Published in final edited form as:

Soc Sci Res. 2016 May ; 57: 195–210. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2015.12.005.

New Faces in New Spaces in New Places: Residential Attainment among Newly Legalized Immigrants in Established, New, and Minor Destinations

Reanne Frank¹ [Associate Professor of Sociology] and Ilana Redstone Akresh² [Associate Professor of Sociology]

¹Ohio State University. 238 Townshend Hall, Columbus, OH. 43210. frank.219@osu.edu. Ph (614) 247-4679 fax (614) 292-6687

²University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign

Abstract

Immigrants at the beginning of the twenty-first century are located in a more diverse set of metropolitan areas than at any point in U.S. history. Whether immigrants' residential prospects are helped or hindered in new versus established immigrant-receiving areas has been the subject of debate. Using multilevel models and data from the New Immigrant Survey (NIS), a nationally representative sample of newly legalized immigrants to the U.S., we move beyond aggregate-level analyses of residential segregation to specify the influence of destination type on individual-level immigrant residential outcomes. The findings indicate that immigrants in new and minor destinations are significantly more likely to live in tracts with relatively more non-Hispanic whites and relatively fewer immigrants and poor residents. These residential advantages persist net of individual-level controls but are largely accounted for by place-to-place differences in metropolitan composition and structure. Our exclusive focus on newly legalized immigrants means that our findings do not necessarily contradict the possibility of worse residential prospects in new areas of settlement, but rather qualifies it as not extending to the newly authorized population.

Keywords

immigrants; residential attainment; segregation; new destination; geographic dispersion

1. Introduction

Currently, immigrants live in a more diverse set of communities than at any other point in our nation's history (Massey and Capoferro, 2008, Singer, 2011). Unprecedented growth in the foreign-born population across metropolitan America—particularly in areas that did not

Correspondence to: Reanne Frank.

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

have appreciable pre-existing immigrant populations—has been one of the most striking aspects of U.S. immigration over the past several decades (Singer, 2004). The geographic dispersal of immigrants to communities across the country has raised the question—how are immigrants in these new receiving areas being incorporated? Or as framed by Massey (2008: 351) in his edited volume on the changing geography of immigration: do “new places” mean “new assimilation”? In the realm of residential location, the answer has been mixed. While a small number of studies have found that immigrants are less residentially segregated from native-born non-Hispanic Whites in newer and emerging immigrant destinations (e.g. Alba et al. 2010; Park and Iceland 2011), most have found the opposite and argue that immigrants’ residential prospects are distinctly disadvantaged in new destinations as opposed to more established ones (Hall, 2013, Hall and Stringfield, 2014, Lichter, et al., 2010).

This paper contributes to the discussion by analyzing the residential outcomes of the first nationally representative sample of any broad section of the U.S. immigrant population—newly legalized immigrants. The New Immigrant Survey (NIS) consists of individual-level data that are supplemented with residential addresses across over 150 metropolitan areas in the U.S. The recent availability of the geocoded NIS enables us to conduct a multi-level analysis of whether and how different immigrant receiving areas shape residential opportunity structures for newly legalized immigrants. Our work advances the existing literature on immigrant segregation, which has largely been limited to aggregate-level analyses, by incorporating multi-level models and focusing explicitly on residential attainment, defined here as the ability to attain residence in desirable neighborhoods (South, et al., 2011). Doing so allows us to make explicit an implicit assumption in the existing research, namely that immigrants’ location in new versus traditional immigrant receiving metropolitan areas influences the types of neighborhoods they are able to access. Much of the research on immigrant residential location has focused primarily on racial composition, e.g. distance from non-Hispanic white neighbors. We expand the focus beyond exposure to the non-Hispanic White majority to also assess immigrants’ individual propensities to reside in neighborhoods characterized by varying poverty levels and by varying concentrations of other immigrants. While a focus on residential racial/nativity concentration informs us about social distance, a focus on non-racial neighborhood characteristics, e.g. poverty, tells us something about the conditions of the neighborhoods in which immigrants live.

Our analysis focuses explicitly on newly legalized immigrants. Arguably, those who have initiated the legalization process are of particular interest because they are the most likely out of the entire immigrant population to become the country’s next citizens. Determining whether their patterns of residential attainment vary across destination type is a key first step in assessing whether metropolitan America is differentially integrating its newest members.

2. Background

A considerable amount of scholarly and popular attention has been given to the dramatic dispersal of Mexican immigrants out of gateway cities and into non-traditional, and often non-metropolitan, destinations (Hall and Stringfield, 2014, Leach and Bean, 2008, Zúñiga and Hernández-León, 2005). Notwithstanding transformative shifts in the settlement patterns

of Mexican immigrants, including population increases of over 1000 percent in some new destinations, geographic diversification has actually been a much broader phenomenon characterizing the entire foreign-born population at the end of the twentieth century (Parrado and Kandel, 2008). An analysis of Latino, Asian and other immigrant groups found that, although the biggest change was for Mexicans, all groups experienced a greater diversity of destinations between 1990 and 2000 (Massey and Capoferro, 2008). Although growth rates increased most dramatically in non-urban destinations, immigration remains a decidedly metropolitan affair, with over 95 percent of immigrants residing in metropolitan areas (Singer, 2013). The result has been a movement of millions of immigrants into metropolitan areas with little prior history of incorporating newcomers (Hall, 2013, Massey, 2008).

The shift away from metropolitan areas characterized as long-standing engines of immigrant integration has raised the question of how immigrants are faring in the new immigrant destinations (Hall, 2013, Massey, 2008). One aspect of immigrant incorporation that has received considerable attention is residential location. In the highly segregated U.S. residential landscape, location is a powerful indicator and determinant of social position because so many economic and social resources are tied to one's residential location (Fischer and Tienda, 2006). Residential integration with members of the host society, a process labeled "spatial assimilation" is often considered the linchpin upon which full societal incorporation depends (Alba, et al., 2000, Massey and Mullan, 1984, Timberlake and Iceland, 2007).

To date, empirical evaluations of immigrant residential situations in new versus established destinations have followed almost exclusively in the footsteps of the extensive literature on black-white racial residential segregation and have relied on aggregate-level analyses of segregation, e.g. at the city or metropolitan level, to assess variation in residential situations. Fischer and Tienda's (2006) analysis was one of the first to connect immigrant geographic diversification with patterns of racial/ethnic segregation in the case of the Latino population. Focusing their analysis on the 100 largest metropolitan areas, they found that foreign-born Latinos were more highly segregated from non-Hispanic Whites in new Latino destinations (as measured by the index of dissimilarity) but that their social isolation (as measured by the degree of potential contact, i.e. the P^* index) was considerably lower in new Latino destinations than in traditional ones (Fischer and Tienda, 2006). Subsequent studies have continued in this tradition, contrasting aggregate-level segregation measures for different groups across various destination-type typologies, and have arrived at mixed conclusions. For instance, while findings from Lichter et al.'s (2010) analysis of Latinos residing in both metro and nonmetro places echoed those of Fischer and Tienda (2006), Park and Iceland (2011) found that segregation from non-Hispanic whites was higher in established gateways than in new destinations among immigrants generally and, separately, among Latinos and Asians, irrespective of nativity. In the most comprehensive assessment so far, Hall (2013) estimated differences in metropolitan segregation levels using the index of dissimilarity for 10 different immigrant groups in the largest 100 metropolitan areas (Hall, 2013). Using both immigrant-wide and group-specific destination typologies (i.e. new Vietnamese destinations versus established Vietnamese destinations), he found that most immigrant sub-groups were more segregated from native-born non-Hispanic whites in new and minor immigrant destinations compared to more established ones.

Prior studies' exclusive focus on between-destination type variation in immigrant segregation, while informative and raising contrasting expectations for how immigrants are residentially integrating in new versus established areas, actually tell us very little about the degree to which immigrant neighborhood composition varies across, rather than within, different metropolitan destination types. As noted by Alba et al. (2014), "segregation research offers a limited window on residential situations: knowing how segregated a group is does not necessarily tell us what kinds of neighborhoods its members typically live in" (2). This latter concern, i.e. variation in the composition and quality of neighborhoods, has been more commonly addressed in the locational attainment research tradition, which focuses on how individual-level characteristics influence the ability of group members to achieve residence in desirable neighborhoods (Alba and Logan, 1993, Cort, 2011, Swisher, et al., 2013). While a cornerstone of research on immigrant spatial assimilation, models of locational attainment often ignore the broader geographic context in which the immigrant residential attainment process plays out (some exceptions exist with respect to broad racial/ethnic groupings, e.g. Logan et al. (1996)).

In our assessment of variation in immigrant residential outcomes by destination type, we attempt to bridge these two approaches, aggregate-level segregation analyses on the one hand and individual-level locational attainment models on the other. In doing so we follow South et al. (2011) in their study of black and white residential attainment and take individuals as the level of analysis but focus on identifying and characterizing the features of the metropolitan area that impact neighborhood composition. In the context of immigrant destination type, this strategy allows us to assess the implicit assumption in the existing literature, namely that metropolitan destination type influences the neighborhoods that immigrants can access. One recent analysis comes closest to our approach. In a study that focused exclusively on Latinos, Alba et al. (2014) attempted a novel strategy that used 2000 census data but approximated a household family income variable via tract-level tables, enabling the use of multilevel models to assess non-Hispanic white tract representation. Important for our interests, they distinguished metros by Latino growth patterns and found that, while there were no significant differences between new and established destinations, Latinos residing in fast Latino growth metros had a smaller average percentage of whites within their residential tracts. In contrast, places with low Latino growth showed the opposite pattern with significantly higher average tract representation of non-Hispanic whites.

Utilizing the New Immigrant Survey (NIS) geocoded data with information on individual-level residential locations and a much broader set of individual-level covariates, we are able to expand on the efforts of Alba et al. (2014) and conduct a more comprehensive assessment of immigrant residential attainment by destination type. The multilevel geocoded NIS data allows us to explicitly model individual-level residential outcomes and assess whether there is actual variation in the types of neighborhoods immigrants are accessing in different immigrant receiving communities. Additionally, much of the focus on whether and why new destination areas may disadvantage immigrants is restricted to the Latino or Mexican populations, particularly the undocumented segments, whose growth and geographic diversification have been most dramatic (Fischer and Tienda, 2006, Hall and Stringfield, 2014, Lichter, et al., 2010). But unauthorized immigrants are a select group whose

disadvantaged position vis-a-vis authorized immigrants makes their experiences in new versus established metros potentially unique. Indeed, a recent empirical analysis of residential segregation between Mexican immigrants and native-born whites and blacks found that higher levels of segregation from native-born non-Hispanic Whites in new destinations depended heavily on legal status (Hall and Stringfield, 2014). Once a metropolitan area's proportion of unauthorized immigrants was considered in the multivariate models, new destination areas were no longer significantly different than established metros in their levels of segregation. This finding raises the possibility that the worse residential patterns evident in new destinations may be limited to undocumented immigrants and may not extend to the authorized immigrant population. The present analysis focuses explicitly on the authorized immigrant population in the first nationally representative sample of any subset of immigrants. Doing so provides a counterbalance to past work that has focused either generally upon the foreign-born population, certain subsets, e.g. Latinos, or on the role of the undocumented population in contributing to aggregate patterns (Hall and Stringfield, 2014, Lichter, et al., 2010, Park and Iceland, 2011).

3. Research Questions

In our assessment of variation in residential attainment across destination types, we focus on three different tract-level characteristics. In the spatial assimilation tradition, improvements in immigrant residential location are typically conceptualized as movements out of immigrant enclaves and closer to non-Hispanic Whites (Alba and Nee, 2003). But high concentrations of immigrants or low levels of non-Hispanic Whites do not necessarily indicate undesirable neighborhood conditions such as high poverty (Iceland, 2009). Research in the locational attainment tradition has long acknowledged the importance of evaluating neighborhood characteristics beyond exposure to whites, such as median income (Cort, 2011, Logan, et al., 1996, Pais, et al., 2012, Sampson and Sharkey, 2008), violent crime (Krivo, et al., 2009), percent in professional/managerial jobs (Alba et al. 2014), and poverty (Swisher, et al., 2013). In addition to measures capturing foreign-born and non-Hispanic white tract representation, we also assess tract-level percent in poverty to assess the quality of the neighborhoods in which immigrants reside. For the three distinct tract-level outcomes, we pose three research questions.

First, we ask whether immigrant neighborhood composition and quality varies across immigrant destination types. Although this is the implicit assumption in aggregate-level analyses of differences in immigrant segregation across destination types, it has yet to be empirically evaluated. Following the technique utilized by South et al. (2011) in their analysis of black white residential attainment, we decompose the variance in tract-level outcomes to explicitly assess the extent that immigrant destination type contributes to between metropolitan-area variation in the types of neighborhoods in which immigrants reside.

Second, after establishing whether immigrants experience variation in neighborhood outcomes across destination types, we ask whether the observed differences are a function of individual-level factors that distinguish immigrants across destination types. Spatial assimilation theory views residential attainment as occurring in tandem with other indicators

of integration into the U.S., such as increased time spent in the country, higher levels of English language ability, higher socioeconomic status and occupational prestige, among others. Aggregate analyses of differences in immigrant segregation are suggestive of this possibility. Hall's (2013) analysis of immigrant segregation levels found that immigrants were more segregated in new compared to established destinations and that this association was partly explained by positive associations both between higher proportions of non-English speakers and lower levels of immigrant home ownership levels and immigration segregation. In the case of Latinos, Lichter et al. (2010), found that higher levels of segregation in new Latino destinations compared to established destinations persisted beyond differences in the relative size of the immigrant population. Because the NIS has a wide range of information on individual-level indicators of integration, we are able to move beyond aggregate-level analyses and empirically assess whether observed differences in neighborhood outcomes across destination types are primarily a function of differences in characteristics of immigrants living in these metros.

Our third research question assesses the role of characteristics of the metropolitan area. We concentrate on three different sets of metropolitan factors. The first involves a set of metro-level measures that are intended to capture the role of demographic opportunity. It may be that the likelihood of gaining access to a particular type of neighborhood is solely reflective of differences in the extent of its presence across destination types. Immigrants may be less likely to live near non-Hispanic whites in traditional immigrant receiving destinations because there are relatively fewer non-Hispanic whites in these areas than compared to new immigrant destinations. Past multilevel models of residential attainment have found just this pattern, whereby black, white, and Latino households located in metropolitan areas with relatively large minority populations experienced less exposure to non-Hispanic white neighbors (South, et al., 2011, South, et al., 2005, South, et al., 2005). In order to assess the role of demographic availability in explaining variation in residential outcomes across destination types, we include three metro-level compositional measures of the relative sizes of the foreign-born, poor, non-Hispanic black, Latino, and Asian populations.

The other side of the demographic availability argument holds that variation in residential outcomes is due, not only to availability (i.e. everyone is less likely to near non-Hispanic whites in metros with more minority members), but also discriminatory housing policies that restrict access to certain neighborhoods. Labeled the place stratification model of residential attainment, it places emphasis on the role of racial/ethnic discrimination in limiting the residential options of minority group members (Timberlake and Iceland, 2007). In the context of immigrants in new versus established destinations, Park and Iceland (2011) have argued that new immigrant areas potentially afford immigrants more opportunities to bypass racially segregated enclaves and reside closer to the non-Hispanic white majority. Conversely, while new areas may present more demographic opportunities to live next to certain residents, e.g. non-Hispanic whites, others have found that these same metros limit access to non-Hispanic white neighborhoods (Lichter et al. 2011; Hall 2013). Hinting at the underlying mechanism, Hall and Crowder (2014) found that the tendency for native-born residents to move away from census tracts with a higher average level of immigrants was more pronounced in metropolitan areas that were developing into a major immigrant gateway, although no significant differences were found when comparing new to established

destinations. In an attempt to tease out the role of demographic availability from housing discrimination practices, we account for the extent of metro-level racial/ethnic segregation in the models of residential attainment.

The third set of metropolitan characteristics we investigate are intended to capture a metropolitan area's ecological context and include population size, extent of new housing and degree of suburbanization. All three have been identified as predictors of aggregate-level immigrant segregation, although the degree that they affect variation in residential outcomes across destination type is not yet known (Iceland and Scopilliti, 2008). The traditional ecological argument holds that large population aggregations give rise to spatial differentiation and result in higher levels of segregation (South, et al., 2011), a pattern that has been consistently documented in the case of immigrant segregation (Hall, 2013, Park and Iceland, 2011). Conversely, new housing availability is often inversely associated with immigrant segregation and is hypothesized to create more opportunities for immigrants to attain residence in more desirable neighborhoods (Hall, 2013, Lichter, et al., 2010, Park and Iceland, 2011). Similarly, some have argued that suburbanization may create more opportunities for immigrants to gain access to more desirable neighborhoods, a pattern observed in the case of Latinos in traditional receiving areas but not in new immigrant destinations (Lichter, et al., 2010).

3. Data and Methods

Our analysis is built around the New Immigrant Survey (NIS), the first nationally representative dataset of newly legalized immigrants supplemented with geocoded residential addresses across over 150 metropolitan areas in the U.S. The NIS sample is unique in that it is the only survey that is nationally representative of any broad part of the U.S. foreign-born population, namely immigrants who achieved legal permanent residency at the beginning of the 21st century. The NIS is made up of immigrants who were granted a green card between May and November 2003. We reiterate here that the NIS does not include members of the currently unauthorized population nor individuals who have already achieved citizenship through naturalization. In 2003, legal permanent residents made up around one-third of the total foreign-born population (Rytina, 2005). Accordingly, the NIS is not nationally representative of the entire foreign-born population in the U.S. but rather the newly authorized population (of course, this necessarily includes some who began their settlement in the U.S. in an unauthorized state but subsequently adjusted their status). Indeed, one of our primary interests is to determine whether earlier aggregate-level analyses documenting higher levels of residential segregation in new destinations extends to the individual-level residential outcomes of newly legalized immigrants (Hall and Stringfield, 2014).

One of the primary strengths of the NIS is that it includes a diverse sample of immigrants from 169 different immigrant-sending countries who reside in over 150 metropolitan areas. It is precisely this diversity that allows us to determine how immigrants residentially integrate across metro America. When we consider the newly authorized population in its entirety we have an analytic sample of 7,619, which represents a loss of 954 observations

due to missing covariates (two of the primary sources of loss are missing information on English proficiency and the childhood income measure).

3.1. Dependent Variables

Following the common practice in previous work we use census tracts to approximate neighborhoods. We focus on three tract-level outcomes that indicate residential attainment: immigrant concentration, neighborhood poverty, and non-Hispanic white concentration. These are operationalized as the percent of the tract population that shares each respective trait. All of the tract level data come from the Summary Tape File 3 (STF3) of the 2000 decennial census.

3.2. Metropolitan-level Independent Variables

Our primary aim is to assess variation in immigrant residential outcomes across different destination type metropolitan areas. Past studies have typically relied on typologies to operationalize the immigration context of different communities (e.g. Park and Iceland 2011; Lichter et al. 2010; Hall 2013; Hall 2014). We follow Hall (2013) and distinguish metropolitan areas as “established”, “new”, and “minor.” “Established” refers to metropolitan areas where the metro percent foreign-born in 1980 exceeded the mean percent foreign-born across all metros and where the absolute number of immigrants in a particular metro exceeded the mean foreign-born population size across all metros. For all those metropolitan areas not classified as “established,” we determined if they fit the criteria for a new immigrant destination. “New” refers to non-established metropolitan areas where the percent foreign-born in 1990 was larger than the average percent foreign-born across all metros and the foreign-born growth rate in the 1980s or the 1990s was at least two times the metro mean foreign-born growth rate across all metros during each respective decade. “Minor” refers to metros not classified as either established or new.¹ As our data span three decades, all boundaries have been normalized to match 2000 census boundaries.

In addition to our focal destination type variables, we additively include three sets of metropolitan-level features that are relevant for immigrant spatial incorporation and have been identified in prior aggregate analyses of immigrant residential segregation to be characteristics of the metro context that are associated with residential outcomes. First, we add controls for demographic availability. These include the relative size of the foreign-born, poor, non-Hispanic black, Hispanic and Asian populations. Second, we include three measures of racial/ethnic segregation as measured by the dissimilarity index, the conventional measure of segregation which indicates the percentage of one racial/ethnic group that would have to move to other census tracts in order to achieve parity between groups in their distribution across all tracts in the metro. We include measures of the dissimilarity index measuring segregation between non-Hispanic whites and three different groups, non-Hispanic blacks, Latinos and Asians. Third, we include three measures of the metropolitan ecological context: the percent new housing (the number of new housing structures divided by the total number of housing structures), the percent suburban (the

¹We examined various categorizations of new, minor and established to assess the robustness of our results, including using Singer's (2004) categorization schema and Hall and Stringfield's (2014), and arrived at similar conclusions in each case.

percent of individuals residing in suburban locations in the metropolitan area); and a measure of the 2000 population size (which is logged because of the skewed nature of the distribution). All of the metro-level data come from the Summary Tape File 3 (STF3) of the 2000 decennial census, except for percent suburban which is assessed from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, State of the Cities Data Systems (SOCDS) and the dissimilarity indices which were estimated by Frey (2005) with data from the 2000 census (Frey, 2005).

3.3. Individual-level Independent Variables

An important feature of this analysis is our ability to assess the individual-level predictors of residential location. We include a cumulative measure of the respondent's time in the U.S. and a continuous measure of age. We also include an indicator for whether the respondent is currently married and the number of household members under the age of 18. We use a dummy indicator for whether the respondent owns their home, a continuous measure of the respondent's years of education, and a self-reported measure of English proficiency (categorized as proficient in spoken English or not). We include a dummy variable for whether the respondent's childhood family income was above average. The measure of childhood income comes from the following question: "Now I'd like to ask you some questions about when you were a child. Thinking about the time when you were 16 years old, compared with families in the country where you grew up, would you say your family income during that time was far below average, below average, average, above average, or far above average?" Responses of above average or far above average are coded as high childhood SES, others have a value of 0.

All respondents to the NIS survey were granted a greencard between May and November 2003. We include indicators for five visa class of admission categories coded as: immediate relative, other family preference, employment, diversity/other, and refugees. Although all respondents were officially granted a greencard, over one-fifth of the sample (21.7 percent) began their settlement in the U.S. in an unauthorized state but subsequently adjusted their status. We include an indicator of whether the individual had any previous trips to the U.S. without a valid visa to control for whether pre-immigration experiences were in undocumented status. Finally, we measure seven region/country of origin effects and indicators for the respondent's racial/ethnic self-identification (including black, white, Asian, and Hispanic, and missing race information).

3.4 Methods

We use hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to specify the association between immigrant destination type and the composition of immigrants' census tracts. Multi-level modeling is the appropriate technique for this assessment because of the hierarchical nature of the data structure which has individuals nested within metropolitan areas and because our primary interest is in understanding how the metro-level immigrant receiving context is associated with individual-level neighborhood attainment (South, et al., 2011). Multilevel models allow for the inclusion of a random intercept at the metropolitan level, which corrects for the observational clustering within metropolitan areas and, additionally, allows us to model variation in tract-level outcomes as a function of both individual and metro-level factors. All

the model sets presented consist of a series of two-level random-intercept models predicting residence in neighborhoods characterized by tract composition and quality (i.e. immigrant concentration, poverty level, and non-Hispanic white concentration). The first model set estimates a one-way analysis of variance with random effects, which indicates the extent of variance in neighborhood composition (i.e. tract-level percent foreign-born, poor, and non-Hispanic White) that exists across metropolitan areas. The second model set consists of 2-level random intercept models that include our primary metro-level predictor: immigrant destination type, i.e. established, new or minor. To assess the degree that the associations between immigrant metropolitan destination type and tract-level composition are explained by individual-level factors, the third set of models adds as predictors the individual-level covariates. Model sets four through six add the additional metropolitan-level covariates to evaluate the contributing role of the three different metro-level factor sets (i.e. demographic availability, segregation, and the ecological context).

4. Results

4.1. Characteristics of immigrant metropolitan destinations by destination type

Table 1 presents a descriptive picture of the different immigrant destination types used in the analysis. Of the 167 metros in the data, 73 (44 percent) are categorized as established immigrant destinations. The top three include the traditional immigrant receiving areas of Los Angeles, New York, and Chicago. Another 43 (26 percent) of the NIS metros are considered “new” according to our typology. These include such metros as Atlanta, Minneapolis, and Baltimore, MD. The remaining 51 (31 percent) are considered minor destinations and include metros such as Columbus OH, St. Louis, and Kansas City.

As expected, established immigrant destinations have the highest percent foreign-born, accounting for 17 percent of the total metro population. Minor destinations average only 3.3 percent foreign-born, with new destinations falling between these two extremes and averaging around 8.3 percent foreign-born. Established immigrant metros are considerably larger, on average, and more racially diverse than either new or minor areas, with fewer non-Hispanic Whites and higher percentages of Latinos and Asians. The exception is in the case of the non-Hispanic Black population whose share is largest in minor destination areas (15.3 percent), partially the result of the disproportionate location of minor destinations in Southern states compared to established destinations (over 40 percent of minor destinations are located in the South compared to only 22 percent of established destinations but 42 percent of new). Established destinations have higher levels of Hispanic-white segregation than either new or minor metros whereas minor destinations have higher levels of black-white segregation than either established or new metros. There are no significant differences across destination types in levels of Asian-white segregation levels. New immigrant metros have higher levels of new housing and lower levels of suburbanization, on average, than established or minor metros, although the differences in suburbanization across destination type are not significant. There are no significant differences in metropolitan poverty level across the three destination types.

4.2. Characteristics of immigrants by destination type

Table 2 presents a description of the average characteristics of NIS immigrants residing in the different immigrant destination types. Reflecting the continued pull of traditional immigrant destinations, the majority of the sample of newly legalized immigrants resides in established metropolitan areas (86.3 percent), with another 8.9 percent residing in new destination areas and only 4.8 percent in minor immigrant destinations.²

NIS immigrants residing in established metros have been in U.S. the longest--on average for 4.5 years and are significantly older than immigrants in new or minor destinations. Despite their longer average tenure, immigrants in established destinations have significantly lower levels reporting that they speak English well. They also have significantly lower levels of education, on average, compared to immigrants in minor and new metros. In minor destinations more immigrants come from a high SES background than in established or new metros; they are also more likely to be married. There are no significant differences across metros in the sex ratio or the average number of minors in the household.

In the general sample and across the metro types, the majority of immigrants received legal permanent residency via either an immediate relative or a family preference visa. Minor destinations have higher percentages arriving on employment visas whereas refugee entrants are more highly represented in established metros than in either new or minor ones. The highest proportion of immigrants reporting that they had taken a previously undocumented trip to the U.S. occurs among immigrants residing in established areas (23.1 percent) and the lowest in minor areas (6.6 percent).

In terms of racial identification, established destinations have a higher percentage who identify racially as Hispanic than in new or minor metros. In terms of region of origin, established metros have a larger percentage of Mexicans (18.6 percent), South/Central Americans (26.6 percent) and Asians than compared to new or minor destinations and the lowest proportion of immigrants from Africa (7 percent compared to roughly 16 percent each for new and minor), India and the Middle East. Minor destinations have higher proportions of immigrants from Asia, India, the Middle East, Africa and Eastern and Western Europe.

The bottom section of the table demonstrates that immigrants live in significantly different neighborhoods depending on destination type. Compared to immigrants in new or minor destinations, immigrants in established metros live in tracts that, on average, have more immigrants (double and quadruple the percentages in new destinations and minor destinations--30.3 percent compared to 12.2 percent and 6.3 percent, respectively), have more poor residents (14.3 percent), and considerably fewer non-Hispanic white residents (45 percent compared to 67.4 percent in new destinations and 77 percent in minor destinations). Individuals in minor destinations have the most positive residential outcomes to the extent that they reside in tracts that have, on average, the lowest percentage of poor residents (9.3

²This distribution closely matches the degree that the total foreign-born population has settled in new destinations. Analysis of the U.S. 2000 census demonstrates that among immigrants who have settled in the 167 metropolitan areas represented in our data, 86.8% resided in established metros, 8.0% in new immigrant destinations and 5.3% in minor ones.

percent) and immigrants (6.3 percent) and the highest percentage non-Hispanic Whites (77.1 percent).

4.3. Multivariate results of immigrant residential attainment

Our key question is whether residence in different neighborhoods is conditioned upon the immigrant destination type of the metropolitan area (as opposed to a uniform nation-wide process), and, if so, determining which individual and metro-level factors account for the differences. Table 3 presents the first set of multilevel linear models predicting average neighborhood composition for three different tract-level outcomes (percent of the tract that is: foreign-born, poor, and non-Hispanic white). The first model is an empty model with no covariates from which the variance components are used to calculate the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC). The ICC indicates the percent of the variance in the tract characteristics that exists *across* metros and is calculated by dividing the level-2 variation by the sum of the level-2 and level-1 variation (South, et al., 2011). The variance components indicate that a substantial portion of variation in exposure to different types of neighborhoods exists across metropolitan areas--from over one-third of the variation in percent tract foreign born and percent white to nearly one-fifth for percent poor.³ Model 2 adds the main metro-level explanatory variable to the model, i.e. whether the metropolitan area is an established, new or minor immigrant destination. Changes in the variance components from model 1 to model 2, demonstrate the amount of the variance in exposure to different tract percentages that is the result of being located in established, new or minor immigrant destinations. Not surprisingly, a sizable amount of variance in tract percentage foreign-born at the metropolitan level is accounted for by assessing the destination type of the metro. Immigrant destination type explains 41 percent of the metro-level variance in immigrants' exposure to other immigrants. Metro-level destination type also explains a large (nearly one-third) portion of metro-level variance in immigrants' exposure to non-Hispanic whites (32.7 percent) but a much smaller portion of the variance in exposure to poor residents (only 11.3 percent).⁴

The direction of the effects indicate that, before accounting for individual-level covariates or place-to-place differences in metropolitan structure, newly legalized immigrants display more advantaged residential outcomes in new and minor areas compared to established destinations. In contrast to several prior studies of immigrant residential segregation that have found higher levels of segregation in new destinations, we find that, in terms of individual-level residential outcomes among the NIS immigrants, those in new or minor destinations are significantly less likely to reside in tracts with higher average levels of other immigrants or poor residents than in established metros. They are also significantly more likely to reside in tracts with higher average levels of non-Hispanic white neighbors in new or minor destinations compared to established metros. In general, the contrasts are particularly pronounced when comparing minor destinations to established ones.

³Calculations of ICC taken from Table 3, Model 1: Percent foreign-born: $96.94/(96.94+183.33)=34.6$ percent. Percent poor $23.52/(23.52+95.01)=19.2$ percent. Percent non-Hispanic white $338.15/(338.15+616.62)=35.4$ percent.

⁴Calculations of changes in variance components. Taken from Table 3, Models 1 and 2: Percent foreign-born: $(96.94-57.05)/96.94=41.15$ percent. Percent Poor: $(23.52-20.87)/23.52=11.27$ percent. Percent non-Hispanic white: $(338.15-227.50)/338.15=32.72$ percent

Table 4 adds the full set of individual-level controls, enabling us to answer the second research question which asks the degree to which individual-level factors are responsible for the observed differences in residential outcomes across destination types. The coefficients are only slightly attenuated and suggest that the individual characteristics are not highly consequential in explaining differences in the tendency to have immigrant, non-Hispanic white or, to a lesser extent, poor neighbors across destination types. All of the new and minor contrasts, with one exception, remain significantly different from established metros once we account for differences in individual-level characteristics. The exception is in the case of neighborhood poverty, whereby the negative coefficient for minor destinations is rendered insignificant once individual covariates are added to the model.

The individual-level factors operate as expected. These predictors demonstrate evidence in support of both the spatial assimilation and place stratification perspectives of immigrant residential attainment. In accordance with the spatial assimilation tradition, NIS immigrants are able to translate higher socioeconomic status into closer residence with the non-poor and the non-Hispanic white majority and farther away from immigrant concentrated neighborhoods. All three socioeconomic measures are highly significant for predicting residential location and all operate in the expected direction. Home ownership, higher education level and high childhood SES are all positively associated with residence in tracts with more non-Hispanic white neighbors (column 3) and negatively associated with residence in tracts with higher levels of immigrants (column 1) and poverty (column 2). In terms of acculturation, we find that immigrants who are English proficient are less likely to reside next to their fellow immigrants or in poor neighborhoods and are more likely to have non-Hispanic white neighbors. However, in the case of years in the U.S., a pattern in opposition to spatial assimilation emerges. Among this sample of newly legalized immigrants, we find that individuals with more U.S. experience are significantly more likely to reside in neighborhoods with more immigrants, after accounting for the other individual covariates. We suspect this finding is related to the nature of the NIS sample of new legal permanent residents. In this sample, it is likely that immigrants who have been in the U.S. for longer periods have characteristics that make them more likely to reside in ethnic enclaves. This is empirically supported by additional specifications (not shown) in which, for immigrants here less than a year, there is a negative association between time in the U.S. and tract percent foreign born; for those here more than a year, the relationship is positive.

Findings in line with the place stratification perspective are evident in the strong racial patterning in residence. All immigrants who do not identify as white are significantly less likely to have non-Hispanic white neighbors (column 3). Supporting past work that suggests that the failure to choose a racial identity is itself the product of a racialization process, those who did not report a racial identification are even less likely to live in a tract with higher levels of non-Hispanic white residents than immigrants who identified Hispanic as their racial identity (Frank, et al., 2010).

After controlling for racial identity, Mexican immigrants are the least likely to have non-Hispanic white neighbors (Column 3). With the exception of South/Central Americans, all of the other immigrant groups are significantly less likely than Mexican immigrants to live in immigrant and poor neighborhoods. The type of visa an immigrant enters on is also

significantly associated with residence in certain types of tracts. Relative to immigrants who enter on a family preference visa via an immediate family member, immigrants who enter on a non-immediate relative family preference visa, a diversity visa, or a refugee visa are all more likely to reside in tracts with more immigrants (column 1) and more poor residents (column 2). Immigrants who enter on an employment visa are more likely to reside next to non-Hispanic whites. Individuals who reported having taken a previously undocumented trip to the U.S. display significantly worse residential outcomes and are significantly more likely to reside in tracts with relatively more immigrants and poor residents.

If individual-level compositional differences play a relatively minor role in contributing to variation across metro destination types in residential attainment, then our third research question turns towards the characteristics of the metros themselves. The benefit of multilevel models is that we are able to evaluate, not only the role of individual-level compositional differences in contributing to variation in residential outcomes across destination types, but also simultaneously account for the metropolitan context. That is we can assess the degree that different residential outcomes across destination types are due to variation in metro-level factors. Table 5 presents three sets of models that additively account for different sets of metropolitan characteristics. The first three columns add metro-level controls intended to account for variation in demographic availability. This set of models asks whether immigrants in new and minor destinations are less likely to live in tracts with, on average, more foreign-born, poor and non-white residents because these metros simply have fewer foreign born, poor and non-white residents than do established destinations. In Table 5, Model set 1, all of the destination contrasts are substantially reduced when the metropolitan compositional controls are included. The reductions are particularly large, and in fact are rendered insignificant, in the cases of predicting tract immigrant and poverty levels for new compared to established destinations. In the case of the contrasts in residential outcomes between new and established destinations, the results suggest that a key explanation involves differences in the relative size of the immigrant, poor and minority populations across these metro types.

Comparing minor to established destinations, controlling for metro demographic availability substantially reduces the gap in residential outcomes but significant differences remain, suggesting other factors beyond metro-level compositional differences are at work. In fact, the contrast between minor and established in predicting tract-level poverty regains significance in Model 2, partially due to the larger relative sizes of the non-Hispanic black and Latino populations in established metros which suppresses the positive effect of minor destinations. The main metro-level compositional effects operate as expected. Higher proportions of foreign-born residents in the metropolitan area are associated with increases in the probability that immigrants reside in tracts with relatively higher levels of other immigrants (Table 5, Model set 1). Displaying a similar magnitude, the coefficients for metro-level poverty demonstrate that higher levels of poverty in the metro are associated with an increased probability of residing in a relatively poorer neighborhood. And higher levels of non-White minority groups in the metro (i.e. non-Hispanic blacks, Asians and Latinos) are all significantly associated with a lower likelihood of residing in a tract with relatively more non-Hispanic whites. These main metro-level compositional associations are all highly significant and remain virtually unchanged in full model indicating robust

associations between these metropolitan compositional factors and immigrant residential outcomes.

The next set of models includes three measures that account for levels of metropolitan racial segregation (Table 5, Model set 2). The addition of metro-level segregation indices evaluates whether, beyond demographic compositional differences, different levels of metro-level racial segregation funnel immigrants into less desirable neighborhoods in established compared to new and minor destinations. The results demonstrate that, of the remaining significant destination type contrasts, all are partially reduced once controls for metro-level racial residential segregation are added to the model and, additionally, the contrast between minor and established metros in predicting tract-level percent foreign-born is rendered insignificant. The three types of segregation are generally positive for predicting tract-level foreign-born size and poverty levels and negative for predicting tract-level size of the non-Hispanic white population. However, none are statistically significant in predicting the neighborhood outcomes with metro-level nativity, racial composition, and poverty held constant in the model. The only exception is the coefficient for white-Hispanic segregation levels in predicting neighborhood poverty, which is positive and statistically significant. Higher levels of white-Hispanic segregation at the metro-level are significantly associated with a higher likelihood of immigrants residing in relatively poorer neighborhoods. This positive effect occurs in the context of two negative racial composition metro-level effects (for metro percent Latino and non-Hispanic Black) that lower the probability of residing in a relatively poor tract. While residence in metros with more Latinos and Blacks opens up opportunities for immigrants to reside outside of relatively poorer neighborhoods, higher levels of Hispanic-white segregation operate in the opposite direction.

The last set of models accounts for a set of metropolitan-level ecological features to evaluate the role of metropolitan population size, new housing and suburbanization level in impacting the contrasts in tract-level outcomes across immigrant destination type. As observed in the aggregate-level segregation literature, the results demonstrate that at the individual-level, residence in larger metropolitan areas increases the probability of living in tracts with relatively more immigrants and poor residents. New housing operates in the opposite direction and significantly decreases the probability of residence in a poor neighborhood. As documented in the black-white residential attainment literature, the ecological variables suggest that metros with more new housing open up opportunities to live closer to non-Hispanic whites even as higher levels of suburbanization limits these opportunities (South et al. 2011).

The addition of these variables renders the previously significant contrast between minor and established metros in predicting tract-level poverty insignificant. As a result, in the full models, no significant differences remain in the residential outcomes for either tract percent immigrant or for percent poor between new and minor destinations on one hand and established destinations on the other. These results suggest that in the cases of immigrant concentration and neighborhood poverty, any residential advantages associated with residence in new or minor metros are explained entirely by place-to-place differences in metropolitan structure, particularly differences in demographic availability. The exception is in predicting tract-level non-Hispanic white. Even with the addition of the ecological

variables, significant contrasts remain in the probability of living with relatively more non-Hispanic Whites in new and minor compared to established immigrant destinations. Beyond metro-level demographic availability, segregation, and ecological factors, Model 3 suggests that newly legalized immigrants in new and minor destinations are residentially integrating with non-Hispanic Whites more successfully than in established destinations.

Additional Analyses—The more advantaged residential outcomes experienced by immigrants in new and minor destinations compared to established ones apply to the general newly legalized immigrant population. It may be that these patterns do not extend to all immigrant sub-groups. To the extent that the existing literature has documented higher levels of immigrant residential segregation in new immigrant destinations it has often been with respect to Latino immigrants (e.g. Lichter et al. 2010) or in metros with higher levels of undocumented Latino immigrants (e.g. Hall and Stringfield 2014). To assess whether the positive residential outcomes we documented in new and minor areas hold for different immigrant groups we conducted several additional analyses (results presented in Appendices A-C). First, we analyzed sub-samples of Latino and Asian immigrants separately to determine if the associations between immigrant destination type and residential attainment were different for the two largest immigrant groups (Appendices A and B). While pan-ethnic groupings are not ideal, sample size issues precluded distinguishing the sample by specific country-of-origin groups. Acknowledging the diversity within such large pan-ethnic categories as Latino and Asian, we included, in addition to the range of individual characteristics, specific origin-country dummies to the extent that sample size permitted (Mexico and El Salvador for the Latino immigrant sub-sample and China and India for the Asian immigrant sub-sample). The findings for both groups largely replicated those documented in the general NIS immigrant sample, with some differences. Before controls, Latino and Asian immigrants generally had more positive residential outcomes in new and minor destinations compared to established ones. In new and minor destinations both groups were significantly less likely to live next to other immigrants and more likely to live next to non-Hispanic white neighbors, although in the fully specified model only Latino immigrants in minor destinations remained significantly more likely to reside next to non-Hispanic whites. An additional difference concerns the lack of a significant relationship between destination type and tract-level poverty level. In the general sample, immigrants in new and minor destinations were significantly less likely to reside in relatively poorer neighborhoods, before accounting for individual and metropolitan-level differences. For Latino and Asian immigrants, the coefficients for new and minor destination types, while similarly negative, were smaller in magnitude and not significantly predictive of tract-level poverty level.

Another related, although distinct, question is whether the patterns we documented in the general immigrant sample, and among Latinos and Asians separately, would hold if we reclassified metropolitan areas based on each immigrant sub-group's specific representation (Hall 2013). Instead of assessing the residential attainment process for Latinos and Asians in new and minor immigrant destinations, a group-specific typology assesses residential outcomes for Latino immigrants in "new Latino" or "minor Latino" destinations compared to "established Latino destinations" (e.g. Hall 2013; Lichter et al. 2011). Under the group-specific categorizations, the top new destinations for Asian immigrants included Atlanta,

Fort Worth, Texas and Arlington, Virginia whereas for Latinos the top new destinations were Las Vegas, Nevada, Atlanta and Austin, Texas. Despite changes in the metropolitan areas that constituted each destination type, the general patterns largely remained the same as observed in the full immigrant sample and in the Latino and Asian sub-samples based on the immigrant-wide typology. Latino immigrants in new Latino and minor Latino destinations had significantly more advantaged residential outcomes than in established Latino areas. Similar patterns, although with smaller magnitudes, were found for Asian immigrants in new and minor Asian immigrant metros. One key exception again concerns tract-level poverty, which was not significantly different for Asian immigrants in new or minor Asian immigrant destinations compared to established Asian immigrant destinations. Similar to the Latino and Asian sub-group analysis using the immigrant-wide destination typology, once the full set of individual and metro-level controls were included in the model there were no significant differences in residential outcomes for Latino or Asian immigrants in new or minor destinations compared to established ones. Accordingly, once place-to-place differences in metropolitan structure are accounted for, particularly differences in demographic availability, the residential outcomes of Latino and Asian immigrants are no better in new or minor areas than in established ones. The singular exception is Latino immigrants in minor metros (using the immigrant-wide classification scheme), who remain significantly more likely to reside in tracts with relatively higher levels of non-Hispanic whites (Appendix A, Panel A, Model C).

A final additional analysis we conducted was to assess whether there are differences in residential outcomes across destination type depending on prior documentation status for Latino immigrants. It may be that the more advantaged residential outcomes we documented in new and minor destinations among Latino immigrants prior to accounting for metropolitan-level differences, do not extend to those who were previously undocumented. Previous research has suggested as much, finding higher levels of segregation in metros with higher levels of undocumented Latino immigrants (Hall and Stringfield 2014). The NIS sample includes a sub-set of individuals who made a previously unauthorized trip to the U.S. As a way of exploring the possibility of variation by documentation status for Latino immigrants, we ran an additional set of models that included a cross-level interaction between previously undocumented trip and the Latino-specific destination typology (Appendix C). Only one of the six interaction terms was significant (a negative coefficient for undocumented trip and a minor receiving destination in the model predicting non-Hispanic white representation), and the interaction term lost statistical significance when the individual-level predictors were added to the model, suggesting that this diminished residential outcome for those with a previously undocumented trip in minor destinations is reflective of other individual-level characteristics that are associated with previous undocumented status. The obvious limitation with this assessment is that is we are unable to assess the role of current documentation status.

Taken together, the results from the ancillary analyses demonstrate that, as in the general sample of newly legalized immigrants, the Latino and Asian immigrant sub-sets of this population generally experience more advantaged residential outcomes in new and minor destinations, at least before place-to-place differences in metropolitan context are taken into account. This pattern is evident regardless if we are using the immigrant wide-destination

typology or group specific categorizations of metropolitan destination type, but was much less evident of the case of neighborhood poverty. Unlike in the general sample, however, the improved residential outcomes were nearly fully accounted for by the individual and metropolitan covariates included in the models. This is in contrast to the full immigrant sample, in which immigrants continued to display a higher likelihood of residing near non-Hispanic Whites in new and minor destinations compared to established ones, even after accounting for a range of metro-level factors.

5. Conclusion

According to immigration scholar Roger Waldinger: “Much of the sociological research on the new immigration to the United States is about people who just happen to live in cities; but how the particular characteristics of the immigrant-receiving areas impinge on the newcomers is a question immigration researchers rarely raise” (Waldinger 1989: 211). In our analysis, we applied this question to the case of differences in immigrant residential settlement in new and minor versus established immigrant destinations. Whether immigrants’ prospects for successful incorporation vary across this new variety of settlement areas has been subject to debate, particularly when contrasting traditional immigrant receiving destinations to newer ones. We bring new evidence to bear on this question in the case of residential attainment for newly legalized immigrants. By conducting a multi-level analysis of a nationally representative sample of the newly legalized immigrant population, the analysis presented here tested one of the implicit assumptions of the immigrant residential segregation literature, namely that, net of individual characteristics, destination type influences the composition and quality of immigrants’ neighborhoods.

Our analysis documents that, even after accounting for individual-level characteristics, differences in immigrants’ residential outcomes persist across established, new and minor destinations. In this sense we affirm the conclusions from prior aggregate-level analyses that differences in residential outcomes by metro areas characterized by different histories of immigration go beyond individual-level factors (Hall, 2013, Lichter, et al., 2010). In other ways, however, our results diverge from prior work on immigrant residential segregation. Instead of worse residential prospects for immigrants in new and minor destinations, we found that newly legalized immigrants had better residential outcomes in new and minor destinations to the extent that they were less likely to reside near other immigrants and in poor neighborhoods and more likely to reside near non-Hispanic Whites. In this respect, we find evidence for the contention that, largely due to a combination of metro-level compositional and structural factors, immigrants have more positive residential outcomes in new and emerging immigrant destinations than established ones (Alba, et al., 2010, Iceland and Scopilliti, 2008). As argued by Hirschman and Massey (2008), we also conclude that, although immigrants in new and minor immigrant receiving areas may, “at times encounter indifferences and even hostility on occasion, the dominant response still appears to be incorporation within the larger American ‘nation of immigrants’” (4).

There are three qualifications to our general findings. First, the more advantaged residential outcomes in new and minor destinations were most evident in the case of tract percent immigrant and percent non-Hispanic white concentration. Residence in relatively poor tracts

demonstrated much smaller differences across destination types, and, in the case of Hispanics and Asians, trended towards insignificant (Iceland, 2009, Logan, et al., 2002). The weaker pattern for neighborhood poverty draws attention to the distinction between ethno-racial differences in neighborhood composition on one hand and differences in neighborhood quality on the other. Neighborhood conditions, such as exposure to poverty and crime, are highly relevant to life quality, and the finding that neighborhood poverty is less variable across destination types suggests that there are limits to the significance of destination type in shaping immigrant residential experiences, at least in the case of some neighborhood conditions.

A second qualification concerns our attempt to unpack the more advantaged residential outcomes observed in new and minor destinations. Overall, we found that the patterns were primarily due to metro-level demographic compositional differences. The fact that these baseline advantages were accounted for does not diminish their significance but rather suggests that there is nothing intrinsic about the integration processes occurring in new and minor metros that distinguish them from more established ones. Instead, it is their demographic composition, and to a lesser degree their segregation profiles and ecological structures, that enable them to provide immigrants with more advantaged residential opportunities. The exception is in the case of predicting residence near relatively more non-Hispanic Whites. In this case, we found enduring positive effects in new and minor areas compared to established immigrant destinations. For the most part, this pattern was only evident in the full sample and did not extend to the Asian or Latino immigrant sub-samples. These findings potentially point to mechanisms unique to new and minor destination areas that function to better spatially integrate certain immigrants into non-Hispanic white neighborhoods, beyond the individual characteristics and metro-level conditions we consider here. A direction for future work is to specify under which conditions, and for which groups, immigrants are more successfully accessing non-Hispanic white neighborhoods in these metropolitan areas.

A third qualification to our findings is that they apply only to the population of newly legalized immigrants. One possible reason for the better residential outcomes in new and minor destinations observed in our sample is that the NIS does not include the currently unauthorized population, precisely the group some prior analyses have suggested to be particularly disadvantaged in new destinations and the most vulnerable to discrimination and blocked opportunities (Massey, 2008). The possibility that legal status plays a consequential role in explaining differences in residential segregation across destination types has been raised recently in an aggregate-level analysis of the Mexican immigrant population (Hall and Stringfield 2014). While our ancillary evidence of Latino immigrants did not find strong evidence that previous undocumented status plays a consequential role in predicting differences in contemporary residential outcomes by destination type, it by no means rules it out. Indeed, our findings that the residential prospects of newly legalized immigrants are not disadvantaged in new or minor destinations points to the potential relevance legal status may hold in understanding differences in immigrant residential attainment across destination types.⁵ In this sense our findings do not necessarily contradict Lichter et al.'s (2010) prediction of increasing spatial balkanization as a result of increasing immigrant geographic

diversification, but rather qualifies it as not extending to the individual-level residential outcomes of the newly authorized immigrant population generally.

We have argued that the multilevel analysis presented here is a significant advance over past work on the contextual predictors of immigrant residential attainment that has been limited by aggregate-level data. However, our analysis remains limited by the cross-sectional nature of the data. The individual and metro-level associations revealed here could be a consequence (instead of a cause) of neighborhood attainment. Aggregate-level segregation research has also highlighted the dynamic nature of immigrant geographic diversification and segregation. In explaining the apparent lack of change in the national averages of Latino and Asian segregation over the last few decades, Logan and Stults (2011) point to two counterbalancing trends. While Latino and Asian population growth has occurred more rapidly in the last three decades in metropolitan areas with lower levels of segregation, there has also been increasing segregation within those regions that have gained the largest shares of Latinos and Asians. So areas of low segregation that are receiving new immigrants have themselves become more segregated. Similarly, Park and Iceland (2011) found that, in the case of Hispanics, segregation levels, while lower in new destination areas, were converging with those of established areas over time. These trends mean that cross-sectional snapshots of immigrant geographic diversification and differences in residential outcomes, like the one presented here, are capturing only one moment in a dynamic system of continual change. The NIS fielded a second wave of data five years after the first and, once geocoded, has the potential to provide researchers the opportunity to incorporate a longitudinal dimension to future analyses of the residential attainment process.

We draw attention to the fact that our focus on the adult sample of the NIS focuses on immigrants exclusively (and not on subsequent generations). This allows us to concentrate precisely on those individuals who set the stage for the residential integration of future generations. Only by first understanding how the foreign-born population navigates the residential settlement process across metro America can we begin to understand the constraints and opportunities faced by their descendants.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported in part by P2C-HD058484 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development awarded to the Ohio State University Institute for Population Research.

References

1. Alba R, Deane G, Denton N, Disha I, McKenzie B, Napierala J. The Role of Immigrant Enclaves for Latino Residential Inequalities. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies*. 2014; 40:1–20. [PubMed: 24563610]

⁵To assess whether there were differences in the distribution of individual-level characteristics between the newly legal and the total foreign-born population across destination types, we compared our data to the foreign-born segment of the U.S. census 2000. We found considerable similarities in the patterning of the individual-level characteristics across destination types, giving more weight to the possibility that it is legal status (and not differences in individual-level characteristics between the newly legal and total foreign-born population across destination types) that is at the root of the differences between previous aggregate-level segregation research and our study.

2. Alba, R.; Denton, N.; Hernandez, D.; Disha, I.; McKenzie, 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*. Urban Institute Press; Washington DC: 2010. p. 3-47.
3. Alba, R.; Nee, V. *Remaking the American Mainstream*. Harvard University Press; Cambridge: 2003.
4. Alba RD, Logan JR. Minority Proximity to Whites in Suburbs: An Individual-Level Analysis of Segregation. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1993; 98:1388–1427.
5. Alba RD, Logan JR, Stults BJ. The Changing Neighborhood Contexts of the Immigrant Metropolis. *Social Forces*. 2000; 79:587.
6. Cort DA. Reexamining the Ethnic Hierarchy of Locational Attainment: Evidence from Los Angeles. *Social Science Research*. 2011; 40:1521–1533.
7. Fischer, M.; Tienda, M. Redrawing the Spatial Color Line: Hispanic Metropolitan Dispersal, Segregation, and Economic Opportunity. In: Tienda, M.; Mitchell, F., editors. *Hispanics and the Future of America*. The National Academies Press; Washington D.C.: 2006. p. 100-131.
8. Frank R, Akresh IR, Lu B. Latino Immigrants and the U.S. Racial Order: How and Where Do They Fit In? *American Sociological Review*. 2010; 75:378–401.
9. Frey WH. Analysis of 2005-9 American Community Survey and 2000 Census Decennial Census tract data. 2005
10. Hall M. Residential Integration on the New Frontier: Immigrant Segregation in Established and New Destinations. *Demography*. 2013; 50:1873–1896. [PubMed: 23192394]
11. Hall M, Stringfield J. Undocumented Migration and the Residential Segregation of Mexicans in New Destinations. *Social Science Research*. 2014; 47:61–78. [PubMed: 24913945]
12. Hirschman, C.; Massey, DS. *Places and Peoples: The New American Mosaic, New Faces in New Places: the Changing Geography of American Immigration*. Russell Sage Foundation; New York: 2008. p. 1-21.
13. Iceland, J. *Where We Live Now: Immigration and Race in the United States*. University of California Press; Berkeley: 2009.
14. Iceland J, Scopilliti M. IMMIGRANT RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION IN U.S. METROPOLITAN AREAS, 1990-2000. *Demography*. 2008; 45:79–94. [PubMed: 18390292]
15. Krivo LJ, Peterson RD, Kuhl DC. Segregation, Racial Structure, and Neighborhood Violent Crime. *American Journal of Sociology*. 2009; 114:1765–1802.
16. Leach, MA.; Bean, FD. The Structure and Dynamics of Mexican Migration to New Destinations in the United States. In: Massey, DS., editor. *New Faces in New Places: the Changing Geography of American Immigration*. Russell Sage Foundation; New York: 2008.
17. Lichter DT, Parisi D, Taquino MC, Grice SM. Residential Segregation in New Hispanic Destinations: Cities, Suburbs, and Rural Communities Compared. *Social Science Research*. 2010; 39:215–230.
18. Logan JR, Alba RD, McNulty T. Making a place in the metropolis: Locational attainment in cities and suburbs. *Demography*. 1996; 33:443–453. 1996, B.F. [PubMed: 8939417]
19. Logan JR, Alba RD, Shu-Yin L. Minority Access to White Suburbs: A Multiregional Comparison. *Social Forces*. 1996; 74:851–881.
20. Logan JR, Alba RD, Zhang W. Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles. *American Sociological Review*. 2002; 67:299–322.
21. Logan, JR.; Stults, BJ. The Persistence of Segregation in the Metropolis: New Findings from the 2010 Census, Census Brief prepared for Project U.S. 2010. Brown University; 2011.
22. Massey, D. Assimilation in a New Geography. In: Massey, DS., editor. *New Faces in New Places: the Changing Geography of American Immigration*. Russell Sage Foundation; New York: 2008. p. 343-353.
23. Massey, D.; Capoferro, C. The Geographic Diversification of American Immigration. In: Massey, D., editor. *New Faces in New Places: the Changing Geography of American Immigration*. Russell Sage Foundation; New York: 2008. p. 25-50.

24. Massey DS, Mullan BP. Processes of Hispanic and Black Spatial Assimilation. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1984; 89:836–873.
25. Pais J, South SJ, Crowder K. Metropolitan Heterogeneity and Minority Neighborhood Attainment: Spatial Assimilation or Place Stratification? *Social Problems*. 2012; 59:258–281. [PubMed: 22639470]
26. Park J, Iceland J. Residential segregation in metropolitan established immigrant gateways and new destinations, 1990–2000. *Social Science Research*. 2011; 40:811–821. [PubMed: 25589795]
27. Parrado, EA.; Kandel, W. New Hispanic Migrant Destinations; A Tale of Two Industries. In: Massey, DS., editor. *New Faces in New Places: the Changing Geography of American Immigration*. Russell Sage Foundation; New York: 2008. p. 99-123.
28. Rytina, N. Estimates of the Legal Permanent Resident Population and Population Eligible to Naturalize in 2003. Statistics, U. S. D. o. H. S. O. o. I. , editor. Washington D.C.: 2005.
29. Sampson RJ, Sharkey P. Neighborhood Selection and the Social Reproduction of Concentrated Racial Inequality. *Demography*. 2008; 45:1–29. [PubMed: 18390289]
30. Singer, A. *The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways, The Living in Cities Census Series*. The Brookings Institution; Washington DC: 2004.
31. Singer, A. Immigrants in 2012 Metropolitan America: A Decade of Change, Keynote presentation presented to the National Immigrant Integration Conference. Seattle: 2011.
32. Singer, A. Migration and the Metropolis. In: Mah, B., editor. *Cities of Migration Practice to Policy: Lessons from Local Leadership on Immigrant Integration*. The Maytree Foundation; 2013. p. 9-10.
33. South S, Crowder K, Pais J. Metropolitan Structure and Neighborhood Attainment: Exploring Intermetropolitan Variation in Racial Residential Segregation. *Demography*. 2011; 48:1263–1292. [PubMed: 21863366]
34. South SJ, Crowder K, Chavez E. Geographic Mobility and Spatial Assimilation among U.S. Latino Immigrants. *International Migration Review*. 2005; 39:577–607.
35. South SJ, Crowder K, Chavez E. Migration and Spatial Assimilation among U.S. Latinos: Classical versus Segmented Trajectories. *Demography*. 2005; 42:497–521. [PubMed: 16235610]
36. Swisher RR, Kuhl DC, Chavez JM. Racial and Ethnic Differences in Neighborhood Attainments in the Transition to Adulthood. *Social Forces*. 2013; 91:1399–1428.
37. Timberlake JM, Iceland J. Change in Racial and Ethnic Residential Inequality in American Cities, 1970–2000. *City & Community*. 2007; 6:335–365.
38. Waldinger R. Immigration and Urban Change. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 1989; 15:211–232.
39. Zúñiga, V.; Hernández-León, R. *New destinations : Mexican immigration in the United States*. Russell Sage Foundation; New York: 2005.

Table 1

Metro Level Sample Characteristics

	New (n=43)		Minor (n=51)		Established (n=73)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Percent New Housing _{a,c}	22.37	6.60	17.80	6.66	16.47	8.18
Percent in Poverty	11.72	4.06	11.49	2.75	12.96	6.08
Percent Suburban	59.67	19.37	62.50	18.15	63.92	21.43
Percent Black _{a,b}	9.38	8.21	15.32	11.18	8.31	6.41
Percent Latino _{a,b,c}	10.99	9.19	3.53	3.00	23.84	21.15
Percent Asian _{a,b,c}	2.75	1.69	1.24	0.54	5.68	7.62
Percent Non-Hispanic White _{b,c}	78.68	8.18	79.03	10.89	71.77	12.10
Percent Foreign-Born _{a,b,c}	8.27	3.28	3.33	1.05	17.06	9.48
Population in 2000 _{b,c}	745308	836621	679851	593322	1755362	1988617
Segregation						
White-Black _{a,c}	48.55	13.37	57.86	12.06	56.15	14.23
White-Hispanic _{b,c}	38.44	11.17	35.61	10.72	46.40	10.22
White-Asian _{a,c}	36.23	8.13	38.52	6.28	38.79	8.24

Note: a indicates significant difference (at the 5% level between minor and new, b indicates significant difference at the 5% level between minor and established, c indicates a significant difference at the 5% level between new and established.

Source: New Immigrant Survey, 2003.

Table 2

Individual-level Sample Characteristics

	New	Established	Minor
Percent of Sample	8.89	86.33	4.78
Individual level			
<i>Descriptive Characteristics (Means unless otherwise noted)</i>			
Years of U.S. Experience _{a,b,c}	3.75	4.53	3.06
Age _{b, c}	37.15	39.20	36.89
Owns Home _b	0.18	0.15	0.21
Years of Education _{a,b,c}	12.90	12.00	14.37
High Childhood SES _{a,b}	0.19	0.18	0.26
Married _{a,b}	0.77	0.74	0.88
Speaks English Well _{a,b,c}	0.56	0.46	0.64
Female	0.59	0.56	0.58
Number in Household under 18	0.96	0.98	0.96
% Undocumented Trip _{a,b,c}	16.49	23.06	6.63
<i>Class of Admission_d (%)</i>			
Immediate Relative	50.77	48.42	53.07
Family Preference	15.25	18.24	6.50
Employment	10.76	9.04	19.02
Diversity/Other	11.46	8.85	10.73
Refugee	11.76	15.45	10.69
<i>Respondent's Race</i>			
Black _{b,c}	0.15	0.08	0.17
Asian	0.29	0.29	0.33
Hispanic _{a,b,c}	0.32	0.42	0.22
Other	0.00	0.01	0.00
Missing Race Information _b	0.03	0.02	0.04
<i>Region of Origin_d (%)</i>			
South/Central America	17.77	26.61	13.38
Mexico	16.95	18.64	9.77
W Europe	7.02	4.07	8.33
E Europe	9.06	9.73	11.75
Asia	18.82	20.08	21.60
India, Middle East	14.32	13.15	18.38
Africa	16.07	7.00	16.80
Tract-level (%)			
Percent Foreign Born _{a,b,c}	12.26	30.27	6.35
Percent in Poverty _{b,c}	10.39	14.31	9.30
Percent Non-Hispanic White _{a,b,c}	67.38	44.99	77.09
Unweighted N	704	6540	375

Note: **a** indicates significant difference (at the 5% level between minor and new, **b** indicates significant difference at the 5% level between minor and established, **c** indicates a significant difference at the 5% level between new and established, **d** indicates a chi-squared test significant at the 5% level. Each race category is its own dummy variable; there are a small number of people (<10) who identify as more than one racial group.

Source: New Immigrant Survey, 2003.

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 3

Multi-level Models Predicting Residential Attainment

	Model 1			Model 2		
	Tract Percent Foreign Born	Tract Percent in Poverty	Tract Percent Non-Hispanic White	Tract Percent Foreign Born	Tract Percent in Poverty	Tract Percent Non-Hispanic White
Intercept	15.80***	12.55***	62.03***	22.48***	13.82***	51.59***
Destination Type						
New (ref: Established)	--	--	--	-10.62***	-2.35*	16.88***
Minor	--	--	--	-16.52***	-3.64**	26.21***
Variance Components						
Level 2	96.94	23.52	338.15	57.05	20.87	227.50
Level 1: Resid.						
Variance	183.33	95.01	616.62	183.00	95.04	616.17

Source: New Immigrant Survey, 2003.

* significant at the 0.05 level,

** at the 0.01 level,

*** at the 0.001 level.

Table 4

Individual-Level Traits Predicting Tract-Level Characteristics among Immigrants

	Tract Percent Foreign-born	Tract Percent Poverty	Tract Percent Non-Hispanic White
	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3
Intercept	26.52 ***	20.74 ***	33.94 ***
Metro-level Destination Type (ref: Established)			
New	-10.03 ***	-1.96 *	15.55 ***
Minor	-14.79 ***	-1.94	20.85 ***
Individual-level Covariates			
Years of U.S. Experience	0.04	0.01	0.02
Female	-0.30	-0.22	0.82
Age	-0.04 ***	-0.05 ***	0.10 ***
Married	0.34	-0.24	1.77 **
Number in Household 18 or Under	-0.30 *	-0.13	-0.17
Owns Home	-2.13 ***	-1.88 ***	2.55 **
Years of Education	-0.16 ***	-0.20 ***	0.63 ***
High SES as a Child	-1.30 **	-1.32 ***	3.08 ***
Family Preference (ref: Immediate Relative)	2.27 ***	1.21 ***	-3.02 ***
Employment	0.22	-0.44	3.55 ***
Diversity/Other	2.42 ***	1.08 **	-2.72 **
Refugee	3.73 ***	1.80 ***	-3.37 ***
Prior Undocumented Trip	1.50 **	1.14 **	-0.09
Black (ref: non-Hispanic White)	-0.10	0.35	-12.05 ***
Asian	2.19 **	-0.54	-7.01 ***
Hispanic	0.95	0.50	-5.64 **
Other	0.95	-0.95	-3.45
Missing Race Information	-0.73	-0.64	-6.22 **
English Proficiency	-2.06 ***	-0.96 ***	1.77 **
South/Central America, Caribbean (ref: Mexico)	-0.84	-0.10	3.12 **
Western Europe, Canada, Australia, New Zealand	-5.08 ***	-3.39 ***	14.77 ***
Eastern Europe, Former USSR	-1.63	-3.39 ***	17.30 ***
Asia	-2.37 *	-2.50 **	11.85 ***
Indian subcontinent, Middle East	-1.84	-3.39 ***	15.93 ***
Africa	-1.72	-1.38	9.64 ***

	Tract Percent Foreign-born	Tract Percent Poverty	Tract Percent Non-Hispanic White
	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3
Variance Components			
Level 2	52.34	15.09	156.04
Level 1: Residual Variance	173.46	85.46	515.34

Data Source: New Immigrant Survey 2003.

* significant at the 0.05 level,

** at the 0.01 level,

*** at the 0.001 level.

Table 5

Multi-level Models Predicting Residential Attainment (n=7619)

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	Tract Percent Foreign Born	Tract Percent in Poverty	Tract Percent Non- Hispanic White	Tract Percent Foreign Born	Tract Percent Foreign Born	Tract Percent in Poverty	Tract Percent Non- Hispanic White	Tract Percent Foreign Born	Tract Percent in Poverty	Tract Percent Non- Hispanic White	Tract Percent Foreign Born	Tract Percent Non- Hispanic White
Destination Type												
Intercept	9.34***	10.66***	63.67***	4.76*	8.95***	8.95***	69.46***	-4.37	6.48*	58.19***		
Metro Level Factors												
<i>Demographic Availability</i>												
Percent Foreign-Born	1.12***	0.04	-0.1	1.12***	0.04	0.04	-0.08	1.09***	-0.01	-0.06		
Percent Black	0.07	-0.16***	-0.58***	0.05	-0.16***	-0.16***	-0.54***	0.03	-0.16***	-0.60***		
Percent Latino	-0.14***	-0.14***	-0.66***	-0.13***	-0.15***	-0.15***	-0.69***	-0.13**	-0.12***	-0.69***		
Percent Asian	0.09	-0.02	-1.15***	0.07	-0.01	-0.01	-1.15***	0.08	-0.01	-1.15***		
Percent in Poverty	-0.01	1.08***	0.01	-0.02	1.13***	1.13***	0.03	0.03	1.12***	-0.07		
<i>Segregation</i>												
White-Black	--	--	--	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.05	-0.02	-0.03	0.00		
White-Hispanic	--	--	--	0.04	0.04*	0.04*	-0.01	0.03	0.01	-0.02		
White-Asian	--	--	--	0.06	-0.01	-0.01	-0.07	0.03	-0.03	-0.08		
<i>Ecological Factors</i>												
Percent New Housing	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.03	-0.09***	0.14*		
Percent Suburban	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.01	0.00	-0.05*		
Population 2000, logged	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.82*	0.54*	0.80		
Variance Components												

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	Tract Percent Foreign Born	Tract Percent in Poverty	Tract Percent Non- Hispanic White	Tract Percent Foreign Born	Tract Percent in Poverty	Tract Percent Non- Hispanic White	Tract Percent Foreign Born	Tract Percent in Poverty	Tract Percent Non- Hispanic White
Level 2	1.70	0.67	4.74***	1.42	0.47	4.06**	1.28	0.20*	2.44
Level 1: Resid. Variance	172.64	85.57	514.95	172.58	85.62	514.96	172.51	85.60	514.96

All models include the following individual controls: years in the U.S., female, age, married, number in household under 18, owning a home, years of education, high SES as a child, class of admission dummies, English proficiency, and dummies for region of origin.

Source: New Immigrant Survey, 2003.

* significant at the 0.05 level,

** at the 0.01 level,

*** at the 0.001 level.

Appendix Table A

Latinos Only (n=2521)

	Model A Tract Percent:			Model B Tract Percent:			Model C Tract Percent:		
	Foreign- Born	In Poverty	Non- Hispanic White	Foreign- Born	In Poverty	Non- Hispanic White	Foreign- Born	In Poverty	Non- Hispanic White
PANEL A – Cutoffs for the Full Sample									
New (ref: Established)	-12.26*** -2.24	-2.38 -1.59	19.72*** -3.89	-11.95*** (2.16)	-2.09 (1.54)	18.89*** (3.67)	-1.46 (1.32)	1.00 (1.13)	4.88 (2.58)
Minor	-19.57*** -2.82	-3.81 -2.04	32.05*** -4.88	-17.41*** (2.75)	-1.75 (1.99)	26.35*** (4.66)	-2.30 (2.05)	0.01 (1.70)	9.42* (3.82)
PANEL B – Latino Cutoffs									
New (ref: Established)	-11.70*** (3.01)	-6.58** (2.03)	28.45*** (5.04)	-11.17*** (2.86)	-6.17** (1.95)	26.61*** (4.68)	-0.01 (1.71)	-0.14 (1.46)	3.24 (3.58)
Minor	-15.82*** (1.95)	-3.66** (1.33)	24.39*** (3.28)	-14.92*** (1.87)	-2.85* (1.28)	21.36*** (3.06)	-1.14 (1.18)	0.26 (1.01)	-2.81 (2.48)

Note: Model A includes indicators for metro types only. Model B includes all individual level controls. Model C includes all individual and metro level controls.

Source: New Immigrant Survey, 2003.

* significant at the 0.05 level,

** at the 0.01 level,

*** at the 0.001 level.

Appendix Table B

Asians Only (n=2441)

	Model A Tract Percent:			Model B Tract Percent:			Model C Tract Percent:		
	Foreign- Born	In Poverty	Non- Hispanic White	Foreign- Born	In Poverty	Non- Hispanic White	Foreign- Born	In Poverty	Non- Hispanic White
PANEL A – Cutopts for the Full Sample									
New (ref: Established)	-11.24*** (2.10)	-0.78 (0.93)	15.80*** (3.70)	-10.97*** (2.07)	-0.64 (0.86)	15.52*** (3.56)	-0.39 (1.21)	0.65 (0.67)	1.77 (1.96)
Minor	-15.09*** (2.28)	-1.99 (1.04)	19.92*** (4.02)	-14.49*** (2.26)	-1.20 (0.97)	17.89*** (3.87)	-0.74 (1.49)	-1.27 (0.82)	4.59 (2.42)
PANEL B – Asians Cutopts									
New (ref: Established)	-9.21** (3.08)	0.62 (1.37)	11.25* (5.48)	-8.68** (3.04)	1.01 (1.25)	10.18 (5.29)	-1.38 (1.56)	0.66 (0.90)	2.89 (2.59)
Minor	-14.30*** (1.78)	-0.18 (0.77)	20.12*** (3.18)	-13.99*** (1.76)	0.35 (0.70)	18.56*** (3.07)	-1.11 (0.97)	-0.15 (0.54)	-0.58 (1.60)

Note: Model A includes indicators for metro types only. Model B includes all individual level controls. Model C includes all individual and metro level controls.

Source: New Immigrant Survey, 2003.

* significant at the 0.05 level,

** at the 0.01 level,

*** at the 0.001 level.

Appendix Table C

Latinos Only (n=2521)

	Model A: Tract Percent:			Model B: Tract Percent:			Model C: Tract Percent:		
	Foreign-Born	In Poverty	Non-Hispanic White	Foreign-Born	In Poverty	Non-Hispanic White	Foreign-Born	In Poverty	Non-Hispanic White
New (ref: Established)	-10.19** (3.17)	-5.95** (2.18)	29.71*** (5.29)	-10.03*** (3.04)	-5.76** (2.11)	28.27*** (4.98)	0.98 (1.98)	0.32 (1.65)	5.59 (3.81)
Minor	-15.67*** (2.04)	-3.68** (1.41)	26.11*** (3.40)	-14.99*** (1.97)	-2.87* (1.37)	22.68*** (3.23)	-1.01 (1.33)	0.1 (1.12)	-1.37 (2.60)
No Visa Previous Trip	3.54*** (0.68)	2.31*** (0.53)	-3.27** (1.16)	1.89* (0.81)	1.52* (0.62)	-0.18 (1.36)	1.66* (0.79)	1.45* (0.61)	0.32 (1.34)
New*No Visa Previous Trip	-3.41 (2.68)	-1.30 (2.06)	-3.65 (4.57)	-2.91 (2.65)	-1.06 (2.03)	-4.06 (4.45)	-2.49 (2.55)	-1.05 (1.98)	-5.66 (4.34)
Minor*No Visa Previous Trip	0.36 (1.63)	0.56 (1.25)	-5.52* (2.79)	0.20 (1.62)	0.07 (1.24)	-3.43 (2.72)	0.05 (1.54)	0.38 (1.20)	-3.80 (2.63)

Note: Model A includes indicators for metro types only. Model B includes all individual level controls. Model C includes all individual and metro level controls.

Source: New Immigrant Survey, 2003.

* significant at the 0.05 level,

** at the 0.01 level,

*** at the 0.001 level. Metro level cutpoints are the same as those in Appendix Table A, Panel B.