

HISPANIC WORKERS IN THE MIDWEST:
A DECADE OF ECONOMIC CONTRAST
1970-1980

by
Santos, Richard, Ph.D.
University of New Mexico

Working Paper No. 02
October 1989

HISPANIC WORKERS IN THE MIDWEST: A DECADE OF ECONOMIC CONTRAST 1970-1980

by
Santos, Richard, Ph.D.
University of New Mexico

Working Paper No. 02
October 1989

Abstract:

This paper examines how Latinos in the Midwest have fared in the labor market during the changing economic conditions of the last decade. In the economic downturn of the 70's, Latinos experienced higher rates of unemployment than whites. Latinos continued to be especially vulnerable to a decline in industrial jobs. Although Latinos will benefit from efforts to revitalize basic industries, revitalization of industrial America will not by itself guarantee jobs for Latinos. Unless revitalization involves addressing the low educational attainment of Latinos, these new industrial jobs will be beyond their grasp.

Acknowledgements:

Research support for this study was provided by the Center for Human Resource Research, The Ohio State University. The research assistance of Hijin Kang and Rufus Milsted, and the consulting advice of Gilbert Nestel is hereby acknowledged and appreciated. Also, the generous availability of data sources by Carlos Arce, Myriam Torres and Jan Beals of the Chicano Research Network (Institute for Social Research/University of Michigan) is also appreciated.

About the Author:

Dr. Richard Santos is currently an Associate Professor of Economics at the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque. Dr. Santos has published widely on the Latino labor force. His most recent book, *Hispanic Youth: Emerging Workers*, was published by Praeger in 1985.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Santos, Richard, Ph.D. *Hispanic Workers in the Midwest: A Decade of Economic Contrast, 1970-1980, Working Paper Series #02*, The Julian Samora Research Institute, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1998.

RELATED READINGS

- WP-05** Torres, Roberto E. "Health Status Assessment of Latinos in the Midwest." (1990) \$3.00
- WP-06** Aponte, Robert "Urban Hispanic Poverty in the U.S.: Theory and Context." (1990) \$3.00
- WP-10** Torres, Roberto E. "Health Consequences of an Unhealthy Economy: Latinos in the Midwest." (1991) \$3.00
- WP-14** Aponte, Robert "Ethnicity and Male Employment in the Inner City: A Test of Two Theories." 55pp. (1993) \$3.00
- RR-02** Santiago, Anne M. "Life in the Industrial Heartland: A Profile of Latinos in the Midwest" 124pp. (1990) \$6.00
- RR-03** Torres, Roberto E. "Chartbook on Health of Latinos in the Midwest." 62pp. (1990) \$5.00
- RR-05** Aponte, Robert and M. Siles, "Latinos in the Heartland: The Browning of the Midwest." 81pp. (1994) \$6.00

The Julian Samora Research Institute is committed to the generation, transmission, and application of knowledge to serve the needs of Latino communities in the Midwest. To this end, it has organized a number of publication initiatives to facilitate the timely dissemination of current research and information relevant to Latinos. The Julian Samora Research Institute Research Report Series (RR) publishes monograph length reports of original empirical research on Latinos in the nation conducted by the Institute's faculty affiliates and research associates, and/or projects funded by grants to the Institute.

HISPANIC WORKERS IN THE MIDWEST: A DECADE OF ECONOMIC CONTRAST 1970-1980

Introduction.....	<i>1</i>
Migration to the Midwest	<i>1</i>
A Decade of Economic Contrast.....	<i>2</i>
Changes in the Hispanic Population:1970 to 1980.....	<i>2</i>
Employment Status, 1970, 1976,and 1981 Survey Weeks.....	<i>2</i>
Work Experience in 1969, 1975, and 1980.....	<i>3</i>
Total Earnings; 1969, 1975, and 1980	<i>3</i>
Summary and Conclusions	<i>4</i>
References	<i>5</i>
Tables 1,2,&3	<i>5</i>
Tables 4,5,6,&7	<i>6</i>
Table 8	<i>7</i>
Table 9	<i>8</i>

HISPANIC WORKERS IN THE MIDWEST: A DECADE OF ECONOMIC CONTRAST 1970-1980

Introduction

According to the 1980 U.S. Census, nearly 15 million persons of Hispanic origin were residing in the U.S. mainland. Although Hispanics are the second largest minority group in the nation, the socioeconomic problems of Hispanics are generally viewed in a regional context; Mexican Americans in the Southwest; Cubans in Florida, and Puerto Ricans in the Northeast. To be sure, the majority of the Hispanic groups reside in the respective regions noted.¹ Yet one would not have a complete picture of Hispanics by limiting the analysis to regions where the majority of Hispanics predominantly reside. Indeed, in 1980 a million Hispanics resided in five Midwestern states: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin. The migration of Hispanics to the Midwest has been shown to be directly related to the labor needs of agriculture and manufacturing in the region.² Much less, however, is known about how Hispanics have fared economically in this major industrial setting.

The purpose of this study is to examine the economic performance of Hispanics in the Midwest under contrasting conditions—favorable employment opportunities in the early seventies and high unemployment in the early eighties. Comparative data from 1970 and the end of the decade on the socioeconomic status of Hispanic workers age 16-64 in the Midwest will come from several sources: (1) the 1970 U.S. Census public use tapes; (2) the 1976 Survey of Income and Education; and (3) the March 1981 Current Population Survey (CPS).³ Prior to 1970, the U.S. Census did not identify persons of Hispanic origin in the Midwest. Census data on Hispanics became available in 1970 on a sample basis. In 1980 the U.S. Census for the first time identifies persons of Hispanic origin in the complete national count.

Using data from several different surveys collected during the decade, the study will examine the effect of changing economic conditions on the size of the Hispanic population, changes in the survey week employment status, annual work experience, and total earnings. In addition, the effects of the recession on Hispanic workers will be compared with the impact on white workers. A more complete picture of how Hispanics performed in the labor market during this period could have been obtained if a longitudinal data analysis from several data sources will permit an aggregate employment evaluation of Hispanics in the Midwest.

Migration to the Midwest

Hispanic migration to the Midwest reflects economic as well as political considerations. Employment played a primary force in attracting Hispanics to the Midwest.⁴ Many Mexican immigrants and chicanos from the Southwest, for example, were attracted to the rapidly increasing jobs in manufacturing, railroad construction, and harvesting of sugar beets and other agricultural crops in Northern and Midwestern states.⁵ The demand for migrant farm labor by Northern growers was, however, not satisfied by the inflow of chicanos from the Southwest. Agricultural interests turned to the federal government for relief, and the government in 1943 responded with Public Law 78, more commonly known as the Bracero Act. The legislation, which remained in effect until 1964, permitted the U.S. Department of Labor to import foreign workers to harvest crops. Although the exact number of braceros who remained illegally in the Midwest is not known, the legislation permitted the introduction of economic opportunities available in the Midwest to Mexicans.⁶

Manufacturing in the Midwest has likewise benefited from the supply of Mexican labor and has contributed to the growth of the Hispanic population. The need for industrial labor during both World War I and II as well as during strike activities in the steel industry in 1919 and the meat packing industry in 1921 assured the continued migration of chicanos to the Midwest.⁷ Moreover, as the decline in migrant farm workers accelerated in the late sixties and early seventies as a result of agricultural mechanization, manufacturing—especially the auto-related industries—tapped former migrant workers for work. One study of chicanos in Michigan viewed the period in the early seventies as a transition for chicanos from field workers to factory workers.⁸

Most population projections on Midwest Hispanics in the early seventies were sanguine. The favorable industrial climate of the Midwest was seen as providing continued migration incentives for Hispanics.⁹ Favorable manufacturing conditions would absorb displaced chicano workers from agriculture as well as attract Hispanic labor from the Southwest and Northeast. Illegal and legal migration from Mexico and other Latin countries would also play a role in the growth of the Midwest Hispanic population. The seventies did not materialize into a favorable economic decade but rather, one of contrast.

A Decade of Economic Contrast

Economically, the late sixties represented the best of industrial conditions, whereas near depression conditions reflect the late seventies and early 1980's. In 1970, all of the states in the Midwest except one reported higher median income for Hispanic males 16 years and older than other states with a Hispanic population of 100,000 or more.¹⁰ The national economy, spurred by increased government spending for both social and military programs to finance a war on poverty as well as the Vietnam War, contributed to favorable employment conditions; the national unemployment rate in 1969 was 3.5 percent and in April 1970, the Census month, the rate was 4.3 percent.¹¹ Economic conditions, however, changed dramatically with recessions in 1975 and 1982.

By 1980, employment in the manufacturing sector, especially the auto industry, had declined substantially; employment of production workers in the automobile industry dropped by one-fourth from the previous year.¹² Midwest cities with large Hispanic populations experienced high unemployment: Detroit, 13 percent; Flint, Michigan, 18 percent; and Toledo, Ohio, 12 percent.¹³ Although the U.S. economy is recovering, the industrial heartland of America is not likely to regain its previous employment levels.

Changes in the Hispanic Population: 1970 to 1980

Preliminary data from the 1980 Census suggest the earlier projected Midwest Hispanic population increases of the decade did not occur. To be sure, Hispanic population in the Midwest increased by one-fourth from 1970. Table 1, however, indicates that the population increase was not uniform throughout the region. Illinois experienced a 62 percent increase which was commensurate with the increase in Hispanics nationwide.¹⁴ The Midwestern state with the second largest Hispanic increase was Michigan, 8 percent. Wisconsin's Hispanic population remained stable between 1970 and 1980, but two other states in the region experienced Hispanic population losses; Indiana by one-fifth and Ohio by nearly one-tenth. Without the Hispanic increase in Illinois, the rest of the region suffered a decline in the Hispanic population during the decade.

The increase of Hispanics in Illinois is specifically attributable to Chicago where in 1980 an estimated half million Hispanics resided.¹⁵ In comparison to other Midwest cities, Chicago has not experienced a high level

of unemployment. Chicago has also historically attracted Hispanics, especially foreign born workers.¹⁶ The migration pattern of Hispanics to Chicago and other Midwest labor markets have to await further study until detailed 1980 U.S. Census tapes are available.

The March 1979 CPS tape does, however, permit a preliminary examination of migration patterns by identifying place of residence five years ago.¹⁷ Table 2 shows that most Midwest Hispanic workers lived in the same region five years ago, but one-tenth were living in a foreign country. For the Midwest, foreign migration continues to contribute to the growth of the Hispanic population.

Finally, the Hispanic population in the Midwest has not changed in one important demographic characteristic, educational attainment. For the population age 16-64 years, whites average 12 years of schooling in 1970 in comparison to 10 years for Hispanics. In March 1981, whites gained on average an additional year of school from 1970 but mean years of school remained the same for Hispanics. In favorable and unfavorable economic periods, Hispanic workers competed in the labor market with a substantial educational disadvantage.

Employment Status, 1970, 1976, and 1981 Survey Weeks

Table 3 compares by sex the employment status of Hispanics and whites age 16-64 in the 1970, 1976, and 1981 survey weeks.¹⁸ Among males, whites and Hispanics participated about equally in the labor force in the survey weeks. Changes in the labor force participation rates (LFPR) between surveys were slight. For women the LFPR of whites increased during the decade, despite unfavorable economic conditions, but for Hispanic females the LFPR did not change substantially. Cultural factors may account for the lower LFPR of Hispanic Females but the role of the economic downturn cannot be discounted either.

In comparison to the LFPR, unemployment rates in 1981 were four to five times higher than the previous levels in 1970. In 1981 about one-fourth of the Hispanic male labor force was unemployed. The incidence of unemployment was more severe for Hispanics than whites; about one-and-a-half times greater than whites. Among females, unemployment was higher than males in the 1970 and 1976 surveys. By 1981, the unemployment rate of females was lower than that of males. The average hours worked showed slight variations in the survey periods. For males,

Hispanics worked on average fewer hours in the later surveys than in the 1970 survey, while whites worked more hours. Among females, the hours worked on average remained the same irrespective of race or survey period.

Work Experience in 1969, 1975, and 1980

Table 4 presents the proportions by race and sex who worked in 1969, 1975, and 1980, as well as the mean number of weeks worked in each year. Among males, the proportion of whites who worked remained stable, but Hispanics experiences a decline from 1969 in the proportion who worked. For whites and Hispanics, the 1975 recession produced the lowest mean number of weeks worked; Hispanics, however, worked on average about two weeks less in 1975 than whites. Among the groups under study, white females were the only ones who increased their proportion who worked during the decade. The proportion who worked during the decade basically remained constant for Hispanic females, and was the lowest rate among the groups. Once in the work force, Hispanic females, with the exception of the 1975 recession, worked on average about the same mean number of weeks as whites.

The occupational distributions by race and sex in 1970 and 1981 are compared in Table 5.19 As one would expect from a predominantly industrial region, operative and craft occupations dominated the type of work done by males in both 1970 and 1981. Half of the Hispanics and over a third of the whites in both survey years were employed in operative and craft occupations. Operative work, however, comprised more and crafts less of the occupations for Hispanics than whites.

In comparison to whites, Hispanics continued in both survey years to be under-represented in the professional/technical occupations and as managers, but over-represented as laborers. For example, Hispanics were about half as likely as whites to work in the professional occupations and nearly twice as likely to work as laborers. Whites and Hispanics were equally likely in 1970 to be employed as service workers but in 1981 Hispanics had increased their proportion.

Among females, clerical work was a major occupation in both 1970 and 1981. During the decade the proportion of whites in clerical work declined but such work nevertheless remains the most frequent occupation for whites. the proportion of Hispanic females in clerical occupations remained about the same during the decade, but the proportion employed as operatives was equal to

clerical work in 1970 and greater in 1981. For whites, the proportion of women in service work in 1981 increased from 1970 but remained the same for Hispanics. As in the case of males, the underrepresentation of Hispanics in comparison to whites in the professional/technical occupations continued through the decade.

Manufacturing generated the bulk of employment for males in 1970 as well as 1981, as shown in Table 6. The proportion employed in manufacturing remained the same throughout the decade, but provided more jobs for Hispanics than whites. For example, in 1981 over half of the jobs for Hispanics were attributed to manufacturing, in comparison to one-third for whites. Retail/wholesale trade employed the second largest proportion of males in both periods; whites were only slightly more likely than Hispanics to be in the trade industry. For both whites and Hispanics, the remaining industries generally provided less than one-tenth of the employment.

In comparison to males, the employment of females was more diverse (Table 6). Manufacturing, retail/wholesale trade, and professional services provided most of the jobs for the females in both periods but not in equal proportions. Manufacturing in 1981 provided two-fifths of the jobs for Hispanics in comparison to one-fifth for whites, increasing from 1970 for Hispanics and declining for whites. In wholesale and retail trade, employment declined from 1970 for Hispanics but remained the same for whites. Whites were more likely than Hispanics to be employed in the professional and related services, and the 1981 proportion of whites in this industry increased from 1970.

Total Earnings; 1969, 1975, and 1980

Among males in 1969, Hispanics earned on average one-fifth less than whites. Table 7 presents average total earnings in three time periods and the earnings ratios of Hispanics to whites. For males, the Hispanic earnings ratio in 1980 declined from 1969. Among females the earnings gap between whites and Hispanics was not so great as those of males and, with the exception of the 1975 recession, remained constant in the surveys.

In order to examine more closely the earnings of white and Hispanic workers, an earnings equation was estimated. The dependent variable was the natural logarithm of total earnings in 1980. Several variables were hypothesized to influence earnings: labor force experience (proxy variable measured by age of respondent minus years of schooling minus age 6), years of schooling, SMSA residency, state of Midwest residency, marital status, and Hispanic origin

group. For males, whether one was an armed forces veteran was included as an independent variable and presence of children was included in the female equations. The means and standard deviations of the variables used in the earnings equations are presented in Table 8.

The log earnings regression results are noted in Table 9. In the white and Hispanic male equations, experience in the work force, years of school, residency in an SMSA and being married contributed to total earnings in 1980. The effects of experience on earnings appeared identical for whites and Hispanics, but the effects of education were twice the return for whites than Hispanics. Being an armed forces veteran significantly affected the earnings of whites but not Hispanics. State of Midwest residency did not yield a significant earnings effect for whites or Hispanics. Among Hispanics, significant differences among the groups (Chicano, Cuban, Puerto Rican, other) were noted.

For females, experience and education increased total earnings; experience in about the same percentage for Whites and Hispanics and education more so among Hispanics. In comparison to women with no children, earnings were lower for those with preschool age children, as well as those with older children. For Hispanic females, no significant differences were noted between those with no children and women with preschool age children. Once in the workforce, Hispanic women with preschool age children may have a high economic necessity to remain working.

Summary and Conclusions

Economically, 1969 represented the best of recent economic times for the Midwest, whereas near depression conditions characterized the end of the decade. As one would expect, the economic downturn in the decade was more clearly reflected in unemployment rates than employment characteristics like labor force participation rates and hours worked. The incidence of unemployment in 1981 among males increased from 1970 over four times. The unemployment rate in 1981 approached 17 percent for Hispanic males and 10 percent for whites. In addition, the proportion of Hispanic males who worked in 1980 declined from the beginning of the decade.

Females also experienced higher unemployment in 1981 as compared to 1970. White females, however, had in 1981 the lowest unemployment of the groups. In addition, the economic downturns did not reduce either LFPR or proportion who worked in 1980 among white females. Instead, white females increased their participation in the

work force during the decade. One would expect a declining economy to reduce work participation among women, but the changing role of women during this period could have cushioned the economic impact. Hispanic females, however, experienced no change in LFPR or proportion who worked during the seventies. For Hispanics, economic conditions may have been more significant in explaining their participation in the work force than the changing nature of women's role in society.

The high level of unemployment in the late seventies may also account for the lack of an increase in the Midwest Hispanic population (excluding Illinois) reported by the 1980 U.S. Census. Rapid economic growth in the sunbelt region may have also deterred the migration of chicanos from the Southwest to the Midwest. On the other hand, Illinois, with the Chicago labor market, witnessed a 62 percent increase in the Hispanic population. In comparison to other Midwest areas, Chicago had lower rates of unemployment. Further study will be needed to determine the reasons for the Hispanic population growth in Illinois. For example, what proportion of the growth can be attributed to factors such as better counting methods used by the Census, increase in foreign migration, or the structure of industry in Chicago?

The comparison of jobs held by Midwest workers during the decade also revealed the continuing vulnerability of the region to unemployment. In 1970 and 1981, manufacturing provided most of the jobs for workers in the region except for white females. Hispanics were especially vulnerable to a decline in industrial jobs; over half of the males and two-fifths of the females attributed their employment in 1981 to manufacturing. The role of Hispanic females in the work force is especially linked to occupations associated with manufacturing; over a third in 1981 worked as operatives.

The concentration of Hispanics in manufacturing and their work as operatives suggests that workers stand to benefit substantially from the establishment of a national program to revitalize basic industries such as automobile, rubber, and steel. The revitalization of industrial America will not by itself guarantee employment for Hispanics. Many of the jobs will require advanced skills and training. For Hispanic workers, the new industrial jobs may be beyond their grasp. Hispanics are not making improvement in education; in 1981 and 1970 Hispanics averaged only 10 years of schooling. For Hispanics to benefit from revitalization of basic industries or creation of high tech jobs, extensive training and education will be an important prerequisite.

Finally, efforts to combat discrimination in the labor market need to be continued. Even in the best of times, Midwest Hispanic males in 1969 earned about one-fifth less than whites and the earnings gap has continued into the eighties. Once the 1980 U.S. census public use tapes become available, the influence of education and other human capital skills, as well as the effect of foreign birth on the structure of earnings, can be examined and compared with results from the 1970 Census. Prior study, however, has indicated that earnings differences in 1969 were not removed after controlling for socioeconomic factors.²⁰ Furthermore, a cursory analysis of earnings in 1980 suggests that among males the returns of education for whites are twice that of Hispanics. Both the findings from the 1970 study as well as the discrimination efforts by the government in both favorable and unfavorable economic conditions.

References:

1. In the 1980 U.S. Census, 83 percent of the Mexican Americans resided in five Southwestern states, 61 percent of the mainland Puerto Ricans resided in New York and New Jersey, and 59 percent of the Cubans lived in Florida. Data on where Hispanics live is presented in Cary Davis, Carl Haub, and Joann Willette, "U.S. Hispanics: Changing the Face of American," Population Bulletin, Vol. 38, No. 3 (Population Reference Bureau, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1983) Table 4 and p. 13
2. For a discussion of chicano migration in the Midwest, refer to Gilbert Cardenas, "Who are the Midwestern Chicanos?" in *Aztlan*, Vol. 7 No. 2, Summer 1976 - Special issue on Chicanos in the Midwest.
3. A description of the 1970 U.S. Census public data sources can be obtained from U.S. Department of Commerce, Public Use Sample of Basic Records from the 1970 Census: Description and Technical Documentation (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census), April, 1972. For information on the 1976 Survey of Income and Education and the Current Population Survey contact the Data User Services Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233.
4. Daniel O. Price, "Rural to Urban Migration of Mexican Americans, Negroes, Anglos," *International Migration Review*, Vol. 5, November 1973.
5. The migration of Hispanics to the Midwest presented in this section pertains primarily to Mexican Americans or chicanos, who represented over 60 percent of the Midwest Hispanic population. Few studies are available on

the migration pattern of other Hispanic groups to the Midwest. For an excellent article on Puerto Rican migration, refer to J. Hernandez Alvarez, "The Movement and Settlement of Puerto Ricans Within the United States, 1950-1960," *International Migration Review*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Spring 1968), pp.40-51.

6. Cardenas, op.cit p. 162.
7. *Ibid.* p. 5-6.
8. Harry M. Choldin and Grafton D. Trout, *Mexican Americans in Transition: Migration and Employment in Michigan Cities*, Department of Sociology/Rural Manpower Center, Michigan State University, 1964.
9. David I. Verway, "Spanish Michigan," *Michigan State Economic Record* (Michigan State University, East Lansing, Bureau of Business and Economic Research), Vol. 15 (January/February, 1973), p. 7.
10. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population: 1970 Subject Reports, Final Reports PC(2)-1C, Persons of Spanish Origin* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973). Wisconsin did not have a population of 100,000 or more Hispanics in 1970 and therefore no median income was reported for that state.
11. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1970* (91st edition), Washington, D.C., 1970, p. 213.
12. U.S. department of Labor, *Employment and Training Report of the President, 1981*. Table C-6, p. 216.
13. *Ibid.*, Table D-8. pp. 243-46.
[14]U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population and Housing: Advance Reports, PHC 80-V-1.
15. The 1980 population for Hispanics in Cook County, Illinois is used as a proxy for the Chicago Hispanic population.
16. Julian Samora and Richard A. Lamanna, *Mexican Americans in a Midwest Metropolis: A Study of East Chicago*. Advance Report #10 to the Mexican American Study Project, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, UCLA, 1967, and Francisco A. Rosales and Daniel T. Simon, "Chicano Steel Workers in the Midwest, 1919-45" *Aztlan*.(University of California, Los Angeles, Chicano Studies Center) Vol. 6, No. 2.
17. Recent migration data on place of residency five

years ago was available on in the March 1979 CPS tape, but not on other data files. Special tabulation was performed to acquire this information.

18. The March 1981 CPS contains the following sample size age 16-64: whites, 6,375 males and 6,875 females and Hispanics, 288 males and 255 females. The 1976 SIE sample contained among whites, 16,805 males and 17,752 females, and for Hispanics, 275 males and 264 females. The 1970 public use Census tape contained a randomly selected white sample: 1,211 males and 1,305 females. The Hispanic sample contained 2,251 males and 2,327 females. The data presented in this study, unless noted otherwise, are unweighted. In addition, the 1970 Census analysis of workers age 16-64 in the Midwest is taken from R. Santos, "An Analysis of Earnings among persons of Spanish Origin in the Midwest" (East Lansing, Michigan, Michigan State University, 1977), unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.

19. Occupational industry is given for persons employed in the 1970 and 1981 survey, but also includes the last jobs held within a specifies period for the unemployed and out-of-the-labor force.

20. R. Santos, "Earningsd among spanish Origin Males in the Midwest," Social Science Journal, April 1982, Vol.

	<i>1970 number</i>	<i>1980 number</i>	<i>Percent change</i>
U.S. Total	9,072,602	14,605,883	61.0
Midwest Region Total	849,616	1,067,794	25.7
Illinois	393,204	635,525	61.6
Indiana	112,472	87,020	-22.6
Ohio	129,995	119,880	-7.8
Michigan	151,070	162,388	7.5
Wisconsin	62,875	62,981	0.2

SOURCES: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970 "Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States," and 1980 "Census of Population and Housing: Advance Reports," HC80-147.

<i>Region of Residence 5 Years Ago</i>	<i>Males</i>		<i>Females</i>	
	<i>White</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>
Northeast	1	0	1	0
North Central	96	85	97	82
South	2	4	2	6
West	1	2	1	1
Abroad	1	9	0	10

*UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-64 in the Midwest.
SOURCE: March 1979 CPS public use tape.*

<i>Employment Status During Survey Week</i>	<i>Males</i>		<i>Females</i>	
	<i>White</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>
Labor Force Participation Rate				
1970	86.3	88.0	51.2	47.2
1976	89.2	88.0	56.5	48.9
1981	87.9	85.0	60.9	48.3
Unemployment Rate				
1970	2.3	4.1	4.0	6.8
1976	5.5	12.0	7.9	11.6
1981	10.3	15.9	7.9	12.2
Mean Hours Worked				
1970	41.0	41.0	34.0	35.5
1976	44.0	40.5	33.4	34.2
1981	42.2	38.6	33.7	34.3

*UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-64 in the Midwest.
SOURCE: 1970 U.S. Census Public Use Tape 5% 11100 basic records, 1976 Survey of Income and Education, and the March 1981 Current Population Survey.*

Table 4: Work Experience in 1969, 1975, and 1980

Work Experience	Males		Females	
	White	Hispanic	White	Hispanic
Portion Who Worked				
1969	92	91	59	55
1975	91	86	62	52
1980	91	84	69	53
Mean Weeks Worked				
1969	46.0	45.5	39.7	38.1
1975	44.7	42.6	39.5	35.5
1980	45.0	44.1	40.4	39.7

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-64 in the Midwest.
 SOURCE: 1970 U.S. Census Public Use Tape 5% 11100 basic records, 1976 Survey of Income and Education, and the March 1981 Current Population Survey.

Table 6: Industrial Distribution in 1970 and 1981

	MALES				FEMALES			
	1970		1981		1970		1981	
	White	Hispanic	White	Hispanic	White	Hispanic	White	Hispanic
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	3	3	4	2	1	1	2	n/a
Mining	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	n/a
Construction	8	6	9	5	1	1	1	n/a
Manufacturing	39	54	36	58	25	37	19	n/a
Trans., Comm., Utilities	21	18	22	14	2	3	2	n/a
Wholesale, Retail, Trade	14	31	14	41	15	30	10	n/a
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	6	7	6	4	0	0	1	n/a
Business/Repair Services	6	12	8	12	1	1	1	n/a
Personal Services	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	n/a
Entertainment	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	n/a
Professional Services	8	9	8	12	4	17	21	n/a
Public Administration	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	n/a

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-64 in the Midwest.
 SOURCE: 1970 U.S. Census Public Use Tapes, 5% 11100 basic records; and the March 1981 Current Population Survey.

Table 5: Occupational Distribution in 1970 and 1981

	MALES				FEMALES			
	1970		1981		1970		1981	
	White	Hispanic	White	Hispanic	White	Hispanic	White	Hispanic
Professional, Technical	16	8	14	6	13	8	15	n/a
Manager	12	4	14	3	3	1	7	n/a
Sales	7	3	6	0	8	7	6	n/a
Clerical	8	7	6	5	42	30	34	n/a
Craftsperson	21	18	22	14	2	3	2	n/a
Operatives	14	31	14	41	15	30	10	n/a
Trans., Operatives	6	7	6	4	0	0	1	n/a
Laborers	6	12	8	12	1	1	1	n/a
Farmers	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	n/a
Farm Laborers	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	n/a
Service	8	9	8	12	4	17	21	n/a
Private Household	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	n/a

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-64 in the Midwest.
 SOURCE: 1970 U.S. Census Public Use Tapes, 5% 11100 basic records; and the March 1981 Current Population Survey.

Table 7: Total Earnings in 1969, 1975, and 1980

Total Earnings	Males		Females	
	White	Hispanic	White	Hispanic
Mean Total Earnings				
1969	9,144	7,175	3,768	3,308
1975	11,602	9,235	4,806	3,945
1980	17,209	12,616	7,503	6,747
Earnings Ratio of Hispanics to Whites				
1969		.78		.88
1975		.80		.82
1980		.73		.90

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-64 in the Midwest.
 SOURCE: 1970 U.S. Census Public Use Tapes 5% 11100 basic records, 1976 Survey of Income and Education, and the March 1981 Current Population Survey.

Table 8 Means and Standard Deviations of Variables Used in the Log Earnings Equation

Variable	MALES			
	Hispanic		White	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
1980 earnings	12615.90	8129.63	17115.82	11547.98
Experience	16.85	12.64	17.64	13.80
Education (years)	10.02	3.82	12.78	2.69
Reside in SMSA	0.93	0.25	0.73	0.44
Married	0.64	0.48	0.68	0.47
Veteran	0.15	0.36	0.38	0.48
No children	--	--	--	--
Children under 5	--	--	--	--
Children 6+ years old	--	--	--	--
Michigan	--	--	--	--
Illinois	0.68	0.47	0.26	0.44
Wisconsin	0.13	0.33	0.23	0.42
Ohio	0.07	0.26	0.27	0.44
Indiana	0.07	0.26	0.14	0.35
Chicano				
Puerto Rican	0.14	0.35	--	--
Cuban	0.03	0.18	--	--
Others	0.13	0.34	--	--
	FEMALES			
1980 earnings	6870.81	4929.98	7589.50	6445.80
Experience	16.00	11.47	16.36	13.60
Education (years)	10.63	3.10	12.68	2.20
Reside in SMSA	0.94	0.24	0.72	0.40
Married	0.61	0.49	0.59	0.40
Veteran	--	--	--	--
No children	--	--	--	--
Children under 5	0.36	0.48	0.17	0.30
Children 6+	0.43	0.50	0.49	0.50
Michigan	--	--	--	--
Illinois	0.59	0.49	0.26	0.40
Wisconsin	0.07	0.26	0.22	0.40
Ohio	0.10	0.30	0.26	0.40
Indiana	0.13	0.33	0.14	0.30
Chicano				
Puerto Rican	0.15	0.36	--	--
Cuban	0.03	0.17	--	--
Others	0.27	0.45	--	--

UNIVERSE: Persons age 16-64 who worked in 1980.

SOURCE: Current Population Survey, March 1981.

Table 9: Log-Earnings Equations

	MALE		FEMALE	
	Hispanic Coefficient (T-value)	White Coefficient (T-value)	Hispanic Coefficient (T-value)	White Coefficient (T-value)
Experience	0.025 (4.20)**	0.023 (19.24)**	0.050 (4.29)**	0.020 (11.48)**
Education (years)	0.068 (3.69)**	0.125 (25.14)**	0.219 (5.18)**	0.145 (15.23)**
Reside in SMSA	0.867 (3.45)**	0.236 (8.13)**	0.368 (0.79)**	0.185 (4.02)**
Married	0.502 (3.54)**	0.830 (26.75)**	0.182 (0.76)**	-0.049 (-1.08)**
Veteran	0.013 (0.07)**	0.067 (2.22)**	--	--
No Children	--	--	--	--
Children under 5	--	--	-0.187 (-0.62)	-0.563 (-8.60)**
Children over 6	--	--	-0.697 (-2.41)**	-0.500 (-10.96)**
Michigan	--	--	--	--
Illinois	0.291 (1.00)	0.068 (1.51)	0.797 (2.27)*	0.107 (1.54)
Wisconsin	-0.100 (-0.30)	-0.051 (-1.12)	0.688 (1.33)	0.043 (0.60)
Ohio	0.496 (1.35)	-0.072 (-1.60)	-0.598 (-1.29)	-0.001 (-0.02)
Indiana	0.228 (0.64)	-0.021 (-0.41)	-0.266 (-0.60)	-0.054 (-0.70)
Chicano	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**
Puerto Rican	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**
Cuban	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**
Others	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**
Constant	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**
R ²	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**
F	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**	0.0 (0.0)**

UNIVERSE: Persons age 16-64 who worked in 1980.

SOURCE: Current Population Survey, March 1981.