

The Racial Paradox: Puerto Rican Ethnicity Challenged Through
Racial Stratification

By

Gabriel Aquino
Department of Sociology
University At Albany, SUNY
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY, 12222

Introduction

The Puerto Rican population in the United States has grown significantly since their initial migration in the 1950s. Currently in the United States, there are over 2.7 million Puerto Ricans, almost three-quarters of the population on the island of Puerto Rico (Rivera-Batiz-Santiago, 1994). Puerto Rican migrants to the United States encounter a culture very different from the Island's culture. As Puerto Ricans develop as a community within the United States, they must confront many of these cultural differences. An extremely difficult challenge to the Puerto Rican community is the racial hierarchy that exists within the United States (Bonilla-Silva 1997; Omi and Winant 1994).

This study is based on an earlier work conducted by Clara Rodriguez in 1991. Rodriguez, in her study, addresses one of the greatest problems faced by researchers who wish to study the effects of race on a multiracial group such as Puerto Ricans using U.S. Census data (Rivera-Batiz and Santiago, 1996; Rodriguez, 1996, 1994, 1991, 1991b; Gonzalez, 1993; Denton and Massey, 1989). Race on the United States Census questionnaire is self reported, this would require a clear understanding on what the choices mean. For immigrants from a multi-racial background, the racial categories in the US Census may have extremely different meanings than those understood by Census Researchers. Regardless of the possible confusions, the race category still may provide some indication of the level of integration of Puerto Ricans into the United States. It should be clear that the answer to the race question on the US census may have little to do with skin color.

Rodriguez (1994), who was part of the Racial Identity Project for Puerto Ricans in New

York, highlighted many cases where the self-identification of race by Puerto Ricans was slightly off when compared to the interviewer's categorization of the Respondent's Race. Many Respondents reported a darker race than how the interviewer recorded them. Conversely, another example had a lighter skinned Puerto Rican Respondent identify as 'Black,' this was done because of a sense of loyalty to the respondent's father skin color. At the other end of the spectrum, others claimed a European ancestry regardless of their skin complexion. Puerto Rico's earlier history with Spain was most cited as the reason for this choice. Although, there exists some variance between the racial categories and true skin color, the significance effects of race on wage in her earlier study, indicates that skin color may serve as a proxy for a yet unidentified phenomenon within the integration process of Puerto Ricans in the United States.

The Racial Identity Project classified Puerto Ricans under the typical Latin American racial categories, which are more expansive than the typical United States categories. There may be some problems with attempting to measure race using non-US categories (Rivera-Batiz and Santiago, 1996; Rodriguez, 1996, 1994, 1991, 1991b, 1980; Gonzalez, 1993; Stepick III and Grenier, 1993). If the interviewer was trained to classify someone under the Latin American category as *Canella* (cinnamon) in skin color, what does that make the subject in US terms? The respondent can be classified as white with a tan, when they are truly be of African ancestry.

The Puerto Rican racial dilemma occurs as soon as they arrive in the United States. Many who would never see themselves as Black, but instead as dark Indian, in the United States become Black or very near Black, but almost surely, for most, non-white. So, how are Puerto Ricans going to assimilate into the United States social system? Will there be a race divide among Puerto Ricans, where Black Puerto Ricans or darker skinned Puerto Ricans will

assimilate into the African American community, and the lighter skinned Puerto Ricans and European Puerto Ricans will assimilate into the mainstream European American culture? This outcome has been rejected by most Puerto Rican scholars, who believe that experiences in the United States are the same regardless of race (Batiz-Rivera and Santiago 1994, Rodriguez 1991).

The focus of this study will be to interpret the impact of race on total income. Total income is going to be used, as opposed to the Rodriguez (1991) study which examined wages. Income is important because it looks at how Puerto Ricans are stratified when it comes to their overall well-being, when compared by racial category?. Total income, which may not measure labor market discrimination, will allow this study to include those who receive income through various sources.

Definitions

For the purpose of this study, the term 'European American' and 'white,' 'African American' and 'black,' and 'Hispanic' and 'Latino' will be used interchangeably respectively. Ethnicity shall be fine as Weber defines it in Economy and Society (1922), where ethnicity is a 'shared sense of commonality among people, regardless of any truly historical or biological connection.' Specifically, this is important when one community is being faced by another ethnic group, or when one ethnic group is being subjugated by another.

Race, on the other hand, shall take on two sets of definition, the first one will be that which identifies biological traits, such as skin color, or type of hair. The second definition will be used as an indicator of assimilation of Puerto Ricans into the mainstream of United States

culture. It will be assumed that those Puerto Ricans who marked off 'white' in the US census questionnaire, for example, are more assimilated and therefore better off than those who mark off 'other race' or 'black.'

If the above holds true, the data shall show the existence of some level of stratification in the Puerto Rican community in the United States by race what it proxies. This study will also expand on the geographical location used by Rodriguez (1991), and include those states where Puerto Ricans have had a great number of migrations between 1980 and 1990. These states will include New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Ohio. The North Eastern regional selection of these states is not completely by chance, as Puerto Ricans have shown great increases in major Metropolitan Statistical Areas in these states (Rivera-Batiz-Rivera and Santiago, 1994,1996).

Data

The five percent Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample (IPUMS) is being used to calculate the impact of race on the total income of Puerto Ricans in Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. The IPUMS data is compiled by the University of Minnesota, Department of History. The University of Minnesota takes the Public Use Microdata Sample, collected by the United States Census Bureau, and recodes it so that variables may be compared from one decennial census to another decennial census.

The five percent sample is being used because of the large number of cases it provides.

Since Puerto Ricans comprise a small percentage of the total United States population, (although being the second largest Latino group in the United States), this sample size proves ideal for calculating inferences on Puerto Ricans in the United States. The five percent IPUMS or PUMS data is also commonly used among scholars who conduct research on Puerto Ricans in the United States.

The 1990 United States Census provided a category for racial identification as well as Hispanic origin. The racial categories included 'white,' 'black,' 'Aleut,' 'Native American,' 'Japanese,' 'Chinese,' 'other Asian,' or 'Other Race,' as well as other more specific choices such as specific Tribe membership for Native Americans. The Hispanic category asked respondents to identify themselves as non-Hispanic or Hispanic, and by nativity or ancestry if identified as Hispanic. Puerto Ricans who identify themselves under the Hispanic category on average identified themselves under 'White' forty-two percent of the time, under 'Black' about four percent of the time, and 'Other Race' about forty percent of the time. The rest are distributed among the other racial categories (Rodriguez, 1991). This closely resembles the distribution from the 1990 IPUMS sample in this analysis (see figure 2).

The variables chosen for this analysis are listed in figure 1. Race detailed variable was used because the 'Spanish Other' category was re-coded for all Latinos, and maintained separate from the 'White' category. This is different from the Race general variable that reclassifies all Latinos who check 'Other' under the race category as 'White.' This is done so that comparisons may be made with the 1970 IPUMS and PUMS data, in which the US Census Bureau initially coded all Latinos who marked the 'other' race category as 'white.' Those who marked themselves as something other than the chosen categories under Race for this analysis have been

omitted.

All the other variables are explained in figure 1, although under occupation farming has been recoded under the Operators, Fabricators, and Laborers. Most Puerto Ricans under the farming category are farm laborers. The Metro variable has been coded, where those who live in a Metropolitan Statistical Area, regardless of whether its central city or outside of the central city are the reference variable.

Methods

The data for the study was collected from the five Percent Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample for 1990. Chosen were Puerto Ricans who resided in Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, or Pennsylvania, who were at least sixteen years old, and recorded themselves under an occupation. These states were chosen because they had the greatest growth rate of Puerto Ricans (see Appendix 2). The states of Florida, California, and Texas were excluded from the analysis, although they, too, had rapid growth rates, due to the influence of migratory selectivity among the population from these states. Puerto Ricans in these three states greatly marked themselves under the race category as 'White,' and had incomes above the average for all Puerto Ricans. In Florida, which was the most extreme State, over seventy percent of the sample marked themselves as 'White'. This alone is well over the average for all other states in the sample (see Figure 2). The majority of the Puerto Ricans in California, Florida and Texas also had a greater rate of home ownership, when compared to each of the chosen states. The inclusion of these extreme States would greatly biased the outcome of

the analysis, and probably may have showed greater disparities among the different Racial categories.

Total income was chosen as the variable for analysis, as opposed to wages. This was done because, although wages may estimate the discrimination that may exist in the labor market, total income looks at the total income available to the individual. Total income also includes outside sources of revenue such as child support, government support, interests, and investments. These other sources of income are more important, because they help measure how well someone is doing, regardless of how poorly they may be doing in the labor market.

Cross-tabulations by race category were conducted on almost all of the independent variables. All of the independent categories had a significant chi-square ($P < .01$). Only those variables not included in the log-linear analysis are shown in tables 1 and 3. The chi-square analysis is susceptible to sample size, and therefore tables 1 through 3 are being used to help descriptive this analysis.

A log-linear regression on total income is being conducted on Puerto Ricans, where the log of income is being used because of the skewness on income.

$$\text{LNY}_{ij} = B_i + X_{ij} + e_i$$

The above formula describes a percent increase in the log of income for every unit of change in the independent variable. For example, as age increases by one year, the B-coefficient is a percent-change in the log of income. Where LNY stands for the log of total income, B is the Y-intercept, X_{ij} are the independent variables in the regression, and e is the error or residual term.

The model showed some multi-collinearity between Education and Ability to Speak English, which may mean why English proficiency is non-significant in some of the models.

The existence of such multi collinearity between Education and Ability to Speak English is not surprising, due to the need for higher educated individuals to learn English, even for those in Higher Education in Puerto Rico. This did not remove all of the significance from the problem variables, and after the proper diagnostics were performed, the Tolerance and VIF test indicated the variables to be right on the borderline. Taking this into account, the decision was made to include the variables in the analysis, and allowed the readers to determine the weight of the analysis with the inclusion of the variables.

Results

The differences that exist among Puerto Ricans and those that chose a specific Race category other than that of 'White' were almost always significantly negative. It is important to reiterate here again that as Clara Rodriguez (1991) pointed out in her analysis of Race on wages of Puerto Ricans in New York City, is that what is being measured here is not so much only skin color, but also, possible attitudes that Puerto Ricans' may have about their position within the United States social class system, and how well assimilated a Puerto Rican may be to the distinct Racial groups in the United States. Also, it may be that aside from skin color Puerto Ricans may choose the Racial category that they do, because the choice may reflect a rejection of the United States race classification, or a lack of true assimilation, or also merely some confusion as to why the racial categories resemble ethnicity categories commonly used throughout the United States today. This last point has been looked at by scholars, and although there is no definitive answer to the true meaning of the question, Puerto Ricans have shown a tendency to respond

consistently over time (Rodriguez, 1991).

Table 1 in the analysis shows the percent of home ownership for Puerto Ricans in the sample by race. Of those who marked themselves as White or European, thirty-five percent own a home or are making payments on a home. This is distinctly different from those who marked themselves off as 'Other Race' or 'Black' who have a twenty-four percent and nineteen percent home ownership rate, respectively. Home ownership becomes an important variable when determining success, because it shows the ability of the person to acquire capital and maintain capital. Home ownership as discussed by Oliver and Shapiro (1995) and by Yinger (1995), is essential for minorities to acquire equity under the current US social system. White Puerto Ricans are not near the European American rate of home ownership. Non-Latino Europeans, for example, have a seventy percent home ownership rate, while Puerto Ricans, according to the United States Census Current Population Survey (1994), have about a twenty-four percent rate. Figure 2, which provides a 28.6 percent home ownership rate for those in the sample area, clearly shows how well below the Puerto Rican average 'Other Race' Puerto Ricans and 'Black' Puerto Ricans tend to be. If the gap shown is truly reflective of Puerto Ricans in the United States, there may be growing stratification in regards to capital accumulation within the Puerto Ricans in the United States.

Table 2 describes poverty status averages in the states chosen, by race. Yet, here again, we can note a great disparity between those who responded 'White' and those who marked themselves off as 'Other Race' or 'Black'. Nationally, Puerto Ricans have almost double the poverty rate of Non-Latino European Americans (US Census, 1994). Puerto Ricans have about thirty-five percent of its population in poverty. In Table 2, approximately twenty-two percent of

those who classified themselves as white are in poverty. Those who marked off 'Other Race' or 'Black' have over ten percent more persons in poverty than those who marked off 'White'. This seems to reflect the national average for Puerto Ricans. The 'White' racial category reflects the national averages of the other two main Latino group Mexican and Cubans, who have a 27 percent and 17 percent poverty rate, respectively.

Table 3 looks at the distribution within occupation, by race. Except for a four percent difference in the number of Puerto Ricans from the 'Other Race' category who are Operators, Fabricators, and Laborers, there are no meaningful differences by race. Table 4, on the other hand, shows some distinguishable differences in education for Puerto Ricans between the racial categories. 'Other Race' Puerto Ricans have a greater percent with less than high school education than both 'White' Puerto Ricans and 'Black' Puerto Ricans. At least a 12th grade education is distributed equally among the racial categories, but as one increases in higher education, the inconsistency among the racial groups grows. White and black Puerto Ricans have higher percentages in the 1 through 3 years of college category.

This table may appear to show some evidence on how racial choice may be an indicator of assimilation into United States society. If assimilation was truly occurring, however, place of birth and years in the United States should have shown a similar pattern. For example, if a pattern around a racial choice by the length of time in the United States or by US birth existed, assimilation into the US racial categories may be apparent. In the sample, the distribution between place of birth and Race was European or 'White' 43.1 percent, 'Other Race' 37.9 percent, and 47.3 percent for 'Blacks' born in the United States. Puerto Rican born distribution was 56.9 percent, 62.1 percent, and 52.7 percent, respectively. Years in the United

States showed similar distribution among those who have been in the United States thirty, twenty, ten, or less than nine years. These distributions indicates that Puerto Ricans are not assimilating into either 'White' society or 'Black' society in the United States by their length of stay. This would hold that a divide within Puerto Rican racial differences is not evident. The Multi-variate regression models in Table 5 were conducted on all Puerto Ricans in the sample to determine what variables had a significant impact on total income. The first model of Table 5 included only those variables which are either core demographic or part of the social economic status of the population. In Model 1, all of the variables, except 'Place of Birth' and 'Speaking English Well' had a significant impact on total income. Under the Race category for those who indicated 'Other Race' the impact was negative and significant. Under the Race category of 'Black', the impact on total income was -.138 percent, when compared to 'Whites'.

In Model 2 where occupations, place of residence, and life experience variables were included, Race was statistically significant. In model 2, all of the occupation variables were significant, and had a negative impact on total income, except for Precision Production, craft, and repair, which was positive for all Puerto Ricans. The reason for this may be easily explained by the flexibility of someone in one of the specific occupations under the Precision production, craft, and repair to earn extra income from their trade. For example, as noted by Mercer (1993) about the Puerto Rican Community in a section of Brooklyn, many Puerto Ricans were part of both the formal economy as well as the informal economy. It seems that among all the other occupations, this would blend itself more easily with the informal and formal economy. Both language and education are statistically significant and negative for all Puerto Ricans.

Of all of the variables in Table 5, gender had one of the strongest, and most negative,

impacts on total income for Puerto Ricans. Income is a variable that affects each gender very differently. Females tend to be paid less than men in the same jobs, and they have lower rates of mobility within their jobs when compared to men (Bianchi, 1995; Wetzel, 1995). Job stratification or occupation queuing of race among the Puerto Rican population, two more regressions (Table 2 and 3) were conducted for each gender.

Table 6 was a log-lin regression conducted on female Puerto Ricans for the selected area in the United States. When looking at Puerto Rican women, many of the same variables continue to be statistically significant, except for Black, which loses its significance. This is unlike Rodriguez (1991), although the 'Other Race' category, identified by her Other Spanish (OS) is statistically significant for Women. Although the coefficient is small, and therefore shows a relatively weak impact on total income when compared to the other variables, it is still significant. This means that at some level, race has some effect on Puerto Rican Women's income, although extended research in this area is necessary in order to specify exactly how it is manifested in life.

The regression done on Puerto Rican Males (Table 7) on the other hand, shows race to be significant. Rodriguez's 1991 study of New York City Puerto Ricans could not show 'Black' to have a statistically significant impact on Puerto Rican wages, as well as other researchers such as Remairs (1984) which she points out could not find significance for race among Puerto Ricans. Although this tables shows that men who mark off 'White' tend to do much better than both 'Black' and 'Other Race', it is important to note how much greater the negative impact is for those who indicate 'Black'. The significance of the variable also holds true for Puerto Ricans born on the Island of Puerto Rico (see appendix 1, Model 3).

Summary and Conclusion

The data above indicated a significant difference among Puerto Ricans who considered themselves under the Racial category as 'White', 'Black' or 'Other Race'. Gender, though important, revealed that some of the impacts of race were felt regardless of one's gender. The quality of life and social economic well-being seemed to be closely connected to the category one provided under race. Those who mark 'Other Race' or 'Black' had less total income, own fewer homes than White Puerto Ricans, and have lower educational means. The impact that of the race is therefore an extremely important question that must be continually studied.

The impact of Race on Puerto Ricans in the United States is difficult to measure accurately. The distinct impact that skin color may have on each individual, and whether it becomes more significant than nationality or ethnicity under the current United States social system, may never be fully understood. The difficulty mainly lies on whether the discrimination is based on being Puerto Rican, or being mistaken for an African American, or for having truly darker skin. Taking this into account, the fact is that for Puerto Ricans in the United States, there seems to be some significance in their overall economic well-being and Race is important. This of course does not mean that Weber's 1992 definition of ethnicity is too antiquated for Puerto Ricans. On the contrary, it is one of the only ethnic definitions or theories that may continue to have some merit, as far as for Puerto Ricans in the United States. Puerto Ricans' proximity to the Island of Puerto Rico, the continual relationship between the Island and the United States, and strong social networks maintained by Puerto Ricans is bound to help maintain the Puerto

Rican ethnicity (Borgas-Mendez, 1993).

What may be interesting is to see if there will be a growing stratification between White Puerto Ricans and Other Puerto Ricans in the future. Clara Rodriguez (1991), in her study of wages in New York City for Puerto Ricans, found some significance by Race. Will the 2000 census also show similar results, or an even greater distancing within the Puerto Ricans' racial groups? The questions that would surely follow if this scenario became real would be: are white Puerto Ricans truly light in skin color, and is Puerto Rican ethnicity becoming more symbolic? A case that Gans (1979) has indicated would involve minimal discrimination if any and full acculturation in the American mainstream European American culture. This may be extremely unique if it occurred due to the fact that many Puerto Ricans will not be able to follow suit, as was done by traditional European groups, because of the racial mixtures within the Puerto Rican community. Although this is only one of many possible outcomes a continued inequality within Puerto Rico grows, it surely makes the continued study of this population that much more important, and interesting, in the time to come.

Table 1**Cross tabulations for Puerto Ricans in CT, IL, MA, NJ, NY, OH, & PA****Home Ownership**

	<u>Race Category</u>		
	<u>European or White</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>African or Black</u>
Owns Home	35.3%	24%	19.3%
Rents	64.7%	76%	80.7%
Total*	100%	100%	100%

*May not add to 100 % due to rounding

Source: 1990 5% Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample, Provided by the Univ. of Minn., History Dept.

Table 2**Cross tabulations for Puerto Ricans in CT, IL, MA, NJ, NY, OH, & PA****Poverty Status**

	<u>Race Category</u>		
	<u>European or White</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>African or Black</u>
Poverty	21.6%	33%	34.1%
Not Poor	78.4%	67%	65.9%
Total*	100%	100%	100%

*May not add to 100 % due to rounding

Source: 1990 5% Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample, Provided by the Univ. of Minn., History Dept.

Table 3
Cross tabulations for Puerto Ricans in CT, IL, MA, NJ, NY, OH, & PA

Occupation	<u>Race Category</u>		
	<u>European or White</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>African or Black</u>
Mgr., & Prof.	3.1%	2%	2.7%
Tech, sales, Admin.	38%	35%	39%
Service	20.5%	21.9%	21.8%
Precision, Craft, repair	10.7%	10.4%	9.3%
Operators, Laborers	26.6%	29.4%	24.8%
Military	1.1%	1.4%	2.3%
Total*	100%	100%	100%

*May not add to 100 % due to rounding

Source: 1990 5% Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample, Provided by the Univ. of Minn., History Dept.

Table 4
Cross tabulations for Puerto Ricans in CT, IL, MA, NJ, NY, OH, & PA

Education	<u>Race Category</u>		
	<u>European or White</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>African or Black</u>
4 plus yrs. of college	8.5%	4.1%	6.2%
1-3 yrs of college	18%	16%	19%
At least 12 yrs. if not HS	32.2%	29.9%	31.4%
Less than 12 yrs.	40.8%	50.2%	43.6%
Total*	100%	100%	100%

*May not add to 100 % due to rounding

Source: 1990 5% Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample, Provided by the Univ. of Minn., History Dept.

Table 5

Log-lin Regression on Income of Puerto Ricans In CT, IL, MA, NJ, NY, OH, and PA

	<u>Model 1</u>	<u>Model 2</u>
	B(t-statistic)	
<u>Constant(Reference)</u>	9.01	9.029
<u>Race(White)</u>		
Black	-0.138 * (-4.350)	-0.131 * (-4.171)
Other	-0.0477* (-3.813)	-0.0453* (-3.649)
<u>Gender(men)</u>		
Female	-0.464 * (-37.846)	-0.433 * (-32.480)
<u>Age</u>	0.02202* (38.326)	0.02196* (37.763)
<u>Place of Birth(US)</u>		
Puerto Rico	-0.0276 (-1.885)	-0.0297* (-2.032)
<u>Marriage(Married)</u>		
Separated	0.472 * (29.020)	0.453 * (27.981)
Divorced	0.223 * (6.012)	0.211 * (5.732)
Widowed	0.218 * (8.452)	0.22 * (8.615)
Single	0.36 * (15.664)	0.354 * (15.526)
<u>Nchild</u>	0.03989* (7.152)	0.04194* (7.564)
<u>Education</u>		
<u>(4 Yrs. Plus of College)</u>		
Some College	-0.312 * (-9.744)	-0.309 * (-9.662)
High School	-0.481 * (-15.535)	-0.473 * (-15198)
Less than HS	-0.941 * (-30.033)	-0.92 * (-28.958)

Table 5 (Continued)

Log-lin Regression on Income of Puerto Ricans In CT, IL, MA, NJ, NY, OH, and PA

	<u>Model 1</u> B(t-statistic)	<u>Model 2</u>
<u>Ability to speak English</u>		
<u>(English Only)</u>		
Very Well	0.06201* (3.263)	0.0552 * (2.912)
Well	-0.02262 (-1.163)	-0.0284 (-1.266)
Not Well	-0.12 * (-4.545)	-0.122 * (-4.622)
No English	-0.237 * (-5.163)	-0.236 * (-5.180)
<u>Occupation(Managers)</u>		
Technical & sales		-0.103 * (-3.233)
Service		-0.275 * (-8.450)
Precision & Repair		0.07082 * (2.024)
Operator & Laborers		-0.0975 * (-3.029)
Military		-0.914 * (-12.975)
<u>Metro(Non-Metro)</u>		
Metro		0.134 * (4.900)
<u>Veteran(served)</u>		
Non-veteran		-0.0422 * (-1.984)
	Adj R ² .230 ** N 29,228	Adj R ² .242 ** N 29,228

*P<.05

**R² f-test P<.05

Source: 1990 5% Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample, Provided by the Univ. of Minn., History Dept.

Table 6**Log-lin regression on Income of Puerto Rican Women in CT, IL, MA, NJ, NY, OH, & PA**

	<u>Model 1</u>	<u>Model 2</u>
	B(t-statistic)	
<u>Constant(Reference)</u>	8.621	8.842
<u>Race(White)</u>		
Black	-0.00893 (-.183)	-0.0117 (-.243)
Other	-0.0518* (-2.656)	-0.0513* (-2.651)
<u>Age</u>	0.02397* (26.758)	0.02412* (26.886)
<u>Place of Birth(US)</u>		
Puerto Rico	-0.054 * (-2.400)	-0.0428 (-1.911)
<u>Marriage(Married)</u>		
Separated	0.288 * (12.066)	0.274 * (11.566)
Divorced	0.182 * (3.001)	0.186 * (3.105)
Widowed	0.174 * (4.831)	0.186 * (5.210)
Single	0.334 * (10.361)	0.337 * (10.587)
<u>Nchild</u>	0.00943 (1.147)	0.01694* (2.073)
<u>Education</u>		
<u>(4 Yrs. Plus of College)</u>		
Some College	-0.33 * (-7.048)	-0.299 * (-6.277)
High School	-0.528 * (-11.367)	-0.47 * (-10.066)
Less than HS	-1.009 * (21.285)	-0.927 * (-19.255)

Table 6
Log-lin regression on Income of Puerto Rican Women in CT, IL, MA, NJ, NY, OH, & PA

	<u>Model 1</u> B(t-statistic)	<u>Model 2</u>
<u>Ability to speak English</u>		
<u>(English Only)</u>		
Very Well	0.09244* (3.060)	0.06752* (2.238)
Well	-0.004 (-.111)	-0.0246 (-.687)
Not Well	-0.0827 (-1.945)	-0.102 * (-2.396)
No English	-0.261 * (-3.677)	-0.275 * (-3.907)
<u>Occupation(Managers)</u>		
Technical & sales		-0.309 * (-5.503)
Service		-0.558 * (-9.487)
Precision & Repair		-0.127 (-1.735)
Operator & Laborers		-0.353 * (-5.908)
Military		-1.194 * (-11.353)
<u>Metro(Non-Metro)</u>		
Metro		0.214 * (4.982)
<u>Veteran(served)</u>		
Non-veteran		-0.119 (-1.392)
	Adj R ² .157** N 13,304	Adj R ² .174** N 13,304

*P<.05

**R² f-test P<.05

Source: 1990 5% Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample, Provided by the Univ. of Minn., History Dept.

Table 7**Log-lin Regression on Income of Puerto Rican Men in CT, IL, MA, NJ, NY, OH, & PA**

	<u>Model 1</u>	<u>Model 2</u>
	B(t-statistic)	
<u>Constant(Reference)</u>	8.964	8.969
<u>Race(White)</u>		
Black	-0.249 * (-6.030)	-0.233 * (-5.677)
Other	-0.0468* (-2.917)	-0.0443* (-2.775)
<u>Age</u>	0.01956* (26.321)	0.01947* (25.601)
<u>Place of Birth(US)</u>		
Puerto Rico	-0.0242 (-.127)	-0.0106 (.558)
<u>Marriage(Married)</u>		
Separated	0.631 * (28.058)	0.612 * (27.333)
Divorced	0.291 * (6.300)	0.274 * (5.953)
Widowed	0.289 * (7.703)	0.28 * (7.512)
Single	0.382 * (11.524)	0.364 * (11.011)
<u>Nchild</u>	0.05093* (6.154)	0.04812* (6.186)
<u>Education</u>		
<u>(4 Yrs. Plus of College)</u>		
Some College	-0.298* (-6.899)	-0.317 * (-7.334)
High School	-0.431* (-10.450)	-0.459 * (-11.043)
Less than HS	-0.881* (-21.244)	-0.9 * (-21.353)

Table 7
Log-lin Regression on Income of Puerto Rican Men in CT, IL, MA, NJ, NY, OH, & PA

	<u>Model 1</u> B(t-statistic)	<u>Model 2</u>
<u>Ability to speak English</u>		
<u>(English Only)</u>		
Very Well	0.03893 (1.617)	0.04418 (1.837)
Well	-0.0458 (-1.615)	-0.0349 (-1.231)
Not Well	-0.144* (-4.331)	-0.132 * (-3.963)
No English	-0.193* (-3.244)	-0.175 * (-2.957)
<u>Occupation(Managers)</u>		
Technical & sales		-0.0272 (-.711)
Service		-0.116 * (-3.017)
Precision & Repair		0.161 * (4.095)
Operator & Laborers		0.02297 (.616)
Military		-0.758 * (-7.767)
<u>Metro(Non-Metro)</u>		
Metro		0.06471 (1.851)
<u>Veteran(served)</u>		
Non-veteran		-0.0356 (-1.644)
	Adj R ² .249** N 15,924	Adj R ² .258** N 15,924

*P<.05

**R² f-test P<.05

Source: 1990 5% Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample, Provided by the Univ. of Minn., History Dept.

Appendix 1Log-lin Regression on Income of Island born Puerto Ricans in CT, IL, MA, NJ, NY, OH, & PA

	<u>Model 1</u> B(t-statistic)	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>
<u>Constant(Reference)</u>	9.499	9.034	9.522
<u>Race(White)</u>			
Black	-0.133 * (-2.665)	0.0481 (.638)	-0.215 * (-4.086)
Other	-0.0675* (-4.391)	-0.0723* (-2.902)	-0.0657* (-3.416)
<u>Gender(men)</u>			
Female	-0.457 * (-28.736)	N/A N/A	N/A N/A
<u>Age</u>	0.01083* (13.283)	0.01343* (10.177)	0.007961* (7.700)
<u>Years in the US</u> <u>(Thirty Plus Yrs)</u>			
20-29	0.02501 (1.193)	0.06911* (2.035)	0.0003785 (.014)
10-19	-0.089 * (-3.505)	-0.0312 (-.780)	-0.135 * (-4.154)
Less than 9	-0.3 * (-11.301)	-0.136 * (-6.216)	-0.32 * (-9.537)
<u>Marriage(Married)</u>			
Separated	0.396 * (19.455)	0.232 * (7.496)	0.544 * (19.747)
Divorced	0.17 * (3.758)	0.226 * (2.904)	0.194 * (3.559)
Widowed	0.167 * (5.513)	0.033 * (2.626)	0.244 * (5.620)
Single	0.293 * (10.897)	0.295 * (7.692)	0.263 * (7.030)
<u>Nchild</u>	0.03728* (5.934)	0.01064 (1.087)	0.04128* (4.897)
<u>Education</u> <u>(4 Yrs. Plus of College)</u>			
Some College	-0.305 * (-6.769)	-0.316 * (-4.634)	-0.289 * (-4.815)
High School	-0.46 * (-10.649)	-0.477 * (-7.220)	-0.43 * (-7.550)
Less than HS	-0.756 * (-17.284)	-0.758 * (-11.264)	-0.733 * (-12.777)

Appendix 1**Log-lin Regression on Income of Island born Puerto Ricans in CT, IL, MA, NJ, NY, OH, & PA**

	<u>Model 1</u> B(t-statistic)	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>
<u>Ability to speak English</u>			
<u>(English Only)</u>			
Very Well	0.02569 (.720)	0.01301 (.212)	0.04553 (1.061)
Well	-0.0252 (-.685)	-0.0496 (-.787)	-0.000708 (-.016)
Not Well	-0.109 * (-2.799)	-0.136 * (-2.042)	-0.0796 (-1.679)
No English	-0.212 * (-3.997)	-0.287 * (-3.345)	-0.131 * (-1.960)
<u>Occupation(Managers)</u>			
Technical & sales	-0.0426 (-1.095)	-0.19 * (-2.519)	-0.0126 (-.278)
Service	-0.19 * (-4.848)	-0.414 * (-5.317)	-0.0885* (-2.001)
Precision & Repair	0.107 * (2.569)	-0.0348 (-.379)	0.146 * (3.231)
Operator & Laborers	-0.0436 (-1.141)	-0.213 * (-2.737)	0.007173 (.169)
Military	-0.96 * (-11.334)	-1.074 * (-8.327)	-1.054 * (-8.775)
<u>Metro(Non-Metro)</u>			
Metro	0.08434* (2.375)	0.183 * (3.137)	0.05194 (.118)
<u>Veteran(served)</u>			
Non-veteran	-0.0283 (-1.087)	0.03802 (0.325)	-0.0282 (-1.076)
	Adj R ² .208**	Adj R ² .128**	Adj R ² .205**
	N 16,515	N 7,130	N 9,385

*P<.05

**R² f-test P<.05

Source: 1990 5% Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample, Provided by the Univ. of Minn., History Dept.

Appendix 2**Distribution of Puerto Ricans by State with the Most Rapid Increase**

State	<u>Percent Contribution to State growth by Puerto Ricans 1980-1990</u>	<u>Percent of State That is Puerto Rican 1990</u>
New York	23.2	6
New Jersey	21	4.1
Florida	4.8	1.9
Massachusetts	26.8	2.5
Pennsylvania	322.2	1.3
Connecticut	32.6	4.5
Illinois	413.7	1.3
California	0.5	0.4
Ohio	27.1	0.4
Texas	0.7	0.3

Source: Rivera-Batiz, Francisco and Carlos Santiago, Puerto Ricans in the United States, National Puerto Rican Coalition, Inc., Washington D.C., Oct. 1994.

Appendix 3**1990 Puerto Rican Population by State**

State	<u>Population Distribution</u>
New York	1,086,580
New Jersey	320,130
Florida	247,010
Massachusetts	151,193
Pennsylvania	148,988
Connecticut	146,842
Illinois	146,059
California	126,417
Ohio	45,853
Texas	42,981

Source: Rivera-Batiz, Francisco and Carlos Santiago, Puerto Ricans in the United States, National Puerto Rican Coalition, Inc., Washington D.C., Oct. 1994.

Works Cited

- Alba, Richard, Ethnic Identity: The Transformation of White America, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT., 1990.
- Bonila-Silva, Eduardo, '*Rethinking Racism.....*' **American Sociological Review**, 62, 1997.
- Borgas-Mendez, Ramon, '*Migration, Social Networks, Poverty and the Regionalization of Puerto Rican Settlement: Barrio Formation in Lawrence and Holyoke, Massachusetts,*' **Latino Studies Journal**, V. 4, N. 2, May 1993.
- Denton, Nancy and Douglas Massey, '*Racial Identity among Caribbean Hispanics: The effect of Double Minority Status on Residential Segregation,*' **American Sociological Review**, V. 54, Oct. 1989.
- Gans, Herbert, *Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America,*' **Ethnic and Racial Studies**, V. 2, N. 1, Jan. 1979.
- Omi Micheal and Howard Winant, Racial Formations in the United States, Routledge Press, NY. NY., 1994.
- Reimers, C., '*The Wage structure of Hispanic Men: Implications for Policy,*' **Social Science Quarterly**, V. 65, N. 2, 1984.
- Rivera-Batiz, Francisco and Carlos Santiago, Puerto Ricans in the United States: A changing Reality, National Puerto Rican Coalition, Inc., Washington D.C., 1994.
- Rivera-Batiz, Francisco and Carlos Santiago, Island Paradox, Russell Sage Publications, New York, NY, 1996.

Rodriguez, Clara, 'Racial Themes in Literature and Other Latinos,' in Latinos in New York: Communities in transition, Edited by Gabriel Haslip-Viera and Sherrie L. Baver, Univ. of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, IN., 1996.

-----'Challenging Racial Hegemony: Puerto Ricans in the United States,' Race, Edited by Steven Gregory and Rodger Sanjek, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ, 1994.

-----'The Effects of Race on Puerto Rican Wages,' In Hispanics in the Labor Force: Issues and Policies, edited by Edwin Melendez, Clara Rodriguez and Janis Barry Figueroa, Plenum Press, NY, NY, 1991.

-----Puerto Ricans Born in the U.S.A., Westview Press, Boulder, CO. 1991b.

-----'Puerto Ricans: between Black and White,' in Historical Perspectives On Puerto Rican Survival on the United States, Edited by Clara Rodriguez and Virginia Sanchez Korrol, Markus Wiener Publishers, Princeton, NJ., 1980.

Ruggles, Steven and Matthew Sobek *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 2.0*

Minneapolis: Historical Census Projects, University of Minnesota, 1997.

URL for the IPUMS site: <http://www.ipums.umn.edu>.

Stepick III, Alex and Guillermo Grenier, 'Cubans In Miami,' In In the Barrios: Latinos and the Underclass debate, Edited by Joan Moore and Raquel Pinderhughes, Russell Sage Foundation, NY, NY, 1993.

Sullivan, Mercer L., 'Puerto Ricans In Sunset Park, Brooklyn: Poverty Amidst Ethnic And Economic Diversity,' In In the Barrios: Latinos and the Underclass Debate, Edited by Joan Moore and Raquel Pinderhughes, Russell Sage Foundation, NY, NY, 1993.

United States Bureau of the Census, Hispanics-Latinos: Diverse People in a multicultural society; A special Report :Second Edition, National Association of Hispanic Publications, Washington D.C., 1995.

Weber, Max, Economy and Society, Bedminster Press, NY, NY, 1922 (1968).