US2010
discover america in a new century

Hispanics in the United States: Not Only Mexicans

John R. Logan
Richard N. Turner
Brown University

March 2013

Report Abstract

When studies are done of Hispanics, the results mostly reflect the experience of Mexicans who are more than 60% of the total. But observers would be mistaken if they thought they knew Hispanics in the U.S. by looking only at Mexicans. The differences among Hispanic groups are becoming more salient in three ways.

First, non-Mexicans are growing fast and are now present in large numbers. In 1990 only three Hispanic groups had more than a million members: Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban. The 2010 Census shows three more – Dominicans, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans – and several others with more than half a million.

Second, some groups are doing a lot better than Mexicans. Puerto Ricans and Cubans earn more, and Argentinians and Venezuelans earn much more. South Americans in general have the highest levels of education. Only Dominicans and Central Americans match the class profile of Mexicans.

Third, these groups also have different levels and trends in separation from non-Hispanics. South Americans are less segregated than Mexicans, while Dominicans and Central Americans are much more segregated. Equally important for the future, every group except Mexicans has experienced a substantial decline in segregation from non-Hispanic whites since 1990. The common view is that Hispanic segregation is unchanging because of the high volume of continuing immigration. However segregation is falling both for the slower growing Puerto Ricans and Cubans and for much faster growing Dominicans, Central Americans, and South Americans.

The Diversity of Hispanic Populations in the United States

Since becoming the nation's largest minority around 2000, Hispanics have continued to increase their numbers. The Census counted nearly 22 million Hispanics in 1990, over 35 million in 2000 and over 50 million in 2010. Hispanics are an especially important component of the population of persons under 18, and fertility will tend to raise their share of Americans even apart from continuing immigration. The 2010 Census showed that Hispanics were only 11.8% of all native born U.S. citizens, but they were 22.1% of those under the age of 18.

Hispanics are themselves a diverse ethnic category. This report calls attention to the mixture of many different groups from the Western Hemisphere whose common link is language. There is a possibility that common language in itself is enough to draw these groups together – certainly it is the basis for marketing and political advertising. Reports after the 2000 Census pointed out that the fastest growth has not been 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) whose presence had not been so visible a decade before (Logan 2001).

Main Findings

Analyses of the most recent data show how important are the differences among these Hispanic groups:

- While Mexicans continue to be about 60% of the Hispanic population, growth of Puerto Ricans and Cubans lags behind and the New Latino groups are gaining much faster. The extreme case is Hondurans, up nearly 400% since 1990 and now numbering over 600,000. Except for Mexicans and Puerto Ricans, a large majority of all other groups (over 60%) is foreign-born. However the share of immigrants who arrived in the last decade is lower than it was ten years ago.

- The socioeconomic ladder of groups shows advantages for Cubans (long considered an advantaged minority) but also for Puerto Ricans and South Americans. Other groups are more similar to Mexicans, with Guatemalans an extreme case of low education, low wages, and high poverty.

- Each Hispanic group has its own pattern of regional concentration, including especially the Southwest, Northeast, and Chicago. The main trend over time is for dispersion from the metropolitan regions that historically housed the most group members.

- Hispanic segregation from whites is dominated by the moderately high segregation of Mexicans, which has not changed since 1990. Dominicans and Central Americans are considerably more separated, while South Americans are more spatially assimilated. The striking finding is that all groups aside from Mexicans have become much less segregated over time.

- Hispanics overall live in neighborhoods with poorer and less educated residents than do non-Hispanic whites. But South Americans are relatively advantaged and Dominicans are in the worst position. A positive trend is the increasing share of neighbors with college education, which reflects a national trend toward higher education levels.

This report summarizes what is known about the sizes, 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 other groups, 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, 2000, and 2010 is available on the US2010 Project web page: http://www.s4.brown.edu/us2010/DDhab/default.aspx.

Counting Hispanic National Origin Groups

The Census has done an excellent job of counting Hispanics, but in 2000 it performed poorly in identifying their origin. In previous years, a single "Hispanic question" on the census served reasonably well to distinguish Hispanics from different national origins. In 1990 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 or 2010 census. The result is a severe underestimate of the numbers of many specific Hispanic groups in 2000 (Logan 2001, Martin 2002, Suro 2002, Cresce, Schmidley and Ramirez n.d.). States and metropolitan areas where New Latinos are particularly concentrated were 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 was only 273,000. In Miami the census counted 74,000 Nicaraguans in 1990, but only 69,000 in 2000. It is implausible that these groups actually decreased in this period of intensified immigration. Nevertheless the Census Bureau continues to report these underestimates for 2000 without correction (Ennis, Rios-Vargas, and Albert 2011).

For this reason we have used tract level data from the 2000 Census, but we have reallocated a share of "Other Hispanics" to specific national origin groups. Details of the procedure are documented in the Appendix to this report. This correction shows more accurately the timing of growth trends. Relying on the Census Bureau's unadjusted numbers for 2000 would lead analysts to **under-report** growth for major sources of Hispanic immigration in the 1990s and then to **overstate** their growth in the last decade.

Table 1 provides a detailed breakdown of the Hispanic population at the national level (not including residents of Puerto Rico) in 1990, 2000, and 2010. These data are based on the decennial census's Hispanic origin question, and people are classified based on the self-report of the person who filled out the census questionnaire.

Table 1. Estimates of the Hispanic Population in the United States: 1990-2010

	1990	2000[a]	2010	Growth 1990-2010
Hispanic total	21,900,089	35,305,818	50,477,594	130%
Mexican	13,393,208	22,487,828	31,798,258	137%
Puerto Rican	2,651,815	3,710,994	4,623,716	74%
Cuban	1,053,197	1,352,802	1,785,547	70%
New Latino groups	2,879,583	5,000,340	8,182,417	184%
Dominican	520,151	1,005,135	1,414,703	172%
Central American	1,323,830	2,216,629	3,998,280	202%
Guatemalan	268,779	489,447	1,044,209	289%
Honduran	131,066	285,885	633,401	383%
Nicaraguan	202,658	233,476	348,202	72%
Panamanian	92,013	120,524	165,456	80%
Salvadoran	565,081	860,885	1,648,968	192%
Other Central American	64,233	226,413	158,044	146%
South American	1,035,602	1,778,576	2,769,434	167%
Colombian	378,726	618,477	908,734	140%
Ecuadorian	191,198	342,374	564,631	195%
Peruvian	175,035	307,378	531,358	204%
Other South American	290,643	510,346	764,711	163%
Other Hispanic	1,922,286	2,753,854	4,087,656	113%

[a] Based on allocation of "other Hispanic" persons

The table shows:

- Self-identified Mexicans have been and continue to be by far the largest Hispanic group, nearly two-thirds of the total and still growing. There were over 13 million Mexicans in 1990, jumping to over 22 million in 2000 and nearly 32 million in 2010. Mexican growth (up 137% in these two decades) mirrors that of the Hispanic population overall (up 131%).

- Puerto Ricans and Cubans remain the next largest Hispanic groups, but their expansion has been at a lesser pace (up about 70%), and they are slowly dropping their relative share of the total.

- In contrast, the groups that we refer to as the New Latinos – Dominicans, Central and South Americans – are growing even faster than Mexicans. They numbered under 3 million in 1990, 5 million in 2000 and now over 8 million. This represents a growth rate of 184% since 1990. Central Americans taken together are nearly half of New Latinos, and their number has more than tripled since 1990.

- The largest of New Latino groups have over 1 million members each: Salvadorans (1.6 million), Dominicans (1.4 million), and Guatemalans (1.0 million). And there are close to a million Colombians. The sheer size of these national origin groups makes it important to understand each of them in its own right.

The Ladder of Success

Another reason to distinguish among Hispanic groups is that they have different social and economic backgrounds, some better prepared for the U.S. labor market (almost on a par with the average non-Hispanic white) and others much less successful. Our best information about their backgrounds is from the Current Population Survey (CPS). To maximize the size of the sample on which they are based, we rely on pooled estimates from the CPS conducted in March 2008 and 2010 reported in Table 2.

The share of recent arrivals is much lower in 2010 than was the case in 2000 (compare to Logan 2001). The share of Mexican immigrants who arrived in the last decade is now 36.2% compared to 49.3% in 2000. Among Dominicans the share of new arrivals has fallen from 45.3% to 31.6%, for Central Americans from 48.2% to 39.6%, and for South Americans from 44.4% to 40.9%. This is a clear reflection of a moderation of immigration in the last ten years that could be due both to changes in border security or immigration policy and to the recessions that the nation experienced in the early and later parts of the decade.

Puerto Ricans are considered by definition born in the United States but about a third were born in Puerto Rico and later migrated to the mainland. Similarly, only about a third of Mexican Americans (38%) were born abroad. The majority of Cubans are foreign-born (62%), though relatively few of those entered the country in the last ten years (28%). They mainly represent a pre-1990 immigration stream. All of the New Latino groups are like Cubans in having a majority foreign-born. An important observation about Nicaraguans and Panamanians is that very few of their foreign-born members immigrated in the last decade; it was in the 1980s and 1990s that the largest share of them came to the U.S., many in response to political turmoil in their home countries. In contrast, over three-fourths of Venezuelans are foreign-born, and over 60% of them arrived since 2000.

Mexicans are the least educated of the older Hispanic groups, with an average education of only 10.5 years, they have relatively low incomes and high poverty. Cubans in the United States have always been regarded as economically successful, though Table 2 shows that they fall considerably behind non-Hispanic whites in wages and have a much higher poverty rate and somewhat higher unemployment rate. In the 2008-2010 pooled sample, using 2010 dollars, the mean annual wages of employed Cubans were $30,000, well above the Hispanic average of $22,000; 16% were below the poverty level, compared to 23.6% for all Hispanics; and only 7.9% were unemployed, compared to 10.4% for all Hispanics.

Table 2. Social and Economic Characteristics of Hispanics, by National Origin (2008-2010)

	% Foreign born	% Recent arrivals[a]	% High school[b]	% BA[b]	Mean years of school[b]	Annual wages[c]	% Below poverty	Unemployment rate
All Hispanics	41.7	35.4	49.0	13.6	11.1	$22,000	23.6	10.4
Mexican	37.5	36.2	46.4	9.9	10.5	$20,200	25.5	10.8
Puerto Rican[d]	33.7	24.0	59.0	16.6	12.2	$29,000	23.7	12.7
Cuban	62.1	28.3	53.6	27.1	12.7	$30,000	16.0	7.9
Dominican Republic	62.0	31.6	50.8	16.9	11.6	$23,558	26.5	11.0
Central American	68.0	39.6	42.5	10.9	10.2	$20,000	21.8	9.2
El Salvador	66.8	32.5	41.7	9.2	10.0	$20,000	17.3	8.9
Guatemala	68.6	49.8	34.3	8.1	9.1	$17,170	29.8	9.3
Honduras	73.8	54.3	38.9	10.4	9.8	$18,180	24.1	9.4
Nicaragua	61.6	17.9	62.1	16.8	12.3	$21,008	13.6	12.0
Panama	61.8	17.8	65.4	24.5	13.3	$25,000	27.5	8.2
South American	71.0	40.9	53.5	31.6	13.2	$25,250	11.8	8.5
Argentina	75.3	39.1	55.6	36.5	13.8	$30,300	13.7	7.1
Colombia	68.7	39.1	50.5	34.9	13.4	$25,250	10.2	8.7
Ecuador	69.0	40.4	52.4	20.2	12.1	$24,000	15.1	10.7
Peru	73.8	39.6	62.1	28.7	13.4	$24,000	8.1	6.4
Venezuela	76.1	61.2	49.1	48.0	14.6	$30,300	17.9	8.0

Source: Pooled estimates from Current Population Survey, March 2008 and March 2010.

Groups with at least 200 CPS observations are separately tabulated

[a] Last 10 years, among immigrants

[b] Persons 25 and older

[c] Median, among those currently employed

d Foreign born and year of arrival refer to migration from Puerto Rico

Puerto Ricans have higher education levels and higher incomes than Mexicans. The New Latino groups are divided in their class position. All of the South American groups have higher incomes than the Hispanic average, especially Argentineans and Venezuelans. Their poverty rates are mostly lower even than Cubans, and their rates of unemployment are generally comparable to those of Cubans. Dominicans and Central Americans generally are doing much worse, quite similar to the Mexican experience. Median wages for Guatemalans are especially low and their poverty share is very high, despite a moderate rate of unemployment. These low-earning New Latinos mostly have lower unemployment rates than Mexicans and Puerto Ricans, possibly because a majority of them were born abroad and they have fewer alternatives to low-wage work.

Thus, a wide 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.

Regional variation

The Hispanic population is still highly concentrated in certain regions of the country, with different patterns for different national origin groups. Yet the general trend over time is that while groups continue to grow in their early centers of concentration, they are also spreading to new areas. Table 3 provides the population counts for the top five metropolitan regions (using constant 2010 metro boundaries) for each group, as well as the share of the national total in each one.

Not surprisingly Mexicans are highly concentrated in California and the Southwest (over 5 million in the LA-Orange County area of California, over 1.5 million in Houston, and over a million in Phoenix). Less well known, Chicago is the metropolitan region with the 4th highest number of Mexican residents (1.3 million). Note, however, that although the number of Mexicans in Los Angeles-Long Beach continues to grow, its share of the national total has dropped from 18.8% to 11.0%. Other metros in the top five have gained slightly, but over 70% of Mexicans are now spread into other parts of the country.

Puerto Ricans have historically been found mainly in the New York metropolitan region, but they, too, are tending to disperse to other areas. The New York metro had over a million Puerto Rican residents already in 1990, but the number has actually declined to about 900,000 in 2010. This is still more than 20% of the national total, but there has been considerable growth in many other places, not only in the Northeast (such as Hartford, which developed a large Puerto Rican population in the 1980s). Orlando and Tampa-St. Petersburg are among the top five metros, increasing from less than 100,000 (combined) in 1990 to over 400,000 (combined) in 2010. Chicago and Philadelphia are the other large Puerto Rican centers, though their Puerto Rican populations have been growing less dramatically.

Cubans continue to be very highly concentrated in Florida, especially Miami (with about 850,000 Cubans, nearly half the national total). The other main historical Cuban center of population is New York, where their numbers have actually fallen (from about 120,000 in 1990 to about 90,000 in 2010). Between them, these two metros accounted for 65% of Cubans in the U.S., and that has dropped to 53%. The largest gainers have been in other Florida metros: Fort Lauderdale, Tampa-St. Petersburg, and West Palm Beach.

Dominicans are another example of early concentration around a single major pole, in this case New York. The New York metro was home to nearly three quarters of the country's Dominican population in 1990 (close to 400,000). The number has increased to over 700,000, but New York now barely accounts for half of Dominicans. The other four top metros for Dominicans are only in the 30,000-60,000 range, though they are increasing quickly in metros not well known for large numbers of immigrants. Aside from Miami, these are suburban areas outside of Boston (Peabody MA) and New York (Nassau-Suffolk NY) and the Providence-New Bedford-Fall River metro in RI and MA.

Table 3. Top 5 metros for each Hispanic national origin group, 1990-2010

	1990		2000		2010	
Mexican total	**13,393,208**		**22,488,909**		**31,798,258**	
Los Angeles-Long Beach	2,519,153	18.8%	3,314,970	14.7%	3,510,677	11.0%
Houston	626,059	4.7%	1,065,805	4.7%	1,579,983	5.0%
Riverside-San Bernardino	587,541	4.4%	1,081,801	4.8%	1,713,658	5.4%
Chicago	544,096	4.1%	1,031,855	4.6%	1,342,897	4.2%
Phoenix	338,334	2.5%	723,606	3.2%	1,068,227	3.4%
Rest of U.S.	8,778,025	65.5%	15,270,872	67.9%	22,582,816	71.0%
Puerto Rican total	**2,651,815**		**3,711,172**		**4,623,716**	
New York	1,002,908	37.8%	1,021,348	27.5%	906,006	19.6%
Chicago	137,750	5.2%	152,202	4.1%	161,812	3.5%
Philadelphia	78,969	3.0%	115,634	3.1%	154,948	3.4%
Orlando	52,298	2.0%	148,459	4.0%	269,781	5.8%
Tampa-St. Petersburg	33,736	1.3%	85,391	2.3%	143,886	3.1%
Rest of U.S.	1,346,154	50.8%	2,188,138	59.0%	2,987,283	64.6%
Cuban total	**1,053,197**		**1,352,867**		**1,785,547**	
Miami-Miami Beach	561868	53.3%	691,479	51.1%	856,007	47.9%
New York	118,507	11.3%	100,582	7.4%	92,475	5.2%
Tampa-St. Petersburg	33,933	3.2%	48,210	3.6%	81,542	4.6%
Fort Lauderdale	24,578	2.3%	55,341	4.1%	83,713	4.7%
West Palm Beach	17,315	1.6%	27,288	2.0%	43,038	2.4%
Rest of U.S.	296,996	28.2%	429,967	31.8%	628,772	35.2%
Dominican total	**520,151**		**1,005,276**		**1,414,703**	
New York	377,517	72.6%	614,473	61.1%	726,118	51.3%
Miami-Miami Beach	23,475	4.5%	46,953	4.7%	57,999	4.1%
Peabody, MA	18,147	3.5%	35,004	3.5%	53,520	3.8%
Nassau-Suffolk	10,202	2.0%	27,510	2.7%	41,967	3.0%
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River	9,664	1.9%	23,825	2.4%	36,931	2.6%
Rest of U.S.	81,146	15.6%	257,511	25.6%	498,168	35.2%
Central American total	**1,323,830**		**2,216,939**		**3,998,280**	
Los Angeles-Long Beach	453,032	34.2%	527,303	23.8%	675,832	16.9%
New York	130,621	9.9%	183,909	8.3%	244,796	6.1%
Miami-Miami Beach	119,534	9.0%	163,178	7.4%	212,542	5.3%
Washington	59,431	4.5%	137,726	6.2%	260,068	6.5%
Houston	59,042	4.5%	110,304	5.0%	249,537	6.2%
Rest of U.S.	502,170	37.9%	1,094,519	49.4%	2,355,505	58.9%
South American total	**1,035,602**		**1,778,825**		**2,769,434**	
New York	311,486	30.1%	457,805	25.7%	551,650	19.9%
Miami-Miami Beach	108,498	10.5%	196,575	11.1%	273,542	9.9%
Los Angeles-Long Beach	95,387	9.2%	102,399	5.8%	118,776	4.3%
Newark	37,817	3.7%	74,633	4.2%	111,077	4.0%
Fort Lauderdale	25,110	2.4%	83,523	4.7%	146,063	5.3%
Rest of U.S.	457,304	44.2%	863,890	48.6%	1,568,326	56.6%

The fast-growing Central American population is found in several growth poles around the country. The largest is Los Angeles, with 675,000 Central Americans. Washington, DC, Houston, New York, and Miami all have over 200,000 Central Americans, up fourfold in the first two of these metros and doubling since 1990 in the latter two. Yet this is another example of regional dispersion over time. LA, NY and Miami accounted for 53% of Central Americans in 1990, but now only 28%.

Finally, South Americans are concentrated on the East and West Coast. The major center is New York (with over 550,000 and more than 100,000 in nearby Newark, NJ). Miami and Fort Lauderdale are the next largest center s(over 400,000 combined), and Los Angeles is the other in the top five. Again there has been a dispersion from LA, NY and Miami, which together counted 50% of South Americans in 1990 but only 34% in 2010.

Another way to think about regional concentrations is to ask how the composition of the Hispanic population is changing over time in a given locale. At a national level the predominance of Mexicans is so great that the shift in composition toward other groups is relatively modest. But we find that it is more dramatic in some major destinations.

There are six metropolitan regions with more than 1.5 million Hispanic residents in 2010. In order of size these are Los Angeles-Long Beach, New York, Houston, Riverside-San Bernardino, Chicago, and Miami-Miami Beach. In the two located in Southern California there has been little compositional change over time. Mexicans were 80% of Hispanics in Los Angeles-Long Beach in 1990 and 92% in Riverside-San Bernardino in 1990, and their shares remain the same in 2010. Central Americans were already a major factor in LA in 1990 but the Central American share has only increased one percentage point since then.

In the other four major Hispanic centers there are some larger shifts (see Appendix Table 1 for details):

- New York's Puerto Rican population was 50% in 1990, and it has dropped to 31%. There has been growth among several other groups. Mexicans are a new group here, and their share has jumped from 4% to 15%. Dominicans, Central Americans, and South Americans have also increased their relative presence.

- Houston was and still is predominantly Mexican, but the Mexican share has declined from 86% to 81%, and the main growth has been among Central Americans, especially Salvadorans (from 8% to 13%).

- Chicago's Hispanic population has historically been mostly Mexican, and in fact the Mexican share here has grown even larger, from 72% to 82%. The counterpoint has been a sharply declining Puerto Rican share of the same magnitude.

- Finally Miami's Hispanic population has historically been predominantly Cuban. Cubans still have a majority but their share has declined from 62% to 55%, while the principal gain has been among South Americans, from 12% to 18%.

Residential integration and separation

Hispanics constitute the nation's largest minority group, and a crucial measure of their incorporation into mainstream society is their residential segregation from other groups. It has been reported (Logan and Stults 2011) that Hispanics in metropolitan areas experience a level of segregation from non-Hispanic whites, as measured by the Index of Dissimilarity, that is intermediate between that of blacks (whose segregation is about 11 points higher) and Asians (about 8 points lower). Perhaps more important, there was almost no change in Hispanic segregation from non-Hispanic whites in the last thirty years. (For convenience we will refer below to non-Hispanic whites simply as "whites.") But that seeming stability masks important differences, because every group except Mexicans has become less segregated since 1990.

We examine here the levels and trends in segregation for every Hispanic national origin group separately, and we find a very different picture. The national averages fit well with the experience of Mexicans, but not other groups. Table 4 presents three segregation measures at the level of metropolitan regions. We used constant definitions of metros for the three time points, and the figures are weighted averages for metros across the country, counting those with larger numbers of a given group more heavily.[1]

Table 4. Segregation of Hispanics: National Metropolitan Averages for 1990, 2000, and 2010									
	D from whites			Exposure to whites			Exposure to Hispanics		
	1990	2000	2010	1990	2000	2010	1990	2000	2010
Hispanic total	50.6	50.8	48.5	42.1	37.0	35.1	42.2	45.0	46.0
Mexican	51.6	51.6	50.1	40.6	35.8	33.4	46.5	48.5	50.1
Puerto Rican	64.9	55.9	50.8	42.4	42.7	42.8	33.1	31.3	31.7
Cuban	60.1	48.9	48.0	38.2	34.8	31.6	51.2	52.2	54.1
Dominican	80.3	74.2	69.5	25.8	24.1	26.2	48.9	48.8	46.5
Central American	66.2	59.8	58.5	36.0	34.0	32.2	41.0	41.0	42.3
South American	53.3	45.3	42.5	55.4	48.4	44.8	27.4	30.9	33.4

---

[1] This weighting reduces the problem of unreliability in indices for metropolitan regions with few group members. The 1990 Census reported counts for only for a one-in-six sample of persons for Dominicans, Central Americans, and South Americans, raising the likelihood of sampling error at the tract level. Concern with sample sizes is also the reason that we combine the Central and South American groups into larger regional categories instead of making national-level calculations for each separate national origin. However, persons interested in specific cases – such as Salvadorans and Guatemalans in Los Angeles-Long Beach – can download this information from the US2010 web page.

1. Index of Dissimilarity

The Index of Dissimilarity (D) is the most widely used summary measure. It compares the distribution of two groups across census tracts and calculates how much one group is over- or under-represented in tracts in relation to the presence of the other group. It ranges between values of 0 (when there is no difference) to 100 (when there is no overlap at all between where two groups live). Table 4 shows that the values of D increased very slightly from 1990 to 2000 and then dropped slightly in 2010. We interpret this as very persistent segregation at a moderate to high level.

The values of D for Mexican mirror this finding nearly exactly (D=51.6 in 1990 and 50.1 in 2010). This is not surprising, since Mexicans are such a large share of the Hispanic population. Whatever pattern is found for Mexicans will necessarily greatly influence the overall Hispanic pattern.

Looking at other groups, there are two outstanding features. First, segregation in 1990 was higher for every one of these groups than it was for Mexicans, barely higher for Central Americans but much higher for Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and Dominicans. Second, while the average value of D did not change for Mexicans, it declined substantially for other groups. There were large declines between 1990 and 2000 for all of them, and a smaller continuing decline in the last decade. By this measure, the overall statement that Hispanic segregation is unchanging – while accurate – is misleading. A more complete conclusion is that Mexican segregation from whites is persistent, but that other groups are experiencing much more integration with whites.

This increasing integration of non-Mexican Hispanics with whites has several sources. Inspecting trends for specific metropolitan regions we find that one source is a decline in segregation in those regions where the group has been most highly concentrated and where, typically, they were historically most segregated. For example, there was a 5-7 point decline in D for Puerto Ricans and Dominicans in New York. A second and more substantial cause was the shift of these groups toward newer destinations, areas where segregation was already somewhat lower and declining faster.

2. Exposure to non-Hispanic whites and to Hispanics

Declining segregation as measured by D did not necessarily mean living in neighborhoods with larger shares of whites or lesser shares of fellow Hispanics. The exposure indices in Table 4 show that exposure to whites (the % white in the census tract where the average group member lived) was declining or stable in this period. The white share in the average Mexican's neighborhood dropped from 40.6% to 33.4%, it dropped 6-7 points for Cubans and 11 points for South Americans. For Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, and Central Americans it stayed about the same.

At the same time living in neighborhoods with other Hispanics (which social scientists refer to a "isolation") tended to rise: up 4 points to above 50% for Mexicans. There was very slight decline in isolation for Dominicans and Puerto Ricans, slight rises for Cubans and Central Americans, and a more substantial increase for South Americans.

One source of increasing isolation is the growing share of Hispanics in the nation and especially in areas with already large Hispanic communities. A source of greater exposure to whites is inter-regional migration to areas with less Hispanics, and another is movement to suburbs where the population mix generally includes a larger white population. We have not measured the importance of these sources here.

Neighborhood quality

A final indicator of minority groups' residential position in U.S. society is the quality of the neighborhoods in which they live. Logan (2012) pointed out that the most recent neighborhood data (from the 5-year pooled census tract reports of the American Community Survey, the source that we also use here for 2006-2010) show a continuing large disparity between whites on the one hand and blacks and Hispanics on the other in the characteristics of the neighborhoods where they live. Even minorities with much higher incomes than the average American live in neighborhoods that are poorer, have fewer college graduates, fewer homeowners, and more unemployed than do whites with below-average incomes.

Here our focus is on differences between the Hispanic groups. Table 5 reports calculations about the average characteristics of the census tracts where the average group member lived in 1990, 2000, and 2010. **These are not characteristics of Hispanics in these neighborhoods, but rather the average for all residents.** Comparable data are also provided for neighborhoods where the average non-Hispanic white person lived.

Table 5. Neighborhood characteristics of the average group member,						
expressed as a ratio to the non-Hispanic white value						
	Median Household Income[b]			Percent College Educated		
	1990	**2000**	**2010[a]**	**1990**	**2000**	**2010[a]**
Non-Hispanic whites	$63,951	$68,213	$65,460	23.6%	28.7%	32.9%
Hispanic total	0.776	0.755	0.775	0.627	0.596	0.638
Mexicans	0.757	0.743	0.753	0.551	0.533	0.565
Puerto Ricans	0.716	0.730	0.765	0.602	0.641	0.705
Cubans	0.838	0.827	0.830	0.771	0.784	0.821
Dominicans	0.655	0.644	0.683	0.564	0.564	0.653
Central Americans	0.798	0.781	0.803	0.733	0.693	0.693
South Americans	0.966	0.928	0.961	1.008	0.969	0.988
[a] Based on ACS 2006-2010 5-year estimates						
[b] Constant 2010 dollars						

One way to evaluate Table 5 is to ask which Hispanic groups live in better or worse neighborhoods. South Americans and Cubans tend to live in the higher income and better educated neighborhoods. In fact, South Americans in all years lived in neighborhoods where the average income level was close to the neighborhoods of non-Hispanic whites and education levels nearly the same. Dominicans live in the poorest neighborhoods (only about two-thirds the income level of whites), and Mexicans live in the least neighborhoods with lowest educated neighbors (less than 60% of the level for whites). Puerto Ricans and Central Americans have an intermediate position.

Another question is how neighborhood quality has changed. With respect to the income levels of neighbors, the answer is very little for the average Hispanic. There has been some improvement for Dominicans and especially for Puerto Ricans relative to whites. For both groups we suspect that the exodus from central city neighborhoods of New York is a contributor. With respect to college education, there ahs been more improvement for Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and Dominicans. For the average Hispanic, however, there has been no change relative to whites. Perhaps the most positive sign is that as education levels in whites' neighborhoods have risen substantially over time (from 23.6% to 32.9% of neighbors with college education), most Hispanic groups have managed not to fall further behind.

Not Just Mexicans

The scale of immigration from non-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 somewhere. Cubans are still above half of the Hispanic total in Miami. They strongly shape the Hispanic community (and its ethnic economy and politics) there, as do Mexicans in Houston and Los Angeles and Puerto Ricans and Dominicans in New York. 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.

Despite this commonality, 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.

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, a situation that may be associated in part with their larger share of dark-skinned members who self-identify as black and with their particular history of incorporation into

New York City. Central Americans are predominantly from rural origins, and many are refugees from war zones.

Except for South Americans the neighborhoods where Hispanics live remain much less advantaged than those of whites, and little progress is being made on that front. But there is one important positive sign here: the increasing residential integration with whites of every Hispanic national origin group except Mexicans. This is a phenomenon that has been submerged by analyses of Hispanics as a single large category, and recognizing it is an important payoff from looking more closely at Hispanics' diverse origins.

References

Cresce, Arthur R., Audrey Dianne Schmidley and Roberto R. Ramirez. n.d. "Identification of Hispanic Ethnicity in Census 2000: Analysis of Data Quality for the Question on Hispanic Origin" Working Paper 75, Population Division, Bureau of the Census. Downloaded from http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0075/twps0075.pdf.

Ennis, Sharon R., Merarys Ríos-Vargas, and Nora G. Albert. 2011. Census Briefs 2010 – The Hispanic Population: 2010. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census.

Logan, John R. 2001. "The New Latinos: Who They Are, Where They Are" Albany: Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research. Downloaded from http://www.s4.brown.edu/cen2000/HispanicPop/HspReport/MumfordReport.pdf.

Logan, John R. 2011. Separate and Unequal: The Neighborhood Gap for Blacks, Hispanics and Asians in Metropolitan America. Brown University: US 2010 Project Report. Downloaded from: http://www.s4.brown.edu/us2010/Data/Report/report0727.pdf.

Martin, Elizabeth. 2002. Questionnaire Effects on Reporting of Race and Hispanic Origin: Results of a Replication of the 1990 Mail Short Form in Census 2000" Wassington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census.   Downloaded from http://www.census.gov/pred/www/rpts/AQE%20R&HO%20Final%20Report.pdf.

Suro, Roberto. 2002. "Counting the 'Other Hispanics'" Report by the Pew Hispanic Center. Downloaded from http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/8.pdf.

Appendix: Estimates of Hispanic-Origin Populations in 2000

> **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.

Our procedure uses the Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) from 2000 as a 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. However we accept the Census numbers for each group in 1990 and 2010.

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.

The Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) from the 2000 census provides individual-level information for a large national sample on Hispanic origin, country of birth, and ancestry. In the PUMS sample, 16.1% 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 7.8%. For some specific states, however, we can do better, reducing Other Hispanics to less than 5% of Hispanics in California and Illinois. These analyses allow us to set a target in every census tract in the nation for the share of "Other Hispanics" in the Hispanic population. For tracts in states with more than 100,000 Hispanics, we calculate the target from data for the state itself. For the 20 states with less than 100,000 Hispanics, we apply the national target of 7.8%.

We then turn to the figures from the 2000 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.

For example, suppose a census tract has 1000 Hispanics, of whom 15% (150) are "Other Hispanic" in the 2000 Census. Suppose our target based on PUMS analyses is 5%. This means we have 100 "excess Other Hispanics" to allocate to specific national origins. Suppose the identified Hispanics

are half Salvadoran and half Dominican. Then we would add 50 to the Salvadoran count and 50 to the Dominican count.

The PUMS analyses revealed that Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans were less likely than other groups to be wrongly classified as "Other Hispanic." This is likely because the instructions with the Hispanic question mentioned them by name. For this reason, we don't allocate Other Hispanics to these three groups in the same way as we do to the New Latino groups. Rather we apply a weighting factor of .285 to their tract populations. Substantively this weight means we are estimating that members of the New Latino groups were 3.5 times more likely to fail to indicate their origin. This weighting procedure is calibrated to yield national totals that are consistent with other sources.

Appendix Table 1. Changing distribution of Hispanics in four major metropolitan regions[a]

		New York	% of Hispanics	Houston	% of Hispanics	Chicago	% of Hispanics	Miami-Miami Beach	% of Hispanics
Hispanic total	**1990**	2,167,211		763,147		782,941		949,668	
	2000	2,819,828		1,353,477		1,323,868		1,291,737	
	2010	3,202,363		2,099,412		1,698,365		1,623,859	
Mexican	**1990**	75,218	3.7%	626,059	86.0%	544,096	72.1%	23,185	2.6%
	2000	269,607	10.2%	1,065,805	85.8%	1,031,855	80.3%	40,414	3.3%
	2010	433,250	14.7%	1,579,983	80.9%	1,342,897	81.7%	51,736	3.4%
Puerto Ricans	**1990**	1,002,908	49.7%	10,856	1.5%	137,750	18.3%	68,610	7.6%
	2000	1,021,348	38.6%	17,224	1.4%	152,202	11.8%	86,736	7.1%
	2010	906,006	30.7%	29,440	1.5%	161,812	9.8%	92,358	6.0%
Cubans	**1990**	118,507	5.9%	8,933	1.2%	16,207	2.1%	561,868	62.1%
	2000	100,582	3.8%	11,161	0.9%	16,874	1.3%	691,479	56.4%
	2010	92,475	3.1%	19,130	1.0%	18,521	1.1%	856,007	55.4%
Dominicans	**1990**	377,517	18.7%	1,050	0.1%	1,848	0.2%	23,475	2.6%
	2000	614,473	23.2%	2,287	0.2%	2,980	0.2%	46,953	3.8%
	2010	726,118	24.6%	4,968	0.3%	4,677	0.3%	57,999	3.8%
Central Americans	**1990**	130,621	6.5%	59,042	8.1%	27,216	3.6%	119,534	13.2%
	2000	183,909	6.9%	110,304	8.9%	39,744	3.1%	163,178	13.3%
	2010	244,796	8.3%	249,537	12.8%	56,541	3.4%	212,542	13.8%
South Americans	**1990**	311,486	15.4%	22,212	3.1%	27,351	3.6%	108,498	12.0%
	2000	457,805	17.3%	35,733	2.9%	41,187	3.2%	196,575	16.0%
	2010	551,650	18.7%	68,766	3.5%	59,151	3.6%	273,542	17.7%
Other Hispanics	**1990**	150,954		34,995		28,473		44,498	
	2000	172,105		110,963		39,027		66,402	
	2010	248,068		147,588		54,766		79,675	

[a] Percentages are based on the total Hispanics with an identified national origin