

Conclusion

This publication portrays some key characteristics and distributions of most of Southern California's ethnic groups. Because media coverage and scholarly research are limited to only a few of these groups, most people not closely connected with any specific group are not at all familiar with it. We hope this online look provides a good introduction to our half-hidden ethnic diversity.

We believe that many Southern Californians associate the larger ethnic groups with certain historic concentrations, not realizing the extent to which the group is widely dispersed. Only distribution maps like ours can demonstrate that. Moreover, members of each ethnic group may be amazed to learn from the maps that people in their group are living in many places that they hadn't realized.

As we consider our tables and graphics, the following are some of the findings that seem notable to us:

1. The number of Armenians in the Los Angeles metro (L.A. and Orange counties) is seven times that in the next largest metro (New York). The number of Iranians is 3.9 times that of the next largest metro (New York). The populations of Indonesians, Pakistanis, Thais, Vietnamese, Mexicans, and Guatemalans are more than double those in the next largest metro for that group.
2. In Los Angeles County the White and Black populations decreased by 25 and 6 percent respectively between 1990 and 2010. In Orange County White numbers decreased by 15 percent while Black numbers increased by 43 percent.
3. The greatest percentage ethnic group increases in Los Angeles County were of Asian Indians and people of Nigerian ancestry, both of whom have more than doubled since 1990.
4. All ethnic groups have grown substantially to the more suburban developments in the Inland Empire and especially Riverside County, where Asian and Hispanic numbers more than tripled since 1990.
5. Asian Indians have clearly the highest median household income of all the groups. The greatest change since 1990 is the increased household income of Nigerians. In 1990 the Nigerian household income was 72 percent that of the White median while in 2010 Nigerian household income was 9 percent above that of Whites.

6. Ethnic numbers in most ethnic residential concentrations have been declining except for Chinese, Armenians, and Iranians.
7. All census tracts in which Blacks are the leading group are now west of the Harbor Freeway (I110) and south of I105, whereas the traditional Black ghetto of South Central was north of I105 (Watts) and east of the Harbor Freeway. This shift over the last forty years resulted from the westward movement of Blacks into previously White areas and their replacement by Mexicans.
8. Except for the above example of Blacks, ethnic enclaves remain and have been mostly stable geographically between 1990 and 2010. This indicates in general that ethnic residential patterns are fairly stable from one decade to the next.
9. As measured by the index of dissimilarity, in Los Angeles County the segregation between Whites and Blacks is still moderately high ($D = .65$) despite dropping each decade for the last half century. (Researchers generally consider D scores above 60 to be high.) However, that present level of segregation is equivalent to the level of segregation between Whites and Chinese, Vietnamese, Mexicans, Hondurans, Guatemalans, Salvadorans, and Armenians. Thus, Blacks are not an all exceptional in their level of segregation from Whites.
10. Moreover, the segregation between Blacks and Asian Indians, Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese, Koreans, Armenians, and Russians is also equally as high, as is the segregation between Hispanics (Latinos) and Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Armenians, and Russians.
11. The above measures show that many ethnic groups are fairly highly segregated from each other. Related research suggests that this pattern is mostly the result of group differences in historical concentrations, economic resources, recency of immigrant arrivals, and the strength and patterns of group preferences and avoidances of other groups. Related research shows lower levels of segregation in the four outlying counties.

Some of our findings may strike some readers as surprising. We hope readers will investigate through interviews and other sources so as to better understand what factors may have led to those results. In some cases the detailed text and analyses of our earlier book, *The Ethnic Quilt*, can provide helpful explanations.

As geographers, we have been particularly concerned with the distribution of groups across our region and the change in those distributions between 1990 and 2010. Most groups are fairly widely dispersed and have tended to move somewhat out of earlier concentrations of their group. That is illustrated both on maps and by widespread slight decreases since 1990, in Los Angeles County at least, in D-scores that measure each group's level of residential separation from other groups. Such changes presumably reflect some degree of cultural and economic assimilation. For example, Cambodians who in 1990 had been quite concentrated in a part of Long Beach and a few other clusters have shifted to some extent out of those concentrations. Also, there has been a small net shift of most Hispanic ethnic groups other than Mexican toward distributions more like those of other Hispanics. Increases in D-scores can generally be explained by large numbers of recent immigrants and other new arrivals, who typically wish to live near friends and relatives. This appears to have been the case with Armenians and Iranians.

In general, the very large number of residents of Southern California and its many different ethnic groups mean that many residents are able to live near others in their group if they wish to do so. That opportunity is found less frequently in smaller metropolitan areas, where numbers in many ethnic groups are so small an ethnic group cannot form much of an enclave or concentration. Such choices help make Southern California an attractive area for many ethnic groups. On the other hand, there is evidence that immigrant members of ethnic groups who live in concentrations of their group tend to learn English and adjust to the dominant culture more slowly than if they were more mixed residentially with other groups.