Occupational Achievement of Indian and Chinese Immigrants in the United States: A Comparative Study

Lopamudra Ray Saraswati[1] and Sayeed Unisa[2]

Introduction

At the start of the new millennium, migration has become more pronounced than ever before. The enduring impact of globalization has brought significant consequences for the socio-economic phenomenon of migration. At the same time migration is helping to transform contemporary economic and social relations. In a world characterized by vastly improved transport facilities and global networks for the production and exchange of goods, services, and information, the world's population is increasingly mobile. International movement of people is now firmly established feature of modern life. In an increasingly integrated international labor market and economy, migration has now become an integral part of the phenomenon commonly referred to as globalization.

But, whether in labor-importing countries or countries those have traditionally attracted immigrants like the United States, as well as, increasingly, in both the developed and the developing countries where migration is a recent phenomenon, migration and migrants have a negative image. Media attention routinely focuses on uncontrolled "flows" of people seeking work or asylum, on undocumented migration, on the criminal activities of traffickers and smugglers, and on problems of integration of migrants with the local population. Some recent policy frameworks and ongoing public discussions have tried to focus on this issue. The 19-member Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM) released a six-chapter consensus report on 5 October 2005 calling on all nations to respect the human rights of migrants and recommending a new Interagency Global Migration Facility to help coordinate migration policies at the regional and eventually global level. The report includes recommendations in six broad areas: migrants in a globalizing labor market, migration and development, irregular migration, migrants in society, the human rights of migrants and the governance of migration.

The United States is the largest immigrant-receiving country from all over the world. Immigration has made the United States the most ethnically and racially diverse nation in the world. Its history is a history of immigrants, and its current position as the most powerful and influential economic and political nation in the world is testimony to the contributions immigrants have made. The status of legal permanent resident (Lawful Permanent Resident, or LPR) of the U.S. is a scarce commodity, as more and more persons from the countries of every corner of the world want to permanently immigrate to the U.S. every year. It has a large immigrant population. In March 2002, the U.S. Census

[1] Ph.D. Scholar, Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU).
[2] Associate Professor, International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS).

Bureau reports that 22.45 million foreign born resided in the United States representing 11.56 per cent of the total U.S. population. The volume and composition of the immigrant population has been changing too very noticeably. Every year, several hundred thousand persons become legal permanent resident of the United States, averaging nearly 782 thousand in the 1991-95 period, around 771 thousand in the 1996-2000 period, and almost 945 thousand in the 2001-04 period (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service's 2001 Yearbook).

Migration affects the economic well-being of migrants in a number of ways. Few people would be surprised to hear that legal immigrants who come to the U.S. often have qualifications and experience that suit them for jobs well beyond what they end up doing once they are in the U.S. Although some legal immigrants may know ahead of time that their transition into the U.S. labor market will likely not be seamless and may require a substantial step down in the employment ladder, may come anyway. It may be that the blue-collar work they find in the U.S. offers them a path to a better life than the white-collar jobs they left behind. They may also see their sacrifice as one step towards a better life for their children.

Occupation influences a wide range of outcomes from health to welfare, yet we know little about why immigrants often end up in occupations for which they are overqualified. Understanding occupational downgrading is important for several reasons. First, it is likely that success in the labor market is correlated with other outcomes of interest, such as remittance behaviour, dependence on public assistance, and the probability of sponsorship. If occupational downgrading is associated with negative outcomes, it is important to understand its determinants. Second, there is empirical interest in knowing whether the trends and stereotypes of economic success generated by patterns of immigration at the beginning of the twentieth century will hold for those admitted at the end of the twentieth century (Masssey 1981). Third, a high prevalence of occupational downgrading suggests an inefficient allocation of skills in the U.S. If a significant number of immigrants with college degrees are working in menial jobs, this may constitute a waste of human resources that could be put to better, more productive use.

There is a debate on whether the move of the migrants is driven by market failure or is a part of a lifetime wage maximization strategy. All proposed theories assume that individuals who migrate and enter the labor force will attempt to obtain the best job, whether measured as ranking or wages, they can. Regardless, of the individual's initial motivations, one hopes that occupational downgrading is a cost that turns out to be short term. Economists have set their attention in understanding how quickly and successfully migrants are able to assimilate into the economic activities and advantages of their new environment (Lucas 2003). Chiswick's (1978) analysis of the 1978 US Census data suggested that, at the time of arrival, immigrants earn 17 percent less than natives, but that immigrants catch up within 10-15 years, and after 30 years immigrants earn some 11 percent more than natives. Chiswick's estimates for the U.S. have been the subject of continuing debate. Borjas (1985) argues that a simple cross-section view can mask declining quality of migrants arriving in more recent cohorts, leading to an impression of

sharply rising pay with duration of residence. Borjas's estimates indicate much more modest increases within each cohort. However, subsequent work by Lalonde and Topel (1992) indicates little decline in education levels within ethnic groups of US immigrants over time, combined with significant acquisition of country-specific human capital during the first ten years in the U.S., and consequently re-establishes substantial gains in migrants' earnings during this interval. Jasso and Rosenzweig (1995) compare outcomes for marital immigrants and employment-based immigrants at the time of permanent residency and at naturalization and find that, although employment-based immigrants have greater labor market success in the short term, less than half of them who began in executive or managerial positions were still in positions of that level at the time of naturalization.

All the above studies have been limited by either the Census data or the data from the Immigration and Naturalization Service. These data have a number of deficiencies disallowing for a clear identification of what are likely to be significant contributing factors to labor market outcomes, such as legal status or years of education. In the present study, using a new data-source – the NIS data, we are able to move beyond a consideration of whether immigrants are better or worse off than native, making it possible to consider whether they are better or worse off than they were in their home country.

Indian and Chinese Immigrants in the U.S.

The 1965 Immigration Act abolished the ethnic-based quota system and established a family and employment-based preference system with a greater weight on family reunification. Since then the U.S. has opened the door to Asia after eight decades of almost complete exclusion. Without a strict rule of screening for skills under the 1965 Immigration law, the admission classes of immigrants have changed. According to the Immigration and Naturalization Service (2000), about 70 per cent of legal immigrations have been family based. Asians constitute the fastest growing minority group in the United States. The Asian population in the US increased by 108 percent in the decade from 1980 to 1990, rising from 3.5 million to 7.3 million (Exter 1992). During the last decade over 2 million immigrants arrived from Asia. It is estimated that by the year 2025 the population of US will be 12 percent Asians (Cummins 1998).

In recent years immigrants have arrived to the United States from every Asian nation. It is impossible to discuss Asian immigration as a singular enterprise because Asians are an extremely diverse group of individuals. Patterns of immigration vary for each specific group of Asians; however all Asians share the common bond of being subject to the same laws. Although patterns of Asian immigration have all been heavily shared by U.S. legislation, each nation has its own unique immigration history. India and China are two nations occupying the leading positions in migrating people to the U.S.

Indians do not resemble the stereotypical portrait of other Asians. As a result of their professional success, Indians have enjoyed financial prosperity in the United States.

Data from the 1980 census rank Indians as being recipients of the second highest median household income among all ethnic groups (Cordasco 1990). Immigrants from India are usually proficient in English skills upon arrival to the United States. Prior English proficiency has proven extremely beneficial in easing Indian assimilation to American culture. More specifically, English fluency has facilitated Indian immigrants' entry into the work force in the United States (Jayakar 1994). It is well documented that Indian immigrants have felt the sting of discrimination (Fisher 1978; Gibson 1988; Saran 1985) and many Asian Indians have endured underemployment in the United States. Immigrants who originally came to the United States in pursuit of education, usually opted to become permanent residence once their studies were completed so they may reap the benefits of their expanded opportunities (Cordasco 1990).

Chinese immigrants to the United States have struggled to manage the clash of their traditional cultural values with American ideals. The clash of cultural values is keenly experienced among the elder Chinese immigrants, who are firmly imbued with traditional Chinese values, and among Chinese adolescents, who are first entering a critical development period of identity formation (Mui 1996). The process of adjusting to life in the United States is exacerbated by the developmentally appropriate need to establish an identity for Chinese adolescent immigrants. Several factors have been linked to Chinese adolescent immigrants' psychological adjustment (Florshein 1997). Similar to the experience of elderly Chinese, family cohesion and conflict appear to be important elements in promoting psychological adjustment among adolescents. Surprisingly, immigrants who speak Chinese as opposed to English fare better in ratings of psychological adjustment.

Although, Asia occupies a leading position in terms of migrating people in the United States and Asian immigrants have a great impact on American society, not many studies have been done on them. Among all the Asian groups, Indian and Chinese are the two major immigrant Asian groups in the United States. According to U.S. statistics compiled by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, individuals originally born in India represent the second largest group of Asian immigrants to the US, with 44,859 immigrants arriving in 1996 alone (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1997). The Immigration and Naturalization Service reports that 41,728 Chinese immigrants entered the United States in 1996. Immigrants of Chinese descent are the fourth largest category of Asian immigrants to the United States. Although some studies have been carried out regarding Chinese immigrants in U.S., not much study have taken place on the Indian immigrants in U.S. However, there have not been studies (only except one or two) comparing the Indians and Chinese in this regard. Any way, the comparison of India and China is worthwhile as the two groups have a number of similarities both being Asian (including that both are subjected to the same US Legislation Act for Asians), as well as a huge dissimilarity, for instance, Chinese are more or less homogeneous in nature whereas Indians are heterogeneous among themselves.

Objectives

Our study attempts to measure, and thereby to compare the extent of upgradation/downgradation of the Indian and Chinese immigrants in the U.S. labor market. The main focus of the study is to find out the factors affecting the labor market performance of these immigrants. For that purpose a vast analysis has been carried out to assess their achievement in the U.S. labor market, comparing their occupational status just before coming to the U.S. with that at the very beginning of their stay in the U.S. The study involves examining changes related to differences in both spatial and time references. Another objective of this study is to compare the achievements of Indian and Chinese immigrants in the U.S. labor market.

Source of Data

The present study is based on a new data-source – the New Immigrant Survey. This is a multi-cohort prospective-retrospective panel study of new legal immigrants to the Unites States. The first full cohort (NIS-2003) sampled immigrants in the period May-November 2003. The base-line survey was conducted from June 2003 to June 2004. The sampled immigrants were located by the addresses to which the immigrants requested to send their Green cards. Interviews were conducted in respondents' preferred languages. In the baseline survey the interview with the immigrant was conducted as soon as possible after his/her admission to the LPR. The sampling frame is based on nationally representative sample of electronic administrative records compiled for new immigrants by the U.S. government.

The informations for the present study are drawn from Round-I (baseline round) of this survey's fiscal year 2003 cohort, known as NIS-2003-I. These data have been released for public use in 2005. This round includes completed interviews with 8,573 respondents in the Adult sample and with 810 parents or guardians of children in the Child sample. Present study has been carried out only on the Adult portion of this data-set for the immigrants with the countries of origin as India and China. In this study the sample size consists of 771 Indian respondents and 469 respondents with their birth in China.

Hypotheses

The probability of experiencing a drop in occupational ranking after moving to the U.S. may be different for the Indian and Chinese immigrants and the factors affecting it may also differ for the two groups. Overall factors may include what brought them to the U.S. In an open labour market, the type of job one can secure is largely determined by education and experience, or human capital. The returns to human capital are likely to vary by whether the inputs were obtained in the U.S. or in their home-country, the former considered more desirable. It is also possible that U.S. education has an indirect effect on

labour market outcomes by increasing the return to human capital acquired in their home-country.

Additional potential influences might include previous U.S. experience or an individual's household structure. Initial migration status may factor into future labour market outcomes. Having previously been in the U.S. illegally may be associated with poor outcomes later on if this signifies that an individual has low skills. Having minors in household might be associated with an increase in the probability of downgrading if it means that the adult is less able to be selective in employment and must settle for an immediate, but possibly lower ranked jobs.

Additionally, the immigrants with adjustee status, like those admitted as refugees and the immigrants admitted through an employer's sponsorship will not likely experience the same outcomes. One might expect that employment based immigrants would have greater labour market success due to higher skills and the higher likelihood that they have a job prior legalization. Among all the immigrants admitted through the family-based categories – the immediate relatives of U.S. citizens may have an easier time in their transition to the U.S. labour market due to access to information leading to better institutional knowledge of their surroundings or networks with greater social capital.

Methodology

An assessment has been done to have an insight into the change in the immigrants' work-status due to migration. Those who were working before migration and have lost job after coming to the U.S. have been presented with respect to various background characteristics. In this analysis all those who are retired, disabled, or homemaker have been excluded. But those homemakers who have worked at least once in life, either before migration or after migration, have been included. Separate analysis has been carried out for the working group to assess the change in their occupational status due to migration.

Classification and Ranking of Occupational Categories

The occupational categories in the NIS-2003-I survey include all the 509 broad occupation groups classified by 2000 U.S. Census. These categories have been classified into 23 major groups following the Standard Occupational Classification system (Ref. U.S. Census 2000). This is a system, provided by U.S. Census for classifying all occupations in the economy in which work is performed for pay or profit. Ranking of the occupation categories was necessary to make a comparison. The data of NIS allow for a ranking of these occupational categories by average education and income levels of the immigrants. For each category the average years of education and the average income of all people in service occupations in their home-country have been calculated first. These averages are ranked from lowest to highest to get the ranks of the occupations according to the education and the income level. The final rank has been obtained by taking the

simple average of these two ranks. After ranking the occupational categories in this way, the twenty-three occupations are aggregated into quartiles based on the ranked distribution of respondents' last occupation before migration. This was necessary for the convenience of the analysis and the interpretation, the 1st quartile being the lowest quartile in terms of the occupational status and 4th being the highest.

Measuring Occupational Mobility

Occupational mobility is measured in terms of whether the individual has got a job in the U.S. with a higher/lower ranking than that of his/her last job before migration. The job in the U.S. refers to the first job after legalization. Mobility is computed to have three categories – upgrading, downgrading and no change. Upgrading refers to those who had a lower ranked last job before migration than their first job in the U.S. Similarly, downgrading means a lower ranked job in the U.S. than that of last job before migration. The difference between the ranks of these two jobs gives a measure of the amount of mobility.

The conditional probabilities of being in the same, higher, or lower ranking quartiles for the first job in the U.S. than the one the respondent was in before migration were calculated differently for Indians and Chinese.

To consider mobility, the multinomial logit models have been estimated of the form:

$$\log\left(\frac{\pi_{ij}}{\pi_{iJ}}\right) = \alpha_i + \beta_{1j} Rank\_Before + \beta_{2j} Visa\_Class + \beta_{3j} Education + \beta_{4j} X_i ,$$

where j can be either upgrading or downgrading and J is the reference category where no change in ranking has occurred, α_i is the constant for category j, *Rank_Before* is the rank of individual's last job before migration, *Visa_Class* is a set of dummy variables capturing the admission category to the legal permanent residence, and also whether the immigrant is adjustee or newly arrived. *Education* variable measures the total years of education for the individual and also decomposes his/her education in the U.S. and in the home-country. Finally, X_i is a vector of demographic and other characteristics for the i-th individual.

Three multinomial logit models have been applied. The baseline model includes the rank of the last job before migration, the demographic variables such as age and sex, knowledge of English and total years of education. In case of the English knowledge, the reference category is the poor/baseline knowledge, the other categories being good, very good and excellent knowledge of English. In the second model the years of education is decomposed into years of education in their home-country and years of education in the U.S. Besides some more variables such as prior U.S. exposure, household structure and whether the individual had help from a relative in getting the job were included. Prior U.S. exposure is measured in terms of the prior trips to the U.S. Household structure includes only one variable indicating whether a minor child is living with the individual.

The final model, besides all these independent variables, includes the visa class of the immigrant, employment category immigrants being the reference category. The other three categories are Immediate Relative of U.S. citizen, Other Family preference categories, and all the other visa categories. To examine the immigrant's adjustment status, one variable indicating whether the immigrant is an adjustee or newly arrived is incorporated.

Basic Features of the Sampled Immigrants

The sample-size for the present study is 771 adult Indians and 469 adult Chinese. Some basic socio-demographic characteristics have been presented here. The percentage distributions of the immigrants by various background characteristics have been calculated using the weighted data.

Socio-demographic characteristics

The NIS sample immigrants include similar percentages of males and females from both India and China (Table-1). For both the groups females are higher in proportion. Indians have higher percentages in the median age-groups, whereas Chinese are mostly in the older age-groups. There are very few immigrants who are unmarried, or separated, or widowed. More than 90 percent immigrants are either married or living together in a married like relationship from both the countries. Indians are living with a child more than the Chinese. Home-ownership is very less for both the immigrant groups. Most of the immigrants live in the preferred states as mentioned earlier.

Education and current occupational status

Immigrants in the NIS sample are more or less highly educated (Table-2). Indians are found to have little more years of education than the Chinese. Chinese are more in the lowest education group. English speaking ability is very high among the Indian immigrants. Chinese are mostly very poor in spoken English. Around 48 percent of the Indian immigrants and 42 percent of the Chinese immigrants are currently working. A very high percentage of them are home-makers.

Migration characteristics

Most of the immigrants have no prior experience about the United States as their number of prior trips to the U.S. is zero (Table-3). However, Chinese are found to have more number of prior trips to the U.S. than the Indians. In the NIS sampled immigrants most of the Indians have a visa in the employment-based category. But Chinese immigrants have got the L.P.R. status mostly through the family-based category. For both the countries newly arrived immigrants are more in percentage than the adjustee immigrants. However, the percentage of newly arrived immigrants is a little higher for the Chinese than that for the Indians.

Main Findings

Table-4 shows percentage distribution of immigrants in various occupational quartiles and in the non-working group. This shows that a large number of Indian immigrants were non-working in their home-country (36.9 percent). Compared to them Chinese immigrants were non-working in less numbers in their home-country (19.9 percent). For both countries the second quartile contains the maximum number of immigrants for their last job before coming to the U.S. It is 24.4 percent for Indians and 32.8 percent for Chinese. But when considering the first job in the U.S., a huge number of Chinese migrants are coming in the non-working status (42.8 percent). Indians show a comparatively low difference in the percentage of non-working in the U.S. and in their home-country. Both for Indians and Chinese, the third quartile contains the minimum number of immigrants for their first job in the U.S. Indians are more in the fourth quartile than the Chinese. The percentages are 21.1 and 7.8 for Indians and Chinese respectively.

Change in work-status of migrants due to the migration

Tables 5a and 5b report the change in immigrants' work-status due to the migration. There are 118 Indian migrants who worked before migration, but have lost job now. Among Chinese immigrants 130 persons had a job before migration, but have no job now. The percentages are 38.7 and 47.1 among total migrants for India and China respectively. But, there are also a number of migrants who have got a job in the U.S. coming from a non-working status in their home-country. Among them 121 persons are from India and 58 persons are from China.

Table-6 presents the percentages of the immigrants coming to the non-working status in the U.S. from a working status in their home-country by their different background characteristics. Males are supposed to face less problem due to job-lose. In the median age-group this problem is the lowest. Inability of English speaking is found to be a main cause for the Chinese immigrants in losing the job. The probability of losing job is the highest among those who were in the lowest occupational quartile before migration. Employment category immigrants are less likely to lose job.

Occupational Status Before and after migration

Tables 7a and 7b show the results of the comparative analysis between the occupational quartiles for the first job in the U.S. and that for the last job in their home-country differently for Indians and Chinese. In the top left cell of the table, there are 69 people from India and 23 people from China who were not working in their home-country and also have not worked since coming to the U.S. Twenty percent of those Indians who were in the lowest quartile job in their home-country remained in the same quartile in the U.S. This value is 48.1 percent for Chinese. In these tables those who are on the diagonal stayed within their quartile; those above the diagonal upgraded and those below the diagonal downgraded. Among all the Indian immigrants who were in the 4^{th} quartile before migration, 77 percent of them are also in the same quartile in the U.S. But in case of the Chinese immigrants, all of those who were in the 4^{th} quartile in their home country,

only 23.8 percent are able to stay in the same quartile in the U.S. Majority of them (42.9 percent) have come to the 2nd quartile after arriving to the U.S. A massive portion of the non-working Indian immigrants have got job after coming to the U.S., most (24.2 percent) of them working in the 2nd quartile occupations. The 1st and the 4th quartile also contain a major portion of them. But for the Chinese immigrants, if they get a job in the U.S. after coming from a non-working status from their home-country, mostly it is in the 1st occupational quartile (28.4 percent).

Occupational mobility

Table-8 represents occupational mobility by different background characteristics. Upgrading, downgrading or no change has been measured for each background characteristic. The distribution of Indian immigrants among the downgrading and upgrading groups is almost equal. Most of them stayed in the same ranked occupation (45.9%). But Chinese immigrants have the highest proportion in the downgrading group (47.5 percent). Around 24 percent of them have upgraded and remaining 28.3 percent have experienced no change in the occupation. When the occupational quartiles for the last job before migration are considered, the Chinese immigrants have experienced very high downgrading (all around 60 percent or above) in the higher quartiles. However, this is lowest (10.8 percent) for the first quartile. Indian immigrants who were in the 3rd quartile experience the highest percentage of downgrading. Those in the 4th quartile experience the lowest down gradation. Immigrants, who were in the 1st quartile, have experienced a high upgrading for both the countries – 73.7 percent for Indians and 41.2 percent for Chinese. Indians, who were in the 4th quartile jobs before migration, remained mostly in the same quartile. But Chinese migrants experienced a high rate of downgrading in this quartile.

While seeing the percentage distribution of the immigrants experiencing upward or downward mobility in different visa categories, it is evident that very low proportion of employment-based immigrants experienced downgrading (15.7 percent Indians and 32.4 percent Chinese). Nearly 64 percent of employment-based Indians experienced no change in occupational ranking, but this value is lower for the Chinese – only 35.8 percent of them experienced no change. All immigrants holding family-based visa have a high probability to downgrade – may it be for the immediate relative of the US citizens or the other family preference based categories. However, the Chinese in the other family preference based categories have higher percentage of down gradation than that of the Indians. It is 56.7 percent for Chinese and 46.6 percent for Chinese.

Results from the Multinomial analysis

Tables 9a and 9b present the results of the three multinomial logit models estimating occupational mobility for India and China respectively – the baseline model with a set of demographic variables, the second model disaggregating the education into that acquired in home-country and that acquired in the U.S., and the final model including the admission classes to the legal permanent residence. For predicting downgrading or upgrading, the reference category of the dependent variable is no change in the

occupational ranking. A comparison of the log likelihoods shows that decomposing education into two categories leads to a significant improvement in the fit from the first model (p=0.07). A similar comparison between the second model and the third models shows that adding controls for the classes of admission further improves the fit of the model (p=0.00). For the ease of interpretations the MCA tables predicting the probabilities of mobility have been calculated for each of the models. The results are shown in the table 3.8.

The occupational quartile of the individual in home-country has a consistent and strong association with the probability of experiencing occupational downgrading or upgrading in the U.S. labour market. Taking no change in the occupational ranking, for all the three models this quartile is showing a significant relationship with the downgrading or the upgrading for both the countries. Table 3.8 shows that the probability of no change is very high for the Indian immigrants who were in the 4^{th} quartile before migration. But, Chinese immigrants who were in the 4^{th} quartile before migration have a very high probability of downgrading. Upgrading is very high among the immigrants who were in the 1^{st} quartile. But Chinese immigrants have high probability of remaining in the same ranking job in this quartile. Sex shows a significant relationship with mobility in case of the Indians. Being male has a higher probability of upgrading and a lower probability of downgrading than being female for Indians. Age is positively related with the upgrading of the Chinese, and is negatively related with the downgrading of the Indians. The speaking ability of English is strongly associated with the decreased probability of downward mobility. In case of Chinese it is highly positively related with the upward mobility. The speaking power of well and very well English is highly positively related with upgrading with reference to the poor/baseline English. The probability of upgrading for a Chinese who's English is very well is 0.403 and that for an Indian is 0.093. Variation in English speaking ability does not seem have much impact on the occupational mobility of Indians. Years of U.S. education has a positive relationship with the downgrading for Indians. But, it has a significant impact on achieving upgrading for the Chinese immigrants. This proves that Indian education may be more valuable in the U.S. and U.S. education is supposed to be beneficial for the Chinese immigrants.

Having help from a relative in getting the job, is correlated with the occupational mobility. In case of Chinese, help from a relative significantly increases the chance of upgrading. The probability of downgrading for an Indian immigrant who did not have help from a relative to get the job is higher. It was expected that having a child under sixteen living with the respondent, who can not yet legally work, may affect the type of job one is willing to settle for and make the need for immediate employment more dramatic, thereby increasing the probability of downgrading (Cobb, Clark and Kossoudji 2000). However, no significant association is found.

Controlling for the class of admission in the final model, different labour market outcomes were found for different visa categories. Since, it is generally thought that employment-based immigrants have the highest probability of labour market success, it is important to consider how other groups fare relative to them. A strong evidence was found supporting the trend of employment-based migrants as having a distinct advantage,

as all other categories have higher probabilities of downgrading. From the MCA table for the final model it is seen that the probability of downgrading of an Chinese employment-based immigrant is only 0.025. Although it is a little higher (0.071) for the Indian employment-based immigrants, the probability is far lower than the other category immigrants, the highest being for the family preference based category (0.737). The probability of no change is highest (0.788) for the employment based immigrants in case of Indians. But it is highest (0.697) for the family-preference category immigrants in case of Chinese. Adjustment status has no statistically significant relationship with the upgrading and downgrading of the immigrants.

Summary and Conclusion

Results clearly indicate that Chinese are in a more preferable position in terms of labour market success in their home-country. But once they arrive to the U.S. it becomes difficult for them to maintain the same occupational status as in their home-country, at least for the first job after arrival. Those in the lowest quartile before migration mostly lose jobs contributing an increase in the proportion of non-working. Indian immigrants, in every sense, are in a better position in the US labour market than the Chinese – be it in terms of the work-status, or in terms of occupational mobility. Indians are far higher in proportions in the highest occupational quartile in the U.S. than the Chinese. Even those having the highest occupational quartile in India are able to remain in the same quartile after coming to the U.S. Non-working status is also far lower among Indians than the Chinese. However, this fails to give a vivid scenario of the achievement of the immigrants in the US labour market as this considers only the first job they get almost within one year of their arrival. These immigrants experiencing a downgrading in the U.S. may be able to achieve higher ranked jobs as the time passes and as they acquire experience in the new environment. Yet it is not suggestible to undervalue the newly arrived immigrants even for their first job in the U.S.

The occupational status in their home-country has a consistently strong association with the mobility. Lower ranked individuals are supposed to experience an upgrading and those with higher rank in their home-country are supposed to experience a downgrading. The lower the level at which one starts, the more room there is to rise, and the higher one starts, the more room to fall. This can partly be considered as a result of the floor and ceiling effects inherent in the comparison, but it is also an indicator of the overall tendencies for movement in those directions. English language deficiency is a major hurdle for the Chinese immigrants in obtaining a high ranked job. Indians are among those who are known to have a good English knowledge. This may be an important cause of their success in the US labour market.

Networking plays an important role in individual's occupational success, as it is evident from the result that those having help from a relative in getting a job have a higher probability of upgrading. Among all the visa categories employment based category showed a preferable condition for the immigrants. This may be because of the fact that they acquire the job before coming to the U.S., whereas all the other category

immigrants are supposed to find a job for them after they come to the United States. So, there is a massive chance of downgrading for the first job in the U.S. for all those who have come in a visa other than the employment-based category. Employment-based immigrants are able to overcome the problem by their visa category itself.

In the context of an increasing concern for the well-being of international migrants, there is no doubt that the policy recommendation should take care of the immigrants' economic benefit. Whatever the goal of the immigration policy in the U.S. be – to benefit the immigrants or the natives, a policy that comes useful for both, should be suggested. Minimizing occupational downgrading can be beneficial for both. Immigrants benefit because they are able to attain better jobs and apply their prior experiences and training. The U.S. native population stands to benefit for two reasons. First, if downgrading is correlated with adverse outcomes later on, particularly those that use public funds, its prevention is desirable. Second, an efficient allocation of skills leads to a more efficient labor market.

References

Borjas, G.J. 1985. "Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality, and the Earnings of Immigrants." *Journal of Labour Economics* 3:463-489.

Chiswick, B.R. 1978. "The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign Born Men." *Journal of Political Economy*, October.

Cordasco, F. 1990. "Asian Indians." in *Directory of American Immigration History*, edited by F. Cordasco. Methuen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press.

Cordasco, F. 1990. "Asian Indians." in *Directory of American Immigration History*, edited by F. Cordasco. Methuen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press.

Cummins, J.S. 1998. "Acknowledging the Extent of Asian Migration." *Migration World Magazine*, 26, 24.

Exter, T.G. 1992. "Middle Aging Asians." *American Demographics* 14, 67.

Fisher, M.P. 1978. "Creating Ethnic Identity: Asian Indians in the New York City Area." *Urban Anthropology* 7: 271-285.

Florshein, P. 1997. "Chinese Adolescent Immigrants: Factors Related to Psychological adjustment." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 26, 2: 143-163.

Gibson, M.A. 1988. *Accommodation without Assimilation: Sikh Immigrants in an American High School*. Itkaca, NY: Cornell University.

Jayakar, K. 1994. "Women of the Indian Subcontinent." in *Women of Color: Integrating Ethnic and Gender Identities in Psychotherapy*, edited by B. Greene and L. Comas-Diaz. New York: Guilford Press.

Lalonde, R. J. and R. H. Topel. 1992. "The Assimilation of Immigrants in the U.S. Labour Market.", in *Immigration and the Workforce: Economic Consequences for the United States and Source Area*, eds. R. Freeman and G. Borjas, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1992.

Lucas, R. E. B. 2003. "The Economic Well-being of Movers and Stayers: Assimilation, Impacts, Links and Proximity." Paper presented in Conference on African Migration in Comparative Prospectives, Johannesburg, South Africa, 4-7, June 2003.

Massey, D.S. 1981. "Dimensions of the New Immigration to the United States and the Prospects for Assimilation." *Annual Review of Sociology* 7: 57-85.

Mui, A.C. 1996. "Depression among Elderly Chinese Immigrants: An Exploratory Study." *Social Work* 41, 6: 33-46.

Saran, P. 1985. *The Asian Indian Experience in the United States*. Cambridge, MA. Schenkmen.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1997. *Population of the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2002. *Population of the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2002. *Population of the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. 1979-2001. *Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing office.

Table 1: Percentages of immigrants in different socio-demographic groups

		India	China
Total		771	469
Sex	Female	57.1	59.2
	Male	42.9	40.8
Age	18-25	9.4	5.8
	26-35	36.3	22.5
	36-45	20.1	21.2
	46-55	17.3	22.1
	56+	16.9	28.4
Marital status	Divorced, separated, widowed	9.1	13.7
	Married, living together	90.9	86.3
Household structure	Living with son/daughter	55.9	42.9
	Living with a minor child	33.5	20.0
Home-ownership	Own/Buying	12.0	12.1
	Don't own	88.0	87.9
Residential location	Preferred states	59.5	68.6
	Elsewhere	40.5	31.4

Table 2: Percentage distribution of immigrants by education and occupation- status

		India	China
Years of education	0-10	18.5	41.3
	11-16	49.4	41.4
	17+	32.0	17.3
English speaking ability	Poor/Baseline	32.2	73.2
	Well	31.7	16.4
	Very well	36.1	10.3
Current employment	Working now	47.8	42.3
	Unemployed & looking for work	18.5	17.4
	Temporarily laid off, on sick or other leave	0.7	0.8
	Disabled	0.3	0.4
	Retired	4.5	12.3
	Homemaker	22.2	17.1
	Other	6.0	9.7

Table 3: Percentage distribution of immigrants by various migration characteristics

		India	China
Prior trips to the U.S.	0	85.7	81.7
	1	7.4	9.8
	2 and more	6.9	8.5
Visa category	Employment-based	36.6	18.3
	Immediate relative of US citizen	31.5	50.7
	Family preference category	21.6	18.7
	Others	10.3	12.3
Adjustment status	Newly arrived	52.0	61.8
	Adjustee	48.0	38.2

Table 4: Percentage Distribution of the Immigrants in Non-working group and Various Occupational Quartiles

	India	China
Before Migration		
Non-working	36.9	19.9
1st Quartile	7.2	21.8
2nd Quartile	24.4	32.8
3rd Quartile	17.2	19.9
4th Quartile	14.4	5.6
After Migration		
Non-working	37.7	42.8
1st Quartile	14.1	28.2
2nd Quartile	21.2	17.4
3rd Quartile	5.9	3.8
4th Quartile	21.1	7.8

Table 5a: Comparison of the Work-status of Indian Immigrants Before and After Migration

Before migration	After migration		
	Working	Non-working	Total
Working	187	118	305
	61.3%	38.7%	100.0%
Non-working	121	69	190
	63.7%	36.3%	100.0%
Total	308	187	495
	62.2%	37.8%	100.0%

Table 5b: Comparison of the Work-status of Chinese Immigrants Before and After Migration

Before migration	After migration		
	Working	Non-working	Total
Working	147	131	278
	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
Non-working	58	23	81
	71.6%	28.4%	100.0%
Total	205	154	359
	57.1%	42.9%	100.0%

Table 6: Percentage distribution of the Immigrants in Different groups who were working in Home-country but not working in the U.S.

		India	China
Total		118	131
Sex	Female	59.4	63.1
	Male	40.6	36.9
Age	18-25	9.2	2.2
	26-35	37.8	27.1
	36-45	9.8	11.5
	46-55	21.6	27.6
	56+	21.6	31.5
Years of education	0-10	9.6	45.6
	11-16	53.3	45.9
	17+	37.1	8.5
English speaking ability	Poor/Baseline	27.7	89.2
	Well	37.3	5.5
	Very well	35.0	5.3
Occupation in home-country	1st quartile	13.5	30.2
	2nd quartile	49.9	42.7
	3rd quartile	27.1	23.1
	4th quartile	9.4	4.0
Visa category	Employment	20.8	5.8
	Relative of US citizen	42.8	52.0
	Family-based	31.6	29.9
	Other	4.8	16.4
Adjustment status	Newly arrived	68.3	77.2
	Adjustee	31.7	22.8

Table 7a: Comparison between the Occupational status of the Indian Immigrants Before and After Migration

	Occupational status after migration					
Occupational status before migration	Non-working	1st quartile	2nd quartile	3rd quartile	4th quartile	Total
Non-working	69	36	46	9	30	190
	36.3%	18.9%	24.2%	4.7%	15.8%	100.0%
1st quartile	16	7	8	3	1	35
	45.7%	20.0%	22.9%	8.6%	2.9%	100.0%
2nd quartile	59	15	32	3	7	116
	50.9%	12.9%	27.6%	2.6%	6.0%	100.0%
3rd quartile	32	10	14	15	9	80
	40.0%	12.5%	17.5%	18.8%	11.3%	100.0%
4th quartile	11	0	6	0	57	74
	14.9%	.0%	8.1%	.0%	77.0%	100.0%
Total	187	68	106	30	104	495
	37.8%	13.7%	21.4%	6.1%	21.0%	100.0%

Table 7b: Comparison between the Occupational status of the Chinese Immigrants Before and After Migration

	Occupational status after migration					
Occupational status before migration	Non-working	1st quartile	2nd quartile	3rd quartile	4th quartile	Total
Non-working	23	23	21	2	12	81
	28.4%	28.4%	25.9%	2.5%	14.8%	100.0%
1st quartile	39	37	1	0	0	77
	50.6%	48.1%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
2nd quartile	56	26	23	3	4	112
	50.0%	23.2%	20.5%	2.7%	3.6%	100.0%
3rd quartile	30	14	8	8	6	66
	45.5%	21.2%	12.1%	12.1%	9.1%	100.0%
4th quartile	5	1	9	1	5	21
	23.8%	4.8%	42.9%	4.8%	23.8%	100.0%
Total	153	101	62	14	27	357
	42.9%	28.3%	17.4%	3.9%	7.6%	100.0%

Table 8: Occupational Mobility by Different Background Characteristics of the Immigrants

	India			China		
	Down-grading	Up-grading	No change	Down-grading	Up-grading	No change
Total percentage with mobility	29.9	24.2	45.9	47.5	24.2	28.3
Before Migration						
1st quartile	19.4	73.7	6.9	10.8	41.2	48.1
2nd quartile	38.7	36.5	24.8	59.2	22.3	18.5
3rd quartile	50.1	20.6	29.3	60.2	17.2	22.7
4th quartile	9.8	1.2	89.0	67.3	5.3	27.4
After Migration						
1st quartile	88.8	7.3	3.9	57.7	18.3	24.0
2nd quartile	44.2	32.0	23.8	58.6	16.4	25.0
3rd quartile	0.0	30.4	69.6	6.4	24.5	69,1
4th quartile	0.0	24.0	76.0	0.0	73.6	26.4
Visa category						
Employment-based	15.7	20.0	64.3	32.4	31.8	35.8
Immediate relative	40.4	39.5	20.1	58.5	18.6	22.9
Family-based	60.3	24.3	15.4	47.7	20.2	32.1
Other	46.6	30.6	22.8	56.7	24.9	18.4
Total	**56**	**45**	**86**	**70**	**36**	**42**

Table 9a: Multinomial Logit predicting Occupational Mobility for Indians

	Baseline model		*Second model*		*Final model*	
	Downgrading	Upgrading	Downgrading	Upgrading	Downgrading	Upgrading
Home-country occupation						
1st quartile[R]						
2nd quartile	-2.043	-3.663*	-1.175	-3.373	-1.878***	-3.332
3rd quartile	-1.671	-4.466**	-1.487	-4.297**	-1.230	-4.227*
4th quartile	-4.287*	-9.594***	-4.059*	-9.430***	-3.386	-9.382***
Sex						
Female[R]						
Male	-0.130	1.098*	-0.135	1.167*	-0.423	1.069*
Age	-0.073	-0.188	-0.065	-0.212	-0.212	-0.162
Age-squared	0.001	0.002	0.001	-0.002	0.002	0.001
English knowledge						
Poor/Baseline[R]						
Well	-0.547	0.222	-0.456	-0.039	-0.065	0.090
Very well	-1.499*	0.167	-1.637*	-0.033	-0.870	0.003
Education						
Total years of education	0.058	0.081	--	--	--	--
Years of US education			0.719**	-0.280	0.832	0.252
Years home education			0.000	0.050	0.044	0.043
Prior US trips			0.122	0.103	0.205	0.159
Help from relative						
No help						
Had help			-0.261	-0.690	-0.882	-0.958
Household structure						
No minor child						
Living with a minor			-0.239	0.313	-0.097	0.330
Visa categories						
Employment[R]						
Immediate relatives					2.246**	1.760*
Family-based					2.977***	1.021
Others					2.579**	0.635
Adjustment status						
Newly arrived[R]						
Adjustee					0.319	0.640

* p< 0.1, ** p< 0.05, *** p< 0.01

Dependent variable categories: No change (reference), Downgrading and Upgrading

Table 9b: Multinomial Logit predicting Occupational Mobility for Chinese

	Baseline model		*Second model*		*Final model*	
	Downgrading	Upgrading	Downgrading	Upgrading	Downgrading	Upgrading
Home-country occupation						
1st quartile[R]						
2nd quartile	4.069***	0.471	4.066***	0.288	4.116***	0.411
3rd quartile	4.310***	0.061	4.687***	0.114	4.611***	0.237
4th quartile	4.240***	-2.365	4.920***	-2.269	4.875***	-2.051**
Sex						
Female[R]						
Male	0.884	1.274**	0.779	0.998	0.990	0.918
Age	0.009	0.163	0.087	0.161	0.085	0.226
Age-squared	0.001	-.002	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002	-0.002
English knowledge						
Poor/Baseline[R]						
Well	1.072	1.256	1.531*	1.414	1.822*	1.484**
Very well	0.004	0.269	-0.062	0.447	0.448	0.768**
Education						
Total years of education	-0.266***	-0.019	--	--	--	--
Years of US education			-0.377**	0.087	-0.315*	0.072
Years home education			-0.265***	-0.018	-0.214**	-0.014
Prior US trips			-0.56*	-0.075	-0.507	-0.105
Help from relative						
No help						
Had help			0.657	1.173*	0.615	1.209*
Household structure						
No minor child						
Living with a minor			-0.936	1.041*	-0.789	0.965
Visa categories						
Employment[R]						
Immediate relatives					1.339*	0.113
Family-based					1.409	-0.515
Others					2.100*	0.776
Adjustment status						
Newly arrived[R]						
Adjustee					-0.140	-0.385

* p< 0.1, ** p< 0.05, *** p< 0.01

Dependent variable categories: No change (reference), Downgrading and Upgrading

Table 10: MCA table predicting Probabilities of the Occupational Mobility from the Final Multinomial Logit model

	India			China		
	Downgrading	Upgrading	No change	Downgrading	Upgrading	No change
Occupational status in the Home-country						
1st quartile	0.122	0.848	0.031	0.009	0.315	0.676
2nd quartile	0.234	0.381	0.384	0.320	0.281	0.399
3rd quartile	0.453	0.158	0.389	0.452	0.203	0.344
4th quartile	0.119	0.002	0.879	0.617	0.022	0.361
Sex						
Female	0.397	0.038	0.565	0.059	0.239	0.702
Male	0.277	0.119	0.604	0.110	0.409	0.481
Age						
20	0.871	0.095	0.034	0.013	0.001	0.986
30	0.663	0.119	0.217	0.030	0.011	0.959
40	0.248	0.074	0.678	0.061	0.096	0.842
50	0.041	0.020	0.939	0.075	0.483	0.441
60	0.005	0.004	0.991	0.034	0.882	0.084
English knowledge						
Baseline	0.420	0.070	0.510	0.062	0.247	0.691
Good	0.402	0.078	0.520	0.177	0.504	0.319
Very good	0.233	0.093	0.674	0.073	0.403	0.523
Years of US education						
0	0.267	0.086	0.647	0.095	0.290	0.615
2	0.641	0.065	0.294	0.051	0.335	0.614
5	0.947	0.017	0.036	0.019	0.396	0.585
Years education in the Home-country						
8	0.253	0.070	0.678	0.154	0.290	0.557
10	0.268	0.074	0.658	0.107	0.300	0.593
12	0.284	0.078	0.638	0.073	0.306	0.622
16	0.317	0.086	0.597	0.033	0.307	0.660
Number of prior trips to the US						
0	0.299	0.083	0.618	0.095	0.309	0.596
2	0.381	0.096	0.523	0.039	0.284	0.677
5	0.509	0.112	0.378	0.010	0.232	0.758

Table 10 contd…

	India			China		
	Downgrading	Upgrading	No change	Downgrading	Upgrading	No change
Had help from a relative in getting the job						
No	0.328	0.090	0.582	0.076	0.279	0.645
Yes	0.181	0.046	0.773	0.082	0.543	0.375
Household structure						
No minor child	0.326	0.074	0.600	0.095	0.262	0.643
Minor child living	0.296	0.103	0.600	0.032	0.500	0.468
Visa Category						
Employment	0.141	0.071	0.788	0.025	0.310	0.665
Immediate relative	0.525	0.163	0.312	0.087	0.313	0.600
Family preference	0.737	0.053	0.210	0.109	0.194	0.697
Other	0.668	0.048	0.284	0.134	0.436	0.430
Adjustment Status						
Newly arrived	0.280	0.062	0.658	0.078	0.336	0.586
Adjustee	0.332	0.102	0.567	0.077	0.259	0.664
