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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander populations in California continue to grow at a faster pace than all other major race and ethnic groups, except for the American Indian or Alaska Native population. However, the growth rates for all groups from 2010 to 2020 have declined compared to that of the previous decade from 2000 to 2010.

This report provides a snapshot of key demographic characteristics of Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander populations. It serves as a baseline for a new data tool that AAPI Data is rolling out in summer 2022, which will provide annual updates on key demographic indicators, disaggregated by race, detailed origin, and geography. Key highlights of this report include:

Demographics

- The three largest Asian groups, Chinese Filipino and Indian Americans, account for a large majority (62 percent) of the Asian American population.
- The four fastest-growing Asian subgroups were Nepalese, Mongolian, Okinawan, and Indian Americans.
- The majority of the NHPI population is composed of the Native Hawaiian, Samoan, and Chamorro American populations (55% of the NHPI alone population).
- The fastest-growing Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander groups were Other Melanesian and Other Micronesian Americans, which more than doubled between 2010 and 2020. Tongan, Chamorro, and Samoan American populations only saw single-digit growth rates between 2010 and 2020.
Geographic Distribution

- While Los Angeles County's sheer size makes it home to largest share of all major race and ethnic groups, the second most and third most populous counties were Santa Clara and Orange Counties for Asian Americans, and San Diego and Sacramento Counties for the NHPI population.
- Los Angeles County does not rank in the top three most populous counties for several groups. Bhutanese Americans were concentrated in Contra Costa County, Hmong Americans in Fresno and Sacramento Counties, Laotian Americans in Sacramento, San Diego, and Fresno Counties, and Vietnamese Americans in Orange and Santa Clara Counties. Santa Clara County and the tech sector influenced the settlement of Indian Americans.
- For NHPI communities, Sacramento County has drawn Fijian and Marshallese American communities while San Diego has the largest Chamorro American community and San Mateo the largest Tongan American community (Table 5). Los Angeles County contained the largest Native Hawaiian and Samoan American communities.

Immigration

- The majority of Asians and multi-racial Asian adults and adult citizens in the US are foreign born. The foreign-born percentages for the NHPI and Hispanic populations are also quite high at over 25% for both groups, again indicating the influx of immigrants across these groups.
- The number of people obtaining legal permanent residency from Asia dropped by 37 percent from 2016 to 2020, the second most decline among the major geographic regions, only behind the 45 percent decline for individuals from North America.
- While almost all Asian national origin groups were majority immigrant, Hmong, Japanese, and multiracial Asian Americans were overwhelmingly native born.
• Almost half of all Nepalese American immigrants arrived in the last 10 years. Mongolian, Bangladeshi, and Bhutanese American immigrants were also more likely to have arrived in the last 10 years. Cambodian, Hmong, and Laotian Americans were the least likely to be recent arrivals.
• NHPI groups were much less likely to be foreign born compared to Asian groups, where only Fijian and Marshallese American groups were majority foreign born. The different relationships each Pacific Island nation has with the United States deeply influences the legal status of each group.
• Various estimates place the number of unauthorized immigrants from Asia living in California at 447,000 to 490,000, with India, China, the Philippines, South Korea, and Vietnam being the most common countries of origin.

Language Diversity and English Proficiency

• The five most common Asian languages spoken in California were Chinese, Tagalog, Vietnamese, Korean, and Hindi. There were roughly 50,000 speakers of different Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander languages in California.
• 33% of the single-racial Asian, 30% of single and multi-racial Asians, and 29% of the Hispanic populations reported that they speak English less than “Very well” or had limited English proficiency (LEP).
• Half or more of Burmese, Vietnamese, and Mongolian Americans in California, and more than 2 in 5 of Thai, Bhutanese, Chinese, and Korean Americans were LEP.
• Among NHPI national origin groups, Tongan and Fijian Americans had the highest LEP rates.
• About 1 in 5 Asian households were linguistically isolated. About one in three households experiencing linguistic isolation in the Mongolian, Korean, Burmese, Bhutanese, Vietnamese, Thai, and Chinese American communities
Educational Attainment

- More than half of Asian American and 1 in 5 Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander adults ages 25 years or older had a bachelor’s degree.
- The high post-graduate degree attainment of Taiwanese and Indian Americans ultimately masks the lower levels of post-graduate degree attainment among Vietnamese, Hmong, Cambodian, Laotian, and Bhutanese Americans, many of whom have been afforded fewer opportunities given their refugee experiences.
- Marshallese Americans stand out with almost half of the adult population not having a high school diploma.
- Foreign-born Asian men are more likely to have obtained post-graduate degrees (24%) compared to foreign-born Asian women (17%), a pattern that reverses for native-born Asian men (18%) and women (22%)
- Native-born NHPIs show increased educational attainment over their foreign-born peers.

Public Opinion and Civic Participation

- Almost half of Asian American registered voters did not identify with either the Republican Party or Democratic Party. Similarly, 57 percent of NHPI voters did not identify as Democrat or Republican.
- Among those who do identify with a political party, there is a clear advantage to the Democratic Party, with Asian American registered voters identifying as Democrat over Republican by more than 3-to-1 margin at 39 percent to 12 percent. The Democratic Party advantage is less for NHPIs, with 27 percent of registered voters identifying as Democrats and 16 percent identifying as Republicans.
- The majority of Chinese, Hmong, and Vietnamese American voters were independent or did not think in terms of parties.
- In the 2016 presidential election, among California’s Asian communities, Clinton had strong support among South Asian Americans, while
underperforming among Filipino, Vietnamese, Hmong, and Chinese American voters. Clinton also had stronger support among Asian American women compared to men and Asian American immigrants over native born.

- AA and NHPI voters in California overwhelmingly favored the 2016 Proposition 55 which extended for twelve more years personal income tax increases on those earning incomes more than $250,000, enacted initially in 2012.
- During the 2016 election cycle, the issues that Asian American voters in California cared about were retirement savings, college affordability, and medical care costs.
- For Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders voters, time to get visas and college affordability were the top issues.
- On the issue of pathways to citizenship, NHPI adults were very favorable towards a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, with Asian American voters less strongly in favor.
- AA’s and NHPI’s impressions of the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement were largely favorable, although Asian Americans were more likely to have never heard of the movement by a wide margin.

**Labor Market Outcomes**

- Asian American and Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders all had some of the highest labor force participation rates.
- Men for both groups were much more likely to be in the workforce than women.
- Tongan American women were more likely to be in the labor force compared to Tongan American men.
- With the exception of Marshallese American women, all other NHPI women had higher labor force participation rates compared to women in general.
- Asian women and Asians age 55 years and over faced the largest impacts on employment during the pandemic. Both demographic groups went from having unemployment rates well below that of their demographic peers in 2019 to having unemployment rates higher than their peers in 2020.
• During the start of the pandemic, Burmese, Bangladeshi, Vietnamese, Korean, Laotian and Indonesian Americans had unemployment rates higher than Asian Americans as a whole. Native Hawaiians and Samoans had a much higher unemployment rate compared to all NHPIs.
• In California, Asian American workers are significantly more likely than other groups to be concentrated in management, professional, and related occupations.
• However, Mongolian, Thai, Nepalese, and Vietnamese American workers are disproportionately employed in service occupations. Japanese, Korean, Malaysian, Indonesian, Sri Lankan, and Pakistani American workers were most likely to be employed in sales and office occupations. Workers from refugee communities such as Bhutanese, Burmese, Cambodian, Laotian, and Hmong Americans, were overrepresented in production, transportation, and material moving occupations.
• Among NHPI origin groups, Marshallese American workers were more likely to be employed in production, transportation, and material moving occupations and service occupations (Figure 35). Native Hawaiians, Chamorro Americans, and Samoan Americans were more likely to be in sales and office occupations compared to other NHPI groups.

Income and Poverty
• While the Asian population’s median household income is substantially higher than all other groups at $101,253, Laotian, Hmong, Mongolian, Cambodian, and Bhutanese American households have median incomes less than two-thirds that amount.
• Poverty rates for Asians, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders were among the lowest of the major race and ethnic groups.
• The child poverty rate for NHPIs was 20.3%, more than 8 percentage points higher than the poverty rate for all NHPIs.
• Among Asian origins, Mongolian and Hmong Americans had the highest poverty rates in California, at 24% and 23% respectively, while the lowest
poverty rates were 5% for Indian Americans and 6% for Filipino Americans. Among NHPI groups, Marshallese Americans had the highest poverty rates at 27% and Fijians had the lowest at 9%.

- The pandemic had a disparate impact on poverty rates among Asian origin groups. Among Asian groups in California, Burmese, Pakistani and Cambodian American poverty rates remained elevated relative to other Asian groups. Similar, Fijian Americans and Native Hawaiians had poverty rates that remained higher than overall NHPI poverty rates.

**Housing**

- While Asian and White households have the highest homeownership rates in California, less than half of NHPI households own their homes.
- Taiwanese, Japanese, and Chinese American households had much higher homeownership rates than White households (Figure 46).
- At the other end of the home ownership spectrum, only about 15% of Mongolian and 35% Nepalese American households own their homes.
- For NHPI groups, Fijian American homeownership rates approached that to White households(Figure 47).
- Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander households were twice as likely to be living in overcrowded housing as White households.
- Asian households to a lesser degree were more likely to be in overcrowded housing than White households.
- One in three Mongolian and Tongan American, and one in four Bangladeshi, Hmong, and Nepalese American households were in overcrowded housing.
INTRODUCTION

The Census Bureau projects that the majority of the U.S. population will be people of color by 2045, a status that California has already achieved. By 2030, the Census Bureau forecasts that deaths will begin to outpace births in the United States and that immigration become the primary source of population growth in the U.S. With immigration from Asian and Pacific Islanders countries providing significant portions of this population growth, it is vital that elected leaders, policymakers, stakeholders and community members better understand this growing segment of the population.

While many public and private agencies and programs continue to group Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders into one super-category, major differences in cultural traditions, group histories, and modes of incorporation into the United States make it imperative for data pertaining to these communities to be collected, analyzed, and disseminated in a disaggregated fashion, and presented back to AA and NHPI communities in ways that are culturally appropriate and widely accessible.

Federal agencies continue to operate under the 1997 Office of Management and Budget standards for Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity, where agencies are required to collect and report data for five minimum race categories: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and White. Agencies are also required to have two categories for data on ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino.

In order to better understand why data disaggregation by detailed origin is essential for AA and NHPI communities, we need to understand the diverse and varied histories of how Asians, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders came to be a part of...
the fabric of the United States. Migration, adaptation, integration, and backlash are all common themes in most histories of these diverse communities.

For Asians, the push and pull factors that drove migration to the United States were often a combination of economic and political turmoil at home and the promises of economic opportunity and mobility that America represented at the time. Chinese immigrants, faced by the unrest and famine during the Taiping Rebellion, arrived in large numbers in the middle of the 19th Century as laborers, first drawn by the gold rush in California, later by jobs building the first transcontinental railroad and the economies that emerged around the railroad. While initially praised for their work ethic, the number of Chinese immigrants grew and dispersed to other jobs and industries. With increasing numbers, they were seen as unwanted competitors for jobs for white laborers. In California, laws were passed to limit the rights of the Chinese, including the right to serve as witnesses in trials and the right to own property. Dehumanizing racial stereotypes of Chinese immigrants combined with the economic pressures of the depression triggered by the Panic of 1873 resulted in violent backlash against Chinese American communities and culminated in the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the nation's first racial exclusion act. California's state leaders played a key lobbying role in convincing the federal government to pass these laws. Despite these restrictions, Chinese migrants continued to seek entry into the United States, creating America's first undocumented immigrants. In addition, there were always a small number of exceptions to Chinese exclusion, including students and refugees.

With Chinese immigrants explicitly banned, the demand for cheap labor for Californian agriculture and businesses needed another source. Each succeeding wave, first Japanese, then Indian, and finally Filipinos, continued the cycle of American commercial interests recruiting Asian laborers, increasing resentment and racial bias against these new communities, and ultimately bans on immigration and restrictions on citizenship and property ownership.
The Gentleman’s Agreement of 1907-08 was a diplomatic arrangement in which the Japanese government agreed to limit Japanese migration to the United States, particularly of laborers. However, family migration was still permitted, resulting in the continued growth of the Japanese community through family reunification and the migration of so-called “picture brides” from Japan to the United States. Japan’s emergence as a world power forced the United States to pursue a diplomatic agreement rather than a legislative ban. Nevertheless, immigration was reduced and bans on naturalization and prohibitions of property ownership remained in place. For other Asians, particularly Indian Americans, the restrictions came with the Immigration Act of 1917 which created a barred zone of immigration from the Middle East through Southeast Asia. Chinese exclusion had been made permanent in 1904 and Korea, which by 1917 was under Japanese occupation, was covered by the Gentleman’s Agreement.

That left Filipinos as the last source of cheap labor for Californian agriculture and business interests. Because of the Philippines' status as a U.S. colony, Filipinos could freely migrate to America as U.S. nationals. However, this ended with the Philippine Independence Act of 1934, where the Philippines were granted independence after a 10-year transition period, but Filipinos were no longer considered U.S. nationals, and Filipinos already in the U.S. lost their status.

The start of World War II resulted in a re-evaluation of naturalization and immigration from Asia. While China and the U.S. were wartime allies, bans on Chinese immigration became untenable and President Roosevelt signed a law in December 1943 ending Chinese exclusion, although extremely small national quotas made the policy change largely symbolic. In addition, Chinese residents were finally allowed to naturalize, the first Asian-origin groups to be allowed the opportunity to do so. At the same time, Roosevelt had signed Executive Order 9066 in February 1942 that forced the internment of Japanese Americans living on the U.S. mainland for the duration of the war. Other Asian communities also were allowed to immigrate and naturalize shortly after the end of World War II, as Cold War pressures prompted the United States to portray itself as a more welcoming nation. Still, restrictive quotas remained in place and fewer than 150 nationals were allowed
to immigrate to the United States each year. Finally, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 opened Asian immigration by removing national quotas and creating three streams of immigration that form the core of today’s immigration system: employment-based, family-based, and refugees/asylees. The act finally removed racist immigration barriers for Asians and resulted in the massive growth of the Asian American population that continues to this day. However, political and economic conditions continue to feed often violent backlash against Asian Americans. One key moment in Asian American activism is the murder of Vincent Chin in 1982 during a time when the American automobile industry was struggling with workers blaming Japanese manufacturers for putting them out of work. Violence directed at Asian Americans during times of turmoil continues to this day, including years of violence against South Asians and Muslims after 9/11 and the recent growth of attacks on Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders during the COVID-19 pandemic, with East Asians primarily feeling the brunt of violent attacks.

U.S. intervention in Southeast Asia and the impact of the Vietnam War, the Khmer Rouge genocide, and the Secret War in Laos resulted in the resettlement of over 1.5 million Southeast Asian refugees between 1975 and 2000 from Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Many of the refugees settled in California, such as the Hmong in the Central Valley and Vietnamese in Orange County. The trauma associated with war, genocide, political persecution, and being uprooted from ancestral homes has resulted in a great need for social and mental health services for refugees. The lack of disaggregated data on Asian Americans is the most harmful to refugee communities as their needs and challenges are often overlooked and hidden. In the early 2000’s, a new wave of refugees from Bhutan, Myanmar (Burma), another wave of Hmong refugees from Thailand, and, most recently, a third wave from Afghanistan were resettled across the country, often in metro areas with declining populations.

Finally, the Immigration Act of 1990 introduced three new immigration streams: Diversity Visas, H1-B employment visas, and Temporary Protected Status (TPS). The Diversity Visa program was especially important for growing the Bangladeshi and Pakistani immigrant populations in the United States. The Diversity Visa is a lottery-
based program open to residents of any territory that had sent less than 50,000 employment- or family-based immigrants to the U.S. in the previous five years. Successful applicants receive permanent residency status for themselves and any spouse or children. The Diversity Visa program has especially boosted immigration from Bangladesh, Nepal, and Uzbekistan, with about 40,000 visas issued for each country since 1995. After these new immigrants settled in and established themselves, they were able to sponsor family members, leading to significant proportional increases in particular communities such as Bangladeshi Americans in New York and Michigan. In fact, migration from Bangladesh is now high enough that Bangladeshis are now ineligible for the Diversity Visa program. The H1-B visa programs accelerated immigration from India and China, bringing in highly skilled science and technology workers to the United States. The majority of the foreign-born Asian American population in the U.S. have arrived since the introduction of the H1B visa program and this program has had a major influence on the economic status of the Asian American population as a whole. Finally, TPS allows the Department of Homeland Security to designate a country for TPS when conditions in the country prevent a safe return. TPS provides protection from removal and authorization for employment and travel. TPS has enabled many Nepalis to remain in the U.S. after the devastating earthquake in Nepal in 2015 and be active contributors to the economy as Nepal slowly recovers.

Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders share different histories and cultural heritage from Asian American populations, with the colonial, territorial, and military expansion of the United States playing a key role in their community formation, including a negative impact on economic security. Different historical circumstances have resulted in a complex system of formal and informal relationships between the Pacific Island nations and the United States. California’s proximity to the Pacific Island nations has made it a prime destination for migrants and immigrants from those areas.

After initial European contact in 1778, Hawaii’s location in the Pacific made the country a center for explorers, whalers, and eventually the sugar industry. America’s growing imperial ambitions at the end of the 19th Century would eventually lead to
the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy and the U.S. annexation of the Hawaiian Islands. The U.S. military presence in Hawaii and the frequent shipping associated with supporting the military and trade with the mainland created opportunities for migration that many Native Hawaiians took. As U.S. citizens, Native Hawaiians are able to work and live anywhere in the U.S. legally, qualify for public benefits, vote in local and federal elections, and serve in the U.S. military.

Further colonial annexations have resulted in the Chamorro people having U.S. citizenship. The ancestral homelands of the Chamorros came under U.S. control first with Guam after the Spanish American War and then with the Northern Marianas Islands after Japan’s defeat in 1945. Since that time the Northern Mariana Islands have entered into a commonwealth status with the United States while Guam remains a territory. As such, Chamorros can live and work legally in the United States, qualify for public benefits, and serve in the U.S. military. But as a territory, residents of Guam and the Northern Marianas are unable to vote in federal elections and have only non-voting delegates in Congress.

After the Tripartite Convention of 1899 divided the Samoan Islands into two, with Germany claiming the western islands and the U.S. the eastern island, the United States formally annexed American Samoa as a territory. However, because Congress has not passed an Organic Act for American Samoa, American Samoans are considered U.S. nationals and do not have birthright citizenship. American Samoans can live and work legally in the U.S., serve in the U.S military, and qualify for most federal benefits, but cannot vote while residing on the mainland. They must apply for naturalization to obtain all the rights and benefits of citizenship.

Other Pacific Islands would fall under U.S. hegemony during and after World War II. Citizens of the Federated States of Micronesia, Republic of the Marshall Islands, and Republic of Palau fall under three Compacts of Free Association, which confers the right to live and work in the U.S. as “non-immigrants” but are not eligible for most federal benefits and again must naturalize to gain access to all rights and benefits as citizens. The Compacts of Free Association are set to expire in 2023 for Micronesia and the Marshall Islands, and 2024 for Palau, and are currently being renegotiated.
Finally, people from the remaining Pacific Island nations are treated as any other immigrants and must apply for legal permanent residency in order to live and work in the U.S. These nations include Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Nauru, Vanuatu, New Caledonia, Aoteroa, Tuvalu, Fiji, Tokelau, Samoa, Tonga, Nuie, Kiribati, and Cook Islands and make up the majority of the Pacific, but are fewer in number in the U.S.\(^3\)

Having high-quality data—by which we mean detailed, accurate, timely, and precise information that includes quantitative and qualitative data collections—will enable AA and NHPI communities to address various barriers associated with immigration-related experiences and statuses, language and other abilities, and the exercise of rights and access to benefits. High-quality data is also valuable to present accurate narratives about our communities, which includes not only combating negative stereotypes that propagate social division and harm, but also highlighting the immense contributions of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders to American society. Finally, high-quality data is essential to identifying opportunities to build coalitions across a variety of racial and ethnic groups, to identify common solutions to shared challenges.
DEMOGRAPHICS

POPULATION CHANGE

The table below illustrates the population size by race and ethnicity alone or in combination in the state of California in 2010 and 2020. These population numbers include multi-racial and multi-ethnic respondents. The White alone or in combination population remains the largest group in 2020, with the NHPI alone or in combination population being the smallest. However, despite being the smallest group, the NHPI population has experienced a fast growth rate, growing by 18% from 2010 to 2020. Similarly, the Asian and American Indian/Alaska Native alone or in combination populations have also grown substantially, with growth rates of 27% and 95% respectively over the past ten years.

Table 1: Population in CA by Race and Ethnicity, alone or in combination, 2010-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Change: 2010-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White alone or in combination</td>
<td>22,953,374</td>
<td>21,597,610</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>14,013,719</td>
<td>15,579,652</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in combination</td>
<td>5,556,592</td>
<td>7,045,163</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone or in combination</td>
<td>2,683,914</td>
<td>2,825,293</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone or in combination</td>
<td>723,225</td>
<td>1,409,609</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander alone or in combination</td>
<td>286,145</td>
<td>337,617</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) and 2010 Summary File 1
Table 2 depicts the population numbers for each race and ethnicity, excluding multi-racial and multi-ethnic individuals. When excluding multi-racial individuals from the population numbers, we can see that the White alone population saw a steeper population decline and the Black alone population saw a 3% decline. Growth in the NHPI alone population was also half the growth rate of the NHPI alone or in combination rate, showing the importance of multiracial identity among NHPI populations. The Asian alone population growth rate was still quite high at 25%.

Table 2: Population in CA by Race and Ethnicity Alone, 2000-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>20,170,059</td>
<td>21,453,934</td>
<td>16,296,122</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>10,966,556</td>
<td>14,013,719</td>
<td>15,579,652</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>3,697,513</td>
<td>4,861,007</td>
<td>6,085,947</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>2,263,882</td>
<td>2,299,072</td>
<td>2,237,044</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>333,346</td>
<td>362,801</td>
<td>631,016</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>116,961</td>
<td>144,386</td>
<td>157,263</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171), 2010 Summary File 1, and 2000 Summary File 1

Figure 1 illustrates the Asian population breakdown by detailed national origin group. The three largest Asian groups, Chinese, Filipino, and Indian Americans, account for a large majority (61 percent) of the Asian American population. However, as we will see in later sections of the report, these groups consist of highly-educated immigrants, which, when coupled with the large population sizes, can mask the needs of smaller Asian American populations.

The Census Bureau expanded the number of unique codes for detailed Asian groups from 32 unique codes in 2010 to 63 unique codes in 2020 for both the decennial census and the American Community Survey (ACS). Some of those new codes
include Central Asians (individuals who identify as Afghan, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Tajik, Turkmen, and Uzbek). For the 2010 Census, there was no explicit code for Central Asians, while Afghans were classified as White.

The four fastest growing Asian subgroups were Nepalese, Mongolian, Okinawan and Indian Americans (Figure 2). The first three groups were among the smaller Asian populations in the U.S and their growth was driven by immigration. However, the Indian Americans had the fourth fastest growth rate and were among the largest Asian American communities in California.
Figure 1: Population in California by Detailed Asian National Origin alone or in combination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese, except Taiwanese</td>
<td>690,445</td>
<td>879,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1,349,111</td>
<td>1,815,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>647,589</td>
<td>788,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>505,225</td>
<td>557,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>428,014</td>
<td>478,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>160,271</td>
<td>201,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>102,317</td>
<td>119,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>81,224</td>
<td>105,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>67,707</td>
<td>81,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>53,474</td>
<td>74,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>69,303</td>
<td>73,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>39,506</td>
<td>50,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>17,978</td>
<td>20,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>10,494</td>
<td>12,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>4,983</td>
<td>7,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>5,595</td>
<td>7,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>2,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>2,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okinawan</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample and 2010 Census Table PCT7
Figure 2: Population Growth in California from 2010 - 2020 by Detailed Asian National Origin alone or in combination

- Nepalese: 142%
- Mongolian: 57%
- Okinawan: 50%
- Asian Indian: 49%
- Pakistani: 39%
- Chinese, except Taiwanese: 35%
- Indonesian: 27%
- Malaysian: 27%
- Other Asian: 26%
- Vietnamese: 22%
- Bangladeshi: 17%
- Cambodian: 16%
- Hmong: 16%
- Burmese: 15%
- Filipino: 13%
- Thai: 13%
- Sri Lankan: 12%
- Japanese: 12%
- Korean: 10%
- Laotian: 7%

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample and 2010 Census Table PCT7
Figure 3 illustrates the NHPI population by detailed national origin. From the table, we can see that the majority of the NHPI population is composed of the Native Hawaiian, Samoan, and Chamorro American populations (56% of the NHPI alone population). Note that the population estimates for smaller NHPI subgroups have margins of error that may dwarf the actual estimate size.

The fastest growing Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander groups were Other Melanesian and Other Micronesian Americans, which more than doubled between 2010 and 2020. Tongan, Chamorro, and Samoan American populations only saw single digit growth rates between 2010 and 2020.

For Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders, the Census Bureau increased the number of unique codes from 29 in the 2010 Census to 51 unique codes in the 2020 Census and the 2020 ACS. For both censuses there were 3 unique codes for Native Hawaiians (Native Hawaiian, Hawaiian, and Part Hawaiian).
Figure 3: Population in California by Detailed NHPI National Origin alone or in combination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Origin</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>74,932</td>
<td>91,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander, not specified</td>
<td>58,778</td>
<td>68,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>60,876</td>
<td>61,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>44,425</td>
<td>47,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>24,059</td>
<td>37,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>22,893</td>
<td>25,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Micronesian</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>7,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Polynesian</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td>4,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>2,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Melanesian</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample and 2010 Census Table PCT10
Figure 4: Population Growth in California from 2010 - 2020 by Detailed NHPI National Origin alone or in combination

- Other Melanesian: 221%
- Other Micronesian: 121%
- Fijian: 55%
- Other Polynesian: 51%
- Native Hawaiian: 22%
- Marshallese: 18%
- Other Pacific Islander, not specified: 17%
- Tongan: 9%
- Chamorro: 6%
- Samoan: 1%

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample and 2010 Census Table PCT10
GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

Since Los Angeles County is three times larger than the next largest county, San Diego, unsurprisingly Los Angeles County is also home to the largest share of each racial and ethnic group (Table 3). It is with the second and third most populous counties that variations begin to emerge for the race and ethnic groups examined. For example, the second most and third most populous counties for Asian and NHPI populations were completely different, with Santa Clara and Orange for the Asian population, and San Diego and Sacramento for the NHPI population.

Table 3: Top 5 Counties of Residence for each Race/Ethnicity in CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>County 1</th>
<th>County 2</th>
<th>County 3</th>
<th>County 4</th>
<th>County 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White alone or in combination</td>
<td>Los Angeles (21.9%)</td>
<td>San Diego (10%)</td>
<td>Orange (8.2%)</td>
<td>Riverside (6.2%)</td>
<td>San Bernardino (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone or in combination</td>
<td>Los Angeles (33.4%)</td>
<td>San Bernardino (7.8%)</td>
<td>San Diego (7.7%)</td>
<td>Alameda (7.3%)</td>
<td>Sacramento (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination</td>
<td>Los Angeles (21.9%)</td>
<td>San Diego (7.2%)</td>
<td>Riverside (6%)</td>
<td>San Joaquin (5.9%)</td>
<td>San Bernardino (5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in combination</td>
<td>Los Angeles (24.8%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (11.6%)</td>
<td>Orange (11.1%)</td>
<td>Alameda (8.6%)</td>
<td>San Diego (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander alone or in combination</td>
<td>Los Angeles (17.4%)</td>
<td>San Diego (10.3%)</td>
<td>Sacramento (8.5%)</td>
<td>Alameda (7.7%)</td>
<td>Orange (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>Los Angeles (31.5%)</td>
<td>Riverside (7.8%)</td>
<td>San Bernardino (7.6%)</td>
<td>San Diego (7.3%)</td>
<td>Orange (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analysis of 2020 American Community Survey 5-year Public Use Microdata File by AAPI Data
Disaggregating by detailed national origin reveals important differences in geographic concentration. Where before Los Angeles County was the most populous county for the Asian population, disaggregating helps us see that Los Angeles County does not rank in the top three most populous counties for several groups: the Indian, Bhutanese, Hmong, Laotian, and Vietnamese American populations (Table 4). The settlement patterns for four of these group, Bhutanese, Hmong, Laotian and Vietnamese Americans, were deeply influenced by refugee resettlement, while Santa Clara County and the tech sector influenced the settlement of Indian Americans.
### Table 4: Top 5 Counties of Residence for each Detailed Asian National Origin in CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian Origin</th>
<th>County 1</th>
<th>County 2</th>
<th>County 3</th>
<th>County 4</th>
<th>County 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>Santa Clara (21.5%)</td>
<td>Alameda (16.3%)</td>
<td>Los Angeles (13.5%)</td>
<td>Orange (7.2%)</td>
<td>San Diego (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>Los Angeles (45%)</td>
<td>Orange (10.7%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (9.2%)</td>
<td>Alameda (6.9%)</td>
<td>San Diego (6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>Contra Costa (55.7%)</td>
<td>Santa Barbara (18.8%)</td>
<td>Sacramento (17.3%)</td>
<td>Alamed (6%)</td>
<td>Los Angeles (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>Los Angeles (32.1%)</td>
<td>Alameda (14.9%)</td>
<td>San Mateo (11.9%)</td>
<td>San Diego (7.8%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>Los Angeles (33.2%)</td>
<td>San Joaquin (10.9%)</td>
<td>Orange (9.4%)</td>
<td>San Diego (6.2%)</td>
<td>Fresno (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese, except</td>
<td>Los Angeles (28.7%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (12.6%)</td>
<td>San Francisco (11.1%)</td>
<td>Alameda (11%)</td>
<td>Orange (7.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>Los Angeles (24.6%)</td>
<td>San Diego (12.2%)</td>
<td>Alameda (6.8%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (6.7%)</td>
<td>Orange (6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Fresno (35.2%)</td>
<td>Sacramento (29.1%)</td>
<td>Merced (6.6%)</td>
<td>San Joaquin (6.2%)</td>
<td>Butte (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Los Angeles (29%)</td>
<td>San Bernardino (14.9%)</td>
<td>Orange (12.8%)</td>
<td>Alameda (5.8%)</td>
<td>Riverside (5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Los Angeles (30.6%)</td>
<td>Orange (12%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (8.5%)</td>
<td>San Diego (8.2%)</td>
<td>Alameda (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Los Angeles (41.5%)</td>
<td>Orange (19.5%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (6.6%)</td>
<td>San Diego (5.6%)</td>
<td>Alameda (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>Sacramento (16.9%)</td>
<td>San Diego (13.3%)</td>
<td>Fresno (9.9%)</td>
<td>Los Angeles (7.7%)</td>
<td>Contra Costa (7.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>Los Angeles (21.5%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (14.2%)</td>
<td>San Diego (8.1%)</td>
<td>Alameda (7.9%)</td>
<td>Orange (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>Los Angeles (38.6%)</td>
<td>Alameda (12.8%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (9.6%)</td>
<td>San Francisco (8.9%)</td>
<td>Sacramento (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>Los Angeles (18.7%)</td>
<td>Contra Costa (15.1%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (13.3%)</td>
<td>Alameda (11.7%)</td>
<td>Orange (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okinawan</td>
<td>Los Angeles (24.1%)</td>
<td>San Diego (23.3%)</td>
<td>Humboldt (7.5%)</td>
<td>Riverside (7.3%)</td>
<td>San Francisco (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>Los Angeles (18.4%)</td>
<td>San Joaquin (13.4%)</td>
<td>Orange (9.9%)</td>
<td>Alameda (9.2%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (7.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>Los Angeles (34.7%)</td>
<td>Orange (16.1%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (7.4%)</td>
<td>Alameda (7.4%)</td>
<td>Contra Costa (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>Los Angeles (32.8%)</td>
<td>Orange (15%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (14.3%)</td>
<td>Alameda (8.7%)</td>
<td>San Diego (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Los Angeles (40.4%)</td>
<td>Orange (9.3%)</td>
<td>San Diego (6.9%)</td>
<td>San Bernardino (5.1%)</td>
<td>Alamed (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Orange (30%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (19.5%)</td>
<td>Los Angeles (15.9%)</td>
<td>San Diego (7.5%)</td>
<td>Alameda (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian, specified</td>
<td>Sacramento (26.7%)</td>
<td>Alameda (11.5%)</td>
<td>Los Angeles (9%)</td>
<td>Contra Costa (8.7%)</td>
<td>Orange (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian, not specified</td>
<td>Los Angeles (22.6%)</td>
<td>Orange (9.6%)</td>
<td>Sacramento (8.5%)</td>
<td>Alameda (7.4%)</td>
<td>San Diego (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analysis of 2020 American Community Survey 5-year Public Use Microdata File by AAPI Data
For NHPI communities, Sacramento County has drawn Fijian and Marshallese American communities while San Diego has the largest Chamorro American community and San Mateo the largest Tongan American community (Table 5). Los Angeles County contained the largest Native Hawaiian and Samoan American communities, though San Diego County for Native Hawaiians was not far behind Los Angeles County.

**Table 5**: Top 5 Counties of Residence for each Detailed National NHPI Origin in CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NHP Origin</th>
<th>County 1</th>
<th>County 2</th>
<th>County 3</th>
<th>County 4</th>
<th>County 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>Los Angeles (17.3%)</td>
<td>San Diego (13%)</td>
<td>Orange (8.2%)</td>
<td>Alameda (6.6%)</td>
<td>San Bernardino (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>Los Angeles (21%)</td>
<td>San Diego (11.1%)</td>
<td>Orange (8.4%)</td>
<td>Alameda (8.2%)</td>
<td>San Bernardino (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>San Mateo (21.1%)</td>
<td>Los Angeles (14.5%)</td>
<td>Alameda (13.1%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (7.3%)</td>
<td>Riverside (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Polynesian</td>
<td>Los Angeles (23.7%)</td>
<td>Orange (12.7%)</td>
<td>San Joaquin (8.3%)</td>
<td>San Diego (7%)</td>
<td>San Bernardino (6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>San Diego (18.7%)</td>
<td>Los Angeles (12.1%)</td>
<td>Riverside (8.8%)</td>
<td>Alameda (7.2%)</td>
<td>Solano (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>Sacramento (46.3%)</td>
<td>Butte (11.9%)</td>
<td>Riverside (9%)</td>
<td>Orange (7.1%)</td>
<td>Alameda (6.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Micronesian</td>
<td>Sacramento (12.6%)</td>
<td>Los Angeles (11.9%)</td>
<td>San Diego (11.3%)</td>
<td>Stanislaus (9.9%)</td>
<td>Riverside (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>Sacramento (29.4%)</td>
<td>Alameda (12.5%)</td>
<td>Los Angeles (7.5%)</td>
<td>Stanislaus (7.2%)</td>
<td>San Mateo (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Melanesian</td>
<td>Alameda (52.4%)</td>
<td>Santa Clara (15.2%)</td>
<td>Los Angeles (14.7%)</td>
<td>Fresno (6.4%)</td>
<td>San Diego (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander, not specified</td>
<td>Los Angeles (24.4%)</td>
<td>San Diego (8.6%)</td>
<td>Sacramento (7.5%)</td>
<td>Orange (6.1%)</td>
<td>Riverside (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Analysis of 2020 American Community Survey 5-year Public Use Microdata File by AAPI Data*
IMMIGRATION

OVERALL TRENDS IN IMMIGRATION BY MAJOR RACE AND ETHNICITY

Table 6 depicts the percentage of residents, adults, and adult citizens that were foreign born. The majority of Asians and multi-racial Asian adults and adult citizens in the US are foreign born, with both numbers being above 60% for either group, indicating how immigration has been a primary driver in population growth for the Asian community. Of note, the foreign-born percentages for the NHPI and Hispanic populations are also quite high at over 25% for both groups, again indicating the influx of immigrants across these groups.

Table 6: Percentage of Foreign Born as a Proportion of Residents, Adults, and Adult Citizens in CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>% Residents</th>
<th>% Adults</th>
<th>% Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in combination</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analysis of 2020 American Community Survey 5-year Public Use Microdata File by AAPI Data
During the Trump administration, there was a concerted effort to slow legal immigration to the United States. Data tracking the number of persons obtaining lawful permanent resident (LPR) status steadily declined from 2017 when the Trump administration first took office (Figure 5). In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic caused an even steeper drop-off in the number of persons obtaining LPR status. LPR among individuals from Asia dropped by 37 percent from 2016 to 2020, the second most decline among the major geographic regions, only behind the 45 percent decline for individuals from North America (Figure 6).\(^6\)

**Figure 5: Persons Obtaining Lawful Permanent Resident Status in California: 2011 - 2020**
IMMIGRATION AND RECENT ARRIVALS BY DETAILED ORIGIN

While in aggregate the majority of Asian Americans are immigrants, disaggregate data shows the wide variation in the impact of immigration on Asian American communities. While almost all Asian national origin groups were majority immigrant, Hmong, Japanese and multiracial Asian Americans were overwhelmingly native born (Figure 7). Proportions of Cambodian and Laotian Americans who were immigrants were well below the proportion for all Asians.
Great variation in immigration patterns among the detailed Asian national origins can be seen in the data on recent arrivals. Almost half of all Nepalese American immigrants arrived in the last 10 years (Figure 8). Mongolian, Bangladeshi and Bhutanese American immigrants were also more likely to have arrived in the last 10 years. Cambodian, Hmong, and Laotian Americans were the least likely to be recent arrivals, which reflects the history of refugee immigration for those groups.
Figure 8: Proportion of Immigrants in California Arriving within the Past 10 Years by Detailed Asian National Origin

- Nepalese: 44.5%
- Mongolian: 30.8%
- Bangladeshi: 29.4%
- Bhutanese: 28.4%
- Asian Indian: 25.9%
- Malaysian: 25.3%
- Burmese: 23.8%
- Other Asian: 21.9%
- Sri Lankan: 20.7%
- Pakistani: 19.2%
- Chinese: 18%
- Thai: 17.5%
- Indonesian: 14.7%
- Taiwanese: 12.6%
- Vietnamese: 10.8%
- Korean: 10.6%
- Filipino: 10.4%
- Japanese: 9.8%
- Cambodian: 7.3%
- All combinations of Asian: 4.6%
- Hmong: 2.9%
- Laotian: 2.4%

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
NHPI groups were much less likely to be foreign born compared to Asian groups, where only Fijian and Marshallese American groups were majority foreign born (Figure 9). The different relationships each Pacific Island nation has with the United States deeply influence the legal status of each group. Fijian and Marshallese American immigrants were also more likely than other NHPI groups to have arrived in the last 10 years (Figure 10). While Native Hawaiians and Chamorro Americans are almost all native born, several thousand immigrants from primarily the Philippines, Mexico, Guatemala, and the rest of Latin America have Native Hawaiian ancestry, a result of the complex interplay of colonialism, trade, and migration.

Figure 9: Proportion of Residents in California that are Foreign Born by Detailed NHPI National Origin

- Fijian: 68.9%
- Marshallese: 53.3%
- Tongan: 44.6%
- Other Pacific Islander: 34.2%
- Samoan: 20.3%
- Chamorro: 5%
- Native Hawaiian: 3.6%

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
Several agencies and organizations use a variety of methodologies to estimate the unauthorized population in California. The Department of Homeland Security's latest estimates on the unauthorized population was 2.6 million in 2018. The Center for Migration Studies estimated that in 2019 there were only 2.2 million unauthorized immigrants in California, with 447,000 from Asian countries (Table 7). The Migration Policy Institute estimated a larger unauthorized population of 2.7 million also with 490,000 from Asian countries.

The Center for Migration Studies also estimated unauthorized populations for each state by country of origin for a greater number of countries than the other sources. The estimates were just over 116,000 from India, just under 116,000 from China, 68,000 from the Philippines, 50,000 from South Korea, 25,000 from Vietnam, less than 6,000 from Thailand, less than 4,000 from Nepal, and 3,000 from Pakistan.
**Table 7**: Estimates of Unauthorized Population in California in 2019 by Region of Birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total: All Countries</td>
<td>2,251,756</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>1,317,815</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>447,294</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America</td>
<td>356,528</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>44,831</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>46,973</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>25,900</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>6,253</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>5,418</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LANGUAGE DIVERSITY AND ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

One of the key arguments for data disaggregation centers around the wide array of languages and dialects spoken under the AA and NHPI umbrella. As we saw in the demographic section, the fastest-growing portions of the AA and NHPI populations were some of the newest communities to arrive in the United States. The variations in English proficiency across these language groups are significant as both are tied to language access and equity outcomes related to jobs, health, education, and integration into civic and political life.

LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH SPOKEN AT HOME

Populations with a large share of immigrants are more likely to speak a language other than English at home. Given the high concentration of first-generation immigrants in the Asian and Hispanic populations, these groups have the greatest percentages that speak a language other than English at home (Figure 11).
Table 8 depicts the prevalence of AA and NHPI languages spoken at home. Unsurprisingly, the largest Asian ethnic groups correspond to the most frequently spoken languages, with Chinese topping the chart at 1,265,753 speakers (including Mandarin, Cantonese, and Min Na Chinese speakers). Though smaller in number, the total number of NHPI language speakers still accounts for roughly 50,000 speakers in the state of California.
### Table 8: Prevalence of AA and NHPI Languages Spoken at Home in CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese*</td>
<td>1,265,753</td>
<td>Cebuano</td>
<td>15,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>659,067</td>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>15,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>570,691</td>
<td>Iu Mien</td>
<td>14,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>361,667</td>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>13,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>198,150</td>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>12,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>144,973</td>
<td>Other Philippine</td>
<td>8,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>135,888</td>
<td>Other languages of</td>
<td>7,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>128,768</td>
<td>Sinhala</td>
<td>6,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>74,124</td>
<td>Other Eastern</td>
<td>6,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malayo-Polynesian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer</td>
<td>71,779</td>
<td>India N.E.C.</td>
<td>6,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>65,066</td>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>4,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>58,331</td>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>4,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>57,464</td>
<td>Other Indo-Iranian</td>
<td>3,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>50,557</td>
<td>Other Indo-European</td>
<td>3,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>45,092</td>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>2,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao</td>
<td>30,876</td>
<td>Konkani</td>
<td>2,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>30,643</td>
<td>Tibetan</td>
<td>2,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>29,047</td>
<td>Pakistan N.E.C.</td>
<td>1,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilocano</td>
<td>23,270</td>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>1,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>21,909</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>1,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayalam</td>
<td>19,271</td>
<td>Karen languages</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>18,486</td>
<td>Chuukese</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>18,238</td>
<td>Chin languages</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Analysis of 2020 American Community Survey 5-year Public Use Microdata File by AAPI Data

*Includes Chinese, Cantonese, Mandarin, and Min Nan Chinese
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) POPULATION

The challenge of limited English proficiency is significant for Asian Americans and, to a lesser extent, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders. The Census Bureau defines limited English proficiency, or LEP, as those who speak a language other than English at home and who speak English “less than very well.” Asian, multi-racial Asian, and Hispanic populations have the highest levels of LEP, with 33% of the single-racial Asian, 30% of single and multi-racial Asians, and 29% of the Hispanic populations reporting that they speak English less than “Very well” (Figure 12). In contrast, the White and Black populations both have much lower levels of limited English proficiency at 11% and 2%, respectively.

![Figure 12: Limited English Proficient Population in California by English-Speaking Ability by Race/Ethnicity](chart)

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
Note: Percentages less than 1.5% are not labeled
Total LEP population included in parentheses after racial group label
Disaggregating the LEP population by detailed Asian national origin reveals the critical nature of providing language services for the Asian American community, with limited English proficiency individuals comprising the majority of the Burmese, Vietnamese, and Mongolian Americans (Figure 13). In addition, more than 2 in 5 Thai, Bhutanese, Chinese, and Korean Americans were LEP. Conversely, given that the educational systems in India and the Philippines teach largely in English, especially at the college-level, we see that LEP is relatively lower for Indian and Filipino Americans compared to the other Asian national origin groups. Japanese Americans being largely native born also had relatively low levels of LEP.

Among NHPI national origin groups, Tongan and Fijian Americans had the highest LEP rates (Figure 14). The remaining NHPI groups all had LEP rates lower than the lowest LEP rate among Asian groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese, except Taiwanese</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
LINGUISTICALLY ISOLATED HOUSEHOLDS

Linguistic isolation is another measure of language proficiency. If a household is linguistically isolated, there is no one in the household who is 14 years or older that speaks English exclusively or “very well”. As expected, the racial groups with the highest percentages of linguistically isolated households correspond directly to the populations with the highest levels of limited English proficiency, with 21% of Asian households, 20% of multi-racial Asian households, and 16% of Hispanic households experiencing linguistic isolation (Figure 15).

As perhaps expected, the groups that are the most linguistically isolated correspond fairly closely to the groups with high percentages of limited English proficiency, with about one in three households experiencing linguistic isolation in the Mongolian, Korean, Burmese, Bhutanese, Vietnamese, Thai, and Chinese American communities (Figure 16). Again, we see that the Indian American population sits at the opposite end of the chart (7%). Despite this fact, it’s still important to note that a greater proportion of Indian American households are linguistically isolated than American Indian or Alaska Native (6%), White (5%), NHPI (3%), and Black (1%) households.
### Figure 15: Linguistic Isolation in California by Race or Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in combination</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
### Figure 16: Linguistic Isolation in California by Detailed Asian National Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Isolated Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese, except Taiwanese</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
Figure 17: Linguistic Isolation in California by Detailed NHPI National Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Educational attainment is calculated for adults ages 25 years or older, presuming that most individuals are finished with their formal education by that age. Educational attainment is closely tied to labor outcomes and income levels. This section will examine educational attainment from several characteristics: race, ethnicity, sex, and nativity.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT BY RACE AND ETHNICITY

Figure 18 illustrates educational attainment by race and ethnicity. When examining the percentage of each group with a Bachelor’s degree or higher, the disparities are apparent: 53% of the Asian population, 36% of the White population, 27% of the Black population, 21% of the Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander population, 18% of the Hispanic population, and 15% of the American Indian or Alaska Native population have Bachelor’s degrees or higher.

![Figure 18: Educational Attainment in California by Race/Ethnicity](image)

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
Disaggregating by detailed Asian national origin reveals a wide range of educational outcomes. Where previously the Asian racial group as a whole had the highest levels of college attainment or higher, highly educated immigrants from countries like Taiwan and India skew the racial group's distribution for educational attainment. The post-graduate degree attainment of Taiwanese and Indian Americans, for example, ultimately masks the lower levels of post-graduate degree attainment from groups like Vietnamese, Hmong, Cambodian, Laotian, and Bhutanese Americans, many of whom have been afforded fewer opportunities given their refugee experiences (Figure 19). Disaggregated by detailed NHPI national origin also reveals a range of intra-group differences, but not to the extent of the Asian groups. Marshallese Americans stand out as having almost half of the adult population not having a high school diploma (Figure 20).
Figure 19: Educational Attainment in California by Detailed Asian National Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Less than high school</th>
<th>High school</th>
<th>Some college</th>
<th>Bachelor's degree</th>
<th>Post graduate degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
DIFFERENCES IN EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT BY SEX AND NATIVITY

Educational attainment among Asian Americans also varies by sex and nativity. Notably, foreign-born Asian men are more likely to have obtained post-graduate degrees (24%) compared to foreign-born Asian women (17%), a pattern that reverses for native-born Asian men (18%) and women (22%) (Table 9). The fact that foreign-born Asian men have such high levels of post graduate degree attainment is potentially due to the broader immigration trends of employment-based visas. The data for NHPIs by sex is less clear given the smaller sample size and larger margins of error, but native-born NHPIs show increased educational attainment over their foreign-born peers (Table 10).
### Table 9: Differences in Educational Attainment in CA by Sex and Nativity, Asian Americans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational attainment</th>
<th>Foreign-born</th>
<th>Native-born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate degree</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Analysis of 2020 American Community Survey 5-year Public Use Microdata File by AAPI Data*

### Table 10: Differences in Educational Attainment in CA by Sex and Nativity, NHPIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational attainment</th>
<th>Foreign-born</th>
<th>Native-born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate degree</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Analysis of 2020 American Community Survey 5-year Public Use Microdata File by AAPI Data*
LABOR-MARKET OUTCOMES

The economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic revealed serious vulnerabilities in AA and NHPI employment outcomes. The difference in labor force participation rates between men and women for some AA and NHPI communities and the reliance on service sector occupations resulted in more single-income families facing considerable income disruption during the mandatory shut down of businesses and drop in demand for in-person services.

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION

Labor force participation is defined by the government as the share of the population ages 16 years or older who are working or actively seeking employment. Asian American and Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders all had some of the highest labor force participation rates (Table 11). Men for both groups were much more likely to be in the workforce than women. For detailed Asian national origins, Bangladeshi, Burmese, Cambodian, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Pakistani Americans had labor force participation rates lower than the statewide average (Table 12). Bangladeshi, Bhutanese, Japanese, and Pakistani American women had labor force participation rates below 50 percent. Meanwhile, Bhutanese, Indian and Nepalese American men had labor force participation rates higher than 80 percent.

Marshallese and Samoan Americans had labor force participation rates lower than the general population (Table 13). For men and women, the sample size for Marshallese Americans was too small to produce statistically stable estimates, though the data suggests that a significant gap between men and women in labor force participation, similar to data for Marshallese Americans workers at the national level. Tongan American women were more likely to be in the labor force compared to Tongan American men. With the exception of Marshallese American women, all other NHPI women had higher labor force participation rates compared to women in general.
### Table 11: Labor Force Participation Percentages in CA in 2020 by Race and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Analysis of 2020 American Community Survey 5-year Public Use Microdata File by AAPI Data*
**Table 12:** Labor Force Participation Percentages in CA in 2020 by Detailed Asian National Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>origin</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Analysis of 2020 American Community Survey 5-year Public Use Microdata File by AAPI Data*
Table 13: Labor Force Participation Percentages in CA in 2020 by Detailed NHPI National Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>origin</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guamanian or Chamorro</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data for Marshallese are presented but are not statistically stable.
Source: Analysis of 2020 American Community Survey 5-year Public Use Microdata File by AAPI Data

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that Asian women and Asians age 55 years and over faced the largest impacts on employment during the pandemic (Table 14). Both demographic groups went from having unemployment rates well below that of their demographic peers in 2019 to having unemployment rates higher than their peers in 2020.

Asian women also fared worse compared to Asian men, going from similar unemployment rates in 2019 to Asian women having unemployment rates much higher than Asian men. A similar but not as strong difference occurred between all women and all men.
Table 14: Unemployment Rates by Age and Sex in CA for Asians and All Workers, 2019 and 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Point Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, 16 to 24 years</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, 25 to 54 years</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, 55 years and over</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 16 to 24 years</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 25 to 54 years</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, 55 years and over</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Men</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Women</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Men</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Women</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The American Community Survey (ACS) is another source of data on the impact of the pandemic on Asian and NHPI communities. The 2020 ACS faced numerous challenges including the suspension of key data collection activities from mid-March to June 2020, the peak of the economic impact of the pandemic. As a result, the Census Bureau was not able to release an official 2020 ACS 1-year data product that met their statistical quality standards. However, the Census Bureau did release an experimental version of the 2020 ACS 1-year data for researchers to evaluate. Using this dataset to examine differences between detailed Asian and NHPI groups can be useful to see if certain communities were disproportionately impacted by the pandemic relative to other groups.
Due to the way that unemployment data is collected by the ACS, the unemployment rates calculated from ACS are consistently lower than the official unemployment rate data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. For the figure below, the data should only be used to compare relative differences among groups within each figure and not with other unemployment rate data.

Among detailed Asian groups, Burmese, Bangladeshi, Vietnamese, Korean, Laotian and Indonesian Americans had unemployment rates that were a full percentage point or more greater than the overall Asian unemployment rate. Indian, Japanese, Taiwanese and Sri Lankan Americans had unemployment rates a full percentage point or more lower than the overall Asian unemployment rate (Figure 21).
For the NHPI community, Native Hawaiians and Samoans had a much higher unemployment rate in 2020 compared to all NHPIs. Tongans and Chamorros appeared to have much lower unemployment rates (Figure 22).
Among the employed, Asian Americans are significantly more likely than other groups to be concentrated in management, professional, and related occupations. (Figure 23) While nearly almost half of employed Asian Californians worked in these types of jobs, only about one in five Latinos and two in five Black or African Americans did so. When compared to Latinos and Black or African Americans, Asian Americans are also considerably less likely to work in production, transportation, and material moving occupations. Finally, when compared to whites, Asian Americans are more likely to work in management and professional occupations and less likely to work in natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations.
Disaggregated data by AA and NHPI national origin groups reveals wide variations in occupational outcomes. Mongolian, Thai, Nepalese, and Vietnamese American workers are disproportionately employed in service occupations. Japanese, Korean, Malaysian, Indonesian, Sri Lankan, and Pakistani American workers were most likely to be employed in sales and office occupations (Figure 24). Workers from refugee communities such as Bhutanese, Burmese, Cambodian, Laotian, and Hmong Americans, were overrepresented in production, transportation, and material moving occupations. Half or more of Chinese, Indian, Sri Lankan, and Taiwanese American workers were employed in management and professional occupations.

Among NHPI origin groups, Marshallese American workers were more likely to be employed in production, transportation, and material moving occupations and service occupations (Figure 25). Native Hawaiians, Chamorro Americans, and Samoan Americans were more likely to be in sales and office occupations compared to other NHPI groups. Native Hawaiians and Tongan Americans were more likely than workers in general to be in natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations. Fijian American workers were more likely to be in management and professional occupations than workers in general.
Figure 23: Occupation Among Employed Persons in California by Race/Ethnicity

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
### Figure 24: Occupation Among Employed Persons in California by Detailed Asian National Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
Figure 25: Occupation Among Employed Persons in California by Detailed NHPI National Origin

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
INCOME AND POVERTY

Income and poverty data for AA and NHPI households and families should be disaggregated to avoid mischaracterization of the needs and experiences of these communities. Often the focus is on the high median incomes of AA households, which are largely driven by highly educated immigrants on employment visas who have access to high paying careers. But this focus ends up overlooking the challenges faced by refugees and asylees who have less educational attainment and English proficiency and end up with limited economic resources.

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME

While the Asian population's median household income is substantially higher than all other groups at $101,253 and nearly twice the median household income of the Black population, this is potentially attributable to individuals with high levels of educational attainment and significant access to resources who immigrate to the United States (Figure 26). In other words, such groups have access to far more opportunities for accruing and maintaining wealth compared to other groups that have been forced to endure institutionalized racism for several generations. However, when disaggregating by detailed Asian national origin, we see again that the high incomes of large groups mask the lower incomes of refugee populations.
Disaggregating median household income by detailed Asian national origin reveals a stark contrast: while Indian American households have the highest median household income of $158,257, Laotian, Hmong, Mongolian, Cambodian, and Bhutanese American households have median incomes about one third of that amount (Figure 27). This again reflects similar trends in other outcomes, in which refugee populations are unable to access the same opportunities as highly-educated immigrants. Among NHPI groups, the lower educational attainment levels for Marshallese Americans resulted in lower labor force participation rates and lower median household incomes compared to other NHPI groups (Figure 28).
### Figure 27: Median Household Income in California by Detailed Asian National Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian National Origin</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>$158,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>$118,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>$108,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>$107,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>$105,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian overall</td>
<td>$101,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>$101,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>$98,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>$96,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>$94,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>$90,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>$88,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>$88,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>$78,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>$78,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>$78,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>$76,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>$70,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>$66,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>$66,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>$64,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>$64,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>$37,372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
Examining per-capita household income by race and ethnicity also reveals important differences in household composition. Though the Asian and White populations still have the highest per-capita household incomes, we see that NHPI and Hispanic populations tend to have larger households, thereby driving their per-capita household incomes lower than other populations despite having higher median household incomes. For example, the median household incomes for NHPI and Black populations are $80,184 and $54,342 respectively, but their per-capita household incomes are about equal at around $28,000. This ultimately demonstrates that median household incomes can be deceptive when failing to account for household sizes.
POVERTY STATUS

This chart depicts poverty status by race and ethnicity across different age groups. While poverty rates for Asians, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders were among the lowest of the major race and ethnic groups, significant differences among age groups appear among the different groups (Figure 30). Child poverty for most of the race and ethnic groups, including NHPIs, was much higher than the all-ages poverty rates for each group. For example, the level of poverty of the total NHPI population is 12.8%, but nearly doubles to 20.3% for the child NHPI population, highlighting the importance of providing youth services to these groups. The two exceptions were multiracial and Asian children, whose poverty rates were close to the all-age poverty rate. While nationally Asian American senior poverty rates were higher than the all-ages poverty rate for Asians, in California, Asian senior poverty rates were in line with the overall poverty rates for Asians.
The poverty rates by detailed national origin group show wide variation in poverty rates. Among Asian origins, Mongolian and Hmong Americans had the highest poverty rates in California, at 24% and 23% respectively, while the lowest poverty rates were 5% for Indian Americans and 6% for Filipino Americans (Figure 31). Among NHPI groups, Marshallese Americans had the highest poverty rates at 27% and Fijians had the lowest at 9% (Figure 32).
Figure 30: Poverty Status in California by Race/Ethnicity

Total Poverty
- Black or African American alone: 19.8%
- Some Other Race alone: 17.5%
- American Indian or Alaska Native alone: 18.2%
- Hispanic: 16.5%
- Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone: 12.8%
- White alone: 11.5%
- Two or More Races: 12.1%
- Asian alone: 10%

Child Poverty
- Black or African American alone: 25.3%
- Some Other Race alone: 24.5%
- American Indian or Alaska Native alone: 22.5%
- Hispanic: 22.5%
- Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone: 20.3%
- White alone: 15.7%
- Two or More Races: 12.8%
- Asian alone: 10.3%

Senior Poverty
- Black or African American alone: 17.8%
- Some Other Race alone: 20.1%
- American Indian or Alaska Native alone: 16.9%
- Hispanic: 18.3%
- Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone: 13.8%
- White alone: 10%
- Two or More Races: 12.9%
- Asian alone: 12.4%

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
Figure 31: Poverty Status in California by Detailed Asian National Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Origin</th>
<th>Poverty Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
IMPACT OF COVID-19 PANDEMIC ON POVERTY

The 2020 ACS 1-year experimental data release from the U.S. Census Bureau provides a snapshot look at the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on Asian and NHPI poverty. Income losses due to pandemic shutdowns were offset in part by federal government support and spending, resulting in an overall decline in poverty. However, disaggregated data from the 2020 ACS suggests that not all Asian and NHPI groups were able to access needed support. Among Asian groups in California, Burmese, Pakistani and Cambodian American poverty rates remained elevated relative to other Asian groups (Figure 33). Similar, Fijian Americans and Native Hawaiians had poverty rates that remained higher than overall NHPI poverty rates (Figure 34).

As mentioned before in the unemployment rate section, the 2020 ACS 1-year experimental data should not be compared with other data sources due to several
methodology limitations that the COVID pandemic created, including stopping of data collection for several months and sample bias from changes in non-response follow-up procedures. The data is presented here to identify potential differences in poverty rates among the Asian and NHPI detailed origin groups.

**Figure 33: Estimated Poverty Rates in California by Detailed Asian National Origin in 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Poverty Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Asian</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Asian</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020 ACS 1-year Public Use Microdata with Experimental Weights
Figure 34: Estimated Poverty Rates in California by Detailed NHPI National Origin in 2020

- Fijian: 18.7%
- Native Hawaiian: 15.2%
- All NHPI: 11.8%
- Samoan: 11.6%
- Other Pacific Islander: 9.8%
- Tongan: 6.4%
- Chamorro: 6.2%

Source: 2020 ACS 1-year Public Use Microdata with Experimental Weights
Note: Samples sizes in the 1-year ACS were too small to produce estimates for Marshallese
Home ownership has been one of the primary ways for building wealth in the U.S. Access to mortgages and affordable housing options are all important tools to help new immigrants build wealth and financial security.

While Asian and White households have the highest homeownership rates in California, less than half of NHPI households own their homes (Figure 35). Disaggregated data again shows the wide variety of circumstances among AA and NHPI national origin groups. Taiwanese, Japanese, and Chinese American households had much higher homeownership rates than White households (Figure 36). At the other end of the home ownership spectrum, only about 15% of Mongolian and 35% Nepalese American households own their homes. For NHPI groups, Fijian American homeownership rates approached that to White households (Figure 37). Marshallese American household data were not included due to small sample size.
Figure 35: Renting and Home Ownership in California by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Own</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI alone or in combination</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in combination</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
**Figure 36: Renting and Home Ownership in California by Detailed Asian National Origin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Origin</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Own</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample*
A common measure of overcrowding in households used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the U.S. Census Bureau is when the number of persons per room is greater than one. There has been a renewed interest in tracking this statistic because of the challenges of finding space to quarantine at home during the COVID-19 pandemic. Using this measure, we find that Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander households were twice as likely to be living in overcrowded housing as White households (Figure 38). Asian households to a lesser degree were more likely to be in overcrowded housing than White households. By national origin, we see that almost one in three Mongolian American households were living in overcrowded housing (Figure 39). Around one in four Bangladeshi, Hmong, and Nepalese American households were also in overcrowded housing. Almost one in three Tongan American households were overcrowded, while Marshallese American household data were not included due to small sample size (Figure 40).
Figure 38: % of Overcrowded Households in California by Race/Ethnicity

- Some Other Race alone: 22.8%
- Hispanic/Latino: 18.4%
- Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone: 12.9%
- American Indian or Alaska Native alone: 10.7%
- Two or More Races: 9.6%
- NHPI alone or in combination: 9.3%
- Asian alone: 8.8%
- Asian alone or in combination: 8.5%
- White alone: 5.8%
- Black or African American alone: 5.6%

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
Figure 39: % of Overcrowded Households in California by Detailed Asian National Origin

- Mongolian: 30.7%
- Bangladeshi: 26.3%
- Hmong: 25.3%
- Nepalese: 24.1%
- Pakistani: 21.4%
- Burmese: 19.9%
- Malaysian: 16.8%
- Cambodian: 16.6%
- Other Asian: 15.9%
- Laotian: 12.4%
- Sri Lankan: 11.3%
- Filipino: 11.3%
- Indonesian: 10.5%
- Vietnamese: 10%
- Asian Indian: 10%
- All combinations of Asian: 8.6%
- Korean: 8.3%
- Thai: 7%
- Chinese: 5.9%
- Taiwanese: 3.2%
- Japanese: 2.5%

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
Note: The Bhutanese population is not included on this chart due to small sample sizes
Figure 40: % of Overcrowded Households in California by Detailed NHPI National Origin

- Tongan: 31.4%
- Samoan: 18.5%
- Fijian: 10.3%
- Other Pacific Islander: 9.4%
- Chamorro: 8.7%
- Native Hawaiian: 7.8%

Source: 2020 American Community Survey Five-year Public Use Microdata Sample
PUBLIC OPINION AND VOTING

The rapid growth of the AA and NHPI communities over the last few decades beyond the major cities that were hubs of Asian immigration has resulted in increased focus and engagement with AA and NHPI voters and communities. This section will look at voter turnout and public opinion survey results to understand the issues and opinions of this diverse electorate to guide continued voter outreach and engagement work and measure the impact of voter engagement efforts on AA and NHPI turnout.

PARTY IDENTIFICATION AMONG AANHPIS

According to the 2016 National Asian American Post-Election Survey, 49 percent of Asian American registered voters did not identify with either the Republican Party or Democratic Party. Thirty-five percent of Asian Americans declared themselves to be independents and 14 percent indicated that they did not know or that they did not think in terms of political parties. Similarly, only 43 percent of NHPI voters identified as Democrat or Republican. This high level of AAPI party non-identification overshadows the 37 percent of non-AA or NHPI registered voters choosing not to identify in 2016 (Figure 21). However, among those who do identify with a political party there is a clear advantage to the Democratic Party, with Asian American registered voters identifying as Democrat over Republican by more than 3-to-1 margin at 39 percent to 12 percent. The Democratic Party advantage is less for NHPIs, with 27 percent of registered voters identifying as Democrats and 16 percent identifying as Republicans.
Data by Asian national origin show that for many groups that the Democratic Party had a clear advantage in party identification. The majority of Chinese, Hmong, and Vietnamese American voters were independent or did not think in terms of parties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian National Origin</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Do not think in terms of parties</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 National Asian American Post-Election Survey
PRESIDENTIAL VOTE BY NATIONAL ORIGIN, NATIVITY, AND SEX

Asian American voters at the national level were more supportive of Clinton over Trump during the 2016 Election, with 72% of Asian Americans compared to 56% of NHPI and non-AANHPI voters. However, in California, NHPI and non-AANHPI voters were much more likely to vote for Clinton compared to their national peers, while Asian Californian voters showed slightly less support for Clinton compared to Asian American voters nationally. Among California’s Asian communities, Clinton had strong support among South Asian Americans, while underperforming among Filipino, Vietnamese, Hmong, and Chinese American voters. Clinton also had stronger support among Asian American women compared to men and Asian American immigrants over native born.
**SUPPORT FOR PROPOSITION 55**

AA and NHPI voters in California overwhelmingly favored the 2016 Proposition 55 which extended for twelve more years personal income tax increases on those earning incomes more than $250,000, enacted initially in 2012. The revenues are...
allocated to K-12 schools and community colleges, and to health care in certain years. The proposition passed with 63% voting yes. While the majority of Hmong Americans who voted supported the Proposition, 46 percent of Hmong Americans did not cast a vote on the proposition (Figure 23). Almost one-third of Japanese Americans voted against the proposition, the highest level of opposition among the Asian origin groups.

**Figure 43: Support for Proposition 55 in California by Race and National Origin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race Overall</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Not Asian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Asian Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race Overall</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Cambodian</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Hmong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: 2016 National Asian American Post-Election Survey**
VIEWS ON MAJOR ISSUES FOR THE ASIAN POPULATION

In terms of the issues that Asian Americans in California cared about during the 2016 election cycle, retirement savings, college affordability, and medical care costs were at the top (Figure 24). While time to get visas ranked low for Asian Americans as a whole, disaggregating the data by national origin shows higher salience for Asian groups facing the longest wait times for family-based visas, with the exception of Chinese American voters (Figure 25). For Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders in 2016, time to get visas and college affordability were the top issues (Figure 26).

![Figure 44: Percent of Asian Respondents in California that View Each Issue as 'Very Serious']
Figure 45: Percent of Respondents in California that View Problems with Visa Wait Times as ‘Very Serious’ by Detailed Asian National Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Origin</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Overall</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 National Asian American Post-Election Survey
Figure 46: Percent of NHPI Respondents in California that View Each Issue as 'Very Serious'

- Time to get visas: 49%
- Affordability of college: 40%
- Credit card debt: 32%
- Quality of children's schools: 29%
- Rent/mortgage payments: 28%
- Childcare costs: 27%
- Bullying at school: 26%
- Student loan debt: 23%
- Medical care costs: 23%
- Retirement savings: 22%
- Elder care costs: 10%
- Medical debt: 6%

Source: 2016 National Asian American Post-Election Survey
On the issue of pathways to citizenship, NHPI adults were very favorable towards a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, with Asian American voters less strongly in favor (Figure 27). By Asian national origin group, most groups were strongly in favor by at least a 2 to 1 margin, except for Chinese and Korean Americans. Almost half of Korean American voters in California were opposed to a pathway to citizenship, the only groups where a plurality of voters opposed the issue. Only 45 percent of Chinese American voters were supported a pathway to citizenship, while 41 percent opposed and 15 percent did not take a position.

*Figure 47: Responses to the statement: 'Undocumented or illegal immigrants should be allowed to have an opportunity to eventually become U.S. citizens.' by Race and National Origin (California)*

(Source: 2016 National Asian American Post-Election Survey)
AA and NHPI impressions of the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement were largely favorable, although Asian Americans were more likely to have never heard of the movement by a wide margin (Figure 28). In addition to South Asian Americans showing highly favorable impressions of BLM, Korean Americans also had a very highly favorable impression of Black Lives Matter, likely owing to various efforts to improve racial healing and intergroup relations following racial tensions in New York and Los Angeles during the 1980s and 1990s. Vietnamese Americans were the most likely to have not heard of the movement. Less than half of Cambodian, Chinese, Hmong, and Vietnamese Americans had a favorable impression.

Figure 48: Impressions of the Black Lives Matter movement in California by Race and National Origin

Source: 2016 National Asian American Post-Election Survey
The 2016 National Asian American Post-Election Survey also contained a question about environmental policy that reveals pro-environmental attitudes among AA and NHPI voters. Support for stricter emissions limits on power plants to address climate change was strong among Californian voters, with over three-quarters of AA voters, just shy of three-quarters of non-AANHPI voters, and almost two-thirds of NHPI voters showing support (Figure 49). Both AA and NHPI voters were much more likely to not know what their position is on emissions limits that non-AANHPI voters, demonstrating an opportunity for voter education on this issue. Among Asian national origin groups, more than 8 in 10 Korean, Indian, Vietnamese, and Hmong Californian voters supported stricter emissions limits. Support among Cambodian and Filipino Californian voters was weaker, though a good portion was due to more voters not knowing their stance on the issues than outright opposition.

These pro-environmental attitudes are in line with findings from other voter surveys such as the Asian American Voter Surveys (AAVS), which have gauged opinion among Asian American registered voters in the six largest national-origin groups that account for over three-quarters of the Asian American electorate (Figure 50). In 2020, respondents were asked whether they support or oppose federal legislation aimed at reducing the effects of climate change/global warming. Over three-quarters supported such policies, with majority support across all Asian American groups as measured by ethnicity, sex, educational attainment, and nativity. Similarly, in 2016, respondents were asked if they support or oppose setting stricter emissions limits on power plants in order to address climate change. Just under three-quarters (74%) of Asian American voters supported those limits, with majority support across all Asian American groups.
Figure 49: Support for/Opposition against stricter emissions limits on power plants to address climate change by Race and National Origin (California)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Origin</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Overall</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 National Asian American Pre-Election Survey
Finally, gun control is another issue where Asian Americans tend to converge in opinion across groups, with strong support for stricter gun laws. Across Asian American Voter Surveys (AAVS), we find very strong and consistent support for stricter gun control among Asian American voters in California. In the AAVS, respondents were asked if they agree or disagree with this statement: “We should have stricter gun laws in the United States.” Across the four most recent AAVS, more than three-quarters of Asian American voters in California have shown support for stricter gun control laws. Nationally, the majority of Asian American voters across ethnic groups and political parties supported stricter gun control laws.

Figure 50: Support for stricter gun laws and environmental protection among Asian American registered voters in California (2014 - 2020)

- **Support stricter gun laws**
  - 2020: 77%
  - 2018: 80%
  - 2016: 75%
  - 2014: 82%

- **Support environmental protection**
  - 2020: 76%
  - 2016: 74%

*Source: 2014-2020 Asian American Voter Surveys*
## Table A15: Educational Attainment in CA by Detailed Asian National Origin for Native-Born Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Less than high school</th>
<th>High school</th>
<th>Some college</th>
<th>Bachelor's degree</th>
<th>Post graduate degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A16: Educational Attainment in CA by Detailed Asian National Origin for Foreign-Born Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Less than high school</th>
<th>High school</th>
<th>Some college</th>
<th>Bachelor’s degree</th>
<th>Post graduate degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A17: Educational Attainment in CA by Detailed NHPI National Origin for Native-Born Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Less than high school</th>
<th>High school</th>
<th>Some college</th>
<th>Bachelor's degree</th>
<th>Post graduate degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A18: Educational Attainment in CA by Detailed NHPI National Origin for Foreign-Born Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Less than high school</th>
<th>High school</th>
<th>Some college</th>
<th>Bachelor's degree</th>
<th>Post graduate degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table A5: Population by Race or Ethnicity by CA Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>42,065</td>
<td>57,705</td>
<td>35,474</td>
<td>83,905</td>
<td>38,060</td>
<td>46,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>2,073,169</td>
<td>682,824</td>
<td>322,504</td>
<td>1,551,399</td>
<td>1,061,712</td>
<td>109,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>459,207</td>
<td>362,002</td>
<td>334,102</td>
<td>826,567</td>
<td>216,791</td>
<td>50,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>43,457</td>
<td>31,930</td>
<td>14,165</td>
<td>25,281</td>
<td>22,792</td>
<td>6,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>808,545</td>
<td>771,129</td>
<td>926,878</td>
<td>2,182,716</td>
<td>602,826</td>
<td>355,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>599,877</td>
<td>615,984</td>
<td>387,598</td>
<td>787,224</td>
<td>498,365</td>
<td>219,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>3,687,140</td>
<td>4,215,995</td>
<td>2,579,488</td>
<td>5,429,308</td>
<td>4,053,450</td>
<td>2,126,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>324,674</td>
<td>182,382</td>
<td>194,323</td>
<td>759,792</td>
<td>182,415</td>
<td>70,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in combination</td>
<td>2,344,145</td>
<td>838,613</td>
<td>397,868</td>
<td>1,754,739</td>
<td>1,243,428</td>
<td>153,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI alone or in combination</td>
<td>91,616</td>
<td>68,621</td>
<td>33,214</td>
<td>61,774</td>
<td>55,795</td>
<td>17,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*
### Table A6: Population by Detailed Asian National Origin by CA Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>66,473</td>
<td>20,458</td>
<td>12,008</td>
<td>52,830</td>
<td>32,528</td>
<td>2,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>417,532</td>
<td>139,366</td>
<td>27,252</td>
<td>113,303</td>
<td>99,419</td>
<td>9,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>6,643</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>6,327</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>4,717</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>12,355</td>
<td>25,911</td>
<td>7,507</td>
<td>33,521</td>
<td>13,988</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>709,324</td>
<td>93,941</td>
<td>68,653</td>
<td>457,842</td>
<td>168,303</td>
<td>21,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>395,365</td>
<td>151,538</td>
<td>106,402</td>
<td>355,251</td>
<td>234,843</td>
<td>31,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>82,695</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>7,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>6,025</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>6,319</td>
<td>11,133</td>
<td>4,588</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>68,636</td>
<td>23,498</td>
<td>10,068</td>
<td>99,181</td>
<td>53,753</td>
<td>9,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>87,656</td>
<td>17,725</td>
<td>25,448</td>
<td>214,420</td>
<td>118,014</td>
<td>8,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>10,708</td>
<td>25,873</td>
<td>2,903</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>10,136</td>
<td>2,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>8,294</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>9,916</td>
<td>13,127</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>9,585</td>
<td>5,378</td>
<td>2,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>19,363</td>
<td>20,747</td>
<td>7,355</td>
<td>13,823</td>
<td>8,271</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>4,755</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>29,309</td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td>5,021</td>
<td>29,589</td>
<td>18,623</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>9,104</td>
<td>3,861</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>27,123</td>
<td>6,568</td>
<td>1,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>205,897</td>
<td>53,656</td>
<td>32,396</td>
<td>107,299</td>
<td>275,465</td>
<td>7,388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*
Table A7: Population by Detailed NHPI National Origin by CA Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>5,945</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>3,991</td>
<td>3,687</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>1,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>10,122</td>
<td>12,869</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>5,091</td>
<td>3,918</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>4,268</td>
<td>5,212</td>
<td>1,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4,744</td>
<td>4,079</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>3,845</td>
<td>3,361</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>8,999</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>4,002</td>
<td>8,433</td>
<td>6,974</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>8,322</td>
<td>2,134</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>2,769</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates
### Table A8.1: Population by Age Group and Race/Ethnicity by CA Region (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th></th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th></th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>18-64</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>18-64</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or</td>
<td>8,561</td>
<td>28,747</td>
<td>4,757</td>
<td>13,302</td>
<td>36,613</td>
<td>7,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,432</td>
<td>23,025</td>
<td>4,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>373,374</td>
<td>1,394,567</td>
<td>305,228</td>
<td>162,391</td>
<td>432,836</td>
<td>87,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67,118</td>
<td>207,846</td>
<td>47,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African</td>
<td>88,890</td>
<td>302,623</td>
<td>67,694</td>
<td>90,864</td>
<td>232,718</td>
<td>38,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82,182</td>
<td>213,107</td>
<td>38,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>8,657</td>
<td>30,145</td>
<td>4,655</td>
<td>7,262</td>
<td>21,837</td>
<td>2,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Other Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,383</td>
<td>9,281</td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islander alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>224,695</td>
<td>530,087</td>
<td>53,763</td>
<td>233,851</td>
<td>481,483</td>
<td>55,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>263,340</td>
<td>601,648</td>
<td>61,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>237,671</td>
<td>327,402</td>
<td>34,804</td>
<td>244,273</td>
<td>336,426</td>
<td>35,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151,836</td>
<td>213,589</td>
<td>22,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>631,480</td>
<td>2,339,181</td>
<td>716,479</td>
<td>1,027,475</td>
<td>2,524,363</td>
<td>664,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>607,778</td>
<td>1,544,632</td>
<td>427,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>79,005</td>
<td>211,212</td>
<td>34,457</td>
<td>53,625</td>
<td>109,263</td>
<td>19,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52,497</td>
<td>124,715</td>
<td>17,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in</td>
<td>501,960</td>
<td>1,525,983</td>
<td>316,202</td>
<td>237,464</td>
<td>507,313</td>
<td>93,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104,387</td>
<td>242,499</td>
<td>50,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI alone or in</td>
<td>25,828</td>
<td>57,987</td>
<td>7,801</td>
<td>21,124</td>
<td>42,234</td>
<td>5,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,865</td>
<td>19,817</td>
<td>2,532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimate*
## Table A8.2: Population by Age Group and Race/Ethnicity by CA Region (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>18-64</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or</td>
<td>18,070</td>
<td>56,239</td>
<td>9,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>257,022</td>
<td>1,016,129</td>
<td>278,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African</td>
<td>160,522</td>
<td>543,813</td>
<td>122,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and</td>
<td>4,885</td>
<td>17,534</td>
<td>2,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>574,099</td>
<td>1,428,620</td>
<td>179,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>262,827</td>
<td>473,155</td>
<td>51,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>1,093,725</td>
<td>3,477,735</td>
<td>857,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>174,513</td>
<td>504,129</td>
<td>81,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in</td>
<td>346,311</td>
<td>1,119,805</td>
<td>288,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI alone or in</td>
<td>15,550</td>
<td>39,927</td>
<td>6,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** *American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*
### Table A9.1: Population by Citizenship and Race/Ethnicity by CA Region (1/2)

|                      | Bay Area                  | Central Valley             | Inland Empire            |
|(9,5),(945,977)
|                      | Native-born | Naturalized | Not a citizen | Native-born | Naturalized | Not a citizen | Native-born | Naturalized | Not a citizen |
| American Indian or Alaska Native alone |            |            |              |            |            |              |            |            |              |
| Asian alone          | 33,944      | 3,367      | 4,754        | 52,408      | 2,923      | 2,374        | 31,629      | 1,779      | 2,066        |
| Black or African American alone | 747,004     | 832,969    | 493,196      | 304,465      | 252,318    | 126,041      | 121,703     | 134,040    | 66,761        |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 410,572     | 27,366     | 21,269       | 343,892      | 11,434     | 6,676        | 314,617     | 11,832     | 7,653        |
| Some Other Race alone | 28,029      | 9,311      | 6,117        | 19,029       | 7,568      | 5,333        | 11,771      | 1,422      | 972          |
| Two or More Races   | 455,173     | 121,101    | 232,271      | 505,241      | 84,349     | 181,539      | 607,776     | 131,860    | 187,242       |
| Hispanic/Latino      | 184,995     | 68,701     | 70,978       | 132,468      | 23,054     | 26,860       | 130,577     | 38,495     | 25,251        |
| Asian alone or in combination | 983,389     | 854,763    | 505,993      | 435,586      | 264,606    | 138,421      | 188,928     | 139,317    | 69,623        |
| NHPI alone or in combination | 67,998      | 15,572     | 8,046        | 48,910       | 12,461     | 7,250        | 28,202      | 3,197      | 1,815         |

Source: *American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*
### Table A9.2: Population by Citizenship and Race/Ethnicity by CA Region (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native-born</td>
<td>Not a citizen</td>
<td>Native-born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>60,423</td>
<td>9,187</td>
<td>14,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone Black or African American alone</td>
<td>543,207</td>
<td>663,265</td>
<td>344,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>760,635</td>
<td>41,308</td>
<td>24,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>18,643</td>
<td>3,535</td>
<td>3,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>1,269,375</td>
<td>362,022</td>
<td>551,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>4,038,806</td>
<td>716,703</td>
<td>673,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in combination</td>
<td>386,618</td>
<td>187,495</td>
<td>185,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI alone or in combination</td>
<td>716,489</td>
<td>682,619</td>
<td>355,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A9.1a: Population by Citizenship and Detailed Asian National Origin by CA Region (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native-born</td>
<td>Naturalized</td>
<td>Not a citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>46,337</td>
<td>15,211</td>
<td>4,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>126,802</td>
<td>121,708</td>
<td>169,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>3,912</td>
<td>1,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>5,378</td>
<td>5,763</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>150,414</td>
<td>185,287</td>
<td>59,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>2,077</td>
<td>2,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>41,595</td>
<td>8,553</td>
<td>18,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>30,590</td>
<td>32,983</td>
<td>24,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>4,986</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>2,519</td>
<td>4,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>4,112</td>
<td>3,054</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>6,277</td>
<td>8,385</td>
<td>4,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>9,989</td>
<td>12,737</td>
<td>6,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>4,212</td>
<td>2,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates
## Table A9.2a: Population by Citizenship and Detailed Asian National Origin by CA Region (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native-born</td>
<td>Naturalized</td>
<td>Not a citizen</td>
<td>Native-born</td>
<td>Naturalized</td>
<td>Not a citizen</td>
<td>Native-born</td>
<td>Naturalized</td>
<td>Not a citizen</td>
<td>not a citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations</td>
<td>36,590</td>
<td>13,033</td>
<td>3,207</td>
<td>25,562</td>
<td>5,959</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>35,547</td>
<td>40,386</td>
<td>37,370</td>
<td>33,154</td>
<td>35,094</td>
<td>31,171</td>
<td>3,683</td>
<td>3,472</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>3,524</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>14,599</td>
<td>15,082</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>6,188</td>
<td>5,996</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>138,524</td>
<td>197,815</td>
<td>121,503</td>
<td>57,367</td>
<td>64,273</td>
<td>46,663</td>
<td>8,576</td>
<td>5,943</td>
<td>6,805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>118,615</td>
<td>174,559</td>
<td>62,077</td>
<td>95,210</td>
<td>105,288</td>
<td>34,345</td>
<td>14,238</td>
<td>11,894</td>
<td>5,656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>5,171</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>4,222</td>
<td>4,191</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,769</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>62,391</td>
<td>13,230</td>
<td>23,560</td>
<td>30,461</td>
<td>9,691</td>
<td>13,601</td>
<td>6,964</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>64,600</td>
<td>96,374</td>
<td>53,446</td>
<td>39,730</td>
<td>49,238</td>
<td>29,046</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3,627</td>
<td>5,835</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>4,775</td>
<td>3,228</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>2,687</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>5,252</td>
<td>5,802</td>
<td>2,769</td>
<td>3,310</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>10,286</td>
<td>14,950</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>6,444</td>
<td>9,313</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>7,471</td>
<td>12,715</td>
<td>6,937</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>3,173</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>34,806</td>
<td>59,253</td>
<td>13,240</td>
<td>91,520</td>
<td>151,490</td>
<td>32,455</td>
<td>3,803</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates
### Table A9.1b: Population by Citizenship and Detailed NHPI National Origin by CA Region (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native-born</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Naturalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>5,655</td>
<td>3,682</td>
<td>3,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>3,757</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>2,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>4,941</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>1,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3,281</td>
<td>2,589</td>
<td>1,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>6,770</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1,437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*

### Table A9.2b: Population by Citizenship and Detailed NHPI National Origin by CA Region (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native-born</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Naturalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>3,449</td>
<td>4,860</td>
<td>1,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>4,076</td>
<td>5,111</td>
<td>1,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>7,006</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*
### Table A10.1: Educational Attainment for Adults Age 25 years and over by Race/Ethnicity by CA Region (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>More than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>8,230</td>
<td>5,644</td>
<td>15,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>182,714</td>
<td>168,386</td>
<td>1,199,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>73,366</td>
<td>27,419</td>
<td>224,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>10,181</td>
<td>4,186</td>
<td>16,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>143,303</td>
<td>167,752</td>
<td>179,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>51,175</td>
<td>33,466</td>
<td>215,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>404,032</td>
<td>184,249</td>
<td>2,209,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>47,937</td>
<td>39,655</td>
<td>127,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in combination</td>
<td>197,279</td>
<td>174,594</td>
<td>1,293,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI alone or in combination</td>
<td>15,363</td>
<td>6,029</td>
<td>35,195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** *American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*
### Table A10.2: Educational Attainment for Adults Age 25 years and over by Race/Ethnicity by CA Region (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less high school</td>
<td>More than high school</td>
<td>Less high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>13,688 18,007 24,683</td>
<td>6,393 5,422 14,465</td>
<td>9,367 6,283 15,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>173,524 133,390 868,800</td>
<td>96,736 85,223 589,984</td>
<td>13,297 8,652 48,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>135,662 58,911 392,913</td>
<td>34,079 11,994 100,075</td>
<td>8,776 6,389 20,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>5,853 2,108 9,802</td>
<td>5,815 1,106 9,625</td>
<td>1,126 796 2,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>370,833 535,662 441,415</td>
<td>93,821 139,111 135,904</td>
<td>47,568 94,676 59,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>89,638 88,221 261,004</td>
<td>45,709 35,829 170,728</td>
<td>25,713 20,723 65,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>749,222 650,939 2,458,160</td>
<td>510,888 298,052 2,056,627</td>
<td>327,525 164,215 1,006,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>120,910 161,896 223,957</td>
<td>22,088 18,617 81,141</td>
<td>9,597 8,802 24,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in combination</td>
<td>183,836 139,044 943,676</td>
<td>106,703 89,060 651,148</td>
<td>16,406 9,843 61,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI alone or in combination</td>
<td>9,103 4,074 25,841</td>
<td>8,245 2,157 23,242</td>
<td>2,043 1,386 6,144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*
### Table A10.1a: Educational Attainment for Adults Age 25 years and over by Detailed Asian National Origin by CA Region (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian National Origin</th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>More than high school</td>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>24,069</td>
<td>1,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>13,669</td>
<td>261,878</td>
<td>14,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>5,301</td>
<td>4,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>68,697</td>
<td>402,851</td>
<td>10,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>46,850</td>
<td>241,156</td>
<td>18,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>10,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>3,684</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>7,646</td>
<td>51,108</td>
<td>3,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>6,206</td>
<td>57,269</td>
<td>1,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>4,108</td>
<td>5,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1,532</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>3,965</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>5,037</td>
<td>1,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>10,206</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>21,169</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>6,292</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>26,358</td>
<td>91,333</td>
<td>7,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates
Table A10.2a Educational Attainment for Adults Age 25 years and over by Detailed Asian National Origin by CA Region (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>More than high school</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,672</td>
<td>19,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>6,070</td>
<td>5,497</td>
<td>68,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>2,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>3,922</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>11,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>58,504</td>
<td>56,188</td>
<td>233,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>32,920</td>
<td>13,620</td>
<td>230,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>5,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>14,008</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>66,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>29,360</td>
<td>11,519</td>
<td>128,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>1,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>4,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>6,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>3,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>19,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>3,325</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>16,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>14,227</td>
<td>22,763</td>
<td>43,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates
### Table A10.1b: Educational Attainment for Adults Age 25 years and over by Detailed NHPI National Origin by CA Region (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NHPI National Origin</th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>More than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>2,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>3,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>2,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>1,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>3,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>2,240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates

### Table A10.2b: Educational Attainment for Adults Age 25 years and over by Detailed NHPI National Origin by CA Region (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NHPI National Origin</th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>More than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>2,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1,011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates
### Table A11.1: English Language Proficiency for Population Age 5 years and over by Race/Ethnicity by CA Region (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>10,746</td>
<td>5,702</td>
<td>12,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>854,462</td>
<td>607,325</td>
<td>257,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>37,963</td>
<td>12,420</td>
<td>16,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>16,759</td>
<td>4,955</td>
<td>12,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>359,216</td>
<td>259,817</td>
<td>301,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>121,883</td>
<td>50,322</td>
<td>130,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>533,436</td>
<td>243,508</td>
<td>690,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>120,777</td>
<td>80,155</td>
<td>51,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in combination</td>
<td>897,292</td>
<td>620,345</td>
<td>278,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI alone or in combination</td>
<td>25,288</td>
<td>7,490</td>
<td>19,537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*
Table A11.2: English Language Proficiency for Population Age 5 years and over by Race/Ethnicity by CA Region (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>28,384</td>
<td>19,105</td>
<td>8,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>556,406</td>
<td>561,836</td>
<td>393,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>57,600</td>
<td>15,317</td>
<td>19,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>9,025</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>5,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>1,005,566</td>
<td>726,295</td>
<td>258,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>227,495</td>
<td>123,542</td>
<td>111,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>1,420,288</td>
<td>887,619</td>
<td>756,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>316,298</td>
<td>263,081</td>
<td>61,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in combination</td>
<td>590,196</td>
<td>575,280</td>
<td>418,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI alone or in combination</td>
<td>16,427</td>
<td>5,195</td>
<td>9,768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All combinations of Asian</th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>246,195</td>
<td>51,755</td>
<td>66,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>4,624</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>9,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>168,292</td>
<td>82,589</td>
<td>58,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>34,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>14,286</td>
<td>13,306</td>
<td>3,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>32,152</td>
<td>27,916</td>
<td>5,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>3,758</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>10,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>3,961</td>
<td>2,902</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>4,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>10,287</td>
<td>3,601</td>
<td>9,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>13,507</td>
<td>9,736</td>
<td>1,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>3,543</td>
<td>1,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>68,794</td>
<td>100,821</td>
<td>17,593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates
### Table A11.2a: English Language Proficiency for Population Age 5 years and over by Detailed Asian National Origin by CA Region (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>12,178</td>
<td>9,715</td>
<td>7,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>56,624</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>53,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>2,913</td>
<td>2,289</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>2,301</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>11,087</td>
<td>12,608</td>
<td>4,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>142,392</td>
<td>217,791</td>
<td>64,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>164,125</td>
<td>76,548</td>
<td>93,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>4,788</td>
<td>3,974</td>
<td>1,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>21,222</td>
<td>23,293</td>
<td>12,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>68,446</td>
<td>103,001</td>
<td>40,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>3,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>4,091</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>7,239</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>4,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>12,013</td>
<td>12,561</td>
<td>8,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>8,054</td>
<td>13,862</td>
<td>1,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>33,626</td>
<td>53,324</td>
<td>91,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*
**Table A11.1b:** English Language Proficiency for Population Age 5 years and over by Detailed NHPI National Origin by CA Region (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Limited English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>6,253</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>7,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native Hawaiian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Other Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islander</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>1,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>3,298</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>1,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>3,981</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*

**Table A11.2b:** English Language Proficiency for Population Age 5 years and over by Detailed NHPI National Origin by CA Region (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native Hawaiian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Other Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islander</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>1,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>3,259</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>2,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*
### Table A12.1: Language Isolated Households by Race/Ethnicity by CA Region (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Not linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>13,242</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>129,332</td>
<td>546,242</td>
<td>36,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>166,850</td>
<td>1,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>11,901</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>34,506</td>
<td>161,343</td>
<td>38,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>8,177</td>
<td>137,867</td>
<td>14,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>45,792</td>
<td>1,466,655</td>
<td>92,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>12,676</td>
<td>84,495</td>
<td>6,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in combination</td>
<td>131,365</td>
<td>600,763</td>
<td>38,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI alone or in combination</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>23,952</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates
## Table A12.2: Language Isolated Households by Race/Ethnicity by CA Region (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Not linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>23,171</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>133,926</td>
<td>388,089</td>
<td>65,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>2,814</td>
<td>317,386</td>
<td>2,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>7,249</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>109,715</td>
<td>443,570</td>
<td>22,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>20,444</td>
<td>185,646</td>
<td>9,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>168,173</td>
<td>1,801,136</td>
<td>56,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>49,252</td>
<td>176,211</td>
<td>5,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone or in combination</td>
<td>137,161</td>
<td>433,784</td>
<td>67,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI alone or in combination</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>17,045</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*
Table A12.1a: Language Isolated Households by Detailed Asian National Origin by CA Region (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Not linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Not linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Not linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Not linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Not linguistically isolated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>12,326</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>4,081</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>6,323</td>
<td>126,519</td>
<td>5,321</td>
<td>31,454</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>6,833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>5,144</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>74,559</td>
<td>183,664</td>
<td>10,232</td>
<td>23,538</td>
<td>7,762</td>
<td>13,873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>8,934</td>
<td>99,696</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>39,798</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>27,624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>13,384</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>4,174</td>
<td>27,846</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>10,991</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>3,352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>7,870</td>
<td>24,664</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>4,581</td>
<td>2,732</td>
<td>5,498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>5,419</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>5,041</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>3,386</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>9,394</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>19,289</td>
<td>40,122</td>
<td>4,678</td>
<td>10,856</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>6,811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates
Table A12.2a: Language Isolated Households by Detailed Asian National Origin by CA Region (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Not linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All combinations of Asian</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>9,785</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>3,622</td>
<td>34,105</td>
<td>1,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>7,231</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>54,684</td>
<td>103,378</td>
<td>14,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>10,055</td>
<td>96,247</td>
<td>4,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>2,635</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>7,933</td>
<td>36,663</td>
<td>3,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>35,032</td>
<td>49,802</td>
<td>12,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3,435</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwanese</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>8,406</td>
<td>1,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>3,067</td>
<td>6,009</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>9,434</td>
<td>21,997</td>
<td>24,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates
### Table A12.1b: Language Isolated Households by Detailed NHPI National Origin by CA Region (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Isolated Households by Detailed NHPI National Origin by CA Region</th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Central Valley</th>
<th>Inland Empire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Not linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*

### Table A12.2b: Language Isolated Households by Detailed NHPI National Origin by CA Region (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Isolated Households by Detailed NHPI National Origin by CA Region</th>
<th>LA-Ventura</th>
<th>Orange-SD</th>
<th>Rest of CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Not linguistically isolated</td>
<td>Linguistically isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>1,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshallese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*
### Table A13: Top Asian and NHPI Languages Spoken at Home by CA Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Top Asian Languages</th>
<th>Top NHPI Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bay Area</strong></td>
<td>Chinese (298,069)</td>
<td>Tongan (6,028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tagalog (211,986)</td>
<td>Samoan (4,927)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese (175,018)</td>
<td>Other Eastern Malayo-Polynesian languages (2,574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cantonese (154,712)</td>
<td>Chamorro (1,115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin (118,229)</td>
<td>Hawaiian (462)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindi (109,416)</td>
<td>Marshallese (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean (62,130)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telugu (42,420)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Punjabi (39,143)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamil (38,586)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino (36,198)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese (34,862)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gujarati (20,622)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urdu (19,144)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marathi (15,534)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Valley</strong></td>
<td>Punjabi (79,698)</td>
<td>Other Eastern Malayo-Polynesian languages (2,044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tagalog (64,778)</td>
<td>Samoan (1,639)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hmong (62,284)</td>
<td>Tongan (1,289)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese (43,282)</td>
<td>Chamorro (751)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese (38,751)</td>
<td>Marshallese (632)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindi (30,201)</td>
<td>Hawaiian (313)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khmer (19,274)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cantonese (18,096)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino (17,986)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin (14,134)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lao (12,424)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urdu (11,365)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean (11,278)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iu Mien (8,915)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese (8,499)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inland Empire</strong></td>
<td>Tagalog (53,054)</td>
<td>Tongan (1,404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese (31,705)</td>
<td>Samoan (1,341)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese (26,852)</td>
<td>Chamorro (602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean (19,321)</td>
<td>Other Eastern Malayo-Polynesian languages (206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin (16,994)</td>
<td>Hawaiian (112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino (12,498)</td>
<td>Marshallese (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urdu (5,827)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesian (5,725)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese (5,671)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khmer (5,560)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindi (5,479)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cantonese (5,388)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Punjabi (5,378)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gujarati (4,371)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai (3,346)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Top Asian Languages</td>
<td>Top NHPI Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-Ventura</td>
<td>Tagalog (201,521)</td>
<td>Samoan (4,347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese (177,790)</td>
<td>Tongan (1,959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean (173,484)</td>
<td>Other Eastern Malayo-Polynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin (125,481)</td>
<td>languages (949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese (89,588)</td>
<td>Chamorro (484)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cantonese (81,344)</td>
<td>Marshallese (450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese (52,571)</td>
<td>Hawaiian (194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino (36,744)</td>
<td>Hindi (28,606)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khmer (25,751)</td>
<td>Korean (23,560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai (23,560)</td>
<td>Urdu (14,282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min Nan Chinese (12,705)</td>
<td>Other Eastern Malayo-Polynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Punjabi (12,246)</td>
<td>languages (277)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesian (11,663)</td>
<td>Filipino (22,616)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telugu (9,274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange-SD</td>
<td>Vietnamese (230,539)</td>
<td>Gujarati (12,087)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tagalog (114,230)</td>
<td>Khmer (10,872)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean (88,946)</td>
<td>Telugu (9,274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese (81,223)</td>
<td>Min Nan Chinese (7,848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin (38,313)</td>
<td>Lao (7,660)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese (30,113)</td>
<td>Urdu (6,918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino (26,516)</td>
<td>Hindi (21,791)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cantonese (13,530)</td>
<td>Cantonese (13,530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gujarati (12,087)</td>
<td>Khmer (10,872)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telugu (9,274)</td>
<td>Min Nan Chinese (7,848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lao (7,660)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urdu (6,918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of CA</td>
<td>Tagalog (13,498)</td>
<td>Tongan (767)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese (9,655)</td>
<td>Chamorro (477)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean (6,508)</td>
<td>Samoan (266)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hmong (6,074)</td>
<td>Other Eastern Malayo-Polynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese (5,412)</td>
<td>languages (160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin (4,646)</td>
<td>Hawaiian (119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese (4,172)</td>
<td>Marshallese (110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino (2,726)</td>
<td>Hindi (2,657)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cantonese (2,467)</td>
<td>Other Eastern Malayo-Polynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Punjabi (1,655)</td>
<td>languages (160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ilocano (1,621)</td>
<td>Hawaiian (119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai (1,368)</td>
<td>Marshallese (110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gujarati (963)</td>
<td>Ilocano (1,621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iu Mien (957)</td>
<td>Thai (1,368)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-year Estimates*
REGION DEFINITION

- **Bay Area**
  - Alameda County
  - Contra Costa County
  - Marin County
  - Napa County
  - San Francisco County
  - Solano County
  - Sonoma County
  - Stanislaus County
  - Sutter County
  - Tulare County
  - Yolo County
  - Yuba County

- **Central Valley**
  - El Dorado County
  - Fresno County
  - Kern County
  - Kings County
  - Madera County
  - Merced County
  - Placer County
  - Sacramento County
  - San Joaquin County

- **Inland Empire**
  - Riverside County
  - San Bernardino County

- **Los Angeles- Ventura Counties**

- **Orange-San Diego Counties**

(Continued Next Page)
• **Rest of California**
  - Alpine County
  - Amador County
  - Butte County
  - Calaveras County
  - Colusa County
  - Del Norte County
  - Glenn County
  - Humboldt County
  - Imperial County
  - Inyo County
  - Lake County
  - Lassen County
  - Mariposa County
  - Mendocino County
  - Modoc County
  - Mono County
  - Monterey County
  - Nevada County
  - Plumas County
  - San Benito County
  - San Luis Obispo County
RACE AND ETHNICITY CATEGORIES
(Based on the 1997 OMB standards on race and ethnicity, see https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/FR-1997-10-30/97-28653)

American Indian or Alaska Native – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America) and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.

Asian – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.

Black or African American – A person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.

Hispanic or Latino – A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.

White – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.

Asian American - Term used by community organizations, researchers, journalists, and public agencies to refer to residents of the United States who self-identify as Asian with respect to race or as one of the detailed Asian racial categories. Asian American should not be hyphenated.

Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander or NHPI - Alternative term for the racial category of Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander as currently maintained by the 1997 OMB standards.

AA and NHPI - Acronym that recognizes the fact that Asian American and NHPI are separate racial categories per the 1997 OMB standards.
AAPI - Asian American and Pacific Islander. Term has less common usage today, given that it does not explicitly mention Native Hawaiian as part of the NHPI racial category.

API - Asian Pacific Islander. Term in infrequent use today, given that Asian American is the preferred term to refer to residents of the United States who self-identify as Asian or as one of the detailed Asian racial categories.

APA - Asian Pacific American. Legacy term that is used by several organizations founded prior to the 1997 OMB standards on race and ethnicity.

APIA - Asian and Pacific Islander American. Legacy term that is used by several organizations founded prior to the 1997 OMB standards on race and ethnicity.
ENDNOTES


3 We are grateful to Empowering Pacific Islander Communities (EPIC) for their thorough explanation of the web of relationships involving the United States and Pacific Islander communities https://www.empoweredpi.org/our-community


5 2010 Census National Summary File of Redistricting Data Technical Documentation, prepared by the U.S. Census Bureau, 2011.

6 North America is defined by the DHS as Canada, Mexico, and the nations in Central America and the Caribbean.

