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Abstract

Since 1980, Latinos have participated in an unprecedented geographic dispersal that altered the ethno-racial contours of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas throughout the nation. After summarizing recent trends in spatial distribution, we review scholarship about trends in residential segregation, the rise of multiethnic neighborhoods, and residential mobility. New trends, notably the emergence of hypersegregation and rising segregation levels in several places, call into question earlier views about the inevitability of Hispanics’ spatial assimilation, as do studies that examine direct links between individual mobility and locational attainment. The growing support for the tenets of the place stratification model suggests that Hispanic origin is becoming a racial marker. Following a brief review of social and economic correlates of Hispanics’ residential makeover, we conclude by discussing opportunities for future research, emphasizing the importance of dynamic assessments that consider the new contours of racialization in the context of multiethnic places.
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INTRODUCTION

Hispanics reconfigured the ethnic and geographic landscape of the United States during the latter quarter of the twentieth century. Representing less than 5% of the US population in 1970 (Bean & Tienda 1987, table 3.1), the Hispanic population surged over the next 40 years owing to mass migration from Latin America and high immigrant fertility (Ennis et al. 2011, Tienda & Mitchell 2006). For perspective, between 1966 and 2006 the US population added 100 million residents, reaching the 300 million milestone; Latinos accounted for 36% of the net change (Pew Hisp. Cent. 2006). After surpassing blacks as the largest minority at the turn of the twenty-first century, Hispanic population growth continued at a rapid clip, topping 50 million by 2010 (Ennis et al. 2011, Mather et al. 2011). Concurrently, Latinos became more diverse by nationality, birthplace, generation, and legal standing (Tienda & Mitchell 2006).


In what follows, we describe how Latinos transformed the US metropolitan landscape since 1970 and leverage comparisons with African Americans, Asians, and non-Hispanic whites to address an overarching theme: Namely, what new insights about residential patterns and geographic mobility can be garnered by studying Hispanics? Our review of Hispanics’ changing metropolitan profile summarizes what we know, identifies outstanding questions, and in the final section, outlines directions for future research. Beyond altering the ethno-racial contours of urban, suburban, and rural areas, Latinos’ changing metropolitan imprints also have implications for the theoretical frameworks and measures used to study spatial integration in multiethnic settings and to portray the evolution of racial hierarchies in physical space (Logan 2012, Marrow 2013).

To begin, we expand on the salient residential trends since 1970, followed by a brief review of theoretical frameworks used to understand the significance of spatial arrangements for social integration. Many studies about Latinos’ changing geographic profiles focus on residential segregation, which we elaborate in some detail, followed by a discussion of the socioeconomic consequences of the new spatial arrangements. The conclusion emphasizes the importance of undertaking dynamic assessments of residential change and examining what the growth of multiethnic places portends for processes of racialization.

First a note on terminology. We use the terms Hispanic and Latino interchangeably, although we acknowledge that when members of this group are offered a preference between the two panethnic labels—Hispanic or Latino—they prefer the former by a ratio of two to one (Tienda & Mitchell 2006). Second, because we focus on the spatial rather than the cultural dimensions of social hierarchies, we use the terms assimilation and integration interchangeably.

HISPANIC METROPOLITAN TRENDS: PARADOXES OF PLACE

Summarily stated, Latinos’ geographic profile is one of growing dispersion amid persisting...
regional concentration. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, roughly three-fourths of Hispanics resided in five southwestern states, with additional concentrations in southern Florida and several cities along the Northeast corridor (Bean & Tienda 1987, table 5-1; Fischer & Tienda 2006). With three out of four Latinos residing in the Southwest today, this broad regional profile remains intact (Ennis et al. 2011); however, persisting regional concentration belies enormous intraregional dispersal within the interior West in states such as Utah and Nevada as well as across a greater range of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan communities within the traditional states of residence (Frey 2012b, Hall et al. 2011, Lichter & Johnson 2009, Singer 2004). Beginning in the late 1980s and with even greater momentum through the 1990s, Latinos began a massive regional makeover by scattering across the nation to places where few had previously settled (Fischer & Tienda 2006, Kochhar et al. 2005, Lloyd 2012).

Notwithstanding deep roots as agricultural workers, Latinos are more urbanized than either African Americans or non-Hispanic whites and currently outnumber African Americans in over half of all US metropolitan areas (Frey 2011). Already by 1970, more than 80% of Latinos resided in metropolitan areas—mostly in central cities (Bean & Tienda 1987). In 1970, 55% of US Hispanics resided in just 10 metropolitan areas compared with 45% in 2010; Los Angeles and New York alone housed almost one in three Latinos in 1970 compared with one in five today (Berube et al. 2010, p. 53; Motel & Patten 2012). Better job opportunities, lower housing costs, and safer communities are among the primary factors undergirding the geographic dispersal (Berube et al. 2010, p. 55; Fischer & Tienda 2006).

Latinos’ metropolitan scattering is evident in the rank ordering of the top metro areas, which largely coincides with recent growth centers such as Reno, Charlotte, and Atlanta. Since 2000, for example, Arizona’s Hispanic population grew 46%, catapulting Phoenix into the top 10 largest Hispanic metropolitan areas and displacing San Francisco from eighth to tenth place (Motel & Patten 2012). Table 1, which shows the top 30 metropolitan areas by size in 2010, reveals enormous variation in both the size of the Hispanic population as well as the share that are foreign-born. Hispanics’ presence in metro areas beyond traditional gateways reveals their residential shifts away from Southern California and Florida. Metro areas with sizeable Hispanic populations are scattered across the United States, ranging from Nevada in the interior West to Atlanta in the South and Washington, DC, in the mid-Atlantic region. Parallelizing national trends, the growth of Hispanics in many of the new metro areas decelerated during the 2000s (Frey 2012b). In particular, the housing market collapse after 2007 appears to have triggered some retrenchment of Latinos away from new destinations toward the traditional Hispanic metro areas, notably Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, and Miami; however, after more than two decades of putting down roots in new places, a major reversal of the metropolitan dispersal is highly unlikely (Frey 2011).

Beyond size differences, which range from just under 350,000 to over 5 million, the top 30 Latino metro areas vary appreciably in population composition, which has implications for segregation levels. Three metro areas along the Texas-Mexico border—McAllen, El Paso, and Brownsville—are over 80% Hispanic (Mexican), yet less than one-third of residents are foreign-born. This contrasts with Arizona’s and California’s border metros—Tucson and San Diego—where Hispanics represent about one in three residents. These metro areas appear to serve as immigrant pathways to other places. Miami and Fort Lauderdale in Florida, along with Atlanta, Georgia, and Washington, DC, also have become prominent immigrant gateways for Hispanics since 1990 (Singer 2004, Suro & Singer 2002). With some notable exceptions (e.g., Las Vegas), home ownership rates tend to vary inversely with the size of the foreign-born population. In cities with established third-generation Hispanic communities, such as San Antonio, Albuquerque, and El Paso, home ownership rates hover around
Table 1  Selected characteristics of the top 30 metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) by 2010 Hispanic population size (all percentages are of the total MSA population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>Hispanic population (in thousands)</th>
<th>Hispanic share (%)</th>
<th>Foreign-born (%)</th>
<th>Owns home (%)</th>
<th>ID*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles–Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>5,724</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York–Northeastern, NJ</td>
<td>4,243</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston–Brazoria, TX</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside–San Bernadino, CA</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>1,934</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas–Fort Worth, TX</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Hialeah, FL^b</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco–Oakland–Vallejo, CA</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC/MD/VA</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAllen-Edinburg-Pharr-Mission, TX</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver–Boulder, CO</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa–St. Petersburg–Clearwater, FL</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lauderdale–Hollywood–Pompano Beach, FL^b</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA/NJ^c</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield, CA</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA/NH^d</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsville–Harlingen–San Benito, TX</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Adapted from Motel & Patten 2012, appendix table A-1; segregation indices from Frey 2012a.

\*The index of dissimilarity (ID) is a measure of evenness that ranges from 0 to 100, where 0 indicates even distribution of groups and 100 indicates complete segregation.

\^bFor combined Fort Lauderdale–Miami Metro Area.

\^cA portion of the MSA for Philadelphia, PA, spills over into the neighboring state of New Jersey.

\^dA portion of the MSA for Boston spills over into the neighboring state of New Hampshire.
60%. Except for New York and Los Angeles, residential segregation from whites is in the moderate range, with lower index of dissimilarity (ID) values corresponding to metros with established third-generation communities.

Latinos’ spatial redistribution also involved a growing representation in new suburban and nonmetropolitan communities, many with low levels of ethnic heterogeneity (Lee et al. 2012, Lichter & Johnson 2009, Massey & Capoferro 2008). Hispanic suburbanization, which was part of a national trend in which blacks and Asians also participated, was especially brisk in the new metropolitan destinations (Fischer & Tienda 2006, Lloyd 2012, Suro & Singer 2002). According to Berube and colleagues (2010, p. 61), "for the first time, more than half of all racial and ethnic groups in large metro areas reside in suburbs." This population shift spawned numerous studies that investigate residential segregation, housing, and immigrant reception beyond the central city, which we review below.

Following decades of nonmetropolitan depopulation, Hispanic immigrants also have infused new life into many rural communities and small towns throughout the nation (Griffith 2008, Lichter & Johnson 2009, Zúñiga & Hernández-León 2005). Although the share of all Hispanics residing in nonmetropolitan areas fell from 11% to less than 8% between 1980 and 2010 (Carr et al. 2012, table 1; Fischer & Tienda 2006, table 1), Latinos—large majorities of which are foreign-born—spearheaded the demographic replenishment of nonmetropolitan areas after 1990, nearly doubling their population share by 2006 from 26% to 45% (Lichter & Johnson 2009). As Hispanics replaced native whites, they visibly altered the ethnic makeup of rural America in a relatively short time.

Several aspects of Latinos’ metropolitan makeover are relevant for appreciating its social significance. First, Hispanics share urban spaces with Asians and African Americans in a growing number of metropolitan areas. Currently they outnumber African Americans in over half of all US metropolitan areas, including many in the Deep South (Frey 2011). This novel development, which has implications for the ethnoracial as well as socioeconomic contours of physical space, affords opportunities for understanding how social boundaries are constructed in multiethnic settings (Fong & Shibuya 2005, Kim & White 2010, Lee et al. 2012, Logan & Zhang 2010). Specifically, the rise of multiethnic cities and suburban places affords opportunities to ferret out new insights about the social significance of Hispanics’ participation in the social and ethnic transformation of US metropolitan areas and the racialization of Hispanic ethnicity (Lloyd 2012, Tolnay 2003).

Second, although Hispanics’ geographic dispersal involved both native- and foreign-born residents, recent immigrants fueled the growth of new residential destinations in response to surging labor demand in food and construction industries (Donato & Bankston 2008, Fischer & Tienda 2006, Flippen & Parrado 2012, Kandel & Parrado 2005, Zúñiga & Hernández-León 2005). Because many of the new immigrant gateways lack the social institutions dedicated to cultural and structural integration of recent arrivals, immigration adds a layer of complexity to Hispanics’ geographic dispersal (Fischer & Tienda 2006; Marrow 2011, 2013; Singer 2004). As immigrant labor flows evolved into family streams, schools and other social institutions were affected by the new settlement patterns (Flippen & Parrado 2012, O’Neil & Tienda 2010). The contentious national debate about immigration reform since 9/11 has drawn attention to Latinos’ geographic dispersal by spotlighting social tensions in communities with visible foreign-born populations (Marrow 2013).

Third, the number and diversity of the new Hispanic destinations complicate generalizations about social consequences, which are simultaneously positive and negative for both the people and the places involved (Hirschman & Massey 2008, Waters & Jimenez 2005, Zúñiga & Hernández-León 2005). For example, the growing Latino presence in the South raises new integration concerns for brown immigrants in a context marred by a legacy of slavery and overt exclusion of African
Americans (Lichter 2013, Lloyd 2012, Marrow 2013). Media focus on isolated incidents involving undocumented immigrants, as occurred in Hazelton, PA, and Farmingville, NY, for example, potentially thwarts integration prospects of Latinos by blurring legal status boundaries among the foreign-born (Amuedo-Dorantes et al. 2013, Marczak et al. 2011).

Because economic opportunities and social amenities are unequally distributed across space, the significance of recent residential trends depends on whether they promote social integration and foster economic mobility or result in new forms of race and class divisions. The answer, of course, depends not only on individual and group advancement but also on the broader macrostructural conditions and public institutions that define social and economic opportunities. That Latinos’ residential dispersion evolved against a background of rising income inequality, industrial restructuring, population aging, increasing unauthorized immigration, and political polarization also has implications for their integration prospects. This is evident from scholarship about residential segregation, home ownership, labor market integration, and neighborhood transformation discussed below.

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

As a dimension of stratification, location is a powerful indicator of social standing because employment opportunities, resource amenities, school quality, and public safety are unequally distributed across space (Fischer & Tienda 2006, Massey & Denton 1993). Therefore, where people live portrays status and class inequities and shapes the contours of social interaction. The extent to which residents are tied to places also reproduces ecologically distributed advantages and disadvantages (Logan 1978). Migration ostensibly permits residents to overcome place-linked disadvantages and improve life circumstances; however, in practice institutional barriers, economic conditions, and housing constraints also limit the realization of social mobility through geographic mobility (Logan 1978, Tolnay 2003).

Until recently, most studies of spatial integration focused on residential segregation, often inferring interaction patterns on the basis of probabilistic rather than actual contact (Charles 2003, Logan 2012). Virtually all studies about segregation draw on two complementary theoretical perspectives—spatial assimilation and place stratification—although recent scholarship has expanded on these perspectives in numerous ways. The former posits that status differences (e.g., education, occupational status, and income) are responsible for observed differences in racial and ethnic group sorting across neighborhoods that differ in amenities and opportunities. Thus, with status improvements, access to desirable neighborhoods rises, which presumably is realized via residential mobility. Building on the premise that residential neighborhoods are ordered along a hierarchy of desirability (Logan 1978), the place stratification perspective claims that institutional barriers, such as discriminatory lending practices, zoning, and redlining, undermine the ability of minority groups to translate their social status into desirable residential locations.

Tolnay (2003, p. 227) claims that the place stratification model cannot be falsified short of minorities “living in better neighborhoods than whites and receiving returns on their human capital that are neither less than nor greater than those enjoyed by whites.” Although he acknowledges that the formulation of weak and strong versions of the place stratification model increased its value by reconciling locational improvements with returns to status, Tolnay also claims that the modifications simultaneously “weakened the model’s theoretical integrity and specificity.” These issues are particularly germane for understanding Hispanic residential segregation because their placement in the US racial hierarchy has been less clearly defined than that of African Americans (except perhaps in South Texas and Southern California) and because the social significance of Hispanicity is itself being transformed through domestic and

Many sociological studies of residential patterns focus on neighborhood ethno-racial transformation as social groups trade places in social space (Fong & Shibuya 2005, Logan & Zhang 2010). The emergence of multiethnic neighborhoods led several researchers to question the utility of the ethnic invasion-succession framework formulated around the experience of blacks and, in particular, the presumption of inevitable, unidirectional transitions from all-white to minority-dominant neighborhoods (Iceland et al. 2002). Denton & Massey (1991) showed that Hispanic neighborhoods are more likely to experience succession than black neighborhoods, but the evidence for Latinos is less consistent in part because of differences in the experiences of native- and foreign-born Hispanics (Flippen & Parrado 2012, Morenoff & Tienda 1997).

Three specific conceptual issues are pertinent for Hispanics. One is the relevance of the tipping point in multiethnic contexts and the circumstances that lead to integration when multiple groups share social and physical space (Denton & Massey 1991, Fasenfest et al. 2004, Fong & Shibuya 2005, Lee et al. 2012, Lichter 2013). Because places differ appreciably in their ethno-racial composition and segregation levels differ across groups, it is unclear what ethnic mixes, if any, optimize social and economic integration. Although some recent studies suggest that Hispanics facilitate lower racial segregation by serving as a buffer between blacks and whites, empirical support for this claim is mixed (Fong & Shibuya 2005, Logan & Zhang 2010).

Population diversification within and among metropolitan areas also bears on the measurement of spatial distance, which with few exceptions (e.g., Fischer et al. 2004, Iceland 2004, Iceland et al. 2002, Timberlake & Iceland 2007) typically assesses spatial relations using binary comparisons: black-white, Hispanic-white, Asian-white. The ID is the most frequently used measure of segregation both because it is easy to calculate and interpret and because it captures about the same amount of unique information as competing choices when tested empirically (Massey & Denton 1988); however, the exposure index is a close second to the ID (Fischer & Tienda 2006). Multigroup segregation measures such as the entropy index are better suited for measuring spatial separation in diverse places because they take into account the presence of several groups simultaneously, yet relatively few studies use them.

Massey & Denton (1988) clarified conceptually the measurement of segregation by identifying and empirically verifying five core dimensions: evenness, clustering, exposure, centralization, and concentration. A subsequent analysis based on a larger set of metropolitan areas affirmed the multidimensional character of residential segregation with qualifications because the measures of concentration and clustering are less robust (Massey et al. 1996). An important spin-off from this work was the identification of hypersegregation, a condition of maximum social exclusion resulting when groups are highly segregated along several dimensions. African Americans qualified as hypersegregated in 16 metropolitan areas in 1980 and 29 in 1990, but since 2000 Hispanics reached the hypersegregation threshold in Los Angeles and New York City—two metropolitan areas that together hosted almost one in five Latinos in 2010 (Wilkes & Iceland 2004).

In what follows we illustrate how the study of metropolitan growth and diversification through the lens of the Hispanic experience sheds light on these theoretical and measurement considerations. We also examine the contours of urban inequality more generally.

**HISPANIC RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION**

Research about residential segregation has mushroomed since the late 1970s, due partly to the growing availability of data in digital form, partly to methodological advances, and partly to new developments in the spatial distribution
of social groups. Prior to 1980, when the US Census Bureau added a Spanish origin question to the 100% enumeration schedule, there was no single indicator to identify persons of Spanish origin; therefore, most studies about the Spanish origin population were regionally based and focused on specific groups (Bean & Tienda 1987).

Paralleling Hispanics’ growing spatial imprint since 1980, scholarship about the dimensions, causes, and consequences of their residential segregation increased. To organize our review of the dimensions and correlates of segregation and impose some coherence to the vast array of findings, we distinguish between studies conducted within the ecological tradition—including paths of neighborhood transformation—and research that directly examines how social and residential mobility are related.

**Ecological Approaches**

Even before Latinos were enumerated as a national population using a common identifier, Massey (1979a,b) pioneered the modern study of Hispanic residential segregation at a national level by piecing together various Spanish-origin indicators available in 1970—Spanish language, Spanish surname, Puerto Rican birth or parentage—to distinguish Hispanics from whites and blacks in the 29 largest urbanized areas. Invoking ecological theory, he postulated that status gains typically associated with immigrant assimilation manifest as lower levels of residential separation from whites.

Two core findings from this early work continue to inspire contemporary scholarship. First, Massey (1979a) showed that, compared with blacks, in 1970 the Spanish-language population was far less segregated from whites, that Hispanic segregation levels were lower in suburbs than in central cities, and that the foreign stock population (first and second generations combined) was more segregated from whites than were third- and higher generation Hispanics. Second, Massey (1979b) produced early support for the spatial assimilation model by demonstrating an inverse association between Hispanic-white segregation levels and two status markers: education and family income. Using 1980 data, an expanded number of metro areas, and comparisons with other groups, Denton & Massey (1988, p. 807) not only reaffirmed the veracity of Latinos’ spatial assimilation but also underscored the salience of racial divisions that distinguished them from African Americans: “[E]ven among Hispanics with 0–4 years of education, segregation is lower than among blacks with a college education.”

Puerto Ricans stood as a notable and initially puzzling exception to the predictions of the spatial assimilation model for Hispanics (Denton & Massey 1988, Massey 1979b). Exploiting the African American heritage of Caribbean Hispanics, Denton & Massey (1989) analyzed segregation patterns of black and white Hispanics across 10 metro areas in 1970 and 1980. Based on measures of evenness and exposure, they revealed that Caribbean Hispanics are highly segregated from Anglos and blacks, but segregated to a much lower degree from white Hispanics. Using more recent data, Iceland & Nelson (2008) confirmed that black and white Hispanics exhibit low levels of segregation from each other, and they also show that black Hispanics experience greater separation from Anglos and less spatial distance from blacks than do white Hispanics.

In sum, Massey’s early studies were important in extending ecological theory to accommodate Latinos, providing early benchmarks for appraising subsequent changes in Hispanic segregation patterns and illustrating how Latinos’ spatial arrangements differ from those of African Americans. Moreover, by identifying the paradox of Puerto Rican segregation, these forerunners also revealed the complexity of Hispanicity as a panethnic category (Kim & White 2010, Nelson & Tienda 1985, South et al. 2005). Subsequent studies of Hispanic residential segregation differ in temporal and comparative scope, geographic coverage, and measurement, but most are framed around the spatial assimilation and place stratification models (e.g., Iceland &

Until 2000, the number of metropolitan areas analyzed was limited to a few with sufficient numbers of Hispanics and Asians for reliable analyses (Denton & Massey 1988, Massey & Denton 1987), but later studies expanded the number of places compared (Fischer & Tienda 2006, Fischer et al. 2004, Iceland et al. 2002, Rugh & Massey 2013). Virtually all studies confirm that Hispanics are less segregated from whites than African Americans, and most corroborate the premises of spatial assimilation. Nevertheless, there is appreciable temporal, geographic, and racial variation in the contours of Latinos’ spatial inequality (Frey 2011, Iceland et al. 2002, Lichter et al. 2010, Massey & Denton 1987).

For example, Fischer & Tienda (2006) show that residential segregation increased in new destinations, but they find no clear association between demographic growth and residential segregation. Fischer and colleagues (2004) partly clarify this puzzle by showing that unlike blacks, whose average segregation levels have declined over time, Hispanic segregation levels remained steady due to offsetting trends: a drop in neighborhood segregation within places coupled with a rise in segregation between regions, metro areas, and places. Rugh & Massey (2013) provide additional insight into the underlying mechanisms. Analyzing segregation trends for 287 metropolitan areas from 1970 to 2010, they show that Hispanic residential dissimilarity increased modestly while Hispanic isolation rose appreciably owing to rapid population growth. (By construction, the isolation index is more sensitive to demographic growth than is the ID.)

The rise in Hispanic residential segregation warrants further study because its growing complexity in multiethnic contexts calls into question the veracity of the spatial assimilation model. Iceland and associates (2002) show that three dimensions of Hispanic-white segregation rose during the 1980s and 1990s— evenness, isolation, and clustering; nevertheless, Hispanic segregation remained lower than that of blacks on all three dimensions. The emergence of Hispanic hypersegregation in Los Angeles is a particularly notable development (Rugh & Massey 2013, Wilkes & Iceland 2004) that may signal growing salience of place stratification for Hispanics in the future (Lichter et al. 2010, Pais et al. 2012). Denton & Massey (1988) claim that residential isolation is produced in urban areas when minority populations constitute a large share of an urban population that is unevenly distributed spatially.

High immigration levels also changed the contours of Latinos’ residential segregation. Massey & Denton (1987) show that between 1970 and 1980, Hispanic residential segregation rose in metro areas where large numbers of immigrants settled and that spatial separation from whites was lower among more acculturated and higher-status Latinos. Fischer & Tienda (2006) also find evidence of resegregation in places with high immigration during the 1980s and 1990s. Iceland & Wilkes (2006) corroborate the spatial assimilation model with evidence that in both 1990 and 2000, high-status Hispanics were less segregated from whites than were lower-status Hispanics.

Using four different measures of spatial distance and growth curves to understand trends
Table 2  Index of dissimilarity (ID)\textsuperscript{a} for the top 10 most segregated metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) with populations greater than 500,000: Hispanics, 1990–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>Springfield, MA</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>Providence, RI</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lancaster, PA</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>Springfield, MA</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Springfield, MA</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>Providence, RI</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>Bridgeport, CT</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>Lancaster, PA</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bridgeport, CT</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>Bridgeport, CT</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>Allentown, PA</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{a}The ID is a measure of evenness that ranges from 0 to 100 where 0 indicates even distribution of groups and 100 indicates complete segregation.

in residential inequality over a 30-year period, Timberlake & Iceland (2007) detected more nuanced patterns of convergence and divergence in segregation levels than previously revealed using binary comparisons. Specifically, using the multigroup entropy index, they show that residential segregation fell for all groups between 1970 and 2000. Based on evidence that blacks and Hispanics are able to convert status improvements into higher neighborhood quality even if they are less successful at closing spatial gaps, they infer spatial assimilation. Because some trends for Latinos diverge from predictions of the spatial assimilation model, however, Timberlake & Iceland (2007) caution that continued increases in Latinos’ residential segregation levels could thwart their socioeconomic integration.

Table 2 provides some insight about the evolution of Hispanic segregation over the past two decades as reflected by the ID. With ID values approaching or in excess of 60, virtually all of the listed metro areas qualify as highly segregated in 1990 and 2000 compared with approximately half in 2010. Seven metro areas remain in the top most segregated throughout the period. Temporal comparisons also reveal the reach of the dispersal and its role in accentuating Hispanic-white spatial divisions in new metropolitan areas. Between 1990 and 2000, Allentown and Providence replaced Philadelphia and Cleveland among the 10 most segregated metropolitan areas; by 2010, Miami and Milwaukee replaced Lancaster and Allentown among the 10 most segregated metro areas.

Hispanics’ geographic dispersal redoubled interest in new Hispanic destinations, including suburbs where many new immigrants settled (Clark & Blue 2004; Frey 2011; Lichter et al. 2007, 2010). New Hispanic destinations are of particular interest because of the number, size, and geographic location of impacted places; the role of immigration in population growth and diversification; and the variable size and racial composition of their native host populations (Fischer & Tienda 2006). Clark & Blue (2004) are sanguine about the potential for status gains to foster residential integration in the major immigrant gateways, but their optimism about long-term prospects for reducing Hispanic spatial segregation seems unwarranted for two reasons. First, two of the five metropolitan areas they study became hypersegregated, which runs counter to their optimistic assessment. Second, descriptive comparisons between suburbs and central cities do not constitute compelling empirical evidence from which to draw inferences about future trends in residential segregation.
As many studies show, suburbanization does not de facto constitute spatial integration (Lichter 2013, Lichter et al. 2010).

Lichter and colleagues (2007, 2010) are more justified in drawing optimistic conclusions about the spatial integration prospects of Hispanics because they compare metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas, use more granular ecological units, and examine temporal variation. Their consideration of rural areas and small towns is an important extension of residential integration research. They show that “levels and changes in recent patterns in rural racial segregation are remarkably similar to patterns observed in larger metropolitan places” (Lichter et al. 2007, p. 577). More recent evidence supporting the place stratification model is less sanguine about spatial integration prospects, however (Lichter et al. 2010). In addition to challenging implicit assumptions that suburbanization implies spatial mobility, high segregation levels in new Hispanic destinations raise questions about whether these new residential divisions are temporary or will become an enduring feature of the residential landscape. Moreover, given the number of places and people involved, evidence that higher incomes do not guarantee spatial integration in new destinations is a matter of some consequence for the nation, but its significance partly hinges on the extent to which the observed concentration patterns reflect group preferences or result from discrimination and involuntary exclusion (Charles 2003, Clark 2009).

**Paths of Neighborhood Transformation**

In an early study signaling the rise of multiethnic neighborhoods, Denton & Massey (1991) asserted that all-white urban neighborhoods were becoming rare in large metropolitan areas, yet they conceded that increases in the proportion of minorities tended to precipitate white flight. Morenoff & Tienda (1997) showed that Mexican immigration revitalized many poor neighborhoods during the 1980s, transforming them into working-class neighborhoods rather than underclass neighborhoods, as predicted by Wilson (1989). Their study illustrates the value of a longer temporal horizon—minimally 20 but preferably 30 years—to appreciate how population diversification transforms urban landscapes.

Fasenfest and associates (2004) find that the number of predominantly white neighborhoods fell by 30% during the 1990s in the 10 largest metro areas; that mixed white-Hispanic or mixed white-Asian neighborhoods became more prominent in formerly majority-white communities; and that within central cities, mixed-race neighborhoods increased as all-white communities diminished. Given the rise of multiethnic places, several recent studies consider what the rise of multiethnic places portends for the study of spatial inequality, neighborhood instability, and social integration (Crowder et al. 2012, Friedman 2008, Lee et al. 2012, Vicino et al. 2011). Friedman (2008) appropriately challenges implicit assumptions that multiethnic neighborhoods are stably integrated and provides tentative evidence that mixed neighborhoods with lower shares of blacks are more stable than comparably mixed neighborhoods with larger black populations; however, she stops short of suggesting an optimal ethnic mix to achieve stable integration. Based on actual residential mobility patterns, Crowder et al. (2012) analyze the residential decisions undergirding the emergence and transformation of multiethnic neighborhoods; their results reveal considerable variation in the contours of integration across groups.

Questioning the utility of the invasion-succession model for understanding multiethnic paths of urban neighborhood change, Logan & Zhang (2010) empirically evaluate several versions of the buffer hypothesis to clarify whether and under what circumstances the growth of Asian and Hispanic populations is associated with lower levels of black-white segregation. They identify two general paths of neighborhood change, one involving replacement of whites by Hispanics and Asians and another leading to mixed
ethnic neighborhoods. Evidence that sizeable minority and immigrant populations do not prevent white flight points to the fragility of multiethnic neighborhoods. This finding warrants further research about the conditions fostering stable and meaningful integration across racial and ethnic groups as well as more explicit specification of integration outcomes (Crowder & South 2008, Friedman 2008).

**Locational Attainment and Geographic Mobility**

A major limitation of spatial segregation studies in the ecological tradition is their inability to assess directly the residential returns to social mobility and to specify whether and for which social groups segregation is based on preferences for proximity to coethnics rather than on involuntary exclusion from more desirable places (Charles 2003, Clark 2009). Locational attainment models partly obviate problems of ecological inference endemic to studies of residential segregation by asking how status achievements increase the likelihood of residential moves and by estimating the residential exchange value of individual traits. Unlike studies of individual geographic mobility, locational attainment studies situate individuals in diverse neighborhood contexts.

Comparisons of movers and stayers between central cities and suburbs are crude approximations of locational attainment. For example, Clark (2007) shows that Hispanics who move from central cities to suburbs average higher income than do stayers or movers within central cities; however, his evidence about residential differences according to education levels is inconsistent with the tenets of the locational attainment perspective. In the absence of information about whether the quality of Hispanic suburban neighborhoods is comparable to that of whites, Clark’s claim that geographic mobility reduces racial divisions is premature. Furthermore, without comparisons between quality of origin and destination neighborhoods, it is impossible to ascertain whether the moves imply residential convergence between groups.

To identify the circumstances that permit black, Hispanic, and Asian suburbanites to comingle with whites, Alba & Logan (1993) execute a novel strategy that transforms aggregate census data into the functional equivalent of individual records. Their findings that English-proficient, native-born Hispanics are less segregated from whites than foreign-born Latinos who are not fluent in English lend support to the tenets of spatial assimilation; however, evidence that Mexican origin and racial appearance are also associated with higher separation from whites supports place stratification. Alba & Logan concede that the higher tendency of Mexicans to reside in coethnic communities may reflect individual preferences. Whether and how such preferences vary across metropolitan areas is an empirical question warranting further investigation.

Geographic mobility studies overcome limitations of both locational attainment and ecological approaches by directly testing whether higher-status minorities are more likely than their lower-status counterparts to undertake a residential move and, conditional on moving, whether the residential exchange value of social status is uniform among demographic groups. Although associations between individual-level social and geographic mobility overcome some limitations of ecological correlations between social attributes and residential outcomes, causal inferences based on movers are unwarranted unless analysts correct for selection bias resulting from systematic differences between movers and nonmovers (Charles 2003).

Residential mobility studies based on individual behavior generally buttress spatial assimilation, but they have also generated support for place stratification. Several studies by Kyle Crowder, Scott South, and their various collaborators use individual mobility data supplemented with extensive place attributes to assess whether and for whom high social status provides access to better-quality neighborhoods (Crowder et al. 2011, 2012; Crowder & South 2008; South et al. 2005; Pais et al. 2012). Using geo-coded data from the Panel Survey of Income Dynamics and the
Latino National Political survey, South and associates (2005) ask whether residential mobility increases Hispanics’ residential proximity to whites. In addition to correcting for potential selection bias, the authors compare Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans with Anglos. Like many studies using ecological and locational approaches, they find that English proficiency, generational status, and educational attainment enable moves that reduce spatial distance with whites, and they also reaffirm that black Hispanics remain more segregated from whites than do their lighter-skinned counterparts.

Pais et al. (2012) respond to Tolnay’s (2003) challenge to specify the strong and weak versions of place stratification by asking whether residentially mobile blacks and Hispanics access more advantaged neighborhoods, which they define based on income and percentage of white residents. In support of spatial assimilation, they find that in many metropolitan areas, high-income minorities achieve neighborhood parity with highest-earning whites. Their results also provide strong support for the weak version of the place stratification model insomuch as high-income black and Hispanic movers are successful in moving closer to whites; however, compared with the lowest-income whites, the highest-income minority movers settle in neighborhoods with lower shares of white residents. That blacks and Hispanics are less successful than whites in gaining access to high-income neighborhoods buttresses the strong version of place stratification.

Current Debates

A review of the residential segregation literature provides ample evidence that, even as black residential segregation and isolation remain high in many places, black-white spatial integration has increased steadily since 1960 (Rugh & Massey 2013). A second generalization is that Hispanic-white residential segregation levels increased modestly, but isolation levels rose appreciably. In fact, the two largest Hispanic metropolitan areas became hypersegregated. Finally, Asian residential segregation held steady at moderate levels even though spatial isolation increased (Rugh & Massey 2013). Despite agreement about these general trends, Glaeser & Vigdor (2012) sparked a controversy about spatial integration trends by declaring the “end of the segregated century.”

Several demographers take issue with this bold claim (e.g., Alba & Romalewski 2012, Lichter 2013, Rugh & Massey 2013). In addition to systematically providing counter-evidence, critics of Glaeser & Vigdor note that assessments of segregation levels depend on the types of measures used—binary versus multigroup—and the ecological level at which segregation is measured. For example, Alba & Romalewski (2012) assemble granular data for New York to demonstrate that spatial distance across multiple groups is a defining feature of the largest metropolitan area. Fischer and associates’ (2004) decomposition of segregation by levels of geography also illustrates how seemingly stable levels of residential segregation mask countervailing trends across regions, metro areas, places, and neighborhoods.

Furthermore, neither minority suburbanization nor the growth of multiethnic neighborhoods can ensure cross-group co-mingling (Lichter et al. 2007, 2010; Massey & Denton 1993). For Hispanics—whose residential patterns include the emergence of hypersegregation amid broad geographic dispersal—both economic and demographic forces as yet uncertain will determine whether and when segregation will end. Evidence that active expressions of anti-Latino sentiment are associated with levels of residential segregation and spatial isolation provide strong evidence that the segregated century is far from over (Rugh & Massey 2013).

RESIDENTIAL DISPERSAL AND PARADOXES OF PLACE

The significance of Latinos’ changing residential profile partly derives from the timing of the dispersal, the characteristics of the newcomers, and the diverse contexts of reception they encountered. Notwithstanding
consensus that labor demand was the primary factor driving Hispanics’ residential dispersal (Fischer & Tienda 2006, Kandel & Parrado 2005, Massey & Capoferro 2008), most of the job growth was in secondary labor market sectors that attracted unskilled, foreign-born workers, including many lacking legal status (Donato & Bankston 2008, Donato et al. 2005, Goodwin-White 2012, Kandel & Parrado 2005). Thus, in addition to the pace of growth and residential concentration of Hispanics, their legal status and skill disparities bear on their spatial imprints and terms of belonging (Flippen & Parrado 2012). The major question posed by Latinos’ geographic scattering is whether movement promotes integration in ways that transcend coresidence with Anglos. We briefly illustrate the paradoxes of place for Hispanics through an examination of housing, employment, and the terms of reception.

Housing

Home ownership is an important indicator of social integration because it represents a substantial personal investment and a commitment to remain in a community (Flippen 2012). Hispanic home ownership rates tracked below 50% before the housing crisis of 2008–2009 (Kochhar et al. 2009), with lower rates for immigrants than natives. For the largest 100 metro areas, Fischer & Tienda (2006) show a slight increase in Hispanic home ownership rates between 1990 and 2000, with most of the rise in established Hispanic metropolitan areas. Friedman et al. (2013) explain that lower ownership rates among Hispanic immigrants reflect residential segregation from whites, and more so among homeowners than renters. Low home ownership rates relegate Hispanic immigrants to places with high crime rates, worse schools, and more limited amenities (Flippen 2012). Fuentes (2007) reveals that New York City landlords view undocumented Mexican immigrants as desirable tenants over other Hispanics because they tolerate housing code infractions and are reliable for rent payments.

Several recent studies examine links between Latinos’ segregation patterns and home ownership. Flippen (2001, 2010) reveals that three segregation measures—evenness, isolation, and clustering—are associated with higher rates of Hispanic home ownership. Her comparison with blacks is instructive because it implicates ethnic neighborhoods as a condition facilitating Latinos’ access to the housing market and suggests that Hispanic barrios may differ from black ghettos in ways that appear to promote neighborhood stability. This claim is consistent with Morenoff & Tienda’s (1997) study of Chicago neighborhood trajectories showing that growth of Mexican-origin residents, most of them foreign-born, appear to prevent the expansion of underclass neighborhoods.

Flippen’s (2010) analysis of multiple metropolitan areas confirmed that the size of a coethnic community, rather than its growth, is the reason for the positive association between residential segregation and Hispanic home ownership. Presumably the positive spillover effects of residence in a large coethnic community reflect easier access to information, lower language barriers, and shared interest in neighborhood maintenance. The size of coethnic communities is also associated with health status. Inagami et al. (2006) find that blacks and Latinos experience lower all-cause mortality rates when they live in residentially homogeneous neighborhoods, with young Latino males and black seniors reaping the largest benefit. Burgos & Rivera (2012), however, show protracted disability rates among Puerto Ricans living in conditions of hypersegregation, lending support to the place stratification model.

Although favorable housing conditions attracted many Latinos to new destinations (Fischer & Tienda 2006, Kochhar et al. 2009), Flippen (2010) cautions that the rate of Hispanic population growth does not necessarily increase home ownership rates, as prior research suggested. Rather, because group size appears to be the condition enabling Latinos’ access to the housing market, ownership rates will likely remain low in new residential destinations until a critical mass of own-group members is stably integrated. Consistent with
differentials in ownership rates reported by Fischer & Tienda (2006), Flippen (2010) notes that Hispanics registered higher home ownership rates in established Hispanic hubs rather than in new destination metros.

The ill-famed housing bubble of the early 2000s, characterized by low interest rates and loose lending guidelines, coincided with high levels of immigration and residential dispersal—conditions that jointly rendered thousands of first-time Hispanic homebuyers vulnerable to predatory lending (Kuebler & Rugh 2013, Rugh & Massey 2010). Kochhar and associates (2009) report that Hispanic home ownership rates peaked in 2007; consequently, Latinos were particularly hard-hit when the market crashed because they had borrowed more, on average, than whites with similar incomes; because their ownership rates had increased faster and for a longer period than the overall market; and because they had higher exposure to the subprime market. Rugh & Massey (2010) argue that residential segregation created a natural market for exploitation of immigrants and minorities, which is evident in the substantially higher Hispanic foreclosure rates in segregated urban housing markets after 2008. Simply stated, residential segregation racialized the foreclosure crisis, disproportionately impacting places with large, established Hispanic populations.

Using home ownership and census data supplemented with information about credit scores, income-to-price ratios, and owner demographic and economic characteristics, Kuebler & Rugh (2013) examine trends and differentials in ownership rates between whites and Hispanic national origin groups from 2001 to 2010. Consistent with the premises of place stratification, they show that black and Puerto Rican ownership rates were adversely affected by the housing market crash. In support of the spatial assimilation hypothesis, their results also indicate that, compared with whites, home ownership rates of Mexicans, Cubans, and Asians did not erode after 2007. As the authors caution, however, these inferences are based on the hypothetical comparisons of “statistically comparable” groups; this inference requires equivalence in wealth and income—a condition their own statistical portrait shows does not exist.

**Economic and Social Consequences**

Contentious debates about immigrant reform largely ignore the myriad contributions immigrants make to the economy (Marrow 2011, Massey & Capoferro 2008). In addition to providing needed personal services, Latinos’ residential dispersal helped revive local communities by expanding revenue streams through consumption, business creation, and infusion of cash into housing markets (Massey & Capoferro 2008). For example, between 2000 and 2010, Hispanics contributed $9 billion annually in North Carolina to the state’s economy through taxes and purchases (Carr et al. 2012, pp. 42–43). By some estimates, Oregon’s economy would lose between $400 and $656 million per year without its unauthorized Hispanic population—a fact not overlooked by local political and business elites who welcome hard-working immigrants with a blind eye to their legal status. Not all communities are so welcoming, however.

Latinos’ residential dispersal will shape the future contours of racial and ethnic stratification, but that social narrative is a work in progress. Children, in particular, will bear the brunt of discrimination directed toward their parents, particularly if they are undocumented. Comparing two communities in North Carolina—one impacted by a surge in immigration and the other not—O’Neil & Tienda (2010) do not detect evidence of widespread hostility toward immigrants; however, their analysis indicates that competition for educational resources lowers tolerance for immigrants. Restricted access to educational resources, assistance programs, and medical care is particularly detrimental for children’s development. Bean et al. (2013) estimate that the children of unauthorized Mexicans pay an achievement penalty of a full year or more. Given that fertility is the driver of Hispanic...
population growth, these social costs will reverberate in myriad ways for years to come (Tienda & Mitchell 2006).

As Latin American immigration streams have altered metropolitan labor markets in both traditional and new destinations (Hall et al. 2011), researchers have uncovered latent and manifest changes in intergroup relations. Von Lockette & Johnson (2010) show that Hispanic men have worse employment in more segregated labor markets over a 20-year period. Attempting to reconcile the divergent conclusions about labor market displacement based on qualitative and econometric studies, Rosenfeld & Tienda (1999) illustrate the importance of considering occupational succession in areas impacted by industrial restructuring along with changes in the ethno-racial composition of employment. Their comparison of Los Angeles, Chicago, and Atlanta also underscores that the impact of Latinos’ residential dispersal depends on the racial stratification system in place prior to the influx of new immigrants.

Based on an ethnographic study in New York City, Fuentes-Mayorga (2011) illustrates how employers in small service establishments use race, gender, and immigration status to stratify workers. Interviews with employers and workers revealed that lighter-skinned Dominicans and legal Mexican immigrants occupy “front-stage” functions, whereas black and undocumented immigrants are assigned “back-stage” tasks that limit exposure to clients. Her study demonstrates the importance of considering how and where groups actually come together to understand what Latinos’ dispersal portends for social integration, including the utility of Hispanicity to represent racialized social boundaries (Kim & White 2010).

**Contexts of Reception**

Even where Hispanics have offset native population losses and revitalized anemic local economies (Carr et al. 2012), their growing visibility has not always resulted in unqualified acceptance, particularly in locales where immigration enforcement is usurped by state and local governments (Marczak et al. 2011). Partly due to rapid growth and partly to persisting residential concentration, a more visible Hispanic population is altering the order of social relations among residents in places unaccustomed to culturally diverse groups (Flippen & Parrado 2012).

Although some receiving communities have embraced newcomers (Marrow 2011, Winders 2011), in others foreign-born Hispanics face discrimination and outright rejection, as evident in the proliferation of state and local ordinances to enforce immigration laws (Amuedo-Dorantes et al. 2013). O’Neil (2011) finds that at both the county and municipal levels, increases in the size of the foreign-born population raise the risk of actually passing anti-immigrant legislation, but only in nontraditional gateway states or in localities that voted Republican in 2004. Based on a comparison of restrictive and nonrestrictive state and local immigration policies, Marczak et al. (2011) find mixed economic consequences of state and local ordinances, which they claim depress employment but do not suppress establishment of new businesses. They acknowledge, however, that macroeconomic consequences are likely larger, particularly after the financial crisis.

Although researchers disagree about whether employment verification is effective in curtailing unauthorized immigrants’ access to jobs and services (Amuedo-Dorantes et al. 2013, Brown 2013), several scholars have signaled more ominous social implications. Menjívar (2013) maintains that the blurring of immigration and criminal laws will subject Hispanics to new forms of violence. Carr and associates (2012) claim that legislation targeted against unauthorized immigrants spills over to all foreign-appearing residents, not only compromising Hispanics’ social acceptance in the short run but also impairing integration prospects for future generations (Bean et al. 2013, Marrow 2011). The significance of these developments will likely depend on the future of Latinos’ residential dispersal as well as the prospects of comprehensive immigration
CONCLUSIONS

Hispanics’ metropolitan profile has evolved in profound ways that call into question initial optimism that spatial assimilation is ineluctable. Despite extensive empirical evidence from the residential segregation literature supporting the premises of spatial assimilation for Latinos, recent studies based on multigroup segregation indicators and analyses of actual residential mobility indicate either that integration has slowed or that its contours have changed in ways that increase the salience of group membership. Unlike the trend for blacks, which shows secular declines in residential segregation, by several measures and in many places Hispanics’ spatial separation from whites has increased. In hindsight, it appears that initial claims about Latinos’ spatial assimilation were premature because most were based on cross-sectional analyses that cannot portray social processes; even stability over time can mask improvements across neighborhoods and places (Fischer et al. 2004, Tolnay 2003).

If the Great Migration of African Americans from the Deep South to northern cities was one of the most significant demographic events during the mid-twentieth century, the geographic dispersal of Latinos away from traditional immigrant gateways and regional ethnic hubs qualifies as an equally profound occurrence during the last quarter of the twentieth century. Unlike blacks’ migration, which was primarily bound for northern industrial towns, Latinos’ geographic scattering is national in scope and involves a broad range of places, from global cities to rural boomtowns. Furthermore, it simultaneously involves concentration and resegregation as well as dispersal and, presumably, social integration.

That black return migration coincides with Latinization of the South affords a unique opportunity to understand the evolution of US race relations, and the racialization of Hispanicity in particular (Kim & White 2010, Lichter 2013, Lloyd 2012). Marrow (2011, p. 249) claims that Hispanic immigrants who settle in the South experience exclusion and discrimination based on both skin color and citizenship, which accentuates the social divisions that result in Hispanics being defined as “undeserving outsiders.” Focusing on the integration challenges of immigrant and second-generation youth, for example, she advocates for approaches that can reveal the workings of soft segregation, which ranges from academic tracking to tolerance for segregated extracurricular activities.

The emergence of Hispanic hypersegregation in Los Angeles and New York is a noteworthy development not only because these are the two largest metro areas but also because they differ in ethnic composition, economic base, and immigration history. An in-depth comparison of forces responsible for Hispanic hypersegregation in these two metro areas could yield valuable insights about the institutional arrangements and social forces conducive to growing spatial divisions between Latinos and Anglos in multiethnic settings. Although the number of black hypersegregated metro areas has declined, Atlanta and Mobile have qualified as hypersegregated since 2000; notably, both witnessed an influx of Hispanics in recent years. This development also invites research that investigates how the coincidence of black return migration and Hispanic in-migration have altered racial divisions.

Several additional issues warrant further research attention in light of the trends reviewed here. The most general concerns the very meaning of integration under conditions of high immigration and rapid population diversification (Charles 2003, Fasenfest et al. 2004, Friedman 2008). Clarifying whether and how spatial distances acquire social content in multiethnic contexts may illuminate the softening or reification of group boundaries, including those between natives and immigrants (Fischer et al. 2004, Kim & White 2010, Lee et al. 2012, Lichter 2013). Because physical and social distances are not isomorphic (Logan 2012), one concrete question warranting further research is whether conceptualization...
of multiethnic cities as melting pots is justified, as Frey (2011) suggests, or whether lower segregation patterns are more entrenched.

A more nuanced understanding of the social content of integration is important because spatial mobility of Latinos in traditional metropolitan areas often has involved limited intermingling between white and Hispanic residents (Fischer & Tienda 2006, Logan & Zhang 2010). Residential proximity may be a necessary condition for intergroup comingling, but it is insufficient as revealed by studies of soft segregation within schools (Tienda & Mitchell 2006). Exposure measures, for example, can be improved upon by using GPS systems and mobile phones to expand static segregation measures based on residence to include actual movements through physical space. Based on a pilot study, Palmer and collaborators (2013, p. 1123) make a compelling case about "the importance of moving beyond static, census-unit measurements when investigating the relationship between people and place."

Furthermore, the growth of multiethnic places invites further investigations that clarify the necessary and sufficient conditions for achieving stable integration in communities witnessing population growth through internal and international migration. If the growth of multiethnic places provides conditions for greater intergroup contact, then it behooves researchers to discern the conditions that produce new equilibriums among diverse places. Furthermore, suggestive evidence that Hispanics reap health and home ownership benefits from living in ethnic neighborhoods also requires additional study to distinguish the salutary from the deleterious consequences of segregation. The presumption that all forms of segregation are involuntary and deleterious is questionable.

Finally, Hispanics’ retrenchment to traditional metropolitan gateways in the aftermath of the Great Recession provides yet another research opportunity to reexamine how race and place intersect to shape economic fortunes. Hispanics incurred formidable economic penalties as the construction and repair service jobs that lured them to nontraditional destinations collapsed (Berube et al. 2010, Frey 2012b), subprime mortgages resulted in foreclosures (Kochhar et al. 2009, Rugh & Massey 2010), and job competition rose. Frey (2012b, p. 15) claims that the unfavorable economic conditions during the late 2000s were responsible for both the slowdown in immigration and Latinos’ return to traditional Hispanic hubs, which raises questions about the holding power of the new residential configuration. This also is an issue worth further investigation because it has implications for understanding the very essence of integration and its persistence over time.
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