

**UCLA**

**Volume IV. 1988-89 - Conference on Comparative Ethnicity: The  
Conference Papers, June 1988**

**Title**

Hispanic Suburbanization in Los Angeles: Social Arrival and Barrio Formation

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6s3927f4>

**Author**

Estrada, Leobardo F.

**Publication Date**

1988-06-01

## Notice:

This working paper was printed by the Institute as a means for disseminating the research findings of Institute and University-related scholars. The text is provided in order to facilitate academic discourse and is free to use for personal academic purposes utilizing proper citation. Copyright of the information contained within lies with the authors, and requests for use other than personal research purposes must be directed to the authors.

HISPANIC SUBURBANIZATION IN LOS ANGELES:  
SOCIAL ARRIVAL AND BARRIO FORMATION

LEOBARDO F. ESTRADA  
University of California, Los Angeles

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS...

Dr. Leo F. Estrada is an Associate Professor at the Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning at UCLA and Senior Scholar at the Tomas Rivera Center in Claremont, California. He received his B.A. from Baylor University in 1966, and his M.A. and Ph.D. from Florida State University in 1968 and 1970, respectively. Prior to his present position he taught at North Texas State University, The University of Texas, El Paso, and the University of Michigan. Dr. Estrada also has a record of public service, having worked at the U.S. Bureau of the Census in 1975 to 1977 and returning in 1979 to 1980 to assist in managing the 1980 Decennial Census of the U.S. as a Staff Assistant to the Deputy director. He presently serves as Chair of the Hispanic Advisory Committee to the Census Bureau on the 1990 Census. Dr. Estrada has published extensively on the Hispanic population of the United States and his expertise has been acknowledged by the numerous advisory boards, study panels and board of directors on which he has served for local, regional and national organizations. He is a member and has held elective or appointed positions in the Population Association of America, The American Statistical Association, the American Sociological Association, and the American Public Health Association.

A version of this paper was prepared for the UCLA CONFERENCE ON COMPARATIVE ETHNICITY, June 1988. The Conference was coordinated by Institute for Social Science Research and sponsored by The President's Office, Chancellor's Office, College of Letters and Science, Institute of American Cultures, Center for Afro-American Studies, and Department of Geography and Sociology, UCLA; and by the Division of Social Sciences and Communication, the Los Angeles Project and Department of Geography and Political Science, USC.

## INTRODUCTION

Sunbelt states began to prosper at the expense of the older, industrial-based states in the 1950s. Sunbelt states experienced dramatic gains in population and industry in the 1960s; its large towns grew into cities and the largest urban areas became regional metropolitan centers. During the last two decades, the five Southwestern states -- Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico and Texas -- have shared in the growth trends in population and economic development which have favored this part of the nation.

In these same territories, four centuries before, Hispanic culture first gained a foothold in the northern hemisphere. The presence of Hispanic culture in the Southwest for over four centuries left an indelible mark upon the architecture, the cuisine, the language, the ranch/farm technologies and the systems of governance.

In the mid-19th century, these territories became the spoils of war or were sold to meet the expansionary needs of a youthful American nation expanding westward. This new nation imposed a significantly distinct cultural layer upon the existing society and its institutions. Among the changes introduced were new ideas regarding non-sectarian education, an Anglo-European influenced cityscape and dominance of the English language. Soon thereafter, Mexican origin persons who comprised most of the original settlers, found themselves strangers in their own land. Largely agricultural workers, often landless, and excluded from roles of influence, the Hispanic population urbanized and was relegated to living segregated from Anglos in specific areas of towns and cities. Under these circumstances, the barrio community became a place of refuge from Anglo discrimination and a viable, almost self sufficient community. Forced residential segregation was the foundation for contemporary Latino culture, minority status, and urban living patterns. Latino segregation created the need to develop parallel institutions, informal sub-economies and to maintain the Spanish language both as a buffer from the outside world, and as a socially functional behavior. In time, the Southwest became as segregated as the deep South states, with two important differences slavery existed for only a brief period among Indians, and the proximity of Mexico made it possible to escape from extreme forms of oppression. Two separate and unequal groups -- the dominant Anglos and subordinated Mexicans and Indians -- coexisted through a system of accommodations which included segregated school systems and housing, lower level occupations, and political powerlessness.

The 1960s represent a significant historical era in the Southwest. Through a combination of litigation and protests heard from collective voices, the entrenched system began to give way. Among the more significant civil rights battles was the breakdown of housing segregation patterns. The aftermath of the 1960s was an uneasy period in many communities for residents who had historically become unaccustomed to one another's language and culture. Not surprisingly, the period of transition resulted in Hispanics being steered away from housing in various neighborhoods, racial covenants, owners being pressured not to sell, and finding themselves unwelcome when they could find housing. More than twenty years later, the situation has improved for Latinos in the Southwestern metropolitan areas. Hispanics have experienced extensive intra-metropolitan dispersion. However, as will be indicated, Latino patterns of suburbanization appear to be distinct from the patterns for the Anglo

population. As the end of the twentieth century approaches, the Latino population of Los Angeles appears to be well-positioned for further prosperity; their outward dispersion coincides with the outward dispersion of jobs.

To understand the patterns and possible consequences of Latino suburbanization, it is necessary to comprehend the historical demographic processes which have resulted in this centralization (urbanization) and decentralization (intra-metropolitan dispersion). The following sections will describe these processes, discuss their distinctiveness, and Finally, consider the implications which point to a concurrent process for Latinos in Los Angeles of "traditional" suburbanization and new barrio formation.

#### HISTORICAL TRENDS OF LATINO URBANIZATION

Formerly a largely rural population dispersed throughout the agricultural Southwest, the Hispanic population today is the second most urban population (88 percent) among the major ethnic/racial groups in the U.S. Although now more geographically dispersed than at any previous time in history, the movement of Latinos from rural to urban to metropolitan residence over a period of three decades stands out as one of the major inter-regional migration movements in the history of the U.S.

For several decades prior to 1950, close to 90 percent of all Mexican-origin persons resided in the Southwestern states. Since that time, the proportion had decrease due to the settled-out migrant farm workers in the industrial Midwest and to a lesser extent, Pacific Northwest. By 1980, 17 percent of Mexican-origin persons resided outside the five traditional Southwestern states.

A more significant movement than that outside the Southwest was the movement occurring within the Southwest. Jaffe, Cullen and Boswell (1980) point to the fact that in 1850, almost half of the Mexican-born population lived in California compared to one-third in Texas. Over the following four decades, the mexican stock population decreased dramatically until by 1900, one-tenth of the Mexican stock population resided in California compared to two-thirds in Texas. It should be noted that this refers to Mexican-born stock population and not the Mexican-origin (native born) population. These figures represent a rather significant shift in the foreign-born stock, responding to the decline of the California gold rush and the growing cattle industry and cotton farming expansion in Texas.

Since 1910, the Census Bureau has reported data on native-born persons of Mexican origin as well as Mexican foreign stock, but the methods and items used to identify this group have varied considerably (Estrada 1977). Boswell (1979) has used the available data to designate three significant periods of population shifts from 1910 to 1970:

- A. 1910 to 1920: A period of high population growth due largely to immigration, with little proportional redistribution among the Southwestern states. The minimal residential shifts that did occur involve moves out of Texas, New Mexico and Arizona into California and the Midwest. Those individuals who moved into the midwest headed for large urban centers, which was less true of those who moved to California (Broadbent 1941).
- B. 1920 to 1940: A period of uneven population growth. Hispanics grew significantly during the 1920's but subsequently declined, due to the economic depression and massive repatriations. During this period, California once again increased its share of the total Mexican origin population, while Texas and Colorado experienced relative decline.
- C. 1940 to 1970: A period of impressive population growth and a moderate

amount of intra-regional redistribution of the Mexican origin population. The relative share of Chicanos residing in Arizona and New Mexico declined gradually during this period, while the share of Mexican origin persons residing in Texas, Colorado and California increased hardly at all or only slightly (Tienda 1980).

To this might be added a fourth period:

- D. 1970 to 1980: A period of continued population growth with an increased Latino concentration in California until one of every three Latinos in the U.S. resides in the state of California. In addition, the increased urbanization is fueled by the recent entry of Central and South American immigrants and their resettlement in metropolitan areas.

These trends point to the decline in population growth in the more rural states of Arizona, New Mexico and Colorado while the more urbanized states of California and Texas increase their share of Hispanic population.

#### POST WAR METROPOLITANIZATION

The metropolitanization of Hispanics in California is a post-World War II phenomena. In 1910, a time when the Mexican origin population was distributed throughout the agricultural Southwest, only four cities -- San Antonio, Laredo, El Paso, and Los Angeles had more than 5,000 Mexican residents. Of these, only in El Paso did the number of Mexicans exceed 10,000 (Broadbent 1941). Not surprisingly, during the 1920's, the Mexican population concentrated heavily in seasonal agricultural occupations was clearly identifiable as a rural population.

Broadbent identified two changes in Mexican settlement patterns during the 20's which set in motion the move toward Hispanic urbanization. First, a significant segment of the population began to combine part-time rural residence with part-time residence in or near urban centers. Second, Mexican rural residence patterns shifted from scattered rurality to a form of clustered rurality which favored the incorporation of later immigrants.

During the 1930's and early 40's, greater numbers of Mexican origin persons clustered near some of the larger urban centers or around areas of specialized crop agricultural centers (e.g., San Joaquin Valley, Imperial Valley, South Texas, etc.).

The rural-to-urban movements gained momentum after World War II to an extent and magnitude best appreciated by comparing Mexican origin urbanization to U.S. urbanization as a whole. As late as 1930, Mexican origin persons were much less likely to live in urban areas than U.S. residents in general. By 1950, approximately two-thirds of the Spanish surnamed population of the Southwest was urban, but this was still less than that of the Anglo population. By 1960, nearly 80 percent of all Mexican origin persons in the Southwest were urban dwellers and by 1970 only 15 percent of the Southwest Mexican origin population lived in rural areas. In 1980, the proportion of Southwest Hispanic urban dwellers is 88 percent compared to 74 percent for the U.S. as a whole.

Of course, the rural-to-urban movement varied considerably by state. Whereas virtually all the Mexican-origin persons living outside the Southwest live in metropolitan areas, within the Southwest, New Mexico's Hispanos are the least likely to be urbanized and California's Latinos are the most highly urbanized.

The structural changes that explain the rural-to-urban movement among Mexican origin persons have been well documented: the rapid mechanization

of agriculture (Moore 1970); the loss of land grants in New Mexico and Colorado (Knowlton 1961); and labor recruitment patterns of Mexican workers (Durant and Knowlton 1978). Other important explanations include the growing tendency for new immigrants to settle in large urban centers rather than rural areas (Hernandez 1966). The participation of immigrants in the urbanization process, particularly after 1930, appears to account for the rapid acceleration of the urbanization process for Mexican origin persons. This process continues in the present, as noted in the flows of Central Americans and other Latin Americans to large metropolitan areas as their primary destination.

#### METROPOLITAN HOUSING PATTERNS

Indications have existed for some time on a macro level that Latino urban residents in Los Angeles are undergoing a deconcentration process. The findings of Grebler, Moore and Guzman (1970), Massey (1979), Matre and Mindiola (1977) and Lopez (1981), while focusing on residential housing segregation, have documented the movement of Hispanic urban residents into mostly White non-Hispanic neighborhoods. On a macro level, these findings can be interpreted as showing that Latinos are less restricted to the ethnic enclave and more suburban than Blacks.

Moore and Mittlebach (1966) showed that as early as 1960, Los Angeles followed the predominant pattern of housing segregation found in the Southwest, namely, a pattern showing the highest indices for Black-White segregation; and the lowest indices of segregation for Mexican-White segregation. Lopez (1981) confirms similar findings for the 1970 data. As shown in Table 1, not all cities in Southern California follow the primary pattern. San Bernadino, for example, has a higher index of Mexican-White segregation than Mexican-Black segregation. What is clear regardless of the pattern is the dramatic decline in Mexican-White residential segregation for the years studied. These findings led Lieberman (1963) to conclude that the segregation of Mexicans and Anglos is becoming more like that of European White ethnics and less like that of Blacks.

Similar findings on housing segregation provide evidence of the dispersal of Latinos in metropolitan areas of Southern California. As indicated in Table 2, the deconcentration process in Los Angeles is a common one. Over the past decade, the pattern of White suburbanization continues. Black suburbanization also increased significantly during the 1970's however, the majority of Black urban dwellers continue to be inner city dwellers. Hispanic deconcentration while intermediate to Whites and Blacks, is more similar to the White rates. What cannot be revealed by these macro level measures are the dynamics of the movements. It is not clear from these findings if Latino suburbanization is due to the movement from central city barrio areas to the suburbs, or comprised of movements from other parts of the country or from abroad.

Residential segregation indices have been shown to relate to other factors such as city size, proportions of Black and Latino population, and the size of census tracts. The fact that Latinos comprise twice the proportion of Blacks in Los Angeles County may affect the results as well. These findings do, however, provide a macro-level perspective on the issue of Latino dispersion in Los Angeles, and there can be little doubt that over the past two decades, the Latino urban population has been undergoing a constant process of suburbanization.

#### METROPOLITAN GROWTH AND RESIDENTIAL LOCATION

California Latinos have the majority of their population (56.2 percent)

residing in the urban fringe, although not to the extent as found among Whites, but to a greater extent than Blacks, who only have 39 percent of their population residing outside the central city.

Lopez (1983) has compared Black and Latino residential location variables for 58 SMSAs using 1980 data. He concludes that increases in manufacturing, retail and wholesale employment and natural growth plus the existence of familial and friendship networks were significant determinants of metropolitan growth for Latinos during the 1970s. Latino metropolitan growth was also found to be related to the growth of manufacturing employment in contrast to Blacks whose growth was more associated with the growth in service-oriented employment. More interestingly, settling in SMSAs where kin and friends reside were important factors for minority populations, particularly Latinos.

Lopez also points to the "push-pull" factors which attract and dissuade Hispanic movement to the inner city. He lists among the pull factors: preference for residing near kin and friends, economies associated with a common language, increases in central city employment, and the supply of small but affordable older housing stock. Among the push factors listed are: the existence of a large Black population in the inner city, traffic congestion, higher density housing occupancy, pollution, higher crime, and greater competition for resources and services.

In sum, Lopez concludes that Latinos reside in the central city because they are most willing to exchange smaller residential space and more urban disamenities for access to manufacturing employment and possibly lower journey-to-work costs. By inference, as manufacturing jobs suburbanize, Latinos are more than willing to chase after those jobs into the suburbs, with that movement often resulting in the integration into the service sector as well.

These findings by Lopez indicate that before concluding that Latino suburbanization patterns appear to be similar to general suburbanization patterns observed previously, further research is needed to determine whether Latino suburbanization is an indicator of "social arrival," as usually considered, or rather a process of job chasing which signifies a form of extended barrio expansion to suburban areas.

#### COMPARING LATINO INNER CITY AND LATINO SUBURBAN DWELLERS

Previous suburbanization studies have relied heavily on comparisons of central cities and the urban fringes of urbanized areas. This research suggests that the presence of Blacks and Latinos, the presence of persons not living in families (singles, widows or widowers, and divorced persons), concentrations of youth (18 to 24) and elderly (65 and older), the presence of condominiums, small household size, apartments, low housing values, low rent values, and the presence of significant numbers of housing units with low quality plumbing characterize the central city. Persons and housing units with complementary characteristics would thus more likely be found in the urban fringe (Glenn 1973).

These findings must be regarded partly as an artifact of the central city-urban fringe comparisons. Treadway (1983) has noted in his analysis of the validity of central city-urban fringe comparisons that a few variables (i.e., percent Black, value of housing, and rent of housing) consistently characterized the inner city from the urban fringe. Other variables, including percent Latino, are found to have mixed results in characterizing the inner city. Again, this is not surprising when one considers that Latino residential patterns are closer to White patterns than patterns associated with the Black population. Despite these limitations, the following analysis is a preliminary attempt to determine if those

characteristics, which prior research indicates differentiates between the inner city populations and suburban populations, are confirmed for Latinos in Los Angeles.

#### Minority Presence

Table 2 shows that Blacks and Latinos are more likely to live in the central city of Los Angeles than Whites, although the difference between the proportion of Latino and White central city dwellers is only seven percentage points apart (compared to a difference of 18 percentage points between Latinos and Blacks). While the Los Angeles data is in the direction expected, it is likely that in the near future only the proportion of Black residents may distinguish between central city and urban fringe census tracts.

#### Age Polarizations

As shown in Table 3A, the expected pattern of an excess of youth and elderly in the central city is confirmed, although the differences when considering the population as a whole are minimal. When taken by the age of the householder, the expected findings are more pronounced for youthful householders who are generally more likely to reside in the central city, but mixed results are found among the elderly householders. Here, the oldest age group (75 and older) are more likely to reside in the urban fringe, while householders 65 to 74 years of age are slightly more likely to reside in the central city. Thus, the expected pattern of age polarization is more apparent when comparing the age of the householder than when comparing the Latino population in general. Given the lower median age of the Latinos residing in Los Angeles, it may simply be that the narrower distribution of ages washes out the expected differences or at least diminishes their effect.

#### Persons Who Do Not Live in Families

Table 3B indicates that as expected, married couple families predominate in the urban fringe while female headed householders are more likely to reside in the central city. A more detailed look shows that males rather than females comprise the majority of non-family households, which are slightly more common in the central city than in the urban fringe of Los Angeles. Further analysis of the differences in the household composition between central city and urban fringe is also indicated in Table 3B. These data show that households with the presence of a relative (other than a child) are most likely to exist in the central city. Briefly, households other than those comprised of parent(s) and child(ren) are more likely to characterize inner city households, particularly those with a non-relative present.

#### Immigration

Table 3C indicates that immigrants are more likely to reside in the central city of Los Angeles than the urban fringe. These findings would support the contention that the destination of Latino immigrants is directed toward the inner city and is partially responsible for the rapid urbanization of the Latino population. One reason that might be posited for the attraction of the inner city for immigrant is the existing concentration of Spanish-speaking Latinos in the inner city. The results shown in Table 3C would indicate that the majority of foreign-born Spanish speakers reside in the



inner city, but a sizeable number also reside in the urban fringe. The direction of these results indicate that nativity distinguishes better between central city and urban fringe residence than Spanish language use.

These comparative results should be interpreted in light of the geographic context of the Los Angeles SMSA. It is, first of all, an immense urban area comprised of 83 independent cities. The use of central city-urban fringe comparisons in areas with multiple core cities belies some of the nuances of population movements. In most cases, the larger the urban areas being considered, the greater the tendency for certain populations to concentrate in the inner city, which increases the differences between central cities and the urban fringe partly because of greater diversification throughout the entire urbanized area.

In addition, one must consider the proportion of the Los Angeles population residing in the central city. Generally, the higher the proportion residing in the central city, the less likely one is to find small differences in population and housing characteristics since the central city may include most of the suburban-like areas. Thus we can conclude that the central city-urban fringe comparisons of Latino suburbanization are not surprising, although they identify some specific variables which appear to be extremely important for explaining Latino suburbanization patterns. Research is needed to compare several traditional inner city barrio areas with newer suburban Hispanic concentrations to determine the extent to which they differ or are similar.

#### SUBURBANIZATION AND LATINO IDENTITY

Acculturation, however identified, is a difficult concept to measure because the type of longitudinal studies needed to follow the acculturation process over time are few in number. Most of the knowledge gained about the association of levels of acculturation and overt behavior is based on cross-sectional studies. Examples of the types of items used to assess the degree of acculturation include the significance given to the retention of Spanish language usage, the celebration of traditional folkways and practices, and the salience of ethnic identity. The fact that ethnic identity is often seen as part of the acculturation process rather than as a result of it, means that insufficient attention has been given to changes in ethnic identification as a result of the suburbanization/acculturation process.

Census research on this topic is able to provide several trends in ethnic identification research which deserves attention. The major finding is that ethnic identification appears to shift with upward social mobility. Several studies which sought to determine which Latinos were most unlikely to respond to the Spanish origin identifier, found that nonresponse rates sometimes increased among Latinos residing in suburban census tracts with the highest socioeconomic indicators (Fernandez 1986). It is impossible at this point to differentiate between the effects of intermarriage, suburbanization, and upward social mobility on ethnic identification, but nonresponse was particularly significant among upper middle class, native born, Latino households.

The Census Bureau collects information on education, occupation and income which can be used to approximate the socioeconomic status of the population. Using this information, it has been shown that Cuban origin and Puerto Rican origin persons show the least ambiguity and Mexican origin persons show the greatest amount of inconsistency in reporting ethnic origin regardless of suburban residence or socioeconomic status (Levin, Nampeo and Berman 1984). The primary reason for the difference is in the recency of residence in the U.S. by Cubans, and the strong identification

with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in the case of Puerto Ricans. Mexican origin persons may be more ambiguous due to their very long term residence in the U.S. (i.e., two thirds are native born) as well as the attention given to the concept of minority status. As a historical minority group, ethnic identifiers were often imposed (Levin and Farley 1982) and are associated with various denotations related to the term "minority." This may help to explain why Mexican origin groups appear to be more sensitive to labeling (Fernandez and McKenney 1980).

#### INTERMARRIAGE, SUBURBANIZATION AND ACCULTURATION

On the whole, the consequences of suburbanization on acculturation are difficult to measure but one important implication is the effect that suburbanization has upon ethnic self identification. Since 1970, the U.S. Bureau of the Census has relied on self-identification as the primary means of determining racial and ethnic status. As a result, the extent to which Latinos are willing to self-identify and the understanding of the circumstances such as suburbanization that may challenge that willingness to self-identify are of paramount interest.

Several follow-up studies by the Census bureau are useful in understanding these effects (Fernandez 1975). The Census Bureau understands that the questionnaire mailed out to most households is usually filled out by one adult member of the household. Even if an interviewer follows up on a non-responding household, as is usually the case in most surveys, one adult respondent is used as an informant for other non-present members of the household and children. In most of these cases the ethnic/racial "self-identification" was provided for other adult members of the household as well as for all underage children by the person who took the responsibility to fill out the questionnaire or by the person interviewed. The Census Bureau has learned that the information provided by the household respondent was generally unambiguous and when other adult members were asked to self identify, generally speaking, there was exceeding high agreement (Word 1982).

A special case appeared when ethnic/racial intermarried couples were located and reinterviewed. In this case, the major concern was with shifting ethnic identity and with the ethnic categories given to the children. Interestingly, the ethnicity of the person who fills out the form in a Latino and non-Latino intermarriage does not bias the choice of ethnicity for the children.

The results of the findings indicated a wide variety of strategies for ethnic/racial categorization of intermarried couples (Estrada 1979). However, in general, Latino males who out-married usually had their children assigned a Hispanic origin with the exception of intermarriage with an American Indian woman. This finding is consistent with the general findings by census researchers that father's lineage is preferred to mother's lineage (Fernandez 1985). However, when a Latina married out, the results were mixed and it required further analysis before it became evident that the determining factor was whether the Latina who married out continued to reside in a high density Latino community or lived in a mostly Anglo community. Thus, the children of Latina exogamy were identified as Latino primarily if the woman remained close to the Latino community and less likely to be identified as Latino if she resided in areas with few if any other Latino families. Needless to say, inner city and suburban residence here is probably serving as a proxy for acculturation.

Intermarriage probably results in lower enumeration of Latinos. Content reinterviewers indicate that the total number of persons reporting as Spanish origin when interviewed directly was greater than that counted in

the census.

#### LATINO SUBURBANIZATION

The Latino suburbanization process appears to be a natural outgrowth of the pressures of an expanding population in search of larger and affordable housing closer to expanding employment opportunities (Farley 1976). Having faced less housing segregation and discrimination than Blacks, Hispanics have quickly moved from the inner city to the urban fringe.

The results of the analysis shown here lead to the conclusion that the degree of Hispanic suburbanization has been relatively high and that it has some similarities to like processes observed for the general population. Hispanics residing in the central city of Los Angeles differ from Hispanics residing in the urban fringe in terms of age polarization and persons who do not live in families. This analysis also found two other variables which are not normally regarded in studies of suburbanization, namely, the presence of non-relatives in the household and nativity, as factors distinguishing Hispanic inner city dwellers from Hispanic urban fringe dwellers. Both variables require further analysis to determine their relationship to socioeconomic variables, as well as length of residence-related variables.

Immigration has historically been an important component of growth among the Latino population. These historical flows of immigrants from Mexico and Latin America coupled with the above average levels of fertility have fueled Latino growth for decades (Garcia 1986). It has also generally been assumed that immigrants are, generally speaking, concentrated in the central city.

Today, legal immigration from Mexico and Latin America accounts for one-fourth of all legal immigration and an unknown but assumed high proportion of undocumented immigration. Prior to the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1987 (IRCA), the immigrant flow consists largely of workers who have little or no intention of remaining in the U.S. on a permanent basis. The primary goals of short term immigration are seasonal or short term employment, accumulation of savings, and return to their country of origin to invest those savings in property, housing, to pursue education or to provide living expenses. Their short term goals require that they concentrate geographically in areas where unskilled labor requirements are high. In addition, a small proportion of undocumented immigrants from the large and constant immigration flow "settle out" and become part of the foreign born, permanent resident population of the U.S. The selectivity of those who opt to become permanent residents of the U.S. is in all likelihood related to their success in finding secure employment and family reunification on the U.S. side. To the extent that employment is dispersed, it is expected that the residence of the permanent resident stock of immigrants will also be dispersed.

Despite the long historical nature of Latino immigration, new elements have been introduced over the last fifteen years which have changed the composition and the intensity of the immigrant flow. First, is the introduction of a large segment of immigrants from Central America into the flow (the vast majority of whom expect to remain in the U.S. for a lengthy period of time as is generally the rule for longer-distance immigrants), whose first destination is a metropolitan area. Immigrants from Central and South America are presently concentrated in the inner cities of Los Angeles, San Francisco, Miami and Houston. Secondly, is the enactment of the IRCA. The vast majority of immigrants from Central America and many immigrants from South America are recent arrivals and are not eligible for amnesty provisions. This new legislation is just now being implemented and

it is too early in the process to evaluate its full implications. However, there are a few issues that can be raised regarding this new law. For example, it is clear that if concerted efforts are made to deport these amnesty-ineligible populations, they will be forced to disperse out of the inner city in order to be less vulnerable. Thus, while IRCA was intended to be an immigration control act, is it likely to serve to accelerate the suburbanization process further among non-Mexican-origin persons.

## CONCLUSION

One of every three persons in the Southwest is a member of one of the major U.S. minority groups. Each of the minority groups has its own settlement patterns, but all are being affected by common trends: a) the scarcity of affordable housing, b) gentrification of older neighborhoods, c) suburbanization by middle-class minority families, and d) the emergence of new minority enclaves as the number of families exceed the available housing stock and seek out new areas for housing.

Suburbanization has generally been associated with the concept of social arrival. Numerous studies for decades have confirmed that suburbanites have higher socioeconomic status. The findings presented here confirm that Latino suburbanization is in process and in many ways, it is not unlike non-Latino suburbanization. In addition, another observation has been the eventual dispersion of immigrant groups and their children. This same process has also been observed among Latinos in Los Angeles. Thus, Latino suburbanization patterns appear to be rather conventional in many respects with the economically stable Latino family moving outward as housing size needs increase, educational needs change, and as expectations change in terms of the expected standard of living. As a result, Latinos now reside in some of the better areas in Los Angeles, such as, Rowland Heights, Hacienda Heights, West Covina, Arcadia, Glendale, Granada Hills, Chatsworth, West L.A., Costa Mesa, Newport Beach, and many others.

There is another aspect of suburbanization which is not commonly found in the literature on suburbs related to the creation of new ethnic enclaves in suburban areas. The Los Angeles metropolitan area began with one barrio in East Los Angeles. By 1960, there were two additional smaller barrios, in south Los Angeles near the harbor in an area called Wilmington and in the San Fernando Valley in the San Fernando City-Pacoima area. By the 1970s, the East L.A. barrio had expanded to envelope the civic center area and to include Vernon, Pico Union, Westlake, Echo Park, Lincoln Heights, and Boyle Heights. In addition, new suburban barrios began to appear in the San Gabriel Valley (El Monte-Baldwin Park, Pico Rivera); the Harbor area (San Pedro, Long Beach); and, East San Fernando Valley (Northwest Van Nuys, Panorama City). These suburban barrios differed from the central city barrio in their lower density due to the dispersed housing in these areas, however, in all other respects they are like inner city barrios. These new suburban barrios, along with the inner city barrio, exhibit higher proportions of population under 19 years of age, higher number of persons per household, lower proportions of households with married heads, lower median school years completed, lowest proportion of managerial and professional workers, the highest proportion of craftsmen and operatives, the highest proportion of laborers, the highest proportion with incomes below poverty, the lowest median family income, the lowest proportion of dwellings which are owner occupied, the highest proportion with dwellings having greater than 1.01 persons per room, the lowest proportion of females sixteen years or older in the labor force, and the lowest rent. What does the evolution of these non-inner city barrios represent and why have they emerged in the sites where they have? These are questions which have yet to

be answered but it is clear that the research on these evolving communities are deserving of further research as a means of understanding the economic and social forces which can create new ethnic barrios in selected communities. In particular, the role of immigrants, expanding employment opportunities, and the availability of affordable housing need to be differentiated in terms of their effect on choice of residence and compared with the traditional conception of the suburbanization process to understand its dynamics.

#### REFERENCES

- Boswell, Thomas D., and Timothy C. Jones. 1979. "Applied Geography: A Regionalization of Mexican Americans in the United States." *Geographic Review* 70:88-98.
- Broadbent, Elizabeth. 1941. "Mexican Population in Southwestern United States." *Texas Geographic magazine* 5:16-24.
- Durant, Thomas J. and Clark S. Knowlton. 1978. "Rural Ethnic Minorities: Adaptive Responses to Inequality." in *Rural U.S.A.: Persistence and Change*, edited by T.R. Ford. Ames: Iowa State.
- Estrada, Leo F., Jose Hernandez, and David Alvirez. 1977. "Using Census Data to Study the Spanish Heritage Population of the United States." In *Cuantos Somos: A Demographic Study of the Mexican American Population*, edited by Teller, et al. Austin: The University of Texas, Center for Mexican American Studies, Monograph No. 2.
- Estrada, Leo F. 1977. "Ethnic Identification of Minors in Racial/Ethnic Inter marriages." Presented at the American Sociological Association Meetings, San Francisco.
- Farley, Reynolds. 1976. "Components of Suburban Population Growth." In *The Changing Face of the Suburbs*, edited by B. Schwartz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fernandez, Edward W. 1975. "Comparisons of Persons of Spanish Surnames and Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States." Technical Paper No. 38, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Fernandez, Edward W. and Arthur Cresce. 1986. "Who are the Other Spanish?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, San Francisco.
1985. "Social and Economic Status of the Hispanic Foreign Born: The Assimilation Experience." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, Boston.
- Fernandez, Edward W. and Nampeo R. McKenney. 1980. "Identification of the Hispanic Population: A Review of Census Bureau Experiences." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Statistical Association, Houston.
- Garcia, Philip. 1986. "Immigration Issues in Urban Ecology: The Case of the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area." In *Urban Ethnicity: A New Era*, edited by Joan W. Moore and Lionel Maldonado. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Glenn, Norval D. 1973. "Suburbanization in the United States Since World

- War II." in *The Urbanization of Suburbs*, edited by Louis H. Masotti and Jeffrey K. Hadden. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore and Ralph C. Guzman. 1970. *The Mexican American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority*. New York: Free Press.
- Hernandez, Jose. 1966. "A Demographic Profile of Mexican Immigration to the United States, 1910-1950." *Journal of Inter-American Studies* 8:471-496.
- Jaffe, A.L., Ruth Cullen and Thomas N. Boswell. 1980. *The Changing Demography of Spanish Americans*. New York: Academic Press.
- Knowlton, Clark. 1961. "The Spanish Americans in New Mexico." *Sociology and Social Research* 45:448-455.
- Lieberson, Stanley. 1963. *Ethnic Patterns in American Cities*. New York: Free Press.
- Levin, Michael J. and Reynolds Farley. 1982. "Historical Comparability of Ethnic Designations in the United States." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Statistical Association, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Levin, Michael J., Nampeo R. McKenney and Patricia A. Berman. 1984. "Uses and Interpretation of Racial and Ethnic Data From the United States Census." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Statistical Association, Philadelphia.
- Lopez, Manuel N. 1981. "Patterns of Inter-Ethnic Residential Segregation in the Urban Southwest." *Social Science Quarterly* 62:1:50-63.
- Lopez-Aqueres, Waldo. 1983. "An Econometric Model of Metropolitan Growth and Location of Ethnic Minorities in the United States." Dissertation. University of Southern California.
- Massey, Douglas S. 1979. "Residential Segregation of Spanish Americans in United States Urbanized Areas." *Demography* 16:553-563.
- Matre, M. and Tacho Mindiola. 1977. "Residential Segregation in the Urban Southwest." Paper presented at Population Association of America.
- Moore, Joan W. 1970. "Colonialism: The Case of the Mexican American." *Social Problems* 17:463-472.
- Moore, Joan W. and Frank G. Mittlebach. 1966. "Residential Segregation in the Urban Southwest: A Comparative Study." Mexican American Study Project, Advance Report No. 4. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Tienda, Marta. 1980. "Familism and Structural Assimilation of Mexican Immigrants in the United States." *International Migration Review* 14:383-408.
- Treadway, Roy C. 1983. "Suburbs and Central Cities." Paper presented at the Population Association of America.
- Word, David L. 1982. "Evaluating the Hispanic Origin Response in the 1980 Census: A Redefinition Through Indirect Measures." Paper presented at

the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Demographic Group, Orlando, Florida.

TABLE 1

Residential Segregation Indices for  
Racial/Ethnic Groups 1960-1970

|                               | Mexican-Anglo |      |      | Mexican Black |      |      | Black-Anglo |      |      |
|-------------------------------|---------------|------|------|---------------|------|------|-------------|------|------|
|                               | 1960          | 1970 | 1980 | 1960          | 1970 | 1980 | 1960        | 1970 | 1980 |
| Los Angeles                   | 57.4          | 51.0 |      | 75.7          | 82.1 |      | 87.6        | 89.7 |      |
| San Bernadino                 | 67.9          | 56.7 |      | 35.2          | 53.5 |      | 83.5        | 82.3 |      |
| San Diego                     | 43.6          | 37.3 |      | 55.2          | 60.1 |      | 81.1        | 78.2 |      |
| Mean For All<br>Calif. Cities | 49.2          | 35.1 |      | 49.5          | 48.5 |      | 77.9        | 64.9 |      |

Index of Dissimilarity: Percent of one group that would have to move from census tracts with too high a percentage of their own group to those with too low a percentage in order to achieve an even distribution of population across tracts. Thus, the higher the numerical value, the greater the degree of residential segregation between the groups (see Taeuber and Taeuber, 1969).

TABLE 2

Central City Concentration for Los Angeles, 1970-1980

|   |            | Whites | Hispanics | Blacks |
|---|------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Percent Residing in<br>the Central City | 1970       | 41.3   | 45.8      | 69.0   |
|   | 1980       | 36.7   | 43.8      | 61.2   |
|   | difference | -4.6   | -2.0      | -7.8   |

TABLE 3A

Central City and Urban Fringe Comparisons for  
Hispanics in Los Angeles County, 1980

|               | Central City | Urban Fringe | Difference |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Age           |              |              |            |
| Total         | 1,646,359    | 2,194,552    |            |
| % 15 to 24    | 22.8         | 22.4         | .4         |
| % 65 or older | 4.3          | 3.6          | .7         |
| Median Age    | 23.4         | 22.7         | .7         |
| Male          | 23.0         | 22.3         | .7         |

|                    |         |         |      |
|--------------------|---------|---------|------|
| Female             | 23.7    | 23.1    | .6   |
| Age of Householder |         |         |      |
| Total              | 451,058 | 567,101 |      |
| % 15-24            | 13.6    | 12.3    | 1.3  |
| % 25-34            | 32.2    | 31.5    | .7   |
| % 35-44            | 20.1    | 21.7    | -1.6 |
| % 45-54            | 15.1    | 16.4    | -1.3 |
| % 55-64            | 9.9     | 10.2    | -.3  |
| % 65-74            | 5.8     | 5.2     | .6   |
| % 75+              | 3.3     | 6.2     | -2.9 |

TABLE 3B

Central City and Urban Fringe Comparisons for  
Hispanics in Los Angeles County, 1980

|                                | Central City | Urban Fringe | Difference |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Marital Status                 |              |              |            |
| Total Families                 | 348,848      | 472,820      |            |
| % Married Couple<br>Families   | 71.4         | 77.2         | 5.8        |
| % Female-No<br>Husband Present | 20.8         | 16.6         | -4.2       |
| Family/Non-Family Households   |              |              |            |
| Family Householder             |              |              |            |
| Male                           | 16.4         | 17.6         | .8         |
| Female                         | 5.2          | 4.2          | -1.0       |
| Non-Family Householder         |              |              |            |
| Male                           | 3.7          | 2.4          | -1.3       |
| Female                         | 2.6          | 1.9          | -.7        |
| Household Composition          |              |              |            |
| Presence of                    |              |              |            |
| Child                          | 41.0         | 43.6         | 2.6        |
| Brother or Sister              | 3.0          | 2.4          | .6         |
| Parent                         | 1.1          | .9           | -.2        |
| Other Relatives                | 5.6          | 5.4          | -.2        |
| Non Relatives                  | 5.8          | 4.3          | -1.5       |

TABLE 3C



Central City and Urban Fringe Comparisons for  
Hispanics in Los Angeles County, 1970

|                                    | Central City | Urban Fringe | Difference |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Nativity                           |              |              |            |
| % Foreign born                     | 54.8         | 45.2         | 9.6        |
| % Mexico foreign born              | 53.5         | 46.7         | 6.6        |
| Mother Tongue                      |              |              |            |
| % Native born<br>Spanish speaking  | 44.5         | 55.5         | -11.0      |
| % Foreign born<br>Spanish speaking | 52.3         | 47.7         | 4.6        |

-----  
Requests for ordering copies of this paper should be submitted to:  
  Working Papers  
  Institute for Social Science Research  
  UCLA  
  Box 951484  
  Los Angeles, CA 90095-1484

or email: [issr@issr.ucla.edu](mailto:issr@issr.ucla.edu)