

# The Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics of Post-1965 Immigrants to New York City: A Comparative Analysis by National Origin<sup>1</sup>

---

Héctor Cordero-Guzmán\* and Ramon Grosfoguel\*\*

## ABSTRACT

This article analyses and compares the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of persons born abroad who immigrated to New York City after 1965 and still lived in the City in 1990.

Using data from the 1990 Census, we classify persons into the twenty four largest national origin groups and compare their demographic and socio-economic characteristics (sex, age, educational attainment, labour force participation, unemployment, occupation, income, and poverty).

We pose and answer three empirical questions. The first question is: what are some of the main differences by national origin in the composition of persons immigrating to New York City after 1965? The second question is: what are some of the main differences in the location of post-1965 immigrants in New York's socio-economic structure? The third question is: what are some of the main differences in the economic rewards received by persons who immigrated to New York City since 1965?

We find that immigrants with less than a high school education have higher labour force participation rates than the US-born population in the same educational category and also have slightly higher earnings. Immigrants with a high school degree have labour force participation rates close to (or slightly higher than) the average for the US-born population but their incomes are slightly lower than the average income for the US-born population. Immigrants with a college degree have participation rates

---

\* Robert J. Milano Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy, New School University, New York, United States.

\*\* Sociology Department, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, United States.

similar or slightly lower than those of the US-born population while their earnings are significantly lower than those of US-born college graduates.

## INTRODUCTION

Immigration has always played a central role in the demographic, social and economic structure of New York City. In 1990, persons born outside the US (mostly from Latin America, the Caribbean, Europe, Asia, and increasingly, Africa and the Middle East) constituted about 41 per cent of the population aged 16 to 64 years in New York City. Changes in both the volume and national origin composition of recent immigrants have led to a proliferation of books, articles, and reports by academic researchers (Foner, 1987; Mollenkopf and Castells, 1991; Torres, 1995; Torres and Bonilla, 1993; Haslip-Viera and Baver, 1996; Hispanic Research Center, 1996; Hernandez et al., 1995), and government agencies (City of New York, Department of City Planning, 1992 and 1996; City University of New York, 1995) on both the nature and extent of recent socio-economic and demographic changes and their implications for New York City. Many of these reports highlight the central role of immigration in demographic and socio-economic changes in the City and analyse directly the effects of public policies on immigrants. Some of the recently circulated reports utilize Census data from the Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS) to examine the socio-economic characteristics of immigrants from Latin America and the Caribbean (Hispanic Research Center, 1996; Hernandez et al., 1995), the impact of immigration on enrolments at the City University (City University of New York, 1995), or differences in the economic incorporation of immigrants (Mollenkopf and Castells, 1991; Torres, 1995; Howell and Mueller, 1996). Unfortunately, despite the acknowledged importance of the role of recent immigration in changing the demography of the City, there has not been a methodical analysis based on information from the 1990 Census, or other sources, that systematically compares the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of post-1965 immigrants to New York City from the largest national origin groups. The main goal of this article is to begin to fill this gap by providing a detailed analysis of the characteristics of recent immigrants to New York City from the main source countries.

In order to understand contemporary differences in selectivity and characteristics, location in the socio-economic structure, and in patterns of social and economic mobility among immigrant groups, it is important to frame the analysis within a broader historical and structural context. There are three elements of the political economy that need to be kept in mind when analysing immigration flows. First, the socio/politico/economic history between the country of origin and the receiving country. Second, the particular location of the sending (and receiving) country in the global political economy. Third, the

particular migratory history between the sending country and the receiving country (Grosfoguel and Cordero-Guzman, 1999).

The particular historical development, power dynamics, and the specific evolution of the political and economic relation between a sending country and the US (or any other receiving country) play a role in explaining class selectivity and the particular location of members of that national origin group in the receiving country's socio-economic structure (Sassen, 1988). However, once these various communities are formed in the receiving country, transnational factors continue to impact the group (particularly if there is a continuous immigrant flow) but national class forces, local labour market structures, racial dynamics, and political processes begin to exert an increased influence on a given community's rate of socio-economic integration, mobility, and asset accumulation in the receiving society (Portes and Rumbaut, 1990). Transnational ties and connections are central to the life of immigrant communities (Basch et al., 1992) and have been facilitated in recent years by a number of processes, including increasing economic globalization, advances in communications technology, more accessible transportation, the important role of economic investments and remittances sent to the country of origin, and changes in many sending countries allowing for dual nationality and for the involvement of diasporic communities in home country politics and in the formulation of foreign policy in the receiving country. However, and at the same time, immigrant communities have been reshaped by the local manifestations of global forces and by the differential impact of national and local level policies and stratification processes in the receiving area on each national origin group (Cordero-Guzman et al., 2001; Morales and Bonilla, 1993; Sassen, 1988).

The purpose of this article is to analyse empirical data on recent immigrants to New York City in order to compare and understand national origin differences in demographic and socio-economic characteristics of immigrant groups in the receiving area. We make this comparison, however, in the context of a broader attempt to make a theoretical and empirical distinction between five interrelated but analytically distinct elements of the socio-economic attainment process:

- *the political economy of the relationship between the sending country and the US (or receiving country);*
- *the selectivity of the immigrants (or the characteristics and assets that immigrants bring with them to the country and how these compare with the population in both the sending and receiving areas);*
- *the characteristics of the migration process and the process of entry into the receiving country (or what Portes and Rumbaut (1990) call the context of reception);*
- *the particular location of immigrants in the socio-economic structure (or the structural position that various immigrant groups occupy in the country's socio-economic hierarchy);*

- *the process of socio-economic attainment* (or the financial rewards that members of various groups receive for their characteristics and endowments, their socio-economic mobility, and asset accumulation).

Each of these elements of the socio-economic attainment process is connected but, at the same time, each has its own internal dynamic that responds to particular metropolitan level forces and to education, labour market, and income policies. In this article we focus on immigrants entering the US after 1965 (the period that marks the beginning of what has been called the “New Immigration”), and present evidence related to national origin differences in the characteristics of immigrants, in their location in the socio-economic structure, and in the income that they receive.

The first element of the socio-economic attainment process that we examine empirically is the selectivity and composition of immigrants.<sup>2</sup> This involves an analysis of differences in levels of educational attainment, average age, and gender composition among the various immigrant groups. In our analysis of the particular location of immigrants in New York City’s socio-economic structure, we show that educational characteristics are related to labour force participation and unemployment but the relationship is not the same for all groups. Some groups have educational levels below those of the US-born population but have above average labour force participation rates (Poland, Mexico, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, El Salvador, Jamaica, Trinidad, Guyana, Haiti, and China), but there are a few national origin groups that have educational attainment rates at or below average, coinciding with low labour force participation rates (Greece, Former Soviet Union, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic). The location of immigrants in the City’s socio-economic structure is explored by analysing and comparing per cent in the labour force, per cent employed, per cent unemployed,<sup>3</sup> and the occupational distribution for the largest national origin immigrant groups in the City. The third element of the socio-economic attainment process – levels of compensation – is explored by examining the level and sources of annual wages, earnings, and incomes within and across educational categories for the 24 national origin groups included in our analysis.

## SOCIAL CHANGE IN NEW YORK CITY AND IMMIGRATION SINCE 1965

New York City has undergone substantial demographic, economic, social, political, and fiscal transformation during the last four decades (Morales and Bonilla, 1993; Mollenkopf and Castells, 1991; Sassen, 1988, 1991, and 1993; Torres, 1995; Torres and Bonilla, 1993). The networks of labour immigration, which originally destined workers to manufacturing, have been transformed with the City’s economy and now extend into the broad service sectors and many areas of sales and trade. The garment industry is a good example of the

ethnic process of entry and displacement that has characterized New York's labour market (Waldinger, 1996). During the 1930s and 1940s, workers in the industry were mostly Jewish, Italians and other Europeans. They were eventually displaced by Blacks and Puerto Ricans in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s. Since the 1970s, other Latinos and Chinese have provided most of the labour in this sector while, at the same time, manufacturing in the garment industry has been internationalized into Asia, the Caribbean, and Mexico (Waldinger, 1996). Over the last two decades, New York City's economic structure has changed from a goods producing and distribution centre and an industrial headquarters into a global producer of professional, personal and business services, a finance, insurance and real estate centre, and a central node in the global market economy (Mollenkopf and Castells, 1991). Changes in the structure of the economy, in federal welfare policies, and increasing immigration has meant that while newcomers can find work due to the significant demand for their labour, they are entering a more competitive and bifurcated labour market where there are barriers to higher wages and where opportunities for socio-economic mobility are limited and increasingly tied to educational attainment and formal credentials.

While New York City's population has remained at 7.3 to 7.9 million since 1970, there have been substantial changes in its composition, both in terms of social class and racial/ethnic/national origin. First, the large out-migration of middle class whites ("white flight"), particularly between 1970 and 1980, contributed to reducing their proportion in the City's population (though there has also been some internal migration since the 1980s). Second, there have been large increases in international migration to the City and, consequently, in the proportion of the City's foreign born population. Third, the continued influx of West Indians and other Caribbeans, the small return of some African-Americans to the south, and increased immigration from Latin America have changed the composition and origin of the Black and Hispanic populations in the City. A larger proportion of blacks in New York are foreign born while a smaller proportion of the Latino population in the City comes from Puerto Rico. Increases in the level of immigration prevented New York from losing population in the 1970s and 1980s. As several thousand middle class whites left the City, increasing numbers of Asians, Latinos, West Indians, and Eastern Europeans entered it (City of New York Department of City Planning, 1992; City of New York Department of City Planning, 1996; Waldinger, 1996). The Department of City Planning estimates that by the year 2000 the population of New York City will approximate 7.9 million and that the direction of racial, ethnic, national origin changes in the composition of the population will continue ("Major ethnic changes under way", *New York Times*, March 29, 1995: B1). If current migration, fertility, and mortality trends persist, non-Hispanic whites are expected to be 35 per cent of the population, Hispanics 29 per cent, non-Hispanic Blacks 26 per cent and Asians 10 per cent.

The flow of recent immigration to the US and to New York City has increased steadily since 1946 (City of New York Department of City Planning, 1992, Table 2-1). Between 1946 and 1949, the average annual number of immigrants to the US was 153,725 with 32,265, or 21 per cent going to New York City. The total number of immigrants to the US increased in the following decades from 2,499,268 in the 1950s to 4,726,165 between 1982 and 1989. The yearly averages for the number of immigrants in the US and in New York City were, respectively, 249,927 and 47,060 in the 1950s, 321,375 and 57,557 in the 1960s, 433,600 and 78,325 in the 1970s, 590,771 and 85,602 between 1982 and 1989. Between 1990 and 1994 the average annual number of immigrants to the US was 769,832 and the number immigrating to New York was 112,598. The proportion of immigrants settling in New York City as a percentage of total immigrants to the US declined from 21 per cent in the 1940s to 14.5 per cent during the 1980s and early 1990s. New York has lost ground relative to other migrant destinations but the City is still the largest receiving metropolitan area for immigrants entering the US.

According to INS Data analysed by the Department of City Planning (1992 and 1996) on the national origin composition of immigrants to New York,<sup>4</sup> between 1982 and 1989 the largest number of immigrants were from the following countries (in order): Dominican Republic, Jamaica, China, Guyana, Haiti, Colombia, Korea, India, Ecuador, Philippines, Trinidad and Tobago, Soviet Union, UK, Honduras, El Salvador, Barbados, Israel, Poland, Peru, and Pakistan. Between 1990 and 1994 the numbers changed slightly with El Salvador and Barbados dropping from the top 20 list and Bangladesh and Ireland entering the list of the largest 20 source countries.

Immigration data show a significant representation of individuals from countries in the Caribbean (Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Guyana, Haiti, Trinidad and Tobago, Barbados) with 33 per cent of the total, South America (Colombia, Ecuador and Peru) with 12.3 per cent and Central America (Honduras and El Salvador) with 3.3 per cent. In recent years, immigration from Mexico seems to have increased substantially (Smith, 1996) but these numbers are not reflected in data from the Department of City Planning which show a total 3,449 Mexican immigrants between 1990 and 1994 (annual average 690). The three largest sending countries from Latin America are Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. In terms of Asian countries (26.1 per cent of the total), China has the highest proportion followed by Korea, India, the Philippines, Pakistan and Bangladesh. European countries accounted for around 21.7 per cent of immigrants to New York City between 1990 and 1994, the largest numbers from the (former) Soviet Union, UK, Ireland, and Poland. Information provided by the Department of City Planning, however, is limited because it is not available by educational category. The following sections compare the socio-economic characteristics of the largest immigrant groups by national origin, using information from the 1990 Census, in order to illustrate the extent of national

origin differences in educational attainment, labour force participation, and earnings among persons immigrating into New York City after 1965. We present the data separately by broad educational category.

## DATA SOURCES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The information presented comes from an analysis of the 1990 Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS) from the US Census for the State of New York. We select data from the five boroughs (counties) that make up the City of New York and focus analysis on the “New Immigration” which comprises persons who immigrated to the US after 1965. We classify these individuals into 23 separate national origin groups and we create categories including only persons born in each particular country who entered the US after 1965 and were between 16 and 64 years of age in 1990. The total weighted sample size is 4,840,189 cases which represents the City’s population between 16 and 64 years of age. In addition to the national origin categories for persons immigrating since 1965 (1,043,936 weighted cases), we add two comparison categories. The first includes all persons born in the US (2,883,236 weighted cases); the second category includes both all persons born abroad that immigrated to the US before 1965 and all persons that immigrated to the US since 1965 that are not from the largest immigrant groups (a total of 913,417 weighted cases).

The national origin groups are ordered in our tables on the basis of three criteria: location of the country in the global economy and level of economic development, its geopolitical and historical relation to the US, and geographic location (see Grosfoguel and Cordero-Guzman, 1999). The first set of countries on our list are part of the core and include the UK, Germany, Italy, and Japan. The second set have a semi-peripheral relation to the US and are considered “emerging markets” in the global financial system.<sup>5</sup> These include Greece, Ireland, Poland, the former Soviet Union<sup>6</sup> and Korea. The third includes countries that have had a sustained and deeply rooted relationship with the US (some as colonies and former colonies) both in terms of US foreign and domestic policy in the Americas. These countries are also the largest source of Latinos residing in the US and of US-born Hispanics and include Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic. It is difficult to find a term that best describes the complex historical and contemporary relationship between the US and these four countries. We suggest that the term inner-peripheries describes well the national and transnational components of the experience of these populations in the US and the experience of their countries with US foreign policy. The fourth set of countries includes those in a peripheral relation with the US but with varying degrees of power relations and differences in the levels of exchange of peoples and goods. Countries in the Latin American periphery with large numbers of immigrants to New York

include Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and El Salvador. The fifth set of countries included in the Caribbean periphery are the former British and French colonies of Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, and Haiti. The last set of countries analysed includes three large Asian periphery countries with a sustained history of migration to the US: China, India, and the Philippines.

Our analysis focuses on differences in immigrant characteristics, location in the socio-economic structure, and differences in the process of integration into the US socio-economic structure as measured by incomes. We explore the question of “selectivity and composition” by analysing a number of population characteristics, including gender composition, age distribution, and levels of educational attainment. The question of “location is the socio-economic structure” is explored by analysing the information on labour force participation rates, unemployment rates, and occupational composition. We then explore the question of “economic integration” by analysing national origin differences among immigrants in income levels, sources of income, poverty rates, and incomes within broad educational categories (less than high school, high school graduates and college graduates).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Empirical results

Table 1 (pages 62-63) shows the national origin of persons who immigrated to New York City after 1965 from the 23 largest groups and were still in the City during the 1990 Census. The figures show that 40.4 per cent of persons aged 16 to 64 residing in New York City in 1990 were born abroad (or Puerto Rico), and 1,043,936 individuals or 21.5 per cent of persons aged 16 to 64 were born in one of the 23 largest national groups and immigrated to the City after 1965. The Dominican Republic (183,032), Puerto Rico (134,398), China (117,118), Jamaica (74,231), Colombia (53,253), Ecuador (49,219), Haiti (47,182), and Korea (46,181) are the largest groups in the Census, each with at least 4 per cent of the post-1965 immigrants to New York City. As expected, countries in the *inner-periphery* (Mexico, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic and Cuba) sent the largest number of migrants: 365,755, or 35 per cent of persons entering after 1965. Four countries in the *Caribbean periphery* (Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, and Haiti) sent 178,028 persons, or 17 per cent of those entering New York City after 1965, while three countries in the *Asian periphery* (China, India, and the Philippines) sent 177,978 persons, or 17 per cent entering after 1965. As expected, Colombia and Ecuador had the largest share of immigrants from the *Latin American periphery*: together with Peru and El Salvador, 133,103, or 12.75 per cent of persons entering after 1965. Countries in the *semi-periphery* (Greece, Ireland, Poland, USSR, and Korea) sent 124,914 migrants, or 11.9 per cent entering

after 1965, while *core* countries accounted for 63,755 persons, or 6.1 per cent. Most immigrants from the four *core* countries (UK, Germany, Italy, and Japan) come from one country, Italy, which has had a long migration history with the US.

The question of immigrant selectivity is quite complex and data necessary to address this issue are difficult to gather. We analysed and compared levels of completed education by national origin group, but do not know when or where these individuals received their education and whether (and how) it overlapped (or not) with the migration experience (whether education was completed before, during, or after migration). However, Census information allows us to get at one dimension of immigrant selectivity and to compare the educational attainment of various immigrant groups in New York City. These results are presented in Table 2 (page 64).

In general terms, European (UK, Germany, USSR, Ireland) and Asian countries (Japan, Korea, India, Philippines) have the highest levels of completed education. Italy, Greece and, to a lesser extent, Poland have below average educational levels with 54.1 per cent of Italians and 43.1 per cent of Greeks not completing a high school degree. China is the exception in terms of the Asian countries: 43.7 per cent of Chinese immigrants did not complete high school, while all other Asian groups have either average or above average educational levels. For Latin America (periphery and inner-periphery), Mexico, the Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico had the lowest levels of educational attainment. The levels for Salvadoran, Ecuadorian, Colombian and Cuban (43 per cent with less than high school degree) migrants were a little higher but still below the population average. Almost 70 per cent of immigrants from Peru had a high school or higher education, the highest level of any Latin American country listed. Countries in the Caribbean periphery (Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica, Haiti and Guyana) had relatively high proportions of high school graduates and persons with some college education, but the proportion with a college degree was in the 10 per cent range. Of the countries listed, Latin American countries (with the exception of Cuba and Peru) have the lowest proportions with a college degree or higher education.

Table 3 (pages 65-66) presents the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of post-1965 immigrants by national origin: per cent female, average age for each group, average number of years schooling, proportion that speaks English well or very well (for the groups that are not from English-speaking countries). The table also includes socio-economic information on per cent in the labour force, per cent employed, per cent unemployed, and average number of weeks worked. This demographic information helps us address the question of selectivity, while information on labour force status helps us answer the second research question, the location of immigrants in the socio-economic structure.

The demographic data suggest that there are relatively small differences in the average age between immigrants and non-immigrant groups. The three main exceptions are Italy and Cuba with relatively older populations, and Mexico with the youngest average age. The category “Other Foreign Born” includes individuals born abroad who immigrated to New York City before 1965 and, as expected, their average age was the highest of all the groups included. In terms of gender composition, most countries have slightly more females but there are several exceptions. Italy, Greece, Ireland, Poland, Mexico, Cuba, Ecuador, Peru and India have an over representation of males while Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Colombians, Filipinos, and the four Caribbean periphery countries (Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica, Haiti and Guyana) have an over representation of females in their group.

The data on labour force participation, per cent of the population employed, and per cent of the labour force unemployed, presents a more complicated picture. First, there are significant national origin differences. Second, the relation between a group’s educational attainment and per cent in the labour force varies by national origin. The zero-order correlation between educational attainment and labour force participation is relatively low (.3880), and several groups have lower than average educational attainment but relatively high labour force participation rates. Third, Latin American (inner periphery and periphery) and Caribbean periphery countries have high labour force participation rates but also relatively high unemployment rates. This suggests that a higher proportion of Latino and Black immigrants in the labour force are actively seeking work and that they face more difficulties finding employment than immigrants from Europe and Asia.

The figures also indicate that European, Caribbean, and Asian periphery countries, in addition to Mexico and Peru, have the highest labour force participation rates. This is notable in the case of Caribbean periphery countries because it suggests high participation rates coinciding with a high proportion of females in the various groups. Most immigrant groups have labour force participation rates higher than the average for US-born, but several immigrant groups have quite low labour force participation rates. Dominican and Russian immigrants have labour force participation rates in the low 60 per cent range while Puerto Rican migrants have the lowest participation rates at 43 per cent.

The data on unemployment indicate that Latin American (inner periphery and periphery) and Caribbean periphery groups have relatively high unemployment rates compared with other migrants and to the US-born population. Dominicans have the highest unemployment rate at 17.4 per cent with Puerto Ricans following at 16.5 per cent. All other Latin American and Caribbean periphery groups have unemployment rates over 10 per cent. In contrast, the unemployment rates of immigrants from the UK, Germany, Japan, Ireland, Poland, India and the Philippines are significantly lower, at less than 7 per cent. In general

terms, immigrants to New York City have higher labour force participation rates and employment to population ratios than the US-born population. Immigrants from Latin America and the Caribbean, however, also have relatively higher unemployment.

Table 4 (pages 67-68) presents data on economic characteristics for the various immigrant groups by national origin. The first column lists the percentage of cases with incomes below the poverty line. The second to tenth columns list data on average<sup>7</sup> total earnings and total incomes and then divides the sources of income into various components. The first component is wages or salaries, the second is income derived from non-farm self-employment, the third includes income derived from interests, dividends, and rents, the fourth includes social security, the fifth is public assistance and the sixth is retirement income. The table concludes with a seventh column on income from all other sources. For every group the table lists the mean income by source.

The data show that there are substantial differences in income among post-1965 immigrants by national origin. These are evident not only in terms of levels of income but also in terms of the sources or components of income. Most immigrant groups have significantly lower total incomes than the average for the US-born population (\$23,286). The only exceptions with significantly higher income are the UK, Germany, Japan, and the Philippines. The lowest income groups, in descending order, are El Salvador, Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, and Mexico. Though there are significant income differences by national origin, incomes tend to cluster within the six main country groupings. Incomes for core countries are the highest at around \$30,000 with the exception of Italy. Semi-periphery countries have incomes around \$17,500 with immigrants from Ireland having the highest incomes and those from the former Soviet Union the lowest. Similarly, countries in the Asian periphery have incomes around \$19,000 with the highest for immigrants from the Philippines and the lowest for immigrants from China. Migrants from the Caribbean periphery earn average incomes of around \$15,700 and are relatively close to each other with Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago at the high end and Guyana and Haiti at the low end. Immigrants from the Latin American periphery average total incomes of around \$12,000 and the four countries are also very close to each other with Peruvians earning the highest incomes and Salvadorans the lowest. Countries in the inner-periphery have very similar incomes (average around \$9,000) with the exception of Cubans at around \$14,000. In general terms, the high income groups not only have more income from salaries, they also have higher average income from various other sources such as self-employment and interest, dividends, and rents. This suggests that in addition to differences in income, there are also differences in assets and levels of wealth among the groups. Low income groups derive most of their income from wages with some groups receiving relatively small average amounts from “public assistance”.

Table 5 (page 69) presents information on the occupational distribution of post-1965 immigrants to New York City in six broad categories: (a) managerial and professional, (b) technical, sales, and administrative support, (c) services, (d) precision production, crafts, and repair, (e) operators and labourers, and (f) other. European groups have the highest proportion (over 46 per cent) in managerial and professional occupations. The exception, again, is immigrants from Italy with only 18.4 per cent in managerial and professional occupations. Immigrants from India and the Philippines also have high proportions in this category (31 per cent and 44 per cent respectively). Immigrants from Latin America (inner periphery and periphery) and the Caribbean periphery are under-represented in the managerial and professional occupations with Mexico, Dominican Republic, Ecuador and El Salvador having less than ten per cent of their occupational distribution in this category. In terms of employment in technical, sales, and administrative support occupations, the data show some over-representation, with over 40 per cent for immigrants from Korea, Trinidad, and Guyana, India, and the Philippines. There is under-representation of immigrants from Mexico, Ireland, and El Salvador in technical, sales, and administrative support with less than 20 per cent of their distribution in this category.

There is a significant amount of immigrant over-representation in service occupations. Employment in service occupations accounts for 13.2 per cent of the US-born compared with over 23 per cent for immigrants from Ireland, Mexico, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, El Salvador, Jamaica, and Haiti. Most other immigrant groups, including Greece, Poland, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Trinidad, Guyana, and China, also have over 20 per cent of their distributions in service occupations. Precision production, crafts, and repair has over-representation (relative to the US-born) among immigrants from Italy, Greece, Ireland, Poland and Peru. Other national origin groups cluster around or are slightly higher than the City average. A third set of occupations where a significant number of immigrant groups are over-represented is the lowest paid operators and labourers category. Most immigrants from Europe (with the exception of Italy at 22 per cent) are under-represented in this category while immigrants from Latin America and China are over-represented. Immigrants from Italy, Mexico, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Haiti, and China have over 21 per cent of their distribution working in the operators and labourer category. Table 5 also shows that relative to the US-born population, immigrants concentrate in three occupational categories: (a) service occupations, (b) precision production, crafts, and repair (particularly immigrants from the semi-periphery and Latin America), and (c) the operator and labourer categories (particularly immigrants from the inner-periphery and Latin America). Close to 71 per cent of the US-born work in the top two categories that include managerial/professional and technical/sales/administrative support occupations. Less than 15 per cent of the US-born work in the lowest two occupational categories. In contrast, immigrants from Europe, India and the Philippines are likely to work in the top occupations.

Immigrants from the semi-periphery and the Caribbean tend to work in the middle occupations while immigrants from Latin America and the inner-periphery are concentrated in the lowest occupational categories.

The story so far would seem fairly familiar and straightforward. Immigrants from the richest countries in Europe (with the exception of Italy) are the most educated, have higher labour force participation rates, work in the most prestigious occupations, and earn the highest incomes. Immigrants from the semi-periphery have equal to or slightly less education than the US-born population, have slightly higher labour force participation rates and slightly lower incomes. Immigrants from the Asian periphery are mixed, with those from Philippines and India on the high end in education and employment and similar in earnings, while immigrants from China have lower than average education but higher than average labour force participation rates and lower unemployment than the US-born population. Immigrants from the Caribbean have slightly lower education, relatively high labour force participation and employment, but also higher unemployment and incomes slightly lower than the semi-periphery and the Asian periphery. Immigrants from Latin America have relatively low average education but high labour force participation and high unemployment. They are concentrated in the middle to lower occupations and their average earnings are less than half the average for the US-born. Immigrants from the inner periphery have low education, relatively low labour force participation and employment, the highest levels of unemployment, and earnings that average 44 per cent of the US-born (and 39 per cent if we exclude Cubans). However, an examination of employment and income levels by national origin within educational categories reveals a number of interesting patterns that illustrate the role of immigrants in stratification processes and can help explain why New York continues to draw significant numbers of working and middle class immigrants from Europe, Latin America, Asia, and the Caribbean.

Tables 6, 7 and 8 (pages 70-75) examine the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of post-1965 immigrants separately by broad educational category. The information has been divided into three groups: persons with less than a high school degree; with a high school degree and/or some college education; a college degree or more education. Each table lists demographic information on the average age, per cent female, and socio-economic information on the per cent in the labour force, per cent of the population employed, per cent unemployed, and the average number of weeks worked during 1989 (the complete year prior to the 1990 Census). The tables also list the proportion of cases with incomes below the poverty line. The last set of columns on the tables list data on total earnings and total incomes and then show the average income derived from four main sources. The first component is wages or salaries, the component is income derived from non-farm self-employment, the third

includes income derived from interests, dividends, and rents (an indication of wealth). The last source of income listed in this table is public assistance.

Table 6 (pages 70-71) shows the socio-economic characteristics of post-1965 immigrants with less than a high school degree by national origin. Labour force participation and unemployment rates differ significantly by national origin with most immigrants having relatively high labour force participation rates compared with the population total and the US-born category. The two notable exceptions are Puerto Ricans and Russians who have low labour force participation rates (close to 40 per cent). In terms of unemployment, Puerto Ricans, Russians and Dominicans with less than high school education have the highest unemployment rates while most immigrant groups have low unemployment rates relative to the US-born population with less than high school education. Poverty rates for persons with less than a high school degree differ substantially, with Europeans having the lowest poverty rates followed by immigrants from Asia. Immigrants from Latin America and the Caribbean have moderate to high poverty rates but most of the groups have lower poverty rates than the US-born population (32.54 per cent). Figures on incomes for persons with less than a high school degree indicate that most groups have incomes that are higher (with many over \$10,000) than the average income for the US-born population (\$8,363). These differences are even greater if we compare the average for US-born with the averages for most European and West Indian immigrants. In general terms, this table indicates that immigrants with less than high school education have significantly higher labour force participation rates, lower unemployment, lower levels of poverty and higher incomes than the US-born population in this educational category.

Table 7 (pages 72-73) presents data on the socio-economic characteristics of post-1965 immigrants who have a high school degree (or some college) but are not college graduates. Most immigrant groups have higher labour force participation and employment rates compared with the US-born population with a high school degree, but the incomes for most groups (with the exception of immigrants from core countries) are lower than the incomes of the US-born. The per cent employed among most immigrant groups is higher than the 66 per cent for the US-born population with a high school degree (or some college). Only Japan (57.7 per cent), Greece (62.3 per cent), USSR (50.4 per cent), Puerto Rico (54.6 per cent) and Dominican Republic (57 per cent) have employment rates lower than the US-born population in the educational category. Labour force participation rates for immigrants from the Caribbean periphery are quite high relative to all other groups. Puerto Ricans, Dominicans and Russians have the lowest labour force participation and the highest unemployment rates. While most immigrant groups have higher labour force participation and employment rates compared with the US-born population, the incomes for most groups (with the exception of immigrants from core countries) are lower than the incomes of the native born. The average income

for US-born persons with a high school degree (or some college) was \$16,991, but immigrants from the inner-periphery countries and from the Latin American periphery made significantly less than the US-born. Immigrants from the Caribbean, and to a lesser extent the Asian periphery, reported incomes that were closer to the average for New York City's US-born population. This suggests that immigrants with a high school degree (or some college) have slight advantages over the US-born in terms of labour force participation and employment but their incomes (with the exception of immigrants from some countries in Europe) on average are lower than the US-born population.

Table 8 (pages 74-75) presents data on the socio-economic characteristics of post-1965 immigrants with a college degree or more education. This table, unlike the previous two tables, indicates that the labour force participation rates for immigrants are lower than the 88 per cent average for the total population and the 89 per cent average for the US-born population. Immigrants from Korea, Russia, Mexico, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Colombia, and China with a college degree had lower labour force participation rates compared with European and Caribbean periphery immigrants and compared with the US-born population with a college degree or more. Immigrants from Puerto Rico with a college degree had a labour force participation rate of 88 per cent, which is the same as the average rate for all groups (the City total). Data on average incomes by national origin group for college graduates indicates that with the exception of three core European countries all immigrant groups earned less than college graduates born in the US. The average income for US-born college graduates was \$35,260, but college graduates from most immigrant groups (particularly from the Latin American periphery, Mexico, and the Dominican Republic) had averages that were significantly lower and in many cases below \$20,000. Unlike immigrants with less than high school, with a high school degree, or with some college, immigrants with a college degree have significantly lower labour force participation rates and employment to population ratios and have higher unemployment than the US-born population in the same educational category. Immigrant college graduates (with the exception of immigrants from the UK, Germany, and Japan) also had significantly lower incomes from all sources including self employment and interests, dividends and rents.

### **Discussion**

In terms of educational attainment, there is substantial variation in the educational levels of post-1965 immigrants to New York City with most groups having either average (compared with the City total) or below average education. Most immigrant groups have higher than average labour force participation and employment rates, which means that after some search they are able to secure employment and work at a rate sometimes higher than the US-born population. The unemployment picture for immigrants is quite diverse. Some groups (mostly European and Asian) have lower unemployment

rates compared with the population average, while other groups (mostly Latin American and Caribbean periphery) have unemployment rates that are higher than the population average. While immigrants have higher participation rates than the US-born population, most immigrant groups have incomes that are below (in some cases significantly below) the average for the City's population.

In terms of national origin differences, European and Asian immigrants from core and semi-periphery countries are the most advantaged in terms of educational attainment, labour force participation rates, unemployment rates, and earnings when compared with the US-born population and other immigrant groups. Mexican immigrants have very low educational levels coinciding with high labour force participation rates, low unemployment levels, and low earnings. Immigrant from Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic also have relatively low educational attainment but their low education is combined with low participation rates, high unemployment levels, and very low earnings relative to other immigrant groups and to the US-born population. Immigrants from the Latin American periphery (mostly the Andean region) have relatively low educational attainment levels coinciding with high labour force participation rates, high unemployment rates, and relatively low earnings. Immigrants from the Caribbean periphery have educational levels that are close to the average for the total population and the US-born and also have relatively high labour force participation rates. However, West Indians pay some penalties by having high unemployment rates and relatively low earnings, particularly considering their educational levels. Immigrants from China have low educational attainment, average labour force participation rates, low unemployment rates and low earnings. Immigrants from India and the Philippines have relatively high educational attainment levels, relatively high labour force participation, low unemployment, and average to high earnings.

The data on employment and earnings within broad educational categories (persons with less than a high school degree, persons with a high school degree and/or some college education, and persons with a college degree or more education) reveal several patterns. Immigrants with less than a high school education have higher labour force participation rates compared with the US-born in the same educational category and also have slightly higher earnings. Immigrants with a high school degree have labour force participation rates that are close to (or slightly higher than) the average for the US-born population but their incomes are slightly lower than the average income for the US-born population. Immigrants with a college degree have participation rates that are similar or slightly lower than those of the US-born population while their earnings are significantly lower than those of US-born college graduates. The advantages of immigrants with less than high school over the US-born in average incomes, the slight disadvantages of those with a high school degree or some college, and the larger disadvantages among the college graduates, can be seen by computing a ratio of the average earnings of each group to the average

earnings of the US-born. This calculation shows a positive ratio for those with less than high school, a ratio around .7 for those with a high school degree or some college, and a ratio of between .5 and .7 for the income of immigrant to US college graduates.

## CONCLUSION

In this article we have asked three empirical questions related to the socio-economic status of post-1965 immigrants in New York City. The first question was: are there national origin differences in the composition of persons immigrating to New York City after 1965? Our answer is a definitive yes. Our data show significant national origin differences in the socio-economic characteristics of immigrants entering New York after 1965 residing in the City in 1990. We find that, in general, immigrants from European and Asian countries (with some exceptions such as Italy and China), and to a lesser extent the West Indies, have the highest levels of educational attainment while immigrants from Latin America and the Spanish Caribbean have lower than average educational attainment levels. The second question was: are there national origin differences in the location of post-1965 immigrants in New York's socio-economic structure? Our answer to this question is also affirmative following our examination and comparison of labour force participation rates, unemployment rates, and occupational category by national origin group. We find, for example, that most immigrant groups have participation rates that are higher than the average for the US-born population and only very few groups have lower labour force participation rates. European and Caribbean periphery countries, in addition to Mexico and Peru, have the highest labour force participation rates, while Dominican, Russian and Puerto Rican immigrants have the lowest labour force participation rates. The third question was: are there national origin differences in the economic rewards received by persons who immigrated to New York City since 1965? There are substantial differences in incomes among post-1965 immigrants by national origin, not only in terms of levels of income but also in terms of the sources or components of income. Most immigrant groups have lower incomes than the average for the US-born population (\$23,285). The only exceptions are the UK, Germany, Japan, Ireland and the Philippines. The groups with the lowest incomes are El Salvador, Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, and Mexico.

Data from the 1990 Census show that there is significant variation in the educational attainment levels among post-1965 immigrants to New York City. However, in spite of significant variation in education, most immigrant groups have relatively high labour force participation rates. Unemployment rates also differ by group with European and Asian groups having the lowest unemployment rates and Latin American (inner-periphery and periphery) and Caribbean periphery groups having relatively high unemployment rates (with the exception

of Mexico), suggesting that Blacks and Hispanics have more difficulty in finding employment.

The advantages that most immigrant groups have in terms of higher labour force participation rates are offset by disadvantages in terms of earnings and incomes when compared with the US-born population. However, this is the case for the average of the total population which conceals significant variation within broad educational categories. Immigrants with less than a high school education have higher labour force participation rates than the US-born in the same educational category and also have slightly higher earnings. Immigrants with a high school degree have labour force participation rates that are close to (or slightly higher than) the average for the US-born population, but their incomes are lower than the average income for the US-born City residents with a high school degree. Immigrants with a college degree have participation rates that are similar or slightly lower than those of the US-born population while their earnings are significantly lower than those of US-born college graduates.

When examining “how” and “why” a given national origin group is “doing better” than another, the usual explanation offered is that national origin differences in cultural practices impact educational levels and “skills” which shape employment opportunities and, in turn, these impact wage levels and earnings growth (Portes and Zhou, 1992; Borjas, 1990). We also see a linkage between education, employment, and wages but we see the relationship between these three variables as mediated by structural level processes (such as the political economy of particular migrations, state policies towards immigrants, socio-economic networks, employment structures, and discriminatory sorting), and by differences in material resources in families, schools, and communities. In this article, we have shown that there are national origin differences in: (a) levels of educational attainment; (b) in how education translates into employment outcomes, and; (c) in how educational attainment is compensated in the labour market. But our central point is that these differences are not *sui generis* or explained by differences in group-specific cultural attributes or cultural practices, but that differences in education, employment, and earnings are socially produced by deeply rooted racial, ethnic, gender, and class dynamics that operate both in the in the US (or receiving society) and abroad in sending countries.

Immigrants play a key role in New York City’s economy and labour market by providing labour, capital for small businesses, and extensive economic, social, and cultural contacts with their countries of origin. Our analysis suggests that immigrants with less than a high school degree are preferred in the labour market and have higher incomes than US-born City residents without a high school degree. However, data for the higher educational categories show that labour force participation and income advantages of immigrants decline and the gap between the immigrant and US-born populations increases. As the

earnings of US-born workers with less than a high school degree (mostly Black and Hispanic) have stagnated and decreased, immigrants from Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia, and Europe have entered those sectors of the economy and other growing low paying sectors such as services. These groups have become the highest earners among those in the population with less than a high school degree (the low paying sectors). Immigrants with high school degrees (or some college) have slight advantages over the US-born in terms of labour force participation and employment but their incomes (with the exception of immigrants from some countries in Europe) on average are lower than the US-born population. In contrast, immigrants with a college degree have significantly lower labour force participation rates and employment to population ratios, and have higher unemployment than the US-born population with a college degree. Immigrant college graduates (with the exception of immigrants from some countries in Europe) also had significantly lower incomes from all sources compared with US-born college graduates, including self-employment and interests, dividends, and rents, which suggests that in addition to differences in income there are disparities in accumulated wealth.

#### NOTES

1. We thank Doug Massey, John Mollenkopf, Nancy Foner and two anonymous reviewers for their comments. We would like also to thank Dr. Melvin Oliver and the Ford Foundation for their support.
2. Due to data limitations we can not explore how immigrant flows compare with the population in the particular sending countries. Rather, we focus on how immigrants (by national origin) compare with other immigrants and the non-immigrant population in the receiving area (New York City).
3. The number of persons in the labour force is the number of persons employed plus the number actively looking for work. The number of persons employed plus the number of persons actively looking for work (the labour force), plus the number not in the labour force, equals all persons. The per cent unemployed was computed by dividing the number unemployed over the number in the labour force. The per cent in the labour force was computed by dividing the number unemployed and the number working over the population 14 to 64 years of age (per cent in labour force = unemployed+employed/population 16-64). The per cent employed was computed by dividing the number employed over the population aged 16 to 64 years.
4. Table 2-2 (1992) and Table 2.6 (1996).
5. Core countries are members of the OECD while countries in the semi-periphery, inner-periphery and periphery are classified in the “emerging markets” category by *The Economist*.
6. The data were taken in 1990 and all persons are classified as USSR.
7. The same information was also computed using the median total earnings and median total income. For many groups the median is about half the average with the exception of Caribbean periphery countries where both figures are very close.

## REFERENCES

- Basch, L., N. Glick Schiller, and C. Szanton Blanc  
 1992 *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, And Deterritorialized Nation-States*, Gordon and Breach, New York.
- Borjas, G.J.  
 1990 *Friends or Strangers: The Impact of Immigrants on the US Economy*, Basic Books, New York.
- City of New York, Department of City Planning  
 1992 *The Newest New Yorkers: An Analysis of Immigration into New York City During the 1980s*, Department of City Planning, New York.  
 1996 *The Newest New Yorkers: 1990-1994*, Department of City Planning, New York.
- City University of New York  
 1995 *Immigration/Migration and the CUNY Student of the Future*, CUNY, New York.
- Cordero, H., R. Grosfoguel, and R. Smith  
 2001 *Migration, Transnationalism, and the Political Economy of New York*, Temple University Press (forthcoming), Philadelphia.
- Foner, N. (Ed.)  
 1987 *New Immigrants in New York*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Grosfoguel, R., and H. Cordero-Guzman  
 1999 "Social capital, context of reception, and transnationalism: recent approaches to international migration", *Diaspora*, 7(3): 351-369.
- Haslip-Viera, G., and S.L. Bayer  
 1996 *Latinos in New York: Communities in Transition*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame.
- Hernandez, R., F. Rivera-Batiz, and R. Agodini  
 1995 *Dominican New Yorkers: A Socio-Economic Profile*, Dominican Research Monographs, The CUNY Dominican Studies Institute, New York.
- Hispanic Research Center  
 1996 *Nuestra America en Nueva York*, Fordham University, New York.
- Howell, D., and E. Mueller  
 1996 "Immigrants as workers in New York City: a review of current debates and evidence", Immigrant New York Series no. 3, International Center for Migration, Ethnicity and Citizenship, New School for Social Research, New York.
- Mollenkopf, J.H., and M. Castells (Eds)  
 1991 *Dual City: Restructuring New York*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- Morales, R., and F. Bonilla (Eds)  
 1993 *Latinos in a Changing US Economy*, Sage Series on Race and Ethnic Relations, vol. 7, Newbury Park, California.
- Portes, A., and R. Rumbaut  
 1990 *Immigrant America: A Portrait*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Portes, A., and M. Zhou  
 1992 "Gaining the upper hand: economic mobility among immigrant and domestic minorities", *Racial and Ethnic Studies*, 15(4): 491-552.
- Sassen, S.  
 1988 *The Mobility of Labour and Capital*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- 1991 *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- 1993 “Urban transformation and employment”, in R. Morales and F. Bonilla (Eds), *Latinos in a Changing US Economy*, Sage Series on Race and Ethnic Relations, Newbury Park, California.
- Smith, R.C.
- 1996 “Mexicans in New York: membership and incorporation in a new immigrant community”, in G.H. Viera and S.L. Baver (Eds), *Latinos in New York: Communities in Transition*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame.
- Torres, A.
- 1995 *Between the Melting Pot and the Mosaic: African Americans and Puerto Ricans in the New York Political Economy*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- Torres, A., and F. Bonilla
- 1993 “Decline within decline: the New York perspective”, in R. Morales and F. Bonilla (Eds), *Latinos in a Changing US Economy*, Sage Series on Race and Ethnic Relations, Newbury Park, California.
- Waldinger, R.
- 1996 *Still the Promised City? African-Americans and New Immigrants in Post-industrial New York*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

TABLE 1a  
POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS TO NEW YORK CITY 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Weighted frequency	Total per cent	Post-1965 per cent	Unweighted frequency	Total per cent unweighted	Post-1965 per cent unweighted	Post-1965 per cent* unweighted
<i>Core Countries</i>							
United Kingdom	12,063	0.25	1.16	430	0.23	1.06	1.22
Germany	6,700	0.14	0.64	255	0.14	0.63	0.73
Italy	34,329	0.71	3.29	1,504	0.81	3.72	4.28
Japan	10,663	0.22	1.02	361	0.19	0.89	1.03
Sub-total	63,755	1.32	6.11	2,550	1.37	6.31	7.25
<i>Semi-Periphery</i>							
Greece	20,136	0.42	1.93	857	0.46	2.12	2.44
Ireland	12,036	0.25	1.15	476	0.26	1.18	1.35
Poland	21,963	0.45	2.10	866	0.46	2.14	2.46
Former Soviet Union	24,601	0.51	2.36	1,031	0.55	2.55	2.93
Korea	46,181	0.95	4.43	1,897	1.02	4.69	5.39
Sub-total	124,917	2.58	11.97	5,127	2.75	12.69	14.58
<i>Inner-Periphery</i>							
Mexico	30,355	0.63	2.91	1,273	0.68	3.15	3.62
Puerto Rico	134,398	2.78	12.88	5,240	2.81	12.97	n/a
Cuba	17,970	0.37	1.72	665	0.36	1.65	1.89
Dominican Republic	183,032	3.78	17.54	6,897	3.70	17.07	19.61
Sub-total	365,755	7.56	35.05	14,075	7.55	34.83	25.12

TABLE 1b  
POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS TO NEW YORK CITY 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Weighted frequency	Total per cent	Post-1965 per cent	Unweighted frequency	Total per cent unweighted	Post-1965 per cent unweighted	Post-1965 per cent* unweighted
<i>Periphery-Latin America</i>							
Colombia	53,253	1.10	5.10	2,193	1.18	5.43	6.24
Ecuador	49,219	1.02	4.72	1,975	1.06	4.89	5.62
Peru	15,226	0.31	1.46	641	0.34	1.59	1.82
El Salvador	15,405	0.32	1.48	633	0.34	1.57	1.80
Sub-Total	133,103	2.75	12.75	5,442	2.92	13.47	15.47
<i>Periphery-Caribbean</i>							
Jamaica	74,231	1.53	7.11	2,438	1.31	6.03	6.93
Trinidad and Tobago	24,605	0.51	2.36	794	0.43	1.96	2.26
Guyana	32,010	0.66	3.07	1,138	0.61	2.82	3.24
Haiti	47,182	0.97	4.52	1,553	0.83	3.84	4.42
Sub-Total	178,028	3.68	17.06	5,923	3.18	14.66	16.84
<i>Periphery-Asia</i>							
China	117,118	2.42	11.22	4,798	2.57	11.87	13.64
India	34,200	0.71	3.28	1,422	0.76	3.52	4.04
Philippines	26,660	0.55	2.55	1,074	0.58	2.66	3.05
Sub-Total	177,978	3.68	17.06	7,294	3.91	18.05	20.74
<b>Total Foreign-Born Post 1965</b>	<b>1,043,536</b>	<b>21.56</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>40,411</b>	<b>21.68</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>35,171</b>
US-Born	2,883,236	59.57		110,716	59.39		
Other Foreign-Born	913,417	18.87		35,310	18.94		
Sub-Total	3,796,653	78.44		146,026	78.32		
<b>Population Total</b>	<b>4,840,189</b>			<b>186,437</b>			

Note: \* Excluding Puerto Rico.

Source: PUMS, 1990 US Census.

TABLE 2  
 COMPLETED EDUCATION OF POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS TO NEW YORK CITY  
 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Less than 9th grade	9th grade to 12th grade	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	Masters or more	Total per cent
<b>US-Born</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>18.9</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>16.4</b>	<b>11.0</b>	<b>100</b>
<i>Core Countries</i>							
United Kingdom	1.0	12.1	18.0	26.0	23.5	19.4	100
Germany	3.5	3.6	17.1	25.1	20.7	30.0	100
Italy	39.5	14.6	21.8	13.5	6.9	3.7	100
Japan	1.4	3.0	22.3	21.9	37.3	14.0	100
<i>Semi-Periphery</i>							
Greece	26.6	16.5	25.1	16.5	9.3	6.0	100
Ireland	2.7	14.3	40.4	24.5	13.5	4.6	100
Poland	10.8	17.0	26.3	22.0	11.5	12.4	100
Former Soviet Union	5.5	13.3	26.5	21.9	18.1	14.7	100
Korea	6.8	13.9	26.8	21.3	20.1	11.1	100
<i>Inner-Periphery</i>							
Mexico	43.0	24.3	20.0	7.8	2.5	2.4	100
Puerto Rico	22.3	34.8	22.7	15.3	3.3	1.7	100
Cuba	22.8	20.8	23.0	21.0	8.2	4.2	100
Dominican Republic	31.0	28.7	18.8	16.0	3.7	1.8	100
<i>Periphery-Latin America</i>							
Colombia	16.3	23.7	29.5	21.7	6.4	2.4	100
Ecuador	20.6	24.8	26.3	21.5	5.1	1.8	100
Peru	9.1	20.9	31.9	27.3	6.6	4.2	100
El Salvador	29.2	28.4	23.8	14.3	3.8	0.5	100
<i>Periphery-Caribbean</i>							
Jamaica	9.3	23.5	28.7	25.6	9.3	3.5	100
Trinidad and Tobago	8.1	21.3	33.4	27.3	7.6	2.5	100
Guyana	9.6	25.3	31.3	25.4	6.5	1.9	100
Haiti	11.1	21.9	22.8	32.7	8.5	3.1	100
<i>Periphery-Asia</i>							
China	24.2	19.5	19.8	16.0	13.5	7.0	100
India	8.6	14.8	18.0	19.0	22.0	17.7	100
Philippines	2.0	5.0	7.9	21.9	50.7	12.6	100
<b>Other Foreign-Born</b>	<b>16.9</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>24.7</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>10.3</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>20.2</b>	<b>25.5</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: PUMS, 1990 US Census.

TABLE 3a  
 DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS  
 TO NEW YORK CITY 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Per cent female	Average age	Educational attainment	Use of English per cent	Per cent in the labour force	Per cent employed	Per cent unemployed	Average weeks worked
<b>US-Born</b>	<b>53.03</b>	<b>36.27</b>	<b>10.95</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>71.35</b>	<b>65.15</b>	<b>8.70</b>	<b>32.21</b>
<i>Core Countries</i>								
United Kingdom	51.69	35.82	12.12	n/a	80.17	77.01	3.94	37.68
Germany	52.37	36.58	12.57	65.5	83.78	79.54	5.06	37.98
Italy	46.96	40.22	8.15	65.9	71.48	65.67	8.13	32.74
Japan	50.53	35.15	12.43	69.2	70.64	68.77	2.64	30.75
<i>Semi-Periphery</i>								
Greece	44.41	38.74	9.12	71.4	67.68	61.84	8.62	30.20
Ireland	45.74	33.05	10.69	14.2	83.39	79.56	4.59	36.99
Poland	47.67	38.22	10.41	58.0	79.79	74.17	7.05	33.78
Former Soviet Union	52.93	38.70	11.17	65.7	62.38	53.39	14.41	24.54
Korea	50.62	36.39	10.94	53.7	70.64	66.59	5.74	29.10
<i>Inner-Periphery</i>								
Mexico	35.83	28.49	7.13	34.5	77.56	71.00	8.45	31.39
Puerto Rico	55.84	34.50	8.23	66.1	52.08	43.46	16.55	20.20
Cuba	45.30	41.47	9.11	59.2	70.05	60.61	13.48	29.98
Dominican Republic	55.01	34.26	7.93	46.1	63.00	52.03	17.41	24.92

TABLE 3b  
 DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS  
 TO NEW YORK CITY 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Per cent female	Average age	Educational attainment	Use of English	Per cent in the labour force	Per cent employed	Per cent unemployed	Average weeks worked
<i>Periphery-Latin America</i>								
Colombia	54.18	36.02	9.14	57.5	76.02	67.80	10.82	31.64
Ecuador	48.71	35.31	8.87	51.2	76.31	67.91	11.01	31.55
Peru	47.74	35.88	9.92	62.3	76.68	71.02	9.73	33.15
El Salvador	49.35	32.98	7.81	51.0	75.77	67.26	11.22	30.82
<i>Periphery-Caribbean</i>								
Jamaica	57.52	36.53	9.87	n/a	82.18	73.53	10.53	35.01
Trinidad and Tobago	58.05	36.61	9.95	n/a	81.54	73.26	10.16	35.39
Guyana	54.77	35.26	9.71	n/a	75.22	69.04	8.21	32.59
Haiti	52.52	36.75	9.79	78.9	80.10	70.46	12.03	33.15
<i>Periphery-Asia</i>								
China	50.67	37.31	9.10	50.7	73.72	69.35	5.93	32.39
India	44.73	36.25	11.23	60.6	75.94	70.45	7.21	33.15
Philippines	62.81	37.87	12.84	90.4	86.52	84.70	2.11	39.79
<b>Other Foreign-Born</b>	<b>51.18</b>	<b>41.50</b>	<b>9.61</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>69.93</b>	<b>63.94</b>	<b>8.56</b>	<b>30.81</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>52.52</b>	<b>37.17</b>	<b>10.33</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>70.95</b>	<b>64.50</b>	<b>9.09</b>	<b>31.40</b>

Source: PUMS, 1990 US Census.

TABLE 4a  
 ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS  
 TO NEW YORK CITY 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Per cent below poverty	Total earnings \$	Total income \$	Wages or salary \$	Non-farm self- employment \$
<b>US-Born</b>	<b>15.43</b>	<b>21,182</b>	<b>23,285</b>	<b>19,702</b>	<b>1,458</b>
<i>Core Countries</i>					
United Kingdom	8.08	35,047	36,863	32,730	2,285
Germany	11.51	32,403	34,179	29,517	2,870
Italy	8.06	19,335	20,560	18,054	1,236
Japan	19.17	30,698	31,474	28,721	1,763
<i>Semi-Periphery</i>					
Greece	10.45	15,644	16,858	13,805	1,807
Ireland	8.38	23,255	24,076	22,576	639
Poland	15.42	16,887	18,096	15,758	1,033
Former Soviet Union	32.10	14,233	15,354	13,019	1,158
Korea	17.51	13,478	14,054	11,339	2,044
<i>Inner-Periphery</i>					
Mexico	22.54	8,730	9,049	8,434	278
Puerto Rico	41.88	7,765	9,212	7,442	304
Cuba	20.07	13,173	14,142	12,150	1,017
Dominican Republic	33.78	8,293	9,257	7,779	507
<i>Periphery-Latin America</i>					
Colombia	16.51	11,772	12,301	11,156	610
Ecuador	16.83	11,357	12,012	10,856	457
Peru	14.13	12,596	12,935	12,039	553
El Salvador	23.84	10,549	11,078	10,242	286
<i>Periphery-Caribbean</i>					
Jamaica	12.01	16,353	16,964	15,772	573
Trinidad and Tobago	12.39	16,058	16,696	15,670	358
Guyana	12.92	14,018	14,515	13,818	181
Haiti	14.97	14,106	14,678	13,472	596
<i>Periphery-Asia</i>					
China	17.43	12,653	13,414	12,171	474
India	10.90	18,030	18,956	16,672	1,357
Philippines	5.17	25,070	25,691	23,730	1,327
<b>Other Foreign-Born</b>	<b>18.13</b>	<b>16,306</b>	<b>17,853</b>	<b>15,241</b>	<b>1,040</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>17.35</b>	<b>18,518</b>	<b>20,251</b>	<b>17,275</b>	<b>1,219</b>

TABLE 4b  
 ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS  
 TO NEW YORK CITY 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Interest, dividends and rent \$	Social security income \$	Public assistance income \$	Retirement income \$	Income from all other sources \$
<b>US-Born</b>	<b>1,129</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>183</b>
<i>Core Countries</i>					
United Kingdom	1,526	40	28	162	58
Germany	1,453	107	77	112	25
Italy	751	182	74	74	142
Japan	669	43	0	9	54
<i>Semi-Periphery</i>					
Greece	838	114	69	79	112
Ireland	411	133	25	107	143
Poland	791	94	91	122	109
Former Soviet Union	380	98	423	56	161
Korea	413	15	36	23	86
<i>Inner-Periphery</i>					
Mexico	9	71	128	36	72
Puerto Rico	52	135	995	93	168
Cuba	226	187	365	90	97
Dominican Republic	48	75	649	48	141
<i>Periphery-Latin America</i>					
Colombia	161	53	142	34	136
Ecuador	139	78	262	60	115
Peru	62	29	89	8	148
El Salvador	136	75	139	68	108
<i>Periphery-Caribbean</i>					
Jamaica	286	57	107	35	123
Trinidad and Tobago	219	73	179	110	53
Guyana	184	47	128	15	120
Haiti	132	93	94	100	141
<i>Periphery-Asia</i>					
China	537	47	56	3	85
India	707	24	46	32	115
Philippines	406	15	63	19	116
<b>Other Foreign-Born</b>	<b>691</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>161</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>866</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>166</b>

Source: PUMS, 1990 US Census.

TABLE 5  
 COMPLETED DISTRIBUTION OF POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS  
 TO NEW YORK CITY 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Managerial professional specialty	Technical sales administration	Services	Precision production craft/repair	Operators labourer	Other	Total (per cent)
<b>US-Born</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>38.5</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>100</b>
<i>Core Countries</i>							
United Kingdom	53.2	29.2	10.0	4.4	2.6	0.6	100
Germany	48.8	36.5	6.0	5.1	3.1	0.5	100
Italy	18.4	22.0	16.5	20.5	22.2	0.3	100
Japan	46.2	30.8	17.9	2.0	2.8	0.2	100
<i>Semi-Periphery</i>							
Greece	20.3	25.0	20.2	18.6	15.8	0.1	100
Ireland	26.8	19.4	23.6	18.9	10.9	0.4	100
Poland	19.2	21.7	22.9	20.7	14.5	1.0	100
Former Soviet Union	28.0	32.7	14.6	12.9	11.3	0.4	100
Korea	22.7	43.4	11.8	7.8	14.1	0.1	100
<i>Inner-Periphery</i>							
Mexico	5.1	13.4	38.8	10.2	31.7	0.7	100
Puerto Rico	12.0	31.6	22.0	10.4	23.2	0.8	100
Cuba	15.6	32.1	22.8	11.1	17.7	0.6	100
Dominican Republic	8.7	25.4	22.7	9.7	33.0	0.5	100
<i>Periphery-Latin America</i>							
Colombia	10.8	23.6	27.9	11.7	25.8	0.2	100
Ecuador	8.0	24.4	23.3	12.3	31.7	0.3	100
Peru	11.2	21.9	26.7	14.6	25.3	0.3	100
El Salvador	6.1	17.1	34.4	11.1	30.2	1.0	100
<i>Periphery-Caribbean</i>							
Jamaica	18.2	33.1	28.8	9.2	10.6	0.2	100
Trinidad and Tobago	17.8	40.3	21.6	10.4	9.9	0.0	100
Guyana	16.1	38.2	20.5	8.6	16.2	0.3	100
Haiti	13.0	25.4	33.6	6.9	21.0	0.1	100
<i>Periphery-Asia</i>							
China	17.7	29.0	21.4	6.0	25.7	0.1	100
India	31.0	39.4	10.9	7.2	11.2	0.2	100
Philippines	44.6	37.1	10.6	2.8	4.9	0.0	100
<b>Other Foreign-Born</b>	<b>22.8</b>	<b>30.7</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>35.1</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>12.7</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: PUMS, 1990 US Census.

TABLE 6a  
 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS  
 TO NEW YORK CITY 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD WITH LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL  
 BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Average age	Per cent female	Per cent in the labour force	Per cent employed	Per cent unemployed	Average weeks worked	Poverty status (per cent)
<b>US-Born</b>	<b>33.90</b>	<b>49.84</b>	<b>45.29</b>	<b>35.34</b>	<b>21.97</b>	<b>17.11</b>	<b>32.54</b>
<i>Core Countries</i>							
United Kingdom	35.91	54.65	68.88	58.95	14.42	31.45	4.68
Germany	41.76	49.79	81.72	65.76	19.54	28.63	30.04
Italy	45.21	49.04	65.81	58.60	10.96	30.06	8.68
Japan	37.47	25.75	77.90	77.90	0.00	32.50	11.80
<i>Semi-Periphery</i>							
Greece	44.37	50.27	62.50	54.78	12.34	27.52	12.44
Ireland	31.54	40.62	76.14	68.54	9.97	33.48	7.59
Poland	40.83	42.81	71.56	62.66	12.43	30.21	16.04
Former Soviet Union	37.04	45.15	40.99	32.46	20.81	15.35	38.00
Korea	36.68	56.29	56.13	51.39	8.44	22.49	19.49
<i>Inner-Periphery</i>							
Mexico	28.55	35.70	75.54	69.26	8.43	30.44	24.60
Puerto Rico	35.45	55.86	41.50	32.61	21.42	15.19	50.46
Cuba	45.96	42.47	61.54	50.86	17.35	24.47	26.66
Dominican Republic	35.92	55.63	57.87	47.28	18.29	22.42	37.99
<i>Periphery-Latin America</i>							
Colombia	38.29	58.94	69.62	61.02	12.35	27.78	21.25
Ecuador	37.57	47.32	73.13	65.01	11.10	29.66	19.71
Peru	38.01	47.04	68.30	59.29	13.20	28.41	17.74
El Salvador	33.03	50.77	73.11	63.25	13.48	29.49	28.06
<i>Periphery-Caribbean</i>							
Jamaica	38.52	52.72	75.13	65.60	12.68	30.03	17.31
Trinidad and Tobago	39.03	54.71	75.24	63.79	15.22	29.54	17.87
Guyana	35.89	53.90	63.40	55.98	11.70	25.67	17.08
Haiti	38.47	56.94	74.10	63.71	14.03	29.12	21.72
<i>Periphery-Asia</i>							
China	40.36	53.64	70.38	66.12	6.05	30.58	20.68
India	38.23	49.90	62.35	54.10	13.23	25.38	15.34
Philippines	31.77	55.65	57.42	54.84	4.49	24.50	6.18
<b>Other Foreign-Born</b>	<b>44.54</b>	<b>52.18</b>	<b>57.34</b>	<b>50.76</b>	<b>11.48</b>	<b>24.41</b>	<b>25.83</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>37.55</b>	<b>51.33</b>	<b>53.33</b>	<b>44.64</b>	<b>16.29</b>	<b>21.28</b>	<b>29.92</b>

TABLE 6b  
 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS  
 TO NEW YORK CITY 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD WITH LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL  
 BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Average earnings (\$)	Average income (\$)	Wages or salary income (\$)	Non-farm Self-employment (\$)	Interest dividends and rent (\$)	Public assistance income (\$)
<b>US-Born</b>	<b>6,811</b>	<b>8,363</b>	<b>6,617</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>592</b>
<i>Core Countries</i>						
United Kingdom	18,876	19,561	17,864	1,012	377	107
Germany	12,938	14,277	12,914	23	791	444
Italy	14,161	15,558	13,441	688	809	80
Japan	28,118	28,483	27,324	793	-665	0
<i>Semi-Periphery</i>						
Greece	11,968	13,287	10,485	1,417	846	118
Ireland	15,545	16,539	15,088	457	439	0
Poland	12,560	14,021	12,160	399	737	137
Former Soviet Union	5,825	7,032	5,382	443	103	788
Korea	8,397	9,144	7,393	911	426	81
<i>Inner-Periphery</i>						
Mexico	7,852	8,180	7,654	171	18	141
Puerto Rico	4,944	6,639	4,716	204	44	1,229
Cuba	8,413	9,715	7,738	662	146	624
Dominican Republic	6,666	7,736	6,201	463	25	756
<i>Periphery-Latin America</i>						
Colombia	8,585	9,215	7,993	586	83	222
Ecuador	9,654	10,438	9,117	481	110	382
Peru	9,301	9,876	8,982	319	57	158
El Salvador	9,353	9,765	9,061	257	115	164
<i>Periphery-Caribbean</i>						
Jamaica	12,071	12,686	11,602	465	241	110
Trinidad and Tobago	11,559	12,078	11,434	125	257	170
Guyana	9,176	9,589	9,074	103	183	132
Haiti	10,340	10,854	9,677	562	41	167
<i>Periphery-Asia</i>						
China	7,751	8,493	7,459	282	426	96
India	8,897	9,502	8,485	397	217	130
Philippines	8,141	8,256	8,141	0	36	79
<b>Other Foreign-Born</b>	<b>9,728</b>	<b>11,323</b>	<b>9,165</b>	<b>534</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>525</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,924</b>	<b>9,330</b>	<b>7,584</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>548</b>

Source: PUMS, 1990 US Census.

TABLE 7a  
 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS  
 TO NEW YORK CITY 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD WITH A HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE  
 OR SOME COLLEGE BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Average age	Per cent female	Per cent in the labour force	Per cent employed	Per cent unemployed	Average weeks worked	Poverty status (per cent)
<b>US-Born</b>	<b>36.65</b>	<b>55.39</b>	<b>72.89</b>	<b>66.58</b>	<b>8.65</b>	<b>33.18</b>	<b>13.67</b>
<i>Core Countries</i>							
United Kingdom	36.25	58.88	71.83	68.93	4.04	33.91	13.12
Germany	35.64	61.51	78.60	75.13	4.41	37.46	11.14
Italy	33.90	46.22	75.78	71.20	6.04	34.46	7.92
Japan	34.32	57.31	60.19	57.75	4.06	25.44	24.70
<i>Semi-Periphery</i>							
Greece	34.89	42.00	67.81	62.32	8.10	39.62	10.01
Ireland	33.36	47.97	84.50	81.55	3.50	36.44	8.11
Poland	37.14	51.20	79.20	74.76	5.62	32.82	17.31
Former Soviet Union	38.50	55.66	60.60	50.48	16.70	23.95	32.25
Korea	36.06	51.76	73.60	69.42	5.68	29.65	18.12
<i>Inner-Periphery</i>							
Mexico	27.53	35.52	82.00	75.21	8.28	33.19	18.46
Puerto Rico	32.97	55.45	63.27	54.70	13.55	25.45	33.07
Cuba	37.91	45.62	75.21	66.08	12.14	33.00	16.66
Dominican Republic	31.50	54.49	68.66	57.05	16.92	27.79	28.90
<i>Periphery-Latin America</i>							
Colombia	34.38	51.34	79.95	71.46	10.59	34.23	13.27
Ecuador	33.40	50.31	78.43	69.94	10.82	32.64	14.99
Peru	34.44	48.22	82.49	74.74	9.40	34.33	12.32
El Salvador	32.33	48.99	77.29	71.75	7.17	32.55	19.79
<i>Periphery-Caribbean</i>							
Jamaica	35.38	58.38	83.74	74.90	10.56	35.96	10.49
Trinidad and Tobago	35.34	58.77	83.17	75.40	9.34	36.56	11.42
Guyana	34.68	55.90	80.73	75.07	7.01	35.69	11.19
Haiti	35.64	51.85	81.72	71.62	12.37	34.03	12.81
<i>Periphery-Asia</i>							
China	34.72	49.62	72.16	67.19	6.89	31.20	17.24
India	33.77	48.06	74.77	69.27	1.36	32.19	10.70
Philippines	35.77	49.75	81.03	78.48	3.14	34.26	7.17
<b>Other Foreign-Born</b>	<b>39.59</b>	<b>53.02</b>	<b>74.19</b>	<b>62.14</b>	<b>8.16</b>	<b>32.94</b>	<b>15.14</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>36.68</b>	<b>54.42</b>	<b>73.45</b>	<b>66.93</b>	<b>8.88</b>	<b>32.80</b>	<b>14.86</b>

TABLE 7b  
 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS  
 TO NEW YORK CITY 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD WITH A HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE  
 OR SOME COLLEGE BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Average earnings (\$)	Average income (\$)	Wages or salary income (\$)	Non-farm Self-employment (\$)	Interest dividends and rent (\$)	Public assistance income (\$)
<b>US-Born</b>	<b>17,622</b>	<b>19,260</b>	<b>16,991</b>	<b>612</b>	<b>653</b>	<b>214</b>
<i>Core Countries</i>						
United Kingdom	21,796	23,221	19,519	2,240	1,228	31
Germany	22,294	24,605	20,803	1,490	1,810	22
Italy	21,252	22,017	19,941	1,240	403	78
Japan	14,322	14,752	11,926	2,376	388	0
<i>Semi-Periphery</i>						
Greece	14,888	16,095	13,077	1,804	866	32
Ireland	20,563	21,187	20,124	378	238	38
Poland	14,989	16,011	14,302	687	644	91
Former Soviet Union	12,420	13,373	11,197	1,105	322	381
Korea	11,648	12,026	9,590	2,035	246	40
<i>Inner-Periphery</i>						
Mexico	10,099	10,363	9,664	433	-47	121
Puerto Rico	9,743	10,879	9,432	295	46	759
Cuba	14,918	15,650	14,274	643	248	195
Dominican Republic	9,972	10,825	9,506	451	74	537
<i>Periphery-Latin America</i>						
Colombia	12,714	13,080	12,141	572	117	96
Ecuador	11,996	12,515	11,496	470	125	175
Peru	13,017	13,274	12,465	546	72	70
El Salvador	10,719	11,334	10,374	340	37	117
<i>Periphery-Caribbean</i>						
Jamaica	16,473	17,043	15,741	722	255	131
Trinidad and Tobago	16,090	13,731	15,570	471	124	214
Guyana	15,357	15,877	15,092	255	154	103
Haiti	13,785	14,234	13,200	581	128	67
<i>Periphery-Asia</i>						
China	11,571	12,163	11,082	486	453	36
India	13,473	14,117	12,836	684	539	19
Philippines	18,046	16,453	15,339	707	247	47
<b>Other Foreign-Born</b>	<b>15,979</b>	<b>17,310</b>	<b>15,170</b>	<b>797</b>	<b>585</b>	<b>193</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,464</b>	<b>17,867</b>	<b>15,789</b>	<b>658</b>	<b>561</b>	<b>215</b>

Source: PUMS, 1990 US Census.

TABLE 8a  
 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS  
 TO NEW YORK CITY 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD WITH COLLEGE DEGREE  
 OR MORE BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Average age	Per cent female	Per cent in the labour force	Per cent employed	Per cent unemployed	Average weeks worked	Poverty status (per cent)
<b>US-Born</b>	<b>37.48</b>	<b>51.23</b>	<b>89.51</b>	<b>86.51</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>42.59</b>	<b>4.88</b>
<i>Core Countries</i>							
United Kingdom	35.36	43.41	92.16	90.81	1.47	13.44	3.95
Germany	36.64	45.13	88.37	85.13	3.66	39.72	9.21
Italy	35.76	38.79	86.08	83.32	3.21	40.72	5.32
Japan	35.67	46.80	79.03	77.50	1.94	35.19	15.40
<i>Semi-Periphery</i>							
Greece	33.35	34.46	81.94	80.48	1.78	39.35	6.04
Ireland	33.35	42.53	86.21	82.76	4.00	42.25	10.07
Poland	37.36	46.18	90.55	86.36	4.63	39.87	10.87
<i>Former Soviet Union</i>							
Soviet Union	39.96	53.36	77.22	69.64	9.82	30.67	28.50
Korea	36.72	45.10	75.69	72.28	4.50	32.63	15.26
<i>Inner-Periphery</i>							
Mexico	33.14	39.27	78.67	71.02	9.72	34.14	17.40
Puerto Rico	35.20	58.53	88.29	82.39	6.69	37.69	10.42
Cuba	38.25	54.13	81.78	75.60	7.56	38.67	8.93
Dominican Republic	33.80	51.56	83.01	71.93	13.65	33.99	18.96
<i>Periphery-Latin America</i>							
Colombia	35.29	49.09	82.23	77.10	6.24	34.13	13.84
Ecuador	33.60	46.77	82.65	72.94	11.75	36.50	10.63
Peru	37.85	47.07	86.67	83.31	3.38	39.87	14.06
El Salvador	38.08	33.38	97.89	81.27	16.98	42.09	3.00
<i>Periphery-Caribbean</i>							
Jamaica	36.26	66.14	93.57	87.96	5.99	43.69	4.91
Trinidad and Tobago	37.29	63.45	90.15	87.96	2.42	45.41	2.30
Guyana	36.50	50.78	87.09	82.60	5.15	40.48	7.38
Haiti	37.11	43.13	33.65	84.19	5.81	40.42	6.05
<i>Periphery-Asia</i>							
China	35.33	46.18	83.56	79.98	4.28	38.31	10.88
India	37.39	38.58	85.04	81.23	4.49	38.64	8.46
Philippines	39.53	69.74	92.32	90.91	1.52	44.07	4.12
<b>Other Foreign-Born</b>	<b>39.73</b>	<b>44.58</b>	<b>86.24</b>	<b>81.73</b>	<b>5.24</b>	<b>39.20</b>	<b>9.08</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>37.67</b>	<b>50.11</b>	<b>88.42</b>	<b>85.00</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>41.50</b>	<b>6.33</b>

TABLE 8b  
 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF POST-1965 IMMIGRANTS  
 TO NEW YORK CITY 16 TO 64 YEARS OLD WITH COLLEGE DEGREE  
 OR MORE BY NATIONAL ORIGIN

Post-1965 immigrants by national origin	Average earnings (\$)	Average income (\$)	Wages or salary income (\$)	Non-farm Self-employment (\$)	Interest dividends and rent (\$)	Public assistance income (\$)
US-Born	39,349	42,757	35,260	4,046	2,716	39
<i>Core Countries</i>						
United Kingdom	53,557	56,120	50,802	2,721	2,183	0
Germany	43,544	44,936	39,096	4,418	1,249	71
Italy	39,309	41,184	35,280	4,011	1,583	35
Japan	45,041	46,151	43,326	1,317	1,025	0
<i>Semi-Periphery</i>						
Greece	28,071	29,009	25,153	2,917	743	32
Ireland	40,166	41,537	38,417	1,749	1,008	0
Poland	25,753	27,043	22,883	2,471	1,151	37
Former Soviet Union	21,716	23,035	20,074	1,644	625	277
Korea	19,648	20,417	16,633	2,805	662	0
<i>Inner-Periphery</i>						
Mexico	13,036	13,550	12,168	868	205	0
Puerto Rico	21,126	26,083	23,607	1,519	199	106
Cuba	23,800	24,432	20,195	3,604	431	58
Dominican Republic	15,337	15,665	13,999	1,338	130	195
<i>Periphery-Latin America</i>						
Colombia	20,787	21,802	19,807	937	771	50
Ecuador	18,170	18,922	17,899	205	416	73
Peru	19,483	19,614	18,233	1,250	23	0
El Salvador	25,095	26,431	24,902	193	1,300	0
<i>Periphery-Caribbean</i>						
Jamaica	26,792	27,561	26,561	226	530	0
Trinidad and Tobago	28,974	29,938	28,618	355	695	0
Guyana	25,075	25,884	24,913	0	395	282
Haiti	26,390	27,718	25,607	765	411	13
<i>Periphery-Asia</i>						
China	24,959	28,054	24,063	861	922	4
India	27,658	29,036	25,072	2,550	1,152	21
Philippines	31,185	37,963	29,399	1,765	521	69
<b>Other Foreign-Born</b>	<b>31,105</b>	<b>33,081</b>	<b>28,345</b>	<b>2,709</b>	<b>1,475</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>36,400</b>	<b>39,264</b>	<b>32,837</b>	<b>3,516</b>	<b>2,257</b>	<b>46</b>

Source: PUMS, 1990 US Census.

CARACTÉRISTIQUES DÉMOGRAPHIQUES ET SOCIO-  
ÉCONOMIQUES DES IMMIGRANTS ARRIVÉS A NEW YORK  
APRÈS 1965: ANALYSE COMPARÉE PAR ORIGINE NATIONALE

Cet article analyse et compare les caractéristiques démographiques et socio-économiques des étrangers arrivés comme immigrants à New York après 1965 et habitant encore cette ville en 1990.

A partir de données du recensement de 1990 nous avons classé ces personnes d'après les 24 groupes d'origine nationale les plus importants et comparé leurs caractéristiques démographiques et socio-économiques (sexe, âge, niveau d'instruction, taux d'activité de la main-d'œuvre, chômage, profession, revenus et pauvreté).

Nous posons trois questions empiriques et y apportons une réponse. La première: quelles sont, entre autres, les principales différences par origine nationale dans la composition des personnes arrivées comme immigrants à New York après 1965? La deuxième: quelles sont, entre autres, les différentes places occupées par ces immigrants dans la structure socio-économique de New York? La troisième: quelles sont, entre autres, les principales différences dans les bienfaits économiques dont jouissent les personnes arrivées comme immigrants à New York depuis 1965?

Nous constatons que les immigrants ayant un niveau d'instruction inférieur au niveau secondaire ont des taux d'activité de la main-d'œuvre plus élevés que la population née aux Etats-Unis appartenant à la même tranche d'éducation, ainsi que des revenus légèrement supérieurs. Les immigrants diplômés de l'école secondaire ont des taux d'activité à peu près égaux (ou légèrement supérieurs) à la moyenne observée pour la population née aux Etats-Unis, alors que leurs revenus sont légèrement inférieurs au revenu moyen de cette population. Les immigrants ayant un diplôme de l'enseignement supérieur ont des taux d'activité analogues ou légèrement inférieurs à ceux de la population née aux Etats-Unis, alors que leurs revenus sont sensiblement inférieurs à ceux des personnes nées aux Etats-Unis possédant un diplôme de l'enseignement supérieur.

CARACTERÍSTICAS DEMOGRÁFICAS Y SOCIOECONÓMICAS  
DE LOS INMIGRANTES LLEGADOS A NUEVA YORK  
DESPUÉS DE 1965: ANÁLISIS COMPARADO  
DE SUS ORÍGENES NACIONALES

El artículo analiza y compara las características demográficas y socio-económicas de las personas que, nacidas en el extranjero, inmigraron a Nueva York después de 1965 y que en 1990 aún vivían en esta ciudad.

Utilizando los datos del Censo de 1990, hemos clasificado a las personas en los veinticuatro grupos más numerosos según sus orígenes nacionales y hemos comparado sus características demográficas y socioeconómicas (sexo, edad, escolaridad, participación en la fuerza laboral, desempleo, ocupación, ingresos y pobreza).

Planteamos tres cuestiones empíricas y les damos respuesta. La primera cuestión es: ¿cuáles son algunas de las principales diferencias por orígenes nacionales en la composición de los grupos de personas que han inmigrado a Nueva York después de 1965? La segunda pregunta es: ¿cuáles son algunas de las principales diferencias en la situación de esos inmigrantes de después de 1965 dentro de la estructura socioeconómica de Nueva York? Y la tercera pregunta: ¿cuáles son algunas de las principales diferencias en las compensaciones económicas recibidas por las personas que han inmigrado a Nueva York desde 1965?

Hemos encontrado que los inmigrantes que no alcanzaron la escolaridad superior tienen mayores tasas de participación en la fuerza laboral que los del grupo de población nacido en los Estados Unidos y de la misma categoría de educación y que además obtienen ingresos ligeramente superiores. Los inmigrantes que han alcanzado la escolaridad superior tienen tasas de participación en la fuerza laboral próximas, o ligeramente superiores, al promedio de la población nacida en los Estados Unidos, pero sus ingresos son ligeramente inferiores al promedio de los ingresos obtenidos por la población nacida en los Estados Unidos. Los inmigrantes con un título preuniversitario tienen tasas de participación similares o ligeramente inferiores a las del grupo de población nacido en los Estados Unidos, mientras que sus ingresos son considerablemente inferiores a los de los que han obtenido un título preuniversitario y han nacido en los Estados Unidos.