Educational and labor market outcomes of Ghanaian, Liberian, Nigerian, and Sierra Leonean Americans, 2010–2017

Ernesto F. L. Amaral
Texas A&M University, amaral@tamu.edu

Arthur Sakamoto
Texas A&M University, asakamoto@tamu.edu

Courtney Nelson
Sweet Briar College, nelson20@sbc.edu

Sharron X. Wang
Texas A&M University, xw2683@tamu.edu

Abstract

Research on immigrant African Americans is slowly increasing, but more studies are needed particularly in regard to specific ethnic groups and their second-generation offspring. We investigate socioeconomic outcomes among second-generation African Americans focusing on those from English-speaking countries in West Africa including Ghana, Liberia, Nigeria, and Sierra Leone (GLNS). We use data from the 2010–2017 Current Population Surveys to impute ethnicity on the basis of country of parental birth. Results for generalized ordered logit models for men reveal that GLNS are more likely to have a bachelor's degree than third-plus-generation whites, third-plus-generation blacks, second-generation whites, other-second-generation blacks, but not second-generation Asians. Among women, GLNS are more likely to have a bachelor's degree than all of these groups. OLS estimates of regressions of wages show that net of education, age, marital status, and having children, GLNS men are not disadvantaged relative to third-plus-generation whites in contrast to the disadvantage of 7 percent for other-second-generation blacks and 18 percent for third-plus-generation blacks. In regard to women, neither GLNS nor other-second-generation blacks are disadvantaged relative to third-plus-generation whites in contrast to the disadvantage of 8 percent for third-plus-generation blacks. Overall, these findings highlight the significance of ethnic diversity and gender among African Americans. The high socioeconomic attainments of GLNS are noteworthy because not only do they have higher levels of educational attainment but also their wages are commensurately rewarded in the labor market at a rate similar to mainstream whites. The results for second-generation GLNS do not show a net racial disadvantage at least in regard to educational attainment and wages. By contrast, other-second-generation black men continue to have a net racial disadvantage in educational attainment and wages relative to third-plus-generation white men.

Keywords: Education. Wages. Second generation. Immigrant integration. West Africa. Ghana. Liberia. Nigeria. Sierra Leone.

Acknowledgments: This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 1757813.

1. Introduction

President Trump has made disparaging comments about people from Africa as being from "[expletive deleted] countries" including Nigeria whose immigrants to the U.S. would "never go back to their huts" (Davis, Stolberg, & Kaplan, 2018). His comments seem to imply that the view that the socioeconomic status of immigrants from Africa are endemically or permanently low. They are implicitly portrayed as likely to become a particular burden on American tax system which should be considered when reforming immigration laws.

Unfortunately, systematic empirical evidence relating to the socioeconomic aspects of President Trump's view about African immigrants is comparatively sparse. Although much research has been conducted on the socioeconomic attainments of immigrants from Latin America and Asia, those from Africa have been less carefully investigated. To some extent, this relative neglect derives from limited sample sizes. Immigrants from Africa have been less numerous than those from Asia or Latin America.

Before the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, first and second-generation immigrants were relatively rare in the African American population. The 1960 Census ascertained that only about 0.7 percent of African Americans were foreign born (i.e., first generation) while about another 0.7 percent were native born with foreign born parents (i.e., second generation) (Sakamoto, Woo, & Kim, 2010). By the second decade of the 21st century, however, enough time has elapsed since 1965 that a sizeable population of first- and second-generation African Americans has by now accumulated (Capps, McCabe, & Fix, 2012). According to the 2000 and 2010 Censuses, immigrants from Africa doubled from over 800,000 to 1.6 million with particular

increases from West Africa and East Africa (AIC, 2012). By 2016, the first generation had grown to about 10 percent while the second generation had grown to 8 percent of the African American population (Anderson & López, 2018). The "foreign stock" —i.e., first- and second-generation immigrants (Shryock & Siegel, 1976)— have thus become a significant component of the black population in 21st-century America.

In addition to providing timely and relevant information that is pertinent to the immigration debate in the contemporary U.S., further research on African immigrants is now more feasible given its larger population size. This demographic case is informative not only in regard to public policy and sociological theories about immigrant incorporation but also for understanding racial/ethnic inequalities more broadly in modern America. We provide empirical results about the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation Ghanaian, Liberian, Nigerian, and Sierra Leonean Americans (GLNS). To our knowledge, the following is the first systematic demographic analysis of the educational and income outcomes for those groups.

2. Background

Second-generation immigrants have often been noted to be relatively high achievers (Boyd, 2002; Farley & Alba, 2002; Kao & Tienda, 1995; Zeng & Xie, 2004). Given the well-known labor market disadvantages faced by African Americans in general, the issue arises as to whether the socioeconomic attainments of their second generation are less constrained due to their immigrant background (Massey, Mooney, Torres, & Charles, 2007; Sakamoto et al., 2010). We investigate the extent to which the racial disadvantage that is typically evident among African

Americans as a whole may be less pronounced in the socioeconomic attainments of GLNS as well as the other second-generation African Americans.

Some prior studies have documented the labor market disadvantages of first-generation black immigrants (Butcher & Case, 1994; Capps et al., 2012; Dodoo, 1997; Dodoo & Takyi, 2002; Hamilton, 2014; Kalmijn, 1996; Model, 1995). This research suggests that the earnings of immigrants are significantly affected by whether one's college degree was obtained in the U.S., years of work experience in the U.S. versus years of work experience abroad, period of immigration to the U.S., and English language skills. Because we focus specifically on the African American second generation, however, none of these variables are very substantively significant. As persons who were either born in the U.S. or arrived here at a young age (i.e., the 1.5 generation), most of the schooling achieved by our target population is obtained in the U.S., and English is used with native fluency. Thus, our focus is on ascertaining specifically the racial disadvantage of second-generation African Americans who are not characterized by any of the disadvantages that are often associated with immigrants.

In regard to theoretical perspectives, perhaps the most pessimistic vision emphasizes that second-generation African Americans are susceptible to falling into the American lower class (Gans, 1992; Portes & Zhou, 1993). In the context of pervasive societal discrimination against African Americans as a racial group, black immigrants are vulnerable to joining the American underclass in an increasingly unequal labor market in which middle-class employment opportunities are declining (Sakamoto, Kim, & Tamborini, 2018). Due to racial discrimination in the housing market combined with the disadvantages that an immigrant usually faces in the labor market,

first-generation African Americans are said to be more likely to live in segregated, low-income, inner-city neighborhoods with other disadvantaged African Americans where schools are under-funded and middle-class socioeconomic opportunities are disappearing.

In this context of inadequate educational and job opportunities, inner-city African American youth are sometimes said to sometimes develop "adversarial outlooks" or an "oppositional culture" (Portes & Rumbaut, 2005; Portes & Zhou, 1993). This sub-culture is hypothesized to discourage educational achievement, and is seen as reducing adolescents' chances for upward social mobility. Second-generation African Americans are more likely to have been raised in traditionally disadvantaged black neighborhoods with inferior schools and to assimilate into the so-called "oppositional culture" of the inner city. This perspective emphasizing lower class vulnerability suggests that the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans will be, on average, similar to third-plus-generation African Americans.

A second and somewhat less pessimistic perspective is based on a qualitative study of African immigrants from the West Indies (Waters, 1994). Her research finds that, despite the fact that West Indian immigrants strongly identified themselves as "black," a substantial portion also attempted to distance themselves from the traditional African American community by simultaneously identifying themselves as West Indians, Jamaicans, or "immigrants." The need for this differentiation stems from their belief that assimilation into "black America" lowers socioeconomic attainment (Arthur, 2000; Waters, 1994).

Waters (1994) also observed this ethnic identification pattern among second-generation black immigrants. She reported that the need to emphasize their ethnicity was particularly salient among interviewees of middle-class backgrounds. These findings may be interpreted as suggesting that West Indian immigrants promote their ethnic identity so as to reduce their chances of experiencing the discrimination or negative stereotypes that are often associated with being viewed as a member of the traditional African American population.

We refer to Waters' (1994) perspective as a segmented assimilation theory because it contends that the selective retention of the immigrants' culture of origin can have a protective effect for second-generation African Americans. Waters' (1994) findings indicating that West Indians distance themselves from traditional "black America" is consistent with this view because immigrant parents appear to be strategically fostering the acculturation and identity of their children so as to enhance their chances for high achievement in the context of an increasingly unequal labor market. Waters' (1994) subjects seemed to believe that being viewed as an ethnic or "immigrant" African American is preferable to being a mainstream African American at least in terms of social status or socioeconomic opportunity in the U.S.

The hypothesis derived from Waters' (1994) perspective is that the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans will be, on average, greater than third-plus-generation African Americans because the "immigrant" ethnic identity of the second generation will to some extent ameliorate racism and the consequent socioeconomic disadvantages associated with the traditional black community. Given the continuing significance of the racism, however, the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans will be, on average, lower

than those for third-plus-generation white Americans. Mainstream, third-plus-generation white Americans are still advantaged in the labor market because second generation African Americans cannot fully disguise their identity as African Americans due to the perceptibility of their darker skin tones.

Another strand of research on assimilation refers to immigrant optimism (Kao & Tienda, 1995; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 1995). This view suggests that the second generation may have high socioeconomic attainments due to greater selectivity, effort, ambition and motivation. Second-generation children are frequently reminded of the sacrifices that their parents have made in order to come to the U.S. often for the purpose of obtaining better socioeconomic opportunities. Immigrant parents may find that their own labor market prospects are quite constrained, and may motivate their children into becoming high academic achievers in a way that maximizes their chances for career success (Goyette & Xie, 1999).

Although studies referring to immigrant optimism have not focused on African Americans, we interpret this literature as suggesting the hypothesis that the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans will be, on average, greater than the third-plus-generation African Americans. This deduction yields the same hypothesis that was just discussed above in regard to Waters' work on segmented assimilation. In the case of the later view, the immigrant ethnic identity of the second generation to some extent ameliorates racism. In the literature on immigrant optimism, the selectively high aspirations and motivations of the second generation serve to raise the socioeconomic attainments of the second generation above those of mainstream

African Americans. These two explanations may be complementary (i.e., not mutually exclusive).

To some extent, these conclusions seem to be further compatible with the distinction between "voluntary" and "involuntary" immigrants (Ogbu, 1978). According to Ogbu (1978), "voluntary" immigrants are persons and their descendants who came to the U.S. with their collective identities intact and positively developed. "Involuntary" immigrants are those who were forced to come to the U.S. or formed their collective identity in the context of subjugation and oppression by the dominant white society. Being the descendants of slaves, most members of the mainstream African American community are considered to have a collective identity associated with "involuntary" immigrants. For this reason, according to Ogbu (1978), some aspects of mainstream African American sub-culture reject the assumptions of dominant white society (a conclusion that would appear to be consistent with the "oppositional culture" considered above in regard to the studies by Portes and Zhou).

By contrast, recent African American immigrants are said to be "voluntary" because they came to the U.S. by choice rather than by slavery. They may be characterized as being mostly economic migrants who choose to immigrate in order to acquire for better job and education opportunities. Contemporary African American immigrants are therefore outside of the mainstream collective identity of third-plus-generation African Americans. The second-generation offspring of "voluntary" black immigrants are thus more likely to reject the "oppositional culture" and "adversarial outlooks" of the inner city.

Another aspect of being a "voluntary" immigrant is refugee status. Some immigrants were essentially forced to leave their home country due to political or religious persecution. Their typically enter the host nation under the status of a refugee or an asylee (Capps et al., 2012; Cassidy, 2004). While the proportion of contemporary black African immigrants who enter as "involuntary" refugees is slightly higher than for other immigrant groups, most first-generation blacks are still nonetheless "voluntary" economic migrants (Capps et al., 2012).

The hypothesis that we derive from Ogbu (1978) is that the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans will be, on average, greater than mainstream African Americans. Because they are associated with a "voluntary" immigration stream, second generation African Americans are predicted to be able to obtain higher earnings because they are more likely to more fully embrace the mainstream culture of dominant white society. This hypothesis is that same that was derived above in regard to the segmented assimilation views of Waters (1994) and the studies of immigrant optimism.

An additional perspective refers to the offspring of post-1965 immigrants as the new second generation (Farley & Alba, 2002). In contrast to a pessimistic view (Gans, 1992), this other approach notes that recent immigrants have a few advantages over immigrants of the early part of the 20th century (Farley & Alba, 2002). These advantages include the passage and enforcement of various civil rights laws, an expanded educational system, programs for bilingual education of children until they are able to master English, the higher educational levels of immigrant parents, and enhanced opportunities for the socioeconomic attainments of females.

The hypothesis that we derive from the literature on the new second generation is that the socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans will be not only greater than the traditional black community but also at least as high as third-plus-generation whites. Given the higher motivations of the second generation and the increased civil rights for minorities in contemporary America, second generation persons may be able to obtain socioeconomic attainments that are as high as mainstream white Americans if not perhaps slightly higher. Although Farley and Alba (2002) do not explicitly focus on second-generation African Americans, the continuation of racism does not appear to be viewed as a major obstacle according to the new second generation perspective.

>>> Table 1 <<<

3. Ghanaian, Liberian, Nigerian, and Sierra Leonean Americans

Research on first-generation black immigrants is increasingly coming to recognize their diversity. Specific groups of black immigrants vary in terms of their educational background, English language skills, work experience and demographic factors that can shape their patterns of mobility (Bean & Stevens, 2003; Capps et al., 2012; Farley & Alba, 2002; Sakamoto & Wang, 2016; Sakamoto et al., 2010). As stated by Hamilton (2014:1000), "Black immigrants are one of America's most diverse immigrant subgroups: they speak a variety of languages and migrate from vastly different birth-country contexts."

We distinguish GLNS from other second-generation blacks. We do not believe Ghana, Liberia, Nigeria and Sierra Leone have identical cultures or histories, but they may share at least some commonalities because they are all located in a similar region in West Africa (Idang, 2015).

Furthermore, prior research has identified English language skills as a critical resource for first-generation black immigrants (Hamilton, 2014) and Ghana, Liberia, Nigeria and Sierra Leone all countries in which English is designated as an official national language. Second-generation GLNS may be slightly advantaged over other second-generation blacks if GLNS families are more fluent or dominant in English (Waters & Pineau, 2015).

In general, the education level of immigrant parents likely has a major influence on the educational and cognitive skill outcomes of second-generation children (Waters & Pineau, 2015). Many immigrants from Asia and Africa are arriving with higher education whereas Latin America and the Caribbean immigrants arrive with lower attainment (Waters & Pineau, 2015). Black African immigrants have higher education levels compared to the U.S. average which means their children will tend to obtain more education or may possess higher levels of cognitive skills (Capps et al., 2012).

Note, however, that parental education may still vary greatly within national origin groups despite their average differentials in the aggregate. Ghana, Liberia, Nigeria and Sierra Leone are seen in the U.S. as specific homogenous countries but actually they each have their own diverse set of ethnic groups with various sorts of social and regional divisions. Partly due to greater ethnic tensions, Ghana, Liberia, Nigeria, and Sierra Leone have all had serious levels of political instability or civil wars in recent decades. For this reason, some African immigrants have come to the U.S. as refugees particularly in the case of Liberia. At least some first-generation immigrants from these countries arrived in the U.S. under adverse circumstances or with limited resources (Capps et al., 2012).

An additional consideration is the interaction of gender and nationality. Some African female immigrants from these countries may be Muslim and have reduced levels of labor force participation (Capps et al., 2012). Others may be exhibit higher levels of employment and have highly professional careers such as the case of immigrant Nigerian women working as nurses. Ten percent of men and 33 percent of women who have immigrated from African countries work in health occupations, whereas these numbers are only 3 and 13 percent, respectively, for the entire American labor force (Capps et al., 2012).

4. Data and methods

We investigate data from the 2010–2017 Current Population Survey (CPS). More specifically, we analyze data from the Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) of CPS, which is a national survey that provides annual estimates covering socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of each person who is a household member at the date of the interview. We aggregate data from 2010 to 2017 to obtain an adequate sample size of immigrants from Ghana, Liberia, Nigeria, and Sierra Leon (GLNS). The dataset provides what we refer to as an "objective" measure to classify the ethnic ancestry of individuals (conditional on their subjective identity as being "black" on the race question) based on parents' country of birth. That is, we impute the ethnic identity of second-generation blacks by assuming that it corresponds to the country in which their parents were born.

We limited our sample to those aged 25–54 at the time of the survey, comprising individuals in prime ages in the labor market, which is customary in studies on this topic. We included

individuals up to 54 years of age, instead of 64, in order to reflect the age range of recent/contemporary 1.5 and second-generation African immigrants (Sakamoto & Wang, 2016). For the analysis on labor outcome (wage and salary income), we excluded individuals who are not in the labor force or did not report any positive earnings for the year. For the study on educational outcome (educational level), we included individuals with no job or earnings.

Some studies distinguished specific African immigrants by nationality from the broad category of African Americans (Farley & Alba, 2002; Sakamoto & Wang, 2016). In our study, we include several mutually exclusive racial/ethnic/generational groups, including only those who self-identify as "single race," resulting on the following groups: (1) third-plus generation of non-Hispanic whites; (2) third-plus generation of blacks, including Hispanics and excluding Ghanaian, Nigerian, Liberian, and Sierra Leonean Americans; (3) 1.5 and second generation of Asian Americans; (4) 1.5 and second generation of Ghanaian, Liberian, Nigerian, and Sierra Leonean Americans, including Hispanics; (5) second generation of non-Hispanic whites; and (6) second generation of blacks, including Hispanics and excluding Ghanaian, Nigerian, Liberian, and Sierra Leonean Americans.

The first dependent variables we explored was hourly wage. We utilized the CPS variable that indicates each respondent's total pre-tax wage and salary income for the previous calendar year. This variable measures the amount of money received as an employee. We estimated the number of hours worked per year as the product of weeks worked last year (number of weeks, in single weeks, that the respondent worked for profit, pay, or as an unpaid family worker during the preceding calendar year) by usual hours worked per week last year (number of hours per week

that respondents usually worked if they worked during the previous calendar year). Finally, to obtain hourly earnings, we divided the wage/salary income variable by the number of hours worked per year. To eliminate the effect of outliers, any hourly wage above zero dollars and less than one dollar was set to be equal to one dollar and any wage over 750 dollars was set to 750 dollars (Sakamoto & Wang, 2016). We used hourly earnings instead of yearly earnings to control for disparities in income between those who have fulltime and part-time jobs. In the regression models, we used the natural logarithm of hourly earnings to approximate our variable to a normal distribution. In addition to race/ethnicity/generation variable, we included other independent variables in our models. A set of variables control for demographic characteristics: age and age squared (to measures non-linear association of age with earnings); marital status (married vs. not married); and number of own children of any age or marital status residing with each individual, including step-children and adopted children, as well as biological children (have children vs. do not have children). Our models also controlled for highest level of educational attainment (less than high school, high school or general educational development, some college or associate degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree, and professional school or doctorate degree), region of residence (New England, Mid-Atlantic, East North Central, West North Central, South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central, Mountain, and Pacific), and residence in metropolitan area (in metro area vs. not in metro area).

We estimated a set of generalized ordered logit regression models for level educational attainment as an ordinal dependent variable (less than high school, high school or general educational development, some college or associate degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree, and professional school or doctorate degree). Since our outcome has six possible values, the

generalized ordered logit model estimates coefficients for the first five categories. The odds ratios indicate the factor change in odds of observing a value above the listed category versus observing values at or below the listed category. The key independent variable is information on race/ethnicity/generation. We also included age and age squared as independent variables, as well as whether respondent had any physical or cognitive difficulty, as measured by an affirmative response to at least one of the six cognitive difficulties (hearing difficulty, vision difficulty, difficulty remembering, physical difficulty, disability limiting mobility, personal care limitation). The sample size for these models by race/ethnicity/generation categories and sex are illustrated on Table 2.

>>> Table 2 <<<

We also estimated a series of Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression models to predict the logarithm of hourly earnings, as a continuous variable. We estimated progressive models by first including only the race/ethnicity/generation variable, adding demographic variables in a second model (age, age squared, marital status, and presence of children), including educational level in a third model, and finally estimating a fourth model with region of residence and information on residence in metropolitan area. The sample size for these models by race/ethnicity/generation categories and sex are illustrated on Table 3.

>>> Table 3 <<<

For all Generalized Ordered Logit and OLS models, we estimated separated regressions for men and women, which allow us to verify interactions of all independent variables with sex. We considered the complex survey design of CPS by indicating the Annual Social and Economic Supplement Weight, which is a person-level weight that is used in analyses of individual-level CPS supplement data. In all regression models, we estimated robust standard errors by utilizing

the weight option that denotes the inverse of the probability that the observation is included due to sampling design.

5. Results

5.1. Education

Descriptive statistics for men and women from the 2010–2017 CPS are presented on Table 4. GLNS immigrants is younger than third-plus-generation whites and blacks. A higher percentage of whites and blacks reported a disability, compared to the GLNS group. GLNS had higher percentages in the Bachelor's, Professional, or Doctorate degree categories, compared to third-plus-generation whites and blacks.

>>> Table 4 <<<

We discuss now results from the generalized ordered logit models for men (Table 5). The estimated odds ratio for GLNS in the less than high school category does not have meaningful interpretation, because there are no GLNS in that educational group. We concentrate the analysis on the chance of having individuals above Associate degree (at least Bachelor's degree) versus having individuals in that educational level or below, compared to third-plus-generation white men. For this analysis all values are statistically significant for models 1 and 2. Model 1 only controls for the race/ethnicity/generation variable and indicates that GLNS men are 118 percent [(2.18–1)*100] more likely to have at least a Bachelor's degree versus having a lower degree, compared to white men. Third-plus-generation black men are 60 percent less likely to have at least a Bachelor's degree versus having a lower degree, compared to white men. Asian men are 152 percent more likely to have at least a Bachelor's degree versus having individuals in lower educational levels, compared to third-plus-generation white men. Model 2 controls for

race/ethnicity/generation, as well as for age, age-squared, and existence of any disability. GLNS men are 93 percent more likely to have at least a Bachelor's degree versus having a lower education, compared to white men. Third-plus-generation black men maintained 60 percent lower chances of having at least a Bachelor's degree. Asian men are 134 percent more likely to have at least a Bachelor's degree versus having a lower degree, compared to white men.

>>> Table 5 <<<

Table 6 illustrates results from the generalized ordered logit models for women. As for men, the estimated odds ratio for less than a high school degree for GLNS does not have meaningful interpretation, because there are no GLNS women in that group. We concentrate the analysis on the chance of having individuals above Associate degree (at least Bachelor's degree) versus having individuals in that educational level or below, compared to third-plus-generation white women. Model 1 only controls for the race/ethnicity/generation variable and indicates that GLNS women are 184 percent more likely to have at least a Bachelor's degree versus having a lower degree, compared to white women. Third-plus-generation black women are 53 percent less likely to have at least a Bachelor's versus having lower education, compared to white women. Asian women are 124 percent more likely to have at least a Bachelor's degree versus having a lower degree, compared to white women. Model 2 controls for age, age-squared, and any disability. GLNS women have are 144 percent more likely to have at least a Bachelor's degree versus having a lower degree, compared to white women. Third-plus-generation black women are 54 percent less likely to have at least a Bachelor's degree versus having a lower degree, compared to white women, which is similar to findings from Model 1. Asian women are 93 percent more likely to have at least a Bachelor's degree versus having a lower degree, compared to white women.

>>> **Table 6** <<<

5.2. Hourly Earnings

Descriptive statistics for men and women between 2010 and 2017 for individuals who had some earnings reported on CPS are illustrated on Table 7. GLNS are younger than third-plus-generation whites. GLNS have lower percentage of people married and higher percentage of people without children than third-plus-generation whites. GLNS have higher levels of education compared to whites. GLNS are concentrated in the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, and East North Central regions. Third-plus generation whites are also concentrated in the same three regions.

>>> **Table 7** <<<

Average hourly earnings for men and women ages 25-54 by race/ethnicity/generation groups are illustrated on Table 8, based on data from the 2010–2017 CPS. Third-plus-generation whites have higher earnings than GLNS, not controlling for other independent variables. When we control for marital status and presence of children in the household, married individuals and those with children have higher earnings than the other categories. Third-plus-generation whites still have higher earnings than GLNS for these sub-groups of marital status and presence of children. When we control for highest level of education, GLNS have higher earnings than third-plus-generation whites among those with Master's, Professional, or Doctoral Degree. Taking region of residence into account, the areas with highest concentration of third-plus-generation whites and GLNS (South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, and East North Central) have higher earnings for whites, compared to GLNS.

>>> **Table 8** <<<

OLS regression results for the logarithm of hourly earnings as the dependent variable are presented in Table 9 for each sex separately. The first model included only race/ethnicity/generation as an independent variable. In relation to results for men, GLNS immigrants have earnings that are 9.46 percent ([exp(–0.0994)–1]*100) lower than third-plus-generation white men, but this result is not statistically significant. This finding suggests that these two groups have similar earnings, which is an indication that GLNS men are integrating into the labor market with earnings at the same levels as white men. On the other side, third-plus-generation black men have earnings that are 25.9 percent lower than the reference category and this result is statistically significant. The second model adds age, age-squared, marital status, and presence of children in the household. For this model, GLNS men make 1.99 percent more than third-plus-generation whites. The third-plus-generation blacks make 23.05 percent less than whites. In model 3, controlling for level of educational attainment, GLNS men make 9.51 percent less than the reference category. Third-plus-generation blacks make 16.39 percent less compared to third-plus-generation whites. Model 4 has all previous independent variables and also includes region of residence and information about residence in a metropolitan area. In this final model, GLNS men make 11.49 percent less than third-plus-generation whites. Third-plus-generation blacks make 16.56 percent less than the reference category. In all four models, results for GLNS men are not statistically significant, which suggest similar earnings for this immigrant group as third-plus-generation whites. All the values for third-plus-generation black men are statistically significant, which indicate lower earnings than the reference category.

>>> Table 9 <<<

Models for women indicate that GLNS immigrants tend to have higher earnings than third-plus-generation white women, but the results are statistically significant only in model 2. More

specifically, in model 1 GLNS women make 16.10 percent more than third-plus-generation white women, but these results are not statistically significant. In model 2, after controlling for demographic variables, this differential increases to 26.24 percent with statistical significance. In model 3, this percentage drops to 9.04 and it loses significance. Finally, for model 4, after controlling for all independent variables, GLNS women experience earnings that are 7.18 percent higher than third-plus-generation white women, but with no statistical significance. Third-plus-generation black women have lower earnings than the reference category, which is similar to findings from male models. These disparities in earnings for third-plus-generation black women decrease across models, but these women still make significantly less than third-plus-generation whites. All estimated coefficients for third-plus-generation black women are statistically significant. In model 1, third-plus-generation black women make 18.62 percent less compared to third-plus-generation white women. In model 2, third-plus-generation black women make 15.04 percent less than the reference category. This differential drops to 8.11 percent in model 3 after controlling for educational attainment. After controlling for all independent variables, third-plus-generation black women have earnings that are 8.72 percent lower than those of third-plus-generation white women.

Results for Asian immigrants indicate that they have higher earnings than whites. For Asian men, model 1 indicates higher earnings for this immigrant group than the reference category with statistical significance. However, the coefficient becomes negative by model 4 (when controlling for all independent variables) and it is not statistically significant. More specifically, in model 1 Asian men make 9.91 percent more than third-plus-generation whites and by model 4 they make 1.68 percent less. Trends for Asian women show that they make more than third-plus-generation

white women. These differentials decrease across the models when controlling for the other independent variables. In model 1, Asian women make 24.73 percent more than the reference category. In model 4, this negative percentage decreases to 8.26, but it is still statistically significant.

Overall, these results support previous findings that African and Asian immigrants have the highest levels of educational attainment (Waters & Pineau, 2015). Both GLNS and Asian men had not statistically significant coefficients in models related to earnings, when compared to white men. However, these male immigrants had significant higher chances of having at least a Bachelor's degree versus having a lower education level, compared to whites. These similar patterns of GLNS and Asian immigrants are important to consider even if coefficients were not statistically significant in the earnings models, because they show a close comparison between these two groups. Asians are often referred to as the model minority and the GLNS group seems to have similar socioeconomic outcomes as Asians. GLNS women are more likely than Asian women to have at least a Bachelor's degree versus having a lower degree, compared to white women. However, Asian women tend to have higher earnings. A component of segmented assimilation theory emphasizes the importance of receptiveness by the host society, which can explain that high education levels do not necessarily equate to higher earnings. Lower earnings may arise from racial discrimination toward GLNS women, which is a topic that goes beyond the models estimated by this study.

6. Final considerations

Our study indicates that GLNS immigrants have statistically significant higher chances of having at least a Bachelor's degree versus having lower education, compared to third-plus-generation whites. However, GLNS immigrants do not have statistically significant higher earnings than whites. These findings are in line with previous research, which investigated socioeconomic outcomes for first-, 1.5- and second-generation African immigrants. Due to the lack of statistical significance for earnings differentials between GLNS immigrants and third-plus-generation whites, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that earnings of these two groups are similar. These findings support our hypotheses related to educational and earnings outcomes, as well as corroborates the assimilation theory. Instead of having similar educational and labor outcomes as the same racial group (third-plus-generation blacks), GLNS immigrants have better educational attainment and similar earnings to third-plus-generation whites. Higher education levels, but similar earnings of Ghanaians, Liberians, Nigerians, and Sierra Leoneans, compared to third-plus-generation whites, can also be addressed by the framework of segmented assimilation. Research on first-generation immigrants has shown that African immigrants tend to have higher education. However, they encounter difficulties in the labor market (such as discrimination), which tend to depreciate their earnings.

We are unable to test some aspects of the segmented assimilation theory, because of the lack of key variables in the database being analyzed. More specifically, important factors which could be used to test segmented assimilation are not available. For instance, CPS does not provide information on family members not living in the household. Moreover, there is no data on earnings and level of educational attainment of parents. Another limiting issue is that CPS does not provide variables to account for discrimination in the workplace. Racial discrimination could

be an explanation for low earnings, which is an untested hypothesis of our study. Finally, CPS has a small sample size, which could be the reason of estimating non-significant coefficients for earnings in the ordinary least squares regression models for GLNS immigrants.

The complexity of immigrant assimilation provides a wide scope of topics for future research on African immigrants and their children. Although this study looked at socioeconomic outcomes, studies could be conducted to evaluate other standard measures on assimilation theory, such as spatial concentration, language assimilation, and intermarriage. There are also a multitude of immigrant groups that have previously been underrepresented in the data for which these analyzes could be developed. For instance, studies could investigate black Caribbean immigrants, other regional African groups, and those practicing the Muslim faith. Qualitative and quantitative methods could be utilized to fill in the limitations of each method.

This research is a part of a larger project which aims to integrate CPS and ACS. CPS has the limitation of a small sample size. However, it has an objective measure to estimate generation of immigrants, which is parents' place of birth. ACS has a bigger sample size. However, it has a subjective measure to estimate generation of immigrants, which is based on ancestry information. We will use CPS to assign generation of immigrants into ACS data, through the implementation of Endogenous Switching Regressions with Unknown Sample Separation.

Table 1. Summary of prior literature on socioeconomic outcomes for second-generation African Americans

Literature	Relative to 3+ Generation Blacks	Relative to 3+ Generation Whites
Lower Class Vulnerability (Gans 1992; Portes and Zhou 1993)	Equal to	Less than
Segmented Assimilation (Waters 1994)	Greater than	Less than
Immigrant Optimism (Kao and Tienda 1995; Suarez-Orozco and Suarez-Orozco 1995)	Greater than	Less than or equal to
Voluntary Immigrant View (Ogbu 1978)	Greater than	Equal to
New Second Generation (Farley and Alba 2002)	Greater than	Equal to or greater than

Table 2. Sample size for educational outcome by race/ethnic/generation groups and sex, 2010–2017

Race/ethnicity/generation	Male		Female		Total	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage	N	Percentage
3+ Gen. NH Whites	86,057	82.27	89,009	79.85	175,066	81.02
3+ Gen. Blacks	11,409	10.91	15,263	13.69	26,672	12.34
1.5 and 2nd Gen. Asians	2,728	2.61	2,677	2.40	5,405	2.50
1.5 and 2nd Gen. GLNS	95	0.09	75	0.07	170	0.08
2nd Gen. NH Whites	3,769	3.60	3,783	3.39	7,552	3.50
2nd Gen. Blacks	547	0.52	665	0.60	1,212	0.56
Total	**104,605**	**100.00**	**111,472**	**100.00**	**216,077**	**100.00**

Source: 2010–2017 Current Population Surveys (CPS).

Table 3. Sample size for labor outcome by race/ethnic/generation groups and sex, 2010–2017

Race/ethnicity/generation	Male		Female		Total	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage	N	Percentage
3+ Gen. NH Whites	71,607	83.34	66,117	79.92	137,724	81.67
3+ Gen. Blacks	8,379	9.75	11,045	13.35	19,424	11.52
1.5 and 2nd Gen. Asians	2,281	2.65	2,075	2.51	4,356	2.58
1.5 and 2nd Gen. GLNS	74	0.09	60	0.07	134	0.08
2nd Gen. NH Whites	3,134	3.65	2,900	3.51	6,034	3.58
2nd Gen. Blacks	443	0.52	529	0.64	972	0.58
Total	**85,918**	**100.00**	**82,726**	**100.00**	**168,644**	**100.00**

Source: 2010–2017 Current Population Surveys (CPS).

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for men and women aged 25–54 with information on education, 2010–2017

Independent variables	Men						Women					
	3+ Whites	3+ Blacks	1.5&2nd Asians	1.5&2nd GLNS	2nd Whites	2nd Blacks	3+ Whites	3+ Blacks	1.5&2nd Asians	1.5&2nd GLNS	2nd Whites	2nd Blacks
Age (mean)	39.78	39.02	35.04	33.29	39.37	34.00	40.18	38.98	35.36	31.17	39.67	35.13
Any disability (%)	7.42	10.09	3.47	0.13	6.18	5.28	7.45	9.29	2.73	3.40	5.05	5.58
Educational attainment (%)												
Less than high school	6.05	10.89	2.48	0.00	4.62	9.19	4.48	9.07	3.58	0.00	3.01	5.27
High school or GED	31.03	40.20	15.97	22.96	21.19	26.92	24.23	31.37	13.31	22.30	17.31	21.10
Some college or Associate degree	28.12	31.27	24.21	23.28	28.05	34.31	30.92	35.50	22.85	11.88	25.57	36.63
Bachelor's degree	24.10	12.72	37.82	41.22	29.81	22.55	26.81	15.59	38.22	31.08	32.98	21.61
Master's degree	7.52	4.07	11.95	7.38	10.68	4.76	10.83	7.13	13.76	24.49	16.07	10.70
Professional or PhD degree	3.17	0.85	7.58	5.16	5.65	2.28	2.73	1.33	8.29	10.25	5.06	4.70
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source: 2010–2017 Current Population Surveys (CPS).

Table 5. Odds ratios estimated with generalized ordered logit regressions for level of educational attainment as the dependent variable for men aged 25–54, 2010–2017

Independent variables	Model 1					Model 2				
	At least HS/GED	At least Associate	At least Bachelor's	At least Master's	At least Prof./PhD	At least HS/GED	At least Associate	At least Bachelor's	At least Master's	At least Prof./PhD
Race/ethnicity/generation										
3+ Gen. NH Whites	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
3+ Gen. Blacks	0.527***	0.564***	0.401***	0.433***	0.263***	0.539***	0.563***	0.403***	0.425***	0.258***
	(0.0227)	(0.0142)	(0.0127)	(0.0236)	(0.0302)	(0.0236)	(0.0143)	(0.0128)	(0.0230)	(0.0296)
1.5 and 2nd Gen. Asians	2.528***	2.605***	2.519***	2.027***	2.506***	2.249***	2.348***	2.342***	2.058***	2.561***
	(0.328)	(0.160)	(0.124)	(0.125)	(0.235)	(0.295)	(0.143)	(0.117)	(0.128)	(0.242)
1.5 and 2nd Gen. GLNS	1.664e+09***	1.977**	2.179***	1.198	1.662	1.530e+09***	1.688*	1.925***	1.259	1.764
	(2.846e+08)	(0.624)	(0.536)	(0.386)	(0.817)	(1.946e+08)	(0.534)	(0.474)	(0.404)	(0.873)
2nd Gen. NH Whites	1.330***	1.694***	1.605***	1.631***	1.831***	1.291**	1.680***	1.595***	1.641***	1.840***
	(0.136)	(0.0837)	(0.0706)	(0.0936)	(0.169)	(0.134)	(0.0831)	(0.0703)	(0.0938)	(0.169)
2nd Gen. Blacks	0.636**	1.043	0.787**	0.632***	0.712	0.568***	0.951	0.749***	0.675**	0.767
	(0.133)	(0.120)	(0.0864)	(0.103)	(0.199)	(0.122)	(0.113)	(0.0828)	(0.110)	(0.214)
Age						1.017	1.021**	1.039***	1.245***	1.274***
						(0.0193)	(0.0100)	(0.0103)	(0.0193)	(0.0369)
Age squared						1.000	1.000***	0.999***	0.997***	0.997***
						(0.000238)	(0.000123)	(0.000126)	(0.000194)	(0.000359)
No disability						ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Any disability						0.292***	0.382***	0.267***	0.280***	0.244***
						(0.0131)	(0.0125)	(0.0119)	(0.0218)	(0.0359)
Constant	15.53***	1.697***	0.534***	0.120***	0.0327***	16.12***	1.656***	0.332***	0.00143***	0.000234***
	(0.292)	(0.0157)	(0.00495)	(0.00170)	(0.000827)	(5.866)	(0.312)	(0.0632)	(0.000431)	(0.000133)
Observations	104,605	104,605	104,605	104,605	104,605	104,605	104,605	104,605	104,605	104,605

Note: Exponential of robust standard errors in parentheses. *** Significant at p<0.01. ** Significant at p<0.05. * Significant at p<0.1.
Source: 2010–2017 Current Population Surveys (CPS).

Table 6. Odds ratios estimated with generalized ordered logit regressions for level of educational attainment as the dependent variable for women aged 25–54, 2010–2017

Independent variables	Model 1					Model 2				
	At least HS/GED	At least Associate	At least Bachelor's	At least Master's	At least Prof./PhD	At least HS/GED	At least Associate	At least Bachelor's	At least Master's	At least Prof./PhD
Race/ethnicity/generation										
3+ Gen. NH Whites	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
3+ Gen. Blacks	0.471***	0.594***	0.467***	0.589***	0.476***	0.479***	0.574***	0.455***	0.569***	0.462***
	(0.0188)	(0.0132)	(0.0114)	(0.0219)	(0.0423)	(0.0194)	(0.0130)	(0.0113)	(0.0212)	(0.0414)
1.5 and 2nd Gen. Asians	1.267*	1.986***	2.236***	1.801***	3.192***	1.130	1.678***	1.925***	1.660***	2.942***
	(0.156)	(0.124)	(0.109)	(0.104)	(0.290)	(0.139)	(0.105)	(0.0957)	(0.0966)	(0.268)
1.5 and 2nd Gen. GLNS	1.609e+12	1.406	2.840***	3.391***	4.035***	1.383e+09***	1.144	2.441***	3.405***	4.002***
	(0)	(0.543)	(0.866)	(1.008)	(1.612)	(1.221e+09)	(0.458)	(0.781)	(1.020)	(1.610)
2nd Gen. NH Whites	1.695***	1.695***	1.695***	1.695***	1.695***	1.662***	1.662***	1.662***	1.662***	1.662***
	(0.0709)	(0.0709)	(0.0709)	(0.0709)	(0.0709)	(0.0709)	(0.0709)	(0.0709)	(0.0709)	(0.0709)
2nd Gen. Blacks	0.846	1.127	0.866	1.159	1.741**	0.803	0.963	0.755***	1.070	1.617*
	(0.160)	(0.128)	(0.0857)	(0.157)	(0.450)	(0.152)	(0.110)	(0.0760)	(0.147)	(0.419)
Age						1.050**	1.035***	1.057***	1.236***	1.232***
						(0.0222)	(0.0105)	(0.00999)	(0.0175)	(0.0361)
Age squared						0.999***	0.999***	0.999***	0.997***	0.997***
						(0.000264)	(0.000127)	(0.000119)	(0.000179)	(0.000364)
No disability						ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
Any disability						0.249***	0.408***	0.279***	0.267***	0.272***
						(0.0113)	(0.0126)	(0.0114)	(0.0189)	(0.0486)
Constant	21.26***	2.478***	0.678***	0.157***	0.0283***	11.48***	2.297***	0.395***	0.00330***	0.000639***
	(0.444)	(0.0236)	(0.00596)	(0.00196)	(0.000710)	(4.680)	(0.446)	(0.0710)	(0.000893)	(0.000363)
Observations	111,472	111,472	111,472	111,472	111,472	111,472	111,472	111,472	111,472	111,472

Note: Exponential of robust standard errors in parentheses. *** Significant at p<0.01. ** Significant at p<0.05. * Significant at p<0.1.
Source: 2010–2017 Current Population Surveys (CPS).

Table 7. Descriptive statistics for men and women aged 25–54 with earnings, 2010–2017

Independent variables	Men						Women					
	3+ Whites	3+ Blacks	1.5&2nd Asians	1.5&2nd GLNS	2nd Whites	2nd Blacks	3+ Whites	3+ Blacks	1.5&2nd Asians	1.5&2nd GLNS	2nd Whites	2nd Blacks
Age (mean)	39.39	38.75	35.02	34.07	39.16	34.04	39.84	38.71	35.22	31.84	39.48	34.94
Married (%)	56.75	42.77	48.67	32.32	50.90	31.94	57.99	31.04	54.97	31.86	52.13	32.54
No own child in household (%)	57.45	57.41	62.98	61.25	63.01	64.42	51.05	38.22	54.12	60.42	57.27	46.76
Educational attainment (%)												
Less than high school	4.25	7.02	1.89	0.00	3.68	6.31	2.52	5.35	2.31	0.00	1.91	4.52
High school or GED	29.28	37.32	14.94	16.11	18.91	27.25	21.72	28.74	12.10	17.68	15.24	18.50
Some college or Associate degree	28.46	34.18	23.70	23.81	27.31	33.59	30.77	37.25	21.45	14.64	24.64	37.02
Bachelor’s degree	26.15	15.37	38.50	47.59	32.02	24.84	29.28	18.42	39.37	29.62	34.73	23.01
Master’s degree	8.40	5.12	12.83	7.72	11.68	5.37	12.57	8.66	15.36	24.26	17.86	11.44
Professional or PhD degree	3.47	1.00	8.14	4.76	6.41	2.64	3.13	1.58	9.41	13.79	5.63	5.51
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Region of residence (%)												
New England	5.19	1.47	3.63	10.04	9.70	6.42	5.72	1.34	4.26	2.25	10.36	8.05
Middle Atlantic	12.80	9.44	16.17	20.10	21.29	35.26	12.80	9.97	13.93	25.68	21.55	34.03
East North Central	18.32	13.66	7.38	14.07	13.55	4.50	18.64	15.00	7.44	6.95	13.19	6.05
West North Central	9.53	3.64	4.62	0.97	4.28	1.70	9.69	3.50	3.57	4.74	3.53	0.53
South Atlantic	18.65	35.20	13.30	31.95	16.03	27.27	18.60	36.48	11.55	38.63	16.48	29.07
East South Central	6.99	11.17	1.42	2.20	1.98	2.57	7.11	10.30	0.87	7.16	2.87	1.59
West South Central	9.61	15.26	7.60	9.27	7.14	7.98	9.53	15.44	6.95	8.14	5.41	7.03
Mountain	7.52	2.97	4.81	3.90	7.18	3.11	7.01	1.98	5.06	1.00	6.68	3.67
Pacific	11.39	7.20	41.07	7.50	18.85	11.19	10.91	6.00	46.37	5.44	19.93	9.98
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Live in metro area (%)	82.27	89.68	98.15	99.10	92.96	98.22	81.70	90.45	97.79	98.84	91.96	98.88

Source: 2010–2017 Current Population Surveys (CPS).

Table 8. Average hourly earnings for men and women aged 25–54, 2010–2017

Variables	Men						Women					
	3+ Whites	3+ Blacks	1.5&2nd Asians	1.5&2nd GLNS	2nd Whites	2nd Blacks	3+ Whites	3+ Blacks	1.5&2nd Asians	1.5&2nd GLNS	2nd Whites	2nd Blacks
Hourly earnings (average)	29.47	21.98	33.32	25.83	33.69	22.24	23.21	18.73	29.43	27.61	27.33	22.11
Hourly earnings (standard deviation)	35.29	29.41	34.91	19.73	41.12	16.82	26.42	23.44	32.68	26.25	29.84	21.39
Hourly earnings (median)	22.19	16.83	24.04	20.00	25.00	17.31	18.27	14.90	22.45	18.27	20.98	16.88
Log of hourly earnings (average)	3.11	2.81	3.20	3.01	3.21	2.90	2.90	2.69	3.11	3.05	3.04	2.87
Married	33.47	25.12	39.32	32.26	38.87	28.34	24.47	21.38	32.60	30.50	29.93	25.01
Not married	24.23	19.63	27.62	22.76	28.33	19.37	21.48	17.54	25.56	26.26	24.50	20.71
Have own child in household	33.54	24.04	39.93	30.13	41.06	25.53	23.78	18.43	30.68	30.73	28.70	21.71
No own child in household	26.46	20.45	29.43	23.11	29.37	20.42	22.68	19.23	28.37	25.57	26.31	22.56
Educational attainment												
Less than high school	18.89	15.05	16.00	—	33.08	15.62	12.69	11.94	12.18	—	11.49	13.18
High school or GED	21.91	18.23	18.53	14.07	22.75	15.44	16.33	14.18	17.78	15.18	19.15	14.24
Some college or Associate degree	25.25	20.73	22.13	23.43	27.22	19.80	19.43	17.56	22.92	20.36	20.19	17.01
Bachelor’s degree	36.14	31.05	34.03	23.65	37.33	27.23	27.44	23.57	28.96	27.01	28.22	28.40
Master’s degree	42.51	34.72	47.32	45.05	42.73	41.60	31.67	29.24	38.77	30.18	36.98	32.45
Professional or PhD degree	58.99	48.64	71.64	68.23	59.31	52.76	43.12	38.49	50.20	48.02	49.98	42.35
Region of residence												
New England	32.90	20.84	30.13	20.11	36.37	31.26	25.37	19.87	25.23	38.77	25.99	28.24
Middle Atlantic	31.18	22.96	32.59	27.11	34.07	21.48	25.38	19.85	34.62	17.49	29.12	21.12
East North Central	28.29	20.30	33.63	22.90	32.87	27.64	21.44	18.53	28.78	14.50	23.91	18.36
West North Central	26.40	22.45	27.80	10.75	26.89	17.63	21.47	16.83	23.17	30.18	19.93	16.85
South Atlantic	28.94	22.48	30.44	26.78	33.82	19.83	23.26	18.30	26.13	36.76	28.20	22.85
East South Central	25.18	18.27	23.42	26.44	28.13	15.13	20.04	17.62	24.69	19.23	22.70	30.58
West South Central	30.43	21.54	31.74	35.74	31.94	24.26	23.32	18.76	27.19	24.52	22.53	19.04
Mountain	29.95	25.08	31.13	16.48	31.33	18.56	23.53	19.83	25.90	14.09	24.10	22.11
Pacific	32.82	26.86	36.27	25.87	36.07	25.04	25.82	22.38	30.48	38.45	31.99	21.74
Live in metro area	30.83	21.88	33.54	25.92	34.32	22.31	24.32	19.19	29.58	27.45	28.14	22.07
Do not live in metro area	23.18	22.85	21.53	16.10	25.45	17.86	18.27	14.43	22.73	41.43	18.06	25.07

Source: 2010–2017 Current Population Surveys (CPS).

Table 9. Coefficients estimated with ordinary least squares models for the logarithm of hourly earnings as the dependent variable for men and women aged 25–54, 2010–2017

Independent variables	Men				Women			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Race/ethnicity/generation								
3+ Gen. NH Whites	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.	ref.
3+ Gen. Blacks	-0.298***	-0.198***	-0.177***	-0.181***	-0.206***	-0.103***	-0.0844***	-0.0912***
	(0.0101)	(0.00945)	(0.00933)	(0.00949)	(0.00853)	(0.00774)	(0.00787)	(0.00806)
1.5 and 2nd Gen. Asians	0.0943***	0.0314*	0.0430**	-0.00168	0.209***	0.136***	0.136***	0.0794***
	(0.0202)	(0.0172)	(0.0172)	(0.0173)	(0.0197)	(0.0170)	(0.0170)	(0.0172)
1.5 and 2nd Gen. GLNS	-0.1000	-0.135	-0.101	-0.122	0.148	0.0735	0.0860	0.0639
	(0.0865)	(0.0836)	(0.0819)	(0.0826)	(0.0956)	(0.0911)	(0.0906)	(0.0885)
2nd Gen. NH Whites	0.101***	0.0292*	0.0458***	0.0183	0.142***	0.0656***	0.0692***	0.0362**
	(0.0174)	(0.0157)	(0.0155)	(0.0156)	(0.0178)	(0.0160)	(0.0160)	(0.0159)
2nd Gen. Blacks	-0.215***	-0.0950***	-0.0655**	-0.0998***	-0.0294	0.0304	0.0446	-0.00173
	(0.0384)	(0.0333)	(0.0333)	(0.0332)	(0.0334)	(0.0294)	(0.0295)	(0.0298)
Age		0.0704***	0.0461***	0.0457***		0.0520***	0.0497***	0.0499***
		(0.00335)	(0.00342)	(0.00341)		(0.00323)	(0.00338)	(0.00336)
Age squared		-0.000687***	-0.000418***	-0.000413***		-0.000527***	-0.000506***	-0.000508***
		(4.23e-05)	(4.30e-05)	(4.29e-05)		(4.07e-05)	(4.25e-05)	(4.22e-05)
Educational attainment								
Less than high school		-0.212***	-0.205***	-0.197***		-0.291***	-0.285***	-0.275***
		(0.0153)	(0.0151)	(0.0151)		(0.0173)	(0.0174)	(0.0173)
High school or GED		ref.	ref.	ref.		ref.	ref.	ref.
Some college or Assoc. degree		0.152***	0.143***	0.133***		0.179***	0.180***	0.174***
		(0.00723)	(0.00711)	(0.00714)		(0.00742)	(0.00741)	(0.00737)
Bachelor's degree		0.500***	0.484***	0.461***		0.530***	0.526***	0.502***
		(0.00759)	(0.00749)	(0.00756)		(0.00779)	(0.00780)	(0.00777)
Master's degree		0.637***	0.607***	0.580***		0.697***	0.690***	0.663***
		(0.0110)	(0.0109)	(0.0109)		(0.00937)	(0.00938)	(0.00936)
Professional or PhD degree		0.885***	0.850***	0.825***		0.943***	0.936***	0.909***
		(0.0176)	(0.0174)	(0.0174)		(0.0170)	(0.0170)	(0.0170)
Married			0.173***	0.178***			0.0671***	0.0764***
			(0.00671)	(0.00669)			(0.00597)	(0.00594)
Not married			ref.	ref.			ref.	ref.
Have own child in household			ref.	ref.			ref.	ref.
No own child in household			-0.0804***	-0.0841***			0.0146**	0.00993*
			(0.00644)	(0.00642)			(0.00589)	(0.00585)
Region of residence								
New England				0.0728***				0.0657***
				(0.0143)				(0.0118)
Middle Atlantic				0.0620***				0.0566***
				(0.0106)				(0.0105)
East North Central				0.0120				-0.0183**
				(0.00912)				(0.00885)
West North Central				-0.0300***				-0.0305***
				(0.00989)				(0.0100)
South Atlantic				ref.				ref.
East South Central				-0.0539***				-0.0563***
				(0.0114)				(0.0119)
West South Central				0.0418***				-0.0141
				(0.0109)				(0.0107)
Mountain				0.0144				0.00287
				(0.0110)				(0.0115)
Pacific				0.0974***				0.0817***
				(0.0106)				(0.0107)
Live in metro area				0.116***				0.154***
				(0.00733)				(0.00718)
Do not live in metro area				ref.				ref.
Constant	3.110***	1.210***	1.686***	1.586***	2.898***	1.386***	1.399***	1.271***
	(0.00341)	(0.0639)	(0.0666)	(0.0670)	(0.00340)	(0.0618)	(0.0653)	(0.0657)
R-squared	0.018	0.204	0.226	0.234	0.016	0.199	0.201	0.213
Adjusted R-squared	0.0183	0.204	0.226	0.234	0.0156	0.199	0.201	0.212
Observations	85,918	85,918	85,918	85,918	82,726	82,726	82,726	82,726

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** Significant at p<0.01. ** Significant at p<0.05. * Significant at p<0.1.
Source: 2010–2017 Current Population Surveys (CPS).

References

AIC. (2012). *African Immigrants in America: A Demographic Overview*. Retrieved from Washington, DC:

Anderson, M., & López, G. (2018). Key facts about black immigrants in the U.S. http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/01/24/key-facts-about-black-immigrants-in-the-u-s/

Arthur, J. A. (2000). *Invisible Sojourners: African Immigrant Diaspora in the United States*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Bean, F. D., & Stevens, G. (2003). *America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Boyd, M. (2002). Educational attainments of immigrant offspring: Success or segmented assimilation? *International Migration Review, 36*(4), 1037-1060. doi:10.1111/j.1747-7379.2002.tb00117.x

Butcher, K. F., & Case, A. (1994). The effect of sibling sex composition on women's education and earnings. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 109*(3), 531-563.

Capps, R., McCabe, K., & Fix, M. (2012). *Diverse Streams: Black African Migration to the United States*. Retrieved from Washington, DC:

Cassidy, R. (2004). *Involuntary and Voluntary Migrant Estimates*. Retrieved from Warrington: http://www.copafs.org/UserFiles/file/seminars/methodology _ and _ data _ quality/Involuntary and Voluntary Migarant Estimates.pdf

Davis, J. H., Stolberg, S. G., & Kaplan, T. (2018, January 11, 2018). Trump alarms lawmakers with disparaging words for Haiti and Africa. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/11/us/politics/trump-shithole-countries.html

Dodoo, F. N.-A. (1997). Assimilation differences among Africans in America. *Social Forces, 76*, 527-546.

Dodoo, F. N.-A., & Takyi, B. K. (2002). Africans in the diaspora: Black-White earnings differences among America's Africans. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 25*, 913-941.

Farley, R., & Alba, R. (2002). The new second generation in the United States. *International Migration Review, 36*(3), 669-701.

Gans, H. H. (1992). Second generation decline: Scenarios for the economic and ethnic futures of the post-1965 American immigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 15*, 173-192.

Goyette, K., & Xie, Y. (1999). Educational expectations of Asian American youths: Determinants and ethnic differences. *Sociology of Education, 72*, 22-36.

Hamilton, T. G. (2014). Selection, language heritage, and the earnings trajectories of black immigrants in the United States. *Demography, 51*(3), 975-1002. doi:http://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-014-0298-5

Idang, G. E. (2015). African culture and values. *Phronimon, 16*(2), 97-111.

Kalmijn, M. (1996). The socioeconomic assimilation of Caribbean American Blacks. *Social Forces, 74*, 911-930.

Kao, G., & Tienda, M. (1995). Optimism and achievement: The educational performance of immigrant youth. *Social Science Quarterly, 76*, 1-19.

Massey, D. S., Mooney, M., Torres, K. C., & Charles, C. Z. (2007). Black immigrants and Black natives attending selective colleges and universities in the United States. *American Journal of Education, 113*, 243-272.

Model, S. (1995). West Indian prosperity: Fact or fiction? *Social Problems, 42*(4), 535-553.

Ogbu, J. U. (1978). *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective*. New York: Academic Press.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2005). Introduction: The second generation and the children of immigrants longitudinal study. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 28*(6), 983-999. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870500224109

Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 530*, 74-96.

Sakamoto, A., Kim, C., & Tamborini, C. R. (2018). Changes in occupations, jobs, and skill polarization. In B. Hoffman & L. Wegman (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook on the Changing Nature of Work*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Sakamoto, A., & Wang, S. X. (2016). *The socioeconomic attainments of Nigerian and Ghanaian Americans: Evidence from the 2014 American Community Survey*. Paper presented at the 2016 Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America (PAA), Washington, DC.

Sakamoto, A., Woo, H., & Kim, C. (2010). Does an immigrant background ameliorate racial disadvantage? The socioeconomic attainments of second-generation African Americans. *Sociological Forum, 25*(1), 123-146. doi:10.1111/j.1573-7861.2009.01160.x

Shryock, H. S., & Siegel, J. S. (1976). *The Methods and Materials of Demography*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Suárez-Orozco, C. E., & Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (1995). *Transformations: Immigration, Family Life, and Achievement Motivation Among Latino Adolescents.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Waters, M. C. (1994). Ethnic and racial identities of second-generation black immigrants in New York City. *International Migration Review, 28*(4), 795-820. doi:10.2307/2547158

Waters, M. C., & Pineau, M. G. (2015). *The Integration of Immigrants into American Society* (978-0-309-37398-2). Retrieved from Washington, DC: http://www.nap.edu/catalog/21746

Zeng, Z., & Xie, Y. (2004). Asian-Americans' earnings disadvantage reexamined: The role of place of education. *American Journal of Sociology, 109*, 1075-1108.