Immigrant Residential Segregation in the U.S. in Established Immigrant Gateways and New Destinations, 1990-2000

Julie Park & John Iceland
University of Maryland Penn State University

Paper proposed for presentation at the annual meetings of the Population Association of America, April-May 2009, Detroit.

ABSTRACT

In the 1990s, many immigrants bypassed established gateways like Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and Miami. Instead, they migrated to other metropolitan areas across the U.S. creating new immigrant destinations. In this paper, we examine how segregation and spatial assimilation might differ between established gateways and new destinations. Are immigrants in new destinations segregated at the same levels as those in established gateways? How does this vary by race/ethnicity and year of entry? Did both types of immigrant destinations experience similar trends in segregation during the 1990s? Using restricted data from the 1990 and 2000 censuses, we calculate levels of dissimilarity and isolation by race/ethnicity, nativity, and year of entry for these two gateway types. Our preliminary findings show that segregation levels are consistently lower in new destinations. However, both types experienced increases in segregation over time. We intend to run multivariate models to examine what factors explain these patterns.

INTRODUCTION

In the earlier part of the post-1965 immigration era, established immigrant gateways, such as Los Angeles, New York City, Chicago, Houston, 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 that new destinations to be characterized by high levels of segregating because of the recency of 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, which often have large established ethnic enclaves 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 emerging destinations and established gateways? 2) Do changes in residential patterns between 1990 and 2000 suggest that emerging gateways are essentially following in the footsteps of established gateways? 3) Do segregation patterns by nativity and year of entry 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. We calculate levels of segregation using the dissimilarity and isolation index by race/ethnicity, nativity, and year of entry and compare patterns in established gateways vs. those in emerging destinations. In doing so, we hope to shed

light on whether patterns of immigrant incorporation vary by the type of immigrant destination.

DATA AND METHODS

Singer and her colleagues (2004; 2008) offer a useful typology that categorizes large metropolitan areas, those with greater than 1 million population, into six different types of immigrant destinations (see Table 1). For the purposes of this paper, the six categories are collapsed into 3 categories: established gateways (continuous and post World War II gateways), new destinations (emerging and re-emerging gateways), and other (former and pre-emerging gateways). The analysis will compare segregation levels in 16 established gateways and 16 new destinations.

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.[1]

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 and, among the foreign-born, year of entry. 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 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

[1] Random factors and geocoding errors are more likely to play a large role in determining the settlement pattern of group members when fewer members are present, causing these indexes to contain greater volatility (Iceland et al. 2002).

study focuses on the residential patterns of Black, Hispanic, and Asian and Pacific Islander immigrants, as well as non-Hispanic White immigrants in some analyses (non-Hispanic Whites are included in the analyses that focus on the foreign-born only, as native-born non-Hispanic Whites are the reference group in our segregation calculations). In 2000, minority groups in this analysis include those who identified as being a member of that minority 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.[2]

This analysis uses the dissimilarity and isolation indexes to measure residential patterns. Dissimilarity is the most common index in the segregation literature. It is 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. Dissimilarity (D) is computed as:

$$D = .5 * \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| x_i / X - y_i / Y \right|$$

[2] Our more inclusive racial definitions mean that the minority group definitions are not mutually exclusive. Some of those who are Black may also, for example, be Asian. Other work has shown that adopting a race definition where a person is considered in a group if he or she chooses only that particular group has little effect on African American segregation calculations and 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 (2.4 percent). 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.

where n is the number of tracts in a metropolitan area, x_i is the population size of the minority group of interest in tract i, X is the population of the minority group in the metropolitan area as a whole, y_i is the population of the reference group (native-born non-Hispanic Whites in this analysis) in tract i, and Y is the population of the reference group in the metropolitan area as a whole.

The isolation index (P*) is the second most commonly-used segregation index. When conceptualized as isolation, *P** is interpreted as the average percentage of members of a particular racial/ethnic group in a city's neighborhoods. The formula for P^* for racial/ethnic group *X* is

$$_xP^*_x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} [x_i / X][x_i / t_i]$$

where x_i and X are as defined above, and t_i is the total population of tract i. Unlike dissimilarity, the isolation index is sensitive to (though by no means completely determined by) the proportion of a racial/ethnic group in a city. For example, if a group comprises just 5% of the population of a city, group members will be much more likely to live in neighborhoods with many members of other groups (and thus experience a much lower isolation) than if it comprises 50% of the population, other factors being equal. However, these 5% might still live in only a handful of neighborhoods, and would therefore be "segregated" in the sense of not being evenly distributed throughout the city.

We calculate metropolitan-level dissimilarity indexes where native-born non-Hispanic Whites are the reference group: 1) by race and Hispanic origin and nativity and 2) among the foreign born by race and Hispanic origin and year of entry. The cutoffs

used for length of time in the U.S. are: present less than 10 years, 10 to 19 years, 20 to 29 years, and 30 years or more.[3] Using 10-year categories permits us to see how segregation patterns for approximate cohorts in 1990 changed by 2000.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Table 2 shows the average levels of metropolitan residential segregation by gateway types. In 2000, the overall foreign-born population has a higher dissimilarity index in established gateways (.481) than in new immigrant destinations (.411). This is consistent across all race-ethnic groups. As expected, the foreign-born are more likely to be segregated than the native-born in the same race-ethnic group. The difference between established and new gateways is even starker when using the isolation index. The larger difference observed with the isolation index between the gateways types is due in large part to the larger number of minority group members in established gateways than new immigrant destinations...

[3] Different year-of-entry categories were tested using the 2000 census data to see whether patterns are sensitive to their specification. General patterns did not differ much, except that segregation for recent arrivals is highest when this category is defined more narrowly; in particular, segregation was higher for "recent" immigrants defined as arriving between 1995 and 2000 than the "recent" immigrants defined as those arriving from 1990 to 2000.

REFERENCES

Iceland, John, Daniel H. Weinberg, and Erika Steinmetz. 2002. *Racial and Ethnic Residential Segregation in the United States: 1980-2000*. U.S. Census Bureau, Census Special Report, CENSR-3, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Iceland, John and Melissa Scopilliti. 2008. "Immigrant Residential Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1990-2000." *Demography* 45, 1: 79-94.

Jones, Nicholas A. and Amy Symens Smith. 2001. *The Two or More Races Population: 2000*. U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Brief, C2KBR/01-6, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Logan, John R., Stults, Brian, and Reynolds. Farley. 2004. "Segregation of Minorities in the Metropolis: Two Decades of Change." *Demography* 41, 1: 1-22.

Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Singer, Audrey. 2004. *The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways.* The Living Cities Census Series. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Singer, Audrey, Susan W. Hardwick, and Caroline B. Brettell (eds.) 2008. *Twenty-First Century Gateways: Immigrant Incorporation in Suburban America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Table 1: Immigrant Gateway Types, Metropolitan Areas, 2000

Six Immigrant Gateway Types (Singer, 2004)

Former	Continuous	Post-World War II	Emerging	Re-Emerging	Pre-Emerging
Baltimore	Bergen-Passaic	Fort Lauderdale	Atlanta	Denver	Austin
Buffalo	Boston	Houston	Dallas	Minneapolis-St. Paul	Charlotte
Cleveland	Chicago	Los Angeles	Fort Worth	Oakland	Greensboro-Winston-Salem
Detroit	Jersey City	Miami	Las Vegas	Phoenix	Raleigh-Durham
Milwaukee	Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon	Orange County	Orlando	Portland, OR	Salt Lake City
Philadelphia	Nassau-Suffolk	Riverside-San Bernardino	Washington, D.C.	Sacramento	
Pittsburgh	New York	San Diego	West Palm Beach	San Jose	
St. Louis	Newark			Seattle	
	San Francisco			Tampa	

3 Immigrant Gateway Types

Established Gateways		New Destinations		Other	
Bergen-Passaic	Nassau-Suffolk	Atlanta	Phoenix	Austin	Milwaukee
Boston	New York	Dallas	Portland, OR	Baltimore	Philadelphia
Chicago	Newark	Denver	Sacramento	Buffalo	Pittsburgh
Fort Lauderdale	Orange County	Fort Worth	San Jose	Charlotte	Raleigh-Durham
Houston	Riverside-San Bernardino	Las Vegas	Seattle	Cleveland	Salt Lake City
Jersey City	San Diego	Minneapolis-St. Paul	Tampa	Detroit	St. Louis
Los Angeles	San Francisco	Oakland	Washington, D.C.	Greensboro-Winston-Salem	
Miami		Orlando	West Palm Beach		
Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon					

Table 2: Dissimilarity from Native-Born Non-Hispanic Whites and the Isolation Index by Race, Hispanic Origin, and Nativity: 2000

	Dissimilarity Index		Isolation Index	
	Established Gateways	New Destinations	Established Gateways	New Destinations
Total Foreign Born	0.481	0.411	0.596	0.383
Hispanic Total	0.578	0.483	0.678	0.434
Native-Born Hispanics	0.547	0.420	0.555	0.308
Foreign-Born Hispanics	0.624	0.589	0.622	0.380
Asians & Pacific Islanders (PIs) Total	0.472	0.403	0.407	0.298
Native-Born Asians & PIs	0.424	0.360	0.213	0.154
Foreign-Born Asians & PIs	0.507	0.445	0.368	0.254
Blacks, non-Hispanic Total	0.733	0.606	0.715	0.552
Native-Born Blacks NH	0.735	0.613	0.698	0.549
Foreign-Born Blacks NH	0.750	0.623	0.580	0.211
Whites, non-Hispanic Foreign Born	0.323	0.268	0.201	0.078

Table 3: Dissimilarity from Native-Born Non-Hispanic Whites and Isolation by Race, and Decade of Arrival: 2000

	Dissimilarity Index		Isolation Index	
	Established Gateways	New Destinations	Established Gateways	New Destinations
Total Foreign Born	0.481	0.411	0.596	0.383
1990s Arrivals	0.543	0.496	0.483	0.316
1980s Arrivals	0.526	0.446	0.443	0.214
1970s Arrivals	0.473	0.382	0.317	0.112
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.339	0.261	0.222	0.059
Hispanic Foreign Born	0.624	0.589	0.622	0.380
1990s Arrivals	0.670	0.645	0.513	0.330
1980s Arrivals	0.647	0.599	0.469	0.208
1970s Arrivals	0.622	0.569	0.360	0.118
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.522	0.479	0.296	0.054
Asians & PIs Foreign Born	0.507	0.446	0.368	0.256
1990s Arrivals	0.564	0.509	0.273	0.182
1980s Arrivals	0.538	0.486	0.239	0.150
1970s Arrivals	0.483	0.446	0.136	0.076
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.512	0.468	0.086	0.036
Blacks, non-Hispanic Foreign Born	0.752	0.619	0.588	0.255
1990s Arrivals	0.771	0.678	0.468	0.205
1980s Arrivals	0.772	0.643	0.473	0.131
1970s Arrivals	0.774	0.636	0.407	0.088
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.780	0.686	0.372	0.058
Whites, non-Hispanic Foreign Born	0.323	0.268	0.201	0.078
1990s Arrivals	0.479	0.426	0.163	0.057
1980s Arrivals	0.415	0.389	0.077	0.020
1970s Arrivals	0.388	0.386	0.048	0.015
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.267	0.268	0.063	0.029

Table 4: Dissimilarity from Native-Born Non-Hispanic Whites by Race, Hispanic Origin, Nativity, and Decade of Arrival: 1990 and 2000

	Established Gateways		New Destinations	
	1990	2000	1990	2000
All Foreign Born	0.451	0.481	0.349	0.411
1990s Arrivals		0.543		0.496
1980s Arrivals	0.488	0.526	0.388	0.446
1970s Arrivals	0.327	0.473	0.245	0.382
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.481	0.339	0.411	0.261
Hispanic Total	0.569	0.578	0.437	0.483
Native-Born Hispanics	0.539	0.547	0.403	0.420
Foreign-Born Hispanics	0.622	0.624	0.553	0.589
All Foreign-Born Hispanics	0.622	0.624	0.553	0.589
1990s Arrivals		0.670		0.645
1980s Arrivals	0.666	0.647	0.627	0.599
1970s Arrivals	0.647	0.622	0.596	0.569
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.543	0.522	0.473	0.479
Asians & PIs Total	0.458	0.472	0.394	0.403
Native-Born Asians & PIs	0.422	0.424	0.359	0.360
Foreign-Born Asians & PIs	0.488	0.507	0.438	0.445
All Foreign-Born Asians & PIs	0.488	0.507	0.438	0.446
1990s Arrivals		0.564		0.509
1980s Arrivals	0.537	0.538	0.504	0.486
1970s Arrivals	0.488	0.483	0.455	0.446
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.508	0.512	0.451	0.468
Blacks, non-Hispanic Total	0.764	0.733	0.646	0.606
Native-Born Blacks NH	0.769	0.735	0.652	0.613
Foreign-Born Blacks NH	0.766	0.750	0.654	0.623
All Foreign-Born Blacks NH	0.768	0.752	0.649	0.619
1990s Arrivals		0.771		0.678
1980s Arrivals	0.784	0.772	0.695	0.643
1970s Arrivals	0.787	0.774	0.687	0.636
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.789	0.780	0.706	0.686
Whites, non-Hispanic Foreign Born	0.280	0.323	0.240	0.268
1990s Arrivals		0.479		0.426
1980s Arrivals	0.442	0.415	0.421	0.389
1970s Arrivals	0.397	0.388	0.373	0.386
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.244	0.267	0.240	0.268

Table 5: Dissimilarity from Native-Born Non-Hispanic Whites by Race, Hispanic Origin, Nativity, and Decade of Arrival: 1990 and 2000

	Established Gateways		New Destinations	
	1990	2000	1990	2000
All Foreign Born	0.513	0.596	0.255	0.383
1990s Arrivals		0.483		0.316
1980s Arrivals	0.462	0.443	0.226	0.214
1970s Arrivals	0.336	0.317	0.116	0.112
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.237	0.222	0.067	0.059
Hispanic Total	0.612	0.678	0.322	0.434
Native-Born Hispanics	0.487	0.555	0.249	0.308
Foreign-Born Hispanics	0.563	0.622	0.253	0.380
All Foreign-Born Hispanics	0.563	0.622	0.253	0.380
1990s Arrivals		0.513		0.330
1980s Arrivals	0.498	0.469	0.223	0.208
1970s Arrivals	0.394	0.360	0.131	0.118
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.319	0.296	0.062	0.054
Asians & PIs Total	0.323	0.407	0.221	0.298
Native-Born Asians & PIs	0.152	0.213	0.103	0.154
Foreign-Born Asians & PIs	0.290	0.368	0.186	0.254
All Foreign-Born Asians & PIs	0.290	0.368	0.187	0.256
1990s Arrivals		0.273		0.182
1980s Arrivals	0.250	0.239	0.161	0.150
1970s Arrivals	0.134	0.136	0.076	0.076
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.097	0.086	0.038	0.036
Blacks, non-Hispanic Total	0.727	0.715	0.571	0.552
Native-Born Blacks NH	0.718	0.698	0.573	0.549
Foreign-Born Blacks NH	0.558	0.580	0.173	0.211
All Foreign-Born Blacks NH	0.565	0.588	0.208	0.255
1990s Arrivals		0.468		0.205
1980s Arrivals	0.491	0.473	0.186	0.131
1970s Arrivals	0.424	0.407	0.099	0.088
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.400	0.372	0.067	0.058
Whites, non-Hispanic Foreign Born	0.160	0.201	0.060	0.078
1990s Arrivals		0.163		0.057
1980s Arrivals	0.108	0.077	0.033	0.020
1970s Arrivals	0.058	0.048	0.016	0.015
Pre1970 Arrivals	0.085	0.063	0.036	0.029

Figure 1: Percent Foreign-Born and Decade of Arrival for Immigrants, 2000