



Published in final edited form as:

*Soc Sci Res.* 2011 May ; 40(3): 811–821. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.10.009.

## Residential Segregation in Metropolitan Established Immigrant Gateways and New Destinations, 1990–2000\*

Julie Park and

University of Maryland

John Iceland

Penn State University

### Abstract

In the 1990s, many immigrants bypassed established gateways like Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and Miami to create new immigrant destinations across the U.S. In this paper, we examine how segregation and spatial assimilation might differ between established gateways and new destinations among the 150 largest metropolitan areas. Using data from the 1990 and 2000 censuses, we calculate levels of dissimilarity for Hispanics and Asians by nativity for these two gateway types. Our findings show that segregation levels are consistently lower in new destinations. However, Hispanics in new destinations experienced significant increases segregation during the 1990s, suggesting a convergence in residential patterns by destination type. Nevertheless, in both destinations the native-born are less segregated than the foreign born—consistent with immigrant spatial incorporation. Finally, socioeconomic indicators are generally consistent with predictions of spatial assimilation.

### Keywords

immigrants; residential segregation; new gateways; spatial assimilation

## INTRODUCTION

In the earlier part of the post-1965 immigration era, established immigrant gateways, such as Los Angeles, New York City, Chicago, Houston, and Miami, attracted a majority of immigrants. However, the 1990s ushered in a new era of immigrant settlement with immigrants dispersing to a wide array of new destinations. While a fair amount is known about residential segregation patterns in established gateways, research on new or emerging gateways is just starting to get under way. On the one hand, we might expect new destinations to be characterized by high levels of segregation because of the recency of

© 2010 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

\*Direct all correspondence to Julie Park, Sociology Department, 2112 Art/Sociology Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-1315, juliepark@socy.umd.edu.

**Publisher's Disclaimer:** This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

migration and the pull of ethnic enclaves among newcomers. On the other hand, it could be that new destinations have lower levels of segregation than established gateways, as the latter often have large established ethnic communities that already form the basis for ethnic social, economic, and political life.

Thus, the main research questions we address in this study are: 1) How do levels of segregation differ between new or emerging destinations and established gateways? 2) Do changes in residential patterns between 1990 and 2000 suggest that new gateways are essentially following in the footsteps of established gateways? 3) Do segregation patterns by nativity suggest similar patterns of spatial assimilation in each of these destination types? 4) Do these patterns vary by racial/ethnic group in each of the destinations? We address these questions using data from the 1990 and 2000 decennial censuses. Because the emergence of new destinations is mostly due to the migration of Hispanics and Asians into areas that previously had few immigrants, we limit our analysis to Hispanics and Asians. We calculate levels of segregation using the dissimilarity index for these two groups by year and nativity, and compare patterns in established gateways versus those in new destinations. In doing so, we hope to shed light on whether patterns of immigrant incorporation vary by the type of immigrant destination.

## BACKGROUND

### Assimilation theory and general patterns of segregation by race and nativity

Throughout much of the 20th century, residential segregation patterns for immigrants have largely been understood through the spatial assimilation model. Originally derived from the Chicago School (Massey 1985; Park and Burgess 1921), this model asserts that new immigrants initially cluster together in immigrant neighborhoods and enclaves. Over time, immigrants experience a process towards integration with a society's majority group through the adoption of mainstream attitudes, culture, and human capital attributes (Alba and Nee 2003). This upward socioeconomic mobility then translates into being less segregated residentially (Alba and Logan 1991).

For example, as immigrants become more familiar with local norms and as their English language ability improves, they may become more comfortable interacting with others and living outside of their ethnic enclave. Immigrants may also become more familiar with the amenities of alternative neighborhoods, such as good schools and clean streets, and, if their own socioeconomic standing allows it, they may be more likely to move to those areas, which often contain members of other ethnic groups. The result is a dispersion of immigrant group members and desegregation over time. Contemporary assimilation theorists emphasize that assimilation need not be a one-way street, where immigrants become more like native majority group members. Rather, assimilation involves a general convergence of social, economic, cultural, and—the focus here—residential patterns (Alba and Nee 2003). Alba and Nee (2003) also emphasize that assimilation is often a process that occurs across generations. While immigrants themselves might assimilate to some extent, progress is predicted to be more evident among their descendants, who presumably grow up fully acculturated.

In contrast to the residential convergence of groups theorized by spatial assimilation theory, the “place stratification” perspective emphasizes majority-group prejudice and discrimination in shaping residential patterns of new or marginalized groups in a society (Massey 1985; Charles 2003). Discrimination ranges from public to private practices which include real estate agents steering racial groups to certain neighborhoods and unequal access to mortgage credit, among other practices (Massey and Denton 1993; Yinger 1995; Squires and Kubrin 2006). Alba and Logan (1993: 1391) explain the place stratification model predicts that, “racial and ethnic minorities are sorted by place according to their group’s relative standing in society and this limits the ability of even the social mobile members of these groups to reside in the same communities as comparable whites.” Applying this model to the segregation, Hispanic and Asian segregation would not significantly vary by nativity, income, and other individual characteristics. Some recent studies show that place stratification still play a central role in shaping the residential patterns of minority group members in the United States (Squires and Kubrin 2006; Ross and Turner 2005).

Previous empirical studies have indicated that place stratification theory seems most applicable to describing the residential experiences of blacks, who remain “hypersegregated” in many U.S. metropolitan areas (Alba and Logan 1993; Iceland 2009; Massey and Denton 1993; Rosenbaum and Friedman 2007; Wilkes and Iceland 2003). However, housing audit studies have found that Asians and Hispanics also experience discrimination in the housing search process (Ross and Turner 2005; Turner and Ross 2003). For example, Hispanic home seekers are shown fewer properties on average than white home seekers and are more likely to be steered toward available units in minority neighborhoods. This practice directly serves to reinforce residential segregation. With regards to the effect of nativity on segregation in particular, previous studies have found that foreign-born Asians and Hispanics tend to be moderately more segregated from whites and less likely to move into white neighborhoods than the native-born of these respective ethnic groups (Denton and Massey 1988; Iceland and Scopilliti 2008; Iceland and Nelson 2008; South, Crowder, and Chavez 2005a, 2005b). These patterns by nativity are generally consistent with spatial assimilation.

### **Immigrant Destinations**

The research focusing on the residential patterns of immigrants described above has not delved much into how patterns might differ in old versus new immigrant destinations. Certainly, in long-established immigrant gateways like Chicago and New York, immigrant residential segregation patterns have generally followed the spatial assimilation model, though both cities still have prominent ethnic communities in the central city (Singer 2004).

But residential patterns in new immigrant destinations, such as Seattle, Tampa, and Las Vegas differ more generally. These places have experienced rapid growth in recent years and are much more suburban in character than many traditional immigrant gateways. As such, we have seen less of the traditional initial movement of immigrants into dense central city enclaves in new areas than in older ones. New and old destinations also differ in immigration history, size, and immigrant “institutional arrangements” (Waters and Jimenez 2005, p.118). For example, established gateways have governmental bureaucracies and non-

profit organizations present that have experience dealing with immigrant problems and issues. Waters and Jimenez assert that comparing the two gateway types by levels of segregation or along other dimensions will bring greater theoretical insight into the immigrant assimilation process.

Massey (2008) presents a similar argument in the concluding chapter of his edited volume on new immigrant destinations. He asserts that long-established gateways have served as “assimilation machines” for the nation which buffers the vast majority of Americans from new immigrants (pp. 351–352). These gateways have well-developed institutions for immigrant integration and more importantly, a native population who is quite accustomed to new immigrants. In contrast, Massey notes how immigrants are received in new destinations with neither the institutional support nor the familiarity of the native population. His observations lead him to question whether these new places will bring about new patterns of assimilation. The evidence presented by researchers throughout his book suggests that the process of immigrant adaptation in these new destinations will be more difficult than was observed in established gateways.

Other new notable edited collections by Víctor Zúñiga and Rubén Hernández-León (2005), and Audrey Singer, Susan W. Hardwick, and Caroline B. Brettell (2008) have also begun to explore immigrant settlement and incorporation in specific new destinations. Researchers in each volume offer explanations of how immigrant residential concentrations develop in new destinations. Donato, Stainback, and Bankston (2005) describe how the residential location of new immigrants can largely be determined by the openness of the native population. In their research of two cities in southern Louisiana, Donato et al. found that the fears and anti-immigrant sentiment of the community kept Mexican immigrants from settling within city limits and inadvertently, contributed to the emergence of an immigrant community just outside of the city. On the other hand, Odem (2008) explains how immigrants concentrate in certain geographies due to the availability of affordable housing, proximity to jobs and transportation, and the presence of other immigrants. Regardless of the mechanisms explaining why immigrant residential concentrations emerge in new destinations, researchers do observe immigrant segregation in new destinations.

Researchers focusing specifically on segregation in other new destinations find slightly different patterns of immigrant settlement and concentration. Price et al. (2005) find that immigrant newcomers in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area disperse to a wide range of areas. Singer (2004) and Friedman et al. (2005) likewise suggest that several distinctive patterns of immigrant settlement may be defined in different types of metropolitan areas, where the classic, Chicago-school spatial assimilation account may be more appropriate for long-established immigrant gateways but that it may not apply to new immigrant destinations because immigrants are bypassing traditional central city locations in these metro areas. Price et al. (2005) also caution that the observed residential dispersion of new immigrants is not necessarily a sign of full integration into mainstream American society.

These kinds of works are vital in laying the groundwork for understanding what is happening in individual metropolitan areas as their immigrant population grows. However, empirical research directly comparing segregation in established gateways to that in new

destinations has only recently started to get underway. Lichter et al. (2010) compared Hispanic segregation in new Hispanic destinations to established places. They found that “Hispanics are highly segregated in new destinations, often at levels greatly exceeding those in established places” (Lichter et al. 2010, p. 226). In an earlier study, Fischer and Tienda (2006) compared Hispanic segregation in new destinations vs. traditional gateways in the 100 largest metropolitan areas. Contrary to the Lichter et al. study, they found that Hispanic segregation was generally lower in new destinations than in established gateways, but the difference narrowed over the 1980 to 2000 period.

The key difference between the two studies is the ways in which they define new destinations and what geographical units they are using. Lichter et al. (2010) include metropolitan cities, suburban places, and rural communities based on block data. They show that nonmetropolitan new destinations have higher than average levels of segregation, which could explain at least some of the difference in the findings of the two studies (Lichter et al. vs. Fischer and Tienda). In addition, while it can be informative to examine “place”-based segregation (as done in Lichter et al), the drawback with generalizing on segregation patterns with this approach is that places within metropolitan areas are assumed to constitute separate housing and labor markets, while the broader metropolitan areas themselves are in fact explicitly designed to represent such markets. Finally, Lichter et al. also use a fairly restricted definition of what constitutes a “new destination”—those places with very rapid immigrant growth—such that Hispanics in new destinations accounted for 1.2 percent of the total U.S. Hispanic population in 2000. Fischer and Tienda (2006) instead use the more common approach of analyzing metropolitan areas based on census tracts and a broader definition of new destinations. However, their descriptive chapter did not examine Asian residential patterns or conduct multivariate analyses on the differential effect of group characteristics in the two destination types as we do in this study.

We therefore seek to investigate how residential patterns in these destinations differ. What are the implications of the initial dispersion of immigrants in new destinations versus the concentrated patterns found in immigrant gateways? Do the patterns in new destinations facilitate further spatial assimilation over time? Or are the patterns in new destinations simply indicative of the coming spatial concentration in these areas? Do racial differences observed in the spatial assimilation literature apply to both kinds of immigrant destinations?

In short, the spatial assimilation model essentially predicts that new immigrants are initially highly segregated in neighborhoods largely comprised of co-ethnics and relatively few non-Hispanic whites. With increasing duration in the U.S. and increases in socioeconomic status, immigrants and their descendents become less segregated, such that the foreign born of a particular race-ethnic group would on the whole be more segregated from whites than their native-born counterparts. In addition, group characteristics, such as average income, are expected to be negatively associated with segregation (i.e., higher incomes are expected to be associated with lower segregation). These aspects of the spatial assimilation model can be tested by gateway type to see if they work in the same way.

Alternatively, the place stratification perspective predicts that immigrant groups will preserve their residential distinctiveness across generations. Thus, there will be little

difference in segregation levels by nativity. In addition, group socioeconomic characteristics, such as average income levels, are not expected to play a large role in shaping segregation patterns, given the paramount importance of race in shaping patterns. For example, until relatively recently, blacks of all income levels have been very highly segregated from whites.

Our focus is whether one of these models (spatial assimilation and place stratification) helps to better explain the residential patterns in both kinds of immigrant destinations or if the residential patterns in new destinations are developing in ways that are significantly different from those in established gateways. Previous research findings consistently show spatial assimilation to be most fitting for explaining segregation patterns for Hispanics and Asians in established gateways. However, from the arguments made by Massey and colleagues (2008) and others, place stratification may be more fitting for explaining segregation in new destinations since “assimilation machines” are not yet firmly in place. Hostility against immigrants may be higher in new destinations because of the lack of previous exposure to immigrants and their customs. Lichter et al. (2010) also hypothesize that segregation is higher in new destinations than in established gateways for several empirical reasons and their results confirm their hypothesis. Therefore, consistent with what the current literature suggests, we hypothesize that the place segregation model is more fitting to explain residential patterns in new destinations while the spatial assimilation model is more for established destinations.<sup>1</sup> This hypothesis is tested by comparing segregation by nativity in both established and new gateways separately, as well as the association between segregation and socioeconomic characteristics like income (which, according to spatial assimilation theory, should be associated with residential patterns). Examining and comparing the patterns of segregation by destination type begins to reveal whether new destinations are following in the footsteps of established gateways or new destinations might be forging new patterns of persistent stratification for Hispanics and Asians.

This study offers several contributions to the existing literature on segregation patterns among immigrants. First, we systematically compare residential patterns in new destinations with those in established gateways using the typology of metropolitan immigrant destinations developed by Audrey Singer (2004) and extended by Hall et al. (2009). Second, we calculated detailed segregation scores by race/ethnicity and nativity in these metropolitan areas in order to provide greater insight into the assimilation process for Hispanics and Asians. Third, we examine the changes in segregation from 1990 to 2000 so that patterns of segregation are not only observed at a single point in time but also followed through a time period of shifting immigrant settlement. Lastly, we use multivariate analyses to determine which group or metropolitan characteristics can help to explain the differences between established gateways and new destinations.

---

<sup>1</sup>We do recognize that studies similar to ours (Fischer and Tienda 2006) find that segregation in new destinations is lower than in established gateways. However, our hypotheses are based on what the most recent research has shown.

## DATA AND METHODS

### Defining Gateway Types

Singer and her colleagues (2004, 2008) offer a useful typology that categorizes large metropolitan areas (MSAs, PMSAs, or NECMAs), those with greater than 1 million population, into six different types of immigrant destinations. Using census data from 1900 to 2000, gateway type is determined by the number of foreign born, the foreign-born share, and the growth rate of the foreign-born population for each metropolitan area. This general typology, or variations of it, have been used by other researchers (e.g., Fischer and Tienda 2006; Hall et al. 2009; Painter and Yu 2008). Singer's typology includes 45 large metropolitan areas divided into six different categories (Former, Continuous, Post-World War II, Emerging, Re-Emerging, and Pre-Emerging).

For the purposes of this paper, we adapt Singer's classification of large metropolitan areas, though we collapse her six categories into 3: established gateways (continuous and post World War II gateways), new destinations (emerging and re-emerging gateways), and other (former and pre-emerging gateways). Established gateways either have a higher foreign-born share than the national average during each decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century or begin to have a higher foreign-born share than the national average after World War II. New destinations had a low percentage foreign-born until 1970 followed by high proportions in the post-1980 period. To be clear, the foreign-born population used to determine this typology includes foreign-born people of all race/ethnicities. Our analysis focuses on only established gateways and new destinations in order to both simplify the analysis and because, conceptually, the main point of contrast is expected to occur between old and new destinations. For *large* metropolitan areas, the analysis now includes 16 established gateways and 16 new destinations.

Though many of the new destinations that emerged during the 1990s have been large metropolitan areas, many are also smaller metropolitan areas (less than 1 million in population) and some smaller metropolitan areas are also established gateways for immigrants. However, attempting to categorize smaller metropolitan areas poses several challenges. First, many of these smaller metropolitan areas have only recently emerged and they lack the long history of larger areas that have existed for the entire 20<sup>th</sup> century. This precludes directly using Singer's six-category typology for smaller areas. Second, smaller metropolitan areas were previously not considered significant immigrant destinations. The notion that smaller metropolitan areas can be home to a sizable immigrant population is relatively new. It has been long understood in the immigration literature that immigrants concentrated in the large urban centers of the U.S., settling in ethnic enclaves in places like New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Though smaller metropolitan areas were not previously categorized into different types of immigrant destinations in Singer's original typology (2004), they are becoming important in understanding emerging immigrant settlement patterns of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Hall et al. (2009) offer a useful typology of immigrant destinations for the 150 largest metropolitan areas which follows and extends Singer's typology. They construct 4 categories of destination types: old, traditional, new and developing which results in 29 established gateways and 49

new destinations. In order to adapt their typology for the purposes of this paper, we have to make slight adjustments since they use the 1990 metropolitan boundaries while we use those for 2000. Most of the metropolitan area boundaries remain consistent between 1990 and 2000 with the exception of two New England areas.<sup>2</sup> In sum, there are 26 established immigrant gateways and 48 new destinations (see Table 1). Using this typology, 16.6 million Hispanics live in established gateways compared to 6.9 million Hispanics living in new destinations. In other words, 26.4% of all Hispanics in the top 150 metropolitan areas live in new destinations. For Asians, 4.4 million are in established gateways while 2.3 million are in new destinations. A slightly larger share of all Asians in the top 150 metropolitan areas lives in new destinations (30.0%).

## Data

Our segregation calculations rely on data drawn from internal 1990 and 2000 long-form Census files. We operationalize metropolitan areas based on Census definitions of metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), primary metropolitan statistical areas (PMSAs), and for New England states, New England county metropolitan areas (NECMAs), together referred to hereafter as metropolitan areas (MAs). When presenting comparable data for 1990 and 2000, the 2000 boundaries of county-based metropolitan areas, as defined by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on June 30, 1999, were used to ensure comparability.

We calculate segregation scores for specific racial/ethnic/nativity groups only in metropolitan areas where there are 1,000 or more members present, as segregation indexes for metropolitan areas with small group populations are less reliable than those with larger ones. To examine the distribution of different groups across neighborhoods within metropolitan areas, we use census tracts. Census tracts typically have between 2,500 and 8,000 individuals, are defined with local input, are intended to represent neighborhoods, and typically do not change much from census to census, except to subdivide. In addition, census tracts are by far the unit most used in research on residential segregation (e.g., Logan, Stults, and Farley 2004; Massey and Denton 1993). Thus, the data include information on population counts for various racial/ethnic group by census tract in the metropolitan areas of interest, as well as counts of these groups by nativity. We exclude counts of individuals in institutional group quarters (such as prisons).

The 1990 census collected information on four race groups: White; Black; American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut; and Asian or Pacific Islander. There was an additional question on whether an individual was of Hispanic origin. In the 1990s, after much research and public comment, OMB revised the racial classification for Census 2000 to include five categories – White; Black or African American; American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; and Native

<sup>2</sup>Hall et al. include three separate PMSAs for the Boston area (Boston, Worcester, and Brockton) and three for the New Haven area (New Haven, Bridgeport, and Stamford). Since we use the New England County Metropolitan Area definitions (NECMAs), we combined the three in each area which results in the Boston-Worcester-Lawrence-Lowell-Brockton, MA-NH NECMA and New Haven-Bridgeport-Stamford-Waterbury-Danbury, CT NECMA. For the New Haven-Bridgeport-Stamford-Waterbury-Danbury, CT NECMA, Hall et al. consider Bridgeport and New Haven areas to be two separate traditional gateways and Stamford to be a new destination. Since 82.8% of the NECMA population lives in the two traditional gateways, we have defined this NECMA as an established gateway.



Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander—and allowed individuals to report more than one race. Census 2000 figures indicate that 6.8 million, or 2.4 percent of the population, reported more than one race (Jones and Smith 2001). Our study focuses on the residential patterns of Hispanics and Asians and Pacific Islanders. In 2000, Asians in this analysis include those who identified as being a member of that group either alone or in combination with another race. Non-Hispanic Whites consist of those who marked only White and who indicated that they were not Hispanic. The reference group in the segregation calculations is native-born non-Hispanic Whites.<sup>3</sup>

## Method

This analysis uses the dissimilarity index by race and Hispanic origin, nativity, and destination type to measure residential patterns. Dissimilarity is the most common index in the segregation literature. It is a metropolitan-level summary measure that describes how evenly people of different groups are distributed across neighborhoods within a metropolitan area. It ranges from 0 (complete integration) to 1 (complete segregation), and specifies the percent of a group's population that would have to change residence for each neighborhood to have the same percentage of that group as the metropolitan area overall.

The regression analyses examine the factors that explain metropolitan-level variation in segregation scores, focusing on the role of destination type, nativity, and other group and metropolitan characteristics. Our models include a metropolitan observation for each racial/ethnic and nativity group, such that we have up to four observations per metropolitan area corresponding to segregation scores for native and foreign-born Hispanics and Asians. This allows us to examine the effect of nativity (by race/ethnicity) and to include the characteristics of each racial/ethnic and nativity group (such as income relative to whites and group size) in the models. Because the same metropolitan areas are included up to four times in the models, we produce corrected standard errors by using Generalized Linear Regression models that account for the correlated error structure (i.e., because we are using repeated, clustered observations) among the independent variables.<sup>4</sup> Our models are similar to those employed in some other studies (Iceland and Nelson 2008; Massey and Denton 1989).

Our first model in the regression analysis focuses on the effect of destination type by comparing segregation levels in new destinations to established gateways (established gateway is the omitted category). The second set of models add group level characteristics with a nativity dummy variable, group median household income relative to the native-born non-Hispanic whites in the same metropolitan area, and group size (in the 10,000s) for each metropolitan area.<sup>5</sup> These models are not necessarily an attempt to determine causal

---

<sup>3</sup>Adopting a race definition where a person is considered in a group if he or she chooses only that particular group has would have only a modest effect on Asian segregation calculations (Iceland et al. 2002, Appendix A). The similarity of scores across group definitions results, in large part, from the fact that the proportion of people who marked two or more race groups in the 2000 Census was small. Hispanic indexes are not affected by this specific issue since Hispanic origin is asked in a separate question. Methodologically, the most important issue is to ensure that the two groups used in any given index calculation are mutually exclusive, which is indeed the case in this analysis.

<sup>4</sup>We used the SAS proc genmod procedure with repeated statements. Liang and Zeger (1986) originally introduced generalized estimating equations as a method of dealing with correlated data.

<sup>5</sup>English language proficiency is an important indicator of acculturation. However, English language proficiency is very highly correlated with nativity status. Therefore, it is not included as a group-specific characteristic.

relationships but rather to ascertain whether there are significant differences between immigrant gateway types, and whether these differences can be explained by group-level characteristics thought to be important according to the spatial assimilation perspective.

The third set of regression models adds metropolitan area characteristics that have been shown to be associated with segregation (Frey and Farley 1996; Logan, Stults, and Farley 2004). We treat these mainly as controls in our analyses. These variables include the metropolitan area population size, the percentage of the metropolitan area population in the suburbs, the percentage of housing units built in the last 10 years, and the region.

## DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS

Table 2 shows the average levels of metropolitan residential segregation by gateway type in 2000. The table includes metropolitan areas that contained at least 1,000 members of the particular racial/ethnic group by nativity status in both the 1990 and 2000 censuses. This method allows us to gauge patterns of change for a fixed set of metropolitan areas.<sup>6</sup> Generally, the dissimilarity index indicates that established gateways are more segregated than new destinations. In 2000, the total foreign-born population has a higher dissimilarity index in established gateways (0.481) than in new immigrant destinations (0.408). Contrary to our hypothesis, we find that new destinations actually have lower levels of segregation than in established gateways. However, this finding is consistent with other similar studies (Fischer and Tienda 2006).

Consistent with spatial assimilation in both gateway types, the foreign born are more likely to be segregated than the native born for both Hispanics and Asians. The difference between gateway types is larger among the Hispanic native born than for the foreign born. Furthermore, the difference by nativity is greater in new destinations than in established gateways for Hispanics while the pattern does not differ as much for Asians. These patterns suggest that Hispanic immigrants are much more likely to be segregated than their native-born counterparts in new destinations. However, there is only a marginally significant difference in dissimilarity by gateway type for Hispanic immigrants.

Table 3 highlights changes in segregation by showing the dissimilarity index by gateway type in both 1990 and 2000. In established gateways, segregation has not significantly changed during the 1990s. However segregation for immigrants as a whole in new destinations increased significantly from 0.349 in 1990 to 0.408 in 2000. This increase in segregation holds true for Hispanics but not for Asians, among whom there is almost no change in segregation regardless of nativity status. In addition, the difference in segregation by gateway type for immigrants is larger in 1990 (0.107) than it is in 2000 (0.073) and this pattern holds mainly for Hispanics.

Overall, these patterns suggest that segregation is higher in traditional gateways than new destinations for all groups. However, we find increasing levels of Hispanic-white

---

<sup>6</sup>Results are quite similar whether we include a fixed set of metropolitan areas that meet the population threshold in *every* nativity subgroup (as shown in the table) versus if we include all metropolitan areas that meet the population threshold only in a given category.

segregation in new destinations. The increase occurred mainly among foreign-born Hispanics.

## MULTIVARIATE RESULTS

Our multivariate analyses examine to what extent group and metropolitan area factors are associated with segregation. As described above, we focus on the effect of assimilation-related variables—nativity and income relative to whites—and see if their effect differs across destinations. If they are significant in the expected direction, then assimilation theory receives support. If they are not significant, this suggests that place stratification may hold—and we may see that it holds in one kind of destination but not the other. Table 4 shows the average values of our independent variables in the multivariate models by gateway type. As expected, group size is much larger in established gateways than in new destinations (4.7 times larger for Hispanics and 3.6 times larger for Asians) and the same holds true for total metropolitan population. Hispanics have a higher household income ratio to non-Hispanic whites in new destinations (0.718) than in established gateways (0.609). The income ratio for Asians is virtually the same in both destination types, and close to parity with whites. New destinations have a larger share of its population living in the suburbs and a larger share of its housing that was built in the last ten years.

Table 5 shows multivariate results for levels of dissimilarity separately for Hispanics and Asians. Overall, according to Model 1 results, Hispanics and Asians are less segregated in new destinations than in established gateways.<sup>7</sup> Foreign-born Hispanics are more segregated than their native-born counterparts, as well as Asians in Model 3 once metropolitan characteristics are controlled. Also for Hispanics, higher levels of income are associated with lower levels of segregation, which is consistent with spatial assimilation. The interaction term in Models 2 and 3 indicates that effect of household income levels on segregation is not as strong in new destinations. For Asians, the household income ratio does not have a significant effect on their segregation levels. Group size has a positive association with segregation for Asians, while the size of the metropolitan area is positively associated with segregation among both groups. And lastly, both groups are more segregated in the Northeast and Midwest regions than in the West.

The multivariate results in 2000 reveal a few interesting findings. First, the moderately significant difference between gateway types in Model 1 for Asians disappears once group characteristics are controlled while the difference between gateway types for Hispanics persists even after controlling for both group and metropolitan characteristics. Second, Hispanic segregation from whites follows the general predictions of spatial assimilation. Among Hispanics, nativity and income are significant while only nativity is significant for Asians in Model 3. Third, the effect of nativity and income on segregation for Hispanics is different by gateway type. The signs of the coefficients indicate that assimilation-related variables may be less salient in new destinations than in traditional gateways.

---

<sup>7</sup>It should be noted that segregation scores in the descriptive tables (2 and 3) are weighted by the size of the group of interest to show levels of segregation experienced by the typical group member, while all of the regression models are unweighted because our aim is to understand the factors associated with metropolitan-level variation in segregation patterns. Unweighted descriptive statistics are similar to what we see in the bivariate regression results (Model 1) in Table 5.

Table 6 shows the results for modeling change in segregation between 1990 and 2000. For both Hispanics and Asians, Model 1 shows that new destinations did not experience a change in segregation that was significantly different from the change observed in traditional gateways. However, Model 2 for Hispanics reveals that once group characteristics are controlled, an increase in segregation for new destinations is statistically significant. Higher income levels are associated with less change in segregation similar to what was observed in the 2000 models. Unlike the models for 2000, larger group size is associated with larger changes in segregation. Lastly, the difference between gateway types remains significant for Hispanics even with the introduction of metropolitan characteristics.

For Asians, Model 1 shows that changes in segregation do not significantly differ by gateway type. In Models 2 and 3 higher income is associated with lower segregation and larger group size is associated with higher segregation while all other characteristics do not have a significant association with segregation.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The main purpose of this paper is to examine the differences in segregation by immigrant gateway type (established gateways and new destinations). Our descriptive results are clear in several respects. We find that dissimilarity is higher in established gateways than in new destinations among the foreign-born population as whole, and among Hispanics and Asians, irrespective of nativity status. Contrary to our hypothesis and the assumptions of some researchers in the current literature, Hispanics and Asians in new destinations are not more segregated than their counterparts in established gateways. However, the differences between gateway types were larger in 1990 than in 2000. And while segregation has not changed all that much from 1990 to 2000 in established gateways, Hispanic segregation in particular increased in new destinations. This suggests that, though segregation is lower in new destinations in 2000, residential patterns in new destinations are becoming more like those in established gateways. Also consistent with the assimilation perspective, segregation scores were also generally higher among foreign-born Hispanics and Asians than the native born of the respective groups. We find this in both gateway types indicating that the spatial assimilation model helps to explain residential patterns in both gateway types.

Multivariate analyses indicated that when significant, acculturation and socioeconomic indicators also tend to be consistent with predictions of spatial assimilation in group-specific regressions. For example, the native born of both Hispanics and Asian have lower dissimilarity scores than the foreign born, and greater Hispanic median household income relative to that of whites is associated with lower segregation. However, there are some notable differences by destination type. Among Hispanics, the effect of nativity is larger in traditional gateways, suggesting that that the assimilation perspective has stronger predictive power there. It could be that new immigrants arriving in traditional gateways are more likely to live in large, established ethnic enclaves than those moving to new destinations, where ethnic enclaves may be smaller and more diffuse. Similarly, Hispanic income relative to whites has less of an association with segregation in new destinations than it does in established gateways.

For Hispanics, the difference in segregation levels by gateway type persists even after controlling for group and metropolitan characteristics. However, this does not hold true for Asians. The difference in segregation levels by gateway type for Asians is largely explained by group characteristics where larger group size is associated with higher segregation. The persisting difference in segregation by gateway type for Hispanics and not for Asians could be an indication that Hispanic residential patterns in new destinations differ from what was observed in established gateways. On the other hand, Asian residential patterns in new destinations may be similar to what was observed in established gateways. More generally, the multivariate results were not uniformly significant in all instances, indicative of nontrivial nuances in our findings (described in the results section) and suggest that that caution is essential to avoid making overly strong generalizations on patterns across destination types and assimilation-related characteristics for all groups in all instances.

Some researchers (e.g., Massey 2008) have raised questions about whether immigrant incorporation will occur as readily in new destinations as in traditional gateways, for the latter have well established institutions that are designed to facilitate immigrant integration that are often lacking in the former. While we do find that the segregation of immigrants increased in new destinations and not in established gateways between 1990 and 2000, we find other patterns consistent with the assimilation of immigrants in both types of places. In particular, the native born tend to be less segregated than the foreign born in both kinds of destinations. Thus, while we find some convergence in the levels of segregation by destination type, we also see signs that incorporation is at least to some extent occurring in both.

Within these general patterns of spatial assimilation, there is a noteworthy difference by destination type which imply that, among Hispanics, spatial assimilation may not operate as strongly in new destinations as in established gateways. The strength of the association of Hispanic income and segregation differs in new destinations than in established gateways. The same incremental increase in Hispanic income is associated with much lower segregation in established gateways than in new destinations. This may be an indication that either the process of assimilation will be slower in new destinations or that spatial assimilation may be hindered in destinations for certain groups. Further research in examining the mechanisms shaping residential patterns in new destinations relative to those in established gateways would therefore be worthwhile.

There are certain limitations to this study that warrant mention and discussion. First, the typology is applied to the 150 largest metropolitan areas which may exclude some smaller immigrant destinations. As seen in Lichter et al. (2010), these smaller metropolitan areas or rural areas experience different patterns of immigrant settlement and segregation than what is presented here and the findings for these areas are no less important or relevant for understanding immigrant segregation and spatial assimilation. This paper generally aims to compare the largest established gateways and new destinations in order to begin the discussion of differences between gateway types and their implication for the current understanding of immigrant segregation and spatial assimilation.

Second, some researchers suggest a more elaborate scheme of defining new immigrant destinations for each major racial-ethnic group. Certainly, some immigrant groups are larger than others in a given location and a more tailored list of new destinations by race-ethnicity could yield more detailed and nuanced results. Creating such a typology would provide an excellent avenue for future research. In the meantime, however, the typology offered here provides immigrant gateways in a broader framework within which to understand or to compare an analysis with alternative sets of new destinations. Moreover, the analysis of segregation patterns for race-ethnic groups in this paper allows us to understand the impact of immigrant flows on these different groups as well as the metropolitan areas as a whole.

Overall, immigrant segregation is higher in established gateways than in new destinations. The moderate increases in Hispanic-white segregation in new destinations hint that their segregation levels are converging with that of established gateways. However, the difference between the two gateways remains significant in 2000. Thus, a continued examination of residential segregation trends to 2010 is absolutely crucial in providing more definitive answers to our questions about differences across destination types.

## References

- Alba, Richard; Logan, John R. Minority Proximity to Whites in Suburbs: An Individual-Level Analysis of Segregation. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1993; 98(6):1388–1427.
- Alba, Richard; Logan, John R. Variations on Two Themes: Racial and Ethnic Patterns in the Attainment of Suburban Residence. *Demography*. 1991; 28(3):431–453. [PubMed: 1936377]
- Alba, Richard; Nee, Victor. *Remaking the American Mainstream*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 2003.
- Denton, Nancy; Massey, Douglas S. Racial Identity Among Caribbean Hispanics: The Effect of Double Minority Status on Residential Segregation. *American Sociological Review*. 1989; 54:790–808.
- Donato, Katharine M.; Stainback, Melissa; Bankston, Carl L, III. The Economic Incorporation of Mexican Immigrants in Southern Louisiana: A Tale of Two Cities. In: Zúñiga, Víctor; Hernández-León, Rubén, editors. *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2005. p. 76-100.
- Fischer, Mary J.; Tienda, Marta. Redrawing Spatial Color Lines: Hispanic Metropolitan Dispersal, Segregation, and Economic Opportunity. In: Tienda, M.; Mitchell, F., editors. *Hispanics and the Future of America*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2006. p. 100-37.
- Friedman, Samantha; Price, Marie; Singer, Audrey; Cheung, Ivan. Race, Immigrants, and Residence: A New Racial Geography of Washington, DC. *Geographical Review*. 2005; 95(2):210–230.
- Frey, William H.; Farley, Reynolds. Latino, Asian, and Black Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: Are Multiethnic Metros Different? *Demography*. 1996; 33:35–50. [PubMed: 8690139]
- Hall, Matthew; Graefe, Deborah Roempke; De Jong, Gordon F.; Irving, Shelley K. *Population Research Institute of the Pennsylvania State University Working Paper Series*. 2009. The Geographic Inequality of Immigrant Human Capital: A Skills Typology of Old and New Metropolitan Destinations.
- Iceland, John. *Where We Live Now: Immigration and Race in the United States*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 2009.
- Iceland, John. Beyond Black and White: Residential Segregation in Multiethnic America. *Social Science Research*. 2004 Jun; 33(2):248–271.
- Iceland, John; Weinberg, Daniel H.; Steinmetz, Erika. *Racial and Ethnic Residential Segregation in the United States: 1980–2000*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office; 2002. U.S. Census Bureau, Census Special Report, CENSR-3

- Iceland, John; Nelson, Kyle. Hispanic Segregation in Metropolitan America: Exploring the Multiple Forms of Spatial Assimilation. *American Sociological Review*. 2008; 73(5):741–765.
- Iceland, John; Scopilliti, Melissa. Immigrant Residential Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1990–2000. *Demography*. 2008; 45(1):79–94. [PubMed: 18390292]
- Jones, Nicholas A.; Smith, Amy Symens. The Two or More Races Population: 2000. Washington, DC: U.S Government Printing Office; 2001. U.S Census Bureau, Census 2000 Brief, C2KBR/01-6
- Liang, Kung-Yee; Zeger, Scott L. Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models. *Biometrika*. 1986; 73(1):13–22.
- Logan, John R.; Stults, Brian; Reynolds, Farley. Segregation of Minorities in the Metropolis: Two Decades of Change. *Demography*. 2004; 41(1):1–22. [PubMed: 15074122]
- Lichter, Daniel T.; Parisi, Domenico; Taquino, Michael C.; Grice, Steven Michael. Residential Segregation in New Hispanic Destinations: Cities, Suburbs, and Rural Communities Compared. *Social Science Research*. 2010; 39(2):215–230.
- Logan, John R.; Zhang, Wenquan; Alba, Richard D. Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles. *American Sociological Review*. 2002; 67(April):299–322.
- Massey, Douglas S., editor. *New Face in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*. Russell Sage Foundation; New York: 2008.
- Massey, Douglas S. Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Review. *Sociology and Social Research*. 1985; 69:315–50.
- Massey, Douglas S.; Denton, Nancy A. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 1993.
- Odem, Mary E. Unsettled in the Suburbs: Latino Immigration and Ethnic Diversity in Metro Atlanta. In: Singer, Audrey; Hardwick, Susan W.; Brettell, Caroline B., editors. *Twenty-First Century Gateways: Immigrant Incorporation in Suburban America*. Brookings Institution; Washington, DC: 2008. p. 105-136.
- Painter, Gary; Yu, Zhou. Leaving Gateway Metropolitan Areas: Immigrants and the Housing Market. *Urban Studies*. 2008; 45:1163–91.
- Park, Robert E.; Burgess, Ernest. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1921.
- Price, Marie; Cheung, Ivan; Friedman, Samantha; Singer, Audrey. The World Settles In: Washington as an Immigrant Gateway. *Urban Geography*. 2005; 26(1):61–83.
- Rosenbaum, Emily; Friedman, Samantha. *The Housing Divide: How Generations of Immigrants Fare in New York's Housing Market*. New York: NYU Press; 2007.
- Ross, Stephen L.; Turner, Margery Austin. Housing Discrimination in Metropolitan America: Explaining Changes between 1989 and 2000. *Social Problems*. 2005; 52(2):152–80.
- Scopilliti, Melissa; Iceland, John. Residential Patterns of Black Immigrants and Native-Born Blacks in the United States. *Social Science Quarterly*. 2008; 89(3):551–572.
- Singer, Audrey. *The Living Cities Census Series*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution; 2004. *The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways*.
- Singer, Audrey; Hardwick, Susan W.; Brettell, Caroline B., editors. *Twenty-First Century Gateways: Immigrant Incorporation in Suburban America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution; 2008.
- South, Scott J.; Crowder, Kyle; Chavez, Erick. Migration and Spatial Assimilation Among U.S. Latinos: Classic Versus Segmented Trajectories. *Demography*. 2005a; 42:497–521. [PubMed: 16235610]
- South, Scott J.; Crowder, Kyle; Chavez, Erick. Geographic Mobility and Spatial Assimilation Among U.S. Latino Immigrants. *International Migration Review*. 2005b; 39:577–607.
- Squires, Gregory D.; Kubrin, Charis E. *Privileged Places: Race, Residence, and the Structure of Opportunity*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers; 2006.
- Turner, Margery A.; Ross, Stephen L. *Discrimination in Metropolitan Housing Markets: Phase 2—Asians and Pacific Islanders of the HDS 2000*. Washington, DC: US Department of Housing and Urban Development; 2003.
- Waters, Mary; Jiménez, Tomás. Assessing Immigrant Assimilation: New Empirical and Theoretical Challenges. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2005; 31:105–25.

- White, Michael J.; Biddlecom, Ann E.; Guo, Shenyang. Immigration, Naturalization, and Residential Assimilation among Asian Americans in 1980. *Social Forces*. 1993; 72(1):93–117.
- White, Michael J.; Sessler, Sharon. Judging Not Only by Color: Ethnicity, Nativity, and Neighborhood Attainment. *Social Science Quarterly*. 2000; 81(4):997–1013.
- Wilkes, Rima; Iceland, John. Hypersegregation in the Twenty-First Century: An Update and Analysis. *Demography*. 2004; 41(1):23–36. [PubMed: 15074123]
- Zúñiga, Víctor; Hernández-León, Rubén, editors. *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2005.



Table 1

Established Immigrant Gateways and New Destinations for the 150 Largest Metropolitan Areas, 2000

Established Gateways		New Destinations	
1	Boston-Worcester-Lawrence-Lowell-Brockton, MA-NH	1	Albuquerque, NM
2	Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, TX	2	Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA
3	Chicago, IL	3	Anchorage, AK
4	Dutchess County, NY	4	Atlanta, GA
5	El Paso, TX	5	Atlantic-Cape May, NJ
6	Fort Lauderdale, FL	6	Bakersfield, CA
7	Fresno, CA	7	Columbus, OH
8	Hartford, CT	8	Dallas, TX
9	Honolulu, HI	9	Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL
10	Houston, TX	10	Daytona Beach, FL
11	Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	11	Denver, CO
12	McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX	12	Des Moines, IA
13	Miami, FL	13	Fort Myers-Cape Coral FL
14	New Haven-Bridgeport-Stamford-Waterbury-Danbury, CT	14	Fort Pierce-Port St. Lucie, FL
15	New York, NY	15	Galveston-Texas City, TX
16	Newburgh, NY-PA	16	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, MI
17	Providence-Warwick-Pawtucket, RI	17	Kalamazoo-Battle Creek, MI
18	Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	18	Kansas City, MO-KS
19	Salinas, CA	19	Lancaster, PA
20	San Antonio, TX	20	Las Vegas, NV-AZ
21	San Diego, CA	21	Lincoln, NE
22	San Francisco, CA	22	Melbourne-Titusville-Palm Bay, FL
23	Springfield, MA	23	Minneapolis-St. Paul MN-WI
24	Tacoma, WA	24	Modesto, CA
25	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	25	Monmouth-Ocean, NJ
26	Trenton, NJ	26	Naples, FL
		27	Oklahoma City, OK
		28	Omaha, NE-IA
		29	Orlando, FL

Established Gateways	New Destinations
	30 Pensacola, FL
	31 Phoenix-Mesa, AZ
	32 Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA
	33 Reno, NV
	34 Rockford, IL
	35 Sacramento, CA
	36 San Jose, CA
	37 Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Lompoc, CA
	38 Santa Rosa, CA
	39 Scranton-Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, PA
	40 Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA
	41 South Bend, IN
	42 Stockton-Lodi, CA
	43 Tucson, AZ
	44 Ventura, CA
	45 Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, CA
	46 Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV
	47 West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL
	48 Wilmington-Newark, DE-MD

Table 2

Residential Segregation for Established Gateways and New Destinations: Dissimilarity from Native-Born Non-Hispanic Whites by Race-Ethnicity and Nativity, 2000

2000	Established Gateways	N	New Destinations	N	Difference (Established Gateways – New Destinations)
<b>Total Foreign Born</b>	0.481	26	0.408	48	0.073 ***
<b>Hispanics</b>					
	0.563	26	0.474	48	0.089 ***
Native-Born	0.532	26	0.418	48	0.114 ***
Foreign-Born	0.615	26	0.580	48	0.035 *
<b>Asians &amp; Pacific Islanders</b>					
	0.468	25	0.395	47	0.074 ***
Native-Born	0.423	25	0.359	47	0.064 ***
Foreign-Born	0.514	25	0.438	47	0.076 ***

Significance test performed on difference between established gateway and new destination:

\* t-test significant at 0.10

\*\* t-test significant at 0.05

\*\*\* t-test significant at 0.01

**Table 3**

Change in Residential Segregation for Established Gateways and New Destinations: Dissimilarity from Native-Born Non-Hispanic Whites by Race-Ethnicity and Nativity, 1990 to 2000

	Established Gateways				New Destinations				
	1990	N	2000	N	1990	N	2000	N	Change
<b>Total Foreign Born</b>	0.456	26	0.481	26	0.025	48	0.408	48	0.059 ***
<b>Hispanics</b>	0.559	26	0.563	26	0.004	46	0.474	46	0.036 **
Native-Born Hispanics	0.530	26	0.532	26	0.003	46	0.419	46	0.010
Foreign-Born Hispanics	0.618	26	0.615	26	-0.002	46	0.580	46	0.031 **
<b>Asians &amp; Pacific Islanders (PIs)</b>	0.460	24	0.468	24	0.008	39	0.395	39	-0.001
Native-Born Asians & PIs	0.420	24	0.423	24	0.003	39	0.358	39	-0.009
Foreign-Born Asians & PIs	0.503	24	0.514	24	0.011	39	0.439	39	-0.003

Significance test performed on difference between 1990 and 2000:

\* t-test significant at 0.10

\*\* t-test significant at 0.05

\*\*\* t-test significant at 0.01

**Table 4**

Mean Group and Metropolitan Characteristics by Gateway Type, 2000

	Established Gateways	New Destinations
Hispanic Group Size	694,131	147,646
Asian Group Size	184,199	50,867
Ratio of <b>Hispanic</b> Household Income to the Household Income of Native-Born Non-Hispanic	0.609	0.718
Ratio of <b>Asian</b> Household Income to the Household Income of Native-Born Non-Hispanic Whites	0.982	0.994
Total Population	2,594,554	1,132,498
Percent in suburbs	57.9%	62.2%
Percent new housing	15.0%	19.5%
Share of Metropolitan Areas in Region		
NORTHEAST	29.2%	12.8%
MIDWEST	4.2%	23.4%
SOUTH	33.3%	25.5%
WEST	33.3%	38.3%

**Table 5**  
Generalized Linear Regression Results Indicating the Association Between Group and Metropolitan Characteristics with Levels of Dissimilarity from Native-Born Non-Hispanic Whites by Race-Ethnicity, 2000

	Hispanics			Asians & PI		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Intercept	0.525 ***	0.833 ***	0.496 ***	0.416 ***	0.392 ***	0.207 **
New Destination	-0.053 **	-0.278 ***	-0.153 *	-0.027 **	-0.025	-0.018
Foreign Born		0.077 ***	0.077 ***		0.031	0.036 **
New Destination * Foreign Born		0.068 **	0.064 **		0.018	0.017
Household income ratio to reference <sup>1</sup>		-0.556 ***	-0.512 ***		-0.012	-0.047
New Destination * Household income ratio		0.339 **	0.194 *		0.004	0.011
Group Size (10,000s)		0.000	0.000		0.002 ***	0.002 ***
Log of total metro population			0.020 **			0.014 **
% in suburbs			0.045			0.023
% new housing			-0.124			-0.099
NORTHEAST			0.082 ***			0.060 ***
MIDWEST			0.058 ***			0.066 ***
SOUTH			-0.029 *			0.008
<i>N</i>	148	148	148	144	144	144
Log likelihood	104.3	151.6	182.7	171.8	188.4	210.0

\* p&lt;0.1

\*\*

p&lt;0.05

\*\*\*

p&lt;0.01

<sup>1</sup> Ratio of group household income to household income of native-born non-Hispanic whites in the same metropolitan area

Table 6

Changes in Dissimilarity 1990 to 2000, Generalized Linear Regressions Indicating the Association Between Group and Metropolitan Characteristics by Race-Ethnicity

	Hispanic			Asian & PI		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Intercept	0.011 *	-0.008	-0.016	-0.010	-0.018 *	0.001
New Destination	0.007	0.019 *	0.019 *	-0.013	-0.015	-0.016
Foreign Born		0.006	0.006		-0.004	-0.003
New Destination * Foreign Born		-0.001	-0.002		0.014	0.014
Household income ratio to reference <sup>†</sup>		-0.142 **	-0.138 **		-0.064 *	-0.066 *
New Destination * Hhld income ratio		0.098	0.077		0.012	0.009
Group Size (10,000s)		0.001 *	0.001 *		0.003 **	0.003 **
Log of total metro population			0.050 ***			-0.026
% in suburbs			0.010			0.046
% new housing			-0.061			0.003
NORTHEAST			-0.020 *			-0.019 *
MIDWEST			-0.016			-0.023 *
SOUTH			-0.012			-0.010
<i>N</i>	138	138	138	122	122	122
Log likelihood	250.1	255.1	263.2	214.1	222.5	228.1

\* p&lt;0.1

\*\* p&lt;0.05

\*\*\* p&lt;0.01

† Change in ratio of group household income to household income of native-born non-Hispanic whites in the same metropolitan area