Characteristics of the U.S. Population by Generational Status: 2013 Current Population Survey Reports

Edward Trevelyan, Christine Gambino, Thomas Gryn, Luke Larsen, Yesenia Acosta, Elizabeth Grieco, Darryl Harris, and Nathan Walters Issued November 2016 P23-214





U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration U.S. CENSUS BUREAU census.gov

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared under the direction of **Stephanie Ewert**, **Roberto Ramirez**, **Bashiruddin Ahmed**, and **Karen Battle** of the Population Division. Peer review was provided by **Wendie Choudary, Paul Jacobs, Shabnam Shenasi Azari,** and **Laquitta Walker. Frank Hobbs** and **Victoria Velkoff** provided conceptual guidance with earlier drafts of the report.

Linda Chen and **Amanda Perry** of the Public Information Office provided publication management, graphics design and composition, and editorial review.

Characteristics of the U.S. Population by Generational Status: 2013

Current Population Survey Reports

Issued November 2016

P23-214



U.S. Department of Commerce Penny Pritzker, Secretary

> Bruce H. Andrews, Deputy Secretary

Economics and Statistics Administration

Justin Antonipillai, Counselor, Delegated Duties of Under Secretary for Economic Affairs

> U.S. CENSUS BUREAU John H. Thompson, Director

SUGGESTED CITATION Edward Trevelyan, Christine Gambino, Thomas Gryn, Luke Larsen, Yesenia Acosta, Elizabeth Grieco, Darryl Harris, and Nathan Walters, U.S. Census Bureau, *Characteristics of the* U.S. Population by Generational Status: 2013, Washington, DC, 2016.



Economics and Statistics Administration

Justin Antonipillai,

Counselor, Delegated Duties of Under Secretary for Economic Affairs



U.S. CENSUS BUREAU John H. Thompson, Director

Nancy A. Potok, Deputy Director and Chief Operating Officer

Enrique Lamas, Associate Director for Demographic Programs

Karen Battle, Chief, Population Division

David G. Waddington, Acting Chief, Social, Economic, and Housing Statistics Division

Contents

Terminology and Definitions	1
The 2013 Current Population Survey and Annual Social and Economic	
Supplement	2
Introduction	3
Age and Sex	8
Hispanic Origin	11
Educational Attainment	13
Labor Force Participation and Employment Status	15
Occupation	19
Industry	21
Income and Earnings	23
Poverty Status	28
Homeownership	31
Voting	33
Conclusion	36
Source and Accuracy	37

Terminology and Definitions

This report uses the following definitions:

- Foreign born: The U.S. Census Bureau uses the term foreign born to refer to anyone who is not a U.S. citizen at birth. This includes naturalized citizens, legal permanent residents, temporary migrants (such as foreign-born students), humanitarian migrants (such as refugees), and undocumented migrants.
- Native born: The term native born refers to anyone born

in the United States, Puerto Rico, or a U.S. Island Area (Guam, American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands), or those born abroad of at least one U.S. citizen parent. The terms native and native born are used interchangeably in this report.

• First generation: Foreign born. The terms first generation and foreign born are used interchangeably in this report.

 Second generation: U.S. native (born in the United States or territories) with at least one foreign-born parent.

•

Third-and-higher generation: U.S. native (born in the United States or territories) with both parents native born. Also referred to in this report as the third generation.

The 2013 Current Population Survey and Annual Social and Economic Supplement

The statistics presented in this report are from the Annual Social and Economic (ASEC) supplement to the 2013 Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS, sponsored jointly by the U.S. Census Bureau and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, is the primary source of labor force statistics for the population of the United States. The survey also provides a wealth of other demographic, social, and economic information.

The monthly CPS questionnaire includes questions on place of birth, parental place of birth, U.S. citizenship status, and year of entry into the United States. The ASEC supplement includes these questions and others about poverty status, money income received, health insurance, household and family characteristics, marital status, and geographic mobility. Because of sample size constraints, analysis of the population by generational status is restricted to the national level.¹ The CPS instrument includes two questions on parental place of birth: "In what country was your father born?" and "In what country was your mother born?" Information on parental place of birth can be used to categorize the population into generational groups, allowing policymakers and researchers to examine questions about the adaptation and integration of immigrants and their descendants over time.

¹ For technical information about the CPS, see U.S. Census Bureau, *Design and Methodology: Current Population Survey*, Technical Paper 66, issued October 2006, <www.census.gov/prod/2006pubs/tp-66 .pdf>.

Introduction

Often referred to as a "nation of immigrants," the United States has a resident population that is one-quarter foreign born or native born with at least one foreignborn parent. While most residents have immigration in their family histories, some 235 million, or 75 percent, must look back to the time of their grandparents' generation or before in order to access their family's immigration experience (Figure 1).

Successfully navigating the transition from immigrant origins, in which one or more parents or grandparents were foreign born, plays a central role in the mythology of the "American dream." This expectation that one's economic status will improve over those of one's parents and grandparents is particularly salient in immigrant communities, in which the first generation often must work harder to overcome numerous cultural and economic challenges. This report looks for evidence of such "intergenerational mobility" with a focus on the second generation, whose demographic and economic characteristics are compared with those of other generation groups:

- The first-generation population (foreign born) numbered about 40 million people, or 13 percent of the total population in 2013 (Figure 1).
- The second-generation population (native-born residents with at least one foreign-born parent) comprised 12 percent of the total population in 2013, or about 36 million people.

 The third-and-higher generation (native-born respondents with two native-born parents) was the largest group at 235 million people, or 75 percent of the total population.

In spite of its size and diverse composition, the third-and-higher generation had the slowest rate of growth among the three generational groups. In the past 15 years (between 1998 and 2013), it grew just 10 percent (Figure 2a) while its share of the total population declined from 79 percent to 75 percent (Figure 2b). Meanwhile, the second generation grew 23 percent from 30 million to 36 million, and the first generation grew 53 percent, from 26 million to 40 million. The Census Bureau projects that by 2060, nearly one in five residents of the United States

Figure 1.

U.S. Population by Generational Status: 2013

(Data based on sample. Universe is total civilian population of the United States, plus Armed Forces members who live in housing units—off post or on post—with at least one other civilian adult. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf)



Figure 2a. Percentage Population Growth by Generational Status: 1998 to 2013

(Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see *www2.census* .gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf)



Figure 2b. **Population by Generational Status: 1998 and 2013** (Percent distribution)



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1998 and 2013 Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

(19 percent) will be foreign born, compared with about one in eight

(13 percent) in 2014.² In 2013, the Pew Research Center projected

² Sandra L. Colby and Jennifer M. Ortman, *Projections of the Size and Composition of the U.S. Population: 2014 to 2060*, Current Population Reports, P25-1143, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC, 2014, p.2. that 82 percent of the U.S. population increase between 2005 and 2050 will be immigrants and their descendants, or 93 percent if only the working-age population is considered.³

Parental nativity information is required to determine generation, and therefore this report makes use of the Annual Social and Economic (ASEC) supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS), which asks questions on parental place of birth.⁴ The CPS is the most widely used dataset in the United States for nationallevel statistics on demographic, social, and economic characteristics by generational status.⁵ The CPS data included in this report are cross-sectional. Data in this report related to differences between generations, or change within generations over time, do not include any longitudinal analyses of the same person or family over time. Although this report shows associations rather than causation, it provides some support for the phenomenon of intergenerational mobility: high first- and secondgeneration achievement, followed by stabilization and sometimes regression in subsequent generations. Intergenerational mobility is not the same as assimilation to

³ Pew Research Center, Second-Generation Americans: A Portrait of the Adult Children of Immigrants, 2013.

⁴ There is no parental nativity or parental citizenship question on the ASEC supplement questionnaire. For this report, questions on parental place of birth were used to infer parental nativity, which may cause incorrect generational classifications in a small number of cases. For example, a respondent with one native-born parent and one parent who was born abroad as a U.S. citizen (i.e., born to parents who were U.S. citizens living abroad) would have been incorrectly classified as second generation instead of third-and-higher generation.

⁵ Ruben G. Rumbaut, "Ages, Life Stages, and Generational Cohorts: Decomposing the Immigrant First and Second Generations in the United States," *International Migration Review*, 38, 3, 2004, pp. 1160–1205.

American culture. Several studies have shown that, while assimilation to American culture generally increases from the first to the thirdand-higher generation, measures of intergenerational advancement do not always increase.⁶ This mixed success in intergenerational mobility has been referred to in studies as "segmented assimilation," in which obstacles to advancement may appear after the initial firstand second-generation immigrant experiences, complicating expectations that generational progress occurs in a linear fashion.^{7, 8, 9, 10, 11}

⁸ Susan K. Brown and Frank D. Bean, Assimilation Models, Old and New: Explaining a Long-Term Process, Migration Policy Institute, 2006.

⁹ Min Zhou, "Growing Up American: The Challenge Confronting Immigrant Children and Children of Immigrants," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 1997, pp. 63-95.

¹⁰ Julie Park and Dowell Myers, "Intergenerational Mobility in the Post-1965 Immigration Era: Estimates by an Immigrant Generation Cohort Method," *Demography*, 47, 2, 2010, pp. 369–392.

¹¹ Gary R. Pike and George D. Kuh, "Firstand Second-Generation College Students: A Comparison of Their Engagement and Intellectual Development," *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76, 3, 2005, pp. 276–300.

Children of Immigrants

It has been reported that half of the first generation came from Latin America, but the origins of the second generation are less well understood.¹² The second generation are native born by definition and have either two foreign-born parents (59 percent) or one native-born parent and one foreign-born parent (20 percent with a foreign-born mother and 21 percent with a foreign-born father) (Figure 3).

For the second generation, the distribution of parental place of birth varied only slightly by sex of the parent (Figures 4 and 5). Over 40 percent had either fathers or mothers born in Latin America

¹² Elizabeth M. Grieco, et al., "The Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2010," *American Community Survey Reports,* U.S. Census Bureau, 2012, p. 2.

⁶ David North, *The Immigrant Paradox: The Stalled Progress of Recent Immigrants' Children*, Center for Immigration Studies, 2009.



⁷ Alejandro Portes and Min Zhou, "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants," *Annals Of The American Academy Of Political And Social Science*, 530, 1993, pp. 74–96.

(43 percent and 42 percent, respectively), about double the share of those who had parents born in the United States (20 percent for fathers and 21 percent for mothers). About 15 percent of parents of the second generation were born in either Asia or Europe, with smaller proportions from other northern America, Africa, and other areas.^{13, 14}

With charts and interpretive text, this report examines generational

¹⁴ The number of the second-generation respondents whose fathers were born in Asia was not significantly different from the number whose fathers were born in Europe. The number of the second-generation respondents whose mothers were born in Other Northern America was not significantly different from the number whose mothers were born in Africa. differences in demographic indicators such as age, sex, and Hispanic origin. Economic characteristics like educational attainment, labor force participation, and occupation, as well as outcomes of well-being such as income and poverty, are areas of special focus. Political participation and voting behavior are considered as possible indicators that immigrants and their descendants are increasingly woven into the fabric of American society.



¹³ Other Northern America includes primarily Canada, but also Bermuda and Saint Pierre and Miquelon (self-governing territories of the United Kingdom and France, respectively). Other areas refers to Oceania, which includes Australia, New Zealand, and other Pacific islands.



Age and Sex

The approximate 50:50 ratio of males to females in the United States differed only slightly by generation.

The total population of the United States was about evenly divided between males (49 percent) and females (51 percent) in 2013. For every 100 females in the country, there were 96 males. There was little variation among the sex ratios of the three generational groups. The second generation had the highest number of males per 100 females (99) compared with the first generation (95) and the third generation (96).¹⁵

¹⁵ The total populations for secondgeneration males and females were not significantly different.

The median age of the U.S. population varied considerably by generation.

Although the median age for the total population was 38 years in 2013 (Figure 6), the median age of the second generation (21 years) was considerably lower than that of the first and third generations (43 years and 39 years, respectively). Several factors contribute to these differences. First, most immigrants come to the United States as adults, and fewer arrive as children, which boosts the average age of the first generation. Second, children of immigrants born in the United States are considered native, not foreign-born, and so do not lower the median age of the first generation. Finally, because about half of

the second generation are children of recent immigrants, their average age is inevitably younger than the parental group.

Median age has risen gradually over time for the first and third generations, while remaining consistently low for the second generation.

Figure 6 shows that the median ages for the first and third generations climbed since 1998 (to 43 and 39 years, respectively, in 2013), while the second generation's median age leveled off at 21 years in 2004 after falling from about 28 years in 1998.



Nearly half of the second generation were under 18 years old, while over 80 percent of the first generation were aged 18 to 64.

In 2013, nearly two-thirds (62 percent) of the total population were in the working-age group of 18 to 64, and 40 percent were over age 44 (Figure 7). Thirty-two percent of the first generation were aged 45 to 64. In contrast, 45 percent of the second generation were under 18 years, and 77 percent were less than 45 years old. This young age structure of the second generation reflects the fact that most of their first-generation parents (over 75 percent) have entered the United States since 1980.¹⁶

¹⁶ Elizabeth M. Grieco, et al., *The Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2010*, American Community Survey Reports, U.S. Census Bureau, 2012, p. 10.



Figure 8.

Age Distribution for the First and Second Generations: 1998 to 2013

(Percent distribution. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf)



The proportion of foreign born under age 45 fell since 1998, yet about half were aged 18 to 44 in 2013.

Figure 8 shows the relative youthfulness of the second generation, with over 40 percent under age 18 since 2003. As a sign that this historically young group is beginning to age, the proportion of the second generation in the large working age group (18 to 64) has grown from 39 percent to 44 percent between 1998 and 2013. However, the proportion older than age 44 decreased from 35 percent in 1998 to 23 percent in 2013. Meanwhile, the older working aged first generation (over age 44) has grown in recent years, from one-third in 1998 to 45 percent by 2013.

In 2013, each of the three generation groups had a distinctive age distribution that varied slightly by sex.

Age-by-generation patterns varied only slightly by sex. The population pyramids in Figure 9 show left-toright symmetry, suggesting approximately equal male-female distributions across the age and generation groups. The subtle deviations from symmetry include a broader distribution of first-generation females than males in the 30 to 54 year-old age group, reflecting the relatively large numbers of 35 to 39 year-old male immigrants who might have arrived alone seeking employment. The third-generation pyramid illustrates the general population's tendency to be evenly distributed

(under age 65), with 6 to 7 percent in most age cohorts of both sexes. The concentration dips to about 5 percent in the 35 to 39 year-old cohort (the prime working-age cohort that is most highly represented among the first generation). The baby boom bulge in the middleto-late fifties cohort is followed by rapidly diminishing percentages among the older population, although the latter trend is more pronounced among males than females. The youthful age structure of the second generation appears prominently in Figure 9. Over half of males and females occupied the age cohorts less than 25 years of age, while slightly over one-quarter were under 10 years of age.



Age and Sex by Generational Status: 2013

(Percent distribution. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf)



Hispanic Origin

The first-, second-, and third-generation Hispanic population sizes differed only slightly in 2013. However, this distribution is changing as Mexican immigration slows down and affects the first generation's share of the Hispanic population.

In 2013, there were 53.2 million Hispanics living in the United States, representing 17 percent of the total U.S. population. About half (46 percent) of the first and second generations were Hispanic, compared to 8 percent of the third generation (Figure 10).¹⁷ Each generation group represented about one-third of the total Hispanic population (Figure 11). There were 18.6 million firstgeneration Hispanics (35 percent of the Hispanic population), 17.9 million third-generation Hispanics (34 percent), and 16.8 million secondgeneration Hispanics (32 percent).

In contrast to this balanced generational distribution of the Hispanic population, the total population and non-Hispanic population in 2013 were comprised primarily of the third-and-higher generation (75 percent and 84 percent, respectively) (Figure 11).

These differences are expected, given the fact that large-scale movement from Latin America is a relatively new phenomenon in the history of U.S. immigration.¹⁸ It has taken roughly four decades to reach the point at which one-third of Hispanics (17.9 million) have two parents who were native born. It took the non-Hispanic population (many of whom descend from Asian and especially European immigrants

Figure 10.

Percent Hispanic by Generational Status: 2013

(Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf)



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

Figure 11. Hispanic Origin by Generational Status: 2013

(Percent distribution. Total population at top of columns. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs /cpsmar13.pdf)



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

¹⁷ The first- and second-generation Hispanic populations were not significantly different.

¹⁸ Before the 1965 Immigration Act, U.S. immigration policy favored European entries and discouraged cross-border flows from Mexico.

from the 1970s or earlier) many more decades, since the peak immigration wave of the early 20th century, to reach their large (84 percent) nonimmigrant composition.

People of Mexican origin comprised almost twothirds of the total Hispanic population in 2013 and were distributed evenly across the generations. Cubans and Central and South Americans had higher proportions of firstgeneration arrivals.

The generational distribution of the Hispanic population varied considerably among the five largest Hispanic-origin groups (Figure 12). Because Mexicans made up, by far, the largest Hispanic group (34.3 million), they largely mirrored the distribution of the overall Hispanic population, with about one-third in each generation.¹⁹

The Puerto Rican origin population was nearly all third-and-higher generation (90 percent), reflecting the fact that Puerto Rico is a U.S. territory, and people born in Puerto Rico are U.S. citizens by birth.20 While two-thirds of Mexicans were either born in Mexico or were children of Mexican immigrants, most people of Puerto Rican heritage were born in Puerto Rico or mainland United States to Puerto Rican parents. To be first- or second-generation Puerto Ricans, respondents either immigrated to Puerto Rico from outside the United States (1 percent) or had parent(s) who immigrated to Puerto Rico from outside the United States (9 percent).

The distribution of the Cuban population was majority first generation (59 percent), followed by the second generation (28 percent), and third generation (13 percent). Most

Figure 12. Population by Hispanic Group and Generational Status: 2013

(Percent distribution. Total population at top of columns. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov /programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf)



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

Cubans living in the United States (about 87 percent) were either first or second generation, many families composed of immigrants and children of immigrants who arrived after the 1959 Cuban Revolution or after the Mariel boatlift of 1980. The remaining 13 percent were children of two native-born parents (thirdand-higher generation).

There was little difference between the generational distributions of Cubans and Hispanics of Central or South American heritage. Like Cuban immigrants, these groups have arrived in recent decades, responding to political upheaval and economic hardship, particularly in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Venezuela, Honduras, Peru, Chile, and Colombia. They too were mostly first and second generations (60 percent and 33 percent, respectively), with only 7 percent in the third-generation group. The Other Hispanic²¹ group, over one third of whom identified as Dominican, had a generational distribution not unlike that of Mexicans, though somewhat larger (41 percent) in its third generation component. Included in this thirdgeneration Other Hispanic group are grandchildren of European immigrants who arrived before the post-1965 immigration wave, after which most Hispanic immigrants came from Mexico and other Latin American countries.22

¹⁹ The first- and third-generation Mexican populations were not significantly different.

²⁰ Puerto Ricans living in Puerto Rico are not included in the CPS sample. This population is included in the Puerto Rico Community Survey.

²¹ Other Hispanic includes Dominicans and people who responded "Hispanic," "Latino," or provided other general terms.

²² The first- and second-generation Other Hispanic populations were not significantly different.

¹² Characteristics of the U.S. Population by Generational Status: 2013

Educational Attainment

The second generation was more likely than either the first or the third-andhigher generations to attain bachelor's or graduate degrees.

Overall, 32 percent of the total population aged 25 and older in 2013 had completed a bachelor's degree or higher.23, 24 More of the second generation had attained a bachelor's or higher degree (37 percent) than had the first and third-and-higher generations (about 30 percent) (Figure 13). Additionally, a large proportion of the second generation (15 percent) had completed a master's degree or higher (master's, professional, or doctorate) than had the first or third-and-higher generations (12 percent and 11 percent, respectively).

High school graduation rates were higher for second and third-and-higher generations than for the first generation.

The first generation was less likely than either the second or the thirdand-higher generations to have completed high school. A little over 70 percent of the first generation had attained a high school or equivalent degree or higher, compared with over 90 percent of both the second and third-and-higher generations (Figure 13).

Figure 13.

Cumulative Educational Attainment for the Population Aged 25 Years and Older by Generational Status: 2013

(Percent distribution. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs /cpsmar13.pdf)



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

Nearly one in five in the first generation had less than a 9th grade education.

Looking at the highest level of educational attainment by generation, seventeen percent of the first generation had less than a 9th grade education, compared with 3 percent of the second generation and 2 percent of the third-and-higher generation (Figure 14). Generational differences were smaller for completing 9th to 12th grade without a high school diploma. Eleven percent of the first generation completed 9th to 12th grade without a diploma, compared to 6 percent of the second or third-and-higher generations. Among non-high school graduates, second-generation educational attainment rates were less likely to resemble those of first generation than the third generation.

²³ Educational attainment is only shown for those who are aged 25 years and over. ²⁴ U.S. Census Bureau, *Educational Attainment of the Population 25 Years and Over by Sex and Generation: 2013*, Foreign-Born Tables Package, Annual Social and Economic Supplement to the Current Population Survey, Table 4.5, 2016, <www.census.gov/population/foreign/data /cps2013.html>.



Highest Educational Attainment for the Population Aged 25 Years and Older by Generational Status: 2013

(Percent distribution. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf)



Note: Highest educational attainment represents the most advanced level of education that a person has attained. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

The third-and-higher generation was more likely than other generation groups to graduate from high school but not graduate from college.

The percentage of high school graduates in the second generation that did not go on to college resembles the first generation. However, the percentage of the second generation that attended college but did not earn a bachelor's degree is closer to the third-andhigher generation.

The third-and-higher generation was more likely to graduate from high school without attending college (31 percent) than the first or second generation (26 percent and 27 percent, respectively). Meanwhile, the first generation was less likely to have attained some college or an associate's degree (17 percent) than the second and thirdand-higher generations (27 percent and 29 percent, respectively).

Labor Force Participation and Employment Status

Employed civilians: Civilians 16 years old and over who were either (1) "at work"—did any work during the previous week as paid employees, worked in their own business or profession, worked on their own farm, or worked 15 hours or more as unpaid workers on a family farm or in a family business or (2) "with a job but not at work"—did not work during the previous week but had jobs or businesses from which they were temporarily absent due to illness, bad weather, industrial dispute, vacation, or other personal reason.

Full-time: Employed civilians who worked 35 hours or more per week during the majority of the weeks worked. Employees working less than 35 hours were considered full-time if the reasons for absence were not economic (illness, for example).

Part-time: Employed civilians who worked 1 to 34 hours per week during the majority of the weeks worked.

Unemployed civilians: Civilians 16 years old and over who (1) were neither "at work" nor "with a job but not at work" during the reference week, and (2) were looking for work during the last 4 weeks, and (3) were available to start a job.

Civilian labor force: Anyone classified as either employed (full-time or part-time) or unemployed in accordance with definitions for employed and unemployed civilians.

Not in labor force: Anyone 16 years old and over who is neither employed nor seeking employment, nor in the military. This category consists mainly of students, housewives, retired workers, seasonal workers interviewed in an off season who were not looking for other work, institutionalized people, and people doing only incidental unpaid family work (fewer than 15 hours during the previous week).

Less than two-thirds (63 percent) of the civilian population aged 16 and over was in the labor force in 2013, but there was variation by generational status (Figure 15). Labor force participation among the first generation (66 percent) was higher than that of the third-andhigher (63 percent) and second (59 percent) generation groups.

Figure 15.

Labor Force Participation by Generational Status: 2013

(Percent distribution of the civilian population aged 16 and older. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf)



First-generation workers aged 16 to 24, as well as aged 65 and older, were more likely to work fulltime than second- and third-and-higher-generation workers in the same age group. Figure 16 shows the labor force aged 25 to 64 as one large group, since there was little difference in employment status between workers aged 25 to 44 and workers aged 45 to 64. About 80 percent of the overall labor force between the ages of 25 and 64 were employed fulltime, for all generations. Among the 16 to 24 year-old age group, the percentage working full-time was higher among the first generation (51 percent) compared with the second (41 percent) and third-and-higher generations (42 percent) of the same age group.²⁵

²⁵ The populations of second- and thirdgeneration full-time workers in the 16 to 24 age group were not significantly different.



Among workers 65 and older, the first generation was also more likely to work full-time (64 percent) than the second (50 percent) and third-and-higher (53 percent) generations.²⁶ Workers aged 16 to 24 and aged 65 and older in the first generation were less likely to work part-time than those of the same age group in the other generations.

²⁶ The populations of second- and thirdgeneration full-time workers in the 65 and older age group were not significantly different.

Among all generation groups, full-time employment was highest for those with a bachelor's degree or higher.

Those with higher educational attainment were more likely to work full-time. Over 82 percent of

Figure 17. **Employment Status of the Civilian Labor Force by Educational Attainment** and Generational Status: 2013 (Percent distribution of the civilian population aged 16 and older who were in the labor force in 2013. The data used to generate this figure differ from seasonally adjusted data published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf) Part-time Unemployed Full-time Total Generation 76.0 16.4 7.6 72.2 Less than high school 10.0 17.8 High school graduate 8.1 First 74.6 17.3 Some college or 71.3 20.9 7.8 associate's degree Bachelor's degree 11.9 82.8 5 3 and higher Total 69.8 21.5 8.7 Less than high school 46.8 32.7 20.5 10.8 Second 69.1 20.1 High school graduate Some college or 62.4 28.6 9.0 associate's degree Bachelor's degree 82.4 13.4 4.2 and higher 73.7 18.5 7.8 Total Less than high school 44.7 21.7 33.6 Third-and-higher High school graduate 72.4 17.3 10.3 Some college or 70.7 22.3 7.0 associate's degree Bachelor's degree 13.1 83.3 3.6 and higher Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

the civilian population aged 16 and older with a bachelor's or higher degree were employed full-time, regardless of generational status (Figure 17).

Among those with less than a high school education, under half of the second generation (47 percent) and third-and-higher generation (45 percent) were employed fulltime.²⁷ By comparison, the fulltime employment rate for the first generation with less than a high school diploma was notably higher (72 percent). In addition, members of the first generation with less than a high school diploma were less likely to be unemployed (10 percent) than members of either the second (21 percent) or third-and-higher (22 percent) generations with less than a high school diploma.²⁸ About 30 percent of the second- and third-and-higher-generation popula-tions with less than a high school diploma was employed part-time.²⁹

²⁷ The populations of second- and thirdgeneration full-time workers without a high school education were not significantly different.

²⁸ The populations of second- and thirdgeneration unemployed workers without a high school education were not significantly different.

²⁹ The populations of second- and thirdgeneration part-time workers without a high school education were not significantly different.

Occupation

Over three-quarters of the civilian employed workforce were third-and-higher generation.

In 2013, the third-and-higher generation accounted for about 76 percent of the civilian employed workforce (Figure 18). The first generation made up about 16 percent while the second generation accounted for the remaining 8 percent of those employed in the civilian workforce.

The first generation represented over two out of every five workers in farming, fishing, and forestry occupations.

While only 16 percent of the civilian employed workforce, the first generation accounted for 41 percent of workers in farming, fishing, and forestry occupations. The first generation also accounted for a higher proportion of workers in service occupations (23 percent); construction, extraction, and maintenance occupations (22 percent); and production, transportation, and material moving occupations (21 percent). Conversely, the first generation represented a smaller proportion of workers than their share of the total population in management, professional, and related occupations (13 percent), and sales and office occupations (12 percent).

About eight in ten workers in sales and office occupations and management, professional, and related occupations were third-andhigher generation.

Nearly 80 percent of workers in sales and office occupations

(79 percent) and management, professional, and related occupations (78 percent) were third-and-higher generation. The third-and-higher generation made up about threefourths of the civilian employed workforce but only about two-thirds of service-occupation workers (69 percent). Third-and-highergeneration workers in farming, fishing, and forestry occupations (55 percent) were also underrepresented compared with their share of the civilian employed workforce. The second generation, which represented 8 percent of the civilian workforce, was similarly underrepresented in farming, fishing, and forestry occupations (5 percent) and construction, extraction, and maintenance occupations (6 percent).



Across generation groups, management, professional, or related occupations were most common.

Thirty-one percent of the first generation, 40 percent of the second generation, and 40 percent of the third-and-higher generation was in management, professional, and related occupations (Figure 19).³⁰ By comparison, each generation group was least likely to work in farming, fishing, and forestry occupations, with only about 2 percent of the first generation and less than 1 percent each of the second- and third-and-higher-generation workers concentrated in this occupation group.³¹

Comparing the likelihood of each generation group to be found in

³¹ The second- and third-generation shares of workers in farming, fishing, and forestry occupations were not significantly different. either of these two occupation categories, first-generation workers were 19 times more likely to work in a management, professional, or related occupation than in a farming, fishing, or forestry occupation. The gap was even greater for second- and third-and-highergeneration workers, with secondgeneration workers being 100 times more likely and third-and-highergeneration workers nearly 80 times more likely to work in a management, professional, or related occupation than in a farming, fishing, and forestry occupations.

First-generation workers were more likely than second-generation or thirdand-higher-generation workers to be employed in service occupations.

About one-quarter (25 percent) of first-generation workers were employed in service occupations, compared with less than 20 percent of second-generation or third-and-higher-generation workers (18 percent and 16 percent, respectively). First-generation workers were about as likely to be in service occupations (25 percent) as secondgeneration or third-and-highergeneration workers were in sales and office occupations (26 percent and 25 percent, respectively).³²

About 15 percent of first-generation workers were employed in production, transportation, and material moving occupations, compared with 10 percent of second-generation and 11 percent of third-and-highergeneration workers. Finally, 11 percent of first-generation workers were employed in construction, extraction, and maintenance occupations, compared with only 6 percent of second-generation and 8 percent of third-and-highergeneration workers.

³² These likelihoods were not significantly different from one another.

Figure 19. Generational Status by Occupation of Civilian Employed Workforce: 2013 (Percent distribution. Data based on sample. Smaller samples, such as mining, can be disproportionately subject to sampling error. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf) First Second Third-and-higher 30.6 Management, professional, 40.2 and related occupations 39.7 25.3 Service occupations 17.9 16.3 16.6 Sales and office occupations 26.3 24.5 1.6 Farming, fishing, 0.4 and forestry occupations 11.0 Construction, extraction, 5.7 and maintenance occupations 7.8 15.0 Production, transportation, 9.6 and material moving occupations 11.2 Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

³⁰ The second and third-generation shares of workers in management, professional, and related occupations were not significantly different.

Industry

Within each generation group, workers were most likely to be employed in the educational and health services industry.

Eighteen percent of the first and twenty-four percent each of the second and third-and-higher generations worked in the educational and health services industry (Figure 20).³³ Among all workers employed in this industry, about three-fourths (79 percent) were third-and-higher generation (Figure 21). Firstgeneration workers were slightly underrepresented in the educational and health services industry, having a 13 percent share compared with their 16 percent share of the employed population.

³³ The populations of second- and thirdgeneration workers in the educational and health services industry were not significantly different.

By comparison, workers within each generation group were least likely to be employed in the mining industry.

About 1 percent of each generation group was employed in the mining industry. Among all workers employed in this industry, 88 percent were third-and-higher generation. Conversely, second-generation workers were underrepresented in the mining industry when compared

Figure 20.

Generational Status by Industry of Civilian Employed Workforce: 2013 (Percent distribution. Data based on sample. Smaller samples, such as mining, can be disproportionately subject to sampling error. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf)



with their share of all employed civilian workers—5 percent compared with 8 percent.

At least one in ten workers of each generation group was employed in the wholesale and retail trade industry and the professional and business services industry.

Within each generation group, approximately one in ten was employed in the professional and business services industry: 14 percent of first, 12 percent of second, and 11 percent of third-and-higher-generation workers. First-generation workers were overrepresented in this industry—20 percent of all professional and business service workers were first generation compared with the first generation's 16 percent share of the total working population. In addition, 12 percent of first, 15 percent of second, and 14 percent of third-and-higher-generation workers were employed in the wholesale and retail trade industry.³⁴

³⁴ The populations of second- and thirdgeneration workers in the wholesale and retail trade industry were not significantly different.

First-generation workers were overrepresented in certain industries.

Overall, foreign-born workers represented 16 percent of the total civilian employed labor force aged 16 and over. However, the foreign born represented over 20 percent of workers in the following industries: construction (24 percent); leisure and hospitality and other services (each 22 percent); and agricultural, foresting, fishing, and hunting (22 percent).³⁵

³⁵ The populations of foreign-born workers in each of these industry categories were not significantly different from one another.

	F	irst	Second	Third-and-higher	
Total population	16.4	8.1		75.5	
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting	21.9	3.5		74.6	
Mining	6.8 4.8 88.3				
Construction	24.2	5	.9	69.8	
Manufacturing	18.3	6.6		75.1	
Wholesale and retail trade	14.0	9.2		76.8	
Fransportation and utilities	16.2	6.6		77.2	
Information	11.3 8.9			79.8	
Financial activities	13.4 9	.2		77.4	
Professional and business services	19.5	8.5		72.0	
Educational and health services	13.0 8.	4		78.6	
Leisure and hospitality	22.4	9	.8	69.7	
Other services	21.6	7.0		71.3	
Public	7.7 8.9			83.4	

Income and Earnings

Income: Total money income is the sum of money wages and salaries, net income from self-employment, and income other than earnings.

Earnings: Total earnings is the sum of money wages and salaries.

Generational status of household: The generational status of a household is solely determined by the generational status of the householder. **Family/nonfamily household:** A family household is a household in which there is at least one person present who is related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. A nonfamily household is a household where this condition does not apply.

First-generation households had lower median household income than second-generation or thirdand-higher-generation households.

In 2012, the median household income for the first generation was \$45,475, compared with \$51,291 for the second generation and \$51,853 for the third-and-higher generation (Figure 22).^{36, 37} This pattern was generally consistent across broad household types, though the generational effect was more apparent for family households. Among family households, median household income was \$51,150 for the first generation, compared with \$65,119 for the second generation and

³⁶ Items about income, earnings, and poverty on the CPS questionnaire refer to the year prior to the survey—in this case, 2012. ³⁷ The median household income estimates for the second generation (\$51,291) and the third-and-higher generation (\$51,853) were not significantly different. \$66,678 for the third-and-higher generation.³⁸

Furthermore, family households tended to have more income than nonfamily households, regardless of generational status. This is to be expected, since family households often have multiple income sources (such as dual wage earners), whereas nonfamily households

Figure 22. Median Household Income by Household Type and Generational Status of the Householder: 2012

(In dollars. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see *www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf*)



³⁸ The median family household income estimates for the second generation and the third-and-higher generation (\$65,119 and \$66,678, respectively) were not significantly different, nor were the median nonfamily household income estimates for the second and third-and-higher generations (\$33,361 and \$30,979, respectively).

include single wage earners living alone. The income gap between family and nonfamily households increased with generation. The median income for first-generation family households (\$51,150) was 86 percent higher than first-generation nonfamily households (\$27,548); among second-generation households, the median income of family households (\$65,119) was 95 percent higher than nonfamily households (\$33,361); and among the third-and-higher-generation households, the median income of family households (\$66,678) was more

than twice as much as nonfamily households (\$30,979).³⁹

Among the third-and-higher generation, the median income of men was over 25 percent larger than that of women—the widest gender gap among the generation groups.

At the individual level, income varied by generational status,

regardless of sex or age. In all except the youngest (15–24) age groups, members of the second generation were more likely to receive higher total money income than members of either the first or the third-and-higher generation.⁴⁰ In the 15–24 age group, third-andhigher generation median income

Figure 23. Median Income of Individuals Aged 15 and Older by Sex, Age, and Generational Status: 2012

(In dollars. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf)



³⁹ See previous footnote. Also, the percent difference between median family and nonfamily household income among the first generation (86 percent) was not significantly different from that among the second generation (95 percent).

⁴⁰ The median income of secondgeneration males (\$51,241) was not significantly different from that of third-and-highergeneration males (\$52,072). Also, the median income of the second generation was not significantly different from that of the thirdand-higher generation for both the 15–24 year old age group (\$24,164 and \$24,914, respectively) and the 25–44 year old age group (\$45,861 and \$45,261, respectively).

was slightly higher than secondgeneration median income (Figure 23). In total, the first generation aged 15 and older had a median income of \$36,669, compared with \$46,764 for the second generation and \$46,795 for the third-andhigher generation.⁴¹ This pattern was consistent across sex, though women had consistently lower median incomes than men across all three generation groups.⁴² The income gap between the sexes was smallest among the first generation, in which the median income of men (\$39,082) was about 16 percent higher than that of women (\$33,814), and largest among the third-and-higher generation, in which the median income of men (\$52,072) was 28 percent higher than that of women (\$40,531).43

Median income of the population aged 15 and older increased with age for all three generation groups, but the median income of the first generation was generally smaller than those of the other two groups for all age brackets.⁴⁴ However, the disparity in income between the first generation and other generation groups varied across age. Among the population aged 15 to 24, second-

generation median income (\$24,164) was only 4 percent higher than the first generation (\$23,185). Compared to first-generation median income, second-generation median income was 27 percent higher among those aged 25 to 44 (\$45,861 compared with \$36,151), 49 percent higher among those aged 45 to 64 (\$59,428 compared with \$39,982), and 26 percent higher among those aged 65 and older (\$63,924 compared with \$50,706).⁴⁵

⁴⁵ The percent difference between median incomes of the second generation and the first generation among those aged 65 or older (26 percent) was not significantly different from that of either the 15 to 24 age group (13 percent) or the 25 to 44 age group (27 percent). Also, the median income of those aged 15 to 24 among the second generation (\$24,164) was not significantly different from that among the third-and-higher generation (\$24,914).

Earnings

Similar to the pattern of income, the median earnings of second- and third-or-higher-generation workers aged 18 to 64 were higher than those of their counterparts in the first generation.

In 2012, the median earnings of first-generation men and women aged 18 to 64 were considerably lower than those of their counterparts in the second and third-andhigher generations.⁴⁶ Among the first generation, the median earnings was \$35,954, over 20 percent less than the other generation groups: \$45,481 for the second generation and \$45,356 for the third generation (Figure 24).47 Firstgeneration workers earned less than workers in other generation groups within each sex group, and men had higher earnings than women within each generation group. Men had earnings that were 16 percent higher among the first generation (\$37,356 and \$32,204, respectively), 23 percent higher among the second generation (\$50,184 and \$40,687, respectively), and 31 percent higher among

⁴⁶ In this report, "workers" refers to the

population that was employed full-time, yearround. The terms "workers" and "the working

⁴⁷ The median earnings of the second

different from that among the third generation

generation (\$45,481) was not significantly

population" are used interchangeably.

(\$45,356).

⁴¹ The median income of the second generation (\$46,764) was not significantly different from that of the third-and-higher generation (\$46,795).

⁴² The median income of secondgeneration males (\$51,241) was not significantly different from that of third-and-highergeneration males (\$52,072).

⁴³ The percent difference between male and female median income among the first generation (16 percent) was not significantly different from that among the second generation (23 percent).

⁴⁴ The median income of the second generation aged 45 to 64 was not significantly different from that of the second generation aged 65 or older, and the median income of the second generation aged 25 to 44 (\$45,861) was not significantly different from that of the third-and-higher generation aged 25 to 44 (\$45,261).

Figure 24.

Median Earnings Among Full-Time, Year-Round Workers Aged 18–64 by Sex and Generational Status: 2012

(In dollars. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf)



the third-and-higher generation (\$50,915 and \$38,945, respectively).

The gender gap in median earnings among workers aged 25 to 64 was widest for those with graduate degrees and smallest for those with only a high school diploma, regardless of generational status.

Because higher levels of education can provide pathways to careers that pay higher salaries, it is useful to study earnings data not only by sex, but also educational attainment. In 2012, median earnings increased with educational attainment for male and female workers aged 25 to 64 in all three generation groups (Figure 25). However, the patterns of differences in median earnings by sex among the generation groups were associated with educational attainment. For those in the two lowest education groups with a high school diploma or less, first-generation workers had lower median earnings than the other two generation groups. This pattern was the same for men with some college or a bachelor's degree, but

for women with the same level of education, there were no significant differences in median earnings by generational status (ranging from \$41,215 to \$42,111). Among those with advanced degrees, the patterns by sex differed. For men, the first and third-and-higher generations had slightly differing median earnings (\$91,460 and \$91,790, respectively), while the second generation had about 9 percent higher median earnings (\$100,034). Meanwhile, for women with advanced degrees, the first and second generations had median earnings (\$71,585 and \$70,687, respectively) that differed little from one another. The thirdand-higher generation had median earnings that were about 12 percent lower (\$62,125).

The earnings gap between male and female workers aged 25 to 64 was found at all educational attainment levels, regardless of generational status (Figure 25).⁴⁸ Due in part to the first generation's overall lower wages, the percent difference between median earnings of men and women was smallest among the first generation-ranging from 21 percent for high school graduates (\$31,507 for males, compared with \$25,939 for females) to 28 percent for those with advanced degrees (\$91,460 compared with \$71,585).⁴⁹ Among the second generation, the percent difference in median earnings by sex ranged from 27 percent for high school graduates (\$40,527 compared with \$31,916) to 42 percent for those with advanced degrees (\$100,034 compared with \$70,687); among the third-and-higher generation, the percent difference ranged from 34 percent for high school graduates (\$41,445 compared with \$30,877) to 48 percent for those with advanced degrees (\$91,790 compared with \$62,125).50

⁴⁸ Figure 25 shows median earnings (in dollars) for males and females. The percent differences referred to in the text are not shown in the figure.

⁴⁹ The percent difference between males and females among first-generation highschool graduates (21 percent) was not significantly different from that among firstgeneration advanced-degree holders (28 percent).

⁵⁰ The percent difference between males and females among second-generation highschool graduates (27 percent) was not significantly different from that among secondgeneration advanced-degree holders (42 percent).



Poverty Status

The Annual Social and Economic (ASEC) supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS) is the source of official national poverty estimates. If a family's total money income is less than the applicable threshold, then that family and every individual in it are considered to be in poverty. The official poverty definition uses money income before taxes and tax credits and excludes capital gains and noncash benefits (such as Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits and housing assistance). The thresholds do not vary geographically.

The poverty rate was higher for the first and second generations than the thirdand-higher generation.

In 2012, about 19 percent of the first and second generations were living below the poverty level, compared with about 14 percent of the third-and-higher generation (Figure 26).⁵¹ The first generation had the highest poverty rates within each age group, with 30 percent under 18 years old living in poverty, 19 percent aged 18 to 64, and 16 percent aged 65 and over.⁵²

In all generational groups, children were most likely to live in poverty.

Children under 18 years old represented a disproportionately larger

⁵² The poverty rates for the first- and second-generation populations under age 18 were not statistically different. share of those in poverty than in the total population, a pattern that holds true across each generational group. This partially reflects how poverty thresholds are defined, which depends on the number of people in a household. Children under 18 are not likely to contribute substantially to household income, but do count toward the number of people in the household, so households with children under 18 are, by definition, more likely to have incomes below the poverty threshold. Nationwide, over one out of every five children (22 percent) lived in households where income was below the poverty threshold. For first-generation children, this rate was considerably higher, with about one out of three firstgeneration children (30 percent) living in poverty. The poverty rate of second-generation children was also high (28 percent), which in part reflects their first-generation parents' income.

The poverty rate for those aged 65 and older was twice as high for the first generation compared with both the second and thirdand-higher generations.

Adults aged 65 and older had lower poverty rates than other age groups, regardless of generational status. However, 16 percent of those aged 65 and older in the first generation lived below the poverty level, a rate twice as high as for members of the second and thirdand-higher generations (8 percent each) who were aged 65 and older.

The poverty rate for adult females was higher than for adult males, regardless of age group or generational status.

The poverty rates for male and female children under age 18 varied little across generations.⁵³ However, for adults aged 18 and older,

⁵¹ Poverty level refers to income received during the previous calendar year. Family poverty is determined by comparing the total income of the family to poverty thresholds for that size family. The thresholds account for annual changes in the Consumer Price Index. The current poverty thresholds are on the U.S. Census Bureau's Web site at <www.census .gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/index .html> and discussion of poverty and its measurement at <www.census.gov/hhes/www /poverty/methods/index.html>.

⁵³ The poverty rates for males and females were not statistically different for the population under 18 years old within the first, second, or third-and-higher generations. However, in the total population under 18 years old (all generations combined), the poverty rate for females (22.3 percent) was slightly higher than for males (21.3 percent).



the percentage of females in poverty was higher than for males.⁵⁴ For females aged 18 to 64, poverty rates were about 3 to 4 percentage points higher compared to males, for all generational groups. The difference between males and females was most apparent for the 65 and older age group in the second and third generations, with over 10 percent of females living below the poverty level, about twice the rate of males (5 percent in the second generation and 6 percent in the third generation). In contrast, the difference in poverty rates between first-generation males and females aged 65 and older was smaller, 17 percent for females and 15 percent for males.

⁵⁴ The poverty rates for males and females in the first-generation population aged 65 and older were not statistically different.

For all generational groups, family households with a female householder and no spouse present were more likely to live in poverty than other family households.

Poverty rates varied for different types of families, with similar patterns seen across different generational groups (Figure 27). For all generations, families headed by a married couple were least likely to live below the poverty level and families headed by a female householder and no spouse present were most likely to live below the poverty level. The poverty rate for families with a male householder and no spouse present fell in between these two groups.

First-generation families of all types were more likely than second- or third-andhigher-generation families to live below the poverty level.

Nineteen percent of families with a first-generation householder lived below the poverty level. This rate was lower for first-generation married couples (14 percent) but higher for both first-generation male householders with no spouse present (22 percent) and for firstgeneration female householders with no spouse present (37 percent). Among all family types, families with first-generation householders had higher poverty rates than families with second- or third-andhigher-generation householders. First-generation married couples had over twice the poverty rate (14 percent) of secondgeneration married couples (6 percent), and about three times the

rate of third-and-higher-generation married couples (5 percent).

In families headed by a single male or female householder, secondgeneration-headed families had the lowest poverty rate.

In families headed by either a male or female householder with no spouse present, second-generationheaded families had lower poverty rates (12 percent for those with male householders and 24 percent for those with female householders) than third-and-higher-generation families (16 percent for male householders and 30 percent for female householders). First-generationheaded family households had the highest poverty rates among family households led by either a male or female with no spouse present (22 percent for male householders and 37 percent for female householders).



Homeownership

Householder: One person in each household is designated as the householder. In most cases, this is the person, or one of the people, in whose name the home is owned, being bought, or rented. If there is no such person in the household, any adult household member 15 years old and over could be designated as the householder.

Family/Nonfamily household: A family household is a household in which there is at least one person present who is related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. A nonfamily household is a household where this condition does not apply.

Households headed by firstgeneration householders were less likely to live in owned homes, regardless of family type.

The homeownership rates of both the second and third-and-higher

generations were broadly comparable and higher than those of the first generation, even among the different household types. Among family households, about half (55 percent) headed by first-generation householders were owned, which is notably lower than the rate for

the second (68 percent) and thirdand-higher (76 percent) generations (Figure 28). This pattern of lower homeownership rates among firstgeneration householders persists among the various family and nonfamily household types.



Married-couple family households had the highest rate of homeownership, regardless of the generational status of the householder

Households headed by married couples had the highest rate of homeownership among all household types. Overall, 80 percent of married-couple households were owned. While there were differences among the generation groups, married-couple households remained the most likely to be homeowners: 61 percent of first, 76 percent of second, and 85 percent of third-and-higher-generation married-couple households lived in owned homes.

Among second- and thirdand-higher-generation family households, male householders were more likely than female householders to be homeowners.

Overall, homeownership rates for second- and third-and-highergeneration family households varied by the sex of the householder: second-generation households with male householders (55 percent) were more likely than households with female householders (46 percent) to be owned, as were third-and-higher-generation households (59 percent and 48 percent, respectively).⁵⁵ However, among households with a foreign-born householder, there was no significant difference in the homeownership rates between males and females.

In contrast, among nonfamily households, female householders were more likely than male householders to be homeowners, regardless of generational status.

Among all nonfamily households, over half (51 percent) were owned. Less than one-third of nonfamily households headed by firstgeneration householders (33 percent) were owned, compared with over half of second- and third-andhigher-generation nonfamily households (54 percent and 53 percent, respectively).⁵⁶ An interesting pattern emerges when looking at homeownership rates of nonfamily households by sex of householder: females (54 percent) tended to have higher homeownership rates than males (48 percent). Among nonfamily households with a female householder, the second generation and third-and-higher generations were more likely to be homeowners (57 percent and 56 percent, respectively) than the first generation (39 percent).⁵⁷ This generational pattern was similar among nonfamily households with a male householder, where the third-and-higher generation and second generation were more likely to be homeowners (51 percent and 50 percent, respectively) than the first generation (27 percent). 58

⁵⁵ Homeownership rates for secondgeneration male-headed households were not significantly different from third-generation male-headed households. The same was true for female-headed households.

⁵⁶ The homeownership rate in nonfamily second-generation-headed households is not significantly different than the rate of homeownership in nonfamily third-generationheaded households.

⁵⁷ The proportion of homeowners among nonfamily households with a female householder was not statistically different for the second and third-and-higher generations.

⁵⁸ The proportion of homeowners among nonfamily households with a male householder was not statistically different for the second and third-and-higher generations.

Voting

The November 2012 Current Population Survey (CPS) Voting and Registration Supplement asked voting and registration questions of all persons who were both U.S. citizens and 18 years or older in the civilian noninstitutionalized population of the United States living in households. People in the military, U.S. citizens living abroad, and people in institutional housing, such as correctional institutions and nursing homes, were not included in the survey. Voting and registration data are collected every 2 years to monitor trends in the voting behavior of U.S. citizens in terms of their different demographic and economic characteristics.*

Electorate: The portion of the population who are eligible to vote. By definition, adults aged 18 and older in the second and third-and-higher generations are included in the electorate. The electorate also includes first-generation adults who have become U.S. citizens through naturalization. Noncitizen members of the first generation and all children below age 18 are excluded from the electorate.

Figure 29.

U.S. Electorate by Generational Status: 2012

(Civilian noninstitutionalized U.S. citizen population 18 and older. Data based on sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www2.census.gov /programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpsmar13.pdf)



^{*} Because data on the U.S. electorate are based on the November 2012 CPS Voting and Registration Supplement, totals by generation do not match other totals in this report, which are based upon the (March) 2013 Annual Social and Economic (ASEC) supplement to the CPS.

The first and second generations represented a greater proportion of the total population than they did of the eligible voting population.

This section examines levels of reported voting and registration by generational status for the electorate (U.S. citizens aged 18 and older) during the November 2012 presidential election. In 2012, there were about 215 million people eligible to vote in the United States. The majority were third-and-higher generation (178 million), followed by the second (20 million), and then first (17 million) generations (Figure 29).

There were notable differences between the distribution of eligible voters and that of the total population when divided by generational status. The first generation represented 13 percent of the total population aged 18 and older, but 8 percent of the electorate. The second generation made up 12 percent of the total population, but 9 percent of the electorate. However, the third-and-higher generation represented 75 percent of the total population and 83 percent of the electorate.⁵⁹

Registration and voting rates were highest among eligible voters in the third generation and lowest among eligible voters in the first generation.

About 71 percent of U.S. citizens aged 18 and older were registered to vote in the 2012 presidential election, but only about 62 percent reported voting (Figure 30).60 Among those who were eligible to register, the third-and-higher generation had the highest registration rate (73 percent) while the first generation had the lowest registration rate (62 percent). The second generation fell in the middle, with 67 percent registered to vote. Among those eligible to vote in 2012, the third-and-higher generation was most likely to vote (63 percent), followed by the second (57 percent), and then the first (54 percent) generations.

These patterns of higher rates of registration and voting for the third generation compared to lower

rates for the first generation were seen for the total population, for males, and for females. In 2012, there was more variation in voting rates across generation than across gender.

Women in the second and third generations were more likely than men to register and vote. However, there was little difference in the registration and voting rates of first generation women and men.

In 2012, women were more likely to register and vote (73 percent and 64 percent, respectively) than men (70 percent and 60 percent, respectively). This gender difference seen in the total population also existed within the second and third-or-higher generations. Women in the third generation were the most likely to register (75 percent) and to vote (65 percent), followed by third-generation men (71 percent registered and 61 percent voted). In the second generation, women were also more likely to register and vote (69 percent and 60 percent, respectively) than men (65 percent and 54 percent, respectively). Among the first generation, men and women were likely to register and vote at rates lower than second- and thirdgeneration men and women.

⁵⁹ Overall population and electorate totals differ slightly because their months of data collection were March 2013 and November 2012, respectively.

⁶⁰ In determining registration and voting rates, nonrespondents were counted as nonregistrants and nonvoters. Nonrespondents to the registration guestion include those who responded "Don't Know," and "Refused," as well as those who were not asked the registration question. Nonrespondents to the voting guestion include those who responded "Don't Know," and "Refused," as well as those who were not asked the voting question. While there is no way to know actual rates of voting participation among nonrespondents, it is a common assumption that it is more likely that they were nonregistrants and nonvoters than active participants who chose not to acknowledge this in a follow-up survey.



Conclusion

Successful intergenerational mobility holds a prominent place in the mythology of the "American Dream," with the expectation that one's economic status will improve over that of one's parents. This is especially true for many immigrants who may work harder to succeed amidst cultural and economic challenges. Evidence of such intergenerational mobility can be found in the second generation's higher levels of educational attainment and income, as seen in Figures 13 and 23, respectively.

For other socioeconomic indicators, this report shows gradual improvement occurring from generation to generation. For example, Figure 26 shows that the third-and-higher generation had the lowest poverty rate and the first generation had the highest. This is also consistent with previous research, such as a Pew report on second-generation Americans, which found improvements in demographic and socioeconomic indicators for the second generation compared to the first generation.⁶¹

Comparisons across generations within a single annual dataset must acknowledge the diversity that exists within the generational construct. Almost half (16 million) of the second generation were under age 18 and therefore do not appear in all characteristics data analyzed in this report. The other half of the second generation includes adult progeny of parents who were part of the pre-1965 waves of mostly-European immigrants.

Along with these differences in age cohorts that existed within the second generation, race and ethnicity crosscut generational analysis and undoubtedly play an important role in explaining outcomes. Figures 10 through 12 show how Hispanic identity varied by generation as well as national sub-group. Future research might examine the relationship between generational status and other key background characteristics and their effects on socioeconomic outcomes.

⁶¹ Pew Research Center, *Second-Generation Americans: A Portrait of the Adult Children of Immigrants,* 2013.

Source and Accuracy

The majority of the data in this report are from the 2013 Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic (CPS ASEC) supplement and were collected in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The data do not represent residents of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Island Areas.⁶² The estimates in this report are controlled to independent national population estimates by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin for March 2013; these population controls are based on the 2010 Census.

The CPS is a household survey primarily used to collect employment data. The sample universe for the basic CPS consists of the resident civilian noninstitutionalized population of the United States. People in institutions, such as prisons, longterm care hospitals, and nursing homes, are not eligible to be interviewed in the CPS. Students living in dormitories are included in the estimates only if information about

them is reported in an interview at their parents' home. Since the CPS is a household survey, persons who are homeless and not living in shelters are not included in the sample. The sample universe for the CPS ASEC is slightly larger than that of the basic CPS since it includes military personnel who live in a household with at least one other civilian adult, regardless of whether they live off post or on post. All other Armed Forces are excluded. For further documentation about the CPS ASEC, see <www.census.gov /prod/techdoc/cps/cpsmar13.pdf>.

The estimates in this report (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population. Sampling error is the uncertainty between an estimate based on a sample and the corresponding value that would be obtained if the estimate were based on the entire population (as from a census). All comparative statements in this report have undergone statistical testing, and comparisons are significant at the 90 percent level unless otherwise noted. In addition to sampling error, nonsampling error may be introduced during any of the operations used to collect and process survey data, such as editing, reviewing, or keying data from questionnaires. In this report, the variances of estimates were calculated using the Successive Difference Replication (SDR) method.⁶³ Most of the data from the CPS ASEC were collected in March 2013 (with some data collected in February and April).

Contact

For additional information on these topics, please call the U.S. Census Bureau Call Center Staff at 1-866-758-1060 (toll-free) or visit <www.census.gov>.

⁶² U.S. Island Areas include American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Virgin Islands of the United States.

⁶³ Robert E. Fay and George F. Train, "Aspects of Survey and Model-Based Postcensal Estimation of Income and Poverty Characteristics for States and Counties," *Proceedings of the Section on Government Statistics*, American Statistical Association, Alexandria, 1995 pp. 154–159.