Residential and Demographic Patterns of Immigrants In Texas at A Glance: Focus on Mexico Foreign-Born Immigrants

Yann-Yann Shieh, **American Institutes for Research, Washington DC, yshieh@air.org**
Pamela Rogers, **University of Texas at Austin, Texas, progers@mail.utexas.edu**

Introduction

State of Texas has the longest border with Mexico than any of the three U.S. states bordering Mexico. As one of the most dynamic regions in the world, the U.S.-Mexico border region extends 2,000 miles from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean, 1,254 miles of which are along the Texas border. Decades before the passage of NAFTA in 1994, Mexican immigrants journeyed to Texas to work as temporary migrant agricultural laborers.[1] However, since the late 1980s the international trade flows between the United States and Mexico has increased not only the truck traffic at ports of entry but the entry of Mexican immigrants following the trail of commerce. The large metropolitan areas of Texas and other urban centers in the United States have become the new agricultural fields of immigrants. Data have shown that by the end of the 1990s, the population in the largest Texas counties and Mexican states along the Texas-Mexico border reached 13.6 million. According to Mexico's census estimates, the population of the Mexican states bordering Texas—Chihuahua, Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, and Tamaulipas—increased 22 percent, to almost 12 million, from 1990 to 2000, adding 2.2 million residents. On the U.S. side, the population of El Paso, Webb, Hidalgo and Cameron counties increased by about 391,000 inhabitants, from 1.4 million in 1990 to 1.8 million in 1999—a 29 percent increase.[2]

Little empirical research is available about the trajectories of immigrants, that the spatial mobility, mainly, housing and work-seeking experience, mainly, economic mobility, of recently arrived immigrants in Texas. The proximity of Texas to Mexico and the size of the Mexican foreign-born population underscore the importance of this research. This research extends naturally from existing work on remittances and migration behavior among Texas Mexican residents, and upon colonia-type housing developments both in the Texas-Mexico border. This study makes a considerable contribution to the study of immigrant employment and residential search studies. The research also helps academicians and policymakers decide the most viable approaches to undertake in researching this population group.

Brief Literature Review

Household Composition

The large influx of immigrants have also affected national trends in household composition. From 1940 to 2000, the most common household size was represented by two people. The household size declined from 4.60 people in 1900 to 2.59 in 2000, or by 44 percent. The percent of married-couple households also declined from more than 78 percent to 52 percent of all households. At the same time the share of one-person households increased more than any other from 9.5 percent in 1950 to 26 percent in 2000. The growth in one-person households can also be an indicator of immigration as recent immigrants tend to be male, single, and living in households which consist of unrelated persons. In the traditional Gateway cities, the higher number of households may represent a more established community while the higher number of one-person households in the Hispanic community in emerging Gateway cities represent newer arrivals to the community. In the new Latin destinations, Suro and Singer show that 22 percent of households represented nonfamily households.

---

[1] See David M. Reimers, *Still the Golden Door: The Third World Comes to America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985); Rodolfo Acuna, *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos* (New York: Harper & Row, 1981).
[2] David E. Lorey, ed. *United States-Mexico Border Statistics since 1990* (University of California, at Los Angeles, UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1993), pp. 7-13 and pp. 25-38; and INEGI, "XII Censo General de Poblacion y Vivienda, 2000," December 2, 2000 (*http://www.inegi.gob.mx/difusion/ espanol/bvinegi/cpyv/indice.html)* quoted in "State Functions at the Texas-Mexico Border and Cross-border Transportation," Texas Comptrollers' Office, January 2001.

Population Change in Texas

The tremendous population change experienced in Texas during the 1990s mirrored national patterns. Between 1980 and 2000, the U.S. population grew by 11.43 percent in 1980, 9.78 in 1990, and 13.15 in 2000. In 2000, the total population of Texas of 20, 851, 820 million, had increased by 22.76 percent from 1990, 19.38 percent in 1990, and by 27.08 percent in 1980. Between 1980 and 2000, the Hispanic population increased by 45.3 percent in 1980, 53.68 percent in 1990, and 123.38 percent between 1980 thru 2000. By 2000, the Hispanic or Latin population was estimated at 6, 669, 666 million, and was largely located in the main industrial and economic hubs located along IH-35: Houston, Dallas, Austin, and San Antonio. Moreover, a larger number of Hispanics or Latinos lived in Harris (1,119,751) and Dallas (662, 729) counties alone than in the thirteen contiguous counties along the Texas-Mexico border.
Similarly, the percent change by race/ethnicity in Texas between 1980 and 2000 mirrored national trends. As minority populations have continued to increase in Texas, the proportion of the population of Anglo or African-American has not experienced significant growth and the Hispanic population as has become more diversified. In 1990 Anglos represented 60.6 percent of the population yet by 2000 their dominance had declined to 53.1 percent. Anglos increased in 1980 by 10 percent, declined by 7.61 percent in 1990, and increased 18.44 betweens the 1980 thru 2000 period. African Americans experienced a lower population increase of 16.7 percent in 1980, 22.53 percent in 1980 and 43.08 across 1980 thru 2000. Concentrated primarily in urban areas such as Dallas and Houston, the African American proportion of the population remained steady throughout 1980 to 2000 at roughly 11.6 percent of the population. Hispanics, on the other hand, represented 21 percent of the population in 1980, 25.6 percent of the population in 1990, and 32 percent of the population in 2000. However, although the actual numbers are still small in comparison to Hispanic populations, he most dramatic increase all racial and ethnic categories has been the Asian population. In the 1980s the Asian population increased by 88.78 percent in the 1980s, 81.15 percent in the 1990s, and by almost 242 percent between 1980 thru 2000.[3] The Other racial and ethnic category, representing the influx of Asian and other minorities, represented a slight 1.4 percent of the population in 1980, 2.2 percent in 1990, and 3.3 percent in 2000. [4]

Although the Mexican origin population continues to be the largest Hispanic population in Texas, increasing by 30 percent from 3,899,518 million in 1990 to 5,071,963 million in 2000, other Hispanic groups are also arriving. The decade of the 1990s saw a dramatic increase in other Hispanics such as Central Americans. As indicated in Table 5 in the Appendix, the Honduran and Guatemalan populations increased by 128 percent and 58 percent. Other Hispanics such as Puerto Ricans, increased their population share by 52 percent throughout the decade.

The majority of growth in the foreign-born population in Texas during the 1990s, particularly after 1995. As seen in Table A1, Texas's foreign-born population increased by 69 percent in the 1990s to 1, 335,524 million, compared to the growth in the 1980s. In the five-year periods leading up to the 1980s, the foreign-born population increased by 772,500 and during the 1980s by an additional 791, 618. However, the almost doubling of the population during the 1990s, compared to other periods dating as far back as 1965, demonstrates the dramatic impact the decade had on the foreign-born population.

Considering the number of immigrants who arrived since 1995, it is not surprising that few have achieved legal status. The five-year residency requirements preclude residents from achieving citizenships during that waiting period. However, many individuals who arrived ten years ago or even longer, have not become citizens. As indicated in Table A2, only 10 percent immigrants who arrived during 1990 and 2000 have achieved citizenship, compared to 37 percent who arrived during the 1980s.

[3] State Data Center, Texas A&M University, Table 1: Population and Percent Change by Race/Ethnicity in the State of Texas, 1980-2000.
[4] Ibid., Table 2: Proportion of the Population in each Race/Ethnicity Group in 1980, 1990, and 2000, Numerical Change 1980 to 1990 and 1990 to 2000 by Race/Ethnicity, and Proportion of Net Change.

Table A1. Year of Entry for the Foreign-born Population in Texas, 1965-March 2000

	Texas
Total Population 2000	20,851,820
Total Foreign-Born	2,899,642
Date of Arrival:	
1995 to March 2000	791,434
1990 to 1994	544,090
1985 to 1989	398,395
1980 to 1984	393,223
1975 to 1979	290,453
1970 to 1974	182,296
1965 to 1969	99,595
Before 1965	200,156

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau; Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data.

Table A2. Citizenship Status of the Foreign-Born in Texas, 1990-2000

	Texas
Total:	2,899,642
Year of entry 1990-2000	**46%**
Naturalized citizen	10%
Not a citizen	90%
Year of entry 1980 to 1989:	**27%**
Naturalized citizen	37%
Not a citizen	63%
Year of entry before 1980:	**27%**
Naturalized citizen	63%
Not a citizen	37%

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau; Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data

Homeownership

Data on housing can highlight the process of social stratification or residential segregation. Because it is one of the most important generators of wealth, it is associated with socioeconomic and residential mobility. Differential access to homeownership can intensify racial and ethnic stratification processes. The location of the home, size, age, value, and type and mortgage cost are socioeconomic indicators of residential segregation. Richard Alba and John Logan studied two spatial processes, assimilation and stratification, in national homeownership patterns of racial and ethnic groups (1992), including Hispanics and non-Hispanic whites, American Indian, Asian and Blacks. The majority population showed higher homeownership levels than minority population, especially in suburban areas, and minority groups tended to settle in central city areas. Using PUM data (5 percent) from the 1980 Census, the authors found a strong correlation between homeownership and other individual-level variables, namely, age, household composition, socioeconomic position, and language acculturation. Although Anglos registered high percentages of homeownership, other groups were roughly divided in the middle between homeowners and renters. Of special interest in the finding were the location of homeownership of certain groups, the majority of Anglos and some minority groups (Cubans, Koreans, Asian Indian, and American Indian) have the highest percentage of homeownership in the suburbs while Blacks and Puerto Ricans had the highest percent of homeownership in the central cities. Other groups such as the Chinese and Mexican were equally divided between the central city and the suburb.

Many housing studies use data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics or the Annual Housing Survey. For example, Elena Gouskava and Frank Stafford's study, based on data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), found that wealth and home ownership rates have increased modestly for the nation as a whole. While the PSID study primarily studies white and African American households, a small number of non-black, or Hispanic, households have been added in recent years but were excluded from Gouskava and Stafford's analysis. Nevertheless the study found that the white/black gap remained large and the average level of wealth among African American remained low, opening up questions that the Hispanic sample.[5]

Ethnic Entrepreneurship and Employment

The importance of social networks for immigrant employment is well documented in the literature (Gurak and Caces 1992; Kritz and Zlotnik 1992; Massey et al. 1987, 1993; Portes and Bach 1985; Portes and Borocz 1989; Waldinger 1986; Bailey and Waldinger 1991). Granovetter (1973, 1985) first examined the importance of embedded networks of interpersonal relations for economic actions, theorizing that weak ties based on acquaintances rather than family or close friends serve as bridges between networks because strong ties such as family members are thought to be connected to the same networks. Since the 1980s several case studies and theories of ethnic entrepreneurship have emerged. Ivan Light (2002, 2001, 1980) used case studies of Asian ethnic entrepreneurs and middlemen in Southern California and Los Angeles to theorize the collective and individualistic strategies ethnic entrepreneurs. Bonavich (1973) studied the role of middlemen (or "sojourners"), who concentrate in narrow economic niches. Aldrich and Waldinger 1990 examined different types of ethnic entrepreneurial markets. Research has also focused on different success rates of entrepreneurship by group as related to differences in social and human capital characteristics (Bates 1994; Light 1972; Sanders and Nee 1996; Yoon 1991). Massey and Denton (1993) found that although residential segregation may be beneficial in the early stages of ethnic entrepreneurship, its long-term effect proven to be detrimental because of its interaction with socioeconomic structures, that is, the limited effective demand in segregated urban areas. These authors also found that segregated urban areas were areas of high crime, and hence not conducive to favorable business climates. Thomas Bailey studied immigrants and restaurants in New York City, and the relationship between minority groups and entrepreneurs. Traditional economists have long used labor market segmentation theories to study industrial restructuring and labor market segmentation processes at the national and regional levels. Spatial mismatch theories have also been used to identify labor demand within and outside of labor markets, as determined by spatial proximity. Few studies, however, have addressed the job seeking activities of immigrants and their housing choices, focusing more on labor market activity and the representation of immigrants in service or construction sectors. Within the literature on job-seeking or the entrepreneurial activities of immigrant, hardly any information is available of the use of technology, credit services, economic incentives of migrant communities.

[5] Trends in household wealth dynamics, 1999 – 2001 - September, 2002; http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/Publications/Papers/TrendsIndynamics1999-2001.pdf. Home ownership rates rose slightly from 61 percent to 67 percent (p.2).

Research Questions

This research study uses quantitative approach to examine the demographic information, job and residential search behaviors, among recent Mexican foreign-born immigrant populations in Texas. The focus on Mexican foreign-born immigrant in Texas is because among immigrants in Texas, Mexican foreign-born population accounts for near 30%. Using census data, this work sheds light on two primary areas.

First, the study addresses a set of questions largely contextual, based on the housing and person character data derived from Census. The data identify the percentage of the foreign-born Mexicans who currently live in the Texas, period of residency in the United States, demographic information (age, household composition, etc.), as well as socioeconomic characteristics (median household income, households on public assistance, language acquisition, owner-occupied households), and other relevant demographic data. Questions of interest are the following:

1. What characteristics distinguish Mexican foreign-born immigrant people in Texas?
2. What are the major socioeconomic characteristics of Mexican foreign-born immigrant in Texas such as income and employed status?
3. What are the education characteristics of Mexican foreign-born immigrant people in Texas?
4. What is the Mexican foreign-born immigrant housing status?

The second part of questions seek to explain the mobility patterns of recent arrivals of foreign-born individuals by determining the trajectory of homeownership and social mobility including education attainment established in the first section. Questions of interest are as follows:

1. What facilitates Mexican foreign-born immigrants' move from being sharers or renters upon arrival to later tenure housing arrangements as they become settled?
2. What are the major factors relating to Mexican foreign-born immigrants' education attainment?
3. What are the major factors relating to Mexican foreign-born immigrants' person total income behavior?
4. What is the relationship between the search for work behavior and its translation into spatial patterns of mobility and residence?

Methods

Databases

This study is based on data from the U. S. Census 5% Public-Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) of the 2000 decennial census to analyze the residential mobility patterns of immigrants in Texas. The Census long form Summary File 3 (SF 3) was sent to 17 percent of housing units, together with the short form Summary Form 1 (SF1) which was sent to 83 percent of housing units, form a complete count of the U.S. population. The SF3 contains many available variables. Information on population, age, year of arrival, residence prior to the United States, gender, race/ethnicity, housing unit data, household relationships, income, education, workforce, ancestry, citizenship, employment status, occupation categories, industry, class of worker, income levels, household earnings, and poverty status are available. Census data is also available on sharer or owner householder type, type of housing units, year structure was built, number of rooms, year householder moved into the unit, number of occupants per room, value of the owner-occupied units, gross rent as a percentage of renter-occupied units, and others.

Data analysis

Descriptive analyses are used to answer the research questions and to summarize immigrants' characteristics. Regression analyses are also performed to examine the immigrant spatial mobility and the relationship among *language acquisition, income, education* and *tenure* of homeowners and renters.

The 2000 PUMS file structure is hierarchical and contains two basic record types of 314 characters each: the housing unit record and the person record. Each record has a unique identifier (serial number) that links the people in the housing unit to the proper housing unit record. Due to the hierarchical nature of the data, the hierarchical model approach is performed.

Results

The data derived from the 2000 Census here represent 530,686 households and 1,138,586 persons in the household who were Mexican immigrants in Texas. To provide a detailed context of the characteristics of Mexican immigrants, descriptive data analyses from the housing and person records are conducted. The results are presented below.

Household Demographic Characters

The average number of persons living in a household was 4.28 persons ranging from 1 person to 27 persons. Near 51% of household members were from 4 to 6 persons (see table 1). Nearly 61% of households rented a house with an average rent of $432, and 39% owned a house with an average property value of $50,000 to $59,999 (see table 2). The majority of households (47%) moved in the house in 1999 and 2000 followed by 1995 to 1998 (42%) (see table 3). 31% of household owned a two-bedroom place, 27% owned a one-bedroom place, 25% owned a three-bedroom place, and 10% owned a studio without any bedroom (see table 4). 39% of the household owned a vehicle, 35% owned two vehicles and 12% did not have any vehicle (see table 5). In terms of household structure, 65% of them were married coupes and 23% of them were either male-headed or female headed (see table 6). The majority of households did not have any individuals 65 years old or older living there, and 43% of households had at least one to two children under the age of 18 years old (see table 7). Spanish was spoken in 97% of households, and 42% indicated linguistic isolation (see tables 8 and 9).

Table 1. Number of Persons in Household for Mexican Immigrants in Texas

Num person records follow house record	Frequency	Percent
1	30784	5.80
2	70951	13.37
3	95928	18.08
4	115040	21.68
5	95076	17.92
6	58511	11.03
7	29790	5.61
8	15870	2.99
9	8243	1.55
10	5044	0.95
11	2233	0.42
12	1851	0.35
13	478	0.09
14	410	0.08
15	240	0.05
16	66	0.01
17	93	0.02
19	21	0.00
22	27	0.01
24	15	0.00
27	15	0.00
Total	530686	100.00

Table 2. Household Home Ownership and Average Property Value or Rent for Mexican Immigrants in Texas

Home Ownership	Frequency	Percent	Average property value or rent	Minimum	Maximum
Owner-occupied	208796	39.35	$50,000 to $59,999	Less than $10,000	$1,000,000 plus
Renter-occupied	321890	60.66	$432.08	$4	$2,200
Total	530686	100			

Table 3. Year Moved in for Mexican Immigrants in Texas

Year Moved In	Frequency	Percent
1999 / 2000	247706	46.68
1995 to 1998	221214	41.68
1990 to 1994	30252	5.70
1980 to 1989	17879	3.37
1970 to 1979	8742	1.65
1969 / earlier	4893	0.92
Total	530686	100.00

Table 4. Number of Bedrooms in Household for Mexican Immigrants in Texas

Bedrooms	Frequency	Percent
0	54231	10.22
1	144927	27.31
2	166865	31.44
3	130529	24.60
4	29155	5.49
5	4979	0.94
Total	530686	100.00

Table 5. Number of Vehicles in Household for Mexican Immigrants in Texas

Vehicles available	Frequency	Percent
0	63530	11.97
1	208490	39.29
2	184767	34.82
3	53168	10.02
4	14341	2.70
5	3834	0.72
6	2556	0.48
Total	530686	100.00

Table 6. Household Structure for Mexican Immigrants in Texas

Household Structure	Frequency	Percent
Married couple	345129	65.03
Male-headed	54629	10.29
Female-headed	67408	12.70
Nonfamily	63520	11.97
Total	530686	100

Table 7. Number of People over 65 and Children under 18 in Household for Mexican Immigrants in Texas

	People 65 years plus in household		children under 18 years in household	
Number	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
0	489928	92.32	188200	35.46
1	31342	5.91	114172	21.51
2	8732	1.65	115808	21.82
3	612	0.12	72272	13.62
4	66	0.01	27926	5.26
5			8615	1.62
6			2479	0.47
7	6	0	772	0.15
8			294	0.06
9			109	0.02
10			15	0
11			24	0
Total	530686	100	530686	100

Table 8. Language Use in Household for Mexican immigrants in Texas

Household language	Frequency	Percent
English only	14342	2.70
Spanish	513663	96.79
Other language	2681	0.51
Total	530686	100.00

Table 9. Linguistic Isolation in Household for Mexican immigrants in Texas

Linguistic isolation	Frequency	Percent
not linguistic isolated	306095	57.68
Linguistic isolated	224591	42.32
Total	530686	100.00

Person Demographic Characters

Data from the person record file shows that among Mexican foreign-born immigrants in Texas, 55 % were male and 46% were female. 62% were between the ages of 25 and 64 with an average age of 31, ranging from 5 to 93 (see tables 10 and 11). For people 25 years or older, only 15% completed high school, only near 6% obtained bachelor degree or higher, and the majority of them had less than a high school education (see table 12). 62% of persons at least 15 years old had been married and 27% of them had never been married (see table 13). For school attendance or enrollment status, only 17% of them had been enrolled in school since February 1, 2000. Among those attendees, 96% enrolled in public schools or college (see table 14). 13% attended undergraduate college, 27% were in high school, 28% were in middle school, and only 2% were in postsecondary higher education programs (see table 15). In terms of language, 94% spoke a non-English language, and 6% spoke English only. Among those non-English speakers, 56% spoke English well and 44% spoke English poorly (see tables 16 and 17). With respect to citizenship status, 81% were not citizens of the United States, 17% were U.S. citizens by naturalization, and 2% had been born aboard with American parents (see table 18). For people who worked in 1999, the average age was 33 with ranges from 16 to 93, the average working hours per week was 41 with ranges from 1 to 99, the average weeks working in 1999 was 42 with ranges from 1 to 52, and the average income for people worked in 1999 was $18,324 (see table 19). When asking people about their residency five years ago, 70% were in the United States and 30% were out of the country (see table 20). When asking people if they are looking for work, near 65% said no and only 10% said yes (see table 21). In terms of people's occupation, 86% were private-employed, 5% were government-employed, and 7% were self-employed (see table 22).

Table 10. Sex Distribution for Mexican Immigrants in Texas

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	631246	55.44
Female	507340	44.56
Total	1138586	100.00

Table 11. Age Group Distribution for Mexican Immigrants in Texas

Age group	Frequency	Percent
5-15	128266	11.27
16-24	270313	23.74
25-64	710465	62.40
65 and older	29542	2.59
Total	1138586	100.00

Table 12. Education Attainment for Mexican Immigrants in Texas Age 25 or Older

	Frequency	Percent
no school	80871	10.93
elementary school	203711	27.53
less high school	231136	31.23
high school	109658	14.82
some college	73754	9.97
bachelor or higher	40877	5.52
Total	740007	100.00

Table 13. Marital Status for Mexican Immigrants in Texas Age 15 or Older

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Married	635178	62.07
Widowed	22178	2.17
Divorced	42764	4.18
Separated	42434	4.15
Never married	280846	27.44
Total	1023400	100.00

Table 14. School Enrollment Status of Mexican Immigrants in Texas

School Enrollment/Attended since Feb 1, 2000	Frequency	Percent	% with Attendees only
no, not attend since Feb 1	939798	82.54	
yes, public school/college	189985	16.69	95.57
yes, private school/college	8803	0.77	4.43
Total	1138586	100	100.00

Table 15. Grade Level Attending of School Attendees for Mexican Immigrants in Texas

School enrollment: Grade level attending with Attendees only	Frequency	Percent
Nursery school, preschool	2910	1.46
Kindergarten	9253	4.65
Grade 1 to Grade 4	45731	23.00
Grade 5 to Grade 8	56273	28.31
Grade 9 to Grade 12	54636	27.48
College undergraduate	25681	12.92
Graduate/professional school	4304	2.17
Total	198788	100.00

Table 16. Proportion of Non-English Language Speakers for Mexican Immigrants in Texas

Non-English Language	Frequency	Percent
Yes	1075028	94.42
No	63558	5.58
Total	1138586	100.00

Table 17. English Ability of Non-English Language Speakers for Mexican Immigrants in Texas

English Ability	Frequency	Percent
Speaks English poorly	602635	56.06
Speaks English well	472393	43.94
Total	1075028	100.00

Table 18. Citizenship Status of Mexican Immigrants in Texas

Citizenship Status	Frequency	Percent
Yes, born aboard-Am parent/parents	17650	1.55
Yes, US citizen by naturalization	193685	17.01
No, not a citizen of the United States	927251	81.44
Total	1138586	100.00

Table 19. Descriptive Analysis Results of People Who Work in 1999 for Mexican Immigrants in Texas

For people who worked in 1999	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Age	682062	32.66	10.39	16	93
Weeks worked in 1999	682062	42.48	14.00	1	52
Hours per week in 1999	682062	40.91	10.99	1	99
Person's Total Income in 1999	682062	18323.79	22564.31	0	719000

Table 20. Residence Five Years Ago of Mexican Immigrants in Texas

Residence 5 years ago	Frequency	Percent
No,out US-out US/PRico	339047	29.78
No,dif house in US/PRico	799539	70.22
Total	1138586	100.00

Table 21. Work Search Behavior of Mexican Immigrants in Texas

Looking for work	Frequency	Percent
Yes, looking for work in last 4 weeks	45739	9.81
No	300791	64.49
Not Reported	119876	25.70
Total	466406	100.00

Table 22. Occupations of Mexican Immigrants in Texas

Occupation	Frequency	Percent
Privately employed	687707	85.92
Govt. employed	43031	5.38
Self-employed	57027	7.12
Not employed	12626	1.58
Total	800391	100.00

Regression Analysis Results

To better understand Mexican foreign-born immigrants and Texas's housing behavior, a further analysis using logistic regression analysis was conducted to examine the unique relationship of household characteristics with homeownership. The regression coefficients or odds-ratios of each variable indicate the unique relationship of the particular variable with homeownership. As shown in table 23, the number of persons in the household, the overall household income in 1999, the household structure, as well as language isolation were significantly related to homeownership. As for household structure, married couples were 3.87 times more likely than non-married couples to own a house after controlling for all other variables. Similarly, households that were not isolated linguistically were two times more likely than linguistically isolated households to own a home after controlling for all other variables.

Table 23. Results of logistic regression analysis predicting on home ownership for household by household demographic backgrounds

Predictor variables	Home ownership	
	Regression coefficient	Odds-ratio
Constant	-2.531*	0.080*
Number of persons in household	0.059*	1.061*
Household income in 1999	0.000*	1.000*
Household Structure		
Married couple	1.354*	3.873*
Male-headed	0.256*	1.292*
Female headed	0.828*	2.289*
Language isolation (no/yes)	0.729*	2.072*

Note. Cox & Snell R Square=0.119; -2likelihood ratio=644048.373
* Significant at the .05 level.

To better understand Mexican foreign-born immigrants in Texas's high school education attainment, we selected a group of people whose age was 25 or older to further analyze using logistic regression analysis techniques to examine the unique relationship of person information with high-school education attainment. The regression coefficients or odds-ratios of each variable indicate the unique relationship of the particular variable with high-school education attainment. As shown in table 24, gender, person's English ability, person's citizenship status as well as person's total income in 1999 were significantly related to high-school education attainment. It is noteworthy that males age 25 or older were less likely to attain high school degree than their female counterparts after all other variables were controlled. As for English ability, people who speak English well were 3.5 times more likely to earn high school education than people who speak English poorly after controlling for all other variables. Similar to the significance of English ability, Mexican foreign-born immigrants in Texas age 25 or older who were U.S. citizens were 1.3 times more likely than people who were not U.S. citizens to attain a high school education even after all other variables were considered.

Table 24. Results of logistic regression analysis predicting on high school degree attainment for people age 25 or higher by person demographic backgrounds

Predictor variables	High school attainment	
	Regression coefficient	Odds-ratio
Constant	-1.408*	0.245*
Gender (male/female)	-0.430*	0.650*
English ability (well/poorly)	1.260*	3.524*
Citizenship (yes/no)	0.276*	1.317*
Person total income in 1999	0.000*	1.000*

Note. Cox & Snell R Square=0.106; -2likelihood ratio=779895.324
* Significant at the .05 level.

In addition, in order to know Mexican foreign-born immigrants in Texas's personal total income in 1999, people with age 25 or older were selected for further analysis using regression analysis technique to examine the unique relationship of person information with person income. As shown in table 25, gender, person's English ability, person's citizenship status as well as person's high school education attainment were significantly related to person's total income. It is noteworthy that males age 25 or older tended to earn more income than their female counterparts after all other variables were controlled. As for English ability, people who speak English well tended to earn $5,131 more than those who speak English poorly after controlling for all other variables. Similarly, Mexican foreign-born immigrants in Texas age 25 or older who were U.S. citizens tended to have higher incomes than people who were not U.S. citizens after all other variables were considered. People aged 25 years or older who had a high school education also had higher incomes than those who did not have a high school education after all other variables were considered.

Table 25. Results of regression analysis predicting on person total income in 1999 for people age 25 or higher by person demographic backgrounds

Predictor variables	Person total income in 1999	
	Regression coefficient	t
Constant	3497.163*	77.952
Gender (male/female)	11977.850*	235.341
English ability (well/poorly)	5130.605*	91.826
Degree attainment (high school/less than high school)	4937.364*	85.733
Citizenship (yes/no)	3872.809*	61.893

Note. R=0.338; R Square=0.114; Adjust R Square=0.114
* Significant at the .05 level.

Summary and Conclusions

One of the primary goals of this analysis is to provide largely contextual demographic information including household and person characteristics for Mexican foreign-born immigrants in Texas. Results show that the average number of persons living in a household was 4.28 persons. Near 61% of household rented a house and 39% owned a house. Majority household (47%) moved in the house in 1999 and 2000 following by 1995 to 1998 (42%). In terms of household structure, 65% of them were married coupes and 23% of them were either male-headed or female headed. 97% of household language was Spanish and 42% of household indicated they were linguistically isolated. In addition, among Mexican foreign-born immigrants in Texas, 55 % were male and 46% were female. 62% were between the ages of 25 and 64 with an average age of 31. For people 25 years old or older, only 15% completed high school education, only near 6% obtained bachelor degree or higher, and the majority of them had less than a high school education. 62% of persons at least 15 years old were married. 94% spoke a non-English language and 6% spoke English only. Among those non-English speakers, 56% spoke English well and 44% spoke English poorly. With respect to citizenship status, 81% were not a citizen of the United States. For people who worked in 1999, the average age was 33, the average working hours per week was 41, the average weeks working in 1999 was 42, and the average income for people who worked in 1999 was $18,324. In terms of people's occupation, the majority were employed in the private sector (86%).

The second goal of this study seeks to explain the mobility patterns of recent arrivals by determining the trajectory of home ownership and social mobility, for example, education attainment, established in the first research goal. Findings suggest that the number of persons in the household, overall household income in 1999, household structure, as well as language isolation were significantly related to homeownership. Gender, English ability, citizenship status, as well as personal total income in 1999 were significantly related to high-school education attainment. Similarly, gender, English ability, citizenship status, as well as a person's high school education attainment were significantly related to person's total income. These findings are consistent with Richard Alba and John Logan's study using Census 1990 data. The authors found a strong correlation between homeownership and other individual-level variables, namely, age, household composition, socioeconomic position, and language acculturation.

These results represent an initial step in using this multi-level database to examine the potential effects of household and person background information on home ownership, academic, and income outcomes. These preliminary results suggest that language ability and education attainment have a positive effect on the likelihood of Mexican immigrants owning a house. The results also suggest that immigrant homeownership may be increased by promoting immigrant enrollment in language programs that provide either a credential or a certificate, which would further enhance the attractiveness of immigrants to stay in school to complete a program.

Research into mobility patterns of immigrants presents an avenue to further our understanding of the immigrant experience. As noted above, this analysis is somewhat exploratory and could be refined in a number of ways. It may be the case that household and person information have a differential effect on the likelihood of owning a house. Future analyses will consider these and other refinements.

References

Alba, Richard D., and John R. Logan
1992 "Assimilation and stratification in the homeownership patterns of racial and ethnic groups." *International Migration Review* 26, no. 4: 1314-41.

Aldrich, Howard, John Carter, Trevor Jones, David McEvoy, and Paul Velleman
1985 "Ethnic residential concentration and the protected market hypothesis." *Social Forces* 63:996-1009

Durand, J, Douglas, Massey, and R.M. Zenteno
2001 "Mexican Immigration to the United States: Continuities and Changes." *Latin America Research Review,* 36 (1): 107-27.

Foley, Douglas
1973 "Institutional and Contextual Factors Affecting the Housing Choices of Minority Residents." In *Segregation in Residential Areas,* edited by A.H. Hawley and V.P. Rock, 85-147. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences.

Granovetter, Mark

1973 "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78:1360-80.

1983 "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited." In *Sociological Theory 1983*, edited by Randall Collins, 201-33. Jossey-Bass.

1985 "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology* 91:481-10.

Jenkins, J.C.
1977 "Push-Pull in Recent Mexican Migration to United States." *International Migration Review* 11 (2): 178-89.

Jones, Richard C
1984 "Changing Patterns of Undocumented Mexican Migration to South Texas." *Social Sciences Quarterly* 65 (2): 465-81.
1995 "Immigration Reform and Migration Flows: Compositional and Spatial Changes in Mexican Migration after the Immigration Reform Act of 1986." *Annual Association of American Geographers* 85 (4) (December): 715-730.
2003 "The segregation of ancestry groups in San Antonio." *Social Science Journal* 40, no. 2: 213-33.

Kritz, Mary M., and Hania Zlotnik
1992 "Global Interactions: Migration Systems, Process and Policies." In *International Migration Systems: A Global Approach*, edited by Mary M. Kritz, Lin Lean Lim, and Hania Zlotnik, 1-16. London: Oxford University Press.

Krivo, L.J.
1990 "The Hispanic Immigrant Context and Housing Market Conditions: A Comparison of Anglo and Hispanic Populations." Working paper #10, IUP/SSRC, Committee on Public Policy Research on Contemporary Hispanic Issues, The Center for Mexican American Studies, The University of Texas at Austin.

Logan, John R., Richard D. Alba, and Thomas L. McNulty
1994 "Ethnic economies in metropolitan regions: Miami and beyond." *Social Forces* 72:691-724.

Logan, John R, Richard D. Alba, and Wenquan Zhang
2002 "Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles." *American Sociological Review* 67, 2 (April): 299-322

Massey, Douglas S.
1985 "Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Overview." Sociology and Social Research 69:315-360.

1986 "The Social-Organization of Mexican Migration to the United States." Annals of the *American Academy of Political Science* 487 (September): 102-13.
1987 "Understanding Mexican Migration to the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 92 (6) (May): 1372-1403.

Massey, Douglas, Rafael Alarcon, Jorge Durand, and Humberto Gonzalez
1987 *Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico*. University of California Press.
1993 "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal." *Population and Development Review* 19:431-66.

Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton
1987 "Trends in the Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians: 1970-80," *American Sociological Review* 52 (December): 802-25.
1988 "The dimensions of residential segregation." *Social Forces* 67:281-315.
1989 "Residential Segregation of Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans in U.S. Metropolitan Areas." *Sociology and Social Research* 73:73-83.
1992 "The Residential Segregation of Asian Origin Groups in U.S. Metropolitan Areas." *Sociology and Social Research* 76:170-77.

Massey, Douglas S., and Mitchell L. Eggers
1989 "The ecology of inequality: Minorities and the concentration of poverty 1970-1980." *American Journal of Sociology* 95:1153-1188.

Massey, Douglas S., and J. Durand, H. Gonzalez, et al.
1985 "The Social-Organization of Mexican Migration to the United States." *Population Index* 51 (3): 413.

Massey, Douglas, and R. Zenteno
2000 "A Validation of the Ethnosurvey: The Case of Mexico-U.S. Migration." *International Migration Review* 34 (3) (Fall): 766-793.

Massey, Douglas S., Michael J. White, and Voon-Chin Phua
1996 "The dimensions of segregation revisited." *Sociological Methods and Research* 25:172-206.

Poulsen, Michael., and James Forrest, Ron Johnston
2002 "From Modern to Post-Modern? Contemporary ethnic residential segregation in four US metropolitan areas." *Cities* 19, 3 (June):161-73.

Ward, Peter
1999 *Colonias and Public Policy in Texas and Mexico: Urbanization by Stealth.* Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press.

U.S. Census
2000 "Residential Segregation of Hispanics or Latinos: 1980 to 2000." Chapter 6. In *Housing Patterns - "Racial and Ethnic Residential Segregation in the United States: 1980-2000.* U.S. Government Printing Office.
2002 *Texas 2000: Summary Population and Housing Characteristics.* 2000 Census of Population and Housing. U.S. Government Printing Office.
October 2002.
2003 *Foreign-Born Population in the United States*. U.S. Government Printing Office. February 2003.
2003 *The Hispanic Population in the United States: March 2002*. U.S. Government Printing Office. June 2003.

Appendix

The following tables present some of housing record results for all immigrants in Texas. Table A shows that 48% of Texas immigrants owned the house and near 52% rented. Majority of them moved into their home before 1995. Near 44% moved in around 1999 and 2000 (table B). English is still the dominant language in the household (67%), Spanish follows by English as a household language (26%) (table C). Near 51% of household/family type are married family household (table D). Only 8% of household have one member at age of 65 or higher (table E). For member age 18 or younger, 45% of them have at least 1 to 4 younger members at home (table F).

Table A. Home Ownership

Home Ownership	Frequency	Percent
Owned w/mortgage or loan	1644104	37.25
Owned no mortgage or loan	467483	10.59
Rented for cash	2199039	49.83
Occupied no pay cash-rent	102814	2.33
Total	4413440	100.00

Table B. Year Moved In

Year Moved In	Frequency	Percent
1999 / 2000	1929109	43.71
1995 to 1998	1910332	43.28
1990 to 1994	211493	4.79
1980 to 1989	170962	3.87
1970 to 1979	106725	2.42
1969 / earlier	84819	1.92
Total	4413440	100.00

Table C. Household language

Household language	Frequency	Percent
English only	2956911	67.00
Spanish	1162989	26.35
Other Indo-European	143142	3.24
Asian/Pacific Islander	117685	2.67
Other language	32713	0.74
Total	4413440	100.00

Table D. Household/family Type

Household/family Type	Frequency	Percent
fam hhold: married-couple	2234896	50.64
fam hhold: mhholder,no wife	236661	5.36
fam hhold: fhholder,no husband	627466	14.22
Nonfam hhold: mhholder,live Alone	475979	10.78
Nonfam hhold: mhholder,not live Alone	231187	5.24
Nonfam hhold: fhholder, live Alone	461728	10.46
Nonfam hhold: fhholder, not live Alone	145523	3.30
Total	4413440	100.00

Table E. People 65 years plus in household

People 65 years plus in household	Frequency	Percent
0	3929020	89.02
1	349787	7.93
2	129542	2.94
3	4346	0.10
4	483	0.01
5	177	0.00
6	42	0.00
7	6	0.00
9	37	0.00
Total	4413440	100.00

Table F. People under 18 years in household

People under 18 years in household	Frequency	Percent
0	2358380	53.44
1	825403	18.70
2	734317	16.64
3	333219	7.55
4	110178	2.50
5	33470	0.76
6	11454	0.26
7	3849	0.09
8	2152	0.05
9	765	0.02
10	135	0.00
11	63	0.00
12	21	0.00
26	31	0.00
28	3	0.00
Total	4413440	100.00

In looking at the person record data, the percentage of male and female are the same, sharing 50% each among immigrants in Texas (table G). Majority report their race group as one race, 3% report two races (table H). 44% got married and 9% got divorced (table I). Tables J to L present the education information for immigrants in Texas. 81% are US citizen (table M) and 51% are employed (table N).

Table G. Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	5226006	49.80
Female	5266951	50.20
Total	10492957	100.00

Table H. Major Race Groups Marked

Major Race Groups Marked	Frequency	Percent
One Race	10189043	97.10
Two Races	286571	2.73
Three Races	15396	0.15
Four Races	1565	0.01
Five Races	268	0.00
Six Races	114	0.00
Total	10492957	100.00

Table I. Marital Status

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Now Married	4568050	43.53
Widowed	263582	2.51
Divorced	950100	9.05
Separated	262098	2.50
Never Married (inc under 15 yrs)	4449127	42.40
Total	10492957	100.00

Table J. School Enrollment/Attended since Feb 1, 2000

School Enrollment/Attended since Feb 1, 2000	Frequency	Percent
no, not attend since Feb 1	7213176	68.74
yes, public school/college	2947890	28.09
yes, private school/college	331891	3.16
Total	10492957	100.00

Table K. School enrollment: Grade level attending

School enrollment: Grade level attending	Frequency	Percent
NIU	7213098	68.74
Nursery school,preschool	85877	0.82
Kindergarten	223840	2.13
Grade 1 to Grade 4	852373	8.12
Grade 5 to Grade 8	722378	6.88
Grade 9 to Grade 12	603375	5.75
College undergraduate	632462	6.03
Graduate/professional school	159554	1.52
Total	10492957	100.00

Table L. Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
No schooling completed	404534	3.86
Nursery school to 4th grade	1150224	10.96
5th grade / 6th grade	627134	5.98
7th grade / 8th grade	582520	5.55
9th grade	429013	4.09
10th grade	359808	3.43
11th grade	349149	3.33
12th grade, no diploma	314787	3.00
High school graduate	1877980	17.90
Some college,under 1 year	636493	6.07
One plus yrs college,no degree	1387300	13.22
Associate degree	433891	4.14
Bachelors degree	1345939	12.83
Masters degree	396779	3.78
Professional degree	131939	1.26
Doctorate degree	65467	0.62
Total	10492957	100.00

Table M. Citizenship Status

Citizenship Status	Frequency	Percent
Yes,born US	8501254	81.02
Yes,born PRico,Guam,USVirIs,Am Samoa/NMarianas	32743	0.31
Yes,born aboard-Am parent/parents	118392	1.13
Yes,US citizen by naturalization	426650	4.07
No,not a citizen of the United States	1413918	13.47
Total	10492957	100.00

Table N. Employment Status Recode

Employment Status Recode	Frequency	Percent
NIU	2129457	20.29
employed, at work	5415830	51.61
employed, but not at work	111410	1.06
Unemployed	356122	3.39
Armed Forces, at work	100042	0.95
Armed Forces, w/job-not at work	567	0.01
Not in labor force	2379529	22.68
Total	10492957	100.00