the diverse face

of Asians and Pacific Islanders in Los Angeles County
Asians and Pacific Islanders are often thought of as a homogenous people, a "model minority" held up as an example of all that can be accomplished in our country and, more specifically, in the Los Angeles area. Like many myths, this one exaggerates facts and is riddled with misperceptions.

The reality is that the Asian and Pacific Islander (API) community in Los Angeles County is not homogeneous—in fact, it is one of the most diverse and complex bodies of people in Southern California. Though they may all fall under a single banner in the public imagination and share some common issues and values, Chinese, Bangladeshis, Tongans, Cambodians, and other API groups are different from one another in many ways.

To respond to these differences, the Asian Pacific American Legal Center (APALC) works to make demographic information available that illustrates the intricacies of the growing API population. Through data collection, analysis, and mapping, APALC compiles demographic information that can be helpful in program planning, service delivery, and advocacy.

With *The Diverse Face of Asians and Pacific Islanders in Los Angeles County*, we hope to communicate the rich diversity, the deep, multiple layers, and the fascinating complexities that bring both unlimited opportunity and difficult challenges to this collection of Asian and Pacific Islander cultures, histories, and needs.

The report studies the Asian and Pacific Islander groups both separately and as a whole to illustrate the individual challenges of specific groups, while at the same time acknowledging the shared roots of Asian and Pacific Islander cultures and the common issues among them.

Many Asians and Pacific Islanders live full and successful lives. However, the success of some threatens to overshadow the everyday hardships that other Asian and Pacific Islander groups are facing. It is only by peeling back the layers that core problems can be revealed, and it is only with these revelations that solutions can be found. It is hoped that the analysis and recommendations presented in this report will serve as the impetus for positive change for those who still struggle to find their place in the Southern California landscape.

I would like to extend my thanks to the organizations and sponsors who made this report and its launch possible. In particular, I would like to thank the United Way of Greater Los Angeles, with whom we have partnered to present this profile.

Stewart Kwoh
President & Executive Director
Asian Pacific American Legal Center
Introduction

Asians and Pacific Islanders are a growing force in Southern California’s landscape. As the Asian and Pacific Islander (API) population continues to grow, so does its participation in communities, schools, the economy, and virtually every other aspect of civic and private life. But with this rising wave of influence comes an increase in the need for social services that address the unique circumstances of diverse Asian and Pacific Islander groups.

Often viewed as a racial monolith, L.A. County’s API community reveals a compelling story of rich diversity when looked at more closely. The Asian and Pacific Islander population is comprised of more than 45 distinct ethnic groups and a multitude of cultures speaking more than 28 languages. Moreover, APIs vary generationally, spanning from recently arrived immigrants to those with roots in the community for more than one hundred years. While as a whole APIs are often seen as wealthy and well educated, disaggregated data for each ethnic group reveals a wide array of incomes, poverty rates, and levels of educational attainment—from those doing very well to those struggling on multiple fronts.

For the first time, the 2000 Census allowed people to report membership in more than one racial/ethnic group. A unique feature of this report is the presentation of data for both single race and multiracial populations. Throughout the report the term “alone” refers to persons reporting a single race only, and the term “inclusive” refers to the single race and multiracial population combined for a given group. Unless otherwise noted, inclusive figures are used for the facts presented herein. (See Technical Notes on page 23 for a more detailed explanation. Other terminology is defined in the Glossary on page 22.)

This report is designed as a tool to assist elected officials, program planners, funders, advocates, business leaders, and grant writers in better understanding and describing the API community and its needs. It compiles and evaluates data predominantly from the 2000 Census for the Asian and Pacific Islander population as a whole and for 20 ethnic subgroups with a substantial presence in Los Angeles County.* We hope that it will provide a comprehensive view of the API community and reveal the socioeconomic diversity found within this growing and dynamic group.

> Key Findings

For the third decade in a row, Asians and Pacific Islanders were the fastest growing major racial/ethnic group in Los Angeles County.

APIs had a growth rate of 35% from 1990 to 2000 using inclusive figures, followed by Latinos who grew by 27%. APIs also grew by 54% across the state and 75% nationally, again outpacing Latino growth. While API ethnic enclaves continue to expand in areas such as the San Gabriel Valley, API populations also doubled in areas outside of these well-established communities.

While collectively Asians rate above average on socioeconomic status measures, Pacific Islanders and many individual Asian groups fall well below average, some groups being among the most poverty-stricken and least educated in L.A. County.

Among Asian ethnic groups, the Southeast Asian groups of Vietnamese, Cambodians, Laotians, and Hmong consistently ranked among the most disadvantaged. More than half of Hmong live in poverty and a majority of Cambodians have less than a high school degree. Pacific Islanders as a whole fell below the county average for most socioeconomic measures.

Asian groups have alarmingly high rates of limited English proficiency and linguistic isolation. With only slight improvements occurring in the 1990s, the challenge of limited English proficiency (LEP) among Asians is persistent. Ten Asian groups have a majority LEP population, including three of the largest groups: Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese. Among households that speak a language other than English at home, Asian households have the highest levels of linguistic isolation.

Asians and Pacific Islanders have the highest multiracial rates of all major racial/ethnic groups. Forty-five percent of Pacific Islanders and 9% of Asians are multiracial, which are higher rates than those for Latinos, whites, and African Americans. The mixed race population is younger, with smaller households, lower incomes, and lower home ownership rates. But it is also less impoverished, better educated, and less likely to be foreign born. Poverty is lower among multiracial Pacific Islanders than among Pacific Islanders of a single race, 19% compared to 23%.

* Demographic profiles for the Asian and Pacific Islander populations of Orange County and San Diego County are also available from the Asian Pacific American Legal Center.
Race and Ethnicity

L.A. County's Asian and Pacific Islander population is larger than that of any state in the nation, except California. There are more Chinese, Filipinos, and Koreans in Los Angeles County than in the states of New York or Hawaii.

For the third decade in a row, Asians and Pacific Islanders were the fastest growing major racial/ethnic group in Los Angeles County. APIs emerged as the third largest racial/ethnic group in 2000, moving up from fourth place in 1990. APIs broke the one million mark during the 1990s to comprise 1.2 to 1.3 million people in 2000.

Asian Islanders

The Pacific Islander population changed from 1990 to 2000 from a decline of 6% using alone numbers to a growth of 71% for inclusive numbers. This wide range is due to the large number of Pacific Islanders who reported more than one race. Pacific Islanders have the highest percentage reporting more than one race among the major racial/ethnic groups. With 45% reporting a multiracial heritage, Pacific Islanders consist of 27,053 of a single race and 22,461 who reported Pacific Islander plus at least one other race. Among Pacific Islander ethnic groups, Native Hawaiians have the highest multiracial percentage, with 68% reporting more than one race.

Asian Islands

The Asian population grew 35% from 1990 to 2000, followed by Latinos, who grew by 27%.

Chinese continue to be the largest Asian ethnic group in the county and the fastest growing among the five largest Asian groups.

More than 9% of Asians were multiracial, a rate higher than that of Latinos (6%), whites (6%), or African Americans (7%). Among the five largest Asian ethnic groups, Japanese have the highest multiracial percentage (15%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian Ethnic Groups</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>% Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>453,008</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chinese, except Taiwanese</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Taiwanese</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>401,053</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>145,431</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>139,736</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>62,694</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>43,023</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>27,819</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>15,010</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>5,417</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lankan</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrong</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>13,002</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one Asian Group</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Asian Population</td>
<td>925,461</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Groups ranked by inclusive number. Alone figures are single race responses only. Inclusive figures include single race and multiracial responses. Alone figures for Asian and Pacific Islander ethnic groups are single race and single ethnic group.
Asians

> The number of communities that have a majority Asian population increased from one in 1990 to seven in 2000 (see Table 2). Six of these are in the San Gabriel Valley. *
> Major growth in the Asian population occurred across the San Gabriel Valley between 1990 and 2000. Five SGV communities experienced Asian increases of 20 percentage points or more across the decade: Arcadia, Rowland Heights, Temple City, Walnut, and Diamond Bar.
> One-third of the county's Asian population lives in the city of Los Angeles. Filipinos are the largest Asian ethnic group in the city. Nearly half of the Korean population and 42% of Asian Indians live in the city of Los Angeles.
> Sixty percent of Los Angeles County's Cambodian population lives in the city of Long Beach.

Pacific Islanders

> Pacific Islanders are concentrated in the southern part of the county. Along with large populations in the cities of Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Carson, more than one thousand Pacific Islanders live in the cities of Compton, Torrance, and Hawthorne.

* The Los Angeles County Service Planning Area (SPA) 3 is used to define this area in this report referred to as San Gabriel Valley. This area is defined by the eastern region of the county: approximately bounded by San Andreas Fault, San Bernardino County, Angeles National Forest, the 60 Freeway, and the City of Los Angeles.

** Unincorporated Census Designated Place

Table 2. Communities with the Highest Concentration of Asians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Park</td>
<td>38,205</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centris</td>
<td>31,263</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>17,310</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowland Heights CDP</td>
<td>25,083</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel CDP</td>
<td>6,515</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>9,772</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airmont</td>
<td>41,870</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>25,026</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Gabriel CDP</td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures are for the inclusive population (single race and multiracial population combined)

* Unincorporated Census Designated Place

Table 3. Communities with the Highest Concentration of API Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial / Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>Centris</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>20,262</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Monterey Park</td>
<td>28,810</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>18,220</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Gardena</td>
<td>7,445</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Centris</td>
<td>9,109</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>3,401</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Rosemead</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures are for the inclusive population (single race and multiracial population combined)

Dating back to the formation of Chinatown in the 1860s, Asian communities have had a rich history in Los Angeles County. Little Tokyo was established at the turn of the century, while Koreatown developed in the 1960s and Little India in the 1970s. Thai Town was officially named in 1999, and in August of 2002, the oldest and best-known Filipino settlement was formally recognized as "Historic Filipinotown." These communities continue to grow and expand out into the suburbs.

Today, dim sum can be found as readily in the suburban malls of the San Gabriel Valley as in urban Chinatown.
Social Characteristics

The great diversity within the Asian and Pacific Islander community is evident when social characteristics are described separately for each of the API ethnic groups. The median age ranges from 19 to 38, average household size from 2.2 to 5.5, and lack of a high school degree from 7% to 56%.

**Median Age**
Asians as a group are older (median age 35) and Pacific Islanders are younger (median age 26) than L.A. County's median age of 32. But many individual Asian ethnic groups have median ages younger than the general population.

- Hmong, Tongans, Samoans and Cambodians have the county's lowest median ages at 19, 20, 21, and 24 respectively.
- The percentage of seniors in the Asian population is continuing to increase. Seniors increased 6% in 1980 to 7% in 1990 to 11% in 2000.
- The median age decreases for APIs with the inclusion of the multiracial population, showing the relative youth of those of mixed race. Asian median age decreases from 36 to 35, and Pacific Islanders from 27 to 26. Using inclusive figures, median age decreases by five years for Japanese, Guamanians, and Native Hawaiians.

**Average Household Size**
Asians and Pacific Islanders have larger average household sizes than non-Hispanic whites. Pacific Islanders have an average household size of 3.6 and Asians average 3.0, compared to 2.6 for non-Hispanic whites. Household size ranges from a low of 2.2 persons per household for Japanese to a high of 5.5 for Tongans.

- Vietnamese (3.8) and Filipinos (3.6) have the largest average household sizes among the five largest Asian groups, while Laotians, Hmong, Samoans, Cambodians, and Tongans have larger households than any of the major racial or ethnic groups in the county.
- The multiracial population has smaller households. Using inclusive figures, average household size decreases from 4.6 to 3.6 for Pacific Islanders and from 3.1 to 3.0 for Asians.

**Home Ownership**
As a whole, 50% of Asians are homeowners, slightly higher than the county average of 48%. However, the majority of Asian ethnic groups have home ownership rates lower than the general population.

- Asian homeowners range from a high of 69% for Taiwanese to a low of 15% for Hmong.
- Fourteen API groups have home ownership rates lower than the county average. Of these, Hmong, Cambodians, Laotians, Bangladeshis, Pakistanis, Samoans, and Koreans have home ownership rates lower than any of the major racial/ethnic groups.

**Education**
Compared to non-Hispanic whites, Asians are less likely to have completed high school, but more likely to have a college degree. Eighteen percent of Asians have less than a high school degree compared to 11% of whites. Forty-two percent of Asians have at least a bachelor's degree, while 38% of whites have a bachelor's degree or higher.

During the 1990s, Asians and Pacific Islanders showed a slight improvement in educational attainment, with Cambodians, Samoans, and Guamanians showing significant improvement in high school completion.

**High School Education**
While most API groups show high rates of high school graduation, some Southeast Asian and Pacific Islander groups are faring much worse.

- Four Southeast Asian groups (Cambodian, Hmong, Vietnamese, and Laotian) have some of the lowest rates of high school completion in the county. Despite significant improvements, Asians have the lowest levels of high school completion: 50% lack a high school diploma.
- Tongans and Guamanians have high school completion rates lower than the county average while Samoans do better with 25% and Native Hawaiians much better with 18% having less than a high school degree.

- South Asian Indonesia and Vietnamese have low rates of college completion. Hmong and Tongans have the lowest rates of obtaining at least a bachelor's degree. 4% and 6% respectively.
- Cambodians, Laotians, Guamanians, and Samoans have college graduation rates under 15%. Vietnamese have higher rates, with 20% completing at least a bachelor's degree, but are still below the county average of 25%.
- Although Native Hawaiians have high rates of high school graduation (86%), only 22% have a bachelor's degree or higher.
- Groups with the highest rates of bachelor's or advanced degrees include Asian Indians (58%), Pakistanis (53%), and Maylansians (50%).

The highest level of education for half of Pacific Islanders is a high school degree. Only 19 percent of Pacific Islanders have a bachelor's degree or higher.

![Educational Attainment](image-url)

*Note: All education figures are for the population 25 years and older.*
Economic Indicators

Data for individual
Asian and Pacific Islander ethnic groups find some populations facing great barriers to economic stability. Figures for APIs as a whole show a population doing better than other groups economically, but this masks the economic differences between communities.

Income
Paradoxically, both Asians and Pacific Islanders have median household incomes that are higher than the county average but per capita incomes that are lower than the county average.

Median Household Income
Median household income is $47,406 for Asians and $53,813 for Pacific Islanders, compared to $53,978 for non-Hispanic whites. Although APIs as a whole have a median household income above the county average, half of all API ethnic groups fall below this mark.

> The high median household income is misleading because APIs have larger average household sizes, suggesting that either more people are being supported by, or contributing to, the household income. In Los Angeles County, 21% of Pacific Islander and 17% of Asian families have three or more workers, compared to 9% of white families.

> Hawaiians, Cambodians, and Tongans have a median household income lower than any major racial/ethnic group, and Koreans have the fourth lowest median household income among Asians.

Per Capita Income
Per capita income (the amount available for each person in a household) is $20,138 for Asians and $15,025 for Pacific Islanders, compared to $35,785 for non-Hispanic whites. Fifteen of the 20 API groups have per capita incomes lower than the county average.

> Hawaiians, Cambodians, Tongans, and Samoans have the county's lowest per capita incomes.

> While Filipinos have the highest median household income of all racial/ethnic groups in the county, their larger household size pushes them below the county average for per capita income.

Public Assistance Income
While most Asian groups have a low proportion receiving public assistance, Southeast Asian and Pacific Islander groups show above average public assistance rates.

> Five API groups have public assistance rates higher than any other major racial or ethnic group: Cambodian, Laotian, Vietnamese, Tongan, and Samoan.

> Many Southeast Asian refugees such as Cambodians, Hmong, Laotians, and Vietnamese were placed on public assistance as part of U.S. refugee resettlement programs. Cambodians make up 3% of the Asian population, but account for 15% of Asians receiving public assistance. Vietnamese are 7% of the Asian population, but are 20% of those receiving public assistance.

Poverty
The overall Asian poverty rate is lower than that of the county, and Pacific Islanders are slightly higher. Still, nine API groups have rates higher than the county average, and five API groups have poverty rates higher than any of the major racial or ethnic groups in the county.

Below The Federal Poverty Line ($17,020 annually for a family of four in 1999)
While most racial/ethnic groups experienced small increases in poverty in the 1990s, Cambodians and Vietnamese experienced significant decreases in poverty. Still, these two groups remain among those with the highest poverty rates. Guamanians also showed a decrease from 22% to 15% from 1990 to 2000. Thais experienced a notable increase in poverty, from 11% to 17% from 1990 to 2000.

> More than half of Hmong, 38% of Cambodians, and more than a quarter of Tongans, Samoans, and Bangladeshis live below the poverty line.

> Asians overall have a higher rate of senior poverty: 12% versus the county average of 10%. Koreans make up a disproportionate share of Asian seniors in poverty, accounting for 23%.

> Japanese, Filipinos, and Sri Lankans have low poverty rates equal to or lower than non-Hispanic whites.

> While only 15% of Chinese are in poverty, they comprise the greatest number of Asians in poverty. Nearly one-third of Asians in poverty are Chinese.

> The poverty rate for Asians also varies by geography. Smaller areas of study by city reveal higher rates of poverty than the county average (see table below).

Below 200% Of The Federal Poverty Line ($34,058 for a family of four in 1999)
In areas with higher costs of living, the federal poverty line is doubled to better identify the low income population. Thirty percent of Asians and 41% of Pacific Islanders are below 200% of the federal poverty line, compared to the county average of 40%. Eight API groups have rates higher than the county average for populations living below 200% of poverty.

> More than half of the populations of six API groups were living below 200% of the poverty line: Hmong, Cambodians, Tongans, Bangladeshis, Lao, and Samoans.

> Among the largest API groups, 44% of Vietnamese and more than one-third of Koreans are below 200% of poverty.

Table 4: Communities with the Highest Asian and Pacific Islander Poverty Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Number in Poverty</th>
<th>% in Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>15,048</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemead</td>
<td>6,354</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>4,301</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County Average</td>
<td>1,674,588</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Limited to places with an API population greater than 1,000. For single race population only.
### Major Racial and Ethnic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Average Household Size</th>
<th>Home Ownership</th>
<th>Less than High School Degree</th>
<th>Below Federal Poverty Line</th>
<th>200% of Federal Poverty Line</th>
<th>Public Assistance Income</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Per Capita Income</th>
<th>Foreign Born</th>
<th>Naturalization Rate of Foreign Born</th>
<th>Speak Other than English at Home</th>
<th>Speak English Less than &quot;Very Well&quot;</th>
<th>Linguistically Isolated Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>PCT 4</td>
<td>PCT 5</td>
<td>PCT 142</td>
<td>PCT 143</td>
<td>PCT 106</td>
<td>PCT 130</td>
<td>PCT 132</td>
<td>PCT 133</td>
<td>PCT 34</td>
<td>PCT 38</td>
<td>PCT 38</td>
<td>PCT 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Latino  25</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Black 37%</td>
<td>Latino 58%</td>
<td>Latino 24%</td>
<td>Latino 56%</td>
<td>Black 13%</td>
<td>Latino 11,103</td>
<td>Latino 66%</td>
<td>Latino 27%</td>
<td>Latino 47%</td>
<td>Latino 48%</td>
<td>Asian 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pac Island 25</td>
<td>Pac Islander</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Black 37%</td>
<td>Am. Indian 31%</td>
<td>Black 24%</td>
<td>Latino 44%</td>
<td>Am. Indian 43%</td>
<td>Pac Islander 15,025</td>
<td>Am. Indian 49%</td>
<td>Am. Indian 29%</td>
<td>Pac Islander 43%</td>
<td>Pac Islander 52%</td>
<td>Am. Indian 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Am. Indian 31</td>
<td>Am. Indian</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Black 37%</td>
<td>Am. Indian 31%</td>
<td>Black 24%</td>
<td>Am. Indian 44%</td>
<td>Am. Indian 43%</td>
<td>Pac Islander 15,025</td>
<td>Am. Indian 49%</td>
<td>Am. Indian 29%</td>
<td>Pac Islander 43%</td>
<td>Pac Islander 52%</td>
<td>Am. Indian 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Black 32</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Black 37%</td>
<td>Black 24%</td>
<td>Black 44%</td>
<td>Black 13%</td>
<td>Black 37%</td>
<td>Black 11,690</td>
<td>Black 9%</td>
<td>Black 4%</td>
<td>Black 16%</td>
<td>Black 17%</td>
<td>Black 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Asian 35</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Black 37%</td>
<td>Black 24%</td>
<td>Black 44%</td>
<td>Black 13%</td>
<td>Asian 36%</td>
<td>Asian 7,610</td>
<td>Asian 66%</td>
<td>Asian 27%</td>
<td>Asian 47%</td>
<td>Asian 48%</td>
<td>Asian 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. White 41</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Black 37%</td>
<td>Black 24%</td>
<td>Black 44%</td>
<td>Black 13%</td>
<td>White 15%</td>
<td>White 7,610</td>
<td>White 66%</td>
<td>White 27%</td>
<td>White 16%</td>
<td>White 17%</td>
<td>White 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Avg. 32</td>
<td>County Avg.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Black 37%</td>
<td>Black 24%</td>
<td>Black 44%</td>
<td>Black 13%</td>
<td>Black 37%</td>
<td>Black 11,690</td>
<td>Black 9%</td>
<td>Black 4%</td>
<td>Black 16%</td>
<td>Black 17%</td>
<td>Black 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Figures are for the inclusive population (single race and multisracial respondents) except for white which are for single race non-Hispanic whites.

### Asian and Pacific Islander Ethnic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Average Household Size</th>
<th>Home Ownership</th>
<th>Less than High School Degree</th>
<th>Below Federal Poverty Line</th>
<th>200% of Federal Poverty Line</th>
<th>Public Assistance Income</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Per Capita Income</th>
<th>Foreign Born</th>
<th>Naturalization Rate of Foreign Born</th>
<th>Speak Other than English at Home</th>
<th>Speak English Less than &quot;Very Well&quot;</th>
<th>Linguistically Isolated Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>PCT 4</td>
<td>PCT 5</td>
<td>PCT 142</td>
<td>PCT 143</td>
<td>PCT 106</td>
<td>PCT 130</td>
<td>PCT 132</td>
<td>PCT 133</td>
<td>PCT 34</td>
<td>PCT 38</td>
<td>PCT 38</td>
<td>PCT 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hmong 19</td>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Hmong 15%</td>
<td>Cambodian 56%</td>
<td>Cambodian 41%</td>
<td>Cambodian 51%</td>
<td>Cambodian 36%</td>
<td>Hmong 6,508</td>
<td>Hmong 24%</td>
<td>Hmong 100%</td>
<td>Hmong 100%</td>
<td>Hmong 100%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Samoan 10</td>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Samoan 30%</td>
<td>Samoan 36%</td>
<td>Samoan 30%</td>
<td>Samoan 36%</td>
<td>Samoan 36%</td>
<td>Samoan 2,577</td>
<td>Samoan 24%</td>
<td>Samoan 100%</td>
<td>Samoan 100%</td>
<td>Samoan 100%</td>
<td>Samoan 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tongan 15</td>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Tongan 15%</td>
<td>Tongan 36%</td>
<td>Tongan 36%</td>
<td>Tongan 36%</td>
<td>Tongan 36%</td>
<td>Tongan 3,573</td>
<td>Tongan 24%</td>
<td>Tongan 100%</td>
<td>Tongan 100%</td>
<td>Tongan 100%</td>
<td>Tongan 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vietnamese 10</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Vietnamese 39%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 39%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 39%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 39%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 39%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 2,573</td>
<td>Vietnamese 24%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 100%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 100%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 100%</td>
<td>Vietnamese 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Thai 15</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Thai 15%</td>
<td>Thai 39%</td>
<td>Thai 39%</td>
<td>Thai 39%</td>
<td>Thai 39%</td>
<td>Thai 2,573</td>
<td>Thai 24%</td>
<td>Thai 100%</td>
<td>Thai 100%</td>
<td>Thai 100%</td>
<td>Thai 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Avg. 15</td>
<td>County Avg.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>County Avg. 15%</td>
<td>County Avg. 15%</td>
<td>County Avg. 15%</td>
<td>County Avg. 15%</td>
<td>County Avg. 15%</td>
<td>County Avg. 20,663</td>
<td>County Avg. 24%</td>
<td>County Avg. 100%</td>
<td>County Avg. 100%</td>
<td>County Avg. 100%</td>
<td>County Avg. 63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Figures are for the inclusive population (single race and multisracial respondents) except for white which are for single race non-Hispanic whites.

---

_Figures are for the inclusive population (single race and multisracial respondents) except for white which are for single race non-Hispanic whites._

---

**ASIAN & PACIFIC ISLANDER DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE — ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN LEGAL CENTER**
From 1990 to 2000, Asians experienced only a slight decrease in the population that is limited English proficient (LEP). With high LEP rates among the largest groups such as Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese, language barriers continue to be a critical issue in Asian communities.

A Language Other Than English Spoken At Home

> More than 85% of the populations in ten Asian groups speak a language other than English at home, including three of the largest groups: Vietnamese, Koreans, and Chinese.
> Just over half of Pacific Islanders as a whole speak a language other than English at home, but this figure varies greatly among the four largest groups. More than 65% of Tongans and Samoans speak a language other than English at home, but 39% of Guamanians and only 19% of Native Hawaiians speak another language at home.

Linguistic Isolation

> Thirty percent of Asian and 9% of Pacific Islander homes are linguistically isolated. Linguistic isolation is defined as all household members age fourteen years or older having limited English proficiency.
> The most linguistically isolated groups are also among the five largest groups: Koreans (47%), Vietnamese (45%), and Chinese (39%).

Areas With High Language Needs

The San Gabriel Valley has the largest number of linguistically isolated API households as well as the highest growth rate of such households. Eight of the ten communities with the highest percentage of linguistically isolated API language households are in the San Gabriel Valley.

> A majority of the API language speaking households in three cities in the San Gabriel Valley are linguistically isolated: El Monte, San Gabriel, and Rosemead.
> Seven of the ten communities that experienced the highest growth of linguistically isolated API language speaking households from 1990 to 2000 were in the San Gabriel Valley.
> Five communities more than doubled their number of linguistically isolated API language speaking households and also have high concentrations of such households: Temple City, El Monte, Rowland Heights, East San Gabriel, and La Crescenta-Montrose. More than 40% of the API language speaking households in those areas are linguistically isolated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. El Monte</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. San Gabriel</td>
<td>2,702</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rosemead</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Alhambra</td>
<td>6,086</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Monterey Park</td>
<td>5,236</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. East San Gabriel CDP*</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rowland Heights CDP*</td>
<td>2,915</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Temple City</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. La Crescenta-Montrose CDP*</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gardena</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Limited to places with more than 1,000 API language speaking households
* Unincorporated Census Designated Place

Three of the five largest Asian groups – Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese – have a majority limited English proficient population.
Asians have the highest foreign-born rates in the county, a result of the relatively recent lifting of immigration restrictions on Asian nations. Multiracial Asians have lower foreign-born rates, impacting the reporting of these percentages. Foreign-born percentages range from 68% when including multiracial Asians to 70% for the single race Asian population only.

Immigration
- Asians are more likely to be foreign born than other racial and ethnic groups in Los Angeles County. Asians are 66% (inclusive) to 70% (alone) foreign born, compared to 49% of Latinos.
- Only 26% (inclusive) to 27% (alone) of Pacific Islanders are foreign born. Tongans have higher foreign-born rates than other Pacific Islander groups (47% to 52%). At just 6%, Native Hawaiians have the lowest foreign-born rate of all API groups in the county.
- Bangladeshis, Taiwanese, Malaysians, and Sri Lankans have the highest foreign-born percentages among API groups, all above 80%.

Citizenship / Naturalization
- Asians have high rates of naturalization. Fifty-four percent of foreign-born Asians are naturalized compared to 27% for Latinos. Still, nearly half of foreign-born Asians are not naturalized citizens, leaving them ineligible to vote.
- Foreign-born APIs who become naturalized citizens are a strong presence in the API electorate in Southern California. APALC's Southern California Voter Survey conducted in November of 2002 found that 76% of API voters were foreign born. Of these foreign-born API voters, 16% made use of bilingual assistance at the polls.

Note: Figures are for inclusive population, unless otherwise noted.

---

Source: 2000 Census, Summary File 3. Language data is only for Asian and Pacific Islander language speakers (as classified by the Census Bureau) who use the language at home. Individuals who also speak English at home, South Asian Indo-European Languages (such as Hindi, Urdu, Gujarati, Nepali, Bengali, Marathi, Tamil, etc.) are not included.
Health status indicators and health insurance coverage rates for Asians and Pacific Islanders differ from other racial/ethnic groups and vary by API ethnic group and immigration status. Linguistic and cultural barriers to obtaining health care services are critical issues in the API community.

**Health Insurance Coverage**
The figures provided below are for the API population as a whole. It is important to note that studies have shown that API ethnic groups vary widely in their health insurance coverage. Rates for the uninsured range from 13% for Japanese to 34% for Koreans nationally, according to the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research.

**Child Health Insurance Coverage**
Asians and Pacific Islanders have the second-highest percentage of uninsured children in 1989–2000 (12%) among the major racial/ethnic groups in Los Angeles County, following Latino children (29%). This is a decrease from 20% in 1997 of uninsured API children.

---

**Adult Health Insurance Coverage**
One in five API adults age 18 to 64 were uninsured in 2002-03, second highest among the major racial/ethnic groups after Latinos (40%). All groups across the county experienced improvements in unemployment rates from 1997 to 2003, including APIs who decreased from 35% to 21% uninsured.

**Infant Mortality**
Asians and Pacific Islanders have the lowest infant mortality rates in the county. In 1997, the API infant mortality rate was 3.5 per 1,000 live births, compared to the county rate of 5.9.

**HIV/AIDS**
From January to June 2003, L.A. County reported 1,280 new AIDS cases and 18,689 persons living with AIDS. Since reporting began, 46,642 cumulative AIDS cases have been found in the county. Asians and Pacific Islanders made up 2% of the cumulative AIDS cases, or 967 cases.

**Tuberculosis**
Tuberculosis rates in L.A. County were highest in Asian and Pacific Islander (37.2 per 100,000) and African-American (22.7 per 100,000 populations as of 1997). Two-thirds of all county cases reported in 1997 were born outside the United States. The largest proportion of foreign-born cases was among individuals born in Mexico (38%), followed by the Philippines (16%).

---

**More than one-third of all Asians and Pacific Islanders in the nation live in California. From 1990 to 2000, California had the nation's largest growth in number of APIs, with an increase of over a million people. California is home to more Asians than any other state and has the second largest population of Pacific Islanders, after Hawaii.**

**Pacific Islanders**
- Pacific Islander growth ranged from 6% using alone numbers to 100% using inclusive numbers. This wide range results from a large number of multiracial Pacific Islanders.
- Nearly half (47%) of Pacific Islanders are multiracial.

**Geographic Concentrations**
- Half of California's Asian population lives in three counties: Los Angeles, Santa Clara, and Orange County.
- At 33% of the area's population, San Francisco County has the highest percentage of Asian residents.
- Places, Santa Clara, Orange, and Alameda Counties had the highest rates of Asian growth from 1990 to 2000.
- Sacramento County had the fastest rate of Pacific Islander growth, with an increase of 55% (alone) to 206% (inclusive) over the past decade.

**Race and Ethnicity**
Asian and Pacific Islanders are the fastest growing major racial/ethnic group in California.

**Asians**
- Asians increased from 9% of the population in 1990 to 12% in 2000. California is the only state, other than Hawaii, whose population is more than 10% Asian.
- There are 4.2 million Asians in the state.
- The Asian growth rate from 1990 to 2000 ranged from 35% alone to 52% inclusive.
- California's Asians are 11% multiracial, a rate higher than that of the state's African Americans (10%), Latinos (6%), or whites (4%).

---

The Los Angeles area has long enjoyed thriving Asian and Pacific Islander communities, but the cultural and historical diversity of these ethnic neighborhoods is not often explored. As Asians and Pacific Islanders continue to rise in numbers, influence, and importance in Los Angeles County, we all must work to forge pathways across racial lines and strive for understanding of every group that contributes to the mosaic of our community.

Understanding the API community and its unique challenges is not only the responsibility of a complex, multiracial, and multiethnic society, but is also in the best interest of all who participate in that society. The shift in demographics requires that public and private policies evolve to meet emerging needs, not just to benefit newer populations, but also to ensure that all communities, businesses, civic organizations, and individuals can prosper together.

Policy Recommendations

Identify and respond to changing needs in areas experiencing rapid growth and increasing concentrations of APIs

This report portrays an API community that is growing both in size and diversity. As this population increases, its needs grow and become more complex. With the dramatic growth of the API population comes an increase in community needs such as English-language education, translation for government and health services, outreach to senior populations, sensitivity to cultural differences, and naturalization and immigration services. Government agencies and others serving the API community must respond to this growth by allocating greater resources to meet these needs.

Increase services responsive to ethnic groups and communities with significant language needs

The Asian population continues to experience high rates of limited English proficiency and linguistic isolation. These persistent language issues need to be addressed by increasing assistance to those who might find it difficult to access basic services and offering greater access to English language acquisition. Service providers and government agencies must recognize the critical role language plays in the delivery of assistance, as well as the ability to participate in education, economic, and civic life. Language is an essential tool for navigating through the basic functions of the daily world. Without programs to overcome language barriers, these populations remain vulnerable.

Further study the multiracial Asian and Pacific Islander population

APIs have high multiracial rates, impacting the reporting of both growth and population characteristics. Trends indicate that the multiracial population will continue to grow. New ways of reporting that incorporate the multiracial population in a simple and accurate manner should be developed and used.

Encourage separate reporting of racial and ethnic data for Asian and Pacific Islander groups

The myth surrounding the image of a homogeneous, well-to-do “model minority” needs to be dispelled. Chinese and Filipinos, who overall do fare better than the country average in many indicators of well-being, make up more than half of the API population. Therefore, combined statistics for APIs mask the great diversity of need among the 45 API ethnic communities. Disaggregation of API ethnic group data is critical to ensure that the needs of all API groups are recognized, and are not overlooked or marginalized by certain pockets of success.
Race and Ethnicity

**Alone:** Racial or ethnic population figure that includes those who reported a single race only.

**Inclusive:** Racial or ethnic population figure that combines those who reported a single race and those who reported more than one race. Also referred to as "alone and in combination" or "single race and multiracial population."

**Multiracial:** Those who reported more than one race. Also referred to as "mixed race" or "in combination."

Social Characteristics

**Income, Median Household:** A measurement of income that divides the income distribution of households (all persons living in the same residence) in 1999 into two equal parts, half falling below and half above the median household income.

**Income, Per Capita:** The mean income computed for every man, woman, and child in a particular group. It is derived by dividing the total income of a particular group by the total population of that group.

**Income, Public Assistance:** Public assistance income includes general assistance and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). Separate payments received for hospital or other medical care (vendee payments) are excluded. This does not include Supplemental Security Income (SSI).

**Limited English Proficient:** Persons who speak English less than "very well."

**Linguistically Isolated Households:** Households in which all members 14 years old or older speak English less than "very well."

---

The 2000 Census marked the first decennial census in which persons could report more than one racial or ethnic background, capturing the multiracial population for the first time in U.S. Census history. While the change resulted in a more detailed description of race and ethnicity, it complicates reporting and prevents direct comparisons between the 2000 Census and 1990 or any other previous census.

The U.S. Census reports racial and ethnic background for the 2000 Census as two figures, "alone" and "inclusive." Alone numbers represent single race responses. Inclusive (also referred to as "alone and in combination") numbers represent single race and multiracial responses combined. Because the 1990 Census reported racial and ethnic background as a single figure, two measures of population growth are possible: one measuring growth from 1990 to 2000 alone and another measuring growth from 1990 to 2000 inclusive. Data for social and economic characteristics such as education, income, and home ownership are provided for the inclusive population for all racial and ethnic groups except for white, for which the alone population is described.

The U.S. Census does not consider Latino or Hispanic a racial category but as an ethnic category. Those of Latino or Hispanic origin can be of any race. Therefore, figures for the Latino population include persons of all racial backgrounds who indicated Latino or Hispanic origin. Likewise, all racial categories include those of Latino or Hispanic origin, except for white, which is non-Hispanic.

With the exception of data on health issues, which is from the L.A. County Public Health Service and UCLA, the source for data in this report is the U.S. Census Bureau.
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