INTERNATIONAL MIGRANTS, GOVERNMENTAL CONTEXT OF RECEPTION, SECOND-GENERATION EDUCATIONAL INTERGRATION

(Paper for PAA 2019)

Ngoc-Thoa Khuu (*nvkhuu@uci.edu)*

Frank D. Bean (*fbean@uci.edu*)

Department of Sociology, University of California Irvine

Demographic changes, such as rising longevity, lowered birthrates, and the retirement of the early Baby Boom cohort, have all contributed to shrinkages in the U.S.-working-age population (National Academy of Sciences 2017; Bean, Bachmeier and Brown 2014). Such changes point to immigration as an important source in sustaining the U.S economic growth (Bean and Brown 2017; Coleman 2006). Yet, dealing with workforce decline through immigration will not be easy. Among other matter, America's current economic inequalities and sociocultural insecurities have fueled unrest about immigrants among a large swath of U.S natives, some of whom now routinely scapegoat newcomers and accuse them of failing to integrate successfully (for examples of such accusations, see Jimenez 2018; Inglehart 2018). While the very enunciation of such charges itself reveals the *ipso facto* importance many natives appear to attach to immigrant integration, their presumption of newcomer failure betrays lack of awareness of not only the extent of actual immigrant integration, but also the various factors that might contribute to its generation. Developing deeper and more widely disseminated knowledge about the U.S. immigrant-integration process, especially successes, is thus crucially important for creating support for policy reforms needed to deal with the demographic trends as noted above.

Unfortunately, knowledge about the factors making for better integration is sparse. Part of the reason is conceptual/theoretical. Most recent research tends to be conducted from approaches emphasizing either assimilation or disadvantage dynamics. These either take integration largely for granted or view it as hard to achieve because social blockages are hard to overcome. The former, predicated on optimistic depictions of *laissez-faire* processes, sees integration taking place on its own, while the latter rather pessimistically assumes strong structural/cultural impediments severely limit integration. Neither approach directs attention explicitly toward the detection and assessment of factors that might enhance integration. The present research seeks to move beyond this by taking advantage of a unique moment in recent U.S. immigration history, one in which members of certain groups (namely Cold War refugees) were able to come to the country while receiving both tangible governmental support and a relatively warm welcome, factors likely to facilitate integration. To assess this, we conduct a quasi-natural experiment to gauge whether and to what extent such favorable integration auspices enhanced the educational integration of the adult children of Cold-War refugees compared to that of their counterparts among non-Cold-War refugees and other legal immigrants.

Theoretical and Public Policy Considerations

Scholarship on immigrant integration has outlined as many as nine somewhat distinctive theoretical perspectives on immigrant integration (Bean, Brown and Bachmeier 2015). To a certain extent, these can be distilled into two main approaches – assimilation and disadvantage perspectives. Assimilation theoretical notions, elaborated by Gordon (1964) and re-interpreted and revised by Alba and Nee (2003), envision the passage of time and the sheer exposure of immigrants to their new environments as major drivers of integration. Disadvantage theories, by

contrast, focus on structural and cultural (like deeply rooted prejudice) barriers that block or slow incorporation. The segmented assimilation perspective falls under the latter category and constitutes the most often relied upon perspective for interpreting research findings. While it does stipulate an allowance for the possibility that positive contexts of immigrant reception might facilitate integration, research drawing on this approach, including that by its original formulators (Portes and Zhou 1993), has overwhelmingly emphasized the influence of factors that prevent or render incomplete assimilation processes. Racialization theoretical approaches narrow the emphasis further, arguing that prejudice and discrimination against ethno-racial groups operate to stigmatize newcomers to a degree reminiscent of the bias accorded American blacks, blocking mobility altogether or hampering it by inflicting such debilitating and long-lasting scars that attainment becomes exceedingly difficult (Telles and Ortiz 2008).

Most recently, in something of a counterweight to emphases on impediments, analysts have started to outline the potential importance for integration of a number of heretofore underemphasized or neglected factors. These include: the presence of institutional resources (e.g., the adoption of anti-discriminatory laws as noted in neo-assimilation approaches [Alba and Nee 2003]), the greater favorability of complex community and metropolitan structures for the development of immigrant opportunity (e.g., Bean et al 2013), the deliberate development of civic leadership and local governmental initiatives designed to support immigrant integration (e.g., de Graauw and Bloemraad 2017; Mollenkopf and Pastor 2016; Pastor 2018), the degree of newcomer receptivity by the government, society, and, if any, pre-existing ethnic communities (e.g., Portes and Rumbaut, 2001), and differences in the legal membership auspices under which migration takes place, which often govern access to institutional resources (e.g., Bean, Brown and Bachmeier 2015; Brown and Bean 2016). Numerous important case studies along the lines

emphasized by many of these have emerged (e.g., Brenner and Pastor 2016, and Mollenkopf and Pastor 2016), although with the exception of some research on Hispanics in new destinations (e.g. Lichter and Johnson 2009), research endeavors that provide large-scale evidence-based assessments of the relative importance of factors facilitating integration have largely been lacking.

This research thus aims to fill an important gap in U.S. research on immigrant integration. We define integration as the process by which immigrants and members of the host society come to resemble one another over time (Brown and Bean 2006; National Academies of Sciences 2015). Time can be indicated either by years of exposure to the new society among immigrants themselves, or by successive generations (e.g., the second [or the children of immigrants], the third [or the grandchildren of immigrants], etc.). We examine the effects of admission status, or the auspices under which immigration occurs, on the integration experiences of immigrants' children. Despite an abundance of research on the effects of unauthorized status on immigrants (e.g., Bean et al 2012; Hiroshi 2011; Hall, Greenman and Farkas 2010), only in the past couple of decades has much work focused on how the adult children of immigrants have been influenced by the migration experiences of their parents (for key examples, see Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Kasinitz, Mollenkopf, Waters, and Holdaway 2008). To our knowledge, no research has examined differences in how types of *legal* admission affect the integration experiences of the adult children of immigrants.

A second void this research seeks to address derives from the theoretical imbalance noted above, namely the direct examination of how immigrating under inclusive conditions may facilitate integration. In recent work, Brown and Bean (2016) emphasize the exclusion end of an

exclusion/inclusion continuum, noting that excluded immigrants are officially and unofficially viewed as illegitimate and ineligible for societal membership, as illustrated in the case of unauthorized Mexican migrants. They further maintain that societal membership is a prerequisite for structural integration. Withholding it from unauthorized Mexican migrants not only substantially reduces the amount of schooling attained by their children, even their U.S.-born children, it also slows other facets of structural integration (Bean et al. 2011; Bean, Brown, and Bachmeier 2015).

But the concept of exclusion also implies an antithesis. Studying certain refugees to the United States affords a unique opportunity to gauge integration outcomes at the inclusion end of the continuum. Those fleeing communist countries during the Cold War were not only admitted legally, they were welcomed by both the government and, to a lesser extent, the public (Bon Tempo 2008; Perez 2007), even though the government's foreign policy priorities kindled some of that warmth. Such positive reception for refugee admissions were most pronounced during a 10-year window between 1980, when the U.S. Refugee Act—the first long-term legislation allowing the systematic (as opposed to ad hoc) admission of refugees (Zolberg 2006)—was passed, and 1989, when the Soviet Union collapsed and the post-WWII Cold War came to an official end. The refugee families coming during this decade were eligible to seek financial assistance and employment and language trainings at entry. They were allowed to count time as a refugee toward the five-year residency requirement that LPRs have for citizenship. In other words, they have a fast track to citizenship. They were also departing hostile and life-threatening situations, so they held little promise of returning to their origins (with the exception of Cubans whose proximity to origin allowed hopes of eventual return to flourish) (Perez 2007), a circumstance that perhaps strengthened incentives to adapt to their new destination. A major

benefit of the present research is its assessment of the degrees to which tangible and intangible inclusion afforded to Cold War refugees are associated with greater structural integration among their accompanying children, all else equal, compared with other types of immigrant children. Such an advantage would matter for public policy in that it would indicate what the country might expect from adopting immigrant settlement policies that welcome and support immigrants instead of current rather laissez-faire policies of providing immigrants with little beyond the opportunity to come.

Research Expectations and Analytical Strategy

Refugee applicants who received the highest priority for admission to the United States during the decade of the 1980s were those leaving communist countries. Almost all were in this category, although some came from other countries and were admitted because of fears of persecution associated with non-communist governments. Those coming from communist countries not only received the tangible benefits embodied in and made available by the Refugee Act of 1980 to all refugees, many of them were also welcomed warmly by the U.S. government. Not only had these entrants departed from communist-regime countries, in certain instances they had fled war-torn places where the anti-communist side in the conflict had been supported by the United States. The U.S. government thus thought it important for foreign policy reasons to give priority to such entrants because they had lined up "on the U.S. side." and their flight vindicates American political values (Haines and Rosenblum 2010; Loescher and Scanlan 1986). During the 1980s, the largest number of such persons by far came from Vietnam, with notable numbers also from Cuba (mostly) and Afghanistan. These refugees were thus accorded somewhat warmer welcomes compared to those received by other refugees, and especially other legal immigrants (LA Times 2018).

We expect the tangible support received by all refugees who came during the 1980s and the intangible support accorded to refugees from communist countries to facilitate integration. It is probable that the tangible support received by 1980s refugees facilitated their integration and their children's later attainment through either paying for or providing language and citizenship training. We would thus expect an appreciable amount of the children's educational attainment to be explained by the mediating factors of English proficiency and naturalization. Separately, we would expect the intangible support received by those fleeing communist countries to facilitate this integration even further, with those departing war-torn communist countries to receive the most intangible support (and concomitantly to be the most affected from having received such support). We would thus expect the particular aspect of integration on which we focus here, the eventual educational attainment of the children of the refugees, to be higher for the adult children of refugees compared to those of regular legal immigrants, to be higher for the offspring of refugees from communist countries than that of refugees from non-communist countries, and to be higher still for those who came from war-torn communist countries than those from communist countries.

RESEARCH APPROACH

Data

This project draws on the Integrated Public Use Microdata (IPUMs) from the U.S. Bureau of the Census for 1990, and pooled six-year data for circa 2011 to 2016 from the American Community Survey (ACS). These data have the advantage of large sample sizes of immigrant groups and generalizability in a comparative research design. Because our study focuses specifically on the educational attainment of the children of Cold-War refugees, we use

only foreign-born respondents who arrived in the United States in the 1980s at or before the age of 18 and who had reached at least age 24 by the time of survey.

Measures

Main response variable: educational attainment. We measured educational attainment by the number of years of schooling completed by respondents. The ACS reports respondents' highest level of education completion, which we recode into a numerical variable by assigning to each education level the standard number of years of schooling required to complete it.

Measuring refugee status by proxy. While the ACS data permits estimation of nativity status and year of entry for immigrants, they do not provide information on the auspices of migration. As a result, we use a proxy for the refugee population, adopting the methodology used in other research (Capps et al. 2015; Evans and Fitzgerald 2017; Fix, Hooper and Jong 2017). This involves calculating the percentage of refugees from country *x* arriving in the United States in each year, as determined by refugee admissions and the total of those becoming LPRs, as reported in the annual Yearbook of Immigration Statistics. Respondents are designated as refugees if they arrived in a year when refugees constituted more than 55 percent of the total arrivals from their country (and usually much more). Non-refugees are defined as those whose country/year cohort of refugees made up less than 5 percent of the total annual flow. Under these definitions, there is no overlap in national origins between those identified as refugee versus non-refugee. Those who do not meet the criteria for refugee or non-refugee are excluded from our analytical sample. However, we did run a separate analysis that categorizes those excluded under a "mix" category and find that this group falls between refugees and non-refugees with regards to educational outcome after we have accounted for all measurable factors in our study.

Our preliminary research shows that our refugee proxy alone captures more than 95 percent of the refugees identified in these country/year groupings in INS administrative data (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1980-1989). The high level of coverage of the refugee population compares favorably with other research using similar methods of identification (Fix, Hooper, and Zong 2017; Capps et al., 2015). While the data entail some limitations, the disadvantages of census and ACS data are overshadowed by their advantages: very large sample size, geographical specificity, and structural information collected on the entire U.S. population. Moreover, there is no preferable alternative.

Refugee sub-categories. For individuals who meet the criterion for refugee, we further assess whether they were from a communist country and whether the country had experienced a large-scale U.S-Soviet proxy war shortly before or during the 1980s. We categorized those who came from Cuba, Laos, and the Soviet bloc in the former category (Cold-War refugees), and those who arrived from Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Vietnam in the latter category (war-afflicted, Cold-War refugees). The residual group (non-Cold-War refugees) are those who came from Haiti, Thailand, Iraq, and Sudan.

Socio-demographic controls. Among our other explanatory variables, we included socio-demographic factors to control for demographic differences between the refugee and non-refugee population that may affect the educational outcome. These controls include youthfulness of arrival; years of residence in the U.S; gender; and ethno-racial background. Youthfulness of arrival is a reverse code of the age at which respondents immigrating to the United States. This variable is important because it reflects the developmental stage at which an immigrant arrived in the United States and has implications for adaption and, ultimately, the extent of assimilation (Beck, et al. 2012; Brown & Bean 2016; Lee & Edmonston 2011; Myers, Gao & Emeka 2009).

The number of years of residence, on the other hand, measures the length of temporal exposure to host society and culture, which may have a significant but separate implication for immigrant integration.

Socioeconomic background. While immigrating as a refugee signals a positive governmental context of reception, at least during the Cold-War era in the United States, it also suggests a certain degree of class selectivity that may independently affect educational outcome. Therefore, it is important to control for respondents' parental socioeconomic status (SES). Due to an absence of data on individual parental SES in the ACS, however, we estimate average SES for those with the same national origins and immigrated the same year. We define SES using three factors: mother's absolute educational attainment, relative attainment, and relative family income. Together, these country/year cohort averages are used as proxies for individual SES.

We use the U.S Census' 1990 IPUM 5-percent sample to construct the SES proxies. To calculate cohort averages for mother's absolute educational attainment, we limit our sample to females who immigrated as an adult (ages 19 to 62) in the 1980s, and who reported ever having children. We take their average numbers of years of schooling by origin country and year of migration and assigned them to those in the ACS sample who share the same country/year cohort. In doing so, we create a variable that estimates the cohort parental education of the immigrants who came as children in the ACS sample.

Absolute years of schooling completed, however, is an imperfect measurement of class status for migrant parents because educational norms vary significantly across different countries (Feliciano & Lanuza, 2017). Thus, we also calculate averages for mother's relative attainment. Barro-Lee's Educational Attainment Dataset reports educational distributions by nation, gender and age. We used this dataset and Ichou's (2014) methodology to convert absolute attainment

into relative attainment. The result is a percentile that reflects where mother's average absolute attainment stand in the educational distribution of female co-nationals of comparable age who did not immigrate. A low average for absolute attainment does not automatically translate to low relative attainment because the mothers who immigrated may have more education on average than those who remained in their origin country.

We also use country/year cohort average to estimate relative family income. We define relative family income as the ratio of family income to the poverty threshold established by the federal government. Again, we use the 1990 IPUM sample to calculate the average relative family income for immigrant mothers by origin country and migration year, and assigned those averages to respondents in the ACS sample of the same country/year cohort.

Mediating factors: resources and skills gained after migration. Two factors that are shaped by post-migration conditions and can potentially explain how refugee status influence educational outcomes are English proficiency and naturalization. We code respondents as English proficient if they reported speaking English as their only language or that they speak English well or very well. We also noted whether the respondent has gained U.S citizenship. Including these variables in the analysis makes it possible to assess the second hypothesis: whether and the extent to which skills and access to resources after migration act as mechanisms through which refugee status exerts influences on educational attainment.

Analytic Methods

To analyze the association between refugee status and educational outcomes and the possible mediating factors in the association, we use ordinary least squares regression. If the refugee effect we anticipate finding is not a mere reflection of ethno-racial, socio-demographic, or class selection difference between refugees and other legal migrants, then refugees should

experience higher attainment even after controlling for these differences. We also explore to what extent the expected association between refugee status and educational attainment is explained by tangible resources, as represented by English proficiency and naturalization. If our hypothesis is supported, refugees should be more likely to possess these resources, due to governmental policies and assistance, and these two factors should mediate at least some of the positive refugee effect we expect to see on educational attainment.

To assess the effect of intangible support that Cold-War refugees received, we run a similar but separate analysis in which refugee status is further divided into three subcategories: war-afflicted, Cold-War refugees; Cold-War refugees; and non-Cold-War refugees (see Table 1). Although we expect refugees to generally attain higher education than non-refugees, all else being equal, we also expect attainment to vary between the refugee subcategories, with war-afflicted Cold-War refugees experiencing the highest and non-Cold-war refugees experiencing the lowest attainment.

RESULTS

The 2011-2016 ACS sample yields a total of 118,980 observations, of which 14,281 are classified as refugees. At ages 24 or older, refugees attain, on average, 13.4 years of schooling, which is 1.4 years more than the mean attainment of non-refugees. The two groups also show different socio-demographic compositions and kinds of immigrant selection, with the refugee group predominated by Asians (84.8 percent) and the non-refugee group by Hispanic (63.4 percent). In terms of parental SES, refugees have lower mother's absolute education and relative family income, but higher mother's relative education than the non-refugees. Refugees, however, clearly have higher naturalization and English proficiency rates than non-refugees. Overall, these results are consistent with our expectations. Although refugees experience some negative class

selection, they make greater post-migration human capital gains in English proficiency, naturalization, and educational attainment.

Analyses of the Relationship Between Refugee Status and Child Immigrant Educational Attainment

As shown in Model 1 of Table 3, the zero-order association between refugee status and education is 1.31 years ($p < 0.001$). Once we controlled for socio-demographic factors and the interaction of refugee and ethno-racial background in Model 2, the main refugee effect essentially disappears, and refugees of minority status demonstrate particularly low attainment compared to the reference group—non-Hispanic white non-refugees ($b_{refugee} + b_{Asian} + b_{refugee*Asian} = -0.99$; $b_{refugee} + b_{Hispanic} + b_{refugee*Hispanic} = -1.28$; $b_{refugee} + b_{Black/Others} + b_{refugee*Black/Others} = -0.43$). This outcome, however, is due in large parts to refugees' generally more disadvantaged socioeconomic background because, once we controlled for parental cohort SES factors, the education gap between each ethno-racial refugee group and the non-refugee reference group either reversed in favor of the refugee group or greatly reduced in the case of Hispanic refugees. Asian refugees, in particular, have the highest attainment among all ethno-racial groups of any migration status ($b_{refugee} + b_{Asian} + b_{refugee*Asian} = 1.17$) after controlling for socio-demographic and class background. Model 3 results thus support our first hypothesis, that is refugees tend to do better than other legal migrants, all else being equal.

We expected this positive effect to be explained by both tangible and intangible resources allocated to those who migrated under the refugee auspice during the Cold War. Indeed, the fact that controlling for English proficiency and naturalization reduces the effect of refugee status (Model 4) and that refugee*English proficient and refugee*naturalized have significant positive effects on education (Model 5: $b_{refugee*naturalized} = 0.74$, $b_{refugee*English} = 1.11$, $p < 0.001$) suggest that

the acquisition of English skills and U.S citizenship, and, by extension, the governmental assistance provided to refugees in the acquisition of such resources, are pivotal to the socioeconomic mobility of the children of refugees. Furthermore, the fact that certain refugee ethno-racial groups experience an extra boost in their education that cannot be explained by exogenous and mediating variables (Model 5: $b_{refugee*Asian} = 0.97$, $p<0.001$; $b_{refugee*Hispanic} = 0.95$, $p<0.001$; $b_{refugee*Black/Others} = 0.79$, $p<0.001$) provide some circumstantial evidence to our hypothesis about the intangible warmth in reception that Cold-War refugees received for ideological and political reasons. Table 4, which separate refugees into subcategories, provides more direct evidence for our hypothesis. After controlling for all exogenous and mediating variables, war-afflicted, Cold-War refugees achieve the highest attainment ($b_{war-afflicted/Cold-War} = 0.55$, $p<0.001$), followed by Cold-War refugees ($b_{Cold-War} = 0.42$, $p<.001$). The non-Cold-War refugees, on the other hand, appears to experience less education not only compared to Cold-War refugees, but also to the non-refugee reference group. These results provide clear support for our final hypothesis.

Validity and Robustness Checks

We run two tests to check the validity of our refugee proxy and the robustness of our findings. First, to ensure that the ACS sample has an accurate representation of the foreign-born population who arrived in the 1980s, particularly those who came from refugee-sending countries, we use person weight to project the population sizes of 1980s arrivals. We compare these numbers to admission statistics in the Yearbook. We expect some attrition due to death and return migration and some errors in reporting, but overall the ACS population projections should be consistent in their slight deviation from the Yearbook's statistics. Indeed, this is what we find for populations with national origins we have categorized as refugee (see Appendix: Table 2).

The ACS projects population sizes are, on average, 23 percent smaller than those found in the Yearbook, which is a reasonable rate of attrition. Exception for the cases of the USSR and countries that do not have admissions statistics for the entire span of the 1980s, the country-specific projections are generally consistent in their deviation from the original admission statistics. This suggest that there is a degree of reliability in using INS admission statistics to make inferences about the immigrant population represented in the ACS sample.

Second, to check the robustness of our findings, we run a national-origin fix-effect analysis (see Appendix: Table 3). In this analysis, we do not use categorical variables to indication migration status. Instead, we use a continuous variable that reflect the percentage of refugees who arrival from the same country/year as the respondents. Basically, this variable estimates the probability that a respondent is themselves a refugee. The results of the fix-effect analysis show that, even after controlling for country-level differences, higher refugee probability is associated with higher educational attainment. Granted, the magnitude of this coefficient does decrease and loses significance as we control for more exogenous factors, but it remains consistently positive, suggesting that this method of approximating refugee status does capture some divide between the auspices of migration that is unrelated to country of origin and is consistent with our hypotheses.

DISCUSSION

Ours is the first study to examine whether and how legal auspices of migration influence immigrant integration. The positive governmental context of reception that Cold-War refugees of the 1980s received upon arrival make for a rare opportunity to examine factors that can potentially facilitate generational integration. Refugees who arrived during the 1980s not only received tangible support from the government, as stipulated by the Refugee Act, but a large

portion who came from communist countries also received additional warmth in their reception due to perception of their ideological alliance with the United States against communism. By making cross-group comparisons between the children of refugees versus those of other legal migrants and within-group comparisons among the refugees, we investigate whether tangible and intangible governmental support influences the educational outcome of the children of immigrants.

As expected, we find that the children of refugees tend to fare better than the children of other legal migrants after controlling for measurable demographic and socioeconomic differences. For non-Hispanic white refugees, educational parity with their non-refugee counterpart is achieved primarily through gaining English skills and U.S citizenship, as these two human capital gains contribute more to the education of the children of refugees than they do to to that of their non-refugee counterpart. For other groups, English proficiency and citizenship only partially mediates the relationship between refugee status and education. These results reveal two important points that adhere to our expectation: 1) human capital gains, which was likely facilitated by governmentally-funded English training program and an expedited route to citizenship for refugees, are crucial for the education attainment of the children of refugees, and 2) although refugee status boosts education in general, its effect is felt more strongly for certain groups than others. In fact, those who reap the most benefits of their refugee status are the children of Cold-War refugees, particularly those who came from war-torn countries. These findings support our theory that intangible resources in the form of greater ideological support for those fleeing from communist countries have consequential benefits in the children's generation.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study suggest that America as a nation may benefit from a rethink of its laissez-faire attitude toward newcomers. The U.S public has often been skeptical of the abilities of immigrants to integration and has, furthermore, viewed public assistance recipients ungenerously, but evidence of the generational benefits that refugee status confers, through both tangible and intangible governmental support, suggest immigrant socioeconomic integration can be advanced through positive reception in terms of public assistance and political support. Given that immigration has been and will continue to be a pillar in sustaining U.S economic growth, especially as the nation faces demographic-induced shrinkages in its working-age population, it is important that more research is made to better understand not only how immigrants fare in the United States but also the factors that contribute to their economic mobility and integration.

In future research, it may be fruitful to compare U.S. Cold-War refugees to their contemporaries settled in other nations that do not have the same views and criteria of selection for refugees. Such cross-national comparisons could bring even greater understanding of how different components of reception (i.e., availability of structural resources and social acceptance) affect integration. We think it is necessary to also examine the gradient of immigrant reception, as embodied in different auspices of migration apart from refugee status, and its effect on the experiences of immigrants. Are there discernible differences in outcomes across other migration categories (e.g., refugee, authorized highly skilled, authorized family-sponsored, and unauthorized immigrants)? The immigration literature, and the nation overall, would benefit from a more nuanced understanding of these factors and their various effects on immigrant integration.

REFERENCES

Alba, Richard D., and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and the New Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bean, Frank D., Susan K. Brown, and James D. Bachmeier. 2015. *Parents Without Papers: The Progress and Pitfalls of Mexican American Integration.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bean, Frank D., Susan K. Brown, James D. Bachmeier, Tineke Fokkema, and Laurence Lessard-Phillips. 2012. "The Dimensions and Degree of Second-Generation Incorporation in U.S. and European Cities: A Comparative Study of Inclusion and Exclusion." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 53 (3): 181-209.

Bean, Frank D., Susan K. Brown, James D. Bachmeier, Zoya Gubernskaya, and Christopher D. Smith. 2012. "Luxury, Necessity and Anachronistic Workers: Does the United States Need Unskilled Immigrant Labor?" *American Behavioral Scientist* 56 (8): 1008-1028.

Bean, Frank D., Mark A. Leach, Susan K. Brown, James D. Bachmeier, and John R. Hipp. 2011. "The Educational Legacy of Unauthorized Migration: Comparisons Across U.S. Immigrant Groups in How Parents' Status Affects Their Offspring." *International Migration Review* 45 (2): 348-385.

Bon Tempo, Carl J. 2008. *Americans at the Gate: The United States and Refugees during the Cold War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Brown, Susan K., and Frank D. Bean. 2006. "Assimilation Models, Old and New: Explaining a Long-Term Process." Migration Information Source (special issue on the second generation). Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute. http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?id=442

-----. 2016. "Migration Status and Political Knowledge Among Latino Immigrants." *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences* 2 (3): 22-41.

Capps, Randy, Kathleen Newland, Susan Fratzke, Susanna Groves, Gregory Auclair, Michael Fix, and Margie McHugh. 2015. *The Integration Outcomes of U.S. Refugees*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Coleman, David. 2006. "Immigration and Ethnic Change in Low-Fertility Countries: A Third Demographic Transition." *Population and Development Review* 32(3):401-446.

de Graauw, Els, and Bloemraad, Irene. 2017. "Working Together: Building Successful Policy and Program Partnerships for Immigrant Integration." *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 5 (1): 105-123.

Evans, William, and Daniel Fitzgerald. 2017. *The Economic and Social Outcomes of Refugees in the United States: Evidence from the ACS*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Fix, Michael, Kate Hooper, and Jie Zong. 2017. *How are Refugees Faring? Integration at U.S. and State Levels.* Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute.

Gordon, Milton, 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Haines, David W. and Karen E. Rosenblum. 2010. "Perfectly American: Constructing the Refugee Experience." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(3): 391-406.

Inglehart, Ronald. 2018. "The Age of Insecurity: Can Democracy Save Itself?" *Foreign Affairs* 97(3). https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2018-04-16/age-insecurity

Loescher, Gil and John Scanlan. 1986. *Calculated Kindness: Refugees and America's Half-Open Door, 1945 to the Present*. New York: Free Press.

Lichter, Daniel T., and Kenneth M. Johnson 2009. "Immigrant Gateways and Hispanic Migration to New Destinations." *International Migration Review* 43 (3): 496-518.

Mollenkopf, John H., and Manuel Pastor 2016; *Unsettled Americans: Metropolitan Context and Civic Leadership for Immigrant Integration*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2015. *The Integration of Immigrants into American Societ*y. Panel on the Integration of Immigrants into American Society, M.C. Waters and M.G. Pineau, editors. Committee on Population, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Eucation. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2017. *The Economic and Fiscal Consequences of Immigration*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press. doi: https://doi.org/10.17226/23550.

Pastor, Manuel. 2018. *State of Resistance: What California's Dizzying Descent and Remarkable Resurgence Mean for America's Future*. New York: The New Press.

Lisandro Pérez. 2007. "Cubans." *The New Americans*, edited by Mary Waters and Reed Ueda. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530 (1): 74-96.

Telles, Edward E., and Vilma Ortiz . 2008. *Generations of Exclusion: Racial Assimilation and Mexican Americans.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. 1981-1990. *Statistical Yearbook of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service*, years 1980-1989. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Van Hook, Jennifer, Susan K. Brown, and Frank D. Bean. 2006. "For Love or Money? Welfare

Reform and Immigrant Naturalization." *Social Forces* 85: 643-666.

Zolberg, Aristide R. 2006. *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Table 1: Number of Cases in the 2011-2016 ACS Sample by Migration Status/National Origin and Migration Year

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	Total
War-afflicted, communist refugees											
Afghanistan	0	23	38	27	21	23	19	25	20	25	221
Cambodia	320	495	241	221	272	224	90	52	55	57	2,027
Vietnam	2,208	1,067	856	563	616	609	476	407	356	667	7,825
Communist refugees											
Albania	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Bulgaria	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	6
Cuba	0	0	0	0	0	108	65	82	136	0	391
Czechoslovakia	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	2	9
Hungary	0	0	0	0	6	10	0	8	18	0	42
Poland	0	0	0	0	112	0	0	0	0	0	112
Romania	0	46	46	64	74	79	50	43	31	68	501
USSR	78	29	11	14	12	20	12	0	56	182	414
Laos	934	348	163	87	134	89	208	142	134	176	2,415
Non-communist refugees											
Haiti	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	0	162
Iraq	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	23
Sudan	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Thailand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	0	0	126
Non-refugees	15,117	8,390	8,037	7,453	9,359	12,066	10,844	8,766	10,737	13,930	104,699

Table 2: Descriptive statistics by Migration Status and Ethno-racial Background

	Refugee				
	White	Asian	Hispanic	Black/Other	Total
Education	14.6	13.2	12.9	13.9	13.3
Ethno-racial background (%)	9.9	84.8	2.9	2.5	100.0
Age immigrated	8.8	7.3	6.6	7.2	7.4
Years of residence	28.4	30.4	27.2	26.0	30.1
Mom's absolute edu	12.6	8.1	10.7	10.0	8.6
Mom's relative edu (%-tile)	72.0	72.1	64.3	85.1	72.0
Relative income (%)	252.5	181.7	186.6	186.7	188.5
Naturalized (%)	90.2	87.5	76.3	77.3	87.3
English proficient (%)	98.4	88.4	91.1	96.0	89.5
Sample size (n)	1,334	12,354	417	176	14,281
	Non-Refugee				
	White	Asian	Hispanic	Black/Other	Total
Education	14.4	15.0	10.6	13.9	12.0
Ethno-racial background (%)	7.9	20.7	63.4	8.0	100.0
Age immigrated	8.1	8.4	6.7	7.1	7.2
Years of residence	29.5	28.8	28.8	29.1	28.9
Mom's absolute edu	12.4	13.0	8.4	11.5	9.9
Mom's relative edu (%-tile)	74.2	81.2	59.3	81.9	66.6
Relative income (%)	309.2	279.4	151.9	245.2	197.2
Naturalized (%)	68.9	89.5	51.3	75.9	62.4
English proficient (%)	97.8	95.9	74.9	98.7	83.0
Sample size (n)	7,918	21,944	67,387	7,450	104,699

Table 3: Coefficients and Std. Errors from OLS Regressions of Educational Attainment on Migration Status and other Exogenous and Mediating Factors

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Refugee	1.31***	0.03	0.17	-0.21**	-1.96***
	(0.04)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.15)
Refugee*Asian		-1.53***	0.79***	0.88***	0.97***
		(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Refugee*Hispanic		2.25***	0.93***	0.75***	0.95***
		(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.19)
Refugee*Black/Other		-0.08	0.34	0.70***	0.79***
		(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.27)	(0.27)
Asian		0.51***	0.10**	0.01	0.01
		(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Hispanic		-3.56***	-1.14***	-0.96***	-0.99***
		(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Black/Others		-0.38***	-0.14**	-0.27***	-0.28***
		(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Male		-0.53***	-0.49***	-0.46***	-0.46***
		(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Youthfuless		0.17***	0.16***	0.12***	0.12***
		(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Years of residence		-0.03***	-0.05***	-0.05***	-0.05***
		(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Mom's education			0.38***	0.34***	0.34***
			(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Mom's rel. education			0.03***	0.01***	0.02***
			(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Log of relative income			0.60***	0.32***	0.33***
			(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Naturalized				1.35***	1.31***
				(0.02)	(0.02)
English proficient				2.78***	2.69***
				(0.03)	(0.03)
Refugee*Naturalized					0.74***
					(0.09)
Refugee*English proficient					1.11***
					(0.09)
Constant	12.02***	14.07***	4.09***	4.35***	4.43***
	(0.01)	(0.10)	(0.35)	(0.33)	(0.33)
Observations	118,980	118,980	118,980	118,980	118,980
Adjusted R-squared	0.010	0.265	0.304	0.390	0.391

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 4: Coefficients and Std. Errors from OLS Regressions of Educational Attainment on Migration Status, Refugee Subcategories, and other Exogenous and Mediating Factors

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Refugee subcategories				
War-afflicted, Cold-War refugees	1.44***	-1.04***	0.85***	0.55***
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Cold-War refugees	0.96***	-1.32***	0.86***	0.42***
	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.06)
Non-Cold-War refugees	1.78***	-0.89***	-0.40**	-0.31*
	(0.23)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.19)
Asian		0.17***	0.22***	0.13***
		(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Hispanic		-3.73***	-1.06***	-0.90***
		(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.05)
Black/Others		-0.55***	-0.05	-0.19***
		(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.06)
Male		-0.54***	-0.49***	-0.46***
		(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Youthfuless		0.17***	0.16***	0.12***
		(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Years of residence		-0.03***	-0.05***	-0.05***
		(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Mom's education			0.35***	0.31***
			(0.01)	(0.01)
Mom's rel. education			0.03***	0.02***
			(0.00)	(0.00)
Log of relative income			0.72***	0.44***
			(0.08)	(0.08)
Naturalized				1.35***
				(0.02)
English proficient				2.78***
				(0.03)
Constant	12.02***	14.45***	3.62***	3.93***
	(0.01)	(0.10)	(0.35)	(0.33)
Observations	118,980	118,980	118,980	118,980
Adjusted R-squared	0.011	0.262	0.304	0.390

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Appendix

Table 1: Immigrants Admitted to the United States by National Origin and Admission Year where RCR ≥ 0.55

Year	Origin country	# immigrants	# refugees	RCR
1980	Cambodia	2,801	2653	0.95
1980	Laos	13970	13791	0.99
1980	USSR	10543	8415	0.80
1980	Vietnam	43483	38973	0.90
1981	Afghanistan	1861	1604	0.86
1981	Cambodia	12749	12636	0.99
1981	Ethiopia	1749	1443	0.83
1981	Laos	15805	15727	1.00
1981	Romania	1974	1204	0.61
1981	USSR	9223	8340	0.90
1981	Vietnam	55631	53393	0.96
1982	Afghanistan	1569	1340	0.85
1982	Cambodia	13438	13309	0.99
1982	Czech	960	592	0.62
1982	Ethiopia	1810	1381	0.76
1982	Laos	36528	36398	1.00
1982	Romania	3124	2348	0.75
1982	USSR	15462	14647	0.95
1982	Vietnam	72553	69523	0.96
1983	Afghanistan	2598	2321	0.89
1983	Cambodia	18120	17957	0.99
1983	Czech	940	687	0.73
1983	Ethiopia	2543	2209	0.87
1983	Laos	23662	23503	0.99
1983	Romania	2543	1757	0.69
1983	USSR	5214	4404	0.84
1983	Vietnam	37580	34285	0.91
1984	Afghanistan	3222	3032	0.94
1984	Cambodia	11856	11663	0.98
1984	Czech	1218	936	0.77
1984	Ethiopia	2461	2018	0.82
1984	Hungary	825	455	0.55
1984	Iraq	2930	1862	0.64
1984	Laos	12279	12094	0.98
1984	Poland	9466	5601	0.59
1984	Romania	4004	3226	0.81
1984	USSR	6088	5206	0.86
1984	Vietnam	37236	32033	0.86
1985	Afghanistan	2,794	2,555	0.91
1985	Cambodia	13,563	13,365	0.99
1985	Cuba	20,334	15080	0.74
1985	Czech	1,222	958	0.78
1985	Ethiopia	3,362	2,762	0.82
1985	Hungary	1,009	588	0.58
1985	Laos	9,133	8,921	0.98
1985	Romania	5,188	4,426	0.85
1985	USSR	3,521	2,638	0.75
1985	Vietnam	31,895	26,775	0.84

Table 1 cont.

Year	Origin country	# immigrants	# refugees	RCR
1986	Afghanistan	2,831	2,600	0.92
1986	Cambodia	13,501	13,300	0.99
1986	Cuba	33,114	30,333	0.92
1986	Czech	1,118	841	0.75
1986	Ethiopia	2,737	2,102	0.77
1986	Laos	7,842	7,556	0.96
1986	Romania	5,198	4,308	0.83
1986	USSR	2,588	1,654	0.64
1986	Vietnam	29,993	23,930	0.80
1987	Afghanistan	2,424	2,141	0.88
1987	Cambodia	12,460	12,206	0.98
1987	Cuba	28,916	26,952	0.93
1987	Czech	1,357	1,075	0.79
1987	Ethiopia	2,156	1425	0.66
1987	Hungary	994	589	0.59
1987	Laos	6,828	6,560	0.96
1987	Romania	3,837	2,959	0.77
1987	Thailand	6,733	3751	0.56
1987	Vietnam	24,231	20617	0.85
1988	Afghanistan	2,873	2,597	0.90
1988	Bahamas	1,283	753	0.59
1988	Cambodia	9,629	9,255	0.96
1988	Cuba	17,558	13,612	0.78
1988	Czech	1,482	1,164	0.79
1988	Ethiopia	2571	1723	0.67
1988	Haiti	34,806	25,481	0.73
1988	Hungary	1,227	738	0.60
1988	Laos	10,667	10,349	0.97
1988	Romania	3,875	3,028	0.78
1988	USSR	2,949	1,642	0.56
1988	Vietnam	25,789	21407	0.83
1989	Afghanistan	3,232	2,606	0.81
1989	Cambodia	6,076	5,648	0.93
1989	Czech	992	640	0.65
1989	Laos	12,524	12,033	0.96
1989	Romania	4573	3338	0.73
1989	USSR	11128	9264	0.83
1989	Vietnam	37,739	21883	0.58

Source: INS Yearbook of Immigration Statistics 1980-1989

Table 2: INS Yearbook 1980-1989 U.S Immigrant Admission Statistics and ACS Population Estimates of Immigrants Who Arrived Between 1980-1989 by National Origins

Birth Country	1980-89 Yearbook immigrant total	ACS population projection	ACS estimate/yearbook proportion
Afghanistan	24126	21268	0.88
Albania*	163	748	4.59
Bulgaria*	1194	984	0.82
Cambodia	114193	83086	0.73
Cuba	163566	147682	0.90
Czechoslovakia	11133	6428	0.58
Haiti	185379	132544	0.71
Hungary	8928	8414	0.94
Iraq	20455	15055	0.74
Laos	149238	95999	0.64
Poland	81578	86239	1.06
Romania	36229	29556	0.82
Sudan*	824	1288	1.56
Thailand	59638	52822	0.89
Vietnam	396130	328313	0.83
USSR	69100	8808	0.13
Total	1252774	1045719	0.77

*listed only in the 1980-85 Yearbooks

Table 3: Coefficients and Std. Errors from OLS Regressions of Educational Attainment with National-Origin Fix Effects (Robustness Check)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
refugee concentration rato	0.47**	0.32*	0.27	0.12
	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.17)
Asian		0.64***	0.64***	0.49***
		(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)
Hispanic		-0.33***	-0.32***	-0.24**
		(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.10)
Black/other		-0.33***	-0.32***	-0.34***
		(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)
male		-0.46***	-0.46***	-0.44***
		(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)
youthfulness		0.16***	0.15***	0.11***
		(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
years of residence		-0.03***	-0.01***	-0.03***
		(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
mom's edu			0.54***	0.50***
			(0.04)	(0.04)
mom's relative edu			-0.03***	-0.04***
			(0.01)	(0.01)
log relative income			-0.04	0.13
			(0.13)	(0.12)
naturalized				1.33***
				(0.02)
English proficient				2.78***
				(0.03)
Constant	12.24***	15.06***	11.74***	8.47***
	(0.02)	(0.12)	(0.51)	(0.48)
Observations	127,911	127,911	127,911	127,911
Number of bpld	108	108	108	108
Adjusted R-squared	-0.001	0.068	0.070	0.180
Standard errors in parentheses				
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1				