Published in final edited form as:

Soc Sci Res. 2017 November ; 68: 117–131. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2017.08.006.

Solamente Mexicanos? Patterns and Sources of Hispanic Diversity in U.S. Metropolitan Areas*

Barrett A. Lee,

Department of Sociology and Population Research Institute, The Pennsylvania State University

Michael J.R. Martin, and

Department of Sociology and Population Research Institute, The Pennsylvania State University

Matthew Hall

Department of Policy Analysis and Management, Cornell University

Abstract

Rapid Hispanic growth has been a major source of increasing ethnoracial diversity in the United States. However, diversity *within* the Hispanic population is frequently obscured by the tendency to lump all Latinos together. Our study examines Hispanic diversity at the local level, drawing insights from the Mexican dominance, Caribbean-centric settlement, spatial assimilation, and economic opportunity perspectives. Measures of the magnitude and structure of Hispanic origin-group diversity during the 1990–2010 period are constructed for 363 metropolitan areas based on each area's shares of Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Colombians, and 'others'. We find that diversity magnitude varies markedly across metropolitan Hispanic populations. Although the most diverse metro areas lack a majority origin group, Mexicans often constitute a majority or plurality of local Latinos. Diversity levels and structures have remained relatively stable over time. In both 1990 and 2010, metro areas with more diverse, multigroup Hispanic communities are distinguished by their larger size, smaller proportion of Hispanics, location farther from Mexico and closer to the Caribbean, and greater odds of being a military hub. They also exhibit higher rates of housing construction and lower rates of agricultural and manufacturing employment. We use weighted data to show that Dominican metro dwellers experience the highest Hispanic diversity while the average Mexican lives in an area where four-fifths of all Latinos are Mexican. Overall, our results provide primary support for the Mexican dominance perspective but some support for the other three perspectives as well.

Keywords

Hispanic diversity; origin groups; metropolitan areas; entropy index; exposure

*Lee, the corresponding author, can be reached at bal6@psu.edu or 814.863.7430.

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.

Among contemporary demographic trends in the United States, none attracts more attention than increasing ethnoracial diversity (Frey 2015; Lee and Bean 2010; Lichter 2013). Immigration, high fertility, youthful age structures, and other forces driving minority gains have been strong enough during recent decades that people of color are projected to surpass whites as a fraction of the national population by mid-century (Colby and Ortman 2015). Although researchers, policy makers, and the public continue to debate the consequences of diversity for a range of institutions (e.g., education, politics, the economy), a clearer picture has emerged regarding the geography of diversification. Shifts toward more equal-sized racial and ethnic groups—which is how we define the concept of diversity—can be seen in all regions and at all spatial scales, but the pace of the process remains uneven (Lee et al. 2014; Lichter 2012; Wright et al. 2014). On average, larger metropolitan communities have more diverse profiles than other types of places.

Hispanic residents figure prominently in the metropolitan diversity story.¹ Their influence is due in part to rapid growth, with the number of Hispanics in the U.S. tripling over the last three decades and accounting for a major share of the total population gain nationally (Ennis et al. 2011; Johnson and Lichter 2008). Given such growth, it should come as no surprise that Latinos now make up nearly one-half of all members of ethnoracial minority groups. They are also highly urbanized. Of the 50.5 million Hispanics counted in the 2010 census, 92.5% live in metro areas compared to 79.6% of non-Hispanic whites (Wilson et al. 2012). The metro Hispanic population exceeds the entire black population (metro plus nonmetro) by several million and is three times larger than the entire Asian population.

Our research is motivated by the tendency for metropolitan Hispanics, like Hispanics generally, to be viewed in panethnic fashion even though their roots lie in many countries of origin or ancestry. When justifying the panethnic approach, which is common to both scholarship and popular perception, one can point to similarities across origin groups on cultural indicators such as language or religion. Yet the panethnic treatment of Latinos obscures differences by origin in citizenship status, ethnic identity, socioeconomic standing, and—most relevant to the present analysis—locational concentration or dispersion in the U.S. (Logan and Turner 2013; Portes and Truelove 1987; Rumbaut 2006; Saenz and Morales 2015). The period from 1990 to 2010 is of interest since it coincides with the differential growth and the spatial redistribution of origin groups, two phenomena that imply greater intermetropolitan variation in Hispanic diversity. At the hypothetical extremes, Hispanic diversity will be lowest when only one origin group lives in a metro area and highest when an area's Latino inhabitants are equally divided among all origin groups. The structure of diversity—the particular origin groups present—is likely to vary across areas as well.

Patterns of Hispanic diversity within metropolitan settings are potentially important because of their implications for relations among origin groups, political engagement, job market competition, specialized service needs, ethnic self-identification, and other outcomes. Thus far, however, little research has examined Hispanic diversity in a direct, thorough manner. To address this gap, our study focuses on four guiding questions. First, how do the magnitude and structure of origin group diversity differ across metropolises? Second, how has Latino

¹The terms 'Hispanic' and 'Latino' are used interchangeably, in keeping with common practice.

diversity changed over time? The third question asks where diversity levels and changes are greatest; that is, with which metro area characteristics is diversity associated? And fourth, does exposure to Hispanic diversity vary among origin groups or between Hispanic and non-Hispanic residents?

Before turning to these questions, we make the case for unpacking Hispanic panethnicity at the local level. We then propose a handful of perspectives—Mexican dominance, Caribbean-centric settlement, spatial assimilation, and economic opportunity—that suggest answers to our questions. The perspectives are evaluated with 1990–2010 census data for 363 metropolitan areas and their embedded Hispanic populations. We construct measures of metro Hispanic diversity based on the representation of Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, Guatemalans, Salvadorans, Colombians, and a residual category of all other Hispanics. The measures allow us to analyze Latino diversity not only from the vantage point of metro areas but of origin groups, the latter via weighting that captures the diversity experienced by the average group member.

Background

Unpacking Panethnicity

The institutionalization of Hispanic or Latino panethnicity is relatively recent, emerging from prolonged negotiations that began in the 1970s between the Census Bureau and an assortment of Latino advocacy organizations, businesses, and media over how best to classify people of ‘Spanish origin’ (Mora 2014). Conceptually, the social construction of a panethnic population emphasizes what persons from different national or ancestral backgrounds are believed to have in common. In the case of Hispanics, the most obvious similarities include regional roots (Latin America), language (Spanish), and religion (Catholicism). Panethnic status may be further grounded in distinctive consumer preferences, shared experiences with discrimination, or the existence of bridging organizations that link multiple origin groups (Lopez and Espiritu 1990; Masuoka 2006). Irrespective of its sources, a collective panethnic identity can help mobilize these groups, enabling them to pursue their political interests more effectively than they could on their own (Beltran 2010; Itzigsohn 2009; Padilla 1985).

Although studying Hispanics as a whole is legitimate for some purposes, we are concerned about the details that the panethnic approach obscures. For instance, the potential political benefits of panethnicity assume an underlying affinity or cohesion among Latino origin groups. Yet groups with more resources or longer histories in a community could feel threatened by newcomers who in turn resent the perceived advantages of their more established counterparts (De Genova and Ramos-Zayas 2003; Hamilton and Chinchilla 2001). Members of different origin groups might live and work in separate locations as well (Iceland et al. 2014; Lopez et al. 1996). Limits to panethnic cohesion are to be expected, given the degree to which the groups vary in U.S. citizenship, English proficiency, racial composition, educational attainment, family structure, health, and other characteristics (Cho et al. 2004; Durand et al. 2006; Landale et al. 2006; Logan and Turner 2013; Lopez 2015; Rumbaut 2006; Saenz and Morales 2015). Because of this variation, country of origin or ancestry constitutes a primary identity for many individuals, even among those who self-

identify as Hispanic or Latino under certain conditions (Itzigsohn and Dore-Cabral 2000; Jones-Correa and Leal 1996; Lopez 2013).

The lesson here is that unpacking the Hispanic panethnic population makes sense insofar as its component origin groups are unique and are recognized as such by their members. Accordingly, we examine the number and proportional representation of eight Latin American origin groups within each metropolitan area of the United States. This simple demographic and spatial disaggregation, essential for understanding local Hispanic diversity, has never been undertaken to the best of our knowledge. However, evidence on the geographic distribution of the groups offers some tangential insights (Ennis et al. 2011; Frey 2015; Logan and Turner 2013). As of 2010, over three-fourths of all Latinos still inhabited the West and South, a pattern with historical roots that is driven by the preponderance of Mexicans in Los Angeles, Houston, and other major Southwestern metropolises. Salvadoran and Guatemalan distributions resemble that of Mexicans, but nontrivial pockets of the Central American groups are found in some Northeastern and Southern metro areas. Cubans, by contrast, remain heavily concentrated in Miami and Dominicans in New York. Puerto Ricans are found throughout the Northeast and in parts of the South, especially Florida. This 2010 snapshot reflects the dispersion of most of the origin groups since 1990, from traditional gateways to newer destinations.

Recent distributional shifts imply differences in the degree to which individual metropolitan settings are occupied by a single Hispanic origin group or many. Case studies confirm the second possibility, identifying communities where multiple groups co-exist (Alberts 2006; Hamilton and Chinchilla 2001; Lobo and Salvo 2013; Ricourt 2002; Winders 2013). Hispanic diversity can also be inferred from the literature on global gateways such as New York and Los Angeles, where perceived opportunities attract immigrants from countries across Asia and Africa as well as Latin America and the Caribbean. At the same time, some Southwestern metro areas are likely to have homogeneous (all-Mexican) Latino populations. Our objective is to improve upon the indirect, partial information currently available, painting a comprehensive picture of metropolitan Hispanic diversity for the 1990–2010 period.

Perspectives on Hispanic Diversity

To help anticipate how our questions about diversity patterns, changes, correlates, and exposure might be answered, we develop four general perspectives on Hispanic diversity. The initial perspective, here termed *Mexican dominance*, acknowledges the numerical superiority of the Mexican origin population, which contains over three-fifths of all Latinos in the United States (Ennis et al. 2011). This group's higher fertility and young average age should sustain the rapid growth of the group well into the future. Proximity to Mexico—manifested as a shared border from the Pacific Ocean to the southern tip of Texas—has made an obvious contribution to Mexican demographic advantage. Many persons of Mexican or Spanish descent lived north of that border prior to the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, which annexed what is now the American Southwest (Foley 2014). Thus, the roots of the dominance perspective are geographic and historical as well as demographic.

The perspective also contains a legal dimension. A unique feature of Mexican immigration over the last half century is that flows have been fueled by irregular or unauthorized forms of entry, often in response to shifts in American border control policies and practices. Approximately half of Mexican immigrants are currently estimated to be unauthorized, with a larger share living in mixed-status households (Passel and Cohn 2017a). One implication here is that Mexicans in general—both native and foreign born—have high exposure to Mexican immigrants who lack legal authorization to live and work in the U.S. (either via their own status or through family members). Not only does this undocumented status severely restrict economic and social integration (see Waters and Pineau 2015 for a review), but there is evidence that unauthorized migrants congregate in areas where their status can be disguised by the masses (Passel and Cohn 2017b; Hall and Stringfield 2014).

Irrespective of documentation status, Mexicans have traditionally headed for Southwestern gateway communities in pursuit of jobs. They are also drawn to and retained by such destinations because of the presence of co-ethnic social networks and organizations where Spanish is spoken and other Mexican cultural resources can be accessed. Over time, the demographic dominance of the group may translate into broader civic engagement, with more Mexican-origin residents elected to local political office, serving on school boards, and attaining prominence in business and professional circles (NALEO Educational Fund 2016; Ochoa 2004; Vallejo 2012). Replenished via continuing immigration (Jimenez 2010), metropolitan gateways become Latino—and especially Mexican—ethnic ‘comfort zones’. In some instances, however, saturated labor and housing markets and anti-immigrant sentiments and policies have deflected Mexicans away from their traditional gateways (Light 2006; Massey and Capoferro 2008). Recent work documents the gradual dispersion of group members to new destinations throughout the country, although their historic concentration persists in states along the border (Lichter and Johnson 2009; Massey 2008; Zuniga and Hernandez-Leon 2005).

Several implications for metro Hispanic diversity follow from the Mexican dominance perspective. On average, a low to moderate magnitude of diversity can be expected, with Mexicans frequently the majority origin group. As this group continues to grow, diversity should decline or perhaps remain stable, tempered by the dispersion of some Mexicans from homogeneous (all-Mexican) metro areas to more heterogeneous ones. Mexican dominance seems most likely in metropolises closer to Mexico (in the West and Texas), particularly those with smaller total populations and a larger percentage of Latino residents. The latter two metro characteristics make it easier for the Mexican origin group to be the largest ‘slice’ of the Latino demographic ‘pie’. Finally, Mexican metro dwellers are anticipated to experience a low level of Hispanic diversity because they live disproportionately in parts of the country to which few other Hispanic origin groups have deep historical connections.

Our second perspective, *Caribbean-centric settlement*, focuses on how metropolitan Hispanic diversity is shaped by Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and Dominicans, the most populous origin groups after Mexicans. The perspective stresses the prominence of non-Mexican groups in metro areas outside the West. Cubans in Miami serve as the classic example, but Caribbean groups are found throughout the metropolitan Northeast as well (Arreola 2004; Portes and Rumbaut 2006). Their gravitation to the East Coast once again underscores the

role of geographic proximity, enhanced by the advent of affordable commercial airline travel between San Juan (and other Caribbean cities) and New York in the 1950s. Poor economic conditions at home have long prompted the U.S.-bound migration of all three groups, as has political turmoil in both the Dominican Republic and Cuba (Alberts 2006; Torres-Saillant and Hernandez 2013). The growth of these groups also owes much to American immigration policy. Since the mid-1960s, special legislation has given Cubans a smoother path to citizenship than most other origin groups, and many Dominicans have achieved legal permanent status under the family reunification provisions of the amended Immigration and Nationality Act (Tienda and Sanchez 2013). As American citizens, Puerto Ricans are free to enter and move about the mainland. Not coincidentally, they far out-number their Cuban and Dominican counterparts.

The forces just summarized, coupled with the smaller size of the Caribbean groups relative to the Mexican origin population, indicate that moderate to high Hispanic diversity is possible in some metro areas. Such areas may exhibit a Puerto Rican majority among their Latino residents, although a no-majority diversity structure—where none of the origin groups makes up as much as one-half of the local Hispanic community—appears more feasible. The Caribbean-centric perspective further anticipates a rise in Hispanic diversity over time, as the dispersion of Caribbean groups within the eastern half of the U.S. and the spread of Mexicans (and, to a lesser extent, Salvadorans and Guatemalans) eastward produces more equal origin-group shares (Arreola 2004; Mahler 1995; Smith 2006). In particular, diversity should be substantial and increasing for metro areas closer to the Caribbean (mainly in the Northeast and Florida), which generally have smaller proportions of Hispanic inhabitants and, by inference, fewer Mexicans. Because of their distance from regions of Mexican dominance, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Dominican metro residents are predicted to encounter a variety of origin groups. Thus, their exposure to Latino diversity should be relatively high.

The third perspective of interest, *spatial assimilation*, paints with broader strokes than either of its predecessors. This perspective normally informs residential segregation, suburbanization, and attainment research (Farrell 2016; Iceland 2009; South et al. 2008), but a scaled-up version can be applied to Latino diversity within metropolitan areas. In simplest form, the assimilation process involves two steps. Immigrant-rich minority groups initially congregate in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Miami, and other high-profile multiethnic gateways. Over time, as group members experience (or seek) upward social mobility and acculturation, they leave the gateway cities behind to pursue economic and quality-of-life opportunities across a wider range of destinations. Available evidence supports both steps of the process (Alba and Nee 2008; Hall 2009; McConnell 2008; Singer et al. 2008; Waters and Pineau 2015; White and Glick 2009), with the important caveat that origin groups may socially and spatially assimilate at different rates or along different trajectories (Brown 2007; Portes and Zhou 1993; South et al. 2005). Among Hispanics, for example, position in the American racial hierarchy could slow the progress of darker-skinned people with African ancestry such as Dominicans or Puerto Ricans.

If we concentrate on the direction rather than the pace of spatial assimilation, all Hispanic origin groups have grown increasingly dispersed throughout metropolitan America during

recent decades (Frey 2015; Suro and Singer 2003). As their distributions across metropolitan areas even out, so should their shares of the Hispanic population within areas, resulting in higher or rising levels of diversity. While Latino diversity is likely to remain impressive in the larger, traditional gateways—thanks to the concentration of opportunities and ethnic resources there—newer metro destinations may undergo the greatest transformation. Indeed, spatial assimilation logic predicts a narrowing of the differences between gateways and new destinations in diversity magnitude and structure. Floor and ceiling effects, or the statistical likelihood that the least diverse metro Hispanic populations will become more diverse and the most diverse populations less so, further strengthen the chances of diminishing differences among metro areas. This trend toward convergence in turn could have countervailing implications for exposure to diversity, depending on the types of Hispanic populations and metro areas in which a group's members are over- or under-represented. Such a possibility suggests only modest gains in exposure over time for most origin groups.

Thus far we have emphasized the implications of the perspectives for diversity patterns, changes, and exposure. However, they also speak to our research question about the characteristics of metropolitan areas associated with Latino diversity. Both the Mexican dominance and Caribbean-centric models identify the distance of a metro area to particular migrant-sending countries as a potential correlate: the farther from Mexico and closer to Caribbean nations an area is, the greater its diversity will be.² Similarly, Mexican dominance and spatial assimilation models predict that the larger population size of traditional gateways should promote Hispanic diversity, and all three perspectives agree on the negative link between diversity and overall Hispanic representation (which rises with the number of Mexicans in an area).³

The perspectives also acknowledge the role played by metropolitan economic forces in attracting members from one or more origin groups but are rather vague about the details. We therefore propose several factors under the rubric of a fourth perspective labeled *economic opportunity*. Most of these factors are likely to have broad appeal, i.e., to draw Latinos from a wide range of origins. Perhaps the most obvious metropolitan economic attribute is Hispanics' relative income, with a higher ratio of Hispanic to total income levels in an area predictive of greater Hispanic diversity. A second metro characteristic, robust housing construction activity, should increase access to affordable housing for Latino consumers, in part through chains of moves that create vacancies in older units (a process known as filtering). Construction jobs themselves may boost diversity in more direct fashion, given that Mexicans, Central Americans, and members of other origin groups have disproportionately found work in this industrial sector (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2015; Center for Construction Research and Training 2009). By contrast, we anticipate metro areas

²As a matter of convenience, we include Puerto Rico when discussing Caribbean nations of origin despite its status as a U.S. territory.

³The number or share of unauthorized immigrants is another metropolitan area characteristic that the Mexican dominance perspective suggests should be negatively correlated with local Latino diversity. However, several technical and data limitations preclude the incorporation of this variable in our analysis. With few exceptions (e.g., the Survey of Income and Program Participation, or SIPP), the nationally representative studies featured in immigration research identify naturalized citizen and non-citizen members of a particular group but do not ask more detailed questions about the legal or documentation circumstances of the non-citizens. This necessitates reliance on a variety of residual differencing and imputation strategies to determine which members are most likely to be unauthorized. A recent review indicates that none of the strategies yields consistently unbiased estimates, especially at the subnational level (Van Hook et al. 2015). While estimates of authorization status have been generated for regions and states, they are not available for our universe of interest (all metropolitan areas) at all three time points.

marked by higher rates of agricultural and manufacturing employment to exhibit lower diversity. Both sectors historically have had large concentrations of Mexicans (Economic Research Service 2015; Hernandez-Leon 2008; Innis-Jimenez 2013).

The last aspect of economic opportunity to be examined is the presence of what we refer to as institutional hubs. Previous research reports higher panethnic diversity in college towns, military base communities, and seats of government (Allen and Turner 1989; Lee et al. 2012; Lee and Sharp 2017). We anticipate a similar bolstering of Hispanic diversity in the metropolitan areas anchored by these types of institutions. Colleges and universities, for example, have grown more diverse due to the rising number of foreign students who hail from Colombia, Venezuela, Brazil, and other countries throughout Latin America and the world (Ruiz 2014). The increased enlistment and diversity of Latinos in the U.S. armed forces in part reflects targeted recruitment efforts; Hispanic military personnel now come from varied generations and origins, with non-Mexicans over-represented (Lutz 2008; Segal and Segal 2007). Amplifying the consequences of such patterns for local Hispanic communities, evidence indicates that seventh-tenths of all active duty personnel are posted stateside, many to installations in or near southern metropolises which qualify as new destinations (U.S. Census Bureau 2012; U.S. Department of Defense 2010). And each member of the military is accompanied by roughly one and a half dependents who further contribute to the local demographic impact (U.S. Department of Defense 2014). Finally, because government agencies, like their higher education and military counterparts, adhere to equal opportunity standards, the metro areas hosting concentrations of these agencies may enjoy favorable reputations across Latino origin groups, not to mention other minorities. In more concrete terms, government hubs are often sites of employment and services for people of color.

Methods

Data

We rely on data from the summary files (SFs) of the 1990 and 2010 decennial censuses and the 2008–2012 American Community Survey (ACS) to explore Hispanic diversity. The race by Hispanic or Latino origin crosstabulation in SF1 yields counts of Hispanics of any race and of non-Hispanic whites, blacks, Asians, Pacific Islanders, Native Americans, multi-race individuals, and those reporting some other race. Collapsing categories enables us to define Hispanic and non-Hispanic populations in an exhaustive, mutually exclusive, and largely comparable manner. More crucial for present purposes, the SF1 data provide sufficient detail to distinguish among Hispanics from different backgrounds. Items in the census questionnaire permit Latino respondents to report more specific identities based on country of origin or ancestry. The seven Hispanic origin groups featured in our study, ranked by size, are Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, and Colombians. They represent the largest groups within their panethnic domain, accounting for 86% of all Hispanics nationally in 2010.⁴ The decision to examine the last two decades is a practical one: data on Dominicans, Salvadorans, Guatemalans, and Colombians first

⁴Of the 12 other Latin American origin groups recognized by the Census Bureau in 2010, only Hondurans, Ecuadorians, and Peruvians number at least a half million. The Honduran group is the largest at roughly 633,400, but it lags far behind Colombians

became available in 1990. To extend coverage to the entire Latino population, we construct an eighth, residual origin group consisting of ‘other Hispanics’ and labeled as such.⁵

Our research questions direct attention to Hispanics residing in metropolitan areas at the time of each census. Metro areas approximate relatively self-contained housing and labor markets. As operationalized by the Census Bureau, they consist of at least one urbanized population of 50,000 or more, the central county (or counties) in which that population is located, and any surrounding counties that share strong commuting ties with the central county (Frey et al. 2006). We impose December 2009 Office of Management and Budget geographic definitions to obtain a sample of 363 metro areas with constant boundaries from 1990 through 2010. These areas are home to more than four-fifths of all Americans and over nine-tenths of all Latinos. The mean size of metro Hispanic populations has increased from roughly 56,700 to 127,600 over the two-decade period, although the medians are much smaller (4,500 in 1990 and 19,123 in 2010). As of 2010, the fewest Latinos live in Wheeling, WV (1,056) and the most in Los Angeles (5.7 million).

Diversity Measurement

The *entropy index*, a measure of diversity symbolized by E , rests on the concept of evenness: how equally members of a population are spread over a set of categories (see White 1986). We employ the index to capture the *magnitude* dimension of origin group diversity for Hispanic populations within metropolitan areas. Formally,

$$E = \sum_{r=1}^R p_r \ln \left(\frac{1}{p_r} \right)$$

where p_r refers to origin group r 's proportion of the Hispanic population in a given metropolis and R signifies the number of groups. Because the entropy index does not have a fixed upper limit, we have created a standardized version, dividing each E score by its maximum (the natural log of R , or 2.079 for eight groups) then multiplying by 100. If each origin group makes up one-eighth of a metro Hispanic population, the E value for the area would be 100, indicating maximum diversity.⁶ But if all Latino residents belong to the same group, the metro population becomes fully homogeneous, resulting in an E of 0 (no diversity).

(908,700), the smallest group included in our analysis. The 12 excluded groups typically constitute 1% or less of the total Hispanic population. Moreover, 1990 data are not available for seven of them, making group-specific changes impossible to track during the period of interest.

⁵Several investigators have criticized the quality of 2000 census data on Hispanic or Latino origin, citing a large, unexpected rise over 1990 figures in the percentage of Hispanic respondents identifying as ‘other Hispanic’ and a concomitant dip in the percentages identifying with smaller origin groups (Logan 2001; Martin 2002; Suro 2002). These shifts appear attributable to a series of changes in census questionnaire design between 1990 and 2000, most notably the removal of example origin groups for respondents to write in if they fell outside the Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban check-box categories. Fortunately, the 1990 census version of the Hispanic origin module was reinstated in 2010. To minimize concerns about lack of comparability, we restrict our analysis to 1990 and 2010 estimates of Hispanic diversity.

⁶The absolute standard (equal group shares) utilized by the entropy index facilitates cross-sectional and over-time comparisons for our sample of metropolitan areas. Such comparisons would become more difficult if metro Hispanic diversity were measured relative to the origin-group composition of some larger context (e.g., the state or region in which a metro area is embedded, the nation as a whole in each census year).

The second dimension of diversity, *origin group structure*, refers to the detailed Hispanic make-up of an area (percent Mexican, percent Puerto Rican, percent Cuban, etc.) and is displayed via bar graphs that depict the shares of all eight groups within the local Latino community. When exploring diversity's correlates, we also construct two simplified structural measures to identify metro Hispanic populations with a Mexican majority or with a Puerto Rican majority or plurality. In general, the metropolitan area characteristics hypothesized to predict diversity magnitude (*E*) should exhibit the same signs in relation to the Puerto Rican structural indicator, given that both dependent variables capture multigroup Hispanic compositions. For the less diverse Mexican majority type of structure, however, we expect the signs of most predictors to reverse direction.

During much of the analysis, metropolitan areas—or more precisely, Latino populations within metro areas—are the cases of interest. Unweighted entropy scores and group proportions are thus appropriate as measures of diversity. However, an adjustment is needed to address the final research question, about Hispanic diversity from the residents' perspective. To insure that our measures reflect *exposure* to diversity, we weight them by the ratio of an origin group's population in each area to the summed population of that group across all areas. These weighted means convey the magnitude and structure of Hispanic diversity experienced by the average Mexican, Dominican, or other group member living in metropolitan America.

Other Variables

We compare local Hispanic communities on several characteristics of their surrounding metropolitan areas that our guiding perspectives identify as relevant and for which SF1, SF3, or ACS data are available. Three of these characteristics are used both in mean breakdowns of diversity patterns and as predictors of diversity in OLS and logistic regression models. Metropolitan *population size* is treated as continuous when it is included in the regressions. At other points, though, we assign areas to size categories (less than 250K, 250–749K, and 750K or more). Some areas grow or decline enough in a decade to shift categories, which they are allowed to do. Overall *Hispanic representation* in an area is handled in similar fashion to size: it can be either continuous (the percentage of all metro residents who are Hispanic) or categorical (less than 5% Hispanic, 5% to 9.9%, and 10% or more) as the analysis demands. Census Bureau-defined regions provide a convenient proxy for *distance* to countries of origin, situating metro areas in the Northeast, Midwest, South, or West. Two more direct measures of distance have been developed for the regression-based assessment of diversity correlates. The first measure is the number of miles from a metro area to the nearest of 14 crossing locations along the Mexico-U.S. border, while the second taps the average distance between an area and the largest cities of Puerto Rico (San Juan), Cuba (Havana), and the Dominican Republic (Santo Domingo).⁷

⁷Distances are calculated between the centroids of the urban units of interest. Each crossing location along the border pairs a community on the Mexican side with one on the U.S. side; the centroid of the former is used when measuring distance. The 14 locations, from west to east, are Tijuana/San Diego (CA), Mexicali/Calexico (CA), San Luis Rio Colorado/Yuma (AZ), Nogales/Nogales (AZ), Naco/Naco (AZ), Agua Prieta/Douglas (AZ), Las Palomas/Columbus (NM), Ciudad Juarez/Sunland Park-El Paso (NM and TX), Ojinaga/Presidio (TX), Ciudad Acuna/Del Rio (TX), Piedras Negras/Eagle Pass (TX), Nuevo Laredo/Laredo (TX), Reynosa/McAllen (TX), and Matamoros/Brownsville (TX).

To flesh out the regression models, we incorporate a series of metropolitan attributes representing economic opportunity. Most of the attributes have been used in previous studies of ethnoracial diversity and segregation (see, e.g., Lichter et al. 2015; Logan et al. 2004; Lee and Sharp 2017; Sharp and Lee 2016) and enjoy a reasonable degree of face and empirical validity. Relative *Hispanic income* is operationalized as the ratio of Hispanic per capita income to total per capita income in a metro area. The percentage of housing units built in the preceding 10 years constitutes an indicator of *new construction activity*. Two variables, *agriculture* and *manufacturing*, reflect the percentage of employed persons 16 years of age or older working in each of these industries.⁸ Finally, opportunities associated with the presence of one or more institutional hubs in an area are captured with three variables: (1) *education*, measured as the percentage of persons aged 18–29 enrolled in college;⁹ (2) *government*, the percentage of employed persons 16 or older in federal, state, or local government positions; and (3) *military*, the percentage of persons 16 or older in the labor force serving in the armed forces. We convert each of these variables to a dichotomy, with a value at least one standard deviation above the national metropolitan percentage as the threshold for a metro area attaining hub status on the higher education, government, or military dimensions.¹⁰

Results

Metropolitan Variation

Our initial research question asks how Latino origin group diversity differs from one metropolitan area to the next. We begin to address this question by describing the magnitude of diversity in 2010. Across all 363 metro areas, the average entropy index score equals 50, at the midpoint of E 's 0–100 range. However, marked variation exists around that average. Table 1 explores the tails of the distribution, identifying the 10 most and least diverse areas by name and presenting mean characteristics for the 25 most and least diverse. Boston ($E = 88$) has the most diverse Hispanic population, and it is joined in the top 25 by several other large metropolises (e.g., New York, Baltimore, Tampa). For every high-diversity area, E exceeds 75 (mean = 82). These areas share two characteristics relevant to the Caribbean-centric perspective. All are found in states on or near the East Coast, closer to Caribbean countries of origin, with nine located in Florida and others clustered in New England and the Mid-Atlantic. And all areas but two (New York and Cape Coral) have a lower percentage of Latino residents than does the U.S. metropolitan population as a whole (18% in 2010). In line with the economic opportunity model, several of the most diverse areas are hubs of higher education (e.g., Gainesville, Ithaca, State College) or government (Richmond, Tallahassee, Washington, DC).

⁸Although limited by the age cut point in the census data, we should note that federal and state labor laws permit children under 16 years old to work in agricultural occupations with their parents (or with parental consent) outside of normal school hours (U.S. Department of Labor 2007, 2017). To the extent that this practice is more common among Latinos than other panethnic populations, they will be underrepresented in our agricultural employment measure.

⁹This age range is designed to capture both undergraduates and students enrolled in graduate or professional degree programs. We regard the inclusion of graduate and professional training in the educational hub measure as conceptually appropriate, but it also addresses a comparability issue: the 1990 census data for the numerator, unlike the 2010 data, combine all types of higher education enrollees in a single category, precluding an exclusive focus on undergraduates.

¹⁰Sensitivity tests using a criterion different than standard deviation units (e.g., continuous percentages, multiples of the average metropolitan percentage) indicate that our results are generally robust to alternative operationalizations of the institutional hub variables.

A contrasting profile is evident in the lower half of the table, which features the 25 metro areas with the least diverse Hispanic communities. The E values for the areas average 18—less than one-fourth the mean of their most diverse counterparts—and reach a low of 9 in the El Centro metropolitan area, which abuts the California-Mexico border east of San Diego. Although some are scattered throughout the Pacific Northwest and the Southwest, most of the low-diversity areas are concentrated in California and Texas. Their overall Hispanic shares dwarf that of the national metropolitan population. Indeed, in 14 of these areas Hispanics constitute a majority of all residents. Laredo is the extreme case, its 2010 population over 95% Hispanic.

Laredo and other low-diversity metro areas are also distinguished by their origin group structure, the second diversity dimension of interest. As can be seen in the middle columns of Table 1, Mexican dominance is the rule. This group typically makes up nine-tenths or more of the local Latino community in 2010. The residual ‘other’ category comprises the second largest origin group in the least diverse areas, followed by Puerto Ricans (never as much as 2% of any low-diversity Hispanic population) in third place.¹¹ Origin group structures take a quite different form in the 25 most diverse metropolises (upper half of the table). True to the equal-size conception of diversity, the largest Latino origin groups in these areas fall short of numerical majorities while the second, third, and fourth largest groups often achieve double-digit percentages. Puerto Ricans are the largest group in a dozen of the high-diversity metro areas, with ‘others’ and Mexicans the largest in the rest. Dominicans, Cubans, Salvadorans, and Guatemalans appear among the ranks of the second through fifth largest groups.¹²

To obtain a fuller picture of the frequency of various diversity structures, we classify all 363 metropolitan Hispanic populations nationally according to their majority origin group or, in the absence of such a majority, their plurality group. The results of this exercise lend strong support to the Mexican dominance perspective. As of 2010, Mexicans attain a majority in 261 metro areas and a plurality in another 44; thus, they are the largest Latino group in 84% of all 363 metro areas. Consistent with the Caribbean-centric model, Puerto Ricans represent a majority of Latino inhabitants in 24 areas and a plurality in 23, and Cubans have plurality status in one metropolis (Miami). ‘Other’ Hispanics reach a majority twice and a plurality eight times. Reinforcing a point from Table 1, every type of metropolitan Hispanic population with a non-Mexican majority or plurality group has a much higher average level of diversity than do Mexican majority populations, with mean E scores 12 to 36 points higher than the Mexican majority mean of 42.

Temporal Patterns

The next step in the analysis involves determining if the 2010 snapshot of local Hispanic diversity is a recent development or a continuation of the past. The 1990 and 2010 mean entropy scores in Figure 1 (listed at the right edge of the compositional bars) favor the latter

¹¹ Salvadorans are the third largest group in six of the low-diversity metro areas, although none of these rank among the bottom 10 identified in Table 1.

¹² Due to space constraints, only the five largest groups for each area are shown in Table 1. Thus, the row percentages do not sum to 100.

scenario in terms of diversity magnitude. Across all metro areas, the average Hispanic E has remained essentially stable (top pair of bars). In the remainder of the figure we check the robustness of this overall pattern, reporting mean diversity levels for metro areas subdivided by population size, region (as a proxy for distance to Mexico or the Caribbean), and percentage of Hispanic residents. Most of the changes are relatively minor, with E rising or falling less than two points between 1990 and 2010. Such aggregate stability again confirms the Mexican dominance perspective. However, a couple of exceptions deserve mention. Metropolises in the Northeast—where Latino diversity was already high 20 years ago—have become even more diverse, registering an 11-point gain in average E score by 2010. This finding, presumably driven by the dispersion of Dominicans within the region and the eastward spread of Mexicans, appears to align with the Caribbean-centric model. Also, metro areas with a Hispanic presence of 5% or more have trended upward in diversity (bottom two pairs of bars), a change partially supportive of the convergence hypothesis based on spatial assimilation.

The colored segments of the compositional bars in Figure 1 highlight changes in the structure of Latino diversity. Aside from obvious contrasts impervious to time (e.g., between areas in the Northeast and West), some consistent shifts in origin group structure are discernable. For instance, the mean percentage of Mexicans (conveyed via light blue segments) has increased between 1990 and 2010 and the percentage of ‘others’ (brown) has decreased everywhere but in heavily Hispanic (10%+) metro areas.¹³ Average Puerto Rican (orange) and Cuban (gray) shares stay the same or shrink since 1990, with high Hispanic areas again the exception. Among newer origin groups, the representation of Dominicans (yellow), Guatemalans (blue), and Salvadorans (green) generally climbs.

Because means can mask variation in trajectories among metropolitan areas, a 1990–2010 transition matrix has been constructed based on the majority and plurality classification scheme employed in the previous section. The matrix, shown in Table 2, allows us to assess the extent to which metro Hispanic populations wind up with different origin group structures in 2010 than they had two decades earlier. Both the persistence and the emergence of Mexican-oriented populations stand out. All but four of the 178 Mexican majority areas in 1990 retain their status over time; the four that do change move to a Mexican plurality structure. Of the 81 metro Hispanic communities with 1990 ‘other’ majorities or pluralities, 65 have become Mexican majority or plurality. Local Latino populations in which Puerto Ricans initially constituted the largest group (either a majority or plurality) display a substantial degree of stability, although six of the 47 shift to one of the Mexican structural types. Taken together, the transition patterns suggest the growing applicability of the Mexican dominance perspective.

¹³Although a number of origin groups in the ‘other’ category (e.g., Hondurans, Peruvians, and Ecuadorians) experienced major population growth during the 1990–2010 period, so did many of the groups on which we focus. For example, the Mexican-origin population more than doubled in size, the Dominican and Salvadoran populations nearly tripled, and the Guatemalan population nearly quadrupled. Hence, the shrinking representation of the ‘other’ category reflects a relative rather than absolute decline that has been driven by the expansion of several larger, established origin groups.

Predicting Diversity

In which metropolitan areas is the level of Latino diversity greatest? Where are particular types of origin group structures found? The mean differences in Table 1 and Figure 1 touch on these questions in bivariate fashion. Here we switch to multivariate mode, regressing diversity magnitude and two types of diversity structure on the 11 metropolitan area characteristics discussed earlier.

Consistent with the Mexican dominance, Caribbean-centric settlement, spatial assimilation, and economic opportunity perspectives, we expect the diversity of local Latino communities (as measured by the entropy index E) to be positively associated with metro population size, distance from Mexico, Hispanic income (relative to area-wide income), new construction activity, and institutional hub status (education, government, military) and negatively associated with overall Hispanic representation, distance from major Caribbean cities, and employment in agriculture and manufacturing. All but one of these characteristics should relate in the opposite direction to the likelihood of a Mexican-majority structure; a positive sign is hypothesized for the construction variable, given Mexicans' prominent role in that industry. Because areas with Puerto Rican-heavy structures nevertheless include multiple origin groups, signs for most of the predictors in the Puerto Rican models should largely match those in the diversity magnitude models. Population size and Hispanic representation are the only two exceptions. Like Mexicans, Puerto Ricans will presumably be less able to gain a numerical advantage when the metro population is large but more likely to do so in the context of a substantial Hispanic presence. These directional hypotheses confirm the appropriateness of one-tailed tests when evaluating the statistical significance of our predictors.

The first two models in Table 3 use the metro characteristics to predict diversity magnitude (E). The models rely on OLS estimation criteria and are cross-sectional in design, pertaining to 1990 and 2010. At both time points, they account for three-fourths of the variance in E . Metropolises with more equal-sized Latino origin groups tend to be larger and located farther from Mexico and closer to major Caribbean cities. Hispanics also make up a smaller share of the total population of such areas. The positive coefficient for size conforms to the spatial assimilation perspective while the coefficients for distance and Hispanic percentage better correspond to Mexican dominance and Caribbean-centric logic. With respect to economic opportunity, Latino diversity is positively related to new housing construction activity and negatively related to agricultural and manufacturing employment in both years; the hypothesized positive association between relative Hispanic income and diversity holds only for 2010. The institutional hub variables achieve significance less consistently—higher education in 1990, military specialization at both time points—albeit in the anticipated positive direction.

The third and fourth models focus on arguably the most important aspect of diversity structure, treating whether the local Hispanic population has a Mexican majority (1 = yes, 0 = no) as a function of the same metropolitan characteristics already deployed. The logistic regression coefficients underscore the role played by location: Mexican majority communities are more likely to be embedded in areas closer to Mexico than the Caribbean.

¹⁴ Economic opportunity matters as well, with housing construction (1990 only) and

manufacturing employment (both years) boosting the likelihood of a Mexican majority while government hub status reduces that likelihood in 1990. As predicted, Hispanics' relative income tends to be lower in metro areas where Mexicans dominate, irrespective of year. Our interpretation of this relationship rests on Mexican's low average wages among Latino origin groups (Logan and Turner 2013) and the possibility that large numbers of Mexican workers flood local labor markets and drive down Hispanic wages compared to those of other panethnic populations. Pseudo- R^2 values for the Mexican majority models are more modest than those for diversity magnitude yet still respectable.

The same can be said for the R^2 s in the last two models of Table 3, where the existence of a Puerto Rican majority or plurality—the next most common 2010 origin-group structure after the Mexican majority type—serves as the dependent variable. Unlike the Mexican case and in line with hypotheses, the chances of a metropolitan Latino community having a sizeable Puerto Rican presence increase with distance from Mexico and proximity to the Caribbean. The likelihood of this structural type is also significantly higher when a metro area serves as a military hub (1990) and lower in response to agricultural employment (2010). Finally, the positive association between overall Hispanic representation and the odds of a Puerto Rican majority or plurality represents a notable divergence from the results for diversity magnitude in models 1 and 2. In general, we conclude that a parsimonious set of metropolitan attributes can effectively distinguish among diverse, multigroup Latino communities, more homogeneous Mexican ones, and those marked by Puerto Rican prominence.

Diversity Exposure

So far we have considered metropolitan areas and their associated Hispanic populations as the principal units of analysis. But it can also be valuable to view Hispanic diversity from the perspective of metro dwellers. Hence our final research question is about how much exposure different categories of residents have to metro-wide diversity.¹⁵ Weighting the entropy index and its component origin group percentages by category size permits an answer, revealing the level and structure of Latino diversity experienced by the average category member.

The first type of comparison, between Hispanic and non-Hispanic residents, is briefly summarized here rather than presented in full.¹⁶ A valuable insight from the weighted data concerns the lower level of Latino diversity in the average Hispanic's metropolis. In particular, Hispanics tend to live among larger shares of Mexicans across most kinds of metro settings than do non-Hispanics of any race. (Northeastern areas constitute the lone exception.) The typical non-Hispanic metro resident, on the other hand, is exposed to higher proportions of Puerto Ricans and 'others'. By definition, this greater equality of size among origin groups accounts for the non-Hispanic edge in the magnitude of exposure to Latino

¹⁴We have replicated the 1990 and 2010 regression models in Table 3, substituting regional dummy variables for the Mexico and Caribbean distance measures. Diversity magnitude (E) is significantly greater for metropolitan areas located in the Northeast or South (i.e., closer to the Caribbean) while the likelihood of Mexican majority status is greater in the West (closer to Mexico) than elsewhere. Other significant predictors from the regional models are also similar to those in Table 3.

¹⁵'Exposure' as used here refers to a different geographic scale than is customary. While segregation researchers often rely on P^* measures to estimate the distribution of own-group and other-group residents across neighborhoods, we are interested in the composition of the Hispanic population for entire metropolitan areas to which average residents of various types are exposed.

¹⁶The Hispanic vs. non-Hispanic exposure results are available upon request.

diversity. The diversity level encountered by the average metropolitan inhabitant—whether Hispanic or not—has increased slightly or remained stable during the 1990–2010 period. Also, Hispanic and non-Hispanic residents of large, low-Hispanic areas in the Northeast (closer to the Caribbean than to Mexico) are exposed to more diverse local Latino populations than their counterparts elsewhere.

In a second set of comparisons, we unpack Latino exposure to diversity into that experienced by individual origin groups. Each pair of bars in Figure 2 refers to the 1990 and 2010 magnitude and structure of Hispanic diversity in the hypothetical metropolitan area that the average member of a particular group inhabits. According to the weighted E scores, diversity has risen moderately for all groups since 1990. A majority of the gains fall in the 4–6 point range, with the largest for Cubans and the smallest for ‘others’. Perhaps most striking is the relative isolation of Mexicans from the rest of the origin groups: on average, they make up nearly four-fifths of the metro Hispanic populations to which they belong, in line with Mexican dominance reasoning. Guatemalans and Salvadorans also reside in areas where Mexicans comprise half or more of the Hispanic community.

Unlike Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and Cubans are normally part of more heterogeneous Latino populations without a majority origin group. In both instances, their own group remains a plurality but has become a smaller slice of the pie over time as the representation of Mexicans and more recently arrived groups has grown. Dominicans are exposed to the greatest magnitude of Hispanic diversity, living among larger percentages of Puerto Ricans, ‘others’, and (as of 2010) Mexicans than of fellow Dominicans. These generally high exposure levels comport with the Caribbean-centric perspective. However, they reflect very different redistribution patterns for metropolitan Cubans, Dominicans, and Puerto Ricans. Members of the first group manifest persistent concentration in Miami, an area that has increasingly attracted Hispanic migrants from a variety of origins besides Cuba (Alberts 2006). While Dominicans have undergone significant spatial dispersion, three-fifths are still concentrated in New York. Puerto Ricans have become more spread out as well, albeit from a lower initial degree of concentration in New York and a handful of other traditionally important metro destinations in the Northeast.

Conclusion

Our analysis offers answers to a series of understudied questions about the origin-group diversity of Hispanic populations within metropolitan areas. We find that the magnitude of Hispanic diversity, as measured by E , ranges widely. Local Latino communities with no-majority structures are concentrated at the high end of the diversity continuum; homogeneously Mexican communities, at the low end. Mexicans make up the majority or plurality origin group in more than eight of every ten metro areas. They have increased their proportion of all metro Hispanics since 1990, although diversity levels and structures remain relatively stable in the aggregate. The structural transitions that have occurred are to Mexican majorities or pluralities.

We also shed light on metropolitan characteristics correlated with diversity. At both the beginning and end of the observation period, metro areas with more diverse, multigroup

Hispanic profiles are larger, have a smaller share of Hispanics overall, and tend to be located farther from Mexico and closer to the Caribbean. Additionally, the areas exhibit high rates of new housing construction, low rates of agricultural and manufacturing employment, and increased odds of being a military hub. The average Hispanic and non-Hispanic residents of these areas are exposed to greater diversity, the latter more so than the former. Caribbean origin groups (along with Colombians) live in especially diverse Latino settings. Dominican metro dwellers, concentrated in New York and the Northeast, experience the highest diversity of any origin group. By contrast, the average Mexican inhabits a metropolis in which four-fifths of all Latinos are of Mexican ancestry.

Taken together, these results best align with the Mexican dominance narrative. Mexicans' historical roots in the Southwest and the nearness of their country of origin contribute to a tremendous demographic advantage, not only in traditional gateways but elsewhere as they disperse to new destinations throughout the metropolitan U.S. At the same time, the Caribbean-centric perspective—again emphasizing the role of proximity—gives a plausible account of the diverse metro Hispanic communities found along the East Coast. The Mexican and Caribbean models are complemented by spatial assimilation and economic opportunity ideas about the importance of metropolitan size, industrial specialization, and certain kinds of institutional hubs as predictors of local variation in the magnitude and structure of diversity. While we regard Mexican dominance as the key dynamic, all four perspectives provide relevant insights.

The foundation laid here is an initial step toward understanding local Hispanic diversity. Of course, there is still much to do. Other potential metro correlates of diversity, such as the size of the unauthorized component of the Mexican-origin population, could be examined, assuming the availability of suitable data. Another useful task would be to replicate our metropolitan analysis of diversity for census-defined *places*, which comprise such familiar units as cities, suburbs, and small towns. The vast majority of places are incorporated governmental entities, responsible for service provision and the well-being of their residents. Place jurisdictions thus constitute meaningful contexts within which to study the *consequences* of Hispanic diversity. For example, the absence of a majority origin group (i.e., high diversity) would seem to make panethnic coalition-building essential as Latino groups seek political office and other forms of influence. Members of diverse Latino communities might further benefit from cross-group contacts that facilitate access to valued resources (e.g., ethnic role models, businesses, and organizations). Yet one can readily imagine a more fragmented scenario where different origin groups go their separate ways, perceiving each other as competitors for the same piece of the municipal pie. The nature of Hispanic intergroup relations could in turn have nontrivial microlevel implications. Indeed, a central question for future research is how individuals' ethnic identities and life chances are shaped by the heterogeneity or homogeneity of the local Hispanic populations to which they belong.

Acknowledgments

Support for this research has been provided by a grant from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R01HD074605). Additional support comes from the Population Research Institute of Penn State University, which receives infrastructure funding from NICHD (2R24HD041025). The

content of the paper is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not reflect the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

References

- Alba, Richard, Nee, Victor. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 2008.
- Alberts, Heike C. The Multiple Transformations of Miami. In: Smith, Heather A., Furuseth, Owen J., editors. *Latinos in the New South: Transformations of Place*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate; 2006. p. 135-51.
- Allen, James P., Turner, Eugene. The Most Ethnically Diverse Urban Places in the United States. *Urban Geography*. 1989; 10(6):523–39.
- Arreola, Daniel D. Hispanic American Legacy, Latino American Diaspora. In: Arreola, Daniel D., editor. *Hispanic Spaces, Latino Places: Community and Cultural Diversity in Contemporary America*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press; 2004. p. 13-35.
- Beltran, Cristina. *The Trouble with Unity: Latino Politics and the Creation of Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press; 2010.
- Brown, Susan K. Delayed Spatial Assimilation: Multigenerational Incorporation of the Mexican-Origin Population in Los Angeles. *City & Community*. 2007; 6(3):193–209.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. Report 1057. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor; 2015. Labor Force Characteristics by Race and Ethnicity, 2014. Accessed online at <http://www.bls.gov/opub/reports/cps/labor-force-characteristics-by-race-and-ethnicity-2014.pdf>
- Center for Construction Research and Training. CPWR Data Brief. Vol. 1. Silver Spring, MD: Center for Construction Research and Training; 2009. Hispanic Employment in Construction. Accessed online at <http://www.elcosh.org/record/document/1686/d000989.PDF>
- Cho, Youngtae, Parker Frisbie, W., Hummer, Robert A., Rogers, Richard G. Nativity, Duration of Residence, and the Health of Hispanic Adults in the United States. *International Migration Review*. 2004; 38(1):184–211.
- Colby, Sandra, Ortman, Jennifer M. Current Population Reports. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau; 2015. Projections of the Size and Composition of the U.S. Population: 2014 to 2060; p. P25-1143. Accessed online at <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2015/demo/p25-1143.pdf>
- Crook, Karen, Druetto, Shirley. 2010 Census Planning Memoranda Series, Report No. 181. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau; 2012. 2010 Census Federally Affiliated Overseas Count Operation Assessment Report. Accessed online at https://www.census.gov/2010census/pdf/2010_Census_Federally_Affiliated_Overseas_Count_Operation_Assessment.pdf
- De Genova, Nicholas, Ramos-Zayas, Ana Y. *Latino Crossings: Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and the Politics of Race and Citizenship*. New York: Routledge; 2003.
- Durand, Jorge, Telles, Edward, Flashman, Jennifer. The Demographic Foundations of the Latino Population. In: Tienda, Marta, Mitchell, Faith, editors. *Hispanics and the Future of America*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2006. p. 66-99.
- Economic Research Service. Farm Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture; 2015. Accessed online at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/farm-economy/farm-labor/background.aspx#demographic>
- Ennis, Sharon R., Rios-Vargas, Merarys, Albert, Nora G. 2010 Census Briefs. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau; 2011. The Hispanic Population: 2010; p. C2010BR-04 Accessed online at <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-04.pdf> <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-04.pdf>
- Farrell, Chad R. Immigrant Suburbanization and the Shifting Geographic Structure of Metropolitan Segregation in the United States. *Urban Studies*. 2016; 53(1):57–76.
- Foley, Neil. *Mexicans in the Making of America*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press; 2014.
- Frey, William H. *Diversity Explosion: How New Racial Demographics Are Remaking America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press; 2015.

- Frey, William H., Wilson, Jill H., Berube, Alan, Singer, Audrey. Tracking American Trends in the Twenty-First Century: A Field Guide to the New Metropolitan and Micropolitan Definitions. In: Berube, Alan, Katz, Bruce, Lang, Robert E., editors. Redefining Urban and Suburban America: Evidence from Census 2000. Vol. 3. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press; 2006. p. 191-234.
- Hall, Matthew. Interstate Migration, Spatial Assimilation, and the Incorporation of U.S. Immigrants. *Population, Space and Place*. 2009; 15(1):57-77.
- Hall, Matthew, Stringfield, Jonathan. Undocumented Migration and the Segregation of Mexican Immigrants in New Destinations. *Social Science Research*. 2014; 47:61-78. [PubMed: 24913945]
- Hamilton, Nora, Chinchilla, Norma Stoltz. Seeking Community in a Global City: Guatemalans and Salvadorans in Los Angeles. Philadelphia: Temple University Press; 2001.
- Hernandez-Leon, Ruben. Metropolitan Migrants: The Migration of Urban Mexicans to the United States. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 2008.
- Iceland, John. Where We Live Now: Immigration and Race in the United States. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 2009.
- Iceland, John, Weinberg, Daniel, Hughes, Lauren. The Residential Segregation of Detailed Hispanic and Asian Groups in the United States: 1980-2010. *Demographic Research*. 2014; 31(20):593-624. [PubMed: 26097412]
- Innis-Jimenez, Michael. Steel Barrio: The Great Mexican Migration to South Chicago, 1915-1940. New York: New York University Press; 2013.
- Itzigsohn, Jose. Encountering American Faultlines: Race, Class, and the Dominican Experience in Providence. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2009.
- Itzigsohn, Jose, Dore-Cabral, Carlos. Competing Identities? Race, Ethnicity, and Panethnicity among Dominicans in the United States. *Sociological Forum*. 2000; 15(2):225-47.
- Jimenez, Tomas. Replenished Ethnicity: Mexican Americans, Immigration, and Identity. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 2010.
- Johnson, Kenneth, Lichter, Daniel T. Natural Increase: A New Source of Population Growth in Emerging Hispanic Destinations. *Population and Development Review*. 2008; 34(2):327-46.
- Jones-Correa, Michael, Leal, David L. Becoming 'Hispanic': Secondary Panethnic Identification among Latin American-Origin Populations in the United States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 1996; 18(2):214-54.
- Landale, Nancy S., Salvador Oropesa, R., Bradatan, Christina. Hispanic Families in the United States: Family Structure and Process in an Era of Family Change. In: Tienda, Marta, Mitchell, Faith, editors. Hispanics and the Future of America. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2006. p. 138-78.
- Lee, Barrett A., Iceland, John, Farrell, Chad R. Is Ethnoracial Residential Integration on the Rise? Evidence for Metropolitan and Micropolitan America since 1980. In: Logan, John R., editor. Diversity and Disparities: America Enters a New Century. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2014. p. 415-56. Accessed online at https://www.russellsage.org/sites/all/files/logan/logan_diversity_chapter13.pdf
- Lee, Barrett A., Iceland, John, Sharp, Gregory. US2010 Project Research Report. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2012. Racial and Ethnic Diversity Goes Local: Charting Change in American Communities over Three Decades. Accessed online at <http://www.russellsage.org/research/reports/racial-ethnic-diversity>
- Lee, Barrett A., Sharp, Gregory. Ethnoracial Diversity across the Rural-Urban Continuum. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2017; 672(10):26-45.
- Lee, Jennifer, Bean, Frank D. The Diversity Paradox: Immigration and the Color Line in Twenty-First Century America. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2010.
- Lichter, Daniel T. Immigration and the New Racial Diversity in Rural America. *Rural Sociology*. 2012; 77(1):3-35. [PubMed: 26478602]
- Lichter, Daniel T. Integration or Fragmentation? Racial Diversity and the American Future. *Demography*. 2013; 50(2):359-91. [PubMed: 23440733]
- Lichter, Daniel T., Johnson, Kenneth M. Immigrant Gateways and Hispanic Migration to New Destinations. *International Migration Review*. 2009; 43(3):496-518.

- Lichter, Daniel T., Parisi, Domenico, Taquino, Michael C. Toward a New Macro-Segregation? Decomposing Segregation Within and Between Metropolitan Cities and Suburbs. *American Sociological Review*. 2015; 80(4):843–73.
- Light, Ivan. *Deflecting Immigration: Networks, Markets, and Regulation in Los Angeles*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2006.
- Lobo, Arun Peter, Salvo, Joseph J. A Portrait of New York's Immigrant Melange. In: Foner, Nancy, editor. *One Out of Three: Immigrant New York in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Columbia University Press; 2013. p. 35–63.
- Logan, John R. *The New Latinos: Who They Are, Where They Are*. Albany, NY: Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research; 2001. Accessed online at <http://www.s4.brown.edu/cen2000/HispanicPop/HspReport/MumfordReport.pdf>
- Logan, John R., Stults, Brian L., Farley, Reynolds. Segregation of Minorities in the Metropolis: Two Decades of Change. *Demography*. 2004; 41(1):1–22. [PubMed: 15074122]
- Logan, John R., Turner, Richard N. *US2010 Project Research Report*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2013. Hispanics in the United States: Not Only Mexicans. Accessed online at <http://www.russellsage.org/blog/diversity-hispanic-populations-united-states>
- Lopez, David, Espiritu, Yen. Panethnicity in the United States: A Theoretical Framework. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 1990; 13(2):198–224.
- Lopez, David E., Popkin, Eric, Telles, Edward. Central Americans: At the Bottom, Struggling to Get Ahead. In: Waldinger, Roger, Mehd, Bozorgmehr, editors. *Ethnic Los Angeles*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 1996. p. 279–304.
- Lopez, Gustavo. *Hispanic Trends Statistical Profiles*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center; 2015. Hispanics of Colombian/Cuban/Guatemalan Origin in the United States, 2013. Accessed online at <http://www.pewhispanic.org/author/glopez/>
- Lopez, Mark H. *Hispanic Trends Report*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center; 2013. Hispanic Identity. Accessed online at <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2013/10/22/3-hispanic-identity/>
- Lutz, Amy. Who Joins the Military? A Look at Race, Class, and Immigration Status. *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*. 2008; 36(2):167–88.
- Mahler, Sarah J. *Salvadorans in Suburbia: Symbiosis and Conflict*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon; 1995.
- Martin, Elizabeth. *Census 2000 TXE Program Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau; 2002. Questionnaire Effects on Reporting of Race and Hispanic Origin: Results of a Replication of the 1990 Mail Short Form in Census 2000. Accessed online at <https://www.census.gov/pred/www/rpts/AQE%20R&HO%20Final%20Report.pdf>
- Massey, Douglas S., editor. *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2008.
- Massey, Douglas S., Capoferro, Chiara. The Geographic Diversification of American Immigration. In: Massey, Douglas S., editor. *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2008. p. 25–50.
- Masuoka, Natalie. Together They Become One: Examining the Predictors of Panethnic Group Consciousness among Asian Americans and Latinos. *Social Science Quarterly*. 2006; 87(5):993–1011.
- McConnell, Eileen Diaz. The U.S. Destinations of Contemporary Mexican Immigrants. *International Migration Review*. 2008; 42(4):767–802.
- Mora, G Cristina. Cross-Field Effects and Ethnic Classification: The Institutionalization of Hispanic Ethnicity, 1965 to 1990. *American Sociological Review*. 2014; 79(2):183–210.
- NALEO Educational Fund. *National Directory of Latino Elected Officials*; 2016. Los Angeles: NALEO Educational Fund; 2016. Accessed online at https://d3n8a8pro7vnm.cloudfront.net/naleo/pages/188/attachments/original/1474060157/2016_National_Directory_of_Latino_Elected_Officials.pdf
- Ochoa, Gilda L. *Becoming Neighbors in a Mexican American Community: Power, Conflict, and Solidarity*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press; 2004.
- Padilla, Felix M. *Latino Ethnic Consciousness: The Case of Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans in Chicago*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press; 1985.

- Passel, Jeffrey S., Cohn, D'Vera. FactTank. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center; 2017a. As Mexican Share Declined, U.S. Unauthorized Immigrant Population Fell in 2015 Below Recession Level. Accessed online at www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/04/25/as-mexican-share-declined-u-s-unauthorized-immigrant-population-fell-in-2015-below-recession-level/
- Passel, Jeffrey S., Cohn, D'Vera. FactTank. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center; 2017b. 20 Metro Areas are Home to Six-in-Ten Unauthorized Immigrants in U.S. Accessed online at www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/02/09/us-metro-areas-unauthorized-immigrants/
- Portes, Alejandro, Rumbaut, Reuben G. Immigrant America: A Portrait. 3. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 2006.
- Portes, Alejandro, Truelove, Cynthia. Making Sense of Diversity: Recent Research on Hispanic Minorities in the United States. Annual Review of Sociology. 1987; 13(1):359–85.
- Portes, Alejandro, Zhou, Min. The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 1993; 530(1):74–96.
- Ricourt, Milagros. Dominicans in New York City: Power from the Margins. New York: Routledge; 2002.
- Ruiz, Neil G. Global Cities Initiative Report. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution and JPMorgan Chase; 2014. The Geography of Foreign Students in U.S. Higher Education: Origins and Destinations. Accessed online at https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Foreign_Students_Final.pdf
- Rumbaut, Ruben. The Making of a People. In: Tienda, Marta, Mitchell, Faith, editors. Hispanics and the Future of America. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2006. p. 16-65.
- Saenz, Rogelio, Morales, Maria C. Latinos in the United States: Diversity and Change. Cambridge, UK: Polity; 2015.
- Segal, Mady Wechsler, Segal, David R. Latinos Claim Larger Share of US Military Personnel. Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau; 2007. Accessed online at <http://www.prb.org/Publications/Articles/2007/HispanicsUSMilitary.aspx>
- Sharp, Gregory, Lee, Barrett A. New Faces in Rural Places: Patterns and Sources of Nonmetropolitan Ethnoracial Diversity since 1990. Rural Sociology. 2016. (early view). Accessed at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ruso.12141/epdf>
- Singer, AudreyHardwick, Susan W., Brettell, Caroline B., editors. Twenty-First Century Gateways: Immigrant Incorporation in Suburban America. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press; 2008.
- Smith, Robert Courtney. Mexican New York: Transnational Lives of New Immigrants. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 2006.
- South, Scott J., Crowder, Kyle, Chavez, Eric. Migration and Spatial Assimilation among U.S. Latinos: Classical Versus Segmented Trajectories. Demography. 2005; 42(3):497–521. [PubMed: 16235610]
- South, Scott J., Crowder, Kyle, Pais, Jeremy. Inter-Neighborhood Migration and Spatial Assimilation in a Multi-Ethnic World: Comparing Latinos, Blacks, and Anglos. Social Forces. 2008; 87(1):415–43.
- Suro, Roberto. Counting the 'Other Hispanics': How Many Colombians, Dominicans, Ecuadorians, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans Are There in the United States?. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center; 2002. Accessed online at <http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/reports/8.pdf>
- Suro, Roberto, Singer, Audrey. Changing Patterns of Latino Growth in Metropolitan America. In: Katz, Bruce, Lang, Robert E., editors. Redefining Urban and Suburban America: Evidence from Census 2000. Vol. I. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press; 2003. p. 181-210.
- Tienda, Marta, Sanchez, Susana M. Latin American Immigration to the United States. Daedalus. 2013; 142(3):48–64. [PubMed: 26560092]
- Torres-Saillant, Silvio, Hernandez, Ramona. Dominicans: Community, Culture, and Collective Identity. In: Foner, Nancy, editor. One Out of Three: Immigrant New York in the Twenty-First Century. New York: Columbia University Press; 2013. p. 223-45.
- U.S. Department of Defense. 2010 Demographics: Profile of the Military Community. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense; 2010. Accessed online at <http://download.militaryonesource.mil/12038/MOS/Reports/2010-Demographics-Report.pdf>

- U.S. Department of Defense. 2014 Demographics: Profile of the Military Community. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense; 2014. Accessed online at <http://download.militaryonesource.mil/12038/MOS/Reports/2014-Demographics-Report.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Labor. Child Labor Bulletin 102. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor; 2007. Child Labor Requirements in Agricultural Occupations under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Accessed online at <https://www.dol.gov/whd/regs/compliance/childlabor102.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Labor. State Child Labor Laws Applicable to Agricultural Employment. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor; 2017. Accessed online at <https://www.dol.gov/whd/state/agriemp2.htm>
- Vallejo, Jody. Barrios to Burbs: The Making of the Mexican-American Middle Class. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press; 2012.
- Van Hook, Jennifer, Bachmeier, James D., Coffman, Donna L., Harel, Ofer. Can We Spin Straw into Gold? An Evaluation of Immigrant Legal Status Imputation Approaches. *Demography*. 2015; 52(1):329–54. [PubMed: 25511332]
- Waters, Mary, Pineau, Marisa Gerstein, editors. The Integration of Immigrants into American Society. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2015.
- White, Michael J. Segregation and Diversity Measures in Population Distribution. *Population Index*. 1986; 52(2):198–221. [PubMed: 12340704]
- White, Michael J., Glick, Jennifer E. Achieving Anew: How New Immigrants Do in American Schools, Jobs, and Neighborhoods. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2009.
- Wilson, Steven G., Plane, David A., Mackun, Paul J., Fischetti, Thomas R., Goworowska, Justyna. 2010 Census Special Reports. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau; 2012. Patterns of Metropolitan and Micropolitan Change: 2000 to 2010; p. C2010SR-01
- Winders, Jamie. Nashville in the New Millennium: Immigrant Settlement, Urban Transformation, and Social Belonging. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2013.
- Wright, Richard A., Ellis, Mark, Holloway, Steven R., Wong, Sandy. Patterns of Racial Diversity and Segregation in the United States, 1990–2010. *Professional Geographer*. 2014; 66(2):173–82. [PubMed: 25083001]
- Zuniga, Victor, Hernandez-Leon, Ruben, editors. New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2005.

Figure 1.
Mean Hispanic Diversity and Origin Group Structure by Metro Size, Region, and Hispanic Percentage, 1990 and 2010

Figure 2.
Exposure of Specific Hispanic Origin Groups to Each Other in Metro Areas, 1990 and 2010

Table 1**25 Metro Areas with Highest and Lowest Hispanic Diversity**

Area	Hispanic E Score	Group as % of All Hispanics					Percent Hispanic
		Largest	2nd Largest	3rd Largest	4th Largest	5th Largest	
Highest							
Boston, MA	87.76	28.03 (PR)	22.23 (Dom)	20.16 (Oth)	9.00 (Sal)	6.83 (Mex)	9.02
Port St. Lucie, FL	85.63	31.20 (Mex)	22.11 (PR)	17.32 (Oth)	9.81 (Gua)	9.72 (Cub)	15.06
New York, NY	85.46	27.21 (PR)	25.16 (Oth)	19.30 (Dom)	12.97 (Mex)	5.28 (Col)	22.90
Cape Coral, FL	84.72	30.19 (Mex)	21.63 (PR)	17.87 (Cub)	15.62 (Oth)	5.62 (Gua)	18.31
Portland, ME	84.53	27.18 (Mex)	26.28 (Oth)	22.99 (PR)	6.27 (Sal)	5.12 (Cub)	1.55
Richmond, VA	84.33	32.93 (Mex)	21.72 (Oth)	15.92 (PR)	13.02 (Sal)	8.38 (Gua)	5.03
Baltimore, MD	84.20	28.44 (Oth)	26.70 (Mex)	16.29 (PR)	14.53 (Sal)	5.26 (Gua)	4.57
Providence, RI	84.00	32.67 (PR)	22.56 (Dom)	15.62 (Oth)	13.16 (Gua)	6.83 (Mex)	10.22
Tallahassee, FL	83.51	32.32 (Mex)	22.31 (Oth)	16.14 (PR)	15.00 (Cub)	5.56 (Sal)	5.81
Gainesville, FL	82.71	27.40 (Oth)	24.30 (PR)	20.62 (Cub)	14.04 (Mex)	8.13 (Col)	8.17
Mean (Top 25)	82.01	32.09	24.47	18.26	10.91	5.92	8.59
Lowest							
El Centro, CA	9.44	96.10 (Mex)	3.08 (Oth)	0.33 (PR)	0.27 (Sal)	0.09 (Cub)	80.37
McAllen, TX	12.27	94.11 (Mex)	5.25 (Oth)	0.24 (PR)	0.11 (Cub)	0.09 (Sal)	90.63
Yuma, AZ	13.15	94.34 (Mex)	4.04 (Oth)	0.84 (PR)	0.36 (Sal)	0.14 (Cub)	59.72
Yakima, WA	14.09	93.22 (Mex)	5.73 (Oth)	0.39 (PR)	0.31 (Sal)	0.14 (Gua)	45.01
Visalia, CA	14.24	93.36 (Mex)	5.29 (Oth)	0.53 (PR)	0.48 (Sal)	0.18 (Gua)	60.62
El Paso, TX	14.55	93.16 (Mex)	5.35 (Oth)	1.00 (PR)	0.13 (Cub)	0.12 (Sal)	82.20
Merced, CA	15.23	93.01 (Mex)	5.22 (Oth)	0.73 (PR)	0.63 (Sal)	0.21 (Gua)	54.92
Odessa, TX	15.39	91.49 (Mex)	7.93 (Oth)	0.28 (PR)	0.14 (Cub)	0.07 (Sal)	52.75
Brownsville, TX	16.06	91.42 (Mex)	7.73 (Oth)	0.29 (PR)	0.21 (Sal)	0.13 (Cub)	88.07
Laredo, TX	16.29	90.98 (Mex)	8.29 (Oth)	0.36 (PR)	0.11 (Sal)	0.09 (Cub)	95.74
Mean (Bottom 25)	17.73	91.08	6.98	0.90	0.48	0.25	52.27

Table 2

Hispanic Origin Group Structure in Metro Areas, 1990 and 2010

1990 Type of Structure		2010 Type of Structure									
		Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		Other Hispanics		N of Areas	
		Majority	Plurality	Majority	Plurality	Majority	Plurality	Majority	Plurality		
Mexican	Majority	174	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	178
	Plurality	45	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55
Puerto Rican	Majority	-	-	21	7	-	-	-	-	-	28
	Plurality	1	5	3	10	-	-	-	-	-	19
Cuban	Majority	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Plurality	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Other Hispanics	Majority	12	9	-	2	-	-	2	1	-	26
	Plurality	29	15	-	4	-	-	-	7	-	55
N of Areas		261	44	24	23	0	1	2	8	-	363

Table 3
Predictors of Hispanic Diversity and Origin Group Structure in Metro Areas, 1990 and 2010

Metro Characteristics	Hispanic <i>E</i> Score ^c		Mexican Majority ^d		Puerto Rican Maj/Plur ^d	
	1990 <i>b</i> (S.E.)	2010 <i>b</i> (S.E.)	1990 <i>b</i> (S.E.)	2010 <i>b</i> (S.E.)	1990 <i>b</i> (S.E.)	2010 <i>b</i> (S.E.)
Population ^a	3.651 *** (0.579)	2.081 *** (0.608)	-0.149 (0.240)	-0.039 (0.261)	-0.307 (0.339)	-0.450 (0.328)
Hispanic Representation ^a	-7.092 *** (0.556)	-5.229 *** (0.646)	0.534 * (0.237)	-0.666 (0.344)	1.206 ** (0.419)	1.729 *** (0.464)
Mexico Distance	0.008 *** (0.001)	0.011 *** (0.001)	-0.003 *** (0.000)	-0.004 *** (0.001)	0.004 *** (0.001)	0.005 *** (0.001)
Caribbean Distance	-0.003 *** (0.001)	-0.005 *** (0.000)	0.001 *** (0.000)	0.002 *** (0.000)	-0.003 *** (0.001)	-0.001 *** (0.000)
Hispanic Income	4.151 (2.706)	9.477 * (4.895)	-6.358 *** (1.631)	-6.945 *** (2.000)	-5.882 (2.362)	0.235 (2.976)
New Construction	0.442 *** (0.060)	0.335 *** (0.085)	-0.045 (0.026)	0.137 *** (0.042)	-0.034 (0.044)	-0.062 (0.047)
Agriculture ^a	-3.307 ** (1.080)	-3.017 *** (0.793)	0.127 (0.464)	0.083 (0.344)	-0.939 (0.817)	-1.299 ** (0.544)
Manufacturing	-0.368 *** (0.081)	-0.935 *** (0.106)	0.087 ** (0.032)	0.325 *** (0.062)	0.045 (0.045)	-0.051 (0.055)
Education ^b	3.955 ** (1.331)	1.050 (1.282)	0.193 (0.568)	0.453 (0.583)	-2.676 (1.411)	-0.739 (0.744)
Government ^b	1.553 (1.321)	-0.545 (1.280)	-1.625 ** (0.632)	0.840 (0.591)	0.776 (0.868)	-0.882 (0.784)
Military ^b	2.888 * (1.688)	3.362 * (1.751)	0.053 (0.851)	-0.338 (0.749)	1.858 * (1.122)	-0.610 (1.277)
Intercept	-31.270 *** (10.038)	9.333 *** (10.237)	9.771 *** (4.145)	-1.159 *** (4.401)	9.538 *** (7.236)	4.114 *** (5.798)

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Metro Characteristics	Hispanic <i>E</i> Score ^c		Mexican Majority ^d		Puerto Rican Maj/Plur ^d	
	1990 <i>b</i>	2010 <i>b</i>	1990 <i>b</i>	2010 <i>b</i>	1990 <i>b</i>	2010 <i>b</i>
	(S.E.)	(S.E.)	(S.E.)	(S.E.)	(S.E.)	(S.E.)
Adjusted R ²	0.722	0.757	0.604	0.606	0.640	0.591
*** p<.001;						
** p<.01;						
* p<.05;						
one-tailed tests						
^d Natural log						
^b See text for details						
^c OLS regression						
^d Logistic regression						