



City University of New York (CUNY)
CUNY Academic Works

Center for Latin American, Caribbean, and
Latino Studies

Centers & Institutes

2013

The Mexican-Origin Population in Metropolitan Statistical Areas Across the United States, 1990-2010

Haiwen Chu

Center for Latin American, Caribbean, and Latino Studies

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/clacsl_pubs/44

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu



CLACLS

Center for Latin American, Caribbean & Latino Studies

The Mexican–Origin Population in Metropolitan Statistical Areas

Across the United States,

1990–2010

Haiwen Chu

Ph.D. Urban Education

Center for Latin American,
Caribbean & Latino Studies

Graduate Center
City University of New York
365 Fifth Avenue
Room 5419
New York, New York 10016

212–817–8438

clacls@gc.cuny.edu

<http://web.gc.cuny.edu/lastudies>



The Center for Latin American, Caribbean and Latino Studies is a research institute that works for the advancement of the study of Latin America, the Caribbean, and Latinos in the United States in the doctoral programs at the CUNY Graduate Center. One of its major priorities is to provide funding and research opportunities to Latino students at the Ph.D. level.

The Center established and helps administer an interdisciplinary specialization in Latin American, Caribbean and Latino Studies in the Masters of Arts in Liberal Studies program.

The Latino Data Project was developed with the goal of making information available on the dynamically growing Latino population of the United States and especially New York City through the analysis of extant data available from a variety of sources such as the U.S. Census Bureau, the National Institute for Health, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and state and local-level data sources.

All Latino Data Project reports are available at <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/lastudies/>

For additional information you may contact the Center at 212-817-8438 or by e-mail at clacls@gc.cuny.edu.

Staff:

Laird W. Bergad, Distinguished Professor, Latin American and Puerto Rican Studies, Lehman College, Ph.D. Program in History, Executive Director, CLACLS

Teresita Levy, Assistant Professor, Department of Latin American, Latino and Puerto Rican Studies, Lehman College, Associate Director

Laura Limonic, Administrative Director and Director of Quantitative Research

Victoria Stone-Cadena, Director of Outreach and Special Projects

Lawrence Cappello, Research Associate

Justine Calcagno, Quantitative Research Associate

Mila Burns, Website Developer

Copyright @ 2013
Center for Latin American, Caribbean and Latino Studies
Room 5419
Graduate Center
City University of New York
365 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10016
212-817-8438
clacls@gc.cuny.edu
<http://web.gc.cuny.edu/lastudies>

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

This brief documents changes in the Mexican American population in metropolitan areas across the United States from 1990 to 2010. We report changes in the top 10 Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) in terms of total Mexican population, concentration of Mexican as a percentage of total population and as a percentage of the Latino population, and the rate of growth in the ten-year period from 1990 to 2010.

The bulk of this report, however, focuses on six MSAs. One of these is New York City, which although ranked 12th in 2010 in terms of total Mexican population, has one of the highest growth rates and highest projections for continued growth. Atlanta is also included as having a rapid growth rate in terms of its Mexican population. Four other MSAs with the largest Mexican populations in 2010—Los Angeles, Riverside, Chicago, and Houston—are also included. We compare demographic, economic, linguistic, educational attainment, and political characteristics of Mexican populations across these MSAs drawing upon data from the 2010 Decennial Census.

Trends in Mexican Population on Concentration, 1990-2010

There are two ways to measure the concentration of Mexican population. The first is the percentage of the total population of an area that is Mexican. A second measure is the Mexican population as a percentage of the total Latino population. A third quantity, which is the percentage that Latinos represent compared to the total population can also be derived from these two percentages.

Concentration at the State Level

Two levels of geographical detail provide two different portraits of the Mexican population. First, at the state level, the top ten states in 2010 in terms of concentration of Mexican population compared to the total population has been relatively stable (see Table 1). The national percentage of the population that is Mexican has nearly doubled in the period from 1990 to 2010, increasing from 5.6% of the total population in 1990 to 11.0% in 2010. This factor of increase was greatly exceeded by Nevada nearly tripled in Mexican concentration from 7.2% of the total population in 1990 to 21.4% in 2010. In four other states among the top ten, the concentration of Mexicans more than doubled: Illinois (5.5% to 13.1%), Utah (3.8% to 10.7%), Oregon (3.2% to 10.5%), and Idaho (4.3% to 10.2%).

One way to view this concentration is to compare the national percentage, as a mean, to the state-level percentages. By this measure, seven states in each of the years 1990, 2000, and 2010 had concentrations of Mexican population above the mean. Overall the distribution of Mexican concentration by state has moved to the right; on average the share of the population represented by Mexicans has increased across the fifty states.

Table 1
 Mexicans as Percentage of Total Population

| | 1990 | | 2000 | | 2010 | |
|------------|------|------------|------|------------|------|------------|
| | Rank | Percentage | Rank | Percentage | Rank | Percentage |
| Texas | 1 | 23.6% | 1 | 27.9% | 1 | 34.1% |
| California | 3 | 21.0% | 2 | 27.3% | 2 | 32.4% |
| New Mexico | 2 | 22.5% | 4 | 22.1% | 3 | 29.7% |
| Arizona | 4 | 17.6% | 3 | 22.9% | 4 | 27.6% |
| Nevada | 6 | 7.2% | 5 | 15.8% | 5 | 21.4% |
| Colorado | 5 | 8.8% | 6 | 12.1% | 6 | 16.6% |
| Illinois | 7 | 5.5% | 7 | 9.9% | 7 | 13.1% |
| Utah | 10 | 3.8% | 9 | 6.9% | 8 | 10.7% |
| Oregon | 12 | 3.2% | 8 | 7.0% | 9 | 10.5% |
| Idaho | 8 | 4.3% | 10 | 6.9% | 10 | 10.2% |
| Wyoming | 9 | 4.3% | | | | |
| National | | 5.6% | | 8.2% | | 11.0% |

A second measure is the Mexican population relative to the Latino population. Many states have concentrations of Mexicans as a percentage of the total Latino population above the national average (see Table 2). These national averages have increased slowly from 1990 to 2010, with Mexicans accounting for nearly two-thirds (64.9%) of all Latinos in 2010.

Table 2
Mexicans as Percentage of Latino Population

| | 1990 | | 2000 | | 2010 | |
|--------------|------|------------|------|------------|------|------------|
| | Rank | Percentage | Rank | Percentage | Rank | Percentage |
| Arizona | 1 | 91.3% | 1 | 88.5% | 1 | 90.8% |
| Texas | 2 | 91.3% | 2 | 85.7% | 2 | 88.7% |
| Idaho | 5 | 82.2% | 3 | 84.2% | 3 | 87.7% |
| Oregon | 9 | 75.9% | 6 | 82.4% | 4 | 85.7% |
| Kansas | 4 | 82.8% | 4 | 82.6% | 5 | 84.7% |
| Oklahoma | 8 | 75.9% | 7 | 79.0% | 6 | 84.4% |
| California | 6 | 80.4% | 5 | 82.4% | 7 | 84.2% |
| Nebraska | 3 | 83.3% | 11 | 77.8% | 8 | 83.0% |
| Washington | 12 | 75.2% | 8 | 78.3% | 9 | 82.3% |
| Illinois | 15 | 70.0% | 10 | 77.9% | 10 | 80.2% |
| Iowa | 10 | 75.9% | 9 | 78.0% | | |
| South Dakota | 7 | 76.4% | | | | |
| National | | 61.1% | | 62.6% | | 64.9% |

The distribution of the concentration of Mexicans as Latinos, however, places the national mean closer to the median of states. That is, in approximately half of states in each of the years 1990, 2000, and 2010, Mexicans are more concentrated than average. This distribution of the concentration appears to be relatively uniform below the mean but more normally distributed above the mean.

Concentration at the MSA Level

Table 3
 Mexicans as Percentage of Total Population by MSA

| | 1990 | | 2000 | | 2010 | |
|--------------------------------------|------|------------|------|------------|------|------------|
| | Rank | Percentage | Rank | Percentage | Rank | Percentage |
| Laredo, TX | | | 1 | 88.9% | 1 | 93.3% |
| McAllen–Edinburg–Pharr–Mission, TX | 1 | 83.7% | 2 | 84.3% | 2 | 89.6% |
| Brownsville–Harlingen–San Benito, TX | 2 | 79.6% | 3 | 79.5% | 3 | 86.5% |
| El Paso, TX | 3 | 68.1% | 4 | 74.2% | 4 | 79.9% |
| Las Cruces, NM | 4 | 52.4% | 5 | 54.5% | 5 | 63.0% |
| Visalia–Tulare–Porterville, CA | 8 | 37.5% | 7 | 48.7% | 6 | 60.1% |
| Yuma, AZ | 7 | 41.6% | 6 | 48.7% | 7 | 57.8% |
| Merced, CA | 12 | 29.6% | 9 | 43.1% | 8 | 53.9% |
| San Antonio, TX | 6 | 47.1% | 8 | 44.2% | 9 | 51.8% |
| Corpus Christi, TX | 5 | 50.0% | 12 | 38.0% | 10 | 49.9% |
| Fresno, CA | 9 | 33.4% | 10 | 41.7% | | |
| Odessa, TX | 10 | 30.5% | | | | |
| National | | 5.6% | | 8.2% | | 11.0% |

These two analyses of the concentration of Mexicans can be carried out at the level of the MSA. Table 3 displays the top 10 MSAs in 2010 in terms of concentration of Mexicans as a percentage of the total population and traces the concentration in these MSAs back through 1990 and 2000.

Of note is Laredo, TX which was over 90% Mexican in 2010 and also the most concentrated MSA. Laredo was not, however, large enough in 1990 to qualify as an MSA. The number of MSAs which are more than 50% Mexican has increased from four in 1990 to five in 2000 to nine in 2010. In 2010, among the top ten MSAs, four Texas MSAs had especially high concentrations of MSAs effectively above 80%. The other six MSAs in the top 10 were effectively majority Mexican.

Table 4
 Mexicans as Percentage of Latino Population by MSA

| | 1990 | | 2000 | | 2010 | |
|--------------------------------------|------|------------|------|------------|------|------------|
| | Rank | Percentage | Rank | Percentage | Rank | Percentage |
| McAllen–Edinburg–Pharr–Mission, TX | 1 | 97.6% | 2 | 95.0% | 1 | 98.3% |
| Yakima, WA | 14 | 92.7% | 3 | 94.7% | 2 | 97.8% |
| Visalia–Tulare–Porterville, CA | 6 | 95.3% | 4 | 94.2% | 3 | 97.7% |
| Brownsville–Harlingen–San Benito, TX | 4 | 96.1% | 8 | 92.9% | 4 | 97.5% |
| Merced, CA | 15 | 92.4% | 6 | 93.7% | 5 | 96.6% |
| El Paso, TX | 3 | 96.5% | 5 | 93.8% | 6 | 96.3% |
| Laredo, TX | | | 7 | 93.4% | 7 | 95.8% |
| Yuma, AZ | 2 | 96.6% | 1 | 95.2% | 8 | 95.6% |
| Odessa, TX | 5 | 95.8% | 16 | 90.7% | 9 | 95.5% |
| Rochester, MN | 181 | 33.0% | 96 | 74.0% | 10 | 95.3% |
| Richland–Kennewick–Pasco, WA | | | 9 | 92.6% | | |
| Fresno, CA | 7 | 94.6% | 10 | 92.5% | | |
| Corpus Christi, TX | 8 | 94.4% | | | | |
| Midland, TX | 9 | 94.3% | | | | |
| San Antonio, TX | 10 | 93.6% | | | | |
| National | | 61.1% | | 62.6% | | 64.9% |

In terms of the concentration of Mexicans among all Latinos at the MSA level, there have consistently been at least 10 MSAs which are above 90% Mexican (see Table 4). One MSA is notable for its growth from 1990 to 2010. Rochester, MN has nearly tripled the percentage of its Latino population which is Mexican, going from 33% in 1990 to over 95% in 2010. This rapid increase is also reflected in its relative ranking, making it the tenth most concentrated Mexican population among Latinos in 2010. The number of MSAs in which Mexicans were at least 90% of the Latino population was relatively stable from 1990 to 2000, with 19 and 18 such MSAs, respectively. By 2010, however, 33 MSAs had Mexicans accounting for at least 90% of their Latino population. If 80% is used as a cut-point for the concentration of Mexicans among the Latino population, then the number of MSAs which had at least this percentage increased from 59 in 1990 to 64 in 2000 and 92 in 2010.

Trends in Mexican Population Growth, 1990-2010

This section focuses on the growth of the Mexican population in different MSAs. The top three MSAs in terms of total Mexican population in 2010 were Los Angeles, Riverside, and Houston (see Table 5). While Los Angeles has long been MSA with the largest population, the rates of growth in Riverside and Houston were larger, with the Mexican population more than tripling in Riverside from 1990 to 2010, and nearly tripling in Houston. Chicago, which was ranked fifth in 1990, more than doubled its Mexican population to become the second-ranked MSA in 2000. Growth from 2000 to 2010 in Chicago's Mexican population slowed by comparison (34%). Similar patterns of rapid growth (more than doubling) between 1990 to 2000 and relatively slower growth (about 50%) in the 2000 to 2010 period occurred in Dallas and Phoenix. In most MSAs, the rate of growth between 2000 and 2010 was indeed lower than that from 1990 to 2000. In two MSAs, McAllen and El Paso, the rate of growth was about equal in these two periods. In San Antonio, the rate of growth of the Mexican population more than doubled from 23% between 1990 and 2000 to 49% between 2000 and 2010.

Table 5
 Mexican Population by MSA and Growth Rates, 1990–2010

| 1990 | | 2000 | | 2010 | | Percent Changes | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|------|
| Rank | Mexican Population | Rank | Mexican Population | Rank | Mexican Population | 1990 to 2000 | 2000 to 2010 | 1990 to 2010 | |
| Los Angeles–Long Beach, CA | 1 | 2,576,869 | 1 | 3,343,870 | 1 | 3,703,979 | 30% | 11% | 44% |
| Riverside–San Bernardino, CA | 2 | 606,025 | 3 | 1,093,886 | 2 | 1,823,619 | 81% | 67% | 201% |
| Houston–Brazoria, TX | 3 | 576,937 | 4 | 1,010,721 | 3 | 1,567,286 | 75% | 55% | 172% |
| Chicago–Gary–Lake, IL | 5 | 497,889 | 2 | 1,127,998 | 4 | 1,506,635 | 127% | 34% | 203% |
| Dallas–Fort Worth, TX | 9 | 318,704 | 6 | 700,734 | 5 | 1,054,018 | 120% | 50% | 231% |
| Phoenix, AZ | 10 | 318,070 | 8 | 684,720 | 6 | 1,044,339 | 115% | 53% | 228% |
| San Antonio, TX | 4 | 556,462 | 7 | 685,368 | 7 | 1,019,045 | 23% | 49% | 83% |
| San Diego, CA | 7 | 455,784 | 9 | 677,150 | 8 | 928,858 | 49% | 37% | 104% |
| Anaheim–Santa Ana–Garden Grove, CA | 6 | 481,195 | 5 | 774,600 | 9 | 913,870 | 61% | 18% | 90% |
| McAllen–Edinburg–Pharr–Mission, TX | 12 | 316,638 | 12 | 476,693 | 10 | 698,897 | 51% | 47% | 121% |
| El Paso, TX | 8 | 400,516 | 10 | 502,076 | 11 | 642,474 | 25% | 28% | 60% |

The general pattern of rapid growth between 1990 and 2000 followed by slower growth between 2000 and 2010 was also observed among the top five MSAs in terms of growth rates in those two time periods (see Table 6). From 1990 to 2000 many MSAs had their Mexican populations more than double, with the New York metropolitan Mexican population more than tripling and the Mexican population in Atlanta more than seventh-fold. The rates of growth within the Mexican population indicate that Atlanta, GA and the New York Metropolitan area, including Northeast New Jersey, are among the MSAs with the most rapid population growth in terms of Mexican population. While smaller by comparison, growth rates among the top five between 2000 to 2010 averaged between 5.5% and 6.7% annually. Over the twenty year period from 1990 to 2010, the top five MSAs in terms of growth rates more than tripled in Mexican population.

Table 6
Top 5 MSAs ranked by Percent Change in Number of Mexicans

| 1990 to 2000 | | 2000 to 2010 | | 1990 to 2010 | |
|------------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|
| | % Increase | | % Increase | | % Increase |
| Atlanta, GA | 639% | Atlanta, GA | 91% | Atlanta, GA | 1310% |
| New York– Northeast NJ | 218% | Las Vegas, NV | 88% | New York–Northeast NJ | 458% |
| San Jose, CA | 198% | Fort Worth–Arlington, TX | 78% | Fort Worth–Arlington, TX | 287% |
| Chicago–Gary–Lake, IL | 127% | New York–Northeast NJ | 76% | San Jose, CA | 251% |
| Dallas–Fort Worth, TX | 120% | Bakersfield, CA | 71% | Austin, TX | 237% |

The remainder of this report will focus on New York and Atlanta as two representatives of the MSAs which have rapidly growing Mexican populations. These two will be compared with the top four MSAs in terms of total Mexican population in 2010: Los Angeles, Riverside, Houston, and Chicago. This set of six MSAs also reflects regional diversity by including the Northeast, California, the Southeast, and the Midwest.

Profile of Characteristics of the Mexican Population in Six MSAs, 2010

This section consists of two kinds of comparisons. First, Mexicans are compared to non-Mexican Latinos in terms of variables especially pertinent to Latinos, including nativity, citizenship, and English proficiency. Second, Mexicans are compared to other racial/ethnic groups on other variables including age structure, household income, poverty, educational attainment, employment status, and health insurance. In these comparisons to non-Latino subgroups, Mexicans are first compared to each other based upon nativity before they are compared to other groups, including non-Mexican Latinos.


Nativity

Among the six focal MSAs, there are three types of concentration of Mexicans relative to other Latinos. In four MSAs, Mexicans greatly outnumber other Latinos to comprise at least 75% of the Latino population (see Table 7 and Figure 4). In Atlanta, while Mexicans are also a majority of Latinos, the total population is much smaller. In the New York City metropolitan area, non-Mexican Latinos outnumber Mexicans by more than a factor of six.

Table 7
Population by Nativity


| | Mexican | | | non-Mexican Latino | | |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------|-----------|
| | Domestic-Born | Foreign-Born | Total | Domestic-Born | Foreign-Born | Total |
| Atlanta | 134,871 | 188,586 | 323,457 | 101,138 | 133,010 | 234,148 |
| NYC area | 253,277 | 328,867 | 582,144 | 1,821,184 | 2,036,705 | 3,857,889 |
| Chicago | 893,938 | 693,382 | 1,587,320 | 236,740 | 158,088 | 394,828 |
| Houston | 1,046,060 | 603,216 | 1,649,276 | 170,012 | 267,299 | 437,311 |
| Los Angeles | 2,790,120 | 1,827,729 | 4,617,849 | 521,237 | 685,467 | 1,206,704 |
| Riverside | 1,221,257 | 602,362 | 1,823,619 | 133,381 | 103,336 | 236,717 |

Figure 1
Mexicans and non-Mexican Latino Population in thousands in Six MSAs, 2010



In four MSAs which have substantially larger Mexican populations among Latinos, more Mexicans are foreign-born than domestic-born (see Figure 2). Three MSAs with the largest Mexican populations overall of Los Angeles, Riverside, and Houston all have domestic-born populations that account for at least three-fifths of the Mexican population. This distribution reflects the more established nature of the Mexican population within these MSAs. By contrast, in the more rapidly growing MSAs of Atlanta and New York City, less than half of the Mexican population is domestic-born.

Figure 2
Domestic-Born and Foreign-Born Mexicans in Six MSAs, 2010



These trends can be compared to the nativity status of non-Mexican Latinos in these six MSAs (Figure 3). In terms of nativity, Non-Mexican Latinos are similar to Mexicans in Atlanta and New York City, with a majority being foreign-born. In Houston and Los Angeles, non-Mexican Latinos were much more likely to be foreign-born than Mexicans in the same MSA (see Figure 4). Meanwhile, in Chicago and Riverside, non-Mexican Latinos were more likely to be domestic-born than foreign-born. These differences suggest that the non-Mexican Latino population may have a different, more recent immigration history in Houston and Los Angeles, as reflected by lower domestic-born populations which are in line with the percentages of domestic-born Mexicans in Atlanta and New York City.

Figure 3





Figure 4

Percentage of Mexican and non-Mexican Latinos who are Domestic-Born in Six MSAs, 2010



Citizenship


In terms of naturalization rates of foreign-born Latinos, across all six MSAs Mexicans had a lower rate of naturalization than their non-Mexican Latino counterparts (see Table 8 and Figure 7). The gap appears to be narrower in MSAs where Mexicans are more established, such as Houston, Los Angeles, and Riverside, as compared with areas such as Atlanta and New York City where Mexicans are more rapidly growing but are not such large numerical majorities within the Latino population.

Table 8

Citizenship Status of Mexicans and non-Mexican Latinos by MSA

| | Mexicans | | | | | non-Mexican Latinos | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------|
| | Citizen | Born abroad of American parents | Naturalized citizen | Not a citizen | Total | Citizen | Born abroad of American parents | Naturalized citizen | Not a citizen | Total |
| Atlanta | 135,472 | 2,233 | 14,659 | 171,093 | 323,457 | 115,974 | 5,338 | 32,999 | 79,837 | 234,148 |
| NYC area | 254,389 | 5,107 | 35,330 | 287,318 | 582,144 | 2,156,930 | 50,082 | 690,120 | 960,757 | 3,857,889 |
| Chicago | 894,878 | 9,537 | 178,826 | 504,079 | 1,587,320 | 287,578 | 5,088 | 46,739 | 55,423 | 394,828 |
| Houston | 1,046,060 | 8,334 | 131,865 | 463,017 | 1,649,276 | 179,246 | 5,251 | 69,521 | 183,293 | 437,311 |
| Los Angeles | 2,790,625 | 22,145 | 548,438 | 1,256,641 | 4,617,849 | 531,963 | 9,914 | 274,095 | 390,732 | 1,206,704 |
| Riverside | 1,221,950 | 19,237 | 190,703 | 391,729 | 1,823,619 | 139,171 | 3,011 | 38,507 | 56,028 | 236,717 |

Figure 5
Naturalization Rates among Foreign-Born Latinos in Six MSAs, 2010




English Proficiency

The foreign-born Mexican population has generally lower rates of English language proficiency compared to their non-Mexican counterparts, but this gap is narrower in Houston, Riverside and Los Angeles than it is in Atlanta and New York City (see Table 9 and Figure 6).

Table 9
English Language Proficiency Among Foreign-born Latinos, 2010

| | Mexicans | | | | non-Mexican Latinos | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| | does not speak English | English not well | speaks English well or very well | speaks English | does not speak English | English not well | speaks English well or very well | speaks English |
| Atlanta | 18.9% | 31.5% | 46.4% | 2.8% | 9.6% | 18.2% | 60.7% | 10.4% |
| NYC area | 21.8% | 36.6% | 37.1% | 3.5% | 12.1% | 26.5% | 55.9% | 5.0% |
| Chicago | 15.1% | 32.8% | 49.1% | 2.4% | 7.6% | 17.9% | 63.1% | 11.2% |
| Houston | 17.9% | 31.3% | 46.2% | 3.9% | 18.2% | 25.6% | 49.4% | 5.8% |
| Los Angeles | 18.7% | 31.5% | 46.8% | 2.5% | 13.8% | 26.9% | 54.0% | 4.9% |
| Riverside | 16.8% | 26.9% | 51.7% | 4.0% | 11.1% | 22.7% | 58.2% | 7.2% |

Figure 6
Foreign-Born Population Speaking English Well or Very Well, 2010



Age Structure


The domestic-born Mexican population tends to be younger than their foreign-born counterparts (see Table 10 and Figure 7).

Table 10
Age Distribution by Nativity of Mexican Population

| | Domestic-born | | | | | Foreign-born | | | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 0-14 | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-59 | 60+ | 0-14 | 15-29 | 30-44 | 45-59 | 60+ |
| Atlanta | 96,367 | 24,214 | 8,502 | 4,173 | 1,615 | 16,467 | 66,753 | 77,113 | 24,260 | 3,993 |
| NYC area | 164,146 | 55,469 | 19,288 | 9,911 | 4,463 | 14,695 | 112,745 | 147,653 | 42,699 | 11,075 |
| Chicago | 466,246 | 255,276 | 105,400 | 45,241 | 21,775 | 30,684 | 159,571 | 278,923 | 157,904 | 66,300 |
| Houston | 492,522 | 281,271 | 139,063 | 87,436 | 45,768 | 35,095 | 149,066 | 235,834 | 129,697 | 53,524 |
| Los Angeles | 1,226,557 | 884,708 | 369,679 | 183,236 | 125,940 | 73,355 | 350,125 | 683,705 | 475,523 | 245,021 |
| Riverside | 541,836 | 372,506 | 161,074 | 93,579 | 52,262 | 31,005 | 111,245 | 231,814 | 155,495 | 72,803 |

Figure 7

Age Distribution by Nativity and MSA



In all six MSAs, Mexicans are younger than other Latinos and other racial/ethnic groups in terms of median age (see Table 11).

Table 11
Median Age

| | Mexican | Other Latino | White | Black | Asian |
|-------------|---------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Atlanta | 24 | 29 | 40 | 31 | 33 |
| NYC area | 25 | 31 | 43 | 35 | 35 |
| Chicago | 25 | 30 | 41 | 34 | 35 |
| Houston | 25 | 30 | 41 | 31 | 35 |
| Los Angeles | 24 | 32 | 44 | 37 | 39 |
| Riverside | 25 | 30 | 45 | 36 | 36 |

Household Income

Generally, domestic-born households have lower household incomes than their foreign-born counterparts in Atlanta and New York City (see Table 12). In MSAs with more established Mexican populations, however, domestic-born households have higher household incomes.

Table 12
Mexican Household Income by Nativity


| | Atlanta | | NYC | | Chicago | | Houston | | Los Angeles | | Riverside | |
|-----------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Domestic born | Foreign born | Domestic born | Foreign born | Domestic born | Foreign born | Domestic born | Foreign born | Domestic born | Foreign born | Domestic born | Foreign born |
| 0–9,999 | 9% | 7% | 6% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 5% | 4% | 4% | 3% | 4% | 4% |
| 10,000–19,999 | 20% | 15% | 11% | 10% | 9% | 9% | 11% | 14% | 9% | 11% | 8% | 11% |
| 20,000–29,999 | 13% | 17% | 13% | 14% | 12% | 14% | 14% | 17% | 11% | 13% | 12% | 14% |
| 30,000–39,999 | 16% | 16% | 14% | 13% | 12% | 14% | 12% | 16% | 12% | 14% | 12% | 12% |
| 40,000–49,999 | 11% | 10% | 10% | 11% | 13% | 14% | 11% | 11% | 10% | 11% | 11% | 12% |
| 50,000–74,999 | 16% | 17% | 20% | 21% | 22% | 23% | 20% | 19% | 20% | 22% | 22% | 24% |
| 75,000–99,999 | 7% | 11% | 7% | 11% | 15% | 13% | 14% | 11% | 13% | 12% | 13% | 12% |
| 100,000–199,999 | 7% | 5% | 14% | 15% | 13% | 11% | 13% | 7% | 18% | 12% | 16% | 10% |
| 200,000+ | 1% | 0% | 5% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 1% |
| Median | \$33,000 | \$35,400 | \$45,600 | \$49,000 | \$51,800 | \$48,000 | \$48,000 | \$38,700 | \$53,900 | \$47,150 | \$52,000 | \$47,600 |

Mexican households have lower incomes than other Latino households, with the gap being largest in Atlanta and Riverside (see Table 13 and Figure 8). Further, Mexican household substantially lag behind White households in terms of median household income, with the median White household income in New York City, for instance, being twice as much as the median Mexican household income.

Table 13
Median Household Income

| | Mexican | Other Latino | White | Black | Asian |
|-------------|---------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Atlanta | 35,000 | 49,400 | 78,200 | 46,100 | 70,700 |
| NYC area | 48,000 | 51,000 | 99,800 | 55,000 | 80,000 |
| Chicago | 49,700 | 54,440 | 85,000 | 40,000 | 80,200 |
| Houston | 44,000 | 46,800 | 85,000 | 46,800 | 75,500 |
| Los Angeles | 51,000 | 53,200 | 90,000 | 50,000 | 75,800 |
| Riverside | 50,270 | 61,400 | 73,400 | 55,100 | 80,000 |

Figure 8
Median Household Income



Poverty Status

Across all six MSAs, there were not pronounced differences between domestic-born and foreign-born Mexican individuals in terms of poverty status (see Table 14).

Table 14
Mexican Population Poverty Rates by Nativity


| | | Poverty | Up to 200% Poverty | Up to 300% Poverty |
|-------------|---------------|---------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Atlanta | Domestic-born | 40% | 75% | 84% |
| | Foreign-born | 32% | 77% | 89% |
| NYC | Domestic-born | 30% | 59% | 74% |
| | Foreign-born | 25% | 62% | 80% |
| Chicago | Domestic-born | 20% | 49% | 71% |
| | Foreign-born | 20% | 52% | 77% |
| Houston | Domestic-born | 25% | 51% | 71% |
| | Foreign-born | 27% | 62% | 81% |
| Los Angeles | Domestic-born | 21% | 50% | 68% |
| | Foreign-born | 24% | 59% | 79% |
| Riverside | Domestic-born | 23% | 52% | 71% |
| | Foreign-born | 24% | 59% | 79% |

Compared to other racial and ethnic groups, Mexicans were among those with the highest poverty rates (see Table 15 and Figure 9). With the exception of Blacks in Chicago, Mexicans had the highest poverty rates of any subgroup in all six of the MSAs. In Atlanta in particular the Mexican poverty rate (35%) was nearly twice that of other Latinos and Blacks (both 20%).

Table 15
Poverty Rates

| | Mexican | Other Latino | White | Black | Asian |
|-------------|---------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Atlanta | 35% | 20% | 8% | 20% | 12% |
| NYC area | 27% | 22% | 7% | 19% | 14% |
| Chicago | 20% | 16% | 6% | 29% | 11% |
| Houston | 26% | 21% | 7% | 21% | 11% |
| Los Angeles | 22% | 18% | 9% | 21% | 13% |
| Riverside | 23% | 18% | 10% | 21% | 10% |

Figure 9
Poverty Rates




Employment Status

Across each of the MSAs, domestic-born Mexicans had higher unemployment rates and not-in-labor-force-rates than their foreign-born counterparts (see Table 16). Compared to other racial/ethnic groups, Mexicans had low to average unemployment rates (see Table 17 or Figure 10). The one exception was in Riverside, where the Mexican unemployment rate (19%) was nearly as high as the Black unemployment rate (21%).

Table 17
Unemployment Rates

| | Mexican | Other Latino | White | Black | Asian |
|-------------|---------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Atlanta | 12% | 12% | 10% | 20% | 8% |
| NYC area | 8% | 13% | 8% | 15% | 9% |
| Chicago | 13% | 14% | 9% | 22% | 8% |
| Houston | 10% | 8% | 7% | 14% | 7% |
| Los Angeles | 13% | 13% | 11% | 17% | 10% |
| Riverside | 19% | 15% | 13% | 21% | 12% |

Figure 10
Unemployment Rates by Racial/Ethnic Group



Educational Attainment

There are several significant differences between the domestic-born and foreign-born Mexican populations in terms of educational attainment. Given the relative youth of the domestic-born population especially in the Atlanta and New York City areas, there are far fewer domestic-born individuals who are aged 25 or older (see Table 18). Specifically, foreign-born Mexicans outnumber their domestic-born counterparts by 6.9-to-1 in Atlanta and 5.77-to-1 in New York.

Table 18
Educational Attainment of Mexicans Aged 25 and Older by Nativity

| | | Did not graduate HS | HS Graduate | Some College | Associates | Bachelors or Higher | Total |
|-------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Atlanta | Domestic-born | 3,523 | 6,888 | 4,068 | 1,471 | 3,748 | 19,698 |
| | Foreign-born | 78,700 | 37,712 | 10,072 | 2,486 | 6,843 | 135,813 |
| NYC area | Domestic-Born | 6,529 | 10,186 | 7,415 | 2,898 | 18,132 | 45,160 |
| | Foreign-born | 140,455 | 81,832 | 16,371 | 6,268 | 15,453 | 260,379 |
| Chicago | Domestic-Born | 43,929 | 69,860 | 55,870 | 20,034 | 47,513 | 237,206 |
| | Foreign-born | 303,818 | 169,350 | 54,038 | 14,253 | 36,694 | 578,153 |
| Houston | Domestic-Born | 85,229 | 114,976 | 83,397 | 19,683 | 47,704 | 350,989 |
| | Foreign-born | 288,574 | 104,001 | 49,442 | 8,866 | 31,045 | 481,928 |
| Los Angeles | Domestic-Born | 159,909 | 252,185 | 234,212 | 75,133 | 156,473 | 877,912 |
| | Foreign-born | 972,609 | 346,759 | 147,833 | 40,579 | 73,041 | 1,580,821 |
| Riverside | Domestic-Born | 85,723 | 126,831 | 112,508 | 31,923 | 38,465 | 395,450 |
| | Foreign-born | 295,187 | 115,650 | 57,420 | 16,925 | 23,826 | 509,008 |

These differences can be illustrated at two different ends of the educational spectrum. Foreign-born Mexicans were much more likely to be high school non-completers (see Figure 14). While up to 25% of domestic-born Mexicans did not complete high school, that figure ranged between 50% and slightly over 60% among the foreign-born population. Meanwhile, domestic-born Mexicans were more than twice as likely to have a Bachelors degree or higher in all six of the focal MSAs (see Figure 15). In New York City in particular, 40% of the domestic-born Mexican population had a Bachelor's degree or higher, a figure which is close to the percentage for non-Hispanic Whites (46%). Although their share of the population is much smaller, this level of educational attainment among domestic-born Mexicans may indicate great promise for the future. There thus does appear to be a significant divide in terms of educational attainment based upon nativity among Mexicans. Given the further imbalance in the newer but rapidly growing areas such as New York City and Atlanta, the subsequently reported differences between Mexicans and other groups tend to be weighted more toward the characteristics of the foreign-born population.

Figure 11
High School Non-Completion by Mexicans aged 25 or Older by Nativity





Figure 12
Mexicans Aged 25 or Over with a Bachelors Degree or Higher



High school non-completion rates among Mexicans were higher than for any other group, reaching nearly one half of the population aged 25 or older across all six MSAs (see Table 19). Similarly, the proportion of Mexicans aged 25 or older attaining a bachelor’s degree or higher was lower than for any other racial or ethnic subgroup (see Table 20). Compared to other Latinos, Mexicans were about half as likely to hold a bachelors degree or higher.

Table 19
High School Non-completion Rates

| | Mexican | Other Latino | White | Black | Asian |
|-------------|---------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Atlanta | 53% | 27% | 8% | 12% | 12% |
| NYC area | 48% | 32% | 7% | 17% | 18% |
| Chicago | 43% | 22% | 6% | 17% | 9% |
| Houston | 45% | 41% | 6% | 12% | 16% |
| Los Angeles | 46% | 38% | 6% | 12% | 13% |
| Riverside | 42% | 28% | 8% | 11% | 11% |

Table 20
Bachelors or Higher Educational Attainment

| | Mexican | Other Latino | White | Black | Asian |
|-------------|---------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Atlanta | 7% | 27% | 41% | 26% | 52% |
| NYC area | 11% | 17% | 46% | 22% | 52% |
| Chicago | 10% | 22% | 42% | 19% | 63% |
| Houston | 9% | 18% | 40% | 23% | 51% |
| Los Angeles | 9% | 16% | 45% | 23% | 48% |
| Riverside | 7% | 18% | 26% | 20% | 47% |

Health Insurance

Across all six of the focal MSAs, foreign-born Mexicans were more than twice as likely to be uninsured, with the greatest gap being in New York City. In the New York City area, foreign-born Mexicans were more than six times as likely to be uninsured, or a gap of 61.9%, even though domestic-born Mexicans in the New York City were the most likely to be insured (88.8% are) (See Table 21).

Table 21
Mexican Individuals without Insurance by Nativity

| | Domestic-born | Foreign-born |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| Atlanta | 25.3% | 81.5% |
| NYC area | 11.2% | 73.1% |
| Chicago | 15.1% | 48.3% |
| Houston | 29.1% | 64.9% |
| Los Angeles | 19.3% | 50.3% |
| Riverside | 20.0% | 47.7% |

Compared to other racial/ethnic groups, Mexicans and other Latinos have similar but lower rates of access of health insurance in the more established areas of Houston, Los Angeles and Riverside. In the newer and more rapidly growing areas of Atlanta and New York City, Mexicans lag behind other Latinos. In Atlanta, both Mexicans (58%) and other Latinos (40%) are far more uninsured than their peers. In New York, Mexicans are far more uninsured (46%) than their more established Latino peers (22%).

Table 22
Individuals without Health Insurance

| | Mexican | Other Latino | White | Black | Asian |
|-------------|---------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Atlanta | 58% | 40% | 11% | 23% | 26% |
| NYC area | 46% | 22% | 7% | 15% | 17% |
| Chicago | 30% | 20% | 9% | 20% | 17% |
| Houston | 42% | 44% | 12% | 23% | 22% |
| Los Angeles | 32% | 36% | 11% | 17% | 19% |
| Riverside | 29% | 29% | 13% | 17% | 19% |

Highlights

- At the state level, the Mexican population has spread both in terms of concentration as a percentage of total population and as a percentage of the Latino population.
- At the level of the metropolitan statistical level (MSA), Texas has consistently contained the MSAs with highest concentrations of Mexicans. Of the nine MSAs nationwide with a majority Mexican population, five were in Texas.
- In terms of population growth in the MSAs with the largest Mexican populations, four MSAs (Riverside, Chicago, Dallas-Fort Worth, and Phoenix) have had their Mexican population more than triple between 1990 and 2010. The Mexican population of three MSAs (Houston, San Diego, and McAllen, TX) has more than doubled between 1990 and 2010.
- Other MSAs with smaller total Mexican populations have experienced even more rapid Mexican population growth. The Mexican population of Atlanta has increased by a factor of 14 between 1990 and 2010. In the New York metropolitan area, the Mexican population has more than quintupled between 1990 and 2010.

Comparisons of Riverside, Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, Atlanta, and New York City

- In Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, and Riverside MSAs, Mexicans are at least 75% of the total Latino population. In the New York City MSA, the Mexican population accounts for less than 15% of the total Latino population.
- The Mexican population of the Atlanta and New York City MSAs consists of more foreign-born than domestic-born individuals. The Houston, Riverside, and Los Angeles MSAs, however, have Mexican populations which are more than 60% domestic-born.
- A smaller percentage of foreign-born Mexicans are naturalized citizens compared to other Latino subgroups. Fewer foreign-born Mexicans speak English well or very well compared to other foreign-born Latinos. These differences are larger in MSAs with newer Mexican populations, such as Atlanta and New York City, as well as Chicago.
- The Mexican population is younger than other racial/ethnic groups including other Latinos. The domestic-born Mexican population is younger than the foreign-born Mexican population.
- In the Atlanta and New York City MSAs, domestic-born Mexican households have lower household incomes than foreign-born Mexican households. In Chicago, Houston, Riverside, and Los Angeles, however, domestic-born Mexican households have higher incomes than foreign-born Mexican households.
- Although there were not differences in poverty rates among Mexicans based upon nativity, Mexicans were generally somewhat poorer than other Latinos. In Atlanta, however, nearly twice as many Mexicans were poor compared to other Latinos.
- Domestic-born Mexicans were more likely than foreign-born Mexicans to be unemployed or not in the labor force. Although Mexicans generally had low to average unemployment rates compared to other racial/ethnic groups, in Riverside the Mexican unemployment rate was among the highest for racial/ethnic groups.
- Foreign-born Mexicans were much more likely to be high school non-completers than domestic-born Mexicans. Domestic-born Mexicans were more than twice as likely to have at least a Bachelor's degree. In New York City, 40% of all domestic-born Mexicans above the age of 25 had at least a Bachelor's degree. High school non-completion rates, however, for Mexicans aged 25 or older were over 40% in all six MSAs.
- Foreign-born Mexicans were more than twice as likely to be uninsured compared to domestic-born Mexicans. In Riverside, Houston, and Los Angeles, Mexicans were about as likely to be uninsured as other Latinos. In Atlanta, Chicago, and New York City, Mexicans were less likely to be insured than other Latinos. In all six MSAs, Mexicans were less likely to be insured than non-Latinos.