Racial Identification and Latino Non-Enrollment

Population Association of America
2004 Annual Meeting
April 1-3
Boston, Massachusetts

Sonya M. Tafoya
Research Associate
Pew Hispanic Center
1919 M Street Suite 460
Washington, DC 20036
tafoya@pewhispanic.org
(202) 452-1709

Abstract

The objective of this paper is to test hypotheses of immigrant incorporation, with a specific focus on Latino youth enrollement as measured by the 2000 Census. Additionally, this paper treats the residual census category "some other race," as an analytical category, in order to determine whether it has expanatory power with regard to non-enrollment rates. Using logistic regression techniques, I find that for most 15-17 year-old foreign-born youth, differences in educational enrollment relative to native-born youth can be explained by year of arrival, socioeconomic status (SES) and other housheold characteristics. Puerto Rican- and Mexican-born youth are the exception, and have higher non-enrollment rates not explained by these models. Race effects are not evident for foreign-born youth. For native-born youth, I find general support for the "immigrant optimism" hypothesis, in that native-born youth with a foregin-born parent show higher enrollment odds, than those with a native-born parent. This effect is significant for Cuban and Mexican native-born youth. For native-born youth the effect of race is highly significant before SES and household charactersitics are added to the models, however after these covariates are added, the disadvantage of SOR identification is only evident, and very slight in magnitude, for Mexican youth with a native-born Latino houshehold head.

Introduction

Large-scale immigration over the past three decades has led to a strong interest in the processes associated with immigrant economic, educational and cultural incorporation. While many scholars have used the models of assimilation applied to pre-1924 European immigrants, to explain the incorporation of current immigrants and their descendents, others have introduced variations on these models (DeWind and Kasinitz, 1997). Traditional or "straight-line" models of assimilation assume an upward trajectory eventually resulting in full incorporation for the descendents of immigrants (Gordon, 1964). The "segmented assimilation model," on the other hand adds alternative trajectories one of which results in downward mobility. In this model, children of

immigrants exposed to declining inner-city environments and who are regarded as non-white by society are at risk of incorporation into an urban non-white underclass (Portes and Zhou, 1993). Yet another alternative to "straight-line assimilation" has been labeled the "immigrant optimism hypothesis." With regard to student achievement, this model predicts that foreign-born students will be at a disadvantage due to their more limited English language abilities, but will be have the advantage of having highly motivated immigrant parents who promote educational achievement. Native-born youth with immigrant parents, according to this model will have the duel advantages of high parental support, and English language ability. Given these advantages they should fare better than both immigrant youth, and native-born youth with native-born parents (Kao and Tienda, 1995).

Fundamental these alternative models particularly the "segmented-assimilation" model, is the supposition that immigrants can be divided into white and non-white racial groups. In this context Latinos constitute a unique demographic group in that nationwide roughly half identify as racially white and 47 percent identify as "some other race" (SOR) (Census 2000, Logan 2003). While scholars have often divided Latinos into white and non-white racial categories, few have focused exclusively on the difference between white and SOR Latinos. In this paper, I argue that since the SOR race group contains nearly half of the Latinos in the United States, that it can be used as an analytical group distinct from both Black Latinos and white Latinos. Assessing the value of the SOR as an analytical group has some pitfalls, but does merit consideration given that such a large share of the Latino population, both native- and foreign-born, identify as SOR.[1]

[1] Add fn about non response rates and fluidity of responses, also that minors are identified by their parents, not by the adolescents themselves.

Many scholars, noting the SES similarities between Black Latinos and African Americans, argue that these similarities provide a meaningful basis for aggregating these two groups (Logan, 2003). However, more commonly Black Latinos and SOR Latinos are aggregated into one non-white Latino group (Hirschman, 2001). In this paper, I depart from any discussion of differences between those Latinos identified as black versus those identified as white in the 2000 Census. While following the general methods used by Hirschman (2001), I examine the differences in youth non-enrollment rates between the largest Hispanic race groups White and SOR, where the SOR category excludes Latinos who were identified as black.

Using 1990 Census data Hirschman (2001) tested several assimilation hypotheses. His analysis covered all immigrant youth, and used non-enrollment of 15, 16 and 17 year old immigrant youth as indicator of a downward trajectory. By using immigrant youth who had arrived at young ages as a proxy for second generation youth, he tested the assumptions that could be drawn from the "segmented assimilation hypothesis", and focused on how these assumptions operated within one generation. Hirschman (2001) argues that if the segmented assimilation argument holds true, some immigrant groups upon longer exposure to impoverished inner city conditions, will exhibit lower educational aspirations. On the other hand, if the immigrant optimism argument holds true, he predicts that immigrant children will, even after longer exposure to the United States, maintain the high educational aspirations of their parents, while benefiting from their early exposure to English and increased mastery of the language.

I do not limit my analysis here to the foreign-born, but do limit it exclusively to Latino immigrants and native-born Latino origin youth. I attempt to tease out

generational differences by running the analysis first with foreign-born youth who arrived as very young children, versus those who arrived at older ages. Next I run the analysis for native-born Latinos, and attempt to distinguish differences between those youth who reside with a foreign-born head, versus those who reside with a native-born head. In models which include race, I seek evidence to refute or support the idea that identification as SOR is a risk factor for a downward trajectory of incorporation.

The logic of this analytical flow in this paper is meant to represent youth groups along a continuum, albeit imprecise, of exposure to American values and culture. At one end of the continuum are foreign-born youth who began their schooling outside of the United States, and migrated to the United States at an age older than eight. Next along the continuum are foreign-born youth who arrived at a very early age, eight or younger, such that they have been exposed not only to the values of their foreign-born parents, but also they have started school in the United States at an age which presumably facilitated their incorporation. In this analysis, rather than assume that this group is a proxy for second generation youth, I run an additional set of regression models for native-born Latino youth. Those youth who are native-born and live with in a household with a foreign-born head, are next along the continuum. These youth are analyzed in conjunction with native-born youth who live in a household with a native-born head. Native-born youth residing with a native-born head, in this analysis represent the endpoint on the continuum of exposure to American culture and values. If the proxy group defined by Hirschman (2001) is reliable and can be extended to 2000 Census data, the results should be similar for immigrant youth who arrived at age eight or younger, and native-born youth with a foreign-born householder.

I include the foreign-born, the native-born living with foreign-born householders as well as the native-born with native-born householders to probe possibility that to the extent that race effects are significant at all, they may be strongest among the native-born youth of native-born parents.

Data and Measurement:

The results presented here are focused on a single dimension of successful incorporation, rates of Latino adolescent youth enrollment. Table 1 lists the countries of origin for Latino immigrants aged 15-17 in 2000. The first column shows that the vast majority (66 percent) of Latino adolescent immigrants in the PUMS 5 percent sample are from Mexico. The next largest groups are from Central America and Puerto Rico. Despite the fact that Puerto Rican born persons are citizens of the United States, many Puerto Ricans born on the island experience an adjustment period when they move to the mainland that is analogous to the experience of Latin American immigrants. Puerto Ricans born on the island are therefore treated as foreign-born, while those born on the mainland are considered native-born for the purposes of this study.

[Table 1 about here]

In terms of age distribution, immigrant adolescents tend to be slightly older than the native-born. Two reference groups are used in this study, the first is native-born Latino adolescents and the second is native-born, non-Hispanic, white adolescents. For each of these native-born groups exactly one third are age 17, while slightly more are aged 17 among the immigrant groups. In terms of sex ratios, Mexican-, Central American- and South American-born adolescents tend to be more male than female. Among the native-born, the ratio is nearly 50:50. As for the racial identification of

adolescents, among native-born Latinos about 48 percent are identified as White, and an additional 40 percent are identified as "Some other race." Among Cuban and South American immigrants, the race distribution favors the White category. Among Puerto Rican, Mexican and Central American immigrants the opposite is true; "some other race" is the more frequent racial identification. The final column of table 1 shows the share of adolescent immigrants who arrived prior to 1992. Arrival prior to 1992 indicates that these adolescents were between the ages of six and eight upon arrival. This group would have had the opportunity to begin school in the United States at an early enough age, that their transition to the United States, to an English speaking country, and to a new school system would have been relatively easier than those who arrived at an older age already versed in the language and school system of another country. Table 1 shows that in if this assumption is true, Cuban- and South American-born adolescents are the most advantaged by this measure.

The dependent variable in these analyses is the non-enrollment rate for 15-17 year olds. Non-enrollment is a rare event for the native-born population. Over 95 percent of both male and female native-born, non-Hispanic, whites are enrolled in school (Table 2). For US-born Latinos, the figure is still over 90, but less favorable than the rate for white non-Latinos. Non-enrollment rates are much higher for Latino immigrant youth and rates vary by country of birth. The table is divided both by sex and by time of arrival. In general, females have lower non-enrollment rates than males. The only exceptions are Puerto Rican-born females who identify as racially white. Comparing countries of origin, Mexican immigrants have the highest non-enrollment rates, and Central Americans also show high rates of non-enrollment. The pre-1992 cohort of adolescent immigrants has

much lower non-enrollment rates than their counterparts who arrived at older ages. For example, South American male adolescents in the pre-1992 cohort have non-enrollment rates very similar to those of the native-born reference groups.

[Table 2 about here]

Decennial census data requires the matching of characteristics of the household head to the adolescents in the data set, in some instances the household head may be the youth's parent or step-parent, or may be a related or non-related adult. The child of house holder, married couple family, and college educated household indicators in table 3 are created through the matching process. These characteristics, coded (1, 0), are included in the models to explore the extent to which they explain the higher non-enrollment rates of immigrant youth relative to their native-born counterparts.

Table 3 shows that among native-born, white non-Latino adolescents, 93 percent are the child of the household head. In other words, very few of these adolescents are living in the home of a grandparent, any other relative, or an unrelated individual. Most US-born Latino adolescents also tend to be children of the household head (86 percent). For Puerto Rican-, Central American- and Mexican-born youth, relatively fewer are the child of the householder. Another indicator of home environment is the marital status of the householder. On this measure, Cuban-born and Non-Latino US-born are the most likely to live in married couple households. Puerto Rican- and West Indian-born immigrant youth are the least likely to live in a married couple household.[2]

[Table 3 about here]

[2] Add fn West Indian immigrants who identify as Latino are almost exclusively born in the Dominican Republic.

Fundamental to the "segmented assimilation" argument is that inner city environments, coupled with high poverty are risk factors for immigrant youth.[3] Indeed table 3 shows that only 12 percent of US-born non-Hispanic whites reside in central cities. One quarter of native-born Latinos live in central cities, and for all but Cuban immigrant youth, one quarter or more of the other Latino immigrant groups live in central cities. The most extreme groups are West Indian-born (62 percent) and Puerto Rican-born youth, 40 percent of who live in central cities. Among US-born non-Latino white youth, 59 percent live with a householder who has attended some college. For native-born Latinos 33 percent of adolescents live with a householder who has attended some college. For Mexican-born youth, only 11 percent live with college educated householders. Latinos immigrant youth also tend to have higher poverty rates than native-born non-Latino whites. The rates are particularly high for Puerto Rican- and Mexican-born youth. South American and Cuban immigrant youth on the other hand have poverty levels equal to those of all native-born Latinos (23 percent). Mexican- and Cuban-born youth experience the highest level of linguistic isolation of all the immigrant groups. Linguistic isolation is a term applied to an entire household. Linguistically isolated households are those which, either no person age 14+ speaks only English, or households in which no person age 14+, who speaks a language other than English, speaks English "Very well."

Models of Educational Enrollment:

Because there is ample variation in these measures of SES and household characteristics, we can measure how much variation in terms of non-enrollment rates among different groups of Latino immigrants is a result of their family characteristics,

[3] Central City Residence defined by IPUMS variable

family SES status and their residential settlement in inner cities. In the following logistic regression results I model the probability of non-enrollment. In the basic models, I add only immigrant's country of origin, sex and age as explanatory variables. In a corresponding model I add the covariates in Table 3.

[Table 4 about here]

The regression results are presented in eight models sets starting with table 4. The first four models of each set are run without controls, and the last four are then repeated with controls added. Models 1 and 5 include all immigrant youth irrespective of their year of arrival. Models 2 and 6 correspond to models 1 and 5, except I run these models for the subset of immigrant youth who arrived after 1992. Similarly, models 3 and 7 are run on the subset of those who arrived before 1992. Models 4 and 8 are run to examine whether interactions between year of arrival and place of birth are significant.

In the following regressions, an odds ratio of one means that the foreign-born group's odds of non-enrollment : enrollment are equal to those of the reference group. Odds ratios less than one indicate that the foreign-born group has a lower probability of non-enrollment than the reference group. Alternatively, odds ratios greater than one, indicate that the foreign-born group has a higher probability of non-enrollment than the reference group.

Latino Immigrant Youth Relative to Native-born Latinos

The results from model 1 (table 4) show that without controlling for any of the SES, household factors, all Latino immigrants except those from the Caribbean, have higher

odds of non-enrollment than do the native-born Latino reference group. Immigrant youth from Central America and Mexico have particularly high non-enrollment odds. Model 5 shows the extent to which the covariates (poverty, child of householder, living in a married couple household, living with a householder with some college, and central city residence) contribute to the odds of non-enrollment. The introduction of the covariates lowers the odds ratio for all groups, except South Americans whose odds ratios increase slightly. About 30 percent of the non-enrollment of Mexican immigrant youth, and 22 percent for Central American youth are due to the disadvantages they have in socioeconomic status and household characteristics, represented by the covariates introduced in model 5. Even after adding these covariates, their educational deficit remains higher than that of South American and Puerto Rican immigrant youth. Adding the covariates decreases the Puerto Rican non-enrollment rate by only 2 percent. Immigrant youth from the Caribbean, are just as likely to be enrolled as the native-born Latino youth reference group.

Among the covariates, poverty has the strongest negative effect on enrollment. In order of strength, factors with a positive effect are child of householder, householder with some college, and living in a married couple household. Central city residence has no significant effect when the reference group is native-born Latino youth. As shown in table 3, Latino native-born youth are very similar to their foreign-born counterparts in this measure.

Models 2 and 6 are run exclusively on immigrant youth who arrived after 1992, these youth are recent arrivals, an in order to be in the sample of 15-17 year olds had to be 9 or older at the time of immigration. Thus, they are youth who had probably begun their

schooling in another country and subsequently had to make the transition not only to a new country, but also to a new school system. As reflected in the odds ratios shown under model 2, these immigrants have far higher non-enrollment odds than the group of immigrants as a whole. Hirschman (2001) found a similar pattern of high non-enrollment probabilities for older, recently arrived youth. He suggests that for some older youth, international migration may be motivated by the search for employment, such that their probabilities of non-enrollment for this group may still be high even once the covariates are added to the model. Comparing models 2 and 6 for Mexican-born youth who arrived after 1992, the covariates reduce the non-enrollment odds ratio by 39 percent, from 9.8 to 6.0. Central American-born youth showed a similar, but less extreme pattern.

Comparison of Models 3 and 7, the youth who were younger than 8 years old at their time of arrival, show a pattern of lower non-enrollment odds. In fact, once the covariates are added (model 7) only Mexican- and Puerto Rica-born youth show an enrollment deficit relative to all native-born Latinos. Model 4 and model 8 test for the interaction between year-of-arrival and place of birth. Significant interactions are evident for Central American-, Mexican-, and South American-born youth. In each case the odds of non-enrollment are reduced for the cohort that arrived at younger ages.

Among Puerto Rican-born youth the educational deficit is second only to Mexican-born youth once the covariates are added to the model (model 7). While the more recent Puerto Rican arrivals seem to have a higher educational deficit, it is not significantly different that the pre-1992 Puerto Rican group (model 8). This may be related to the fact that all Puerto Rican youth are American citizens by birth which may attenuate the effect of arrival year seen among other groups.

Latino Immigrant Youth by Race Relative to Native-born Latinos

[Table 5 about here]

In this section, regression results are again presented in eight models sets (Table 5). The difference in this model is the addition of race to the equations. The reference group used in the previous set of regression is the same, native-born Latino youth. In these regressions, models 2 and 6 are run only with those identified as SOR and models 3 and 7 are run only with those youth identified as White. Rather than running separate models for the pre- and post-1992 immigrant youth, this component of the analysis is incorporated into the place of birth variable, so that the variable represents both place of birth and interval of arrival. Following Hirschman (2001), the division into three time-of-arrival intervals is done to explore the impact of increasing duration of residence in the United States on non-enrollment patterns. Those immigrants who arrived before 1992 are referred to as early arrivals, those who arrived between 1992 and 1996 are intermediate arrivals, and finally those who arrived after 1996 are referred to as recent arrivals. Race is added to these equations because it is a potentially important factor in the "segmented assimilation" model. Those students perceived as non-white may encounter greater discrimination, and diminished expectations not only from teacher but also from society in general. In this model I limit the sample of youth to those identified as white or SOR. The object of this is to determine if differences exist between SOR and white students independent of those youth who identify as Black.

Table 5 shows that for Mexican-born youth, those who arrive at an early age have the most favorable enrollment rates (model 1), while those who were recent arrivals had the least favorable odds (13.3). For all cohorts there is still an enrollment deficit relative to US-born Latinos, but the deficit is moderated by the addition of covariates to the model (model 5). Differences between white and SOR Mexican-born youth are not significant (model 8). For Mexican-born youth, these results suggest an upward trajectory associated with longer exposure to American schools. Furthermore, it suggests that at least among the foreign-born, race is not a significant factor in school enrollment.

Among Caribbean-born youth enrollment odds are indistinguishable from those of native-born Latinos. This result is consistent in all models. Central and South American-born youth who arrived in the earliest two intervals do not have significantly different non-enrollment rates than all US-born Latinos once the covariates are added to the equation (models 5), nor does race seem to alter these results (model 8). For the Central and South American-born youth most recently arrived, non-enrollment is significantly higher than for US-born Latinos, even after the covariates are added to the model (models 5) , yet again the race effects for these youth are insignificant (model 8). The odds of non-enrollment are particularly unfavorable for recent Central American-born youth.

The results for Puerto Rican-born youth are puzzling. Once the covariates are added to the model, there is a race by place of birth interaction for the intermediate year of arrival group (model 8). Contrary to any predictions of the "segmented assimilation" model, the white group has higher non-enrollment than the SOR group. These results may reflect a pattern of racial identification in census 2000 whereby most Puerto Rican-born census respondents identified as white, while most mainland born Puerto Rican

respondents identified as SOR (cite, 2XXX). Hirschman (2001) also found inexplicable results in his analysis Puerto Rican-born youth, suggesting a unique experience not easily explained by this model. The descriptive statistics in table 2 also show an inconsistent pattern of enrollment by racial identification between males and females.

Reference Groups

In the first segment of this paper, I use all native-born Latinos as the reference group. However, in the interest of extending this analysis to native-born Latinos as well, I also repeat the above described analysis using native-born non-Latino whites as a reference group (Tables 6 and 7). In all respects, except reference group, table 6 corresponds to table 4, and table 7 corresponds to table 5. The question of how well Latin American immigrants are incorporating into the United States turns on who they are compared to. In the case of adolescents, many native-born Latinos are children of immigrants, thus their characteristics are sometimes more similar to foreign-born Latino youth than they are to native-born non-Latino whites. For example, only nine percent of non-Latino white youth live below poverty, as compared to 25 percent for Latino native-born youth, and 28 percent of all foreign-born Latino youth (Table 3).

[Table 6 about here]

Therefore comparison of tables 4 and 6 show that adding SES and household covariates have a stronger impact in the analysis using native-born non-Latino whites as a reference group. However, qualitatively, the results are the same. The results from model 1 (table 6) show that without controlling for any of the SES, language or household factors the odds of non-enrollment are higher for immigrant youth than they are for native-born non-Latino whites. Central American- and Mexican-born youth have

particularly high non-enrollment rates. Model 5 shows the extent to which the covariates contribute to the odds of non-enrollment. The introduction of the covariates lowers the odds ratio for all groups. Whereas these covariates explained about 30 percent of the non-enrollment of Mexican immigrant youth relative to native-born Latino youth, they explain over half of the educational deficit of Mexican-born youth when compared with native-born, non-Latino, white youth.

Adding the covariates decreases the Puerto Rican non-enrollment rate by only 2 percent relative to native-born Latinos, whereas relative to the non-Latino white reference group, addition of the covariates reduces the deficit by 40 percent. This effect may be mediated by the central city residence covariate. With non-Latino whites as the reference group, the central city residence covariate becomes significant. As shown in table 3, between 25 and 30 percent of both Latino native-born youth and Latino foreign-born youth reside in central cities. Among non-Latino whites only 12 percent reside in central cities. Puerto Rican youth are among the most likely immigrant groups to live in central cities (40 percent).

For pre-1992 immigrant youth from Central American, Mexico and Puerto Rico, enrollment odds are less favorable relative to the reference group (model 3). However, the addition of covariates (model 7), reduces non-enrollment rates for these groups, and for Central Americans to the point that their non-enrollment odds are not significantly different than the reference group. In model 7, when all the covariates are added to the model, Puerto Rican- and Mexican-born youth still show moderate educational deficits. Interactions between year of arrival and place of birth are significant for Mexican, Central and South American youth (models 4 and 8). Again, in qualitative terms the

major findings are the same for pre-1992 youth. Once controls are added, pre-1992 Mexican-born youth have the highest non-enrollment rates, followed by Puerto Rican-born youth.

Just as table 5 showed regression results that incorporated race into the analysis, table 7 shows similar results for using native-born non- Latino, whites as the reference group. Although results are also presented for Caribbean and South American groups, the focus of the regressions involving race focus on the groups with the highest non-enrollment rates.

For Mexican-born youth, again the results are qualitatively the same. Once covariates are added to the model (model 5) those immigrants who arrived at the earliest two intervals have most favorable non-enrollment rates relative to the most recent arrivals. However, an enrollment deficit is till present relative to the non-Latino white reference group. Race has no significant impact on the results (model 8). Likewise the qualitative results for Central American-born youth are the same. Once covariates are added to the model (model 5), the earliest arriving two cohorts have enrollment rates indistinguishable from the reference group, and the addition of a race interaction does not alter these results (model 8). For the most recent arrivals, non-enrollment is significantly higher than the reference group even with the covariates added (model 5), but there is no significant race interaction (model 8). Models for the Puerto Rican-born group are similar to those with a native-born Latino reference group, and are not easily interpreted.

[Table 7 about here]

Native-born Latino Educational Models

Tables 8, 9, and 10 correspond roughly to tables 1, 2 and 3. They provide analogous descriptive statistics for native-born Latino national origin groups. For example, Table 8 shows that among US-born Latino adolescents, just as among the foreign-born, Mexican origin adolescents comprise the largest share of the sample. Unlike the foreign-born sample of adolescents, where Central Americans were the second largest group, Puerto Ricans born on the mainland comprise a larger share of the native-born population than do native-born Central Americans. The category Other Latino has no equivalent in the foreign-born sample, and is somewhat of an unintended consequence of wording from the Hispanic origin question on the 2000 Census (Martin et al, 2003). The native-born Latino origin groups are very similar to native-born non-Latino white adolescents in their age distribution, and sex ratio. The share of native-born Latino origin adolescents identified as white is highly variable, ranging from 91 percent for Cubans, to 26 percent for Dominicans.

[Table 8 about here]

Whereas the first set of analyses employed foreign-born youth and measured length of exposure to the United States by age at arrival and time since arrival. This section of the paper roughly extends the idea of exposure by dividing native-born youth into those with a foreign-born Latino head of household, those with a native-born head of household, and those with a native-born non Hispanic white head of household. Table 9 shows the distribution of each native-born Latino origin group by nativity and ethnicity of the household head and their corresponding enrollment rates. Among Mexican, Puerto Rican and Other Latino origin youth, SOR identified youth tend to have higher non-

enrollment rates. This pattern however, does not hold true for Central American origin youth.

[Table 9 about here]

The covariates used in the earlier regressions are shown in table 10, in this instance calculated for the native-born Latino origin groups. The child of householder variable has less variation among the native-born groups, and is similar although slightly lower than that of non-Latino whites. Native-born Latino adolescents are less likely to live in married couple households than are their non-Latino white counterparts. Their foreign-born counterparts (table 3) in fact were also more likely to live in married couple households. There is considerable variation in the central city residence indicator in table 10 ranging from 7 percent for non-Latino whites to 71 percent for native-born Dominicans identified as SORs. Among non-Hispanic white adolescents, 59 percent live with a householder who has at least some college education. For all native-born Latino origin groups the share of adolescents living with college educated householders is lower, and across all groups it is lower for SORs than for whites. The share of native-born adolescent Latinos living below poverty is about 23 percent, whereas for non-Latino whites it is only 9 percent. The highest poverty rates are among Puerto Rican adolescents born on the mainland who are identified as SOR. Rates of households that are considered linguistically isolated are exceedingly low for all but the Dominican native-born adolescents.

[Table 10 about here]

Latino Native-born Youth Relative to Native-born Non-Latinos Whites

Model 1 (table 11) shows that among native-born Latinos, Mexican origin and Puerto Rican origin adolescents have the highest odds of non-enrollment.[4] However, in model 5 with covariates added it is the SES and household characteristics that account for these deficits. Adding the covariates boosts the enrollments odds of South American origin youth, such that their odds of enrollment are more favorable than those of native-born non-Latino whites. Sub-setting the native-born adolescents into those with a foreign-born head, shows that again Mexican and Puerto Rican origin youth have educational enrollment deficits (model 2). Adding the covariates makes up for the educational deficits among Mexican and Puerto Rican origin youth. Addition of SES and household characteristics for South American and Dominican origin youth result in significantly lower non-enrollment rates than those of non-Latino whites.

[Table 11 about here]

Model 3 shows results for native-born adolescents with native-born household heads. In this model Cuban, Mexican and Puerto Rican youth show educational deficits. Once the covariates are added to the model (model 7) these deficits are diminished, but still significantly higher than the reference group.

The interaction between the nativity of the household head and the country of origin for each of these native-born Latino groups is shown in models 4 and 8. For both Cubans and Mexicans the interaction is significant when all the covariates are added to the model. These results indicate that youth with a foreign-born parent have more favorable

[4] Other Latinos also have high non-enrollment, but hold comments until next draft when their origin is more clear.

enrollment rates, although the difference in odds ratios for Mexican origin youth is very marginal. A pessimistic interpretation of these results is that there is a third generation decline in progress. The explanation of the lower non-enrollment odds for those adolescents with a foreign-born parent may be evidence for the "immigrant optimism hypothesis" at work helping the second generation navigate a less favorable social context.

Latino Native-born Youth, by Race Relative to Native-born Non-Latinos Whites

In the previous set of regressions we observed that, native-born Mexican youth with a foreign-born household head have more favorable enrollment rates. In this final set of regressions I primarily examine the effect of race on native-born Mexican youth.

[Table 12 about here]

In model 1, (table 12) with no covariates for SES, native-born Mexican youth with a non-Latino white native-born household head the have the most favorable enrollment odds, while youth with a foreign-born Latino head have the least favorable odds. However, when the covariates are added (model 5), the opposite pattern prevails. Addition of the SES and household characteristics result in more favorable educational enrollment odds for youth with a foreign-born Latino householder, and less favorable enrollment odds for youth living with a native-born head. However, in model 5, also shows that while those youth with a native-born householder have significantly worse enrollment odds relative to the reference group, those youth with a foreign-born head are not significantly different from the non-Latino White reference group.

Model 2 is calculated for the subset of native-born Latino origin youth identified in the census as SOR. Without controls for SES or household characteristics, Mexican

origin youth identified as SOR show educational enrollment deficits relative to the reference group. When the covariates are added to the model (model 6), only Mexican origin youth with a native-born Latino household head have higher non-enrollment than the reference group. In model 3 the same regression is run for the subset of native-born Latino youth identified as white. Once call the covariates are added to this model (model 7) only those with a native-born non-Latino white householder have higher non-enrollment odds than the native-born white reference group.

While many "race by origin" interactions are significant in model 4, all but one of the interaction terms can be explained by differences in the covariates. In model 8 only one interaction term is significant. This interaction term indicates that among Mexican origin youth with a native-born Latino householder, those identified as white have slightly, but significantly more favorable odds than those identified as SOR.

Conclusion

The objective of this paper was to test hypotheses of immigrant incorporation, with a specific focus on Latino youth enrollement, and to explore the value of using the residual census category "some other race," as an analytical category distinct from other non-white Latino categories. Among the hypotheses offered in the literature, I find the strongest evidence for the "immigrant optimism hypthesis." I find that consistent with this hypothesis Mexican-born youth, even those who arrived as young children exhibit the largest enrollment deficits, and that native-born Mexican youth with native-born household heads also experience enrollment deficits. It is only native-born youth with a foreign-born householder who are indistinguisible from the native-born non-Hispanic white reference group. Differences between the reference group and the native-born

Mexican youth with native-born parents, however are very minimal. The effect of SOR racial idenitifaction is stronger for the native-born, but is associated with less favorable SES and household, characteristics such that race effects are minimal once covaraites are added to the models.

References

Hirschman, C. 2001. "The Educational Enrollment of Immigrant Youth: A Test of the Segmented-Assimilation Hypothesis." *Demography* 38: 3 317-336.

Portes, A. and M. Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *Annals of the American Political and Social Sciences* 530 (November):74-96.

Kao, G. and M. Tienda. 1995. "Optimism and Achievement: The Educational Performance of Immigrant Youth." *Social Science Quarterly* 76:1-19.

Gordon, M. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Martin, E., Eleanor Gerber and Cleo Redline. 2003. *Synthesis Report: Census Alternative Questionnaire Experiment. Final Report.*

Logan, J. 2003. "How Race Counts for Hispanic Americans." Publication of the Lewis Mumford Center, University at Albany.

Table 1. Characteristics of United States Youth (Age 15-17), by Ethnicity, and Place of Birth, 2000

	N unweighted	Percentage					
		Age 17	Female	White	SOR	Any other Single or Mixed Race	Pre-1992
Place of Birth							
Latinos:							
Central America	2,752	0.40	0.45	0.37	0.53	0.09	0.57
Cuba	368	0.35	0.50	0.89	0.05	0.06	0.82
Mexico	15,526	0.38	0.43	0.40	0.55	0.05	0.61
South America	1,961	0.37	0.48	0.55	0.36	0.10	0.62
West Indies	941	0.37	0.53	0.18	0.64	0.18	0.61
Puerto Rico*	1,528	0.37	0.49	0.42	0.49	0.09	0.44
Rest of World	135	0.40	0.46	0.51	0.25	0.24	0.54
All Foreign Born**	23,211	0.38	0.44	0.41	0.52	0.07	0.59
Born Abroad American parents Latinos	796	0.32	0.48	0.52	0.28	0.20	0.40
US Outlying Latinos	20	0.46	0.67	0.32	0.26	0.41	0.47
US Born Latinos	52,932	0.33	0.50	0.48	0.40	0.12	
US Born Non-Hispanic White	384,964	0.33	0.49	1	na	na	na

Source: Author's calculation of 2000 Census IPUMS 5 percent sample.
Although Puerto Rican born adolescents are US Citizens, they are considered foreign born for the purposes of this study.
Latino immigrants from the West Indies are primarily those born in the Dominican Republic

Table 2. Percentage of Youth (Age 15-17) Not Enrolled in School, by Ethnicity, Place of Birth, Race, Sex and Year of Arrival, 2000

			Males			Females		
				Year of Entry			Year of Entry	
Ethnicity	POB	Race	Total	Post 1992	Pre 1992	Total	Post 1992	Pre 1992
Latino	Central America	White	24.6	36.4	7.5	15.6	20.1	9.1
		SOR	20.0	29.2	7.3	11.2	16.2	5.5
Latino	Cuba	White	9.0	8.2	12.7	4.4	3.8	6.9
		SOR	3.3	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Latino	Mexico	White	31.7	41.8	10.9	21.8	30.5	9.4
		SOR	32.0	46.0	9.6	20.3	30.6	8.4
Latino	South Am	White	9.3	12.0	4.9	5.1	6.4	2.9
		SOR	12.0	15.0	6.8	7.7	11.0	2.1
Latino	West Indies	White	7.5	4.8	11.8	2.4	1.8	3.3
		SOR	6.4	7.0	5.3	5.5	6.3	4.3
Latino	Puerto Rico*	White	7.2	13.0	2.5	15.0	17.4	12.8
		SOR	14.6	16.0	13.6	8.3	10.2	6.9
Latino	Rest Of World		2.8	3.4	2.2	4.1	7.7	0.0
Latino	All Foreign Born**		25.9	36.4	8.9	16.6	23.3	7.9
Latino	US Born Latinos	White	5.8	na	na	5.5	na	na
		SOR	6.7	na	na	6.3	na	na
		All	6.2	na	na	5.7	na	na
Non-Latino	US Born	White	4.0	na	na	3.7	na	na

Source: 2000 Census 5 % PUMS

Puerto Rico considered foreign born for the purposes of this study. All Foreign born includes Island born Puerto Ricans

Table 3.

Ethnicity	POB	Race	Child of Householder	Married-Couple Household	Central City Residence	College Educated Householder	Below Poverty	Linguistic Isolation
Latino	Central America	White	73	66	23	23	28	32
		SOR	74	68	34	20	27	25
		ALL	74	66	30	22	28	28
Latino	Cuba	White	81	75	3	34	25	36
		SOR	87	87	13	34	11	23
		ALL	81	77	5	33	23	37
Latino	Mexico	White	66	73	25	12	37	40
		SOR	66	73	25	9	34	35
		ALL	66	73	25	11	36	37
Latino	South Am	White	83	77	22	55	22	22
		SOR	79	67	34	40	24	22
		ALL	81	72	27	50	23	22
Latino	West Indies	White	79	53	52	29	32	23
		SOR	84	53	64	24	35	22
		ALL	83	53	62	26	33	22
Latino	Puerto Rico*	White	66	60	31	44	32	14
		SOR	66	46	47	27	46	18
		ALL	66	51	40	35	39	16
Latino	Rest Of World	ALL	71	79	19	56	33	13
Latino	All Foreign Born**	White	71	71	24	22	34	35
		SOR	70	69	30	15	33	31
		ALL	70	70	28	18	33	32
Latino	US Born Latinos	White	87	68	22	39	22	3
		SOR	86	65	28	23	26	5
		All	86	65	25	33	23	4
Non-Latino	US Born	White	93	76	12	59	9	na

Source: 2000 Census 5 % PUMS

Puerto Rico considered foreign born for the purposes of this study. All Foreign born includes Island born Puerto Ricans

Table 4. Logistic Regression Results of Nonenrollment on Place of Birth and Social Background, Latino Immigrant Youth 15-17. Reference Group is All Native Born Latinos : United States 2000

(Odds Ratio of Non Enrollment:Enrollment)

		Baseline Models with Age and Gender				Models with All Covariate					
			Year Of Arrival				Year Of Arrival				
Ethnicity	POB	Model 1 All Latino Immigrants	Model 2 Post-1992	Model 3 Pre-1992	Model 4 Interact YOA*POB	Model 5 All Latino Immigrants	Model 6 Post-1992	Model 7 Pre-1992	Model 8 Interact YOA*POB	N Pre-1992	N Post-1992
Latino	Carib	0.957	1.023	0.822		0.854	0.894	0.806		367	760
Latino	Central America	3.353**	5.558**	1.179	**	2.620**	3.827**	1.201	**	1,095	1,412
Latino	Mexico	5.707**	9.803**	1.604**	**	3.963**	6.014**	1.541**	**	5,944	8,826
Latino	South Am	1.344**	1.81**	0.629*	**	1.387**	1.695**	0.826	**	672	1,094
Latino	Puerto Rico*	1.734**	2.081**	1.48**		1.704**	1.899**	1.494**		763	621
Latino	US Born	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*		
Age15		0.198**	0.195**	0.206**		0.231**	0.222**	0.217**			
Age16		0.531**	0.508**	0.505**		0.563**	0.536**	0.526**			
Age17		*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*		
Male		1.394**	1.345**	1.068		1.036**	1.255**	1.053			
Poverty						1.115**	1.116**	1.265**			
Child of Householder						0.171**	0.205**	0.258**			
Married Couple Household						0.717**	0.719**	0.732**			
Householder with College						0.519**	0.531**	0.566**			
Central City Residence						1.020	1.004	1.031			
exp. contant		0.0947	0.0982	0.1108	0.0982	0.4636	0.4302	0.3817	0.4365		
-2 Log-Likelihood		40,744	34,056	25,023	38,941	34,586	29,491	22,150	33,776		
Chi-Square		5,902	7,166	1,090	7,583	8,990	8,669	2,621	9,480		
N		68,013	59,172	55,300	68,013	67,004	58,232	54,385	67,004		

Source: 2000 Census 5 % PUMS

Puerto Ricans born on the island of Puerto Rico are classified as foreign born for the purposes of this study.

Carib is West Indies and Cuba

* p <.05; **p<.01

Table 5. Logistic Regression Results of Nonenrollment on Place of Birth and Social Background, Latino Immigrant Youth 15-17, by Race. Reference Group is All Native Born Latinos : United States 2000

(Odds Ratio of Non Enrollment:Enrollment)

		Baseline Models with Age and Gender				Models with All Covariates					
			Race				Race				
Ethnicity/POB	Arrival Interval	Model 1 All Latino Immigrants	Model 2 SOR	Model 3 White	Model 4 Interact RaceXPOB	Model 5 All Latino Immigrants	Model 6 SOR	Model 7 White	Model 8 Interact RaceXPOB	N SOR	N White
Latino/Carib	pre-1992	0.757	0.709	0.945		0.765	0.678	1.021		244	123
	1992-1996	1.062	1.173	0.976		0.963	1.048	0.887		315	214
	post-1996	0.709	0.996	0.567		0.646	0.926	0.508		125	186
Latino/C. Am.	pre-1992	1.068	1.018	1.285		1.112	1.021	1.385		679	416
	1992-1996	0.997	0.92	1.226		0.934	0.817	1.253		364	226
	post-1996	7.294**	6.865**	8.676**		4.914**	4.62**	6.006**		524	414
Latino/Mexico	pre-1992	1.46**	1.469**	1.622**		1.408**	1.421**	1.543**		3,704	2,240
	1992-1996	1.609**	1.723**	1.561**		1.599**	1.691**	1.575**		2,219	1,574
	post-1996	13.318**	14.416**	13.435**		7.304**	7.973**	7.652**		3,183	2,554
Latino/S. Am.	pre-1992	0.57**	0.654	0.559*		0.778	0.826	0.781		279	393
	1992-1996	0.56**	0.658	0.501*		0.738	0.85	0.666		237	282
	post-1996	2.407**	2.946**	2.251**		1.996**	2.148**	2.025**		275	416
Latino/Puerto Rico	pre-1992	1.341*	1.62**	1.13		1.443**	1.602**	1.278		428	335
	1992-1996	1.247	0.914	1.835*		1.313	0.825	2.25**	**	194	152
	post-1996	2.146**	2.42**	2.083**		1.836**	1.784*	2.017**		165	175
Latino	US Born	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*		
Age15		0.199**	0.199**	0.2**		0.225**	0.22**	0.217**			
Age16		0.516**	0.51**	0.496**		0.546**	0.535**	0.526**			
Age17		*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*		
Male		1.3**	1.247**	1.171**		1.237**	1.203**	1.053**			
Poverty						1.126**	1.172**	1.203**			
Child of Householder						0.21**	0.231**	0.234**			
Married Couple Household						0.743**	0.741**	0.74**			
Householder with College						0.501**	0.521**	0.541**			
Central City Residence						1.010	1.027	0.999			
exp. constant		0.1091	0.1076	0.1113	0.1090	0.4505	0.4106	0.4217	0.4496		
-2 Log-Likelihood		38,316	30,446	28,020	38,297	33,510	26,774	31,650	33,490		
Chi-Square		8,056	5,542	4,549	8,065	9,559	6,754	5,778	9,564		
N		68,013	58,781	55,691	68,013	67,004	57,838	54,779	67,004		

Source: 2000 Census 5 % PUMS, * p <.05; **p<.01

Puerto Rico Island born treated as foreign born for the purposes of this study.

Carib is West Indies and Cuba

Table 6. Logistic Regression Results of Non Enrollment on Place of Birth and Social Background, Latino Immigrant Youth 15-17. Reference Group is Native Born Non Latino Whites: United States 2000

		(Odds Ratio of Non Enrollment to Enrollment)							
		Baseline Models with Age and Gender				Models with All Covariates			
			Year Of Arrival				Year Of Arrival		
Ethnicity	POB	Model 1 All Latino Immigrants	Model 2 Post-1992	Model 3 Pre-1992	Model 4 Interact YOA*POB	Model 5 All Latino Immigrants	Model 6 Post-1992	Model 7 Pre-1992	Model 8 Interact YOA*POB
Latino	Carib	1.485**	1.59**	1.282		0.858	0.9	0.752	
Latino	Central America	5.253**	8.746**	1.823**	**	2.741**	4.031**	1.173	**
Latino	Mexico	9.000**	15.533**	2.5**	**	4.194**	6.406**	1.503**	**
Latino	South Am	2.098**	2.825**	0.977	**	1.508**	1.841**	0.882	**
Latino	Puerto Rico*	2.705**	3.242**	2.299**		1.643**	1.857**	1.374**	
Non-Latino White	US Born	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*
Age15		0.193**	0.192**	0.194**		0.2**	0.196**	0.193**	
Age16		0.465**	0.455**	0.448**		0.475**	0.463**	0.454**	
Age17		*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*
Male		1.19**	1.167**	1.094**		1.179**	1.158**	1.104**	
Poverty						1.376**	1.429**	1.588**	
Child of Householder						0.242**	0.268**	0.306**	
Married Couple Household						0.663**	0.659**	0.658**	
Householder with College						0.424**	0.421**	0.419**	
Central City Residence						1.085**	1.086**	1.146**	
exponentiated constant		0.069	0.071	0.073	0.070	0.414	0.390	0.355	0.397
-2 Log-Likelihood		143,486	136,764	127,691	141,655	125,875	120,621	113,118	124,953
Chi-Square		16,874	18,224	5,585	18,579	26,455	25,958	15,073	26,768
N		406,518	397,677	393,805	406,518	402,749	393,977	390,130	402,749

Source: 2000 Census 5 % PUMS, * p <.05; **p<.01

Puerto Rico considered foreign born for the purposes of this study.

Carib is West Indies and Cuba

Table 7. Logistic Regression Results of Non Enrollment on Place of Birth and Social Background, Latino Immigrant Youth 15-17, by Race. Reference Group is Native Born Non Latino Whites: United States 2000

(Odds Ratio Non Enrollment to Enrollment)

		Baseline Models with Age and Gender				Models with All Covariates					
			Race				Race				
Ethnicity/POB	arrival interval	Model 1 All Latino Immigrants	Model 2 SOR	Model 3 White	Model 4 Interact Race*POB	Model 5 All Latino Immigrants	Model 6 SOR	Model 7 White	Model 8 Interact Race*POB	N SOR	N White
Latino/Carib	pre-1992	1.259	1.143	1.526		0.765	0.634	1.054		244	123
	1992-1996	1.697**	1.822**	1.505		0.998	1.017	0.935		315	214
	post-1996	1.044	1.378	0.838		0.685	0.908	0.543		125	186
Latino/Cent. Am.	pre-1992	1.783**	1.647**	2.064**		1.169	1.028	1.427		679	416
	1992-1996	1.322	1.186	1.625*		0.97	0.835	1.258		364	226
	post-1996	11.931**	10.886**	13.705**		5.455**	4.946**	6.437**		524	414
Latino/Mexico	pre-1992	2.447**	2.387**	2.619**		1.492**	1.452**	1.566**		3,704	2,240
	1992-1996	2.256**	2.387**	2.109**		1.664**	1.714**	1.593**		2,219	1,574
	post-1996	21.868**	22.963**	21.227**		8.309**	8.778**	8.266**		3,183	2,554
Latino/S. Am.	pre-1992	0.955	1.063	0.9		0.874	0.872	0.883		279	393
	1992-1996	0.768	0.878	0.67		0.792	0.891	0.704		237	282
	post-1996	3.879**	4.598**	3.513**		2.248**	2.306**	2.26**		275	416
Latino/Puerto Rico	pre-1992	2.249**	2.623**	1.829**		1.414*	1.454*	1.29		428	335
	1992-1996	1.826**	1.29	2.641**		1.323	0.802	2.264**	*	194	152
	post-1996	3.285**	3.602**	3.107**		1.896**	1.779*	2.035**		165	175
Non Latino	US Born	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*		
Age15		0.193**	0.193**	0.193**		0.198**	0.195**	0.194**			
Age16		0.458**	0.453**	0.448**		0.468**	0.46**	0.454**			
Age17		*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*		
Male		1.161**	1.138**	1.119**		1.155**	1.14**	1.12**			
Poverty						1.431**	1.508**	1.537**			
Child of Householder						0.267**	0.287**	0.291**			
Married Couple Household						0.668**	0.663**	0.661**			
Householder with College						0.414**	0.414**	0.417**			
Central City Residence						1.114**	1.139**	1.127**			
(exp)Constant		0.0722	0.0725	0.0733	0.0722	0.3938	0.3720	0.3710	0.3936		
-2 Log-Likelihood		141,291	133,274	130,806	141,271	124,655	117,812	115,620	124,635		
Chi-Square		18,061	12,798	11,048	18,071	26,415	21,368	19,793	26,421		
N		406,518	397,286	394,196	406,518	402,749	393,583	390,524	402,749		

Source: 2000 Census 5 % PUMS, * p <.05; **p<.01

Puerto Rico considered foreign born for the purposes of this study. Carib is West Indies and Cuba.

Table 8.

Characteristics of United States Youth (Age 15-17), Native Born Only by Hispanic Origin

		Percentage		
	N unweighted	Age 17	Female	White
US Born Latinos:				
Central America	958	0.34	0.48	0.46
Cuba	1,191	0.33	0.50	0.91
Mexico	29,437	0.34	0.49	0.54
South America	760	0.35	0.51	0.70
Dominican Republic	609	0.31	0.49	0.26
Puerto Rico	4,493	0.34	0.49	0.55
Other Latino	8,905	0.32	0.51	0.52
US Born Non-Hispanic White	384,964	0.33	0.49	100

Source: 2000 Census PUMS 5 percent sample.
Note: Restricted to Hispanics who identify race as White or Some Other Race
Note Puerto Rico refers to Puerto Ricans born on the mainland

Table 9.

Percentage of Native Born Youth (Age 15-17) Not Enrolled in School, by Ethnic Origin, Race, sex and Nativity of Household Head, 2000

			Males			Females		
				Nativity of Head			Nativity of Head	
Ethnicity	US Born	Race	Total	NB Head	FB Head	Total	NB Head	FB Head
Latino	Central America	White	5.2	8.2	4.3	5.3	6.2	4.9
		SOR	2.7	0.0	3.0	1.9	5.9	1.5
Latino	Mexico	White	5.6	6.1	5.0	5.8	5.7	6.0
		SOR	6.6	7.3	6.1	6.8	7.6	6.3
Latino	Puerto Rico	White	4.5	4.6	4.4	6.0	5.4	6.8
		SOR	6.7	5.0	8.0	6.4	6.8	6.2
Latino	Other Latinos	White	4.3	4.9	3.0	4.6	5.1	3.6
		SOR	5.5	6.6	4.3	5.3	6.0	4.6
Non-Latino	US Born	White	3.8	3.8	3.1	3.7	3.7	3.1

Source: 2000 Census 5 % PUMS

Puerto Rican US born in this table refers to those youth born on the mainland.

Cuban, South American and Domincan Groups were dropped from this section of the analysis due to small sample sizes.

Table 10

Characteristics of Household of United States Youth (Age 15-17), Native Born Only by Hispanic Origin 2000

	Percentage					
	Child of Householder	Married Couple Household	Central City Residence	College Educated Householder	Below Poverty	Linguistic Isolation
US Born Latinos:						
Central America						
White	89	66	24	40	18	5
SOR	90	70	37	29	17	4
Cuba						
White	90	69	6	57	12	1
SOR	89	63	28	26	23	0
Mexico						
White	86	69	21	34	23	4
SOR	86	68	22	19	25	5
South America						
White	92	67	24	63	15	2
SOR	90	64	43	51	16	4
Dominican Republic						
White	90	49	57	39	27	6
SOR	89	54	71	30	31	7
Puerto Rico						
White	88	59	35	42	23	2
SOR	86	46	53	28	35	4
Other Latino						
White	88	67	18	43	20	2
SOR	86	62	28	27	27	4
US Born Non-Hispanic White	93	76	7	59	9	0

Source: 2000 Census PUMS 5 percent sample.
Note: Restricted to Hispanics who identify race as White or Some Other Race
Note Puerto Rico refers to Puerto Ricans born on the mainland

Table 11. Logistic Regression Results (Odds Ratios) of Non Enrollment on Origin and Social Background, Latino Native Born Youth 15-17, by Nativity of Head. Reference Group is Native Born Non Latino Whites: United States 2000

		(Odds Ratio of Non Enrollment to Enrollment)							
		Baseline Models with Age and Gender				Models with All Covariate			
			Nativity of Head				Nativity of Head		
Ethnicity		Model 1 All Latino NB	Model 2 FB Head	Model 3 NB Head	Model 4 Interact Nativity Head X Origin	Model 5 All Latino NB	Model 6 FB Head	Model 7 NB Head	Model 8 Interact Nativity Head X Origin
Latino	Central America	1.071	0.955	1.362		0.779	0.716	1.038	
Latino	Cuba	1.129	0.916	1.831**	*	1.02	0.809	1.685*	*
Latino	Mexico	1.655**	1.456**	1.625**		1.054	0.982	1.108**	*
Latino	South Am	0.68	0.529*	0.864		0.552*	0.484*	0.724	
Latino	Dominican Republic	1.207	1.005	2.239		0.706	0.617*	1.456	
Latino	Puerto Rico*	1.61**	1.594**	1.447**		0.994	0.985	0.968	
Latino	Other Latinos	1.432**	1.025	1.535**		0.969	0.769**	1.074	**
Non-Latino White	US Born	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*
Age15		0.195**	0.195**	0.193**		0.193**	0.193**	0.191**	
Age16		0.446**	0.444**	0.443**		0.451**	0.449**	0.448**	
Age17		*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*
Male		1.082**	1.077**	1.082**		1.085**	1.088**	1.095**	
Poverty						1.582**	1.601**	1.636**	
Child of Householder						0.315**	0.313**	0.326**	
Married Couple Household						0.665**	0.659**	0.664**	
Householder with College						0.432**	0.424**	0.424**	
Central City Residence						1.105**	1.123**	1.142**	
exp. constant		0.074	0.074	0.074	0.074	0.346	0.351	0.336	0.344
-2 Log-Likelihood		142,866	131,525	132,859	142,851	126,597	117,084	118,234	126,573
Chi-Square		6,253	5,425	5,664	6,270	16,106	14,905	15,299	16,129
N		431,317	407,426	408,009	431,317	426,865	403,820	404,403	426,865

Source: 2000 Census 5 % PUMS, * p <.05; **p<.01

In this model Puerto Ricans are only those who were born on the mainland.

Table 12. Logistic Regression Results (odds Ratios) of Non Enrollment on Origin and Social Background, Latino Native born Youth 15-17, by Race. Reference Group is Native Born Non Latino Whites: United States 2000

		Baseline Models with Age and Gender				Models with All Covariate					
			Race				Race				
Ethnicity	USA	Model 1 All Latino NB	Model 2 SOR	Model 3 White	Model 4 Race X Origin	Model 5 All Latino NB	Model 6 SOR	Model 7 White	Model 8 Race X Origin	N White	N SOR
Latino	*Mexico*										
	FB Head-Latino	1.685**	1.681**	1.69**	**	0.987	1.009	0.934		5,847	8,181
	NB Head-Latino	1.681**	1.9*	1.521**	**	1.099*	1.149*	1.044	*	6,647	4,952
	NB Head-White Not Latino	1.402**	1.493**	1.375**	*	1.181*	1.021	1.239*		2,287	637
Latino	*Puerto Rico*										
	FB Head-Latino	1.761**	1.958**	1.547**	**	0.995	0.996	0.948		1,038	1,146
	NB Head-Latino	1.557**	1.684**	1.445*	**	1.023	0.957	1.062		824	692
	NB Head-White Not Latino	1.151	1.932	1.002		0.851	1.098	0.784		480	102
Latino	*Other Latinos*										
	FB Head-Latino	1.272**	1.309**	1.217	*	0.773*	0.802*	0.697*		1,258	1,996
	NB Head-Latino	1.542**	1.785**	1.34**	**	1.049	1.124	0.962		2,386	2,305
	NB Head-White Not Latino	1.5**	1.207	1.608**		1.279	0.896	1.446*		661	237
White (not Hispanic)	US Born	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*		
Age15		0.195**	0.194**	0.196**		0.193**	0.192**	0.193**			
Age16		0.446**	0.442**	0.446**		0.452**	0.447**	0.45**			
Age17		*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*	*omitted*		
Male		1.081**	1.081**	1.09**		1.085**	1.088**	1.095**			
Poverty						1.59**	1.611**	1.632**			
Child of Householder						0.317**	0.318**	0.322**			
Married Couple Household						0.666**	0.658**	0.665**			
Householder with College						0.429**	0.423**	0.423**			
Central City Residence						1.115**	1.144**	1.124**			
exp. constant		0.074	0.074	0.074	0.076	-1.065	-1.0572	-1.0808	-1.0625		
-2 Log-Likelihood		141,727	132,263	132,241	141,888	125,527	117,263	117,001	125,536		
Chi-Square		6,214	5,738	5,520	6,052	16,032	15,167	14,950	16,025		
N		427,799	405,562	407,201	427,799	423,376	401,606	403,128	423,376		

Source: 2000 Census 5 % PUMS, * p <.05; **p<.01

In this model Puerto Ricans are only those who were born on the mainland.