

LATINO POPULATION GROWTH, SOCIOECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

JORGE CHAPA
BELINDA DE LA ROSA
Indiana University, Bloomington

Data from the U.S. Census Bureau and the National Center for Education Statistics indicate that Latinos lag behind non-Latinos in education and in other socioeconomic characteristics. Although there are some positive indications such as the decrease of individuals and children living in poverty and an increase in the number of individuals working in the technical, sales, and administrative support sectors, the increases have been small. Current census population estimates indicate that the Latino population will continue its very rapid rate of growth for the foreseeable future. An overview of salient sociodemographic characteristics of the Latino population, including educational attainment, poverty, immigration, family income, family size, family type, and language status is provided. The steady increase of this very youthful population makes it imperative that it receive an education that will provide it with the skills to make it a productive citizenry.

Keywords: *Latinos; Hispanics; education; immigration; poverty; language status; occupational distribution; post-secondary enrollment; tenure-track Latino faculty; educational policy; minority doctorate recipients*

We provide a broad overview of Latino population trends in light of the 2000 Census and other recent data. One focus in this article is on the phenomenal increase in the Latino population. Population counts from the 2000 Census indicate that the Latino population grew many times faster in the 1990s than did the total population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001). The marked increase in the proportion of Latinos will have a dramatic impact on the configuration of education in the decades ahead. An analysis of socioeconomic characteristics such as educational attainment, income, and language status with respect to educational trends is also presented here. The high rate of immigration in the 1990s has resulted in a rapid increase in the non-English-speaking population.

EDUCATION AND URBAN SOCIETY, Vol. 36 No. 2, February 2004 130-149
DOI: 10.1177/0013124503261320
© 2004 Corwin Press, Inc.

DATA, DEFINITIONS, AND METHOD

The analyses that will be presented in this article were based on the following sources: population counts from the 1990 Census and the 2000 Census (U.S. Census Bureau, 1991, 2001), data taken from the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Reports on the Latino Population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003), and tabulations from other machine-readable data sets.

The terms *Latino* and *Hispanic* are used here interchangeably, although we prefer the term *Latino* (see Hayes-Bautista & Chapa, 1987, for a discussion of the use of Latino rather than Hispanic). *Anglos* might be more familiarly known as White non-Latinos. The terms *Anglo* and *White* will be used interchangeably as well. In our tabulations, the relatively small proportions of Blacks who are also Latino are grouped with Latinos. Thus, Blacks or African Americans do not overlap with Latinos in the tabulations. Finally, the group *Asian* and other races are also exclusive of Latinos.

Given the rapidly changing ethnic complexion of the United States, it is now essential to deepen our understanding of the increasingly prominent and diverse Latino population of the United States. The marked increase in Latino children will have a dramatic impact on the configuration of education in the decades ahead.

LATINO POPULATION GROWTH

Population counts from the 2000 Census indicate that the Latino population grew by more than 57% since 1990 (compared to a 13% increase for the total population) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001). Moreover, the Latino population has continued to grow very rapidly since the 2000 Census; for instance, the Latino population grew 9.8% between 2000 and 2002, whereas the rate of growth of the population as a whole was 2.5%. The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that there were 38.8 million Latinos in the United States on July 1, 2002. Latino growth accounted for half the total population growth between 2000 and 2002. As had been true since 1980, about half of the Latino growth was because of international migration and the other half was because of natural increases (see Bernstein & Bergman, 2003, and U.S. Census Bureau, 1991). In 2000, about 40% of all U.S. Latinos were foreign-born immigrants (according to an analysis of 2000 U.S. Census Bureau Summary File 4 data [U.S. Census Bureau, 2001]). By all projections, the Latino population will continue to grow at a much faster rate than the U.S. population well into the next century.

TABLE 1A
States with More Than a 100% Increase of Latino Population,
1990 to 2000

	<i>1990 Latino Pop.</i>	<i>2000 Latino Pop.</i>	<i>% Increase</i>
North Carolina	76,745	378,963	394
Arkansas	19,876	86,866	337
Georgia	108,933	435,227	300
Tennessee	32,742	123,838	278
Nevada	124,408	393,970	217
South Carolina	30,500	95,076	212
Alabama	24,629	75,830	208
Kentucky	22,005	59,939	172
Minnesota	53,888	143,382	166
Nebraska	36,969	94,425	155
Iowa	32,643	82,473	153
Mississippi	15,998	39,569	147
Oregon	112,708	275,314	144
Utah	84,597	201,559	138
Delaware	15,824	37,277	136
Indiana	98,789	214,536	117
Oklahoma	86,162	179,304	108
South Dakota	5,252	10,903	108
Wisconsin	93,232	192,921	107
Washington	214,568	441,509	106
Virginia	160,403	329,540	105
Kansas	93,671	188,252	101

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau (2003).

NOTE: Latino Pop. = Latino population.

The 2000 Census also confirmed a new and striking aspect of Latino population growth: a noticeable number of Latinos in areas that previously had relatively few Latinos. For example, the Latino population of North Carolina grew by almost 400% between 1990 and 2000. Similarly, the growth rate in Georgia was 300% (see Table 1a). Note that the 2000 Latino population of Georgia is greater than the 1990 Latino population of Colorado (see Table 1b). Despite the trend toward geographic dispersion, a large part of the Latino population is concentrated in just a few states (see Table 1b). One state, California, has about one third of the nation's Latinos. Together, California and Texas are home to half of the national Latino population.

Another indication of the fact that Latinos are becoming dispersed throughout the United States is that they are living in a larger number of metropolitan areas than they had previously. In 1990, the following 16 metropolitan areas were home to more than two thirds of all U.S. Latinos: Los Angeles/Anaheim/Riverside; New York/New Jersey; Miami/Ft. Lauderdale;

TABLE 1B
States With the Largest Latino Population in 1980, 1990, and 2000,
also Cumulative Percentage and Percentage Increase, 1980 to 2000

	1980	1990	2000	<i>% of Total U.S. Latino Pop.</i>	<i>Cumulative % of Total U.S. Latino Pop.</i>
U.S. Total	14,609	22,379	35,306	100	100
California	4,544	7,704	10,967	31	31
Texas	2,986	4,340	6,670	19	50
New York	1,659	2,214	2,868	8	58
Florida	858	1,574	2,683	8	66
Illinois	636	904	1,530	4	70
Arizona	447	688	1,296	4	74
New Jersey	485	748	1,117	3	77
New Mexico	482	579	765	2	79
Colorado	341	424	736	2	81

SOURCE: Gibson & Jung (2002); U.S. Census Bureau (1991, 2001).

NOTE: Population figures in thousands; Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number; Latino Pop = Latino population.

San Francisco/Oakland/San Jose; Chicago/Gary; Houston/Galveston; San Antonio; Dallas/Fort Worth; San Diego; El Paso, TX; Phoenix; McAllen/Edinburg/Mission, TX; Fresno, CA; Denver/Boulder; Philadelphia/Wilmington/Trenton; and Washington, D.C. (Chapa & Valencia, 1993). In 2000, two thirds of the total national Latino population was located in 39 metropolitan areas (Table 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF LATINOS AND OF LATINO SUBGROUPS

Latinos, like the group called Asian, is an aggregation of several distinct national origin subgroups: Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central American, South American, and other Latinos. The Mexican-origin population is by far the largest, comprising 58% of the total Latino population in 2000. The big change in this distribution was the increase in the other Latinos, besides those of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban origins, from 22.8% of all Latinos in 1990 to 28.4% in 2000 (see Table 3). (Note that all statistics used in this article refer to the population of the 50 states. All statistical references to Puerto Ricans are limited to those residing within the 50 states.)

TABLE 2
**Total Latino Population, Percentage of Latino and Cumulative Percentage of
 Total U.S. Latino Population for Metropolitan Areas With Population Greater Than 1 Million**

	Total Population	Total Latino Population	% Latino	Cumulative % U.S. Total Latino
Los Angeles/Riverside/Orange County, CA CMSA	16,373,645	6,598,488	40.3	18.7
New York, NY/NJ/CT/PA CMSA	9,314,235	2,339,836	25.1	25.3
Miami/Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	3,876,380	1,563,389	40.3	29.7
Chicago/Gary/Kenosha, IL/IN/WI CMSA	9,157,540	1,498,507	16.4	34.0
San Francisco/Oakland/San Jose, CA CMSA	7,039,362	1,383,661	19.7	37.9
Houston/Galveston/Brazoria, TX CMSA	4,669,571	1,348,588	28.9	41.7
Dallas/Fort Worth, TX CMSA	5,221,801	1,120,350	21.5	44.0
Phoenix/Mesa, AZ MSA	3,251,876	817,012	25.1	47.2
San Antonio, TX MSA	1,592,383	816,037	51.2	49.5
San Diego, CA MSA	2,813,833	750,965	26.7	51.7
Washington/Baltimore, DC/MD/VA/WV CMSA	7,608,070	484,902	6.4	53.0
Denver/Boulder/Greeley, CO CMSA	2,581,506	476,627	18.5	54.4
Boston/Worcester/Lawrence, MA/NH/ME/CT CMSA	5,819,100	358,231	6.2	55.4
Philadelphia/Williamstown/Atlantic City, PA/NJ/DE/MD CMSA	6,188,463	348,135	5.6	56.4
Austin/San Marcos, TX MSA	1,249,763	327,760	26.2	57.3
Las Vegas, NV/AZ MSA	1,563,282	322,038	20.6	58.2
Sacramento/Yolo, CA CMSA	1,796,857	278,182	15.5	59.0
Orlando, FL MSA	1,644,561	271,627	16.5	59.8
Atlanta, GA MSA	4,112,198	268,851	6.5	60.5
Tampa/St. Petersburg/Clearwater, FL MSA	2,395,997	248,642	10.4	61.2
Portland/Salem, OR/WA CMSA	2,265,223	196,638	8.7	61.8
Seattle/Tacoma/Bremerton, WA CMSA	3,554,760	184,297	5.2	62.3
Detroit/Ann Arbor/Flint, MI CMSA	5,456,428	155,903	2.9	62.8
Salt Lake City/Ogden, UT MSA	1,333,914	144,600	10.8	63.2

West Palm Beach/Boca Raton, FL MSA	1,131,184	140,675	12.4	63.6
Hartford, CT MSA	1,183,110	113,540	9.6	63.9
Milwaukee/Racine, WI CMSA	1,689,572	109,501	6.5	64.2
Minneapolis/St. Paul, MN/WI MSA	2,968,806	99,121	3.3	64.5
Providence/Fall River/Warwick, RI/MA MSA	1,188,613	93,868	7.9	64.7
Kansas City, MO/KS MSA	1,776,062	92,910	5.2	65.0
Cleveland/Akron, OH CMSA	2,945,831	80,736	2.7	65.2
Charlotte/Gastonia/Rock Hill, NC/SC MSA	1,499,293	77,092	5.1	65.5
Oklahoma City, OK MSA	1,083,346	72,998	6.7	65.7
Raleigh/Durham/Chapel Hill, NC MSA	1,187,941	72,580	6.1	65.9
Grand Rapids/Muskegon/Holland, MI MSA	1,088,514	68,916	6.3	66.1
Greensboro/Winston-Salem/High Point, NC MSA	1,251,509	62,210	5.0	66.2
New Orleans, LA MSA	1,337,726	58,545	4.4	66.4
Norfolk/Virginia Beach/Newport News, VA/NC MSA	1,569,541	48,963	3.1	66.5
Rochester, NY MSA	1,098,201	47,559	4.3	66.7
Indianapolis, IN MSA	1,607,486	42,994	2.7	66.8
Jacksonville, FL MSA	1,100,491	42,122	3.8	66.9
Nashville, TN MSA	1,231,311	40,139	3.3	67.0
St. Louis, MO/IL MSA	2,603,607	39,677	1.5	67.1
Buffalo/Niagara Falls, NY MSA	1,170,111	33,967	2.9	67.2
Columbus, OH MSA	1,540,157	28,115	1.8	67.3
Memphis, TN/AR/MS MSA	1,135,614	27,520	2.4	67.4
Cincinnati/Hamilton, OH/KY/IN CMSA	1,979,202	22,488	1.1	67.5
Pittsburgh, PA MSA	2,358,695	17,100	0.7	67.5
Louisville, KY/IN MSA	1,025,598	16,479	1.6	67.6

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau (1991).

NOTE: CMSA = consolidated metropolitan statistical area; MSA = metropolitan statistical area.

TABLE 3
Distribution of the Latino Population by Origin, 1990 and 2000

	<i>1990 (%)</i>	<i>2000 (%)</i>
All Latino origins	100	100
Mexican origin	60.4	58.5
Puerto Rican	12.2	9.6
Cuban origin	4.7	3.5
Other Latino	22.8	28.4
Latinos as a percent of total U.S. population	9.0	12.5

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau (1991, 2001).

LATINOS' YOUTHFUL AGE DISTRIBUTION

Latinos are a young population. More than one third are under age 18, as compared to about one quarter of the non-Latinos. They have much younger age distributions (median age of 26 years) compared to non-Latinos (median age of almost 36 years), a difference of nearly 10 years. There are also discernible differences in the median age and thus in the age distribution among Latino subgroups. For example, the median age of Mexican-origin Latinos is 24 years, and for Cuban-origin Latinos it is almost 41 years, a difference of 17 years.

The concentration of Latinos in the younger ages further emphasizes the previous discussion of the growing concentration of Latinos. The median age indicates that there are more Latinos among the younger age groups than is true of other groups. Moreover, many Latino adults are also relatively young and have relatively more child-bearing years ahead of them as compared to groups with older median ages. Combining their relative youth with the fact that Latino fertility has decreased but is still high when compared to most other groups in the United States, Latinos are assured of becoming an even greater part of the young school-age population in the near future (see Table 4). The rapid growth of Latinos in the younger age groups demonstrates that we must all pay more attention to issues, problems, and policies that pertain to Latino youth.

Recent data and reports on Latino population projections tell us that Latinos will continue to grow at very high rates and will continue to compose larger and larger portions of the preschool, school-age, college-age, and general populations. Latinos are becoming a major population group in several states and in many cities. Before discussing these demographic realities vis-à-vis educational issues, we turn to an overview of sociodemographic characteristics of Latinos.

TABLE 4
Percentage of Population Under 18 and 18 Years and Over
for Latinos by Type and for Non-Latinos, March 2002

	<i>Under 18 Years Old (%)</i>	<i>18-64 Years Old (%)</i>	<i>65 Years Old and Older (%)</i>
Total	25.7	62.3	12.0
Hispanic	34.4	60.5	5.1
Non-Hispanic, White	22.8	62.8	14.4
Non-Hispanic, Other	30.8	61.4	7.8
Mexican	37.1	58.9	4.0
Puerto Rican	30.6	62.8	6.6
Cuban	19.6	57.8	22.6
Central and South American	28.1	67.7	4.2
Other Hispanic	33.7	60.0	6.3
Non-Hispanic	24.4	62.6	13.0

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau (2003).

SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF LATINOS

One of the strongest indicators of social mobility is educational attainment. Table 5 illustrates that, unfortunately Latinos, and in particular Mexicans, have the lowest educational attainment in comparison to all groups. For example, 43% of all Latinos and 49% of Mexicans, specifically, have less than a high school diploma. Among all the Hispanic subgroups, Cubans had the highest high school completion rates, with 34.8%, and Mexicans the lowest, with 26.7%. In fact, Cubans had high school completion rates that were slightly higher than the 33% of Anglos. Without exception, among all Hispanics, Mexicans have the lowest rates of educational attainment for all levels of education.

The decline of the traditional family, consisting of a father, mother, and a child (or children), continues. In 1990, 79.9% of non-Latinos were married couples with children. In 2000, the percentage decreased to 77.4%, a drop of 2.5%. This trend was reflected in the Latino population as well. Overall, the percentage of married Latino families with children decreased 2.2%. Among Mexicans the percentage of married couples with families decreased by 2.3%. However, Puerto Ricans had the largest decrease of 5% and were followed by Cubans with a decrease of 2.5% among Latinos (see Table 6).

Of particular note, the percentage of single, male-headed households increased for all the groups from 1990 to 2002. The overall percentage of female heads of households has historically been large and in double digits;

TABLE 5
**Distribution of Educational Attainment of Hispanics, Non-Hispanic Whites,
 and Non-Hispanic Others and of Latinos by National Origin Groups, 2002**

	Total	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Other	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central and South American	Other Hispanic	Non-Hispanic
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Less than high school diploma	15.9	43.0	11.3	18.6	49.4	33.2	29.2	35.3	26.0	12.6
High school graduate	32.1	27.9	33.0	30.9	26.7	29.5	34.8	28.9	29.9	32.6
Some college or associate degree	25.3	18.0	26.3	25.5	16.4	23.2	17.4	18.5	24.4	26.2
Bachelor's degree	17.7	8.1	19.3	16.9	5.6	10.4	12.4	12.5	14.0	18.9
Advanced degree	9.0	3.0	10.1	8.2	1.9	3.6	6.2	4.8	5.7	9.7

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau (2003).

TABLE 6
Distribution of Family Type for Non-Latinos, Latinos, and Latino Subgroups, 1990 and 2002

<i>Family Type</i>	<i>Non-Latino (%)</i>		<i>Latino (%)</i>		<i>Mexican (%)</i>		<i>Puerto Rican (%)</i>		<i>Cuban (%)</i>	
	1990	2002	1990	2002	1990	2002	1990	2002	1990	2002
Married couple families	79.9	77.4	70.0	67.8	72.5	70.2	57.2	52.2	77.4	74.9
Male householder	4.2	5.5	6.8	9.6	8.0	10.0	4.0	9.5	3.7	7.9
Female householder	16.0	17.1	23.0	22.6	19.6	19.8	38.9	38.3	18.9	17.3

SOURCE: Chapa & Valencia (1993); U.S. Census Bureau (2003).

NOTE: Some totals do not total 100% because the estimated percentages were each rounded to the nearest tenth of a percentage point independently of the other estimates.

TABLE 7
Average Family Size of Non-Hispanics,
Hispanics, and Hispanic Subgroups, 1990 and 2002

<i>Group</i>	<i>1990</i>	<i>2002</i>
Non-Hispanics	3.1	3.1
All Hispanics	3.8	3.8
Mexican origin	4.1	4.0
Puerto Rican	3.3	3.4
Cuban origin	3.0	3.1
Central and South American	3.7	3.7
Other Hispanic	3.1	3.4

SOURCE: Chapa & Valencia (1993); U.S. Census Bureau (2003).

however, almost without exception, that characteristic is on the decline. The trend of increasing male heads of households is an interesting phenomenon. Although non-Latinos increased the least (1.3%), the subgroup that experienced the largest growth was Puerto Rican (5.5%).

In addition to family type, family size has an impact on socioeconomic characteristics. As discussed earlier, the growth of the Latino population is dramatic, and the average family size, illustrated in Table 7, shows that Mexicans continue to lead in the number of family members with an average size of four individuals. In comparison, non-Hispanic family size remained static, at 3.1 individuals. The slight reduction of Mexican family size indicates that other types of Latinos are increasing at a faster rate. It is difficult to discern if the other Latino subgroups are increasing faster because of increased migration or because of higher numbers of children. It is most probably a combination of both these effects.

Although Latinos are more than twice as likely as are non-Latinos to live in poverty, the percentage of Latinos living in poverty has decreased at a more dramatic rate than for non-Latinos (see Table 8). With the exception of Cubans, who increased slightly, the percentage of all Latinos living in poverty decreased by 4.8%. The variation between Latino subgroups was marked. Mexicans decreased by 5.6% and Puerto Ricans decreased even more, by 6.9%, in comparison to non-Latinos, who decreased by only 1.4%. Although the percentage of Cubans living in poverty increased slightly, the percentage of Cuban children living in poverty decreased by 3.6%. This is only slightly less than the non-Latino decrease of 3.7%. The intragroup variation among Latinos was distinctive. Overall, the number of Latino children living in poverty decreased by 8.2%. The number of Mexican children decreased slightly less, by 7.8%. However, the number of Puerto Rican children decreased by a dramatic 15.1%.

TABLE 8
Poverty Characteristics of Non-Hispanics, Hispanics, and Hispanic Subgroups, 1990 and 2002

	<i>Non-Latino</i>		<i>Latino</i>		<i>Mexican</i>		<i>Puerto Rican</i>		<i>Cuban</i>	
	1990	2002	1990	2002	1990	2002	1990	2002	1990	2002
% of all persons below poverty level	11.6	10.2	26.2	21.4	28.4	22.8	33.0	26.1	15	16.5
% of children under 18 below poverty level	17.5	13.8	36.2	28.0	37.1	29.3	48.4	33.3	23.8	20.2

SOURCE: Chapa & Valencia (1993); U.S. Census Bureau (2003).

Although Latinos are still twice as likely to work in service occupations in comparison to non-Latino Anglos, more Latinos are now working in the technical, sales, and administrative support sectors (see Table 9). The intragroup variation is marked in service occupations, with Cubans occupying fewer of these positions and Central and South Americans occupying the most of any subgroup. One possible rationale is that the latter group is immigrating to the United States in larger numbers and has fewer language skills and lower levels of education. This is also evident in the technical, sales, and administrative support sectors, which presumably require more skills than the service occupations. Central and South Americans occupy this niche at the lowest rate of any group. On the other hand, Cubans occupy this niche at the highest level of all the job categories reported. Hispanics are also twice as likely to work as operators, fabricators, laborers, farming, forestry, and in fishing than are non-Latino Anglos; Mexicans are the subgroup that leads all the others in these occupations.

Table 10 illustrates that 78% of Latinos over the age of 5 speak Spanish, with Cubans having the highest intragroup rate of 85.8%. In addition, more than 30% of these individuals speak English not well or not at all. Limited English proficiency (LEP) has great implications for educational policy. Among school-age Latinos, only 15% do not speak English well or at all, and it is this small percentage that is the focus of bilingual education. The social capital of being a bilingual Spanish speaker has not been appreciated, nor has it been taken advantage of by the U.S. educational system. The majority of public schools do not even teach a second language until middle school (grades 7-9).

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The rapid growth of the Latino population has serious implications for educational policies and for the economic growth of the United States. Recently, Latinos were dubbed the majority minority because their numbers have out-paced the number of African Americans in the country. As discussed earlier, the educational attainment of the growing numbers of Latino school-age children continues to lag behind that of non-Latino Anglos. More than 70% of Latinos have a high school education or less, and of those, the majority has less than a high school diploma. Although the percentage of Latinos in higher education has increased, they are still less than 10% of total enrollments in 2-year, 4-year, and graduate institutions (see Table 11). The numbers of Latinos participating in higher education has been creeping up

TABLE 9
**Occupational Distribution of Hispanics, Non-Hispanic Whites and
 Non-Hispanic Others, and Latinos by National Origin Groups, 2002**

	Total	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Other	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Central and South American	Other Hispanic	Non-Hispanic
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Managerial and professional Technical, sales, and administrative support	31.4	14.2	35.1	27.7	11.9	19.5	23.0	14.7	24.3	33.7
Service occupations	28.6	23.6	29.6	28.1	21.9	32.6	33.5	21.6	29.7	29.3
Precision production, craft, and repair Operators, fabricators, and laborers	14.2	22.1	11.6	20.4	21.3	22.1	17.9	27.3	19.1	13.2
Farming, forestry, and fishing	10.6	14.7	10.7	7.3	16.2	10.2	12.1	13.0	11.3	10.1
	12.8	20.8	10.9	15.6	22.7	14.7	13.1	20.9	13.7	11.7
	2.3	4.6	2.2	1.0	6.0	0.9	0.5	2.5	2.0	2.0

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau (2003).

TABLE 10
 Age by Language Spoken at Home and by
 Ability to Speak English for the Population 5 Years and Older

	Total Pop. United States	Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban
Total: Ages 5 and older	262,375,152	31,569,576	18,513,696	3,091,161	1,189,479
Speak only English	215,423,557	6,764,744	3,923,681	761,550	162,947
Speak Spanish	28,101,052	24,636,215	14,539,577	2,315,342	1,020,786
% who speak Spanish	10.7	78.0	78.5	74.9	85.8
Distribution of English ability among Spanish speakers (%)	100	100	100	100	100
Speak English very well (%)	51.1	48.2	45.3	64.6	46.7
Speak English well (%)	20.7	21.6	21.4	20.6	18.1
Speak English not well (%)	18.3	19.0	20.3	11.4	20.1
Speak English not at all (%)	10.0	11.2	13.1	3.4	15.1
5 to 17 years old	53,096,003	8,595,305	5,362,504	832,795	167,766
Speak only English	43,316,237	2,590,250	1,514,525	330,022	47,895
Speak Spanish (%)	12.9	69.5	71.5	59.9	71.0
Distribution of English ability among Spanish speakers (%)	100	100	100	100	100
Speak English very well (%)	62.2	61.6	58.1	70.5	74.1
Speak English well (%)	22.6	23.5	25.2	19.1	16.0
Speak English not well (%)	12.2	11.6	12.6	9.2	7.7
Speak English not at all (%)	3.0	3.4	4.1	1.1	2.2

SOURCE: U.S. Census Bureau (2001).
 NOTE: Total Pop. = total population.

TABLE 11
Total Fall Enrollment by Level and by Race, 1990 and 2000

	1990 Number	1990 %	2000 Number	2000 %	Change, 1999-2000
All Students					
Total	13,818.6	100	15,312.3	100	10.8
Non-Hispanic White	10,722.5	77.6	10,462.1	68.3	-2.4
Total minority	2,704.7	19.6	4,321.5	28.2	59.8
Non-Hispanic Black	1,247.0	9.0	1,730.3	11.3	38.8
Hispanic	782.4	5.7	1,461.8	9.5	86.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	572.4	4.1	978.2	6.4	70.9
American Indian, Alaskan native	102.8	0.7	151.2	1.0	47.1
Nonresident alien	391.5	2.8	528.7	3.5	35.1
2-year					
Total	5,240.1	100	5,948.4	100	13.5
Non-Hispanic White	3,954.3	75.5	3,804.1	64.0	-3.8
Total minority	1,218.6	23.3	2,055.4	34.6	68.7
Non-Hispanic Black	524.3	10.0	734.9	12.4	40.2
Hispanic	424.2	8.1	843.9	14.2	98.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	215.2	4.1	401.9	6.8	86.7
American Indian, Alaskan Native	54.9	1.0	74.7	1.3	36.0
Nonresident alien	67.1	1.3	89.0	1.5	32.6
4-year					
Total	8,578.6	100	9,363.9	100	9.2
Non-Hispanic White	6,768.1	78.9	6,658.0	71.1	-1.6
Total minority	1,486.1	17.3	2,266.1	24.2	52.5
Non-Hispanic Black	722.8	8.4	995.4	10.6	37.7
Hispanic	358.2	4.2	617.9	6.6	72.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	357.2	4.2	576.3	6.2	61.3
American Indian, Alaskan Native	47.9	0.6	76.5	0.8	59.8
Nonresident alien	324.3	3.8	439.7	4.7	35.6
Graduate					
Total	1,586.2	100	1,850.3	100	16.7
Non-Hispanic White	1,228.4	77.4	1,258.5	68.0	2.5
Total minority	190.5	12.0	359.4	19.4	88.7
Non-Hispanic Black	83.9	5.3	157.9	8.5	88.2
Hispanic	47.2	3.0	95.4	5.2	102.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	53.2	3.4	95.8	5.2	80.0
American Indian, Alaskan Native	6.2	0.4	10.3	0.6	66.5
Nonresident alien	167.3	10.5	232.3	12.6	38.8

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education (2002) Tables 207 and 208.

NOTE: Calculated from U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall Enrollment surveys.

TABLE 12
Full-Time Minority Tenure-Track Faculty
in Degree-Granting Institutions, 1998

<i>Academic Rank</i>	<i>% African American</i>	<i>% Asian</i>	<i>% Latino</i>
Full professor	2.90	4.90	2.70
Associate professor	5.40	6.30	2.70
Assistant professor	7.40	8.00	3.60

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education (2002), Table 231.

slowly. For example, in 1990, Hispanics were at 3% of graduate-school enrollments. By 2000, this increased to 5.2%. However, the majority of Latinos still participate in higher education at 2-year institutions. Community colleges have the highest percentage of Latino enrollments, specifically 14.2%.

The low participation rates of Latinos in higher education has obviously had an impact on the number of Latinos in academia. Table 12 illustrates that Latinos were only 2.7% of the full and the associate professors and only 3.6% of assistant professors of tenure-track faculty in degree-granting institutions in 1988. However, despite low educational participation, there was an availability of underrepresented minorities for faculty positions as assistant professors in law schools of 22.1%. Table 13 further indicates that there was an availability of minority faculty in foreign language and in literature of 18.9%, and in the field of education, the availability of minority faculty was 16.8%.

There is still a great disparity between Anglos and minorities in the number of individuals receiving doctorate degrees. Table 14 illustrates that, in 2000, Anglos received 22,911 doctorates. By comparison, Latinos received only 1,157; African Americans received 1,656; Asians received 1,407; and American Indians received 169 doctorates. Minority doctoral students combined represented 16% of the doctorates awarded in 2000.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite the rapid growth of the Latino population, it is clear that Latinos lag behind non-Latinos, as illustrated by the sociocharacteristics discussed here. The steady increase of this very youthful population makes it imperative that it receive an education that will provide it with the skills to make it a productive citizenry. Although there are some positive indications, such as the decrease of individuals and of children living in poverty and an increase

TABLE 13
Availability of Underrepresented Minorities for
Tenured and for Untenured Faculty Positions

	<i>Availability of Under- represented Minorities for Tenured Faculty Positions^a (%)</i>	<i>Availability of Under- represented Minorities for Faculty Positions as Assistant Professors^b (%)</i>
Life sciences		
Agricultural sciences	5.6	9.6
Biological sciences	4.3	6.7
Other life sciences	7.1	9.5
Total	4.7	7.3
Computer science, math, engineering		
Engineering	4.3	6.5
Computer science	2.8	6.1
Mathematics	3.7	4.9
Total	4.2	6.3
Physical sciences		
Chemistry	4.5	6.7
Geological	2.4	5.3
Physics	3.5	4.5
Other physical sciences	3.0	4.8
Total	3.9	6.0
Humanities		
Psychology	7.8	12.1
Social sciences	8.9	10.8
History	6.6	8.0
Letters	5.4	7.5
Foreign language and literature	18.3	18.9
Fine arts	4.5	6.4
Other humanities	6.1	8.1
Total	6.7	8.3
Education	12.6	16.8
Professional fields		
Business management	4.9	9.0
Communications	9.6	11.0
Law	8.8	22.1
Other professional fields	10.2	13.5
Total	7.8	10.2
Grand total	6.7	9.5

SOURCE: University of California Office of the President Data Management and Analysis (2003a, 2003b). Availabilities calculated with data from the following: National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, U.S. Department of Education, National Endowment for the Humanities, U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Survey of Earned Doctorates; New appointments: Academic Advancement's new appointments database.

NOTE: Underrepresented minorities include American Indians, African Americans, and Chicanos or Latinos;

a. 1981 to 1995 National Science Foundation national doctoral degree recipients.

b. 1996 to 2000 National Science Foundation national doctoral degree recipients.

TABLE 14
Number of U.S. Citizen Doctorate Recipients by Race, 2000

<i>Race</i>	<i>Number</i>
Asian	1,407
Black	1,656
Hispanic	1,157
Native American	169
White	22,911
Total	27,300

SOURCE: Hoffer et al., (2001), Table 9.

in the number of individuals working in the technical, sales, and administrative support sector, the increases have been small. Latinos continue to have low enrollments in higher education and even lower graduation rates. Moreover, although the number of students that have LEP has decreased, there is still a need to provide bilingual education to those who require it. No country can ignore a large potential workforce, and with the shift from a manufacturing to a technology-based economy, it is vital that every segment of society be educated to its full potential.

REFERENCES

- Bernstein, R., & Bergman, M. (2003). *Young, diverse, urban: Hispanic population reaches all-time high of 38.8 million, new census bureau estimates show*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, Census Bureau Public Information Office's Web site. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/2003/cb03-100.html>
- Chapa, J., & Valencia, R. (1993). Latino population growth, demographic characteristics, and educational stagnation: An examination of recent trends. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Studies*, 15(2), 165-187.
- Gibson, C., & Jung, K. (2002, September). *Historical Census statistics on population totals by race, 1790 to 1990, and by Hispanic origin, 1970 to 1990, for the United States, regions, divisions, and states* (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, working paper series No. 56). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0056.html>
- Hayes-Bautista, D., & Chapa, J. (1987). Latino terminology: Conceptual basis for standardized terminology. *Journal of the American Public Health Association*, 77(1), 61-68.
- Hoffer, T., Dugoni, B., Sanderson, A., Sederstrom, S., Ghadialy, R., & Rocque, P. (2001). *Doctorate recipients from United States universities: Summary report 2000*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.norc.uchicago.edu/issues/docdata.htm>
- University of California Office of the President Data Management and Analysis. (2003a). *UC tenured faculty, October 2002 & academic availabilities (1982 to 1996 selected national*

- doctoral degree recipients) universitywide*. Retrieved October 31, 2003, from <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/datamgmt/avails-minorities-ten.pdf>
- University of California Office of the President Data Management and Analysis. (2003b). *UC non-tenured faculty, October 2002 & academic availabilities (1982 to 1996 selected national doctoral degree recipients) universitywide*. Retrieved October 31, 2003, from <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/datamgmt/avails-minorities-non-t.pdf>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (1991). *1990 Census: Summary File 1*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen1990.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2001). *2000 Census: Summary File 4*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2003). *American factfinder*. Available online at <http://factfinder.census.gov/>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2003). *Current population survey (March 2002)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, Ethnic and Hispanic Statistics Branch.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *Digest of Educational Statistics, 2001*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/digest2001/>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2003). *Digest of Educational Statistics, 2002*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2003/digest02/>

Jorge Chapa, Ph.D., is a professor and founding director of Latino studies at Indiana University, Bloomington. From 1988 through 1999, Chapa was a faculty member of the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas, Austin. His education includes a B.A. with honors from the University of Chicago and a M.A. and Ph.D. in sociology and a separate M.A. in demography from the University of California, Berkeley. He has many publications reflecting his research focus on the low rates of Latino educational, occupational, and economic mobility, and on the development of policies to improve these trends. His multiauthored book, Apple Pie and Enchiladas: Latino Newcomers in the Rural Midwest, is scheduled for publication in 2004 by the University of Texas Press. He is planning future research on maximizing minority higher-education participation.

Belinda De La Rosa, Ph.D., is currently special assistant to the vice president for student development and diversity at Indiana University. Her work centers on minority student retention and development, as well as faculty and staff retention. She is the founding chair of the Latino Faculty and Staff Council at Indiana University. Her prior positions include evaluation consultant for Michigan State University, research associate for the Tomás Rivera Policy Institute, and administrative analyst for the University of California, University-wide Task Force on AIDS. De La Rosa received her bachelor's in Chicano studies and her masters in public health from the University of California, Berkeley. Her doctorate is in higher education leadership from the University of Texas at Austin.