National Origin (Mis)Identification Among Latinos in the 2000 Census: The Growth of the "Other Hispanic or Latino" Category.

Matt A. Barreto
University of California, Irvine

Harvard Journal of Hispanic Policy
Volume 15, June 2003

Abstract. The 2000 Census revealed unprecedented population growth among Latinos in the United States with the total Latino population growing to over 35 million. However, the census also revealed its inability to accurately count and distinguish between countries of ancestry among the Latino population. Over fifteen percent of all Latinos living in the United States indicated "other Hispanic or Latino" when asked for specific country of origin for their family heritage. This misclassification has lead many groups of Latinos to question the validity and accuracy of the census instrument, and has frustrated others, expecting to find big gains in their population. Using data from the Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF1) I model identification as "other" Latino at the county level. Not surprising, I find that Dominicans, Colombians, Salvadorans, and Guatemalans were among the top nationalities miscounted by the 2000 census. In sum, nearly 2 million Central and South Americans were misidentified by the census putting their numbers and clout in question. Through OLS regression analysis I can identify which groups are most misrepresented and what regional variations exist. This research holds great promise not just for advocacy groups, eager to see a more accurate count of their population, but also for policy makers responsible for designing official government survey forms. It is my hope that this research will lead to a more accurate understanding of the Latino population in the United States, and help address problems associated with the large population identified as "others."

** The author would like to thank John Bretting, Claudine Gay, Darren Davis, José Muñoz, Claire Kim, Guillermo Barreto-Vega and the editors of this journal for their comments and suggestions in refining this research and to Nathan Woods and Gary Segura for their advice in estimating the models. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2002 Midwest Political Science Association annual conference. Data were obtained from the Census website at factfinder.census.gov using the Summary File 1 (SF-1) dataset from the 2000 Census. For comments: *MBarreto@uci.edu.*

National Origin (Mis)Identification Among Latinos in the 2000 Census: The Growth of the "Other Hispanic or Latino" Category.

Introduction

Identification can take many forms. We can identify ourselves, or be identified by others. When identifying ourselves, we may express our racial or ethnic heritage, our gender, our religion, our age, our profession, our class status, our sexuality, and so on. While we may have multiple identities, we are often asked to select one – typically our race or ethnicity – with which we most identify. However, racial categories are still broad and lack the specificity of nationality or heritage. In the early 20th century, Italian and Irish immigrants were both classified as "White" although their identities ran much deeper and were tied to their national origins. Now, in the early 21st century, Hispanic Americans, the largest minority group in the United States, are facing a similar identity dilemma in which Mexican Americans, Cuban Americans, Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Colombians, Salvadorans, and more are being identified as "Latino" but also have multifaceted identity claims connected with their national origins.

Undeniably, the federal government shapes how we view ourselves and we are viewed by others (including the state) through the decennial counting of the population. The census, required by the Constitution, plays a key role in measuring population growth, dividing state representation in the House, and proportioning federal resources. However, beyond merely counting the number of inhabitants of each county and state, the census has evolved to classify and categorize the American population. What originated as distinguishing "Colored" from "Anglo-European" progressed to the classification of multiple racial and ethnic groups[1]. Because of the power in numbers, minority groups put considerable stock in the findings and official enumeration of the American population according the census. However, the style, format and terminology employed by the federal government on the census questionnaire, have severely constricted, and in some cases entirely prevented self-identification.

More specifically, I will examine the impact of the various methods used by the census to count Hispanic and Latino subgroups and how recent census statistics have been viewed negatively by many sub-nationalities within the Latino community. For example, according to the official numbers from the 2000 census, some groups such as Dominicans in New York, and Guatemalans in Los Angeles, experienced population declines between 1990-2000, despite considerable evidence of population growth from "non-official" sources. Changes in the census

[1] The first census taken in 1790 differentiated people based on two racial categories free "white" persons and "colored" slaves. This categorization continued from 1790 through 1860. In 1870 the classifications changed to White, Colored, Chinese, and Indian. In 1890 the terminology for blacks was changed to "Negro." For a complete history of the U.S. Census see *200 Years of Census Taking: Population and Housing Questions, 1790-1990.* Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census, 1989.

form have potentially resulted in less recognition and fewer resources for specific Latino communities living in the United States. In Los Angeles County alone, more than 600,000 Latinos were identified only as "other." Many fear that future changes in the officially recognized census could lead to their groups eventually vanishing from the political landscape and thereby erasing their identity and culture. In this respect, this research will incorporate many contemporary theories addressing identification and the importance of maintaining multiple cultural/ethnic outlets of recognition.

One of the main problems has been the large increase in the number of Latinos who were identified simply as "Other Hispanic or Latino" by the 2000 census. In 1990 only eight and a half percent of the Latino population was categorized as "other" while in 2000 it doubled to over seventeen percent. In an attempt to uncover what groups are most likely to identify as "other," rather than specifying their national origin, I will conduct a simple regression using county level data to determine what nationalities are predictors of the "other" category, and what regional variations exist. In addition, I will incorporate the opinions and statements of various advocacy organizations to highlight the importance of sub-group identification among Latinos.

This analysis begins by reviewing the multiculturalism literature regarding racial and ethnic identification. Milton Gordon, Will Herberg, Will Kymlicka, Charles Taylor, Michael Omi and Howard Winant, Amy Gutmann and others have all addressed this issue from different angles and an understanding of their theories provides an important framework for this paper. Next, will I incorporate interviews and statements by Puerto Rican, Dominican, Colombian, Salvadoran and other Latino advocacy groups to demonstrate the salience of identification with national origin. Following this review, I will examine census findings beginning with an exploration of the wording of the Census questionnaire and moving on to an evaluation of the undercounts of specific Latino subgroups. Finally, I will detail the findings of my regression analysis in hopes that a clearer picture of Latino identification will emerge.

Theories of Identification

According to Gordon, the first question of human civilization was asked when a Pleistocene hunter roamed too far away from the safety of his home and encountered a person he had never seen before. "That question is 'Who are you?'" (1964: 19). But how then will the hunter respond? As Gordon maintains, "he places himself in a group which is a political unit, which is culturally uniform, and which occupies a definite geographical place, and within this group he occupies more specific relationships of kinship," (1964: 19). Since this first "encounter" the world has evolved and the simple question of self-identification is now quite complex. While an individual may have multiple identities as depicted earlier, there is often a group of people with whom an individual may share many identities, such as language, cultural practices, religion,

and race. "Peoplehood" then is roughly "coterminous with a given rural land space, political government, no matter how rudimentary, a common culture in which a principal element was set of religious beliefs and values shared more or less uniformly by all members of the group, and a common racial background ensuring an absence of wide differences in physical type," (Gordon 1964: 23). This sense of peoplehood is best described as the individual's ethnicity (from the Greek *ethnos*, meaning "people") that may encompass his or her race, religion, national origin, language and more. Not only is ethnic identity as a whole quite important, but each of the layers within one's ethnic identity is equally important to the individual.

Although ethnic identity is fluid, a society may develop seemingly fixed categories for identification that serve to reinforce each identity as separate and unique. Eventually, all people are expected to fit neatly into one identity or another. Early works on religious identity found that in America a person must be Protestant, Catholic or Jewish, or else nothing, regardless of their formal connection with any religion (Herberg 1955). Further during the 1950s, racial status was usually fixed to either "White," "Negro," or "Mongoloid" and no other options were available. As Herberg notes: "The way in which one identifies and locates oneself ('Who, what, am I?') is closely related to how one is identified and located in the larger community ('Who, what, is he?')" (1955: 25). Although he is referring to religious cleavages, Herberg's description of "belonging" and group association is equally applicable to ethnic groups and national origins. He states, "to be 'something,' to have a name, one must identify oneself to oneself, and be identified by others, as belonging to one or another of the three great religious communities in which the American people are divided," (1955: 54). More broadly, Herberg advances the following theory on self-identification:

Everyone finds him/herself in a social context which he/she shares with many others, but within this social context, how shall he/she locate him/herself? Unless he/she can so locate him/herself, he/she cannot tell him/herself, and others will not be able to know, who and what he/she is; he/she will remain 'anonymous,' a nobody – which is intolerable. To live, he/she must "belong"; to "belong," he/she must be able to locate him/herself in the larger social whole, to identify him/herself to him/herself and to others. (Herberg 1955: 24)[2]

Thus, there is strong internal pressure to identify oneself as well as external pressure to be identified as belonging to one group or another. If a group does not appear large enough or salient it loses its identity and falls into a category where "all other forms of self-identification and social locations are either peripheral or obsolescent," (Herberg 1955: 53). Gordon agrees with such an assessment and finds that group categorization is a powerful force in society: "Group categorization, then, has its own social momentum once it is set in motion and is by no means purely a matter of individual volitions acting

[2] This passage from Herberg has been gender paraphrased.

in concert," (1964: 29). The social constructions of group identification, whether real or not, guide individuals to take their place in a group and act as a member of the group, which may or may not be congruent with our personal interests, preferences, and happiness. Thus, a variety of ethnic and other group identities should remain open to all people as viable alternatives.

Ethnic and national origin identities are important for a number of reasons. Primarily, they provide a psychological foundation for group identification and are central to the intimate sense of peoplehood. In a more practical sense, such identity is important because it provides a patterned network of associations, organizations, businesses and institutions that allow group members to define their primary relationships within their ethnic or national origin group. Finally, the overarching national cultural patterns and values are absorbed and reflected through the unique cultural heritage of the group (Gordon 1964). Dominicans, Peruvians, Hondurans, and Argentineans all have distinctive cultural traits that are important to their group members' identity, and certainly different than if all members were considered "other Latinos."

There are parallels of racial and ethnic classification in our nations history. Slaves brought to America from Africa were stripped of their unique national and tribal identities and categorizes simply as "black," based on their shared physical traits. Omi and Winant write that the "establishment and maintenance of a 'color line,'" rendered the specific African identities such as Ibo, Yoruba, and Fulani obsolete (1989). In their investigation of "racial formation" in America, they argue that the otherizing of people of color reproduced by social, economic and political forces negatively impacts the individual and collective psyche of minorities. This fixed, generalization of racial/ethnic categories is dangerous because it ignores the fluidity of self and group identification. Instead, race must be understood as "*an unstable and 'decentered' complex of social meanings constantly being transformed by political struggle*," (Omi and Winant 1989: 67, emphasis in original). The official and political classifications of ethnicity by the state bear serious consequences on people of color. Indeed, "racial minorities pay a heavy price in human suffering as a result of their categorization as 'other' by the dominant racial ideology," (Omi and Winant 1989: 67).

The struggle for recognition then is a serious one and can have many personal and political implications. The identity that one reveals is impacted (negatively) by the lack of recognition or misrecognition that the group receives. In his book, *The Politics of Recognition*, Taylor argues that "our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the *mis*recognition of others, and so a person or a group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves," (1994: 25). For those with stable and clearly recognizable identities, the process of misrecognition may seem trivial or inconsequential, however "nonrecognition or misrecognition can inflict

harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being," (Taylor 1994: 25). In this example, to be nothing more than "other Latino" is not even to be Latino, but to be less than Latino, meaning the individual somehow lacks a complete and sufficient identity. In fact, the official census enumeration lists the total number of respondents within each possible national origin group that comprise Latinos, and then lists a category called "other Hispanic or Latino" that includes Spanish, Spanish-American, and Spaniard identities, and then further lists a quite sizable category called "all other Hispanic and Latino." This sub-delineation further segregates the respondents in such a category that places them at an inferior level. In fact, Taylor concludes that "misrecognition shows not just a lack of due respect. It can inflict a grievous wound, saddling its victims with a crippling self-hatred. Due recognition is not just a courtesy we owe people. It is a vital human need," (1994: 26).

Further, suppressing the national identity of minority groups is not conducive to stable racial/ethnic communities. The linguistic, cultural and religious bonds to the groups national heritage generally run deep and are well established, and attempts to restrain claims of identity may actually intensify the level of isolation and hostility between the dominant and minority groups (Kymlicka 1995). Further, having access to our specific societal cultures is an important part of our liberty and freedom. "Put simply, freedom involves making choices amongst various options, and our societal cultures not only provides these options, but also makes them meaningful to us," (Kymlicka 1995: 83).

As mentioned above, identity, in particular ethnic or national origin identity, is not only shaped by the individual members of the group, but also by the larger American society. This partly explains why groups fight for recognition and are so concerned with their population size. As the group grows, its legitimacy grows. African American scholars have noted that black identity is in large part influenced by the core American society and institutions, and focusing solely on internal community identity building is naïve (Appiah 1994: 155). Thus, it is important not only for individuals to express their national origin identity, but also that this identity be accurately depicted and accepted by the dominant culture and government institutions. Further, the existence of subcultures and national identities is not guaranteed, especially in an environment where a dominant cultural identity exists. Where such identity is "threatened with debasement or decay, we must act to protect it," (Kymlicka 1995: 83).

Speaking directly to the issue of Hispanic or Latino identity, Kymlicka notes the many problems with focusing on a single all encompassing label:

> The category of 'Hispanic' should be used with caution. Since the 1960s, the US Census has treated 'Hispanic' as a common ethnic group or origin, but most Hispanics themselves view their ethnic or national identity in a more particular way – as Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, Cubans, Mexicans, Spaniards, or Guatemalans – reflecting

> the very different histories these groups have experienced in the United States…At present however, 'Hispanic' is little more than a statistical category covering a range of national minorities, immigrants, and exiles, all with their own distinct identities and demands. (1995: 16).

However, a counter-argument might state that as long as subgroups such as Ecuadorians, Panamanians, and Uruguayans can still identify as Latino, they have not lost access to cultural identity. While there are ethnic ties across all Latino national origins, it is unreasonable to suggest that one can replace their Panamanian identity with an overarching Latino identity. In fact, the very essence of Hispanic or Latino ethnic identity is its incorporation of multiple Latin American national cultures and its diversity of customs, celebrations, and even language. While leaving ones culture behind is technically possible, Kymlicka compares it to taking a vow of eternal poverty and celibacy – possible, but not desirable (1995: 86). Similarly, he argues that "in developing a theory of justice, we should treat access to one's culture as something that people can be expected to want, whatever their more particular conception of the good. Leaving one's culture, while possible, is best seen as renouncing something to which one is reasonably entitled," (86). Intracultural diversity then is just as an important as intercultural diversity. It is not enough to say that an individual can officially identify as 'Hispanic' (as was the case for the first time in 1970), but within the Latin culture, there needs to be a range of viable national origins with which individuals can meaningfully identify.

National origin identity in particular serves as the main focus of self-identification because it is based on simple notions of belonging, rather than accomplishment. This type of cultural identity provides an anchor for an individual's self-identification and the security of belonging. In turn, the individual's self-respect is connected to the respect of the national group within larger society. If the national culture is not respected, or appears to be eroding, so too will the dignity and self-respect of the individual members erode (Kymlicka 1995: 89). More often than not, official government measures of identity discourage specific national origin identity which may be problematic for issues of representation.

Th[is] challenge is endemic to liberal democracies because they are committed in principle to equal representation of all. Is a democracy letting citizens down, excluding or discriminating against us in some morally troubling way, when major institutions fail to take account of our particular identities? (Gutmann 1994: 4)

The Community Perspective

Latinos are the largest minority group in the United States and trace their ancestry to over twenty Latin American nations. In order to fully understand the diversity of the Latino community it is essential to get an accurate picture of the immigration patterns and size of the various national origins. In particular, community activists and

organizations seek an accurate count of Latino nationalities to promote and protect their group members. In addition to explaining the importance of proper recognition of national origin identity, as assessed by Gordon, Taylor and others, the statements and opinion of community leaders within different Latino nationalities embody the everyday significance of this identity.

In New York City, Dominicans are a large and growing segment of the Latino community. As a group of predominantly African and Spanish descent, Dominicans have a unique heritage and culture separate from "other Latinos." Their identity is complex and their numbers are important to their community's growth. Alianza Dominicana, the largest Dominican agency in New York City providing social services was deeply troubled by the release of the Census 2000 results. Moises Perez, executive directory of Alianza Dominicana, called the initial census numbers for Dominicans "ridiculous" and stated that the government form was too confusing and did not provide an opportunity for many members of his community to correctly identify themselves as Dominican (Scott 2001). Perez recalls dealing with Dominicans after the census was taken: "I remember a few times people telling us, 'Dominican? I didn't' find that category.' People were obviously confused," (Cheng and Janison 2001). For Perez and other Dominicans, their ability to count themselves and be counted by the government is an integral part of the growth and legitimization of their community.

In addition to Dominicans, Colombians and Ecuadorians in New York were considered undercounted by representatives of their communities. In Los Angeles, Central American-based advocacy organizations noted that Guatemalan and Salvadoran numbers appeared to have been underestimated by the census. Arturo Ignacio Sanchez, a professor of urban planning and community leader notes that each groups political capital is inherently tied to their official standing with the census: "If Colombians are perceived to be a decreasing group over the long run, what political presence will they have when they speak to elected officials?" (Scott 2001).

In California, despite over forty percent population growth for Latinos as a whole between 1990 and 2000, the census counts 100,000 fewer Central Americans in the state. This finding has Guatemalan and Salvadoran organizations puzzled and angry. Carlos Vaquerano, director of the Salvadoran-American Leadership and Educational Fund says reports that the Salvadoran population in Los Angeles has declined are wrong. His organization has conducted separate studies that show growth among the Salvadoran population. "I don't think that can be accurate. We've taken a lot of pride in being the second-largest Latino group here and the fastest-growing. We expected the census to prove that," (Fields 2001).

Official Census Bureau reports (see Appendix A – question E) recognize the importance of collecting specific ethnic and national origin identity through the census and point to the Voting Rights Act, Civil Rights Act, Public Health Act, and Community Reinvestment Act as

prime examples of why such information is significant. These federal laws, and others, require fair representation among all people in the United States and accurate census is vital to this effort.

Among Latino organizations that work with the Census Bureau, there was somewhat of a mixed response. The National Council of La Raza (NCLR) and the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) both claim the increase in the "other" category may be primarily due to a growing pan-Hispanic identity rather than misidentification (Field 2001; Spangler 2001). Other groups such as the Puerto Rican Legal Defense Fund (PRLDEF) and the Tomás Rivera Policy Institute (TRPI) insist that more clarity is needed from the Census to accurately count Latinos of all nationalities. Angelo Falcon, senior policy analyst with PRLDEF wrote a letter to the director of the Census Bureau demanding clarification:

> I am writing to express my organization's concerns about the significant misidentification that has occurred in the year 2000 Census for Latinos forced to use the "other" category in the Hispanic question. As you may be aware, this has caused considerable controversy in at least New York and New Jersey, where large numbers of Dominicans, Colombians and other Central and South Americans reside. We believe that the Census Bureau can and must correct this problem in a timely fashion. (Falcon 2001)

Likewise, Harry Pachon, TRPI president, noted that "you can't really tell anything about where their roots are from," without a proper identification of all Latino nationalities (Field 2001).

Some members of Congress from New York echo these sentiments. Representative Jose Serrano (D-NY), the ranking Democrat on the Commerce appropriations subcommittee, described the "Other Hispanic" category as "this incredible new number that, one, we do not know how to service; two, we do not know where they come from; and three, we do not know how best to deal with all of their needs," (Lowenthal 2001). Representative Carolyn Maloney (D-NY), introduced an amendment to a census bill that would have required a recalculation of the "Other Hispanic" category, but the amendment did not win support in the House. Maloney commented: "all Hispanics deserve to be counted accurately. The census is supposed to provide a snapshot of America. But this vote leaves Hispanics out of the picture."

An important question that needs to be answered before moving on is the degree to which the growth in the "other" category was error or misidentification. If persons of Latin American heritage are beginning to purposely identify only as "Hispanic" as some have suggested, those means of self-identification should be respected. To put the issue in perspective let us consider the demographics of the new Latino population between 1990 – 2000. To begin, the Latino population as a whole grew by 13.1 million between the two census counts, of which 4.3

million[3] were foreign-born immigrants from Latin American nations. Because of their strong cultural ties to their home countries, it is unlikely that many of these new immigrants would have intentionally opted for the generic Hispanic label when allowed to specify their national origin. Further, the Latino population continues to lag in educational attainment, with 43 percent obtaining less than a high school diploma[4], making them more reluctant and less capable of understanding the vague directions given on the 2000 form. Further, estimates from the 2000 Current Population Survey (CPS) reveal that, when specifically asked about their national origin, only 3 percent did not specify, suggesting that the 2000 Census results of 17 percent without national origin is indeed erroneous (see Table 2).

The political implications of misidentification are clear for advocacy organizations and city planning departments. Social services and electoral clout are only two components of what's at stake for Dominicans, Colombians, Salvadorans and other undercounted Latinos. John Logan, director of the Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research has argued that "the decisions about how to allocate and channel resources depend on what public officials see as the size and needs of these communities. Undercounted can easily turn into underserved," (Field 2001). In addition to social services, citizenship status may be on the line for many Central Americans because "the diminished figures for Salvadorans and other Central and South American groups might influence the ongoing national debate about whether and how to expand legal residency to undocumented immigrants," (Field 2001).

Falcon, in his letter to the Census Director summarizes the implications of misrecognizing Latino subgroups as threefold:

The consequences of this underreporting of specific Latino subgroups are serious. First, the lack of public awareness of the actual size of these communities will adversely affect resources and strategies for addressing their specific needs. Second, the confidence that organizations like ours expended a great deal of effort and resources in developing over the last few years for Census 2000 and beyond (as did the Bureau's expensive advertising campaign) is already being seriously eroded in these communities. Third, important research and other uses of Census data on and by these newly emerging Latino communities will be undermined. The result is not only an underestimation of the size of these growing communities but also making it more difficult for Latino advocates to encourage greater community participation in future Census programs. (Falcon 2001)

---

[3] According to reports from the INS, 4,294,819 legal immigrants from Mexico, the Caribbean and Central and South America relocated to the United States between 1991 – 2000.

[4] In comparison, 15.9 percent of non-Latinos had less than a high school diploma according to the 2000 Current Population Survey (CPS) estimates.

The 2000 Census

Although some Latinos trace their ancestry to the early 1600s when Spaniard settlers founded townships in New Mexico, Colorado, Texas, and Arizona, the U.S. Government did not begin to recognize Latino identities until 1930. In 1930 1.3 million "Mexicans" were reported, in 1940 1.6 million persons of "Spanish mother tongue" were counted, in 1950 and 1960 "persons of Spanish surname" were counted by the census at 2.3 and 3.5 million respectively. In 1970, the census formalized the count and called the category "Spanish" origin and turned up 9.1 million such persons. In 1980, the census began using the word "Hispanic" and counted 14.6 million. In 1990 22.4 million Hispanics were identified and most recently the 2000 census used the classification of "Hispanic or Latino" and counted 35.3 million Latinos (Census Bureau 1992, 2001). The chronology of Latino identity in the United States demonstrates the diversity of the population as well as the government's inability to understand the population. Early categories such as "Mexican" and "Spanish" show an understanding of national origin (although a limited one), while the categories "Spanish mother tongue" and "Spanish surname" demonstrate an attempt to group together like individuals of Latin American heritage. Indeed, Hispanic, Latino, and Chicano identities have been constructed and misappropriated by the state for over two hundred years. In a recent historical investigation of Mexican American racial identity, Menchaca (2002) notes that Spanish, Mexican, and American authorities created artificial racial hierarchies that marginalized Mexicans, restricted their political rights, and stripped them of the land. What the historical and contemporary state has ignored according to Menchaca is the uniqueness of Latino/Chicano identities and importance of these roots to the community.

In 1990 the Census Bureau appeared to be moving in the right direction by recognizing the unique national origins of the Hispanic population. That year all respondents had to answer question number 7 which asked whether or not the individual considered him or herself of Spanish/Hispanic origin. The question had five possible boxes for the respondent to check: No (not Spanish/Hispanic); Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano; Yes, Puerto Rican; Yes, Cuban; and Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic. Recognized as the three largest national origins among the Hispanic population, Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban origin warranted their own boxes, while the remaining groups had to check the Other Spanish/Hispanic category. In addition to checking the box, respondents were instructed to specify their country of national origin and many examples were provided: "Print one group, for example: Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spaniard, and so on," (Census Bureau 1990).

[Figure 1 about here]

In 1990, of the 22.4 million Latinos counted, only 1.9 million, or about 8.5% did not specify their national origin. Although the form was fairly clear, there may have been some respondents that did not

understand the question accurately and failed to specify their national origin, and others, (likely 3rd or 4th generation respondents) that choose to identify only as Hispanic, rather than specifying their national origin. In 2000, the census questionnaire changed the wording of question 7, and the percentage of Latinos identified as "other" doubled nationwide.

On the 2000 census form, people were asked if there were Spanish/Hispanic/Latino or not. Again, the same five check boxes were available as in 1990 with the addition of "/Latino" to the 1990 Spanish/Hispanic categorization. However, the last option: Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino had no additional instructions or examples besides "print group." Many have suspected that without examples of national origin, or even the instructions to "print national origin" rather than "group" some non-Mexican, non-Puerto Rican, and non-Cuban Latinos were confused, or viewed the question as a multiple choice between "Spanish," "Hispanic," and "Latino." Indeed, the number of respondents that checked the box, and then wrote in one of these three ethnic labels soared in 2000. As argued previously, this misrecognition creates numerous problems.

However, some responded that the growth of the "other" category represents a new pan-Hispanic consciousness and uniformity of the Latino community. While certainly a few individuals may hold this viewpoint, it is unlikely that over 6 million Latinos, or roughly 17 percent of the US Latino population, share this perspective. Further, with increases in Central and South American immigration to the United States between 1990 – 2000, many of the Dominican, Colombian, Salvadoran and Guatemalan respondents are new residents in the U.S. who are unlikely to have shed their national origin identities and immediately identify with a pan-Hispanic image. In fact, Logan and other demographers dismiss the idea of such a large pan-Hispanic identity. His analysis of the March 2000 Census Current Population Survey (CPS), which contained specific national origin questions, revealed only about 1 million in the "other Hispanic" category, less than 3 percent of the entire Latino population (Spangler 2001). Confusion seems to be the main reason for the miscalculation and some Census Bureau officials are acknowledging the problem. In reality, there didn't seem to be much discrepancy in the number of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban origin Latinos in 2000, all groups that had a specific box to check with their national origin identity. Roberto Ramirez, a statistician for the Census Bureau noted, "When we asked, 'Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino,' they might have thought, 'I'm Argentinian but, yeah, I'm Hispanic.' Some respondents may not have understood that they were supposed to give us a detailed origin," (Scott 2001).

The argument then is that measurement error did occur, and that this is of importance to studies of race and ethnicity. Similarly, Davis (1997a; 1997b) has argued that ethnic minorities "bring to public opinion surveys their normal everyday level of distrust and cautiousness," of interviewers, particularly, I would add, of official government representatives (i.e. the Census). Davis and others have suggested that

measurement error needs to be identified when possible, and taken note of in analyses of minority populations, rather than glossed over as the Census Bureau is seemingly doing.

Predicting Misidentification on the 2000 Census

Nationwide, more than 1 out of every 6 Latinos has been classified as "other Hispanic or Latino." However, there were important regional variations in the percentage that were identified in this category, which call for a more in-depth investigation of the issue. For example in Santa Fe more than 50% of all Latinos fall into the category of "all other Latinos" which excludes any responses of Spaniard, Spanish, or Spanish American. In Albuquerque, 44% of Latinos are "all other." Pueblo, Colorado finds 42% of its Latino community without national origin while the figures stands at 36% in Lubbock, Texas and 30% in Arlington, Virginia. In comparison, in Chicago only 7% of Latinos marked "other" and in Milwaukee the figure was 8%.

[Table 1 about here]

To examine these differences, I use county level data from the 2000 Census for question 7 regarding Latino national origin identity. All counties in all fifty states and the District of Columbia are examined for a total of 3,141 observations. Variables include the total population, total Latino population, median Latino age, and twenty Latin American nationality populations.

The Census Bureau details two different classifications of "other Latinos." The broader category includes all respondents who checked the "other" box and did not specify a Latin American national identity. This includes the responses of Spaniard, Spanish, and Spanish American. A more narrow category, "all other" Latinos excludes respondents with possible ties to Spain and counts only those who checked the "other" box, and wrote Hispanic, Latino, left it blank, or some other non-national origin identity. In this analysis, I use the "all other" Hispanic or Latino category as a more conservative estimate, and so that persons who indicated a quasi-Spanish identity can be recognized as such. The dependent variable, "all other Latino" is measured as the raw number of respondents in this category in each county and ranges from zero in twenty-four counties with only a handful of Latinos to 621,502 in Los Angeles County.

Before moving into the regression analysis, it is possible to get a sense for which groups of Latinos were the most undercounted. Logan's research at the Mumford Center (2001) uses more accurate estimates of Latino national origin from the March 2000 Current Population Survey (CPS) and applies them to the undercounts on the 2000 Census. Table 2 compares the official Census 2000 estimates, the Mumford estimates and the underestimate difference for each nationality. Most notably, the number of Latinos that actually belong in the "other" category is off by more than 80 percent. The Census counts 6.2 million Latinos in the "other" category, however the revised estimates put only 1.1 million in this category. This leaves over 5 million Latinos whose identity has been

misrecognized. Looking at the percent difference column, it is clear that the three groups that have their national origin listed on the census form were the least likely to be wrongly identified.

[Table 2 about here]

According to Logan's estimates, there are nearly 2 million more Central and South American Latinos living in the U.S. than the census estimates. Specifically, Salvadorans were underestimated by 460,000, Dominicans by 350,000, Colombians by 270,000, and Guatemalans by 250,000. While Mexicans were also underestimated by 2.4 million, this represented only 12 percent of their population, and many of these individuals are people in the southwest who do not trace their identity to Mexico, as much as Spanish colonized territories in Mexico or even the United States. In sum, these estimates reveal that many Central and South American Latino nationalities were undercounted in the 2000 Census. My research hopes to shed light on the likelihood that any specific national origin group was misidentified.

Table 3 displays the results for the OLS regressions. Using the total number of Latinos counted in the "all other" category as the dependent variable, I measure the influence of each of the non-designated national origins (those without their own check-box, i.e. Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, etc.) on the number in the other category. The county level analysis is conducted for the U.S. as a whole, regionally for the east coast and southwest[5], and for the states of New York and California.

[Table 3 about here]

For the entire U.S. (Model 1-A) many variables are significant predictors of the other Latino population. In order of the magnitude of their coefficients, the variables Paraguayan, Spaniard, Uruguayan, Panamanian, Colombian, Salvadoran, Nicaraguan, and Dominican are positive and significant predictors of the size of the "all other" Latino population. This indicates that, nationwide, counties with large populations with roots from these nations had larger "other" Latino populations. This suggests that many of the Latinos in the other category may in fact identify with this group of national origins. In addition, age and size of the Latino population demonstrated a positive and significant relationship with the dependent variable. The age variable may mean that older Latino communities were more likely to misidentify and not specify a national origin while the Latino population variable simply means that in counties with more Latinos, there are likely to be more that fall into the other grouping. This is counterintuitive because we would expect stronger outreach efforts and higher levels of awareness about the Census form in large Latino communities, as opposed to small, or geographically isolated communities. Interestingly, Costa Rican, Honduran, Argentinean, Chilean and Peruvian have negative and

[5] States in the east coast group include New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Rhode Island, and the District of Columbia; states in the southwest group include Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and California.

significant influences on the size of the other Latino population. This may suggest that these groups are the most likely to correctly specify their national origin group and least likely to have been undercounted[6]. The aim of the model is not explain all the variance of the dependent variable "other Latino," but rather to determine which independent variables are significant predictors. Thus, while the high adjusted R^2 of .89 may seem problematic, it is more a function of collinearity between some of the independent and dependent variables.

Table 4 shows the correlations values (all at p<.000) for the dependent variable and country of origin independent variables. Because of the high levels of misidentification by many national origin groups, there is a strong correlation between some nationalities and the "other Latino" category. Not surprisingly, the dependent variable has a positive correlation of higher than .70 for seven of the countries listed (Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, and Spanish) and many of the countries correlate at high levels with each other. For example, South Americans from Chile, Peru, and Argentina all correlate with each other at better than .90 while Central Americans from Guatemala and El Salvador correlate even higher at .95. This is likely the result of similar migration patterns for both cohorts due to strong geographic ties in the countries of origin[7]. These collinearity issues may be artificially driving the robustness of the adjusted R^2, however, it is important to include all countries of origin in the same model to observe how different groups answered the census in the presence of each other group (which is the precise situation in the real world). With these limitations in mind, I am interested only in the significance and direction of each coefficient, rather than trying to account for as much variance as possible in the dependent variable[8].

[Table 4 about here]

To accommodate the potential problems of multicollinearity of the independent variables, I have replicated Model 1-A and dropped out the "worst offender" variables identified above. First, I isolate the Guatemalan and Salvadoran variables in Models 1-B and 1-C. Model 1-B drops out the Guatemalan variable and keeps in the Salvadoran variable, and the results for the Salvadoran variable remain quite similar to the original model in which both are included. In the original model, Salvadoran is positive and significant and it's coefficient measures 1.609 and in the second model (1-B) it is also positive and significant and measures 1.829. Likewise, in Model 1-C when only Guatemalan is included it is comparable to the original model, again positive and significant although slightly larger in size (0.639 compared to 2.493). The

[6] While these countries of origin display a negative relationship in the multivariate analysis, they are positively correlated with the dependent variable in the bivariate analysis (See Table 4).

[7] Thus, when a hurricane hits Central America, it may impact Guatemalans and Salvadorans alike, and increased immigration would be expected from both groups, most likely to the similar counties within the U.S.

[8] In addition, other key demographic variables are missing from the model such as mean education and income of the Latino community within each county, leaving the overall model underspecified. These variables from the 2000 Census were not yet available by Race and Ethnicity at the county level at the time of this research.

final three models (D,E,F) focus on the highly correlated South American variables Argentinean, Chilean, and Peruvian. In Model 1-D when only Peruvian is included it remains positive and significant as in the original model as is Argentinean in Model 1-E, while Chilean is negative and significant in both Model 1-A and the Chilean-only Model 1-F. Because the variables remain significant and in the same direction in the replicated findings (Models B-F) we can conclude that the multicollinearity might be problematic for the large adjusted R^2, but does not greatly affect the performance of the independent variables.

In addition to a nationwide perspective, regional variations account for important differences in some variables and should be considered. Looking only at states in the northeast (Model 2), the claims of community leaders that Dominicans, Colombians, and Ecuadorians were undercounted appear to be correct. In addition to these variables being positive and significant predictors of the other Latino population, Guatemalan, Honduran, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Bolivian, Paraguayan, Uruguayan, and Venezuelan national identities appear to have also been underestimated on the east coast group of states.

Meanwhile, analysis of the southwest (Model 3) reveals that Central American groups such as Guatemalans, Hondurans, Nicaraguans, and Panamanians bore a positive and significant influence on the size of the other Latino population, as did the South American nationalities of Colombian, Ecuadorian, Paraguayan, and Peruvian. In addition, the Spaniard identity is a significant predictor of the other Latino population in the southwest. This may be a result of the old colonial Spanish occupation of much of the southwest (in particular New Mexico – see Table 1) where Latino communities do in fact trace their lineage in the United States back seven or more generations. One note, the variable Salvadoran has a negative and significant relationship in the southwest model. This does not suggest that Salvadorans in Los Angeles County specifically were counted correctly. Surveys of Los Angeles itself and Logan's CPS findings indicate that Salvadorans were undercounted. This finding simply proposes that in the 423 counties in southwest states, the size of the Salvadoran community regresses negatively against the size of the other Latino population.

[Table 5 about here]

Discussion

The 2000 decennial census marked an important, but troubled event in the Latino community. One the one hand, Latinos surpassed African Americans as the largest minority group in the United States. On the other hand, the official Census Bureau estimates failed to provide national origin information for over 6 million Latinos, leaving one out of every six Latinos classified as "other" by the government. This research has demonstrated that rather than choosing the "other" category, there was a considerable undercount of Mexicans, Salvadorans, Dominicans, Guatemalans, and Colombians in the recent census, all off by more than 250,000 nationwide.

Further, interesting regional differences exist that bare out the claims made by many community activists. While the Latino population as a whole is growing rapidly and gaining political attention, we must keep in mind that there is no single Hispanic nationality and the diversity of Latin American nations from which the U.S. Latino population traces its heritage is an integral component of the ethnicity's identity. As Gordon, Taylor, Kymlicka and others have noted, the ability to identify with one's national origin is a fundamental part of the individual's identity. As I have argued, multiple levels of identification should remain open to all people and efforts should be made to encourage the most accurate possible enumerations of the diverse nationalities within the Latino population.

To prevent another problem with misrecognition in the 2010 Census, the form should be reevaluated to increase the specification rate of national origins. First, instead of just three nationalities containing unique identifier boxes, the list should be expanded (similar to the subgroups for 'Asian') to include more representation for groups such as Dominicans, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Colombians, Ecuadorians, Peruvians, Hondurans, and more on the census questionnaire. Second, the form should once again (as in 1990) include specific instructions for those that check the "other" category and encourage respondents to print their country of the ancestry. In addition to changes on the form, the Census Bureau needs to expand multilingual outreach efforts in the high-propensity under-count communities identified herein. Finally, further collaboration with Latino community based organizations will help identify additional recommendations as well as increase the level of trust and confidence in the census.

By incorporating these policy recommendations, the federal government should be able to obtain a more accurate count of the Latino population, and national origin populations within the Latino community. As the Latino population grows, and becomes more diverse with immigration flows from the Caribbean, Central and South America, it is important that official Census Bureau statistics reflect the diversity of this population. Many (first time) respondents to the census may be unfamiliar with the procedures and measures used on the form and steps should be taken to increase ease of use of this technical self-administered survey.

I close simply with a comment by a Dominican respondent who was not counted as Dominican on the census: "It was my first time filling out the census form. I got confused. If they say 'Yes, Puerto Rican and Yes, Cuban,' it should have said 'Yes, Dominican,' too," (Cheng and Janison 2001).

References

Cheng, Mae and Dan Janison. 2001. "Criticizing Census Count of Hispanics." Newsday. June 28, 2001.

Davis, Darren W. 1997a. "The Direction of Race of Interviewer Effects among African-Americans: Donning the Black Mask." *American Journal of Political Science.* 41: 309-322.

Davis, Darren W. 1997b. "Nonrandom Measurement Error and Race of Interviewer Effects Among African Americans." *Public Opinion Quarterly.* 61: 183-207.

Falcon, Angelo. 2001. "Census 2000 Misreporting on Latino Subgroups." Puerto Rican Legal Defense Fund Memo. September 8, 2001.

Field, Robin. 2001. "Decline of Latino Groups in Census Has Agencies Angry, Experts Puzzled." Los Angeles Times. August 10, 2001.

Glazer, Nathan. 1997. *We Are Multiculturalist Now.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gordon, Milton M. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life. The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Gutmann, Amy. 1994. ed. *Multiculturalism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Herberg, Will. 1955. *Catholic – Protestant – Jew.* New York: Doubleday

INS 2002. *Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 2000*. Table 2. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship. A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Logan, John. 2001. The New Latinos: Who They Are, Where They Are. Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research University at Albany. September 2001.

Lowenthal, TerriAnn. 2001. "House of Reps Approves Census Bureau Finding, Designates Money to Explore Count of Overseas Americans." Census 2000 Initiative. <www.census2000.org> July 23, 2001.

Menchaca, Martha. 2002. *Recovering History, Constructing Race: The Indian, White, and Black Roots of Mexican Americans.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1989. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s.* 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Scott, Janny. 2001. "A Census Query is Said to Skew Data on Latinos." New York Times. June 27, 2001. pA1.

Spangler, Anthony. 2001. "Report Shows Hispanic Changes." Star-Telegram.

Taylor, Charles. 1994. *Multiculturalism.* ed. Amy Gutmann. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Figure 1
Comparison of 1990 and 2000 Census Short Form Question #7

Excerpt from 1990 Census Form

7. Is this person of Spanish/Hispanic origin? Fill ONE circle for each person.	o No (not Spanish/Hispanic) o Yes, Mexican, Mexican-Am., Chicano o Yes, Puerto Rican o Yes, Cuban o Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic (Print one group, for example, Argentinean, Colombian, Dominican, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, Spaniard, and so on.)
If **Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic**, print one group →	

Excerpt from 2000 Census Form

→ **NOTE: Please answer BOTH Questions 7 and 8.**

7. Is Person 1 Spanish/Hispanic/Latino? *Mark ☒ the "**No**" box if **not** Spanish/Hispanic/Latino.*

- ☐ **No,** not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
- ☐ Yes, Puerto Rican
- ☐ Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano
- ☐ Yes, Cuban
- ☐ Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino Ð *Print group.*

Table 1.
Top 100 Counties Ranked by Percent of "Other" Latino Population in Census 2000 (For Counties With More Than 25,000 Latinos)

Rank	County	State	All Other Hispanic	Rank	County	State	All Other Hispanic
1	Rio Arriba	NM	67.1%	51	Brazoria	TX	17.6%
2	Santa Fe	NM	54.4%	52	Hudson	NJ	17.5%
3	Sandoval	NM	53.1%	53	Broward	FL	17.2%
4	Valencia	NM	52.2%	54	Westchester	NY	16.9%
5	Bernalillo	NM	44.2%	55	Travis	TX	16.9%
6	Pueblo	CO	42.4%	56	McLennan	TX	16.7%
7	Jim Wells	TX	40.7%	57	Marin	CA	16.6%
8	Lubbock	TX	36.6%	58	Mercer	NJ	16.5%
9	San Patricio	TX	36.0%	59	Salt Lake	UT	16.4%
10	Nueces	TX	32.8%	60	Brazos	TX	16.2%
11	Chaves	NM	31.1%	61	Suffolk	NY	16.1%
12	Montgomery	MD	29.9%	62	Boulder	CO	15.9%
13	Arlington	VA	29.5%	63	Essex	NJ	15.9%
14	Washington	DC	29.5%	64	San Mateo	CA	15.6%
15	Victoria	TX	28.6%	65	Bronx	NY	15.4%
16	Jefferson	LA	27.8%	66	Passaic	NJ	15.2%
17	Jefferson	CO	27.6%	67	Pinal	AZ	15.1%
18	Fairfax	VA	27.4%	68	Harris	TX	15.1%
19	Bexar	TX	26.0%	69	Duval	FL	14.9%
20	Guadalupe	TX	25.9%	70	Bell	TX	14.9%
21	Dona Ana	NM	25.8%	71	Los Angeles	CA	14.7%
22	El Paso	CO	24.7%	72	Maverick	TX	14.5%
23	Prince George's	MD	24.5%	73	Miami-Dade	FL	14.4%
24	Adams	CO	24.3%	74	Galveston	TX	14.3%
25	Hays	TX	22.7%	75	Jerfferson	TX	14.2%
26	Potter	TX	22.5%	76	Kings	NY	14.2%
27	Ector	TX	21.9%	77	Denton	TX	14.2%
28	Denver	CO	21.6%	78	Collin	TX	14.2%
29	Prince William	VA	21.5%	79	Rockland	NY	14.2%
30	Midland	TX	21.4%	80	Palm Beach	FL	14.1%
31	Tom Green	TX	21.2%	81	Hillsborough	FL	14.0%
32	Nassau	NY	21.2%	82	Contra Costa	CA	14.0%
33	Weld	CO	20.8%	83	El Paso	TX	14.0%
34	San Francisco	CA	20.2%	84	Fairfield	CT	14.0%
35	Arapahoe	CO	19.8%	85	Cochise	AZ	13.9%
36	Providence	RI	19.7%	86	Middlesex	NJ	13.6%
37	Somerset	NJ	19.6%	87	Val Verde	TX	13.4%
38	Suffolk	MA	19.5%	88	Tarrant	TX	13.3%
39	Union	NJ	19.4%	89	Santa Cruz	AZ	13.2%
40	Queens	NY	19.1%	90	King	WA	13.1%
41	Webb	TX	19.0%	91	Solano	CA	13.1%
42	Fort Benton	TX	18.7%	92	Pinellas	FL	13.1%
43	Honolulu	HI	18.7%	93	Snohomish	WA	13.1%
44	Essex	MA	18.6%	94	Mecklenburg	NC	13.0%
45	Morris	NJ	18.5%	95	Hidalgo	TX	13.0%
46	Cameron	TX	18.5%	96	Utah	UT	12.8%
47	Middlesex	MA	18.5%	97	Montgomery	TX	12.8%
48	Bergen	NJ	18.3%	98	Lehigh	PA	12.7%
49	Williams	TX	18.2%	99	Alameda	CA	12.7%
50	New York	NY	18.1%	100	Atlantic	NJ	12.7%

Table 2.
Census Estimates vs. Mumford Estimates of Latino Groups in the United States

Nationality	Census 2000	Mumford 2000	Difference	% Difference
Mexican	20,640,711	23,060,224	+ 2,419,513	11.7%
Puerto Rican	3,406,178	3,640,460	+ 234,282	6.9%
Cuban	1,241,685	1,315,346	+ 73,661	5.9%
Dominican	764,945	1,121,257	+ 356,312	46.6%
Costa Rican	68,588	115,672	+ 47,084	68.6%
Guatemalan	372,487	627,329	+ 254,842	68.4%
Honduran	217,569	362,171	+ 144,602	66.5%
Nicaraguan	177,684	294,334	+ 116,650	65.7%
Panamanian	91,723	164,371	+ 72,648	79.2%
Salvadoran	655,165	1,117,959	+ 462,794	70.6%
Total Central Am.	1,686,937	2,863,063	+ 1,176,126	69.7%
Argentinean	100,864	168,991	+ 68,127	67.5%
Bolivian	42,068	70,545	+ 28,477	67.7%
Chilean	68,849	117,698	+ 48,849	71.0%
Colombian	470,684	742,406	+ 271,722	57.7%
Ecuadorian	260,559	396,400	+ 135,841	52.1%
Paraguayan	8,769	14,492	+ 5,723	65.3%
Peruvian	233,926	381,850	+ 147,924	63.2%
Uruguayan	18,804	30,010	+ 11,206	59.6%
Venezuelan	91,507	149,309	+ 57,802	63.2%
Total South Am.	1,353,562	2,169,669	+ 816,107	60.3%
Total Central/South	**3,040,499**	**5,032,732**	**+ 1,992,233**	**65.5%**
Other Hispanic	6,211,800	1,135,799	- 5,076,001	-81.7%

* Mumford estimates overlay March 2000 CPS responses with Census 2000 results

Table 3.
Nationwide Regression Results

Model 1: Nationwide OLS Regression predicting "other Hispanic" category

	Model 1-A	Model 1-B	Model 1-C	Model 1-D	Model 1-E	Model 1-F
Argentinean	17.993 ***	20.095 ***	24.766 ***		8.072 ***	
	(1.919)	(1.803)	(1.924)		(1.639)	
Bolivian	-4.097 ***	-4.246 ***	-2.782 ***	-4.368 ***	-4.382 ***	-3.561 ***
	(.762)	(.761)	(.781)	(.776)	(.719)	(.724)
Chilean	-26.478 ***	-28.304 ***	-20.177 ***			-11.991 ***
	(2.632)	(2.572)	(2.683)			(2.184)
Costa Rican	-3.718 *	-2.729 t	-5.934 ***	0.210	-0.995	0.811
	(1.507)	(1.477)	(1.550)	(1.493)	(1.438)	(1.399)
Dominican	0.247 ***	0.239 ***	0.101 **	0.275 ***	0.224 ***	0.316 ***
	(.034)	(.034)	(.033)	(.033)	(.034)	(.033)
Ecuadorian	-0.424 t	-0.313	-1.303 ***	0.360	0.073	0.507 *
	(.231)	(.229)	(.231)	(.223)	(.216)	(.203)
Guatemalan	0.639 **		2.493 ***	1.357 ***	1.089 ***	1.277 ***
	(.202)		(.162)	(.193)	(.199)	(.192)
Honduran	2.082 ***	1.884 ***	5.902 ***	1.000 *	1.814 ***	0.444
	(.441)	(.438)	(.367)	(.418)	(.443)	(.413)
Nicaraguan	1.176 ***	1.302 ***	-0.506 *	1.218 ***	0.534 *	1.990 ***
	(.256)	(.253)	(.236)	(.210)	(.251)	(.244)
Panamanian	1.462 *	1.187 *	2.326 ***	0.978	1.319 *	0.494
	(.609)	(.604)	(.627)	(.618)	(.603)	(.598)
Paraguayan	18.203 *	15.156 *	29.415 ***	-5.940	-3.654	0.739
	(7.212)	(7.158)	(7.410)	(6.993)	(6.943)	(7.039)
Peruvian	0.927 *	0.857 *	1.334 **	0.337		
	(.422)	(.422)	(.435)	(.408)		
Salvadoran	1.609 ***	1.829 ***		1.633 ***	1.424 ***	1.883 ***
	(.110)	(.086)		(.103)	(.110)	(.108)
Uruguayan	-4.817	-5.810	-7.580 *	-11.700 **	-12.971 ***	-5.530
	(3.571)	(3.562)	(3.685)	(3.542)	(3.467)	(3.587)
Venezuelan	-2.176 *	-2.748 **	-7.347 ***	0.768	-1.886 *	2.623 ***
	(.875)	(.857)	(.826)	(.706)	(.882)	(.734)
Age	-12.260	-12.740	-13.584	-13.864	-14.476	-12.416
	(17.679)	(17.703)	(18.267)	(18.023)	(17.956)	(17.940)
Total Pop	0.014 ***	0.014 ***	0.011 ***	0.013 ***	0.012 ***	0.015 ***
	(.001)	(.001)	(.001)	(.001)	(.001)	(.001)
% Latino	15784.240 ***	15735.790 ***	15691.200 ***	15735.610 ***	15723.680 ***	15832.170 ***
	(709.791)	(710.646)	(733.373)	(723.668)	(720.483)	(719.905)
Constant	-795.018 t	-798.033 t	-692.615	-774.472 t	-717.270	-849.867 t
	(443.247)	(443.884)	(457.935)	(451.706)	(450.163)	(449.771)
N	3141	3141	3141	3141	3141	3141
F	1428.00	1507.07	1404.52	1537.83	1550.91	1554.17
Adj R^2	0.8911	0.8908	0.8837	0.8868	0.8876	0.8878

*** p<.001 ** p<.01 * p<.05 t p<.10 two-tailed test

Dependent Variable = actual number of respondents (by county) in the "all Other Hispanic or Latino" category
Country or Origin Independent Variables = actual number of respondents (by county) identifying with each country of origin

Table 4.
Correlation Matrix

"Other Latino" by Country of Origin

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
(1) Other Latino	1.000																	
(2) Argentina	0.785	1.000																
(3) Bolivia	0.448	0.550	1.000															
(4) Chile	0.728	0.976	0.583	1.000														
(5) Colombia	0.459	0.813	0.486	0.839	1.000													
(6) Costa Rica	0.801	0.896	0.483	0.865	0.687	1.000												
(7) Dominican	0.274	0.349	0.196	0.351	0.430	0.339	1.000											
(8) Ecuador	0.397	0.515	0.388	0.522	0.741	0.482	0.623	1.000										
(9) Guatemala	0.873	0.712	0.411	0.633	0.313	0.753	0.104	0.302	1.000									
(10) Honduras	0.755	0.900	0.517	0.897	0.735	0.843	0.435	0.470	0.633	1.000								
(11) Nicaragua	0.495	0.839	0.395	0.850	0.720	0.677	0.199	0.236	0.385	0.811	1.000							
(12) Panama	0.532	0.643	0.373	0.636	0.608	0.663	0.504	0.582	0.378	0.685	0.522	1.000						
(13) Paraguay	0.372	0.549	0.503	0.592	0.768	0.512	0.438	0.858	0.279	0.464	0.331	0.460	1.000					
(14) Peru	0.688	0.915	0.625	0.924	0.878	0.850	0.399	0.659	0.602	0.817	0.721	0.616	0.683	1.000				
(15) El Salvador	0.864	0.676	0.457	0.614	0.280	0.717	0.085	0.274	0.956	0.641	0.343	0.355	0.271	0.580	1.000			
(16) Spanish	0.882	0.714	0.453	0.692	0.468	0.741	0.285	0.430	0.729	0.653	0.425	0.527	0.415	0.668	0.720	1.000		
(17) Uruguay	0.496	0.784	0.492	0.815	0.872	0.740	0.394	0.664	0.379	0.718	0.633	0.565	0.681	0.857	0.360	0.511	1.000	
(18) Venezuela	0.384	0.800	0.399	0.828	0.842	0.634	0.297	0.337	0.213	0.768	0.900	0.568	0.424	0.743	0.179	0.361	0.746	1.000

For all variables n=3141; $p<.000$

Table 5.
Regional Regression Results

Models 2-5: Regional OLS Regressions predicting "other Hispanic" category

	Model 2			Model 3			Model 4			Model 5		
	EASTCOAST			SOUTHWEST			NEW YORK			CALIFORNIA		
Variable	Coef.	SE	t value	Coef.	SE	t value	Coef.	SE	t value	Coef.	SE	t value
Dominican	0.280	0.01	**25.26**	-62.954	12.65	**-4.98**	0.353	0.03	**11.66**	-15.740	8.43	-1.87
Costa Rican	-0.060	0.17	-0.35	-67.500	12.43	**-5.43**	0.906	0.66	1.37	42.023	11.40	**3.69**
Guatemalan	0.254	0.05	**5.42**	10.627	1.47	**7.24**	0.031	0.14	0.21	0.974	0.56	1.75
Honduran	0.617	0.12	**5.16**	16.753	3.76	**4.45**	2.101	0.31	**6.83**	15.171	3.74	**4.06**
Nicaraguan	3.270	0.28	**11.80**	3.853	1.14	**3.38**	-2.931	2.91	-1.01	0.390	0.52	0.75
Panamanian	-0.194	0.09	**-2.14**	26.796	4.21	**6.36**	0.215	0.37	0.58	0.746	5.32	0.14
Salvadoran	0.387	0.02	**18.32**	-6.126	0.86	**-7.13**	0.037	0.04	0.99	-0.718	0.41	-1.74
Argentinean	-2.704	0.73	**-3.73**	-49.804	14.34	**-3.47**	-3.927	1.43	**-2.75**	6.625	7.82	0.85
Bolivian	0.601	0.10	**6.07**	-8.951	17.83	-0.50	3.449	3.11	1.11	4.184	8.46	0.49
Chilean	0.809	0.48	1.68	-140.722	11.09	**-12.68**	5.300	0.73	**7.24**	-22.192	5.90	**-3.76**
Colombian	0.247	0.04	**6.23**	31.731	5.45	**5.83**	0.379	0.23	1.66	-19.099	6.10	**-3.13**
Ecuadorian	0.216	0.05	**4.34**	36.316	16.47	**2.20**	0.560	0.28	**1.98**	-6.867	9.19	-0.75
Paraguayan	2.570	0.93	**2.77**	253.961	95.50	**2.66**	-4.255	7.84	-0.54	58.090	51.04	1.14
Peruvian	-0.009	0.05	-0.19	26.942	4.71	**5.45**	-1.543	0.87	-1.78	7.017	2.13	**3.29**
Uruguayan	1.715	0.44	**3.92**	-397.562	85.22	**-4.66**	14.425	3.34	**4.32**	-42.424	28.92	-1.47
Venezuelan	3.420	0.72	**4.76**	-5.958	15.25	-0.39	0.975	1.59	0.61	-40.417	12.38	**-3.27**
Spaniard	0.490	0.55	0.89	84.673	5.13	**16.49**	-0.357	0.71	-0.50	15.100	3.72	**4.06**
Age	0.750	6.82	0.11	105.065	46.76	**2.25**	-0.142	3.55	-0.04	-42.928	51.39	-0.84
Total Pop	0.000	0.00	0.43	-0.029	0.00	**-7.52**	0.001	0.00	**5.10**	0.001	0.00	0.22
Latino Pop	0.064	0.00	**16.18**	0.156	0.01	**23.65**	0.039	0.01	**4.19**	0.087	0.00	**19.59**
Constant	23.529	183.17	0.13	-2010.7	1262.3	-1.59	-2.174	94.10	-0.02	468.831	1274.8	0.37
n	273			423			62			58		
F	11092.5			1702.7			569.3			440.2		
Adj R^2	0.965			0.972			0.985			0.992		

Bold t values are significant at $p<.05$ or greater for two tailed test

Dependent Variable = actual number of respondents (by county) in the "all Other Hispanic or Latino" category
Country or Origin Independent Variables = actual number of respondents (by county) identifying with each country of origin

EASTCOAST = NY, NJ, MA, CT, DE, MD, VA, DC, RI
SOUTHWEST = TX, NM, AZ, CO, CA

Appendix A
Selected Questions from Census 2000 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) Website

I. Census 2000 Data

Z. How should Hispanics have answered the race question?
People of Hispanic origin may be of any race and should have answered the question on race by marking one or more race categories shown on the questionnaire, including White, Black or African American, American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and Some Other Race. Hispanics should have indicated their origin in the Hispanic origin question, not in the race question because in federal statistical systems ethnic origin was considered to be a separate concept from race.

IV. The Census Questionnaire

D. Why does the Census need to know about race?
Race is key to implementing any number of federal programs and it is critical for the basic research behind numerous policy decisions. States require these data to meet legislative redistricting requirements. Also, they are needed to monitor compliance with the Voting Rights Act by local jurisdictions. Race data are required by federal programs that promote equal employment opportunity and to assess racial disparities in health and environmental risks. The Census Bureau has included a question on race since the first census in 1790.

E. Why does the Census Bureau collect information on Hispanic origin?
The 1970 decennial census was the first to have a question on Hispanic origin on the sample or "long" census form. Since 1980, this question has appeared on the 100 percent or "short" form. Hispanic origin data are needed for the implementation of a number of federal statutes such as the enforcement of bilingual election rules under the Voting Rights Act and the monitoring and enforcement of equal employment opportunities under the Civil Rights Act. Additionally, information on people of Hispanic origin is needed by local governments to run programs and meet legislative requirements at the community level. For example, these data are used to help identify segments of the population who may not be receiving medical services under the Public Health Act or to evaluate whether financial institutions are meeting credit needs of minority populations under the Community Reinvestment Act.

I. Why do you have one question on race and another question on Hispanic origin?
On October 30, 1997, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued "Standards for Maintaining, Collecting, and Presenting Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity." All federal agencies, including the Census Bureau, who collect and report data on race and ethnicity must follow these standards. Race and ethnicity are considered to be two separate and distinct concepts in this standard, and OMB accepted the Interagency Committee for the Review of the Racial and Ethnic Standards recommendation that two separate questions -- one for race and one for ethnicity or Hispanic origin -- be used whenever feasible to provide flexibility and ensure data quality.

J. Does the Census Bureau collect data on Hispanic subgroups other than Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban?
Yes. In Census 2000, like in the 1990 census, the Hispanic origin question has a write-in line which is used to obtain write-in responses of Hispanic subgroups other than the major groups of Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Ricans. Persons with other Hispanic origins such as Salvadoran, Nicaraguan, Argentinean, and so on, were able to write in their specific origin group. In fact, the Census Bureau's code list contains over 30 Hispanic or Latino subgroups. For Census 2000, maximum detail on Hispanic subgroups will be made available in micro data files while data products containing tabulations will report less detail information.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
For website information, contact Decennial Management Division
Created:18-May-99 / Last Revised:18-July-01

Census 2000 | Subjects A to Z | Search | Product Catalog | Data Access Tools | FOIA | Privacy · Policies | Contact Us | Home

USCENSUSBUREAU
Helping You Make Informed Decisions