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• Next Steps
Persistent Child Poverty and Spatial Distribution of Minority Children

Data and Approach

  o Many Trends also Explored for 2005-2011; Available Upon Request
  o Analyses Limited to White, Black, Asian and Hispanic Population
  o Metropolitan Status or Central City Status Unknown Not Shown
  o Other Comparisons Also Available Upon Request

• 2010 American Community Survey (ACS)
• Present Official Poverty Trends* Among Hispanics
• Compare Trends to non-Hispanic Blacks and Whites
• Discuss Factors Driving these Trends

• *More on this Later
Hispanic Population in Perspective:
Hispanics and foreign-born as a share of US population
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Race-Ethnicity by Metro Area Status (1970)

Race-Ethnicity by Metro Area Status (2010)

Proportion of Hispanic Age Groups by Metro Area Status

Poverty by Race & Ethnicity

Source: IPUMS USA. 1970-2000 Decennial Census & 2010 ACS. People below 100% FPL excludes group quarters.
Reflects people categorized as Hispanic by U.S. nativity. Puerto Ricans born outside US excluded.
Hispanic Poverty by Age Groups

Source: IPUMS USA. 1970-2000 Decennial Census & 2010 ACS. People below 100% FPL excludes group quarters.
# Poverty by Metro Area Status & Race-Ethnicity (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area Status</th>
<th>Below Poverty</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Below poverty (4 groups)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Millions</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Millions</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>9.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Millions</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey (2010). IPUMS USA. People below 100% FPL (excludes group quarters).
## Poverty by Metro Area Status & Race-Ethnicity (2010)
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<th>Below Poverty</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Below poverty</th>
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<td></td>
<td>Millions</td>
<td>1.12</td>
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Source: American Community Survey (2010). IPUMS USA. People below 100% FPL (excludes group quarters).
Rural Poverty Rates by Race-Ethnicity

Source: IPUMS USA. 1970-2000 Decennial Census & 2010 ACS. People below 100% FPL excludes group quarters.
Urban Poverty Rates by Race-Ethnicity

Source: IPUMS USA. 1970-2000 Decennial Census & 2010 ACS. People below 100% FPL excludes group quarters.
Suburban Poverty Rates by Race-Ethnicity

Source: IPUMS USA. 1970-2000 Decennial Census & 2010 ACS. People below 100% FPL excludes group quarters.
Hispanic Poverty Rates by Nativity & Metro Area Status

Hispanic Educational Attainment (25+ years old)

Source: IPUMS USA. 1970-2000 Decennial Census & 2010 ACS. Excludes cases coded “n/a or no schooling.”
Hispanic Poverty by Educational Attainment & Metro Status

Brief Summary of Regression Findings

Rural residence less predictive of poverty over time for all and for Hispanics.

Usual suspects (age, gender, education, marital status, children, employment) operated in the expected ways for all and for Hispanics.

Details available upon request.
OPM VS. SPM

• Implications for Rural America:
  o OPM is MUCH higher than SPM
  o From 17.9% to 13.9% in 2012
  o Why?
    • Driver=Housing Costs

• Implications for Hispanics:
  o SPM is higher than OPM
  o 25.8% to 27.8%
  o Why?
    • Demographics?
    • Safety Net?
    • Immigration?
      o California May Illuminate
Comparison of 2011 Poverty Measures by Race/Ethnicity and Immigration Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>OPM</th>
<th>CPM</th>
<th>SPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, NH</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, NH</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Immigrant</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Poverty Reducing Effect of the Social Safety Net in California by Gender, Race-Ethnicity and Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>CPM Minus Total Safety Net Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Immigrant</td>
<td>-13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measurement Implications for Rural Hispanics?
(Caution: Preliminary)

• **2011 Poverty Rates**
  
  • **All Hispanics**
  - OPM* 25.4%
  - SPM 28.0%
  
  • **All in non-Metro places**
  - OPM* 17.0%
  - SPM 13.4%
  
  • **Hispanics in non-Metro Places**
  - OPM* 31.0%
  - SPM 19.3%
  
  Indeed, SPM for rural Hispanics falls between that for all rural residents and all Hispanics
**Wrap-Up**

"Middle Position" possibly deteriorating over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of looking at individual characteristics to understand racial-ethnic differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Today’s Focus  
  • Place  
  • Nativity  
  • Education  
  • Also:  
  • Age  
  • Family Structure  
  • Etc. |

Increasing size of the Hispanic population underscores the need to really understand trends and changes
Next Steps

Further Analyses of Basic Trends

- Safety Net Use
- Occupation
- Racial Earnings Gap
- Wealth and Assets

Variations within Hispanic Ethnicity

Exploration of Sub-National Trends

- Regional, State

Examination of Recent Trends Using ACS Data

Analytic Models to Summarize and Explain Trends

Decomposition of Changing Racial-Ethnic Gaps
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Rural Earned Income Ratios (Age 25-54)

Urban Earned Income Ratios (Age 25-54)

Suburban Earned Income Ratios (Age 25-54)