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KEY ANALYTICAL POINTS IN PAPER

- Immigrants are increasing share of poor
- Immigrants are more settled – but past mobility may not predict future mobility
- Spatial reconfiguration makes service delivery and civic engagement more challenging
- Education is key to mobility for immigrants and their children
- Racialization and insecure immigration status are big impediments to progress
Immigrant Share of Population versus Share of the Poor

- Immigrant, non-citizen
- Immigrant, naturalized

- Share of pop.
- Share of poor

1970: 3.0% 2.0%
1980: 3.1% 3.1%
1990: 4.7% 2.7%
2000: 8.4% 4.5%
2009: 12.3% 5.5%
Share below 150% Poverty by Recency of Migration
1970-2009, US (Working Age; Ages 25-64)

- Long-term immigrant; migrated 30 years or more, ago
- Migrated twenty to thirty years ago
- Migrated ten to twenty years ago
- Migrated less than ten years ago
THE SUBURBAN GEOGRAPHY OF IMMIGRATION

Percent Foreign-Born by Census Tract, 2005-2009

- 10% or Less
- 10.1% - 20%
- 20.1% - 30%
- 30.1% - 45%
- 45.1% or More

# Educational Profile for Workforce Age U.S.-born Whites and Blacks, Compared to Immigrant Non-citizen Asians and Latinos, 1970-2009, US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White U.S.-born</th>
<th>Black U.S.-born</th>
<th>Asian, Immigrant Non-citizen</th>
<th>Latino, Immigrant Non-citizen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **BA or better**
- **some college**
- **high school grad**
- **< high school**
Percent of Latinos below 150% of Poverty by Immigration Status, 1990-2009, CA

- U.S.-born
- Naturalized Immigrants
- Non-citizen Documented Immigrants
- Undocumented Immigrants
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Percent of Children Living Below 150% of the Poverty Level by Nativity of Parents and Family Type, 1970-2009, US
Work Experience for Householders in Households Living Below 150% of the Poverty Line, by Nativity, 1980 and 2009, US

As share of nativity cohort below 150% poverty

US-born
Immigrant, naturalized
Immigrant, non-citizen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1980</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not work or barely worked</td>
<td>Did not work or barely worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked part-time</td>
<td>Worked part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked full-time, yr. round</td>
<td>Worked full-time, yr. round</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY DIRECTIONS

- Make work pay
  - Labor rights as key
- Make mobility possible
  - ESL and other training
- Serve the new geography
  - Expand to suburbs
- Create a path to citizenship
  - Comprehensive and complete reform
THANKS!

For more reports and data, visit http://csii.usc.edu