Manuel Pastor, Justin Scoggins, and Jennifer Tran
Center for the Study of Immigrant Integration
University of Southern California
June 2010

A STATE RESILIENT

Immigrant Integration and California's Future

About CSII

The Center for the Study of Immigrant Integration's (CSII) mission is to remake the narrative for understanding, and the dialogue for shaping, immigrant integration in America. Our intent is to identify and evaluate the mutual benefits of immigrant integration for the native-born and immigrants and to study the pace of the ongoing transformation in different locations, not only in the past and present but projected into the future. CSII thus brings together three emphases: scholarship that draws on academic theory and rigorous research; data that provides information structured to highlight the process of immigrant integration over time; and engagement that seeks to create new dialogues with government, community organizers, business and civic leaders, immigrants and the voting public.

Visit us at http://csii.usc.edu.

Acknowledgements

We thank the James Irvine Foundation for their support of the USC Center for the Study of Immigrant Integration (CSII), including the maintenance of the databases used in this research. We also thank the California Immigrant Policy Center (CIPC) for making us aware of the Center for Immigration Study's June 2010 report, *A State Transformed: Immigration and the New California*, and suggesting that we respond, as well for their ongoing partnership and excellent work on behalf of California's immigrant communities.

Photo credits from front cover (clockwise):

School bus, by Timo Bouerdick
Dream Act Graduation, by Kris Price / SEIU
High school students, by Jennifer Renteria / Center for the Study of Immigrant Integration
Children reading, by Rudy A. Giron/AntiguaDailyPhoto.com

Introduction

California is easily misunderstood. A highly complex state, our millions of residents come from every walk of life. While we are one of the first "majority-minority" states, we also have more white people than any other state in the nation.[1] We have the largest high tech economy as well as the largest agricultural sector. We have the most millionaires and the most poor people. Whatever your concern or issue, in California you can always find something to love or something to hate.

One of many facts: California remains one of the most college-educated states in the country, ranking sixteenth in the nation. From 1970 to 2008, we became even more robust in our state ranking in terms of median household income, climbing from tenth to eighth highest in the nation. Our workforce is among the country's most productive, with California's GDP per employed worker the sixth highest of any state in the union, just one notch down from our fifth highest ranking in 1970.

Why then do Steven A. Camarota and Karen Jensenius of the Center for Immigration Studies (CIS) offer a dismal assessment of our economic future, calling us the "least educated" state in the country and comparing the strength of our workforce to areas "like Appalachia or parts of the South?" Focusing on the role of mass immigration, the authors note that California has, between 1970 and 2008, slipped to dead last in a list of states ranked by the share of the labor force that has completed high school. They further attribute to immigration a sharp rise in the state's income inequality over the same period.

As one of California's many research centers focused on immigration and immigrant integration, we seek to paint a picture that includes both the good and the bad of the California economy and workforce. Immigrants, after all, are helping to shape California's future, and careful and complete presentations of the data are necessary to inform our policy choices. This policy brief thus tries to provide policy makers and others with a broader context by focusing on some aspects of the interaction between immigration and education that the CIS authors leave unexamined.

We show below that California is actually one of the most educated and productive states in the country. We concur that inequality has indeed risen – but illustrate that this may have more to do with the changing nature of our economy than with the presence of immigrants. Finally, while we agree with Camarota and Jensenius that it is better for immigrants and non-immigrants to complete high school, we note that high school completion may signal very different things for immigrants than non-immigrants to employers in the California labor market and thus have different implications for assessing the quality of our workforce.

We do not pretend that California's educational system is not troubled. Reports like the Editorial Projects in Education Research Center's (EPE-RC) *Graduation by the Numbers, Putting Data to Work for Student Success* shows that California's graduation rates dipped in the last decade.

But that report takes an in-depth look at how drop-out rates are calculated, where they are worst, and why – teasing out nuances in race, geography, and even history along the way. Its authors note that twenty-five of the nation's 11,000 school districts produce a disproportionate share of nongraduates (Los Angeles Unified being one of them) but they also find poverty – not immigration – to be the common denominator.[2]

So before making education a policy weapon for some other agenda, we think it is important to be clear on the facts. California's educational problems definitely need sound analysis and a new approach; confounding and conflating those challenges with an already confusing debate around immigration does not help. A better approach to facing California's long-term future would be to admit the complexity of the educational and demographic changes we have experienced and to invest more strategically in the integration of immigrants and their children (Pastor and Ortiz, 2009).

The Data

In this brief, we use many of the same databases Camarota and Jensenius use in their June 2010 memorandum, *A State Transformed: Immigration and the New California,* particularly the 1970 Census Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) and the 2008 American Community Survey (ACS).[3] We also use a pooled sample of the 2005, 2006, and 2007 ACS to look at the impact of education on workforce quality.[4] All Census and ACS data are taken from the versions provided by IPUMS-USA (see Ruggles, et al. 2010); we also make use of statistics on state gross domestic product (GDP) and employment from the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA).

Using the 1970 PUMS and 2008 ACS data, the CIS authors note that in terms of the share of adult workers who had completed high school, California was the seventh most educated state in 1970 but the fiftieth in 2008.[5] The CIS authors also note that in 1970, California was at the average in terms of an inequality measure called the Gini coefficient; in 2008, the state was the sixth most unequal.[6] Taken together, the report seems to be a dramatic indictment of immigration's effect on the state's educational system, labor force, and economy – but it is a charge built on a selective reading of the data.

California's Resilience

Given the picture Camarota and Jensenius offer of California slouching toward Appalachia, it may be surprising to discover that between 1970 and 2008, California's median household income rose at about the median for all states and faster than the national average.[7] Over this period of mass immigration, as the share of foreign-born in California's population rose from 9 percent to 27 percent, we also went from being tenth in the nation in terms of median household income to eighth in the nation, a slight but notable rise in the ranks of the most well-off states (see Table 1; all Tables follow the text).[8]

California's economic performance is not that surprising, of course: the state has always been a place of tremendous innovation and it has relied, in part, on a labor force that is highly educated and, regardless of education, highly motivated. While Camarota and Jensenius lament how the states' new immigrants have contributed to the rising share of adults who lack a

high school degree, their understanding of the new labor force does not account for immigrant entrepreneurship or labor force attachment (Blackwell, Kwoh, and Pastor 2010).

Moreover, a fuller picture would have included the other end of the spectrum – the rate of those Californians who have completed college. By this measure, California remains near the top, although we have slipped: we used to be the seventh most educated state in the U.S. and now we are the sixteenth (see Tables 2 and 3). A careful examination of Tables 2 and 3 indicates, however, that what may have driven the pattern is the slippage in the relative ranking of the native-born, with the state going from fifth to twelfth in native-born college completion rates.[9] It is notable, however, that we've benefited as a state from educated immigrants – approximately 40 percent of 25-64 year olds with doctorate degrees in California are foreign born.[10]

As for the inequality that the CIS authors attribute to the swelling of California's immigrant population, we make use of the same variable they did, the so-called Gini coefficient, a measure that ranges from 0 to 1 with higher coefficients indicating higher levels of inequality. As Camarota and Jensenius note, in terms of this measure of inequality, California has risen from twenty-fifth in the nation in 1970 to sixth in the nation in 2008 (see Table 4). But apparently we Californians did that all on our own: when considering the income distribution among non-immigrants only over that same period, we rose from twenty-fourth in the nation to sixth in terms of inequality (see Table 5).[11]

The pattern suggests that inequality is not simply a matter of immigrants swelling the bottom of the income distribution. Of course, some might contend that the worsening distribution among non-immigrants is because immigrants are lowering wages of native born workers through competition. However, researchers looking at California have found that because immigrants are often *complementary* labor (and thus help to retain jobs in the state), they have had generally positive impacts on the employment of native-born Californians, no effect on the wages of U.S.-born high school dropouts, and modest positive wage effects for more educated U.S.-born workers; the most competition in terms of wages, it turns out, is actually with foreign-born workers who are already here (Peri 2007).

Inequality is a serious issue meriting serious discussion and policy attention. California has been a national leader in terms of experiencing and adapting to a series of structural economic changes, including the reduction in manufacturing and the rise in a bifurcated service industry. These trends that have polarized our workforce have spread beyond our borders and contributed to increased inequality in the nation as a whole. As a result of these broad economic shifts, lower-skilled immigrants have found work in California. In this sense, immigrants have *followed* the economic changes not *driven* them.

Education, Signals, and Labor Force Quality

California does have serious educational problems, particularly with regard to second-generation Latino drop-out rates, but pointing to the failure to complete high school on the part of immigrant adults is, we think, a somewhat misleading indicator of labor force quality.

If our labor quality has dropped so significantly, then so too should our state's GDP – but this is not the case. If we rank all the states in terms of the gross domestic product produced per

employed worker, California was sixth in the nation in 2008, just one-notch down from our rank as fifth in the nation in 1970.[12] What explains both lower high school completion rates and a continued high rank in terms of worker productivity? To understand the answer, we need a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between education and labor productivity.

Completing high school may suggest a particular skill level but it also serves as what labor economists call a "signal." In particular, employers may see the failure to complete high school on the part of a U.S.-born job seeker as an indication that the worker may not have enough discipline or drive to succeed at work. On the other hand, the failure to complete high school on the part of an immigrant may not say much about the job seeker's discipline or drive but may just be the natural outcome of having to leave school to enter the workforce – a more common choice when living in the context of a poorer country.

To test whether this signaling versus productivity view has merit in the California context, we assembled a large sample of California residents from the 2005, 2006, and 2007 American Community Surveys. Focusing on full-time, year-round workers between 25 and 64, we split the sample into two types of workers: native-born workers and those immigrants who had arrived at age nineteen or older.[13] The age restriction on the immigrants was imposed to ensure that we excluded entirely those immigrants who arrived at an early age; our thought was that such early arrival immigrants had a chance to complete high school in the U.S. and so employers might treat a failure to complete, much like with the native-born, as a "signal." The results are not particularly sensitive, however, to including this "early age" immigrant group in other specifications of the analysis.[14]

We then used a multivariate regression, a statistical technique that tries to disentangle the impact of multiple characteristics on one outcome (for example, how much English ability impacts wages as opposed to, say, occupation or education). We controlled for racial background, years of work experience, English ability, occupation, industry, and regional location in California; the focus of our considerations was on whether the wage "penalty" one paid for not completing high school differed between immigrants (who had arrived after age 19) and non-immigrants.[15]

We found that, controlling for other important factors that explain an individual's wage level, immigrants *without* high school diplomas are "dinged" by the economy just a bit more than U.S.-born workers with *only* a high school diploma. Specifically, immigrant workers *without* high school diplomas were likely to make about 5 percent less than U.S.-born workers *with* a high school diploma (controlling for all other factors that determine wages); by way of comparison, U.S.-born workers without high school diplomas faced a 15 percent penalty relative to U.S.-born workers that completed high school.[16]

This does not mean that immigrant adults who arrived without a high school education make as much as the U.S.-educated workers with a high school education: such immigrants also tend to speak less English, to work in different occupations and industries, and to be more Latino and Asian (and thus face some degree of labor market discrimination).[17] What it does suggest is that employers do not seem to see a high school diploma as the only "signal" of job readiness; despite education level, immigrants are still understood to be good workers and California's productivity numbers would seem to reflect this.

We should be clear. We concur with Camarota and Jensenius that education is critical and we firmly believe that immigrants who arrived later in life – as well as our state as a whole – could benefit if they were afforded the educational opportunities that they were not given or chose to cut short in their country of origin. Moreover, our regression results suggest that when workers get beyond high school – particularly when workers hit college level and obtain advanced degrees – actual skill acquisition begins to matter more than signals for both immigrants and natives. Our only point here is that using only data on high school completion may be inappropriate in assessing the "quality" of the labor force when that labor force includes a large number of immigrants who migrated as adults.

California's Future

With the tough economic and fiscal challenges California faces, we need a balanced and common base of information. Our school systems are surely struggling, but we remain one of the most educated states as well as one of the least. Our inequality is indeed high but it is related to our changing economic structure as well as our role in the global economy. And while we have been one of the country's leading entry points for new immigrants, our share of foreign-born is now actually on the decline, implying that pointing to immigrants as the source of our state's dilemmas may increasingly lose salience as an explanation or guide for action (Myers and Pitkin 2010).

Designing workable solutions for our future will require a serious and civil conversation about all the decisions ahead, including those concerning our immigrant communities. In our view, cherry-picking facts that focus on one side of the education spectrum, implying that immigration is the sole cause of the state's growing inequality, and failing to understand exactly what educational completion signals about California's immigrant workers does not help move us forward to effective policy.

California's future relies on supporting our immigrants. With nearly 30 percent of our residents foreign-born and more than half of our children the children of immigrants, California's leaders know that how that second generation and their parents fare will determine the trajectory of the state. Expanding opportunity and decreasing inequality will require basic improvements in public schooling, wider availability of English classes, and policies that support low-skill workers, among other policy prescriptions (Pastor and Carter 2009).

California's future also depends on a new social compact rooted in American values of mutual benefits and responsibilities between immigrants and native-born residents (Myers 2007). For those of us in the Golden State, the future remains bright, particularly if we can maintain the sense of openness and opportunity that has helped make California both resilient in the face of restructuring and a beacon to the people of the world.

Endnotes

[1] There are 15,453,123 Non-Hispanic White residents in California according to the 2008 American Community Survey. New York State ranks second with 11,642,592 Non-Hispanic Whites.

[2] For more on the report, including the California brief and web extras, see the Editorial Projects in Education Research Center's (EPE-RC), "Graduation by the Numbers: Putting Data to Work for Students – California," a special supplement to Education Week's *Diplomas Count 2010*. Available at http://www.edweek.org/ew/toc/2010/06/10/index.html. The focus on poverty not immigration comes from an Interview by KPCC of Sterling Lloyd, researcher at the Editorial Projects and Education Research Center. http://www.scpr.org/news/2010/06/14/ca-grad-rate/

[3] As we do not focus here on the welfare and health insurance issues they also raise in their report, we do not utilize the pooled 2007-2009 Current Population Survey (CPS) from which they draw those figures.

[4] The pooled 2005-2007 ACS was used in an earlier analysis of California labor markets (Pastor, Scoggins, Tran and Ortiz 2010) and it has the advantage of being a much larger sample than the pooled CPS. We did not include the 2008 ACS because in that year, work hours in the IPUMS version are reported in categories rather than actual hours, making wage calculations problematic.

[5] The CIS authors indicate that they use the labor force (those working or actively seeking work) as the universe for considering education. In fact, their high school dropout results can be duplicated only if one restricts the consideration of those in the labor force to those between the ages of 25 and 64, a point they do not mention in the report. This is not unreasonable as this is the range often considered to bracket the age-eligible (to work) population. However, most calculations (for example, in the Census Summary Files) do not use the extra restriction that this age-eligible population be limited to those currently in the labor force (since those of appropriate age, such as parents temporarily focused full-time on raising children or those completing another phase of education, can enter the work force later and should be considered as part of the stock of human capital available to the state). As the CIS authors note in a footnote, California's ranking by the percent who have not completed high school does not change much when one uses just the age restriction rather than age and labor force status, and so we stick with that more traditional categorization in our subsequent calculations of state rankings for college completion.

[6] The authors further note that California ranks relatively low in terms of 19 year olds who have completed high school, point to a high share of California residents accessing at least one major welfare program, and note that California ranks eighth in the country in terms of the share of the state's population without health insurance. Again, we do not deal with these issues nor do we use the CPS data in this short memo.

[7] The median household income in the 1970 PUMS is, as census observers know, actually from the previous year, 1969; we label it as 1970 in the table simply to facilitate the comparison with the other data (and because the relevant rank by state likely did not change much between those two years).

[8] To be consistent with the CIS authors, we drop Washington, DC from all the rankings. It should be noted, however, that Washington, DC is currently the most unequal "state" in the country if it were included in such a listing. Our household median income rankings for 1970 and 2008 are slightly different (given our method of using the raw data) than the summary numbers given by the Census at http://www.wwwcensusgov.zuom.info/hhes/www/income/histinc/state/state1.html; by that standard, California was 11th rather than 10th in 1970 and 9th rather than 8th in 2008.

[9] For the 1970 data, the only variable available is years of schooling completed; for the 2008 data, we have direct information on degrees obtained. This data limitation also impacts calculations of those who fail to complete high school. While Camarota and Jensenius indicate in the text that they mark high school completion with regard to the highest grade completed, it is possible to "complete" twelfth grade and still not obtain a diploma. In replicating their figures, however, we found that they seem to be appropriately

considering only those who have obtained a diploma. For the B.A., completing four years and obtaining a B.A. are recorded as the same in the IPUMS version of the 2008 ACS; as noted, the 1970 data had only years completed and we took four years of college to mark college completion.

[10] We looked at the share of immigrants within the following educational attainment categories: less than a high school degree, high school diploma/GED, some college or Associate's degree, Bachelor's degree, Master's or Professional Degree, and Doctorate degrees. Although immigrants comprise over 70 percent of 25-64 year olds with less than a high school degree, the second educational category in which they are most represented is among those with Doctorate degrees. Immigrants comprise 37.4 percent of the 25-64 year old group overall, so their proportion in the doctorate category is a slight overrepresentation.

[11] We used the same procedure as Camarota and Jensenius to calculate the Gini coefficient based on household incomes, and, following their process, used household rather than person weights on the income variable. Income inequality also rose somewhat among immigrant households but that left California squarely in the middle of the distribution with regard to immigrant households alone.

[12] To make the calculation, we took the GDP by state series from the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA; see http://www.bea.gov) and divided by the employment numbers, also taken from the BEA. We then ranked the states.

[13] Full-time year-round were defined as those who worked at least 50 weeks during the year prior to the survey and typically worked at least 35 hours per week over the same period.

[14] The results are also not especially sensitive to the choice of other reasonable age breaks to characterize "later age" immigrants.

[15] In one set of regressions, we also entered a variable for whether the worker was male or female; in another set of regressions, we did the analysis separately for men and women. The results we report are for men but the pattern is similar for women. Consistent with past research, we also used the square of work experience and whether the individual was self-employed.

[16] We investigated the results on the wage "penalty" from low levels of education for U.S.-born workers and immigrants who arrived after age 19 in two ways. A first approach involved running separate regressions for U.S.-born and immigrant workers; in this specification, we are comparing the effects of education on wages within each group, with education measured as mutually exclusive categories (not completing high school, completing high school, completing some college or an Associate's degree, completing a B.A., completing an M.A., completing a professional degree, and completing a doctorate with one category left out to have a reference group). As noted in the text, the other controls in these regressions include race, work experience, self-employment, English language ability, occupation, industry, and region in California as well as the aforementioned education levels. A second approach involved pooling both groups and then calculating interactive effects between immigrant status and all the personal characteristics (e.g. race, education levels, work experience, self-employment, and English language ability); this forces the remaining occupational, industry, and regional effects to be the same for both groups but it has the advantage of allowing for a more direct calculation of the difference in wages between immigrants and non-immigrants of different educational levels (with the reference group being non-immigrant high school completers). The within-group differentials by education yielded by both approaches are nearly identical; we present the results of the pooled approach in the text as it offers a more easily understood comparison between immigrants without a high school education and native-born with a high school education. For more on the use of interactive variables in multivariate regressions, see Kennedy (2003:252-253).

[17] Moreover, some share of such immigrant workers are undocumented, a characteristic that we have estimated in other work as incurring a 10 percent wage penalty (Pastor, Scoggins, Tran and Ortiz, 2010).

Table 1. State Rankings by Median Household Income, 1970 and 2008

	1970 Median Household Income (inflation-adjusted to $2008)		2008 Median Household Income ($2008)	
1	Alaska	$66,367	Maryland	$70,778
2	Connecticut	$62,843	New Jersey	$70,676
3	Hawaii	$62,109	Connecticut	$68,639
4	New Jersey	$59,320	Alaska	$68,232
5	Maryland	$59,026	Hawaii	$66,704
6	Michigan	$58,145	Massachusetts	$65,645
7	Illinois	$56,383	New Hampshire	$63,446
8	Massachusetts	$55,796	California	$61,103
9	Nevada	$54,915	Virginia	$61,103
10	California	$53,740	Washington	$58,048
11	New York	$53,446	Delaware	$57,539
12	Ohio	$53,446	Colorado	$57,030
13	Delaware	$53,153	Minnesota	$57,030
14	Washington	$53,153	Illinois	$56,011
15	Wisconsin	$52,859	Nevada	$56,011
16	Indiana	$51,978	New York	$56,011
17	Minnesota	$51,097	Utah	$56,011
18	New Hampshire	$50,216	Rhode Island	$54,993
19	Rhode Island	$49,922	Wyoming	$52,956
20	Pennsylvania	$49,629	Wisconsin	$52,508
21	Utah	$49,629	Vermont	$52,142
22	Colorado	$48,454	Arizona	$50,919
23	Oregon	$47,573	Georgia	$50,919
24	Virginia	$47,573	Pennsylvania	$50,919
25	Arizona	$47,279	Kansas	$50,512
26	Vermont	$46,986	Oregon	$50,003
27	Iowa	$45,517	Texas	$49,901
28	Wyoming	$44,930	Nebraska	$49,188
29	Idaho	$44,490	Iowa	$49,086
30	Kansas	$44,343	Michigan	$48,272
31	Missouri	$43,755	Indiana	$47,997
32	Nebraska	$43,462	Florida	$47,864
33	Texas	$43,462	Ohio	$47,864
34	Montana	$43,021	Idaho	$47,661
35	Maine	$42,287	Missouri	$46,846
36	Georgia	$41,700	North Carolina	$46,439
37	Florida	$41,406	North Dakota	$45,929
38	North Dakota	$41,406	South Dakota	$45,828
39	North Carolina	$41,113	Maine	$45,726
40	New Mexico	$40,819	South Carolina	$44,809
41	South Carolina	$39,938	Montana	$44,198
42	Tennessee	$38,470	Tennessee	$43,791
43	Oklahoma	$38,176	Louisiana	$43,485
44	Kentucky	$37,295	New Mexico	$43,078
45	Louisiana	$37,295	Alabama	$42,772
46	South Dakota	$37,001	Oklahoma	$42,772
47	Alabama	$36,120	Kentucky	$41,143
48	West Virginia	$35,533	Arkansas	$38,902
49	Arkansas	$30,541	Mississippi	$38,454
50	Mississippi	$29,660	West Virginia	$38,190

Table 2. State Rankings by College-Education, 1970

% of Population (age 25-64) that Completed 4 or More Years of College

	All Residents		Immigrants		U.S.-Born	
1	Colorado	17%	Delaware	33%	Colorado	17%
2	Connecticut	15%	Iowa	31%	Connecticut	16%
3	Maryland	15%	West Virginia	29%	Hawaii	15%
4	Hawaii	15%	Kentucky	29%	Utah	15%
5	Utah	15%	Virginia	26%	California	15%
6	New Mexico	15%	Tennessee	24%	Maryland	15%
7	California	15%	Alabama	24%	Massachusetts	15%
8	Washington	14%	Maryland	22%	New Mexico	15%
9	Massachusetts	14%	Kansas	22%	Washington	14%
10	Alaska	14%	North Carolina	22%	Alaska	14%
11	Wyoming	14%	Mississippi	21%	Wyoming	14%
12	New Jersey	13%	Minnesota	20%	New York	14%
13	New York	13%	Missouri	19%	New Jersey	14%
14	Virginia	13%	South Carolina	19%	Arizona	13%
15	Arizona	13%	Oregon	17%	Vermont	13%
16	Oregon	13%	Georgia	17%	Virginia	13%
17	Vermont	13%	Colorado	16%	Oregon	13%
18	Delaware	13%	South Dakota	16%	Texas	12%
19	Kansas	12%	Wisconsin	16%	Kansas	12%
20	Minnesota	12%	Indiana	15%	Minnesota	12%
21	Texas	12%	Washington	15%	Montana	12%
22	Illinois	12%	Nebraska	15%	Delaware	12%
23	Montana	12%	Ohio	15%	Illinois	12%
24	Nebraska	12%	Louisiana	15%	New Hampshire	11%
25	New Hampshire	11%	Alaska	15%	Nebraska	11%
26	Idaho	11%	New Mexico	14%	Idaho	11%
27	Wisconsin	11%	Nevada	14%	Florida	11%
28	Florida	11%	Oklahoma	13%	Wisconsin	11%
29	Nevada	11%	Pennsylvania	13%	Oklahoma	11%
30	Oklahoma	11%	Hawaii	13%	Nevada	11%
31	Rhode Island	11%	Idaho	13%	Rhode Island	11%
32	Iowa	11%	Illinois	13%	Iowa	10%
33	Ohio	10%	California	12%	Michigan	10%
34	Michigan	10%	Vermont	12%	Ohio	10%
35	Georgia	10%	Arkansas	12%	Georgia	10%
36	Missouri	10%	Michigan	12%	North Dakota	10%
37	North Dakota	10%	New Jersey	11%	Missouri	10%
38	Louisiana	10%	North Dakota	11%	Louisiana	10%
39	Pennsylvania	10%	Utah	11%	Pennsylvania	9%
40	Indiana	9%	Wyoming	11%	Indiana	9%
41	North Carolina	9%	New York	11%	North Carolina	9%
42	South Carolina	9%	Florida	11%	South Carolina	9%
43	South Dakota	9%	Massachusetts	10%	South Dakota	9%
44	Tennessee	9%	New Hampshire	9%	Tennessee	9%
45	Alabama	9%	Texas	9%	Alabama	9%
46	Mississippi	9%	Connecticut	8%	Mississippi	9%
47	Maine	8%	Arizona	8%	Maine	8%
48	Kentucky	8%	Montana	8%	Kentucky	8%
49	Arkansas	7%	Maine	8%	Arkansas	7%
50	West Virginia	7%	Rhode Island	7%	West Virginia	7%

Table 3. State Rankings by College-Education, 2008

% of Population (age 25-64) with a B.A. or Higher

	All Residents		Immigrants		U.S.-Born	
1	Massachusetts	42%	West Virginia	51%	Massachusetts	43%
2	Connecticut	38%	New Hampshire	47%	Colorado	39%
3	New Jersey	38%	Ohio	46%	Connecticut	39%
4	Maryland	37%	Maryland	42%	New Jersey	38%
5	Colorado	37%	Vermont	41%	Maryland	36%
6	Virginia	36%	Virginia	40%	New York	36%
7	New Hampshire	36%	Michigan	40%	Virginia	35%
8	Vermont	35%	Pennsylvania	40%	Vermont	35%
9	New York	35%	Delaware	39%	Rhode Island	35%
10	Minnesota	34%	New Jersey	38%	New Hampshire	35%
11	Illinois	33%	Montana	38%	Minnesota	35%
12	Rhode Island	32%	South Dakota	37%	California	34%
13	Washington	32%	Massachusetts	37%	Illinois	33%
14	Kansas	32%	Connecticut	35%	Hawaii	33%
15	Hawaii	32%	Kentucky	34%	Kansas	32%
16	California	31%	Missouri	34%	Washington	32%
17	Nebraska	30%	Minnesota	33%	Nebraska	31%
18	Montana	30%	Washington	31%	Utah	31%
19	Utah	30%	Alabama	31%	Oregon	30%
20	Oregon	30%	New York	30%	Montana	30%
21	Pennsylvania	29%	Georgia	30%	North Dakota	29%
22	Georgia	29%	Iowa	30%	Georgia	29%
23	North Dakota	29%	Illinois	30%	Pennsylvania	28%
24	Delaware	29%	Indiana	30%	Texas	28%
25	North Carolina	28%	Mississippi	29%	North Carolina	28%
26	Wisconsin	28%	Tennessee	28%	Arizona	28%
27	Alaska	28%	Wisconsin	28%	Alaska	28%
28	Missouri	27%	Kansas	28%	Wisconsin	28%
29	Iowa	27%	Maine	27%	Delaware	27%
30	Florida	27%	Florida	27%	Florida	27%
31	Michigan	27%	Louisiana	27%	Missouri	27%
32	Ohio	26%	North Carolina	27%	Iowa	27%
33	Texas	26%	Alaska	27%	New Mexico	27%
34	South Dakota	26%	South Carolina	26%	Idaho	26%
35	Arizona	26%	Hawaii	26%	South Dakota	26%
36	Idaho	26%	Oregon	26%	Michigan	26%
37	New Mexico	25%	California	26%	Ohio	25%
38	Maine	25%	Colorado	24%	South Carolina	25%
39	South Carolina	25%	Utah	22%	Maine	25%
40	Indiana	25%	Oklahoma	22%	Indiana	25%
41	Tennessee	24%	Nebraska	20%	Oklahoma	24%
42	Oklahoma	24%	Rhode Island	20%	Tennessee	24%
43	Alabama	24%	Texas	20%	Nevada	24%
44	Wyoming	23%	Nevada	19%	Wyoming	24%
45	Nevada	23%	Idaho	18%	Alabama	23%
46	Louisiana	22%	Wyoming	18%	Louisiana	21%
47	Kentucky	21%	Arkansas	17%	Arkansas	21%
48	Arkansas	21%	Arizona	17%	Kentucky	21%
49	Mississippi	20%	New Mexico	16%	Mississippi	20%
50	West Virginia	19%	North Dakota	16%	West Virginia	18%

Table 4. Gini Coefficients by State, 1970 and 2008

	All Households			
	1970		2008	
1	Mississippi	0.4608	New York	0.5015
2	Louisiana	0.4502	Connecticut	0.4842
3	Arkansas	0.4458	Mississippi	0.4778
4	Florida	0.4357	Louisiana	0.4756
5	Alabama	0.4357	Texas	0.4736
6	Kentucky	0.4309	California	0.4719
7	Oklahoma	0.4292	Florida	0.4697
8	Missouri	0.4254	Massachusetts	0.4691
9	South Dakota	0.4252	Tennessee	0.4682
10	New Mexico	0.4246	Kentucky	0.4667
11	South Carolina	0.4237	Georgia	0.4658
12	Tennessee	0.4230	Illinois	0.4651
13	Georgia	0.4226	Alabama	0.4642
14	West Virginia	0.4214	South Carolina	0.4630
15	Texas	0.4199	Rhode Island	0.4617
16	Nebraska	0.4119	New Mexico	0.4613
17	Kansas	0.4097	North Carolina	0.4606
18	New York	0.4088	Arkansas	0.4594
19	Montana	0.4081	New Jersey	0.4587
20	Arizona	0.4055	Virginia	0.4579
21	North Carolina	0.4053	Colorado	0.4565
22	Virginia	0.4036	Oklahoma	0.4561
23	Rhode Island	0.4009	Pennsylvania	0.4541
24	Iowa	0.4006	Arizona	0.4522
25	California	0.4002	Montana	0.4512
26	North Dakota	0.3978	Michigan	0.4502
27	Colorado	0.3947	West Virginia	0.4497
28	Oregon	0.3934	Ohio	0.4489
29	Idaho	0.3912	Delaware	0.4487
30	Wyoming	0.3910	Missouri	0.4479
31	Minnesota	0.3894	Oregon	0.4451
32	Washington	0.3894	Minnesota	0.4449
33	Illinois	0.3887	South Dakota	0.4441
34	Pennsylvania	0.3845	Vermont	0.4436
35	Massachusetts	0.3813	Kansas	0.4428
36	Maryland	0.3777	Washington	0.4394
37	New Jersey	0.3774	Wyoming	0.4385
38	Ohio	0.3767	North Dakota	0.4382
39	Wisconsin	0.3766	Maryland	0.4365
40	Alaska	0.3764	Indiana	0.4340
41	Hawaii	0.3759	Nevada	0.4308
42	Nevada	0.3758	Maine	0.4289
43	Indiana	0.3746	Hawaii	0.4287
44	Vermont	0.3740	Iowa	0.4271
45	Maine	0.3731	Nebraska	0.4223
46	Utah	0.3730	Wisconsin	0.4218
47	Connecticut	0.3728	Idaho	0.4207
48	Delaware	0.3725	New Hampshire	0.4190
49	Michigan	0.3721	Utah	0.4144
50	New Hampshire	0.3688	Alaska	0.4095

Table 5. Gini Coefficients by State for U.S.-Born, 1970 and 2008

	U.S.-Born Households			
	1970		2008	
1	Mississippi	0.4606	New York	0.5003
2	Louisiana	0.4497	Connecticut	0.4830
3	Arkansas	0.4455	Mississippi	0.4775
4	Alabama	0.4356	Louisiana	0.4754
5	Florida	0.4320	Texas	0.4694
6	Kentucky	0.4302	California	0.4680
7	Oklahoma	0.4288	Tennessee	0.4671
8	Missouri	0.4240	Illinois	0.4662
9	South Carolina	0.4232	Florida	0.4661
10	Tennessee	0.4225	Georgia	0.4657
11	Georgia	0.4223	Kentucky	0.4643
12	New Mexico	0.4222	Massachusetts	0.4641
13	South Dakota	0.4214	Alabama	0.4638
14	West Virginia	0.4195	South Carolina	0.4628
15	Texas	0.4166	Virginia	0.4604
16	Nebraska	0.4096	North Carolina	0.4597
17	Kansas	0.4078	Arkansas	0.4591
18	North Carolina	0.4047	New Jersey	0.4580
19	Montana	0.4040	New Mexico	0.4574
20	Virginia	0.4024	Rhode Island	0.4572
21	Arizona	0.3988	Oklahoma	0.4561
22	Iowa	0.3988	Pennsylvania	0.4516
23	New York	0.3987	Colorado	0.4512
24	California	0.3947	Montana	0.4508
25	Colorado	0.3930	Arizona	0.4473
26	Idaho	0.3891	West Virginia	0.4472
27	Rhode Island	0.3888	Michigan	0.4471
28	Oregon	0.3885	Ohio	0.4464
29	North Dakota	0.3869	Missouri	0.4456
30	Illinois	0.3849	Delaware	0.4452
31	Washington	0.3839	South Dakota	0.4447
32	Minnesota	0.3836	Oregon	0.4420
33	Wyoming	0.3835	Kansas	0.4419
34	Pennsylvania	0.3783	Vermont	0.4418
35	Maryland	0.3756	Minnesota	0.4407
36	Indiana	0.3732	North Dakota	0.4393
37	Alaska	0.3728	Maryland	0.4380
38	Ohio	0.3726	Wyoming	0.4360
39	Vermont	0.3724	Washington	0.4357
40	Wisconsin	0.3718	Indiana	0.4313
41	Nevada	0.3718	Nevada	0.4303
42	Massachusetts	0.3718	Maine	0.4277
43	Delaware	0.3715	Iowa	0.4256
44	Utah	0.3690	Hawaii	0.4244
45	New Jersey	0.3685	Nebraska	0.4213
46	Michigan	0.3661	Wisconsin	0.4196
47	Hawaii	0.3648	Idaho	0.4179
48	Maine	0.3647	New Hampshire	0.4176
49	New Hampshire	0.3637	Utah	0.4120
50	Connecticut	0.3632	Alaska	0.4063

References

Blackwell, Angela Glover, Stewart Kwoh, and Manuel Pastor. 2010. *Uncommon Common Ground: Race and America's Future.* New York: American Assembly and Norton.

Camarota, Steven A. and Karen Jensenius. 2010. *A State Transformed: Immigration and the New California*. Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies.

Kennedy, Peter. 2003. *A Guide to Econometrics. Fifth Edition.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Myers, Dowell. 2007. *Immigrants and Boomers: Forging a New Social Contract for the Future of America*. New York: Russell Sage Press.

Myers, Dowell, and John Pitkin. 2010. *The New Place of Birth Profile of Los Angeles & California Residents in 2010*. Los Angeles, California: USC School of Policy, Planning, and Development, March.

Pastor, Manuel and Vanessa Carter. 2009. "Conflict, Consensus, Coalition: Economic and Workforce Development Strategies for African Americans and Latinos." *Race and Social Problems* 1(3): 143-156.

Pastor, Manuel and Rhonda Ortiz. 2009. "Immigrant Integration in Los Angeles: Strategic Directions for Funders." The Program for Environmental and Regional Equity at USC.

Pastor, Manuel, Justin Scoggins, Jennifer Tran, and Rhonda Ortiz. 2010. *The Economic Benefits of Immigrant Authorization in California*. Los Angeles, California: USC Center for the Study of Immigrant Integration, January.

Peri, Giovanni. 2007. "How Immigrants Affect California Employment and Wages." *California Counts: Population Trends and Profiles 8*(3), February. San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California.

Steven Ruggles, J. Trent Alexander, Katie Genadek, Ronald Goeken, Matthew B. Schroeder, and Matthew Sobek. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0 [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2010.

University of Southern California

Center for the Study of Immigrant Integration (CSII)
University of Southern California (USC)
P: 213.821.1325
F: 213.740.5680
E: csii@usc.edu
W: http://csii.usc.edu