	6.4	7.9	1.0	3.9	2.5
West North Central	53.2	35.6	85.3	1.7	4.5	11.6	1.1	2.9	4.1
South Atlantic	52.9	35.3	83.5	1.7	3.2	10.1	1.1	3.1	2.9
East South Central	53.3	35.0	86.6	1.3	4.0	11.8	0.7	4.0	3.7
West South Central	51.7	36.0	85.5	1.6	3.1	12.5	1.0	2.1	4.0
Mountain	50.8	33.7	84.7	2.0	4.3	11.1	1.5	2.8	5.1
Pacific	52.2	34.9	80.0	2.2	5.1	12.1	1.5	3.8	4.9

**Table 15**  
**Summary statistics from the 1990 census data, Polish ancestry**

Division	Percent of Polish population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	6.1	1.7	\$16,809	31.3	6.7	48.7	31.6	33.1
New England	8.9	7.0	2.1	18,103	37.9	5.5	46.4	35.7	37.9
Middle Atlantic	30.9	6.6	1.7	17,087	32.2	6.4	48.0	30.7	34.0
East North Central	31.4	5.2	1.7	15,159	27.2	6.9	52.3	26.1	27.1
West North Central	4.3	2.7	0.7	12,937	19.2	10.7	51.0	20.5	25.8
South Atlantic	10.0	6.7	1.5	18,452	34.8	5.5	45.6	40.5	37.0
East South Central	0.9	4.8	0.7	14,923	24.5	9.2	50.5	40.9	35.4
West South Central	3.3	4.1	1.1	16,733	30.6	7.9	48.0	35.3	41.4
Mountain	2.8	5.4	1.4	16,059	28.1	9.2	48.0	33.3	37.3
Pacific	7.5	9.3	2.6	21,621	41.4	6.1	41.4	41.5	39.7

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	51.8	37.8	84.9	2.0	3.9	11.8	1.7	2.8	5.7
New England	51.6	38.7	83.3	2.2	5.4	13.0	2.0	3.5	4.8
Middle Atlantic	52.2	39.1	85.9	1.9	4.0	10.7	1.7	2.6	5.1
East North Central	52.2	37.0	84.7	1.7	3.9	10.0	1.3	3.0	4.4
West North Central	51.6	34.9	86.0	1.4	3.6	12.1	1.3	2.4	7.2
South Atlantic	51.8	39.7	86.3	2.4	3.3	14.2	2.0	2.2	7.7
East South Central	47.5	32.2	86.5	2.4	0.8	11.3	1.5	2.4	4.8
West South Central	51.8	33.9	84.2	2.0	1.7	11.3	1.9	3.3	6.7
Mountain	50.2	36.4	78.0	2.3	4.7	15.5	1.8	3.3	8.7
Pacific	49.5	87.4	84.1	2.7	3.7	16.2	2.1	2.7	9.1

Table 16

Summary statistics from the 1980 census data, Mexican ancestry

Division	Percent of Mexican population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	25.9	14.9	\$4,309	6.3	23.2	41.4	10.4	10.5
New England	0.2	15.5	5.0	5,885	13.1	15.7	48.4	22.2	22.7
Middle Atlantic	0.9	24.3	14.4	5,425	12.3	27.9	39.4	22.6	20.0
East North Central	7.5	31.9	19.3	4,940	9.1	17.4	49.2	7.0	8.3
West North Central	1.4	11.5	6.2	4,694	5.7	17.4	51.7	11.5	13.6
South Atlantic	2.2	13.8	7.2	4,237	7.7	31.1	31.3	14.9	11.9
East South Central	6.3	2.9	1.3	3,510	3.1	35.8	31.6	10.2	11.9
West South Central	29.3	17.3	9.13	3,792	4.4	28.5	36.2	10.2	10.3
Mountain	10.6	14.2	7.9	4,441	6.1	21.4	43.9	12.4	12.8
Pacific	43.1	35.0	2.1	4,554	7.3	20.0	44.0	10.0	9.8

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	49.4	24.5	79.7	0.7	6.2	5.2	0.4	5.1	1.5
New England	52.2	26.7	64.6	1.8	9.5	14.3	0.9	11.1	3.7
Middle Atlantic	51.2	26.7	70.4	1.3	3.9	3.9	1.2	4.3	2.8
East North Central	48.1	23.2	79.5	0.5	8.9	2.9	0.4	6.9	1.6
West North	48.5	23.9	78.8	0.7	5.8	6.8	0.5	2.8	1.1
South Atlantic	48.0	26.0	70.3	0.9	3.2	3.2	0.5	2.4	0.7
East South Central	52.9	30.8	69.1	0.7	4.1	8.1	0.3	11.4	1.1
West South	49.8	25.0	82.4	0.6	4.1	6.2	0.4	3.2	1.4
Mountain	50.0	24.4	80.2	0.8	5.8	5.1	0.4	3.4	1.7
Pacific	48.9	24.0	78.7	0.7	7.4	5.1	0.4	6.8	1.5

**Table 17**  
**Summary statistics from the 1990 census data, Mexican ancestry**

Division	Percent of Mexican population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	34.0	17.1	\$7,518	7.1	27.2	35.6	9.9	15.2
New England	0.2	35.5	21.5	13,965	26.4	12.8	40.0	20.3	28.0
Middle Atlantic	0.9	48.8	35.3	10,600	14.7	21.1	39.8	13.0	19.4
East North Central	5.8	34.4	15.7	8,281	7.6	19.5	46.6	8.1	14.1
West North Central	12.6	17.5	8.3	8,431	6.5	22.8	43.8	10.9	21.3
South Atlantic	2.2	39.4	27.1	8,705	9.1	24.1	31.1	13.2	21.0
East South Central	0.2	12.5	5.3	8,772	9.8	29.6	34.5	15.9	18.2
West South Central	31.1	24.5	10.7	6,249	4.3	34.7	29.7	9.9	15.9
Mountain	11.0	21.6	11.1	7,358	5.9	28.2	35.1	11.9	15.7
Pacific	47.4	43.1	22.4	8,132	8.8	23.4	38.1	9.3	14.1

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	48.6	25.6	71.5	0.6	7.2	6.3	0.5	6.5	3.1
New England	46.0	27.2	82.3	1.8	3.6	9.1	2.3	7.1	1.8
Middle Atlantic	45.9	25.4	67.3	0.9	6.0	6.8	1.1	4.1	2.6
East North Central	47.1	24.4	72.0	0.5	7.5	5.2	0.5	6.8	2.3
West North Central	49.2	24.4	57.3	0.6	2.8	5.0	0.8	3.8	2.7
South Atlantic	42.4	24.1	74.0	0.7	3.7	3.1	0.8	5.0	4.4
East South Central	48.5	26.2	65.1	1.0	0.0	10.9	0.8	7.6	1.5
West South Central	49.9	26.7	74.7	0.6	7.8	7.2	0.5	6.0	3.2
Mountain	49.5	26.0	68.7	0.7	6.7	6.0	0.5	5.5	3.4
Pacific	48.0	24.9	70.0	0.6	7.2	6.2	0.5	7.2	3.1

Table 18

Summary statistics from the 1980 census data, Chinese ancestry

Division	Percent of Chinese population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	64.5	40.1	\$7,368	24.9	11.9	46.6	41.6	27.4
New England	3.6	67.1	38.5	6,861	23.3	16.4	40.4	41.7	35.8
Middle Atlantic	22.0	72.8	43.7	6,342	18.3	14.4	42.8	32.7	19.9
East North Central	6.9	67.8	42.6	7,058	25.0	10.1	54.4	49.2	27.0
West North Central	1.4	79.1	53.9	5,144	13.9	25.7	39.6	60.0	19.0
South Atlantic	6.1	74.0	48.1	7,009	27.1	16.5	36.0	49.0	34.0
East South Central	1.0	63.4	48.8	7,050	20.5	9.0	55.1	73.9	37.5
West South Central	4.2	70.9	49.4	7,840	24.2	11.0	55.5	52.6	25.6
Mountain	2.0	59.3	43.8	6,638	15.5	10.5	61.3	55.6	20.7
Pacific	51.8	58.4	35.8	7,977	28.3	10.0	47.8	40.1	29.6

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	49.5	31.5	90.7	3.5	1.8	12.3	2.3	2.9	5.1
New England	50.4	32.9	91.9	3.3	0.0	3.2	2.6	0.0	0.0
Middle Atlantic	48.5	31.0	93.1	2.9	3.3	8.1	2.0	2.7	3.2
East North Central	48.1	29.5	93.3	4.7	0.0	10.9	2.9	3.9	4.7
West North Central	53.0	26.5	78.8	5.6	4.5	18.2	2.8	3.8	0.0
South Atlantic	50.5	30.3	88.7	4.2	0.9	7.1	3.0	5.8	5.0
East South Central	51.2	28.0	92.6	5.8	0.0	16.7	4.3	10.0	15.0
West South Central	48.5	28.0	91.2	4.0	0.0	18.8	2.4	1.2	10.8
Mountain	48.1	28.8	81.0	4.6	2.7	18.9	2.1	0.0	2.6
Pacific	50.0	32.7	90.3	3.3	1.9	14.7	2.2	2.6	5.9

**Table 19**  
**Summary statistics from the 1990 census data, Chinese ancestry**

Division	Percent of Chinese population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	70.0	39.7	\$14,852	29.9	13.1	39.6	40.9	33.0
New England	4.4	71.9	43.0	16,462	34.0	11.9	30.9	43.5	38.4
Middle Atlantic	21.1	75.6	42.3	13,600	26.6	13.4	38.9	36.8	29.4
East North Central	5.6	70.0	39.7	13,839	28.2	18.9	39.7	52.3	37.1
West North Central	1.3	71.6	47.2	10,386	14.1	13.1	36.2	52.0	56.1
South Atlantic	7.1	75.2	42.3	14,776	29.9	17.4	41.6	48.0	38.2
East South Central	0.9	76.3	43.2	13,211	18.2	17.4	56.1	45.2	36.0
West South Central	4.3	71.3	42.2	15,106	31.0	17.4	37.8	49.4	42.7
Mountain	2.3	67.0	28.8	14,983	21.3	18.4	45.2	51.9	22.2
Pacific	52.9	66.8	38.0	15,439	31.9	11.7	40.0	38.4	31.8

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	50.5	33.2	90.5	3.1	2.5	10.9	2.3	2.9	6.3
New England	51.7	32.1	93.6	3.9	2.9	9.4	2.8	1.2	7.4
Middle Atlantic	50.6	33.2	91.3	2.7	4.2	7.0	2.2	4.4	4.7
East North Central	48.5	31.4	93.7	4.2	0.9	8.5	2.8	2.4	5.7
West North Central	49.2	29.5	86.4	4.6	3.7	5.6	3.3	3.8	13.2
South Atlantic	50.9	32.2	92.8	3.4	2.1	6.3	3.5	2.0	7.4
East South Central	51.8	30.6	96.7	3.4	2.3	14.0	2.2	0.0	7.7
West South Central	50.9	30.8	87.4	4.2	3.0	11.2	3.0	2.3	9.1
Mountain	54.7	32.4	81.7	3.3	0.0	12.8	1.9	3.2	5.3
Pacific	50.4	34.0	90.0	2.8	2.0	13.6	2.2	2.6	6.5

Table 20

Summary statistics from the 1980 census data, African ancestry (black)

Division	Percent of black population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	2.8	1.7	\$4,535	7.7	29.6	37.3	12.7	17.1
New England	1.8	10.5	6.5	5,137	9.5	25.8	41.3	19.7	17.3
Middle Atlantic	16.2	9.2	5.3	4,954	9.3	27.9	40.1	14.9	17.5
East North Central	16.5	1.2	0.6	5,142	11.1	28.1	40.8	12.3	17.6
West North Central	2.8	1.1	0.7	4,763	8.0	25.0	40.8	13.2	20.1
South Atlantic	28.5	1.8	1.1	4,240	6.2	29.6	36.4	11.5	16.8
East South Central	9.4	0.6	0.3	3,350	3.0	38.1	28.0	9.8	15.2
West South Central	13.2	1.0	0.6	4,027	5.4	32.5	34.4	9.7	15.6
Mountain	1.0	1.8	1.2	5,143	9.3	24.7	42.6	18.9	19.7
Pacific	7.5	2.1	1.2	5,686	12.8	22.4	42.0	18.3	20.4

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	53.0	29.0	51.3	0.9	7.9	3.7	0.9	6.0	1.2
New England	52.9	27.7	44.4	1.2	6.0	4.7	0.9	6.5	1.5
Middle Atlantic	54.4	29.7	45.9	1.0	8.6	3.5	0.8	6.2	0.9
East North Central	53.3	28.4	46.4	0.9	13.0	3.1	0.9	5.7	1.2
West North Central	52.3	29.3	49.1	1.1	8.9	2.9	1.0	6.6	1.6
South Atlantic	52.9	29.0	54.2	0.8	5.8	3.7	0.8	6.7	1.2
East South Central	52.9	29.5	56.6	0.7	8.0	3.3	0.8	6.1	0.9
West South Central	52.7	28.8	56.8	0.9	5.4	4.6	0.8	6.3	1.4
Mountain	47.8	27.1	52.0	1.4	5.4	5.6	1.0	7.6	2.0
Pacific	50.9	28.7	49.7	1.6	7.2	4.3	1.3	7.0	1.7

**Table 21**  
**Summary statistics from the 1990 census data, African ancestry (black)**

Division	Percent of black population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	4.2	2.2	\$8,620	10.1	30.6	35.7	14.1	20.3
New England	1.9	15.4	8.3	11,747	17.9	21.3	43.3	17.6	25.1
Middle Atlantic	13.4	13.9	6.6	10,814	16.7	23.2	41.3	17.1	24.0
East North Central	14.0	1.1	0.5	8,948	11.6	32.5	35.9	14.9	20.2
West North Central	2.6	1.8	1.2	8,182	8.6	34.1	33.6	14.7	20.1
South Atlantic	33.5	3.7	2.1	8,462	8.9	27.8	37.4	12.6	19.2
East South Central	11.2	0.5	0.3	5,917	3.5	42.1	27.3	9.7	16.4
West South Central	14.2	1.3	0.7	6,633	5.5	39.6	29.1	11.7	18.4
Mountain	1.2	3.4	1.8	9,905	12.2	26.1	39.6	20.0	22.0
Pacific	8.0	4.1	1.9	11,659	17.9	20.4	40.4	20.3	25.7

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	53.6	30.7	40.0	0.9	8.7	4.6	1.0	7.4	2.3
New England	53.2	29.4	40.5	1.3	9.7	3.5	1.2	6.2	2.9
Middle Atlantic	54.5	32.0	37.9	1.0	9.6	4.3	1.1	6.7	2.0
East North Central	54.2	30.9	34.9	0.9	12.3	4.1	1.0	9.3	1.8
West North Central	53.0	29.8	34.9	1.0	9.0	4.6	1.0	7.7	1.7
South Atlantic	53.7	30.8	42.2	0.8	5.9	4.7	0.9	6.0	2.4
East South Central	54.2	30.4	39.9	0.6	9.0	3.9	0.8	8.5	1.8
West South Central	53.2	30.0	40.0	0.8	11.4	5.1	0.9	9.3	2.6
Mountain	49.1	28.9	40.5	1.2	6.2	4.1	1.2	8.0	3.0
Pacific	51.2	30.5	45.0	1.4	8.7	6.1	1.3	6.4	3.4

Table 22

Summary statistics from the 1980 census data, Japanese ancestry

Division	Percent of Japanese population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	28.8	13.9	\$9,477	36.2	6.7	48.5	40.6	29.9
New England	0.9	55.9	32.4	8,587	28.8	13.6	39.0	46.2	18.8
Middle Atlantic	5.8	69.8	48.0	10,747	39.1	8.3	43.5	53.1	31.8
East North Central	4.8	45.6	25.1	9,410	33.6	9.1	48.0	55.1	25.0
West North Central	1.2	38.6	13.6	7,908	20.7	13.4	63.4	60.0	27.3
South Atlantic	3.4	64.5	35.9	8,110	20.4	9.6	54.3	39.3	18.3
East South Central	0.4	51.5	18.2	5,952	10.0	9.7	60.0	25.0	40.0
West South Central	1.9	65.9	34.8	6,963	16.8	10.0	53.4	57.1	30.0
Mountain	4.8	30.3	10.2	7,634	26.5	6.6	47.9	32.6	27.6
Pacific	76.0	21.2	9.0	9,681	38.5	6.1	48.3	38.8	31.0

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	53.5	35.5	88.7	2.9	1.7	10.6	1.8	1.7	4.5
New England	52.9	29.3	66.7	4.3	0.0	0.0	2.3	12.5	8.3
Middle Atlantic	58.5	31.3	85.5	3.9	0.0	5.9	2.2	2.9	4.3
East North Central	57.6	33.2	88.9	4.0	0.0	7.5	1.6	1.0	4.8
West North Central	58.0	34.0	75.0	3.0	12.5	0.0	1.3	6.3	0.0
South Atlantic	66.9	32.5	90.0	3.9	0.0	3.4	1.2	5.9	1.0
East South Central	54.5	32.9	85.7	2.2	0.0	0.0	1.5	5.9	0.0
West South Central	62.2	30.8	76.7	4.6	6.3	6.3	1.1	0.0	1.8
Mountain	58.6	32.2	85.7	3.2	0.0	8.2	1.4	2.0	5.0
Pacific	51.5	36.5	90.0	2.7	1.9	11.8	1.8	0.9	4.8

**Table 23**  
 Summary statistics from the 1990 census data, Japanese ancestry

Division	Percent of Japanese population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	33.3	17.6	\$20,247	45.8	7.2	40.0	43.9	37.6
New England	1.6	68.7	47.0	21,031	40.2	23.8	33.6	60.6	42.9
Middle Atlantic	6.6	76.3	56.1	23,785	52.8	10.0	29.3	58.0	40.9
East North Central	4.9	62.3	44.1	20,219	48.4	10.4	32.9	66.7	41.8
West North Central	1.0	47.7	22.1	15,894	29.5	16.7	44.9	43.8	36.4
South Atlantic	4.9	66.7	35.1	17,631	31.4	5.4	46.1	50.0	34.5
East South Central	0.9	77.3	52.0	19,697	38.2	8.8	52.9	60.0	66.7
West South Central	2.2	62.3	29.0	18,284	36.3	8.9	45.3	45.7	37.5
Mountain	3.6	29.4	11.1	16,919	30.9	13.7	48.1	45.6	45.3
Pacific	74.2	23.1	10.0	20,368	47.3	6.0	40.4	39.8	36.8

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	53.8	38.2	86.3	2.9	1.6	11.0	2.3	1.4	6.1
New England	54.5	29.2	87.5	4.8	3.0	18.1	3.4	0.0	10.8
Middle Atlantic	55.9	30.2	93.6	3.9	2.1	4.9	2.6	0.6	4.2
East North Central	55.6	34.7	94.4	3.6	0.0	5.6	2.3	1.9	5.6
West North Central	57.0	36.5	81.8	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.3	8.3	0.0
South Atlantic	64.2	34.0	82.1	3.8	1.2	7.1	2.1	2.3	4.6
East South Central	54.7	35.8	100.0	4.4	5.0	5.0	1.7	0.0	0.0
West South Central	66.1	33.5	95.1	3.1	2.9	14.3	1.5	0.0	1.6
Mountain	56.1	35.1	76.3	2.8	0.0	7.0	2.2	1.3	3.9
Pacific	52.2	40.0	84.9	2.6	1.7	12.4	2.3	1.4	6.9

Table 24

Summary statistics from the 1980 census data, Russian ancestry

Division	Percent of Russian population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	12.0	2.7	\$11,451	41.6	6.9	41.3	56.9	44.7
New England	8.2	9.6	2.6	10,742	39.3	7.8	42.6	57.6	51.9
Middle Atlantic	41.8	12.6	3.4	11,399	42.9	6.8	39.8	57.2	46.3
East North Central	11.3	10.2	2.2	11,776	44.1	5.8	42.4	56.0	39.8
West North Central	2.3	8.4	0.8	10,893	36.1	8.3	45.2	45.2	38.3
South Atlantic	13.2	12.9	1.7	11,559	40.0	5.8	41.7	59.6	41.5
East South Central	0.4	19.1	15.7	10,465	30.6	22.4	38.8	52.4	54.5
West South Central	1.9	5.6	1.8	11,363	39.2	7.1	43.6	52.6	37.8
Mountain	2.9	9.9	1.8	9,478	27.1	13.3	50.7	45.7	40.7
Pacific	16.1	14.3	2.3	12,004	42.8	6.9	41.1	59.4	44.6

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	51.8	41.1	87.9	4.0	2.9	19.7	2.9	3.5	6.2
New England	52.9	39.7	89.1	4.5	3.0	20.6	3.5	4.3	7.8
Middle Atlantic	52.7	42.4	88.6	3.9	2.8	19.2	2.9	3.5	4.6
East North Central	51.4	38.2	89.4	3.9	2.5	18.3	2.8	3.6	4.2
West North Central	49.3	39.6	90.4	3.5	4.8	16.2	3.0	1.0	8.2
South Atlantic	51.8	45.7	88.7	4.3	2.5	18.8	2.9	3.4	8.5
East South Central	41.6	36.9	93.8	4.1	4.5	9.0	4.2	0.0	14.3
West South Central	47.7	33.8	86.0	3.6	4.0	18.2	2.8	4.7	5.8
Mountain	51.4	36.8	90.4	3.8	0.8	16.8	2.5	3.1	9.2
Pacific	50.9	39.0	84.8	4.2	3.1	24.5	3.0	3.9	8.7

**Table 25**  
**Summary statistics from the 1990 census data, Russian ancestry**

Division	Percent of Russian population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	9.6	3.3	\$27,391	54.0	5.5	32.1	54.3	52.1
New England	8.6	7.2	3.3	28,589	58.6	4.1	31.3	55.0	56.8
Middle Atlantic	37.3	9.6	3.8	28,899	57.5	4.6	29.8	53.9	54.1
East North Central	10.3	11.1	3.9	24,820	49.3	6.7	35.5	55.5	46.2
West North Central	2.5	7.2	1.0	23,674	41.1	9.9	38.5	47.6	40.9
South Atlantic	16.7	6.2	1.2	26,759	52.3	4.0	35.2	58.2	53.3
East South Central	0.7	8.8	3.7	26,951	60.0	6.2	23.8	52.8	46.7
West South Central	2.1	8.3	2.1	28,872	50.4	6.8	33.9	54.5	48.9
Mountain	3.3	6.2	0.7	20,245	38.0	8.2	40.0	39.6	45.7
Pacific	18.3	14.1	4.8	27,411	53.7	7.2	30.0	55.1	51.3

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	52.0	42.5	88.1	3.7	3.0	20.9	3.2	3.0	11.7
New England	53.1	39.2	88.4	4.1	2.6	23.3	3.7	3.4	12.2
Middle Atlantic	52.3	42.5	90.3	3.7	2.7	20.2	3.3	3.5	10.0
East North Central	51.6	40.8	88.5	3.7	3.4	19.3	3.0	2.3	9.3
West North Central	51.8	40.1	89.7	3.5	3.8	20.8	2.7	1.7	19.2
South Atlantic	52.8	47.0	87.6	4.0	1.8	15.7	3.3	2.4	11.8
East South Central	52.9	40.2	100.0	4.0	0.0	19.4	3.1	0.0	15.8
West South Central	48.1	38.9	91.4	3.6	2.7	19.6	2.9	1.9	11.3
Mountain	49.8	40.7	84.2	3.3	6.3	17.8	2.9	6.1	13.5
Pacific	51.1	41.6	83.4	3.6	3.9	26.4	3.2	3.0	14.4

Table 26

Summary statistics from the 1980 census data, Vietnamese ancestry

Division	Percent of Vietnamese population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	90.5	89.0	\$3,714	6.4	37.4	36.0	16.8	11.4
New England	2.7	95.4	93.8	2,326	0.0	63.9	22.6	25.0	27.3
Middle Atlantic	8.3	89.1	87.6	3,476	4.5	40.3	32.8	13.8	18.2
East North Central	7.2	93.1	92.0	2,967	4.0	51.8	37.0	13.0	4.0
West North Central	4.7	96.5	96.5	4,189	7.1	42.0	33.6	39.1	8.3
South Atlantic	11.0	88.0	85.0	4,744	10.0	23.3	42.9	17.1	14.5
East South Central	1.4	79.4	79.4	4,555	5.8	35.3	58.8	33.3	0.0
West South Central	19.8	89.7	88.7	3,527	5.8	36.2	45.2	18.1	5.6
Mountain	2.7	87.9	84.8	3,505	4.5	27.3	30.3	10.0	2.7
Pacific	39.4	91.7	90.5	3,575	6.5	38.6	29.7	14.2	11.1

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	49.7	23.2	79.8	1.8	7.2	3.5	8.7	2.8	1.9
New England	41.5	22.0	69.2	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0
Middle Atlantic	46.8	22.8	87.7	1.5	9.1	3.0	1.6	3.1	0.0
East North Central	49.4	19.5	87.6	1.8	3.8	0.0	0.3	6.0	3.0
West North Central	43.9	23.5	71.4	2.4	0.0	4.0	1.1	0.0	0.0
South Atlantic	54.5	23.6	84.0	2.2	9.8	2.4	1.0	0.0	2.9
East South Central	58.8	22.2	76.5	4.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0
West South Central	52.5	23.2	83.1	1.8	6.6	3.9	0.5	3.8	3.8
Mountain	45.5	22.9	77.8	1.5	8.3	8.3	0.5	7.1	0.0
Pacific	48.5	23.8	75.6	1.7	7.9	4.5	1.0	3.3	1.7

**Table 27**  
 Summary statistics from the 1990 census data, Vietnamese ancestry

Division	Percent of Vietnamese population	Percent born foreign	Percent immigrated since 1970	Mean per capita income (current dollars)	Percent affluent	Percent poor	Percent middle class	Percent males professional/managerial	Percent females professional/managerial
U.S. total	100.0	81.5	51.1	\$9,131	13.8	25.8	38.3	20.2	16.5
New England	4.2	87.8	76.3	8,386	8.8	32.1	35.0	19.2	27.3
Middle Atlantic	4.9	83.7	51.2	12,792	22.3	26.0	24.5	25.9	21.4
East North Central	4.2	85.0	55.4	8,750	16.8	19.8	38.8	31.3	10.3
West North Central	2.7	77.4	50.3	6,934	2.0	37.1	43.0	18.8	28.6
South Atlantic	10.9	85.0	48.3	10,608	20.2	18.2	43.2	18.4	14.6
East South Central	0.9	69.8	32.1	10,630	9.6	26.9	30.8	10.0	40.0
West South Central	13.9	78.3	37.0	8,823	12.5	23.4	43.0	15.6	16.3
Mountain	3.2	86.2	54.5	7,074	3.8	36.0	44.6	12.1	8.3
Pacific	55.1	80.8	53.0	8,891	13.6	26.6	37.1	21.3	16.1

Division	Percent female	Mean age	Percent children living with both parents	Mean male years of college	Male unemployment rate	Percent males self-employed	Mean female years of college	Female unemployment rate	Percent females self-employed
U.S. total	47.9	26.4	79.3	1.5	7.3	7.1	1.0	5.8	6.0
New England	44.9	26.3	59.2	1.2	5.4	3.5	1.4	4.4	4.4
Middle Atlantic	42.0	26.1	67.9	1.6	5.2	5.1	1.1	8.8	3.5
East North Central	48.3	27.0	78.4	1.9	5.9	2.0	0.6	8.2	6.1
West North Central	45.8	24.5	77.4	1.3	6.1	9.1	2.0	3.7	7.4
South Atlantic	50.7	28.0	74.3	1.7	5.1	5.9	1.0	4.8	3.4
East South Central	39.6	24.5	100.0	0.6	0.0	18.2	1.4	14.3	0.0
West South Central	48.1	25.8	84.8	1.3	5.1	7.2	1.0	5.8	9.2
Mountain	45.5	26.3	70.4	1.6	5.4	0.0	0.6	7.1	2.4
Pacific	48.4	26.3	81.2	1.5	8.9	8.1	1.0	5.6	6.4

## References

- Darity, William, Jr. 1989. "What's Left of the Economic Theory of Discrimination?" in Stephen Shulman and William Darity, Jr. (eds.), *The Question of Discrimination*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
- Darity, William, Jr., and Samuel Myers, Jr. Forthcoming. "Family Structure and the Marginalization of Black Men: Policy Implications" in Belinda Tucker and Claudia Mitchell-Kernan (eds.), *The Decline of Marriage Among African-Americans: Census Consequences and Policy*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Farley, Reynolds. 1990. "Blacks, Hispanics and White Ethnic Groups: Are Blacks Uniquely Disadvantaged?" *American Economic Review*, Vol. 80:2, (May), pp. 237–41.
- . 1989. "Race and Ancestry in the United States Census: An Evaluation of the 1980 Ancestry Question," unpublished manuscript, Population Studies Center, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.
- Greeley, Andrew M. 1981. *The Irish Americans: The Rise to Money and Power*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Ikeda, Kiyoshi. 1973. "A Different 'Dilemma'," *Social Forces*, Vol. 51, (June), pp. 497–500.
- Liebersohn, Stanley. 1980. *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Rosenthal, Erich. 1975. "The Equivalence of United States Census Data for Persons of Russian Stock or Descent with American Jews: An Evaluation," *Demography*, Vol. 12:2, (May).
- Sowell, Thomas. 1981. *Ethnic America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tyree, Andrea. 1991. "Reshuffling the Social Deck: From Mass Migration to the Transformation of the American Ethnic Hierarchy" in Judith R. Blau and Norman Goodman (eds.), *Social Roles and Social Institutions: Essays in Honor of Rose Laub Coser*. Denver: Westview Press, pp. 195–216.
- United Nations. 1990. *Human Development Report 1990*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, Max. 1930. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. London.
- Wilson, William J., and Katherine Neckerman. 1986. "Poverty and Family Structure: The Widening Gap Between Evidence and Public Policy Issues" in Sheldon Danziger and Daniel Weiberg (eds.), *Fighting Poverty: What Works and What Doesn't*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Woodbury, Stephen. 1992. "Culture and Human Capital: Theory and Evidence or Theory Versus Evidence" in William Darity, Jr. (ed.), *Labor Economics: Problems in Analyzing Labor Markets*. Boston: Kluwer.

