EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT IN NEW AND ESTABLISHED LATINO METROPOLITAN DESTINATIONS*

by

Katherine Stamps
The Pennsylvania State University
1001 Oswald Tower
University Park, PA 16802
kstamps@pop.psu.edu

and

Stephanie A. Bohon
University of Georgia
315 Baldwin Hall
Athens, GA 30602
sbohon@uga.edu

*Direct Correspondence to:
Katherine Stamps
The Pennsylvania State University
1001 Oswald Tower
University Park, PA 16802
kstamps@pop.psu.edu

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT IN NEW AND ESTABLISHED LATINO METROPOLITAN DESTINATIONS

ABSTRACT

Over the last twenty years, Latino immigration streams have shifted from a few cities with concentrated Latino populations to include many new destinations across the country, prompting some researchers to speculate that immigrants to new gateways may have more difficulty adapting to their new communities. This paper explores one facet of that argument by comparing the educational attainment of Latino immigrants in established and emerging Latino gateways using the 5% Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample. Contrary to speculation, educational attainment was found to be significantly higher in new Latino destinations than in established Latino metropolitan areas, although much of these differences are mediated by demographic factors. OLS results suggest English proficiency, ethnicity, citizenship status, and migration account for a substantial portion of the differences in educational attainment between destination types.

INDEX WORDS: Latino education, attainment, immigration, gateway, new Latino destinations, established Latino metros, English proficiency, migration

INTRODUCTION

Latinos are the nation's largest and fastest growing minority group. From 1990 to 2000 alone, the Latino population grew by 58 percent (U.S. Census, 2000). Most of that growth is attributable to immigration; currently, Latin American immigrants comprise about 40% of the total Latino population. Since 1965, these immigrants have been concentrated primarily in the Southwest and southern California, with most in a handful of American metropolitan areas including New York, Chicago, Miami and Los Angeles. In fact, over 25% of all Latinos in the United States resided in these four places in 2000 (Suro and Singer, 2002).

However, since 1970 the Latino population has begun to increasingly settle outside of these cities, in a demographic flux variously referred to in academic literature in terms of the new Latino diaspora (Murillo and Villenas, 1997) or new Latino destinations (Suro and Singer, 2002). Additionally, there is a growing literature on new immigrant gateways (Singer, 2004). Keeping in mind that the majority of Latinos in this country are not immigrants, in the new gateways they are overwhelmingly so. Consequently, the new immigrant gateways and new Latino destinations are usually the same places.

Latinos have migrated to the Southeast, Northeast, the Pacific Northwest, and everywhere in between. Cities like Atlanta, Orlando, Seattle, and Washington that were previously home to Latino populations of negligible size have experienced a tremendous amount of Latino growth in the last few decades. The established destinations reported the most growth in absolute numbers, but new Latino destinations with smaller Latino population bases had the fastest (and most immigrant comprised) growth rates. For example, the Latino population in Raleigh, N.C. grew 1,180 percent between 1980 and 2000 (Suro and Singer, 2002), and nearly seventy percent of the Latinos in that metropolitan are immigrants.

The destinations of Latino immigrants are expanding in number as the population increases, yet the new immigrant gateways are understudied relative to traditional destinations. What is known from the little existing research is that the new gateways are different from the established Latino locations in important ways. New Latino immigrants in established destinations benefit from previously arrived immigrants and U.S.-born co-ethnic residents who are a source of advice and political advocacy (Portes and Stepick, 1993; Waldinger, 1996), while those in new receiving areas must adjust to communities that have never experienced a large immigrant influx and have no history of Latino settlement. For example, immigrants in new gateways often end up in substandard housing because they have a poor command of English and a limited understanding of their rights with relatively few advocates to assist them (Atiles and Bohon, 2003). The relegation of these immigrants to segregated housing may impede English acquisition and educational opportunities (Atiles and Bohon, 2002).

While the current literature on emerging gateways is small, some scholars have noted several social problems that hinder immigrant adaptation in new Latino immigrant receiving areas. Singer (2004) argues that local areas respond differently to heavy immigration. She suggests that traditional gateways may benefit from structural advantages that have developed over time; these might include organizational, service, and advocacy infrastructures with a sound knowledge base about Latino immigrants' needs. In Chicago, for instance, the Latino Unity coalition addresses HIV prevention, outreach, and intervention among Latino residents, while the Chicago-Mexico Bilingual Nurse Program helps Spanish-speaking nurses in the Pilsen neighborhood receive U.S. licensure. Additionally, traditional Latino metropolitan areas have often incorporated their immigration gateway position as a point of pride. Los Angeles and Miami, for example, are known for their strong multicultural identities.

New immigrant destinations, in contrast, may not be structurally equipped to deal with the rapid addition of several thousand Latino immigrants. Additionally, the potential problem of absorption in new gateways is exacerbated by rapid population growth among U.S.-born groups that create demands for new schools, roads, and social services. Existing programs may not yet be fully developed or successfully implemented in some cases at a time when political resources are stretching just to meet the needs of native in-migrants (Singer, 2004). Furthermore, formerly black-white cities are newly multiracial, and competition for resources and limited programs may strain social relations (Hamann, Wortham, and Murillo, 2002; Neal and Bohon, 2002; Singer, 2004). The extent to which these difficulties impede immigrant incorporation is just beginning to be explored.

One area in which destinations type may impact immigrant incorporation is education. In a study of new Latino residents to Georgia, Bohon, Macpherson, and Atiles (2005) found that many school districts are struggling to educate a new minority influx with limited English fluency and different educational backgrounds. Their study, along with more general treatments of emerging gateways (e.g. Singer, 2004) suggests that educational attainment may be impeded in new destinations. However, the impact of new Latino destinations on educational attainment has not been systematically studied. Given that some authors suggest that Latinos in new destinations may not fit established models of minority children in school because of the unique situations they encounter in their new communities (Hamann, Wortham, and Murillo, 2002), it is worth asking, will this result in good or bad outcomes? Our research seeks to determine what, if any, differences exist in educational attainment between new and established Latino immigrant destinations.

Educational attainment is an important determinant of social position in America's stratified society, as education level is an important predictor of income, health, job quality, social status, and age at first birth (Ross and Wu, 1996; National Center for Education Statistics, 2001). As Latinos are the country's largest minority group, it is alarming that a mere six percent of Latinos who begin kindergarten in the United States ultimately earn a college degree, while 49 percent of Asians, 16 percent of blacks, and 30 percent of whites do so (Williams, 2003). For immigrant Latinos entering school at later ages, educational attainment is even lower. These trends, coupled with the growth of the Latino population, underscore Vernez's (1996) assertion that "the educational attainment Hispanics eventually reach will in large measure determine the quality of the future labor force and the demand for public services in key states of the country" (15).

Although completed education levels have risen over the past three decades, overall Latino educational attainment lags far behind other major racial and ethnic groups in the United States (Lowell and Suro, 2002; Chapa and De La Rosa, 2004). Latinos are least likely to enroll in college and most likely to drop out of high school and college (Kaufman, Alt, and Chapman, 2001). Over 70% of Latinos have a high school education or less, and most of those do not have a high school diploma (Chapa and De La Rosa, 2004).

The causes of low educational attainment among Latinos in the United States have been widely researched and debated among scholars in the last thirty years. Researchers have looked to language ability (Rumberger and Larson, 1998), native ethnicity (Cheng and Starks, 2002), generational differences (Rumberger, 1995; Wojtkiewicz and Donato, 1995; Zhou, 1997), immigrant status (Bean and Tienda, 1987), and segmented assimilation (Portes and Zhou, 1993)

to explain low levels of schooling among Latinos, particularly Latino immigrants. All of these factors likely contribute to low educational attainment. Our study is concerned with how location is playing a role in the education of Latino immigrants.

While the body of work on education in new immigrant destinations is small, the findings are consistent. Wainer (2001) identifies lack of parental involvement and appropriate teacher training, immigration status issues, and discrimination as primary challenges to be overcome with the influx of Latinos into public schools in the South, where many new destinations are located. Bohon, Macpherson, and Atiles (2005) concur, but expand the list of educational barriers to include lack of understanding about the U.S. school system, lack of residential stability, little school support for the specific needs of Latino students, few incentives for education continuation, and barred access to higher education. All of these factors seem to suggest a difficult educational environment in the new destinations.

Although the existence of these barriers has been established, no work, to date, examines whether or not these barriers have an appreciable impact on the educational attainment of Latino immigrants. Our research is concerned with whether or not educational attainment is different between established and new Latino destinations. We hypothesize that educational attainment in new and established Latino immigrant destinations will be significantly different. Drawing on the limited work on new destinations, which concentrates on the difficulties Latino immigrants encounter in them, we could conjecture that these immigrants in new destinations will have lower levels of educational attainment than those in established gateways. However, as we discuss below, currently held theories of racial and ethnic relations suggest that Latino immigrants in new destinations may have higher levels of attainment than Latino immigrants in established gateways.

EDUCATION BY GATEWAY TYPE

Previous work on emerging gateways (Hamann, Wortham, and Murillo, 2002; Singer, 2004) suggests that established immigrant gateways are more amenable to Latino immigrant educational success, at least in the short run. Educational attainment is related to immigrant integration and accomplishment in American society (Vernez, 1996), and work on emerging gateways implies that educational attainment is higher in the established Latino immigrant gateways than in the new ones. However, this hypothesis has not been tested systematically, and several theoretical works within the immigration and race literature lend themselves to the alternate hypothesis that Latino immigrants in new destinations will do better than those in established metros.

First, segmented assimilation theory argues that immigrant children are incorporated into one of three categories. They may be absorbed into the white middle-class or the poverty-stricken underclass, or they may consciously preserve their immigrant culture. Portes and Zhou (1993) underscore the importance of context in determining into what sector of American society an immigrant group incorporates. The combination of the receptiveness of government, presence or absence of prejudice, and strength or weakness of the co-ethnic community make up the core of the typology of modes of incorporation, which in large part determine how immigrants adapt to their new environments (Portes and Zhou, 1993).

Using this framework, we speculate that the receiving environments in new immigrant destinations are less hostile to new immigrants than some traditional gateways are, hence, Latino immigrants may adapt in ways that lend themselves to higher attainment. Group conflict theory (Bobo, 1988) posits that threat or simply perception of competition affects racial attitudes and preferences, and Neal and Bohon's (2003) findings in new immigrant gateways support the

theory that mere perception of economic threat might underlie anti-immigrant sentiments, even if such threat does not exist in reality. Since the new immigrant destinations are typically places with overall population growth (Suro and Singer, 2002) resulting from emerging economic opportunities (Butler, 1998; Guthey, 2001), this threat might not be as pervasive in the development of negative attitudes toward immigrants, including Latino immigrants.

Residents in new destinations may also lack preconceived notions about their new neighbors (Atiles and Bohon, 2002; Hamann, Wortham, and Murillo, 2002), so the immigrants may be less susceptible to the prejudice and discrimination that facilitates downward mobility in places such as East Los Angeles. This may be important for school success among immigrant children. Taylor (1998) found that whites' attitudes toward blacks varied with the local proportion of black residents, but that Latino presence did not have an effect on attitudes toward Latinos. Still, an analysis comparing these processes in receiving areas with substantially different immigration histories may yield varying results. As Latino presence throughout the country grows and they become a greater economic and political force (or threat to traditional power holders), Latinos' larger share of the local population could result in white attitudes toward Latinos and Latino immigrants that mimic those toward blacks.

In addition, although entrenched Latino communities may have stronger communities in terms of economic diversity and some material resources, immigrants to new destinations may place a higher value on education for upward mobility. Established Latino metropolitan areas have greater financial resources for new immigrants, but these resources may be related to opportunities that do not require high levels of education for success within the community, such as entrepreneurial business. Ogbu's (1978, 1991) theory of oppositional culture states minorities become academically disengaged because they believe their chances for educational success are

slim, and because a group stops believing that the system is working for them. The presence of these attitudes among several Latino and other immigrant groups in traditional gateways has been documented in the literature (Matute-Bianchi, 1986; 1991). Although the concept is controversial, if oppositional cultures exist, then the theory would suggest that Latinos in new destinations might fare better in school than those in established Latino metropolitan areas with oppositional cultures.

Finally, competition theory and the related literature on white flight also suggest the hypothesis that educational attainment may be higher in new destinations than in established metropolitan areas. Like black students who advance academically in integrated schools (Coleman et al., 1966), Latinos appear to fare better in majority white schools than in minority white schools (Hallinan, 1998). Yet many of the established Latino metropolitan areas have reached or are approaching the tipping points where white flight occurs (see Clotfelter, 2004). According to Hallinan (1998), when the population of a majority white school approaches 40% black, it quickly transitions to all black. Because the arrival of Latino immigrants is recent in new Latino destinations, the white flight that often results with the influx of an outgroup (Olzak, 1986; Andrews, 2002) in most places has not yet occurred. Since ethnic competition resulting in white flight from established Latino metropolitan areas (and local public schools) is not yet prevalent in schools located in new immigrant gateways, the loss of resources that tends to accompany white flight (Rossell and Hawley, 1981; Dawkins, 1983) is likely less prevalent in the new destinations. Consequently, Latino immigrant students may benefit from better opportunities in schools with more white students. By contrast, the schools in established Latino metropolitan areas are likely to have already undergone the processes of ethnic competition and

conflict. They are more likely to be segregated, and minority schools may not possess the resources that are available to Latino immigrants in new destinations that remain majority white.

While current data does not allow us to test these theories directly, they do allow us to understand how and why Latino educational attainment might differ between new and established Latino metropolitan areas. That is, Latino immigrants in new Latino destinations may escape some educational disadvantages that immigrants to established gateways experience. They may benefit from a lack of ingrained negativity regarding Latinos that affects established receiving areas (Atiles and Bohon, 2002; Hamann, Wortham, and Murillo, 2002) and better resources in their schools. Thus, they may be more likely to achieve higher levels of school completion than their counterparts in established Latino metros. On the other hand, given the many educational barriers in the new gateways, lower educational attainment could be expected in these areas.

DATA

Our research utilizes individual-level data extracted from the 5% Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample (IPUMS), based on findings from the 2000 Census (Ruggles et al., 2004). Respondents were selected from among the foreign-born population residing in "established Latino metropolitan areas" or "new immigrant destinations" as determined by Suro and Singer (2002). The categories are based on whether the metropolitan areas' Latino base population was greater or less than the eight percent national average in 1980 and whether Latino population growth was greater or less than the 145 percent average growth between 1980 and 2000 for the 100 largest U.S. metropolitan areas. Suro and Singer (2002) classify 16 metropolitan areas as established metros and 51 metropolitan areas as new immigrant destinations, and all are included in this analysis.

The sample is restricted to immigrants over the age of 25 who immigrated at or before age 12 and identified themselves as either Latino or Hispanic. The age cutoffs were selected because most people have completed their education by the age of 25 (or at least are in the final stages of their schooling), and it is a commonly used benchmark in educational attainment literature (Wojtkiewicz and Donato, 1995). Twelve is the highest age allowed at immigration, because immigrants who arrived in the United States after age 12 have already completed the bulk of their secondary schooling or have no schooling in the United States at all. These later age immigrants are likely to have many unmeasurable experiences that inform their educational outcomes (Wojtkiewicz and Donato, 1995). Therefore, their educational attainment is less likely to be a reflection of their new environment than their old one. Those who immigrate as younger children, however, are affected by the characteristics of their new home, and their educational attainment can be interpreted as a product of their American experience. The total sample size for this study is 32,361, of which 26,892 are residents of established Latino metropolitan areas and 5,469 are residents of new Latino destinations.

Educational attainment is completed level of schooling. This variable is coded on a 14-level scale ranging from no school completed to an earned doctorate. Metropolitan residence was coded (0,1) with 1 representing new Latino destinations. Other independent variables include age, sex, ethnicity, U.S. citizenship status, age at immigration, and ability to speak English. Age is a continuous variable. Ethnicity is categorized as Cuban, Mexican, and other with Cuban as the reference category, since Cubans have been found to have more education on average than other U.S. foreign-born Latinos (Portes and MacLeod, 1996). English fluency is categorized as "speaks English very well or speaks only English," "speaks English well," "does not speak English well," and "does not speak English at all" with "speaks English very well or

speaks only English" as the omitted category. U.S. citizenship status and sex are dichotomous variables with naturalized citizen and male coded as 1 (0 for all others).

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the characteristics of the sample by destination type including difference of proportions and means tests. Results of the *t*-test show that average educational attainment is lower in established destinations, while there are no significant differences between the two immigrant destination types in terms of age, age at immigration, or sex. Established metropolitan destinations are more Mexican, while Latino immigrants in new destinations are more likely to be U.S. citizens and to speak English fluently.

[Table 1 about here]

Findings from the *t*-test that mean educational attainment in new Latino destinations and established Latino metros are statistically different ($t=17.218$, $p<.001$) supports the initial hypothesis that educational attainment will vary significantly between destination types. The educational attainment of Latino immigrants in new destinations is, on average, .699 levels higher than the educational attainment of Latino immigrants in established destinations, consistent with race theories.

Although the mean difference is short of one complete education level, it is highly significant, and the difference may be quite meaningful given the level at which it falls. One point on our educational attainment scale is not simply one year of education; it represents a particular level of achievement reached. In real terms, a 9 represents attending the twelfth grade, but not graduating from high school, while a 10 represents earning a high school diploma or its equivalent. These differences represent an important educational benchmark in American society. The average Latino resident in the established Latino metropolitan area is just short of

achieving a high school diploma, while the average Latino resident in the new metropolitan area has a diploma and may have attended some college (11 on the educational attainment scale).

[Table 2 about here]

Table 2 shows the percentage of the sample completing five important educational benchmarks. Slightly less than 77% of Latino immigrants in new Latino destinations have earned at least a high school diploma, compared to 66.1% of Latino immigrants in established Latino metropolitan areas, while 23.5% of the sample in new destinations reported having a college degree, and only 13.5% of the sample in established metropolitan destinations reported having one. These data reveal an important fact—Latino immigrants in new destinations make up a disproportionately large share of the highest education levels and low share of the lowest levels. Although Latino immigrants in new destinations make up only 20.5% of the total sample, they account for 26.4% of all doctorates, 28.5% of all professional degrees, 24.6% of all master's degrees, and 26.2% of all bachelor's degrees in the sample. This suggests that either factors in new Latino gateways encourage high educational attainment or that highly educated Latinos are moving from traditional to emerging destinations. If the latter is the case, then traditional destinations are facing a significant brain drain that may have serious long-term consequences for their areas.

Of course, the differences in educational attainment may simply be due to differences in demographic characteristics between those Latino immigrants living in new destinations and those living in established metropolitan destinations. To test this, we employ OLS regression to determine what factors, if any, explain the variation in educational attainment in both types of receiving areas. Those findings are presented in Table 3.

[Table 3 about here]

The first model controls for age, sex, ethnicity and place of residence. As in the *t*-test, those in new Latino destinations demonstrate significantly higher levels of education, even when demographic factors are taken into account. Age and sex are also significant. Ethnicity is a particularly strong predictor of education levels. Mexican educational attainment is, on average, two and a third levels below Cuban ($p<.001$), while other Latino ethnic groups have average educational levels slightly more than one level below Cubans' average ($p<.001$). It is unfortunate that sample size limitations do not permit a more nuanced examination of the "other" category.

The second model controls for immigrant status; specifically, it includes variables for age at immigration, U.S. citizenship status, and ability to speak English. Even with the addition of these variables, Latino destination type remains significant in the model, which explains 55.2% of the variance in educational attainment. The other independent variables from Model 1 also remain significant except for sex. A crosstabulation of sex and U.S. citizenship (not shown) reveals that women are more likely than men to be citizens, which may explain why male becomes non-significant with the inclusion of the citizenship variable. Sixty-nine percent of women in the sample are U.S. citizens, while just 59% of men are.

The newly added variables (age at immigration, U.S citizenship, and English fluency) are also highly significant predictors of education levels. U.S. citizenship is the best proxy in the IPUMS data for desire to remain in the United States. This is critical, since many Latino immigrants only stay in this country temporarily. Although it is not known whether citizens were naturalized before or after they completed their education, U.S. citizenship is a positive predictor of educational attainment. Those with citizenship have about one more level of education than non-citizens.

English fluency has a monotonic relationship with education. Latino immigrants who speak English well are on average 1.6 educational attainment levels below those who speak very well ($p<.001$), while those who do not speak English well are nearly three educational attainment levels below the reference category on average ($p<.001$). The coefficient for not speaking English at all is very large and negative ($b=-3.856$, $p<.001$). These findings are to be expected as those with minimal English skills may find it very difficult to remain in school while others may speak minimal English because they did not attend much (or any) school in the United States.

To summarize our findings, all included variables are significant at the $p<.001$ level except sex. The factors that appear to have the greatest effect on educational attainment in the OLS regression models are ethnicity (relative to Cubans), U.S. citizenship, and ability to speak English. This suggests that Cubans, naturalized citizens, and those who speak English very well have considerably higher levels of education, regardless of where they live. More important for this study, however, is the fact that Latino residents in new Latino gateways have greater educational attainment than those in traditional gateways, consistent with various theories of race and immigrant incorporation.

Of course, the direction of causality remains unknown. Do emerging gateways offer an environment more conducive of high levels of education than traditional gateways, or are confounding events at play? One decidedly likely alternative is that highly educated Latinos living in traditional gateways choose to move to emerging gateways in response to increased economic opportunities offered in these areas.

To test this, we included a control for the interaction of current residence with place of residence five years earlier. To do this, we divided our sample into four categories: 1) those living in an established destination now who also resided in that metropolitan area five years

ago; 2) those living in an established destination who lived elsewhere five years ago; 3) those living in a new Latino destination now who also resided in that same metropolitan area five years ago; and 4) those living in a new Latino destination now who lived elsewhere five years ago. Using the first category as our reference, we included these factors as controls to our model, eliminating the new Latino destination variable due to collinearity. The findings are presented in Model 3.

Model 3 lends support to the notion that educational differences between new Latino destinations and emerging gateways may be the result of a selection effect. The findings show that only those immigrants who are relative newcomers to their new Latino destination have significantly higher educational attainment than those in established metropolitan areas. This suggests that more highly educated Latino immigrants are choosing new Latino destinations. At the minimum it shows that longer-term residents of the area are faring no better (in terms of educational levels) that those in established destinations.

The interactions tested in Model 3 offer an admittedly weak test for selection effects. In- and out-migration to and from destinations could have occurred more than five years prior. Additionally, our test does not control for previous destinations; newcomers to new Latino gateways could come from other new Latino destinations. In additional analysis (not shown), we examined the possibility of a selection effect two other ways. First, we replicated our analysis using only those immigrants between the ages of 25 and 35. This limits our sample to only those for whom contextual effects would be most salient (since older immigrants presumably have had more time to move around). The results of those findings show patterns similar to the findings presented in Table 3, with the important exception that living in a New Latino destination is not significant. In the model that includes the interaction term, the same pattern as with the full

sample emerges. This lends further support to our argument that a selection effect is responsible for education differences.

The second additional test we conducted involves a replication of our analysis using only U.S.-born Latinos in the same destinations. The results for this test were quite interesting. Those in emerging gateways, including those who lived in them five years earlier, have significantly higher educational levels than long-term residents in established destinations. Newcomers to traditional destinations also have higher than average educational levels compared to those long-term residents in these same locations ($p<.001$ for each). These findings are consistent with migration theories that suggest that the most educated are the most mobile (Shaw 1975). Additionally, our findings demonstrate that U.S.-born Latinos who live in emerging gateways have higher educational levels, regardless of their mobility. This is an interesting finding that requires further study.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Contrary to what existing research on new gateways implicitly suggests, the results presented here indicate that Latino immigrants in new immigrant destinations actually have higher average educational attainment than Latino immigrants in established gateways. The percentages of Latino immigrants completing certain educational benchmarks are markedly different between new and established immigrant gateways. The most striking benchmark is the difference between percentages of those earning a college degree: 23.5% in the new Latino destinations compared to 13.5% in the established Latino metropolitan areas. This suggests that Latinos in new immigrant destinations seem to have better educational attainment than their counterparts in established metropolitan areas.

The OLS regression models indicate that English proficiency, ethnicity, and U.S. citizenship are important and highly significant predictors of educational attainment in these immigrant gateways and account for a large portion of the effect of differential attainment in new and established Latino metros. However, it is notable that even in the full models, the variable for new Latino destination remains highly significant. Our results show that although individual characteristics account for a substantial amount of the variance in educational attainment, educational attainment remains higher in new Latino immigrant destinations.

Our findings suggest that Latino immigrants to new destinations may be advantaged (or, at least, less disadvantaged) by the smaller size and relative newness of the Latino populations there. Given their shorter history in the new destinations, they may be less subject to ingrained hostilities from non-Latino natives that lower educational aspirations and expectations. They may also be less likely to be attending racially segregated schools. These possibilities are important areas for future study, particularly those that focus on U.S.-born Latinos.

A more likely explanation, as indicated by our findings, is that immigrants to new destinations may be "innovators," while those to traditional destinations are not. Historically, human migration has generally occurred in networks. People travel to places that are close to their sending destinations and where there are the most people like them (Zipf, 1942). The geographic paradigm indicates that those people who move to places far away where there are few people like them are considerably different from other people (Shaw, 1975). They may be braver, more ambitious, and less tied to their traditional roots.

The new destinations offer a wealth of economic opportunities to new residents. It may be that these upwardly mobile innovators are willing to migrate to the metropolitan areas that are not firmly established as immigrant gateways. These Latino immigrants would also be more are

likely to pursue higher levels of education, because they are motivated to succeed in their new surroundings. Additionally, the best educated immigrants are most able to avail themselves of these opportunities. In short, new destinations are second destinations for highly-educated immigrants who received their school in traditional gateways. This research suggests that only the recent arrivals to the new Latino destinations actually demonstrate higher levels of education.

The value of this research is that is offers a systematic analysis of the difference between the two immigrant destination types and yields new findings about emerging immigrant destinations. Today, Latino immigrants in new Latino destinations have higher educational attainment than their counterparts in established Latino metropolitan areas. As the new destinations continue to swell with immigrants and Latino in-migrants, it will be interesting to see whether this trend persists over the long run.

REFERENCES

Andrews, Kenneth T. 2002. "Movement-Countermovement Dynamics and the Emergence of New Institutions: The Case of 'White Flight' Schools in Mississippi." *Social Forces* 80(3): 911-936.

Atiles, Jorge H. and Stephanie A. Bohon. 2002. "The Needs of Georgia's New Latinos: A Policy Agenda for the Decade Ahead." Carl Vinson Institute of Government, Athens, GA.

Atiles, Jorge H. and Stephanie A. Bohon. 2003. "*Camas Calientes:* Housing Adjustments and Barriers to Social and Economic Adaptation among Georgia's Rural Latinos." *Southern Rural Sociology,* 19(1): 97-122.

Bailey, Thomas and Roger Waldinger. 1991. "Primary, Secondary, and Enclave Labor Markets: A Training Systems Approach." American Sociological Review 56 (4): 432-445.

Bean, Frank D., and Marta Tienda. 1987. *The Hispanic Population of the United States.* New York: Russell Sage.

Bohon, Stephanie A., Heather MacPherson, and Jorge H. Atiles. 2005. "Educational Barriers for New Latinos in Georgia." *Journal of Latinos and Education*. 4(1): 43-58.

Butler, Pat. 1998. "Hispanics Add Another Thread to South Carolina's Cultural Fabric: Immigrant Population Outpaces State's General Growth." The State. Available online at http://www.thestate.com/mex/1.htm.

Chapa, Jorge and Belinda De La Rosa. 2004. "Latino Population Growth, Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, and Implications for Educational Attainment." *Education and Urban Society* 36:130-149.

Cheng, Simon, and Brian Starks. 2002. "Racial Differences in the Effects of Significant Others on Students' Educational Expectations." *Sociology of Education* 75:306-327.

Clotfelter, Charles T. 2004. *After Brown: The Rise and Retreat of School Desegregation.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Coleman, James, et al. 1966. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Dawkins, Marvin P. 1983. "Black Students' Occupational Expectations: A National Study of the Impact of School Desegregation." *Urban Education* 18:98-113.

Guthey, Greig, 2001. "Mexican Places in Southern Spaces" Globalization, Work, and Daily Life in and Aroung the North Georgia Poultry Industry." Pp57-67 in *Latino Workers in the Contemporary South*, edited by Arthur D. Murphy, Colleen Blanchard, and Jennifer A. Hill. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Hallinan, M. T. 1998. "Diversity effects on student outcomes: Social science evidence." *Ohio State Law Journal*. 59: 733-54.

Hamann, Edmund, Stanton Wortham, and Enrique Murillo. 2002. "Education and policy in the new Latino diaspora." Pp1-16 in *Education in the new Latino diaspora: Policy and the politics of identity*, edited by Edmund Hamann, Stanton Wortham, and Enrique Murillo. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Kaufman, Phillip, Martha Naomi Alt, and Christopher D. Chapman. 2001. "Dropout rates in the United States: 2000, NCES 2002-114." U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (ED 460 174), Washington, D.C.

Lowell, B. Lindsay and Roberto Suro. 2002. "The Improving Educational Profile of Latino Immigrants." Pew Latino Center, Washington, DC.

Matute-Bianchi, M. E. 1986. "Ethnic identities and patterns of school success and failure among Mexican-descent and Japanese-American students in a California high school: An ethnographic analysis." American *Journal of Education* 95: 233-255.

Matute-Bianchi, Maria E. 1991. "Situational Ethnicity and Patterns of School Performance Among Immigrants and Non-Immigrant Mexican-Descent Students." Pp. 205-247 in *Minority Status and Schooling: A Comparative Study of Immigrant and Involuntary Minorities,* edited by Margaret Gibson and John U. Ogbu. New York, NY: Garland.

Murillo, Enrique, Jr. and Sofia Villenas. 1997. "East of Aztlan: Typologies of Resistance in North Carolina Communities." Paper presented at "Reclaiming Voices: Ethnographic Inquiry and Qualitative Research in a Postmodern Age," Los Angeles.

National Center for Education Statistics. 2001. *Educational achievement and black-white inequality.* U.S. Department of Education.

Neal, Micki M. and Stephanie A. Bohon. 2003. "The Dixie Diaspora: Attitudes Toward Immigrants in Georgia." *Sociological Spectrum* 23 (2): 181-212.

Ogbu, John. 1978. *Minority Education and Caste*. New York: Academic Press.

Ogbu, John. 1991. "Immigrant and involuntary minorities in comparative perspective" Pp. 3-33 in M. Gibson & J. Ogbu (Eds.), *Minority status and schooling*. New York: Garland.

Olzak, Susan. 1986. "A Competition Model of Ethnic Collective Action in American Cities, 1877-1889" in *Competitive Ethnic Relations*, Susan Olzak and Joane Nagel, eds.

Peng, S.S. 1985. *High School Dropouts: A National Concern.* Washington, D.C: National Center for Education Statistics.

Portes, Alejandro and Dag MacLeod. 1996. "Educational Progress of Children of Immigrants: The Roles of Class, Ethnicity, and School Context." *Sociology of Education* 69:255-275.

Portes, A. and Zhou, M. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants." *The ANNALS of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 530:74-96.

Ross, Catherine E. and Chia-Ling Wu. 1996. "Education, Age, and the Cumulative Advantage in Health." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 37: 104-120.

Rossell, Christine H. and Willis D. Hawley. 1981. "Understanding White Flight and Doing Something About it." Pp. 157-84 in *Effective School Desegregations" Equitt, Quality, and Feasibility*, edited by Willis D. Hawley. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Steven Ruggles, Matthew Sobek, Trent Alexander, Catherine A. Fitch, Ronald Goeken, Patricia Kelly Hall, Miriam King, and Chad Ronnander. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 3.0* [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center [producer and distributor] 2004.

Ruben G. Rumbaut. 1997. "Ties that Bind: Immigration and Immigrant Families in the United States," in *International Migration and Family Change*, edited by Alan Booth, Ann C. Crouter, and Nancy S. Landale. New York: Lawrence Earlbaum.

Rumberger, R. W. 1995. "Dropping out of middle school: A multilevel analysis of students and schools." *American Educational Research Journal* 32: 583-625.

Rumberger, R. W., and Larson, K. A. 1998. "Student mobility and the increased risk of high school dropout." *American Journal of Education* 107(1): 1-35.

Shaw, R. Paul. 1975. *Migration Theory and Fact*. Philadelphia: Regional Science Research Institute.

Singer, Audrey. 2004. “The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways.” Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Suro, Roberto and Audrey Singer. 2002. "Latino Growth in Metropolitan America: Changing Patterns, New Locations." Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2000. 2000 Census of Population and Housing. Washington, D.C: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Vernez, George, and Allan Abrahamse. 1996. *How immigrants fare in U.S. education*. Santa Monica: Rand.

Wainer, Andrew. 2004. “The New Latino South and the Challenge to Public Education: Strategies for Educators and Policymakers in Emerging Immigrant Communities.” University of Southern California: Tomás Rivera Policy Institute.

Williams, Bellinda, ed. 2003. *Closing the Achievement Gap: A Vision for Changing Beliefs and Practices*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wojtkiewicz, Roger A. and Katharine M. Donato. 1995. "Latino Educational Attainment: The Effects of Family Background and Nativity." *Social Forces* 74:559-574.

Zhou, Min. 1997. "Growing up American: The Challenge Confronting Immigrant Children and Children of Immigrants." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23:63-95.

Zipf, George Kingsley. 1942. “The P1P2/D Hypothesis: On the Intercity Movement of Persons.” *American Sociological Review* 11:677-686.

Table 1. Characteristics of the Sample, by Destination

	New Latino Destinations	Established Destinations†
Average education	9.28	8.58***
	(2.91)	(2.93)
Average age	37.3	37.3
	(9.6)	(10.9)
Average age at U.S. entry	6.9	6.9
	(3.7)	(3.7)
Percent male	50.8	48.6
Latino ethnicity		
Percent Mexican	28.3	55.7***
Percent Cuban	25.2	16.8***
Percent Other	46.5	27.5***
Percent U.S. citizen	68.6	62.8***
Ability to speak English		
Percent "very well"	77.8	71.5***
Percent "well"	13.2	17.5***
Percent "not well"	6.7	7.8***
Percent "not at all"	2.3	3.2***
Percent in established area five years ago		24.6
Percent in established area; elsewhere five years ago		54.9
Percent in emerging area five years ago	6.0	
Percent in emerging area; elsewhere five years ago	14.5	
n	6,530	25,374

†*t*-test relative to new destinations: **p*<.05; ***p*<.01; ****p*<.001(standard deviations in parentheses).

Table 2. Percent of Latino Immigrants Completing Educational Levels, by Place

	Destination Type	
Highest education level completed	New	Established
Less than ninth grade	9.5	13.1
Some high school, no diploma	13.9	20.8
High school diploma or equivalent	21.7	23.7
Some college, no 4-year degree	31.4	28.9
4-year college degree or more	23.5	13.5

Table 3. Educational Attainment in Traditional and Emerging Gateways for Immigrant Latinos: Regression Coefficients shown (standard errors in parentheses)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Main effects:			
New Latino Destination	.257***	.195***	
	(.039)	(.035)	
Age	-.027***	-.032***	-.032***
	(.001)	(.001)	(.001)
Male	-1.63***	-.039	-.039
	(.031)	(.028)	(.028)
Latino Ethnicity			
Cuban	REF	REF	REF
Mexican	-2.359***	-1.492***	-1.489***
	(.043)	(.039)	(.040)
Other Latino	-1.055***	-.515***	-.513***
	(.046)	(.041)	(.041)
Age at immigration		-.049***	-.049***
		(.004)	(.004)
U.S. Citizen		1.078***	1.077***
		(.031)	(.031)
Ability to speak English			
Not at all		-3.856***	-3.858***
		(.083)	(.083)
Not well		-2.827***	-2.828***
		(.054)	(.054)
Well		-1.602***	-1.603***
		(.038)	(.038)
Very well		REF	REF
Interaction effects:			
In established area five years ago			REF
In established area; elsewhere five years ago			.007
			(.035)
In emerging area five years ago			.099
			(.064)
In emerging area; elsewhere five years ago			.241***
			(.047)
Constant	11.282***	11055***	11.055***
n	31,904	31,904	31,904
R^2	.111	.552	.305

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001