

Public Policy Institute *of* California

# A Portrait of Race and Ethnicity in California

*An Assessment of Social and  
Economic Well-Being*

Belinda I. Reyes, Editor

Jennifer Cheng, Elliot Currie, Daniel Frakes, Hans P. Johnson,  
Elizabeth Bronwen Macro, Deborah Reed, Belinda I. Reyes,  
José Signoret, and Joanne Spetz, contributors



The Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) is a private operating foundation established in 1994 with an endowment from William R. Hewlett. The Institute is dedicated to improving public policy in California through independent, objective, nonpartisan research.

PPIC's research agenda focuses on three program areas: population, economy, and governance and public finance. Studies within these programs are examining the underlying forces shaping California's future, cutting across a wide range of public policy concerns, including education, health care, immigration, income distribution, welfare, urban growth, and state and local finance.

PPIC was created because three concerned citizens—William R. Hewlett, Roger W. Heyns, and Arjay Miller—recognized the need for linking objective research to the realities of California public policy. Their goal was to help the state's leaders better understand the intricacies and implications of contemporary issues and make informed public policy decisions when confronted with challenges in the future.

David W. Lyon is founding President and Chief Executive Officer of PPIC. Raymond L. Watson is Chairman of the Board of Directors.

**PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA**  
500 Washington Street, Suite 800  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Telephone: (415) 291-4400  
Fax: (415) 291-4401  
Internet: [info@ppic.org](mailto:info@ppic.org)  
[www.ppic.org](http://www.ppic.org)

# **A Portrait of Race and Ethnicity in California** *An Assessment of Social and Economic Well-Being*

---

Belinda I. Reyes, Editor

Public Policy Institute *of* California

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A portrait of race and ethnicity in California : an assessment of social and economic well-being / Belinda I. Reyes, editor ; Jennifer Cheng ... [et al.], contributors.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references (p. ).

ISBN 1-58213-054-X

1. California—Race relations—Statistics. 2. California—Ethnic relations—Statistics. 3. Minorities—California—Social conditions—Statistics. 4. Minorities—California—Economic conditions—Statistics.  
I. Reyes, Belinda I., 1965– II. Cheng, Jennifer, 1975– III. Public Policy Institute of California.

F870.A1 P67 2001  
305.8'009794—dc21

00-055372

Copyright © 2001 by Public Policy Institute of California  
All rights reserved  
San Francisco, CA

Short sections of text, not to exceed three paragraphs, may be quoted without written permission provided that full attribution is given to the source and the above copyright notice is included.

Research publications reflect the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the staff, officers, or Board of Directors of the Public Policy Institute of California.

# List of Contributors

**Jennifer Cheng**, Educational Outcomes and Labor Market Outcomes  
Berkeley Policy Associates

**Elliot Currie**, Crime and Criminal Justice  
Legal Studies Program, University of California, Berkeley

**Daniel Frakes**, Geographic Distribution  
Berkeley Policy Associates

**Hans P. Johnson**, Demographics  
Public Policy Institute of California

**Elizabeth Bronwen Macro**, Political Participation  
Berkeley Policy Associates

**Deborah Reed**, Educational Outcomes and Labor Market Outcomes  
Public Policy Institute of California

**Belinda I. Reyes**, Geographic Distribution, Economic Outcomes, and Political Participation  
Public Policy Institute of California

**José Signoret**, Political Participation  
Department of Economics, University of California, Berkeley

**Joanne Spetz**, Health Outcomes  
Public Policy Institute of California

# Foreword

In 1999, a team of PPIC research fellows led by Belinda I. Reyes began preparing a demographic portrait of California with special attention to the social and economic well-being of its major racial and ethnic groups. This volume is the result of that effort. It depicts an increasingly diverse California whose residents have experienced broad though uneven progress in health, educational attainment, crime reduction, and political participation. The volume's impressive scope and consistent format allow its readers to follow both the progress of—and persistent inequalities among—California's racial and ethnic groups in these and other areas. Its clear, graphic, and colorful presentation will serve the state's business, policy, media, and scholarly communities equally well.

This volume would not have been possible without the expertise developed by PPIC research fellows over the institution's first six years. Dozens of databases, substantial computer capability, and a good deal of knowledge-sharing were required to compile the data and complete the portrait in less than a year and a half. PPIC's goal has been to replace clichés and caricatures with reliable information about the state's population and policies. This useful reference volume is a notable example of that effort.

David W. Lyon  
President and CEO  
Public Policy Institute of California

# Summary

This book documents differences in socioeconomic status by racial and ethnic groups and explores how patterns have changed over time. The data in this compendium will provide us with a benchmark for evaluating the socioeconomic status of racial and ethnic groups in the future and point us to the most important issues facing them. This book is meant to be a resource for policymakers, the media, and the general public. For the most part, the charts show averages or medians of particular indicators of well-being. A comprehensive examination of the explanations for the trends is beyond the scope of our work.

Using a combination of datasets, we examine the following topics: demographics, geographic distribution, education, health outcomes, labor market outcomes, economic status, crime, and political participation. Each chapter presents key indicators of well-being for the four major racial and ethnic groups: white non-Hispanics, African Americans, Asians, and Hispanics. Where possible, we also present trends and outcomes for major Asian and Hispanic subgroups: Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, Indian Asian, Southeast Asian, Mexican, Cuban/Dominican/Puerto Rican, and Central and South American.

In general, there have been improvements in health, education, crime rates, and political outcomes for all racial and ethnic groups in California over the last 30 years. But disparities between groups have persisted and in some cases even widened. African Americans and Hispanics are especially at a disadvantage along many dimensions, as are Southeast Asians. In the following pages we describe the most important findings in each chapter.

## Demography

Most of California's population growth in the past few decades has occurred among the Hispanic and Asian populations of the state. As recently as 1970, almost 80 percent of the state's residents were white non-Hispanics. By 1998, only 52 percent of the state's residents were white non-Hispanics, Hispanics accounted for 30 percent of the state's population, Asians for 11 percent, and African Americans for 7 percent.

Projections for the future suggest that strong growth among California's Hispanic and Asian populations will continue in the 21st century. The California Department of Finance projects that shortly after the turn of the century, no racial or ethnic group will constitute a majority of the state's population, and that by 2025 Hispanics will represent the largest ethnic group in the state.

## Geographic Distribution

Most counties of the state were predominantly white in 1970. However, between 1970 and 1998, the share of whites declined in all but one county (Sierra County). Whites were over 70 percent of the population of 54 of the 58 counties in 1970. More than 85 percent of the population of the Northern and Mountain counties was white. By 1998, only 28 counties had a population that was over 70 percent white.

A large proportion of the California population resides in the southern part of the state—in Los Angeles or in the rest of Southern California—and in this region whites constituted half or less of the population. All groups became more dispersed in the last 30 years. By 1998, whites were the least geographically concentrated racial and ethnic group and African Americans the most concentrated.

### Education

The main educational finding is that, by and large, Hispanics fare worse than any other group. The low educational attainment of Hispanic adults is not simply a result of recent immigration. U.S.-born Hispanics, particularly those of Mexican descent, have consistently lower high school and college completion rates than do African Americans, Asians, or whites. After Hispanics, African Americans are the next lowest-achieving group. The education gap between African Americans and whites has diminished over the last 30 years, so that high school completion rates of young African Americans are similar to those of whites. However, college completion rates remain much lower for African Americans than for whites.

### Health

In terms of health outcomes, African Americans fare worse than other racial and ethnic groups, both nationally and in California. Hispanics often have less access to health care and lower health status than whites, whereas health indicators for Asians are similar to—and sometimes better than—those for whites. These broad generalizations about the health of Hispanics and Asians do not highlight important differences in the health of different Hispanic and Asian subgroups. Although people of Japanese, Chinese, and Korean ancestry tend to enjoy better health than whites, people of Southeast Asian and Filipino ancestry have comparatively poor health outcomes. Although Mexicans have poorer access to health services such as prenatal care, they have better birth outcomes than other Hispanic groups.

### Labor Market Outcomes

We find that nonwhites, especially Hispanics, tend to have lower earnings than whites. Furthermore, Hispanics and African Americans have particularly high unemployment rates, and their rates of unemployment are more severely affected by economic fluctuations. Low levels of education and recent immigration contribute to low earnings. However, even when we compare U.S.-born workers from different racial and ethnic groups with similar education levels, we find that the median of earnings of white men is higher than the medians for Hispanic, Asian, and African American men.

### Economic Status

Asian and white family incomes are substantially higher than those for African Americans and Hispanics. In 1997, Hispanics had the lowest median family income of any major racial and ethnic group. Not only was their family income lower than other groups, but Hispanics were also the only group that had a greater proportion of people at the bottom 25 percent of the income distribution in 1989 than in 1969.

Lower median income and a greater proportion of the population at the bottom of the income distribution translate into higher poverty rates for Hispanics and African Americans. Also, poverty rates



among African American, white, and Hispanic children were substantially higher in 1997 than in 1970. This is especially true for Hispanic children, for whom poverty rates were 29 percent in 1969 and 40 percent in 1997. Finally, compared to other households, a greater proportion of households headed by an African American received public assistance. However, in the mid-1990s, with the economic recovery and the passage of the welfare reform laws, public assistance use declined for all groups, especially for African Americans. By 1997, welfare use among African American households was half that of 1995.

## Crime

There has been a dramatic shift in the ethnic distribution of those arrested and put behind bars. As in the population as a whole, the proportion of non-Hispanic whites has declined, and the proportion of Hispanic youth and adults behind bars has risen at a faster rate than has the Hispanic proportion of the general population. This shift has transformed the composition of California's correctional system, both for youth and adults. African Americans in California continue to experience the highest risk of arrest and incarceration.

African Americans are also more likely than others to be victims of violence. Along with Hispanics, African Americans are more likely to be killed than whites. They also tend to be killed in different ways and for different reasons. African American and Hispanic homicide victims are more likely to be young and male, to have been killed with a handgun, and to have been killed in a drug- or gang-related incident. White homicide victims tend to be older and more often female than their African American or Hispanic counterparts. They are also more likely to die in the course of a domestic dispute.

## Political Participation

California's story of political participation is complex. Whites are overrepresented in the voting population, and they register and vote at high rates. Although African Americans generally participate at slightly lower rates than whites, their share corresponds with their share of the adult population. They were 7 percent of the adult population in 1996 and 7 percent of the population who voted in that election. But African Americans have made little progress in achieving elected office over the past 20 years, and registration and voting rates declined during the 1990s.

Asians and Hispanics have the lowest participation rates in California. Although a large proportion of both populations are not eligible to vote, this fact alone does not explain their underrepresentation at the polls. Low levels of education coupled with a relatively young voting population may account for the participation rates of Hispanics. However, these same factors do not easily explain the lower rates of Asian participation. Despite these low levels of political participation, Hispanics and Asians have steadily gained in winning elected office over the last two decades.

# Contents

List of Contributors	iii
Foreword	v
Summary	vii
Acknowledgments	xiii
Contacts	xv
<i>Chapter 1</i>	
Introduction	1
<i>Chapter 2</i>	
Demographics	5
<i>Chapter 3</i>	
Geographic Distribution	31
<i>Chapter 4</i>	
Educational Outcomes	47
<i>Chapter 5</i>	
Health Outcomes	71
<i>Chapter 6</i>	
Labor Market Outcomes	91
<i>Chapter 7</i>	
Economic Outcomes	123
<i>Chapter 8</i>	
Crime and Criminal Justice	149
<i>Chapter 9</i>	
Political Participation	167
<i>Chapter 10</i>	
Chart Titles	183
<i>Appendix</i>	
Additional Sources of Information	189
Bibliography	193

# Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Michael Teitz, Joyce Peterson, Kim Rueben, Elias Lopes, Sherry Bebitch Jeffe, and Jon Stiles for their thoughtful reviews of earlier versions of this report. Peter Richardson, Patricia Bedrosian, and Eileen La Russo provided invaluable suggestions on the editing, formatting, and style of this report. I would also like to thank Mai-San Chan and Van Swearingen for their research assistance on this project. Daniel Lawrence provided invaluable help finding books, datasets, and anything else we needed. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the generous and thoughtful contribution of the following authors: Elliot Currie, Daniel Frakes, Jennifer Cheng, Hans P. Johnson, Elizabeth Bronwen Macro, Deborah Reed, José Signoret, and Joanne Spetz. Although this report reflects the contribution of many people, the authors are solely responsible for its contents.

# Contacts

This book is intended as a resource for policymakers, community leaders, and the media. PPIC's research staff can be contacted directly to discuss specific findings or other current public policy issues related to their areas of expertise. Visit the institute's website at [www.ppic.org](http://www.ppic.org) for the most current information about our staff, publications, and projects.

## CHAPTER TOPICS

## RESEARCH CONTACTS

---

### Demographics

**Hans P. Johnson**  
Research Fellow  
(415) 291-4460  
[johnson@ppic.org](mailto:johnson@ppic.org)

---

### Geographic Distribution Economic Outcomes Crime and Criminal Justice

**Belinda I. Reyes, editor**  
Research Fellow  
(415) 291-4492  
[reyes@ppic.org](mailto:reyes@ppic.org)

---

### Educational Outcomes Labor Market Outcomes

**Deborah Reed**  
Program Director and Research Fellow  
(415) 291-4455  
[reed@ppic.org](mailto:reed@ppic.org)

---

### Health Outcomes

**Joanne Spetz**  
Research Fellow  
(415) 291-4418  
[spetz@ppic.org](mailto:spetz@ppic.org)

---

### Political Participation

**Zoltan Hajnal**  
Research Fellow  
(415) 291-4491  
[hajnal@ppic.org](mailto:hajnal@ppic.org)

---

## GENERAL CONTACTS

---

Members of the media and policy community are also encouraged to contact PPIC's public affairs staff for assistance.

**Abby Cook**  
Public Affairs Manager  
(415) 291-4436  
[cook@ppic.org](mailto:cook@ppic.org)

---

**Victoria Pike Bond**  
Public Affairs Associate  
(415) 291-4412  
[bond@ppic.org](mailto:bond@ppic.org)

## Chapter 1

# Introduction

California has one of the most ethnically diverse populations in the world. The current generation of school children is the first in which Hispanics, Asians, African Americans, and mixed-raced children together outnumber whites (California Department of Finance, June 1999). Within the next few years, no racial or ethnic group will constitute a majority of the state's population. This increasing ethnic diversity represents a demographic transformation without historical precedent in the United States. Despite this tremendous demographic change, accurate socioeconomic data about racial and ethnic groups in California are not easily accessible to policymakers. Without such data, it is difficult to understand the important problems facing racial and ethnic groups in the state and how public policy can work to remedy these problems. This book documents differences in socioeconomic status by racial and ethnic groups and explores how patterns have changed over time. In doing so, it points to the most important issues facing these groups and provides us with a benchmark for evaluating their socioeconomic status in the future.

Using a combination of datasets, we look at the following topics as they pertain to race and ethnicity: demographics, geographic distribution, education, health outcomes, labor market outcomes, economic status, crime, and political participation. We selected these topics to present a broad picture of social, political, and economic conditions facing racial and ethnic groups in California. Each chapter presents key indicators of well-being for the four major racial and ethnic groups: white non-Hispanic, African American, Asian, and Hispanic. Where possible, we also present trends and outcomes for major Asian and Hispanic subgroups: Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, Asian Indian, Southeast Asian, Mexican, Cuban/Dominican/Puerto Rican, and Central and South American. Data availability limited the topics we could study and the groups we could consider. This book is therefore best regarded as a starting point for more comprehensive evaluations of race and ethnicity in California.

In general, all racial and ethnic groups in California experienced improvements in health, education, crime rates, and political participation in the last 30 years. But disparities between groups have persisted and in some cases, even widened. African Americans, Hispanics, and Southeast Asians are especially at a disadvantage along many dimensions. Several themes emerge from the data:

- Race and ethnicity continue to be important predictors of well-being in California. On average, whites and Asians enjoy better health, educational, and economic status than African Americans and Hispanics. African Americans and Hispanics have higher crime and victimization rates than Asians and whites. And Asians and Hispanics have lower political participation than African Americans and whites.
- Hispanics have some of the poorest socioeconomic outcomes in California, and by many measures their condition has worsened in the last 30 years. Hispanics have the lowest educational outcomes,

some of the highest levels of victimization, and some of the lowest economic outcomes in California. Family income, weekly earnings, home ownership rates, poverty rates, unemployment rates, and public assistance use are worse only for African Americans. For some of these measures, conditions are worsening. However, most of this deterioration is due to an increasing share of Hispanic immigrants, who typically have low levels of education and earnings, in the Hispanic population. But this increasing share of immigrants cannot alone account for the whole story. Other issues are at play.

- African Americans also have poor socioeconomic well-being, and in many aspects their relative economic status has deteriorated over time. Median weekly earnings for men and home ownership rates were lower and poverty rates higher in recent years compared to past decades. Although there were substantial improvements in education, crime rates, and health outcomes for African Americans in the last 30 years, they still have the poorest crime and health outcomes and the second-lowest educational outcomes of all racial and ethnic groups.
- Asians fare as well as or better than whites in many respects. However, there is a great deal of variation among Asian groups. For instance, the median family income of U.S.-born Asians, Filipino immigrants, and Asian Indian immigrants was higher than that of non-Hispanic whites in 1989, yet the median family income of Southeast Asians was close to that of African Americans. Southeast Asians have the lowest material and physical well-being of all Asian groups. And they have the lowest labor force participation rate, one of the highest levels of unemployment, and the highest rate of poverty of all racial and ethnic groups in California.

### How to Use This Book

This book is meant as a resource for policymakers, the media, and the general public. It documents current and historic differences in well-being across racial and ethnic groups. To do this, we chose the most commonly used measures of well-being and focused on what we believe to be the most important trends and outcomes. We recognized that a comprehensive explanation of these trends and their underlying factors lay beyond the scope of this book. We therefore tried to offer a reasonably complete picture with a limited number of indicators of well-being.

The book is divided into eight chapters: demography, geography, health, education, crime, labor markets, economic status, and political participation. Each chapter starts with a short introduction that discusses the importance of the topic and the key findings. This is followed by a set of charts that present the most important outcomes for racial and ethnic groups in California. Each chart is paired with a description of its most important findings and other related information. A complete list of charts appears at the end of the volume. An appendix presents other sources of information where the reader can find more detailed information on all the topics covered in this book.

### Methodological Issues

Throughout most of this book, we look at the four major racial and ethnic groups in the state using, for

the most part, self-reported racial and ethnic identifications:<sup>1</sup> white non-Hispanics (also referred to as white), African American, Hispanic,<sup>2</sup> and Asian.<sup>3</sup> However, in some chapters, we used other definitions of ethnicity. In the chapter on political participation, for example, the only way to disaggregate party affiliation across counties was to use a surname dictionary. The racial categories in this chapter are therefore not comparable to those in the rest of the book. Some charts in the health and crime chapters use data in which people could select only between white, black, Hispanic, and “other.” We expect that most of the people in the “other” category are Asian, although other groups would also be included in this category. Also, some Hispanics may identify as whites when not given the choice of both a racial category and a Hispanic identifier, which would lead to an undercount of this group. Finally, questions about identity are asked in different ways in different datasets. These differences could also decrease the level of comparability across datasets.<sup>4</sup>

Whenever possible, we disaggregate groups into Asian and Hispanic subgroups. We also examine outcomes for U.S-born and foreign-born Asians and Hispanics. U.S-born Asian groups are Filipino, Chinese, and Japanese. Asian foreign-born groups are Filipino, Chinese, Japanese, Asian Indian, Korean, and Southeast Asian.<sup>5</sup> The Hispanic groups are Mexican, Central and South American,<sup>6</sup> and Caribbean.<sup>7</sup>

We tried to gather information in California for the last 30 years. In some data sources, information is available only for particular years; in others, groups are either missing or the samples are too small to generate reliable results.<sup>8</sup> For the most part, we looked at the full sample of the population for each racial and ethnic group, except when using the decennial Census and the *Current Population Survey*, where we looked only at civilians not living in group quarters (e.g., dormitories, group homes, or prisons).

For ease in presentation, we show trends and averages for the major racial and ethnic groups. We used three-year moving averages to present the trend data. Some charts may show differences in well-being that

---

<sup>1</sup> People of mixed race or ethnicity are classified by their self-reported race and ethnicity, since people were asked to choose one racial group up until the 1990 Census. In the 2000 Census, they were able to choose mixed race.

<sup>2</sup> Hispanics are all the people who identified themselves as Mexican, Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central American, South American, Dominican, and other Hispanic. Filipinos who identified themselves as Hispanic or Spanish are included in the Hispanic category.

<sup>3</sup> In some instances, we included Native Americans, but for the most part they were excluded from the analysis because of data limitations.

<sup>4</sup> For a summary discussion of the effect of question wording on self-identification, see Gey et al., 1993.

<sup>5</sup> Southeast Asians are those who self-identify as Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian, or Hmong.

<sup>6</sup> For the most part, the Central and South American category consists of people from Central America—Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Honduras—or those whose birthplace is these countries.

<sup>7</sup> Caribbeans, unless otherwise specified, are those who self-identify as Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Dominican. Puerto Ricans born on the island were considered foreign-born and those born on the U.S. mainland were considered U.S.-born.


<sup>8</sup> In most of the charts in the crime chapter, we were not able to include Asians, since data were available only for whites, African Americans, Hispanics, and “other.”

may be due only to differences in age across racial and ethnic groups. Hence, we either adjusted the data for age or discussed the effect of age on the outcomes.<sup>9</sup> Age adjustments are specified in the charts.

Because no single dataset provides the breadth of information needed for this report, a combination of data sources was used to generate the charts.

When possible, we examine outcomes for four California regions: the Northern and Mountain counties, the San Francisco Bay Area, the Farm Belt, and Southern California.<sup>10</sup> We chose regions that were contiguous and were either part of the same labor market, such as the Bay Area, or had similar economic profiles, such as the counties of far Northern California. In Chapter 3, we further subdivide the state to gain additional information within regions for different racial and ethnic groups. In that chapter, we examine seven regions—the Northern and Mountain counties, the San Francisco Bay Area, the Valley counties, the Coastal counties, Los Angeles County, Southern California, and the Sacramento metropolitan area.

## 1.1 Four Regions of California



<sup>9</sup> The age distribution for each group was matched to that of the overall California population in 1998, as determined by the California Department of Finance, and is presented in five-year age groups.

<sup>10</sup> The Bay Area comprises Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma Counties. The Farm Belt includes Butte, Colusa, Fresno, Glenn, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, Monterey, Sacramento, San Benito, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Shasta, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Tulare, Trinity, Yolo, and Yuba Counties. Southern counties are Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, and Ventura. The Northern and Mountain counties are the remainder of the counties in the state.



## Chapter 2

# Demographics

The population of California is one of the most diverse and complex anywhere in the world. No other developed region the size of California has sustained such rapid and large population growth over the past several decades. As recently as 1950, California was home to only 10 million people, or about one out of every 15 U.S. residents. By 1990, California's population had tripled to almost 30 million. At the end of the 1990s, one out of every eight U.S. residents is a Californian, and the state's population has reached approximately 34 million. The California Department of Finance projects that by the year 2025, almost 50 million people will reside in California.

The state's population growth and its composition have directly and indirectly engendered numerous public policy debates in areas such as education, housing, political representation, and growth management. The sheer size of the state's population increase has important implications for almost all government services and functions including welfare, education, transportation, and corrections. In addition, large increases in the state's population have important implications for the protection of natural resources, the distribution of water, agriculture, and the location and nature of development. No less important, but perhaps less obvious, is how the changing composition of the state's population will influence the state's economic evolution, its political representation, and its cultural identity or identities.

Most of California's population growth in the past few decades has occurred among Hispanics and Asians (Chart 2.1). As recently as 1970, almost 80 percent of the state's residents were non-Hispanic whites. By 1998, only 52 percent of the state's residents were non-Hispanic whites; Hispanics constituted 30 percent of the state's population, Asians 11 percent, and African Americans 7 percent (Chart 2.2). For almost all Asian and Hispanic subgroups, population growth has been rapid (Charts 2.3 and 2.4).

Projections for the future suggest that strong growth among California's Hispanic and Asian populations will continue into the 21st century (Chart 2.5). The California Department of Finance projects that shortly after the turn of the century, no single racial or ethnic group will constitute a majority of the state's population, and that by the year 2025, Hispanics will be the largest ethnic group in the state (Chart 2.6).<sup>1</sup> In some ways, California's current diversity is a return to the diversity that is more typical of California's demographic history than was the period from 1950 through 1970. By 1998, approximately 25 percent of the state's population was composed of immigrants—a level similar to that seen from the late 1800s to the early 1900s.

To understand this population growth, it is necessary to examine the components of population change (births, deaths, and migration). We look at these factors in the first part of this chapter. Over the

---

<sup>1</sup>The California Department of Finance and the Census Bureau produce population estimates and projections by race and ethnic group, but the California Department of Finance has developed population projections more recently than the Census Bureau.

past few decades, most migrants to California have been Hispanic and Asian (Chart 2.7), reflecting the importance of international migration to the state's population growth. Births to Hispanics and Asians have risen dramatically (Charts 2.8 and 2.9) as the number of women of childbearing age has increased and, especially for Hispanics, as fertility rates have increased (Chart 2.10). By the end of the 1990s, almost half of all births in the state were to Hispanic mothers. In contrast, the vast majority of deaths in California are among whites (Chart 2.11). This reflects the older age structure of whites compared to other groups in the state. Also, life expectancies are longest for Asians and Hispanics (Chart 2.12). Together, these components of change explain the rapid increases in Hispanic and Asian populations in California.<sup>2</sup>

The socioeconomic characteristics of the state's population have also changed. The population lives in larger households and has become more foreign-born, younger, and less likely to live in married-couple families. These changes have important consequences for public policy in the state. In this chapter, we explore these issues by looking at the place of birth, age structure, household size, and family structure of the major racial and ethnic groups in California. In subsequent chapters, we examine in detail changes in the geographic distribution of the population, education, health, labor market, economic status, crime, and political participation.

As noted above, international migration has accounted for much of California's recent population growth (Charts 2.13 and 2.14). In 1990, two of every three Asians in California were foreign-born. Large flows of immigrants to California during the 1970s and 1980s led to an increase in the share of Hispanic immigrants in the population of the state. By 1990, almost half of all Mexicans in California and the vast majority of Central and South Americans in the state were born abroad. On the other hand, the proportion of foreign born among the Caribbean population has been declining. And by 1990, less than half of the Caribbeans in California were foreign-born.

Although the proportion of immigrants has been increasing, many immigrants live in families and households with U.S.-born citizens (Charts 2.15 and 2.16). This is important because some public benefits are based on citizenship status. Most Hispanics, especially noncitizen Mexicans (close to 70 percent of the Mexican population in 1990), live in households with either naturalized citizens or with U.S.-born citizens. A greater proportion of Asian noncitizens than Hispanic noncitizens live with other noncitizens.

The age structure of the state's population is largely determined by the timing and magnitude of past migration flows and birth trends among the state's racial and ethnic groups. The large flows of domestic migrants to California after World War II were primarily composed of whites. Thus, whites have a much older age structure than the other racial and ethnic groups in California. Hispanics, with large numbers of recent immigrants and high birth rates, have the youngest age structure (Charts 2.17 and 2.18). In particular, Asian and Hispanic subgroups are concentrated in working ages (Charts 2.19 and 2.20).

Household size (the number of people per household) and household structure (type of family or household) is determined by age structure, fertility, socioeconomic status, housing costs, and cultural norms. Hispanics and Asians tend to have substantially larger household sizes than African Americans and whites. But household size has been declining for all racial and ethnic groups (Chart 2.21).


---

<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, an increasing share of births in California are to parents of different racial and ethnic groups (see Tafoya, 2000).

Family structure has been found to be correlated with health and educational outcomes for children and is also used to determine eligibility for some social services. Only one in three African Americans in California lived in married-couple families in 1998, whereas the majority of white, Hispanic, and Asian residents of California lived in married-couple households (Chart 2.22).


The 2000 Census will provide a new benchmark for assessing California's population, because Census respondents can check more than one racial or ethnic group. Already of concern is the potential for a large undercount. California had one of the highest undercount rates of any state in 1990, with the undercounts being especially high for African Americans, Hispanics, and children (Chart 2.23). The increasing diversity and complexity of the state's population during the 1990s make an accurate count for the 2000 Census even more difficult and imperative.

## 2.1 California's Population by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1998




- Hispanics and Asians are the fastest growing ethnic groups in California. The Hispanic population grew over fourfold between 1970 and 1998, reaching 10 million by 1998. The Asian population grew over fivefold during this same period.
- The population of whites increased only 11 percent from 1970 to 1998.
- The African American population increased 67 percent from 1970 to 1998. African Americans are now the fourth most populous racial or ethnic group in California after being surpassed by Asians in the mid-1980s.
- California's population is substantially more diverse than that in the rest of the country. One in 11 whites in the United States lives in California, whereas one in three Hispanics and two in five Asians and Pacific Islanders live in California. One in 14 African Americans in the United States lives in California.

## 2.2 California's Population Distribution by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1998




- The white proportion of the state's population has declined substantially. In 1970, three in four Californians were white; by 1998, only one in two Californians was white.
- Hispanic and Asian proportions are increasing rapidly. Hispanics increased from 12 percent of the population in 1970 to 30 percent in 1998. Asians increased from 3 percent of the population in 1970 to 11 percent in 1998.
- African Americans have continued to constitute 7 percent of California's population.
- Only New Mexico (52 percent) and Hawaii (71 percent) have greater proportions of their populations consisting of nonwhites than California (48 percent).

## 2.3 Population of Asian Groups, 1970, 1980, and 1990




- With the exception of the Japanese, population growth for all Asian ethnic groups has been very rapid. Rates of population growth have been much faster than California's overall growth rates.
- Chinese and Filipinos are the most populous Asian groups in California, numbering almost 700,000 in 1990. Both groups more than doubled in size in the 1980s and together constitute more than half of all Asians in the state.
- Southeast Asians have experienced the most rapid growth, more than tripling in number from 1980 to 1990. In the 1980s, Southeast Asians surpassed the Japanese to become the third most populous Asian subgroup.
- In 1990, California was home to half of the nation's Filipinos and Southeast Asians, 40 percent of the nation's Chinese and Japanese, almost one-third of the nation's Koreans, and 20 percent of the nation's Asian Indians. Overall, 12 percent of U.S. residents lived in California in 1990.

## 2.4 Population of Hispanic Groups, 1970, 1980, and 1990



- Mexicans are by far the largest of the Hispanic groups, experiencing strong population growth in the 1970s and 1980s. About 80 percent of Hispanics in California in 1990 were of Mexican descent. The total number of Californians of Mexican descent increased by over four million people from 1970 to 1990, to almost six million.
- Population growth rates have been highest for Hispanics of Central or South American descent. Between 1980 and 1990, their numbers tripled to over 800,000.
- The Caribbean population in California increased 35 percent from 1980 to 1990, somewhat higher than the overall state population increase of 26 percent; just over 200,000 Californians were of Caribbean descent in 1990.
- In 1990, California was home to almost half the U.S. population of Mexican descent and over one-third of the Central and South American population of the United States. Only about one in 20 residents of the United States with Caribbean ancestry lived in California in 1990.

## 2.5 California's Projected Population by Race and Ethnicity, 1990–2040




- Population projections are uncertain. Moreover, concepts and definitions of race and ethnicity change over time. Still, projections are useful in providing a picture of the future, assuming that historic patterns in births, deaths, and migration prevail.
- Asians and Hispanics will experience the greatest population growth. Both groups are expected to more than double in size between 1999 and 2040. Continuing large flows of international immigrants and, for Hispanics, high birth rates are expected to lead to this growth.
- Hispanics will become the largest ethnic group in the state, surpassing whites in the 2020s.
- The white population is expected to experience little change in size, growing only 4 percent between 1999 and 2040.
- The African American population is projected to increase almost 40 percent between 1999 and 2040, somewhat slower than the projected total population increase for the state of 72 percent.




## 2.6 California's Projected Population Distribution by Race and Ethnicity, 1990–2040

Source: California Department of Finance, Race/Ethnic Population with Age and Sex Detail, 1970–2040.



- Shortly after the turn of the century, no racial or ethnic group will make up a majority of California's population.
- By 2040, Hispanics are projected to constitute almost half of all Californians.
- The Asian population is expected to increase from 11 percent of the state's population to 15 percent by 2040.
- The African American population will continue to constitute less than 10 percent of the state's population.


## 2.7 Net Migration by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1996



- Annual net migration is the difference between the number of people who move to California and the number who move out in a given year. It includes both international and domestic migration flows.
- The recession of the early 1990s led to substantial migration out of California to other states. International migration gains offset some of the interstate migration losses.
- Net migration outflows were especially pronounced for whites, reaching a record in 1993. Migration patterns of whites show stronger business cycle effects than for other groups. This is primarily because whites are predominantly interstate migrants and interstate migration is largely determined by economic conditions in California relative to other states.
- Asian migration remained strongly positive even during the recession. During the 1990s, Asians experienced greater net migration than other groups.
- Hispanic migration was strongly positive during the 1970s and 1980s but fell dramatically in the early 1990s. A decline in unauthorized immigration in the early 1990s accounts for some of this fall.

Note: 1970 refers to the period July 1970 through June 1971 (similar for other years).


## 2.8 Births by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1996



- The number of births to Hispanic mothers grew threefold between 1970 and the early 1990s, surpassing whites in 1990. This reflects the large increase in the number of Hispanic women of childbearing age and increasing fertility rates.
- The number of births to white mothers declined substantially in the early 1990s as baby boomers aged out of prime childbearing years and with large migrations out of the state.
- The number of births to Asian mothers increased 11-fold from 1970 to 1996.
- The number of births to African American mothers increased over 50 percent from 1970 to 1989 but has since declined 23 percent.


## 2.9 Distribution of Births by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1996

Sources: California Department of Finance, Race/Ethnic Population Estimates, June 1999 and July 1999.




- In 1970, almost 70 percent of all births were to whites; by 1996, the proportion had declined to 34 percent.
- Almost half of all births in California in 1996 were to Hispanics (48 percent), compared to only 20 percent in 1970.
- The proportion of births to Asians increased from 1 percent of the total in 1970 to 11 percent of the total by 1996.
- The proportion of births to African Americans declined from 9 percent of the total in 1970 to 7 percent of the total in 1996.

## 2.10 Total Fertility Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1998



- The total fertility rate is the average number of children a woman will have in her lifetime (based on current age-specific fertility rates). Replacement-level fertility is 2.1 children per woman.
- Hispanics have substantially higher fertility rates than any other racial and ethnic group. With the increase in fertility during the late 1980s, Hispanics in California have higher fertility rates than those in Mexico (3.3 compared to 2.9).
- Asian fertility rates increased dramatically in the late 1970s and early 1980s, as a result of the arrival of Southeast Asian immigrants who tended to have higher fertility rates than other Asians.
- Total fertility rates for whites have been below the replacement level since the 1970s and are now near the historic lows of the baby bust. High labor force participation and relatively high levels of education are associated with lower fertility levels.
- Total fertility rates for African Americans have declined since the late 1980s and once again are slightly below replacement levels.


## 2.11 Deaths by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1996



- Since mortality rates are much higher for older adults than for people in other age groups, the number of deaths for a racial and ethnic group is determined primarily by the group’s age distribution. Groups with a small proportion of its population age 60 and over would therefore have a lower mortality rate.
- The number of deaths has increased for all groups as the population of older Californians has increased for all groups.
- Most deaths in California are among whites, as whites continue to constitute the vast majority of older Californians.


Note: 1970 refers to the period July 1970 through June 1971 (similar for other years).

## 2.12 Life Expectancy at Birth by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender, 1998



- Life expectancy at birth is the average number of years a newborn infant is expected to live if current age-specific mortality rates remain the same throughout his or her lifetime. It is a broad measure of the health of a population.
- Asians have the longest life expectancies—84 years for females and 79 years for males.
- Hispanics in California have longer life expectancies than whites—a surprising outcome given Hispanics’ relatively low socioeconomic status. Life expectancy for Hispanic females is 83 years and is 76 years for Hispanic males.
- African Americans have substantially lower life expectancies than any other group. African American males have particularly low life expectancies (66 years). The difference between male and female life expectancies for African Americans (eight years) is greater than for any other group. Less access to health care and lower socioeconomic status are associated with lower life expectancies.


## 2.13 Percentage Foreign-Born Among Asian Groups, 1970, 1980, and 1990



- Two of every three Asians in California are foreign-born.
- Reflecting the relatively low levels of recent migration from Japan, the vast majority of Japanese in California are U.S.-born.
- More than three of every four Asian Indians, Koreans, and Southeast Asians are foreign-born. These very high levels reflect the large and recent immigration flows to California from India, Korea, and Southeast Asia.



## 2.14 Percentage Foreign-Born Among Hispanic Groups, 1970, 1980, and 1990



- The share of Caribbean people in California who are foreign-born has been declining. By 1990, less than half were foreign-born.
- Large flows of immigrants to California from Mexico during the 1970s and 1980s led to an increase in the share of Mexicans who are foreign-born—almost half of all Mexicans in the state by 1990.
- The vast majority of Central and South Americans in California are foreign-born. In 1980, almost four of every five Central or South Americans in the state were foreign-born.

## 2.15 Percentage of Noncitizens Among Asian Groups by Citizenship of Other Household Members, 1970, 1980, and 1990

Sources: 1970, 1980, and 1990 Censuses (PUMS).




- Immigrants do not live only with immigrants, and U.S.-born Californians do not live only with other U.S.-born Californians. The mixed citizenship status of household members is important because noncitizens are restricted from receiving certain public benefits.
- Most noncitizen Asian immigrants live in households with U.S. citizens. In 1990, 60 percent of noncitizen Asian immigrants lived in households with U.S. citizens.
- Noncitizen immigrants from Southeast Asia were *least* likely to live with U.S. citizens in 1980 and *most* likely to do so in 1990. This large increase in the percentage of noncitizen Southeast Asians living with U.S. citizens occurred as young adult Southeast Asian immigrants began having U.S.-born children.
- The vast majority (97 percent in 1990) of noncitizen Asian immigrants do not live alone. Japanese noncitizens have the highest rate of living alone (12 percent in 1990). For all other groups, fewer than 5 percent of noncitizens live alone.

Note: Restricted to noncitizen immigrants not living alone.

## 2.16 Percentage of Noncitizens Among Hispanic Groups by Citizenship of Other Household Members, 1970, 1980, and 1990


Sources: 1970, 1980, and 1990 Censuses (PUMS).



- Most noncitizen Hispanic immigrants live in households with U.S. citizens. In 1990, 70 percent of noncitizen Hispanic immigrants lived in households with U.S. citizens.
- Noncitizen immigrants from Mexico were most likely to live with U.S. citizens. In 1990, almost three of every four noncitizen immigrants from Mexico lived in households with U.S. citizens. Most of those lived in households with their own U.S.-born children.
- The vast majority (98 percent in 1990) of noncitizen Hispanic immigrants do not live alone. Caribbean non-citizens have the highest rate of living alone (13 percent in 1990). Only 1 percent of noncitizen Mexican immigrants and 2 percent of noncitizen Central and South American immigrants live alone.

Note: Restricted to noncitizen immigrants not living alone.


## 2.17 Age and Gender Pyramids by Race and Ethnicity, 1990



- These graphs show population broken down into five-year age groups for males (left side) and females (right side). Each graph also notes the median age and the gender ratio (the number of males per 100 females).
- The baby boom cohorts, those age 25–45 in 1990, are especially evident in the age-gender pyramids for whites. Over one-third of whites were between these ages in 1990.
- Hispanics have the youngest population, with a median age of about 25 in 1990. The high gender ratio (107.4 males per 100 females) is driven by the very large number of young adult Mexican males. The large cohorts of males between the ages of 20 and 29 reflect the large numbers of recent immigrants.
- Below age 45, the size of each age group for Asians is relatively uniform. Asians have low gender ratios; even at fairly young ages Asian females outnumber Asian males.
- The most populous age groups for African Americans are those between the ages of 20 and 34.


Note: Detailed categories for Asians include a small number of people who identified as both Hispanic and Asian.

## 2.18 Percentage of the Population Older Than Age 65 and Younger Than Age 18 by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1998




- Over time, all racial and ethnic groups exhibit aging populations, with declining proportions of children and increasing proportions of elderly.
- Whites are much more likely to be elderly than any other group. The proportion of whites age 65 and over increased from 10 percent in 1970 to 15 percent in 1998.
- Hispanics are a very young population in the state. Almost 40 percent of Hispanics were younger than 18 in 1998, compared to just over 20 percent of whites.

## 2.19 Age Structure of Asian Groups, 1970, 1980, and 1990




- Foreign-born Asian groups are concentrated in the working ages of 18–64. For all groups except Southeast Asians, about 80 percent of those foreign-born in 1990 were between the ages of 18 and 64 (compared to 63 percent for California’s overall population). A substantial share of foreign-born Southeast Asians are children—27 percent.
- Among U.S.-born Asian groups, the age structure varies tremendously. Only 20 percent of U.S.-born Japanese are children, compared to 55 percent for U.S.-born Chinese, 65 percent for U.S.-born Filipinos, and over 80 percent for U.S.-born Koreans, Indians, and Southeast Asians. These differences are primarily attributable to the level and timing of past immigration. For example, the vast majority of foreign-born Southeast Asians in California arrived after 1975. By 1990, the U.S.-born children of this group had not yet reached adulthood.
- For most Asian groups, the proportion age 65 and over is substantially lower than the statewide proportion. Foreign-born Chinese and Filipinos and U.S.-born Japanese have the greatest proportions age 65 and over among Asian ethnic groups.

## 2.20 Age Structure of Hispanic Groups, 1970, 1980, and 1990, and 1990



- Hispanic immigrant groups are concentrated in the working ages of 18–64. For each group, about 80 percent of the immigrants in 1990 were between the ages of 18 and 64 (compared to 63 percent for California’s overall population).
- U.S.-born Hispanic groups are very young. In 1990, about half of U.S.-born Mexicans and Caribbeans were younger than age 18. Three in every four U.S.-born Central or South Americans were younger than age 18 (compared to 27 percent for California’s overall population).
- With the exception of Caribbean immigrants, the proportion of Hispanic groups age 65 and over was less than 5 percent for both U.S.-born and foreign-born populations. Among Caribbean immigrants, 17 percent were age 65 and older in 1990.

## 2.21 Average Number of People per Household by Race and Ethnicity, 1969–1997




- The number of people living in a household is a function of housing costs, income, family size, and extended family living arrangements. Household size has implications for housing demand.
- Hispanics and Asians have substantially higher average household sizes (number of persons per household) than do whites and African Americans.
- After declining in the late 1960s and 1970s, average household sizes have been fairly stable for whites and African Americans for the past 10 years.
- Since the mid-1970s, average household sizes have increased for Hispanics. Asians have experienced a decline in average household sizes since the late 1980s.
- Since the mid-1970s, household size has risen faster or declined less in California than in the rest of the United States for all racial and ethnic groups.

Note: Three-year moving averages. Race/ethnicity is determined by the race/ethnicity of the head of household. Data for Asians are not available before 1988 in the CPS.



## 2.22 Household Structure by Race and Ethnicity, 1968, 1978, 1988, and 1998

Source: March Current Population Survey, 1971–1998.




- Only about one-third of African Americans live in married-couple households, compared to about half of whites and over 60 percent of Hispanics and Asians.
- The proportion of whites and African Americans living in married-couple households has declined but has continued to constitute more than 60 percent of all Hispanics and Asians.
- African Americans are the most likely to live in female-headed family households, and Asians are the least likely.
- Whites and African Americans are the most likely to live alone, and Hispanics are the least likely.
- Hispanics and Asians in California are more likely to live in married-couple households than Hispanics and Asians in the rest of the nation. Whites and African Americans in California live in married-couple households at about the same proportion as whites and African Americans in the rest of the nation.

Note: Nonfamilies are households composed of unrelated people or singles living alone. Female-headed family households are mostly composed of a currently unmarried mother and her children but could consist of any unmarried woman heading a household that includes her relatives. Race/ethnicity is determined by the race/ethnicity of the head of household.

## 2.23 1990 Census Undercount Rate by Race and Ethnicity

Sources: 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Public Law 94-171 Data (Official and Adjusted) Age by Race and Hispanic Origin.



- The 1990 undercount is an estimate of the number of people not counted in the 1990 Census. The undercount rate is the undercount divided by an estimate of the entire population. The undercount is important because Census charts are used for apportionment of political representatives and for the distribution of government funds. Undercount rates by race and ethnicity from the 1990 Census serve as an indicator of populations that are vulnerable to high undercount rates in the 2000 Census.
- The undercount rate was almost twice as high in California as in the rest of the country. African Americans in California were especially likely to be missed by the Census. One of every 13 African Americans in California was not enumerated in the 1990 Census.
- Hispanics had substantially higher undercount rates than whites and Asians, although Hispanics in California were no more likely to be missed by the Census than Hispanics in the rest of the country.
- Whites have relatively low undercount rates. However, whites in California were twice as likely to be missed in the Census than whites in the rest of the country.

## Chapter 3

# Geographic Distribution


As members of ethnic groups disperse throughout the state, they become more visible parts of the state's various communities and cultures. Although this process has altered public policy in California as a whole, issues relating to ethnic diversity are most palpable and intense at the local level (Clark, 1998). In this chapter, we explore the character of and changes in the geographic distribution of racial and ethnic groups in California. In particular, we look at the distribution and the level of concentration of the ethnic population in California from 1970 to the late 1990s. We follow this analysis with a discussion of migration patterns into and out of the state. We measure the level of concentration of each racial and ethnic group using the Herfindahl Index, which is the sum of squares of the county shares of each racial and ethnic group.

Unlike other chapters in this book, this one divides the state into seven regions to capture changes in smaller geographical areas. The Northern and Mountain region is similar to that in other chapters, as is the Bay Area. However, we divide Southern California into the Los Angeles metropolitan area and the rest of Southern California and the Farm Belt into the Sacramento metropolitan area, Central Valley counties, and Coastal counties. The seven regions are detailed in Chart 3.1.

In 1970, most counties in the state were majority white (Chart 3.2). Only five counties in the state had a population that was less than 70 percent white. But by 1998, half the California counties had a population that was less than 70 percent white, and these counties were mainly concentrated in the Northern and Mountain region of the state. In the last 30 years, the white population in California grew 12 percent, but their proportion of the state population declined in every county but one (Sierra County). Moreover, in six counties—Alameda, Imperial, Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara—the number of whites declined between 1970 and 1998. In Los Angeles County, the white proportion of the population dropped from 70 percent in 1970 to 34 percent in 1998. Although all groups are more dispersed now than they were 30 years ago, whites are the least concentrated geographically (Chart 3.6). In general, whites moved away from Los Angeles and the Bay Area and into other areas of the state.

During this same time, the Hispanic population in California quadrupled to 10 million residents and doubled in every county except Sierra County (Chart 3.3). Although their geographic distribution changed only slightly—as of 1998, over half of the Hispanic population resided in Southern California—Hispanics have penetrated every area of the state. In 1998, they accounted for over 30 percent of the population in 14 counties and for less than 5 percent in only five counties: Humboldt, Trinity, Shasta, Nevada, and Mariposa. Central and South Americans were especially concentrated in the Los Angeles region, with 58 percent of U.S.-born Central and South Americans and 70 percent of immigrants residing there in 1990 (Chart 3.7). Although U.S.-born and immigrant Hispanics live in the same locations, immigrants are more concentrated geographically than are U.S.-born Hispanics. In 1990, 48 percent of Mexican immigrants were residing in Los Angeles compared to 38 percent of U.S.-born Mexicans.

### 3.1 Seven Regions of California



The Asian population has been growing throughout the state and is becoming an important proportion of the population of a greater number of counties (Chart 3.4). In 1970, Asians constituted more than 5 percent of the population in only three counties (San Francisco, Monterey, and San Joaquin). By 1998, 19 counties were more than 5 percent Asian, and in three counties (San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara), Asians accounted for more than 20 percent of the population. The Asian population has been moving away from the Bay Area and into the Southern coast and the Los Angeles region of the state (Chart 3.6). However, this pattern varies by ethnic and immigrant groups (Chart 3.8). Chinese are more concentrated than other Asians in the Bay Area, whereas Japanese and Korean immigrants are more concentrated in Los Angeles. Filipinos, Southeast Asians, and Asian Indians are the most geographically spread Asian groups. Compared to Hispanic groups, there is more variation in the geographic distribution of Asian groups but less variation between immigrants and natives.

In 1998, African Americans constituted more than 10 percent of the population in only two counties (Alameda and Solano) (Chart 3.5). However, they accounted for at least 5 percent of the population in more counties than previously. Like other groups, African Americans have become less geographically concentrated in the last 30 years, and they followed similar patterns of redistribution as those of the rest of the population. A smaller proportion of African Americans were living in Los Angeles and the Bay Area

in 1998 than in 1970, and a larger proportion of them were in the southern counties (Chart 3.6). African Americans were the most concentrated racial and ethnic group in 1970. Some 73 percent of California's African Americans resided in just three counties (Alameda, Los Angeles, and San Francisco). By 1998, the proportion of African Americans living in these counties had declined to 55 percent.


Between 1970 and 1998, all four major racial and ethnic groups became less concentrated at the county level (Chart 3.9). Whites and African Americans saw the largest drops in geographic concentration because of migration out of urban areas and into other areas of the state. Asians and Hispanics also experienced a decline in their concentration, but a large influx of immigrants, who tend to locate where other immigrants reside, impeded overall reductions in geographic concentration.

Chart 3.10 shows the changing levels of urbanism for each racial and ethnic group in California. African Americans have a greater proportion of people living in central cities than any other racial and ethnic group. However, the proportion of African Americans living in central cities has been declining over time from nearly 70 percent in 1974 to just over 50 percent in 1998. The proportion of Hispanics living in cities has been increasing from close to 30 percent in 1971 to about 45 percent in 1998. Compared to other groups, whites are less likely to live in cities.

About half of the California population changed their place of residence between 1985 and 1990 (Chart 3.11). Racial and ethnic groups did not differ much in their overall level of migration, but they did differ in the types of moves they made. Most migrants moved within the same region, but this proportion was substantially larger for nonwhites. Eighty-one percent of the Hispanics who changed residence between 1985 and 1990 moved to another house within the same region; this was also the case for 77 percent of Asians, 73 percent of African Americans, and 65 percent of whites. Across all racial and ethnic groups, a greater proportion of the out-of-region migrants moved to the southern counties of the state: 34 percent of Asians, 28 percent of whites, 40 percent of African Americans, and 41 percent of Hispanics (Chart 3.12). The majority of people who left California for other states moved to southern and western states (Chart 3.13); of these domestic migrants, 38 percent of Asians, whites, and Hispanics moved to other western states. Over 30 percent of those who moved to California came from those same states. However, only 18 percent of African Americans who left California moved to another western state and only 12 percent who entered the state moved from the West.

### 3.2 White Population in California Counties, 1970 and 1998


Source: California Department of Finance, *Race/Ethnic Population Projections with Age and Sex Detail, 1970–1998*.



- Most counties of the state were predominantly white in 1970. However, between 1970 and 1998, the share of whites declined in all but one county (Sierra). Whites were over 70 percent of the population in 54 of the 58 counties in 1970. More than 85 percent of the population of the Northern and Mountain region was white. By 1998, only 28 counties had a population that was over 70 percent white.
- Only one county in California (Imperial) had a population that was less than 60 percent white in 1970, and none was less than 50 percent white. By 1998, one-third of California counties were less than 60 percent white, and ten counties (Alameda, Fresno, Imperial, Kings, Los Angeles, Merced, Monterey, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Tulare) had no single majority group.
- Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties have undergone the most dramatic transformations. In 1970, Imperial County was 57 percent white; that proportion was 70 percent in Los Angeles, 89 percent in Orange, 85 percent in San Mateo, and 82 percent in Santa Clara. By 1998, whites made up only 22 percent of the population in Imperial, 34 percent of the population of Los Angeles, 57 percent of Orange, 53 percent of San Mateo, and 50 percent of Santa Clara County.

### 3.3 Hispanic Population in California Counties, 1970 and 1998


Source: California Department of Finance, *Race/Ethnic Population Projections with Age and Sex Detail, 1970–1998*.



- Very few counties had large Hispanic populations in 1970. Hispanics constituted more than 15 percent of the population in only nine counties (Fresno, Imperial, Los Angeles, Madera, Merced, Monterey, San Benito, Tulare, and Ventura), whereas most of the Northern and Mountain counties were less than 5 percent Hispanic. However, by 1998 only five counties in the state were less than 5 percent Hispanic (Humboldt, Mariposa, Nevada, Shasta, and Trinity).
- In 1970, Hispanics constituted more than 30 percent of the population in only two counties (Imperial and San Benito). By 1998, 14 counties were over 30 percent Hispanic, and Imperial County's population was 71 percent Hispanic.
- The largest proportional increases in Hispanic population occurred in the smaller counties of Alpine, Mono, and Del Norte. Among the more populous counties, Orange, Riverside, San Benito, and San Diego experienced the greatest increase in Hispanic population.

### 3.4 Asian Population in California Counties, 1970 and 1998

Source: California Department of Finance, *Race/Ethnic Population Projections with Age and Sex Detail, 1970–1998*.




- Asians are the fastest growing ethnic group in California, with a population increase of over 500 percent between 1970 and 1998. However, Asians still represent a small proportion of most California counties. Only the San Francisco Bay Area, a few Central Valley counties, and the four southern counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, and Ventura have substantial Asian populations.
- Asians constituted more than 5 percent of the population in only three counties (San Francisco, Monterey, and San Joaquin) in 1970. By 1998, 19 counties were over 5 percent Asian. In 1970, only the county of San Francisco had a population that was more than 10 percent Asian. By 1998, 15 counties had populations that were over 10 percent Asian, three (San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara) were over 20 percent Asian, and one (San Francisco) was more than 33 percent Asian.
- Among the California counties with large populations, the biggest proportional increases in Asian populations occurred in Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, and San Diego Counties.



### 3.5 African American Population in California Counties, 1970 and 1998


Source: California Department of Finance, *Race/Ethnic Population Projections with Age and Sex Detail, 1970–1998*.



- California's African American population increased 67 percent between 1970 and 1998, but their proportion of the state population was nearly constant.
- Between 1970 and 1998, the African American population became more widely distributed throughout the state. In 1970, 73 percent of California's African American population resided in just three counties: Alameda, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. By 1998, the proportion of the African American population living in those counties had dropped to 55 percent.
- In 1970, only seven counties had populations that were over 5 percent African American (Alameda, Contra Costa, Kern, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Solano, and Sacramento). By 1998, that number had increased to 12 counties.
- Of the most populous California counties, the largest proportional increase in the African American population took place in San Bernardino, Orange, Riverside, Santa Clara, and Sacramento Counties.

### 3.6 Geographic Distribution of Racial and Ethnic Groups, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1998


Source: California Department of Finance, Race/Ethnic Population Projections with Age and Sex Detail, 1970–1998.



- In 1998, whites were the most geographically dispersed group. Even so, close to half lived in the Southern counties, and 19 percent resided in Los Angeles. About two-thirds of Hispanics lived in Los Angeles or Southern California. About 80 percent of African Americans and Asians lived in Southern California, Los Angeles, or the Bay Area.
- The proportion of the population living in Los Angeles and the Bay Area declined for all racial and ethnic groups between 1970 and 1998. It increased in the Southern California region during the same period.
- The Northern and Mountain region had the smallest proportions of all racial and ethnic groups (9 percent of whites, 2 percent of Hispanics and Asians, and 1 percent of African Americans). Furthermore, this proportion has not changed much over time.

Note: In 1980, California had 16 million whites, 4.6 million Hispanics, 1.3 million Asians, and 1.8 million African Americans. By 1998, the state had 17.2 million whites, 10 million Hispanics, 3.7 million Asians, and 2.3 million African Americans.


### 3.7 Geographic Distribution of Hispanic Groups by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990



- Most Hispanics live in Los Angeles and Southern California, but there is some variation across Hispanic groups. Most Central and South Americans lived in Los Angeles in 1990: 70 percent of those who were foreign-born and 58 percent of those born in the United States. About 38 percent of U.S.-born Mexicans and 48 percent of those foreign-born lived in Los Angeles.
- Mexicans are the most geographically dispersed Hispanic group in California. In 1990, less than 50 percent lived in Los Angeles, more than 10 percent lived in the Central Valley, about 25 percent lived in Southern California, and less than 10 percent lived in the Coastal and Northern and Mountain regions.
- Although foreign-born and U.S.-born Hispanics live in similar regions, those foreign-born are more concentrated than Hispanics born in the United States.
- Except for Central and South Americans, a smaller proportion of Hispanics were living in Los Angeles in 1990 than in 1980. The proportion of Hispanics in the Bay Area also declined. The proportion of Hispanics living in Southern California increased for all groups between 1980 and 1990.

Notes: Because of data limitations with the 1970 data, we present the data only for the 1980 and 1990 Censuses. There were 3.6 million Mexicans in California in 1980 and 5.9 million in 1990. In 1980, there were 270,000 Central and South Americans and 812,000 in 1990. In 1980, 154,000 Caribbeans resided in the state, increasing to 208,000 by 1990.


### 3.8 Geographic Distribution of Asian Groups by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990



- Chinese are the most concentrated Asian group. In 1990, 45 percent of foreign-born Chinese and 50 percent of U.S.-born Chinese lived in the Bay Area.
- Foreign-born and U.S.-born Asians locate in the same geographic areas more than other groups. This is especially true for Japanese.
- As a whole, the proportion of Asians has either remained constant or declined in the San Francisco Bay Area and increased in the southern counties. Foreign-born Southeast Asian immigrants are an exception; their proportion in Southern California declined between 1980 and 1990.
- Filipinos have consistently been more dispersed throughout the state than the Japanese and Chinese. Thirty-one percent of Filipinos lived in the Bay Area in 1990, compared to close to half of all Chinese and 42 percent of all Japanese in California.
- The proportion of foreign-born Southeast Asians more than tripled in the Valley counties between 1980 and 1990, but it declined in the southern counties, Los Angeles, and the Bay Area.


Note: In 1980, there were 306,000 Chinese, 260,000 Japanese, 302,000 Filipinos, 58,000 Asian Indians, 105,000 Koreans, and 114,000 Southeast Asians in California. In 1990, there were 627,000 Chinese, 305,000 Japanese, 664,000 Filipinos, 151,000 Asian Indians, 253,000 Koreans, and 517,000 Southeast Asians in the state.

### 3.9 Geographic Concentrations of Racial and Ethnic Groups, 1970–1998



- This chart examines geographical concentration using the Herfindahl index, which looks at the group's population shares in each county and determines their level of geographic concentration. The more concentrated a group is in a limited set of counties, the closer this number is to 1. The less concentrated a group is throughout the state, the closer the score is to 0.
- All racial and ethnic groups experienced a decline in geographic concentration in the last 30 years. African Americans experienced a 12 percentage point drop in their level of concentration in that period. By 1998, they had levels of concentration similar to that of Hispanics.
- Whites in California are the least concentrated group geographically, and African Americans are the most concentrated of all racial and ethnic groups. For African Americans to have the same geographic dispersion as that of whites, 34 percent of the African American population would have to move to areas with few African Americans (not shown in the chart).
- The level of concentration of Asians and Hispanics changed only slightly over the last 30 years. Compared to whites, they became more concentrated between 1970 and 1998.


### 3.10 Percentage of Racial and Ethnic Groups Living in Central Cities, 1970–1998



- Between 1970 and 1998, African Americans consistently had the highest proportion of their population living in central cities, followed by Asians, Hispanics, and whites. Although the relative rankings across groups did not change, the proportions in central cities have followed different patterns over time.
- The proportion of the African American population living in central cities has declined from nearly 70 percent in 1974 to just over 50 percent in 1998. Much of this is due to African American migration out of the Los Angeles area into nearby counties such as San Bernardino and Riverside.
- There has also been a decline in the proportion of Asians living in central cities, as they have been moving out of cities such as San Francisco and into nearby counties such as Santa Clara and San Mateo.
- The opposite is true for Hispanics, who became more urban between 1970 and 1998. Early immigrants were employed mainly in mining, railroads, and agriculture, in rural areas. But now even recent immigrants are settling in urban areas.
- The proportion of the white population living in central cities remained fairly constant between 1970 and 1998, with only about 30 percent of whites living in central cities in 1998.

Note: Data for Asians are not available before 1988 in the CPS.

### 3.11 Migration Patterns of Racial and Ethnic Groups, 1985–1990




- Between 1985 and 1990, almost half of the California population moved to either another residence in the same part of the state, to another region of the state, or across state lines.
- The various racial and ethnic groups did not differ much in their overall levels of migration; however, there were noticeable differences in the types of moves each group undertook. Across all groups, the majority of migrants moved within the same region, but this proportion was substantially larger for nonwhites. Sixty-five percent of whites who changed their place of residence between 1985 and 1990 moved within the same region, whereas among African Americans this figure was 73 percent, among Asians it was 77 percent, and among Hispanics it was 81 percent.
- The rate of out-of-state migration for whites and African Americans (almost 15 percent) was over twice that of Asians and Hispanics (approximately 7 percent).
- Of all the major racial and ethnic groups, the white population had the greatest proportion of out-of-region and out-of-state migration between 1985 and 1990.

Note: This sample is based on the data available as of the 1990 Census. The sample excludes anyone who was living abroad in 1990.

### 3.12 Geographic Distribution in 1980 and the Destination in 1990 for Out-of-State Migrants by Race and Ethnicity


Sources: 1980 and 1990 Censuses (PUMS).



- Out-of-region migrants from all ethnic groups tend to choose similar destinations. The largest proportion of out-of-region migrants moved to the southern counties, the fastest growing region in the state.
- Close to 60 percent of African Americans and Hispanics who moved across regions moved to either Los Angeles or the southern counties. But over half of African American and Hispanics lived in Los Angeles in 1985.
- But white non-Hispanics dispersed throughout the state. Only 28 percent of whites who moved settled in southern counties and 13 percent moved to Los Angeles.
- Compared to other groups, a greater proportion of Asians (19 percent) chose Los Angeles as a destination. Similarly, a greater proportion of Hispanics chose the Central Valley as a destination (14 percent of Hispanic out-of-region migrants).



### 3.13 Destination and Origin of Out-of-State Migrants by Race and Ethnicity, 1985–1990



- When leaving the state, over 38 percent of whites, Asians, and Hispanics moved elsewhere in the West and over 26 percent migrated to the South. In contrast, only 18 percent of African Americans leaving the state stayed in the West, and only 12 percent moving into the state originated from the West. The majority of African Americans (52 percent) leaving California moved to the South; almost half of African Americans migrating to California left the South.
- The Northeast United States was the destination of choice of less than 12 percent of the African American, Hispanic, and white out-migrants. However, 21 percent of Asian out-migrants moved to the Northeast.

## Chapter 4

# Educational Outcomes

Educational attainment is perhaps the most important indicator of lifetime economic opportunities. Higher educational attainment is associated with lower unemployment, higher wages, higher family income, and better health. Parental education is associated with better health, enriched development, and greater educational opportunities for children. Differences in educational attainment explain a substantial portion of differences in social and economic well-being. By any reliable measure, there continues to be large differences in educational opportunities and attainment across racial and ethnic groups in California.

Across these measures, Hispanics fare worse than any other group. The low educational attainment of Hispanic adults is not simply a result of recent immigration. U.S.-born Hispanics, particularly those of Mexican descent, have consistently lower high school and college completion rates than do African Americans, Asians, or whites. After Hispanics, the next-lowest group is African Americans. Although high school completion rates for young African Americans are similar to those of whites, college completion rates remain much lower for African Americans.

Education begins in the home. The most important educators of young children are their family members. Children whose parents have low levels of education are not only more likely to face economic adversity, they may also have lower educational opportunities. Research shows a strong association between parental education and a child's ultimate educational achievement (Coleman et al., 1966; Manski et al., 1992). Policy interventions that reduce education gaps for today's generation will benefit the generations that follow. Maternal education is an early indicator of a child's educational opportunity (World Bank, 1993) (Charts 4.1 to 4.3). Hispanics, particularly immigrant Mexicans, have the lowest levels of maternal education. Over half of all Hispanic mothers do not have a high school diploma. About one-fifth of African American mothers have not finished high school compared to about 15 percent of Asian mothers and 10 percent of white mothers.

English language acquisition is an important concern for children growing up in California. Overall, only a small share of U.S.-born persons report limited English-speaking ability; for most U.S.-born Asian and Hispanic groups, the share reporting that they speak English "not well" or "not at all" was 6 percent or less in 1990 (Charts 4.4 and 4.5). Hispanics of Central and South American descent had a slightly larger share, 9 percent, with limited ability. Limited English-speaking ability is more of a concern for immigrants. Close to half of Mexicans in California and more than one-third of other Hispanics report limited speaking ability. Nearly 40 percent of Southeast Asians and between one-fourth and one-third of Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans reported limited speaking ability.

As a supplement to education in the home, early childhood education programs can promote enriched development and school readiness. Social policies that improve educational opportunities through programs such as Head Start promote early childhood development for economically disadvan-

tagged children. Head Start has improved preschool participation rates, particularly for African American children (Currie and Thomas, 1995). Nevertheless, white children in California have a higher level of participation than their Hispanic, Asian, or African American peers (Chart 4.6). About half of white children age 3 and 4 attend preschool compared to almost 45 percent of African American and Asian children and 35 percent of Hispanic children.

Early childhood development is only one component of educational opportunity. Beneficial effects of preschool intervention may not last if children do not have high-quality elementary school education<sup>1</sup> (Currie and Thomas, 1998). Reading and math proficiency tests show substantial differences in scores across groups (Charts 4.7 and 4.8). More than two-thirds of Hispanic and African American fourth graders scored below basic proficiency in reading and math compared to 35 to 45 percent of whites and Asians.

School quality is an indicator of educational opportunity and may help explain group differences in proficiency scores. Average test scores are an indicator of school quality (Betts et al., 2000) (Chart 4.9). Whites and Asians, on average, attend higher-quality schools where about half of students score above the national median on the math exam of the Stanford Achievement Test. African American and Hispanic students, on average, are in schools where only about 35 percent of students score this well.

After looking at educational opportunities and assessments for youth, an examination of educational attainment for young adults provides a measure of recent education conditions and achievements. High school and college completion rates are two of these measures (Charts 4.10 to 4.15). For people age 25 to 29, high school completion rates for whites, Asians, and African Americans are all about 90 percent. Over 70 percent of U.S.-born Hispanics complete high school, but Hispanic immigrants tend to have lower completion rates. Four-year college graduation rates show more racial group differences. Asians and whites have the highest college graduation levels—above 35 percent. About 20 percent of young African Americans complete college. Only 10 percent of young Hispanics have a four-year degree. Even U.S.-born Hispanics, particularly Mexicans, have low rates of college graduation.

A more general reflection of educational and economic conditions is shown in working-age adult educational attainment. Adult educational attainment has increased over the last three decades for all racial and ethnic groups in California, but persistent differences remain (Charts 4.16 to 4.19). Whites and Asians have the highest educational attainment with about 70 percent having at least some college education. Among Asians, immigrants from Southeast Asia have much lower college education rates than other Asian groups. Hispanics have the lowest education levels—almost half have no high school diploma<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Information on the school activity of young children is available beginning in 1994. *Current Population Survey* asks about school attendance including Head Start and other preschool, kindergarten, or elementary school activity; it is not possible to tell whether some four-year-olds are in kindergarten or in preschool. The small sample size requires combining three years of the surveys. The sample is not large enough to separate by age 3 and 4 nor does it provide enough information to separate into Asian and Hispanic subgroups. The difference between Hispanic and white children was the only statistically significant difference in California.


<sup>2</sup> Differences between whites and Asians in California were not statistically significant. Differences between African Americans and Hispanics in California were not statistically significant. The difference between California and the nation was only statistically significant for white fourth grade students.

(Lopez et al., 1999). More detailed statistics for Hispanic subgroups show especially low education levels among immigrants, particularly those from Mexico. African Americans have achieved substantial improvements in education and by 1997 more than half have at least some college education.

As a measure of socioeconomic opportunities, basic skills are an important alternative measure to formal education. Basic skills and formal education are strongly associated, but basic skills provide a measurement of ability as opposed to years of study. Literary and quantitative abilities are practical job skills as well as life skills (Johnson and Tafoya, 1999). Whites and Asians score substantially higher in both areas, and Hispanics have the lowest scores (see Chart 4.20).

## 4.1 Education of Mothers of Children Born in 1989 and 1997 by Race and Ethnicity


Source: California Department of Health Services, Birth Public Use Tape, 1989–1997.



- Mothers' educational attainment is a strong indicator of children's educational and lifetime opportunities. Children whose parents have low education levels often begin life with financial and educational disadvantages.
- There are large group differences in maternal education rates. In 1997, over half of Hispanic mothers did not have a high school diploma. About 20 percent of African American mothers, 17 percent of Asian mothers, and 10 percent of white mothers had no high school diploma. About 60 percent of Asian and white mothers and 40 percent of African American mothers had at least some college education compared to only 20 percent of Hispanic mothers.
- Between 1989 and 1997, Asians had the largest improvement in high school completion rates—about 8 percentage points. Hispanic and white high school completion rates increased by 5 and 3 percent, respectively. African American high school completion rates did not improve. Whites and Asians had about a 10 percentage point increase in the share with some college education. College education increased by 3 to 4 percentage points for African Americans and Hispanics.

## 4.2 Education of Asian Mothers of Children Born in 1989 and 1997

Source: California Department of Health Services, Birth Public Use Tape, 1989–1997.




- Although Asian mothers as a whole had relatively high levels of education, there are important differences among Asian ethnic groups.
- Foreign-born Southeast Asians have the lowest high school completion rate at about 70 percent in 1997. U.S.-born Chinese and Japanese have the most education, with 91 and 86 percent of mothers having some college or more, respectively.
- For most foreign-born groups, the share of mothers with at least some college education tends to be between 70 and 80 percent. Foreign-born Japanese have a slightly higher rate—83 percent. Foreign-born Southeast Asian mothers have a much lower share with college education of only 38 percent. Foreign-born Filipino mothers have higher levels of education than their U.S.-born peers.
- For most Asian ethnic groups, high school completion rates for mothers were already high in 1989. There was substantial improvement during the 1990s for foreign-born Southeast Asians, whose completion rates rose from 52 to 72 percent. The share with some college increased by about 10 percentage points for almost all foreign-born groups and for U.S.-born Filipinos.

Note: Southeast Asians include only Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian.

### 4.3 Education of Hispanic Mothers of Children Born in 1989 and 1997


Source: California Department of Health Services, Birth Public Use Tape, 1989–1997.



- Over half of Hispanic mothers have less than a high school diploma. Across Hispanic subgroups, however, maternal education levels vary significantly. Among U.S.-born groups, Mexican mothers have the lowest education levels, with high school completion rates of only 65 percent; and only 25 percent had some college education in 1997. Central and South American mothers and Caribbean mothers have high school completion rates of almost 80 percent and between 40 and 50 percent have some college education.
- Almost half of the foreign-born mothers from Central and South America have completed high school and about 20 percent have been to college. Over 80 percent of mothers from the Caribbean have completed high school and about half have some college education. Foreign-born Mexican mothers have only about a 30 percent high school completion rate and only 10 percent have been to college. Compared with their U.S.-born peers, foreign-born Mexican mothers have less than half the rates of some college education and bachelor's degrees or more. Except for Caribbeans, foreign-born mothers' education is lower than that of U.S.-born mothers.
- For most Hispanic subgroups, the share of mothers with a high school diploma and the share with some college education improved by a few percentage points between 1989 and 1997. U.S.-born and foreign-born Caribbeans had more substantial gains in the share with some college education.

Note: Caribbean includes only Puerto Rican and Cuban.


### 4.4 English Language Ability of Asians Age 5 and Over, 1990



- English language ability is important for functioning in California society and in the labor market. Chart 4.4 shows the percentage of Asians over age 5 who spoke English “not at all” or “not well” in 1990. The statistics in this chart are self-reported.
- Among the U.S.-born Asian groups, less than 1 percent reported speaking English “not at all.” U.S.-born Chinese had the highest share with limited English-speaking ability—6 percent—whereas only 2 to 3 percent of Japanese and Filipinos reported limited ability.
- Foreign-born Asian groups reported more limited English. Roughly one-fourth to one-third of those from China, Japan, and Korea and almost 40 percent of those from Southeast Asia reported limited English-speaking ability. The foreign-born from India and the Philippines had smaller shares with limited English—13 and 7 percent, respectively.




## 4.5 English Language Ability of Hispanics Age 5 and Over, 1990



- Chart 4.5 shows the percentage of Hispanics over age 5 who reported that they spoke English “not at all” or “not well” in 1990.
- For U.S.-born Hispanics, roughly 1 to 2 percent reported speaking English “not at all” and only 5 to 7 percent reported “not well.” Overall, about 6 percent of Hispanics of Mexican and Caribbean descent had limited English-speaking ability. For those of Central and South American descent, the share with limited ability was slightly greater at 9 percent.
- Limited English-speaking ability is much more of a concern for foreign-born Hispanics. Almost 50 percent of Mexicans had limited English ability, with 20 percent completely unable to speak English. About 40 percent of Central and South Americans and 35 percent of Caribbeans had limited ability, with roughly 14 percent unable to speak English.


## 4.6 Preschool Activities of Children Age 3 and 4 by Race and Ethnicity, 1995–1997



- Early childhood development programs promote enriched learning and school readiness. Lower rates of preschool attendance may put some children at a greater disadvantage relative to peers who had better early childhood development opportunities. The rates in this chart are based on school attendance—some four-year-olds may be in kindergarten.
- For all groups, at least 30 percent of children age 3 and 5 are enrolled in school. Over half of white children attend preschool activities compared to about 35 percent of their Hispanic peers. Almost 45 percent of Asian and African American children are enrolled in preschool.
- Compared to the rest of the United States, preschool attendance rates in California are similar for whites but lower for nonwhite children. In the rest of the nation, over half of Asian and African American children attend preschool and almost 40 percent of Hispanic children attend.

## 4.7 Reading Proficiency for Grade 4 and Grade 8 Public School Students by Race and Ethnicity, 1998

Source: Ballator and Jerry, *The NAEP 1998 Reading State Report for California, 1999*.




- Reading proficiency test scores are a way to gauge educational achievement and reading performance of students. Higher scores are associated with higher literacy and reading skills.
- In grade 4, close to 70 percent of Hispanic and African American children had scores below basic proficiency. Whites and Asians were below basic proficiency at about 40 percent. Less than 10 percent of Hispanics and African Americans were proficient or advanced compared to about 30 percent of Asians and whites.
- In grade 8, about half of Hispanic and African American students scored below basic proficiency, whereas 28 percent of Asians and 18 percent of whites did so. Roughly one-tenth of Hispanics and African Americans had proficient and advanced scores compared to over one-fourth of Asians and over one-third of white students.
- Compared to test performance at the national level, California students tend to have lower scores, particularly in grade 4. For whites, the percentage of fourth graders scoring below basic proficiency was higher in the state than in the nation. However there was no substantial difference at the grade 8 level. Compared to national averages, more of California Hispanic and Asian students were below basic proficiency in grades 4 and 8. However, reading scores for the state’s African American students nearly matched those of the nation in both grades.

Note: Schools reporting scores for 80 percent of students or more are included in the NAEP report. The reading test was administered to all students only in English.

## 4.8 Math Proficiency for Grade 4 and Grade 8 Public School Students by Race and Ethnicity, 1996

Source: Reese et al., *The NAEP 1996 Mathematics State Report for California, 1997*.




- Mathematics proficiency tests gauge student performance in the area of quantitative achievement. Quantitative skills are important life skills and are required in technical and scientific fields. In grade 4, over 80 percent of African American and over 70 percent of Hispanic students scored below basic proficiency compared to about 40 percent of white and Asian students. Less than 5 percent of African American and Hispanic students scored at proficient or advanced levels compared to over 15 percent of Asian and white students.
- The test for grade 8 assesses more advanced math skills appropriate for that grade level and requires higher scores to achieve proficiency. A smaller share of African American and Hispanic eighth graders scored below basic proficiency than did the fourth graders, but the shares remain high at 68 and 75 percent, respectively. Roughly 30 percent of white and Asian eighth graders scored below basic proficiency.
- Compared to the nation, California fourth grade students tend to have lower test scores. The share of students in California scoring below basic proficiency was 11 percentage points higher for whites and Hispanics and 14 percentage points higher for Asians and African Americans than children in those groups nationally. However, for eighth grade students, the differences between the state and the nation were much smaller. Hispanics were the only group with substantially different eighth grade scores.

Notes: Schools reporting scores for 80 percent of students or more are included in the NAEP report. The mathematics tests were administered to all students only in English. Eighth-grade scores were not available for Asians at the national level.

## 4.9 School Quality as Measured by Student Math Scores, 1998

Source: California Department of Education, CBEDS, 1998, grades 2 through 11.




- There are many measures of school quality including average test scores. Test scores are strongly associated with other measures of school quality such as resources and teacher credentials. For the data shown in this chart, school quality is measured by the percentage of students in the school who scored over the national median on the math exam of the Stanford Achievement Test series (the STAR test in California). Students with limited English proficiency are not used in calculating the school quality measure. For further findings from these data, see Betts et al., 2000.
- The first bar of the chart shows that, on average, white students attend schools where just over half of students scored above the national median. Asian students also attend schools where about half of students scored above the national median. In contrast, African American and Hispanic students attend schools where only about 35 percent of students scored above the national median.

## 4.10 High School Completion Rates of Adults Age 25 to 29 by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1997

Sources: 1970, 1980, and 1990 Censuses (PUMS).


Data for 1997 are combined data from the Outgoing Rotation Group file of the Current Population Surveys, 1996–1998.



- Since high school education is usually completed by age 25, completion rates for young adults (age 25 to 29) provide an indication of recent educational opportunities and conditions.
- In 1997, over 90 percent of young adult whites, Asians, and African Americans had completed high school. Hispanics had a considerably lower rate of 55 percent.
- Because of the nature of the survey questions, statistics from 1970 and 1980 overestimate high school completion rates. The drop in high school completion rates between 1980 and 1990 for all groups probably reflects the change in the nature of the education data and not a real decline in high school completion.
- During the 1990s, whites, Hispanics, and Asians had an increase in completion rates of about 5 percentage points. For African Americans, completion rates increased by 9 percentage points.
- Compared to the rest of the nation, high school completion rates for whites and Asians are similar. African Americans have a 4 percentage point higher completion rate in California. Hispanics have a 7 percentage point lower completion rate in the state.


Notes: For 1990 and 1997, the reported statistic is the percentage with a high school diploma or equivalent. For 1970 and 1980, the reported statistic is the percentage completing at least 12 years of education.

## 4.11 High School Completion Rates of Asians Age 25 to 29 by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990



- Asians overall have over a 90 percent high school completion rate. However, a closer examination of Asian ethnic groups and immigrant status shows a range of completion rates.
- In 1990, foreign-born groups tended to have lower completion rates than U.S.-born groups. The exceptions were Japanese and Filipinos, who showed similar completion rates to their U.S.-born counterparts.
- Among the U.S.-born groups, high school completion rates were at 90 percent and above in 1990. Completion rates for most foreign-born groups were in the high eighties and above. Foreign-born Southeast Asians were an exception, with a high school completion rate of only 64 percent.
- Completion rates in 1980 show the same pattern as in 1990. Because of overestimation of completion rates in 1980, the small drop in completion rates between 1980 and 1990 for many groups probably does not reflect a true decline in education. Most groups probably achieved some increase in completion rates. However, the relatively large decline in high school completion for foreign-born Southeast Asians during the 1980s probably reflects the recent immigration of persons with low levels of education.

## 4.12 High School Completion Rates of Hispanics Age 25 to 29 by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990




- Although the high school completion rates for Hispanic groups as a whole was just over 50 percent in 1990, completion rates by Hispanic subgroup show a more complex story with important differences between the groups.
- Among U.S.-born Hispanics in 1990, Mexicans have the lowest high school completion rates at just over 70 percent. The other two groups have completion rates of just over 80 percent. Foreign-born groups have a wide range of completion rates—from 32 percent for Mexicans and 37 percent for Central and South Americans to 77 percent for Caribbeans.
- Completion rates in 1980 show the same pattern as in 1990. Because completion rates in 1980 are slightly inflated, the change between 1980 and 1990 is underestimated. Most groups probably achieved some growth in completion rates over the decade. However, the relatively large decline in the high school completion rate for foreign-born Central and South Americans probably reflects the recent immigration of persons with low levels of education.



### 4.13 College Completion Rates of Adults Age 25 to 29 by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1997


Sources: 1970, 1980, and 1990 Censuses (PUMS).  
Data for 1997 are combined data from the Outgoing Rotation Group file of the Current Population Surveys, 1996–1998.



- Completion of a bachelor's degree and graduate education are increasingly important in attaining better job opportunities. College completion rates among young adults are strong reflections of lifetime opportunities.
- The share completing a four-year college degree varies greatly among groups. Asians have the highest rate at 48 percent in 1997 compared to 36 percent for whites, 20 percent for African Americans, and 7 percent for Hispanics.
- College completion rates in earlier years show essentially the same patterns across the groups as in 1997. The surveys in 1970 and 1980 overestimate college completion rates. Therefore, although the statistics above show little or no growth in completion rates between 1980 and 1990, most groups probably achieved some improvement over the decade.
- During the 1990s, college completion rates increased by 8 percentage points for whites, Asians, and African Americans, but by only 1 percentage point for Hispanics.
- Compared to the rest of the nation, in California, college completion rates are roughly 5 percentage points higher for whites and African Americans. For Hispanics, college completion rates are 2 percentage points lower in the state. For Asians, those in California have similar college completion rates to those in the rest of the nation.

Note: For 1990 and 1997, the reported statistic is the percentage with a four-year college degree. For 1970 and 1980, the reported statistic is the percentage completing at least 16 years of education.


### 4.14 College Completion Rates of Asians Age 25 to 29 by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990



- Although college completion rates were almost 40 percent for the combined Asian group in 1990, a closer examination shows a range of college completion rates among the U.S.-born and foreign-born groups.
- Among U.S.-born groups, Chinese had the highest college completion rates in 1990 at almost 70 percent, compared to Japanese at 50 percent and Filipinos at 33 percent. Among foreign-born groups, Asian Indians had the highest completion rate at 52 percent and Southeast Asians had the lowest rate at only 15 percent.
- The rankings of the Asian ethnic groups were essentially the same in 1980. Because the 1980 survey overestimated college completion rates, most groups probably achieved more improvement than measured in the statistics above.

Note: For 1990 and 1997, the reported statistic is the percentage with a four-year college degree. For 1970 and 1980, the reported statistic is the percentage completing at least 16 years of education.

## 4.15 College Completion Rates of Hispanics Age 25 to 29 by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990




- Although the college completion rates for the Hispanic group as a whole is below 10 percent, the statistics by Hispanic subgroups show a range of completion rates.
- Overall, U.S.-born Central and South Americans and both groups of Caribbeans had the highest college completion rates at close to 20 percent. The completion rate for U.S.-born Mexicans was 10 percent. Less than 5 percent of foreign-born Mexicans and Central and South Americans have completed a four-year college degree.
- The pattern of college completion across groups in 1980 was similar to that of 1990. Because the 1980 survey overestimates college completion, improvements in completion rates between 1980 and 1990 are underestimated.

Notes: For 1990 and 1997, the reported statistic is the percentage with a four-year college degree. For 1970 and 1980, the reported statistic is the percentage completing at least 16 years of education.

## 4.16 Educational Attainment of Adults Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1997

Sources: 1970, 1980, and 1990 Censuses (PUMS).

Data for 1997 are combined data from the Outgoing Rotation Group file of the Current Population Surveys, 1996–1998.




- Educational attainment is associated with employment, earnings, family income, and health status. Lifetime opportunities are strongly linked to parental education and one's own education.
- Hispanics age 25 to 54 had the lowest levels of education in 1997. Close to half have not finished high school and less than 10 percent have completed a four-year college degree. Only 8 percent of African Americans have no high school diploma and about 23 percent have a college degree. Asians and whites have the highest levels of education. Whereas 12 percent of Asians have not finished high school, about 45 percent have a four-year college degree. Only 5 percent of whites have no high school diploma and 36 percent have a college degree.
- All four groups achieved substantial improvements in educational attainment, especially during the 1970s. Statistics from 1970 and 1980 overestimate educational attainment. Therefore, growth in attainment between 1980 and 1990 was greater than shown in the chart.
- Compared to the rest of the nation, in California, whites and African Americans had slightly higher educational attainment in 1997, with a greater share of adults having attended at least some college. Attainment for Hispanics and Asians was similar in the state and the rest of the nation.

Notes: The data for this chart were age-adjusted. Education levels from 1990 and later are not directly comparable to those in 1980 and earlier. Data from the Outgoing Rotation Group (ORG) file closely match similar data from the March file except the ORG data show somewhat higher educational attainment for African Americans.

### 4.17 Educational Attainment of Asians Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990


Sources: 1980 and 1990 Censuses (PUMS).



- As a group, Asians have educational attainment close to that of whites. Examination of educational attainment by Asian subgroups reveals important differences, showing some groups with far less education than others.
- U.S.-born Asian groups tend to have high levels of education. The least-educated U.S.-born group, Filipinos, had only 10 percent with no high school diploma and over 30 percent with a four-year college degree in 1990.
- Even among Asian foreign-born groups, high school completion rates were over 80 percent for all but Southeast Asians, for whom the rate was only 54 percent. Foreign-born Asian Indians had the highest share with four-year college degrees—55 percent—and most other groups had rates between 40 and 50 percent. College completion rates for foreign-born Filipinos actually exceeded those of native Filipinos. However, only 13 percent of foreign-born Southeast Asians had four-year college degrees.
- All three U.S.-born groups made substantial improvements between 1980 and 1990, particularly in the share with a four-year college degree. Improvements were smaller for most foreign-born groups except Japanese. For foreign-born Southeast Asians, the relatively large increase in the share with less than a high school diploma reflects the low education levels of new immigrants from that region.

Note: The data for this chart were age-adjusted. Because of changes in the surveys, growth in educational attainment between 1980 and 1990 is underestimated.


## 4.18 Educational Attainment of Hispanics Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990



- Overall, roughly 50 percent of Hispanics have less than a high school degree. However, a breakdown of Hispanic subgroups reveals a wide range of education levels across the different groups.
- In 1990, the share of U.S.-born Mexicans with less than a high school diploma was almost 30 percent and only 10 percent had a four-year college degree. For the two other U.S.-born groups, the share without a high school diploma was under 20 percent and 20 to 25 percent had college degrees. Among foreign-born groups, the share with no high school diploma was quite high: 34 percent for Caribbeans, 62 percent for Central and South Americans, and 77 percent for Mexicans. The share with a four-year college degree was under 10 percent for foreign-born Mexicans as well as Central and South Americans. It was 18 percent for foreign-born Caribbeans.
- The surveys underestimate growth in educational attainment between 1980 and 1990. Most groups achieved improvements over the decade, particularly U.S.-born Mexicans for whom the share with no high school diploma fell from above 40 percent to below 30 percent. The decline in education levels for foreign-born Central and South Americans reflects the recent immigration of persons with low levels of education.

Note: The data for this chart were age-adjusted.


## 4.19 High School Completion Rates by Region for Adults Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity, 1990



- For whites and African Americans, there is very little regional variation in high school completion rates, with all regions at roughly 90 percent for both groups.
- For Asians, high school completion rates are substantially lower in the Central Valley and Central Coast region (about 70 percent) compared to the other three regions (about 90 percent).
- For Hispanics, high school completion rates are lower in the Southern California and the Central Valley and Central Coast regions (about 50 percent) compared to the Bay Area and the Northern and Mountain regions (about 60 percent).

Note: The data for this chart were age-adjusted.

## 4.20 Basic Literary and Quantitative Skills of People Age 16 and Over by Race and Ethnicity, 1992



- Basic skills measure the ability to participate in society and perform diverse tasks required in jobs. The percentage achieving scores at each complexity level highlights general patterns of differences among groups. The skills survey was administered only in English and only to persons showing at least moderate English fluency on a pretest.
- Whites had the highest scores. However, roughly one-fourth of whites showed low or very low literary and quantitative skills.
- Asians had the next highest scores with 57 percent scoring at low or very low in literary skills and 45 percent low or very low in quantitative skills.
- About 80 percent of Hispanics and 70 percent of African Americans had scores that represented low or very low skills in both areas.
- Compared to the rest of the nation, in California, about 10 percent fewer African Americans and whites scored low or very low in literary and quantitative skills. About 10 percent fewer Asians scored low or very low in quantitative skills and about 7 percent fewer scored very low in literary skills. Hispanics were the exception to California’s overall higher scores—about 6 percent more scored low or very low in both areas.

Note: The data for this chart were age-adjusted. Results are reported based on five levels of complexity for tasks assessed in the NALS Survey. For further information, see Johnson and Tafoya, 1999.



## Chapter 5

# Health Outcomes

**H**ealth outcomes reflect complex interactions between socioeconomic status, access to health care services, and genetic background. Improvements in medical technology, access to health services, and public health practices have led to improved health outcomes around the world. Likewise, all Californians have enjoyed improvements in health status over the decades, but there remain notable disparities in the health of different racial and ethnic groups. These differences are at least partly related to differences in access to health care services by racial and ethnic group.

In general, African Americans fare more poorly than other racial and ethnic groups, both nationally and in California. Hispanics often have poorer access to health care and lower health status than whites, whereas health indicators for Asians are similar to, and sometimes better than, those for whites. These broad generalizations about the health of Hispanics and Asians do not highlight important differences in the health of different Hispanic and Asian ethnic groups. People of Japanese, Chinese, and Korean ancestry tend to enjoy a better health status than whites, but people of Southeast Asian and Filipino ancestry have comparatively poor health outcomes. Although Mexicans have poorer access to health services such as prenatal care, they have better birth outcomes than other Hispanic groups.

Immigrant status is another important determinant of access to health care services and health outcomes. Although immigrants typically have less access to health care than U.S.-born residents of California, immigrants do not have consistently poorer health outcomes than nonimmigrants. Although the low socioeconomic status of many immigrants has a negative effect on health and access to health care, researchers have found that some immigrants maintain the “healthy behaviors” they had in their home countries (Guendelman, English, and Chavez, 1995). For example, the typical diet of Mexican immigrant women has been shown to be substantially better than the average diet of second-generation Mexican women (Guendelman and Abrams, 1995).

Health insurance is a primary indicator of access to health care services. Having health insurance improves the ability of individuals to obtain preventative medical services such as vaccinations and cancer screening and to seek medical care when illness occurs. Thus, health insurance can lead to improvement in health status. Insurance coverage is correlated with income and employment, as health insurance is expensive and many Californians obtain health insurance as a benefit of employment. White and Asian adults are more likely to have health insurance than Hispanic and African American adults, as would be expected given the relative economic status of these groups (Chart 5.1). Many Californians receive insurance through publicly funded programs designed for poor families, such as Medi-Cal. African American and Hispanic children are more likely to be insured by Medi-Cal and Medicare than white and Asian children (Chart 5.2).

Health insurance is also associated with the use of preventative medical services such as vaccinations and prenatal care. Prenatal care is thought to be a cost-effective way to improve the health of infants, and

many public policies have sought to increase the availability of prenatal care to poor families. In California, nearly 70 percent of mothers receive adequate prenatal care, as defined by leading public health researchers (Kotelchuck, 1994). White and Asian women are more likely to receive adequate prenatal care than African American and Hispanic women (Charts 5.3 to 5.6). As with prenatal care, childhood immunizations are known to be cost-effective in improving the health of children. African American and Hispanic children lag behind whites and Asians in being up to date on immunizations (Chart 5.7).

Although access to medical services has important effects on health, individual behaviors are very important determinants of health. For example, smoking contributes to nearly 400,000 cancer and heart disease deaths in the United States annually. African American Californians have higher rates of smoking than other racial and ethnic groups, with whites following closely (Chart 5.8). Smoking is less common among Hispanics and Asians.

Access to health care and the individual behavior of Californians are associated with the incidence of illness. Infant birthweight is viewed as an important indicator of the health of infants, as low birthweight babies are substantially more likely to die and experience morbidity in their first year of life. African Americans have the highest rate of low birthweight delivery in California, as they do nationally (Charts 5.9 to 5.11). Although Hispanics have comparatively poor access to health care, they have a lower rate of low birthweight delivery than Asians. Whites are the least likely to have low birthweight babies.

African Americans also fare comparatively poorly after infancy. They are more likely to suffer from mental illnesses and many communicable diseases. The use of mental health services measures both the incidence of mental illness and the decision to seek treatment for these disorders. African Americans have the highest rate of use of local mental health services in California (Chart 5.12). Asians are the least likely to use local mental health services.

Several communicable diseases reflect differences in socioeconomic status and access to medical care. Tuberculosis is a significant health problem because of its communicability and the spread of medication-resistant strains. Tuberculosis can spread rapidly among people living in crowded conditions. Asian immigrants are more likely to have tuberculosis than any other group (Chart 5.13). Compared with Hispanics and whites, African Americans have a high incidence of tuberculosis in California. Hepatitis A, an illness usually transmitted through the contamination of food, is prevalent among Hispanics and whites (Chart 5.13). The rate of infection with Hepatitis A among Hispanics is double that among African Americans and Asians.

AIDS is a major concern for the health of young Californians and is the fourth most commonly reported infectious disease nationwide. Although the majority of AIDS infections are transmitted through sexual activity and use of injected drugs, many AIDS infections have been acquired through other activities and from blood transfusions. AIDS infection is twice as prevalent among African Americans as any other racial and ethnic group in California, with nearly 70 cases per 100,000 population (Chart 5.14). In contrast, Asians have fewer than 10 cases per 100,000.


Socioeconomic status, access to care, and behavior are also associated with mortality. Many researchers use infant mortality as an indicator of the overall health of different populations and nations. Although Californians as a whole have enjoyed declining infant mortality, differences among racial groups

have persisted. As with many other health statistics, African Americans suffer from substantially higher infant mortality rates than other groups (Chart 5.15). Young African American Californians also face substantially higher mortality rates from homicide, AIDS, and heart disease (Chart 5.16). Near-elderly African Americans are also more likely to die from cancer and heart disease than other Californians (Chart 5.17).

The differences in the health status of California's racial and ethnic groups are similar to those observed throughout the United States. In some aspects, Californians are worse off than those in the United States as a whole; for example, all racial and ethnic groups in California have lower rates of health insurance. Similarly, a smaller proportion of children receive public insurance in California than in the United States as a whole. African Americans have lower vaccination and higher smoking rates in California than in the United States as a whole. Despite these differences, Californians generally fare as well as or better than other Americans in their health status. California's African Americans and whites enjoy lower rates of low birthweight than the national average, and African Americans have lower AIDS infection rates, infant mortality rates, and heart disease and cancer death rates among the near-elderly.

The disparities described in this chapter are both a result of and a cause of the socioeconomic differences described in this book. Poverty and poor education can lead to a lack of access to health care and poor information about health behaviors. At the same time, poor health reduces educational and economic opportunities. Health disparities between different racial and ethnic groups are not likely to be resolved without consideration of other socioeconomic factors.


## 5.1 Percentage of Adults with Health Insurance by Race and Ethnicity, 1989–1997



- Health insurance is a strong predictor of access to health care. Most people over age 65 are insured by the federal Medicare program, and over half of nonelderly Californians receive health insurance through employment or employed family members (Schauffler and Brown, 2000).
- White adults have the highest rate of health insurance coverage, with over 70 percent of non-Hispanic white adults being insured. Hispanic adults have the lowest rate of health insurance coverage, with less than 50 percent being insured.
- Fewer people are insured during recessions. White, African American, and Hispanic adults experienced small declines in health insurance rates in the early 1990s, but Asian adults did not. There has been some improvement in the rate of health insurance in the mid-1990s. But by 1997, the health insurance rate of African Americans and Hispanics was lower than it had been in 1989.
- Compared to the U.S. average, a higher share of Californian adults lacks health insurance. Hispanic and African American adults in California have much lower rates of insurance coverage than Hispanics and African Americans nationally.

Notes: Three-year moving averages. Adults are age 18 and older.


## 5.2 Percentage of Children Insured by Medi-Cal or Medicare by Race and Ethnicity, 1989–1997



- Health insurance is important for children because many childhood diseases can be prevented with routine medical care and vaccination. In addition, treatment of acute and chronic childhood illnesses is an economic and social investment that produces high dividends. Over half of California's children receive health insurance through a parent's employer.
- Medi-Cal is available for children in poor households. Medi-Cal availability expanded during the 1990s, resulting in more children receiving state-sponsored insurance. Medicare insures some children, primarily those who are disabled.
- Over 40 percent of African American children and nearly 40 percent of Hispanic children are insured by Medi-Cal or Medicare. These rates have risen substantially over the past decade.
- Medi-Cal or Medicare insures 25 percent of Asian children and 15 percent of white children in California.
- A smaller portion of California's children receive public health insurance than the U.S. average. The difference between California and the United States is greatest for white and African American children.


Notes: Three-year moving averages. Children are under age 18.

### 5.3 Percentage of Mothers with Adequate Prenatal Care by Race and Ethnicity, 1989–1997




- Numerous studies have found that prenatal care reduces infant mortality and morbidity and reduces medical care costs in the long run. Adequate prenatal care is defined as starting prenatal care in the fourth month of pregnancy or earlier and having at least 80 percent of recommended prenatal care visits (Kotelchuck, 1994).
- In 1997, over 70 percent of whites and Asians received adequate prenatal care, whereas less than 70 percent of Hispanics and African Americans received adequate prenatal care.
- However, Hispanic women have enjoyed the greatest improvement in access to prenatal care of all major racial and ethnic groups in California, largely because of expansions in Medicaid that target pregnant women who do not receive welfare. However, fewer Hispanics than other groups continue to receive adequate prenatal care.
- National patterns on the adequacy of prenatal care for racial and ethnic groups are similar to those of California.

## 5.4 Percentage of Asian Mothers with Adequate Prenatal Care by Place of Birth, 1997



- Chinese and Japanese women have high rates of receiving adequate prenatal care. Filipinos and Southeast Asians have comparatively low rates of adequate prenatal care use.
- Except for foreign-born Southeast Asian women, U.S.-born and foreign-born Asian women have similar propensities to receive adequate prenatal care.
- U.S.-born Southeast Asian women are substantially less likely to receive adequate prenatal care than foreign-born Southeast Asian women. This is at least partly because U.S.-born Southeast Asian mothers are comparatively young, with over 60 percent being under age 19. In contrast, less than 5 percent of foreign-born Southeast Asian mothers are teens. In 1997, there were only 146 births to U.S.-born Southeast Asian women, whereas there were 10,353 births to foreign-born Southeast Asian women.
- Over the past decade, the receipt of prenatal care has increased slightly among all Asian ethnic groups. The rate of improvement has been greatest for Southeast Asian women.


## 5.5 Percentage of Hispanic Mothers with Adequate Prenatal Care by Place of Birth, 1997



- A smaller share of foreign-born Hispanics receive adequate prenatal care than U.S.-born Hispanics. The difference in prenatal care receipt between foreign-born and U.S.-born mothers is greatest for women of Central and South American ancestry.
- Women of Mexican ancestry are less likely to receive adequate prenatal care than other Hispanic women. Foreign-born Mexican women have the lowest rate of prenatal care use in California.
- All Hispanic ethnic groups have experienced increases in the share of women receiving adequate prenatal care. In 1989, less than 40 percent of Mexican and Central and South American women received adequate prenatal care.




## 5.6 Percentage of Mothers with Adequate Prenatal Care by Race, Ethnicity, and Region, 1997



- Prenatal care use is highest in the San Francisco Bay Area and Southern California. The lowest rate of prenatal care use is in the Central Valley and Central Coast region.
- The low rate of adequate prenatal care among Hispanics is seen in all regions of California.
- Asians living in the Central Valley and Central Coast region have particularly low use of prenatal care relative to other racial and ethnic groups. This may result from the different national heritage of Asians living in the Central Valley: a higher share of the Central Valley's Asians have Southeast Asian heritage than in other regions of California. As seen in Chart 5.4, Southeast Asians are less likely than other Asian groups to receive adequate prenatal care .

## 5.7 Percentage of Children Up to Date on Vaccinations at Age 2 by Race and Ethnicity, 1991–1998


Source: California Department of Health Services, Annual Kindergarten Retrospective Survey.



- Childhood vaccinations are credited with producing substantial worldwide declines in childhood mortality, disability, and illness. An up-to-date vaccination record for a two-year-old child includes three polio, four diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis, and one measles-mumps-rubella vaccinations.
- Immunization rates are correlated with rates of health insurance coverage. African Americans and Hispanics, who have the lowest rates of health insurance, also have the lowest rates of up-to-date immunizations at age 2.
- Nearly 70 percent of white and Asian two-year-olds are up to date on vaccinations.
- Vaccination rates have been improving for all racial and ethnic groups. However, African Americans have experienced the smallest improvement.
- Whites and Asians in California have similar vaccination rates as whites and Asians nationally. However, African Americans and Hispanics in California fall below the U.S. average for these groups.


Note: Three-year moving averages.

## 5.8 Percentage of Adults Who Are Current Smokers by Race and Ethnicity, 1990, 1992, 1993, and 1996




- Smoking is one of the leading preventable causes of death and illness in the United States.
- Asian and Hispanic adults have lower rates of smoking than whites and African Americans.
- Smoking rates have declined for all racial and ethnic groups since 1990; however, African Americans and Asians have experienced increases in smoking rates in recent years.
- National data suggest that California's overall smoking rate is lower than the U.S. average. However, African Americans in California are more likely to smoke than African Americans in the United States as a whole.

## 5.9 Percentage of Births That Are Low Birthweight by Race and Ethnicity, 1982–1997




- Infant birthweight is viewed as an important indicator of the health of infants, as low birthweight babies are substantially more likely to die and experience morbidity in their first year of life. Low birthweight babies are those who weigh under 2500 grams (approximately 5.5 pounds).
- African American women deliver a substantially higher rate of low birthweight babies (12 percent) than other racial and ethnic groups. There has been virtually no improvement in the rate of low weight births among African Americans since the early 1980s.
- Whites, Asians, and Hispanics have substantially lower rates of low birthweight than African Americans. Less than 6 percent of white mothers deliver low birthweight babies. Approximately 6 percent of Hispanic and over 7 percent of Asian mothers deliver low birthweight babies.
- Asians and Hispanics in California and the United States have similar rates of low birthweight babies. Whites and African Americans in California have lower rates of low birthweight infants than the national average for these groups.

## 5.10 Percentage of Asian Births That Are Low Birthweight by Mothers' Place of Birth, 1997




- Southeast Asian, Asian Indian, and Filipino mothers have high rates of delivering low birthweight babies, with over 8 percent of all deliveries.
- The particularly high rate of low birthweight infants among Southeast Asians is at least partly explained by their being comparatively young and receiving less prenatal care than other groups (see Chart 5.4).
- Between 4 and 6.5 percent of Korean, Japanese, and Chinese mothers have low birthweight babies.
- Foreign-born mothers are less likely to have low birthweight babies, except for Korean mothers. Korean-born women are slightly more likely to have low birthweight babies than U.S.-born women of Korean ancestry.
- Women of Japanese ancestry in California have a lower rate of low birthweight deliveries than women of Japanese ancestry nationwide. Chinese and Filipino mothers have a higher rate of low birthweight delivery in California than nationally.

## 5.11 Percentage of Hispanic Births That Are Low Birthweight by Mothers' Place of Birth, 1997



- Puerto Rican and Cuban mothers have higher rates of low birthweight babies than Mexican and Central and South American women.
- Foreign-born mothers are less likely to have low birthweight babies than U.S.-born mothers. Researchers have suggested that Hispanic foreign-born mothers maintain “healthy behaviors” after immigrating to the United States, accounting for their better birth outcomes (Guendelman, English, and Chavez, 1995; and Guendelman and Abrams, 1995).
- National data indicate that Puerto Rican mothers are more likely to deliver low birthweight babies than Cuban women. The national rate of low birthweight infants for Mexican and Central and South American women is similar to that of California.


## 5.12 Rates of Use of Local Mental Health Programs by Race and Ethnicity, 1989–1990



- The use of mental health services reflects both the incidence of mental illness and the willingness of those with mental illness to seek help. Mental illness can be caused by many physical, social, and genetic factors. These data do not reflect the use of services through private mental health care providers. In these data, major functional disorders include schizophrenia, mood disorders, and paranoid disorders. Adjustment disorders are comparatively minor and include anxiety, phobias, sleep disorders, and neuroses.
- African Americans use local mental health programs substantially more than other racial and ethnic groups. Over 24 African Americans seek mental health services from local programs for every 1,000 population.
- Only five out of 1,000 Asians use local mental health programs. This lower rate may result from a lower incidence of mental health disorders or from greater use of private mental health services. National studies have shown that Asians underuse mental health services, suggesting that Asians may not have a lower incidence of mental illness than other racial and ethnic groups.
- Hispanics also use fewer local mental health services per capita.

Notes: Data are for unduplicated visits. Rates per 1,000 population.

### 5.13 Communicable Disease Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1994 and 1995




- Hepatitis A is the seventh most commonly reported infectious disease in the United States. Hispanics have a higher rate of infection with Hepatitis A than other racial and ethnic groups, whereas African Americans and “others” have the lowest rate of Hepatitis A infection.
- Viral meningitis is an infection of the fluid in the spinal cord and around the brain. Viral meningitis is most common among African Americans and Hispanics and least common among “others.”
- Pertussis, commonly called whooping cough, is a serious contagious disease. It can be dangerous for small children, and vaccinations are recommended. Hispanics and whites have higher infection rates for pertussis than other groups.
- Tuberculosis is an easily transmitted, serious respiratory illness. It is most common among “others” and least common among whites. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that over two-thirds of California’s tuberculosis cases are in foreign-born individuals. In contrast, less than 40 percent of U.S. tuberculosis cases are foreign-born, largely because California has a higher share of immigrants than other states. In the United States and California, tuberculosis is more common among Asian immigrants than among immigrants from other countries.

Notes: The “other” group is primarily composed of Asians, since there is no separate category for Asians. Rates per 100,000 population.




## 5.14 AIDS Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1981–1996



- The incidence of AIDS is related to many factors, including the rate of use of injected drugs, participation in risky sexual behavior, and the need for blood transfusions. Those infected with the virus that causes AIDS can often delay or prevent its development with aggressive medical care.
- African Americans living in California have over double the rate of AIDS cases of any other racial or ethnic group, with nearly 70 cases per 100,000 population.
- Asians have the lowest rate of AIDS cases in California, with less than 10 cases per 100,000.
- The prevalence of AIDS has declined for all racial and ethnic groups since 1994, as people who acquired AIDS in earlier years have died and the rate of new transmissions has declined.
- The rate of AIDS infection among African Americans, Asians, and Hispanics is lower in California than in the United States. Whites in California have double the rate of AIDS infection of the U.S. average among whites.

Note: Rates per 100,000 population.

## 5.15 Age-Adjusted Infant Death Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1985–1994




- Infant mortality is widely viewed as a key indicator of community health and well-being. Infant death is defined as a death that occurs before age 1.
- Although infant death rates have decreased over time for all racial groups, differences between racial groups have persisted. For example, the infant death rate for African Americans was about twice the rate for whites, Hispanics, and Asians from 1985 through 1994.
- Hispanics have lower-than-expected infant mortality rates in relation to their education, income, and use of health services (Guendelman, Chavez, and Christianson, 1994).
- African American infant mortality is higher nationally than in California, with about 15 infant deaths for every 1,000 live births. The California rate is approximately 13 deaths for every 1,000 live births. White and Hispanic infant mortality is similar in California to that in the United States, whereas Asian infant mortality is slightly higher in California.

Note: Rates per 1,000 live births.

## 5.16 Death Rates for Persons Age 25 to 34 by Race, Ethnicity, and Cause, 1996


Source: California Department of Health Services, Vital Records Division.



- Homicide is the leading cause of death for African Americans between the ages of 25 and 34 years (it also is the leading cause of death for African Americans age 15 to 24 years). The homicide rate for African Americans between the ages of 25 and 34 was about 10 times greater than that of whites and Asians in 1996.
- AIDS is the second leading cause of death for white and African American adults in this age group and the third leading cause of death for Asians and Hispanics. The AIDS death rate for African Americans is about twice that for whites and Hispanics, and over 12 times that for Asians, in this age group.
- Unintentional injuries are the leading cause of death for whites, Hispanics, and Asians between the ages of 25 and 34 years. They are the third leading cause of death for African Americans in this age group.
- Heart disease is relatively uncommon among individuals between the ages of 25 and 34 years. Nonetheless, heart disease is the fourth leading cause of death among African Americans in this age group.
- Deaths from all these causes were more prevalent among men than women.
- National death rates for these causes are similar to California death rates.

Note: Rates per 100,000 population.

## 5.17 Death Rates for Persons Age 55 to 64 by Race, Ethnicity, and Cause, 1996



- Heart disease and cancer are the leading causes of death among the elderly for all racial groups.
- Death rates for both cancer and heart disease are lower for women than for men among all racial groups.
- African American men have the highest death rates from cancer and heart disease. Asian and Hispanic men and women tend to have lower death rates from both cancer and heart disease than other racial and ethnic groups.
- Deaths from unintentional injuries and AIDS are relatively uncommon among Asians in this age group.
- The national death rate for African Americans for heart disease and cancer is higher than the rate in California.

## Chapter 6

# Labor Market Outcomes

For most families, economic well-being is determined by labor market earnings, which are closely related to the other socioeconomic outcomes. People with low health and educational status are also likely to have relatively low earnings, and groups with low earnings are more likely to have high rates of family poverty. Poor labor market outcomes can also reduce opportunities for health and education for children. Many individual characteristics affect labor market outcomes—level of education, skills, English proficiency, and past experience. In addition, structural factors about the labor market and discrimination also affect labor market opportunities for particular groups. Labor market outcomes vary substantially across racial and ethnic groups. In this chapter, we explore these differences by examining labor force participation, unemployment, wages, and type of occupation. Because men and women have historically had different labor market experiences, the labor market outcomes in this chapter are grouped by gender.

Overall, we find that nonwhites, especially Hispanics, tend to have lower earnings than whites. Hispanics and African Americans also have particularly high unemployment rates, which are more severely affected by economic fluctuations. Low levels of education and recent immigration contribute to low earnings. However, even when we compare U.S.-born workers with similar education levels, we find that the median of earnings of white men is higher than the medians for Hispanic, Asian, and African American men.

Participation in the labor market develops labor market experience that in turn influences future occupational success and earnings. Labor force participation rates measure the share of people who have jobs or are actively looking for work (Charts 6.1 to 6.3). Among men in their prime working years, age 25 to 54, overall labor force participation rates are about 90 percent. African American men have lower participation rates than other groups—about 80 percent in 1997. For women, labor force participation rates are lower than those of men, but they have increased dramatically over the past few decades. In 1997, white, African American, and Asian women participated at rates over 70 percent. For Hispanic women, participation rates have been closer to 65 percent. Although participation rates are high for most Asian groups, immigrants from Southeast Asia have low levels of participation.

Trends in unemployment rates show labor market difficulties for African Americans and Hispanics. The unemployment rate measures the percentage of people in the labor force who are actively seeking employment (Charts 6.4 to 6.7). The unemployment rate fluctuates with the business cycle, reaching peaks during periods of recession. Fluctuations in the unemployment rate are more dramatic for African Americans and Hispanics than for Asians and whites. Even in periods of economic prosperity, unemployment rates are higher for African Americans and Hispanics than for whites and Asians. In 1997, the unemployment rate for white and Asian men was about 4 percent compared to roughly 7 percent for Hispanic men and almost 10 percent for African American men. The unemployment rates of African

American and Hispanic women are about twice those of white and Asian women. Among Asian groups, men and women from Southeast Asia and women from India had high unemployment rates of close to 10 percent in 1990. Mexican immigrant women had the highest level of unemployment in 1990—close to 15 percent.

Looking at young adults (age 16–24), we see that group differences begin early in life. Most young people are actively investing in labor market skills. Activities such as school and work develop skills that can have labor market payoffs in the future (Charts 6.8 to 6.10). In 1997, a greater proportion of African American and Hispanic young adults were neither working nor in school compared to white and Asian young adults. Compared to their male counterparts, young women were even more likely to be neither in school nor working, particularly African Americans (over 20 percent) and Hispanics (about 30 percent). Hispanics and whites have the largest proportion of young adults in the labor market. Young men from Mexico had the highest work participation rates, with over half working and only about 30 percent in school in 1990. In contrast, for each Asian group, over 60 percent of young adults were in school in 1990.

Beyond activity and participation rates, wages provide an indication of labor market success. One measure of wage trends is the median earnings of full-time workers age 25 to 54. Median weekly earnings is the level of earnings at which half of the population earns less per week and half earns more (Charts 6.11 to 6.16). In 1997, the median weekly earnings of white male workers was about \$800, about \$650 for Asian men, just under \$600 for African American men, and just over \$400 for Hispanic men. Among Asian groups, immigrants from Southeast Asia and the Philippines had the lowest medians in 1990. However, for immigrants from Mexico and Central and South America, the median was even lower. Hispanic women also earned substantially less than other groups of women. Median weekly earnings were over \$600 for white women, about \$550 for Asian and African American women, and about \$350 for Hispanic women.


Differences in education can explain some of the differences in median earnings between groups. We compare white median wages to those for different racial and ethnic groups while also distinguishing between workers with college degrees and those with high school diplomas (Charts 6.17 to 6.22). In 1989, the median weekly earnings for Hispanic men was about 50 percent of the white median (Chart 6.11). Within each of the education groups, the Hispanic, Asian, and African American male median was about 80 percent of the white median (except for Asian men with a high school diploma, who earned less than 75 percent of the white median). These results suggest that low levels of education contribute to the low median earnings of Hispanic men. But even when we compare men with similar levels of formal education, many immigrant groups tend to have lower median earnings than U.S.-born workers. College-educated men from the Philippines earned about 65 percent of the earnings of comparably educated whites and those from Mexico and from Central and South American earned about 55 percent. This gap probably reflects a variety of factors for immigrants including lower language skills and less experience in the local labor market as well as discrimination and the wage effect of illegal employment.<sup>1</sup> Within each education group, Hispanic and African American women earned close to 90 percent or more of the median for white women. Asian women with college degrees also earned about 90 percent of the white median, but those with high school diplomas earned only 80 percent.

---

<sup>1</sup> Labor force participation rates are based on workers' self-reported activities in the week before the survey and may include illegal employment and the "underground economy."

Occupation is an alternative indicator of labor market status. Occupation is highly related to earnings, yet occupational segregation illustrates some differences between groups that are not reflected in employment and earnings (Charts 6.23 to 6.28). Occupational segregation results from individual differences in experience, skills, and networks as well as structural factors in the labor market and discrimination that may discourage members of certain groups from entering particular occupations. A large share of white men are employed in managerial and professional occupations—the category with the highest earnings. Asian and African American men are more likely to be employed in moderate earning occupations, and Hispanic men are more likely to be in low earning occupations. For every group, women are slightly more likely than men to be in managerial and professional occupations. Hispanic women have a substantially larger share of low earning occupations than do other women.

## 6.1 Labor Force Participation Rates of Persons Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender, 1979–1997




- Historically, most men age 25 to 54 have been active participants in the labor force. Participation rates for women have increased substantially in recent decades.
- For all groups, male participation rates have been at 80 percent or higher. In 1997, the participation rate was just over 90 percent for white and Hispanic men, just under 90 percent for Asian men, and just over 80 percent for African American men.
- In 1997, participation rates for white and African American women were about 75 percent. For Asian women the participation rate was just over 70 percent and for Hispanic women it was about 65 percent.
- Labor force participation among African American men declined substantially in the 1990s from a high just below 90 percent to just above 80 percent. Participation among African American women also declined in the early 1990s but recovered fully during the recent economic boom.
- For most groups, participation rates in the rest of the nation are similar to those in California. However, the decline in African American male participation during the 1990s was more severe in the state than elsewhere.

Notes: The labor force participation rate is the percentage of the population either employed or actively seeking work. Three-year moving averages. Data for Asians are not available before 1988 in the CPS. Labor force participation rates are based on workers' self-reported activities in the week before the survey and may include illegal employment and the "underground economy."




## 6.2 Labor Force Participation Rates of Asians Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth and Gender, 1980 and 1990



- Across all ethnic groups, except for immigrants from Southeast Asia, Asian men have consistently been in the labor force at rates of 90 percent or greater. Less than 70 percent of foreign-born men from Southeast Asia participated in the labor market in 1980 and 1990.
- For the U.S.-born Asian women, participation has grown substantially, and about 85 percent were active in the labor market in 1990. Foreign-born Filipino women participated at roughly the same rate as U.S.-born Asian women in 1990. About 70 percent of foreign-born Chinese and Korean women were active in the labor market compared to about half of foreign-born Japanese and Southeast Asian women.

Notes: Data in this chart are not directly comparable to data in Chart 6.1, since the Census and CPS data are not directly comparable. There are differences in the sample frame, the sample size, the weighting scheme, and the way in which both surveys were conducted. Also some of the questions were asked slightly differently in both surveys. This could lead to differences in outcomes.


### 6.3 Labor Force Participation Rates of Hispanics Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth and Gender, 1980 and 1990



- Across all subgroups, Hispanic men have consistently been in the labor force at rates of over 85 percent. For most groups, there has been no strong downward trend in male participation. The two exceptions are U.S.-born Central and South Americans, who had a 9 percentage point fall in participation between 1980 and 1990, and foreign-born Caribbeans, who had a 4 percentage point fall.
- All groups of Hispanic women show a strong increase in participation rates. In 1990, the participation rate of most groups was about 70 percent. U.S.-born Central and South American women had a higher rate of 78 percent. Foreign-born women from Mexico had a lower rate of 58 percent.

Note: Data in this chart are not directly comparable to data in Chart 6.1. See the notes to Chart 6.2 for an explanation.


## 6.4 Unemployment Rates of Persons Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender, 1979–1997



- The unemployment rate is a widely reported indicator of labor market conditions. The unemployment rate is defined as the percentage of the labor force without a job but actively seeking work. “Discouraged” workers who are not employed and not seeking a job are not considered unemployed. Workers in the age range of 25 to 54 are in their prime years of labor market activity.
- Unemployment rates fluctuate with the business cycle, reaching peak values during recessions. Whites and Asians tend to have low unemployment rates, ranging from 4 to 6 percent over the 1990s. For Hispanic men, unemployment was over 10 percent during the recent recession but has fallen below 8 percent. For African American men, unemployment peaked at over 13 percent and remained at almost 10 percent in 1997. Unemployment rates for African American and Hispanic women ranged from 9 to 12 percent in the 1990s.
- In 1997, most groups had slightly higher unemployment in California than did their counterparts in the rest of the nation. For African American men, unemployment has been substantially higher in the state in recent years.

Notes: Three-year moving averages. Data for Asians are not available before 1988 in the CPS.


## 6.5 Unemployment Rates of Asians Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth and Gender, 1980 and 1990



- Although Asians overall tend to have low unemployment rates, data by Asian ethnic groups show a range of rates with particularly high unemployment for foreign-born Southeast Asians. Because of data limitations on Asian subgroups, we can look only at unemployment rates in 1980 and 1990, when unemployment rates were low but increasing.
- Among U.S.-born Asian men, the unemployment rate was 2 to 3 percent in 1990. For most immigrant groups, the male unemployment rate was slightly higher at 3 to 4 percent. Foreign-born men from Japan had a lower unemployment rate of only 1 percent, whereas foreign-born men from Southeast Asia had a higher rate of about 9 percent.
- Among women, the unemployment rate for U.S.-born Chinese and Japanese was quite low in 1990—only 2 percent. For U.S.-born Filipinos and most foreign-born groups, unemployment was about 4 percent. Foreign-born women from India and Southeast Asia had substantially higher unemployment of about 9 percent.

Notes: Data in this chart are not directly comparable to data in Chart 6.4. The CPS reports higher unemployment in 1990 for Asian men (4.5 percent vs. 4.1 percent in the Census), for Asian women (3.7 percent vs. 4.7 percent), and for African American women (6.7 percent vs. 8.7 percent).


## 6.6 Unemployment Rates of Hispanics Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth and Gender, 1980 and 1990



- Unemployment rates by Hispanic subgroup show fairly similar levels across the male groups but large variations across the female groups.
- Among U.S.-born Hispanic men, unemployment was 7 percent in 1990. Among foreign-born Hispanic men, it was slightly higher at 8 to 9 percent. U.S.-born Central and South Americans had a substantial rise in unemployment of 3 percentage points between 1980 and 1990.
- Among U.S.-born Hispanic women, the unemployment rate in 1990 was 5 percent for Central and South Americans and Caribbeans and 7 percent for Mexicans. Foreign-born women from the Caribbean also had a low rate of only 5 percent, which had dropped from 1980 rates. However, foreign-born women from Mexico and Central and South America had high rates of 15 and 11 percent, respectively.


Notes: Because of data limitations on Hispanic subgroups, we can look only at unemployment rates in 1980 and 1990. Data in this chart are not directly comparable to data in Chart 6.4. The CPS reports lower unemployment rates for Hispanic women (8.4 percent vs. 10.0 percent).

## 6.7 Unemployment Rates of Persons Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, Gender, and Region, 1990




- There were significant regional variations in the unemployment rates of different racial and ethnic populations. For the Northern and Mountain region, there were too few Asians and African Americans in the sample to allow for accurate estimation of unemployment rates.
- Among men in every region, African Americans and Hispanics had substantially higher unemployment rates than whites and Asians. African American male unemployment was generally higher than that of Hispanics except in the Central Valley and Central Coast region. Asian and white men had relatively similar levels of unemployment, at 3 to 5 percent, except in the Central Valley and Central Coast region, where the rate for Asian men was about 6 percent compared to 4 percent for white men.
- The regional unemployment patterns for women were similar to those for men in that African American and Hispanic women had higher unemployment rates than white and Asian women in every region. Unemployment was especially high in the Central Valley and Central Coast region, at almost 17 percent for Hispanic women and at 10 percent for African American women.

## 6.8 Activities of Young Adults Age 16 to 24 by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender, 1980, 1990, and 1997



- Activities of young adults age 16 to 24 help indicate their future labor market opportunities. School and work can improve labor market skills and increase opportunities for future labor market success. This chart shows the share of young adults who were in school, working and not in school, or doing neither.
- In recent years, over half of young white men were in school, about 35 percent were working, and 10 percent were doing neither. Hispanic men were more likely than whites to be working (about 45 percent) and less likely to be in school (about 40 percent). Asian men were the most likely to be in school (almost 70 percent) with about 20 percent working. More than half of African American men were in school and just below 30 percent were working.
- White and Asian young women had roughly the same activity mix as their male counterparts. Close to 30 percent of Hispanic women and over 20 percent of African American women were neither in school nor working. School and work activity levels tend to be lower for women who are raising young children.
- Compared to the rest of the nation, in California most groups were more likely to be in school and less likely to be working. However, the activity rates of Hispanics in California nearly matched those of Hispanics in the rest of the nation.


## 6.9 Activities of Young Adult Asians Age 16 to 24 by Place of Birth and Gender, 1980 and 1990



- School was the most common activity for Asian young men and women across all subgroups.
- For all groups of Asian men, less than 10 percent were neither studying nor working in 1990.
- Among young women, foreign-born women were more likely to be neither studying nor working with shares close to 15 percent for Southeast Asians, Asian Indians, and Japanese in 1990. Foreign-born Filipino young women had the highest share involved in work activities for both years.




## 6.10 Activities of Young Adult Hispanics Age 16 to 24 by Place of Birth and Gender, 1980 and 1990



- Activities of young people vary widely across Hispanic groups, with the highest share of school activities reported for U.S.-born Central and South American men and women. The highest share of nonschool and non-work activities was reported for foreign-born Mexican women.
- More than half of U.S.-born Hispanic young men were in school in 1990 and 10 to 15 percent were not active in school or work. Foreign-born young men, especially Mexicans, had smaller shares in school, larger shares working, and slightly larger shares doing neither.
- Although more than half of U.S.-born Hispanic young women in each group attended school in 1990, close to 20 percent of U.S.-born Mexicans and Caribbeans were neither studying nor working. The shares of foreign-born Hispanic women who were neither in school nor at work was quite high—over 25 percent for Central and South Americans and Caribbeans and close to 40 percent for Mexicans.


## 6.11 Median Weekly Earnings of Male Full-Time Workers Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity, 1979–1997



- Labor market earnings are the main source of income for most families. Median weekly earnings are calculated for men who worked at least 35 hours in the week before the survey.
- White men have the highest median weekly earnings of any group, at about \$800 in recent years. Asian men have the next highest median, at about \$650. The median for African Americans was about \$600 in recent years. Hispanic men have the lowest median, at just over \$400.
- The median for white and African American men has fallen since the mid-1980s. For Hispanic men, there has been a fairly consistent and substantial fall since the early 1980s.
- Compared to the rest of the nation, in California white and African American men had substantially higher median earnings in 1997 and Asian and Hispanic men had nearly the same medians in the state as in the rest of the nation.

Notes: Three-year moving averages. All dollar values are adjusted to 1998 levels. Data for Asians are not available before 1988 in the CPS.


## 6.12 Median Weekly Earnings of Asian Male Full-Time Workers Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1979 and 1989



- Japanese men had the highest median earnings of all the groups studied. In 1989, median earnings were about \$1,025 per week for foreign-born Japanese and just below \$975 for U.S.-born Japanese.
- In 1989, Filipino men had relatively low median earnings of under \$750 per week for those born in the United States and under \$650 for those foreign-born. The decline between 1979 and 1989 in median earnings of foreign-born Filipinos likely reflects the low earnings of new immigrants.
- For Chinese men in 1989, there was a substantial difference between the median earnings of those born in the United States, about \$975, compared to those foreign-born, about \$750.
- Foreign-born Southeast Asians had the lowest median weekly earnings, about \$600, in 1989.

Note: Data in this chart are not directly comparable to data in Chart 6.11. See the notes to Chart 6.2 for an explanation.


### 6.13 Median Weekly Earnings of Hispanic Male Full-Time Workers Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1979 and 1989



- For most Hispanic subgroups, median weekly earnings were just under \$750 in 1989. Foreign-born Mexicans and Central and South Americans had substantially lower medians of about \$400.
- Between 1979 and 1989, the medians for foreign-born Mexicans and Central and South Americans declined substantially. This probably reflects the lower earnings status of recent immigrants. However, even among U.S.-born Hispanic groups, there has been some decline in median earnings.

Note: Data in this chart are not directly comparable to data in Chart 6.11. See the notes to Chart 6.2 for an explanation.


## 6.14 Median Weekly Earnings of Female Full-Time Workers Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity, 1979–1997



- Women's earnings are the main source of growth in family income over recent decades. Differences in women's earnings across race and ethnic groups are an important source of differences in financial well-being across families. Median earnings are for women who worked at least 35 hours in the week before the survey.
- In recent years, white women have had the highest median weekly earnings at about \$625 compared to about \$550 for Asian and African American women. Hispanic women have had the lowest median earnings at about \$350 per week.
- For white and African American women, median weekly earnings show a strong growth trend over the last two decades, although African American women's wages fell somewhat in the recession of the early 1990s. For Hispanic women, the median has fallen over \$50 since the early 1980s.
- In recent years, the median earnings of white and African American women has been more than \$100 higher in California than in the rest of the nation. The median for Asian women has been only slightly higher in the state. For Hispanic women, the median in the state has been slightly lower.

Notes: Three-year moving averages. All dollar values are adjusted to 1998 levels. Data for Asians are not available before 1988 in the CPS.


## 6.15 Median Weekly Earnings of Asian Female Full-Time Workers Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1979 and 1989



- Comparisons of the Asian ethnic groups show that U.S.-born Asian women ranked highest in earnings in 1989. Among U.S.-born Asian women, Chinese had the highest median wages at about \$750. The median wage was about \$725 for U.S.-born Japanese women and about \$600 for Filipinos.
- Foreign-born groups had substantially lower median wages than their U.S.-born peers. Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino immigrant women had median wages of about \$550. Foreign-born Asian Indians and Koreans had median wages around \$475 and foreign-born Southeast Asians had the lowest median at about \$450.
- All the Asian ethnic groups of women show growth in their median earnings between 1979 and 1989.

Note: Data in this chart are not directly comparable to data in Chart 6.14. See the notes to Chart 6.2 for an explanation.


## 6.16 Median Weekly Earnings of Hispanic Female Full-Time Workers Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1979 and 1989



- Among Hispanic women, U.S.-born Central and South Americans and Caribbeans had the highest median weekly earnings, at about \$550 in 1989. Median weekly earnings for U.S.-born Mexican women were about \$500.
- For foreign-born women from Mexico and Central and South America, median weekly earnings were substantially lower, at only about \$300 to \$325. For foreign-born Caribbeans, the median more closely matched that of U.S.-born groups—about \$500.
- For foreign-born groups from Mexico and Central and South America, there was a decline in median earnings between 1979 and 1989. This decline probably reflects recent immigration of women with low earnings.

Note: Data in this chart are not directly comparable to data in Chart 6.14. See the notes to Chart 6.2 for an explanation.


## 6.17 Median Earnings for Male High School and College Graduates Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity, 1989



- Differences in educational attainment can explain some of the differences in median earnings between groups. This and the following charts show median weekly earnings as a percentage of white median earnings for adult workers who worked at least 35 hours a week.
- Within each education category, Hispanic men earned just over 80 percent of the white median in 1989. When male workers from all education groups are pooled, Hispanics earn about 50 percent of the white median (see Chart 6.11). That is, Hispanic relative earnings are substantially higher within education groups. This suggests that low education is one reason Hispanic men tend to have low relative earnings. The relative median for African American men was also about 80 percent for both education groups.
- Asian men with a college degree earned just over 80 percent of the white median. However, those with only a high school diploma earned less than 75 percent of the white median. This reflects the high concentration of low-earning immigrants among Asians who have only a high school diploma.
- For Hispanic and African American men, relative earnings in California were similar to earnings in the rest of the nation in 1989. For Asian men, those in the state have lower relative earnings by about 10 percentage points in each education category.




## 6.18 Median Earnings for Asian Male High School and College Graduates Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, and Place of Birth, 1989




- Among Asian men, Japanese men have the highest relative earnings. Foreign-born and U.S.-born Japanese men with a high school diploma earned about 90 percent of the white median in 1989. For those with a college degree, U.S.-born Japanese men had median earnings just slightly below those of whites whereas their foreign-born peers earned about 10 percent more than whites.
- U.S.-born and foreign-born Chinese men with a college degree earned about 90 percent of the white median. For Chinese men with a high school diploma, the U.S.-born median was similar to that of the white median but foreign-born men earned only 65 percent of the white median.
- Among U.S.-born groups, Filipinos had the lowest relative earnings. For those with high school diplomas, the median was just above 80 percent of the white median. For those with college degrees, relative earnings were only about 70 percent. In both education groups, the foreign-born earned 65 to 70 percent of the white median.
- The foreign-born from other areas of Asia had low relative earnings, ranging from about 70 to 80 percent of the white median. Asian Indians with college degrees were the exception, earning close to 95 percent of the white median.

## 6.19 Median Earnings for Hispanic Male High School and College Graduates Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, and Place of Birth, 1989




- U.S.-born Hispanic men tend to have higher earnings than their immigrant counterparts.
- U.S.-born Mexican men with a high school diploma earned over 90 percent of the white median, whereas foreign-born Mexicans earned less than 80 percent. U.S.-born Mexican men with a college degree earned 85 percent of the white median and foreign-born Mexican men earned less than 70 percent.
- U.S.-born Hispanic men of Central and South American descent earned close to 80 percent of the white median in both education groups, whereas their foreign-born peers had lower earnings at 50 to 60 percent.
- U.S.-born Caribbean men have high relative earnings at about 95 percent of the white median. Foreign-born Caribbean men earned between 80 and 90 percent.

## 6.20 Median Earnings for Female High School and College Graduates Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity, 1989




- This chart shows the median weekly earnings relative to whites for adult female workers who worked at least 35 hours a week.
- Hispanic women in both education groups earned about 90 percent of the white median in 1989.
- Asian women with a high school diploma earned about 80 percent of the white median, whereas those with a college degree earned close to 90 percent.
- For African American women with a high school diploma, median earnings were similar to those of white women. African American women with a college degree earned about 90 percent of the white median.
- Compared to the rest of the nation, in California relative earnings for women were low in 1989. In the rest of the nation, all groups earned 95 to 100 percent of the white median. As the next two charts show, California's lower relative earnings for Asians and Hispanics can be partially explained by the higher proportion of low-earning immigrants in the state.

## 6.21 Median Earnings for Asian Female High School and College Graduates Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, and Place of Birth, 1989



- Among Asian women born in the United States, most groups had median earnings at or above the white median in 1989. For those with a high school diploma, Chinese women earned almost 30 percent more than the white median, Japanese women earned almost 20 percent more, and Filipinos earned about the same as the white median. Chinese and Japanese women with college degrees had median earnings similar to those of whites. Filipino women with college degrees were the exception, earning only 85 percent of the white median.
- Most ethnic groups of foreign-born Asians earned 75 to 85 percent of the white median. However, foreign-born Chinese with a college degree earned almost 95 percent.


## 6.22 Median Earnings for Hispanic Female High School and College Graduates Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, and Place of Birth, 1989



- For U.S.-born Hispanic women with a high school diploma, median earnings were at or above the white median in 1989. U.S.-born Hispanic women of Central and South American descent actually earned 20 percent more than the white median. For those with a college degree, U.S.-born Mexican women earned the same median as whites, but the other two groups of U.S.-born Hispanic women earned 90 percent of the white median.
- Among immigrant groups, women from the Caribbean had the highest relative earnings. Those with high school diplomas earned the white median, whereas those with a college degree earned 85 percent of the white median for that education group.
- Foreign-born women from Mexico and Central and South America had median earnings of 65 to 75 percent of the white median for both education groups.


## 6.23 Occupations of Employed Men Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity

Source: March files of the Current Population Survey, 1996–1998.




- Occupation is an alternative indicator of socioeconomic status that may illuminate labor market conditions not reflected in employment or wages. Occupational pay scales are strong determinants of wage levels and lifetime job opportunities. Occupational barriers can play a role in persistent gaps in labor market outcomes.
- The largest share of white men, just over 40 percent, worked in managerial and professional occupations—the highest earning category. Slightly less than 40 percent worked in moderate earning occupations (such as technical support, sales, administrative support, precision production, craft, and repair) and the remaining 20 percent were in low earning occupations (such as operators, fabricators, laborers, service, farming, forestry, and fishing).
- More than half of Hispanic men were in the low earning occupations. Hispanics were the only group to have a substantial share of men, about 13 percent, in farming, forestry, and fishing (not shown).
- Asian and African American men had substantial shares working in the managerial and professional occupations (about 35 and 25 percent, respectively) and roughly 40 percent working in moderate earning occupations. About one-third of African American men were in low earning occupations.
- Compared to the rest of the nation, in California African American and white men were more likely to be in the high earning managerial and professional occupations and less likely to be in the low earning occupations. Asian men were more likely to be in moderate earning occupations in California. Hispanic men in the state had a similar occupational distribution to their counterparts in the rest of the nation.

## 6.24 Occupations of Employed Asian Men Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1989



- For most Asian groups, a substantial share of male workers were in high earning occupations. However, for foreign-born men from Southeast Asia, the share in high earning occupations was less than 20 percent.
- Among the U.S.-born groups, Filipinos had the smallest share in high earning occupations (26 percent) and the largest share in low earning occupations (32 percent).
- More than half of foreign-born men from Japan and India were in high earning managerial and professional occupations. Foreign-born men from Southeast Asia had roughly 40 percent of workers in the low earning occupations.


## 6.25 Occupations of Employed Hispanic Men Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1989



- For U.S.-born Mexican men and for all three groups of foreign-born Hispanic men, roughly 40 percent or more worked in low earning occupations. Almost 65 percent of foreign-born Mexican men were in low earning occupations.
- For U.S.-born Hispanic men of Central and South American descent, almost 30 percent were in the high earning occupations. For U.S.-born Caribbeans, the share in high earning occupations was over 20 percent.




## 6.26 Occupations of Employed Women Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity




- For white women, over 40 percent worked in managerial and professional occupations—the highest earning category. About 15 percent worked in low earning occupations.
- Compared to white women, Hispanic women had much a larger share in low earning occupations, about half, and a smaller share in high earning occupations, less than 20 percent.
- Asian women had a substantial share in moderate earning occupations, about 40 percent, and in high earning occupations, over 35 percent.
- The largest share of African American women, about 50 percent, worked in moderate earning occupations with over 30 percent in the high earning managerial and professional occupations.
- For most groups, the occupations of women were similar in California and the rest of the nation. However, African American women in the state were more likely to work in managerial and professional occupations (33 compared to 24 percent). They were less likely to work in low earning occupations (19 compared to 36 percent).

## 6.27 Occupations of Employed Asian Women Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1989



- U.S.-born Asian women were highly concentrated in managerial and professional occupations with close to half of Chinese and Japanese and about 30 percent of Filipinos employed in these occupations. They had smaller shares in low earning occupations: less than 10 percent for Chinese and Japanese women and about 20 percent for Filipino women.
- For foreign-born women from Asia, roughly 40 percent were in moderate earning occupations.
- Compared to U.S.-born Asian women, foreign-born women were more likely to work in low earning occupations. For foreign-born Southeast Asians, almost 45 percent were in low earning occupations.

## 6.28 Occupations of Employed Hispanic Women Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1989



- For U.S.-born Hispanic women, about half were employed in moderate earning occupations. With the exception of those of Mexican descent, the next-largest share was in managerial and professional occupations, the highest earning category. About one-third of U.S.-born Mexican women were in low earning occupations.
- Foreign-born Hispanic women had large shares in low earning occupations. Those from Mexico and Central and South America had over 60 percent in low earning occupations.
- Foreign-born women from the Caribbean had a substantial share, about 20 percent, in high earning managerial and professional occupations.

## Chapter 7

# Economic Outcomes

Economic outcomes are some of the most important indicators of well-being. They show the resources that households have available for current consumption and for their future plans. They are measures of wealth, standing, and hardship. This chapter examines economic outcomes by looking at the distribution of income, family income, wealth, poverty, and public assistance use across California's racial and ethnic groups. We are interested in the relative position of these groups as well as changes in their economic performance over time. No single indicator can provide us with a clear view of these matters, and for this reason, we look at a combination of factors as well as outcomes for individuals, children, and families. In some cases, the measures we select do not allow for comparisons across datasets. For example, the *Current Population Survey* includes a more exhaustive number of sources of income than the decennial Census. Taken together, however, these data help us gauge current economic position, progress, and opportunities for the future.

The data indicate that Asian and non-Hispanic white family income is substantially higher than that of African Americans and Hispanics (Chart 7.1). The median family income of non-Hispanic whites rose between 1970 and 1997 but fell for Hispanic families during the same period. This decline is partly due to an increase in the proportion of immigrants among the Hispanic population and their low educational attainment (see Chapters 1 and 3). As a result of this decline, Hispanics had the lowest median family income of the major racial and ethnic groups in 1997; that figure was close to half that of non-Hispanic white families. Even the median income of Caribbeans—the Hispanic group with the highest median income—was two-thirds that of white non-Hispanics (Chart 7.2). The median family income of U.S.-born Asians and Filipino and Asian Indian immigrants was above that of whites (Chart 7.3), whereas Southeast Asian family income was close to that of African Americans in 1989.

Asset holdings and home ownership are other important measures of economic well-being. Such forms of wealth allow households to maintain living standards during periods of economic fluctuation, to finance education, or to start a business. Also, differences in wealth reinforce differences in family income. Compared to other groups, a substantially greater proportion of whites owned stocks, mutual funds, or savings accounts in 1997, and this difference has been increasing over time (Chart 7.4). By 1997, whites were twice as likely as Asians to own these assets and over four times as likely to do so than African Americans and Hispanics. Some of this difference may be explained by the fact that a great proportion of whites are older than age 45 (see Chapter 2). Home ownership is more common for whites and Asians than for African American and Hispanics (Charts 7.5 to 7.7). About 40 percent of Hispanics and African Americans owned a home in 1990, compared to two-thirds of whites and 59 percent of Asians.

Economic status is also reflected in people's living arrangements. For example, people with limited resources tend to live in overcrowded housing. However, living arrangements are also the result of cultural norms, age structure, fertility, and housing costs. Hispanics and Asians have substantially larger house-

holds than African Americans and whites and are more likely to live in overcrowded housing (Chart 7.8). However, overcrowding is more common among foreign-born groups than U.S.-born residents (Charts 7.9 and 7.10). Of all California's racial and ethnic groups, Southeast Asians have the highest level of overcrowding, with over 50 percent living in *severely* overcrowded housing units.

Differences in median income and wealth holdings provide only a partial description of the economic status of racial and ethnic groups in California. An analysis of income distribution and poverty rates offers another view of economic status and outcomes. In 1989, a smaller proportion of white, African American, and Asian men had incomes at the bottom 25 percent of the income distribution than in 1969, whereas a greater proportion of Hispanics had incomes at the bottom of the income distribution (Chart 7.11). Whites are overrepresented among those at the top 10 percent of the distribution, whereas African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians are overrepresented at the bottom 10 percent of the distribution (Chart 7.12). Compared to other groups, a smaller proportion of Mexican immigrant men earned incomes at the top 25 percent of the distribution and a larger proportion of them earned incomes at the bottom 25 percent (Chart 7.13). At the same time, a greater proportion of Japanese immigrants than any other group earned incomes at the top of the distribution (Chart 7.14).


Lower incomes translated into higher poverty rates for Hispanics and African Americans (Chart 7.15). In 1997, 29 percent of all Hispanics had incomes below the poverty line, compared to 23 percent of African Americans, 16 percent of Asians, and 10 percent of whites. For all groups except Asians, poverty rates were higher in 1997 than they were in 1970. Of the Hispanic groups, foreign-born Mexicans had the highest poverty rate (Chart 7.16). Although family income is high for most immigrants from Asia, Southeast Asians had the highest poverty rates in the state (Chart 7.17).

Poverty among children is of particular concern, as it is associated with lower educational attainment, teenage pregnancy, poor health, crime, cognitive disadvantage, and poor economic performance as adults. Poverty rates are higher for children than for all persons, and the patterns are similar to overall poverty: Hispanic and African American children have substantially higher poverty rates than Asians and whites (Chart 7.18). In 1997, two of every five Hispanic children lived in families with incomes below the poverty line. Poverty rates among children were substantially higher in 1997 than in 1970 for African American, white, and Hispanic children. This is especially true for Hispanic children, for whom poverty rates were 29 percent in 1969 and 40 percent in 1997.

Poverty tends to be concentrated in certain areas of the state. For this reason we divided the state into four regions and examined child poverty in each region (Chart 7.19). The regions are the Northern and Mountain counties, the Farm Belt, the Bay Area, and Southern California. The Bay Area had the lowest proportion of poor children of all regions, and the Farm Belt had the highest. Forty-four percent of Asian children, 39 percent of African American children, 35 percent of Hispanic children, and 15 percent of white children in the Farm Belt lived in households with incomes below the poverty line. In the Northern and Mountain region, 37 percent, 25 percent, and 23 percent of African American, Hispanic, and Asian children were poor, respectively. However, the most populous region of the state is Southern California. And in Southern California, 33 percent of African American, 29 percent of Hispanic, 17 percent of Asian, and 9 percent of white children were poor in 1989.

Given high poverty rates, we expect high use of public assistance. In the final set of charts, we examine the use of public assistance by different racial and ethnic groups. Compared to other households, a greater proportion of those headed by an African American received public assistance (Chart 7.20). However, in the mid-1990s, while the economy was recovering from the recession and after the passage of the Welfare Reform Act of 1996, public assistance use declined for all groups, especially for African Americans (Chart 7.21). In 1997, welfare use among African American households was half that of 1995. Public assistance use among Mexican households is fairly low (16 percent for natives and 11 percent for immigrants), and it has been declining since 1969 (Chart 7.22). Public assistance use among Caribbean immigrants is relatively high, even though their poverty rates are lower than those of other Hispanic groups. Among Asians, Southeast Asians have the highest public assistance use (Chart 7.23). Asian households resemble their white counterparts in their use of public assistance. However, welfare use has been increasing for households headed by non-Japanese Asian immigrants.


## 7.1 Median Family Income by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1997



- Whites and Asians have higher median annual family income than their African American and Hispanic counterparts. Hispanics had higher median family income than African Americans in the 1970s, but by the 1990s, their median family income fell below that of African Americans.
- Relative to whites, African American and Hispanic family income was lower in 1997 than in 1970. In 1970, Hispanic family median income was 72 percent that of whites; the corresponding figure for African American families was 65 percent. By 1998, Hispanic and African American median income was 51 and 60 percent that of non-Hispanic whites, respectively. If we control for family size—Hispanic families are larger than white families—we would observe an even larger difference.
- In the 1990s, median family income declined for all racial and ethnic groups. The median family income of whites, however, began to recover in the early 1990s, but that of Asians, African Americans, and Hispanics did not recover until the mid-1990s.
- Median family income is higher in California than in the rest of the country for all four racial and ethnic groups.

Notes: Three-year moving averages. Family income is the sum of incomes for all family members. The data are adjusted to 1997 dollars based on a Consumer Price Index for California, and comparison statistics for the rest of the nation are adjusted with a Consumer Price Index for the United States (Reed, 1999). The median is for all persons, not families, and we did not adjust for family size.

## 7.2 Median Family Income for Hispanics by Place of Birth, 1969, 1979, and 1989




- Median family income varies across Hispanic groups. In 1989, Caribbeans had the highest median family income of all Hispanic groups: \$38,500 for those foreign-born and \$41,400 for those born in the United States. Mexicans and Central and South Americans had the same median family income: \$31,300 for those foreign-born and \$37,600 for those born in the United States.
- Although median family income for Hispanics has declined, we observe a significant decline only for foreign-born Central and South Americans. All other groups saw either improvement or stability in their family income. The decline in the overall number is for the most part due to an increase in the proportion of Hispanics who are foreign-born, and their lower earnings compared to U.S.-born Hispanics.
- Median family income declined for U.S.-born and foreign-born Central and South Americans. In 1989, foreign-born Central and South Americans earned close to 80 percent of the median family income for their U.S.-born peers.

Notes: Data in this chart are not directly comparable to the data in Chart 7.1. The Census and the CPS differ in their sample frame, sample size, weights, and the way they are conducted. Also, the CPS asks about more sources of income.



### 7.3 Median Family Income for Asians by Place of Birth, 1969, 1979, and 1989




- The median family income of U.S.-born Asians and foreign-born Filipinos and Asian Indians was higher than that of non-Hispanic whites in 1989. Median family income for whites was \$52,700 in 1989.
- The annual family income of Southeast Asians was close to that of African Americans in 1989.
- Median family income increased for all Asian groups in the last few decades. Foreign-born Filipinos experienced the largest increase: from \$40,400 in 1970 to \$62,400 in 1989. For U.S.-born Asians, Chinese experienced the largest increase.
- The income of foreign-born Chinese families, who make up over 70 percent of the Chinese population in California, increased by 19 percent between 1969 and 1989. During the same time period, the family income of U.S.-born Japanese, who are 70 percent of the Japanese population, increased by 32 percent.

Notes: Data in this chart are not directly comparable to the data in Chart 7.1. The Census and the CPS differ in their sample frame, sample size, weights, and the way they are conducted. Also, the CPS asks more about sources of income. Samples for Asian Indians, Koreans, and Southeast Asians were too small to generate reliable estimates in 1969.

## 7.4 Percentage Who Own Stocks, Mutual Funds, Retirement Accounts, or Savings Accounts by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1997


Source: March Current Population Survey, 1970–1998.



- Although most people in California did not receive any income from stocks, mutual funds, retirement accounts, or saving accounts in 1997, the proportion of people who do has been increasing over time.
- Compared to other groups, many more whites received some income from stocks, mutual funds, or savings or retirement accounts. This proportion has been increasing more for whites than for any other racial and ethnic group, increasing the gap between non-Hispanic whites and others. By 1997, 25 percent of whites received some income from stocks, mutual funds, or retirement accounts, a proportion twice as high as Asians, over four times that of African Americans, and seven times that of Hispanics. However, the white population is older than other racial and ethnic groups, which may explain some of the difference in wealth.
- Only 4 percent of Hispanics received some income from stocks, mutual funds, or retirement or savings accounts in 1997.


Notes: Three-year moving averages. The data are for income from interest, dividends, and net rentals. Until 1988, the universe was adults, but after 1988 the universe was those who received interest payments. Data for Asians are not available before 1988 in the CPS.

## 7.5 Home Ownership Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, and 1990



- Home ownership is also a measure of wealth and long-term economic status. In 1989, 67 percent of all whites, 59 percent of Asians, and 42 percent of African Americans and Hispanics owned their homes.
- Although home ownership increased slightly for non-Hispanic whites, it declined for all other groups between 1969 and 1989. The decline for Asians was due to an increase in the proportion of immigrants among the Asian population. Ownership rates declined for both U.S.-born and foreign-born Hispanics, except for Caribbeans (see Chart 7.6).
- A smaller proportion of whites and African Americans owned homes in California than in the rest of the nation. In 1969, a greater proportion of Hispanics owned homes in California than in the nation; by 1989 the opposite was true.


## 7.6 Home Ownership Rates for Hispanics by Place of Birth, 1970, 1980, and 1990



- Less than half of the Hispanic population in California owned homes in 1989.
- In 1989, foreign-born Caribbeans had the highest ownership rate of all foreign-born groups (47 percent) and Mexicans the highest ownership rate of the U.S.-born Hispanic groups (50 percent).
- Between 1970 and 1990, the ownership rate declined for Central and South Americans. By 1989, less than 30 percent of Central and South Americans owned their homes: only 26 percent of foreign-born Central and South Americans—the majority being foreign-born—and 39 percent of the U.S.-born Central and South Americans owned a home.
- Ownership rates declined from 40 to 33 percent for foreign-born Mexicans, and from 53 to 50 percent for U.S.-born Mexicans. The proportion of immigrants among the Mexican population increased, dropping the overall ownership rate for Mexicans from close to 50 percent in 1969 to 42 percent in 1989 (not in the chart).
- Both U.S.-born and foreign-born Caribbeans were the only Hispanic groups whose ownership rate increased between 1969 to 1989.

Note: This chart presents the home ownership rate of adults, not families or households.


## 7.7 Home Ownership Rates for Asians by Place of Birth, 1970, 1980, and 1990



- Over 70 percent of U.S.-born Asians owned a home in 1990, compared to 67 percent of whites.
- Southeast Asians had one of the lowest ownership rates of all racial and ethnic groups. Only foreign-born Central and South Americans had a lower ownership rate.
- Around 50 percent of foreign-born Koreans and Japanese owned their homes in 1990. This is a particularly low rate for Japanese, whose median family income was close to that of whites in 1990.
- Home ownership rates increased for all Asian groups between 1970 and 1990, except for foreign-born Japanese, Koreans, and Asian Indians. Foreign-born Chinese experienced the largest increase between 1970 and 1990, from 42 percent to 49 percent.


Note: This chart presents the home ownership rate of adults, not families or households. The sample for Asian Indians, Koreans, and Southeast Asians was too small to generate reliable estimates for 1969.

## 7.8 Levels of Overcrowding by Race and Ethnicity of the Household Head, 1970, 1980, and 1990




- A household's economic status is often reflected in its living arrangements. However, living arrangements are also the result of cultural norms, age structure, fertility, and housing costs. A household is overcrowded if it has more than one person per room, and is severely overcrowded if it has more than 1.5 persons per room. The number of rooms includes all rooms except bathrooms. For example, a three bedroom house with a living room, dining room, and kitchen would be considered overcrowded if it was the residence of seven or more people. It would be considered severely overcrowded if 10 or more people lived there.
- Between 1980 and 1990, overcrowding increased for all racial and ethnic groups.
- Hispanics and Asians are much more likely to live in overcrowded housing than are whites or African Americans. Over half of Hispanics lived in overcrowded or severely overcrowded housing in 1990.
- In 1970, overcrowding in California was similar to that in the rest of the nation for all racial and ethnic groups. By 1990, however, Hispanics and Asians in California were much more likely to live in overcrowded housing than their counterparts in the rest of the United States.

## 7.9 Levels of Overcrowding in Households Headed by Asians by Place of Birth, 1970, 1980, and 1990



- Overcrowding varies tremendously by Asian ethnic group. Foreign-born Asians tend to have higher rates of overcrowding than U.S.-born Asians. For most groups, overcrowding increased between 1980 and 1990.
- Japanese have very low rates of overcrowding, similar to whites. Fewer than one in 10 foreign-born Japanese and U.S.-born Japanese lives in overcrowded housing. Rates of overcrowding among U.S.-born Japanese have declined since 1970.
- Overcrowding increased substantially for both foreign-born and U.S.-born Chinese between 1980 and 1990. However, foreign-born Chinese have much higher overcrowding rates than U.S.-born Chinese. By 1990, two in five Chinese immigrants lived in overcrowded housing.
- Filipinos, Asian Indians, and Koreans have moderate rates of overcrowding. Differences in overcrowding rates between the foreign-born and the U.S.-born in these groups are not large.
- Southeast Asians have the highest levels of overcrowding of any racial and ethnic group; with over 50 percent living in *severely* overcrowded housing units in 1990.


## 7.10 Levels of Overcrowding in Households Headed by Hispanics by Place of Birth, 1970, 1980, and 1990



- In 1990, those who were foreign-born were more likely to live in overcrowded housing than the U.S.-born.
- Overcrowding levels were particularly high for foreign-born Mexicans and Central and South Americans. About half of each group lived in severely overcrowded housing in 1990.
- U.S.-born Mexicans experienced substantial declines in overcrowding from 1970 to 1990. Still, one in three U.S.-born Mexicans lived in overcrowded housing in 1990.
- Caribbeans are the least likely Hispanic group to live in overcrowded housing. Nevertheless, Caribbeans are substantially more likely to live in overcrowded housing than whites.




## 7.11 Distribution of Personal Income of Men Older Than Age 24 by Race and Ethnicity, 1969, 1979, and 1989



- Income quartiles describe the distribution of personal income. The income range that includes 25 percent of the population defines each of the four income quartiles. The figure shows the proportion of each racial and ethnic group that falls within each income quartile. The median incomes (or the middle point of the income distribution) in California were \$8,950 in 1970, \$15,705 in 1980, and, \$25,500 in 1990.
- Relative to other groups, Hispanics had the largest proportion of men below the California median. Seventy-three percent of Hispanic men earned incomes below the median, and 41 percent earned incomes in the bottom 25 percent of the distribution.
- Whites had the smallest proportion of men earning incomes at the bottom of the income distribution and the largest proportion at the top of the distribution.
- The proportion of men at the top 25 percent of the distribution increased, whereas the proportion at the bottom 25 percent declined for all groups, except for Hispanics. The opposite was true for Hispanics.
- For Hispanics and Asians, the distribution of income has become more uneven in California than in the rest of the nation. It is less so for African Americans and whites.


Note: Total income is the income from all sources.

## 7.12 Top and Bottom 10 Percent of the Income Distribution of Men Older Than Age 24 by Race and Ethnicity, 1989




- This chart presents the proportion of men who earned income at the top 10 percent or the bottom 10 percent of the income distribution. The population at the bottom 10 percent earned less than \$5,820 and those at the top of the distribution earned more than \$90,000.
- Whites are slightly overrepresented and African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians are underrepresented among the top 10 percent of the distribution. Thirteen percent of whites earned incomes in the top 10 percent of the income distribution, but only 2 percent of Hispanics, 3 percent of African Americans, and 7 percent of Asians did so.
- Hispanics, African Americans, and Asians are overrepresented and whites underrepresented among those at the lowest 10 percent of the distribution. Eighteen percent of African Americans, 16 percent of Hispanics, and 15 percent of Asians in California earned incomes at the bottom 10 percent, compared to 7 percent of whites.
- There is a greater proportion of whites at the top and a smaller proportion at the bottom of the distribution in California than in rest of the nation. The opposite is true for African Americans. California has a greater proportion of Asian and Hispanic men at both the bottom and the top of the distribution than the rest of the nation.

### 7.13 Distribution of Personal Income of Hispanic Adults Older Than Age 24 by Place of Birth, 1969 and 1989



- Of all racial and ethnic groups in California in 1989, foreign-born Mexicans had the greatest proportion of their population at the bottom of the income distribution. Forty-nine percent of them earned incomes in the bottom 25 percent of the distribution and 85 percent of them earned incomes below the California median.
- In 1989, there was little variation in the distribution of income of U.S.-born Hispanics, who had a smaller proportion in the bottom 25 percent of the distribution than foreign-born Hispanics. That proportion was also slightly below that of African Americans—30 percent of Central and South Americans, 29 percent of Mexicans, 26 percent of Caribbeans, and 31 percent of African Americans had incomes in the bottom 25 percent.
- Between 1969 and 1989, U.S.-born Hispanics experienced an improvement in the proportion at the top of the distribution. However, the proportion at the bottom also increased, increasing income inequality for Hispanics.
- The distribution of income of foreign-born Caribbeans improved from 1969 to 1989. However, it worsened for Central and South Americans.


## 7.14 Distribution of Personal Income of Asian Adults Older Than Age 24 by Place of Birth, 1969 and 1989



- Foreign-born and U.S.-born Japanese had the highest proportion of men at the top of the income distribution (39 percent) of all racial and ethnic groups in California in 1989. U.S.-born Japanese also had the *lowest* proportion of men in the bottom 25 percent of the distribution (16 percent).
- Foreign-born Southeast Asians had the highest proportion of men in the bottom 25 percent of the income distribution (47 percent) and the smallest proportion at the top of the distribution (8 percent).
- In 1989 the income distribution among Asians was more equal than in 1969, except for U.S.-born Filipinos. The greatest improvement was for foreign-born Japanese.
- Although median family income was very high for U.S.-born Filipinos, a substantial proportion of their population is at the bottom of the income distribution (40 percent).

Notes: The samples for Asian Indians, Koreans, and Southeast Asians were too small to generate reliable estimates for 1969.


## 7.15 Poverty Rates for All Californians by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1997



- Poverty rates measure the proportion of the population who live in households with incomes below the poverty line and who therefore lack the economic resources needed to purchase a minimum acceptable standard of living. The poverty line is based on the level of income necessary to achieve a minimum level of nutrition, adjusting for family composition and size.
- Whites have the lowest proportion of people below the poverty line. African Americans and Hispanics have the highest proportion of their population below the poverty line.
- In 1997, poverty was higher than in 1970 for whites, African Americans, and Hispanics. Poverty rates closely resembled the fluctuations of the economy, but the recoveries have not returned poverty to pre-recession levels. This was especially true for Hispanics for whom poverty rates increased more than for any other racial and ethnic group in the last 30 years.
- In the early 1990s, poverty rates grew for all racial and ethnic groups, but they declined in the mid-1990s.
- Poverty rates were lower in California than in the rest of the nation for all racial and ethnic groups, except for Asians.

Notes: Three-year moving averages. Data for Asians were not available before 1988 in the CPS. Before 1993, small sample sizes make the Asian series unreliable. Also, there was a high degree of variation in the poverty rates of Asians between 1989 and 1993, which makes the estimates unreliable.


## 7.16 Poverty Rates for Hispanics by Place of Birth, 1969, 1979, and 1989



- In 1989, foreign-born Mexicans had the highest poverty rate of all Hispanic groups and Caribbeans had the lowest. One of every four foreign-born Mexicans was poor in 1989; this proportion may have increased in the 1990s, since poverty rates increased for Hispanics in the 1990s (Chart 7.15). Even though Caribbeans had the lowest rate of poverty of all Hispanics, their poverty rate was still twice that of non-Hispanic whites.
- Compared to 1969, 1989 poverty rates were higher or remained the same for all Hispanic groups, except foreign-born Caribbeans.
- Poverty rates increased for foreign-born and U.S.-born Central and South Americans. They increased by 6 percentage points and 5 percentage points, respectively. But the proportion of foreign-born among the Central and South American population also increased, increasing the overall poverty rate for that group.
- Mexicans and Central and South Americans have the greatest proportion of U.S.-born persons who were below the poverty line. In 1989, one of every five U.S.-born Mexicans and Central and South Americans was poor.

Notes: Data in this chart are not directly comparable to the data in Chart 7.15. The CPS includes more sources of income than the Census and is sent only to a selected number of households. Finally, the sampling frame and weights of the CPS for 1990s were based on 1980 Census. They were later adjusted to reflect the changes in the population in 1990. This would lead to differences across samples in 1989.


## 7.17 Poverty Rates for Asians by Place of Birth, 1969, 1979, and 1989



- Southeast Asian poverty rates were among the highest in the nation. Thirty-five percent of foreign-born Southeast Asians living in California in 1989 had incomes below the poverty line.
- Japanese and U.S.-born and foreign-born Filipinos had lower poverty rates than whites in 1989. Only 4 percent of the U.S.-born Japanese and 5 percent of U.S.-born and foreign-born Filipinos living in California in 1989 had incomes below the poverty line, compared to 7 percent of white non-Hispanics.
- Poverty rates declined for all Asian groups between 1969 and 1989, except for foreign-born Koreans and U.S.-born and foreign-born Chinese. Poverty rates may have increased for some of these groups in the 1990s, as poverty rates increased for Asians in the early 1990s (Chart 7.15).
- Poverty rates increased or remained more-or-less constant for foreign-born Koreans and Chinese and U.S.-born Chinese between 1969 and 1989. But they still have substantially lower poverty rates than African Americans and Hispanics.

Notes: Data in this chart are not directly comparable to the data in Chart 7.15. See the notes to Chart 7.16 for an explanation. The samples for Asian Indian, Korean, and Southeast Asian were too small to generate reliable estimates for 1969.

## 7.18 Child Poverty Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1997




- Child poverty measures economic hardship among families with children. Poverty in childhood is also associated with a higher probability of dropping out of school, teenage pregnancy, poor health, and cognitive disadvantage. It is therefore an indicator of access to opportunities and future socioeconomic status.
- Poverty rates among Hispanic children are the highest in the state. In 1997, two of every five Hispanic children lived in a family with income below the poverty line.
- Since 1970, poverty rates among children have increased for all racial and ethnic groups except Asians. This is especially true for African Americans and Hispanics. The poverty rate of Hispanic children was 29 percent in 1970 and 40 percent in 1997. For African Americans it was 23 percent in 1970 and 34 percent in 1997.
- Poverty rates increased in the early 1990s for all racial and ethnic groups. But in the mid-1990s poverty rates declined for all groups. Data from 1994 on are not strictly comparable to data from previous years, but it appears that poverty declined substantially for African American children.

Notes: Children are age 16 or younger. Three-year moving averages. Data for Asians are not available before 1988 in the CPS. Before 1993, small sample sizes make the Asian series unreliable. Also, before 1994, there was a high degree of variation in poverty rates of Asians, which makes the estimates unreliable.




## 7.19 Child Poverty Rates by Race, Ethnicity, and Region, 1989



- Poverty rates were higher for African Americans in every California region, except for the Farm Belt, where Asians are the poorest group.
- The counties in the Farm Belt and those in the Northern and Mountain region have some of the highest poverty rates for all racial and ethnic groups except for Hispanics. One of every three African American, Asian, and Hispanic children in the Farm Belt was living with families whose income was below the poverty line. Over 20 percent of the Asian and Hispanic children in the Northern and Mountain region were poor. Thirty-seven percent of African American children in this region were living in poverty.
- The Bay Area had the lowest proportion of poor children. But even in the Bay Area, one of every four African American children was poor.
- In Southern California, where over half of the California population resides, 33 percent of African American, 29 percent of Hispanic, 17 percent of Asian, and 9 percent of white children were poor in 1989.

Notes: Children are age 16 or younger. Data in this chart are not directly comparable to the data in Chart 7.18. See the notes to Chart 7.16 for an explanation.


## 7.20 Percentage of Households Receiving Public Assistance by Race and Ethnicity, 1969, 1979, and 1989



- High poverty rates may lead particular groups to rely more heavily on public assistance than others. We examine this in this chart.
- African Americans had the largest proportion of households receiving public assistance in 1989. Twenty percent of African American households received public assistance, compared to 14 percent of Asian, 13 percent of Hispanic, and 7 percent of white households.
- Between 1969 and 1989, public assistance use remained fairly constant for whites and African Americans. It declined for Hispanics and increased for Asian households.
- Although Hispanics have the lowest median family income and the highest poverty rate, their public assistance use was similar to that of Asians.
- Although public assistance use was increasing in the nation, it remained constant or declined for whites, African Americans and Hispanics in California. But public assistance use was higher in California than in the nation in 1969. Even after a decline, welfare use in California was above that of the nation in 1989 for Hispanics, white, and African American households.

Notes: We do not take into account that some households may be of mixed ethnicity. Public assistance income includes SSI, AFDC, and general assistance. Separate payments received for hospital or other medical care (vendor payments) are excluded from this item.


## 7.21 Percentage of Households Receiving Public Assistance by Race and Ethnicity of Household Head, 1987–1997



- In the early 1990s, public assistance use increased for African American, white, and Hispanic households. In the later part of the decade, public assistance use declined for all racial and ethnic groups, as the state began to recover from one of its strongest recessions. Between 1994 and 1997, African American households' public assistance use declined by half from 24 percent to 12 percent. The passage of the Welfare Reform Act of 1996 also may have decreased the proportion of households on public assistance.
- Public assistance use remained below 5 percent for white non-Hispanic households throughout the 1990s.
- On the other hand, welfare participation for Asians fluctuated around 10 percent from 1987 to 1994 and then declined to only 6 percent in 1997.


Notes: Data in this chart are not directly comparable to the data in Charts 7.20, 7.22, and 7.23. The Census and the CPS differ in their sample frame, sample size, weights, and the way they are conducted. Also, the CPS asks more about sources of public assistance.

## 7.22 Percentage of Hispanic Households Receiving Public Assistance by Place of Birth, 1969, 1979, and 1989



- Although their poverty rates are lower than those of other Hispanic groups, foreign-born Caribbeans have the highest welfare participation rates among all households headed by Hispanics. Twenty-three percent of foreign-born Caribbean households received public assistance in 1989, compared to 22 percent of African American households.
- Public assistance use among Central and South American households is low despite the high proportion of poor among that group. Only about 9 percent of foreign-born and 7 percent of U.S.-born Central and South American households used public assistance in 1989.
- Public assistance use among foreign-born Mexican households declined from 18 percent in 1969 to 11 percent in 1989. That of U.S.-born Mexican households has remained more or less constant at 16 percent.

## 7.23 Percentage of Asian Households Receiving Public Assistance by Place of Birth, 1969, 1979, and 1989



- Because of their refugee status and their high levels of poverty, foreign-born Southeast Asians have the highest public assistance use of all racial and ethnic groups in California. Forty-eight percent of foreign-born Southeast Asian households received public assistance in 1989.
- Participation rates for U.S.-born Asians are similar to those of non-Hispanic whites. Among U.S.-born Asians, 3 percent of Chinese and Japanese and 5 percent of Filipino households received public assistance in 1989. Public assistance use for U.S.-born Asians has been declining since 1969.
- At the same time, welfare use increased for all foreign-born Asian households except Japanese households. The most dramatic increase was for Chinese and Asian Indian households. Between 1969 and 1989, welfare use doubled for households headed by a foreign-born Chinese and it tripled for households headed by a foreign-born Asian Indian between 1979 and 1989.

Note: The samples for Asian Indian, Korean, and Southeast Asian were too small to generate reliable estimates for 1969.

## Chapter 8

# Crime and Criminal Justice

Issues surrounding crime and punishment are among the most challenging in the state. Although crime has fallen considerably from its recent peaks in the early 1990s, violent crime in California, as in the United States as a whole, remains high compared to rates in industrial societies in Europe and Asia. In addition to relatively high rates of violent crime, California has experienced rapid growth in its prison population. In 1979, the state's adult prisons held slightly more than 21,000 inmates compared to 162,000 in 1999. Counting offenders on parole and other forms of supervision outside prison walls, the state Department of Corrections had jurisdiction over more than 300,000 people at any given time during 1999. Increases in public spending on prisons were equally dramatic, expanding from roughly \$675 million in 1980 to \$4.6 billion in 1999 (California Department of Corrections, *CDC Fact Sheet*, 1999).

These and other trends have been accompanied by striking disparities in arrest, incarceration, and victimization rates across the state's major racial and ethnic groups. Research has produced mixed results regarding the causes of these disparities. Some studies have concluded that some of the disparities may result from racial discrimination and profiling. Others have concluded that the disparities are largely explained by the shifting demographic profile of the state. Still others conclude that both factors may be involved. In this chapter, our purpose is to present racial and ethnic statistics in crime and criminal justice rather than provide evidence for any argument regarding causality.

A notable change over the last two decades is the significant shift in the proportion of white and Hispanic residents among those arrested (Charts 8.1 to 8.4) and put behind bars (Charts 8.5 to 8.7). During that time, the proportion of non-Hispanic whites arrested and incarcerated has fallen while the Hispanic proportion has increased by roughly the same amount. This shift, which partly reflects demographic changes within the state, has transformed the racial and ethnic composition of California's correctional system, for both youth and adults. In California, as in many other states, this shift appears to have been reinforced by the intensified war on drugs and the growing use of aggressive antigang measures, which have disproportionately affected minorities (Charts 8.8 and 8.9).

Compared to the state's other racial and ethnic groups, African Americans have the highest rates of arrest and incarceration, especially for narcotics offenses, and the highest incarceration rates under California's "three strikes" law (Charts 8.1, 8.2, and 8.8). At 7 percent of the population, African Americans account for 23 percent of felony arrestees. African Americans are also more likely than members of other groups to be victims of violence (Chart 8.11).

Overall, Asians in the state have relatively low arrest and incarceration rates. Compared to other minorities, they are also less likely to be victims of homicide. Even so, their presence in both the victimization statistics and the criminal justice system has grown in recent years. The tendency for official statistics to lump Asian groups together, typically in a category called "other," also masks different experiences among these groups. For example, victimization and incarceration figures are very low for

Japanese but very high for Southeast Asians. In fact, the risk of death by homicide for some Southeast Asian groups is among the highest in the state (Chart 8.12).


A closer look at homicide data in California reveals other differences across racial and ethnic groups. African Americans and Hispanics are not only more likely to be killed than whites, they also tend to be killed in different ways and for different reasons. Specifically, African American and Hispanic homicide victims are more likely to be young and male, to have been killed with a handgun, and to have been killed in a drug- or gang-related incident (Chart 8.13). White homicide victims tend to be older and more often female than their African American or Hispanic counterparts (Chart 8.14). They are also more likely to die in the course of a domestic dispute.

In general, racial and ethnic disparities in California's criminal justice system resemble those found in the United States as a whole. However, African Americans in California are more likely to be under the control of the criminal justice system than African Americans nationwide. And although the rapid increase in the number of Hispanics behind bars is a national as well as a state phenomenon, the rise has been particularly rapid in California. Indeed, the national trends in Hispanic incarceration are strongly affected by those in California.

Whatever the reason for these disparities, they seem to be reflected in citizens' perceptions of the criminal justice system. In one study of Los Angeles and Oakland residents, African Americans and Hispanics reported lower levels of satisfaction with their interactions with legal authorities than did whites (Huo and Tyler, 2000). Group differences were especially apparent among those who reported interactions with the police. In another survey, a majority of Californians had doubts about the fairness of their police and courts (Chart 8.15). Those doubts were greatest among some minorities, especially African Americans.

Such skepticism may be fueled in part by the fact that people of color, especially Hispanics, are underrepresented among high-level decisionmakers within the criminal justice system. In the mid-1990s, whites accounted for 84 percent of municipal court judges and 89 percent of superior court judges (Chart 8.16). Given the high average age of such judges and the relatively low citizenship rates among Asians and Hispanics, shifts in the composition of the bench might be expected to lag those in the state's population. Even so, such disparities might very well affect residents' perceptions of legal authority and the criminal justice system generally.

## 8.1 Felony Arrest Rates for Adults by Race and Ethnicity, 1980, 1990, and 1998




- Rates of arrest for felony crimes among adults in California vary significantly by race and ethnicity.
- In 1998, the arrest rate for African American adults was nearly five times that for whites and eight times that of “other” adults. The Hispanic rate was almost twice the white rate and three times the “other” arrest rate.
- Among all groups, arrest rates rose significantly in the 1980s and fell after the early 1990s. The sharpest rise in arrest rates in the 1980s was among “other” adults; the most rapid decline in the 1990s has been among African Americans.

Notes: Rates per 100,000 adults age 18 and over. “Other” includes all other racial and ethnic groups not included in the previous groups and consists predominantly of Asians.



## 8.2 Felony Arrest Rates for Juveniles by Race and Ethnicity, 1980, 1990, and 1998




- Although less extreme than arrest rates for adults, felony arrest rates for California’s juveniles also show significant racial and ethnic disparities.
- In 1998, the arrest rate for African American juveniles was roughly 3.5 times that for whites and 3.7 times that for “other” juveniles.
- Between 1980 and 1998, arrest rates dropped by more than half for whites, but by only a third for Hispanics. Despite roughly equal rates in 1980, the Hispanic rate was 1.5 times that for whites in 1998.
- Arrest rates have fallen for all groups since 1990. Even so, felony arrest rates for “other” juveniles remain higher than they were in 1980.

Note: Rates per 100,000 juveniles under age 18. “Other” includes all other racial and ethnic groups not included in the previous groups and consists predominantly of Asians.

### 8.3 Felony Arrest Rates for Participating in Street Gangs by Race and Ethnicity, 1998


Source: California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center.



- The California Penal Code makes it a crime to “participate” in a street gang. This provision significantly increases the ability of police to arrest individuals suspected of belonging to a gang.
- Among adults and juveniles arrested under this provision in 1998, the overwhelming majority were people of color.
- Hispanics alone accounted for almost two-thirds of arrests for street-gang participation.
- Whites, who made up about 44 percent of those age 15 to 19, accounted for only 13 percent of street-gang arrests.

Note: “Other” includes all other racial and ethnic groups not included in the previous groups and consists predominantly of Asians.


## 8.4 Felony Narcotics Arrests by Race and Ethnicity, 1998



- In California as in the rest of the nation, the “War on Drugs” during the 1980s resulted in rising arrest rates for narcotics violations. Although the number of felony narcotics arrests declined somewhat during the 1990s, it remained almost three times higher in 1998 than in 1980. These arrest rates have varied significantly across California’s racial and ethnic groups.
- The disparity in narcotics arrests is especially striking for African Americans. The African American arrest rate is 16 times the rate for whites and five times the rate for Hispanics, which is itself triple the white rate. The narcotics arrest rate for “other” Californians is the lowest in the state.

Note: Rates per 100,000 population; not age-adjusted. Felony narcotics arrests exclude arrests for marijuana, other “dangerous drugs,” or “other drugs.” “Other” includes all other racial and ethnic groups not included in the previous groups and consists predominantly of Asians.


## 8.5 Distribution of Men Newly Admitted to California Prisons by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1998



- The overall number of men admitted to prison has risen almost tenfold since 1970, from 4,426 to 43,752. The number of white male felons admitted to prison was 417 percent higher in 1998 than in 1970. It was 644 percent higher for African American men, 2,299 percent higher for Hispanic men, and 2,831 percent higher for “other” men.
- These different rates of increase have shifted the racial and ethnic composition of prison admissions in California. In 1970, whites accounted for almost 80 percent of the population and a little more than half of new prison admissions. By 1998, when whites accounted for a little more than half of the population, they made up less than 30 percent of the new admissions.
- In 1970, Hispanics accounted for 12 percent of the population in 1970 and 16 percent of new prison admissions. By 1998, they accounted for about 30 percent of the population and 42 percent of the new admissions.
- New prison admissions for African Americans, who constitute 7 percent of the state population, rose significantly in the 1970s and 1980s and have fallen since. In 1998, they made up a little less than one-fourth of new prison admissions.


Note: “Other” includes all other racial and ethnic groups not included in the previous groups and consists predominantly of Asians.

## 8.6 Distribution of Women Newly Admitted to California Prisons by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1998



- The growth in the imprisonment rate of women in California, like that for the United States as a whole, has been even more rapid than that of men. New prison admissions rose from 264 in 1970 to 5,353 in 1998—a 1,900 percent increase. The 1998 prison admissions figure for women is greater than the total number of felons of both sexes admitted in 1970.
- In 1998, white women’s admissions were just over 40 percent, and their share of the overall population of women was closer to 50 percent. By the same measure, Hispanic and “other” women were underrepresented and African Americans were greatly overrepresented.
- Between 1970 and 1998, the white population declined 25 percentage points and admission rates dropped about 17 percentage points. During the same period, the Hispanic population rose 28 percentage points and admissions rose 15 percentage points. The proportion of African American admissions, though very high, has been relatively stable.


## 8.7 California Prison Incarceration Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1998



- The incarceration rate measures the proportion of various groups in state prison relative to their proportion of the state's total population.
- Higher rates of admission to prison for African Americans and Hispanics have resulted in a prison population whose racial and ethnic composition has increasingly diverged from that of California's population as a whole.
- The disparity in incarceration rates is greatest for African Americans, who are imprisoned at roughly seven times the rate of non-Hispanic whites. The Hispanic incarceration rate is nearly twice the white rate, and the rate for "other" Californians is significantly lower.

Note: Rates per 100,000 population; not age-adjusted. "Other" includes all other racial and ethnic groups not included in the previous groups and consists predominantly of Asians.


## 8.8 Three-Strikes Inmates in California Prisons by Race and Ethnicity, 1999



- California’s “Three Strikes and You’re Out” law, passed in 1994, provides for a prison term of 25 years to life for offenders convicted of a third felony offense. It is the most widely applied law of its kind in the nation. In 1999, almost 6,000 offenders in California were sentenced for a “third strike.”
- At 106 three-strikes inmates per 100,000 population, the African American rate of imprisonment for a third strike is seven times that of Hispanics and 12 times that of whites.
- The racial disparity in three-strikes sentences is even greater than that for the prison population as a whole. African Americans make up 7 percent of California’s population, 24 percent of its prison population, and 44 percent of those sentenced for a third strike.

Note: Rates per 100,000 population. “Other” includes all other racial and ethnic groups not included in the previous groups and consists predominantly of Asians.

## 8.9 Distribution of California Youth Authority First Admissions by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1998




- Of the nearly 8,000 first admissions to the California Youth Authority (CYA) in 1998, 53 percent were Hispanic. The Hispanic share of juvenile felony arrests was 42 percent.
- The white share of CYA admissions dropped steadily between 1970 and 1998.
- Although it remains relatively small, the share of Asian and “other” youth among CYA admissions began rising in 1980.
- For African Americans, the share of CYA admissions rose in the 1970s and 1980s and fell significantly in the 1990s.

Note: “Other” includes all other racial and ethnic groups not included in the previous groups and consists predominantly of Asians.



## 8.10 California Youth Authority Admissions Compared to the Youth Population by Race and Ethnicity, 1998


Sources: CYA Ward Information; Parole Research Bureau (unpublished data). Information on the population base is from the California Department of Finance, Race/Ethnic Population Estimates, April 1990–July 1997.



- The sharp decline in white admissions to the CYA means that the population of the state’s youth prisons has increasingly diverged from California’s youth population as a whole.
- Hispanic youth, who represent more than half of CYA admissions, are only about one-third of the population age 15–19 across the state. At 24 percent of CYA admissions, but only 7 percent of the youth population, African Americans are overrepresented by a factor of almost 4 to 1. Meanwhile, whites are sent to youth prison at a rate only one-third of their share of the youth population.
- These disparities, which are wider than those for adult prison admissions, suggest that in the future the adult prisons are likely to be even more disproportionately nonwhite than they are now.

Note: “Other” includes all other racial and ethnic groups not included in the previous groups and consists predominantly of Asians.

## 8.11 Homicide Rates by Race and Ethnicity of Victim, 1988 and 1997




- The risks of victimization by homicide, the most serious of violent crimes, are sharply divergent among California's racial and ethnic groups.
- The number of homicides fell significantly in the state during the past decade but declined more rapidly for some groups than others. Between 1988 and 1997, the white homicide rate fell by 45 percent, the African American rate by 35 percent, and the rate for Hispanics and "other" by just 14 percent.
- Although the risks of dying by violence have fallen for all groups, the disparities in those risks between minorities and whites have increased. In 1988, Hispanics in California were murdered at a rate 2.3 times that of whites; by 1997, 3.6 times. African Americans in 1988 faced a risk of murder that was already almost eight times that of whites, but it rose to 9.5 that of whites by 1997. The homicide risk for "other" Californians in 1988 was virtually identical with that of whites, but grew to 1.5 times the white rate by 1997.

Note: Rates per 100,000 population. "Other" includes all other racial and ethnic groups not included in the previous groups and consists predominantly of Asians.

## 8.12 Juvenile Homicide Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1997


Source: California Department of Health Services, Center for Health Statistics.



- In 1997, 391 juveniles were murdered in California. Nearly half of all young homicide victims were Hispanic, and 44 percent were Mexican.
- African American youth accounted for 20 percent of juvenile homicide victims, nearly three times their proportion of the state's youth population.
- One out of 18 juvenile homicide victims in 1997 was Southeast Asian. Cambodian and Laotian youth in particular met violent deaths at a rate far exceeding their share of California's population. Homicide rates were low for Chinese and Korean youths, and there were no deaths among Japanese.

Notes: Chart excludes one Cuban and one Pacific Islander death. Southeast Asian includes Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian, and Thai.


### 8.13 Types of Homicides by Race and Ethnicity, 1997



- Nonwhite Californians are more likely to die by violence than whites. They are also killed in different settings and in different ways than whites.
- Hispanic, African American, and “other” victims are far more likely than whites to have been killed with a handgun. Roughly 70 percent of nonwhite victims were shot by handguns compared to just over 40 percent of whites.
- Higher proportions of homicides among people of color are gang- or drug-related. Only about one in 14 white homicides in 1997 took place in a gang- or drug-related incident compared to more than two out of five among Hispanics and African Americans.
- White homicides are far more likely to be family related. About one out of five white victims in 1997 was the spouse, child, or parent of the killer compared to one in 14 among African Americans.

Note: “Other” includes all other racial and ethnic groups not included in the previous groups and consists predominantly of Asians.


## 8.14 Percentage of Homicide Victims Who Are Women and Youth by Race and Ethnicity, 1997



- The differences in the type of homicide suffered by different racial and ethnic groups translate into differences in the gender and age patterns of homicide in California.
- Nonwhite victims of homicide in 1997 were disproportionately young and, especially among Hispanics and African Americans, disproportionately male.
- More than two out of five African American and “other” victims of homicide were under age 25, as were virtually half of Hispanic victims. Less than one-fourth of whites were under age 25.
- The proportion of white homicide victims who were female is nearly three times that of Hispanics, reflecting the greater proportion of white homicides that result from domestic violence.

Note: “Other” includes all other racial and ethnic groups not included in the previous groups and consists predominantly of Asians.


## 8.15 Percentage Disagreeing That Courts Are Fair to All People by Race and Ethnicity, 1993



- As part of a survey commissioned by the California Judicial Council in 1993, Californians of various ethnic and racial groups were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement that “The California courts are equally fair to all people no matter what their race or ethnic origin.”
- The responses varied widely, with African Americans and Native Americans clearly the most skeptical that equal justice prevailed in California. But the majority in most ethnic groups disagreed with the statement that the courts were fair. Asians were the only group among whom a majority believed the courts dispensed justice equally.

## 8.16 Race and Ethnicity of California Superior Court Judges, 1993

Source: California Judicial Council, Advisory Committee on Racial and Ethnic Bias in the Courts, 1997.



- As of the mid-1990s, almost nine in ten Superior Court judges were white. Hispanics and African Americans each accounted for about 4 percent of judges.
- Eighty-six percent of California's municipal court judges were white, less than 7 percent were Hispanic or African American, and less than 3 percent were Asian.
- Among lawyers working in district attorneys' offices, 85 percent were white, 6 percent Hispanic, less than 5 percent African American, and less than 4 percent Asian.

## Chapter 9

# Political Participation

In democratic societies, political participation is often used as an indicator of social integration and influence. Voter registration and turnout have long served as the most basic instruments to measure groups' engagement in and preferences about issues of public policy. Although involvement in politics is not restricted to the formal political process, the purpose of this chapter is to assess and analyze the electoral participation of California's major racial and ethnic groups. Specifically, the chapter looks at voter registration and turnout, party affiliation, and the election of public officials.

Over the past 50 years, political scientists have used various demographic, social, cultural, and socio-economic indicators to explain differences in electoral participation (Milbrath and Goel, 1977; Verba et al., 1995; Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980). This chapter focuses on immigration status, age, and education. Because the three characteristics are not uniformly distributed across California's racial and ethnic categories, differences in political participation are expected.<sup>1</sup>

California's story of political participation is complex. Whites are overrepresented in the voting population and they register and vote at high or the highest rates. Although they generally participate at slightly lower rates than whites, African Americans vote in proportion to their population share. But African Americans have made little progress in achieving elected office over the past 20 years, and their registration and voting rates decreased during the 1990s.

Asians and Hispanics have the lowest participation rates in California. Although large proportions of these populations are not eligible to vote, this factor alone does not explain their large underrepresentation in the voting population. Low levels of education, coupled with a relatively young voting population, may account for the participation rates of Hispanics, although educational attainment, age, and immigration status do not easily explain lower rates of Asian participation. Despite relatively low participation rates, Hispanics and Asians have made steady gains in winning elected office over the last two decades.

We first look at the participation rate of the different racial and ethnic groups. There is a disparity between most groups' population and voting shares (Chart 9.1). Whites are significantly overrepresented, and Asians and Hispanics are underrepresented. Because there are large proportions of noncitizen, or ineligible, adult Asians and Hispanics, significant portions of them are excluded from electoral politics (Chart 9.2). But ineligibility explains only some of the difference in adult and voter population shares. There are also differences in the rate of registration and participation among those eligible to vote. Compared to whites, African Americans register and vote at slightly lower levels, and Asians and Hispanics participate at signifi-

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that voter registration and turnout rates reported in this chapter may overestimate participation. However, there is no compelling reason to believe that one group is overreported more than another. See Verba et al. (1995) for a full discussion of participation measurement. Also see Niemi and Weisberg (1993) and Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) for brief discussions of the phenomenon.



cantly lower rates. Data in Chart 9.2 may overestimate the eligible population, because the *Current Population Survey* is believed to overreport citizenship (Passel and Clark, 1997; Schmidley and Robinson, 1988).

Voting and registration trends tell a similar story. Differences in voter registration and turnout across racial and ethnic groups have existed over the last three decades (Charts 9.3 and 9.4). Whites have participated at consistently higher rates than African Americans, and at dramatically higher rates than Asians and Hispanics. However, participation for Hispanics and Asians has been increasing over time, whereas that of African Americans has been declining. By 1996, the gap between Asians and Hispanics and African Americans had narrowed substantially.

To begin to understand racial and ethnic differences in political participation, we look at the socioeconomic characteristics of each group. Chart 9.5 examines participation rates among those eligible while holding immigration status constant. Hispanics born in the United States have lower rates of participation than foreign-born Hispanics. The opposite is true for Asians. Furthermore, among those born in the United States, Hispanics have the lowest rate of participation.

Differences in educational attainment may also explain variations in voter participation. Studies consistently show a positive correlation between voting and higher levels of education (Milbrath and Goel, 1977; Verba et al., 1995; Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980). More schooling may equip citizens with the knowledge, skills, and socialization to participate in politics (Verba et al., 1995; Cho, 1999). For all groups, college graduates participate at higher rates than their less-educated counterparts, although this result seems less dramatic for Asians (Chart 9.6). High school dropouts have the lowest rate of participation. For all groups, those who finish high school and have some college vote at rates in between their less and more educated peers. Last, Hispanics with a college degree participate at a higher rate than college graduates from all other racial and ethnic groups.

Much like education and place of birth, age has been shown to predict voter turnout. Participation is typically low for young voters, highest for the middle-aged, and slightly lower for the oldest (Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980; Verba and Nie, 1972). Yet this pattern does not emerge from our data (Chart 9.7). For all groups except Asians, the oldest adults participate at the highest rates. Age seems to be a less important predictor of Asian voting behavior, as the middle-aged and older have similar participation rates. With the exception of Asians, the participation of voters over age 45 varies little across racial and ethnic groups.

Although not perfect, party affiliation is used as a proxy for voter preferences. Chart 9.8 examines party affiliation for the major ethnic groups in California. In 1996, most Hispanics were Democrats. Asians, however, were evenly split between the Republican and Democratic parties.

Maps of California's registered voters by county illustrate the distribution of partisan preferences across the state. For all California registrants (Chart 9.9) and for Asian registrants (Chart 9.10), the majority of California's counties are split somewhat evenly between the two major political parties or have a significant proportion of registrants with no party affiliation (over 30 counties). For all California voters, 21 of the other 28 counties lean toward Democratic and seven counties lean toward Republican. Asians, however, affiliate less with the Democratic party. Only in the Bay Area is there a greater proportion of Asians who affiliate themselves with the Democratic party. In almost all California counties, Hispanic registrants (Chart 9.11) are predominantly Democrats.

Chart 9.12 looks at trends over the last two decades in minority representation in federal, state, local, judicial, and educational elected office. Increased representation also suggests increased investment and participation by groups in the political power structure. Indeed, available data in California show that trends in minority representation in elective office are similar to their voter participation and registration rates (Charts 9.3 and 9.4) over the same period.

Over the last two decades, the number of Hispanic and Asian elected officials has increased dramatically, but African American representation has stagnated. Hispanics have enjoyed the largest increases in representation. Asians have steadily increased their numbers since the early 1980s such that by 1996 Asian office-holders outnumbered African American office-holders. Fluctuating only minimally over the past two decades, the number of African American elected officials has fallen behind other minority groups.

Although the number of Asian and Hispanic officials has increased over the last two decades, they, along with African Americans, remain underrepresented in public office. In 1998, Hispanics constituted only 10 percent, Asians 6.5 percent, and African Americans 3 percent of all elected positions.<sup>2</sup> These results correspond closely with current Asian and Hispanic voting shares, although African Americans' representation is less than half of their voting population (Chart 9.1). But when rates of representation for Asians, Hispanics, and African Americans are compared to their adult population shares, dramatic disparities appear for all groups. All racial and ethnic groups, with the exception of whites, are represented in government at half the rate of their representation in the adult population (Chart 9.1).<sup>3</sup>


---

<sup>2</sup> Calculated from data supplied above and California Legislature (1998).

<sup>3</sup> In 1996, the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials began counting Hispanic elected officials in a new way. They previously counted all Hispanics holding office during a given year; the new methodology counts only the number of positions held by Hispanics during a year, to avoid overrepresenting Hispanic officials who replaced other Hispanics in the same positions.


## 9.1 California's Adult and Voter Populations by Race and Ethnicity, 1996

Source: Current Population Survey, November Voter Supplement, 1996.



- Adult population shares can be used as rough predictors of political participation and voting populations. The voting population is expected to approximate the distribution of the adult population.
- In 1996, whites constituted 57 percent of the adult population (age 18 or above) but a disproportionate majority, 75 percent, of the voting population. African Americans were overrepresented by only 1 percent in the voting population. However, Asian and Hispanic adult population shares (12 and 25 percent, respectively) were severely underrepresented in the voting population, constituting only 6 and 12 percent of the California vote. Discrepancies between adult and voter population shares indicate that other factors beyond age eligibility may affect the participation rates of California's major racial and ethnic groups.
- The composition of the adult population in California and in the rest of the United States differs significantly. In the rest of the nation, whites constituted 79 percent of the adult population, and African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians constituted 12, 7, and 2 percent, respectively. However, as in California, discrepancies between the adult and voting population were considerable for the rest of the nation. White voters were 84 percent of the total voting population in 1996, and African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians constituted 11, 4, and 1 percent, respectively.


## 9.2 California's Eligible, Registered, and Voting Population by Race and Ethnicity, 1996



- Over 95 percent of white and African American adults enjoy citizenship and are eligible to vote. Only 55 percent of Asian adults and 48 percent of Hispanic adults are eligible to participate in electoral politics.
- Even when controlling for eligibility, Asians and Hispanics register and participate at lower rates than African Americans and whites. Whites register and vote at higher rates than all other groups, 81 and 72 percent, respectively. African Americans who are eligible register and vote at slightly lower levels than whites. Voter participation rates for eligible Asians and Hispanics are comparatively low: registering only 69 percent and 68 percent and turning out to vote only 57 percent and 54 percent of their eligible populations, respectively.
- Most Asians and Hispanics do not vote. Only 32 percent of adult Asians and 26 percent of adult Hispanics voted in 1996, compared to 68 and 64 percent of white and African American adults, respectively.
- As in California, in the rest of the United States whites and African Americans have the highest shares of eligible adults. The shares of eligible adults were higher in the rest of the nation than in California for the Asian and Hispanic populations. But after controlling for eligibility, all groups registered and voted at higher rates in California than in the rest of the United States.

Notes: To be eligible to vote, a person must be a citizen of the United States and age 18 or older. Felony conviction and other factors that result in the loss of voting privileges are not considered in this analysis of eligibility. Each column in this chart has a different population base. The base for the first column is the eligible adult population; for the second and third columns, it is the total eligible population.


### 9.3 Registration Shares of the Population Eligible to Vote by Race and Ethnicity, 1972–1996



- Whites consistently registered to vote at a higher rate than all other racial or ethnic groups. African American registration rates are slightly below those of whites.
- Hispanics experienced the most significant increase in registration in the last 20 years. In 1974, 35 percent of Hispanics registered to vote. By 1996, rates had increased to 68 percent.
- Eligible Asians and Hispanics registered at similar proportions over the 1990s, fluctuating between 60 and 68 percent, and have begun to approach African American levels of registration. However, both groups remain significantly less likely to register than whites.
- Registration rate ordering by ethnic and racial groups in California mirrors that for the rest of the nation for all groups, although historically rates in the state have been higher. Historically, the gap between eligible African American and white registration rates in California has been wider than in the rest of the United States.

Notes: Whites included Hispanics for 1972. Data for Asians were not available before 1990 in the CPS.

## 9.4 Voter Shares of the Population Eligible to Vote by Race and Ethnicity, 1972–1996




- Trends in voter turnout closely resemble those for registration (Chart 9.3). However, voter participation levels are approximately 10 percent lower than registration rates, with more variation from year to year. For more than 20 years, eligible whites have voted at higher rates than any other group.
- The gap between eligible African American and white voter participation rates, much like registration rates, has widened over the last 20 years. African American participation peaked in 1986 with a 60 percent voting rate but decreased over the last 10 years, resulting in 1996 rates of 52 percent.
- Conversely, the eligible Hispanic population increased its voter participation rate over the past two decades. In 1974, 38 percent of Hispanics registered to vote. By 1996, this had increased to 46 percent. Eligible Asians and Hispanics voted at similar rates over the 1990s, fluctuating between 45 and 48 percent, and have begun to approach African American voting levels. However, they remain significantly less participatory than whites.
- Voter participation rates for all groups in California mirror those of the rest of the nation, although historically rates in the state have been higher. In the rest of the nation, registered Asians have voted at rates about 3 percent higher than Hispanics. But in California, both groups have voted at similar rates.

Notes: Whites included Hispanics for 1972. Data for Asians were not available before 1990 in the CPS.

## 9.5 Voter Participation in California by Race, Ethnicity, and Place of Birth, 1996


Source: Current Population Survey, November Voter Supplement, 1996.



- Immigration status, intimately correlated with citizenship status, is a strong indicator of voter eligibility and participation. The U.S.-born population is expected to vote at significantly higher rates than foreign-born people.
- Studies of voter participation have consistently found that U.S.-born registrants participate more than foreign-born voters. California's Asian population fits this traditional model of voter participation, as their U.S.-born voters participate at higher rates than their foreign-born counterparts. Foreign-born Hispanics, however, vote at higher rates than their U.S.-born peers. This pattern may be related to the age distribution of the Hispanic population.
- Asians and Hispanics have lower participation rates than whites and African Americans regardless of immigration status. In fact, Hispanics born in the United States have the lowest rate of participation, with only about 50 percent voting in 1996.
- Foreign-born Hispanics in the rest of the United States voted at higher rates than U.S.-born Hispanics. The gap between these two groups was larger in the rest of the nation (11 percent) than in California. As in California, the difference in participation rates between U.S.-born and foreign-born Asians in the rest of the nation is minimal.

Note: The sample of foreign-born African Americans and white non-Hispanics was too small to generate significant results.


## 9.6 Voter Participation in California by Race, Ethnicity, and Educational Attainment, 1996



- Disparities in the educational attainment of California's adult population are expected to lead to differences in voting patterns across racial and ethnic groups.
- Across all racial and ethnic groups, completion of college corresponds with higher voter participation rates. This is especially true for Hispanics: 89 percent of those with a college degree voted in 1996. Asian college graduates had the lowest rate of participation at 67 percent.
- For all groups, high school dropouts have similar participation rates: 42 percent of Asian and Hispanics, 45 percent of African Americans, and 47 percent of whites voted in 1996.
- Asians participate at the lowest rates at all levels of educational attainment.
- As in California, in the rest of the United States voter participation rates were higher at higher educational attainment levels. This held true for all groups but especially for African Americans and Hispanics. Eligible Hispanics with a college degree voted at a rate 26 percent higher in 1996 than Hispanics who were not college graduates. For African Americans, the difference was 23 percent.




## 9.7 Voter Participation in California by Race, Ethnicity, and Age, 1996



- Age is often used as a predictor of political participation. Voter turnout generally increases with age, declining after the middle years. For California voters, however, participation increases steadily from the youngest to middle-aged voters and continues to grow for the oldest voters in all groups except Asians.
- Age does not seem to explain much about Asian voting behavior. Although the youngest Asians vote at lower rates, the two other Asian age groups vote at similar levels.
- Whites have the highest rate of participation for the age 18 to 30 group, and Hispanics have the lowest. A substantial proportion of California Hispanics fall in this age group.
- Little difference in participation exists across racial and ethnic groups for the oldest age group, except in the case of Asians. Over 70 percent of all people over age 45 participated in the 1996 election.
- Asians and Hispanics in the rest of the United States participated at comparable rates in all age categories. As in California, eligible Hispanics age 18 to 30 had the lowest participation rates across all age and racial and ethnic categories. However, the lowest rate in the rest of the nation (27 percent) was significantly below California's (40 percent). Eligible whites, followed closely by eligible African Americans, had the highest participation rate in all age categories.

## 9.8 Party Affiliation of Hispanics, Asians, and Others, 1996




- Party affiliation can be used as a predictor of opinion on public policy issues, ballot initiatives, and electoral outcomes. Although partisanship may be less explanatory of voter behavior today than it was 40 years ago, party affiliation remains important.
- More Californians chose to register as Democrat over all other parties. In 1996, 64 percent of Hispanic registrants were Democrats, and only 20 percent were Republicans. Asians and other Californians (mostly whites) were also registered more often as Democrat than Republican, but the gap between the two major parties was far less extreme than for Hispanics.
- Asians identify as nonpartisans more than any other group: 21 percent of Asians register with no party. Only 11 percent of Hispanics and other Californians identify themselves as having no party affiliation. Parties other than Democrat or Republican account for the smallest percentages of registrants—between 4 and 5 percent—in each group.

Notes: Ethnicity was determined by feeding registrants' names through a surname dictionary—an imperfect and less desirable way to assign ethnicity than self-identity. The Hispanic group in this chart does not necessarily correspond to the Hispanic group as defined elsewhere in this book. For example, Filipinos are likely to be counted as Hispanics, which would overestimate Hispanic counts and underestimate Asian counts.

## 9.9 Party Affiliation of Californians, 1996

Source: Institute of Governmental Studies, Statewide Database, University of California at Berkeley.




- Thirty of the 58 California counties are evenly split between Republicans and Democrats or have significant numbers of registrants who identify with no party.
- Twenty-one of the other 28 counties are Democrat. In 15 of them, Democrats make up more than 50 percent of all registered voters. Three counties lean toward Republican, and four have a majority of registered Republican voters.
- Counties leaning toward Democrat or majority Democrat, with the exception of Imperial County, are concentrated on the western part of the state near the San Francisco Bay Area, Sacramento, or Los Angeles. With the exception of Orange County, the counties that lean toward or are majority Republican lie on the eastern border of the state.

Notes: No plurality means that the proportion of voters who declined to list their party affiliation exceeded 20 percent or the difference between Democrat and Republican affiliation was less than 10 percent.

## 9.10 Party Affiliation of Asians in California, 1996

Source: Institute of Governmental Studies, Statewide Database, University of California at Berkeley.




- Much like the overall population, Asians in 33 counties register evenly between the two main parties or claim no party affiliation.
- Asians affiliate themselves with the Democratic party less than all California voters. Asian Democrats are, for the most part, clustered around the Bay Area and Sacramento.
- A higher percentage of Asians affiliate themselves with the Republican party than all California voters. In eight counties Republicans are a plurality of Asian registrants, and 11 counties lean toward Republican. However, Asians in seven counties lean toward Democrat, and in another seven they are predominantly Democrats.
- In the five counties with the highest percentage of Asians (San Francisco, Santa Clara, San Mateo, Alameda, and San Benito), Asian registrants were evenly distributed between the two major parties or claimed no party affiliation.

Notes: No plurality means that the proportion of voters who declined to list their party affiliation exceeded 20 percent or the difference between Democrat and Republican affiliation was less than 10 percent. Asian ethnicity was determined by feeding registrants' names, as listed on registration documents, through a surname dictionary.

## 9.11 Percentage of Registered Democrats Among Hispanics in California, 1996

Source: Institute of Governmental Studies, Statewide Database, University of California at Berkeley.




- In all but seven California counties, over 50 percent of all Hispanic registered voters are Democrat. These seven counties are clustered in the northern and eastern region of the state.
- There is no county in which Republicans are a plurality of Hispanic registered voters. Nevada and Shasta have the highest proportion of registered Republicans: 34 percent of Hispanics were registered Republican in both counties.
- In 27 of the 58 California counties, Democrats accounted for over 60 percent of the Hispanic vote. In four counties (Yolo, Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey), over 70 percent of Hispanics were registered as Democrats.
- In all of the six counties with the highest percentage of Hispanic residents (Los Angeles, Tulare, San Benito, Colusa, Monterey, and Fresno), over 60 percent of registrants are Democrat.

Note: Hispanic ethnicity was determined by feeding registrants' names, as listed on registration documents, through a surname dictionary.

## 9.12 Number of Elected Officials in California by Race and Ethnicity, 1980–1998

Sources: *National Rosters of African American Elected Officials for 1980–84 and 1986–92*; *National Asian Pacific American Roster, 1980–84*; *National Asian Pacific American Political Almanac, 1980–84*; *Annual Directory of Latino Elected Officials, 1984–98*.



- The past two decades have seen representation vary only slightly for African Americans; throughout the 1980s and 1990s, Californians elected between 200 and 300 African American officials.
- The number of Asian elected officials has dramatically increased over the last 20 years. In 1980, Asians had the fewest elected officeholders—only 106. By 1998, the number of Asian elected officials surpassed that of African Americans, totaling 503.
- Since the 1980s, Hispanic elected officials significantly outnumbered their African American and Asian counterparts and further increased their ranks. Rising from 460 in 1984, the number of Hispanics holding public office peaked in 1994 with 796, decreasing only slightly to 789 in 1998.
- Nevertheless, Asians, Hispanics, and African Americans remain underrepresented in public office. In 1998, Hispanics held 10 percent, Asians 6.5 percent, and African Americans 3 percent of these positions (calculated from data cited above and California Legislature, 1998). These rates reflect only half these groups' representation in the adult population (Chart 9.1). These results, however, correspond closely with current Asian and Hispanic voting shares (Chart 9.1), although African American representation is less than half its voting population.

Notes: Data on elected officials include federal, state, regional, municipal, judicial, law enforcement, and education elective offices. Differences in methodology may distort some results.

## Chapter 10

# Chart Titles

### Introduction

- 1.1 Four Regions of California

### Demographics

- 2.1 California's Population by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1998
- 2.2 California's Population Distribution by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1998
- 2.3 Population of Asian Groups, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 2.4 Population of Hispanic Groups, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 2.5 California's Projected Population by Race and Ethnicity, 1990–2040
- 2.6 California's Projected Population Distribution by Race and Ethnicity, 1990–2040
- 2.7 Net Migration by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1996
- 2.8 Births by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1996
- 2.9 Distribution of Births by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1996
- 2.10 Total Fertility Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1998
- 2.11 Deaths by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1996
- 2.12 Life Expectancy at Birth by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender, 1998
- 2.13 Percentage Foreign-Born Among Asian Groups, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 2.14 Percentage Foreign-Born Among Hispanic Groups, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 2.15 Percentage of Noncitizens Among Asian Groups by Citizenship of Other Household Members, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 2.16 Percentage of Noncitizens Among Hispanic Groups by Citizenship of Other Household Members, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 2.17 Age and Gender Pyramids by Race and Ethnicity, 1990
- 2.18 Percentage of the Population Older Than Age 65 and Younger Than Age 18 and by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1998
- 2.19 Age Structure of Asian Groups, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 2.20 Age Structure of Hispanic Groups, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 2.21 Average Number of People per Household by Race and Ethnicity, 1969–1997
- 2.22 Household Structure by Race and Ethnicity, 1968, 1978, 1988, and 1998
- 2.23 1990 Census Undercount by Race and Ethnicity

## Geographic Distribution

- 3.1 Seven Regions of California
- 3.2 White Population in California Counties, 1970 and 1998
- 3.3 Hispanic Population in California Counties, 1970 and 1998
- 3.4 Asian Population in California Counties, 1970 and 1998
- 3.5 African American Population in California Counties, 1970 and 1998
- 3.6 Geographic Distribution of Racial and Ethnic Groups, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1998
- 3.7 Geographic Distribution of Hispanic Groups by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990
- 3.8 Geographic Distribution of Asian Groups by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990
- 3.9 Geographic Concentrations of Racial and Ethnic Groups, 1970–1998
- 3.10 Percentage of Racial and Ethnic Groups Living in Central Cities, 1970–1998
- 3.11 Migration Patterns of Racial and Ethnic Groups, 1985–1990
- 3.12 Geographic Distribution in 1980 and the Destination in 1990 for Out-of-State Migrants by Race and Ethnicity
- 3.13 Destination and Origin of Out-of-State Migrants by Race and Ethnicity, 1985–1990

## Educational Outcomes

- 4.1 Education of Mothers of Children Born in 1989 and 1997 by Race and Ethnicity
- 4.2 Education of Asian Mothers of Children Born in 1989 and 1997
- 4.3 Education of Hispanic Mothers of Children Born in 1989 and 1997
- 4.4 English Language Ability of Asians Age 5 and Over, 1990
- 4.5 English Language Ability of Hispanics Age 5 and Over, 1990
- 4.6 Preschool Activities of Children Age 3 and 4 by Race and Ethnicity, 1995–1997
- 4.7 Reading Proficiency for Grade 4 and Grade 8 Public School Students by Race and Ethnicity, 1998
- 4.8 Math Proficiency for Grade 4 and Grade 8 Public School Students by Race and Ethnicity, 1996
- 4.9 School Quality as Measured by Student Math Scores, 1998
- 4.10 High School Completion Rates of Adults Age 25 to 29 by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1997
- 4.11 High School Completion Rates of Asians Age 25 to 29 by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990
- 4.12 High School Completion Rates of Hispanics Age 25 to 29 by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990
- 4.13 College Completion Rates of Adults Age 25 to 29 by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1997
- 4.14 College Completion Rates of Asians Age 25 to 29 by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990
- 4.15 College Completion Rates of Hispanics Age 25 to 29 by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990
- 4.16 Educational Attainment of Adults Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1997
- 4.17 Educational Attainment of Asians Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990



- 4.18 Educational Attainment of Hispanics Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1980 and 1990
- 4.19 High School Completion Rates by Region for Adults Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity, 1990
- 4.20 Basic Literary and Quantitative Skills of People Age 16 and Over by Race and Ethnicity, 1992

### Health Outcomes

- 5.1 Percentage of Adults with Health Insurance by Race and Ethnicity, 1989–1997
- 5.2 Percentage of Children Insured by Medi-Cal or Medicare by Race and Ethnicity, 1989–1997
- 5.3 Percentage of Mothers with Adequate Prenatal Care by Race and Ethnicity, 1989–1997
- 5.4 Percentage of Asian Mothers with Adequate Prenatal Care by Place of Birth, 1997
- 5.5 Percentage of Hispanic Mothers with Adequate Prenatal Care by Place of Birth, 1997
- 5.6 Percentage of Mothers with Adequate Prenatal Care by Race, Ethnicity, and Region, 1997
- 5.7 Percentage of Children Up to Date on Vaccinations at Age 2 by Race and Ethnicity, 1991–1998
- 5.8 Percentage of Adults Who Are Current Smokers by Race and Ethnicity, 1990, 1992, 1993, and 1996
- 5.9 Percentage of Births That Are Low Birthweight by Race and Ethnicity, 1982–1997
- 5.10 Percentage of Asian Births That Are Low Birthweight by Mother’s Place of Birth, 1997
- 5.11 Percentage of Hispanic Births That Are Low Birthweight by Mother’s Place of Birth, 1997
- 5.12 Rates of Use of Local Mental Health Programs by Race and Ethnicity, 1989–1990
- 5.13 Communicable Disease Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1994 and 1995
- 5.14 AIDS Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1981–1996
- 5.15 Age-Adjusted Infant Death Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1985–1994
- 5.16 Death Rates for Persons Age 25 to 34 by Race, Ethnicity, and Cause, 1996
- 5.17 Death Rates for Persons Age 55 to 64 by Race, Ethnicity, and Cause, 1996

### Labor Market Outcomes

- 6.1 Labor Force Participation Rates of Persons Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender, 1979–1997
- 6.2 Labor Force Participation Rates of Asians Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth and Gender, 1980 and 1990
- 6.3 Labor Force Participation Rates of Hispanics Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth and Gender, 1980 and 1990
- 6.4 Unemployment Rates of Persons Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender, 1979–1997
- 6.5 Unemployment Rates of Asians Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth and Gender, 1980 and 1990
- 6.6 Unemployment Rates of Hispanics Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth and Gender, 1980 and 1990
- 6.7 Unemployment Rates of Persons Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, Gender, and Region, 1990
- 6.8 Activities of Young Adults Age 16 to 24 by Race, Ethnicity, and Gender, 1980, 1990, and 1997
- 6.9 Activities of Young Adult Asians Age 16 to 24 by Place of Birth and Gender, 1980 and 1990

- 6.10 Activities of Young Adult Hispanics Age 16 to 24 by Place of Birth and Gender, 1980 and 1990
- 6.11 Median Weekly Earnings of Male Full-Time Workers Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity, 1979–1997
- 6.12 Median Weekly Earnings of Asian Male Full-Time Workers Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1979 and 1989
- 6.13 Median Weekly Earnings of Hispanic Male Full-Time Workers Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1979 and 1989
- 6.14 Median Weekly Earnings of Female Full-Time Workers Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity, 1979–1997
- 6.15 Median Weekly Earnings of Asian Female Full-Time Workers Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1979 and 1989
- 6.16 Median Weekly Earnings of Hispanic Female Full-Time Workers Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1979 and 1989
- 6.17 Median Earnings for Male High School and College Graduates Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity, 1989
- 6.18 Median Earnings for Asian Male High School and College Graduates Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, and Place of Birth, 1989
- 6.19 Median Earnings for Hispanic Male High School and College Graduates Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, and Place of Birth, 1989
- 6.20 Median Earnings for Female High School and College Graduates Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity, 1989
- 6.21 Median Earnings for Asian Female High School and College Graduates Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, and Place of Birth, 1989
- 6.22 Median Earnings for Hispanic Female High School and College Graduates Age 25 to 54 by Race, Ethnicity, and Place of Birth, 1989
- 6.23 Occupations of Employed Men Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity
- 6.24 Occupations of Employed Asian Men Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1989
- 6.25 Occupations of Employed Hispanic Men Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1989
- 6.26 Occupations of Employed Women Age 25 to 54 by Race and Ethnicity
- 6.27 Occupations of Employed Asian Women Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1989
- 6.28 Occupations of Employed Hispanic Women Age 25 to 54 by Place of Birth, 1989

### Economic Outcomes

- 7.1 Median Family Income by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1997
- 7.2 Median Family Income for Hispanics by Place of Birth, 1969, 1979, and 1989
- 7.3 Median Family Income for Asians by Place of Birth, 1969, 1979, and 1989
- 7.4 Percentage Who Own Stocks, Mutual Funds, Retirement Accounts, or Savings Accounts by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1997

- 7.5 Home Ownership Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 7.6 Home Ownership Rates for Hispanics by Place of Birth, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 7.7 Home Ownership Rates for Asians by Place of Birth, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 7.8 Levels of Overcrowding by Race and Ethnicity of the Household Head, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 7.9 Levels of Overcrowding in Households Headed by Asians by Place of Birth, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 7.10 Levels of Overcrowding in Households Headed by Hispanics by Place of Birth, 1970, 1980, and 1990
- 7.11 Distribution of Personal Income of Men Older Than Age 24 by Race and Ethnicity, 1969, 1979, and 1989
- 7.12 Top and Bottom 10 Percent of the Income Distribution of Men Older Than Age 24 by Race and Ethnicity, 1989
- 7.13 Distribution of Personal Income of Hispanic Adults Older Than Age 24 by Place of Birth, 1969 and 1989
- 7.14 Distribution of Personal Income of Asian Adults Older Than Age 24 by Place of Birth, 1969 and 1989
- 7.15 Poverty Rates for All Californians by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1997
- 7.16 Poverty Rates for Hispanics by Place of Birth, 1969, 1979, and 1989
- 7.17 Poverty Rates for Asians by Place of Birth, 1969, 1979, and 1989
- 7.18 Child Poverty Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1970–1997
- 7.19 Child Poverty Rates by Race, Ethnicity, and Region, 1989
- 7.20 Percentage of Households Receiving Public Assistance by Race and Ethnicity, 1969, 1979, and 1989
- 7.21 Percentage of Households Receiving Public Assistance by Race and Ethnicity of Household Head, 1987–1997
- 7.22 Percentage of Hispanic Households Receiving Public Assistance by Place of Birth, 1969, 1979, and 1989
- 7.23 Percentage of Asian Households Receiving Public Assistance by Place of Birth, 1969, 1979, and 1989

### Crime and Criminal Justice

- 8.1 Felony Arrest Rates for Adults by Race and Ethnicity, 1980, 1990, and 1998
- 8.2 Felony Arrest Rates for Juveniles by Race and Ethnicity, 1980, 1990, and 1998
- 8.3 Felony Arrest Rates for Participating in Street Gangs by Race and Ethnicity, 1998
- 8.4 Felony Narcotics Arrests by Race and Ethnicity, 1998
- 8.5 Distribution of Men Newly Admitted to California Prisons by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1998
- 8.6 Distribution of Women Newly Admitted to California Prisons by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1998

- 8.7 California Prison Incarceration Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1998
- 8.8 Three-Strikes Inmates in California Prisons by Race and Ethnicity, 1999
- 8.9 Distribution of California Youth Authority First Admissions by Race and Ethnicity, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 1998
- 8.10 California Youth Authority Admissions Compared to the Youth Population by Race and Ethnicity, 1998
- 8.11 Homicide Rates by Race and Ethnicity of Victim, 1988 and 1997
- 8.12 Juvenile Homicide Rates by Race and Ethnicity, 1997
- 8.13 Types of Homicides by Race and Ethnicity, 1997
- 8.14 Percentage of Homicide Victims Who Are Women and Youth by Race and Ethnicity, 1997
- 8.15 Percentage Disagreeing That Courts Are Fair to All People by Race and Ethnicity, 1993
- 8.16 Race and Ethnicity of California Superior Court Judges, 1993

### Political Participation

- 9.1 California's Adult and Voter Populations by Race and Ethnicity, 1996
- 9.2 California's Eligible, Registered, and Voting Populaton by Race and Ethnicity, 1996
- 9.3 Registration Shares of the Population Eligible to Vote by Race and Ethnicity, 1972–1996
- 9.4 Voter Shares of the Population Eligible to Vote by Race and Ethnicity, 1972–1996
- 9.5 Voter Participation in California by Race, Ethnicity, and Place of Birth, 1996
- 9.6 Voter Participation in California by Race, Ethnicity, and Educational Attainment, 1996
- 9.7 Voter Participation in California by Race, Ethnicity, and Age, 1996
- 9.8 Party Affiliation of Hispanics, Asians, and Others, 1996
- 9.9 Party Affiliation of Californians, 1996
- 9.10 Party Affiliation of Asians in California, 1996
- 9.11 Percentage of Registered Democrats Among Hispanics in California, 1996
- 9.12 Number of Elected Officials in California by Race and Ethnicity, 1980–1998

## Appendix

# Additional Sources of Information

### Demographics

U.S. Bureau of the Census (<http://www.census.gov>).

Census data and publications on population characteristics (<http://www.census.gov/prod/www/titles.html#pop>).

Census data and publications on race (<http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/race.html>).

Census data and publications on Hispanic origin  
(<http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hispanic.html>).

California Department of Finance Race/Ethnic Population Estimates 1970–1990  
(<http://www.dof.ca.gov/html/Demograp/Eth70-90.htm>).

California Department of Finance Race/Ethnic Population Estimates 1990–1997  
(<http://www.dof.ca.gov/html/Demograp/Race-eth.htm>).

California Department of Finance County Population Projections with Race/Ethnic Detail Estimated July 1, 1990–1996, and Projections for 1997 Through 2040 ([http://www.dof.ca.gov/html/Demograp/Proj\\_race.htm](http://www.dof.ca.gov/html/Demograp/Proj_race.htm)).

### Geographic Distribution

MapStat, Fed Stat (<http://www.fedstats.gov/mapstats/06a.html>).

California State Association of Counties (<http://csac.counties.org>).

### Educational Outcomes

California Department of Education (<http://goldmine.cde.ca.gov>).

California Department of Education (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/demographics/reports>).

National Center for Education Statistics (<http://nces.ed.gov>).

U.S. Department of Education (<http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs98/condition98>).

U.S. Department of Education (<http://www.nces.ed.gov/spider>).

U.S. Department of Education (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard>).

Brookings Institution, Brown Center on Educational Policy ([http://www.brookings.org/gs/brown/brown\\_hp.htm](http://www.brookings.org/gs/brown/brown_hp.htm)).

Urban Institute, Education Policy Center (<http://www.urban.org/centers/epc.html>).

The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning (<http://www.cftl.org>).

## Health Outcomes

National Center for Health Statistics (<http://www.cdc.gov/nchs>).

Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (<http://www.oshpd.ca.gov/hid/index.htm>).

California Department of Health Services (<http://www.dhs.cahwnet.gov>).

California Office of Multicultural Health (<http://www.dhs.cahwnet.gov/director/omh>).

California County Health Status Profiles, 2000  
(<http://www.dhs.ca.gov/hisp/chs/phweek/cprofile2000/profile2000.htm>).

Centers for Disease Control (<http://www.cdc.gov>).

California Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board (<http://www.mrmib.ca.gov>).

California HealthLine, a publication of the California HealthCare Foundation (<http://www.chcf.org>).

U.S. Initiative to Eliminate Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health (<http://raceandhealth.hhs.gov>).

Minority Health Resources, listed by the UC Berkeley Library (<http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/PUBL/minority.html>).

Tobacco Use Research at the Cancer Prevention and Control Program, University of California at San Diego  
(<http://ssdc.ucsd.edu/tobacco>).

California Health Care Fact Book, from the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development  
(<http://www.oshpd.ca.gov/factbook.pdf>).

## Labor Market Outcomes

California Employment Development Department (<http://www.edd.cahwnet.gov>).

California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (<http://www.dfeh.ca.gov>).

California Department of Industrial Relations (<http://www.dir.ca.gov>).

Bureau of Labor Statistics (<http://stats.bls.gov>).

Current Population Survey (<http://stats.bls.gov/cpshome.htm>).

Monthly Labor Review (<http://stats.bls.gov/opub/mlr/mlrhome.htm>).

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (<http://stats.bls.gov/cpshome.htm>).

California Department of Finance (<http://www.dof.ca.gov>).

California Department of Finance, Statistical Abstract ([http://www.dof.ca.gov/html/fs\\_data/stat-abs/sa\\_home.htm](http://www.dof.ca.gov/html/fs_data/stat-abs/sa_home.htm)).

## Economic Outcomes

Department of Housing and Community Development (<http://housing.hcd.ca.gov>).

Office of Small and Minority Businesses, California Department of General Services (<http://www.osmb.dgs.ca.gov>).

Housing and Urban Development Publications (<http://www.huduser.org/publications/pdrpubli.html>).

## Crime and Criminal Justice

California State and Local Government (<http://lcweb.loc.gov/global/state/ca-gov.html>).

State of California, Office of the Attorney General, Criminal Justice Statistics Center (<http://caag.state.ca.us/cjsc>).

California Department of Corrections, Data Analysis Unit, Offender Information Services Branch (<http://www.cdc.state.ca.us>).

California Department of the Youth Authority, Ward Information and Parole Research Bureau (<http://www.cya.ca.gov>).

California Department of Health Services, Center for Health Statistics (<http://www.dhs.ca.gov>).

## Political Participation

California Government Home Page (<http://www.ca.gov>).

California Governor Gray Davis (<http://www.governor.ca.gov>).

California State Assembly (<http://www.assembly.ca.gov/acs/default.asp>).

California State Senate (<http://www.senate.ca.gov>).

California Secretary of State (<http://www.ss.ca.gov>).

California State Office of Research (<http://www.sen.ca.gov/sor>).

California State Assembly Republican Caucus (<http://republican.assembly.ca.gov/index.asp>).

California State Assembly Democratic Caucus (<http://democrats.assembly.ca.gov/english/index.htm>).

State and Local Governments (<http://lcweb.loc.gov/global/state/stategov.html>).

Fed World, National Technical Information Service (<http://www.fedworld.gov>).

United States Congress (<http://thomas.loc.gov>).

U.S. House of Representatives (<http://www.house.gov>).

The White House (<http://www.whitehouse.gov>).

Statewide Database, University of California at Berkeley, Institute of Governmental Studies (<http://swdb.berkeley.edu>).

California Legislative African American Caucus (<http://www.sen.ca.gov/lbc>).

Latino Legislative Caucus (<http://www.assembly.ca.gov/latinocaucus>).

National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) (<http://www.naleo.org>).

Tomás Rivera Center (<http://latino.sscnet.ucla.edu/research/tomas.html>).

## General Sources

Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) (<http://www.maldef.org>).

Russell Sage Publications on Immigration and Ethnic Studies  
([http://www.russellsage.org/publications/subjects\\_immig.htm](http://www.russellsage.org/publications/subjects_immig.htm)).

Urban Institute's Publications on Civil Rights and Affirmative Action  
([http://www.urban.org/combuilding.htm#civil rights](http://www.urban.org/combuilding.htm#civil%20rights)).

Urban Institute's Publications on Community Building (<http://www.urban.org/combuilding.htm#combuilding>).

Urban Institute's Publications on Housing and Discrimination (<http://www.urban.org/combuilding.htm#housing>).

Urban Institute's Publications on Immigration (<http://www.urban.org/socwelfare.htm#immigration>).

California Policy Research Center Latino Policy Research Program (<http://www.ucop.edu/cprc/#LATINO>).

Latino Issues Forum (<http://www.lif.org>).

Legislative Analyst's Office (<http://www.lao.ca.gov>).

Library of Congress (<http://lcweb.loc.gov>).

UC Berkeley Library provides access to the Subject Summary Tapes files for the Hispanic Population, the Asian/Pacific Islander Population, the Foreign-Born Population, and the population by reported ancestry (<http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/GovData/info>).



# Bibliography

- African American Elected Officials: A National Roster*, Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies Press, Washington, D.C., 1986–1992.
- Arteaga, Luis M., Chione Fligel, and Guillermo Rodriguez, *The Latino Vote, 1998: The New Margin of Victory*, Latino Issues Forum, San Francisco, California, 1998.
- Baldassare, Mark, *California in the New Millennium: The Changing Social and Political Landscape*, University of California Press and the Public Policy Institute of California, San Francisco, 2000.
- Ballator, N., and L. Jerry, *The NAEP 1998 Reading State Report for California*, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, NCES 1999-460 CA, Washington, D.C., 1999.
- Betts, Julian R., Kim S. Rueben, and Anne Danenberg, *Equal Resources, Equal Outcomes? The Distribution of School Resources and Student Achievement in California*, Public Policy Institute of California, San Francisco, California, 2000.
- Bishop, Donna M., and Charles E. Frazier, “Race Effects in Juvenile Justice Decision-Making: Findings of a Statewide Analysis,” *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. 86, No. 2, 1996.
- Bouvier, Leon F., and Philip Martin, *Population Change and California’s Future*, Population Reference Bureau, Washington, D.C., 1985.
- California Department of Corrections, *California Prisoners and Parolees, 1995–96*, Sacramento, California, 1998.
- California Department of Corrections, *CDC Fact Sheet*, Sacramento, California, August 1, 1999.
- California Department of Corrections, Data Analysis Unit, Offender Information Services Branch, *Institution Population, by Sex*, December 31, 1978–December 31, 1998.
- California Department of Corrections, Data Analysis Unit, Offender Information Services Branch, *Racial and Ethnic Groups, Felon New Admissions, 1993 and 1998*.
- California Department of Corrections, Data Analysis Unit, Offender Information Services Branch, *Three-Strikes Cases by Offense and Ethnic Group*, December 31, 1999.
- California Department of Education, *California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS)*, 1998.
- California Department of Finance, *Race/Ethnic Population Estimates: Components of Change for California Counties, April 1990–July 1997*, Sacramento, California, June 1999.

- California Department of Finance, *Race/Ethnic Population Projections: Components of Change for California Counties, July 1970–July 1998*, Sacramento, California, July 1999.
- California Department of Finance, *Race/Ethnic Population with Age and Sex Detail, 1970–2040*, Sacramento, California, December 1998.
- California Department of Finance, Unpublished Tables on Fertility and Life Expectancy, 1999
- California Department of Health Services, Center for Health Statistics, Department of Vital Statistics, *Birth Public Use Tape, 1989–1997*.
- California Department of Health Services, Center for Health Statistics, Juvenile Homicide Death Data, unpublished data, 1999.
- California Department of Health Services, Division of Communicable Disease Control, *Communicable Diseases in California, 1994, 1995, 1997*.
- California Department of Health Services, Epidemiological Studies Section, *AIDS Among Racial/Ethnic Groups in California*, 1998 Edition, February 1999.
- California Department of Health Services, Immunization Branch, *Annual Kindergarten Retrospective Survey*.
- California Department of Health Services, Vital Records Division, *Vital Statistics of California, Birth Public Use Tape, 1989–1997*.
- California Department of Health Services, Vital Records Division, *Vital Statistics of California, Birth Statistical Master File, 1982–1988*.
- California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Ethnic Distribution of Arrests for Participating in Street Gangs*, 1999.
- California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Adult and Juvenile Arrests Reported, Race-Ethnic Group by Specific Offense*, various years.
- California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Homicide in California*, 1997.
- California Department of Mental Health, Health and Welfare Agency, *Use of Mental Health Services, 1989–1990*.
- California Journal*, “The Latino Century: Will Latinos Be the Dominant Force of California Politics?” Vol. 21, No. 1, January 2000.
- California Judicial Council, Advisory Committee on Racial and Ethnic Bias in the Courts, *Fairness in the California State Courts: A Survey of the Public, Attorneys, and Court Personnel*, 1994.
- California Judicial Council, Advisory Committee on Racial and Ethnic Bias in the Courts, *Fairness in the California State Courts: A Survey of the Public, Attorneys, and Court Personnel*, Final Report, 1997.

California Legislature, Joint Committee on Legal Equality, *California Roster 1998*, California Secretary of State, 1998.

California Legislature, *The Challenge: Latinos in a Changing California*, Report of the University of California SCR 43 Task Force in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution 43 Introduced by Senator Robert Presley, 36th Senatorial District.

California Youth Authority, Ward Information and Parole Research Bureau, unpublished data, 1999.

Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, *Young African Americans and the Criminal Justice System in California: Five Years Later*, San Francisco, California, 1996a.

Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, *From Classrooms to Cellblocks: How Prison Building Affects Higher Education and African American Enrollment*, San Francisco, California, 1996b.

Cho, Wendy K. Tam, "Naturalization, Socialization, Participation: Immigrants and (Non-)Voting," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 61 No. 4, November 1999, p. 1140.

Clark, William A.V., *The California Cauldron: Immigration and the Fortunes of Local Communities*, Guilford Press, New York, 1998.

Coleman, J. S., E. Campbell, A. Mood, E. Weinfeld, D. Hobson, R. York, and J. McPartland, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966.

Conway, M. Margaret, *Political Participation in the United States*, Congressional Quarterly Inc., Washington, D.C., 1991.

Currie, Elliott, "Race, Violence, and Justice Since Kerner," in Fred R. Harris and Lynn A. Curtis, eds., *Locked in the Poorhouse: Cities, Race, and Poverty in the United States*, Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, Maryland, 1998.

Currie, Janet, and Duncan Thomas, "Does Head Start Make a Difference?" *American Economic Review*, Vol. 85, No. 3, 1995, pp. 341–364.

Currie, Janet, and Duncan Thomas, "School Quality and the Longer-Term Effects of Head Start," National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 6362, 1998.

Erie, Steven P., Harold Brackman, and James Warren Ingram III, *Path to Political Incorporation for Latinos and Asian Pacifics in California*, California Policy Seminar, Research Report, University of California at Berkeley, 1993.

Gey, Fredric, J. Eric Oliver, Benjamin Highton, Darwin Tu, and Raymond E. Wolfinger, *California Latina/Latino Demographic Data Book*, California Policy Seminar, Research Report, University of California at Berkeley, 1993.

- Gibson, Cambell, and Emily Lennon, *Historical Census Statistics on the Foreign-Born Population of the United States: 1850 to 1990*, Population Division Working Paper No. 29, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., 1999.
- Guendelman, Sylvia, and Barbara Abrams, "Dietary Intake Among Mexican-American Women: Generational Differences and a Comparison with White Non-Hispanic Women," *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 85, No. 1, 1995, pp. 20–25.
- Guendelman, Sylvia, Gilberto Chavez, and Roberta Christianson, "Fetal Deaths in Mexican-American, African American and White Non-Hispanic Women Seeking Government-Funded Prenatal Care," *Journal of Community Health*, Vol. 19, No. 5, 1994, pp. 319–330.
- Guendelman, Sylvia, Paul English, and Gilberto Chavez, "Infants of Mexican Immigrants: Health Status of an Emerging Population," *Medical Care*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 1995, pp. 41–52.
- Hayes-Bautista, Aida Hurtado, Robert Burciaga Valdez, and Anthony C.R. Hernandez, *No Longer a Minority: Latinos and Social Policy in California*, UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center, University of California at Los Angeles, 1992.
- Huo, Yuen J., and Tom R. Tyler, *How Different Ethnic Groups React to Authority*, Public Policy Institute of California, San Francisco, California, 2000.
- Institute of Governmental Studies, *Statewide Database*, University of California at Berkeley, 1996.
- Jackson, Bryan O., and Michael B. Preston, *Racial and Ethnic Politics in California*, IGS Press, Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California at Berkeley, 1991.
- Jaynes, Gerald David, and Robin M. Williams, Jr., *A Common Destiny: African Americans and American Society*, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., 1989.
- Johnson, Hans P., and Sonya M. Tafoya, *The Basic Skills of Welfare Recipients: Implications for Welfare Reform*, Public Policy Institute of California, San Francisco, California, 1999.
- Kayden, Xandra, *California Policy Options 1997*, UCLA Policy Forum and UCLA Business Forecasting Project, School of Public Policy and Social Research, University of California at Los Angeles, 1998.
- Kotelchuck, M., "An Evaluation of the Kessner Adequacy of Prenatal Care Index and a Proposed Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization Index," *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 84, 1994, pp. 1414–1420.
- Lopez, Elias, Enrique Ramirez, and Refugio Rochin, *Latinos and Economic Development in California*, California Research Bureau, California State Library, Sacramento, California, 1999.
- Lopez, Elias, Ginny Puddefoot, and Patricia Gandara, *A Coordinated Approach to Raising the Socio-Economic Status of Latinos in California*, California Research Bureau, California State Library, Sacramento, California, 2000.

- Manski, C., G. Sandefeur, S. McLanahan, and D. Powers, "Alternative Estimates of the Effects of Family Structure During Childhood on High School Graduation," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 87, 1992, pp. 25–37.
- Milbrath, Lester W., and Madan Lal Goel, *Political Participation: How and Why Do People Get Involved in Politics?* 2nd ed., Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1977.
- National Asian Pacific American Political Almanac, 1988–99*, 8th ed., UCLA Asian American Studies Center, Los Angeles, California, 1998–99.
- National Asian Pacific American Political Almanac*, 7th ed., UCLA Asian American Studies Center, Los Angeles, California, 1996–98.
- National Asian Pacific American Roster*, UCLA Asian American Studies Center, Los Angeles, California, 1980–84.
- National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) Educational Fund, *Annual Directory of Latino Elected Officials*, Los Angeles, California, 1984–1998.
- National Rosters of African American Elected Officials*, Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies Press, Washington, D.C., 1980–1984.
- Niemi, Richard G., and Herbert F. Weisberg, *Controversies in American Voting Behavior*, CQ Press, Washington, D.C., 1993.
- Oliver, J. Eric, Fredric Gey, Jon Stiles, and Henry Brady, *Pacific Rim States Asian Demographic Databook*, Pacific Rim Research Program, University of California at Berkeley, 1995.
- Ortiz, Vilma, Stephen Trejo, Christian Zolniski, and Juan-Vicente Palerm, *New Research on Latino Workers in the California Economy: The Disadvantaged Labor-Force Position of Latino Immigrants; Obstacles to Labor-Market Progress of Mexican-Origin Workers; Working-Poor Mexican Immigrant Workers in San Jose*, Brief, Vol. 8, No. 9, 1996.
- Passel, Jeffrey S., and Rebecca L. Clark, "How Many Naturalized Citizens Are There? An Assessment of Data Quality in the Decennial Census and CPS," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Washington, D.C. March 1997.
- Pierce, J. P., E. A. Gilpin, S. L. Emery, et al., *Tobacco Control in California: Who's Winning the War? An Evaluation of the Tobacco Control Program, 1989–1996*, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California, 1998.
- Population Reference Bureau, *World Population Data Sheet*, Washington, D.C., 1998.
- Reed, Deborah, *California's Rising Income Inequality: Causes and Concerns*, Public Policy Institute of California, San Francisco, California, 1999.

- Reese, C. M., L. Jerry, and N. Ballator, *The NAEP 1996 Mathematics State Report for California*, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, D.C., 1997.
- Regalado, James, *Minority Political Empowerment: The Changing Face of California?* The Edmund G. "Pat" Brown Institute of Public Affairs, California States University, Los Angeles, 1991.
- Rodriguez, Gregory, *The Emerging Latino Middle Class*, Institute for Public Policy, School of Public Policy, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California, 1998.
- Rosenstone, Steven J., and John Mark Hansen, *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*, Macmillan Publishing Company, New York, 1993.
- Rumbaut, Ruben G., *The New Californians: Assessing the Educational Progress of Children of Immigrants*, CPS Brief Series, 1996.
- Schauffler, Helen, and E. Richard Brown, *The State of Health Insurance in California, 1999*, University of California at Berkeley, 2000.
- Schmidley, A. Dianne, and Gregory Robinson, *How Well Does the Current Population Survey Measure the Foreign-Born Population in the United States?* U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., 1988.
- Schmidley, A. Dianne, and Gibson Cambel, *Profile of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 1997*, Current Population Report Series, Series P-23, Special Studies, Vol. 64, No. 195, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., August 1999.
- Schmidt, Ronald, "The Political Incorporation of Immigrants in California: An Institutional Assessment," *California Politics and Policy*, 1996, pp. 1-19.
- Stiles, Jon, Jonathan Cohen, Zachary Elkins, and Frederic Gey, *California Latino Demographic Databook*, California Policy Seminar, University of California at Berkeley, 1998.
- Tafoya, Sonya M., "Check One or More . . . Mixed Race and Ethnicity in California, *California Counts: Population Trends and Profiles*, Vol. 1, No. 2, January 2000.
- Thernstrom, Stephan, and Abigail Thernstrom, *America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1997.
- Tonry, Michael, *Malign Neglect*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates for States by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin, June 1998.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates for States by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin, July 1, 1998.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates for States by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin, 1999.

- U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990, Census of the Population and Housing Public Law 94-171 Data (Official and Adjusted) Age by Race and Hispanic Origin.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, 1990 Census of Population: General Population Characteristics.
- U.S. Department of Education, *National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS)*, 1992.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Education Statistics to 2008*, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *NAEP 1996 Mathematics Report Card for the Nation and the States*, Washington, D.C., 1996.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *NAEP 1998 Reading Report Card for the Nation and the States*, Washington, D.C., 1998.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education 1998*, Washington, D.C., 1998.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employment and Earnings*, Washington, D.C.
- Verba, Sidney, and Norman H. Nie, *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*, Harper and Row, New York, 1972.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady, *Voice and Equality*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1995.
- Wolfinger, Raymond, and Steven J. Rosenstone, *Who Votes?* Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, 1980.
- Wordes, Madeline, Timothy S. Bynum, and Charles J. Corley, "Locking Up Youth: The Impact of Race on Detention Decisions," *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 31, No. 2, 1994.
- World Bank, *World Development Report*, Washington, D.C., 1993.
- Yanez-Chavez, Anibal, *Latino Politics in California*, Center for U.S.-Mexico Studies, University of California at San Diego, 1996.

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

---

RAYMOND L. WATSON, *CHAIR*  
Vice Chairman of the Board  
The Irvine Company

WILLIAM K. COBLENTZ  
Partner  
Coblentz, Patch, Duffy & Bass, LLP

DAVID A. COULTER  
Vice Chairman  
Chase Manhattan Corporation

EDWARD K. HAMILTON  
Chairman  
Hamilton, Rabinovitz & Alschuler, Inc.

WALTER B. HEWLETT  
Director  
Center for Computer Assisted  
Research in the Humanities

DAVID W. LYON  
President and CEO  
Public Policy Institute of California

CHERYL WHITE MASON  
Partner  
O'Melveny & Myers

ARJAY MILLER  
Dean Emeritus  
Graduate School of Business  
Stanford University

KI SUH PARK  
Design and Managing Partner  
Gruen Associates

A. ALAN POST  
Former State Legislative Analyst  
State of California

CYNTHIA A. TELLES  
Department of Psychiatry  
UCLA School of Medicine

HAROLD M. WILLIAMS  
President Emeritus  
The J. Paul Getty Trust  
and Of Counsel  
Skadden, Arps, Slate,  
Meagher & Flom LLP

## ADVISORY COUNCIL

---

JOEL FOX  
Joel Fox Consulting

CLIFFORD W. GRAVES  
Director of Planning & Physical  
Development  
University of California, Merced

ELIZABETH G. HILL  
Legislative Analyst  
State of California

RUDOLF NOTHENBERG  
Chief Administrative Officer (Retired)  
City and County of San Francisco

HARRY P. PACHON  
President  
The Tomás Rivera Policy Institute

MANUEL PASTOR  
Professor of Latin American  
& Latino Studies  
University of California,  
Santa Cruz

CONSTANCE L. RICE  
Co-Director  
The Advancement Project

PETER SCHRAG  
Contributing Editor  
*Sacramento Bee*

JAMES P. SMITH  
Senior Economist  
RAND

CAROL WHITESIDE  
President  
Great Valley Center



**California's racial and ethnic composition** has changed dramatically over the last generation; so dramatically, in fact, that many businesses, public interest groups, media professionals, and policymakers lack current, reliable information about the state's population. In this volume, Belinda Reyes and a team of researchers provide that information along with a useful description of how the state's major racial and ethnic groups are faring economically, socially, and politically.

Drawing on data compiled between 1970 and the present, the authors examine trends and outcomes in demography, education, health, labor, economic status, crime, political participation, and ethnic geography. Each chapter presents key indicators of well-being for the four major racial and ethnic groups: whites, Hispanics, Asians, and African Americans. Where possible, the authors also present trends and outcomes for major Asian and Hispanic subgroups.

In general, all four groups have experienced improvements in health, education, and crime rates over the last 30 years. However, many disparities have persisted or even widened during this time. These disparities form a clear pattern across the major indicators of economic, social, and political well-being.

---

About the editor: Belinda Reyes is a research fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California, where she studies immigration and the economic progress of immigrants and their families. She holds a Ph.D. in economics from the University of California, Berkeley.

