Published in final edited form as:

J Ethn Migr Stud. 2014 January 1; 40(1): 1–20. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2013.831549.

The role of immigrant enclaves for Latino residential inequalities

Richard Alba,

The Graduate Center, CUNY

Glenn Deane,

The University at Albany, SUNY

Nancy Denton,

The University at Albany, SUNY

Ilir Disha,

The University at Albany, SUNY

Brian McKenzie, and

U.S. Census Bureau

Jeffrey Napierala

The University at Albany, SUNY

Richard Alba: RAlba@gc.cuny.edu; Glenn Deane: gdeane@albany.edu; Nancy Denton: ndenton@albany.edu; Ilir Disha: id454135@albany.edu; Brian McKenzie: brian.mckenzie@census.gov; Jeffrey Napierala: jnapierala@hotmail.com

Abstract

We investigate the difference that immigrant enclaves make for the residential contexts of Latino families in the U.S. We argue that enclaves may no longer function simply as temporary way stations, the classic depiction of them, because of the compromised legal status of many Latinos. We examine this role with an innovative method that uses publicly available census tabulations (from the 2000 Census in our case) to develop HLM models, in which race/ethnicity and income are controlled at the family level, along with neighbourhood context and metropolitan characteristics. Comparing Latino residential patterns to those of whites and blacks reveals the large neighbourhood disadvantages of Latinos, which except for greater exposure to whites are on the order of those suffered by African Americans. We find that Hispanic families improve their residential situations as their incomes go up and usually also when they live in suburbs. But residence outside of immigrant enclaves produces the largest positive changes. The enclaves are a fundamentally different kind of residential space, in which the potential for neighbourhood improvement is modest.

Keywords

enclaves; neighbourhoods; spatial assimilation; place stratification; Hispanics; unauthorized

The residential situations of ethno-racial groups constitute one of the most important indicators of their relative standing in American society (Sharkey, 2008). By comparison with most European countries, minorities are more residentially segregated from the majority population in the U.S.; and the degree of inequality among neighbourhoods--in such basic respects as the condition of housing and the quality of schools--is also more severe (Peach 1996; Schonwalder and Sohn 2009; Wacquant 2008).

The social significance of residential location justifies the prominence of research into residential segregation in American sociology (Massey and Denton 1993). A huge literature on the residential segregation of blacks bears out its importance, but that on the segregation of other groups is more equivocal. In this paper, we focus on Hispanics, who tend to be cast in the segregation literature as an in-between population, in the sense that their levels of segregation fall short of the high values typically found for the black population (Iceland and Nelson 2008; Logan and Stults 2011).

More recently, many analysts have focused on inequalities among the neighbourhoods in which different groups reside rather than segregation per se (e.g., Krivo et al. 2009; Rosenbaum and Friedman 2007; Sampson and Sharkey 2008; Woldoff and Ovadia 2009). For segregation research offers a limited window on residential situations: Knowing how segregated a group is does not necessarily tell us what kinds of neighbourhoods its members typically live in. The alternative focus reveals that, on average, Latinos experience substantial residential disadvantages, i.e., that the characteristics of their neighbourhoods, e.g., in the risk of criminal victimization, are much inferior to those of the white majority (Krivo et al. 2009; Pais et al. 2011). For an understanding of these inequalities, a locational-attainment modeling strategy, in which characteristics of neighbourhoods are predicted by household and personal variables, offers evident benefits. Recent research employing locational-attainment models has contributed numerous insights into Hispanic residential patterns (Sampson and Sharkey 2008; Pais et al 2011).

In this paper, we join this line of research and aim for two sorts of contributions. First, we call attention to the critical role of immigrant enclaves for Latino residential inequalities. The immigrant enclave as a starting point for the settlement process has long been highlighted in the well-known spatial-assimilation model (Massey 1985; Logan et al 2002). However, its role is possibly enhanced for Latinos because of the large number of Latin-American immigrants in compromised legal status, impairing their residential mobility. For those who remain within its confines, the immigrant-rich residential space offers a restricted range for residential improvements. To advance in residential terms, Hispanics usually have to leave enclaves.

The second contribution is methodological. A general difficulty with the locational-attainment strategy is estimating the models. Publicly available census data sets do not provide individual- or household-level records combined with small-area (e.g., census tract) characteristics (Alba and Logan, 1993). Many recent analyses rely therefore on surveys to which neighbourhood data have been appended, such as the PSID (South et al. 2008; Pais et al 2011) or the Chicago survey undertaken by Sampson and his colleagues (Sampson and Sharkey 2008). These surveys are often limited either by geography, to a single metropolitan area, or by samples that do not contain large numbers of Latinos.

We present a method for using publicly available census data to generate an appropriately multi-level locational-attainment model in which family income, a critical determinant of location since housing is “purchased” in a market (Pais et al. 2011), is controlled at the micro-level. Our method can use the American Community Survey data or long-form data from previous decennial censuses. Such data permit us to implement analyses of a wide range of neighbourhood characteristics, with extremely large Latino samples that can measure effects with much greater precision than can attained with other methods. The current paper focuses on two neighbourhood characteristics, the percent of non-Hispanic whites among residents, a measure of residential integration, and the percent who are employed in professional and managerial occupations, a socioeconomic feature.

Theoretical perspectives and their empirical support

Two theoretical models dominate the analysis of minority residential situations: One is the spatial assimilation model, which posits that the residential situations of the members of an immigrant-origin population are a function of their assimilation and socioeconomic statuses (Massey 1985). Upon arrival, immigrants have little choice about where to live. They typically reside in immigrant enclaves that in a variety of ways are disadvantaged environments (Logan et al. 2002). As they or the next generation, their children, gain familiarity with the mainstream society and mastery of its language and as they advance economically and/or occupationally, they seek to improve their residential situations. Since the majority population monopolizes the better neighbourhoods, the residential mobility of the newcomers often leads them into settings where many members of the majority reside, thus bringing about integration (Alba et al. 2000).

The other is the place stratification model, whose point of departure is the assumption of a hierarchy among places. It argues that the more privileged among them employ exclusionary stratagems, such as zoning regulations, to maintain their superior position (Logan and Alba 1993). Among the targets of exclusion are minorities such as African Americans and Latinos, who thus find it difficult or impossible to enter the best residential environments and must pay more than whites to significantly improve their surroundings. One implication is that even integration for minorities may not mean residential parity because they reside with others who are also disadvantaged (Quillian 2012).

The recent research literature offers something to both perspectives but comes down more decisively on the side of place stratification (Pais et al. 2011). Certainly, spatial assimilation appears to have a meaningful role in Hispanic residential patterns. For instance, research on inter-neighbourhood mobility sustains the premise that socioeconomic advance and increasing linguistic assimilation lead to greater Hispanic residential integration with whites, although with variations according to national origin (South et al. 2005). In addition, native-born Hispanics are less segregated than are immigrants, supporting a key contention of the spatial assimilation model about intergenerational change (Brown, 2007; Iceland and Nelson, 2008).

What is contested is whether Latinos can ever catch up to whites in residential terms. Pais et al (2011) distinguish two forms of place stratification: a weak form, in which some degree of convergence takes place because minorities experience greater residential improvements than whites for equal increments for income although whites still live in superior neighbourhoods at all income levels; and a strong form, in which no convergence occurs. Analyzing an indicator of neighbourhood socioeconomic status, they find considerable support for the strong form. Yet some research indicates that convergence with the residential patterns of whites can occur. Woldoff and Ovadia (2009) find that Hispanics who are not recent immigrants attain a neighbourhood quality that is similar to that of whites, and their ability to translate assets into neighbourhood quality is also similar to that of whites.

For an understanding of residential inequalities, an examination of neighbourhoods of group concentration is significant, for these are often areas with significant disadvantages. For example, Goldsmith (2008) finds that students who attended schools with high proportions of Hispanic students have worse educational outcomes in young adulthood than students from other schools. Frank et al (2007) find that residence in census tracts with above average levels of Hispanics and of poverty is associated with greater propensity by Hispanic adolescents to risky behavior such as substance abuse.

Moreover, for those who leave Hispanic neighbourhoods, mobility patterns of Hispanics seem not as constrained as are those of the other major minority, African Americans.

According to South et al. (2008; also Sampson and Sharkey, 2008), higher income and education enable Hispanics to move to more heavily Anglo neighbourhoods, and this is especially true of the U.S. born. Hispanics appear to have an easier time entering neighbourhoods with large numbers of Anglos than do blacks. Like Anglos, mobile Hispanics avoid neighbourhoods with sizable black populations.

Our focus here will be on a particular type of neighbourhood of group concentration, the immigrant enclave. This focus is justified by a distinctive feature of contemporary immigration: namely, the large number of Latin-American immigrants in compromised legal status, who either are unauthorized or hold an insecure legal position, such as the Temporary Protected Status granted to many Central Americans (Menjívar, 2006). The residential mobility of these individuals is likely to be impaired. First, recent research demonstrates how their lives are constrained by fear of exposure of their legal status (Gonzales, 2011; Menjívar, 2006), arguably making many reluctant to leave the protection of immigrant-rich neighbourhoods; second, they are hampered in the open housing market by such impediments as obtaining a bank mortgage. Approximately one fourth of the entire Hispanic population, immigrant and native born, is affected, when the U.S.-born children in the families of the immigrants are included.¹ Of course, there may be other reasons, cultural and social, why Latino families prefer the environment of immigrant enclaves; but the legal status variations are sufficient to justify positing an enhanced contemporary role for immigrant enclaves.

Data and method

Data selection

Our analysis is conducted with 2000 Census data, and all of our results have been produced with summary file 3 of that census. We have selected metropolitan regions (MSAs and PMSAs) for the analysis in accordance with our focus on immigrant enclaves. We selected, to begin with, any metropolitan region that was home to 10,000 or more individuals born in a single Latin American country, and we applied an immigrant-neighbourhood identification procedure, to be described shortly, to these regions. To make sure that the analysis includes important metropolitan types, we added to the analysis all of the top 50 regions by population size that were not selected by the immigrant-population criterion. Altogether, our analysis encompasses 108 regions, which in 2000 covered 84 percent of the Hispanic families in the nation.

Variable construction

The micro units of our analysis are families. This focus is justified by the importance of residential context for the life chances of children. In fundamental ways, children are more dependent on their immediate residential environments than adults are. The great majority attends local schools and plays with children who live near them (Lareau 2003). Children become familiar with the worlds of adults through the grown-ups they encounter in their residential environments, not only their parents and other relatives, but also neighbors and the parents of friends (Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn, 2000; Brooks-Gunn, Aber and Duncan, 1997).

At the family level, our key independent variables are income, which has been repeatedly demonstrated to be a major determinant of residential location (e.g., Pais et al, 2011), and

¹Passel and Cohn (2011) estimate that, in 2010, the number of unauthorized from Mexico and other Latin-American countries amounted to 9.1 million, and that their homes contain 3.9 million U.S.-born children; according to the decennial census, 50.5 million U.S. residents were Hispanic then. Most of the unauthorized appear in census and other official data (Passel, 2002), but they cannot be identified as such in data.

race/ethnicity (specifically: Hispanic,² non-Hispanic white, and black). To implement the analysis at the micro level, we take advantage of tract-level tables of family income by householder race/ethnicity. (The tables come from the P154 series in summary file 3; and in the black case, the table includes black Hispanics.) Each table, with 16 categories of income, is equivalent to a series of family-level cases; that is, it can be written as a series of such cases, as many as are counted in the table, with income (set at the mid-point of a category)³ and race/ethnicity as micro-variables and tract-level variables as neighbourhood characteristics. However, it is not straightforward with aggregated tract data to add additional micro-level variables to the list.

As is conventional, we take census tracts as suitable approximations to neighbourhoods, and we characterize tracts as residential outcomes, i.e., possible dependent variables, in a number of ways. We consider variables that depict the ethno-racial context, such as the percent of residents who are non-Hispanic white. We additionally examine variables that reflect the presence of immigrant populations, such as the percent of residents who speak English fluently. Another dimension of concern involves the socioeconomic aspects of the neighbourhood; among the indicators we use are: the median household income of the tract, and the percent of workers in professional and managerial occupations. We include some housing indicators, such as the degree of crowding (persons/room). For our multivariate analyses, we focus on two of these neighbourhood characteristics, the percent who are non-Hispanic white and the percent in professional and managerial occupations.

A key neighbourhood characteristic on the independent variable side of our analysis is whether a tract is located within a Latin-American immigrant enclave. Using geographical information system (GIS) procedures, we have identified immigrant neighbourhoods as clusters of adjacent tracts (Logan et al. 2002; Mitchell 2005).⁴ Our procedure uses the Anselin Moran's *i* statistic, applying it to the proportions that a specific country-of-origin group forms of the census tracts in a given metropolitan region. The statistic is a local indicator of spatial autocorrelation (LISA); here, it indicates the degree to which each census tract's proportional representation of a given group is similar to that of surrounding tracts, relative to the group's mean proportional representation of the entire metropolitan region. We include a census tract in a clustered ethnic residential area if its Moran's *i* statistic is significant at the 95 percent confidence level or better. We have found it necessary in some cases to make adjustments at the edges, to add bordering tracts that do not meet the local Moran's *i* criterion but contain concentrations of an immigrant group that are equal or superior to the average for a cluster. This procedure led to the identification of 394 immigrant neighbourhoods in the 108 metropolitan regions we consider (for further details, including some maps, see Alba et al 2010). In addition, we consider whether tracts are in central cities or outside of them, in suburbs, since suburbanization has in the past been argued to be a major stage in spatial assimilation (e.g., Massey and Denton 1988).

² Few Hispanics live in households with non-Hispanic householders. For the metropolitan areas analyzed here, 7.9% of Hispanics reside in such households.

³ For instance, if there are four Hispanic families in a tract with incomes between \$10,000 and \$14,999, then four family-level records can be generated, with incomes set at the interval midpoint, \$12,500 and tract characteristics appended. For the top income category, \$200,000 or more, the value of the family-level variable was arbitrarily set at \$225,000. We chose a low value on the assumption that most minority families are concentrated at the lower end of the distribution within this category. This choice affects, in any event, only a small percentage of the families in our analyses—1 percent among both Hispanics and blacks and 5 percent among non-Hispanic whites.

As one reviewer notes, the interpolation of income values adds measurement error that is conservative, working against the hypothesis that family income determines residential location.

⁴ The neighbourhood identifications represent a major investment of research time. Some readers may wonder why we have not simply reproduced all of our Census 2000 results with a more recent ACS cumulative data set, and the neighbourhood identifications are a large part of the answer.

At the metropolitan level, we control for many of the usual suspects in an analysis of residential location: population size (expressed as the natural logarithm); affluence (median household income); ethno-racial composition (specifically, percent non-Hispanic white and percent non-Hispanic black, with the percent Hispanic omitted to avoid the possibility of variables adding approximately to 100 percent); region of the country (the Midwest, South and West, with the Northeast omitted); and the composition of the Hispanic population (the percentages Mexican, Cuban, Puerto Rican, Dominican and Salvadorian among Hispanics). In addition, we indicate the location of the region within the Suro-Singer (2002) classification: established Hispanic region (large presence in 1980, relatively slow growth since then), fast-growth Hispanic hub (large presence in 1980, fast growth since), new destination region (small presence in 1980, fast growth since), and places with a small Hispanic presence (small presence in 1980, slow growth since).

Analysis

In addition to descriptive data on a range of neighbourhood characteristics, we develop two sets of HLM models for the neighbourhood characteristics on which we focus in depth, the percent non-Hispanic white and the percent in professional and managerial occupations. These models are estimated for specific ethno-racial populations (e.g., Hispanics); the dependent variables are the neighbourhood characteristics, and the independent variables include family income and higher level characteristics (e.g., metropolitan variables).

We use one set of these models to evaluate the degree of Latino residential disadvantage: that is, we compare the neighbourhood placements of Hispanics to those of whites and blacks of similar incomes who reside in similar metropolitan regions. These models also allow us to ascertain whether, at high family incomes, Latinos can achieve similar residential outcomes to the white majority. The other set of analyses focuses only on Hispanic families. In these models, we test the effects of divisions within metropolitan space—especially between immigrant enclaves and other neighbourhoods but also between central cities and suburbs. We further examine whether the effects of family income on residential outcomes are similar in these different kinds of spaces.

The HLM models are locational-attainment analyses in the sense that they predict the characteristics of the tract of residence for families of a specific ethno-racial group that possess a certain level of family income, while taking into account aspects of the larger spaces (e.g. metropolitan) in which they are embedded. We allow the intercept and the coefficient of family income to vary randomly and treat the coefficients of the metropolitan-level variables as fixed. We have constructed these variables so that the intercept of the HLM model can be understood as the value of a tract characteristic in the “average” metropolitan region. That is, the continuous variables are centred at their means and the categorical variables are represented by effect, rather than dummy, coding. Further, we express family income as a deviation from the overall mean in each metropolitan region (Enders and Tofghi 2007). This relocation of its zero point facilitates a clear interpretation of the intercept, which can be viewed as a predicted neighbourhood outcome for a family with the average income in the average metropolitan region.

In introducing the enclave/non-enclave and central city/suburban distinctions into the HLM models, we use a dummy variable representation, which yields a direct comparison between two categories, because we are interested in interpreting the coefficients rather than simply controlling for the variables. We treat these coefficients as fixed.

In the standard interpretation of an HLM model, the coefficients of higher variables such as metropolitan characteristics can be understood as effects on the random intercept, and so it is here. Since we have allowed the coefficient of family income to also vary randomly, we

have also tested the ability of metropolitan-level variables to predict it. Since the additional interaction terms did not substantially improve the fit of the models, we have reported models without them, simplifying the interpretation of results

Our estimation of the models was guided by the principle of statistical conservatism. To achieve statistical efficiency, we use weighting and analyze a file constructed so that each income interval for each group in each tract is an observation. Each such observation is then weighted by the count of families in the relevant cell to achieve representativeness. The coefficient estimates yielded by these analyses are essentially identical to those we obtained from analyses where the individual family is the unit of analysis. However, the procedure used here is more statistically conservative because test statistics are based on a smaller number of observations. In addition, to correct for the presence of repeated values of neighbourhood characteristics among families in the same tract, we employ cluster-robust standard errors in all our models.

Neighbourhood inequalities in the aggregate

In the segregation literature Hispanics do not appear as disadvantaged as African Americans because their degree of segregation from whites is less. However, in terms of most neighbourhood characteristics, any residential advantage of Hispanics over African Americans disappears. In Table 1, we have grouped these characteristics into four categories: ethno-racial composition, immigration-related characteristics, socioeconomic status, and housing variables. The table contains weighted averages of tract variables, where the weighting is by the number of families of each group in the tract; thus, each mean can be viewed as describing the tract of residence of the average family of the group in question.⁵

The lower segregation of Hispanic families is reflected in the ethno-racial composition variables. In particular, the percentage of Anglo families in the census tract of the average Hispanic family (i.e., the exposure index in relation to whites) is higher than it is in the census tract of the average black family.

Despite their greater residential exposure to whites, Hispanics are quite distinct in residing in neighbourhoods where immigrants are common. Therefore, the percentage of residents who are foreign born is two to three times higher (29.7 percent) in the neighbourhood of the average Hispanic family than in the neighbourhoods typically occupied by whites and blacks. Accordingly, Hispanic families have many neighbors who do not speak English all the time. In their average neighbourhood, about half of the residents speak a language other than English at home and a quarter are not fluent in English, not able to speak the mainstream language “very well.”

The patterns evident for the socioeconomic variables are the most striking, given the in-between status of Hispanics in terms of segregation. The median household income in the neighbourhood of the average Hispanic family is, at \$39,500, just marginally above its equivalent for the average black family, \$38,000. Both figures are substantially below the level of affluence in the neighbourhood of the average white family, which is almost 50 percent higher (\$57,800). The percentage of residents below the poverty line is equivalent in

⁵ We have generated the equivalent table in the 2005–09 census tract data (from the ACS). The differences between the two tables are very small with two exceptions: First, the median household incomes of tracts are of course higher in the later years, and the absolute differences between the residential areas of white families and minority ones are larger, but only slightly; the ratios between them are smaller. Second, the percentages in overcrowded households are notably smaller in 2005–09, although the differences among the groups are similar.

The general consistency of group inequalities in residential situation between 2000 and 2005–09 gives us confidence that the results we obtain with 2000 data would also emerge from an analysis of the 2005–09 ACS file.

the neighbourhoods of the average Hispanic and black families (19–20 percent) and is nearly three times higher than that in the neighbourhood of the average white.

Insofar as the socioeconomic characteristics of adults create models for children, the neighbourhoods of Hispanic families are arguably more disadvantaged than those of black families, to say nothing of white families. The neighbourhood of the average Hispanic family contains the fewest adults with any education beyond high school. It also has the smallest share of employed adults who work in professional or managerial occupations, although in this case the difference from the neighbourhood of the average black family is small.

Housing is also a source of disadvantage. Homes are crowded: In the neighbourhood of the average Hispanic family, 20 percent of the households shelter more than 1 person per room, double the percentage for the average black family's neighbourhood and four times that for the average white family's neighbourhood. Homeownership is also at a lower level than is found in the neighbourhood of the average white, but there is no difference from blacks.

Controlling for family income

What happens when we control for family income, in the way described in the methodology section? How much are Hispanic families able to improve their neighbourhood situations by increasing their incomes? Does high income enable them to achieve residential parity with whites? Our analysis shows that, for Hispanics as for other groups, family income is strongly related to the "quality" of the neighbourhood, and controlling for income generally explains a substantial portion of the group differences in Table 1. Moreover, increased family income sometimes allows Hispanic families to narrow the gap in neighbourhood quality that separates them from whites. Nevertheless, the gap remains sizable even at high incomes.

As described earlier, we focus on two dependent variables to explain the main outlines of our findings: the percent of non-Hispanic whites among neighbors, and the percent of workers in professional and managerial occupations. The HLM results appear in Table 2. Our discussion focuses on the intercepts and income coefficients of these models because the metropolitan variations, though they are statistically meaningful, do not help much in unraveling group differences.

The results for the two dependent variables exhibit somewhat different patterns. For each, a sizable portion of the raw difference in residential situation between Anglos and Hispanics is explained by family income and the distributions of the two populations across metropolitan areas. The models differ in the extent to which the remaining gap narrows at high incomes: Hispanic families' residential improvements with increased income exceed those of white families in the case of the percent non-Hispanic white but not in the case of the percent in professional and managerial occupations. For both dependent variables, the Hispanic-white gap remains sizable at all incomes.

Consider neighbourhood racial composition: With family income held constant at the mean in the average metropolitan region, the expected percentage of Anglos among neighbors differs by 24.1 percentage points (74.6 vs. 50.5), a little more than half of the difference in Table 1 (78.2 vs. 34.3). In other words, a notable portion of the raw difference in neighbourhood composition is attributable to the unequal family incomes of Anglos and whites (along with their differential placement across metropolitan regions). The same is not true for the neighbourhood difference between Anglos and blacks, which is not much reduced in Table 2.

For non-Hispanic white families, this feature of their neighbourhood environment does not change much as their family income increases; at all levels of income, whites tend to live in heavily white neighbourhoods. For Hispanic (and black) families, however, the percentage of whites among their neighbors grows as their incomes increase. For each additional \$10,000 in family income, the percentage of whites among neighbors increases by approximately 1.4–1.5 points according to the coefficients in Table 2, an increase that is about 2.5 times as large as the increase found among white families.

However, the gap between white and Hispanic families with high incomes remains quite large. For instance, Hispanic families with \$50,000 in annual income above the mean for a metropolitan region gain 7 points in the percentage of white neighbors, while white families at this income level gain only 3 points; but the difference of only 4 points barely dents the large gap in non-Hispanic white neighbors among families in different ethno-racial categories.

White-minority differences in the percent holding professional and managerial jobs are also substantially reduced by controls for family income and metropolitan location. The reduction in the raw difference between whites and Hispanics in Table 1 is about a third. In Table 2, the difference is down to 9 percentage points (38.5 vs. 29.5), from more than 13 points without controls (38.5 vs. 25.5). (The reduction of the black-white difference is smaller.)

However, for this variable, the gap between whites and Hispanics closes very little at higher income. Both groups improve their neighbourhood circumstances by similar amounts as their incomes go up. For every \$10,000 increase in family income, the percent of the college educated in Hispanics' neighbourhoods goes up by .91 points; for whites, the rise is .87.

What the HLM analyses discussed here show, then, is that taking account of family income, as well as a variety of metropolitan-area characteristics, leaves a considerable gap in quality between the neighbourhoods where whites typically live and those where Hispanics are generally found. Latinos do improve their neighbourhood situations as they gain in income, and sometimes, they begin to narrow the neighbourhood disparity when they have higher levels of income. But, generally speaking, a sizable gap remains. In fact, when it comes to the socioeconomic character of neighbourhoods—this conclusion is supported by a wider array of results than we report here--the residential situations of Hispanics and blacks are more similar to each other than is either to that of whites.

The role of immigrant enclaves

It is no longer axiomatic that neighbourhoods of immigrant settlement are places of disadvantage. Some immigrant areas, such as Monterey Park on the outskirts of Los Angeles, are far from the run-down, inner-city settings depicted in an earlier literature (Horton, 1995; Logan et al., 2002). However, for Hispanic families, immigrant enclaves are typically places that look disadvantaged. Table 3 shows the characteristics of the census tract of the average Hispanic family living within such areas and of the average family located outside of them. In every respect, the differences in neighbourhood context are substantial and favor the non-enclave contexts.

In 2000, in the metropolitan regions in our study, 45 percent of Hispanic families resided in immigrant enclaves, as identified by our GIS procedure. To begin with, such families live in much less integrated contexts than do other Hispanic families. The average Hispanic family outside of an immigrant area resides in a neighbourhood where non-Hispanic white residents outnumber Hispanic residents, while the average Hispanic family in one has mostly

Hispanic neighbors and encounters few non-Hispanic whites. Nevertheless, Latinos outside of enclaves still have many co-ethnic neighbors--on average, a third are Latino.

Living outside an immigrant enclave generally demands more linguistic acculturation than would living in one. The average Hispanic family outside of such an area finds that a majority of neighbors speak only English at home, which probably means in most cases that they are English monolinguals. Undoubtedly, where English monolinguals predominate, other aspects of the neighbourhood—for example, signage—are inhospitable to the speakers of other languages. By contrast, immigrant enclaves are far more friendly to individuals who are more comfortable in languages other than English. The immigrant enclave of the average Hispanic family is a place where two-thirds of residents speak a language other than English at home and nearly 40 percent are not fluent in English.

The socioeconomic context for Hispanic families outside of immigrant enclaves is substantially better than the one experienced by families inside of them. The median household income of neighbors outside of immigrant areas is, at \$45,000, about 40 percent higher than the median household income of neighbors in immigrant areas. A quarter of the neighbors of the average Hispanic family in an immigrant area have incomes below the poverty line compared to 15 percent of the neighbors in another area. The percentage of neighbors in non-immigrant areas who work in professional/managerial occupations is, at 31 percent, almost double its equivalent for neighbors in immigrant areas, 18 percent. The comparison for the percentage with post-secondary education is equally stark: 50 versus 30 percent. In addition, the housing conditions improve outside of enclaves: for example, overcrowding, living in fewer rooms than there are people, is down to 13 percent, compared to 29 percent in enclaves.

Yet, perhaps because of the constraints imposed by legal status, as well as the desires of many immigrant families to remain within a comfortable community setting, the effect of family income on residence outside of an immigrant enclave is modest. This finding comes from a HLM logistic regression in which we have controlled also for the same metro-area characteristics as in the regressions in Table 2. Each \$10,000 extra in family income increases the odds of residence outside of an immigrant neighbourhood by .12 ($1.12 = \exp[.11]$). This is equivalent to a doubling of the odds with an increase of \$60,000 in family income. Starting from a 50:50 division between the two types of neighbourhood, an increase in family income this large makes a difference of 16 percentage points (to a 66:34 division). In other words, it takes a large income increment to make a sizable difference.

The addition of the distinction between immigrant enclaves and other neighbourhoods to our HLM models shows that it involves fundamentally different kinds of residential spaces. These analyses take into account also whether families are located in suburbs or central cities. The results are reported in Table 4.

With family income and metropolitan characteristics controlled, living outside an enclave versus in one makes a very large difference for the characteristics of the neighbourhood. For the non-Hispanic white percent, this difference is 28 points; for the professional/managerial percent, 16 points. These differences are much larger than those associated with the suburban vs. central city distinction, for instance, which is just 6 percentage points in the case of racial composition and 2 points (but negative) in the case of the occupational character of the neighbourhood.

In some respects, the improvements brought about by residence outside an immigrant enclave can place Hispanic families in contexts almost equal to those in which socioeconomically similar whites reside. This is the case for the percentage of neighbors holding professional/managerial jobs, where an Hispanic family of average income in the

average metropolitan region is in a neighbourhood where this percentage is 35.5 (intercept in Table 4), while the average white family is in one where it is 38.5 (Table 2). The estimate in Table 4, it should be noted, assumes central-city residence and would be slightly smaller for suburban residence. We should also note that this high degree of convergence occurs for some of the socioeconomic characteristics of neighbourhoods, not all (e.g., not for median household income)

In terms of racial composition, however, the residential environments of Hispanics and whites remain far apart even when the former are outside of enclaves (56.4 for Hispanics in Table 4 vs. 74.6 for Anglos in Table 2). In this case, suburban residence does make a positive difference for Hispanics. The inevitable conclusion is that Latinos typically reside in neighbourhoods with sizable proportions of Latino neighbors, even when these are not immigrant enclaves.

Equally powerful as a demonstration of the power of the enclave/non-enclave distinction is the variation in the residential impact of family income between these two types of spaces. The residential improvements associated with higher incomes are much smaller within the enclave space. Consider again the percentage of neighbors in professional/managerial occupations. The interaction effect between the enclave dummy variable and family income (in Table 4), $-.45$, means that the slope of income is more than halved in enclaves ($.79 - .45 = .34$) as outside them ($.79$). In other words, when they remain within the enclave residential space, even Hispanic families with high incomes do not reside in much better neighbourhoods according to this characteristic.

A parallel variation in the residential impact of family income is found for neighbourhood percent non-Hispanic white. The slope inside of enclaves is half the size of the slope outside them. In this case, there is also an interaction between the suburban dummy variable and family income. It reveals that the slope of income is smaller in suburban areas than in urban ones, though the difference is not as great as for the enclave/non-enclave divide. The substantive interpretation of these interactions is quite different, however. The movement to suburbs brings Hispanic families into neighbourhoods with more white neighbors (+6.2 points); the smaller slope of family income indicates modest differences by income in the neighbourhood racial composition of suburban Hispanic families. One way of putting this is: in suburbs, even low-income Hispanic families tend to live in largely white neighbourhoods. By contrast, the enclave-income interaction indicates: in enclaves, even high-income Hispanic families tend to live with few white neighbors.

Conclusion

Quite clearly, living in an immigrant enclave rather than outside one makes a very large difference for the residential context of Latino families. On average, an immigrant-rich neighbourhood brings much less exposure to members of the white majority and involves neighbors with much weaker socioeconomic characteristics than are found elsewhere; of course, these enclaves have other features, linguistic, for example, that are a direct consequence of immigrant concentration. Within the residential space of enclaves, it is difficult for families to improve by much the character of their residential surroundings, even at high incomes. The residential effects of immigrant enclaves should not be conflated with those of living with co-ethnics, for Hispanic families outside of enclaves also have numerous Hispanic neighbors.

The differences associated with the enclave/non-enclave distinction are much larger than those associated with the other variables we can consider here. The suburban/central city distinction, often seen as critical to spatial assimilation, appears as of modest consequence in

our analyses. The effects of family income (in Table 2) are sizable but even those produced by an increase of \$100,000 do not usually rival the differences made by living in an enclave.

Immigrant enclaves have occupied a central place in sociological thinking about the residential trajectories of immigrant and second-generation families, but mainly as temporary way stations, to be abandoned as soon as economic circumstances and comfort in more mainstream surroundings allow. This was the view enshrined in the spatial-assimilation model. The incapacitating legal status of a sizable minority of Hispanic families, who are either unauthorized or in insecure legal status, requires modification of this view for the contemporary immigration period. Lack of secure legal status arguably prevents many Latino immigrant families from leaving enclaves, even after lengthy periods of residence in the U.S. We do not rule out that some Latino families who could leave enclaves nevertheless prefer them for cultural and social reasons. In the event, we find that nearly half of Latino families reside in such enclaves. It is quite plausible that residence in such disadvantaged places explains some of the transmission of socioeconomic disadvantage from unauthorized parents to U.S.-citizen children that has been uncovered by recent research (Brown et al 2011).

If the powerful role of immigrant enclaves for Hispanic residential inequality is no longer consistent with the spatial-assimilation framework, it is also not adequately addressed in the place stratification model. That model envisions that advantaged places use a variety of exclusionary stratagems to minimize the presence of groups deemed to be undesirable, such as minorities. However, if our arguments are correct, the role of immigrant enclaves is due partly to the difficulty some families experience in leaving them (or to their preference for them), not because these families are excluded from more desirable communities. The impediments to their mobility are rooted in personal status as determined by federal law, not the variations in, say, housing regulations created by the jurisdictions within a metropolitan region.

The role of these enclaves deserves further scrutiny, especially if the current push for immigration reform meets with success, thereby resolving the legal status issues for many long-term immigrants and their foreign-born children. In this respect, we believe that the locational-attainment method for analyzing residential situations that we have presented here has much to offer. Granted, the micro-level variables that can be included are quite limited, but family income, a key determinant of location, is one of them. Moreover, these analyses can be generated from publicly available census tabulations available for census tracts. These tabulations are part of the data arrays created by the U.S. Census Bureau from the five-year compilations of the American Community Survey, which means that our analyses can be regularly updated. Therefore, we hope that not just our findings about immigrant enclaves, but also our method of analysis, will spur further research.

References

- Alba, R.; Denton, N.; Hernandez, D.; Disha, I.; Mackenzie, B.; Napierala, J. Nowhere Near the Same: The Neighborhoods of Latino Children. In: Landale, N.; McHale, S.; Booth, A., editors. *Growing Up Hispanic: Health and Development of Children of Immigrants*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press; 2010.
- Alba R, Logan J. Minority Proximity to Whites in Suburbs: An Individual-Level Analysis of Segregation. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1993; 98(6):1388–1427.
- Alba R, Logan J, Stults B. The Changing Neighborhood Contexts of the Immigrant Metropolis. *Social Forces*. 2000; 79(2):587–621.
- Brooks-Gunn, J.; Aber, J.L.; Duncan, G. *Neighborhood Poverty: Context and Consequences for Children*. Vol. I. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 1997.

- Brown S. Delayed Spatial Assimilation: Multigenerational Incorporation of the Mexican-Origin Population in Los Angeles. *City & Community*. 2007; 6(3):193–209.
- Brown, S.; Bean, F.; Leach, M.; Rumbaut, R. Legalization and Naturalization Trajectories among Mexican Immigrants and Their Implications for the Second Generation. In: Alba, R.; Waters, M., editors. *The New Generation: The Children of Immigrants in Comparative Perspective*. New York: NYU Press; 2011.
- Denton N, Massey D. Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians by Socioeconomic Status and Generation. *Social Science Quarterly*. 1988; 69(4):797–817.
- Enders CK, Tofighi D. Centering Predictor Variables in Cross-Sectional Multilevel Models: A New Look at an Old Issue. *Psychological Methods*. 2007; 12(2):121–138. [PubMed: 17563168]
- Fisher MJ. The Relative Importance of Income and Race in Determining Residential Outcomes in U.S. Urban Areas, 1970–2000. *Urban Affairs Review*. 2003; 38(5):669–696.
- Frank R, Cerda M, Rendon M. Barrios and Burbs: Residential Context and Health-Risk Behaviors among Angeleno Adolescents. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 2007; 48(3):283–300. [PubMed: 17982869]
- Goldsmith PR. Schools or Neighborhoods or Both? Race and Ethnic Segregation in Educational Attainment. *Social Forces*. 2009; 87(4):1913–1941.
- Gonzales R. Learning to be Illegal: Undocumented Youth and Shifting Legal Contexts in the Transition to Adulthood. *American Sociological Review*. 2011; 76(4):602–619.
- Horton, J. *The Politics of Diversity: Immigration, Resistance, and Change in Monterey Park, California*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press; 1995.
- Iceland J, Nelson KA. Hispanic Segregation in Metropolitan America: Exploring the Multiple Forms of Spatial Assimilation. *American Sociological Review*. 2008; 73(5):741–765.
- Lareau, A. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race and Family Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press; 2003.
- Leventhal T, Brooks-Gunn J. The Neighborhoods They Live In: The Effect of Neighborhood Residence on Child and Adolescent Outcomes. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2000; 126(3):309–337. [PubMed: 10748645]
- Logan J, Alba R. Locational Returns to Human Capital: Minority Access to Suburban Community Resources. *Demography*. 1993; 30(2):243–268. [PubMed: 8500639]
- Logan J, Alba R, Zhang W. Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles. *American Sociological Review*. 2002; 67(3):299–322.
- Logan, J.; Stults, B. 'The Persistence of Segregation in the Metropolis: New Findings from the 2010 Census', report of Spatial Structures in the Social Sciences. Brown University; 2011. <http://www.s4.brown.edu/us2010/Projects/Reports.htm>
- Krivo L, Peterson R, Kuhl D. Segregation, Racial Structure, and Neighborhood Violent Crime. *American Journal of Sociology*. 2009; 114(6):1765–1802.
- Massey D. Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Review. *Sociology and Social Research*. 1985; 69:315–350.
- Massey D, Denton N. Suburbanization and Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1988; 94(3):592–626.
- Massey, D.; Denton, N. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 1993.
- Massey D, Fisher M. Does Rising Income Bring Integration? New Results for Blacks, Hispanic, and Asians in 1990? *Social Science Research*. 1999; 28(3):316–326.
- Menjívar C. Liminal Legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Immigrants' Lives in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*. 2006; 111(4):999–1037.
- Mitchell, A. *The ESRI Guide to GIS Analysis: Volume 2: Spatial Measurements and Statistics*. Redlands, CA: ESRI Press; 2005.
- Pais J, South S, Crowder K. Metropolitan Heterogeneity and Minority Neighborhood Attainment: Spatial Assimilation or Place Stratification? *Social Problems*. 2011; 59(2):259–281.
- Passel, J. New Estimates of the Undocumented Population in the United States. Migration Information Source. 2002 May. <http://www.migrationinformation.org/feature/display.cfm?ID=19>

- Passel, J.; Cohn, D. Unauthorized Immigrant Population: National and State Trends. report of the Pew Research Center; 2011 Feb 1.
- Peach C. Does Britain have ghettos? Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers. 1996; 22:216–235.
- Portes, A.; Rumbaut, R. Legacies: Children of Immigrants in America. Berkeley: University of California Press; 2001.
- Quillian L. Segregation and Poverty Concentration: The Role of Three Segregations. American Sociological Review. 2012; 77(3):354–379.
- Rosenbaum, E.; Friedman, S. The Housing Divide: How Generations of Immigrants Fare in New York's Housing Market. NYU Press; New York: 2007.
- Schönwälder K, Söhn J. Immigrant Settlement Structures in Germany: General Patterns and Urban Levels of Concentration of Major Groups. Urban Studies. 2009; 46(7):1439–1460.
- Sampson R, Sharkey P. Neighborhood Selection and the Social Reproduction of Concentrated Racial Inequality. Demography. 2008; 45(1):1–29. [PubMed: 18390289]
- Sharkey P. The Intergenerational Transmission of Context. American Journal of Sociology. 2008; 113(4):931–969.
- South S, Crowder K, Chavez E. Migration and Spatial Assimilation among U.S. Latinos: Classical versus Segmented Trajectories. Social Forces. 2005; 42(1):497–521.
- South S, Crowder K, Pais J. Inter-neighborhood Migration and Spatial Assimilation in a Multi-ethnic World: Comparing Latinos, Blacks, and Anglos. Social Forces. 2008; 87(1):415–443.
- Suro, R.; Singer, A. Latino Growth in Metropolitan America: Changing Patterns, New Locations. report of the Brookings Institution and Pew Hispanic Center; 2002.
- Wacquant, L. Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press; 2008.
- Woldoff R, Ovadia S. Not Getting Their Moneys Worth: African-American Disadvantages in Converting Income, Wealth, and Education into Residential Quality. Urban Affairs Review. 2009; 45(1):66–91.

Table 1

Average Neighbourhood Characteristics of Anglo, Hispanic, and Non-Hispanic Black Families

		Number of Families		
		Anglo N = 26,867,279	Hispanic N = 6,300,554	Black N = 5,170,704
Ethno-Racial Composition	% Non-Hispanic White	78.2	34.3	27.9
	% Hispanic	9.7	48.0	13.3
	% Non-Hispanic Black	5.6	9.8	52.9
Immigration-Related Characteristics	% Foreign Born	11.0	29.7	13.9
	% Who Do Not Speak English Fluently	6.8	26.7	9.4
	% Who Speak Only English at Home	83.4	49.1	80.3
Socio-Economic Characteristics	Median Household Income	\$57,786	\$39,451	\$37,966
	% in Poverty	7.4	19.1	19.7
	% of Adults with Post-Secondary Education	60.0	41.5	45.3
	% in Professional/Managerial Occupations	38.5	25.3	27.4
Housing	% in Overcrowded Households	4.3	20.0	10.2
	% Homeowners	72.5	52.2	52.6

Table 2
HLM locational analyses of neighbourhood characteristics for Anglos, Hispanics and blacks

Neighborhood Characteristic:	% Non-Hispanic White			% with Professional/Managerial Jobs		
	Anglos	Hispanics	Blacks	Anglos	Hispanics	Blacks
Intercept	74.61 ***	50.45 ***	34.93 ***	38.49 ***	29.54 ***	29.85 ***
Family Income (\$10,000s)	0.57 ***	1.46 ***	1.39 ***	0.87 ***	0.91 ***	0.85 ***
Metropolitan Characteristics:						
Median Household Income	0.54	-0.25	-0.03	2.63 ***	1.20	1.59 *
% Non-Hispanic White	0.84 ***	0.90 ***	0.74 ***	-0.05 *	0.04	0.00
% Non-Hispanic Black	0.38 ***	0.29 ***	-0.46 ***	-0.02	0.09	-0.13 ***
% Professional/Managerial	-	-	-	1.33 ***	0.98 *	1.01 **
Logged Metro Population	0.92 *	-1.07	-3.21 ***	-0.18	-0.54	-0.57
New Hispanic Destination	-1.56 **	1.44	2.00	-0.40	0.69	-0.13
Fast Hispanic Growth	1.18	-2.71 *	0.78	-0.22	-0.56	-1.11
Small Hispanic Place	-0.14	3.45 *	-3.76	-0.69	0.10	0.53
South	-1.89 **	1.64	3.57 **	0.28	1.44	1.05
Midwest	0.69	-0.76	-9.18 ***	-0.35	-1.03	-1.18
West	0.13	2.11	7.91 ***	-1.26	-0.62	-0.16
Puerto Rican	0.06	-0.42 ***	-0.11	0.04	-0.15 **	-0.04
% Mexican	0.02	-0.18 ***	0.04	-0.01	-0.13 **	-0.01
% Cuban	-0.06	0.02	0.01	-0.13	-0.13 **	-0.26 **
% Dominican	0.13 **	-0.51 ***	0.03	-0.07	-0.28 ***	-0.09
% Salvadoran	-0.03	-0.07	-0.17	-0.06	0.10	0.02
Intraclass Correlation	0.48	0.36	0.28	0.17	0.14	0.15
Likelihood-Ratio (18 d.f.)	18867 ***	16476 ***	8535 ***	74174 ***	21057 ***	18890 ***

p<.001;

**
p<.01;

*
p<.05

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Table 3

Average Neighbourhood Characteristics of Hispanic Families in Immigrant vs. Non-Immigrant Neighbourhoods

		In Immigrant Enclaves N = 2,746,386	Outside Immigrant Enclaves N = 3,554,168
Ethno-Racial Composition	% Non-Hispanic White	18.3	46.6
	% Hispanic	65.1	34.8
	% Non-Hispanic Black	9.9	9.7
Immigration-Related Characteristics	% Foreign Born	41.1	21.0
	% Who Do Not Speak English Fluently	38.7	17.5
	% Who Speak Only English at Home	32.9	61.6
Socio-Economic Characteristics	Median Household Income	\$32,313	\$44,966
	% in Poverty	24.7	14.8
	% of Adults with Post-Secondary Education	30.0	50.3
	% in Professional/Managerial Occupations	18.1	30.9
Housing	% in Overcrowded Households	28.7	13.2
	% Homeowners	41.2	60.7

Table 4

HLM locational analyses of neighbourhood characteristics for Hispanics, with types of neighbourhood (immigrant/non-immigrant, urban/suburban) and their interactions with income

Neighborhood Characteristic:	% Non-Hispanic White	% Prof/Manag
Intercept	56.38 ***	35.46 ***
Family Income (\$10,000s)	1.23 ***	0.79 ***
Neighborhood Types:		
Immigrant-Rich	-27.78 ***	-15.80 ***
Immigrant-Rich * Family Income	-0.61 **	-0.45 ***
Suburban	6.15 **	-1.67 **
Suburban * Family Income	-0.36 ***	-0.04
Immigrant-Rich * Suburban	-0.10	2.08
Metropolitan Characteristics:		
Median Household Income	-0.85	0.94
% Non-Hispanic White	0.94 ***	0.07 **
% Non-Hispanic Black	0.24 ***	0.06
Logged Metro Population	-0.59	-0.23
New Hispanic Destination	0.05	-0.25
Fast Hispanic Growth	-2.25 **	-0.38
Small Hispanic Place	1.69	-0.13
South	1.04	1.23
Midwest	0.09	-0.86
West	1.83 *	-0.33
% Prof/Manag		1.04 ***
% Puerto Rican	-0.18	-0.03
% Mexican	-0.01	-0.05
% Cuban	0.38 ***	0.12 **
% Dominican	0.02	0.01
% Salvadoran	0.24	0.31 **
Likelihood-Ratio (23 d.f.)	119231 ***	96382 ***

p<.001;

**
p<.01;

*
p<.05