

Hispanic Populations and Their Residential Patterns in the Metropolis

John R. Logan, Director
Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research
University at Albany

May 8, 2002

This report is based on data from the 1990 and 2000 Census of Population and 1998-2000 Current Population Survey, analyzed by Mumford Center researcher Jacob Stowell.

What we call the Hispanic population in America is actually a mixture of many different groups from around the world whose common link is language. As Hispanics move towards becoming the nation's largest minority (up from 22.4 million to 35.3 million in the last decade alone), significant changes are occurring in their composition. The Mumford Center pointed out in an earlier report ("*The New Latinos*" – September 2001) that the fastest growth is not in the traditionally largest Hispanic groups (Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, or Cubans), but among New Latinos – people from the Dominican Republic and a diverse set of countries in Central American (such as El Salvador) and South America (such as Colombia). Their number has more than doubled since 1990, from 3.0 million to 6.1 million. Although Cubans are still the third largest single Hispanic group in the United States, (1.3 million), there are now nearly as many Dominicans (1.1 million) and Salvadorans (also 1.1 million). There are more New Latinos than Puerto Ricans and Cubans combined, and these new groups are growing much more rapidly.

Hispanics are not all alike. In reality, those from South America and Cuba have very different class backgrounds than those from Mexico, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic and Central America. While Mexicans are still highly concentrated in the Southwest, Hispanics in Florida are predominantly Cuban, and in the Northeast, Puerto Rican. Most Dominicans live in the New York metropolis, but Salvadorans are found in many diverse locations – Long Island, NY; Houston, TX; Washington, DC; and Los Angeles, CA.

This report summarizes what is known about the social backgrounds and locations of each major Hispanic group. We emphasize the differences among them at the neighborhood level in the extent of their segregation from whites and blacks, and the degree to which they form separate residential enclaves in the metropolis.

More complete information on the size and residential pattern of Hispanic groups for every metropolis in 1990 and 2000 is available on the Mumford Center web page:

<http://mumford1.dyndns.org/cen2000/HispanicPop/HspPopData.htm>.

The Hierarchy of Success

Hispanics from different national origins have a wide range of social and economic backgrounds, some better prepared for the U.S. labor market, and others much less successful. Our best information about their backgrounds is from the Current Population Survey. To maximize the size of the sample on which they are based, our figures here are pooled estimates from the CPS conducted in March 1998 and 2000.

Nativity and year of entry. Puerto Ricans are considered by definition born in the United States. The majority of Cubans are foreign-born (68%), though relatively few of those entered the country in the last ten years (27%). They mainly represent a pre-1990 immigration stream. In contrast, only about a third of Mexican Americans (36%) were born abroad, but nearly half of their foreign-born members are recent immigrants (49% in the previous ten years).

The New Latino groups are like Cubans in having a majority of foreign-born, ranging from 63% for Dominicans to over 70% for Central and South Americans. But they are like Mexicans in that they represent the most recent wave of immigration – generally 45-50% of their foreign-born arrived in the last ten years.

Education. Mexicans are the least educated of the older Hispanic groups, with an average education of only 10.2 years (for those aged 25 and above). Puerto Ricans average 11.4 years, and Cubans 11.9 years. The New Latino groups range both below the Mexicans and above the Cubans. Salvadorans and Guatemalans have the least education (below 10 years). But Hispanics from most South American origins are better educated than Cubans, averaging 12.6 years.

Income. Compared to Puerto Ricans and Mexicans, Cubans in the United States have always been regarded as economically successful. The mean earnings of employed Cubans are above \$13,500, compared to about \$10,000 for Puerto Ricans and \$8500 for Mexicans. Only 18% of Cubans fall below the poverty line, compared to 26% of Mexicans and 30% of Puerto Ricans.

Among the New Latinos, Dominicans stand out for their very low income: mean earnings below \$8000 and more than a third in poverty (36%). The major Central American groups are roughly equivalent to Puerto Ricans in average earnings, though they are less likely to fall below the poverty line. On the other hand, Hispanics from South America do considerably better, and on average they earn more and have lower poverty rates than do Cubans.

Unemployment and public assistance. Levels of unemployment among Hispanic groups are generally consistent with their average earnings. New Latinos from the Dominican Republic have higher than average unemployment and they are the group most likely to receive public assistance (above 8%). In fact, in both these respects they are less successful than Puerto Ricans. Those from South America have the lowest levels of unemployment and are even less likely than Cubans to receive public assistance.

Thus, a new and wider range of social and economic characteristics accompanies the growing diversity of national origins among Hispanics in the United States. It is becoming harder to view

Hispanics as one group. As their growth and diversity continues, we must recognize that there are many Hispanic situations in America.

Table 1. Social and economic characteristics of Hispanics, by national origin
(pooled estimates from Current Population Survey, March 1998 and March 2000)

	% Foreign Born	% Recent Arrivals**	Years of Education	Mean Earnings	% Below Poverty Line	% Unemployed	% Public Assistance
All Hispanics	38.5%	44.8%	10.7	\$9,432	25.2%	6.8%	3.0%
Mexican/Chicano	36.5%	49.3%	10.2	\$8,525	26.3%	7.0%	2.6%
Puerto Rican	1.3%	26.7%	11.4	\$9,893	30.4%	8.3%	7.3%
Cuban	68.0%	26.7%	11.9	\$13,567	18.3%	5.8%	2.2%
Dominican Republic	62.7%	45.3%	10.8	\$7,883	36.0%	8.6%	8.2%
Central America Total	71.3%	48.2%	10.3	\$9,865	22.3%	6.4%	2.4%
El Salvador*	69.6%	45.9%	9.7	\$9,631	20.8%	5.1%	2.4%
Guatemala*	74.8%	56.1%	9.8	\$9,204	27.1%	7.9%	1.8%
Honduras*	69.0%	50.2%	10.4	\$10,244	27.2%	10.8%	2.5%
Nicaragua*	72.5%	42.7%	12.0	\$10,506	17.4%	4.0%	1.9%
South America Total	73.6%	44.4%	12.6	\$13,911	13.6%	4.3%	0.8%
Colombia*	71.7%	38.4%	12.4	\$11,759	16.4%	4.8%	1.4%
Ecuador*	71.1%	48.9%	11.8	\$11,848	19.0%	5.8%	0.7%
Peru*	73.0%	51.5%	12.7	\$11,996	11.7%	3.0%	0.2%

*Central and South American groups are listed if they had more than 200 persons in the pooled CPS sample.

** "Recent arrivals" represents the percentage of immigrants who arrived in the previous ten years.

Counting Hispanic National Origin Groups

Census 2000 did an excellent job of counting Hispanics, but performed poorly in identifying their origin. In previous years, a single "Hispanic question" on the census has served reasonably well to distinguish Hispanics from different national origins. In the last two decennial censuses people who identify as Hispanic were asked to check one of three boxes (Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban), or to write in another Hispanic category. In Census 2000, no examples of other categories were provided to orient respondents. It is likely that this caused an unprecedented number of Hispanics to provide no information or only the broad category of "Hispanic" or "Spanish." As a result, **6.2 million, or 17.6% of all Hispanics**, were counted in census reports as "Other Hispanics." This represents nearly double the share of the Other Hispanics category in the 1990 census.

There is good evidence that the sharp jump in the Other Hispanic category as to do with the change in the wording of the question itself. A Census study conducted in 2000 compared results from a

questionnaire using the old and new wording (Betsy Martin, “Some Evidence about Questionnaire Effects on Reporting of Specific Hispanic Groups in Census 2000,” October 12, 2001). Using the new wording, 20.1% of Hispanics gave a response that had to be coded Other Hispanic. Using the old wording, only 7.6% gave such responses.

The result is a severe underestimate of the numbers of specific Hispanic groups in 2000. National studies that rely solely on the Hispanic origin question of the decennial census find only modest growth for major sources of Hispanic immigration such as El Salvador (+16%) and Colombia (+24%). States and metropolitan areas where New Latinos are particularly concentrated are dramatically affected by this problem. In the State of California, for example, the census estimated the number of Salvadorans in 1990 as 339,000; ten years later the estimate is only 273,000. In Miami the census counted 74,000 Nicaraguans a decade ago, but only 69,000 in 2000. It is implausible that these groups actually decreased in this period of intensified immigration.

In this report we present improved estimates of the size of every Hispanic group, compared to those relying solely on the Hispanic origin question in Census 2000. Our procedure uses the Current Population Survey, which has the advantage of being conducted in person or by telephone, as the basis for determining the percentage of Hispanics who “really” should be classified as Other Hispanic. We then apply this “target” to Census 2000 data at the level of census tracts. Where the census has an excessive number of Other Hispanics, we allocate them across specific national origin groups according to a pre-established formula. Details of the procedure for 1990 and 2000 are documented in the Appendix to this report.

Table 2 provides a detailed breakdown of the Hispanic population at the national level (not including Puerto Rico) in 1990 and 2000. There are very large disparities between these and the Census counts from the Hispanic origin question, especially in 2000.

In absolute numbers, the Mexicans are the group most affected by our reallocation of Other Hispanics, increasing by 2.4 million from the Census count. In proportion to their number, however, it is the New Latinos for whom the figures changed the most. Taken together the Mumford estimates show that New Latinos more than doubled their number, compared to an increase of about a third reported by the Census Bureau. We calculate more than 350,000 additional Dominicans and Salvadorans, 270,000 additional Colombians, and 250,000 additional Guatemalans.

- By all estimates, Mexicans are by far the largest Hispanic group, about two-thirds of the total and still growing rapidly. The Mumford count is now over 23 million, an increase of 70% in the last decade.
- Puerto Ricans and Cubans remain the next largest Hispanic groups, but their expansion is now much slower, up 35% and 23% respectively since 1990.
- The largest New Latino groups are Dominicans and Salvadorans, both of whom doubled in the last decade and have now reached over 1.1 million.

- There are now over a half million Colombians (nearly 750,000) and Guatemalans (over 600,000) in this country. And three other groups are quickly approaching the half million mark: Ecuadorians, Peruvians, and Hondurans.

Table 2. Estimates of the Hispanic population in the United States, 1990 and 2000

	<u>Mumford Estimates</u>			<u>Census Hispanic Question</u>		
	1990	2000	Growth	1990	2000	Growth
Hispanic total	21,900,089	35,305,818	61%	21,900,089	35,305,818	61%
Mexican	13,576,346	23,060,224	70%	13,393,208	20,640,711	54%
Puerto Rican	2,705,979	3,640,460	35%	2,651,815	3,406,178	28%
Cuban	1,067,416	1,315,346	23%	1,053,197	1,241,685	18%
New Latino groups	3,019,780	6,153,989	104%	2,879,583	3,805,444	32%
Dominican	537,120	1,121,257	109%	520,151	764,945	47%
Central American	1,387,331	2,863,063	106%	1,323,830	1,686,937	27%
Costa Rican		115,672			68,588	
Guatemalan	279,360	627,329	125%	268,779	372,487	39%
Honduran	142,481	362,171	154%	131,066	217,569	66%
Nicaraguan	212,481	294,334	39%	202,658	177,684	-12%
Panamanian	100,841	164,371	63%	92,013	91,723	0%
Salvadoran	583,397	1,117,959	92%	565,081	655,165	16%
Other Central American	68,772	181,228		64,233	103,721	
South American	1,095,329	2,169,669	98%	1,035,602	1,353,562	31%
Argentinian		168,991			100,864	
Bolivian		70,545			42,068	
Chilean		117,698			68,849	
Colombian	399,788	742,406	86%	378,726	470,684	24%
Ecuadorian	199,477	396,400	99%	191,198	260,559	36%
Paraguayan		14,492			8,769	
Peruvian	184,712	381,850	107%	175,035	233,926	34%
Uruguayan		30,010			18,804	
Venezuelan		149,309			91,507	
Other South American	311,353	97,969		290,643	57,532	
Other Hispanic	1,530,568	1,135,799	-26%	1,922,286	6,211,800	223%

National Trends in Hispanic Segregation

Hispanic segregation, as measured by the Index of Dissimilarity, is intermediate between that of blacks (about 14 points higher) and Asians (about 9 points lower). We calculated these figures by computing levels of segregation in every metropolitan area, then taking a weighted average, giving more weight to areas with more group members. We can do the same procedure for individual Hispanic groups, with one provision. The 1990 Census reported counts for Dominicans, Central Americans, and South Americans only for a one-in-six sample of persons. This means that there is sampling error, especially at the census tract level. In metropolitan areas with fewer than 25,000 group members, we believe that the 1990 indices for these groups are unreliable. Therefore we limit our calculations for both 1990 and 2000 to those metropolitan regions with larger numbers of group members. (In the case of Dominicans, this means that only the New York, NY MSA is included.)

This same issue also led us to combine the Central and South American groups into those larger categories. However, persons interested in specific cases – such as Salvadorans and Guatemalans in Los Angeles-Long Beach – can download this information from our web page.

Table 3 shows that considerable variation in Hispanic groups' settlement patterns. Consider first segregation from non-Hispanic whites (the Index of Dissimilarity). The index ranges from 0 to 100, giving the percentage of one group who would have to move to achieve an even residential pattern - one where every tract replicates the group composition of the metropolis. A value of 60 or above is considered very high. Values of 40 to 50 are usually considered moderate levels of segregation, while values of 30 or less are considered low.

Table 3. Segregation of Hispanics: National Averages for 1990 and 2000

	Population		D from whites		D from blacks	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
HISPANIC TOTAL	21,900,089	35,305,818	50.6	51.5	54.0	49.2
Mexican total	13,576,346	23,060,224	51.4	53.1	53.4	49.3
Puerto Rican total	2,705,979	3,640,460	61.9	56.5	56.0	50.2
Cuban total	1,067,416	1,315,346	55.4	49.5	76.1	71.5
Dominican total	537,120	1,121,257	82.0	80.8	69.7	64.3
Central American total	1,387,331	2,863,063	67.2	64.1	63.8	56.3
South American total	1,095,329	2,169,669	51.4	47.8	73.0	68.8
	Group Isolation		Exposure to whites		Exposure to Hispanics	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
HISPANIC TOTAL			41.8	36.5	42.4	45.5
Mexican total	40.3	38.7	40.2	35.0	46.7	49.5
Puerto Rican total	19.1	14.0	42.1	42.4	33.5	31.6
Cuban total	29.8	26.2	37.6	34.5	51.9	52.8
Dominican total	24.1	19.5	16.3	12.7	56.2	57.4
Central American total	12.0	7.9	27.9	23.6	47.6	50.4
South American total	7.2	7.4	46.8	38.4	34.3	39.6

The national average for all Hispanics in 2000 is 51.5 – meaning that 51.5% of either Hispanics or whites would need to move to a different tract for the two groups to become equally distributed.

Three groups have substantially higher levels of segregation from whites: Dominicans (the extreme, measured for New York only, at 80.8), Central Americans (64.1), and Puerto Ricans (56.5). South Americans and Cubans, by contrast, have segregation levels below 50.

The national average increased very slightly in the last decade, while segregation declined for every group except Mexicans. This illustrates the importance of the Mexican experience, since two-thirds of Hispanics are Mexican. It also reflects the fact that the two most segregated groups – Dominicans and Central Americans – grew faster than the others.

Segregation from (non-Hispanic) African Americans is another important feature of the Hispanic experience. Overall Hispanics are about as segregated from blacks as they are from whites. In fact, although many Dominicans and Cubans classify themselves in the census as non-white, they are more segregated from African Americans than are Mexicans. Nevertheless, segregation from blacks has declined 5 points for each Hispanic group, so the trajectory is clearly downward.

Table 3 also shows levels of group isolation (the percentage of same-group members in the census tract where the average group member lives). This is an indicator of the extent to which a group has developed residential enclaves in metropolitan areas. Mexicans, who are less than 10% of the nation's population, live on average in neighborhoods that are almost 40% Mexican, and nearly 50% Hispanic. Cubans, not even 1% of the nation's population, live in neighborhoods where more than a quarter of residents are Cuban and more than half are Hispanic. Every group has a similar experience. Of course, the smaller the group, the lower is its isolation. But even the smaller groups, like Central and South Americans, whose neighborhoods are only 7-8% Central or South American, live in neighborhoods that are half, or nearly half, Hispanic. There is a high residential degree of mixing among these groups: each tends to concentrate in its own specific neighborhoods, but the presence of people from other Hispanic national origins reinforces the Hispanic character of those neighborhoods.

Conversely, exposure to whites (defined as the percentage of non-Hispanic whites in the census tract where the average group member lives) is lower and has fallen over time for every group except Puerto Ricans. Dominicans have the lowest exposure to whites; the average Dominican lives in a neighborhood where only one of eight residents is a non-Hispanic white.

Differences across Metro Areas

We also examined how the experiences of individual groups vary across the metropolitan regions where they are found in the largest numbers.

Metro areas with the most Mexicans are found predominantly in California and the Southwest. About 16.6 million Mexicans (80.7%) live in one of 36 metropolitan areas with a Mexican population greater than 100,000. Of these 36 metro areas, 26 (72%) are in California and Texas. But surprisingly the second largest number is in Chicago, where they nearly doubled in the last decade. Chicago stands out for the very high level of separation of Mexicans from other groups – they have the second highest segregation from whites (more than 10 points above the national average for Mexicans) and by far the highest segregation from African Americans (30 points above the average). Mexicans in Riverside-San Bernardino, by contrast, are much less segregated than the

national average from both whites and African Americans. But the population shifts in this metro area have nevertheless left Mexicans typically in neighborhoods that are more than 40% Mexican, and where exposure to whites has dropped sharply from 49.2 in 1990 to 35.0 in 2000.

Table 4. Segregation of Mexicans, 1990 and 2000

MEXICANS	Population		D from whites		D from blacks	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Mexican total	13,576,346	23,060,224	51.4	53.1	53.4	49.3
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	2,527,152	3,296,648	63.7	65.2	61.3	56.4
Chicago, IL	578,790	1,117,025	64.6	64.5	81.4	78.3
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	591,670	1,098,012	38.5	44.3	38.9	36.6
Houston, TX	571,286	994,856	52.9	57.7	59.5	54.7
Orange County, CA	474,818	766,388	54.5	58.8	41.9	41.8
San Antonio, TX	574,722	751,890	55.0	52.6	57.8	52.2
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ	336,429	750,012	51.3	54.7	35.5	33.0
Dallas, TX	320,093	700,706	52.6	56.2	55.5	52.2
	Isolation		Exposure to whites		Exposure to Hispanics	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Mexican total	40.3	38.7	40.2	35.0	46.7	49.5
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	48.9	49.7	22.0	15.9	60.2	65.2
Chicago, IL	34.9	40.7	43.6	36.3	44.1	49.8
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	35.3	41.9	49.2	35.0	39.5	50.6
Houston, TX	36.6	39.3	40.5	29.8	42.7	51.1
Orange County, CA	43.1	47.1	40.9	29.8	48.2	55.6
San Antonio, TX	61.2	47.1	28.0	25.8	66.0	66.8
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ	34.2	40.0	53.3	42.6	37.1	47.1
Dallas, TX	30.2	38.2	48.6	35.5	33.7	46.2

Although Puerto Ricans are found in the largest numbers along the East Coast and in Chicago, IL, New York, NY stands out as the main Puerto Rican center. In terms of segregation from whites, stark contrasts are found between the two Florida cases and the others. In Orlando and Miami they are much less segregated from whites than the national average; in the remaining cases they are 10 or more points more segregated – levels that are more typical for blacks and whites in the U.S. Puerto Ricans are also highly segregated from blacks, especially in Chicago.

Hartford, CT is not widely recognized as a destination for Puerto Ricans, yet in this city Puerto Ricans are more segregated from whites than any of the other cities examined. Hartford also has the highest degree of isolation (with Puerto Ricans typically living in neighborhoods that are 28.5% Puerto Rican).

Table 5. Segregation of Puerto Ricans, 1990 and 2000

PUERTO RICANS	Population		D from whites		D from blacks	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Puerto Rican total	2,705,979	3,640,460	61.9	56.5	56.0	50.2
New York, NY	932,540	879,901	70.4	68.6	55.8	54.2
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	120,860	171,000	73.8	68.6	69.1	62.8
Chicago, IL	142,322	159,859	74.5	66.2	84.0	78.9
Orlando, FL	52,539	146,530	39.6	46.5	64.2	55.2
Newark, NJ	77,660	90,599	74.4	69.0	63.6	62.3
Hartford, CT	61,397	86,361	74.5	69.8	52.7	46.8
Miami, FL	72,827	84,197	40.8	39.9	59.7	57.9
	Isolation		Exposure to whites		Exposure to Hispanics	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Puerto Rican total	19.1	14.0	42.1	42.4	33.5	31.6
New York, NY	28.7	21.0	22.7	20.6	45.4	44.3
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	29.9	25.4	35.5	35.4	34.0	32.3
Chicago, IL	20.4	13.1	37.1	36.3	48.6	48.0
Orlando, FL	8.9	17.0	74.4	53.0	14.7	29.2
Newark, NJ	22.1	17.5	31.5	30.4	38.0	38.6
Hartford, CT	31.8	28.5	42.2	41.9	36.1	35.5
Miami, FL	5.5	4.8	28.5	19.7	51.5	57.7

Because Cubans and Dominicans are so heavily concentrated in a single metropolitan area – Miami and New York, respectively – we make no cross-region comparisons for them.

Table 6. Segregation of Cubans and Dominicans, 1990 and 2000

CUBANS	Population		D from whites		D from blacks	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Cuban total	1,067,416	1,315,346	55.4	49.5	76.1	71.5
Miami, FL	563,979	681,032	59.8	53.6	82.4	81.3
	Isolation		Exposure to whites		Exposure to Hispanics	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Cuban total	1.6	26.2	37.6	34.5	51.9	52.8
Miami, FL	50.3	46.3	20.4	16.4	73.5	76.5

DOMINICANS	Population		D from whites		D from blacks	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Dominican total	537,120	1,121,257				
New York, NY	351,377	602,714	82.0	80.8	69.7	64.3
	Isolation		Exposure to whites		Exposure to Hispanics	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
New York, NY	24.1	19.5	16.3	12.7	56.2	57.4

Lastly we examine the groups least studied up until now: Central Americans and South Americans. The largest share of Central Americans -- particularly Salvadorans, Guatemalans and Nicaraguans -- resides in Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA. In Miami, FL, the largest group is Nicaraguan. Elsewhere Salvadorans predominate, including suburban Nassau-Suffolk, NY (Long Island).

In general, Central Americans are highly segregated from whites. Miami is an exception: segregation from whites is only moderate, but segregation from blacks is unusually high – this mirrors what we saw for Cubans in Miami. Central Americans typically live in neighborhoods that are rarely over 10% Central American. There is also substantial variation in the extent to which they live in Hispanic enclaves. The extreme cases are Miami, FL, where they are intermixed with Cubans (72% Hispanic in the neighborhood of the average Central American), and Los Angeles, CA, where they live in areas with many Mexicans (61% Hispanic).

Table 7. Segregation of Central Americans, 1990 and 2000

CENTRAL AMERICANS	Population		D from whites		D from blacks	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Central American total	1,387,331	2,863,063	67.2	64.1	63.8	56.3
Indices based on MSA's with more than 25,000 group members in 1990						
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	465,927	676,427	70.0	67.3	62.2	54.0
Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV	82,313	203,508	65.9	62.7	68.4	62.2
Miami, FL	123,121	189,059	57.1	52.9	77.0	70.7
New York, NY	113,684	165,081	72.2	67.9	53.0	49.5
Houston, TX	59,512	150,406	62.3	64.0	64.4	52.2
Nassau-Suffolk, NY	27,908	88,005	71.6	67.7	53.3	43.7
San Francisco, CA	65,986	84,472	61.3	61.2	62.1	56.5
	Isolation		Exposure to whites		Exposure to Hispanics	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Central American total	12.0	7.9	27.9	23.6	47.6	50.4
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	15.7	8.8	20.5	15.9	56.2	61.1
Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV	11.7	10.9	46.5	37.9	19.3	25.6
Miami, FL	13.8	10.5	20.0	14.4	70.0	72.0
New York, NY	3.9	3.0	25.1	21.8	34.7	37.1
Houston, TX	6.3	5.0	41.8	26.8	36.6	47.9
Nassau-Suffolk, NY	7.5	10.1	50.6	41.0	20.5	29.8
San Francisco, CA	11.8	7.6	38.8	32.4	30.8	33.6

South Americans are most highly concentrated in the New York-New Jersey area, Los Angeles, CA, Washington, DC, and Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL. On average they are generally only moderately segregated from whites (D=47.8). But of the metro areas shown in Table 8, only Washington is near this level. New York, NY, and Newark, NJ, are both above 60. Although this is lower than for Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, or Central Americans in New York, it is still very high. Miami, Los Angeles, and Fort Lauderdale are 35 or below. In this respect South Americans are similar to Cubans and Central Americans in Miami. But in Los Angeles, where Mexicans and Central Americans are quite highly segregated, South Americans become the exception.

Table 8. Segregation of South Americans, 1990 and 2000

SOUTH AMERICANS	Population		D from whites		D from blacks	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
South American total	1,095,329	2,169,669	51.4	47.8	73.0	68.8
Indices based on MSA's with more than 25,000 group members in 1990						
New York, NY	249,927	383,671	60.8	61.5	74.1	72.0
Miami, FL	112,138	224,555	40.0	35.2	77.3	77.6
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	99,885	133,743	41.2	34.9	72.0	62.6
Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV	49,991	94,546	49.4	43.4	74.0	66.5
Fort Lauderdale, FL	25,823	93,406	29.0	30.5	69.5	58.9
Newark, NJ	41,683	84,531	64.9	63.8	69.7	68.4
	Isolation		Exposure to whites		Exposure to Hispanics	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
South American total	7.2	7.4	46.8	38.4	34.3	39.6
New York, NY	9.8	9.1	40.6	30.7	34.4	39.4
Miami, FL	9.4	11.3	33.1	24.7	57.1	64.3
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	2.1	1.2	45.7	37.1	35.9	40.3
Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV	3.6	2.9	66.8	54.9	11.3	15.9
Fort Lauderdale, FL	3.3	6.1	78.1	58.8	10.9	22.4
Newark, NJ	7.2	8.8	49.9	42.5	27.8	34.2

There Is No Average Hispanic

The scale of immigration from less traditional Hispanic sources brings new and less known groups into the United States. To be sure, we should become as aware of Dominicans, Salvadorans, and Colombians – people with very different backgrounds and trajectories – as we are of Puerto Ricans and Cubans.

Because they are highly concentrated in a few regions, often in a fairly narrow set of neighborhoods, every Hispanic group has local significance. Yet despite the differences among groups, they often live in areas whose Hispanic flavor comes less from themselves than from the mélange of people from different parts of the Hispanic world. Mexicans are the only ones who, because of their numbers, are typically a great majority of the Hispanics in their neighborhoods. Others typically live in neighborhoods where they are a small minority, but where Hispanics taken together are close to half the population.

Of the groups studied here, Cubans and South Americans stand out for their high degree of economic success. This success translates into moderate levels of segregation from whites, although members of both groups still tend to live in neighborhoods where non-Hispanic whites are outnumbered by Hispanics. They are also the most segregated from African Americans, although this dimension of separation is on the decline.

On the other hand, two of the newer and fastest growing groups -- Dominicans and Central Americans -- lag behind in economic standing. Dominicans are clearly the least successful as well as the most segregated.

Looking to the future, it is likely that the Hispanic population will maintain the diversity we see today. Our ability to distinguish among the national-origin groups is therefore crucial to understanding the Hispanic experience. No longer can we think in terms of the “average Hispanic.”

Unfortunately, as we noted in “The New Latinos” report in September 2001, our knowledge of these differences is undermined by the serious inadequacies of the Census 2000 Hispanic origin question. Alternative estimates should be made available because undercounted can easily translate into underrepresented and underserved.

In this report we have offered one approach to re-estimating the numbers of each group at the census tract level. We continue to encourage public officials to seek better methods of estimation. In particular, we encourage the Bureau of the Census to utilize the wide range of data it has available to ensure a more accurate understanding of America’s Hispanic populations.

APPENDIX: Mumford Estimates of Hispanic-Origin Populations

Decline of Latino Groups in Census Has Agencies Angry, Experts Puzzled (excerpt)

■ By ROBIN FIELDS, *Los Angeles Times*, August 10, 2001.

Local organizations say the county's Salvadoran population at least doubled in the last decade, but the census shows Salvadorans declining 26% from 253,086 in 1990 to 187,193 in 2000.

"I don't think that can be accurate," said Carlos Vaquerano, executive director of the Salvadoran-American Leadership and Educational Fund. "We've taken a lot of pride in being the second-largest Latino group here and the fastest-growing. We expected the census to prove that."

The effect of the paper reductions could be devastating, he added. Growing communities, with burgeoning economic and political clout, attract more corporate investment and marketing attention, as well as more government aid.

The adjustment procedures described here are analogous to standard techniques employed by the Bureau of the Census to deal with incomplete census forms. The Bureau routinely "imputes" information from other household members or from neighbors in order to fill in missing data. The difference is that our adjustment is done at the level of the census tract. To the extent that we believe the tract's Other Hispanic population has been overstated, we impute specific national origins to the "excess Other Hispanics" based on the distribution of responses of others in the tract.

1. Estimates for 1990

We first describe our approach to 1990. The Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) from the 1990 census provides individual-level information for a large national sample on Hispanic origin, country of birth, and ancestry. In the PUMS sample, 8.7% of Hispanics are classed as Other Hispanic. If we also use country of birth and ancestry as a basis for determining individuals' specific Hispanic origin, we can reduce Other Hispanics to 7.5%. For some specific states or metropolitan areas, however, we can do much better, reducing Other Hispanics to less than 1.5% of Hispanics in New York, Los Angeles and Miami.

We treat these estimates of the "real" size of the Other Hispanic category as targets, setting a specific target for every census tract. For tracts in metro areas with more than 100,000 Hispanics (39 metro areas), we calculate the target from data for the metro area itself. In other cases, we apply statewide figures. For the 31 states with less than 100,000 Hispanics, we apply the national target of 7.5%.

We then turn to the figures from the 1990 census, comparing our target for every census tract to the number of Other Hispanics reported by the census. If the reported number is equal to or below the target, we make no adjustment. If it is larger than the target, we allocate the number of "excess" other Hispanics to specific national origin categories based on the reported figures in the tract for those categories.

NOTE: Analysis of 1990 PUMS data reveals that people of Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban birth or ancestry were much less likely (by a factor of 1:4) to fail to indicate an origin than were Hispanics of other backgrounds, a result that we attribute to the questionnaire format. It is appropriate to allocate some Other Hispanics to these listed groups, but not in the same proportion as for unlisted groups.

In allocating Other Hispanics, therefore, we weight members of the listed groups in each tract at .25; this procedure generates national totals that are consistent with the national group populations found in the PUMS.

2. Estimates for 2000

Our procedure for 2000 follows the same logic, but draws on a different source for calculating targets. The public use sample from the Census 2000 is not yet publicly available. Therefore we use the smaller Current Population Survey, pooling together the samples from March 1998 and March 2000. **The Census Bureau, using either the Census 2000 Supplemental Survey or the long-form data from Census 2000, is in a position to provide superior estimates, and we encourage the Bureau to do so.** By 2002 or 2003, when additional files will have been publicly released, we will update our own adjustments.

Nationally, information on the person's country of birth and both parents' country of birth from the CPS allows us to reduce the target to 3.3% – well below the 17.3% reported in the decennial census. These targets also vary by state and metro area. For CMSA's with more than 400 sampled Hispanics, we use CMSA figures to calculate targets (this covered 67 PMSA's). For other cases we employ statewide figures or, where a state has less than 400 sampled Hispanics, we use the national target. In some cases the targets are even lower than 3.9%: they are 2.4% in New York, 1.1% in Los Angeles. This procedure reallocates a very large share of people who were reported as "other Hispanics" in Census 2000.

As in 1990, we allocate a substantial number of Other Hispanics to Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban. The weighting factor for these groups is .10, calibrated to yield national totals that are consistent with the CPS. Substantively this weight means we are estimating that member of other groups were ten times more likely to fail to indicate their origin, a greater discrepancy than in 1990. In our view, the difference reflects the fact that the Census 2000 questionnaire provided no examples to guide respondents from the unlisted groups, examples that proved helpful in 1990.