Connecting Mexico and the Hoosier Heartland: The Economic Impacts of Mexico-Indiana Relations

Sagamore Institute for Policy Research
July 2006
Acknowledgements

When the Mexican Consulate in Indianapolis approached the Sagamore Institute in 2005 to discuss the pressing need for a clearer picture of the linkages between Mexico and Indiana, both sides wanted to produce something that business leaders, policymakers, civic groups and communities in Mexico and Indiana could use to promote economic growth and cultural understanding. We recognized that a shortage of good information and an abundance of inaccurate information are perhaps the most fundamental and formidable obstacles to any enduring, mutually enriching Mexico-Indiana partnership.

Building on the work of similar studies in states as disparate as Utah, Arizona and North Carolina, this report seeks to remove these obstacles—or at least to begin the process of removing them. Along the way, the study paints a fascinating and complex picture of Indiana’s importance to Mexico, Mexico’s importance to Indiana, and their growing interdependence.

This study would not have been possible without the leadership of Sergio Aguilera, who serves not only as the Consul of Mexico in Indianapolis but also as a Sagamore Trustee. Consul Aguilera was tireless in gathering public attention and support for the study. Sagamore is also grateful for the essential support provided by the Nicholas H. Noyes Foundation, the Efroymson Fund of the Central Indiana Community Foundation, Barnes & Thornburg LLP, the Indiana State Commission on Hispanic/Latino Affairs, Mr. Steve Ramos and other valued supporters of the Sagamore Institute.

Please direct any questions, comments or suggestions to Dr. John Clark at john@sipr.org or (317)472-9666.
Contents

1  Mexico: Indiana’s Most Important Partner  4

2  Mexicans in Indiana  7
2.1  The Size and Growth of the Mexican Population in Indiana  7
2.2  Mexicans in the Context of Indiana’s Foreign-Born Population  11
2.3  The Distribution of the Mexican Population in Indiana  16
2.4  Geographic Components of Growth in Indiana’s Mexican Population  22
2.5  The Gender and Age Composition of Indiana’s Mexican Population  24
2.6  Educational Attainment and School Attendance  26
2.7  Language Barriers for Mexicans in Indiana  33
2.8  Labor Force and Employment of Mexicans in Indiana  39
2.9  Employment by Industry and Occupation for Mexicans in Indiana  41
2.10  Housing Characteristics for Mexicans in Indiana  43
2.11  Transportation for Mexicans in Indiana  49
2.12  Work Context  52
2.13  Income for Mexicans in Indiana  58

3  Trade  62
3.1  A Mayor’s Mission to Mexico: An Illustration of Political Balancing  69

4  Finance  71
4.1  Domestic Real Estate Rental Expenses  71
4.2  Residential Real Estate Ownership Expenses  73
4.3  Taxes Paid by Mexicans in Indiana  78
4.4  Remittances  79

About the Authors  82
About Sagamore Institute for Policy Research  83
1. Mexico: Indiana’s Most Important Partner

In the 21st century, no single country is more important to Indiana’s economic prosperity and civic well-being than Mexico. This assertion may seem surprising, but a glance at several other countries that are vital to the state reveals why Mexico matters so much:

- **Japan.** Observers would agree that a higher priority for Indiana policymakers is cultivating economic ties with Japan. Gov. Mitch Daniels led highly publicized trips of the state’s leading businesspeople to Japan in 2005 and 2006 in aggressive search of Japanese investment. The highpoint of the Governor’s first term may well have been the decision by Honda to build a major automobile plant in Greensburg, IN.

  It is true that investment by Mexican firms in Indiana is negligible compared to the large amounts Japanese companies have invested in the state. Mexico is a developing economy that seeks to attract foreign investment rather than invest its capital abroad. But as this report argues, the Japanese investment in Indiana manufacturing — especially automobile manufacturing — is profoundly shaped by the linkages between Mexican and Indiana companies. Without the state’s economic integration with Mexico, Japanese investment in Indiana would be much, much smaller. Moreover, Mexico is a much more important trading partner for Indiana than is Japan: the state exports several times more to Mexico than it does to Japan.

- **Canada.** Looking only at trade statistics, Canada would seem to matter more to Indiana than Mexico. But even more than with Japan, a large part of Indiana’s economic ties with Canada cannot be separated from Mexico. In the last fifteen years, since shortly before the signing of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), manufacturing on the continent has become increasingly integrated. A significant part of trade between Indiana and Canada and between Indiana and Mexico is intra-company trade, within firms operating in Indiana, Mexico, and Canada.

  Mexico’s economic significance to Indiana results from more than trade. Canadians have long had (and today still do have) an important presence in Indiana, but the largest and fastest growing group of newcomers in the state today is Mexicans. As this study argues, Mexicans in Indiana are one of the critical factors for the state to maintain a high rate of economic growth in the years to come.

- **China.** China’s is the economy that dominates the world’s attention these days. China is the biggest target of foreign investment (including large investments from Indiana companies such as Eli Lilly and Cummins). Chinese products are swamping markets across the US, including in Indiana. And American workers are probably most worried that their jobs will “move to China.” It is true that China matters to the world economy more than any other country not named “the United States,” a fact that will be even truer tomorrow than it is today (although many analysts believe that serious weaknesses in the Chinese economy mean that India’s economy will surpass China’s before China tops the US).

  Despite the many goods for sale in stores across Indiana marked “Made in China,” however, China arguably has a much smaller footprint in the state than Mexico, both in reality and symbolically. The reason is the large presence of Mexican immigrants in Indiana. Integrating, assimilating, accommodating, repelling — whatever choices the people and policymakers of Indiana make regarding newcomers from Mexico, these choices will shape almost every aspect of local life, from education to law enforcement, from healthcare to
transportation. It is entirely possible decades from now that the state of Indiana will be faced with the question of how to absorb thousands of immigrants from China (or South Asia or Africa). The decisions then will depend on decisions made about Mexicans moving to the state today.

- **Germany.** Of European countries, Germany has perhaps the greatest presence in Indiana. Germany is a major trading partner of the state and a leading source of investment for Indiana companies. Germans also comprise the largest single ethnic group in the state, with a large percent of Indiana residents claiming German descent. After Spanish, German is the second largest native language for non-English speaking students in Indiana public schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>LEP</th>
<th>FEP</th>
<th>TOTAL LMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>25,832</td>
<td>10,620</td>
<td>36,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German (Amish)</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin (Sichuanese)</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But it is a very distant second place; and the vast majority of German-speaking students in fact are Amish, reflecting the careful preservation of a centuries-old way of life rather than current ties between Indiana and Germany. An ethnic and linguistic presence that has either assimilated into near invisibility or remains frozen in pre-industrial communities, these are the extremes of the German presence in contemporary Indiana.

- **The United Kingdom.** The UK’s economic significance to the state of Indiana parallels Germany’s: it invests substantially in Indiana, its exports and imports are significant (although less than Indiana’s trade with Mexico), and a large share of the state’s population is of British descent. While Germany has left the largest ethnic imprint on the state, the UK has most shaped the civic and political infrastructure of Indiana (and most other states in the US). The Framers of the American political system were inspired by ideas of limited government held accountable to the public, ideas articulated most clearly by philosophers of the English and Scottish Enlightenments. Opponents of immigration often claim to be driven by a desire to defend those British values against the flood of newcomers from undemocratic and un-Anglo political cultures. Of course, the civic culture in the United States has changed much since the thirteen colonies declared their independence in 1776 (declaring independence in part because the British blocked immigration to America). American political culture has not remained fixed and frozen for centuries, but instead has evolved and adapted in response to changes in the international environment and to the challenges of adopting waves of newcomers. Adjusting to new realities of sovereignty and citizenship, to the new vulnerabilities and opportunities represented by globalization are the challenges that will redefine civic culture for the people of Indiana as well as Mexico. It is crucial to remember: not every change and innovation is good.
In short, the Mexico-Indiana relationship is helping to fuel Japanese investment in Indiana, highlighting Indiana’s role as a NAFTA artery for Canada, setting precedents that will shape the nascent China-Indiana relationship, and drawing from — and even challenging — earlier precedents set by British and German influences in the Hoosier state.
2. Mexicans in Indiana

In 2004, an estimated 214,553 people of Mexican origin resided in Indiana. Today, everyone agrees the number is higher—and it is likely to be even higher tomorrow. At nearly a quarter-million, people of Mexican origin living in Indiana represent a population roughly the size of Indiana’s second largest city, Fort Wayne. But in a state of just over six million people, the Mexican population here is hardly enormous, amounting to less than four percent of the total population.

The small relative size of the Mexican population here in Indiana can mask its growing importance, however. Mexican population growth accounted for nearly half of total Indiana population growth between 2000 and 2004: 45.1 percent. This contrast — between static and dynamic, between what is and what is becoming — is the best description of the links connecting Mexico, Indiana, and Mexicans here in Indiana. It forms a partnership that is the Hoosier State’s most important.

The following data puts Indiana in the context of two different comparative groups—the states surrounding Indiana here in the Midwest and the states along the Mexican border. The first group, Indiana’s neighbors, helps clarify the state’s economic rivals as well as states that may be experiencing similar pressures and processes. The second group, the Border States (California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas), possess much larger Mexican populations. Since these states’ challenges are discussed in the national news media much more often, they can influence and even skew the terms of discussion and debate places such as Indiana.

2.1 The Size and Growth of the Mexican Population in Indiana

The size of Indiana’s Mexican population ranks right in the middle of the surrounding states. Michigan’s Mexican population is a bit larger, while Illinois’s is considerably larger. On the other hand, the number of Mexicans in Indiana is more than twice the number in Ohio and more than four times the size of Kentucky’s.

![Graphic 2-1. Absolute Size of the Mexican Population by State, 2004](source)
Compared with the states that line the Mexican border, however, Indiana’s Mexican population of slightly more than 200,000 people looks small. New Mexico’s Mexican cohort amounts to more than 400,000; Arizona’s to more than 1,400,000; Texas’ to more than 6,500,000; and California’s to just more than 10,000,000.

The growth of the Mexican population in Indiana has been greater than in most of its Midwestern neighbors. Indiana’s Mexican population increased by more than 60,000 between 2000 and 2004, a larger increase than all neighbors except Illinois. This is still much less than the flow of Mexicans to the Border States: both California and Texas saw absolute growth of nearly one and a half million during this period.

In relative terms, the growth of Indiana’s Mexican population has been extremely fast, at a rate of 29 percent. This is higher than all the Border States and all Indiana’s neighbors except Kentucky.
While recent growth of the Mexican population in Indiana has been striking, keep in perspective the size of the Mexican population relative to the size of the state’s total population. The Mexican share of the total populace is generally higher here than in the Midwest, except for Illinois. Yet, it is still quite small, only 3.5 percent of the total state.

This fact is put in stark relief by comparing Indiana to the Southwest and lower Pacific regions where the share of the population who are Mexican generally approaches 30 percent—nearly ten times the ratio in Indiana. However rapid the growth of the Mexican population of Indiana has been lately, it is unlikely to reach the percentage of the total population we see today in the Border States.
The two notions of rapid Mexican growth and the share of the total population that is Mexican can be combined. This is shown in Graphics 4a and 4b, which depict the percentage of growth that was driven by the increase in the Mexican population. In the Midwest, there seems a clear pattern in which the Mexican population is relatively more important to Indiana and, especially, Illinois than it is to Indiana’s other neighbors. Population growth in Indiana would have been only slightly more than half the true 2000-2004 increase without newly minted Hoosiers of Mexican origin. The influence is even more marked in Illinois, where population growth would have been less than a fifth of its eventual level without Mexicans.

The trends in the Midwest are, again, a far cry from what is occurring along the Mexican border. There, the exceptional role of Mexicans in driving population growth in Illinois would be the rule and not the exception. New Mexico would have lost overall population in the first half of the decade were it not for Mexican growth.
In general, the overall population data suggest a series of important conclusions:

1) Mexican population growth is increasingly important in Indiana. Its role in a series of population-related policy issues—workforce growth, maintaining Indiana’s representation in the U.S. Congress, etc.—should not be underestimated.

2) The size of the Mexican population in Indiana is remains small. The state is only recently becoming a destination for Mexican-Americans and Mexican immigrants.

3) These two points put Indiana (and most of its neighbors) in a special position. The warning bells are being rung. The Hispanic and Mexican populations here are large enough to draw attention, and sure to get larger in the future. However, the present size is not so large that Indiana is overwhelmed. This gives the state a window of time in which to create institutions and policies that mitigate the challenges of a rising ethnic and immigrant population and workforce while enhancing the benefits of this population and workforce.

2.2 Mexicans in the Context of Indiana’s Foreign-Born Population

No issue surrounding the Mexican population, in Indiana or elsewhere in the United States, receives more attention than immigration. However, the rhetoric surrounding this issue can lead to impressions that distort reality.

The first important way in which the popular discussion is somewhat divorced from reality is the portion of the foreign-born in Indiana that is Hispanic or Mexican. While a significant share of the Mexican population is an immigrant population, this does not mean that Mexicans represent the majority of the foreign-born in this state. On the contrary, of the roughly 190,000 people in Indiana in the Year 2000 who were born outside the country, roughly 130,000 of them were not Hispanic. Only slightly more than one-third were Hispanic and slightly less than one-third were Mexican.

A higher percentage of Mexican immigrants are non-citizens than are the foreign-born of other nationalities or ethnicities. However, less than half of even non-Hispanic foreign-born residents of Indiana in 2000 were non-citizens.
This is not to deny that there may be large circumstantial differences between the foreign-born non-Hispanic and foreign-born Hispanic populations, particularly in the percentage who may be undocumented. But it is crucial to remember that this country has always been a nation of immigrants, and is increasingly home to citizens from all over the globe. Being open to legal immigration perhaps inevitably opens a country to individuals from all over the globe who wish to stay here (however temporarily) without full permission to do so. A number of articles in this past spring’s popular press explored the large number of undocumented Europeans who reside in this country, for example.

Still, this report estimates there were just over 27,000 Mexicans in Indiana in the Year 2000 who were here without either citizenship or documentation. However, this number has gone up significantly, as detailed below.
Turning to comparisons among Indiana and other states, the pattern in the Midwest is fairly consistent with the data on population in the previous section. The percentage of Mexicans who are foreign-born here is higher than in Michigan or Ohio, less than in Illinois, and less than in the rapidly growing Mexican segment of Kentucky.

The pattern is more surprising when comparing Indiana with the Border States. The percentage of Mexicans who are foreign-born in Indiana is about on par with that region of the country. Border States have experienced an influx of Mexicans who are not citizens of the US that is much greater than Indiana’s. However, the Border States have much larger populations of US citizens who are of Mexican descent, so the percentages of non-citizenship among Mexican populations is similar.
As suggested by Graphics 8a and 8b, Indiana’s foreign-born Mexican population has relatively high rates of non-citizenship. The percentage is generally higher in the Midwest than along the border. So, while the non-citizenship percentage in Indiana ranks in the middle of its neighboring states, it would rank as relatively high for the Border States. Though it should be noted that the range among the Border States is extremely small; all are within a band of 70 percent to 80 percent. It may be more accurate to say that Indiana’s non-citizenship percentage among the Mexican foreign-born is roughly approximate to what would be found in the Southwest.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Applying estimated rates of foreign-born composition, citizenship composition, and undocumented composition to the growth in the Mexican population between 2000 and 2004 yields Graphic 2-9. There were approximately 214,000 Mexican-Americans and Mexican-origin individuals in Indiana in 2004. Of these, roughly 90,000 were foreign-born. Of this foreign-born contingent, about 73,000 were not citizens. Of this non-citizen population, an estimated 42,000 were here without documentation. Framed slightly differently:

- Of the 214,000 Mexicans in Indiana in 2004, about 124,000 had been born in the United States.
- Of the 90,000 foreign-born Mexicans residing in Indiana in 2004, about 17,000 were naturalized citizens of the United States.
- Of the 73,000 Mexicans who were not US citizens, about 31,000 were in the US legally.
- The approximately 42,000 undocumented immigrants from Mexico in Indiana represented an increase of about 15,000 from 2000.

Again, the size of these populations is nothing to dismiss, but must be kept in the perspective of Indiana’s total population of over 6,000,000 people.

A general set of conclusions about the foreign-born dimension of the Mexican population in Indiana can be made.

1) As with respect to the Mexican population as a whole, Indiana is in an advantageous position. The size of the foreign-born and undocumented populations here is not so large as to create unmanageable policy challenges. However, these segments of the population are growing very rapidly and could pose problems in the long-term and even medium-term future if Indiana does not begin to prepare itself.

2) Indiana is very clearly becoming a destination state for Mexican immigrants. In nearly every respect — with the exception of the absolute level or size of the immigrant flow — the characteristics of Indiana’s foreign-born population often resemble the Border States more than they do Indiana’s neighbors.
2.3 The Distribution of the Mexican Population in Indiana

A relatively clear Mexican settlement pattern had emerged in Indiana by the Year 2000. Roughly speaking, the pattern forms two belts. One stretches from Lake County in the extreme northwest of the State (where there are more Mexicans than in any other Indiana county) to Allen County in the northeastern part of the State. The second belt runs from Lake County to Marion County.

Source. U.S. Census Bureau, Sagamore Institute for Policy Research
Note. In some cases, county Mexican populations are estimates
Elsewhere, Mexican populations of some size can be found around metropolitan areas such as Louisville, Evansville, and Terre Haute. However, these populations approach neither the absolute size nor the share of the total population found in the two main belts. As a result of these patterns, the urban character of the Mexican population in Indiana in one sense fits the popular perception, while in another sense it does not. The population is largely urban, as might be expected; more than half of Indiana’s Mexicans in 2000 resided in the three largest metropolitan areas of the state: Indianapolis, Gary, and Fort Wayne. Sixty-three percent resided in the consolidated metropolitan areas of Fort Wayne, Indianapolis, and the Indiana portion of Chicago.

On the other hand, many counties that are far more rural in character had relatively high concentrations of Mexican populations. Elkhart County had the second highest concentration of Mexicans in the state. While the phrase “The Greater Lafayette Area” is hardly an everyday term, the Lafayette metropolitan statistical area along with White County (Monticello, IN) and Cass County (Logansport, IN) were home to 11,909 Mexicans. Take out Marion County, and “Greater Lafayette” had a larger Mexican population, and a far larger share of the population, than was found in the remaining 14 counties of the Indianapolis consolidated metropolitan statistical area.
Again, however, the vast bulk—71 percent—of Indiana’s Mexican population lives in consolidated metropolitan areas, as shown in Graphic 2-11. While none of these greater metropolitan areas has a Mexican population that would be characterized as particularly dense, those in the southern half of the state represent particularly low levels of Mexican populations. While the greater Indianapolis region contains the state’s second largest group of people of Mexican origin, the relative concentration is low, and three-fourths of the region’s Mexican population lives in Marion County. By contrast, only 47 percent of the region’s total population lives in Marion County.

The importance of the two belts referenced earlier is evident in Graphic 2-12. More than four-fifths of Mexican-origin Hoosiers live in metropolitan statistical areas. Ninety-two percent of these live in metropolitan areas along the two belts.
The relative dearth of Mexican Hoosiers in more rural areas is apparent in Graphic 2-13. Thirty-percent of the total population residing in what are called “micro-politan statistical areas” does so in the two belts. More than half the Mexican population residing in micro-politan statistical areas does so in the two belts. Micro-politan areas are considered to be less-populated communities in rural areas. As a recent USA Today report explained, these communities “increasingly fill the gaps on the map between major cities...For scholars and urban planners, the new category more accurately reflects changes across the country brought on by development, migration and the shift from farming and manufacturing to an economy dominated by service industries.” More than 28 million Americans live in micro-politan areas.ii
A scant six percent of Indiana’s total population lives in the rural counties referenced in Graphic 2-14. An even more scant three percent of Indiana’s Mexican population lives in these counties. Nearly two-thirds of these rural Mexicans live along the belts referenced earlier.

The maps in this section reinforce an obvious but important point about the growth of Mexican origin populations in Indiana. These populations are not distributed uniformly. The devil is always in the details, and the detailed geography of Mexican demographics is the single most important factor that will shape the success or failure of state policy.

Many communities in Indiana simply will not see significant numbers of Mexican-Hoosiers. Others will. The latter may enjoy substantial benefits in terms of additional population and workforce growth. As with all population growth, however, the potential blessing carries with it serious policy challenges. To illustrate this fact, consider a sub-set of Indiana’s population: its children. Table 2-1 displays the percentage of total Hispanic enrollment by school for the ten schools with the highest concentration of Hispanic enrollment.
Table 2-1 The ten highest relative Hispanic enrollments in Indiana public schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporation</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Hispanic enrollment</th>
<th>Hispanic % of total enrollment</th>
<th>'99-'00 Hispanic % of enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Schools of Frankfort</td>
<td>Samuel P. Kyger Elementary</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School City of East Chicago</td>
<td>Benjamin Harrison Elementary</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School City of East Chicago</td>
<td>William McKinley Elementary</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School City of Hammond</td>
<td>Washington Irving Elementary</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School City of Hammond</td>
<td>Columbia Elementary</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School City of Hammond</td>
<td>Abraham Lincoln Elementary</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Public Schools</td>
<td>Meredith Nicholson #96</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkhart Community Schools</td>
<td>Hawthorne Elementary</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Public Schools</td>
<td>Ernie Pyle #90</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Public Schools</td>
<td>Harriet Beecher Stowe #64</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the share of enrollment that is Hispanic in these ten schools is truly stunning, the growth in Hispanics’ share of enrollment in many of them is more stunning still. The included elementary school from Frankfort saw its proportion jump 30 percent. The gain in the included schools from Hammond was slightly more modest, though still far greater than the East Chicago schools that made the list. By far the largest increases were in Indianapolis, with Ernie Pyle School #90’s share jumping by 54 percentage points in six years.

To be sure, marginal adjustments in school boundaries in urban districts can account for large swings in enrollment characteristics. In large urban settings, Mexican communities are often densely concentrated. This is precisely the point. At small levels of geographic detail, growth in ethnic populations such as Mexican-Hoosiers imposes large policy considerations that did not previously exist. Population proportions that look small in the aggregate can both promise significant benefits and pose immense challenges to individual communities and neighborhoods. Graphic 2-15 further explores this notion in the context of Hispanic enrollment in Indiana schools.
In all, the number of schools with a Hispanic share of enrollment of 10 percent or higher more than doubled between the ’99-’00 and ’05-’06 school years, growing from 158 to 327 schools.

Four critical conclusions follow for Indiana with respect to the geographic distribution of its Mexican population.

1) Indiana’s native and foreign-born Mexican populations tend overwhelmingly to reside in Indiana’s larger cities. However, many “micro-politans”—large towns or small cities—have significant concentrations of Mexican residents.

2) Mexican-origin population size and population growth are most significant in two clear bands or belts, one stretching across the northern part of the State and one stretching from the northwest part of the State to Indianapolis.

3) Differences in growth patterns and population size among communities in Indiana imply magnified differences at the institutional level.

4) Reaching the latter half of a decade always poses challenges for understanding population movements and demographic trends. Decennial census data is becoming obsolete. This is especially true at the sub-state level or for rapidly changing populations. Unfortunately, both issues are at play when analyzing the crucial trends in and effects of Mexican population change in counties and places.

2.4 Geographic Components of Growth in Indiana’s Mexican Population

Due to the controversy surrounding the foreign-born segment of the Mexican origin population, it is important to understand in detail the history of Mexican-Hoosiers, as rhetoric can distort reality. The following tables examine where Mexican Hoosiers in the year 2000 found themselves in the year 1995, as well as further settlement characteristics.
Table 2-2  The Year 1995 geographic status of Indiana’s Year 2000 Mexican population.
Of the 150,652 Mexicans living in Indiana in 2000...

| Percentage born in the U.S. but living in the same house as in 1995 | 18.2% |
| Percentage who were foreign-born but living in the same house as in 1995 | 8.3% |
| Percentage born in the U.S. and living in Indiana in a different house in 1995 | 17.1% |
| Percentage who were foreign-born and in a different Indiana house in 1995 | 9.1% |

**Total who were in Indiana in 1995** 52.6%

| Percentage who were born in the U.S. but living in California in 1995 | 3.6% |
| Percentage who were born in the U.S. but living in Illinois in 1995 | 2.3% |
| Percentage who were born in the U.S. but living in Texas in 1995 | 1.2% |
| Percentage who were born in the U.S. but living in Georgia in 1995 | 0.8% |
| Percentage who were born in the U.S. but living in Arizona in 1995 | 0.7% |
| Percentage who were born in the U.S. but living in states not above in 1995 | 2.3% |

**Percentage who were born in the U.S. living in another U.S. state in 1995** 10.9%

| Percentage who were foreign-born and living in California in 1995 | 3.7% |
| Percentage who were foreign-born and living in Illinois in 1995 | 1.7% |
| Percentage who were foreign-born and living in Texas in 1995 | 0.7% |
| Percentage who were foreign-born and living in Colorado in 1995 | 0.2% |
| Percentage who were foreign-born and living in Georgia in 1995 | 0.2% |
| Percentage who were foreign-born and living in states not above in 1995 | 0.5% |

**Percentage who were foreign-born and living in another U.S. state in 1995** 6.9%

| Percentage who were foreign-born and living outside the U.S. in 1995 | 14.9% |
| Percentage who were born in the U.S. but living outside the U.S. in 1995 | 1.0% |

**Percentage who were outside the U.S. in 1995** 15.9%

| Percentage who were unborn in 1995 and born in the U.S. | 12.8% |
| Percentage who were unborn in 1995 and foreign-born | 0.5% |

**Percentage who were unborn in 1995** 13.3%

A majority of Mexican Hoosiers in 2000 had lived in Indiana for at least five years. Of these, the bulk was born in the U.S. A large share of Mexican Hoosiers in the 2000 had been living in another U.S. state in 1995. California and Illinois, respectively, were the most common states of origin for these Indiana residents. The majority of Mexican Hoosiers who came to Indiana via another U.S. state in 1995 were born in the United States.

A slightly smaller share of Mexican residents of Indiana in the Year 2000 came from outside the country in 1995 than came from another U.S. state.

A slightly smaller share of Indiana’s Year 2000 Mexican population had not been born by the Year 1995. Of these youngest Indiana residents, the vast majority were born in the U.S. between 1996 and 2000.

Key conclusions from the 1995 detailed origin of “Year 2000 Mexican Hoosiers”:

1) Indiana’s Mexican-origin population is diverse in its origins. Large numbers are of course foreign-born. The likelihood is that the foreign-born have been the most rapidly growing segment of the Mexican population since the Year 2000. However, they do not represent anything like a majority of Indiana’s Mexican population.

2) With respect to Indiana’s foreign-born Mexican population in the Year 2000, the most common place of residence in 1995 was right here in Indiana. Slightly less common were foreign-born residents who had been outside the country in 1995. Significantly less common were foreign-born residents who had been in another U.S. state in 1995.
2.5 The Gender and Age Composition of Indiana’s Mexican Population

An important difference between Mexican and non-Mexican Hoosiers can be seen in Graphics 2-16a and 2-16b: Mexican Hoosiers are much more likely to be male. In the general population, the male/female split is close to 50/50, with slightly more females than males. As a sub-population with a large immigrant contingent who has left their home nation to look for work, Mexican-Americans have a skewed gender composition. This seems to be particularly true in Indiana. The male proportion was higher here than in any of the neighboring states except Kentucky, which had a highly skewed split. Indiana also has proportionally more males than any of the Border States.

The same underlying dynamic that gives rise to a largely male population helps shape a population that is much younger than the rest of Indiana’s population. While just over one-third
of the non-Mexican population is 24 or younger, over half the Mexican population is. On the other hand, the share of the Mexican population in its retirement years—55 and older—is relatively small. A higher percentage of Mexican Hoosiers are thus in their prime working years than would otherwise be expected from the large numbers of young people.

The differences among states in terms of age composition of their Mexican populations are differences of degree. Only Kentucky has a significantly smaller cohort of 0-18 year olds than does Indiana. However, Kentucky’s cohort of 19-24 year olds is relatively larger, creating a 0-24 year old cohort of roughly equal relative size. Indiana’s population appeared slightly younger than the Mexican population in the Border States. The share of populations in their prime working years was fairly uniform.
Key considerations from gender and age data:

1) The gender make-up of the Mexican population in Indiana reflects what would be expected from a population with a large immigrant base seeking work; it is largely male. Data from the Border States suggest that the male versus female gap may shrink over time in Indiana.

2) Immigration patterns and family dynamics in Mexican populations create a younger age profile than in states’ non-Mexican populations. This is likely to remain true for the foreseeable future. With such a large proportion who are in their school-aged years, changes to educational persistence—the percentage earning a diploma or continuing on to college—will have a large effect.

---

1 Language minority students enrolled in Indiana public schools in 2004-05 represented 225 native languages other than English. See www.doe.state.in.us/lmmp/docs/language_minority_summary.doc.

2 According to the Declaration of Independence, among the “repeated injuries and usurpations” of King George III “He has endeavoured to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither.”