

**INDIGENOUS OAXACAN COMMUNITIES IN CALIFORNIA:
AN OVERVIEW**

LISA KRESGE

NOVEMBER 2007



**CALIFORNIA
INSTITUTE FOR
RURAL STUDIES**

Table of Contents

Table of Figures	ii
Executive Summary	iii
Introduction	1
Research Methods.....	1
Background	1
Issues Affecting the Health and Well-Being of Oaxacans in California.....	2
Barriers to Outreach and Services among Oaxacans	3
Findings from Official Data Sources.....	4
Region 1: Central Valley	6
Region 2: Los Angeles Metropolitan Area	7
Region 3: San Diego County	7
Region 5: Ventura County	9
Region 6: North of San Francisco.....	10
Recommendations.....	10
Endnotes	12
References Cited.....	13
Appendix A: Key Informants.....	16
Appendix B: Resources	17

Table of Figures

Table 1. Indigenous Oaxacans Residing within Central Valley Counties	6
Table 2. Los Angeles Metropolitan Area.....	7
Table 3. San Diego County.....	8
Table 4. Central Coast.....	9
Table 5. Ventura County	10
Table 6. Areas North of San Francisco.....	10

Executive Summary

- The Mexican state of Oaxaca is home to 17 indigenous groups, each with a distinct cultural and linguistic heritage.
- Indigenous Oaxacans have historically engaged in subsistence farming. In recent years, numerous factors (e.g., population growth, economic crises) have forced people off the land. Although, many displaced Oaxacans have migrated to cities within Mexico, increasing numbers have been making their way to the U.S., seeking a better life for themselves and their families in California.
- Indigenous farmworkers from the state of Oaxaca are currently the fastest growing farmworker population in California.
- Current estimates place the population of indigenous Oaxacans in California at 100,000 to 150,000, at a minimum.
- There are six regions with large communities of indigenous Mexicans from Oaxaca in California. These include the Central Valley, Los Angeles, San Diego County, Ventura County, the Central Coast (including the Santa Maria and Salinas Valleys) and the area north of San Francisco.
- Indigenous Oaxacans are subject to numerous factors that affect their health and well-being. The most significant factors include poverty, lack of health insurance, substandard housing and high levels of stress and anxiety, which may be associated with alcohol abuse, domestic violence and depression.
- Limited Spanish skills and lack of written indigenous languages are some of the most significant barriers to outreach among this population. Other factors limiting access to health and social services include fears associated with immigration status, limited professional interpretation services and limited access to transportation, particularly in more rural and isolated communities.
- Key informants stressed that successful outreach to indigenous Oaxacan communities must be based on developing collaborative relationships with existing indigenous organizations, which are uniquely situated to address cultural, linguistic and other aspects associated with outreach to this unique population.
- Outreach methods addressing the linguistic barriers experienced by this community include the use of radio, audio/visual media and pamphlets with pictures.

Introduction

California has witnessed growing numbers of immigrants from indigenous regions of Mexico in recent years. Many are from the state of Oaxaca, in southern Mexico. Despite their Mexican origins, these immigrants possess numerous characteristics that set them apart from their non-indigenous (“*mestizo*”) counterparts. They speak a variety of indigenous languages, most of which do not have written forms. Many speak little or no Spanish, making traditional outreach challenging. Many of these migrants have low levels of literacy and education and are often poorer than their non-indigenous counterparts. They have also faced centuries of discrimination and marginalization within Mexico. As more recent arrivals, Oaxacan immigrants generally do not have established networks of friends and family members who can help them navigate health and social service systems in the United States.

This report presents an overview of indigenous Oaxacan communities in California. It begins with background information regarding Oaxacan migrations to the United States, followed by a review of the principal issues affecting the health and well-being of Oaxacans in California and barriers to outreach. The following sections present an overview of the principal Oaxacan communities in California, by region, with population estimates and information on principal places of residence within each region. We also provide a series of recommendations regarding strategies to improve outreach to indigenous Oaxacan populations in California.

Research Methods

The findings in this report are based on data collected from a range of sources. Two important sources were the U.S. Census and the National Agricultural Worker Survey (NAWS), conducted under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Labor. Additional data sources included academic literature on Oaxacans in California and in-person and telephone interviews with key informants familiar with issues affecting Oaxacan communities in California. Key informant interviewees include researchers, academics and leaders of community organizations providing outreach and services to indigenous Oaxacans in California.

Site visits were conducted in four California regions with large concentrations of Oaxacan immigrants: San Diego County, Los Angeles, Fresno County and the Salinas Valley. The site visits involved individual and group interviews with experts in each region, which allowed for a more in-depth understanding of the issues. The research was conducted during the period August-October 2007.

Background

Mexico is home to many indigenous communities, each of which possesses a distinct set of cultural and linguistic characteristics. Although indigenous peoples reside throughout Mexico, many are located in the southern states of Guerrero, Oaxaca, Chiapas and Veracruz. Currently, many of the indigenous immigrants living in the U.S. are from the state of Oaxaca.

There are 17 indigenous groups in Oaxaca, which have historically engaged in subsistence agriculture. However, a number of factors – including population growth, environmental degradation and economic crises – have forced many people off the land. Although displaced indigenous Oaxacans often migrated to cities within Mexico, increasing numbers are making their way to the U.S., seeking a better life for themselves and their families in California (Zabin et al., 1993).

Indigenous Oaxacans initially migrated to the United States to participate in short-term labor contracts during the *Bracero* program (1942-1965).¹ A continuous flow of migration began in the 1970s and continued through the 1980s, with widespread recruitment by farm labor contractors and the subsequent development of migration networks (Lopez & Runsten, 2004; Runsten & Kearney, 1994). In the mid 1990s, one of the most significant economic crises in Mexican history spurred yet another surge in migration to the United States (Kada & Kiy, 2004). Indigenous farmworkers from the state of Oaxaca are currently the fastest growing farmworker population in California (Aguirre International, 2005).

Issues Affecting the Health and Well-Being of Oaxacans in California

Numerous factors affect the physical health, mental health and overall well-being of indigenous Oaxacans in the U.S. The most significant of these include high rates of poverty, lack of access to health insurance, substandard housing conditions and high levels of stress and anxiety, which may in turn be associated with alcohol abuse, domestic violence, depression and other behavioral health problems (Bade, 2005; Fernandes, 2005; Gardner, 2007).² These issues are exacerbated by multiple barriers to outreach and services that could help alleviate these troubles.

Income is generally considered to be one of the most significant indicators of health and well-being. Most sources indicate that the majority of indigenous Oaxacans in California have extremely low incomes. The high rates of poverty among Oaxacans is a function of low wages, seasonal unemployment among agricultural workers and the fact that many Mexican immigrants send hundreds or thousands of dollars to their families in the form of remittances each year. Although there are no reliable empirical data regarding income levels among Oaxacans, many – if not most – are believed to live at or below 150 percent of the federal poverty threshold.³

Indigenous Oaxacans working in agriculture appear to earn even less than their urban counterparts. According to the National Agricultural Worker Survey, 43 percent of individual farmworkers – and 30 percent of families – reported average annual incomes below \$10,000 per year (Aguirre International, 2005). Key informants estimated that between 90 and 100 percent of indigenous farmworkers had incomes at or below 150 percent of the federal poverty threshold, compared with an estimated 80 percent of those living and working in Los Angeles.

Substandard housing conditions negatively affect the physical and mental health of indigenous Oaxacans. Poor housing conditions are associated with low incomes, high housing costs, limited availability of affordable housing and lack of access to housing

assistance programs for undocumented immigrants. Substandard housing conditions are exacerbated by overcrowding. Multiple families often share a single apartment; it is not uncommon to find entire families sharing a single bedroom. Housing shortages are often worse among agricultural workers, many of whom live in converted garages or tool sheds lacking running water, toilets or heat. Conditions are worse yet for many others – particularly migrant workers – who sleep in cars, tents, open fields or caves (Bade, 2004; Zabin et al., 1993).

Many Oaxacan immigrants are farmworkers, whose health is compromised by the occupational hazards associated with farm labor. Pesticide exposure, stoop labor, injuries associated with ladders and heavy machinery, heavy lifting and heat stress all contribute to the diminished health of indigenous Oaxacans. Farmworkers who do not speak Spanish are at higher risk of pesticide exposure, because warning labels are printed in English, and in some cases Spanish (Bade, 1999, 2004, 2005; CBDIO, 2007; Reynolds & Kourous, 1998). The risks associated with agriculture are in many ways worse for indigenous farmworkers, who are purportedly given more difficult and dangerous jobs because they are considered unlikely to complain. Indigenous farmworkers are also generally considered to be more reluctant than other farmworkers to report labor law violations (assuming they are even familiar with labor laws) or seek medical attention when sick or injured on the job (Zabin et al., 1993). These factors further exacerbate the health risks associated with agriculture.

Barriers to Outreach and Services among Oaxacans

There are numerous barriers to improving outreach and access to health and social services among indigenous Oaxacans in California. In addition to issues found among other immigrant populations, language and cultural beliefs figure highly among Oaxacans.

Many newly arrived Oaxacan immigrants – particularly women – have non-existent or limited Spanish and virtually no English skills. The fact that written forms of indigenous languages are not yet fully developed (CBDIO, 2007), coupled with low levels of education and literacy, rules out the use of written materials as a viable method of outreach. Key informants indicated that although many Oaxacan immigrants speak enough Spanish to give the impression of understanding, they in fact lack sufficient competency for more complex situations such as obtaining social services or medical or legal situations. Outreach efforts are hindered when providers are not aware that levels of comprehension might be low (Martinez et al., 2005). Outreach efforts may be further hampered by racism that may exist among non-indigenous (“*mestizo*”) eligibility workers, who may be less inclined to “go the extra step” to help indigenous community members obtain services for which they may be eligible.

Lack of health insurance is one of the most frequently cited barriers preventing indigenous Oaxacans from accessing adequate health care. According to the National Agricultural Workers Survey (NAWS), fully 70 percent of California’s farm labor force has no health insurance. Access to dental insurance is even lower. The NAWS survey indicates that indigenous farmworkers are 11 percent less likely to seek needs-based services than other non-indigenous agricultural workers (Aguirre International, 2005).

Fears associated with immigration status are often cited as one of the main impediments to accessing health care and social services, even when services are free or low-cost and targeted to low-income populations (Bade, 1993; Fernandes, 2005; Kada & Kiy, 2004; Martinez et al., 2005). This issue may be particularly pronounced for indigenous farmworkers, 85 percent of whom lack authorization to work in the U.S. (Aguirre International, 2005).

Lack of culturally competent health care presents a significant barrier to seeking health care as well. Most indigenous Oaxacans subscribe to a set of beliefs regarding health and well-being that differs from the majority view in the U.S., making them mistrustful of western – and even Mexican – health care providers. In that regard, linguistic barriers are also an impediment to seeking – and receiving – appropriate health care (CBDIO, 2007; Gardner, 2007). Although the number of medical interpreters speaking indigenous languages is growing, access to professional interpretation services is limited. Many patients therefore rely on non-certified translators, including their children, friends or relatives. In addition to the obvious medical problems associated with the use of non-certified medical interpreters, this raises numerous issues regarding privacy, parent-child relationships and patient willingness to disclose sensitive information.

Health fairs and other outreach efforts have successfully provided many Oaxacans with initial diagnoses of illness and chronic disease. However, informants note that many do not seek follow-up care as advised, because the cost of fee-based services is often prohibitive and access is limited, given the barriers previously cited.

Limited transportation is a significant barrier to accessing health and social services as well, particularly in more rural and isolated communities. A health care provider noted that residents of her rural community must travel at least 15 miles to get to the nearest social service office. Although this may not be that difficult for those with cars, many immigrants do not have their own vehicles (or driver's licenses) and public transportation is often limited (Bade, 1993).⁴ Rides with friends and neighbors are sometimes an option, but this option can be expensive, costing as much as \$40 round trip for relatively short distances.

Findings from Official Data Sources

The difficulties of enumerating indigenous, migrant populations can result in what Kissam and Jacobs (2004) refer to as “mega-undercounting” in official census data. Causes of undercounting are well-documented and include omitting immigrants who are out of the U.S. when census counts take place, the failure of the Census Bureau to address issues related to “low-visibility” populations and shared housing (which is common among Oaxacan immigrants, making it difficult to count all residents within a dwelling using current census forms). Low response rates for race and ethnicity questions are also a function of confusion among census-takers and respondents regarding the Hispanic origin census categories and the proper identification of indigenous persons (Murillo & Cerda, 2004; Kissam & Jacobs, 2004). Because of persistent undercounting, all official census figures provided in this report should be regarded as minimum estimates of the actual population of indigenous immigrants in California.

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, there were 154,362 self-identified “Hispanic American Indians” residing in the state of California. The “Hispanic American Indian” census category encompasses individuals who identified themselves as both “Hispanic” *and* “American Indian” on the census questionnaire. This category includes indigenous groups from North, Central and South America; however, the largest numbers are primarily of Mexican and Guatemalan origin (Murillo & Cerda, 2004). Between the 1990 and 2000 decennial census, the population category of “American Indians of Hispanic” origin grew by 146 percent in California. That is partially due to changes in the census questionnaire, stemming from ongoing debates over improving census categories with regard to self-identification and race (Murillo & Cerda, 2004; Kissam & Jacobs, 2004).⁵

Another official source of indigenous Oaxacan population estimates is the NAWS survey. The most recent NAWS data (collected during the 2003-2004 agricultural season) indicates that 62,208 farmworkers – representing 10 % of all Mexican-origin agricultural laborers in California – were born in the state of Oaxaca. Some researchers estimate that indigenous immigrants will represent over 20 percent of California’s farm labor force by 2010, based on current migratory trends and continued economic problems in Mexico (Fox & Rivera-Salgado, 2004).

Runsten and Kearney (1994) led an effort to enumerate the indigenous Oaxacan community in California in 1991 and estimated the Mixtec population at 50,000. However, due to budgetary constraints, their research was limited to a select group of Mixtec settlements in California and notably did not include urban Oaxacan communities of Los Angeles. Fox and Rivera-Salgado (2004) estimated that 45,000 to 55,000 Mixtecs were working on farms in the Central Valley and that 50,000 to 60,000 Zapotecs were living in the urban neighborhoods of Los Angeles.

Most current estimates place the minimum population of indigenous Oaxacans in California at between 100,000 and 150,000.⁶ It should be noted that many key informants were hesitant to make any estimates because so little is known regarding actual figures for this population, and there is no precedence, other than the Runsten and Kearney study, upon which to base these estimates. Nonetheless, a study conducted by Rick Mines, in collaboration with California Rural Legal Assistance, is currently developing a census of indigenous Oaxacan population in California.

Overview of Indigenous Oaxacan Communities in California

There are six California regions with significant communities of indigenous Oaxacans. Based on estimations, the largest concentration of Oaxacans is found in the Central Valley, followed by Los Angeles County, San Diego County, Ventura County, the Central Coast (including the Santa Maria and Salinas Valleys) and a small area north of San Francisco. This section of the present report provides information for each of these regions, with an overview of population estimates, principal counties, languages spoken and specific communities with significant indigenous Oaxacan populations.

Region 1: Central Valley

As one of the most significant agricultural regions in the world, California's Central Valley has a large farmworker population. Indigenous Oaxacans from Mexico – among other groups from Mexico and Central America – have developed an increasingly significant migratory network to meet this demand for labor. Local estimates place the indigenous Oaxacan population in Central Valley somewhere between 45,000 to over 100,000 (Bade, 2005; Fox & Rivera, 2004; Runsten & Kearney, 1994).

Significant communities of indigenous Oaxacans are established in the Central Valley counties of Madera, Fresno, Kern and Tulare. Smaller communities are also found in Merced, San Joaquin and Kings Counties. The majority of the indigenous language speakers speak Mixteco. However, Triqui, Zapoteco, Chatino and Amusco speakers are increasingly migrating to the Central Valley.

Table 1. Indigenous Oaxacans Residing within Central Valley Counties

County	U. S. Census (2000)	Population Estimate	Principal Languages	Principal Communities	Additional Communities
Fresno	6,567	8,000 ⁷	Mixteco, Triqui	Fresno, Biola, Kerman, Raisin City, Caruthers	Selma, Parlier, Easton, Orange Cove, Fowler, Sanger, Del Rey, Reedley
Madera	1,518	7,000-8,000	Mixteco, Zapoteco, Triqui, Chatino, Amusco	City of Madera and surrounding environs	N/A
Tulare	2,726	2,000 - 2,500 ⁸	Mixteco, Triqui	Cutler, Farmersville, Exeter, Portersville, Lindsay, Traver, Visalia	Dinuba, Orosi
Kern	4,114	2,000 ⁸	Mixteco, Zapoteco	Bakersfield, Arvin, Lamont, Taft	N/A
Merced	1,395	Not available	Mixteco and Triqui	Livingston	Los Banos, Planeda, Le Grande, Merced
San Joaquin	2,846	Not available	Mixteco	Stockton	N/A

Region 2: Los Angeles Metropolitan Area

Although some Zapotecs migrated to California during the *Bracero* program, continuous migration to the Los Angeles area did not begin until the 1970s, with the establishment of migration networks (Lopez & Runsten, 2004). The metropolitan area of Los Angeles is currently home to numerous indigenous Oaxacan communities representing multiple language groups. Current population estimates indicate that there may be as many as 200,000 Zapotecs living in Los Angeles (Hansen, 2002; Takash et al., 2005).⁹

Indigenous Oaxacans in urban Los Angeles primarily work in the service industry, as janitors, housekeepers and restaurant employees (Lopez & Runsten, 2004). Some also work in landscaping and construction; a few work as street vendors and taxi drivers. A small, but increasing number of entrepreneurs are opening restaurants and other businesses in Oaxacan neighborhoods. There are also communities of Oaxacan farmworkers in Orange, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, as well as in the rural parts of Los Angeles County.

Table 2. Los Angeles Metropolitan Area

County	U.S. Census (2000)	Population Estimate	Principal Languages	Principal Communities	Additional Communities
Los Angeles	51,379	50,000 – 250,000 ⁹	Zapoteco, Mixe, Mixteco, Triqui	Mar Vista, Santa Monica, Venice, Culver City, Hollywood, South Central, Pico Union, Koreatown	Manhattan Beach, Torrance
Orange	11,492	Not available	Zapotec, Mixtec	Santa Ana	Anaheim, Orange, La Puente
San Bernardino	10,111	Not available	Mixteco, Zapoteco	City of San Bernardino	N/A
Riverside	8,033	Not available	Mixteco	Mecca, Thermal, Coachella, Indio, Perris, Lake Elsinore, City of Riverside	N/A

Region 3: San Diego County

San Diego County's proximity to the Mexican border makes it the destination – at least temporarily – for the largest group of newly arrived Oaxacan immigrants in California (Kada & Kiy, 2004). Based on statistics from the Mexican Consulate in San Diego, Oaxaca is the principal sending state in Mexico, representing 12 percent (7,397) of all official identification documents ("*matrículas consulares*") issued to Mexican citizens in the U.S. between 1995 and 2002. It is, however, important to note that only about 20% of the estimated 300,000 Mexicans living in San Diego County are included in the *matrícula* data (Runsten, 2005).

The indigenous Oaxacan Community in San Diego is mostly male, increasingly young and likely to be monolingual in an indigenous language.¹⁰ An estimated 10,000 to 15,000 live in informal migrant worker encampments hidden in the hillsides of North San Diego County (Kada & Kiy, 2004). Many of these camps lack basic services such as water, electricity and sewer systems, and residents live in makeshift shelters constructed out of wood scraps, cardboard and nylon tarps (Martinez et al., 2005). Most work harvesting tomatoes and strawberries; however, more established individuals work in landscaping and other services.

Table 3. San Diego County

County	U.S. Census (2000)	Population Estimate	Principal Languages	Principal Communities	Additional Communities
San Diego	9,084	25,000 (Bade, 2005)	Mixteco, Amusco, Triqui	Oceanside, Vista, Escondido, City of San Diego	Carlsbad, Encinitas, Fallbrook, Poway, Bonsall, Del Mar, Leucadia, San Luis Rey, San Marcos

Region 4: The Central Coast (Santa Maria and Salinas Valleys)

The Santa Maria and Salinas Valleys are home to a vast agricultural industry, which demands a significant labor force to work in the strawberry fields and other labor-intensive vegetable crop jobs. As in the Central Valley, many indigenous Oaxacans fill the demand for these farm work jobs. The tourist industry also employs a significant number of indigenous Oaxacans, who work in the hotels and restaurant lining the coast (Cardenas, 2006).¹¹ There are an estimated 15,000 to 30,000 indigenous Oaxacans living in the Central Coast region of California (Cardenas, 2006; Strohlic et al., 2003). The largest communities are concentrated in Santa Barbara and Monterey Counties, with smaller communities in Santa Cruz and Santa Clara Counties. There are some indications of communities in San Luis Obispo, San Benito and San Mateo counties; however, there are no estimates regarding the size of these communities. The Central Coast is perhaps the most diverse California region in terms of different indigenous languages spoken, with large concentrations of Mixteco, Triqui and Zapoteco.

Table 4. Central Coast

County	U.S. Census (2000)	Population Estimate	Principal Languages	Principal Communities	Additional Communities
Santa Barbara	2,649	10,000 - 15,000 (Cardenas, 2006)	Mixteco, Zapoteco, Triqui	Santa Maria	Lompoc, Cuyama, Guadalupe, Goleta
Monterey	2,420	7,500-10,000 ¹²	Triqui, Mixteco, Zapoteco	Greenfield, Salinas, Seaside, Marina, King City, Castroville, Prunedale, Aromas, Las Lomas	Soledad, Gonzales
San Benito	337	Not available	Mixteco, Triqui	Hollister	N/A
Santa Cruz	1,281	1,500–2,000	Mixteco, Triqui, Chatino	Watsonville	Santa Cruz, Davenport
San Mateo	1,594	1,594	Mixteco	Pescadero, Half Moon Bay	N/A
San Luis Obispo	845	Not available	Mixteco, Triqui	San Luis Obispo, Oceano and Paso Robles	
Santa Clara	6,080	Not available	Mixteco	San Jose	Gilroy, Milpitas, Morgan Hill, Sunnyvale, Mt. View

Region 5: Ventura County

Indigenous Oaxacan farm laborers and their families immigrate to Ventura County to work on the strawberry and raspberry harvests. Although Mixteco speakers represent the largest proportion of indigenous language speakers, increasing numbers of other indigenous groups from Oaxaca are arriving in Ventura County. Sources note that more recent arrivals tend to be younger, less likely to speak Spanish and less literate than the more established Oaxacan community, where an estimated 80% speak some Spanish.¹³

Table 5. Ventura County

County	U.S. Census (2000)	Population Estimate	Principal Languages	Principal Communities	Additional Communities
Ventura	3,929	20,000 (Haverland, as quoted in Bien, 2007)	Mixteco, Triqui, Zapoteco, Amusco, Chatino	Oxnard, Port Hueneme, the unincorporated areas of El Rio and Nyland Acres, Thousand Oaks, Santa Paula	N/A

Region 6: North of San Francisco

Although indigenous Oaxacans have been migrating to the Santa Rosa area since the 1970s, jobs in the wine grape-growing counties north of San Francisco have historically been dominated by migratory networks from the Mexican states of Michoacan, Jalisco and Zacatecas (Runsten & Kearney, 1994; Nichols, 2003). However, there are indications that indigenous groups from Oaxaca are increasingly migrating to this region seeking work in the wine grape sector.

Table 6. Areas North of San Francisco

County	U.S. Census (2000)	Population Estimate	Principal Languages	Principal Communities	Additional Communities
Sonoma	1,912	Not available	Mixteco, Triqui	Santa Rosa, Graton, Sebastopol, Hearldsberg, Windsor, Cloverdale, Geyserville	N/A
Napa	403	Not available	Mixteco, Triqui	St. Helena	N/A

Recommendations

When asked for recommendations on ways to improve outreach to Oaxacans in California, virtually every key informant stressed the importance of collaborating with leaders of existing indigenous community organizations. The indigenous Oaxacan community has strong social networks and organizing skills. Drawing upon these networks by developing relationships of trust with leaders of these organizations is by far the most effective way of improving the effectiveness of outreach to Oaxacan communities and by extension, increasing their access to health and social services.

Existing Oaxacan organizations are uniquely situated to provide insights regarding the specific needs of these communities, ideas regarding effective outreach strategies, contacts for interpreters, connections with other outreach organizations and information regarding the cultural nuances of working with indigenous populations. Additional suggestions for improving outreach and increasing access to services include the following:

- Increase the social capital of existing community organizations by providing them with opportunities to offer direct outreach to Oaxacan communities, through *promotores* programs, word of mouth campaigns and direct enrollment of community members in health and social service programs.
- Utilize culturally appropriate outreach methods, including radio, audio/visual media and pamphlets based on pictures and images, given that most indigenous languages are verbal and not written.
- Promote increased opportunities to train indigenous language speakers as medical and administrative interpreters.
- Consistently engage indigenous communities through community meetings, cultural festivals, sports events and health fairs.
- Increase outreach and services to Oaxacans in rural communities through mobile services and outreach programs.
- Approach indigenous communities through existing social structures and leadership networks, with respect for existing norms.

Endnotes

- ¹ As a means of addressing farm labor shortages during World War II, the U.S. government developed the *Bracero* program, under which seasonal Mexican contract laborers were brought to the U.S. to work on American farms. The program ended in the 1960s, under pressure from groups including the Chicano movement and labor activists.
- ² Key informants indicated that issues including drug and alcohol abuse and HIV infection associated with high-risk sexual activity are a growing concern for both indigenous Oaxacans in the U.S. and sending communities in Oaxaca.
- ³ The 2007 federal poverty threshold is \$10,210 for an individual, which increases by \$3,480 for each additional household member. The 2007 federal poverty level for a family of four is consequently \$20,650.
- ⁴ Based on interviews with key informants.
- ⁵ See also “Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF1) 100-Percent Data. Quick Table (QT-P6) Race Alone or in Combination and Hispanic or Latino: 2000.” Available at <http://factfinder.census.gov>.
- ⁶ Based on interviews with key informants.
- ⁷ Local population estimates are based on key informant interviews. These estimates are based on subjective perceptions and individual experiences and should therefore be considered anecdotal.
- ⁸ These population estimates are lower than the U.S. Census figures and should be considered anecdotal.
- ⁹ According to this Los Angeles Times article, local estimates for the population of Oaxacans in Los Angeles run as high as 250,000. The same article references Gaspar Rivera-Salgado as stating that there are more than 60,000 immigrants in Los Angeles from two Zapotec-sending regions in Oaxaca alone.
- ¹⁰ One informant explained that in the last 8 to 10 years many migrants have not been following historic patterns of working in Northern Mexico before migrating to the U.S. These migrants are therefore less likely to speak Spanish and more likely to be monolingual before arriving in San Diego.
- ¹¹ In this study 83% of survey respondents were farmworkers. Other occupations included the service and cleaning industries.
- ¹² Based on estimates from key informants.
- ¹³ Based on interviews with local informants.

References Cited

- Aguirre International (2005). *The California farm labor force overview and trends from the National Agricultural Workers Survey*. Burlingame, CA: Aguirre International.
- Bade, B. (1993). *Problems surrounding health care service utilization for Mixtec migrant farmworker families in Madera, California*. Davis, CA: California Institute for Rural Studies.
- Bade, B. (1999). *Is there a doctor in the field? Underlying conditions affecting access to health care for California farmworkers and their families*. Berkeley, CA: California Policy Research Center.
- Bade, B. (2004). Alive and well: Generating alternatives to biomedical health care by Mixtec migrant families. In J. Fox & G. Rivera-Salgado (Eds.). *Indigenous Mexican migrants in the United States* (pp. 175-200). La Jolla, CA: The Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies and the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies.
- Bade, B. (2005). Farmworker health in Vista, California. In R. Kiy & C. Woodruff (Eds.). *The ties that bind us: Mexican migrants in San Diego County* (pp. 65-85). La Jolla, CA: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies.
- Bien, J. T. (2007). Dancing with tradition: Ventura county's Oaxacan population celebrate Mixtec culture in Oxnard. *Ventura County Reporter, September 27, 2007*. Retrieved November 17, 2007, from <http://www.vcreporter.com/article.php?id=5234 &IssueNum=143>.
- Cardenas, E. (2006). *Portrait of a laborer: Indigenous farmworkers in Santa Barbara County*. Santa Barbara, CA: Central Coast Environmental Health Project (CCEHP).
- Centro Binacional Para el Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño (CBDIO) (2007). *Oaxacan culture: Cultural competence guidebook*. Fresno, CA: Centro Binacional Para el Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño, Inc.
- Fernandes, F. (2005). *Bitter harvest migrant worker health*. Riverside, CA: UC MexUS News.
- Flynn, E. (2005). *Assessing opportunity? A study of Oaxacan civic participation and parental involvement in education in central California*. Unpublished master's thesis. Retrieved November 17, 2007, from http://suseice.stanford.edu/monographs/accessing_opportunity.pdf.
- Fox, J., & Rivera-Salgado, G. (2004). Building civil society among indigenous migrants. In J. Fox & G. Rivera-Salgado (Eds.). *Indigenous Mexican migrants in the United States*, (pp. 1-15). La Jolla, CA: The Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies and the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies.
- Gardner, H. (2007). Honoring Mixtec farmworkers through cultural sensitivity practices. *Outreach, Fall 2007*. Oakland, CA: Farmworker Health Services, Inc.
- Hansen, B. (2002). The Oaxaca connection; Immigrants from southern Mexico have brought real moles, *clayudas* and avocado leaf *barbacoa* to L.A. *Los Angeles Times, May, 1, 2002*. Retrieved November 17, 2007, from http://guelaguetzarestante.com/quienes_somos/docs/oaxaca_connection.pdf.
- Kada, N. & Kiy, R. (2004, March). *Blurred borders: Transboundary issues and solutions in the San Diego/Tijuana border region*. Retrieved November 17, 2007, from <http://www.icfdn.org/publications/blurredborders/documents/Blurred-KiyRemarks3-23-04.pdf>.

- Kissam, E. (2000). *Self help groups. Best practices for migrant workers*. Davis, CA: Migration Dialogue - Changing Face.
- Kissam, E., Intili, J. A., & Garcia, A. (2003). Spanish-language community radio as a resource for health promotion campaigns targeted to farmworkers and recent immigrants. *California Journal of Health Promotion, 1*, 183-197.
- Kissam, E. & Jacobs, I. J. (2004). Practical research strategies for Mexican indigenous communities in California seeking to assert their own identity. In J. Fox & G. Rivera-Salgado (Eds.). *Indigenous Mexican migrants in the United States* (pp. 275-300). La Jolla, CA: The Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies and the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies.
- Kiy, R., & Woodruff, C. (2005). *The ties that bind us: Mexican migrants in San Diego County*. La Jolla, CA: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies.
- Lopez, F. H., & Runsten, D. (2004). Mixtecs and Zapotecs working in California: Rural and urban experiences. In J. Fox & G. Rivera-Salgado (Eds.). *Indigenous Mexican migrants in the United States* (pp. 175-200). La Jolla, CA: The Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies and the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies.
- Martinez, K., Runsten, D., & Ricardez, A. (2005). *Salir adelante - getting ahead: Recent Mexican immigrants in San Diego county*. In R. Kiy & C. Woodruff (Eds.). *The ties that bind us: Mexican migrants in San Diego County* (pp. 100-125). La Jolla, CA: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies.
- Murillo, J. H., & Cerda, I. (2004). Indigenous Mexican migrants in the 2000 U.S. Census: "Hispanic American Indians". In J. Fox & G. Rivera-Salgado (Eds.). *Indigenous Mexican migrants in the United States* (pp. 250-275). La Jolla, CA: The Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies and the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies.
- Nichols, S., Salcido, L. M., Ayala, M., & Mines, R. (2003). *The agricultural worker health study case study, No. 6: Napa County*. Davis, CA: California Institute for Rural Studies.
- Reynolds, K., & Kourous, G. (1998). Farmworkers: An overview of health, safety and wage issues. *Borderlines, 6*, 1-2.
- Runsten, D. (2005). Origins and characteristics of Mexican immigrants in San Diego: Evidence from the *Matriculas Consulares*. In R. Kiy & C. Woodruff (Eds.). *The ties that bind us: Mexican migrants in San Diego County* (pp. 25-50). La Jolla, CA: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies
- Runsten, D., & Kearney, M (1994). *A survey of Oaxacan village networks in California agriculture*. Davis, CA: California Institute for Rural Studies.
- Saca, L., Ayala, M., Clarke, M., Perez, V. M., & Mines, R. (2003). *The agricultural worker health study case study No. 4, North Tulare County*. Davis, CA: California Institute for Rural Studies.
- Schroeder, K., Samaniego, M., Nygaard, K., Mullenax, N., & Mines, R. (2003). *The agricultural worker health study case study No. 3: Oxnard & Santa Clarita Valley*. Davis, CA: California Institute for Rural Studies.
- Strochlic, R., Mullenax, N., Samaniego, M., Villasenor, X., Salcido, L., & Mines, R. (2003). *The agricultural worker health study case study No. 5: Salinas Valley*. Davis, CA: California Institute for Rural Studies.
- Takash, P. C., Hinojosa-Ojeda, R., & Runsten, D. (2005). *Investment of remittances for development in a migratory economy*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA North American Integration and Development Center.

- Villarejo, D., Lighthall, D., Williams, D., Souter, A., Mines, R., Bade, B., Samuels, S., & McCurdy, S. A., (2000). *Suffering in silence: A report on the health of California's agricultural workers*. Davis, CA: California Institute for Rural Studies.
- Zabin, C., Kearney, M., Garcia, A., Runsten, D., & Nagengast, C. (1993). *Mixtec migrants in California agriculture: A new cycle of poverty*. Davis, CA: California Institute for Rural Studies.

Appendix A: Key Informants

The following individuals provided invaluable information for this report. Their knowledge, insights and advice are greatly appreciated.

Rosario Aguirre: Greenfield Clinica de Salud
Bonnie Bade: CSU San Marcos
Flavio Bautista: California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA)
Rufino Dominguez: Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño (CBDIO)
Jonathan Fox: UC Santa Cruz
Anna Garcia: UC Davis
Joe Grebmeier: Greenfield Police Department
Jim Grieshop: UC Davis
Susan Haverland: Mixteco/Indigena Community Organizing Project (MICOP)
Michael Kearney: UC Riverside
Ed Kissam: Aguirre International
Los Angeles community leaders*
Filemon Lopez: Radio Bilingue La Hora Mixteca
Jesus Lopez: California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA)
Graciela Martinez: American Friends Service Committee, Proyecto Campesino
Nayamin Martinez: Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño (CBDIO)
Richard Mines: Richard Mines Consulting
Lorenzo Orpeza: California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA)
Jeff Ponting: California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA)
Alejandrina Ricardez: Coalición de Comunidades Indígenas de Oaxaca (COCIO)
Nora Selinas: Work Connections
Yolanda Teneyuque: Greenfield City Council & Sun Street Centers
Raphael Vasquez: Santa Rosa Junior College
Devra Weber: UC Riverside

*These individuals preferred to not be recognized individually.

Appendix B: Resources

The following resources offer additional information and references to services that can facilitate the provision of outreach and services to Oaxacan communities in California.

Community Organizations

Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño (CBDIO)

Rufino Domínguez Santos
Executive Director
Phone: (559) 499-1178
E-mail: cbdioinc@sbcglobal.net

Mixteco/Indígena Community Organizing Project (MICOP)

Susan Haverland
Executive Director
Phone: (805) 320-0839
E-mail: susan.haverland@mixteco.org
<http://www.mixteco.org/>

California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA)

Jose Padilla
Executive Director
Phone: (415)777-2752
<http://www.crla.org>

Interpretation Resources

Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño (CBDIO)/Frente Indígena Oaxaqueño Binacional (FIOB)

Maintain a listing of interpreters in several indigenous languages.
<http://www.laneta.apc.org/fiob/interpretes1.html>
Phone: (559) 499-1178
E-mail: cbdioinc@sbcglobal.net

CyraCom

<http://www.cyacom.com>
Phone: (800)713-4950
Email: info@cyacom.com

Language Line Services

<http://www.language.com/>
Phone: (877) 886-3885

Verizon Prepaid Interpretation Service
(Service contracted through Language Line Services)
Phone: (888) 323-1238

Optimal Phone Interpreters
<http://www.optimalphoneinterpreters.com/>
Phone: (866) 380-9410

TeleInterpreters
<http://www.teleinterpreters.com>
Phone: (800) 811-7881

Abc Interpreting
(559) 251-9800

NetworkOmni
<http://www.networkomni.com>
Phone: (800) 543-4244

Suggested Readings

Oaxacan Culture: Cultural Competence Guidebook.
Centro Binacional Para el Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño (CBDIO).
An excellent guidebook covering the cultural background of the indigenous communities and tips on culturally sensitive outreach practices.
Contact the CBDIO office (559) 499-1178 for copies.

Understanding the Indigenous Oaxacan Culture
Centro Binacional Para el Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño (CBDIO).
A PowerPoint presentation created to improve understanding and cultural competency in communicating with the indigenous Oaxacan culture.
For more information regarding this and other PowerPoint presentations contact the CBDIO office at (559) 499-1178.

Honoring Mixtec Farmworkers through Cultural Sensitivity Practices.
By Heather Gardner, published in the Outreach Newsletter by Farmworker Health Services, Inc.
A review of culturally sensitive practices relating to indigenous Oaxacan communities.
http://ucop.edu/hia/documents/outreach_newsltrf07.pdf