Published in final edited form as:

Rural Sociol. 2017 September ; 82(3): 411–443. doi:10.1111/ruso.12141.

New Faces in Rural Places: Patterns and Sources of Nonmetropolitan Ethnoracial Diversity Since 1990*

Gregory Sharp and

Department of Sociology, University at Buffalo-SUNY

Barrett A. Lee

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

Abstract

Much of the research on ethnoracial diversity in nonmetropolitan America consists of case studies describing how the arrival of Hispanics has transformed a particular community. To complement this work, we examine the dimensions and sources of diversity for a sample of 10,000 nonmetro places. Two dimensions of diversity—magnitude and structure—are identified, and hypotheses about their changes and correlates are drawn from the spatial assimilation and locational persistence perspectives and relevant scholarship. Our analysis of 1990–2010 decennial census and American Community Survey data documents a pervasive upward trend in diversity magnitude. However, places tend to follow parallel rather than identical diversity trajectories and to retain the same type of racial-ethnic structure in 2010 that they exhibited 20 years earlier. Fixed effects regression models show that ethnoracial diversity gains are most likely in nonmetro communities with plentiful economic opportunities, fewer old residents, and growing total, foreign-born, and correctional populations. These correlates hold for micropolitan and rural places and across census regions. Though our results largely conform to locational persistence logic, we find that spatial assimilation still has some merit, underscoring the importance of incorporating multiple theoretical models in a segmented change perspective on nonmetropolitan diversity.

Introduction

The increasing racial and ethnic diversity of the United States has been examined primarily through an urban lens (Frey 2015; Wright et al. 2014). Recent studies document a near-universal trend among metropolitan areas toward a more equal representation of panethnic populations, which is what we take the concept of diversity to mean. For example, Lee and colleagues (2014) find that 98% of all metro areas nationally have experienced gains in diversity, often substantial, since 1980. Although rural places and counties are becoming more ethnoracially diverse as well (Jensen 2006; Lichter 2012), they pale in comparison to their metropolitan counterparts. Average levels of diversity in nonmetropolitan settings in

*Support for this research has been provided by a grant from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R01HD074605, PI Barrett Lee). Additional support comes from the Population Research Institute of The Pennsylvania State University, which receives infrastructure funding from NICHD (2P2CHD041025). The content of the article is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not reflect the official views of the National Institutes.

Direct correspondence to Gregory Sharp, Department of Sociology, University at Buffalo-SUNY, 468 Park Hall, Buffalo, NY 14260. Sharp can also be reached at gsharp@buffalo.edu and at 716-645-8479.

2010 fall below the levels registered by metro communities two to three decades earlier. For many small rural towns, the homogeneity stereotype—typically all-white but occasionally all-Hispanic, black, or Native American—still contains a grain of truth.

Despite lagging far behind metropolitan cities and suburbs, rural contexts may feel the impact of diversification more acutely. The historical dominance of whites has left rural communities ill prepared to incorporate immigrant-rich groups from Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Given the low-skill jobs available in such communities, the newcomers drawn to them (most notably Mexicans and other Hispanics) tend to be undocumented, less educated, and unable to speak English fluently (Farmer and Moon 2009; Kandel and Cromartie 2004). In light of their attributes, the newcomers can pose challenges for service providers (e.g., schools, healthcare) and elicit prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory treatment from native-born residents, who see them as threats to the quality of local life. But the new arrivals are also lauded for their work ethic and family values, and they often spark demographic, economic, and cultural revitalization in places undergoing long-term decline. The relevant research literature discusses a mix of costs and benefits linked to rural diversification, contingent upon the community and ethnoracial groups in question (Carr et al. 2012; Crowley and Lichter 2009; Fennelly 2008; Gouveia et al. 2005; Grey and Woodrick 2005; Kandel and Parrado 2006; Marrow 2011; Millard et al. 2004).

These consequences highlight the importance of understanding variation in the extent and sources of diversity across nonmetropolitan places and over time. Some attention has already been devoted to the topic, which was the theme of a recent Rural Sociological Society presidential address (Lichter 2012). Our own inquiry is motivated by four features of existing work on rural diversity. First, most scholars stress the growth of one or more minority groups rather than conceptualizing and measuring diversity in direct, comprehensive fashion. Second, Hispanic immigrants—typically of Mexican origin—are the clear group of choice, an emphasis that makes sense due to their dramatic rise in many places but that neglects both U.S.-born Hispanics and the presence of other groups (e.g., African Americans throughout the rural South). Third, because Hispanic ‘new destinations’ are where the action is, they have been the subject of case studies that offer valuable insights yet form an uncertain basis for big-picture conclusions (see, e.g., Zuniga and Hernandez-Leon 2005; Massey 2008; Millard & Chapa 2004). The fourth feature of concern to us is the descriptive character of the case studies; accounting for differences in diversity among places receives lower priority. As a result, little is known about whether the characteristics that set diverse metropolitan places apart are also associated with higher diversity in nonmetro communities, or whether the distinctiveness of the latter implies sources of diversity unique to rural America.

In response to these concerns, we both sharpen and broaden the investigation of rural ethnoracial diversity. The next section conceptualizes diversity, distinguishing between its magnitude and structure, and reviews evidence from nonmetropolitan research that bears on these dimensions. We then turn to two theoretical perspectives—spatial assimilation and locational persistence—for guidance about what trends in diversity might look like, and we identify a series of community attributes hypothesized to be related to diversification. The hypotheses are evaluated with 1990 through 2010 decennial census and American

Community Survey data on the local representation of six panethnic populations. Three of the populations—non-Hispanic whites, blacks, and Native Americans—are dominated by native-born citizens. However, roughly three-fifths of all Asians and one-third of all Hispanics in the U.S. have immigrated here (Pew Research Center 2013; Stepler and Brown 2016). This variability in composition, coupled with public perceptions that often lump together the native- and foreign-born members of each group, leads us to examine diversity for total panethnic populations instead of focusing on their immigrant portions alone.

We also cast a wide geographic net, measuring diversity for a sample of nearly 10,000 nonmetropolitan places. Rather than assume a uniform rural experience, our analysis uses weighted estimates of diversity magnitude to capture the changing exposure to diversity of average residents living in different regions and inside and outside of micropolitan areas. We rely on a ‘majority rule’ typology to explore transitions in racial-ethnic structure and the role played by group-specific growth rates in these transitions. The extent to which Hispanics drive nonmetro diversity patterns is given special attention. Our final empirical section summarizes results from fixed effects regressions that model diversity change as a function of the evolving demographic, economic, and institutional character of rural places.

Background

Diversity: Concept and Evidence

When joined with race and ethnicity, the concept of diversity is a victim of overuse. It has been employed to refer to an abstract ideal, a policy goal, and as code for multiculturalism and tolerance. Here we stick to its demographic definition, which focuses on ethnoracial variation in a population. The *magnitude* or level of diversity is determined by the number of racial-ethnic groups that make up the population and their relative sizes (Teachman 1980; White 1986). A nonmetro community comprising many groups of equal size would be judged highly diverse. At the opposite extreme, when all residents belong to the same group, homogeneity reigns: the local population exhibits an absence of diversity. Several statistics are available with which to capture the magnitude dimension of diversity. We prefer the entropy index, a popular measure known for its desirable statistical properties and conceptual congruence.

In addition to magnitude, diversity may vary in terms of *racial-ethnic structure*. This second dimension reflects the specific groups that constitute a population. Structure is significant because it can differ among places with identical diversity magnitudes. Imagine three rural towns that each has a 50–50 composition: one is half white and half black, one is half white and half Hispanic, and one is half Hispanic and half Native American. Although their entropy index values would all be exactly the same, they are likely to display distinct profiles with respect to socioeconomic status, interethnic relations, and the like. Simply put, to understand diversity we must know which particular groups are present, not just their number and sizes.

The emphasis in rural research thus far has been on the structural dimension of diversity. Most case studies of new destinations in the South and Midwest briefly report changes in the representation of ethnoracial groups. These studies highlight Hispanic and especially

Mexican growth, with only passing attention to Hispanics from other countries of origin (see, e.g., Gouveia et al. 2005; Griffith 2008; Haverluk 2004; Marrow 2011). Some larger-scale analyses have documented the shifting composition of the nonmetropolitan population as a whole (Cromartie and Parker 2014; Jensen 2006), occasionally turning to simple typologies to describe the changes underway in racial-ethnic structure. As an illustration, Johnson (2012) identifies single-group and multi-group counties, and Lichter (2012) provides evidence on minority-majority nonmetro places (defined by populations under 50% white). Regardless of differences in design, the literature addressing the structure of diversity finds that white shares of community populations have declined amid increasing compositional complexity (i.e., more groups present). An important caveat, however, is that rural diversification, like the Hispanic growth fueling it, appears to be confined to relatively few locations (Jensen 2006; Kandel and Cromartie 2004).

Only two analyses of which we are aware measure the magnitude as well as the structure of diversity for rural communities. In an examination of the relationship between ethnoracial diversity and residential segregation, Parisi and collaborators (2015) utilize a detailed structural typology and entropy index scores to describe diversity change in nonmetro (and metro) places between 1990 and 2010. They observe a rise in the number of four-group places, a decline in all-white and mixed-white places, and increases in average diversity levels for nearly every type of place (with all-Hispanic and all-black places the lone exceptions). Similar results are presented by Lee et al. (2014) for micropolitan areas. Virtually all such areas have experienced increases in diversity magnitude since 1980, accompanied by major gains in Hispanic representation and a falling proportion of whites. These patterns are most pronounced in micropolitan gateways with larger foreign-born percentages.

Although less germane for present purposes, we should mention one final line of work that adopts a group-centric rather than a place-centric strategy to investigate rural diversity. This strategy focuses on the spatial redistribution of ethnoracial groups throughout nonmetropolitan America via net migration and natural increase. The principal research question posed is whether group members have become spread more evenly across nonmetro communities. According to studies of immigrants in general (Lichter and Johnson 2006) and native- and foreign-born Hispanics (Kandel and Cromartie 2004; Lichter and Johnson 2009), the answer is a qualified 'yes': substantial dispersion has occurred, but both groups remain more geographically concentrated than their native-born or non-Hispanic white counterparts. The connection to our research is that the increasing dispersion of Hispanics and other minorities implies increasing diversity in the rural communities which receive them.

Theorizing Trends

The descriptive findings just summarized, though valuable, are not yet well understood. Some sort of framework is needed for explaining how and why the nature of ethnoracial diversity change varies across nonmetropolitan places. Two theoretical perspectives strike us as worthy of inclusion in such a framework.

According to the well-known *spatial assimilation* theory, geographic dispersion represents a key concomitant of the social mobility and acculturation experienced by immigrant-laden

minority groups (Alba and Logan 1991; Hall 2009; Iceland 2009; Massey 1985; South et al. 2008). As Hispanics and Asians become more integrated into American society, they can be expected to pursue economic and quality-of-life opportunities throughout the nation. In rural as well as urban contexts, this often means heading for new destinations with fewer co-ethnics. The dispersion process is facilitated by communication technologies that make far-away places easier to learn about and ties to family members and friends easier to maintain over long distances (Zelinsky and Lee 1998). Policy changes have played a role as well. Some, such as the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act, legalized roughly 3 million undocumented newcomers and increased their freedom of movement. More recently, border-hardening measures, state legislation, and local ordinances have deflected immigrant flows within the U.S. in nontraditional directions (Light 2006; Massey and Capoferro 2008; Tienda and Sanchez 2008).

While most rural communities are likely to diversify as a result of minority dispersion, more homogeneous (i.e., whiter) ones will experience the greatest transformation. The implication here is captured in the *convergence* hypothesis, which follows from spatial assimilation logic: differences between established and new destinations in diversity magnitude and structure should narrow over time as the geographic distributions of all ethnoracial groups become increasingly similar. Floor and ceiling effects—the probability of upward or downward shifts in diversity linked to a community’s prior homogeneity or heterogeneity—further strengthen the chances for convergence among nonmetro places.

Perhaps the most significant empirical challenge to the convergence hypothesis is posed by the enduring concentrations of Hispanics in the Southwest and blacks in the South (Ennis et al. 2011; Hunt et al. 2008; Rastogi et al. 2011; Wilson et al. 2012). Such regional clustering seems more consistent with what we term the *locational persistence* model. This model rests on the assumption of path dependence, that the present reflects historical circumstances. Thus, to make sense of the uneven distribution of ethnoracial groups across the nonmetropolitan landscape, one must consider how proximity to the country of origin and labor demand at the time of arrival have channeled each group toward particular destinations (Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Lieberman and Waters 1988). Group members continue to congregate in these destinations, which become rural gateways, because of the ethnic networks, institutions, and economic arrangements that form there. Thanks to their reputation as ethnic ‘comfort zones’, the gateway communities are able to attract and retain new residents who replenish the existing groups (Ellis and Goodwin-White 2006; Frey and Liaw 1999, 2005; Kritz et al. 2011).

This magnet effect is balanced by the many rural places from which minorities have been excluded. Beginning in the late 1800s, the U.S. witnessed the emergence of the ‘sundown town’, defined as “any organized jurisdiction that for decades kept African Americans or other groups from living in it and thus was ‘all-white’ on purpose” (Loewen 2005:4; also see Jaspin 2007). White residents of rural sundown towns used violence, intimidation, local ordinances, social ostracism, and other means to drive out people of color and prevent new ones from entering. Even today, the influence of past sundown status is evident. In addition to the deterrent effect of a reputation for racism, former sundown communities appear more likely than other places to forego economic development initiatives that might attract black

and Hispanic workers and thus erode their homogeneous character (Crowe 2012; Crowe and Ceresola 2014; cf. McConnell and Miraftab 2009). Municipal underbounding—the decision by local officials not to annex nearby territory with a disproportionate share of minority inhabitants—also operates to preserve white dominance (Lichter et al. 2007). Additional government practices that, like underbounding, can have a diversity-dampening impact include zoning, land use regulations, housing construction standards, and codes enforcement.

It is unrealistic to expect every historically white community or ethnic gateway to maintain a constant level of diversity over the long run. Trends in the composition of a community will be influenced by the number of distinct racial-ethnic groups present, relations between the groups, and their rates of growth or decline, among other factors. Accordingly, what the locational persistence perspective hypothesizes is *relative stability* rather than convergence in the diversity hierarchy among places. Based on their initial diversity magnitude, rural places should maintain their positions in relation to each other, displaying parallel trajectories of diversity change.

While the diversity trends predicted by the relative stability and convergence hypotheses are reasonable, alternative possibilities exist. One alternative is persistent homogeneity. As just noted, all-white towns represent the most common expression of this pattern, but communities marked by longstanding black, Hispanic, and Native American dominance are scattered throughout nonmetropolitan areas as well (Falk 2004; Johnson 2012; Norris et al. 2012). Another scenario is the kind of increasing homogeneity observed in racially mixed neighborhoods, where intergroup differences in mobility and growth rates—amplified by whites' aversion to living near minority residents—have rendered diversity a temporary phenomenon (Lee et al. 2014; Logan and Zhang 2010; Charles 2006; Crowder et al. 2011; Pais et al. 2009). Recent research documents this scenario for places that reached their diversity apex in 1980 or 1990 (Lee and Hughes 2015). They subsequently became more homogeneous in the face of black and especially Hispanic succession, 'bucking the trend' toward diversification. Few in number, these places were most often located in the West and South.

Such varied diversity pathways, including those that the spatial assimilation and locational persistence models emphasize, should not be considered mutually exclusive. Instead, we propose an overarching *segmented change* framework to accommodate the lot of them. The similarity of this framework's label to segmented assimilation theory (Portes and Zhou 1993) is intentional: the fate of communities often depends upon the fate of ethnoracial groups. In the present case, compositional shifts in rural communities will be shaped by where immigrants and minorities wind up as they encounter more or less favorable receptions in pursuit of their socioeconomic interests. The past racial-ethnic structures of these communities, along with group differences in growth rates and residential preferences, will also help determine whether diversity rises or falls. In short, the segmented change framework holds that places, like groups, may display a range of trajectories. This principle is too imprecise to qualify as a hypothesis. However, it does underscore the fallacy of implying that one pathway fits all.

Hypotheses about Correlates

The assimilation and persistence models speak to the nature of ethnoracial diversity trends in nonmetro places, but they say little about the sources of those trends. Setting the models aside for now, we consider four types of place attributes that the larger diversity and community literatures suggest may be correlated with local diversity change. The first attribute is the *scale* of a community, indexed by its population size. All else equal, larger or growing places should benefit from their visibility as ‘hot spots’, pulling a variety of groups toward them. Beyond the symbolic message conveyed, a large population increases the likelihood that both service-providing institutions and critical masses of co-ethnics will be available for aid and support. We therefore predict a positive relationship between community scale and ethnoracial diversity, cross-sectionally and over time. Although this hypothesis has only been evaluated for metropolises, suburbs, and micropolitan areas (Hall and Lee 2010; Lee et al. 2012, 2014), it seems relevant to rural places as well.

Co-ethnic appeal is acknowledged more fully in a second set of attributes representing the local *context of reception*. An established or expanding foreign-born population means access to greater ethnic resources—organizations, employment niches, and social capital—which in turn will draw more immigrants to the community.¹ As the share of immigrants increases, it could also blur the traditional black-white color line, facilitating the incorporation of Hispanics and Asians. Alternatively, it could be perceived as a cultural or economic threat that hastens the departure of some white residents (DeFina and Hannon 2009; Frey 1996; Lee and Bean 2010; Parisi et al. 2015). Whether via blurring or threatening, a substantial immigrant presence is hypothesized to promote a more balanced racial-ethnic mix and thus boost the magnitude of diversity.²

However, if a high proportion of local immigrants has recently entered the U.S. (e.g., during the past 10 years), diversity might be reduced for two reasons. First, because these new immigrants are likely lower in socioeconomic status and less acculturated than other residents, they may pose incorporation challenges that undermine whites’ quality of community life, prompting some to move out and discouraging other whites from moving in (Wahl et al. 2007; Hall and Crowder 2014). Second, new immigrants could seek out places that have already become minority-majority in composition, consistent with ethnic ‘comfort zone’ logic. Perhaps a more intuitive hypothesis, though, is that a place’s share of recent immigrants will be positively related to its diversity. Such immigrants may perceive less competition for jobs and housing in new destinations than established gateways and thus head for the former (Kandel and Cromartie 2004; Lichter and Johnson 2009; cf. Crowley et

¹Ideally, we would like to operationalize the context of reception more broadly, encompassing long-term residents’ attitudes toward the newcomers, the availability of supportive institutions and services, and public policies designed to deter or welcome immigrants. As implied by locational persistence theory, the unique historical conditions influencing the reception of immigrants in each community should also be taken into account. However, these dimensions of context are impractical if not impossible to measure for a sample of 10,000 places.

²The relationship between the ethnoracial diversity of a place and the percentage of immigrants living there, though potentially substantial in magnitude, should not be considered tautological, given the conceptual distinction between race-ethnicity and nativity. This point is illustrated by the nontrivial presence of European (non-Hispanic white) immigrants in the U.S. Also, a growing foreign-born population can go hand in hand with rising homogeneity rather than diversity, as in the case of a continuing influx of Hispanics to an already Hispanic-majority community.

al. 2015). As they do so, the ethnoracial make-up of the new destination places will become more mixed.

Senior citizens are another demographic group that we anticipate will shape the local context of reception, albeit in a manner contrary to diversity. In small towns, large proportions of older whites aging in place—most of who prefer racially homogeneous environments—could discourage settlement by people of color or at least signal a moribund economy with poor employment prospects. Ironically, rural retirement destinations are now attracting not only affluent baby boomers but Hispanics, the latter to fill the construction- and service-sector jobs generated by the retirees (Johnson and Lichter 2013; Nelson et al. 2009). Yet the cost of living typical of these high-amenity destinations separates the two groups in residential space, with Hispanics often commuting to work from more affordable locations nearby. The dynamics just identified lead us to hypothesize a negative association between diversity and the 65+ share of a community's age structure.

Economic opportunity, a third place attribute linked to ethnoracial diversity, extends beyond the kinds of jobs available in retirement destinations. Nonmetropolitan settings have traditionally offered low-skill agricultural and manufacturing employment for which members of immigrant and minority groups with limited human capital are qualified. Recent work focuses on the emergence of meat and poultry processing plants in the South and Midwest, where host communities have undergone rapid diversification due to a burgeoning Hispanic labor force (Griffith 2008; Kandel and Parrado 2005; Stull et al. 1995). As a result of formal and informal recruitment efforts, minority workers are also increasingly represented in carpet manufacturing, oil and gas production, forest-related enterprises, and fisheries and seafood processing, among other rural industries (Donato and Bankston 2008; Emery et al. 2006; Griffith 1995; Zuniga and Hernandez-Leon 2009). Compared to expensive metropolitan gateways such as Los Angeles and New York, another form of economic opportunity may be more easily within reach in the rural context: homeownership (Jensen 2006; Schoenholtz 2005). We expect changes in the local minority ownership rate, like changes in agricultural and manufacturing employment, to be positively related to diversity change.

A final place attribute likely to influence diversity is what we term *institutional hub* status (Allen and Turner 1989; Lee et al. 2012). College towns, county seats, and base communities illustrate the concept. These places are anchored by institutions—higher education, government, and the military, respectively—that express a commitment to affirmative action and often provide minorities with avenues of upward mobility. Correctional facilities, which have experienced a rural boom (Glasmeier and Farrigan 2007), constitute a less voluntary type of hub. Whether found inside or outside town limits, the institutions of interest will affect the ethnoracial composition of their community settings. In particular, any significant growth of their work force or clientele is hypothesized to increase local diversity. Contraction (via staff cutbacks, declining enrollments, or base or prison closure) should have the opposite impact.

Past research implies that region and location within a micropolitan area may matter for changes in community diversity. No hypotheses involving these two geographic

characteristics are formulated, in part because we believe they may proxy more specific place characteristics that happen to be unevenly distributed across their categories and that correlate with diversity. Nevertheless, we incorporate regional and micro/rural breakdowns to explore any residual variation.

Research Objectives

In sum, our investigation addresses two primary objectives. The first is to evaluate the convergence and relative stability hypotheses—based on spatial assimilation and locational persistence theorizing—about trends in the magnitude and racial-ethnic structure of diversity for nonmetropolitan places. The second objective is to determine which characteristics of these places are associated with diversity change. We are guided by hypotheses that emphasize the scale of a community, its context of reception, the types of economic opportunity available, and whether the community hosts one or more institutional hubs.

Methodology

Sample of Places

Our analysis of nonmetropolitan ethnoracial diversity draws on summary file data spanning the 1990, 2000, and 2010 decennial censuses as well as information from the 2008–2012 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year summary file. We employ census-defined *places* as the geographic unit of analysis. According to the Census Bureau, places are named locations with concentrated populations. Most are incorporated municipalities as well, performing a range of governmental functions and responsible for any diversity-related issues that arise within their boundaries. Other communities have been defined as census-designated places (CDPs); unlike their incorporated counterparts, they lack formal legal status (see U.S. Census Bureau 1994). However, both types of places constitute symbolic entities that are recognized by residents, who in turn may feel more or less attached to them. Nonmetro places can also be distinguished as either micropolitan or rural. The former fall within micropolitan areas, which are similar to metropolitan areas but smaller. These areas consist of an urban cluster of 10,000 to 50,000 inhabitants, the host core county, and any contiguous counties linked to the core county via commuting (Frey et al. 2006). In the results sections, we frequently compare micropolitan places with rural places (i.e., those outside of micro areas).

Nonmetropolitan places with a population of 100 or more residents in a given census year were initially selected for study. The number of such places has increased from 10,265 in 1990 to 12,783 in 2010, representing roughly 47% of all U.S. places at each time point. To facilitate over-time comparisons, we have further restricted our focus to a constant subset of places that satisfy the 100-person threshold in all three census years. The final 1990–2010 analytic sample thus consists of 9,969 places, 4,405 micropolitan and 5,564 rural.³ We allow

³Our choice of a relatively low population threshold for sample eligibility was guided by the well-known rank-size principle: far more smaller communities exist than larger ones. For example, setting the threshold at 1,000 rather than 100 would have resulted in the exclusion of 5,559 nonmetro places, or 55.8% of the final analytic sample. At the opposite extreme, dropping the bar below 100 risks including places so small that residential entries and exits by a few households from different ethnoracial groups could dramatically alter community diversity.

the boundaries of these places to vary from one year to the next. This decision is informed by the fact that most places, unlike census tracts, constitute ‘real’ governmental jurisdictions with meaningful boundaries. If shifts in diversity caused by annexation or loss of land were to have any consequences, they would affect the community as constituted at that moment rather than in some past or future territorial form.⁴ To be on the safe side, however, we control for areal size when evaluating potential sources of diversity change.

A quick look at the analytic sample shows that the average 2010 population of micropolitan places is 3,660, with Albany, OR topping the list at 50,158. Not surprisingly, rural places are smaller than micropolitan ones, averaging 1,418 residents in 2010. The largest rural place is tourist attraction Steamboat Springs, CO, which boasts a population of 12,088. In terms of regional location, nonmetropolitan places are concentrated in the Midwest (44.0%) and South (34.0%) regions but are sparser in the West (14.1%) and the Northeast (7.9%).

Measuring Diversity

We employ census racial and ethnic tabulations to delineate six groups that form the building blocks for our diversity measures: Hispanics of any race, non-Hispanic whites, non-Hispanic blacks, non-Hispanic Asians (including Pacific Islanders), non-Hispanic Native Americans (American Indians and Alaska Natives), and all other non-Hispanics (multi-race and other-race individuals). Counts of these panethnic groups have been extracted for each nonmetro place in all three census years. Together, the count data provide exhaustive, mutually exclusive coverage of local populations.⁵

As noted earlier, ethnoracial diversity has both a magnitude and a structure. The *entropy index* (symbolized by E) is used to measure the magnitude dimension of diversity, or the degree to which our six panethnic groups comprise equal (one-sixth) shares of a place’s total population (for more detail, see Reardon and Firebaugh 2002; White 1986). The index can be formally expressed as follows:

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

where Π_r refers to ethnoracial group r ’s proportion within each place. We standardize E to a 0–100 scale by dividing by its maximum value (the natural log of R , or 1.792 for six groups) then multiplying by 100. A score of 100 indicates complete diversity, where each ethnoracial group comprises the same proportion of the population. A score of 0 indicates complete

⁴We have computed a ratio of the 2010 areal size (in square miles) of each place to its 1990 size. The ratio allows us to identify places ceding land, remaining stable, or annexing land during the study period. Three results stand out from this exercise: (1) only one-ninth of all nonmetro places increase their areal size by as much as 50% over the two decades of interest; (2) roughly three-fifths remain stable in size or lose land; and (3) mean 1990 and 2010 diversity levels are quite similar across the shrinking, stable, and expanding categories of places.

⁵Although Hispanics and blacks are the most numerous people of color in the nonmetropolitan U.S. overall, some places have substantial Asian representation (especially in Hawaii, Alaska, and California) or large shares of Native Americans (in Alaska, Oklahoma, the upper Midwest, and the Southwest). Hence we consider Asians and Native Americans important to include as separate panethnic categories. Sensitivity tests (not reported) show that leaving them out—measuring diversity based solely on whites, blacks, and Hispanics—bumps the magnitude of place diversity a bit higher but does not alter conclusions about trends over time or variation by micropolitan/rural status or regional location.

homogeneity, where all residents of a place belong to a single group. In the sample, 2010 *E* values peak in the mid-70s to mid-80s for places such as Unalaska, AK and Winslow, AZ, but they descend to low single digits for homogeneously black (e.g., Winstonville, MS), Hispanic (La Grulla, TX), and Native American (Scammon Bay, AK) places and to 0 for a number of all-white communities.

Our investigation captures the racial-ethnic structure of diversity—i.e., the specific groups present in a given community—in a couple of ways. Throughout the analysis, *E* scores are supplemented with bar charts that visually convey the group proportions underlying the magnitude of diversity. We also utilize a ‘*majority rule*’ *typology* (see Farrell and Lee 2011; Holloway et al. 2012; Lee et al. 2012, 2014) that classifies communities as group-majority (white-majority, Hispanic-majority, etc.) if one ethnoracial group constitutes over 50% of the total population.⁶ White-majority places are further subdivided into white-dominant, in which whites are at least 90% of the local population, and white-shared, in which the white percentage is over one-half but less than nine-tenths. We name white-shared subtypes based on any minority groups that constitute 10% or more of all residents (e.g., white-Hispanic, white-black-Hispanic). No-majority places are defined as those where none of the ethnoracial groups exceeds the 50% threshold. Applying this typology, we are able to gauge whether places with particular kinds of racial-ethnic structures have become more or less common during the last two decades, as well as the degree of diversity change by type of structure.

Many of our tables and figures present mean entropy index values and ethnoracial group percentages weighted by a nonmetro place’s total population relative to the summed population of like places of interest (e.g., Midwest places, rural places). These weighted results can be interpreted in *exposure* terms, as the diversity magnitude and racial-ethnic structure encountered by the average resident living in different regions or types of communities.

Independent Variables

We have constructed several year-specific place-level measures to test the hypotheses regarding sources of variation in diversity change. *Community scale* is operationalized by a place’s total population size (logged). Indicators of the local *context of reception* include the percentage of community residents who are foreign born (logged), the percentage of the foreign-born population that recently immigrated to the U.S. (previous 10 years), and the share of the population aged 65 and over. Three place characteristics are relevant to the *economic opportunity* hypothesis: the percentage of the civilian employed population working in the manufacturing sector, the percentage working in agriculture, and the minority homeownership rate (percentage of all nonwhite occupied housing units that are owned).

Our final place attributes represent *institutional hub* status. Military specialization is captured with a dichotomous measure of whether the percentage of a community’s labor

⁶The absolute standard inherent in the majority rule approach facilitates cross-sectional and longitudinal comparisons for our large sample of places. Such comparisons would be harder to make if place diversity were measured relative to the ethnoracial composition of some larger context (e.g., the county or micropolitan area in which a place is embedded).

force employed in the military is at least double the weighted mean percentage for the 9,969 places in the sample (coded 1 if yes). Similarly for college specialization, places are assigned a 1 if the percentage of the total population enrolled in college is two times (or more) greater than the weighted sample mean. A correctional specialization dummy variable taps whether the percentage of a place's residents who are incarcerated is at least twice the weighted sample mean (coded 1 if yes).

Results

Gains in Diversity Magnitude

The initial step in our analysis entails tracing the magnitude of diversity during the last two decades. Perhaps most striking is the fact that approximately nine-tenths (92.1%) of all nonmetropolitan places have experienced an increase in ethnoracial diversity between 1990 and 2010. The weighted mean E values plotted in Figure 1 document this diversification trend: the hypothetical average resident of a nonmetro place (solid gray line, fourth from top) would be exposed to a diversity level in 2010 ($E = 33.8$) nearly three-fifths higher than in 1990 ($E = 21.4$). Although micropolitan communities (third line from top) are more diverse than their rural, outside-micro-area counterparts (fifth from top) across all census years—exhibiting E scores between four and seven points higher—the pace of change for both is identical; mean diversity has increased by 57.2% and 57.4% for micro and rural places, respectively.

A similar pattern emerges for regions. Average 1990 diversity levels of nonmetropolitan places in the South and West (top two lines; $E = 31.8$ and 27.0) far exceeded those in the Northeast and Midwest (bottom two lines; $E = 9.9$ and 11.2) and, despite subsequent gains, the differences remain intact 20 years later. Such parallel rises in ethnoracial diversity are consistent with the locational persistence model, revealing no closing of the gaps by micropolitan/rural status or region. In broader terms, the diversity hierarchy—where all nonmetro places stand in relation to each other—has remained much the same over time, a conclusion reinforced by the strong correlation between 1990 and 2010 place E scores (Spearman $r = .83$) and supportive of the relative stability hypothesis.

Shifting Racial-Ethnic Structure

The second, structural dimension of diversity helps us understand the changing mix of ethnoracial groups accompanying nonmetropolitan diversification. Figure 2 reveals that the typical 1990 nonmetro resident inhabited a place in which whites made up over four-fifths of the population, African Americans just under 10%, and Hispanics about 5%. The degree of white dominance was equally dramatic in micropolitan and rural communities. Over the last two decades, however, white representation has shrunk in tandem with the growth of local Hispanic populations, fueling diversity gains. By 2010 the average Hispanic share in micropolitan places doubles (to 10.6%), and it almost doubles in rural places as well (to 8.9%). While blacks, Asians, and Native Americans experience minimal increases in their average percentages, the 'other' category has seen an uptick since 2000, attributable primarily to the introduction of the multi-race identification item in that year's census questionnaire.⁷

We begin to disaggregate mean patterns in Table 1, applying our majority rule typology to individual places. The left panel of the table shows that roughly nine-tenths of all places qualify as white-majority throughout the study period. Yet white-dominant communities have declined from 69.9% of the total sample in 1990 to 56.5% in 2010. Complementing this trend is a jump in white-shared places (from 21.0% to 30.6%), due mainly to increases in the white-Hispanic and white-multigroup subtypes. (In the latter subtype, no minority group makes up as much as one-tenth of a place population.) Nontrivial increases are also apparent in no-majority communities (3.3% of all nonmetro places as of 2010), followed by smaller gains in black-majority and Hispanic-majority places. The mean magnitude of diversity has risen across every type of community (right panel), with most 1990–2010 differences in *E* scores ranging between 4 and 10 points. (The two exceptions occur for white-Native American and Asian-majority places.) While the shift away from white-dominant places to more complex racial-ethnic structures hints at convergence, the modest diversity levels and changes exhibited by most types of places better conform to the relative stability hypothesis based on locational persistence logic.

To further evaluate the convergence and stability hypotheses, we present a 20-year transition matrix for our sample of nonmetropolitan communities in Table 2. The table row headings identify places classified by the majority rule typology in 1990 and the column headings identify places by type in 2010. The diagonal in bold shows the percentages of 1990 places that have remained stable (i.e., do not transition to a different type of racial-ethnic structure) during the period.

According to the matrix, most places exhibit structural stability despite the pervasive upward trend in diversity magnitude. For example, four-fifths of the places classified as white-dominant (90% or more white) in 1990 retain that type in 2010, and those that do transition become white-shared (19.7%). Similarly, almost four-fifths of white-shared places retain their 1990 designation, but the modal transition for the rest is to the most diverse racial-ethnic structure: 10.3% become no-majority. Black-majority, Hispanic-majority, and Native American-majority communities all reveal high stability as well, with nine-tenths or more of each type not transitioning by 2010. Though no-majority places represent a small share of the sample in 1990, just under half of them remain no majority while the rest become Hispanic-majority, black-majority, or white-shared. Note, however, that no-majority communities more than quadruple in number (from 78 to 328) between 1990 and 2010. Overall, the transition matrix results align with the locational persistence perspective, demonstrating that stability in racial-ethnic structure has been the rule for most places during the last two decades.

Which ethnoracial groups influence the composition of nonmetro places that have remained stable and those that have transitioned? Table 3 addresses this question, reporting mean group-specific growth rates for the stable places (top panel) and for places exhibiting the

⁷Prior to 2000, the residual ‘other’ category consists only of people identifying with some race not recognized by the Census Bureau. However, the option to identify with more than one race, first available in the 2000 census, necessitates that multi-race individuals be accommodated by our classification scheme. Because of their small number, we have elected to include them with the ‘other race’ respondents. Previous research suggests that this combined ‘other’ population produces a slightly higher than expected increase in diversity between 1990 and 2000 (Lee and Hughes 2015).

most prevalent transition within each 1990 structural type (bottom panel). We find that Hispanic growth predominates in the stable places, not just the transitioning ones. Since 1990 local Hispanic populations have more than doubled in size, on average, in five of the seven types of stable group-majority places. The two exceptions are Asian-majority places (of which only 14 exist) and Hispanic-majority communities, where growth has been highest among other nonwhite groups. Turning to the bottom panel of the table, enormous Hispanic gains are apparent in white-majority communities that have transitioned to multigroup structures (i.e., white-shared, no-majority), with African Americans and Asians also experiencing nontrivial growth. Our findings thus buttress earlier research that documents the geographic dispersion of Hispanics throughout rural America (see Kandel and Cromartie 2004; Lichter and Johnson 2009).

Lexington, NE nicely illustrates the role played by Hispanics in transforming nonmetropolitan places (see the top compositional bar of Figure 3). This town has attracted numerous Hispanic workers—mainly Mexican but also Guatemalan and Salvadoran—to jobs at a large meat packing plant (Gouveia and Stull 1995). By 2010, Hispanics make up three-fifths of Lexington's population, which was 94.4% white in 1990. Of course, certain communities register robust levels of panethnic diversity with more modest Hispanic representation, as the remaining examples in the figure confirm. Both Elizabeth City, NC and Tutwiler, MS are black-majority places with 2010 entropy scores of 56.2 and 65.9, respectively. Tutwiler's population is approximately one-fifth Hispanic and one-fifth white. Its diversity has been boosted by the recent construction of a prison, one of the institutional hubs discussed earlier. The ethnoracial structures of Lihue, HI and Barrow, AK attest to the value of using the six-group entropy index. Half of Lihue's residents are Asian or Pacific Islander and another fifth fall in the non-Hispanic 'other' category (primarily multi-race persons). As expected, a hefty percentage of Barrow's population is Native American—specifically Alaska Native (60.5%)—along with substantial shares of Asians/Pacific Islanders (11.2%) and people of other or multiple races (8.1%).

Because Hispanic growth is such an important driver of diversity trends, the country-of-origin groups that make up the Hispanic population deserve a closer look, primarily to confirm the key role played by Mexicans. Here we examine the seven largest groups: three from Central America (Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador), three from the Caribbean (Puerto Rico⁸, Cuba, Dominican Republic), and one from South America (Colombia), plus a residual 'other' category. In a separate analysis (not shown), the weighted average magnitude (measured with E) and structure (group shares) of Hispanic diversity have been calculated for all nonmetro, micro, and rural places in 1990 and 2010, with Hispanic origin groups rather than panethnic populations as the building blocks. Two lessons emerge from this exercise. First, local nonmetro Hispanic populations have become more diverse over the past 20 years, recording an impressive 60.7% increase in mean E score (from 19.1 to 30.7), but these overall gains—fueled by rising percentages of Guatemalans and Salvadorans—are largely confined to micropolitan places. Hispanic diversity in rural places is much lower and has changed little over time (from a mean E of 15.2 to 16.2). The second lesson concerns

⁸As a matter of convenience, we include Puerto Rico when discussing countries of origin despite its status as a U.S. territory.

Mexican demographic dominance which, though slightly diminished, remains the norm. As of 2010, three-fourths of Hispanics in the average micro place are of Mexican origin; in the average rural place, four-fifths are.

That not all nonmetro places have Mexican-heavy Hispanic populations can be seen in Figure 4. The illustrative communities shown are highly diverse, thanks to the presence of sizeable non-Mexican groups (2010 Hispanic E values > 75). A comparison of McRae, GA and Carrabelle, FL reveals that Mexicans comprise 40% of both their Hispanic populations, but McRae boasts a substantial Colombian presence (21.1%) and Carrabelle a significant Cuban one (19.1%). Consider the town of Delhi, NY, with large Puerto Rican (39.7%) and Dominican (15.2%) shares, or the presence of Guatemalans in Laurel, DE (29.5%) and Colombians in Canaan, CT (27.6%). The Hispanic population of Berwick, PA is roughly one-fourth Puerto Rican and one-fourth Salvadoran. Finally, the diverse Hispanic composition of Hanover, NH, home of Dartmouth College, is fueled by the ‘other’ Hispanic category consisting of individuals from Latin American countries not among the seven largest national origin categories. Note that these nonmetro communities are concentrated in the Northeast, near traditional metropolitan gateways for non-Mexican Hispanic groups (Hall 2013).

Predictors of Diversity Change

The final portion of the analysis assesses whether the place-level attributes introduced earlier correlate with changes in ethnoracial diversity as hypothesized. To make this assessment, we estimate fixed effects regression models of the following form:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_t + \mu_i + \beta X_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

where Y_{it} refers to the E value for place i at year t , α_t denotes year-specific fixed effects that change E by the same amount for each place, μ_i represents place-specific fixed effects that vary across places but are stable over time, ε_{it} is the random error term, and β represents the coefficients for a vector of characteristics X for place i at year t . Each coefficient can be interpreted as the *change* in ethnoracial diversity associated with the change in a particular place characteristic over the last 20 years.

An important advantage of fixed effects modeling is that it removes the effects of unobserved stable place characteristics, thus reducing the risk of endogeneity bias (Allison 2009; Firebaugh et al. 2013). Here we do not seek strong causal inferences; rather, our investigation of within-place change between 1990 and 2010 is intended to provide conservative estimates of the factors related to shifts in ethnoracial diversity. Differences in diversity correlates by community type and region are explored via separate fixed effects models for micropolitan and rural places and for places in the four census regions. Given the time-series nature of our data, we pool the data into 29,907 place-period observations. Robust standard errors are used to account for the correlated error structure inherent in this sort of clustered or stacked data.

Table 4 displays regression results for nonmetropolitan places as a whole and for micro and rural communities separately. The positive year-specific coefficients in all models attest to the universal upward trend in diversity magnitude during the last two decades. An examination of the full-sample model reveals that places that increase in size tend to become more ethnoracially diverse, following the scale hypothesis: a standard-deviation increase in a community's population is accompanied by an average gain in E of 6.4, net of other place-level factors. Measures of the local context of reception conform to predictions as well. Places with a growing immigrant presence become more diverse, while an increase in the share of recently-arrived immigrants or the retirement-age population is associated with decreasing diversity.⁹ As hypothesized, enhanced economic opportunities in the form of agricultural and manufacturing jobs and minority homeownership are positively related to rising diversity levels, all else equal. Among the place features considered institutional hubs, the coefficients for military specialization and correctional specialization both reach statistical significance and take the anticipated positive sign.

The remaining models in Table 4 shed light on whether changes in community characteristics operate in different ways for micropolitan and rural places. Generally speaking, we find effects by type of place to be similar to those for the full sample model. However, two differences are worth mentioning. First, the diversity-promoting influence of agricultural and manufacturing employment appears more pronounced in rural places than in their micro counterparts. This finding aligns with prior evidence that ethnoracial minorities have increasingly been recruited to industries such as meat and seafood processing and forest products that are concentrated in rural areas (Emery et al. 2006; Griffith 1995; Kandel and Parrado 2005). Second, a growing share of recent immigrants reduces diversity to a modest but statistically significant extent only in micropolitan communities.

What accounts for the regional variation in ethnoracial diversity among nonmetropolitan places? To address this question, Table 5 summarizes results from fixed effects models for each census region. The place attributes representing the community scale and context of reception hypotheses behave as expected across all regions, but results for our economic opportunity and institutional hub hypotheses are more specific. For example, expanding manufacturing employment significantly increases diversity in the Midwest and South, yet it is related to declining diversity in the West. This seemingly contradictory finding could be viewed as a ceiling effect: that is, the types of jobs attracting Hispanics to Western nonmetro communities already inhabited by large shares of Hispanics might further reduce ethnoracial diversity in such communities. Finally, nonmetro places with growing correctional populations are becoming more diverse across regions (nonsignificantly so in the Northeast), while the positive coefficient for the military specialization variable—associated with increasing diversity—only achieves significance in the Northeast.

Note that the correlates of place diversity identified in Tables 4 and 5 are net of any influence due to territorial expansion (e.g., annexation) or contraction. Although we have

⁹Because of concerns that the two foreign-born variables (percentage foreign born, percentage of new arrivals among the foreign born) may overlap conceptually with ethnoracial diversity (see endnote 2), we have re-estimated all models in Tables 4 and 5 after excluding them. The coefficients for the other predictors do not change appreciably in sign or significance.

allowed community boundaries to vary over time, each regression model controls for the areal size of a place (third-to-last row). The size measure falls short of statistical significance in the nonmetro, micro, and rural models (Table 4) and the West model (Table 5). Among Midwestern places, areal expansion is significantly linked to increasing diversity; in the Northeast and South, diversity declines tend to accompany such expansion. The marginal role played by areal size becomes clear when our models are re-estimated without it (not shown). This sensitivity test reveals no change in the sign or significance level of any predictor.

Conclusion

The goal of this research has been to extend and complement the case study literature on ethnoracial diversification in the nonmetropolitan United States. A sample of 10,000 communities has enabled us to evaluate nonmetro diversity in a comprehensive manner, facilitating generalization. At the same time, conceptualizing diversity and measuring its dimensions provides a degree of nuance absent from much prior work. We find widespread increases with respect to the magnitude dimension: over nine-tenths of all places experienced a rise in diversity after 1990. Yet striking differences are apparent across regions and between micropolitan and rural places, manifested as upward-sloping but parallel trajectories of diversification. More broadly, the diversity hierarchy—how communities rank in terms of diversity level—has remained intact during the 20-year observation period. These results conform to the relative stability hypothesis drawn from locational persistence theory.

The plot thickens somewhat when racial-ethnic structure, the second dimension of diversity, is considered. Applying the majority rule typology, we document a moderate shift between 1990 and 2010 in the distribution of nonmetro places, away from the white-dominant type and toward white-shared (especially white-Hispanic and white-multigroup), minority-majority, and no-majority structures. The last type of place is truly multigroup; indeed, all three ‘destination’ types exhibit much higher average diversity magnitudes than do white-dominant places. Although movement toward more complex racial-ethnic compositions would seem to favor the convergence hypothesis and spatial assimilation logic, the evidence for relative stability strikes us as stronger. One need only recall the transition matrix results, in which four-fifths or more of the places with each type of 1990 group-majority structure retained that same structure two decades later. Future investigations should delve more deeply into the forces responsible for this persistence, especially given the popular perception of rapid and widespread rural diversification. The continued accumulation of case studies can make a key contribution here, identifying the place-specific historical circumstances that underlie contemporary diversity patterns.

Despite the greater support marshalled for the relative stability hypothesis inspired by locational persistence theory, spatial assimilation theory still has value. Our view is that insights from the assimilation as well as the persistence perspective are needed to understand the variable pace of diversification and the demographic dynamics shaping community racial-ethnic structure. As shown earlier, Hispanic growth has played a critical role in nonmetro diversity trends. The influence of Hispanics presumably can be traced to their path-dependent settlement patterns (as anticipated by locational persistence) but also to their

geographic dispersion (as anticipated by spatial assimilation). As we hope this illustration underscores, the segmented forms of ethnoracial change visible throughout rural America—including stable or increasing homogeneity in addition to increasing diversity—will be best accommodated within a framework informed by multiple theoretical models.

The last portion of the analysis takes a step in that direction, shedding light on theoretically-motivated place characteristics correlated with diversity change. Results from the fixed effects regressions indicate that community scale and the local context of reception matter, as hypothesized. Gains in diversity are more likely in growing, immigrant-rich places and less likely when the retirement-age population is increasing. Ethnoracial diversification also goes hand in hand with expanding economic opportunity, particularly higher rates of minority homeownership and manufacturing and agricultural employment. Nonmetropolitan places that host correctional facilities tend to be more diverse, but other kinds of institutional hubs (e.g., military bases) register less consistent associations with diversity. For the most part, the sources of diversification are fairly similar regardless of a place's micropolitan, rural, or regional location.

What intrigues us is the fact that this similarity spans the rural-urban divide. Past research on metropolitan areas and the places embedded within them documents the same kinds of predictors of diversity as reported here, not to mention pervasive increases in diversity magnitude and shifts toward mixed racial-ethnic structures (Farrell 2005; Hall and Lee 2010; Lee et al. 2012, 2014). Thus, an empirical basis exists to proclaim diversification a 'master trend' in the U.S. Before succumbing to that temptation, two important caveats should be noted. First, while the rural-urban boundary has undoubtedly become more blurred over time (Lichter and Brown 2011), a sharp difference endures in the pace of diversification, with current levels of nonmetro diversity lagging decades behind those in metropolitan areas. And second, little work has systematically examined how the social, economic, and political consequences of rising ethnoracial diversity compare across places arrayed along the continuum ranging from major gateway cities to small rural towns. Given such concerns, it seems prudent to withhold the 'master trend' designation for now.

References

- Alba, Richard, Logan, John R. Variations on Two Themes: Racial and Ethnic Patterns in the Attainment of Suburban Residence. *Demography*. 1991; 28(3):431–53. [PubMed: 1936377]
- Allen, James P., Turner, Eugene. The Most Ethnically Diverse Urban Places in the United States. *Urban Geography*. 1989; 10(6):523–39.
- Allison, Paul D. *Fixed Effects Regression Models*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2009.
- Carr, Patrick J., Lichter, Daniel T., Kefalas, Maria J. Can Immigration Save Small-Town America? Hispanic Boomtowns and the Uneasy Path to Renewal. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2012; 641:38–57.
- Charles, Camille Zubrinsky. *Won't You Be My Neighbor? Race, Class, and Residence in Los Angeles*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2006.
- Cromartie, John B., Parker, Timothy S. Population Shifts Across U.S. Nonmetropolitan Regions. In: Bailey, ConnerJensen, Leif, Ransom, Elizabeth, editors. *Rural America in a Globalizing World: Problems and Prospects for the 2010s*. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press; 2014. p. 330–46.

- Crowder, Kyle, Hall, Matthew, Tolnay, Stewart E. Neighborhood Immigration and Native Out-Migration. *American Sociological Review*. 2011; 76(1):25–47. [PubMed: 21731082]
- Crowe, Jessica. The Influence of Racial Histories on Economic Development Strategies. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 2012; 35(11):1955–73.
- Crowe, Jessica, Ceresola, Ryan. Racial History, Legacy, and Economic Development. *Patterns of Prejudice*. 2014; 48(4):350–69.
- Crowley, Martha, Lichter, Daniel T. Social Disorganization in Latino Boomtowns. *Rural Sociology*. 2009; 74(4):573–604.
- Crowley, Martha, Lichter, Daniel T., Turner, Richard N. Diverging Fortunes? Economic Well-being of Latinos and African Americans in New Rural Destinations. *Social Science Research*. 2015; 51(X): 77–92. [PubMed: 25769853]
- DeFina, Robert, Hannon, Lance. Diversity, Racial Threat, and Metropolitan Housing Segregation. *Social Forces*. 2009; 88(1):373–94.
- Donato, Katherine M., Bankston, Carl L. The Origins of Employer Demand for Immigrants in a New Destination: The Salience of Soft Skills in a Volatile Economy. In: Massey, Douglas S., editor. *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2008. p. 124–48.
- Ellis, Mark, Goodwin-White, Jamie. 1.5 Generation Internal Migration in the U.S.: Dispersion from States of Immigration. *International Migration Review*. 2006; 40(4):899–926.
- Emery, Marla, Ginger, Clare, Chamberlain, Jim. Migrants, Markets, and the Transformation of Natural Resources Management: Galax Harvesting in Western North Carolina. In: Smith, Heather A., Furuseth, Owen J., editors. *Latinos in the New South: Transformations of Place*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate; 2006. p. 69–87.
- Ennis, Sharon R., Rios-Vargas, Merarys, Albert, Nora G. The Hispanic Population: 2010. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau; 2011. 2010 Census Brief, C2010BR-04 Accessed at <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-04.pdf>
- Falk, William W. *Rooted in Place: Family and Belonging in a Southern Black Community*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press; 2004.
- Farmer, Frank L., Moon, Zola K. An Empirical Examination of Characteristics of Mexican Migrants to Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Areas of the United States. *Rural Sociology*. 2009; 74(2):220–40.
- Farrell, Chad R. *Urban Mosaics: Multiracial Diversity and Segregation in the American Metropolis*. Unpublished Ph D dissertation University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University. 2005
- Farrell, Chad R., Lee, Barrett A. Racial Diversity and Change in Metropolitan Neighborhoods. *Social Science Research*. 2011; 40(4):1108–23. [PubMed: 21691412]
- Fennelly, Katherine. Prejudice Toward Immigrants in the Midwest. In: Massey, Douglas S., editor. *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2008. p. 151–78.
- Glenn, Firebaugh, Warner, Cody, Massoglia, Michael. Fixed Effects, Random Effects, and Hybrid Models for Causal Analysis. In: Morgan, Stephen L., editor. *Handbook of Causal Analysis for Social Research*. New York, NY: Springer; 2013. p. 113–132.
- Frey, William H. *Diversity Explosion: How New Racial Demographics Are Remaking America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press; 2015.
- Frey, William H. Immigration, Domestic Migration, and Demographic Balkanization: New Evidence for the 1990s. *Population and Development Review*. 1996; 22(4):741–63.
- Frey, William H., Kao-Lee, Liaw. Internal Migration of Foreign-Born Latinos and Asians: Are They Assimilating Geographically?. In: Pandit, Kavita, Withers, Suzanne Davies, editors. *Migration and Restructuring in the United States: A Geographic Perspective*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield; 1999. p. 212–30.
- Frey, William H., Kao-Lee, Liaw. Migration within the United States: Role of Race-Ethnicity. In: Burtless, Gary, Pack, Janet Rothenberg, editors. *Brookings-Wharton Papers in Urban Affairs*, 2005. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press; 2005. p. 207–48.
- 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, AlanKatz, 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.

- Glasmeier, Amy K., Farrigan, Tracey. The Economic Impacts of the Prison Development Boom on Persistently Poor Rural Places. *International Regional Science Review*. 2007; 30(3):274–99.
- Gouveia, Lourdes, Carranza, Miguel A., Cogua, Jasney. The Great Plains Migration: Mexicanos and Latinos in Nebraska. In: Zuniga, Victor, Hernandez-Leon, Ruben, editors. *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage; 2005. p. 23-49.
- Gouveia, Lourdes, Stull, Donald D. Dances with Cows: Beefpacking's Impact on Garden City, Kansas, and Lexington, Nebraska. In: Stull, Donald D. Broadway, Michael J., Griffith, David, editors. *Any Way You Cut It: Meat Processing and Small-Town America*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press; 1995. p. 85-107.
- Grey, Mark A., Woodrick, Anne C. 'Latinos Have Revitalized Our Community': Mexican Migration and Anglo Responses in Marshalltown, Iowa. In: Zuniga, Victor, Hernandez-Leon, Ruben, editors. *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage; 2005. p. 133-54.
- Griffith, David. New Immigrants in an Old Industry: Blue Crab Processing in Pamlico County, North Carolina. In: Stull, Donald D. Broadway, Michael J., Griffith, David, editors. *Any Way You Cut It: Meat Processing and Small-Town America*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press; 1995. p. 153-86.
- Griffith, David. New Midwesterners, New Southerners: Immigration Experiences in Four Rural Settings. In: Massey, Douglas S., editor. *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2008. p. 179-210.
- Hall, Matthew. Residential Integration on the New Frontier: Immigrant Segregation in Established and New Destinations. *Demography*. 2013; 52(5):1873–96.
- Hall, Matthew. Interstate Migration, Spatial Assimilation, and the Incorporation of U.S. Immigrants. *Population, Space and Place*. 2009; 15(1):57–77.
- Hall, Matthew, Crowder, Kyle. Native Out-Migration and Neighborhood Immigration in New Destinations. *Demography*. 2014; 51(6):2179–202. [PubMed: 25428121]
- Hall, Matthew, Lee, Barrett A. How Diverse Are U.S. Suburbs. *Urban Studies*. 2010; 47(1):3–28.
- Haverluk, Terrence W. Hispanization of Hereford, Texas. In: Arreola, Daniel D., editor. *Hispanic Spaces, Latino Places: Community and Cultural Diversity in Contemporary America*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press; 2004. p. 277-91.
- Holloway, Steven R., Wright, Richard, Ellis, Mark. The Racially Fragmented City? Neighborhood Racial Segregation and Diversity Jointly Considered. *Professional Geographer*. 2012; 64(1):63–82.
- Hunt, Larry L., Hunt, Matthew O., Falk, William W. Who Is Headed South? U.S. Migration Trends in Black and White, 1970–2000. *Social Forces*. 2008; 87(1):95–119.
- Iceland, John. *Where We Live Now: Immigration and Race in the United States*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 2009.
- Jaspin, Elliot. *Buried in the Bitter Waters: The Hidden History of Racial Cleansing in America*. New York: Basic Books; 2007.
- Jensen, Leif. *Carsey Institute Report on Rural America*. Vol. 1. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire; 2006. *New Immigrant Settlements in Rural America: Problems, Prospects, and Policies*. Accessed at <http://scholars.unh.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1016&context=carsey>
- Johnson, Kenneth M. *Rural Demographic Change in the New Century: Slower Growth, Increased Diversity*. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire; 2012. *Carsey Institute Issue Brief, No 44* Accessed at <http://scholars.unh.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1158&context=carsey>
- Johnson, Kenneth M., Lichter, Daniel T. Rural Retirement Destinations: Natural Decrease and the Shared Destinies of Elderly and Hispanics. In: Glasgow, Nina, Berry, E Helen, editors. *Rural Aging in 21st Century America*. New York: Springer; 2013. p. 275-94.
- Kandel, William, Cromartie, John. *New Patterns of Hispanic Settlement in Rural America*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture; 2004. *Economic Research Service, Rural Development Research Report, No 99* Accessed at http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/561319/rdr99_1_.pdf

- Kandel, William, Parrado, Emilio A. Restructuring of the U.S. Meat Processing Industry and New Hispanic Migrant Destinations. *Population and Development Review*. 2005; 31(3):447–71.
- Kandel, William, Parrado, Emilio A. Hispanic Population Growth and Public School Response in Two New South Immigrant Destinations. In: Smith, Heather A., Furuseth, Owen J., editors. *Latinos in the New South: Transformations of Place*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate; 2006. p. 112–34.
- Kritz, Mary M., Gurak, Douglas T., Lee, Min-Ah. Will They Stay? Foreign-Born Out-Migration from New U.S. Destinations. *Population Research and Policy Review*. 2011; 30(4):537–67. [PubMed: 22923857]
- Lee, Barrett A., Hughes, Lauren A. Bucking the Trend: Is Ethnoracial Diversity Declining in American Communities. *Population Research and Policy Review*. 2015; 34(1):113–39. [PubMed: 26023247]
- 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 at https://www.russellsage.org/sites/all/files/logan/logan_diversity_chapter13.pdf
- Lee, Barrett A., Iceland, John, Sharp, Gregory. U.S.2010 Project Working Paper. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2012. Racial and Ethnic Diversity Goes Local: Charting Change in American Communities Over Three Decades. Accessed at <http://www.russellsage.org/research/reports/racial-ethnic-diversity>
- 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., Brown, David L. Rural America in an Urban Society: Changing Spatial and Social Boundaries. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2011; 37(1):565–92.
- Lichter, Daniel T., Johnson, Kenneth M. Emerging Rural Settlement Patterns and the Geographic Redistribution of America's New Immigrants. *Rural Sociology*. 2006; 71(1):109–31.
- 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, Grice, Steven M., Taquino, Michael C. Municipal Underbounding: Annexation and Racial Exclusion in Small Southern Towns. *Rural Sociology*. 2007; 72(1):47–68.
- Lieberson, Stanley, Waters, Mary C. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 1988.
- Light, Ivan. *Deflecting Immigration: Networks, Markets, and Regulation in Los Angeles*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; 2006.
- Loewen, James W. *Sundown Towns: A Hidden Dimension of American Racism*. New York: New Press; 2005.
- Logan, John R., Zhang, Charles. Global Neighborhoods: New Pathways to Diversity and Separation. *American Journal of Sociology*. 2010; 115(4):1069–1109.
- Marrow, Helen B. *New Destination Dreaming: Immigration, Race, and Legal Status in the Rural South*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press; 2011.
- Massey, Douglas S. Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Review. *Sociology and Social Research*. 1985; 69(3):315–50.
- Massey, Douglas S. *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.
- McConnell, Eileen Diaz, Miraftab, Faranak. Sundown Town to 'Little Mexico': Old-Timers and Newcomers in an American Small Town. *Rural Sociology*. 2009; 74(4):605–29.
- Millard, Ann V., Chapa, Jorge. *Apple Pie and Enchiladas: Latino Newcomers in the Rural Midwest*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press; 2004.

- Millard, Ann V., Chapa, Jorge, McConnell, Eileen Diaz. 'Not Racist Like Our Parents': Anti-Latino Prejudice and Institutional Discrimination. In: Millard, Ann V., Chapa, Jorge, editors. *Apple Pie and Enchiladas: Latino Newcomers in the Rural Midwest*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press; 2004. p. 102-24.
- Nelson, Peter B., Lee, Ahn Wei, Nelson, Lise. Linking Baby Boomer and Hispanic Migration Streams into Rural America: A Multi-Scaled Approach. *Population, Space and Place*. 2009; 15(3):277-93.
- Norris, Tina, Vines, Paula L., Hoeffel, Elizabeth M. The American Indian and Alaska Native Population: 2010. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau; 2012. 2010 Census Brief, C2010BR-10 Accessed at <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-10.pdf>
- Pais, Jeremy, South, Scott J., Crowder, Kyle. White Flight Revisited: A Multiethnic Perspective on Neighborhood Out-Migration. *Population Research and Policy Review*. 2009; 28(3):321-46. [PubMed: 20161367]
- Parisi, Domenico, Lichter, Daniel T., Taquino, Michael C. The Buffering Hypothesis: Growing Diversity and Declining Black-White Segregation in America's Cities, Suburbs, and Small Towns. *Sociological Science*. 2015 Mar.2:125-57.
- Pew Research Center. The Rise of Asian Americans. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center; 2013. Accessed at <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2012/06/19/the-rise-of-asian-americans>
- Portes, Alejandro, Rumbaut, Reuben G. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. 3rd. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 2006.
- Portes, Alejandro, Zhou, Min. The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 1993; 530:74-96.
- Rastogi, Sonya, Johnson, Tallese D., Hoeffel, Elizabeth M., Drewery, Malcolm P, Jr. The Black Population: 2010. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau; 2011. 2010 Census Brief, C2010BR-06 Accessed at <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-06.pdf>
- Reardon, Sean F., Firebaugh, Glenn. Measures of Multigroup Segregation. *Sociological Methodology*. 2002; 32(1):33-67.
- Schoenholtz, Andrew J. Newcomers in Rural America: Hispanic Immigrants in Rogers, Arkansas. In: Ozdizak, Elzbieta, Martin, Susan F., editors. *Beyond the Gateway: Immigrants in a Changing America*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books; 2005. p. 213-38.
- 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.
- Steppler, Renee, Brown, Anna. *Hispanic Trends Report*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center; 2016. Statistical Portrait of Hispanics in the United States. Accessed at <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2016/04/19/statistical-portrait-of-hispanics-in-the-united-states>
- Stull, Donald D. Broadway, Michael J., Griffith, David, editors. *Any Way You Cut It: Meat Processing and Small-Town America*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press; 1995.
- Teachman, Jay D. Analysis of Population Diversity: Measures of Qualitative Variation. *Sociological Methods and Research*. 1980; 8(3):342-62.
- Tienda, Marta, Sanchez, Susana M. Latin American Immigration to the United States. *Daedalus*. 2013; 142(3):48-64. [PubMed: 26560092]
- U.S. Census Bureau. *Geographic Areas Reference Manual* Economics and Statistics Administration. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau; 1994.
- Wahl, Anna Maria Gonzalez, Breckenridge, R Saylor, Gunkel, Steven E. Latinos, Residential Segregation, and Spatial Assimilation in Micropolitan Areas: Exploring the American Dilemma on a New Frontier. *Social Science Research*. 2007; 36(3):995-1020.
- White, Michael J. Segregation and Diversity Measures in Population Distribution. *Population Index*. 1986; 52(2):198-221. [PubMed: 12340704]
- Wilson, Steven G., Plane, David A., Mackun, Paul J., Fischetti, Thomas R., Goworowska, Justyna. *Patterns of Metropolitan and Micropolitan Change: 2000 to 2010*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau; 2012. 2010 Census Special Reports, C2010SR-01 Accessed at <http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2012/dec/c2010sr-01.pdf>

- 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]
- Zelinsky, Wilbur, Lee, Barrett A. Heterolocalism: An Alternative Model of the Sociospatial Behavior of Immigrant Ethnic Communities. *International Journal of Population Geography*. 1998; 4(1): 281–98. [PubMed: 12294528]
- Zuniga, Victor, Hernandez-Leon, Ruben. *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage; 2005.
- Zuniga, Victor, Hernandez-Leon, Ruben. The Dalton Story: Mexican Immigration and Social Transformation in the Carpet Capital of the World. In: Odem, Mary E., Lacy, Elaine, editors. *Latino Immigrants and the Transformation of the New South*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press; 2009. p. 34-50.

Note: $N = 9,969$ nonmetro places; 4,405 micro and 5,564 rural

Figure 1. Weighted Mean Diversity of Nonmetro Places, Total and by Micropolitan/Rural Status and Region, 1990–2010

Note: $N = 9,969$ nonmetro places; 4,405 micro and 5,564 rural

Figure 2.
Weighted Mean Racial-Ethnic Structure of Nonmetro Places, 1990–2010

Figure 3.
Racial-Ethnic Diversity and Structure of Select Nonmetro Places, 2010

Figure 4.
Hispanic Diversity and Origin Group Structure for Select Nonmetro Places, 2010

Table 1

Distribution and Diversity of Nonmetro Places by Racial-Ethnic Structure, 1990–2010

	% of places			Mean diversity (<i>E</i>)			Absolute change in <i>E</i> 1990–2010
	1990	2000	2010	1990	2000	2010	
All places	100.0	100.0	100.0				
White dominant	69.9	63.3	56.5	6.3	9.8	12.1	5.8
White shared	21.0	25.6	30.6	34.7	38.3	39.0	4.3
White-Black	11.3	9.4	7.9	35.6	40.4	43.1	7.5
White-Hispanic	4.1	6.5	9.3	35.1	38.2	39.1	4.0
White-Native American	2.2	2.0	1.9	33.2	45.3	48.4	15.2
White-Black-Hispanic	.5	1.0	1.3	51.6	55.7	56.8	5.1
White-Multigroup	2.5	6.3	9.5	26.1	29.3	30.2	4.1
Black majority	3.9	4.6	4.9	34.4	38.2	39.7	5.3
Hispanic majority	1.4	1.7	2.1	33.9	37.0	39.6	5.8
Asian majority	0.5	0.3	0.1	46.5	61.4	63.0	16.5
Native American majority	2.5	2.5	2.5	20.0	24.2	25.5	5.5
No majority	0.8	2.1	3.3	51.4	58.8	60.9	9.5

Note: *N* = 9,969 places; only white-shared subtypes shown include 100+ places in at least one year.

Table 2

Type-of-Place Transitions, 1990–2010

	2010 Type of place							N of places
	White dominant	White shared	Black majority	Hispanic majority	Asian majority	Nat Amer majority	No majority	
1990 Type of place								
White dominant	80.1	19.7	.0	.1	.0	.0	.1	6973
White shared	2.3	78.2	5.8	3.1	.0	.4	10.3	2098
Black majority	.0	3.9	89.7	.3	.0	.0	6.2	387
Hispanic majority	.0	7.3	.0	90.5	.0	.0	2.2	137
Asian majority	.0	.0	.0	.0	29.8	.0	68.1	47
Native American majority	.0	.4	.0	.0	.0	97.2	2.4	249
No majority	.0	11.5	17.9	20.5	.0	1.3	48.7	78
N of places	5632	3049	484	210	14	251	328	9969

Table 3

Mean Group-Specific Growth Rates by Type-of-Place Transition, 1990–2010

Type-of-place transition	1990–2010 Mean Group Growth Rate (%)					N of places
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	
<u>No transition</u>						
White dominant	–2.7	92.0	271.9	53.3	36.7	5584
White shared	–8.8	31.4	394.8	93.5	54.1	1640
Black majority	27.7	8.0	481.1	84.9	61.9	347
Hispanic majority	3.5	205.9	5.6	199.2	129.0	124
Asian majority	–4.7	68.9	1.4	–24.9	11.8	14
Native American majority	–17.4	16.1	177.6	37.9	–0.3	242
No majority	–25.6	59.9	261.9	138.4	68.7	38
<u>Select transitions</u>						
White dominant-White shared	–12.5	279.8	817.2	139.0	65.4	1374
White shared-No majority	–27.2	65.9	741.7	159.5	49.5	216
Black majority-No majority	3.6	–21.8	1359.4	193.3	34.0	24
Hispanic majority-White shared	37.6	6.0	–28.4	32.7	127.2	10
Asian majority-No majority	–7.6	52.6	39.8	–38.7	–31.3	32
Native American majority-No majority	13.0	39.8	198.9	147.2	–25.9	6
No majority-Hispanic majority	–28.8	–6.1	31.0	105.9	108.7	16

Table 4

Fixed Effects Regression Models of Nonmetro Place Diversity, Total and by Metropolitan/Rural Status, 1990–2010

	All Nonmetro		Metropolitan		Rural	
	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)
Year (Ref: 1990)						
2000	5.053	(.066) ***	5.236	(.101) ***	4.877	(.089) ***
2010	8.943	(.089) ***	9.213	(.140) ***	8.670	(.119) ***
Population size (ln)	6.357	(.363) ***	6.132	(.488) ***	6.245	(.546) ***
% foreign-born (ln)	0.917	(.042) ***	0.985	(.066) ***	0.865	(.055) ***
% foreign-born arrived last 10 yrs	−0.003	(.001) *	−0.006	(.002) **	−0.001	(.002)
% aged 65 and over	−0.152	(.013) ***	−0.128	(.021) ***	−0.176	(.017) ***
% manufacturing	0.014	(.007) *	−0.004	(.010)	0.028	(.008) ***
% agricultural	0.045	(.010) ***	0.026	(.018)	0.054	(.012) ***
% minority homeownership	0.010	(.001) ***	0.008	(.002) ***	0.011	(.002) ***
Military specialization	0.706	(.252) **	0.579	(.348)	0.802	(.359) *
College specialization	0.199	(.711)	−0.848	(.828)	1.173	(1.142)
Correctional specialization	2.446	(.339) ***	2.134	(.564) ***	2.617	(.421) ***
Areal size	0.002	(.001)	0.006	(.005)	0.002	(.001)
Intercept	−26.684	(2.536) ***	−26.137	(3.552) ***	−24.885	(3.698) ***
N of place-period observations	29907		13212		16695	

Notes: p < .001; p < .01; p < .05. Robust standard errors are reported.

Table 5

Fixed Effects Regression Models of Nonmetro Place Diversity by Region, 1990–2010

	Northeast		Midwest		South		West	
	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)	b	(SE)
Year (Ref: 1990)								
2000	5.016	(.204) ***	4.128	(.092) ***	5.527	(.134) ***	6.839	(.217) ***
2010	9.515	(.314) ***	8.163	(.132) ***	9.340	(.191) ***	10.533	(.284) ***
Population size (ln)	9.520	(1.575) ***	5.833	(.686) ***	6.981	(.584) ***	2.650	(.774) ***
% foreign-born (ln)	0.428	(.114) ***	0.828	(.058) ***	1.107	(.081) ***	0.702	(.128) ***
% foreign-born arrived last 10 yrs	−0.004	(.004)	−0.001	(.002)	−0.006	(.002) *	0.001	(.004)
% aged 65 and over	−0.220	(.037) ***	−0.176	(.018) ***	−0.136	(.026) ***	−0.249	(.042) ***
% manufacturing	0.014	(.017)	0.038	(.009) ***	0.026	(.011) *	−0.057	(.021) **
% agricultural	0.140	(.047) **	0.070	(.015) ***	0.070	(.018) ***	−0.036	(.022)
% minority homeownership	0.000	(.003)	0.015	(.001) ***	0.005	(.004)	0.006	(.006)
Military specialization	1.555	(.651) *	0.657	(.380)	0.540	(.423)	0.757	(.671)
College specialization	3.132	(1.631)	0.568	(1.335)	−1.106	(.878)	1.006	(2.002)
Correctional specialization	1.443	(1.027)	6.155	(.791) ***	0.991	(.411) *	2.062	(.784) **
Areal size	−0.132	(.020) ***	0.348	(.135) **	−0.084	(.039) *	0.002	(.002)
Intercept	−58.974	(11.32) ***	−30.762	(4.587) ***	−21.762	(4.190) ***	6.136	(5.568)
N of place-period observations	2364		13152		10182		4209	

Notes: p < .001; p < .01; p < .05. Robust standard errors are reported.