Race Reporting By Immigrants From Spanish-Speaking Countries Of Latin America In Census 2000[†]

Sharon Ennis and Jorge del Pinal
U.S. Census Bureau, 4700 Silver Hill Road, Washington, D.C. 20233-6700

Key Words: Logistic regression, Race, Latin American Immigrants

Introduction

In 2000, over half of the total foreign-born population residing in the United States was from Latin America (Malone et al., 2003). Based on analysis of Census 2000 long form data, del Pinal and Ennis (2005) found that in answering the race question, a large proportion of respondents born in Spanish-speaking countries in Latin America reported as White (46 percent) or Some Other Race (41 percent).[1] Virtually all respondents (96 percent) born in Spanish-speaking countries in Latin America reported as being of Hispanic origin (del Pinal and Ennis, 2005).

We focus on respondents from Spanish-speaking Latin America because research suggests that there are several issues related to how Hispanics report race in the United States. Rodriguez (2000) believes that Hispanics have a different understanding of race and viewed the race question "as a question of culture, national origin, ethnicity, and socialization rather than simply biological or genetic ancestry or color." Hispanics' views on race are dependent on several factors including the racial formation process in their country of origin, generational differences, phenotype, class, age, and education (Rodriguez, 2000). Based on analysis of the five-percent public use micro sample (PUMS) data from Census 2000, Tafoya (2004) suggests that the choice of race by Hispanics in the U.S. is related to their sense of belonging rather than skin color.

Differences between Hispanics who identify as White and those who identify as Some Other Race "… suggests they experience racial identity as a measure of belonging: Feeling white seems to be a reflection of success and a sense of inclusion" (Tafoya, 2004). Similarly, as suggested by Portes, Zhou, Bankston, and Gibson (cited by Bean, Stevens, and Wierzbicki, 2003), Hispanic immigrants may have adopted a path of "selective assimilation"

or "accommodation without assimilation," which may lead to more flexibility in racial identification. Racial identification occurs at several levels: reactive, symbolic, and selective. Reactive identification may likely result from repeated discrimination and subsequent hardening of oppositional attitudes. Better socioeconomic prospects in the immigrant community may lead to selective identification, while symbolic identification arises among those who already are largely incorporated culturally and economically. Tafoya's (2004) research seems to support these hypotheses.

This paper examines the effects of a number of social, demographic, and economic variables on responses to the race question by immigrants from Spanish-speaking Latin American countries. Based on Tafoya's findings, "…for Hispanics racial identity…is at least partially a function of education, citizenship, civic participation and economic status." She showed that "…Hispanics who identified themselves as white have higher levels of education and income and greater degrees of civic enfranchisement than those who pick the some other race category." Our hypothesis is that immigrants born in Spanish-speaking Latin American countries of higher socioeconomic status are more likely to feel integrated into society, and therefore more likely to report as White in race than those of lower socioeconomic status.

We used logistic regression to model the probability that these respondents reported as White using the selected independent variables. The model took into account interactions, which exist when the effect of an independent variable on a dependent variable differs depending on the value of a third variable.

Data Sources

During Census 2000, every person and housing unit in the U.S. was asked basic demographic and housing questions (for example, race, age, and relationship to householder). A sample of these people and housing units received the long form, which asked more detailed questions about items, such as income, occupation, and housing costs. The sampling unit for Census 2000 was the housing unit, including all occupants. The long form was distributed to about 1-in-6 housing units in the U.S. For more information on sample design, see Chapter 8 (Accuracy of the Data) of the 2000 Census of Population and Housing Technical Documentation at www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf.

This study used Census 2000 long form (sample) data to examine how respondents born in the Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America reported race. This foreign-born Latin American

---

[†]This report is released to inform interested parties of ongoing research and to encourage discussion of work in progress. The views expressed on statistical and methodological issues are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau.

[1] Latin America encompasses Mexico, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean. Spanish-speaking countries include Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic.

population includes householders who were born in the Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America who were not citizens of the U.S. or who became U.S. citizens by naturalization.[2] We included respondents in this group only if they reported place of birth and citizenship data, not if the data were imputed. In order to increase independence of responses in our analysis, we limited our analysis to include only those respondents who were householders.[3]

Methodology

To investigate relationships between respondents who report as White and characteristics of the respondents, we used a logistic regression model. The dependent variable was defined as White alone versus all other single races and Two or More Races. We chose the following independent variables as measures of integration (see Table 1 for a list of variables and how they are defined):

- Educational attainment – We hypothesized that the higher the education, the more likely the respondent is to be integrated and to report as White.
- English ability – Respondents who spoke English only or very well were more likely to report as White.
- Citizenship – Respondents who were naturalized citizens were more likely to report as White.
- Year of entry – Respondents who have been in the U.S. the longest were more likely to feel integrated.
- Poverty level and Income – Respondents who were economically better off were more likely to report as White.

Based on previous research, the following were used as control variables:

- Place of birth – Race reporting by Latin American immigrants varies by country of birth (del Pinal and Ennis, 2005).
- Hispanic origin – Race reporting varies by whether respondents reported as Hispanic or not (del Pinal and Ennis, 2005).
- Sex and Age – Standard demographic control variables.
- First ancestry – Race reporting varies by reported ancestry (del Pinal and Ennis, 2005).
- State – Reported race varies by state and region (Tafoya, 2004).

Some statistical software programs, such as SAS version 8, treat any data set as though it were constructed through a simple random sample, ignoring the complexities associated with data collected through a complex sample (Thomas and Heck, 2001). Using raw expansion weights in these statistical programs causes the programs to err in the calculation of standard error estimates because the program believes that the sample size is larger than it actually is. To deal with this, the raw expansion weight can be adjusted to produce a relative weight, which is defined to be the expansion weight divided by the mean of the expansion weights (Thomas and Heck, 2001; Lee, Forthofer, and Lorimer, 1989). Because the 2000 census utilized a complex sampling design, we used relative weights when conducting our statistical analysis.

Furthermore, we had to correct for potential bias in the estimates. As Thomas and Heck (2001) stated, "If standard errors are underestimated by not taking the complex sample design into account, there exists a greater likelihood of finding erroneously 'significant' parameters in the model than the a priori established alpha value indicates." The design factor, the square root of the design effect, is useful for adjustments that can be made either prior to hypothesis testing or after traditional hypothesis tests have been conducted. To adjust the standard errors under the simple random sample assumption, we multiplied the standard errors in the logistic regression model by the appropriate design factor.[4]

Results[5]

In the Appendix, Table 1 shows the dependent and independent variables and their values. Table 2 contains the model's logistic coefficients, standard errors, odds ratios, and p-values. The model in Table 2 had good fit with a likelihood ratio chi-square of 54507.98 with 65 degrees of freedom (p < .0001). The appendix also contains a graph of the odds ratios of the model (excluding interactions), which provides a visual representation of the odds ratios discussed below.

To ease interpretation, we looked at the odds ratios (see Table 2). An odds ratio more than 1.0 means that respondents in the given category were more likely to report as White than respondents in the reference category. Odds ratios less than 1.0 indicate that respondents in the given category were less likely to report as White than respondents in the reference category.

We found that respondents born in the Spanish-speaking countries of Central America were 0.8 times less likely to report as White than respondents born in Mexico. Respondents born in the Spanish-speaking Caribbean and South America were 1.9 and 1.4 times, respectively, more likely to report as White than respondents born in Mexico.

---

[2] One person in each household was designated as the householder (Person 1). In most cases, the householder was the person, or one of the people, in whose name the home was owned, bought, or rented. If there was no such person in the household, any adult household member 15 years old and over could be designated as the householder (i.e., Person 1). Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens at birth and are not considered foreign-born. Therefore, they are not included in this study.

[3] Because one person in the household generally fills out census questionnaires, the responses of all household members cannot be considered independent. We do not know if the householder was always the person completing the questionnaire.

[4] We obtained the design factor from Chapter 8 (Accuracy of the Data) of the 2000 Census of Population and Housing Technical Documentation. See www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf for more information.

[5] Statements made in this section only apply to householders who were born in the Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America. All confidence intervals were computed at the 90 percent significance level.

Reporting as White was 2.3 times greater for respondents who reported as not Hispanic as for those who reported as Hispanic.

Respondents aged 65 years and older were more likely to report as White than respondents who were 18 to 64 years old.

Respondents whose highest level of schooling was the 9th grade or more were more likely to report as White than those who completed the 8th grade or less. Reporting as White was only slightly greater for respondents who reported 9th grade to 12th grade - no diploma (1.14), high school graduate (1.15), and some college to Associate's degree (1.23) than those who reported an 8th grade education or less. Respondents with a Bachelor's degree or more were 1.7 times more likely to report as White than respondents whose highest level of schooling was the 8th grade or less.

Reporting as White was 2.5 times greater for respondents who reported a European country as their first ancestry than for those who reported their country of birth. Respondents born in the Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America who reported their country of birth as their first ancestry were 1.6 times more likely to report to the race question as White than those who reported a general Hispanic term (Latino, Hispanic, Spanish, etc.). When examining respondents who reported some other ancestry, the p-value of .1074 indicated that these respondents and those that reported their country of birth were not statistically different and had similar reporting trends.

Immigrants who were not citizens of the U.S. at the time of the census were only slightly less likely (0.92) to report as White than immigrants who became citizens by naturalization.

Results showed that immigrants from Spanish-speaking Latin America who resided in the U.S. the longest were more likely to report to the race question as White. Respondents who came to the U.S. during the years 1970 through 1989 were only slightly less likely to report as White than respondents who came to the U.S. during the period 1990 through 2000. Respondents who came to the U.S. during the period 1960 through 1969 were only slightly more likely to report as White. Immigrants who came to the U.S. before 1960 were 1.6 times more likely to report as White to the race question than those who came to the U.S. during the years 1990 through 2000.

We found that the more income a respondent received in 1999, the more likely they were to report as White. Respondents who received an income of $25,000 to $49,999 were not statistically different than those who received less than $25,000 and had similar reporting trends (p = .8105). Reporting as White was 1.2 and 1.6 times greater for those who received an income of $50,000 to $74,999 and $75,000 or more, respectively, than those who received less than $25,000.

Respondents who resided in Florida or Texas at the time of the census were about twice as likely to report as White as respondents who resided in California. Residents of Illinois, New York/New Jersey, and all other states were only slightly more likely to report as White to the race question than residents of California.

An interaction existed between place of birth and state and the results follow. Respondents from Central America, the Caribbean, and South America who resided in Florida at the time of the 2000 census were about two times more likely to report as White than respondents from Mexico who resided in California. Reporting as White was about 1.5 times greater for Mexicans who lived in California than for Central Americans and South Americans who resided in Texas. Mexicans residing in California were 1.7, 4.8, 2.1, and 2.8 times more likely to report as White than respondents born in the Caribbean who resided in Illinois, New York/New Jersey, Texas, and all other states (excluding California and Florida), respectively. Central and South Americans who resided in all other states were only slightly more likely to report as White than Mexicans who lived in California. Central Americans who resided in New York or New Jersey were slightly less likely to report as White than Mexicans who lived in California. Central Americans who resided in Illinois and South Americans who resided in Illinois, New York, or New Jersey were not significantly different from Mexicans who resided in California.

An interaction also existed between year of entry and place of birth. Of the respondents who came to the U.S. during the years 1960 through 1969, respondents born in the Caribbean were 2.2 times more likely to report as White, South Americans were 1.4 times more likely to report as White, and Central Americans were 0.8 times less likely to report as White than Mexicans who came to the U.S. during the years 1990 through 2000. Of the respondents who came to the U.S. before 1960, those born in the Caribbean were 2.6 times more likely to report as White and South Americans were 2.0 times more likely to report as White than respondents born in Mexico who came to the U.S. during the years 1990 through 2000. Central Americans who came to the U.S. before 1960 were not statistically different from Mexicans who came during the period 1990 through 2000 (p = .1682).

Results follow for the interaction that occurred between ancestry and place of birth. Respondents of European ancestry born in the Caribbean or South America were more than twice as likely to report as White than Mexicans who reported their country of birth as their first ancestry. Central Americans of European ancestry were not statistically different from Mexicans who reported their country of birth showing similar reporting trends (p = .5126). Mexicans who reported their country of birth were less likely to report as White than other Latin Americans who reported a general Hispanic term as their first ancestry. For respondents who reported any other ancestry, those who were born in the Spanish-speaking countries of Central America, the Caribbean, and South America were less likely to report as White than respondents from Mexico who reported their country of birth as their ancestry.

Limitations

This study used 2000 census sample data since the long form questionnaire asked more detailed questions. This made more variables available to us to use as dependent variables in our logistic regression analysis. We may have introduced bias here if the reporting pattern of the long-form respondents differs from that of the short-form respondents. Also, non-response bias

exists if long-form respondents differ in their reporting pattern from non-respondents.

We limited our analysis to include only those respondents who were householders to increase independence. Since one person in the household typically fills out census questionnaires, the responses of all household members cannot be considered independent. We do not know if the householder was always the person completing the census questionnaire. By limiting our universe to householders, we may have introduced bias into our results. The degree of this bias depends on the difference between householders and other respondents in terms of their reporting patterns.

We only included two-way interactions in our model. We did not pursue higher order interactions.

Conclusion

This study examined the effects of a number of variables on responding as White to the race question in Census 2000 by immigrants from Spanish-speaking Latin American countries. Examination of respondents by place of birth revealed that respondents born in South America and the Caribbean were more likely to report as White to the race question. Central Americans were less likely to report as White than were Mexicans. Our results showed that immigrants from Spanish-speaking Latin American countries who reported as being non-Hispanic were more likely to report as White.

We also found that Latin Americans with a 9th grade education or more were more likely to report as White than respondents who had an 8th grade education or less. Respondents who received a Bachelor's degree or more were about twice as likely to report as White. Respondents of European ancestry were more likely than those who reported their country of birth as their ancestry to report as White. Immigrants who came to the U.S. before 1960 were more likely to report to the race question as White than those who came to the U.S. during 1990 through 2000. Results showed that the more income a respondent received in 1999, the more likely that they were to report as White. Latin Americans who received an income of $50,000 or more in 1999 were more likely to report as White than those who received less than $25,000. Respondents who resided in Florida or Texas at the time of the census were twice as likely to report as White than respondents who resided in California.

These findings seem to support Tafoya's (2004) suggestion that reporting as White seems to be associated with higher socioeconomic integration. We also found that length of time in the U.S. seems to play a part in reporting as White. Residing in the southern states of Florida and Texas seem to be related to a higher proportion of respondents reporting as White than those residing in California. About 86 percent of Latin American respondents who resided in Florida identified as White. The same was true for 62 percent of Texans and 45 percent of Californians. This seems to imply that foreign-born Latin Americans in California feel less integrated than those in Florida and Texas. In particular, since the majority of the foreign-born Latin American population of both Texas (87 percent) and California (79 percent) were born in Mexico, it appears that foreign-born Mexicans in California do not feel as integrated as

those in Texas. Tafoya (2004) suggests that the "unique and complex history of race relations in Texas is a major influence. This is the only state where a large Latino population was caught up both in Southern-style racial segregation and then the civil rights struggle to undo it." This emphasizes the importance of place of residence in identifying as White for foreign-born Latin Americans.

References

Bean, Frank D, Gillian Stevens, and Susan Wierzbicki, 2003. "The New Immigrants and Theories of Incorporation," pp.94-113, in Bean, Frank. D. and Gillian Stevens, America's Newcomers and the Dynamics of Diversity. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

del Pinal, Jorge and Sharon Ennis, 2005. "The Racial and Ethnic Identity of Latin American Immigrants in Census 2000," Population Association of America.

Hosmer, David and Stanley Lemeshow, 1989. Applied Logistic Regression. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Jaccard, James, 2001. Interaction Effects in Logistic Regession. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, No. 135. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lee, Eun Sul, Ronald N. Forthofer, and Ronald J. Lorimor, 1989. Analyzing Complex Survey Data. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, No. 71. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Malone, N., K.F. Baluja, J.M. Costanzo, and C.J. Davis (2003). The Foreign-Born Population: 2000. U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Brief, C2KBR-34, December 2003.

Menard, Scott, 1995. Applied Logistic Regession Analysis. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, No. 106. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rodriguez, Clara E., 2000. Changing Race: Latinos, the Census, and the History of Ethnicity in the United States. New York, New York: University Press.

Tafoya, Sonya, 2004. Shades of Belonging. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

Thomas, Scott L. and Ronald H. Heck, 2001. Analysis of Large-Scale Secondary Data in Higher Education Research: Potential Perils Associated With Complex Sampling Designs. *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 42, 517-520.

Appendix

Table 1. Variables Included in Logistic Regression Model: 2000

Variable	Values		Weighted N
Dependent variable			
Race	1. White alone		615,803
	2. Black alone, SOR* alone, AIAN* alone, Asian alone, NHOPI* alone, or Two or More Races		
Independent variables			
Place of birth	1. Mexico	3. Caribbean	688,668
	2. Central America	4. South America	
Hispanic origin	1. Hispanic		670,006
	2. Not Hispanic		
Sex	1. Male		682,723
	2. Female		
Age	1. 18 to 64 years		637,422
	2. 65 years and over		
Educational Attainment	1. No schooling completed – 8th grade		652,441
	2. 9th grade – 12th grade, no diploma		
	3. High school graduate		
	4. Some college – Associate degree		
	5. Bachelor's degree – Doctorate degree		
First Ancestry	1. Country of birth		659,162
	2. European country		
	3. General Hispanic term		
	4. All other ancestries that are not country of birth, European, or general Hispanic		
Ability to speak English	1. Speaks English only/Very well		651,971
	2. Well or Not well		
	3. Not at all		
Citizenship status	1. Yes, U.S. citizen by naturalization		688,668
	2. No, not a citizen of the U.S.		
Year of entry to the U.S.	1. 1990 – 2000	4. 1960 – 1969	637,829
	2. 1980 – 1989	5. Before 1960	
	3. 1970 – 1979		
Poverty Level	1. Above		688,668
	2. Below		
Income of householder in 1999	1. Less than $25,000	3. $50,000 – 74,999	527,855
	2. $25,000 – 49,999	4. $75,000 or more	
State	1. California		688,668
	2. New York/New Jersey		
	3. Texas		
	4. Florida		
	5. Illinois		
	6. All others		

SOR = Some Other Race   *AIAN = American Indian or Alaska Native*
NHOPI = Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

Table 2. Logistic Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Model: 2000

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio[†]	90% Lower Limit	90% Upper Limit	p-value
Place of Birth (Central America)	-0.1888	0.0452	0.8280*	0.7686	0.8919	<.0001
Place of Birth (Caribbean)	0.6232	0.1114	1.8649*	1.5528	2.2398	<.0001
Place of Birth (South America)	0.3082	0.0632	1.3610*	1.2265	1.5102	<.0001
Hispanic Origin (Not Hispanic)	0.8199	0.0736	2.2703*	2.0114	2.5625	<.0001
Sex (Female)	-0.0882	0.0147	0.9156*	0.8938	0.9379	<.0001
Age (65 yrs. and older)	0.4027	0.0301	1.4959*	1.4236	1.5718	<.0001
Education (9th-12th, no diploma)	0.1272	0.0170	1.1356*	1.1044	1.1678	<.0001
Education (High school graduate)	0.1383	0.0189	1.1483*	1.1132	1.1845	<.0001
Education (Some college-Assoc.)	0.2055	0.0209	1.2281*	1.1866	1.2711	<.0001
Education (Bachelor's-Doctorate)	0.5230	0.0267	1.6871*	1.6146	1.7628	<.0001
Ancestry (European)	0.9118	0.1243	2.4888*	2.0287	3.0533	<.0001
Ancestry (General Hispanic)	-0.4981	0.0347	0.6077*	0.5740	0.6434	<.0001
Ancestry (Other)	-0.1688	0.1367	0.8447	0.6746	1.0576	0.1074
English Ability (Well/Not Well)	0.1055	0.0155	1.1113*	1.0834	1.1399	<.0001
English Ability (Not at all)	0.1945	0.0240	1.2147*	1.1677	1.2636	<.0001
Citizenship (Not a US citizen)	-0.0828	0.0148	0.9205*	0.8983	0.9433	<.0001
Year to US (1980-1989)	-0.0916	0.0199	0.9125*	0.8831	0.9428	<.0001
Year to US (1970-1979)	-0.1890	0.0228	0.8278*	0.7973	0.8594	<.0001
Year to US (1960-1969)	0.0940	0.0318	1.0986*	1.0426	1.1575	0.0001
Year to US (Before 1960)	0.4562	0.0422	1.5781*	1.4723	1.6914	<.0001
Poverty level (Below)	0.0409	0.0159	1.0417*	1.0149	1.0693	0.0008
Income ($25000-49999)	-0.0030	0.0161	0.9970	0.9710	1.0238	0.8105
Income ($50000-74999)	0.1568	0.0323	1.1698*	1.1092	1.2336	<.0001
Income ($75000 or more)	0.4836	0.0468	1.6219*	1.5018	1.7516	<.0001
State (Florida)	0.8307	0.0580	2.2949*	2.0862	2.5245	<.0001
State (Illinois)	0.1909	0.0308	1.2103*	1.1506	1.2732	<.0001
State (New York/New Jersey)	0.2133	0.0559	1.2378*	1.1290	1.3570	<.0001
State (Texas)	0.7944	0.0196	2.2131*	2.1431	2.2854	<.0001
State (All others)	0.1126	0.0196	1.1192*	1.0838	1.1558	<.0001
Place of birth (Central Am.) * State (FL)	0.7831	0.0819	2.1882*	1.9123	2.5040	<.0001
Place of birth (Central Am.) * State (IL)	0.1057	0.1182	1.1115	0.9152	1.3499	0.2433
Place of birth (Central Am.) * State (NY/NJ)	-0.1104	0.0753	0.8955*	0.7911	1.0136	0.0557
Place of birth (Central Am.) * State (TX)	-0.3244	0.0605	0.7230*	0.6545	0.7986	<.0001
Place of birth (Central Am.) * State (All others)	0.0767	0.0462	1.0797*	1.0006	1.1651	0.0303
Place of birth (Caribbean) * State (FL)	0.5657	0.1219	1.7607*	1.4408	2.1516	<.0001
Place of birth (Caribbean) * State (IL)	-0.5367	0.2094	0.5847*	0.4143	0.8252	0.0008
Place of birth (Caribbean) * State (NY/NJ)	-1.5605	0.1187	0.2100*	0.1728	0.2553	<.0001
Place of birth (Caribbean) * State (TX)	-0.7592	0.1877	0.4680*	0.3437	0.6373	<.0001
Place of birth (Caribbean) * State (All others)	-1.0171	0.1136	0.3616*	0.3000	0.4359	<.0001
Place of birth (South Am.) * State (FL)	0.6354	0.0896	1.8878*	1.6291	2.1875	<.0001

Table 2. Logistic Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Model: 2000

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	Odds Ratio[†]	90% Lower Limit	90% Upper Limit	p-value
Place of birth (South Am.) * State (IL)	-0.0337	0.1246	0.9669	0.7877	1.1868	0.7243
Place of birth (South Am.) * State (NY/NJ)	-0.0619	0.0802	0.9400	0.8237	1.0726	0.3142
Place of birth (South Am.) * State (TX)	-0.4096	0.1015	0.6639*	0.5618	0.7845	<.0001
Place of birth (South Am.) * State (All others)	0.1324	0.0653	1.1416*	1.0253	1.2710	0.0082
Year to US (1980-1989) * Place of Birth (Central Am.)	-0.0449	0.0440	0.9561	0.8893	1.0279	0.1831
Year to US (1980-1989) * Place of Birth (Caribbean)	-0.1241	0.0588	0.8833*	0.8018	0.9730	0.0059
Year to US (1980-1989) * Place of Birth (South Am.)	-0.0512	0.0496	0.9501	0.8756	1.0309	0.1788
Year to US (1970-1979) * Place of Birth (Central Am.)	-0.0643	0.0563	0.9377	0.8548	1.0287	0.1367
Year to US (1970-1979) * Place of Birth (Caribbean)	0.2968	0.0653	1.3455*	1.2085	1.4981	<.0001
Year to US (1970-1979) * Place of Birth (South Am.)	0.1957	0.0571	1.2162*	1.1071	1.3360	<.0001
Year to US (1960-1969) * Place of Birth (Central Am.)	-0.2152	0.0789	0.8064*	0.7083	0.9181	0.0004
Year to US (1960-1969) * Place of Birth (Caribbean)	0.7999	0.0661	2.2253*	1.9959	2.4811	<.0001
Year to US (1960-1969) * Place of Birth (South Am.)	0.3013	0.0695	1.3516*	1.2055	1.5154	<.0001
Year to US (Before 1960) * Place of Birth (Central Am.)	-0.1274	0.1205	0.8804	0.7220	1.0734	0.1682
Year to US (Before 1960) * Place of Birth (Caribbean)	0.9462	0.1229	2.5759*	2.1044	3.1531	<.0001
Year to US (Before 1960) * Place of Birth (South Am.)	0.6742	0.1712	1.9625*	1.4808	2.6008	<.0001
Ancestry (European) * Place of Birth (Central Am.)	-0.0868	0.1727	0.9169	0.6901	1.2181	0.5126
Ancestry (European) * Place of Birth (Caribbean)	1.0026	0.1987	2.7254*	1.9654	3.7792	<.0001
Ancestry (European) * Place of Birth (South Am.)	0.7868	0.1550	2.1964*	1.7019	2.8344	<.0001
Ancestry (General Hisp.) * Place of Birth (Central Am.)	0.4443	0.0549	1.5594*	1.4247	1.7068	<.0001
Ancestry (General Hisp.) * Place of Birth (Caribbean)	0.9591	0.0825	2.6093*	2.2784	2.9884	<.0001
Ancestry (General Hisp.) * Place of Birth (South Am.)	0.5338	0.0648	1.7054*	1.5330	1.8971	<.0001
Ancestry (Other) * Place of Birth (Central Am.)	-0.9131	0.1737	0.4013*	0.3015	0.5340	<.0001
Ancestry (Other) * Place of Birth (Caribbean)	-1.1210	0.2117	0.3260*	0.2301	0.4617	<.0001
Ancestry (Other) * Place of Birth (South Am.)	-0.5812	0.1780	0.5592*	0.4173	0.7495	<.0001

[†] Refer to Table 1 for the reference group for each variable. The reference group is the first group listed for each variable in Table 1.
* Asterisk (if any) indicates that the odds ratio is statistically different than 1.0.

Graph of Odds Ratios