EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT IN NEW AND ESTABLISHED LATINO METROPOLITAN DESTINATIONS

by

KATHERINE CAMILLA STAMPS

(Under the Direction of Stephanie Bohon)

ABSTRACT

Over the last twenty years, Latino migration streams have shifted from a few cities with concentrated Latino populations to include many new destinations across the country. This paper examines the educational attainment of Latinos in these established and emerging Latino immigrant gateways. Statistical analysis of 32,361 Latino respondents in 16 established metropolitan areas and 15 new destinations were compared using the 5% Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample. Interestingly, educational attainment was found to be significantly higher in new Latino destinations than in established Latino metropolitan areas, although much of these differences are mediated by demographic factors. OLS and logistic regression results suggest that English proficiency, ethnicity, and citizenship status account for a substantial portion of the differences in educational attainment between destination types.

INDEX WORDS: Latino education, Attainment, Immigration, Gateway, New Latino destinations, Established Latino metros, English proficiency

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT IN NEW AND ESTABLISHED LATINO METROPOLITAN DESTINATIONS

by

KATHERINE CAMILLA STAMPS

A.B., University of Georgia, 2005

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2005

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT IN NEW AND ESTABLISHED LATINO METROPOLITAN DESTINATIONS

by

KATHERINE CAMILA STAMPS

Major Professor: Stephanie Bohon

Committee: Linda Renzulli
Joseph Hermanowicz

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2005

DEDICATION

This manuscript is dedicated with love to the memory of my father, Thomas Paty Stamps (1952-2003). Thank you, Dad.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank Stephanie Bohon, who gave me my first opportunity to experience sociological research and without whom this project would not have been possible. She has provided me with crucial guidance and advice in research, courses, and professionalization. Joseph Hermanowicz and Linda Renzulli have also offered very valuable instruction at different points in this process. Others who deserve special mention include Mark Cooney and Kathy Lou, who have dedicated much of their time and energy to helping me plan my master's coursework. I would also like to thank Jim Coverdill, Jody Clay-Warner, Jeremy Reynolds, Patricia Richards, Dean Rojek, Lydia Aletraris, Nichole Arnault, Cachet Bird, Daniel Buffington, Liz Cherry, Kimberly Kelly, and Heather Macpherson, from whom I have learned many important lessons, both inside and outside of the classroom. Finally, many thanks to my wonderful family and friends. I especially appreciate George M. Stamps and Gregory Mitchell for their constant support of and inquiry about my biggest academic project to date.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the passage of the 1965 Immigration Act, there has been a sharp rise in the number of immigrants to the United States. The post-1965 immigrants are mostly non-European; many come from Asia, South and Central America, and Africa. They differ in phenotype, language, and traditional customs from previous waves of immigrants, and their assimilation patterns are also different from previous generations of immigrants (Portes and Zhou 1993). Today, Latinos are the nation's largest and fastest growing minority group, and Latin American immigrants comprise 40% of that population. From 1990 to 2000 alone, the Latino population grew by 58 percent (U.S. Census 2000); most of that growth is attributable to immigration.

Since 1965, Latino immigrants have been concentrated primarily in the Southwest and southern California, in a handful of American metropolitan areas including New York, Chicago, and Miami as well as Los Angeles. In fact, over 25% of Latinos in the United States resided in just these four cities in 2000 (Suro and Singer 2002). However, since 1970 the Latino population has begun to increasingly settle outside of these cities, in a demographic flux variously referred to in academic literature in terms of the new Latino diaspora (Murillo and Villenas 1997), new Latino destinations (Suro and Singer 2002), or new immigrant gateways (Singer 2004). Latinos have migrated to the Southeast, Northeast, the Pacific Northwest, and everywhere in between. Cities like Atlanta, Orlando, Seattle, and Washington, D.C. that were previously home to Latino populations of negligible size have experienced a tremendous amount of Latino growth in the last few decades. The established destinations reported the most growth in absolute numbers, but

new Latino destinations with smaller Latino population bases had the fastest growth rates. For example, the Latino population in Raleigh, N.C. grew 1,180 percent between 1980 and 2000 (Suro and Singer 2002).

The destinations of Latino immigrants are expanding in number as the population increases, yet the new immigrant gateways are understudied relative to traditional destinations. What is known from the little existing research is that the new gateways are different from the established Latino locations in important ways. New immigrants in established destinations benefit from longer-term and second-generation co-ethnic residents who are a source of advice and political advocacy (Portes and Stepick 1993; Waldinger 1996), while those in new receiving areas must adjust to communities that have never experienced a large immigrant influx with comparatively little help. For example, immigrants in new gateways often end up in substandard housing because they have a poor command of English and a limited understanding of their rights with relatively few advocates (Atiles and Bohon 2003). The relegation of these immigrants to segregated housing may impede English acquisition and educational opportunities (Atiles and Bohon 2002).

Scholars have noted several social problems that hinder immigrant adaptation to these new Latino receiving areas. Singer (2004) argues that local areas respond differently to heavy immigration. She suggests that traditional gateways may benefit from structural advantages that have developed over time; these might include organizational, service, and advocacy infrastructures with a sound knowledge base about Latino immigrants' needs. In Chicago, for instance, the Latino Unity coalition addresses HIV prevention, outreach, and intervention among Latino residents, while the Chicago-Mexico Bilingual Nurse Program helps Spanish-speaking nurses in the Pilsen neighborhood receive U.S. licensure. Additionally, traditional Latino metros

have often incorporated their immigration gateway position as a point of pride. Los Angeles and Miami, for example, are known for their strong multicultural identities.

New immigrant destinations, in contrast, may not be structurally equipped to deal with the rapid addition of several thousand Latino immigrants. The problem of absorption in new gateways is exacerbated by rapid population growth among other groups, as well, that create demands for new schools, roads, and social services. Existing programs may not yet be fully developed or successfully implemented in some cases (Singer 2004). Furthermore, formerly black-white cities are newly multiethnic, and competition for resources and limited programs may strain social relations (Hamann, Wortham, and Murillo 2002; Neal and Bohon 2002; Singer 2004). The extent to which these difficulties impede immigrant incorporation is just beginning to be explored.

One area in which destinations type may impact immigrant incorporation is education. In a study of new Latino residents to Georgia, Bohon, Macpherson, and Atiles (2005) found that many school districts are struggling to educate a new minority influx with limited English fluency and different educational backgrounds. This study, along with more general treatments of emerging gateways (e.g. Singer 2004) suggests that educational attainment may be impeded in new destinations. However, the impact of new Latino destinations on educational attainment has not been systematically studied. Some authors suggest that Latinos in new destinations may not fit established models of minority children in school because of the unique situations they encounter in their new communities (Hamann, Wortham, and Murillo 2002). My research seeks to determine what, if any, differences exist in educational attainment between new and established Latino immigrant destinations.

CHAPTER TWO

LATINO EDUCATION

Educational attainment is an important determinant of social position in America's stratified society, as education level is an important predictor of personal income as well as such diverse outcomes as health, job quality, social status, and age at first birth (Marini 1980; Rosenfeld, 1980; Marini 1984; Ross and Wu 1996; National Center for Education Statistics 2001). As Latinos are the country's largest minority group, the ramifications of low educational attainment are pervasive. Therefore, it is alarming that a mere six percent of Latinos who begin kindergarten in the United States ultimately earn a college degree, while 49 percent of Asians, 16 percent of blacks, and 30 percent of whites do so (Williams 2003). As Vernez (1996) writes, "It is not going too far to suggest that the educational attainment Hispanics eventually reach will in large measure determine the quality of the future labor force and the demand for public services in key states of the country" (Vernez 1996:15).

Although their completed education levels have risen over the past three decades, overall Latino educational attainment lags far behind other major racial and ethnic groups in the United States (Lowell and Suro 2002; Chapa and De La Rosa 2004). Latinos are least likely to enroll in college and most likely to drop out of high school and college (Kaufman, Alt, and Chapman 2001). Over 70% of Latinos have a high school education or less, and most of those do not have a high school diploma (Chapa and De La Rosa 2004).

The causes of low educational attainment among Latinos in the United States has been widely researched and debated among scholars in the last thirty years. Researchers have looked

to language ability (Rumberger and Larson 1998), native ethnicity (Velez 1989; Bohon, Kirkpatrick-Johnson, and Gorman 2005; Cheng and Starks 2002), generational differences (Rumberger 1995; Wojtkiewicz and Donato 1995; Zhou 1997), immigrant status (Fligstein and Fernandez 1985; Bean and Tienda 1987; Velez 1989), and segmented assimilation (Portes and Zhou 1993) to explain low levels of schooling among Latinos. All of these factors contribute to low educational attainment. My study is concerned with how location is playing a role in the education of Latino immigrants.

The small body of work on education in new immigrant destinations is consistent with regard to barriers to educational success. Wainer (2001) identifies lack of parental involvement and appropriate teacher training, immigration status issues, and discrimination as primary challenges to be overcome with the influx of Latinos into public schools in the South, where many new destinations are located. Bohon, Macpherson, and Atiles (2005) expand the list of educational barriers to include lack of understanding about the U.S. school system, lack of residential stability, little school support for the specific needs of Latino students, few incentives for education continuation, and barred access to higher education.

Appropriate teacher training and discrimination are lacking in new Latino destinations. If teachers are not receptive to their Latino students' needs, educational attainment is likely to suffer. Lack of school support can also have negative effects in new destinations. Programs for those with limited English proficiency is sometimes only available to children of migrant workers, for example, while the rest of a school's Latino population is undersupported. Bilingual and bicultural staffers are in short supply in many schools (Bohon, Macpherson, and Atiles 2005).

For their part, Latino students and parents often lack understanding about the school system. Latino parents often do not understand teachers' and administrators' expectation of the family. With little knowledge of English, those who try to get involved find participation in school life challenging. In addition, the students find few reasons to continue their education, and sometimes feel barred from higher education. All of these factors seem to suggest a difficult educational environment in the new destinations.

The existence of these barriers has been established, but no work, to date, examines whether or not these barriers have an appreciable impact on the educational attainment of Latino immigrants. My research is concerned with whether or not educational attainment is different between established and new Latino destinations. I hypothesize that educational attainment in new and established Latino immigrant destinations will be significantly different. Drawing on the limited work on new destinations which concentrates on the difficulties Latinos encounter in them, one might conjecture that immigrants in new destinations will have lower levels of educational attainment than those in established gateways. However, existing theories about education suggest that immigrants in new destinations will have higher levels of attainment than immigrants in established gateways. Additionally, I address what demographic factors contribute to the differential achievement, if any, in established and emerging gateways.

CHAPTER THREE

EDUCATION IN ESTABLISHED LATINO METROPOLITAN AREAS

Previous work (Hamann, Wortham, and Murillo 2002; Singer 2004) suggests that established immigrant gateways are more amenable to success, at least in the short run. Educational attainment is related to immigrant integration and accomplishment in American society (Vernez 1996), and work on emerging gateways suggests that educational attainment is higher in the established Latino immigrant gateways than in the new ones. However, several theoretical works within the immigration and race literature also lend themselves to the alternate hypothesis that Latino immigrants in new destinations will do better than those in established metros.

First, segmented assimilation theory argues that immigrant children are incorporated into one of three categories. They may adapt into the white middle-class or the poverty-stricken underclass, or they may consciously preserve their immigrant culture. Portes and Zhou (1993) underscore the importance of context in determining into what sector of American society an immigrant group incorporates. The combination of the receptiveness of government, presence or absence of prejudice, and strength or weakness of the co-ethnic community make up the core of the typology of modes of incorporation, which in large part determine how immigrants adapt to their new environments (Portes and Zhou 1993).

Using this framework, I speculate that some receiving environments in new immigrant destinations may be less hostile to new immigrants than some traditional gateways are. Group conflict theory (Bobo 1988) posits that threat or simply perception of competition affects racial

attitudes and preferences, and Neal and Bohon's (2003) findings support the theory that mere perception of economic threat might underlie anti-immigrant sentiments, even if such threat does not exist in reality. Since the new immigrant destinations are typically places with overall population growth (Suro and Singer 2002) resulting from emerging economic opportunities (Butler 1998; Gettleman 2001; Guthey 2001), this threat might not be as pervasive in the development of negative attitudes toward immigrants, including Latino immigrants.

Residents in new destinations may also lack preconceived notions about their new neighbors (Atiles and Bohon 2002; Hamann, Wortham, and Murillo 2002), so the immigrants may be less susceptible to the prejudice and discrimination that facilitates downward mobility. This may be important for school success among immigrant children. Taylor (1998) found that whites' attitudes toward blacks varied with the local proportion of black residents, but that Latino presence did not have an effect on attitudes toward Latinos. Still, an analysis comparing these processes in receiving areas with substantially different immigration histories may yield varying results. As Latino presence throughout the country grows and they become a greater economic and political force or threat to traditional power, Latinos' larger share of the local population could result in white attitudes toward Latinos and Latino immigrants that mimic those toward blacks.

In addition, although entrenched Latino communities may have stronger communities in terms of economic diversity and some material resources, immigrants to new destinations may place a higher value on education for upward mobility. Established Latino metropolitan areas have greater financial resources for new immigrants, but these resources are related to opportunities that do not require high levels of education for success within the community, such as entrepreneurial business. Ogbu's (1978, 1991) theory of oppositional culture states minorities

become academically disengaged because they believe their chances for educational success are slim, and because a group stops believing in the system working for them. The presence of these attitudes among several Latino and other immigrant groups in traditional gateways has been documented in the literature (Matute-Bianchi 1986; 1991; Bourgois 1991). Though the concept is controversial, if oppositional cultures exist, then the theory would suggest that Latinos in new destinations might fare better in school than those in established Latino metropolitan areas with oppositional cultures.

Finally, competition theory and the related literature on white flight also suggest the hypothesis that educational attainment may be higher in new destinations than in established metropolitan areas. Like black students who advance academically in integrated schools (Coleman et al. 1966), Latinos appear to fare better in majority white schools than in minority white schools (Hallinan 1998). Yet many of the established Latino metropolitan areas have reached or are approaching the tipping points where white flight occurs (see Clotfelter 1976, 2004) . According to Hallinan (1998), when the population of a majority white school approaches 40% black, it quickly transitions to all black. Because the arrival of Latino immigrants is recent in new Latino destinations, the white flight that often results with the influx of an outgroup (Olzak 1986; Andrews 2002) may not have yet occurred. Ethnic competition resulting in white flight from established Latino metropolitan areas (and local public schools) may not be as prevalent in schools located in new immigrant gateways. The loss of resources that may accompany white flight (Rossell and Hawley 1981; Dawkins 1983) may not have occurred in the new destinations, so immigrant students may benefit from better opportunities in schools with more white students. The schools in established Latino metropolitan areas are likely to have already undergone the processes of ethnic competition and conflict. They are

more likely to be segregated and minority schools may not possess the resources that are available to Latino immigrants in new destinations.

This study seeks to understand how Latino educational attainment differs in new Latino destinations and established Latino metropolitan areas. According to the previous research referenced above, Latino immigrants in new Latino destinations may escape some disadvantages that immigrants to established gateways experience. They may benefit from a lack of ingrained negativity regarding Latinos that affects established receiving areas (Atiles and Bohon 2002; Hamann, Wortham, and Murillo 2002) and better resources in their schools. Thus, they may be more likely to achieve higher levels of school completion than their counterparts in established Latino metros.

On the other hand, researchers who have studied new Latino destinations suggest that there are many educational barriers in the new gateways that would be expected to lower educational attainment in these areas. In this work, I test these two competing hypotheses. The first predicts that Latino immigrant educational attainment is higher in new Latino destinations than in established Latino metros. The other hypothesis, suggested by the literature on new immigrant gateways, suggests that Latino immigrant educational attainment is lower in new Latino destinations than in established gateways. Additionally, I examine demographic factors that may account for differences in educational attainment between the two types of immigrant destinations, if any exist.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA AND METHODS

My research utilizes individual-level data extracted from the 5% Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample (IPUMS), based on findings from the 2000 Census (Ruggles et al. 2004). The IPUMS contains individual and household records randomly selected from five percent of the 2000 Census long forms. These data were chosen because they provide for a multi-city area comparison of Latino educational attainment.

The metropolitan areas included in the study were informed by monographs published by the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C. Suro and Singer (2002) create a particularly useful typology of the 100 largest metropolitan areas as of 2000, as categorized by the Office of Management and Budget as Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) or Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas (PMSAs). Their framework distinguishes between established Latino destinations and new Latino destinations. "Established Latino metros" include cities such as Miami, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles. Examples of "new immigrant destinations" are Atlanta, Orlando, and Washington, D.C.

The destination categorization is based on whether the metropolitan areas' Latino base population was greater or less than the eight percent national average in 1980 and whether Latino population growth was greater or less than the 145 percent average growth between 1980 and 2000 for the 100 included metro areas. Those metropolitan areas identified by Suro and Singer (2002) as either new Latino destinations or established Latino metros with a Latino sample size in the IPUMS of at least 100 cases were included. Latino immigrants living in all 16 established

metropolitan areas are included in this study. Fifteen of the original 51 new destinations were also included (see Appendix for full listing of Latino destinations included in this analysis).

The sample is restricted to Latino immigrants over the age of 25 who immigrated at or before age 12. The sample is limited to immigrants because Suro and Singer (2002) point out that immigration is undergoing a major change with the general dispersal of Latinos around the country. Traditionally, new Latino immigrants flocked to a few established gateway cities, where complete immigrant communities grew over time with the influx of co-ethnics and the establishment of families (Massey et al. 1993; Saenz and Cready 1998). Many of today's immigrants, however, are choosing to immediately establish residence in the new Latino destinations, where economic and other opportunities are expected. Thus, the comparison of new immigrants (as opposed to internal migrants) to new and established gateways is useful in order to observe contrasting patterns between the two location types. The extract was limited only to immigrants, and then I allowed only naturalized citizens and non-citizens to be included in the final sample in order to exclude children born abroad to American parents and other anomalies.

The age cutoffs were selected because most people have completed their education by the age of 25 (or at least are in the final stages of their schooling), and it is a commonly used benchmark in educational attainment literature (Wojtkiewicz and Donato 1995). Twelve is the highest age allowed at immigration so that only first and "one and one-half generation" immigrants are included in the study (Portes and Zhou 1993; Rumbaut 1997; Zhou 1997). Immigrants who arrived in the United States after age 12 have already completed the bulk of their secondary schooling or have no schooling at all. These later age immigrants are likely to have many unmeasurable experiences that inform their educational outlook (Wojtkiewicz and

Donate 1995). Therefore, their educational attainment is less likely to be a reflection of their new environment. Those who immigrate as younger children, however, are affected by the characteristics of their new home, and their educational attainment can be interpreted as a product of their American experience. It is impossible to disentangle years of education in the U.S. from years of education in the home country, but the variable for ethnicity may account for some of those differences. The total sample size for this study is 32,361, of which 26,892 are residents of established Latino metropolitan areas and 5,469 are residents of new Latino destinations.

Educational attainment is completed level of schooling. In the OLS regression, the variable is coded on a 14-level scale ranging from no school completed to achievement of a doctorate. The included metropolitan areas were coded (0,1) with 1 representing new Latino destinations. Other independent variables include age, sex, ethnicity, U.S. citizenship status, number of years in the United States, Los Angeles residence, and ability to speak English.

Age is a continuous variable and represents the respondent's age as of 2000. Ethnicity, ability to speak English, U.S. citizenship status, sex, and Los Angeles residence are categorical. Ethnicity is categorized as Cuban, Mexican, and other. Cuban is the reference category for ethnicity, since Cubans have been found to be empirically different from other U.S. foreign-born residents (Portes and MacLeod 1996). Cubans consistently have higher incomes and more education on average than other Latino groups. The included categories for English fluency are "speaks English well," "does not speak English well," and "does not speak English at all." The omitted category for English fluency is "speaks English very well or speaks only English." Sex is coded as "male," where males are coded 1, females 0. U.S. Citizenship status is also a dichotomous variable (1=naturalized citizen, 0=non-citizen).

I control for living in Los Angeles since the Latino population there predates the California statehood, and the Latino subculture there is distinctly different from that in other U.S. cities (Charles 2000). Thirty-one percent of the total final sample and 37.8% of respondents in established Latino metropolitan areas were Los Angeles residents. Los Angeles is one of the most racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse cities worldwide (Charles 2000), and is considered unique both in academia and in popular culture. The massive national news coverage of recently elected Los Angeles mayor Antonio Villaraigosa is a testament to power of Latinos in this southern California city. Miami is another city dominated by Latinos. In fact, it is the only city in the United States where Latinos are the majority population. However, since the majority of Cuban immigrants in the United States live in Miami, controlling for Cuban ethnicity is a proxy for Miami residence.

My analytic strategy consists of four steps. First, a t-test is employed to determine whether a significant difference exists in mean educational attainment of Latino immigrants in new Latino destinations and established Latino metros. Next, I examine what factors affect educational attainment using nested multivariate ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models in order to determine whether educational attainment is a selection effect of different kinds of people settling in the different destination types. Regression models are used to investigate whether the metropolitan areas themselves account for the variation in educational attainment or whether it is other factors that explain variation between cities (if any). I use nested models to demonstrate the additive effects of grouped variables. I add demographic variables, immigrant status variables, and English ability variables as groups. English ability is separated from immigrant status variables in order to demonstrate that English ability has an independently strong and significant effect on educational attainment.

Third, educational benchmarks such as high school graduation and college graduation are examined to compare specific differences and commonalities between the two immigrant destination types. Finally, logistic regression models are generated in order to explore what factors explain graduation from high school, an important educational accomplishment in the United States. The independent variables for the logistic regression and OLS regression are the same. The dependent variable for the logistic regression is high school graduation and is coded (1,0) in those models.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the characteristics of the sample by destination type. The first column shows new destination characteristics, while the second column shows established destination characteristics. Table 1 demonstrates, *a priori,* that average educational attainment is higher in new Latino destinations; however, the means are close enough that differences may be primarily due to chance. There are relatively few differences between the two immigrant destination types in terms of age, sex, and age at immigration. Established metropolitan destinations are more Mexican, while Latino immigrants in new destinations are more likely to be U.S. citizens and to speak English fluently.

A t-test for independent samples indicates that the mean education levels completed in new Latino destinations and established Latino metros are in fact statistically different ($t=18.528$, $p<.001$). The null hypothesis of no difference is rejected. This finding supports the initial hypothesis that educational attainment will vary significantly between destination types. The educational attainment of Latino immigrants in new destinations is, on average, .854 levels higher than the educational attainment of Latino immigrants in established destinations.

Although the mean difference is short of one complete education level, it is highly significant, and the difference may be quite meaningful. One level of educational attainment is not simply one year of education; it represents a particular level of achievement reached. In real terms, a 9 represents attending the twelfth grade, but not graduating from high school, while a 10 represents earning a high school diploma or its equivalent. These differences represent a very

important benchmark in American society. The average Latino resident in the established Latino metropolitan area is just short of achieving a high school diploma, while the average Latino resident in the new metropolitan area has a diploma and may have attended some college (11 on the educational attainment scale).

The differences in educational attainment may simply be due to differences in demographic characteristics between those Latino immigrants living in new destinations and those living in established metropolitan destinations. To test this, I employ OLS regression to determine what factors explain the variation in educational attainment in both types of receiving areas. Those findings are presented in Table 3.

The first model echoes the results of the t-test, indicating that Latino immigrants in new Latino destinations have significantly higher educational attainment than Latino immigrants in established Latino metros ($p<.001$). Model 2 controls for age, sex, and ethnicity in addition to the variable for new Latino metropolitan areas, and explains 10.6% of the variance in educational attainment. Age is significant but has a minimal substantive effect, but ethnicity emerges as an important explanatory variable in this model. Mexican educational attainment is, on average, two and a half levels below Cuban ($p<.001$). Other (non-Cuban, non-Mexican) Latino ethnic group have average educational attainment levels slightly more than one level below the Cuban average ($p<.001$). Thus, ethnicity appears to play a very important role in educational attainment in these areas, and it is unfortunate that sample size limitations do not permit a more nuanced examination of the "other" category. Destination type remains significant, but the coefficient becomes smaller. Being male is also significant in this model ($b=-.173$, $p<.001$).[1]

[1] In OLS regression models where new and established Latino destinations were modeled separately, sex is significant in all models. Future research should examine the relationship between sex and educational attainment in these areas.

The third model controls for immigrant status; specifically, it includes variables for age at immigration and U.S. citizenship. In this model, the R^2 is .183. All independent variables except for sex remain highly significant with the addition of these variables. A crosstabulation of sex and U.S. citizenship reveals that women are more likely than men to be citizens, which may explain why sex is not significant in the rest of the models. Sixty-eight percent of women in the sample are U.S. citizens, while just 57% of men are. This finding makes sense since U.S. citizenship is a proxy for permanent residents, and men are more likely than women to come to the United States for temporary occupational opportunities. Both age at immigration and U.S citizenship are highly significant predictors of educational attainment among Latino immigrants at the $p<.001$ level with coefficients of -1.00 and 1.641, respectively.

Another important finding emerges in this model: with each additional year of age at immigration, the average educational attainment level falls by one level. This is a very strong effect, as one additional year of age at immigration can affect educational attainment level by several years. In both destination types, younger immigrant children achieve higher levels of school completion than their older counterparts. This difference implies that policy should be geared towards incorporating children into the system and enrolling them in school as soon as possible.

U.S. citizenship is the best proxy in the IPUMS data for desire to remain in the United States. This is critical, since many Latino immigrants only stay in this country temporarily. Although it is not known whether citizens were naturalized before or after they completed their education, U.S. citizenship is a positive predictor of educational attainment. In this model, the coefficient for new Latino destination is .252 ($p<.001$), suggesting that place of residence

accounts for only a quarter of a level differences in educational attainment once demographic and immigrant characteristics are controlled.

The fourth model incorporates variables representing respondent's self-assessed ability to speak English and explains 29.1% of the variance in educational attainment among Latino immigrants in new Latino destinations and established Latino metros. "Speaks English very well or only speaks English" is the reference category. Latino immigrants who speak English well are on average 1.675 educational attainment levels below those who speak very well ($p<.001$), while those who do not speak English well are nearly three educational attainment levels below the reference category on average ($p<.001$). The coefficient for not speaking English at all is very large and negative ($b=4.006$, $p<.001$). Of course, the direction of causality is difficult to assess with this variable. Those with minimal English skills may find it very difficult to remain in school; on the other hand, they may speak minimal English because they did not attend much (or any) school in the United States. In model 4 the coefficients for ethnicity are smaller than those in Models 2 and 3, but they remain fairly large and highly significant. The coefficient for age at immigration drops over .05 ($p<.001$), but this is expected since immigrating at an earlier age is likely to allow more opportunities to learn English (yet the variables are not collinear).

The final fifth model is nearly identically to the fourth model, but includes residency in Los Angeles. This model was reported because Latinos living in Los Angeles have notably poor educational attainment (Berube, Prince, and Smith 2003). Including Los Angeles residency in the model did lower the coefficient for new Latino destination slightly, and the Los Angeles residence variable was highly significant.

Latino destination type remains significant even in the full model, which explains 29.2% of the variance in educational attainment. All included variables are significant at the $p<.001$

level, except sex, and have varying coefficients. The factors that appear to have the greatest effect on educational attainment in the OLS regression models are ethnicity (relative to Cubans), U.S. citizenship, and ability to speak English fluently. This suggests that Cubans, naturalized citizens, and those who speak English very well have considerably higher levels of education, regardless of where they live.

Completion of ninth grade, some high school, earning a high school diploma, attending some college, and earning a college degree are considered important accomplishments. Each successive level of education has a strong effect on both annual and lifetime earnings for all groups (Day and Newburger 2002), and many jobs require evidence of completion of specific education levels. Overall educational attainment significantly affects future health, job quality, social status, and age at first birth (Marini 1980; Rosenfeld, 1980; Marini 1984; Ross and Wu 1996; National Center for Education Statistics 2001).

Table 4 shows the differences between gateway types in terms of the percentage of persons completing five important educational benchmarks. Slightly less than 77% of Latino immigrants in new Latino destinations have earned at least a high school diploma, compared to 66.1% of Latino immigrants in established Latino metropolitan areas. These percentages are considerably higher (in both places) than the percent of Latinos, overall, who have high school diplomas. There is also a sizable difference in percentage of immigrants obtaining a college degree: 23.5% of the sample in new destinations reported having a college degree, while only 13.5% of the sample in established metropolitan destinations reported having one.

The data reveal another important fact--Latino immigrants in new destinations make up a disproportionately large share of the highest education levels and low share of the lowest levels. Although Latino immigrants in new destinations make up only 16.9% of the total sample, they

account for 26.4% of all doctorates, 28.5% of all professional degrees, 24.6% of all master's degrees, and 26.2% of all bachelor's degrees in the sample. Meanwhile, they constitute only 12.3 percent of those with a 1^{st}-4^{th} grade education and 11.9 percent of those with a 9^{th} grade education. Latinos in new destinations are just 10 percent of those who dropped out after 11^{th} grade in the sample, while Latinos in established metropolitan areas make up the other 90% (crosstabulation available upon request).

High school graduation has long been recognized as a critical educational benchmark (Morgan 1984; Peng 1985), especially for poor and minority children (Ensminger and Slusarcick 1992). I use logistic regression to assess the predictors of high school graduation in order to supplement the findings from the OLS regression. Table 5 displays the results, which confirm the same major significant predictors as the OLS regression.

Again, ethnicity, English proficiency, and U.S. citizenship status emerge as the most important variables (all at the $p<.001$ level). As in the OLS models, English proficiency had the largest coefficients. There is a 69% decrease in the likelihood of graduating of graduating from high school for those who speak English well compared to those who speak English very well, and a 90% decrease for not speaking English at all. Being Mexican or "other" Latino group besides Mexican or Cuban again also decreased one's likelihood of graduating from high school as compared to Cubans. Finally, the logistic regression models indicate that citizens are far more likely to graduate than non-citizens, as well. In the full model, there is a 139% increase in the likelihood of high school graduation for naturalized citizens compared to non-citizens.

There were some differences between the explanatory variables for high school graduation and general educational attainment. Being male had a consistently significant negative effect on probability of high school graduation in all logistic regression models, though

the coefficients and odds ratios were rather small. While sex was not significant in any of the OLS models, the coefficients in those models were also negative. The effects of destination type remain significant in all models predicting high school graduation.

Table 1
Characteristics of the Sample

	New Destinations	*Established Destinations*
Mean Educational Level	10.56 (3.121)	9.71*** (3.102)
Mean Age	36.60 years (9.508)	36.61 years (10.926)
Mean Age at Immigration	6.9 (3.691)	6.8 years* (3.710)
Male	50.3% (2,750)	48.8% (13,124)
Latino Ethnicity		
Mexican	24.0% (1,310)	55.7%*** (14,985)
Cuban	27.3% (1,493)	16.1%*** (4,343)
Other	48.7% (2,666)	28.1%*** (7,564)
U.S. Citizen	69.0% (3,773)	61.6%*** (16,556)
English Ability		
Very well	79.0% (4,323)	71.6%*** (19,251)
Well	12.9% (705)	17.5%*** (4,695)
Not Well	6.0% (327)	7.8%*** (2,092)
Not at All	2.1% (114)	3.2%*** (854)

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 in t-test

Table 2
Variables Used in the Study

Variable	Description
Educational Attainment…….	Level of education completed. Categories are no school completed, 1st-4th grade, 5th-8th grade, 9th grade, 10th grade, 11th grade, 12th grade (no diploma), high school graduate or GED, some college (no degree), associate degree or occupational program, Bachelor's degree, Master's degree, Professional degree, Doctorate.
High School Graduation……..	Graduated from high school. This is a dichotomous variable coded 1 if the respondent is a high school graduate and 0 otherwise.
New Latino Destination……...	New Latino destination according to immigrant gateway classification (Suro and Singer 2002). This is a dichotomous variable coded 1 if the metropolitan area is a new Latino destination and 0 if it is an established metropolitan area. Other metropolitan area types were excluded.
Age…….	Years of age. This variable is measured continuously.
Male……	Self-reported sex of respondent. This is a dichotomous variable coded 1 if the respondent is male and 0 otherwise.
Latino Ethnicity……...	Self-reported ethnicity of respondent. Latino ethnicity is coded as three dichotomous variables: Cuban, Mexican, and Other.
Age at Immigration…….	Respondent's age at time of entry into the United States. Categories are 0-12.
U.S. Citizen…….	Now a citizen of the United States. This is a dichotomous variable coded 1 if the respondent is a naturalized citizen and 0 otherwise.
English Fluency……..	Ability to speak English. English fluency is coded as four dichotomous variables: speaks English very well, speaks English well, does not speak English well, and does not speak English at all.
Los Angeles Resident…….	Respondent is a resident of Los Angeles, California. This is a dichotomous variable coded 1 if the respondent is a resident of Los Angeles and 0 otherwise.

Table 3
OLS Regression of Latino Educational Attainment

	Model 1	*Model 2*	*Model 3*	*Model 4*	*Model 5*
New Latino Destination	.854*** (.046)	.304*** (.045)	.252*** (.043)	.215*** (.040)	.155*** (.042)
Age		-.025*** (.002)	-.040*** (.002)	-.031*** (.001)	-.031*** (.001)
Male		-.173*** (.033)	-.009 (.032)	-.041 (.029)	-.044 (.029)
Latino Ethnicity					
Cuban		reference	reference	reference	reference
Mexican		-2.503*** (.046)	-2.083*** (.045)	-1.610*** (.042)	-1.543*** (.044)
Other Ethnic		-1.179*** (.049)	-.830*** (.047)	-.608*** (.044)	-.574*** (.044)
Age at Immigration			-1.00*** (.004)	-.047*** (.004)	-.048*** (.004)
U.S. Citizen			1.641*** (.034)	1.155*** (.033)	1.150*** (.033)
English Fluency					
Very well				reference	reference
Well				-1.675*** (.041)	-1.676*** (.041)
Not Well				-2.910*** (.058)	-2.916*** (.058)
Not at All				-4.006*** (.088)	-4.014*** (.088)
Los Angeles Resident					-.197*** (.035)
Constant	9.709*** (.019)	12.445*** (.076)	12.252*** (.080)	12.177*** (.074)	12.240*** (.075)
Adjusted R^2	.010	.106	.183	.291	.292
n	32,361	32,361	32,361	32,361	32,361

*p<.05 p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 4
Percentage and number of persons in each gateway type completing educational benchmarks

	New Destinations	*Established Destinations*
Less than 9th grade	9.5%	13.1%
	(516)	(3,521)
Some HS, no diploma	13.9%	20.8%
	(762)	(5,602)
HS diploma or equivalent	21.7%	23.7%
	(1,189)	(6,375)
Some college	31.4%	28.9%
	(1,720)	7,768)
College degree+	23.5%	13.5%
	(1,282)	(3,626)
Total	100%	100%
	(5,469)	(26,892)

Table 5
Logistic Regression Coefficients and Odds Ratios (in italics) for High School Graduation

	Model 1	*Model 2*	*Model 3*	*Model 4*	*Model 5*
New Latino Destination	.521***	.196***	.188***	.171***	.086*
	(.034)	(.037)	(.038)	(.040)	(.041)
	1.684	*1.216*	*1.207*	*1.187*	*1.089*
Age		-.011***	-.023***	-.019***	-.019***
		(.001)	(.001)	(.001)	(.001)
		.989	*.978*	*.982*	*.981*
Male		-.180***	-.075**	-.102***	-.107***
		(.025)	(.026)	(.027)	(.027)
		.835	*.928*	*.903*	*.899*
Latino Ethnicity					
Cuban		reference	reference	reference	reference
Mexican		-1.683***	-1.479***	-1.215***	-1.134***
		(.043)	(.044)	(.046)	(.047)
		.186	*.228*	*.297*	*.322*
Other Ethnic		-.896***	-.679***	-.511***	-.465***
		(.046)	(.047)	(.049)	(.049)
		.408	*.507*	*.600*	*.628*
Age at Immigration			-.072***	-.037***	-.037***
			(.004)	(.004)	(.004)
			.930	*.964*	*.963*
U.S. Citizen			1.087***	.874***	.869***
			(.027)	(.029)	(.029)
			2.965	*2.397*	*2.386*
English Ability					
Very Well				reference	reference
Well				-1.176***	-1.179***
				(.034)	(.034)
				(.309)	*.307*
Not Well				-1.792***	-1.804***
				(.050)	(.050)
				.167	*.165*
Not at All				-2.276***	-2.289***
				(.080)	(.089)
				.103	*.101*
Los Angeles Resident					-.241***
					(.031)
					.786

Constant	.667*** (.013) *1.948*	2.421*** (.062) *11.258*	2.493*** (.070) *12.096*	2.481*** (.073) *11.947*	2.562*** (.074) *12.968*
-2 Log Likelihood	40397.315	38080.126	35865.970	33142.168	33081.035
Chi-Squared	243.199	2560.389	4774.545	7498.347	7559.480
n	32,361	32,361	32,361	32,361	32,361

*p<.05 p<.01 ***p<.001

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Contrary to what existing research on new gateways suggests, the results presented here indicate that Latino immigrants in new immigrant destinations actually have higher average educational attainment than Latino immigrants in established gateways. The current literature on new gateways suggests that new immigrant destinations would benefit from referring to the examples of established gateways when considering issues of immigrant incorporation, but in this arena the new gateways seem to do significantly better than their more established counterparts. In my analysis, the educational attainment of Latino immigrants in new destinations is, on average, .854 levels higher than the educational attainment of Latino immigrants in established destinations. This difference is meaningful, because one level of education can represent three years of school at the elementary and middle school levels, or the difference between merely completing 12th grade and finishing with a high school diploma. These differences have important implications for future outcomes.

The percentages of Latino immigrants completing certain educational benchmarks are markedly different between new and established immigrant gateways. There is a greater percentage of Latinos completing 9th grade and some high school but no diploma in established gateways than in new destinations. A slightly greater but comparable percentage of Latino immigrants completes high school with a diploma in the established gateways. Latino immigrants in the established gateways, however, are more likely to have completed some college. The most striking benchmark is the difference between percentages of those earning a

college degree: 23.5% in the new Latino destinations compared to 13.5% in the established Latino metropolitan areas. My findings support the hypothesis that new destinations have better educational attainment than established metropolitan areas.

The OLS and logistic regression models indicate that English proficiency, native ethnicity, and U.S. citizenship are important and highly significant predictors of educational attainment in these immigrant gateways and account for a large portion of the effect of differential attainment in new and established Latino metros. However, it is notable that even in the full models, the variable for new Latino destination remains highly significant. My results show that though individual characteristics account for a substantial amount of the variance in educational attainment, there may be something contextually significant in the gateway types that is not captured by these characteristics.

It may be that individual characteristics account for the variation in educational attainment between the two areas because the people who settle in new destinations are simply different demographically from those in the established areas. Cubans and those who traditionally have higher levels of education and income may be settling in the new areas in greater numbers, while Mexicans, who have the lowest rates of educational attainment of all Latino groups, are choosing to move to established destinations. This suggestion, however, runs counter to the facts. Mexicans, Guatemalans, and Dominicans are the primary movers to new destinations.

English ability is also a strong predictor of educational attainment in new and established Latino immigrant destinations, which is unsurprising since English fluency is widely accepted as a necessary predicator of educational success among immigrants (Tienda & Niedert 1984; Rumberger & Larson 1998; Bohon 2005). Like ethnicity, it may be that more proficient English-

speaking immigrants are moving to the new destinations, but this is unlikely. The vast majority of Latino immigrants come to the United States without knowing how to speak English.

It is much more likely that immigrants in new gateways are forced to learn English better and more quickly, as there are fewer structural aids in place to assist them in their native language (Atiles and Bohon 2002). Since English fluency is strongly linked to educational attainment (Van Hook 2002), it is no surprise that immigrants fare better in new destinations, if only slightly. In short, it may be that immigrants in new Latino destinations become more proficient at English, which helps them complete higher levels of schooling.

Latino enclaves and neighborhoods in the traditional Latino metropolitan areas are likely to be solely or primarily Spanish-speaking, so immigrants to these areas may be able to become involved in the local economic and social life without learning English quickly. Portes and Zhou (1993, p.86) report that in some immigrant communities there are "niches of opportunity that members of the second generation can occupy, often without a need for an advanced education." In ethnic neighborhoods these jobs may include apprenticeships, skilled trade work, and well-paid positions in local government (see Wilson & Martin 1982; Bailey & Waldinger 1991; Zhou 1992). Furthermore, traditional areas of Latino immigration are likely to have high levels of Latino entrepreneurship and small business opportunities for non-English speakers.

These local jobs do not require a strong command of English or high level of education, and this fact may be affecting the value placed on education and the ability to speak English well in established Latino communities. The life of an entrepreneur, however, is very difficult, and success rates of new businesses are low. In the emerging technology-driven bottleneck economy, skilled trade work is also becoming less available. Higher educational attainment is

most likely to ensure better long-term opportunities for Latinos. In the school system, however, a lack of English proficiency hinders academic success.

In new Latino destinations without such established ethnic neighborhoods or enclaves, immigrant students in new Latino metropolitan areas may find that English acquisition is necessary for basic functioning in the local area. Immigrants are likely to recognize that learning English will be important for successful adaptation to their new environment. The lack of a strong Latino community also results in an absence of jobs for those who only speak Spanish, and even necessary daily situations and encounters may facilitate English acquisition because fellow Spanish speakers are fewer in number. I speculate that because English proficiency is higher among Latinos in new Latino destinations than in established Latino metros a corresponding difference is created in educational success in the U.S school system.

The strong significance of U.S. citizenship in predicting educational attainment level in the OLS models and high school graduation in the logistic regression models leads me to suggest that that those who move to new destinations may be more likely to stay permanently, obtain U.S. citizenship, and pursue their education. U.S. citizenship can be viewed as a proxy for permanency in this study. The economic opportunities that are drawing immigrants to new destinations (Suro and Singer 2002) may entice them to stay long-term. I also interpret the finding that English fluency is important to support this permanence conclusion: those more likely to stay in the United States are more likely to learn English.

There is a related scenario that the strength and significance of English ability and U.S. citizenship suggest, but which I cannot directly test with these data: that immigrants to new destinations are "innovators" while those to traditional destinations are not. Historically, human migration has generally occurred in networks. People travel to places that are close to their

sending destinations and where there are the most people like them (Zipf 1942). An underlying premise in the field of geography, called the geographic paradigm, indicates that those people who move to places far away where there are few people like them are considerably different from other people (Shaw 1975). They may be innovators: braver, more ambitious, and less tied to their traditional roots.

The new destinations offer a wealth of economic opportunities to new residents. It may be that these upwardly mobile innovators are willing to migrate to the metropolitan areas that are not firmly established as immigrant gateways. These Latinos would also be more are likely to encourage their children to pursue higher levels of education, because they are motivated to succeed in their new surroundings. The geographical differences between new and established destinations, then, would not be a function only of differing contextual factors in new and traditional Latino destinations but are partly the result of different demographic groups being drawn to the new destinations. My results suggest that educational attainment does vary between immigrant gateway types because people with different characteristics settle in the different kinds of areas. In this sample, the Latino immigrants to new destinations may be innovators, more willing to immerse themselves in a new language and educational system, and more likely to become permanent citizens, which affects educational attainment.

The value of this research is that is offers a systematic analysis of the difference between the two immigrant destination types and yields surprising findings about new immigrant destinations. However, several limitations exist. The most glaring is the problem of causality. Because the IPUMS records respondents at their place of residence, which is not necessarily their place of education, I can only infer that educational attainment differences by place are actually a function of that place. Perhaps the most educated immigrants living in Los Angeles,

for example, are those most likely to migrate to Atlanta. Berube, Prince, and Smith (2003) report that many established Latino residents in Los Angeles recently moved out of the area. Further analysis incorporating migration histories could be useful in this regard.

Secondly, the data set does not include information about the socioeconomic status of respondents' family of origin. I feel that although this is somewhat limiting, past research has found that the educational differences between Latinos and other racial/ethnic groups remain even when family socioeconomic status is held constant (Portes and MacLeod 1996), so the results are still valuable. Given that Latino immigrants are likely to be drawn to new destinations because of a plethora of jobs (Atiles and Bohon 2002), one explanation for the higher educational attainment of immigrants in these places is higher incomes. Future studies should try to include family of origin characteristics to see if it causes any deviation from these findings.

An analysis of educational attainment by metropolitan area would also benefit from an in-depth analysis of the cities themselves. The new destinations are also often cities that are experiencing tremendous amounts of overall growth, while Latino growth in established Latino metropolitan areas is the largest, and sometimes only cause of population growth (Suro and Singer 2002). There may be other factors that are also affecting Latino educational attainment. Perhaps in the new gateways, the influx of different kinds of people has created a more vibrant, exciting educational atmosphere in some way. Perhaps the established gateways' economies are stagnating, and the financial benefits of moving to a new immigrant destination are allowing Latino parents to provide more opportunities for their children. In addition, in future research it would be helpful if locations could be classified as districts, not cities, especially since white flight is a potential contributor to education differences.

A related question is how school desegregation may be affecting Latino educational attainment. Is white flight in fact more prevalent in the established Latino metropolitan areas than in new Latino destinations? Is school integration facilitating better opportunities for Latino students, while desegregation in established Latino gateways lowers educational achievement? These are all empirical questions that should be examined, though they are beyond the scope of this study.

Today, Latino immigrants in new Latino destinations have higher educational attainment than their counterparts in established Latino metropolitan areas. As the new destinations continue to swell with immigrants and Latino in-migrant Latinos, it will be interesting to see whether this trend persists.

REFERENCES

Andrews, Kenneth T. 2002. "Movement-Countermovement Dynamics and the Emergence of New Institutions: The Case of 'White Flight' Schools in Mississippi." *Social Forces* 80(3): 911-936.

Atiles, Jorge H. and Stephanie A. Bohon. 2002. "The Needs of Georgia's New Latinos: A Policy Agenda for the Decade Ahead." Carl Vinson Institute of Government, Athens.

Atiles, Jorge H. and Stephanie A. Bohon. 2003. "*Camas Calientes:* Housing Adjustments and Barriers to Social and Economic Adaptation among Georgia's Rural Latinos." *Southern Rural Sociology,* 19(1): 97-122.

Bailey, Thomas and Roger Waldinger. 1991. "Primary, Secondary, and Enclave Labor Markets: A Training Systems Approach." American Sociological Review 56 (4): 432-445.

Bean, Frank D., and Marta Tienda. 1987. *The Hispanic Population of the United States.* New York: Russell Sage.

Berube, Alan, Ryan Prince, and Hilary Smith. 2003. *Los Angeles in Focus: A Profile from Census 2000*. Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. http://www.brookings.edu/dybdocroot/es/urban/livingcities/losangles.pdf. Accessed July 8, 2005.

Bohon, Stephanie A., Monica K. Johnson, and Bridget K. Gorman. Forthcoming 2005. "Educational Expectations and Aspirations among Latino Adolescents in the United States."

Bohon, Stephanie A., Heather MacPherson, and Jorge H. Atiles. 2005. "Educational Barriers for New Latinos in Georgia." *Journal of Latinos and Education*. 4(1): 43-58.

Bourgois. P. 1991. *In search of respect: the new service economy and the crack alternative in Spanish Harlem*. Paper presented Conf. on Poverty, Immigration, and Urban Marginality in Advanced Soc. Maison Suger, Paris, May 10-11.

Butler, Pat. 1998. "Hispanics Add Another Thread to South Carolina's Cultural Fabric: Immigrant Population Outpaces State's General Growth." The State. Available online at http://www.thestate.com/mex/1.htm.

Chapa, Jorge and Belinda De La Rosa. 2004. "Latino Population Growth, Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, and Implications for Educational Attainment." *Education and Urban Society* 36:130-149.

Cheng, Simon, and Brian Starks. 2002. "Racial Differences in the Effects of Significant Others on Students' Educational Expectations." *Sociology of Education* 75:306-327.

Clotfelter, Charles T. 1976. "School Desegregation, 'Tipping,' and Private School Enrollment." *Journal of Human Resources* 11(1):28-50.

Clotfelter, Charles T. 2004. *After Brown: The Rise and Retreat of School Desegregation.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Coleman, James, et al. 1966. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Dawkins, Marvin P. 1983. "Black Students' Occupational Expectations: A National Study of the Impact of School Desegregation." *Urban Education* 18:98-113.

Day, Jennifer Cheeseman and Eric C. Newburger. July 2002. "The Big Payoff: Educational Attainment and Synthetic Estimates of Work-Life Earnings." U.S. Census Bureau, *Current Population Reports* P23-210. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Ensminger, M.E. and Slusarcick, A.L. 1992. "Paths to high school graduation or dropout: A longitudinal study of a first-grade cohort." *Sociology of Education*, 65: 95-113.

Fligstein, Neil, and Roberto M. Fernandez. 1985. "Hispanics and Education." Pp. 113-46 in *Hispanics in the United States*, edited by Pastora San Juan Cafferty and William C. McCready. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction.

Gettleman, Jeffrey. 2001. "Obscure Law Used to Jail Day Laborers in Georgia." *The Los Angeles Times* 21 August: A16.

Guthey, Greig, 2001. "Mexican Places in Southern Spaces" Globalization, Work, and Daily Life in and Aroung the North Georgia Poultry Industry." Pp57-67 in *Latino Workers in the Contemporary South*, edited by Arthur D. Murphy, Colleen Blanchard, and Jennifer A. Hill. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Hallinan, M. T. 1998. "Diversity effects on student outcomes: Social science evidence." *Ohio State Law Journal*. 59: 733-54.

Hamann, Edmund, Stanton Wortham, and Enrique Murillo. 2002. "Education and policy in the new Latino diaspora." Pp1-16 in *Education in the new Latino diaspora: Policy and the politics of identity*, edited by Edmund Hamann, Stanton Wortham, and Enrique Murillo. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Kaufman, Phillip, Martha Naomi Alt, and Christopher D. Chapman. 2001. "Dropout rates in the United States: 2000, NCES 2002-114." U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (ED 460 174), Washington, D.C.

Lowell, B. Lindsay and Roberto Suro. 2002. "The Improving Educational Profile of Latino Immigrants." Pew Latino Center, Washington, DC.

Massey, D.S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, J.E. 1993. "Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal." *Population and Development Review* 19 (3): 431-466.

Matute-Bianchi, M. E. 1986. "Ethnic identities and patterns of school success and failure among Mexican-descent and Japanese-American students in a California high school: An ethnographic analysis." American *Journal of Education* 95: 233-255.

Matute-Bianchi, Maria E. 1991. "Situational Ethnicity and Patterns of School Performance Among Immigrants and Non-Immigrant Mexican-Descent Students." Pp. 205-247 in *Minority Status and Schooling: A Comparative Study of Immigrant and Involuntary Minorities,* edited by Margaret Gibson and John U. Ogbu. New York, NY: Garland.

Marini, Margaret Mooney. 1980. Sex differences in the process of occupational attainment: A Closer look." Social Science research 9: 307-61.

Marini, Margaret Mooney. 1984. "Women's Educational Attainment and the Timing of Entry into Parenthood." *American Sociological Review* 49: 491-511.

Morgan, William R. 1984. "The High School Dropout in an Overeducated Society." Pp 215-273 in *Pathways to the Future: A Report of the National Longitudinal Surveys of Youth Labor Market Experience in 1982*, Vol. IV. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Murillo, Enrique, Jr. and Sofia Villenas. 1997. "East of Aztlan: Typologies of Resistance in North Carolina Communities." Paper presented at "Reclaiming Voices: Ethnographic Inquiry and Qualitative Research in a Postmodern Age," Los Angeles.

National Center for Education Statistics. 2001. *Educational achievement and black-white inequality*. U.S. Department of Education.

Neal, Micki M. and Stephanie A. Bohon. 2003. "The Dixie Diaspora: Attitudes Toward Immigrants in Georgia." *Sociological Spectrum* 23 (2): 181-212.

Ogbu, John. 1978. *Minority Education and Caste*. New York: Academic Press.

Ogbu, John. 1991. "Immigrant and involuntary minorities in comparative perspective" Pp. 3-33 in M. Gibson & J. Ogbu (Eds.), *Minority status and schooling*. New York: Garland.

Olzak, Susan. 1986. "A Competition Model of Ethnic Collective Action in American Cities, 1877-1889" in *Competitive Ethnic Relations*, Susan Olzak and Joane Nagel, eds.

Peng, S.S. 1985. *High School Dropouts: A National Concern.* Washington, D.C: National Center for Education Statistics.

Portes, Alejandro and Dag MacLeod. 1996. "Educational Progress of Children of Immigrants: The Roles of Class, Ethnicity, and School Context." *Sociology of Education* 69:255-275.

Portes, A. and Zhou, M. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants." *The ANNALS of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 530:74-96.

Rosenfeld, Rachel A. 1980. "Race and sex differences in career dynamics." American Sociological Review 45: 583-609.

Ross, Catherine E. and Chia-Ling Wu. 1996. "Education, Age, and the Cumulative Advantage in Health." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 37: 104-120.

Rossell, Christine H. and Willis D. Hawley. 1981. "Understanding White Flight and Doing Something About it." Pp. 157-84 in *Effective School Desegregations" Equitt, Quality, and Feasibility*, edited by Willis D. Hawley. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Saenz, Rogelio and Cynthia M. Cready. 1998. "The Role of Human and Social Capital in Geographic Mobility and Annual Earnings among Mexican Immigrants." Unpublished manuscript cited in Hernandez-Leon and Zuniga, 2000 and Suro and Singer, 2002.

Steven Ruggles, Matthew Sobek, Trent Alexander, Catherine A. Fitch, Ronald Goeken, Patricia Kelly Hall, Miriam King, and Chad Ronnander. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 3.0* [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center [producer and distributor] 2004.

Ruben G. Rumbaut. 1997. "Ties that Bind: Immigration and Immigrant Families in the United States," in *International Migration and Family Change*, edited by Alan Booth, Ann C. Crouter, and Nancy S. Landale. New York: Lawrence Earlbaum.

Rumberger, R. W. 1995. "Dropping out of middle school: A multilevel analysis of students and schools." *American Educational Research Journal* 32: 583-625.

Rumberger, R. W., and Larson, K. A. 1998. "Student mobility and the increased risk of high school dropout." *American Journal of Education* 107(1): 1-35.

Shaw, R. Paul. 1975. *Migration Theory and Fact*. Philadelphia: Regional Science Research Institute.

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

Suro, Roberto and Audrey Singer. 2002. "Latino Growth in Metropolitan America: Changing Patterns, New Locations." The Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.

Tienda, Marta and Lisa J. Niedert. 1984. "Language, Education, and the Socioeconomic Achievement of Latino Origin Men." *Social Science Quarterly* 65: 519-35.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2000. 2000 Census of Population and Housing. Washington, D.C: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Van Hook, J. 2002. Immigration and African American educational opportunity: The transformation of minority schools. *Sociology of Education* 75:1-19.

Velez, William. 1989. "High School Attrition among Hispanic and Non-Hispanic White Youths." *Sociology of Education* 62:119-33.

Vernez, George, and Allan Abrahamse. 1996. *How immigrants fare in U.S. education*. Santa Monica: Rand.

Wainer, Andrew. 2004. "The New Latino South and the Challenge to Public Education: Strategies for Educators and Policymakers in Emerging Immigrant Communities." University of Southern California." Tomás Rivera Policy Institute.

Williams, Bellinda, ed. 2003. *Closing the Achievement Gap: A Vision for Changing Beliefs and Practices.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wilson, Kenneth L. and W. Allen Martin. 1982. "Ethnic Enclaves: A comparison of the Cuban and Black Economies in Miami." *American Journal of Sociology* 88:1:135-160.

Wojtkiewicz, Roger A. and Katharine M. Donato. 1995. "Latino Educational Attainment: The Effects of Family Background and Nativity." *Social Forces* 74:559-574.

Zhou, Min. 1992. *Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of an Urban Enclave*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Zhou, Min. 1997. "Growing up American: The Challenge Confronting Immigrant Children and Children of Immigrants." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23:63-95.

Zipf, George Kingsley. 1942. "The P1P2/D Hypothesis: On the Intercity Movement of Persons." *American Sociological Review* 11:677-686.

APPENDIX: DESTINATIONS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

Established Latino Metropolitan Areas

Albuquerque, NM MSA

Chicago, IL PMSA

Denver, CO PMSA

El Paso, TX MSA

Fresno, CA MSA

Jersey City, NJ PMSA

Los Angeles – Long Beach, CA PMSA

McAllen, TX MSA

Miami, FL PMSA

New York, NY PMSA

Oakland, CA PMSA

San Antonio, TX MSA

San Francisco, CA PMSA

San Jose, CA PMSA

Tucson, AZ MSA

Ventura, CA PMSA

New Latino Destinations

Atlanta, GA MSA

Bergen-Passaic, NJ PMSA

Boston, MA-NH PMSA

Fort Lauderdale, FL PMSA

Fort Worth-Arlington, TX PMSA

Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA

Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon, NJ PMSA

Monmouth-Ocean, NJ PMSA

Nassau-Suffolk, NY PMSA

Orlando, FL MSA

Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA PMSA

Seattle-Bellevue, WA PMSA

Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA

Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV PMSA

West Palm Beach, Fl MSA

* Italicized cities have been designated "hypergrowth" destinations, with at least 300 percent Latino population growth between 1980 and 2000 (Suro and Singer 2002).