

UCLA

**Volume IV. 1988-89 - Conference on Comparative Ethnicity: The
Conference Papers, June 1988**

Title

Alternative Thesis of Minority Mobility: Comparing Los Angeles County West Indians and Chinese

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0925b15p>

Author

Arnold, Faye W.

Publication Date

1988-06-01

ISSR
Working Papers
in the
Social Sciences

1988-89, Vol 4, **Number 11**

Alternative Thesis of
Minority Mobility:
Comparing Los Angeles
County West Indians
and Chinese

by

Faye W. Arnold

ABOUT THE AUTHOR..

Faye Arnold is a Lecturer in the Departments of Sociology and Behaviora Science at California State University, Dominquez Hills. She received her doctorate in Sociology from the University of California Los Angeles, in 1987. Her research interest include the impact of race and ethnic relation structures on immigrant groups' attitudes and adaptation. Dr. Arnold is author of "West Indians and London's Hierarchy of Discriminations," which appeared in Ethnic Groups: An International Periodical of Ethnic Studies in 1984.

A version of this paper was prepared for the UCLA CONFERENCE ON COMPARATIVE ETHNICITY, June 1988. The Conference was coordinated by Institute for Social Science Research and sponsored by The President's Office, Chancellor's Office, College of Letters and Science, Institute of American Cultures Center for Afro-American Studies, and Department of Geography and Sociology UCLA; and by the Division of Social Sciences and Communication, the Los Angeles Project and Department of Geography and Political Science, USC.

ISSR

ALTERNATIVE THESES OF MINORITY MOBILITY:
COMPARING LOS ANGELES COUNTY WEST INDIANS AND CHINESE

FAYE W. ARNOLD

California State University, Dominguez Hills

For several decades an argument has raged over the determinants of minority mobility. This paper reviews competing theses in this argument. It then relates hypotheses deriving from the competing theses to empirical findings on West Indians and the Chinese population of Los Angeles County.

COMPETING EXPLANATIONS OF MINORITY MOBILITY

The three contending theses of minority mobility that are the focus of this discussion are the cultural thesis, the structural/cultural thesis, and the reality-constructionist thesis.

The Cultural Thesis

This thesis, the most influential interpretation of minority mobility, holds that certain minority groups -- notably Jews, Chinese, Japanese and Koreans -- occupy a social and economic status between dominant and subordinate groups in the United States due to their own cultural attributes. For example, the intermediate status of Asian groups is attributed to the religious values, civic virtues, ties of trust and loyalty, and the American Protestant work ethic they transported to this country (Glazer and Moynihan 1963; Loewen 1971; Kitano and Sue 1973).² Likewise, proponents of this thesis contend West Indians and their descendants are more economically successful than Black Americans because they also brought to this country similar traits and characteristics (Reid 1939; Glazer and Moynihan 1963; Light 1972; Sowell 1975, 1978, 1981; Arnold, 1984, 1987).

Another version of the cultural thesis adds that minorities with higher socioeconomic mobility in advanced industrial societies have not only transported success-oriented cultural values, but organization patterns (voluntary self-help associations), and/or material resources (job skills, education, language skills, investment capital) that promote successful enterprises, and in a short time, the dominant group's social approval and acceptance (Light 1972, 1974). This version has also been applied to both Chinese and West Indians to explain their higher mobility relative to that

1 In this study the term "West Indian" refers to those immigrants and their descendants with origins in the ex-British Commonwealth West Indies, including Belize and Guyana.

2 As used here, intermediate minority status refers to the social and economic position or standing between dominant group status and subordinate minority status. Intermediate minority status is not synonymous with "middleman minority" status, although the former may have been structurally-generated by a minority group's disproportionate concentration in small businesses and services.

of subordinate minorities (Reid 1939; Light 1972; Foner 1979; Sowell 1975, 1978; Arnold 1984, 1987).

In sum, this thesis posits there is a cultural dimension to America's ethnic and racial hierarchy such that to the degree a minority group's and the dominant white group's cultural values and resources are perceived as similar, the minority group will exhibit higher rates of economic progress and assimilation.

The Structural/Cultural Thesis

This thesis rejects the notion that culture independently determines a minority group's higher mobility. Instead, it explains minority mobility in terms of the relationship it perceives between a small immigrant minority group's engagement in "middleman minority" economic activities and retention of its culturally-based communal solidarity in a hostile environment. In other words, proponents of this thesis claim America's intermediate status minority groups have overcome structural and attitudinal barriers to their economic mobility by organizing in terms of their own cultural traits and values. As a result, they developed successful self-owned-and-operated small businesses in which they brokered goods and services between the subordinate masses and dominant elite. These businesses soon fostered the groups' and their offsprings' higher educational and occupational mobility and increased similarity to, and hence assimilation with, the society's dominant group (Bonacich 1973; Bonacich and Modell 1980).

Clearly, this thesis credits higher ethnic mobility to both structural and cultural forces. However, it does not question whether structural forces may differentially allocate economic opportunities such that similar cultural attributes and ethnic adaptation patterns produce intermediate minority status for one immigrant minority but not for another. Rather, it takes for granted that some minorities just have the internal resources to set in motion the "threat-heightened reciprocal ethnocentrism, ethnic solidarity, business development, professionalization, assimilation" cycle regardless of the intensity of external discouragement. Further, this thesis hypothesizes that such unique, small-business-oriented minorities will, within a generation or so, experience educational mobility leading to over-representation in professional occupations and, consequently, increasing integration into the dominant group's primary social networks (Bonacich and Modell 1980). As we shall see, our data are relevant to these notions.

The Reality-Constructionist Thesis

This thesis, called reality-constructionist for convenience, owes much to the work of Allport (1954), Berger and Luckmann (1966), Becker (1967), Schermerhorn (1967), Pettigrew (1979), and others who have examined how stereotypes and attributions interact with structural situations to produce discrimination and resulting social categories. According to this thesis, subordinate, intermediate, or any other minority status are socially-constructed realities. That is, if a society which is ethnically and racially differentiated due to voluntary and involuntary migrations has divided along the lines of dominant and subordinate groups, it is because the dominant group has used power in its economic, political, or social

form to erect an opportunity structure in which less powerful groups are consigned to lower social and economic positions.

The complex process includes a pivotal subprocess in which the majority group seizes upon an easily verifiable and differentiating characteristic of potential and actual competitors -- such as racial or ethnic origin, religion, language, lack of property, or educational qualification -- and uses it as a pretext for excluding them from competition for economic, political and social advantages. The exclusion, of course, may be nearly total for one group of competitors, while limited inclusion may be granted to another group meeting the majority population's specified conditions. This then invokes the kind of definitions and attributions that converge with situations and constraints to embroil excluded minorities in racism of subordination and relatively less excluded minorities in racism of intermediation (Schermerhorn 1967; Banton 1967; Kinloch 1974).

Since the definitions and attributions are summoned by some external feature -- say, a "Jewish-sounding" or Hispanic last name, the epicanthic eye fold of Asians, a foreign accent, or the negroid features of African ancestry groups -- they become the predominant mode of identifying minority members in connection with social and economic inclusion, and factors which persist over time as potential or actual impediments to their mobility.

The contrast in definitions applied to non-white minorities in this country is usually discussed as the contrast between those applied to Asians and Blacks. Asians are stereotypically imputed to have important desirable cultural characteristics and abilities. On the basis of this perception, dominants make reflexive judgments about them that enhance their educational, occupational, and social advancement (Hosokawa 1978; Lieberman 1980; Wong 1986). Conversely, Blacks are defined as a race, therefore characteristics and abilities credited to them are ones most people consider less desirable or completely undesirable. This gives rise to reflexive stereotypes, representations and judgments about them that increase prejudice and discrimination against them in educational, work and social settings (Allport 1954; Pettigrew 1979; Ritzer 1977; Praeger 1984).

According to reality-constructionists, the effect of anti-Black stereotypes and judgments is revealed most clearly in the selections made by members of the dominant white group during the course of their search behavior. In other words, because of dispositions based on negative definitions of Blacks as a group, dominants tend to select a non-Black over a Black applicant, whether searching for a low or managerial employee (Spence 1973; Kaufman 1986; Banton 1987; Braddock and McPartland 1987; Pettigrew and Martin 1987; Hayward and Coverman 1987), a prospective tenant or home-buyer (Massey and Denton 1987; Blackwell 1985), a would-be university student (Blackwell 1982; Oliver, Rodriguez and Mickelson 1985), or a marriage partner (Cohen 1980; Reiss 1980). Moreover, as this rejection reduces competition from the Black group -- the nation's largest, thus most potentially threatening minority group -- it persists despite laws against discrimination in housing, employment, and education, and the invalidation of laws against interracial marriages.

Is there reason to believe Asian and Black stereotypes and attributions are widely known in Los Angeles and affect the groups' mobility? Table 1 contains the results of an exercise in which students were instructed to ask a non-random sample of faculty and fellow-students at a California State University to indicate their beliefs about stereotypical attributions and labels generally imputed to Chinese and Black people. The task was not carried out in a systematic manner as the goal was simply to have students gain some insight as to what these might be at present. For both groups, those listed were very similar to ones gathered empirically by Katz and

Braly (1933), Gilbert (1951), Maykovich (1971, 1972), and others. What the table graphically shows is that, in contrast with Asians, Blacks are defined by more negative than positive stereotypes and are credited with more entertainment talents than occupational skills.

Within the reality-constructionist scheme Black and Asian generalizations and attributions are especially salient in Los Angeles' occupational and residential context. The region, in the course of urban restructuring since the beginning of the 1960's, has undergone economic changes which are manifest in changes in the production process within industries, and the shift of industries from production of goods to provision of services. One major outcome of this process is the development of businesses and high technology industries demanding scientists, engineers and other workers with "calculability," and tactile and arithmetic/mathematical skills," occupations and skills stereotypically attributed to Asians (Wong 1986, p. 73). Wong (1986) argues, that because the dominant white group needs, and hence welcomes, Asians' intellectual skills and labor, the stereotypical attributions work as self-fulfilling prophecy.

Another outcome of restructuring is the movement of industry from Los Angeles to outer cities in Ventura and Orange counties and other predominantly White suburban areas where Asians are much more likely to live and be given the opportunity to enter the labor force as "high tech" professionals (Massey and Denton 1987).

On the other hand, the labor force transformation in Los Angeles has also meant growth in peripheral sector jobs, especially those related to business office support, health, hospitality, and other social services. The majority of these, of course, are lower level white and blue collar jobs requiring less education, skill, and little status interaction. They are thus perceived as "the proper jobs" for Blacks and new immigrants and are so allocated (Soja, Morales and Wolff 1983; Kaufman 1986).

But the issue here is whether West Indians in particular are negatively affected by anti-Black sentiments and discrimination. As I have noted elsewhere, they and their offspring have distinct ethnic traditions and attributes that can distinguish them from Black Americans and, to some degree, be manipulated to help them avoid some of the outcomes of anti-Black perceptions. Yet, they are initially perceived and treated as Black Americans (Bryce-Laporte 1972; Dominguez 1975; Arnold 1987). Therefore, under the reality-constructionist thesis the expectation is that, in comparison to Chinese, they will have lower rates of economic mobility, residential integration, and marital assimilation.

The preceding theoretical exposition is the source of two alternative, testable hypotheses about ethnic group differences in average social and economic mobility which can be used to guide the following empirical analysis.

1. The cultural, structural/cultural hypothesis. On the basis of their similar cultural attributes and adaptation, ethnic minority groups will, on average, have similar higher rates of social and economic mobility (higher achievement in education, occupation, income, residential integration, and marital assimilation).
2. The reality-constructionist hypothesis. When compared with an Asian ethnic group, a Black group will have, on average, lower rates of occupational and income mobility, residential integration, and marital assimilation than might be expected on the basis of their cultural attributes and educational resources.

DATA AND METHODS

Data on Los Angeles County West Indians and the Chinese population will be used to test these hypotheses. The two ethnic groups are especially well suited as a test case because, to anticipate a conclusion from the following analysis (in the spectrum of non-white ethnic groups in this country originating in voluntary immigration, which is still increasing due to new and chain migrations, and is renowned for achieving higher social and economic mobility relative to subordinate groups) the Chinese represent the upper end of the spectrum, with West Indians at the lower end.

Demographic, attitudinal, and behavioral data on Los Angeles West Indians were collected during the period from May, 1983 to December, 1985 for purposes of a larger study. Structured interviews and a mail survey were administered to 206 people of West Indian origin who were identified through "snowball" sampling techniques. The sample includes 169 immigrants and 37 of their native-born counterparts. Every ex-British Commonwealth Caribbean island (except Bermuda), and Belize and Guyana are represented by one or more respondents. With regard to social and demographic characteristics, 83 are males and 123 are females; and their ages ranged from 16 to 87 years, with a median age of 39 years. Although the sample was not random, there is reason to believe that the respondents' socio-economic and demographic characteristics reflect ones common in the Los Angeles West Indian population as a whole.³

Data on the Los Angeles County Chinese population were taken from the 1980 U.S. Census Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS), a five per cent sample which yielded 94,200 cases.

3. There are not sufficient and accurate data available for reporting unequivocal dimensions of the Los Angeles County (British) West Indian population. My attempt to extrapolate from PUMS the size of the population was disappointing as the 1980 Census did not ask respondents to report the birthplace of their parents in addition to their own. (Respondents to such a question would have identified immigrants as well as their descendants.) Rather, it asked for persons' ancestry. Still, I hoped cross-tabulating answers to this question with answers to the question that asked about race might reveal West Indians' ancestral origin and, thereby, reveal the approximate size of the Los Angeles County West Indian population. However, this procedure was not as fruitful as I had hoped.

Because many West Indians of African, European, Asian, or a mixture of these three ancestral categories were socialized in the Caribbean and thus, unexposed to the "one drop of Black blood determines blackness" rule, they responded to the census "ancestry" and race question accordingly. Some identified themselves as persons of European, African, or Asian ancestry; others identified their ancestry as American and/or Afro-American; still others identified themselves in terms of their Caribbean nationality. Similar variation occurred in response to the race question. Therefore, significant numbers of West Indians of African ancestry are neither categorized as Afro-Caribbean or as people of Caribbean or West Indian origins. Instead, much of the population is dispersed in greatly varying numbers among a globe-spanning array of national and Black and non-Black categories and are uncounted in the figures for the total Los Angeles West Indian population.

The data on West Indians and Chinese were used to compare the groups' social and economic mobility as measured by attained education, occupation and income, residential integration, and marital assimilation. It must be stressed that the absolute values were not compared, but rather the proportional differences between the groups' mobility rates. This strategy of analyzing the data permits us to consider all three explanations of higher ethnic mobility for these reasons:

1. On the basis of their similar cultural attributes and adaptation Los Angeles West Indians and Chinese should, on average, be characterized by similar higher rates of attained education, occupation, income, residential integration, and marital assimilation. (The cultural and structural/cultural position).
2. The same variation in the variables representing social and economic mobility also permits consideration of the alternative reality-constructionist position: As a Black group West Indians will have, on average, lower rates of occupational and income mobility, and will be characterized by lower rates of structural integration at the primary level than might be expected on the basis of their cultural attributes and educational resources.

EVALUATION OF THE HYPOTHESES

In addition to similar cultural characteristics and adaptive patterns, the data indicates that Los Angeles West Indians and Chinese share other features. When queried, both groups were dominated by people 25 years old and older, and the majority of both groups were foreign-born. (However, of the two groups, the West Indian group contains 10% more foreign-born members). This latter feature makes it important to emphasize whether describing proportional differences in occupational achievement, outmarriage, or any other variable, the data on both groups are based on an overwhelming immigrant representation.

As Table 2 reveals, when we compare the educational achievement of Los Angeles West Indians and Chinese, we find the former group contains a larger proportion of adults with at least some college and graduate school credits. But, their enviable educational achievement seems to have not paid off in comparable overall occupational mobility. In contrast to the Chinese, they are much more concentrated in lower-paid white collar jobs.

Table 3 a-b graphically demonstrates this point. Further, it shows that, in comparison to the proportion of adult Chinese with 16 and more years of schooling and professional/managerial jobs, an insignificant but discernibly smaller percentage of West Indian adults with comparable education have such occupations (62% compared to 71%).

The income return to education for West Indians and Chinese would seem to form a different pattern as a smaller proportion of West Indians with 0-11 years of education reported household incomes of less than \$10,000 (see Table 4 a-c). But West Indians without a high school diploma are less likely than Chinese equivalents to belong to households with incomes ranging from \$20,000 to \$49,000. Similarly, those who have attained graduate units are substantially less likely than Chinese counterparts to live in households with incomes of that range. And while six percent of Chinese with 0-11 years of schooling have annual household incomes of \$50,000 or more, not one West Indian with 0-11 years of education report an annual household income in that bracket. It seems only those West Indians who manage to obtain graduate credits are able to overcome lower household

income return to education. Of the West Indians in that category, 44% have household incomes of \$50,000 and more, while 20% of Chinese who completed 17 or more years of education belong to households with like incomes.

It should be noted that West Indians' income data are more recent than that of the Chinese. Doubtlessly, then, the data reflect wage and salary increases that probably occurred over a five year period. They also reflect multiple wage-earner households and, in comparison to Chinese, a higher rate of adult West Indian female labor force participation (58% to 47%). In fact when queried, the vast majority of West Indian female spouses were employed, mostly in nursing, medical administration and support work, sales, and clerical work.

Los Angeles West Indians and Chinese appear to be marked by similar rates of self-employment (7% and 8%, respectively). More immigrant than native-born West Indians are self-employed. But when it comes to the black groups' professional workers, a reverse of the foreign/native born pattern obtains. Interestingly, both patterns describe the Chinese and other classic intermediate status minorities in this country (Bonacich and Modell 1980).

However, Figures 1 and 2 graphically present a sharp, thus significant, difference between the levels of residential integration characterizing Los Angeles West Indians and Chinese. The majority of West Indians are the neighbors of Black Americans in the poor, middle income, and "golden" ghettos forming an elongated "Black corridor" extending almost 20 miles through much of the center of Los Angeles (see Figure 1). That is, many live in the Los Angeles South-Central area, Crenshaw District, and West Side. Smaller numbers live in Compton, Pacoima, Inglewood, Carson -- cities which Black Americans form the numerical majority -- and in predominantly Black enclaves in Long Beach.

Conversely, while numbers of Chinese do tend to cluster in certain communities, (notably, in Chinatown, Monterey Park, Elysian Park, Montebello, West Lake and Alhambra), as shown in Figure 2, a large segment of the community is dispersed among predominantly White suburban neighborhoods. This finding concurs with Massey and Denton's (1987) finding that Black people as a group are nearly twice as segregated as Asians and the presence of Black immigrants exacerbates the segregation. Clearly, in light of the discrepant West Indian and Chinese integration patterns, the reality-constructionist thesis appears convincing.

Finally, Table 4 presents data on acculturation variables (nativity and English proficiency), as well as variables that index equality (mean annual income) and assimilation (outmarriage). Despite the larger percentage of late arrivals and immigrants, West Indians have the acculturation advantage when it comes to being comfortable with English. Nevertheless, when compared to the Chinese, the Black group's mean income does not reflect the equality customarily associated with that advantage. But most exemplary of the two groups' discrepant cultural outcomes in support of the reality-constructionist point of view are their rates of marital assimilation. Indeed, West Indian's "zero rate" suggests the Black group may be many, many generations away from receiving the level of approval and acceptance extended to the Chinese.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This paper has evaluated alternative hypotheses derived from competing theses of minority mobility in light of some data on Los Angeles West Indians and Chinese. The data do not support the cultural and

structural/cultural hypothesis. Despite their similar cultural attributions and adaptation, West Indians and Chinese are not characterized by similar levels of mobility and assimilation. Rather, the discrepant outcomes of West Indians' cultural attributes and resources seem to substantiate the reality-constructionist hypothesis that an inverse relationship exists between negative minority group definitions and attributions and higher social and economic mobility.

However, as noted earlier, the West Indian data were collected for a research project that did not set out to evaluate the competing explanations of the determinants of minority mobility described here. It was only later consideration of some of the data that suggested its insightful applicability to a "preliminary phase" evaluation of those explanations and their hypotheses. Clearly, weaknesses in the West Indian data stemming from non-random sampling methods mean the findings presented here must be considered inconclusive. Still, they suggest a need for more systematic, empirical testing of hypotheses presently available about the determinants of minority mobility.

Of the many points that could be developed on the basis of even this preliminary phase analysis, one in particular deserves special emphasis. It concerns the cultural thesis which so dominates discussions of immigrant minorities' mobility. The data presented here suggest that this thesis might be much improved by reconsideration of the complex nature of, and the multiple factors involved in, minority mobility situations. Admittedly, like cultural explanations, the present analysis has not isolated and examined the many external factors mediating the relationship between subordinate status and higher mobility. But what it has contributed to the picture are some tentative findings that question the simplistic assumption that higher mobility rates among minority groups are caused primarily by their own internal cultural attributes and resources.

No one is suggesting that some cultural attributes and adaptation are not more productive of higher social and economic mobility, regardless of the reactions they invoke. But what I am suggesting is that a minority group's higher mobility in this society is inseparable from the opening of opportunities to it as a result of the favorable definitions, attitudes and reactions of the White majority elite, with the reactions of some of its constituents (educators, employers, real estate sales persons, landlords and the like) playing a crucial part.

REFERENCES

- Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Arnold, Faye W. 1984. "West Indians and London's Hierarchy of Discrimination." *Ethnic Groups* 6:47-64.
- _____. 1987. "Ethnic Identification, Ethnicity, and Ethnic Solidarity in Los Angeles County's West Indian-American Community." Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles. Ph.D. Dissertation, Unpublished.
- Banton, Michael. 1987. *Racial Theories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Becker, Howard. 1967. *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. Glencoe: Free Press
- Berger, Peter and Thomas Luckmann. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday
- Blackwell, James. 1985. *The Black Community: Diversity and Unity*. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row.

- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. 1967. *Toward a Theory of Minority Group Relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Bonacich, Edna. 1973. "A Theory of Middleman Minorities." *American Sociological Review* 37:583-594.
- Bonacich, Edna and John Modell. 1980. *The Economic Basis of Ethnic Solidarity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Braddock, Jomills II and James McPartland. 1987. "How Minorities Come to be Excluded From Equal Employment Opportunities: Research on Labor Market and Institutional Barriers." *Social Issues* 43:5-39.
- Bryce-Laporte, Roy Simon. 1972. "Black Immigrants: The Experience of Invisibility and Inequality," *The Journal of Black Studies* 3:29-56.
- Cohen, Steven M. 1980. *Inter-ethnic Marriage and Friendship*. New York: Arno Press.
- Dominguez, Virginia. 1975. *From Neighbor to Stranger: The Dilemma of Caribbean Peoples in the United States*. New Haven: Antilles Research Program, Yale University.
- Foner, Nancy. 1979. "West Indians in New York and London: A Comparative Analysis." *International Migration Review* 13, 2:284-296.
- Gilbert, G. M. 1951. "Stereotype Persistence and Change Among College Students." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 46:245-254.
- Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan. 1963. *Beyond the Melting Pot*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Hayward, Mark and Shelley Coverman. 1987. "Change in the Racial Composition of Occupations, 1960-1970: How Much Progress for Blacks?" *Sociological Perspectives* 30:87-93.
- Hosokawa, Fumi ko. 1978. *The Sansei: Social Interaction and Ethnic Identification Among the Third Generation Japanese*. San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, Inc.
- Kaufman, Robert. 1986. "The Impact of Industrial and Occupational Structure on Black-White Employment Allocation." *American Sociological Review* 51:310-323.
- Katz, Donald and Kenneth Brayley. 1933. "Racial Stereotypes of One Hundred College Students." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 46:280-90.
- Kinloch, Graham C. 1974. *The Dynamics of Race Relations: Sociological Analysis*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kitano, Harry and Roger Daniels. 1987. *Asian Americans: Emerging Minorities*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Kitano, Harry and Stanley Sue. 1973. "The Model Minorities." *Journal of Social Issues* 29:1-10.
- Lieberson, Stanley. 1984. *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1810*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Light, Ivan. 1972. *Ethnic Enterprise in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1984. "Immigrant and Ethnic Enterprise in North America." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 7, 2:195-215.
- Loewen, James W. 1971. *The Mississippi Chinese: Between Black and White*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Massey, Douglas and Nancy Denton. 1987. "Trends in the Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians: 1970-1980." *American Sociological Review* 52:802-825.
- Maykovich, Minako. 1972. "Reciprocity in Racial Stereotypes: White, Black, and Yellow." *American Journal of Sociology* 77:876-897.
- Oliver, Melvin, Consuelo Rodriguez and Roslyn Mickelson. 1985. "Brown and Black in White: The Social Adjustment and Academic Performance of Chicano and Black Students in a Predominantly White University." *The Urban Review* 17:3-24.

- Pettigrew, Thomas. 1979. "The Ultimate Attribution: Extending Allport's Cognitive Analysis of Prejudice." ***Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*** 5:461-476.
- Pettigrew, Thomas and Joanne Martin. 1987. "Shaping the Organizational Context for Black American Inclusion." ***Social Issues*** 43:41-78.
- Reid, Ira de A. 1939. ***The Negro Immigrant***. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Reiss, Ira. 1980. ***Family Systems in America***. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Schermerhorn, R. A. 1967. ***Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research***. New York: Random House.
- Sowell, Thomas. 1975. ***Race and Economics***. New York: David McKay Company.
- _____. 1978. ***Essays and Data on American Ethnic Groups***, Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- _____. 1981. ***Ethnic America: A History***. New York: Basic Books.
- Soja, Edward, Rebecca Morales, and Goetz Wolff. 1983. "Urban Restructuring: An Analysis of Social and Spatial Change in Los Angeles." ***Economic Geography*** 59:195-230.
- Spence, M. A. 1973. "Job Market Signaling." ***Quarterly Journal of Economics*** 87:355-374.
- Sue, Stanley and Harry Kitano. 1973. "Stereotypes as a Measure of Success." ***Journal of Social Issues*** 29:83-98.
- Treiman, Donald, Vivian Lew, Hye-kung Lee and Thad Brown. 1986. "Occupational Status Attainment among Ethnic Groups in Los Angeles." A Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America. San Francisco, CA.
- Wong, Eugene F. 1986. "Asian American Middleman Minority Theory: The Framework of an American Myth." ***Journal of Ethnic Studies*** 13:51-88.

TABLE 1

Characterizations and Attributions of Chinese and Black Americans

CHINESE: smart; quiet; "a model minority;" good students; hard workers; shy; excellent in math and the sciences but not equally as gifted in areas requiring verbal skills; industrious; thrifty; professionals; engineers and mathematicians; newcomers are heavily represented in laundry, grocery, and restaurant work, but will work upward in a matter of a few years; family oriented; big gamblers; classicist

BLACK AMERICANS: musical; athletic; rhythmic; good dancers; often educationally-marginal; very religious; welfare dependent; pushy; sexual; lively; aggressive; kind to their old people; lazy; good-timers; somewhat lacking in intellectual curiosity; physically strong; love to party; violent; disregard for punctuality

TABLE 1

Characterizations and Attributions of Chinese and Black Americans

CHINESE	smart; quiet; "a model minority;" good students; hard workers; shy; excellent in math and the sciences but not equally as gifted in areas requiring verbal skills; industrious; thrifty; professionals; engineers and mathematicians; newcomers are heavily represented in laundry, grocery, and restaurant work, but will work upward in a matter of a few years; family oriented; big gamblers; classicist
BLACK AMERICANS:	musical; athletic; rhythmic; good dancers; often educationally-marginal ; very religious; welfare dependent; pushy; sexual; lively; aggressive; kind to their old people; lazy; good-timers; somewhat lacking in intellectual curiosity; physically strong; love to party; violent; disregard for punctuality

TABLE 2

Ethnicity By Education, Adult Population, 25+ Years;
Occupation, Persons Age 16+;
Employed Males and Females, 16+*

Education	West Indian	Chinese
0 - 11 Years	9.3%	26.9%
12 Years	15.8	15.0
13-15 Years	32.8	20.4
16 Years	16.9	18.7
17+ Years	25.2	18.8
Total Age 25+	100%	100%
	(186)	(56,280)

Occupation		
Professional and Managerial	22.5%	32.1%
Other White Collar Jobs	52.5	33.8
Blue Collar Jobs	25.0	34.1
Total Employed Age 16+	100%	100%
	(160)	(55,200)

Employed Persons		
Males	41.3%	52.7%
Females	58.7	47.2
Total Employed Age 16+	100%	100%
	(160)	(55,200)

NOTES: *Occupational categories include unpaid family workers, workers employed in their own business, and some others usually omitted in the labor force. See the 1980 Bureau of Census technical documentation for detail. Data on the Los Angeles County Chinese population are from the U.S. Census, 1980.

TABLE 3 A-B

A. Occupations by Years of Education, Employed Persons, Age 25+,
Los Angeles County, 1985

West Indians
Years of School Completed

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>0-11Yrs.</u>	<u>12Yrs</u>	<u>13-15Yrs.</u>	<u>16Yrs.</u>	<u>17+Yrs.</u>	<u>Total</u>
Profess. , Manger, Spec.	5.9%	14.7%	17.6%	17.6%	44.1%	100% (34)
Semi-Profess. , Tech. , Sales Clerical	3.2	11.9	37.6	20.4	26.9	100 (93)
Precis. Product. Crafts, Repair	9.1	45.5	36.4	--	9.1	100 (11)
Service	41.7	16.7	25.0	8.3	8.3	100 (12)
Other Blue Collar	—	—	—	—	—	—

B. Occupations by Years of Education, Employed Persons, Age 25+,
Los Angeles, County, 1980

Chinese
Years of School Completed

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>0-11Yrs.</u>	<u>12 Yrs.</u>	<u>13-15Yrs.</u>	<u>16Yrs.</u>	<u>17+Yrs.</u>	<u>Total</u>
Profess. , Manager, Spec.	5.1%	6.9%	17.3	26.7%	43.9%	100% (15,940)
Semi-Profess. Tech. , Sales, Clerical	8.3	14.2	32.9	26.8	17.7	100 (13,420)
Precis. Product. Crafts, Repair	32.6	21.0	29.7	11.6	5.1	100 (2,760)
Service	48.4	22.8	14.4	10.3	4.1	100 (6,400)
Other Blue Collar	56.5	20.4	15.5	4.3	3.3	100 (6,080)

NOTES: Occupational categories include unpaid family workers, workers employed in their own business, and some others usually omitted in the labor force. See the 1980 Bureau of Census technical documentation for detail. Data on the Los Angeles County Chinese population are from the U.S. Census, 1980.

TABLE 4 A-C

A. Relationship of Household Income and School Years Completed,
Persons Age 25+ and Household Income Less than \$10,000

Ethnic Group	<u>School Years Completed</u>			
	0-11 Years	Percent*	17+ Years	Percent*
West Indian	4	26.7%	6	12.8
Chinese	5700	37.5	1180	11.1

B. Relationship of Household Income and School Years Completed,
Persons Age 25+ and Household Income \$20,000-\$49,000

Ethnic Group	<u>School Years Completed</u>			
	0-11 Years	Percent	17+ Years	Percent*
West Indian	4	26.7%	18	38.3
Chinese	5320	35.1	5700	53.8

C. Relationship of Household Income and School Years Completed,
Persons Age 25+ and Household Income More Than \$50,000

Ethnic Group	<u>School Years Completed</u>			
	0-11 Years	Percent*	17+ Years	Percent*
West Indian	--	--	21	44.7
Chinese	740	6.4	1900	17.9

NOTES:

West Indian income for 1984; Chinese income for 1979.

*Percent of persons in school years completed group.

TABLE 5

Speaks English Well and Very Well, Birthplace, Arrival in U.S.A., Household Income (West Indian Income: 1984; Chinese Income: 1979), and Outmarriage Rate (Chinese Rate: 1984) by Ethnicity, Los Angeles County

	Number	Percent English Well & Very Well	Percent Born in U.S.A.	Percent Arrived Since '70	Mean Annual Income*	Percent Out-marriages**
West Indian	206	100	18.0	21.0	\$17,499	#
Chinese	94,200	54.6	28.2	48.2	\$19,820	30.0

NOTES:

* The median income is given for Los Angeles Chinese. Source: Pacific Rim Profiles, Los Angeles: United Way, 1985, pp. 80.

** Source: Kitano, Harry L. and Roger Daniels. Asian Americans: Emerging Minorities. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1988, pp. 182.

Less than 1% of Los Angeles West Indians were ever married to a spouse of African, Asian, East Indian or white European origin.