

**Strangers in a Strange Land:**  
**The Status of Hmong Immigrants in the U.S. in 1990**

**Wayne Carroll**  
**Department of Economics**  
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire  
[carrolwd@uwec.edu](mailto:carrolwd@uwec.edu)

## **Abstract**

The Hmong are refugees from the mountains of Laos who started arriving in the U.S. in large numbers after the end of the Vietnam War in 1975. By 1990 their numbers in the U.S. had grown to 90,082. Among all recent immigrants to the U.S., they were least equipped to prosper. In 1990 they had the lowest average educational attainment, lowest average earned income, lowest employment rate, highest dependence on public assistance, and one of the lowest average levels of English language skills among all recent immigrant groups. Given their distinctive position among recent immigrants, the Hmong deserve closer attention from those studying immigration and assimilation. This article uses data from the U.S. Census Bureau's 1990 Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS) to compare the Hmong with twenty-six other recent immigrant groups along several dimensions.

**Key Words:** assimilation, Hmong, immigrants, immigration, poverty

The economic and cultural history of the U.S. is a story of successive waves of immigration and assimilation. In the latest chapter of the story a wave of “new immigrants” have arrived in the U.S. in the last twenty-five years with markedly lower average levels of English fluency, literacy, and education than immigrants who arrived in earlier decades.<sup>1</sup> The experience of earlier immigrants provides a trail of well-documented milestones against which the unfolding story of the new immigrants can be measured and compared.

The Hmong occupy a special position among the new immigrants. Refugees from the mountains of Laos, they arrived with the deepest disadvantages in terms of their previous educational attainment, literacy, knowledge of English, and job skills appropriate to the U.S. labor market. In a statistical sense they stand apart from other recent immigrant groups, but they also stand as a prime example of the demographic contrast between the new immigrants in general and earlier immigrants to the U.S. In the years to come, the economic progress of the new immigrants might best be measured by the experience of the Hmong, since their starting point is so different.

The 1990 U.S. Census provided the first clear picture of many of the new immigrants, most of whom had arrived sometime in the previous twenty years or so. Population counts from the 2000 Census show how their numbers have grown in the last decade, and more detailed data to be released later in 2002 or 2003 will document their economic and social progress.

This article uses 1990 U.S. Census data to document the position of the Hmong within the broader spectrum of recent immigrants. The data show that the Hmong indeed did stand apart from other immigrants in most respects in the first years after their arrival in the U.S. Out of all recent immigrants, they ranked among the lowest in average educational attainment, English language skills, and earned income, and on average they had the highest level of

dependence on public assistance income. Given their unusual start in this country, their story calls for special attention; and the evidence presented here is the first chapter in the story.

## **Data**

The Hmong started arriving in the U.S. in large numbers around 1975, after the end of the Vietnam War. The 1980 U.S. Census reported that the nation's Hmong population<sup>2</sup> was 5,204, which is too small to allow detailed demographic analysis.<sup>3</sup> By 1990 the official Hmong population had grown to 90,082, and the data showed clear distinctions between the Hmong and other ethnic minority groups.

In many Census sources, the Hmong are included within the broader, very diverse Asian American and Pacific Islander category, so they cannot be distinguished from other groups. Exact counts for the Hmong (based on the Census "short form," which is completed by 100% of the population) are limited to data on population, household structure, and housing. Detailed Census data on other variables for ethnic subcategories such as the Hmong are only available in two forms. Summary Tape File 4B provides cross-tabulated data for a wide range of variables from the Census "long form," which is completed by a sample of about one-sixth of the population. But these summary data are not easily accessible, so it is hard to perform comparisons involving large numbers of variables or ethnic groups. A second source is the Census Bureau's Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS), which provides easier access to "long form" data for a five-percent sample of the population. The 1990 PUMS sample is the source for all the results presented here. Since these data represent a sample from the population, they are subject to sampling variation and associated errors.

PUMS is a weighted sample in which each individual or household represents a certain number of individuals or households in the broader population, with the number differing across

observations. For example, an individual in one community might be assigned a “person weight” of 25, meaning that he or she represents 25 individuals in that population, while a person in another community might have a “person weight” of 15. The results presented here are whole-population estimates based on the raw sample data and the weights.

Since the aim here is to compare the Hmong with other recent immigrants, this study is based on a subsample that includes all adults (eighteen years or older) whose year of entry to the U.S. was between 1975 and 1990. Therefore the respondents who are included in this study had lived in the U.S. for no more than fifteen years, and many were new arrivals when the 1990 Census was completed.

### **Race vs. Place of Birth vs. Ancestry**

The Hmong are categorized as a “race” in the Census data alongside other Asian subcategories such as Chinese, Filipino, and Japanese and other races such as white, black, or American Indian. In order to identify themselves as Hmong, respondents had to write “Hmong” in a space following an “Other Asian or Pacific Islander” option in the Census questionnaire.<sup>4</sup>

The Census also records the country or state of birth of each respondent. Most immigrant Hmong adults in the 1990 Census records were born in Laos,<sup>5</sup> and they account for about one-quarter of all recent Laotian immigrants who lived in the U.S. at that time. In the results presented here, the Hmong are identified by the race indicator, but their characteristics are compared both with people of other races and people of other places of birth in order to provide a broader comparison with other ethnic groups. Like the Hmong, many individuals are counted both as a members of a race and as representatives of a nationality in the tables below.

The Hmong also can be identified in the Census data by their responses to a question regarding ancestry. According to the 1990 PUMS data, 81,706 individuals claimed Hmong

ancestry in 1990, compared with the official population count (based on the race variable, which was counted for 100% of the population) of 90,082. Recent immigrants such as the Hmong are more likely than other groups to retain strong ethnic and ancestral identities, so it is not surprising that the race and ancestry variables yielded similar estimates of the Hmong population. For other groups it might not be so clear whether individuals would identify themselves primarily by the race, place of birth, or ancestry variable, or a combination of these. Despite an unavoidable element of ambiguity in these classifications, only the race and place of birth variables are used here to distinguish between groups.

In this article the Hmong are compared with individuals of eight other races and eighteen nationalities (or places of birth). These groups were chosen because they include significant numbers of recent immigrants and offer interesting comparisons. In particular, some (such as Cubans and Cambodians) are included because they are similar to the Hmong in some respects, while others (such as white and black immigrants and those born in Africa) are included because they present contrasting statistical profiles.<sup>6</sup>

### **English Fluency**

In the 1990 Census, respondents were asked to rate each individual's English language fluency on the following scale. Note that better English language skills are indicated by lower ratings in this scale.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 0 | Speaks English only, or under five years old |
| 1 | Speaks English "very well"                   |
| 2 | Speaks English "well"                        |
| 3 | Speaks English "not well"                    |
| 4 | Speaks English "not at all"                  |

Based on weighted data from the PUMS sample, Table 1 shows average English language ratings for recent immigrants (aged eighteen years and older) of each race and

nationality (ranked from lowest average English skills to highest). It also gives the estimated number of recent-immigrant adults in each group and the standard deviation of the ratings within each group.

In 1990 the Hmong were among the groups that had the lowest average levels of English fluency, with an average rating of 2.58. Some recent Latin American immigrants – including Cubans and Mexicans – also reported low English skills on average.

The standard deviation of the English-skills responses for the Hmong was also higher than that of many other groups, suggesting that while the Hmong had poorer English skills on average, they also exhibited a broader range of abilities.<sup>7</sup>

### **Years of Schooling**

Educational attainment was measured in the 1990 Census on the following scale:

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 0  | (less than 3 years old)  |
| 1  | No school completed  |
| 2  | Nursery school   |
| 3  | Kindergarten   |
| 4  | 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> , or 4 <sup>th</sup> grade |
| 5  | 5 <sup>th</sup> , 6 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> , or 8 <sup>th</sup> grade |
| 6  | 9 <sup>th</sup> grade  |
| 7  | 10 <sup>th</sup> grade   |
| 8  | 11 <sup>th</sup> grade   |
| 9  | 12 <sup>th</sup> grade, no diploma   |
| 10 | High school graduate, diploma or GED   |
| 11 | Some college, but no degree  |
| 12 | Associate degree, occupational program   |
| 13 | Associate degree, academic program   |
| 14 | Bachelor's degree  |
| 15 | Master's degree  |
| 16 | Professional degree  |
| 17 | Doctorate degree   |

A remarkable 43% of the Hmong adult recent immigrants responded that they had no schooling. This percentage was almost twice as high as for any other races or nationalities in the 1990 Census.

Table 2 shows the average educational attainment rating for each of the twenty-seven groups (ranked from lowest level to highest). The average for the Hmong was 5.7, indicating about an 8<sup>th</sup> grade or 9<sup>th</sup> grade educational level, which was the lowest average among these groups. Once again, the standard deviation for the Hmong responses was high – in fact the highest among these groups – reflecting a broad dispersion in educational attainment.

### **Employment Status**

The 1990 Census asked individuals whether they had worked in 1989. Hmong immigrants were by far the least likely to have worked. Table 3 shows the percentage of recent immigrant adults in each comparison group who had worked in 1989.

The table also shows that employment rates were much higher for Hmong adults in general than for older Hmong adults (over 40 years of age) and Hmong women. Of course, these differences imply that employment rates were higher for men and younger adults. While the same pattern can be seen in all twenty-seven groups, the contrast is much larger among the Hmong. The sharp difference between younger and older Hmong adults is partly explained by the fact that the Hmong were a refugee population, so older adults who were ill-equipped to work in the U.S. came nevertheless. It also can be attributed in part to their remarkable jump from a slash-and-burn agricultural economy in the highlands of Laos to the modern economy of the U.S. Hmong adults in general found it difficult to work in the U.S., but after their arrival the older Hmong had less incentive to acquire the language skills and job experience that would start them on the long, difficult path toward economic progress. The strong pull of tradition can also explain the sharp difference between employment rates for Hmong men and women, since Hmong women in their Laotian homeland often specialized in the production of handicrafts in

the home and in the care of their children,<sup>8</sup> and many continued this work in the first years after their arrival in the U.S.

### **Earned Income**

The Census recorded each individual's reported income in 1989 from each of several sources: wages and salaries, self-employment, public assistance, retirement income, and so on. In this study an individual's "earned income" is defined to be the sum of income from three of these sources: wage and salary income, self-employment income (including farm income), and income from interest, dividends and rental property. Wages and salaries constituted by far the largest share of earned income among the Hmong.

Table 4 ranks average earned income for adult recent immigrants from the twenty-seven ethnic groups. The Hmong, at \$10,070, again ranked lowest on the list. It is interesting to note that the Hmong are the only group (out of these twenty-seven) in which the older workers (over age 40) do not earn significantly more, on average, than younger workers. This is consistent with the evidence in the last section that showed a relative disadvantage for older workers in the labor market. The average earnings of Hmong women are much lower than the earnings of men, but they are matched by low average earnings for Latin American immigrant women.

### **Public Assistance**

As shown in Table 5, adult Hmong recent immigrants received an average of \$3172 in public assistance income in 1989, and this ranked far above the average for any other groups. The Hmong settled mostly in California, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, all of which offered unusually generous public assistance payments in 1989, and this might bias their average public assistance income upward somewhat; but this cannot account for the large differences between the averages of the Hmong and other groups.

## **Family Size**

Hmong families in the U.S. are typically quite large. This doubtless has important implications – as yet largely unexplored – for the labor force participation of Hmong women, the living standards of Hmong families, and perhaps the education and assimilation of Hmong children. In Table 6, the average family size of 6.41 for the Hmong ranks far above the averages for the other groups.

## **Age, Gender, and Year of Entry**

In the first years after their arrival, some immigrant populations are characterized by unusual age or gender distributions that reflect the distinctive circumstances and incentives that drew them to the U.S. While the Hmong stand out among ethnic groups in many other respects, in this regard they are quite unremarkable. Table 7 shows the average ages (as of 1990) of recent immigrant adults from the twenty-seven groups and the percentage of each group who were women. (The groups are ranked in this table by the share of women in each group.) Some groups are unusual, such as Nigerian immigrants, who were predominantly young men, or Filipinos, who were disproportionately female and a bit older than other groups on average. But the Hmong rank near the middle on both counts.

The “normal” age and gender distributions of the Hmong are due (at least in part) to the fact that they are refugees who fled *en masse* from Laos, rather than leaving by choice to pursue better economic opportunities. It follows that the distinctive characteristics of the Hmong that were noted above cannot be simply attributed to an unusual demographic mix.

Could the socioeconomic status of the Hmong in 1990 instead be explained by a relatively late arrival in the U.S.? Table 8 shows that this is not the case. The 1990 Census categorized the year of entry for each immigrant according to the following scheme<sup>9</sup>:

0	Born in the U.S.
1	Arrived 1987 to 1990
2	Arrived 1985 to 1986
3	Arrived 1982 to 1984
4	Arrived 1980 to 1981
5	Arrived 1975 to 1979
6	Arrived 1970 to 1974

Most Hmong immigrants arrived in two waves: one in the late 1970s, and another in the late 1980s. As shown in Table 8, their average year-of-entry rating, 3.36, suggests an average arrival date of about 1983. Rather than late entrants, the Hmong were among the earliest arrivals among the groups of recent immigrants considered here.

### **Conclusions**

The Hmong stood out clearly in the 1990 Census data as the immigrant group with the lowest average educational attainment, lowest average earnings, lowest average employment rate, and heaviest average reliance on public assistance. They also ranked among the groups with the lowest average level of English language skills.

Given their distinctive place among recent immigrant groups, the Hmong merit special attention from those who wish to study immigration and assimilation patterns in the U.S. It will be particularly interesting to measure their progress since 1990 in the detailed 2000 Census data that will be released near the end of 2002.

---

<sup>1</sup> The literature on the economic implications of the “new immigrants” was recently surveyed in Schultz (1998). A sample of other recent literature would include Borjas (1994), Frey (1996), Zavodny (1998), and Enchautegui (1998).

<sup>2</sup> The 1980 PUMS estimated (based on a sample of the population) that 7,949 in the U.S. were of Hmong ancestry, and it estimated that there were 1,000 Meo, which could be another label for the Hmong. It also reported that there were 43,040 individuals of Laotian ancestry, some of whom could have been Hmong. It is interesting to note that in the 1990 Census, about 15,000 Hmong reported that they had arrived in the U.S before 1980 (and therefore should have appeared in the 1980 Census).

<sup>3</sup> The 1980 PUMS estimates for the Hmong are based on only 397 individuals.

<sup>4</sup> The 1990 Census long form can be viewed at [www.census.gov/prod/1/90dec/cph4/appdx.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/1/90dec/cph4/appdx.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> In the 1990 PUMS file almost 96% of the adult Hmong who had immigrated to the U.S. since 1975 reported that they were born in Laos.

<sup>6</sup> Comparable data for over two hundred other races and nationalities are available from the author.

<sup>7</sup> In the 1990 PUMS file, 3% of the Hmong recent immigrant adults reported that they spoke English only, 16% could speak English “very well,” 25% “well,” 34% “not well,” and 23% “not at all.” For comparison, the corresponding percentages for Taiwanese immigrants (whose language ratings were marked by a lower standard deviation) were 2%, 25%, 45%, 24%, and 4%.

<sup>8</sup> The traditional Hmong economy in Laos is described in Thao (1999) and Lo (2001). Referring to Hmong traditions, Thao offers this generalization: “...each member of the Mong family is assigned specific tasks and works diligently to the welfare of the family: the male breadwinning, the wife housework, children tedious and simple manual labor work, and grandparents childcare and educating the young” (p.12). Fadiman (1997) notes that Hmong mothers by custom are exceptionally inclined to dote on their children (pp. 21-22); these traditions surely reduce the labor force participation rate of Hmong women in the first years after their arrival in the U.S.

<sup>9</sup> The Census questionnaire allows four more options covering earlier periods; but these are not relevant here, since consideration is limited to immigrants who have arrived since 1975.

## **Bibliography**

Borjas, G. J. (1994). The economics of immigration, *Journal of Economic Literature* XXXII(4): 1667-1717.

Enchautegui, M. E. (1998). Low-Skilled Immigrants and the Changing American Labor Market, *Population and Development Review* 24(4): 811-824.

Fadiman, A. (1997). *The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down: a Hmong Child, Her American Doctors, and the Collision of Two Cultures*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux,

Frey, W. (1996). Immigration, Domestic Migration, and Demographic Balkanization in America: New Evidence for the 1990s, *Population and Development Review* 22(4): 741-763.

Lo, F. (2001). *The Promised Land: Socioeconomic Reality of the Hmong People in Urban America (1976-2000)*. Bristol, IN: Wyndham Hall Press.

Schultz, T. P. (1998). Immigrant quality and assimilation: A review of the US literature, *Journal of Population Economics* 11: 239-252.

Thao, P. (1999). *Mong Education at the Crossroads*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1999.

Zavodny, M. (1998). Determinants of Recent Immigrants' Locational Choices, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta Working Paper 98-3, April 1998.

## Tables

Table 1 – English Fluency

Race	Number	English Fluency Rating	
		Average	Std. dev.
Hmong	36514	2.58	1.08
Cambodian	76942	2.4	1.02
Laotian	81239	2.34	0.99
Chinese, except Taiwanese	688716	2.17	1.06
Vietnamese	361091	2.07	0.95
Taiwanese	38203	2.04	0.85
White	3850343	1.87	1.29
Asian Indian	383619	1.33	0.91
Black	855508	0.94	1.16
Place of birth	Number	Average	Std. dev.
Cuba	190384	2.61	1.2
Mexico	2294555	2.59	1.15
Dominican Republic	186838	2.52	1.17
El Salvador	338789	2.51	1.1
Guatemala	146788	2.49	1.09
Nicaragua	106242	2.44	1.17
Laos	126892	2.39	1.03
Honduras	64554	2.32	1.17
Colombia	158085	2.23	1.08
Peru	88806	2.06	1.03
Haiti	136901	1.94	0.94
Egypt	36002	1.47	0.84
Ethiopia	27623	1.44	0.79
Philippines	536782	1.39	0.75
Panama	39385	1.26	0.91
Kenya	10279	0.98	0.67
Ghana	14049	0.96	0.65
Nigeria	46730	0.94	0.62

Table 2 – Educational Attainment

	Schooling		
Race	Number	Average	Std. dev.
Hmong	36514	5.7	4.52
Cambodian	76942	6.85	4.25
Laotian	81239	7.25	4.11
White	3850343	9.31	3.91
Vietnamese	361091	9.45	3.57
Black	855508	9.78	3.23
Chinese, except Taiwanese	688716	10.44	4.09
Asian Indian	383619	11.9	3.58
Taiwanese	38203	12.24	3.2
Place of birth	Number	Average	Std. dev.
Mexico	2294555	6.44	3.29
Laos	126892	6.84	4.3
El Salvador	338789	6.88	3.44
Guatemala	146788	7.16	3.55
Dominican Republic	186838	8.02	3.4
Honduras	64554	8.05	3.39
Cuba	190384	8.1	3.43
Haiti	136901	8.71	3.5
Nicaragua	106242	9.07	3.5
Colombia	158085	9.67	3.19
Peru	88806	10.52	2.85
Panama	39385	10.55	2.63
Ethiopia	27623	10.94	2.93
Philippines	536782	11.31	3.17
Ghana	14049	11.91	2.51
Kenya	10279	12.37	2.21
Egypt	36002	12.54	3.12
Nigeria	46730	13.05	2.27

Table 3 – Percentage employed

Race	% of Adults Who Worked in 1989			% of Older Adults Who Worked in 1989			% of Women Who Worked in 1989		
	Total Number of Adults	% Who Worked in 1989	Std. Dev.	Total Number of Older Adults	% Who Worked in 1989	Std. Dev.	Total Number of Women	% Who Worked in 1989	Std. Dev.
Hmong	36514	32%	0.47	10914	19%	0.39	18157	22%	0.42
Cambodian	76942	49%	0.5	23843	32%	0.47	42132	41%	0.49
Laotian	81239	60%	0.49	22046	46%	0.5	39048	52%	0.5
Taiwanese	38203	62%	0.48	13238	62%	0.48	19783	50%	0.5
Vietnamese	361091	67%	0.47	102943	58%	0.49	165951	57%	0.5
Chinese, except Taiwanese	688716	68%	0.47	227810	59%	0.49	355049	61%	0.49
White	3850343	71%	0.45	999409	61%	0.49	1815986	57%	0.5
Asian Indian	383619	74%	0.44	105516	65%	0.48	177489	59%	0.49
Black	855508	76%	0.43	196357	73%	0.45	419385	71%	0.45
Place of Birth	Number	Pct.	Std. Dev.	Number	Pct.	Std. Dev.	Number	Pct.	Std. Dev.
Laos	126892	52%	0.5	34918	36%	0.48	61408	43%	0.49
Dominican Republic	186838	64%	0.48	44661	62%	0.49	99841	54%	0.5
Cuba	190384	65%	0.48	101136	57%	0.49	85826	52%	0.5
Honduras	64554	70%	0.46	10982	66%	0.47	35859	59%	0.49
Panama	39385	71%	0.45	9577	59%	0.49	23339	65%	0.48
Mexico	2294555	72%	0.45	311735	63%	0.48	960973	51%	0.5
Nicaragua	106242	73%	0.44	28277	65%	0.48	55227	63%	0.48
Guatemala	146788	74%	0.44	22497	71%	0.46	68355	62%	0.49
Colombia	158085	74%	0.44	38841	67%	0.47	83603	63%	0.48
Egypt	36002	74%	0.44	12169	69%	0.46	12863	51%	0.5
El Salvador	338789	75%	0.43	55823	67%	0.47	158726	64%	0.48
Peru	88806	76%	0.43	21826	66%	0.47	45805	64%	0.48
Ethiopia	27623	76%	0.43	3416	69%	0.46	11260	67%	0.47
Haiti	136901	78%	0.42	35631	75%	0.43	67348	72%	0.45
Kenya	10279	78%	0.42	1822	84%	0.37	4511	71%	0.46
Philippines	536782	79%	0.41	195515	66%	0.47	319040	75%	0.43
Nigeria	46730	83%	0.37	3091	83%	0.38	13932	69%	0.46
Ghana	14049	85%	0.36	2492	87%	0.33	5476	76%	0.43

Table 4 – Earned Income

Race	Earned Income – workers			Earned Income – older workers			Earned Income – women workers		
	Number	Average	Std. dev.	Number	Average	Std. dev.	Number	Average	Std. dev.
Hmong	11774	\$10,070	8667.91	2084	\$10,493	6791.2	4077	\$8,758	5844.24
Laotian	49032	\$13,786	9127.07	10099	\$15,944	10781.8	20181	\$11,743	7308.78
Cambodian	38065	\$14,735	13293.04	142582	\$18,170	14831.31	17118	\$11,835	9820.56
Black	649025	\$15,932	13301.6	7687	\$18,882	18204.39	1034401	\$12,872	13765.22
Vietnamese	243363	\$17,830	17027.1	134863	\$19,652	24644.36	298093	\$14,078	11131.92
Chinese, except Taiwanese	470051	\$18,680	20916.4	59907	\$21,285	19912.57	94443	\$14,197	13058.06
White	2733279	\$18,929	23558.46	612261	\$26,124	33220.09	216855	\$15,119	15209.73
Asian Indian	284564	\$24,523	28741.25	8271	\$29,182	29327.71	105363	\$16,737	19419.34
Taiwanese	23812	\$25,626	28065.94	68532	\$30,417	34762.75	9924	\$17,417	17943.11
Place of birth	Number	Average	Std. dev.	Number	Average	Std. dev.	Number	Average	Std. dev.
Honduras	45100	\$10,967	11252.78	7260	\$11,376	9824.98	494246	\$8,099	7745.8
Mexico	1651351	\$11,040	9943.04	195452	\$11,713	13293.03	42048	\$8,676	7650.94
Guatemala	108834	\$11,658	11224.82	37237	\$12,704	11842.91	21149	\$8,854	10167.1
El Salvador	254388	\$11,914	10516.32	15889	\$13,056	14246.13	101146	\$9,358	8090.12
Nicaragua	77612	\$12,725	12557.05	27682	\$13,414	13380.72	34778	\$9,911	7724.25
Dominican Republic	118945	\$12,839	12140.37	18292	\$14,007	16985.87	53895	\$10,330	9419.11
Laos	66133	\$13,157	9470.96	26733	\$14,176	14853.18	44829	\$10,837	10827.69
Haiti	106120	\$13,643	12425.91	12602	\$15,280	10850.71	26194	\$11,102	7411.78
Cuba	124043	\$14,504	15571.98	58022	\$15,606	18529.69	48213	\$11,539	9260.98
Colombia	116744	\$15,189	14729.18	26169	\$16,676	19529.79	53032	\$11,563	11133.34
Peru	67743	\$15,774	16223.15	14477	\$18,489	23077.85	29438	\$12,156	11162.03
Ethiopia	21031	\$15,790	14723.28	5692	\$19,260	17595.01	7491	\$13,003	9620.91
Panama	27891	\$16,831	16668.25	2176	\$19,701	11049.5	15137	\$14,210	12158.84
Ghana	11890	\$18,147	12569.12	128982	\$19,979	18520.29	4142	\$14,903	10426.87
Nigeria	38912	\$18,301	15235.27	2553	\$20,308	16523.14	9621	\$15,120	14917.64
Philippines	422708	\$19,310	16499.62	2357	\$21,010	22832.76	3187	\$15,330	17376.29
Kenya	7989	\$22,269	31792.76	8362	\$34,585	38766.95	6509	\$17,894	18459.93
Egypt	26535	\$27,592	30072.71	1527	\$38,732	49888.06	238282	\$18,150	14775.06

Table 5 – Percentage Receiving Public Assistance

		Welfare	
Race	Number	Average	Std. dev.
Hmong	36514	\$3,173	5210.22
Cambodian	76942	\$2,079	4139.81
Laotian	81239	\$1,560	3861.6
Vietnamese	361091	\$707	2449.99
Chinese, except Taiwanese	688716	\$275	1429.65
White	3850343	\$176	1062.75
Black	855508	\$172	1035.56
Taiwanese	38203	\$113	787.63
Asian Indian	383619	\$113	916.29
Place of birth	Number	Average	Std. dev.
Laos	126892	\$2,029	4339.6
Dominican Republic	186838	\$517	1779.47
Cuba	190384	\$434	1403.35
Philippines	536782	\$209	1089.06
Ethiopia	27623	\$180	1222.31
Panama	39385	\$171	1106.36
Egypt	36002	\$132	989.72
Honduras	64554	\$132	916.64
Haiti	136901	\$118	791.38
Guatemala	146788	\$108	875.93
Mexico	2294555	\$105	860.98
Colombia	158085	\$104	762.37
El Salvador	338789	\$96	824.7
Peru	88806	\$73	640.69
Nicaragua	106242	\$71	609.4
Ghana	14049	\$67	763.23
Kenya	10279	\$67	868.51
Nigeria	46730	\$48	580.22

Table 6 – Family Size

Race	Family Size		
	Number	Average	Std. dev.
Hmong	15199	6.41	2.77
Cambodian	32112	4.7	2.33
Laotian	34096	4.62	2.41
Vietnamese	151063	3.72	2.36
White	2538664	3.25	2.12
Asian Indian	192266	3.23	2
Taiwanese	17433	3.16	1.89
Black	552464	3.16	2.12
Chinese, except Taiwanese	314281	3.08	2.09
Place of Birth	Number	Average	Std. dev.
Laos	53296	5.1	2.62
Mexico	1124598	4.36	2.41
Nicaragua	50414	3.9	2.24
El Salvador	162038	3.75	2.15
Dominican Republic	104092	3.73	1.97
Guatemala	79026	3.67	2.16
Philippines	290255	3.62	2.08
Haiti	69194	3.5	2.15
Honduras	39855	3.42	2.07
Panama	35835	3.17	1.85
Peru	52572	3.15	1.9
Colombia	100640	3.11	1.91
Cuba	112611	2.88	1.9
Egypt	24372	2.83	1.87
Kenya	7388	2.83	1.94
Nigeria	33967	2.43	2.14
Ghana	9824	2.32	1.94
Ethiopia	15864	2.1	2.03

Table 7 – Age and Gender

Race	Age			% Women		
	Number	Average	Std. Dev.	Number	Average	Std. Dev.
Filipino	538393	39.68	15.35	538393	59%	0.49
Cambodian	76942	36.17	13.38	76942	55%	0.5
Chinese, except Taiwanese	688716	38.12	14.63	688716	52%	0.5
Taiwanese	38203	37.82	13.18	38203	52%	0.5
Hmong	36514	35.68	15.1	36514	50%	0.5
Black	855508	34.27	12.04	855508	49%	0.5
Laotian	81239	35.15	13.05	81239	48%	0.5
White	3850343	35.04	13.35	3850343	47%	0.5
Asian Indian	383619	36.04	12.44	383619	46%	0.5
Vietnamese	361091	35.37	13.3	361091	46%	0.5
Place of Birth	Number	Average	Std. Dev.	Number	Average	Std. Dev.
Panama	39385	34.8	13.73	39385	59%	0.49
Philippines	536782	39.61	15.27	536782	59%	0.49
Honduras	64554	32.12	10.78	64554	56%	0.5
Dominican Republic	186838	34.32	12.3	186838	53%	0.5
Colombia	158085	34.91	12.03	158085	53%	0.5
Nicaragua	106242	34.79	13.12	106242	52%	0.5
Peru	88806	35.19	12.38	88806	52%	0.5
Haiti	136901	35.58	11.44	136901	49%	0.5
Laos	126892	35.18	13.7	126892	48%	0.5
El Salvador	338789	31.98	11.01	338789	47%	0.5
Guatemala	146788	31.65	10.54	146788	47%	0.5
Cuba	190384	44.21	17	190384	45%	0.5
Kenya	10279	32.34	9.67	10279	44%	0.5
Mexico	2294555	30.44	10.44	2294555	42%	0.49
Ethiopia	27623	31.46	8.96	27623	41%	0.49
Ghana	14049	34.16	8.39	14049	39%	0.49
Egypt	36002	38.55	11.92	36002	36%	0.48
Nigeria	46730	32.1	6.13	46730	30%	0.46

Table 8 – Year of Entry to the U.S.

Race	Number	Year of entry	
		Average	Std. Dev.
Taiwanese	38203	2.9	1.44
Chinese, except Taiwanese	688716	2.97	1.53
Asian Indian	383619	2.97	1.51
White	3850343	3.04	1.57
Black	855508	3.18	1.46
Cambodian	76942	3.27	1.15
Hmong	36514	3.36	1.56
Laotian	81239	3.49	1.31
Vietnamese	361091	3.62	1.44
Place of Birth	Number	Average	Std. Dev.
Nicaragua	106242	2.59	1.46
Ethiopia	27623	2.65	1.38
Honduras	64554	2.68	1.43
Kenya	10279	2.78	1.53
Peru	88806	2.81	1.46
Guatemala	146788	2.82	1.46
Dominican Republic	186838	3.01	1.48
Colombia	158085	3.03	1.45
El Salvador	338789	3.07	1.4
Panama	39385	3.07	1.61
Philippines	536782	3.14	1.51
Mexico	2294555	3.15	1.55
Egypt	36002	3.19	1.54
Ghana	14049	3.24	1.44
Nigeria	46730	3.24	1.38
Haiti	136901	3.29	1.31
Laos	126892	3.47	1.4
Cuba	190384	3.5	1.21