Published in final edited form as:

City Community. 2012 March ; 11(1): 1–30. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6040.2011.01369.x.

Forging Hispanic communities in new destinations: A case study of Durham, NC¹

Chenoa A. Flippen and

Population Studies Center, University of Pennsylvania, 3718 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6298, chenoa@sas.upenn.edu, Phone: 215-898-5534, Fax: 215-898-2124

Emilio A. Parrado

Population Studies Center, University of Pennsylvania, 3718 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6298, eparrado@sas.upenn.edu, Phone: 215-898-7831, Fax: 215-898-2124

Abstract

The Chicago School of urban sociology and its extension in the spatial assimilation model have provided the dominant framework for understanding the interplay between immigrant social and spatial mobility. However, the main tenets of the theory were derived from the experience of pre-war, centralized cities; scholars falling under the umbrella of the Los Angeles school have recently challenged the extent to which they are applicable to the contemporary urban form, which is characterized by sprawling, decentralized, and multi-nucleated development. Indeed, new immigrant destinations, such as those scattered throughout the American Southeast, are both decentralized *and* lack prior experience with large scale immigration. Informed by this debate this paper traces the formation and early evolution of Hispanic neighborhoods in Durham, NC, a new immigrant destination. Using qualitative data we construct a social history of immigrant neighborhoods and apply survey and census information to examine the spatial pattern of neighborhood succession. We also model the sorting of immigrants across neighborhoods according to personal characteristics. Despite the many differences in urban form and experience with immigration, the main processes forging the early development of Hispanic neighborhoods in Durham are remarkably consistent with the spatial expectations from the Chicago School, though the sorting of immigrants across neighborhoods is more closely connected to family dynamics and political economy considerations than purely human capital attributes.

Understanding how newcomers arrive, settle, and subsequently disperse within receiving areas in the United States has long been a central topic of inquiry in the sociological literature on immigrant adaptation. Interest in this issue has resurfaced in recent years as the size of the immigrant population has grown. The Hispanic population, in particular, is not only growing rapidly but is also increasingly dispersed across the country; since 1990 Hispanic populations have exploded in new destinations throughout the American Southeast and Midwest, but particularly the former (Durand, Massey, and Capoferro 2005). These new destinations pose a number of potential challenges to models of immigrant incorporation that were based on the experience of prior waves of immigration.

Unlike earlier generations of immigrants who poured into manufacturing jobs located in the core of Northeastern and Midwestern cities, contemporary Hispanic immigrants arrive to a

¹This research was supported by grant #NR 08052-03 from NINR/NIH (National Institute of Nursing Research, National Institutes of Health). The authors thank Chris McQuiston, René Zenteno, Leonardo Uribe, Claudia Ruiz, Amanda Phillips Martinez, our CBPR partners, El Centro Hispano, and the Durham Hispanic community for their contribution to this work.

Direct all correspondence to Chenoa A. Flippen, 3718 Locus Walk, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6298; chenoa@sas.upenn.edu.

fundamentally different social and economic environment in which both employment and residential patterns are far more decentralized. As immigrants continue to overwhelmingly settle in urban areas, these profound changes in the structure of cities are likely to shape the path of immigrant adaptation and neighborhood formation. In addition, Hispanic communities are growing rapidly in areas that were previously unaccustomed to large immigration inflows (Gozdziak and Martin 2005; Zuniga and Hernandez-Leon 2005). Immigrants to these new destinations thus both lack the “footsteps” of previous generations of immigrants to follow in and enter a social milieu characterized by a rigid black-white divide, lacking the diversity and plurality characteristic of many traditional immigrant gateways. These factors set southern destinations starkly apart from the urban areas on which classic theories of immigrant incorporation were based, and even distinguishes them from the experience of established but decentralized areas of destination such as Los Angeles.

Examining the spatial dynamics of neighborhood formation and succession in the “new Latino South” thus offers a fresh vantage point from which to add to the ongoing debate between the Chicago and Los Angeles schools of urban sociology, highlighted by Michael Dear’s 2002 invitation to debate in *City and Community*. Accordingly, this paper examines the social and spatial processes that shape the formation and early stages of evolution of a new Hispanic immigrant community in a decentralized southeastern context, Durham, NC. Our focus on a single immigrant group in a single city prevents us from testing the complex urban dynamics described by both schools. Rather than adjudicating the overall merits of the two perspectives, we focus on a single issue – the spatial distribution of immigrants over time – and apply expectations derived from the Chicago and Los Angeles schools to the experience of low-skilled Hispanic immigrants in Durham. We focus on three main questions. First, we investigate the social processes attracting Hispanic immigrants to Durham and how they affect the initial patterns of settlement and neighborhood formation. We then trace over time the evolution of Hispanic neighborhoods and the spatial pattern they display. Finally, we model the social characteristics sorting individuals across neighborhoods and derive implications for the process of community formation. We find that at least in these initial stages, the process of emergence, settlement, and evolution of the Durham Latino community closely conforms to expectations from the Chicago School and its extension in the spatial assimilation model. We highlight the relevance of this perspective for understanding new immigrant settlements and elaborate on particular dynamics not systematically considered by the Chicago School.

Theoretical considerations

The Chicago School of urban sociology, and its expansion into the spatial assimilation model, has long been the dominant paradigm for understanding the formation of ethnic communities and the spatial mobility of immigrants as they incorporate into U.S. society. As early as the 1920s, the Chicago School drew attention to the ways in which technological, political, economic, and cultural forces structure the spatial configuration of cities, and how this spatial configuration, in turn, shapes the social and economic behavior of urban residents (Park, Burgess, and McKenzie 1925). In its classic formulation the theory emphasized the centrality of “social integration” and focused on concepts such as social disorganization, ecological succession, and market-regulated social differentiation to understand the spatial position of immigrant groups (Walton 1993). Urban development and incorporation was explained in ecological terms where the spatial location of groups was a simple reflection of their free market position in terms of resources and abilities, and inequality among places was regarded as a natural consequence of functional differentiation (Logan and Molotch 1987: 6).

The geographic representation of this market-ordered space is best exemplified in Ernest Burgess' concentric circles model of urban development (1925). The model provided one of the earliest, and most iconic, representations of the spatial configuration of American cities. Burgess observed that different land uses radiated out of the city center in a series of concentric circles closely related to property values. At the center of the city lay the central business district, ringed by factories and progressively nicer residential housing. Immigrants tended to settle in the inner ring, or "zone in transition," because it was proximate to heavy industry and contained low-rent, dilapidated housing. As a particular immigrant group gained U.S. experience and moved up the socio-economic ladder they would move outward to subsequent rings of modest working class homes and the suburban periphery, and the next wave of immigrants would enter the zone of transition.

This model was expanded upon by subsequent Chicago School theorists such as Zorbaugh and Hoyt, among others, who elaborated on how natural boundaries such as railroad tracks and sectors of development shaped urban land uses (Hoyt, 1939; Zorbaugh, 1926). Homer Hoyt in particular noted the tendency for cities to grow in a star-shaped manner in association with highways and other venues of transportation radiating from the center. Harris and Ullman (1945), recognizing considerable variation across metropolitan areas, argued that cities often contained multiple nuclei that emerge in connection with land use patterns and social and historical forces.

For understanding the experience of immigrants, though, the emphasis on neighborhoods and neighborhood succession provided concrete and empirically identifiable connections between the spatial configuration of cities and residents' socioeconomic position. The free market and integrationist underpinnings of the classical Chicago School, however, came seriously into question during the 1960s and 1970s, a period marked by racial and ethnic conflict, urban rioting, deindustrialization, and fiscal crises. Influenced by a Marxian political economy perspective, a new wave of urban scholars argued that the urban system was not a product of natural forces but rather the spatial manifestation of inequalities embedded within capitalist forms of social relations (Castells 1977; Lefebvre 1991; McQuarrie and Marwell 2009). Cities were situated within a hierarchical global system that shaped the accumulation, circulation, and distribution of both capital and labor. The position of immigrants within cities was not merely a derivative of their socioeconomic endowments but instead directly connected to their particular role in global capitalist development. The end product was more explicit attention to the role of political processes, power elites, and class conflict in shaping the urban landscape.

While the Chicago School and political economy approach clashed over the forces shaping urban settlement patterns, their arguments about the formation and evolution of immigrant communities were not completely incompatible (McQuarrie and Marwell 2009). In fact, there have been many attempts to bridge the two perspectives. Rather than moving away from the spatial processes described by the Chicago School these integrated approaches highlighted the structural processes, such as racial inequality in the housing market or differential capital investments that undergird observed patterns of spatial differentiation (Logan & Molotch 1987).

The spatial assimilation model, in particular, provided a clear and empirically testable theoretical integration of the Chicago School and conflict perspectives as they related to immigrant settlement patterns (Massey, 1985). Immediately after arrival, most immigrants have both extremely limited market resources and social and cultural capital that are ethnically bounded. Both of these factors encourage the formation and maintenance of ethnic communities, where newcomers reside while they become adapted to the United States. However, opportunities and resources are unevenly distributed across the urban

landscape; different neighborhoods confer differential prestige, home values, city and other public services (including quality education), physical safety, and access to employment and a variety of amenities. As people advance economically, they endeavor to translate their gains in financial status into gains in residential status in order to procure access to those resources and opportunities (Massey 1985; Massey and Denton 1993). Thus residence in ethnic neighborhoods or enclaves is expected to be temporary; a stepping stone to higher quality accommodations that immigrants seek to leave once they improve their financial and social situation. As a particular ethnic group advances spatially, they create vacancies that can be filled by newer waves of immigrants. Thus while a neighborhood may succeed from one ethnicity or national origin group to another, it retains its immigrant character. Because higher quality housing tends to be located outside of densely packed inner urban neighborhoods, upward movement generally entails outward movement. While spatial assimilation is a function of these individual socioeconomic processes, it is contingent on features of the larger city context, such as racial discrimination in the housing market, industrial organization, capital investments, and government policies.

Recent scholarship falling under the umbrella of the Los Angeles school, however, has raised important challenges to the Chicago School model stemming from shifting intra-metropolitan settlement patterns. Specifically, since World War II industrial restructuring and the widespread use of automobiles have fundamentally transformed urban areas, and potentially the relationship between cities and behavior. In contemporary post-modern cities decentralized freeways replaced the hub and spoke system creating a sprawling urban area characterized by multiple nuclei of concentration rather than a single central business district, single use as opposed to mixed use zoning, low rather than high density, and horizontal access as opposed to the vertical profiles (Dear 1996, 2002; Fogelson 1967; Fulton 1997; Gottdiener and Klephart 1991; Scott and Soja 1996; Soja 1989; Sorkin 1992). As these cities grow, their multiple centers may increase in density and form mini-business districts of their own, but overall centripetal forces prevail, pulling jobs and other amenities ever outward toward suburban and edge communities.

Spatial form is far from the only concern in these works. Much of the Los Angeles school focuses on cultural and political implications of the post-modern urban form, and issues of fragmentation, governance, and fortification. For spatial analysis though the image of the contemporary city is that of a “patchwork quilt of low-density suburban communities stretching over an extraordinarily irregular terrain” tied together by freeways (Soja 1996: 433), very different from the pre-World War II city described by the Chicago School. Moreover, the city no longer functions as a unified whole, a coherent regional system in which the center organizes its hinterland. Instead, there is no order or reason; development occurs in a non-linear, chaotic, and haphazard manner, resulting in massive disjointed regions that often defy the traditional conception of a single “city” (Dear 1996). In this conceptualization, Los Angeles is not the exception but the new rule for development in the post-modern age. As Garreau put it, “every single American city that is growing, is growing in the fashion of Los Angeles, with multiple urban cores” (1991: 3). Not even the present-day Chicago metropolitan area, it can be argued, conforms to the single-centered concentric rings model of yore (Gans 2002).

One possibility is that these changes in the spatial location of opportunities have altered the settlement patterns of recent immigrants. Post-war cities are not only polycentric they are also polycultural; as cities themselves become more fragmented so too have the forces of assimilation; with both the return of large scale immigration and the advent of significant capital investment from abroad, immigrant groups no longer spread outward through an orderly process of invasion and succession, but rather retain their ethnic character over time and across space (Dear, 1996).

Indeed, a spate of recent studies has painted a mixed portrait of immigrant settlement patterns that seems to challenge some of the tenets of the Chicago School and spatial assimilation models. On the one hand, among Hispanics factors such as higher socioeconomic status, English language proficiency, and nativity predict residence in neighborhoods with higher incomes, lower crime, and greater integration with non-Hispanic whites, supporting the spatial assimilation model (Alba et al. 1994, 1999; Denton & Massey 1998; Logan & Alba 1993; Rosenbaum & Friedman 2001; South, Crowder, and Chavez 2005). On the other hand, immigrants are increasingly bypassing central cities and moving directly to suburbs; by 2000 more immigrants lived in suburbs than in cities, and growth rates there were higher than in cities (Suro 2004). Some have gone so far as to argue that rising concentrations of ethnic groups in the suburbs constitutes a new form of ethnic neighborhoods, the “ethnoburb” (Li 1998). And finally, many ethnic communities are not, as predicted by the spatial assimilation model, disadvantaged. Contemporary immigration streams include a number of relatively highly skilled, affluent national origin groups. These immigrants often reside in ethnic neighborhoods not out of necessity, but by choice, and the neighborhoods can average higher incomes and property values than non-ethnic communities (Logan, Zhang, and Alba 2002; Yu 2006). Indeed, spatial assimilation and increased contact with non-Hispanic whites are no longer as tightly paired as they once were, especially in metropolitan areas that have received large numbers of immigrants in recent years (Alba, Logan & Stults 2000).

These patterns raise the question of whether differences between sprawling post-modern and centralized pre-industrial cities engender a fundamental reordering of the way in which immigrant communities develop, or whether differences are mostly superficial while the essential processes sorting groups across space remain the same (Sampson 2002). While a number of previous studies examine the locational attainment of Hispanics, few consider the spatial distribution of immigrant populations within a particular metropolitan area. What is particularly lacking is an examination of the formation and evolution of immigrant communities in new destinations, which are not only decentralized and sprawling but *also* lack a previous history of immigrant settlement (Waters & Jimenez 2005), potentially further undermining the validity of the spatial assimilation model.

We address the issue by conducting an in-depth social history of the formation and early evolution of Hispanic neighborhoods in Durham, NC. Our overall objective is not to settle decisively on the relative merits of the Chicago or Los Angeles models. After all, both schools of thought are broad and address not only the spatial distribution of groups but also urbanism and community, racial and ethnic conflict, governance and social fragmentation, and a number of other urban issues. There was also considerable overlap in their visions of cities. Rather, our objective is more modest; to provide an original, in-depth, historical account of the relationship between urban form and spatial dynamics in a new southern destination and their implications for models of immigrant settlement.

Contrasting predictions about the spatial pattern of immigrant settlement in new destinations can be drawn from these two models. The Chicago School would expect the emergence of a delineated “zone of transition” that acts as a port of entry for newly arriving immigrants. At the same time, the Chicago school would expect the spatial distribution of Hispanic immigrant neighborhoods in Durham to follow an orderly pattern related to the spatial assimilation model; as immigrants gain in resources and experience they would move out of this transition zone attracted by the neighborhood amenities available where majority groups reside in a pattern that should show some resemblance to concentric circles. The post-modern Los Angeles school, in contrast, places much greater emphasis on the lack of order and contiguity. The absence of preexisting immigrant quarters combined with the dearth of concentrated industrial employment would lead to scattered immigrant settlements within

emerging destinations. While immigrants would still enter the region through inexpensive housing and move to better accommodations as they progress, the lack of order in multi-nucleated cities would suggest that there will be no discernable spatial pattern to this movement. Immigrant settlement would reflect the “quasi-random field of opportunities” (Dear and Flusty 1998: 66) that characterize the modern metropolis, and resemble a gaming board lacking in centralization, rather than orderly spread from an initial port of entry.

Research setting: Durham, NC

Durham’s demographic and economic history differs markedly from the cities on which the Chicago school theories were based. Established in 1853, it was not until after the Civil War that Durham began to develop in earnest, after the discovery and popularity of locally grown Brightleaf tobacco. The phenomenal success of the tobacco industry spurred local investment and encouraged the growth of textile mills in the early 1900s. The population of Durham grew from a mere 6,679 in 1900 to 52,037 in 1930, but growth stalled in the 1930s when increased competition caused many of the textile mills to close. This ushered in a protracted period of slower growth for Durham, exacerbated by the gradual decline of the local tobacco industry.

While the early development of Durham was intimately connected to tobacco, modern Durham is inexorably linked to the technology and research sector, and the larger movement of these firms southward that began in the 1950s and accelerated in the 1980s and 1990s. The late 1950s marked the creation of the Research Triangle Park (RTP) to the southeast between Durham and Raleigh, NC. This special tax district served as a magnet for research and development firms, and steadily drew population to the region. Much of the early growth resulting from RTP occurred in Raleigh and nearby Cary, rather than Durham. Eventually, however, development began to spill over into Durham, which grew by more than 35 percent during both the 1980s and 1990s.

The city’s early dependence on agriculture and sparse industrial base limited the size and density of the historical downtown. Because most growth occurred after World War II and the widespread availability of the automobile, and because RTP was built on undeveloped land between Durham and Raleigh, Durham never developed a large central business district or densely settled downtown residential neighborhoods. As suburbanization increased in the 1960s and 1970s, the economic and retail elements of Durham’s downtown were eclipsed by suburban malls and office parks. Large swaths of downtown residential neighborhoods (particularly those inhabited by blacks) were demolished in the 1960s and 1970s under the rubric of urban renewal, in an attempt to revitalize downtown and to make room for highway construction.

The end result was that Durham housing is almost exclusively suburban, with the boundary between city, suburb, and rural areas often blurred. The city of Durham encompasses most of Durham County, and includes innumerable suburban communities, large tracts of evergreen forests, and thousands of acres of farmland, though the former has increasingly supplanted that latter two. The ready availability of undeveloped land within the city limits coupled with lax regulation of development has resulted in a rather haphazard pattern of development. While there are a handful of older neighborhoods in northwest and south central Durham (not coincidentally where the historic black neighborhoods are located), and proximate to downtown and Duke University, there is no neat relationship between location and age of housing. Housing in these neighborhoods is far from uniform, combining apartments and single family homes, and older housing is not restricted to these areas; there are other aging apartment complexes scattered throughout the area. New subdivisions and apartment complexes are commonly built proximate to older areas, in areas that were

formerly wooded or even small farms. And, like Los Angeles, there are multiple nuclei of concentration.

Durham also differs from older industrial cities in its pattern of racial and ethnic segregation. In general, segregation levels are significantly lower in smaller and southern cities like Durham than in their larger and Rustbelt counterparts; of the top 20 most segregated metropolitan areas only 2 are located in the South. Unlike many northeastern metros whose black-white indices of dissimilarity scores reach into the 70s and 80s, many southern metros have more moderate levels of segregation in the 50s and 60s. Durham is a case in point, with a 2000 black-white index of dissimilarity of 52.7, which indicates that more than half of Durham's black population would need to move in order to achieve even distribution. Within the southern context the Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill metropolitan area is slightly less segregated than some of the larger southern metros like Charlotte, NC (61.1), Atlanta, GA (68.8), Dallas, TX (64.4), and Richmond, VA (62.9); but is roughly comparable to smaller southern metros such as Austin, TX (57.1), Norfolk, VA (53.0), San Antonio, TX (55.5), and Jacksonville, FL (59.3). At 64.0, Durham's Hispanic-white index of dissimilarity in 2000 was actually higher than that of blacks (see www.census.gov/hhes/migration/segregation.html).

Thus Durham conforms to the typical southern, Sunbelt urban morphology that mixes historic neighborhoods with sprawling, scattered large-scale single-family residential subdivisions, strip malls, and low-rise apartment complexes for renters (Smith & Furuseth 2004). It is into this milieu of patchwork development, segregated by race that Hispanic immigrants entered in increasing numbers in the 1990s. The impact of this particular urban form on the development and evolution of Hispanic neighborhoods is the main concern of this paper.

Data and analytic strategy

Data for the analysis come from a mixed-methods study of the relationship between gender, immigration, and health risks among Hispanics in the Durham area. Early in the project's development it became clear that there was substantial neighborhood variation in the context of social organization and health, prompting a more thorough examination of the history of Durham's Hispanic neighborhoods. The current analysis draws on demographic and socioeconomic data collected as part of the broader project and data collected specifically to examine the impact of neighborhoods on immigrant adaptation. Our study employs a 3-pronged approach based on community collaboration, targeted random sampling, and in-depth interviews and field research.

First, in order to enhance access to and understanding of the nascent Hispanic community, our study relied heavily on Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR). This method uses a critical theoretical perspective that includes the "local theory" of community participants as collaborators in the research process (Israel et al. 2005). In our case, a group of 14 Hispanic men and women from the immigrant community were directly involved in every stage of the research, including formulation and revision of the questionnaire, identification of survey locales, and development of strategies to guarantee the collection of meaningful information. Monthly group meetings were held for more than 8 years to discuss research findings and gain culturally grounded interpretations for the analyses.

Second, we draw from 1,415 face-to face survey interviews conducted in Spanish with Hispanic male immigrants² residing in 35 apartment complex neighborhoods in Durham and 5 trailer parks. Our survey followed targeted random sampling techniques to approximate a representative sample of the Durham Hispanic community. Based on CBPR discussions and field work in the community we identified apartment complexes, street blocks, and trailer

parks that house large numbers of immigrant Hispanics. We then conducted a census of all the housing units in these areas to construct a sampling frame and randomly selected individual units to be visited by interviewers. Any foreign born male Hispanics (self-identified) between the ages of 18 and 49 qualified for interview. Working with community interviewers helped us achieve a refusal rate of 10.7%, which compares favorably to other surveys of recent immigrants.

As the parent project was designed to address the connection between immigration, gender, and health risks, we collected extensive information on a broad number of areas. First, we included detailed information on demographic, migration, and employment histories, allowing us to assess the import of how many years respondents had been in Durham, whether they migrated to the area directly from their countries of origin or via another U.S. location, ability to speak English, and legal status. We also collected information on living arrangements, social support, and family structure, distinguishing between men who are single, separated/divorced, married with a co-resident spouse, and married but unaccompanied by their spouse (who continues to reside in their country of origin). We also collected data on employment, including wages, occupation, and whether respondents worked in segregated Hispanic worksites (defined as those who responded positively to the query “Are most of your co-workers other Latinos?”). The survey also collected detailed information on health-related attitudes and behaviors not directly relevant to the current analysis. In addition to data obtained from completed interviews, the interviewers also recorded the race of all ineligible (i.e., non-Hispanic) housing units, providing data on the racial composition of the various neighborhoods. Survey data collection occurred in two phases, from April 2002 to July 2003 (N=475) and then from May 2006 to December 2007 (N=940), so we also have data on how neighborhoods changed over the course of this relatively short period.

And finally, we draw on 33 in-depth interviews with male and female key informants and early immigrants to the Durham area. In addition, the CBPR group was comprised of several current and former residents of the neighborhoods in our study, lending a treasure trove of information on the evolution of local Hispanic communities. Through them and other informants we were able to identify and interview some of the first immigrants to the area, and several people who were the first to move into neighborhoods that now have large Hispanic populations.

Our overall strategy is to piece together individual narratives and fieldwork to describe the social history of Durham’s immigrant Hispanic neighborhoods. We next map the progression of Durham’s Hispanic communities to examine visually the pattern of dispersal over time. Using our social history, we create a rough typology of early, intermediate, and newer Hispanic neighborhoods. We then use survey data to examine the sorting of immigrants across neighborhoods by comparing the socioeconomic, immigration, and family structure characteristics of residents in these different neighborhood types, as well as in Carrboro and trailer communities. We corroborate our findings with comparable information obtained from tract level data from the 2000 Census. And finally, we compare

²While the project also surveyed women we focus on men for several reasons. First, as described in Table 1 below women are unevenly distributed across Durham’s immigrant communities. We argue that movement away from male-dominated environments to neighborhoods with a greater female presence is itself an important sign of integration. Including female respondents would therefore be akin to selecting on one of our dependent variables. Second, while multiple men sharing a residence with no female presence is a common phenomenon, the female counterpart is virtually nonexistent (over 86 percent of women in our survey resided with a partner and the rest with at least one male relative). Relying on male respondents as household representatives thus provides information on where women are living as well. Thus while we use men to report on household members and as a barometer of neighborhood socioeconomic status, women are incorporated both in terms of household composition and neighborhood social organization.

results from our social history with those obtained from a concentric circle approach to see whether in fact socio-demographic characteristics are associated with outward movement.

Our focus on a single case study of a new Hispanic destination has decided advantages and disadvantages. New areas of destination by definition entail a relatively short period of observation, and preclude investigating the long-term process of immigrant adaptation and spatial assimilation. Few immigrants have been in Durham long enough to move out of Hispanic neighborhoods, or to buy a home. Likewise, Durham lacks a sizeable adult second generation necessary to assess intergenerational change. Moreover, our sampling strategy deliberately concentrates on areas where large numbers of Hispanics concentrate. While we have shown in previous work that our sample is representative of the larger immigrant community (Parrado, Flippen, and McQuiston 2005), we do not have a random sample of the most spatially integrated members of the community. However, the clear advantage is that we were able to directly observe the early stages of ethnic neighborhood formation and evolution and interview many of the pioneer immigrants to Durham, and early entrants into particular communities. This information sheds light on the paths of neighborhood change in post-modern, southern urban forms.

Origins of the Durham Hispanic immigrant community

The driving engine of growth of modern Durham was changes in the political economy of the area associated with the high-tech sector. Many of the new jobs created required a higher level of skill than was available in the area, attracting significant numbers of highly educated internal migrants (including natives and immigrants from countries such as India and China). The resulting rapid growth set off a boom in residential and commercial construction, and a commensurate demand for construction labor. At the same time, and similar to the pattern observed in global cities, the growth of upper income residents escalated demand for a plethora of low-skill services including childcare, gardening, housecleaning, and food services, all of which acted as a powerful draw of Hispanic immigrants to the area (Bailey 2005; Parrado and Kandel, 2008; Sassen 2006).

Early immigrants to Durham were primarily recruited out of nearby agriculture or from more traditional immigrant gateways (Griffith 2005; Johnson-Webb 2003). The migration story of Isidro, who settled in Durham in 1992, illustrates the pathway from agricultural employment to Durham. Isidro crossed the border illegally in his early 20s to work in agriculture, harvesting peaches in Georgia. While working there, he was recruited by someone who received \$50 for each immigrant brought to North Carolina by a grower in the area. After working for several months in agriculture in rural North Carolina, he learned of higher paid and more stable employment opportunities in construction in Durham and moved there. Isidro subsequently obtained documentation and is currently working as an employee in the cleaning department at a local university. Geraldo offers an illustration of recruitment from a more traditional immigrant gateway. He crossed the border illegally into Texas in his 20s and had been working in Houston for 3 years in construction. In 1986 found work with a contractor who was based in Durham. He recounted, "When the job ended - the project that (the contractor) had going - he said 'If you guys want, let's go. I have a ton of work in Durham. I'll pay your hotel and food, and loan you money to get started because I have a lot of work.'" Gerardo was one of 6 master carpenters and 8 assistant carpenters who moved to Durham with the contractor, and was one of the very first Hispanics to move to the area.

Once a group of immigrants became established in the area, news quickly spread of the ample employment, relatively high wages, and low cost of living in Durham, encouraging further secondary migration from traditional receiving states. Data from our targeted random

survey show that 44 percent of Durham Hispanics came to the area via another U.S. location, primarily California and Texas. As more immigrants became established in Durham, direct migration from Mexico and Central America became increasingly common, particularly after 1996 when hurricane Fran wreaked extensive damage in the area and spurred a cleanup effort that generated a spike in the demand for low-skill labor.

The impact of labor demand and network processes is clearly evident in the rapid growth of the Hispanic population. In 1990 the Census registered 2,054 Hispanics in Durham County, representing 1.1 percent of the total population. By 2000, the census registered 17,039 Hispanics, 75 percent of whom were foreign born and more than 85 percent of whom had migrated to the United States after 1990. The population continued to grow rapidly, reaching an estimated 32,904 and 12.2 percent of the total population by 2009. Our data indicate, not surprisingly, that most Hispanic immigrants in the area are recently arrived, with an average of less than 5 years of Durham residence. Interestingly, internal immigrants average a mere 3.6 years of additional U.S. experience than immigrants who migrated directly to Durham. The vast majority (roughly 90 percent) of Hispanic immigrants are undocumented, exhibit relatively low levels of English fluency, and are concentrated in low-skill employment with little occupational diversity (more than 60 percent of employed immigrant men work in construction). Like many areas of new immigrant destination, the gender composition of the Hispanic population is highly uneven (Suro & Singer 2002), with more than 2 men aged 20 to 29 for every woman in the same age range. Thus, in addition to gradients across neighborhoods in terms of income and U.S. experience, there is also substantial variation in the gender balance across Hispanic areas of settlement.

Social history of Durham Hispanic neighborhoods

The spatial assimilation model posits that these origin characteristics powerfully shape residential settlement patterns among Hispanic immigrants. Their low incomes in tandem with the increasingly inhospitable political environment render recently arrived immigrants a highly vulnerable and marginalized population. Their initial residential concentration is likely to reflect this disadvantage. Limited financial and social capital is expected to channel them to more disadvantaged and dilapidated areas, with lower rental costs, higher vacancies, and greater tolerance of overcrowding. While lacking in material resources, these initial areas of settlement provide ethnic and social support that would not be available to immigrants if they were more evenly dispersed across the metropolitan area. For instance, certain neighborhoods have a reputation for providing free housing to new immigrants; the concentration of multiple men sharing apartments makes it relatively easy to take in one more, providing newcomers with a couch or cot to sleep on free of charge until they get established (Parrado, Flippen, and McQuiston 2005). At the same time, these neighborhoods also facilitate entry into U.S. employment since labor recruiters often visit the complexes when they are in need of workers. It is this duality of deteriorated conditions and extensive ethnic support that characterizes the first Hispanic neighborhoods to emerge.

In-depth interviews with long-time immigrants to the areas describe this process. One of the first areas to house large numbers of Hispanics in Durham was Spruce Street³, popularly known as *Mexico Chiquito*. A relatively small cluster of one-story duplexes in northeast Durham, the area was predominantly African American until the mid 1990s. However, a few early immigrants settled there and the area soon became a magnet for new arrivals. In fact, it was common during those years for employers looking for day laborers to travel to *Mexico Chiquito* to pick people up in a van to bring them to local job sites. *Mexico Chiquito* was also the site of one of the very first Hispanic stores in the area, as a resident sold goods from

³Names of streets and apartment complexes have been changed to ensure anonymity.

his apartment that he later parleyed into a traditional store that eventually included 3 branches. *Mexico Chiquito* also became a center for socialization with immigrants from around Durham congregating there on the weekends for cook-outs and drinking. They were attracted by the Hispanic store and small back yards that served as public space for gathering.

Because *Mexico Chiquito* was small and surrounded by owner-occupied single family housing, the Hispanic population quickly outgrew the locale. A new early neighborhood began to grow in Pine Estates, which was later dubbed “*La Maldita Vecindad*.” *La Maldita*, a collection of eight 3-story apartment buildings, was also predominantly African American until roughly 1994–1996 when it rapidly turned Hispanic; by 2000 there were only a couple of African American families remaining. Gerardo, the immigrant described above who was recruited to Durham out of construction in Texas, was one of first to settle in *La Maldita* in 1993. As he put it, “First there were 4 living there, then 6, then 8, then 12 (in a 2 bedroom apartment). And then we rented another apartment, and more and more and more people kept coming.” As the Hispanic population continued to grow, they spilled out of *La Maldita* into more or less adjacent areas in northeast Durham, toward the general direction of downtown. Elm Road apartments, in particular, began to receive a sizeable overflow of single and unaccompanied married men, and was dubbed *La Maldita 2* by residents.

Other apartment complexes were quickly converted from African American and white to Hispanic starting in the early 2000s. The story of Chestnut Park was typical. As late as 2000 the complex, which is situated close to Duke University, was predominantly occupied by whites, including a number of students. However, around 2002–2004 a number of newer apartment buildings were built nearby that led to a rapid exodus of white residents. The management hosted a series of pool parties to try to attract new residents, but they were often rowdy and some resulted in vandalism of the property. So the management abandoned trying to recruit new white occupants and began advertising in Spanish, including promotions that any resident making a successful referral would be given 1 month of free rent. The complex quickly turned Hispanic.

Around the same time the first Hispanic communities also began appearing in southwestern Durham. Magnolia Terrace, a large complex of over 500 apartments, was the first in this section of town. Magnolia Terrace was rapidly losing white tenants due to a combination of forces: the complex was old and faced stiff competition from a number of newer developments that opened during the first years of the 2000s. In addition, the newly completed Streets at Southpoint Mall, further south in Durham, opened and hastened the demise of the nearby South Square Mall, which was closed shortly thereafter. With vacancy rates rising, the management of Magnolia Terrace took advantage of its location right off a major thoroughfare to attract new Hispanic residents, hanging large banners in Spanish on the sides of their buildings that were clearly visible from the highway. The banners advertised discounted rents and services in Spanish and the complex rapidly turned Hispanic.

Once established in Magnolia Terrace, Hispanics spread out from there into apartment complexes around the now-demolished South Square Mall, including Maple Street and Royal Oaks. Many of these apartments were in far better condition than earlier Hispanic complexes such as *Mexico Chiquito* and *La Maldita*. Earlier neighborhoods tended to be extremely run down both in the interior and exterior of the apartments, and overwhelmingly lacked amenities such as laundry facilities and pools. The next set of apartments to turn Hispanic tended to be in somewhat better condition; most had on-site laundry facilities and some even had pools. What these later Hispanic neighborhoods had in common was a rapid loss of native born tenants to nearby newly built developments. In the next few years the

Hispanic population further expanded southward and eastward to apartments such as the Ash Meadows and Willowbrook apartments. During this period a popular Salvadorian restaurant and a number of Hispanic *tiendas* and *taquerias* also opened in the vicinity, further enhancing the ethnic character of the area. Over time, Hispanics also began to make inroads into some of the better maintained and newer apartment complexes like Birch Park, which actually had a waiting list for apartments in 2007.

Hispanic settlement in the area, however, is not constrained to Durham. The neighboring communities of Carrboro and Chapel Hill, NC are also important to the history of Hispanic immigrant communities in the region. While Chapel Hill's relatively high prices (due to a combination of a small housing market, large number of student renters, and well-reputed public schools) discouraged Hispanic settlement, Carrboro, located to the south of Chapel Hill, housed a number of immigrant communities. Although considerably more rural and lower density than Durham, the evolution of Hispanic neighborhoods in Carrboro followed a similar pattern. The first immigrants to the area settled in the Cherry Blossom Apartments, known as *El Cerezo*. *El Cerezo* was down the street from Shady Lane, a small strip mall that became a favorite gathering point for Carrboro immigrants owing to its position as a site where day laborers congregated, a popular Hispanic *Tienda*, and Laundromat. Though *El Cerezo* was close to the UNC, it was an old complex and the close proximity to Shady Lane and the immigrants who congregated there gave it a reputation for being dangerous, hastening the exodus of white students and opening the door to ethnic succession. Several other older apartment complexes that once catered to students and were also within walking distance to Shady Lane followed suit and turned Hispanic in the years that followed in a pattern strikingly similar to that in Durham. Their transitions were hastened by the development of new construction close to campus toward the end of the 1990s. These units were fresher, more modern, and also came with new pools and community amenities. As vacancy rates rose in the older, less favored complexes, administrators lowered their credit demands and began promoting the apartments to Hispanics. While the majority of Hispanic neighborhoods in Carrboro are proximate to Shady Lane, there are also a number of immigrants in Dogwood Estates, further to the north and east. Dogwood Estates is managed by the same company as one of the other now-Hispanic complexes near Shady Lane, which facilitated the transition there.

There are also a number of trailer park communities in both Durham and Carrboro that have attracted Hispanic homebuyers. While a Latino Credit Union has operated in Durham since 2000, and several local banking institutions offer limited services in Spanish, homeownership remains relatively uncommon among area immigrants. Low and unstable wages, lack of familiarity with U.S. lending and real estate industries, and their precarious legal situation and frequent desire to eventually return to Mexico are common impediments to homeownership among Hispanic immigrants. Trailers offer a critical entryway into homeownership for those who plan to stay in the area, as they are significantly less expensive than even the lowest priced fixed homes, and also often have private financing available from trailer owners and managers (indeed, for some immigrants living in trailers is more akin to renting than owning). Thus even though many of these communities are old and in poor condition, they represent a significant step up from apartment living.

Spatial history of Durham Hispanic neighborhoods

The Chicago School and spatial assimilation model posit a close overlap between social and spatial distributions. The main expectation is of social and temporal movement outward from a central core, captured in Burgess's classical representation of a geographical pattern of concentric circles. Our social history of the community describes the progression of Hispanic neighborhood formation, but it does not capture the spatial configuration of the

community. It is precisely in this spatial configuration that new areas of Hispanic destination are most likely to diverge from the Chicago School model.

To examine the issue, Figure 1 maps the location of the Hispanic complexes and blocks in our sample together with percent Hispanic population in 2000 by block. At first glance, contrary to the Chicago School and more in line with the Los Angeles model, there appears to be little ecological order in the settlement pattern of Hispanic immigrant neighborhoods in Durham. The Hispanic population in the area is largely diffuse and lacks a large, contiguous area of concentration. Instead, Hispanics settle in dispersed pockets, reflecting the scattered nature of low-rent apartment buildings in the region.

However, superposing the temporal order of settlement captured in our social history to the spatial distribution of Hispanic neighborhoods presents a different picture. Figure 2 maps the distribution of Hispanic neighborhood in this case against the percent Black population in 1990 by block. The complexes are divided into three distinct phases according to the temporal order of formation captured in our social history: early, intermediate, and new. “Early” neighborhoods were the first to form according to our informants, and were already predominantly Hispanic when we began data collection in 2002. “Intermediate” neighborhoods formed a few years later; these communities were just beginning to house large numbers of Hispanics when we entered the field in 2002. And finally, “new” neighborhoods were not included in our original sample because they had yet to attract large numbers of immigrants. These areas were newly predominantly Hispanic when we collected our second round of data in 2006. In the description above, *Mexico Chiquito*, *La Maldita* and *La Maldita 2* were all early neighborhoods; Magnolia Terrace, Maple Street, Royal Oaks, and Chestnut Park are included in intermediate neighborhoods; and Ash Meadows, Willowbrook, and Birch Park are counted as new neighborhoods. Other complexes not specifically mentioned in the text are also sorted according to approximate period of settlement.

We next superimpose 2 concentric circles on our maps of ethnographically-derived neighborhood histories to help evaluate the degree to which the concentric image applies to our setting. While the overall map of the Hispanic population presented in Figure 1 shows no discernable pattern, if we look back through time at the historical evolution of Durham’s Hispanic neighborhoods a very different picture emerges, one in which a handful of point-of-entry communities emerged, and subsequent expansion emanated from this early “core.” The earliest neighborhoods are concentrated southeast of downtown; all but 1 of the intermediate neighborhoods falls within the middle concentric circle; and 60 percent of the newer neighborhoods fall in the outer circle. The correlation between our social history and the superimposed circles suggests that while not perfect, the temporal sequence described by the Chicago School does conform roughly to Hispanic immigrants in Durham.

Moreover, mapping Hispanic settlement against black residential composition shows a racial element to the progression of Hispanic neighborhoods. As the Hispanic population moves outward, there appears to be a slight tendency to move away from segregated black communities, particularly in the newest areas of settlement. However, even in the newest immigrant neighborhoods Hispanics tend to enter predominantly black apartment complexes. What distinguishes these areas from earlier areas of settlement is that the larger surrounding areas are predominantly white and neighborhood amenities are more plentiful.

The connection with transportation lines and highways is diffuse. The Durham area does not exhibit the pattern of highways radiating out from a central city expected in other localities. The main corridor is arguably highway I-40 to the South of the city that connects Raleigh, Durham, and Chapel Hill. However, early Hispanic immigrant neighborhoods were located

not near this major artery, but rather to the east of downtown. Likewise, subsequent neighborhood development did not seem to follow other major roadways. One main reason for the weak association between highways and immigrant neighborhood formation is that the area remains relatively low-density, especially as compared to Chicago or Los Angeles but also relative other new destinations such as Atlanta. Data from the 2000 Census indicate a population of 340 per square mile of land area in Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, compared to 671 for Atlanta, 2,344 for Los Angeles-Long Beach, and 1,634 for Chicago (<http://www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/density.html>). As such, proximity to highways thus does not confer the same advantages in Durham as in larger cities.

In many ways, Carrboro settlements, located to the West of Durham in Figure 2, reflect a mix of influences. Many immigrants enter Carrboro directly, either from abroad or from another state. As described above, the Carrboro community had its own process of neighborhood evolution, with immigrants spreading out from *El Cerezo*. However, Carrboro, which is located to southwest of Durham, has significantly fewer black residents than Durham, and is part of the larger cultural environment spilling over from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. There is a generalized perception of greater tolerance towards immigrants in the area which is reflected in the election of a Hispanic (also the founder of the Latino Credit Union) to the Board of Aldermen in 2001. Coupled with a better school system, many immigrants perceive a move from Durham to Carrboro as a step up in social and spatial position. Thus Carrboro experiences the force of spatial assimilation within its own boundaries and is also connected to the process of spatial assimilation in Durham.

Finally, while not plotted in our map, trailer parks are also an important part of the process of outward mobility and decentralization. Trailer communities are scattered throughout Carrboro and Durham, and to a lesser extent Chapel Hill (in fact the only areas with large immigrant shares in Chapel Hill proper are in a handful of trailer communities). Trailer parks are the most geographically dispersed of all places considered in this paper, and are located in more rural areas of considerable distance from the city center. They also generally lack Hispanic majorities.

The composition of Hispanic neighborhoods by social history and spatial location

The prior evidence points towards the usefulness of the Chicago School for understanding the spatial history of Hispanic neighborhoods in Durham. However, the spatial assimilation model also implies a social hierarchy in settlement patterns. Rather than maturing, the initial neighborhoods of settlement should remain ports of entry for the continuing flow of immigrants, while more established residents move on to more attractive locations. Understanding this connection is different from the simple temporal description of outward movement because it implies that the composition of these neighborhoods should also follow a pattern of succession with new arrivals and more disadvantaged immigrants over-represented in the earliest ethnic neighborhoods.

To investigate the issue, Table 1 compares overall neighborhood demographics and the characteristics of the Hispanic population in particular across neighborhood types. The left hand side of the table reports tract level averages drawing on 2000 census data; the middle panel neighborhood averages from the 2002/3 targeted sample; and the right-hand side of the table from the 2006/7 targeted sample.⁴ We are thus able to provide external validation

⁴These figures are computed as the average of all individuals in each neighborhood type, and are not the average of neighborhood averages. Thus these estimates are not unduly influenced by the composition of smaller neighborhoods.

of our original survey data and add a longitudinal dimension to our analysis of neighborhood composition.

Table 1 shows a clear relationship between neighborhood composition and phase of settlement. The tracts we identified as being early sites of Hispanic settlement had larger representations of Hispanic, black, and poor residents at the tract level in the 2000 census, as well as higher vacancy rates and lower average rental prices, compared to neighborhoods that developed later. For instance, compared to the census tracts in which the newest neighborhoods were located, the tracts with the earliest neighborhoods contained 6 percentage points more Hispanics, 21 percentage points more blacks, 10 percentage points more poor, and 2 percentage points more vacancies. Median rents were also \$160 higher in new relative to early neighborhoods.

While our targeted sample did not contain information on the larger census tract economic and racial composition, our data also show marked differences in Hispanic composition across neighborhood types. Specifically, in 2002 foreign born Hispanics comprised 88 percent of early Hispanic neighborhoods in our social history. This figure seems to represent a saturation level as it increased only slightly, to 89 percent, by 2006/7. Intermediate neighborhoods were also predominantly Hispanic by 2002/3, but at 53 percent were clearly not as well established as their earlier counterparts. By 2006/7, fully 78 percent of residents in these neighborhoods were immigrant Hispanics. Neighborhoods classified as new were not in our original sample because they lacked sufficient numbers of Hispanics to justify inclusion. Nevertheless, with the accelerating growth in the Hispanic population during the early 2000s, these areas were already 71 percent Hispanic by 2006/7. The Carrboro neighborhoods included in our sample (also not surveyed in 2002) were roughly 79 percent Hispanic in 2006/7. While we did not collect systematic data on the ethnic composition of the trailer communities, Hispanics generally constituted less than a quarter of the population there.

Table 1 also documents considerable variation across neighborhoods with respect to the characteristics of Hispanic residents in particular. In both the census and the targeted survey data residents of the earliest neighborhoods were more recently arrived and spoke less English than their peers in Hispanic neighborhoods that formed later. The fact that this pattern remains across 3 different periods of observation and 2 different data sources attests to the enduring nature of point-of-entry communities over time. To illustrate the magnitude of these differences across neighborhoods, in our targeted 2006/7 survey 71 percent of early neighborhood residents had arrived in the five years prior to interview, relative to only 60 percent in intermediate and 54 percent in new neighborhoods. Carrboro has a similar level of new arrivals as intermediate and newer areas in Durham (61 percent), while the lowest share by far is found in trailer parks (49 percent). Likewise, in 2006/7 68 percent of residents in newer neighborhoods reported being able to speak some English, relative to 61 and 55 percent in intermediate and early neighborhoods, respectively. Once again, Carrboro is more akin to newer Durham neighborhoods, and trailers stand out as having the highest share of English speakers, 70 and 81 percent, respectively. While rates of documentation are low across the board,⁵ residents of the earliest neighborhoods are somewhat less likely than others to be legal residents. The highest percentage is registered among trailer park residents (21 percent).

⁵The one exception is the unusually high rate of documentation among residents of intermediate neighborhoods in 2002/3. This anomaly is explained by the clustering of immigrants by national origin and the temporary surge, in percentage terms, in legal residents that resulted from the TPS (temporary protected status) visas given to Hondurans after Hurricane Mitch. By 2006/7 a greater share of Hondurans had entered the country outside of the TPS system (i.e., undocumented), and the concentration of visa holders was not as pronounced.

Hispanics' socioeconomic characteristics also vary across neighborhoods in accordance with the spatial assimilation model. In the census and both rounds of targeted surveys residents of early stage Hispanic neighborhoods averaged lower levels of education and income, and were more concentrated in Hispanic occupational niches. Using the targeted survey as an illustration, in 2006/7 residents of the earliest neighborhoods averaged 6.6 years of education, relative to 7.8 and 7.5 among residents of intermediate and new neighborhoods, respectively. Even higher average levels of education are registered in Carrboro and among trailer park residents, 8.2 and 9.4 years, respectively. Ranging from \$10.30 to \$10.90 an hour, average wages do not differ significantly across neighborhood types, though residents of trailers do earn more (\$11.40). There are, however, important differences in industrial concentration across apartments. In 2006/7, for instance, fully 73 percent of early neighborhood residents worked in construction, compared to 68 percent and 62 percent among intermediate and new neighborhoods, respectively. Concentration in construction is even lower in Carrboro (47 percent) and trailer parks (49 percent). In addition, early neighborhoods contain more men working in predominantly Hispanic worksites than newly formed areas, 84 and 60 percent, respectively. Again, employment in segregated environments is lower in Carrboro (54 percent) and trailer parks (42 percent). To the extent that concentration in construction and more ethnically constrained jobs reflects lower incorporation into the mainstream, these results are consistent with the expectation that initial neighborhoods maintain their segregated character in spite of their longer existence.

Finally, differences in family status are also pronounced across neighborhood types in both data sources. The share of men who are accompanied by a spouse rather than single, separated, divorced or married and living apart from their wives, is considerably higher in new than in earlier neighborhoods. For example, in early neighborhoods in 2006/7 only 25 percent of all households are composed of accompanied married men, while in the newest communities this figure is 41 percent. The corollary is that while 64 percent of all households contain women in newer communities, only 48 percent do in early neighborhoods. Family and gender composition has been found to be a central predictor of neighborhood organization, with the presence of women reducing excessive alcohol consumption and other health risks such as sex worker use (Parrado and Flippen, 2010). Again, Carrboro neighborhoods fall somewhere in between, reflecting their greater heterogeneity; unaccompanied married men account for only 22 percent of residents and 52 percent of apartments contain women. The trailer communities stand out as having a much lower representation of unaccompanied married men (12 percent) as well as much higher proportion of households with a female resident (86 percent).

As a further test of the applicability of a more stringent spatial assimilation paradigm to the distribution of neighborhoods, we also compared neighborhoods in their ethnic, immigration, socioeconomic, and family structure characteristics according to the concentric circles depicted in Figure 2. Results, reported in Appendix 1, show remarkable similarity with those that obtain from the social history. Compared to neighborhoods in outer rings, neighborhoods in inner rings have a higher concentration of Hispanics, recent immigrants, poor English speakers, undocumented immigrants, less educated immigrants, workers in construction and segregated Hispanic worksites, and unaccompanied married men.

The sorting of immigrants into neighborhoods: individual level processes

The overlap between social and ecological processes described above supports basic tenets of the spatial assimilation model. These average neighborhood characteristics, however, do not capture the underlying mechanisms that sort individuals into particular neighborhoods. The next set of analyses examines Hispanic neighborhood formation from the opposite

perspective, by investigating the individual level factors that predict residence in particular neighborhoods.

Ethnographic data strongly support the relationship between social status and residential location. In many ways early Hispanic neighborhoods personify the image of the highly disadvantaged port-of-entry immigrant communities. *La Maldita* is an excellent example, as indicated by the very name given it by immigrants; translated literally it means the damned or cursed neighborhood. The community benefits from the dense web of ties between residents, as described above. At the same time, however, the preponderance of newly arrived and unaccompanied men, who often congregate in open areas playing cards and drinking alcohol, create an environment that is regarded by most residents as inhospitable to women and children. Interviewees commonly report that because *La Maldita* was perceived as dangerous, immigrants sought to move to more secure environment as soon as their circumstances allowed. While men might tolerate the crowded and run down conditions in order to remit as much money as possible to their families, when they are able to bring their wives and children to Durham they move out. As one man who had moved away from *La Maldita* put it, “While I was alone there it was fine for me, but when my wife came it was not a good environment to leave a woman alone.” Likewise, a woman who had moved some years earlier from *La Maldita* to the Ash Meadows apartments recounted how she had moved because she didn’t want her two children to remain there when they became adolescents, for fear that the alcohol and drug use in the area would be a bad influence on them. As part of this movement, other neighborhoods became more known for housing more families, and for their more tranquil environments, though these reputations sometimes changed over time.

These personal characteristics associated with incorporation, time of residence, and family status undergird the variation in neighborhood conditions reported above. To investigate this issue more systematically, Table 2 presents results from a simple multinomial logit model predicting propensities to reside in the different neighborhood types (i.e., intermediate or new neighborhood in Durham, Carrboro, or trailer parks) relative to living in an early Durham neighborhood, according to the individual socioeconomic, immigration, and family structure characteristics described above. Estimates support the expectation that this sorting is not random but rather closely associated with personal resources, family status, and measures of incorporation. Educational attainment is a strong predictor of where immigrants live; better educated immigrants are significantly more likely than their less educated peers to live in areas outside of early areas of settlement. The effect is particularly strong for residence in a trailer park. Interestingly, wages do not predict residential location, suggesting the primacy of other dimensions of incorporation in structuring neighborhood choice. Employment in construction and segregated Hispanic worksites, on the other hand, are highly predictive of residential patterns. Construction workers are less likely than other workers to live in Carrboro and trailers. Likewise, men who work in segregated Hispanic worksites are less likely to live outside of point-of-entry communities.

That education and segregated employment capture processes of integration and participation was reinforced by models that did not include them as predictors. These results show that education and work in segregated Hispanic worksites are highly correlated with immigrants’ ability to speak English. While the full model reported in Table 2 shows no effect for English ability on neighborhood location, models that exclude education and segregated worksites show English fluency to be positively associated with residence in intermediate and new neighborhoods in Durham, as well as residence in Carrboro and trailer parks.

Additional evidence of a social sequence in spatial assimilation is found in the relationship between immigration characteristics and residential location. As time in Durham increases so too does the likelihood of residing outside areas of initial settlement; the effect is particularly large for Carrboro and trailer parks. Being a legal resident does not appear to significantly affect neighborhood location, though the small size of the documented population could mask its importance. Evidence from our ethnographic data suggest that the requirements for renting an apartment vary dramatically across neighborhoods; in complexes with weak demand, management often accepts less stringent proof of employment, waives deposit requirements, and lower the standards for confirming identity. In areas with firmer demand, apartment managers often require two months of official paystubs (thus eliminating people who are paid in cash), a valid social security number with which to run a credit check, and other documentation that are difficult for many immigrants, particularly the recently arrived, to come by. While our models do not pick up the effect of these processes, there is some evidence that net of other characteristics, undocumented immigrants tend to gravitate towards Carrboro. This effect could be a reflection of the perceived greater level of tolerance of immigrants in the area.

The centrality of family status to residential location is also clearly evident in Table 2. Unaccompanied married men are significantly less likely than their married counterparts to live in intermediate and new Durham neighborhoods, supporting the ethnographic data that married men seek to leave point-of-entry communities when they are joined by their families. The same does not apply to single men, in part because their residential location is often driven by the presence of family in the area, which includes married relatives. In the case of trailer parks, the most salient characteristic differentiating them from early settlements is the greater likelihood of residing with an adult, non-spouse woman. The coincidence of gender composition and family status makes it difficult to separate both effects; models estimated without controls for gender composition illustrate the importance of family status, as unaccompanied men are significantly less likely to reside in trailer parks.

Finally, we also estimated multivariate logit models of the individual predictors of residential location using concentric circles instead of our social history classification. Results, reported in Appendix 2, show remarkably similar patterns to those reported above. That is, factors such as education, employment in segregated Hispanic worksites, experience in Durham, and family structure all predict physical distance from initial point-of-entry communities. Thus even in this highly decentralized urban form immigrants are differentially sorted across space in Durham, with better established, higher status immigrants living further from the city center than their less established and lower status counterparts.

Conclusions

Informed by the debate between the Chicago and Los Angeles schools of urban sociology, this paper traces the origins and early evolution of a Hispanic immigrant community in Durham, NC. Compared to the immigrant receiving cities upon which the Chicago School was based, new Hispanic destinations represent a markedly different urban landscape characterized by sprawling decentralization of both employment and residence, predominance of black-white relations, and lack of prior immigrant communities. The main question guiding the analysis was whether these characteristics would alter the processes connecting social and spatial dynamics outlined by the spatial assimilation model.

Indeed, on the surface Durham's Hispanic settlement patterns look very different from the ethnic neighborhoods described by the Chicago school. Hispanic neighborhoods are not spatially contiguous but rather concentrated in aging apartment complexes that are scattered

across the area. It would be easy to assume that Durham's patch-work style pattern of development would decouple Hispanic settlement patterns from those observed among immigrants to more concentrated, centralized cities with clear residential areas and a longstanding history of immigrant neighborhoods.

But underneath the more dispersed pattern and in spite of major differences in historical experience with immigration, Durham follows many of the same basic processes that informed the Chicago School. Initial places of settlements were dictated by the socioeconomic characteristics of the early immigrants to Durham; their lack of resources channeled early immigrants to run-down, largely African American neighborhoods with high vacancy rates and lacking in amenities to the south and east of downtown. Subsequently Hispanic neighborhoods expanded outward in a spatial pattern that loosely conforms to the concentric circle representation dominant in the Chicago School. Moreover, the earliest neighborhoods to form did not mature and evolve into neighborhoods of more settled immigrants but rather retained their point-of-entry character over time.

In addition, even at these initial stages of community formation there is a clear association between social and spatial attainment. Both the ethnographic and quantitative data show that immigrants with greater resources (particularly education) are more likely to disperse outward, to more recently-formed and higher amenity neighborhoods. However, rather than wages it is factors such as the ability to speak English and working outside of Hispanic worksites and niches (i.e., construction) that correlate with residence in better neighborhoods. Especially important are the role of family status and the presence of women; immigrants residing with a spouse or another adult female resident tend to gravitate to better neighborhoods. These social capital dimensions have been somewhat overlooked in prior investigations, but are a central mechanism linking the population dynamics of the immigration flow with prospects for spatial assimilation in new destinations.

Durham also conforms to the Chicago School model in the pattern of inter-racial contact entailed in Hispanic neighborhood development. The movement towards higher amenity neighborhoods described in the spatial assimilation model implicitly assumes movement towards majority white areas. While this view has been criticized for its obfuscation of the potential for immigrant integration with the black middle class, the pattern of Hispanic neighborhood formation in Durham is consistent with a gradual movement away from areas of black concentration. However, it is unclear whether black concentration per se represents a disamenity for Hispanic immigrants, or whether it is the association of these areas with lower quality housing and social environments that encourages better-off immigrants to move elsewhere. The fact that the most recent Hispanic neighborhoods are also located in or proximate to black neighborhoods where the surrounding area is both whiter and less run down supports the latter interpretation. How Hispanics fit within the traditional black-white divide in the South, and how the growth of the region's black middle class will affect residential patterns, remain to be seen.

These patterns are not completely at odds with the depiction of Los Angeles. Especially if we take a broader view of the region, including Durham, Carrboro, and neighboring Raleigh, NC, we see that Hispanic settlement is indeed multi-nucleated. But the key finding is that even within (and to some extent across) these multiple and varied nuclei, there is a clear pattern to settlement over time. Given the marked differences in urban form between turn-of-the-century Chicago and contemporary Durham, these findings raise the question as to why the Chicago School model continues to be relevant. Here, insight from the political economy perspective is instructive. Like earlier waves of immigrants arriving to pre-war cities, Hispanics in Durham are drawn to the United States by a strong demand for inexpensive, low-skilled labor. They enter both the labor and housing markets at a decidedly

disadvantaged position. And, like pre-war Chicago, the housing market in Durham is expanding rapidly, creating vacancy chains that make room for new entrants at the bottom. This helps explain why neighborhoods can go from almost completely black to almost completely Hispanic over the span of a few years without setting off riots or other forms of severe ethnic conflict.

In addition, as Gans (2002) notes, spatial differences between the Chicago of the 1920s and contemporary new destinations may not be as pronounced as one would think, especially when considering the locational choices open to immigrants. In new and old destinations alike immigrants are steered to particular neighborhoods based not only on their economic position, but also by the location of both family and friends *and* institutional actors. For instance, early employers sometimes provided housing to new arrivals, steering them to particular parts of town. More importantly, contractors in search of labor often recruit in specific neighborhoods, further enhancing the immigrant nature of all areas within walking distance. We also uncovered numerous examples of rental apartment managers and staff actively recruiting Hispanic tenants, and changing rental requirements as needed to boost occupancy. Taken together, the spatially bounded social networks and practices of institutional actors such as employers and apartment managers seeking to capitalize on nearby immigrant populations help explain how Hispanic settlement could develop radially even in a disjointed urban form.

Our analysis also has a number of implications over and above their interest as a model of urban evolution. The existence of point-of-entry communities and their association with neighborhood disorder is a topic that has preoccupied urban scholars at least since the early 1900s. In Durham, the earliest areas of Hispanic settlement continue to concentrate recent arrivals and unaccompanied men, with negative repercussions for health risk behaviors such as alcohol abuse and commercial sex (Parrado and Flippen, 2010; Parrado, Flippen & Uribe 2009). These neighborhoods remain important targets for interventions seeking to improve the health and functioning of immigrant populations.

A few caveats are in order. Chicago School authors were not always explicit regarding the time frame of their theories, which were variably applied to immigrants themselves and to their descendants. Our study describes the formative years of the Durham Hispanic community. We focus on the residential patterns of recently arrived immigrants and the processes connected to their spatial and social distribution mainly across rental units. As more immigrants achieve homeownership, however, the pattern of dispersion should presumably continue. Nevertheless, as the Hispanic population continues to grow larger, more well-defined ethnic neighborhoods could potentially emerge. Likewise, our study focuses on low-skill Hispanic immigrants in a single locale and does not speak to how settlement patterns differ among more highly skilled immigrant groups in Durham, or among Hispanic immigrants to other new destinations. This analysis of Durham's early Hispanic communities should be viewed as a benchmark with which subsequent analyses can be compared.

References

- Alba, Richard; Logan, John; Stults, Brian. The Changing Neighborhood Contexts of the Immigrant Metropolis. *Social Forces*. 2000; 79:587–621.
- Alba, Richard; Logan, John; Bellair, P. Living With Crime: The Implications of Racial and Ethnic Differences in Suburban Location. *Social Forces*. 1994; 73:395–434.
- Alba, Richard; Logan, John; Stults, B.J.; Marzan, G.; Zhang, W. Immigrant Groups in the Suburbs: A Reexamination of Suburbanization and Spatial Assimilation. *American Sociological Review*. 1999; 64:446–460.

- Bailey, Raleigh. New Immigrant Communities in the North Carolina Piedmont Triad: Integration Issues and Challenges. In: Gozdzia, Elzbieta; Martin, Susan, editors. Beyond the Gateway: Immigrants in an Changing America. New York: Lexington Books; 2005. p. 57-85.
- Burgess, EW. The Growth of the City. In: Park, RE.; Burgess, EW.; McKenzie, R., editors. The City: Suggestions of Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1925. p. 47-62.
- Castells, Manuel. The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach. London: Edward Arnold; 1977.
- Dear, Michael; Schockman, Eric; Hise, y Greg, editors. Rethinking Los Angeles. London: Sage; 1996.
- Dear, Michael. Los Angeles and the Chicago School: Invitation to a Debate. City and Community. 2002; 1:5-32.
- Denton, Nancy; Massey, Douglas. Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians by Socioeconomic Status and Generation. Social Science Quarterly. 1998; 69:797-817.
- Durand, Jorge; Massey, Douglas; Capoferro, Chiara. The New Geography of Mexican Immigration. In: Zuniga, Victor; Hernandez-Leon, Ruben, editors. New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2005. p. 1-20.
- Firey, Walter. Sentiment and Symbolism as Ecological Variables. American Sociological Review. 1945; 10:140-8.
- Fogelson, RM. The Fragmented Metropolis: Los Angeles. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 1967. p. 1850-1970.
- Gans, Herbert J. The Sociology of Space: A Use-Centered Approach. City and Community. 2002; 1:329-339.
- Garreau, J. Edge City: Life on the New Frontier. New York: Anchor Books; 1991.
- Gottdiener, M.; Klephart, G. The Multinucleated Metropolitan Region. In: Kling, R.; Spencer, O.; Poster, M., editors. Postsuburban California: The Transformation of Orange County Since World War II. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 1991. p. 31-54.
- Gozdzia, Elzbieta; Martin, Susan, editors. Beyond the Gateway: Immigrants in an Changing America. New York: Lexington Books; 2005.
- Griffith, David. Rural Industry and Mexican Immigration and Settlement in North Carolina. In: Zuniga, Victor; Hernandez-Leon, Ruben, editors. New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2005. p. 50-75.
- Harris, Chauncy D.; Ullman, Edward L. The nature of cities. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 1945; 242:7-17.
- Hoyt, H. The structure and growth of residential neighborhoods in American Cities. Washington: U.S. Federal Housing Administration; 1939.
- Fulton, William. The Reluctant Metropolis: The Politics of Urban Growth in Los Angeles. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press; 1997.
- Israel, Barbara; Eng, E.; Schulz, A.; Parker, E., editors. Methods in Community-based Participatory Research for Health. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2005.
- Johnson-Webb, Karen D. Recruiting Hispanic Labor: Immigrants in Non-traditional Areas. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC; 2003.
- Lefebvre, H. The Production of Space. Oxford: Blackwell; 1991.
- Li, Wei. Anatomy of a new ethnic settlement: The Chinese ethnoburb in Los Angeles. Urban Studies. 1998; 35:479-501.
- Logan, John; Molotch, Harvey. Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place. Los Angeles: University of California Press; 1987.
- Logan, John; Alba, Richard. Locational Returns to Human Capital: Minority Access to Sub-urban Community Resources. Demography. 1993; 30:243-68. [PubMed: 8500639]
- Logan, John; Zhang, Wenquan; Alba, Richard. Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles. American Sociological Review. 2002; 67:299-322.
- Massey, Douglas. Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Review. Sociology and Social Research. 1985; 69:315-50.
- Massey, Douglas; Denton, Nancy. American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 1993.

- Park, Robert; Burgess, Ernest W.; McKenzie, Roderick D. *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1925.
- Parrado, Emilio A.; Flippen, Chenoa. Community attachment, neighborhood context, and sex worker use among Hispanic migrants in Durham, NC. *Social Science and Medicine*. 2010; 70(7):1059–1069. [PubMed: 20122769]
- Parrado, Emilio A.; Flippen, Chenoa; Uribe, Leonardo. Concentrated Disadvantages: Neighborhood Context as a Structural Risk for Latino Immigrants in the US. In: Haour-Knipe, Mary; Aggleton, Peter; Thomas, Felicity, editors. *Dangerous Liaisons? Mobility, Sexuality and AIDS*. 2009. p. 40-54.
- Parrado, Emilio A.; Kandel, William. New Hispanic Migrant Destinations: A Tale of Two Industries. In: Massey, Douglas S., editor. *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2008. p. 99-123.
- Parrado, Emilio A.; McQuiston, Chris; Flippen, Chenoa. Participatory Survey Research: Integrating Community Collaboration and Quantitative Methods for the Study of Gender and HIV Risks among Hispanic Migrants. *Sociological Methods and Research*. 2005; 34(2):204–239.
- Rosenbaum, Emily; Friedman, S. Differences in the Locational Attainment of Immigrant and Native-Born Households with Children in New York City. *Demography*. 2001; 38:337–48. [PubMed: 11523262]
- Sampson, Robert J. Studying Modern Chicago. *City and Community*. 2002; 1:45–48.
- Sassen, Saskia. *Cities in a World Economy*. London: Sage Publications; 2006.
- Scott, Allen J.; Soja, Edward J. *The City: Los Angeles and Urban Theory at the End of the Twentieth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press; 1996.
- Smith, Heather A.; Furuseth, Owen J. Housing, Hispanics and Transitioning Geographies in Charlotte, North Carolina. *Southern Geographer*. 2004; 44:216–235.
- Soja, Edward. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. New York: Verso; 1989.
- South, Scott J.; Crowder, Kyle; Chavez, Erick. Migration and Spatial Assimilation among U.S. Latinos: Classical versus Segmented Trajectories. *Demography*. 2005; 42:497–521. [PubMed: 16235610]
- Sorkin, M., editor. *Variations on a Theme park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*. New York: Hill and Wang; 1992.
- Suro, Robert. *The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways (The Living Cities Census Series)*. Washington, DC: Center for Urban and Metropolitan Policy, The Brookings Institute; 2004.
- Suro, Robert; Singer, Audrey. Report. Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy and the Pew Hispanic Center. Washington, D.C.: 2002. *Hispanic Growth in Metropolitan America: Changing Patterns and New Location*.
- Walton, John. Urban Sociology: The Contribution and Limits of Political Economy. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 1993; 19:301–320.
- Waters, Mary C.; Jimenez, Tomas R. Assessing Immigrant Assimilation: New Empirical and Theoretical Challenges. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2005; 31:105–25.
- Yu, Zhou. A different path to homeownership: The case of Taiwanese immigrants in Los Angeles. *Housing Studies*. 2006; 21:555–579.
- Zorbaugh, Harvey. The Natural Areas of the City. In: Burgess, EW., editor. *The Urban Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1926. p. 219-229.
- Zuniga, Victor; Hernandez-Leon, Ruben, editors. *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2005.

Appendix 1. Variation in Demographic, Immigration, and Socioeconomic Characteristics according to Concentric Circles

	Durham Hispanic Survey						
	2002/3		2006/7				
	Inner	Middle	Inner	Middle	Outer	Carrboro	Trailers
Neighborhood Characteristics							
% Hispanic	91.9	66.1	94.9	74.7	71.2	78.8	-
Characteristics of the Hispanic population							
Migration Experience							
% recent ^a	47.4	44.0	70.8	60.2	53.8	61.1	48.8
% speaks English well	43.1	64.3	54.7	61.1	67.9	70.4	81.4
% documented	6.0	26.1	6.6	9.5	7.3	7.6	20.9
Socioeconomic characteristics							
% less 9 years education	67.2	49.4	62.7	51.7	53.4	42.4	27.9
Hourly wage	9.39	9.99	10.30	10.87	10.81	10.51	11.4
% in construction	64.7	57.7	72.6	67.8	62.2	46.5	48.8
% in segregated Hispanic worksites	-	-	84.0	66.1	59.5	54.1	41.9
Family structure							
% accompanied married	37.1	44.8	25.5	41.7	41.2	43.0	32.6
% female in unit	41.4	61.8	48.1	67.2	63.7	51.7	86.1
N individuals	116	241	106	312	307	169	43
N neighborhoods	5	5	6	15	7	7	5

Source: 2006/7 Durham Hispanic Survey

Note: Neighborhood composition was not collected for trailer communities, and worksite information was not collected in 2002/3

^a Refers to those migrating 3 years prior to survey

Appendix 2. Multinomial Logit Model Predicting of Residential Location according to Location in Concentric Circles

	Neighborhood type (ref=inner)							
	Middle	(s.e.)	Outer	(s.e.)	Carrboro	(s.e.)	Trailer	(s.e.)
Socioeconomic characteristics								
Education	0.103 ***	(0.037)	0.080 **	(0.038)	0.123 ***	(0.045)	0.248 ***	(0.065)
Hourly wage	0.026	(0.044)	0.013	(0.045)	0.001	(0.050)	0.051	(0.063)
Construction employment	-0.260	(0.270)	-0.092	(0.276)	-0.962 ***	(0.309)	-0.633	(0.419)
Segregated Hispanic worksite	-0.717 **	(0.319)	-1.469 ***	(0.315)	-1.208 ***	(0.351)	-1.686 ***	(0.445)
Migration Experience								
Years in Durham	0.080 *	(0.044)	0.067	(0.045)	0.117 **	(0.048)	0.117 **	(0.060)
Internal migrant	0.142	(0.249)	-0.214	(0.257)	3.566 ***	(0.427)	0.116	(0.405)
Speaks English well	-0.362	(0.253)	0.347	(0.263)	-0.073	(0.308)	0.166	(0.484)

City Community. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2014 January 28.

	Neighborhood type (ref=inner)							
	Middle	(s.e.)	Outer	(s.e.)	Carrboro	(s.e.)	Trailer	(s.e.)
Documented	0.220	(0.461)	-0.503	(0.499)	-1.158 **	(0.533)	0.377	(0.617)
Family structure								
Single	-0.287	(0.307)	-0.454	(0.313)	0.126	(0.357)	-0.521	(0.468)
Unaccompanied married	-0.733 **	(0.326)	-0.811 **	(0.334)	-0.430	(0.390)	-0.968	(0.610)
Female in unit	0.224	(0.244)	0.026	(0.250)	-0.241	(0.290)	1.018 **	(0.419)
Constant	0.944	(0.628)	1.529 **	(0.637)	-1.627 **	(0.803)	-2.704 ***	(1.048)
Chi-square	381.8 **							

Source: 2006/7 Durham Hispanic Survey

*

p< .10

**

p<.05

p<.01

Figure 1.
Map of Survey Neighborhoods and Percent Hispanic by Block in 2000 in Durham, NC

Figure 2.
Map of Survey Neighborhoods according to Period of Formation and Percent Black by Block in 1990 in Durham, NC

Table 1

Variation in Demographic, Immigration, and Socioeconomic Characteristics according to Stage of Hispanic Neighborhood Formation

	2000 Census				2002/3				Durham Hispanic Survey			
	Early	Int'med.	New	Carrboro	Early	Int'med.	Early	Int'med.	New	Carrboro	Trailers	
Neighborhood Characteristics												
% Hispanic	21.9	18.4	16.2	11.5	88.0	53.2	89.3	78.0	71.4	78.8	-	
% Black	65.4	44.0	44.1	14.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
% Poor	37.7	30.9	28.1	13.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
% Vacant units	15.8	14.4	13.7	13.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Median rent (\$)	410.0	520.0	570.0	630.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Characteristics of the Hispanic population												
Migration Experience												
% recent ^a	92.5	85.4	89.0	80.7	47.4	45.4	70.8	60.2	53.8	61.1	48.8	
% speaks some English	64.9	72.6	76.9	71.8	43.1	59.6	54.7	61.1	67.9	70.4	81.4	
% documented	-	-	-	-	6.0	22.3	6.6	9.5	7.3	7.6	20.9	
Socioeconomic characteristics												
% less 9 years education	52.3	36.6	40.5	32.3	67.2	51.5	65.1	51.8	53.4	42.4	27.9	
Income (\$) ^b	16,222	18,713	17,335	16,343	9.39	9.96	10.30	10.87	10.81	10.51	11.4	
% in construction	58.4	60.5	49.3	45.0	64.7	58.2	72.6	67.8	62.2	46.5	48.8	
% in segregated Hisp. worksites	-	-	-	-	-	-	84.0	66.1	59.5	54.1	41.9	
Family structure												
% accompanied married	43.7	52.5	56.9	53.2	25.8	43.4	25.5	41.7	41.2	35.5	55.8	
% female in unit	-	-	-	-	41.4	58.2	48.1	67.2	63.7	51.7	86.1	
Male/female ratio (age 20-39)	3.0	2.2	2.1	2.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
N individuals					116	359	109	357	262	169	43	
N Tracts or neighborhoods	3	6	4	3	5	6	6	12	10	7	5	

Source: author calculations from 2000 U.S. Census, 2002/3 and 2006/7 Durham Hispanic Survey

Note: Neighborhood composition was not collected for trailer communities, and worksite information was not collected in 2002/3

^a In census recent immigration refers to 1990–2000, in our sample to those migrating 3 years prior to survey

b_j In census median annual income for full time workers, in our survey mean hourly wage

Table 2
Multinomial Logit Model Predicting of Residential Location according to Stage of Hispanic Neighborhood Formation

	Neighborhood type (ref=early)				
	Durham		Carrboro	Trailer	(s.e.)
	Intermed.	(s.e.)	New	(s.e.)	
<i>Socioeconomic characteristics</i>					
Education	0.105 ***	(0.037)	0.074 **	(0.038)	0.124 *** (0.045) 0.248 *** (0.065)
Hourly wage	0.021	(0.044)	0.019	(0.046)	0.001 (0.050) 0.052 (0.063)
Construction employment	-0.096	(0.268)	-0.306	(0.277)	-0.949 *** (0.309) -0.635 ** (0.418)
Segregated Hispanic worksite	-0.994 ***	(0.313)	-1.231 ***	(0.319)	-1.221 *** (0.350) -1.690 *** (0.444)
<i>Migration Experience</i>					
Years in Durham	0.070 *	(0.043)	0.082 *	(0.045)	0.117 ** (0.048) 0.118 ** (0.060)
Internal migrant	0.233	(0.246)	-0.395	(0.262)	3.562 *** (0.427) 0.123 *** (0.405)
Speaks English well	-0.234	(0.251)	0.214	(0.265)	-0.080 (0.308) 0.155 (0.484)
Documented	0.012	(0.462)	-0.189	(0.496)	-1.144 ** (0.532) 0.412 (0.616)
<i>Family structure</i>					
Single	-0.386	(0.304)	-0.319	(0.316)	0.125 (0.357) -0.514 (0.468)
Unaccompanied married	-0.735 **	(0.322)	-0.807 **	(0.340)	-0.424 (0.390) -0.965 (0.610)
Female in unit	0.273	(0.241)	-0.065	(0.253)	-0.228 (0.290) 1.018 ** (0.419)
Constant	1.134 *	(0.623)	1.437 **	(0.646)	-1.631 ** (0.804) -2.706 *** (1.049)
Chi-square	364.8 **				
N	940				

Source: 2006/7 Durham Hispanic Survey

* p< .10

** p<.05

*** p<.01