THE ENROLLMENT AND ATTAINMENT OF HISPANIC YOUTH IN THE NEW SETTLEMENT AREAS

March 3, 2008

Richard Fry
Pew Hispanic Center
Washington, DC
rfry@pewhispanic.org

---

*The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Pew Hispanic Center or The Pew Charitable Trusts. Prepared for presentation at "The Immigration Process and Children's Outcomes in Origins and Destinations" session at the 2008 Population Association of America meetings. I appreciate the comments of Isabel Ruiz on an earlier draft as well as participants at an NEA-sponsored session at the American Allied Social Science Association meetings.

Richard FRY, *The Enrollment And Attainment of Hispanic Youth in the New Settlement Areas*, Pew Hispanic Center, 1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036

Since 1990 the Hispanic population has dispersed to nontraditional places. Using Census data, this analysis documents the growth of Hispanic adolescents in new settlement areas versus traditional Hispanic metros and then carefully examines the trends in some of the basic educational outcomes of Hispanic teens. Similar to white and black youth, Hispanic teens educated in traditional Hispanic areas have improved their likelihood of completing high school. There has not been comparable progress for Hispanic youth in the new settlement areas. Controlling for the differing characteristics of Hispanics in traditional Hispanic areas versus new Latino locations attenuates the lack of progress, but it remains the case that Hispanic youth suffer a penalty from residing in a new settlement metro. Latinos in the new settlement metros are estimated to be about 34 percent less likely to finish high school than similar Latinos in the traditional, established Latino communities. However, the penalty for residing in a new settlement area is not confined to Hispanic youth. NonHispanics in new settlement areas also have less favorable educational outcomes than their nonHispanic counterparts in the traditional Hispanic metros and this disparity is already apparent in 1980. Rather than an issue of immigrant adaptation *per se*, the subpar outcomes of Hispanic youth in their new school communities also reflect broad, long-standing geographic disparities in education.

Keywords: Hispanic, education, attainment, dropout, dispersion
JEL-Code: I21, J11, J15

The Enrollment and Attainment of Hispanic Youth in the New Settlement Areas

Aside from the extraordinary growth of Hispanics, the dispersion of the Hispanic population has received considerable attention. Often referred to as the "new Latino diaspora," "Hispanics unprecendented geographic dispersion to new urban destinations" has been duly documented (Fischer and Tienda, 2006). Driven by the immigration of foreign-born Hispanics, the most salient aspects of the diaspora are likely to be found among Hispanic adult outcomes.[1] Nevertheless, the diaspora has had large impacts on the distribution of Hispanic children and some public schools in the new settlement areas have experienced tremendous growth in Hispanic enrollments. Public schools in the South, the heartland, and the Pacific Northwest are now educating large numbers of Latino youth. Fifteen years ago these schools and districts had very little exposure to the opportunities and challenges of educating Hispanic youth.

An established case-study literature developed by ethnograhers and education researchers asserts that generally Hispanic youth are faring poorly in the schools serving the "newcomer Latinos." In regard to education in the new Latino South, "Latino public education in emerging immigrant communities has been quite troubled (Wainer, 2004)." This assessment refers to a "crisis in Latino education in the South" that "is widely recognized by scholars and educators alike." Similarly, ethnographers synthesize that "few Latino Diaspora schools so far are able to help Latino schoolchildren overcome the economic and social barriers they face (Hamman, Wortham, and Murillo, 2001)."

Formal empirical analysis of Hispanic educational outcomes in the new settlement areas has been sparse. Stamps and Bohon (2006) investigate the educational attainment of Hispanic immigrants over the age of 25 that arrived in the U.S. during their childhood and hence were U.S. educated. They find that Hispanics in new gateways have higher educational attainment than Hispanics in established gateways. This evidence is only suggestive of Hispanics experience in new settlement areas since adult Hispanics residing in new settlement areas need not have been educated in new settlement schools. It is also does not address the largest group of Hispanic children, those that are U.S. born.

[1] In regard to Mexican immigrants in new settlement areas, Durand, Massey, and Capoferro (2005) indicate that initially the migration was composed of working-age men whose families had not migrated.

Nationally, four-of-five Hispanic school-age children were born in the United States (not including U.S. outlying areas).

This analysis examines important educational outcomes of Hispanic teens in new Latino destinations compared to traditional Hispanic destinations. One innovation is that we examine not just the most recent crosssection of data but examine the trends for the last quarter century. This allows us to establish whether Hispanics have always fared comparatively worse in their educational outcomes in the new Latino public schools and assess whether current outcomes in new settlement areas can be attributable to, or might be related to, the large Hispanic (and nonHispanic) growth that has occurred since 1990. A second innovation is to examine the outcomes of nonHispanic teens in the new settlement areas as well as the outcomes of Hispanic teens. Are the educational outcomes of Hispanic youth in new settlement areas distinct or confined to Hispanic youth or are they simply symptomatic of the educational outcomes of all teens educated in new settlement schools? Examination of the historical and cross group outcomes can help us to understand whether policy responses should distinctly concentrate on Latino youth and reflect specific difficulties in the adaptation of schools and communities to Latino immigrants or whether the relatively poor educational outcomes of Hispanic youth in their new schools simply reflect long-standing educational shortcomings in these areas of the country.

Hispanic Youth in New Settlement Areas

Youth outcomes in this analysis are partitioned into three basic geographic areas: new settlement metro areas, traditional Hispanic metro areas, and other Hispanic metro areas. Hispanics are heavily concentrated in 100 metropolitan areas (Fischer and Tienda, 2006) and this analysis examines youth outcomes in the metro areas with the 100 largest Hispanic public school enrollments (Appendix Table 3). Hispanic public school enrollments in the 33 new settlement areas grew very quickly during the 1990s. At minimum Hispanic enrollments at least doubled since the 1993-94 school year and in many instances Hispanic enrollments more than quadrupled over 10 years in the new settlement areas. In contrast, Hispanic enrollments in the 44 traditional metropolitan areas in California, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, as well as New York, Miami and

Chicago grew but did not double since the 1993-94 school year. Hispanic public school enrollments in the 23 "other Hispanic" metros also grew at a more modest pace since the 1993-94 school year.

This paper's universe is all youth, not students enrolled in public schools. Table 1 reveals that the growth patterns of Hispanic 15-to-17 year-olds mirror Hispanic public school enrollments. Nationally the number of Hispanic teens has more than doubled since 1980. Though schools in the traditional metro areas such as Los Angeles and Houston continued to educate the bulk of Hispanic teens in 2006 (64%), the number of Hispanic teens in new settlement areas has grown at a much higher rate. Hispanic teens more than quintupled in number in the new settlement areas since 1980. In 1980 5 percent of Hispanic 15-to-17 year-olds resided in the new settlement metros. By 2006 13 percent of such youth resided in these 33 metros.

New settlement metros not only educated growing numbers of Hispanic youth but white, black and Asian youth as well. Many other parts of the country had declining white teen populations and black teen populations that remained stable in size over the 26 years.

Much of the growth of Hispanic teens in the new settlement areas has been youth of Mexican origin. Teens of Mexican origin accounted for 6-out-of-10 of the additional Latino teens in new settlement areas since 1980. However, perhaps reflecting the concentration of traditional Hispanic metros in the southwest and greater proximity to Mexico, teens of Mexican origin accounted for more of the Hispanic youth growth in the traditional Hispanic areas than the new settlement areas. By 2006, nearly 70 percent of the Hispanic teens in traditional Hispanic metros were of Mexican origin, whereas 60 percent of the Hispanic youth in the new settlement metros were of Mexican origin.

Data Source and Measuring Educational Outcomes

The analysis in this paper examines Census data (decennial Census and the American Community Survey (ACS)) since 1980. Although some of the Census questions have remained unchanged since 1980, there have been changes in some of the interview questions pertinent to this analysis. The Data Appendix discusses the data sources and comparability issues in greater detail. Appendix Table 1 reports the sample

sizes for a representative group analyzed. Though the number of Asian youth in the new settlement metros was not plentiful in 1980, for the other major racial/ethnic groups the Census has very large numbers of youth.

The educational outcomes captured in the Census are limited. But two basic and important educational measures can be constructed. The measures are related but conceptually distinct. The first measure is the high school dropout rate. Discussions of Hispanic schooling have long been dominated by the elevated dropout rate of Hispanic youth. The dropout rate examined herein is the status high school dropout rate or the fraction of youth at the date of interview that were not enrolled in school and had not completed high school.[2]

The large sample sizes available in Census data enable status dropout rates to be calculated for narrow age ranges of youth. Following Hirschman (2001), the dropout rate is tabulated for 15-to-17 year-olds. This is the age range that we typically expect youth to be enrolled in high school. Furthermore, this analysis focuses on Hispanic youth outcomes. Some foreign-born Hispanic youth recently arrived in the United States and they may never have enrolled in U.S. schools since arrival. These youth were educated abroad and their characteristics are not a reflection of their experience in U.S. schools. It is not possible to pristinely identify foreign-born teens that have never "dropped in" to U.S. schools since the Census does not ask whether foreign-born persons have ever been enrolled in U.S. schools. However, the prevalence of recently arrived youth and recently arrived youth that have never been enrolled in U.S. schools is minimized by examining younger youth.

The second measure examined is the high school completion rate of 18-to-19 year-olds. I follow National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) practice and tabulate the status completion rate for 18-to-19 year-olds that were not enrolled in elementary or secondary school at the date of interview. The high school completion rate is the fraction of youth that have left high school and have completed high school either by receiving a high school diploma or a General Educational Development (GED)

[2] The status dropout rate is one of three dropout rate measures published by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2007). The Census Bureau also publishes status dropout rate measures (Census Bureau, 2003).

certificate. Presently Census-based measures of high school completion can not distinguish between graduation with a diploma and GED receipt.[3]

High school completion rates tabulated in the Census tend to be lower than the rate published by the NCES. NCES rates utilize the Current Population Survey. Part of the explanation for the discrepancy may be the different universes of the survey. Census data includes all resident youth. The Current Population Survey is restricted to civilian, non-institutionalized youth.

Dropping out and Attainment of Hispanic Youth in the New Settlement Metros

At the national level dropout rates have markedly fallen and they have declined for youth of all racial/ethnic origins. Table 2 reports that dropout rates have declined at least 50 percent at the national level since 1980 for each group of youth.[4] Since 1990 the school enrollment patterns of Hispanic youth in new settlement areas have diverged from Hispanic youth residing in the traditional Hispanic metros. In the 1990s the Hispanic dropout rate rose in new settlement areas while continuing to decline in traditional Hispanic areas. From 1990 to 2006 the Hispanic dropout rate fell 64 percent in traditional Hispanic areas but only declined by 38 percent in new settlement areas.

An explanation for the lack of progress of Hispanic youth in new settlement areas since 1990 is that the influx of Hispanic youth in these areas was due to recently arrived foreign-born youth who tend to have much higher dropout rates. While compositional change might have contributed to the relatively poor outcomes of Hispanic youth in new settlement areas since 1990, it is not likely that immigration is the sole factor. The lower panel of Table 2 reports dropout rates for "U.S. educated" youth, i.e., youth that were either native-born or arrived in the U.S. early in their childhood. The dropout rate for U.S. educated Hispanics fell by 63 percent since 1990 in the traditional Hispanic metros but only by 33 percent in the new settlement areas.

Similar geographic trends are apparent in Hispanic high school completion rates. In 1990, 58 percent of Hispanic 18-to-19 year-olds in new settlement metros had

[3] Beginning in 2008, the ACS will distinguish between regular high school graduation and GED receipt.
[4] The official dropout series published by the National Center for Education Statistics shows a similar decline. For example, the dropout rate for white 16-to-24 year-olds declined from 11.4% in 1980 to 6.0% in 2005 (NCES, 2007).

completed high school (Table 3). Among their peers in traditional Hispanic metros, 59 percent had finished high school. The similarity in outcomes dissipated since then. In 2006 77 percent of Latinos in traditional Hispanic areas had finished high school, compared with 64 percent of Latinos in new settlement areas.[5] The 1990s particularly stand out as a difficult period for Latino youth in new settlement areas. The completion rate dipped from 58 percent to 45 percent from 1990 to 2000 for Latino youth in new settlement areas while the completion rate remained quite stable for other youth over the 1990s.

The lower completion rates for Hispanic youth in new settlement areas is apparent among U.S. educated Hispanic teens. In 1990 U.S. educated Latino teens completed high school at a 70 percent rate regardless of whether they resided in a new settlement metro or traditional Hispanic area. By 2006 82 percent of U.S. educated Hispanic teens residing in traditional Hispanic areas were high school completers, but only 76 percent of similar teens in new settlement areas.

Completion rates are particularly lagging among youth of Mexican Hispanic origin in the new settlement areas. In 2006 75 percent of Mexican origin youth in the traditional Hispanic areas have finished high school. In comparison, 56 percent of their peers in the new settlement areas have completed high school.

How much do Youth and Family Characteristics Account For?

Since 1990 Hispanic youth residing in new settlement areas have fared relatively poorly in their educational outcomes. In terms of dropout rates, more Latino youth in the new settlement metros were staying in school in 2006 compared to 1990. But their counterparts educated in the traditional Hispanic areas made much greater progress. Dropout rates among Latino youth in traditional Hispanic areas fell by more than 50 percent since 1990, with much of the reduction occurring during the 1990s. In regard to attainment of a high school credential, almost two-thirds of Hispanic youth in new

[5] The large increase in completion rates nationally from 2000 to 2006 leads one to ask whether the American Community Survey (ACS) is comparable to the 2000 Decennial Census. The trend for all the years from 2000 to 2006 suggests that it is. The ACS from 2001 to 2005 only covered the household population. The white high school completion rate for 18-to-19 year-olds residing in households was 81% in the 2000 Census. The trend in the ACS for this same rate was 82% in 2001, 83% in 2002, 85% in 2003, 87% in 2004, 87% in 2005, and 88% in 2006. The increase was not discontinuous between 2000 and 2001 but rather has occurred smoothly from 2000 to 2006.

settlement metros finished high school in 2006. This is an improvement from 1990, but, again, progress is lacking in comparison to traditional Hispanic areas. Hispanic youth in the traditional Hispanic areas increased their completion rate by more than 15 percentage points since 1990.

Multivariate analysis of both dropping out and high school completion reveals that some of the lack of educational progress in the new settlement areas can be attributed to differences in the characteristics of Hispanic youth in the new settlement areas compared to traditional Hispanic areas.[6] Table 4 reports the results of logistic regressions where the dependent variable is alternatively dropping out of school in the upper panel and attainment of a high school credential in the lower panel. These logistic regressions do not pool the four crosssections. Rather a separate logistic regression was estimated for each year. In this first set of results only Hispanic youth were included in the estimation.

Table 4 only reports the logistic results for the key variable of interest, a dummy variable for residence in a new settlement metro. The omitted geographic category is residence in a traditional Hispanic area, so the results on the new settlement dummy are relative to the outcome of a similar Hispanic teen residing in a traditional Hispanic metro.[7] Table 4 reports the odds-ratio or the likelihood of the outcome occurring relative to the likelihood of it occurring in the omitted category. So, for example, the second row reports the odds ratio on the new settlement dummy in the simplest specification that only additionally controls the teen's age and gender. The 1980 estimate of 1.167 in the upper panel indicates that Hispanic 15-to-17 year olds in new settlement areas were about 16.7 percent more likely to dropout of school than Hispanic 15-to-17 year-olds of the same age and gender residing in traditional Hispanic areas.

The results for the simplest specification controlling for age and gender replicates the patterns observed for the rates in Tables 2 and 3. In 1990 Hispanic youth residing new settlement areas were about 15 percent more likely to dropout of school than their traditional Hispanic counterparts and statistically just as likely to complete high school.

[6] Descriptive statistics for youth residing in new settlement metros and traditional Hispanic metros (in 2006) are reported in Appendix Table 2.

[7] Only youth residing in the 100 metropolitan areas examined in this analysis are included in the samples for the results reported in Table 4. Geographic dummies include residence in a new settlement metro and residence in one of the other 23 metros. Residence in one of the 44 traditional Hispanic metros is the omitted category. Youth not residing in one of the 100 included metros are excluded from the analysis.

By 2000 a major deterioration in their educational outcomes occurred. They were twice as likely to dropout and they were 44 percent less likely than their traditional Hispanic peers to complete high school.

The third row of each panel reports the odds-ratio from a fuller model of the determinants of dropping out and completion. The model includes a standard set of correlates including nativity, recency of arrival among foreign-born youth, the number of parents in the household, education level of the household head, household poverty status, if the youth has ever been married, whether the female is a parent, number of siblings in the household, and Hispanic origin group identity, as well as age and gender. Hirshman (2001) estimates a very similar model in his classic study of school enrollment of foreign-born youth. Introducing controls for the youth's characteristics reduces the magnitude of the new settlement effects, but they remain quite sizable. In 1990 Hispanic youth are estimated to be 19 percent more likely to dropout than their peers in traditional Hispanic areas. In 2006 they are 64 percent more likely to dropout. In terms of high school completion, in 1990 new settlement Hispanics were 21 percent less likely to finish compared to Hispanics educated in traditional Hispanic metros. By 2006 they are 34 percent less likely to complete.

Hispanic youth in new settlement areas do have different characteristics than their traditional Hispanic area counterparts, but accounting for these differences we still observe a significant deterioration in Latino educational outcomes in new settlement areas relative to traditional Hispanic metros since 1990.

Is the Lack of Progress Unique to Latinos?

The adverse effects of being educated in a new settlement area have increased since 1990, but are these effects confined to Hispanic youth? Table 5 reports the results of a logistic regression analysis estimated utilizing youth of all racial/ethnic identities, not just Hispanic youth. Results for the full model specification are reported in Table 5. Again, only the results for the key variable of interest, the new settlement metro dummy, are reported. In this specification, dummy variables for the major racial/ethnic identities are included and nonHispanic white youth are the omitted racial/ethnic category. So the odds ratios on the new settlement metro dummy reflect the estimated effect of residence

in a new settlement metro area, relative to residing in a traditional Hispanic area, for white youth. Interaction terms of Hispanic origin and the new settlement metro dummy capture whether the new settlement metro effect differs for Hispanic youth from white youth.

Table 5 shows that outcomes for all youth have been less favorable in new settlement metros compared to traditional Hispanic areas. In 1990 white youth were 31 percent more likely to dropout in new settlement areas and 29 percent less likely to complete high school. By 2000 whites in new settlement areas were 71 percent more likely to drop out and 38 percent less likely to complete high school. The logit analysis does not present strong evidence however that Hispanic youth experienced a greater penalty for residing in a new settlement metro than white youth. The Hispanic interaction terms in the high school completion models are statistically insignificant and thus in relative terms Hispanic youth were faring no worse from residing in a new settlement area than white youth were. The evidence from dropping out is mixed. In 2000 the Hispanic interaction term is statistically insignificant. However, in 2006 the estimated penalty for residing in a new settlement area for white 15-to-17 year-olds is estimated to be about 31 percent, whereas Hispanic youth in the most recent crosssection experienced a new settlement penalty of about 64 percent. What is clear from Table 5 is that new settlement areas have had longstanding difficulties (relative to traditional Hispanic metros) educating both white and Hispanic youth and these difficulties predate the population boom in the new settlement areas since 1990.

Conclusion

The growing literature on Hispanics in new settlement areas has called attention to the poor educational outcomes of Latino youth in their new school communities. The most recent Census data indeed suggest that the basic high school enrollment and completion rates of Latino youth are below average in new settlement areas. Latino youth in new settlement areas have not experienced the degree of progress of their Hispanic counterparts in the traditional Hispanic areas. However the lack of educational progress experienced by Latinos in the new settlement schools appears not to be confined to Hispanic youth. All youth in the new settlement areas do not go as far educationally as

their counterparts in the traditional Hispanic areas. The evidence is mixed on whether the educational penalty for residing in a new settlement areas has grown worse over time, making it difficult to draw inferences as to whether the influx of youth (black, Asian, and white as well as Hispanic) into the new settlement areas since 1990 has hampered the educational outcomes of youth in these areas. But the 1980 data indicate that as far back as 25 years ago youth in new settlement areas were not faring as well as their counterparts in the traditional Hispanic areas, suggestive of long-standing educational disparities along geographic lines rather than racial/ethnic lines.

Table 1. 15-to-17 Year-old Population by Race/ethnicity, Mexican Origin, and Hispanic Settlement, 1980 to 2006

Group	1980	1990	2000	2006	Percent Change 1980 to 2006
			nation as a whole		
Hispanic	970,060	1,134,990	1,771,648	2,225,886	129
White	9,432,140	6,963,167	7,730,550	8,002,253	-15
Black	1,797,200	1,486,341	1,756,491	2,060,994	15
Asian	172,060	326,199	464,986	521,817	203
American Indian/Alaska Native	102,000	97,795	122,911	118,597	16
other	10,840	13,776	21,831	41,570	283
TOTAL	12,480,000	10,020,000	11,870,000	12,970,000	4
			new settlement metros		
Hispanic	52,940	76,095	197,489	291,554	451
White	1,158,740	942,819	1,281,617	1,394,261	20
Black	251,040	247,867	358,473	463,230	85
Asian	18,320	46,027	74,012	94,936	418
			Traditional Hispanic metros		
Hispanic	618,800	760,945	1,149,654	1,422,286	130
White	1,700,900	1,145,214	1,376,915	1,479,034	-13
Black	484,000	382,401	462,538	534,227	10
Asian	83,060	166,746	256,550	281,843	239
			other metros		
Hispanic	56,720	62,376	114,528	142,473	151
White	941,280	622,594	753,883	810,779	-14
Black	186,840	157,001	179,644	221,470	19
Asian	8,860	19,989	33,386	36,515	312
Mexican-origin Hispanic					
new settlement metros	31,000	44,498	116,413	176,724	470
Traditional Hispanic metros	375,780	508,286	739,806	982,376	161
other metros	20,280	21,264	38,020	49,600	145

Source: 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census and 2006 American Community Survey (ACS) Integrated Public Use Micro Samples

Table 2. High School Dropout Rate of 15-to-17 Year-olds (in percent)

Group	1980	1990	2000	2006
nation as a whole				
Hispanic	14	11	9	5
White	7	6	3	3
Black	8	8	4	4
Asian	4	4	2	2
new settlement metros				
Hispanic	16	13	14	8
White	8	6	3	3
Black	8	9	4	3
Asian	5	4	2	1
Traditional Hispanic metros				
Hispanic	14	11	8	4
White	6	5	2	2
Black	7	8	4	3
Asian	4	4	2	1
other metros				
Hispanic	15	13	11	7
White	5	5	3	3
Black	7	8	4	5
Asian	7	4	4	4
US Educated				
new settlement metros				
Hispanic	14	9	7	6
White	8	6	3	3
Black	8	9	4	3
Asian	4	3	2	1
Traditional Hispanic metros				
Hispanic	12	8	5	3
White	6	5	2	2
Black	8	8	4	3
Asian	3	3	1	1
other metros				
Hispanic	15	11	8	7
White	5	5	3	3
Black	7	8	4	5
Asian	6	2	4	1
Mexican origin Hispanic				
new settlement metros	21	16	19	9
Traditional Hispanic metros	16	12	9	5
other metros	16	14	17	8
non Mexican origin Hispanic				
new settlement metros	10	8	8	7
Traditional Hispanic metros	11	9	5	4
other metros	14	12	8	7

Source: 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census and 2006 American Community Survey (ACS) Integrated Public Use Micro Samples

Note: "U.S. educated" refers to youth born in the United States and foreign-born youth that arrived in the U.S. more than 10 years before the date of interview.

Table 3. NCES High School Completion Rates of 18-to-19 Year-olds (in percent)

Group	1980	1990	2000	2006
nation as a whole				
Hispanic	57	60	57	74
White	81	86	85	91
Black	70	75	72	82
Asian	87	91	90	96
new settlement metros				
Hispanic	59	58	45	64
White	79	84	83	90
Black	70	75	73	84
Asian	84	90	86	94
Traditional Hispanic metros				
Hispanic	55	59	60	77
White	83	88	89	93
Black	70	75	74	83
Asian	88	91	91	96
other metros				
Hispanic	57	62	55	72
White	85	88	88	92
Black	66	70	71	80
Asian	83	92	92	96
US Educated				
new settlement metros				
Hispanic	63	70	62	76
White	79	84	83	90
Black	70	75	73	83
Asian	89	93	87	95
Traditional Hispanic metros				
Hispanic	62	70	70	82
White	83	88	89	93
Black	70	75	74	83
Asian	93	94	93	97
other metros				
Hispanic	59	66	63	78
White	85	88	88	92
Black	66	70	71	79
Asian	89	96	92	97
Mexican origin Hispanic				
new settlement metros	45	50	38	56
Traditional Hispanic metros	51	56	57	75
other metros	53	64	47	62
non Mexican origin Hispanic				
new settlement metros	80	70	60	77
Traditional Hispanic metros	63	67	67	80
other metros	59	61	59	78

Source: 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census and 2006 American Community Survey (ACS) Integrated Public Use Micro Samples

Note: "U.S. educated" refers to youth born in the United States and foreign-born youth that arrived in the U.S. more than 10 years before the date of interview.

Table 4. Logistic Odds Ratios on New Settlement Metro Area Residence[a]

	1980	1990	2000	2006
	High School Dropout of Hispanic 15-to-17 Year-olds			
N	36,423	44,038	71,448	16,462
Controlling for Age and Gender	1.167**	1.145*	1.988**	1.772**
Controlling for Age, Gender, and Immigrant Status[b]	1.233**	1.138*	1.662**	1.524**
Full Model Specification[c]	1.381**	1.188**	1.661**	1.637**
	High School Completion of Hispanic 18-to-19 Year-olds			
N	18,464	22,587	35,400	7,274
Controlling for Age and Gender	1.189**	0.932	0.568**	0.585**
Controlling for Age, Gender, and Immigrant Status	1.170**	0.935	0.694**	0.727**
Full Model Specification	0.871	0.793**	0.694**	0.663**

Source: 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census and 2006 American Community Survey (ACS) Integrated Public Use Micro Samples

Notes: *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$

[a]The omitted category is residence in a traditional Hispanic metro area.

[b]Refers to early childhood arrival and recent arrival for the foreign born (native-born being omitted category)

[c]Includes controls for age, gender, immigrant status, parent presence in the household, education of the household head, poverty status, youth ever married, female parenthood, number of siblings, and Hispanic origin subgroup identity.

Table 5. Logistic Odds Ratios on New Settlement Metro Area Residence[a] Estimated Using all Youth

	1980	1990	2000	2006
	High School Dropout of 15-to-17 Year-olds			
N	276,666	216,728	295,292	66,615
Full Model Specification[c]				
New Settlement Metro Effect	1.341**	1.305**	1.709**	1.305**
New Settlement Metro Effect*Hispanic	1.031	0.928	1.013	1.313*
	High School Completion of 18-to-19 Year-olds			
N	127,733	102,564	110,325	23,936
Full Model Specification				
New Settlement Metro Effect	0.840**	0.714**	0.624**	0.647**
New Settlement Metro Effect*Hispanic	1.104	1.078	0.993	0.939

Source: 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census and 2006 American Community Survey (ACS) Integrated Public Use Micro Samples

Notes: $^{*}p < .05$, **p < .01

[a]The omitted category is residence in a traditional Hispanic metro area.

[b]Refers to early childhood arrival and recent arrival for the foreign born (native-born being omitted category)

[c]Includes controls for age, gender, immigrant status, parent presence in the household, education of the household head, poverty status, youth ever married, female parenthood, number of siblings, and race/ethnicity.

References

Betts, Julian R., and Magnus Lofstrom. 2000. "The Educational Attainment of Immigrants: Trends and Implications," in *Issues in the Economics of Immigration*, edited by George J. Borjas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boggess, Scott, and Nikki L. Graf. Undated. Measuring Education: A Comparison of the Decennial Census and the American Community Survey, mimeo, Washington, D.C.: Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau. Available at http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/ACS/finalboggesspaper.pdf.

Durand, Jorge, Douglas S. Massey, and Chiara Capoferro, 2005. "The New Geography of Mexican Immigration," in *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*, edited by Victor Zuniga and Ruben Hernandez-Leon. New York, N.Y.: Russell Sage Foundation.

Fischer, Mary J., and Marta Tienda, 2006. "Redrawing Spatial Color Lines: Hispanic Metropolitan Dispersal, Segregation, and Economic Opportunity," in *Hispanics and the Future of America*, edited by Marta Tienda and Faith Mitchell. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.

Hamann, Edmund T., Stanton Wortham, and Enrique G. Murrillo, Jr. "Education and Policy in the New Latino Diaspora," in *education in the New Latino Diaspora: Policy and the Politics of Identity*, edited by Stanton Wortham, Enrique G. Murrillo, and Edmund T. Hamann. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Hirschman, Charles, 2001. "The Educational Enrollment of Immigrant Youth: A Test of the Segmented-Assimilation Hypothesis," *Demography*, August, pages 317-336.

Jaeger, David A. 1997. "Reconciling the Old and New Census Bureau Education Questions: Recommendations for Researchers," *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, vol. 15, no. 3, July.

National Center for Education Statistics. 2007. *Dropout Rates in the United States: 2005*. NCES 2007-059. Washington, D.C.: NCES.

Stamps, Katherine, and Stephanie Bohon. 2006. "Educational Attainment in New and Established Latino Metropolitan Destinations," paper presented at the 2006 Population Association of America meetings, Los Angeles, CA.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2003. *School Enrollment: 2000*. August. Census 2000 Brief C2KBR-26. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.

Vernez, Georges, and Allan Abrahamse. 1996. *How Immigrants Fare in U.S. Education*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Wainer, Andrew. 2004. *The New Latino South and the Challenge to Public Education: Strategies for Educators and Policymakers in Emerging Immigrant Communities*. Los Angeles, CA: Tomas Rivera Policy Institute

Data Appendix

This analysis is based on the U.S. Census Bureau's decennial Censuses and the 2006 American Community Survey (ACS). The decennial Census tabulations utilize the 5% public use micro samples. The 2006 ACS public use sample has nearly 3.0 million person records and was a 1% sample. The universe for the 2006 ACS is the resident population; identical to the decennial Census universe. As the ACS is designed to replace the Census 2010 long-form data collection, the ACS questionnaire is very similar to the 2000 Census long form questionnaire. There are, however, some substantive issues which may affect the comparability of the tabulations over time.

School Enrollment In regard to the comparability of the ACS and decennial Census, the school enrollment questions are highly correspondent in wording but the reference period differs between the 2000 Census and the ACS. Nonetheless, among children between the ages of 5 to 19, the ACS and the 2000 Census yield very similar enrollment estimates (Boggess and Graf, undated).

For the purposes of this analysis, the school enrollment question in the 1980, 1990 and 2000 Census remained virtually unchanged. Several prominent studies have compared school enrollment in the 1980 and 1990 Censuses (Vernez and Abrahamse, 1996; Betts and Lofstrom, 2000).

Educational Attainment The question on educational attainment is significantly different between the 1980 Census and latter Censuses and the ACS. Since 1990 the survey asks the youth "what is the highest degree or level of school this person has COMPLETED?" Responses distinguish between completing "12th grade, NO DIPLOMA" and "HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE." From 1990 onward a youth that has finished 12th grade but not completed high school is coded as having not completed high school. The 1980 Census did not ask the youth about the highest degree obtained. Instead, educational attainment is simply measured by the highest grade completed. Youth that completed 12th grade are considered as having completed high school whether or not they obtained a high school diploma or its equivalent. For this reason, the 1980 educational outcomes are not entirely comparable to the 1990 measures and thereafter. The 1980 high school completion rate is biased up (and the dropout rate is too low) relative to the 1990 measures and thereafter. No attempt was made too correct the 1980

tabulations for this measurement problem (see Jaeger (1997) for further details on the old and new measures of attainment).

As discussed in the text, the high school completion rate is estimated on the basis of youth that are not enrolled in high school or below. The 2000 Census and the ACS inquire "what grade or level was this person attending?," so it is possible to precisely identify youth enrolled in high school or below. Earlier Censuses did not ask the youth about their current grade level. This analysis assumes that enrolled youth that have not completed high school are enrolled in high school or below

Race Commencing with the 2000 Census the racial classification significantly changed. Before 2000 youth could only report one racial identity. After 2000 youth of multiple racial identities could report multiple identities. Since Hispanic origin is not based on racial classification, the change in racial identification should not alter the comparability of Hispanic counts over time. The racial identity of nonHispanic youth herein is tabulated using the Integrated Public Use Micro Sample's new RACESING variable. The RACESING variable recodes or "bridges" the multiple-racial responses present after 1990 into single race responses. Interested readers should consult the online IPUMS documentation for further details.

Geography Fry (2006) investigates the growth of Hispanic public school enrollments in the new settlement areas. That analysis utilizes administrative data collected by the U.S. Department of Education. Although there is extensive overlap between the metropolitan areas in that analysis and the 100 examined herein, the correspondence is not exact. Six of the smaller Hispanic metro areas in that analysis do not have a counterpart in the IPUMS metro classification: El Centro, CA; Hanford-Corcoran, CA; Madera, CA; Midland, TX; Victoria, TX; and Ogden-Clearfield, UT. In their stead I substituted youth residing in the important Nevada metros of Las Vegas, NV and Reno, NV (unavailable in the U.S. Dept. of Education data), and 4 smaller metros that ranked near the top 100. Appendix Table 2 reports the 100 metro areas examined herein.

Appendix Table 1. Sample Size for US Educated 18-to-19 Year-olds

Group	1980	1990	2000	2006
		new settlement metros		
Hispanic	1,522	1,826	4,168	1,143
White	39,069	31,651	35,467	7,726
Black	8,242	7,779	9,746	1,974
Asian	245	821	1,528	421
		Traditional Hispanic metros		
Hispanic	15,967	18,656	28,504	6,285
White	57,406	41,242	40,576	8,740
Black	14,160	10,373	11,787	2,220
Asian	1,460	3,280	5,711	1,415
		other metros		
Hispanic	1,584	1,642	2,719	579
White	32,002	21,385	21,677	4,793
Black	5,484	3,928	4,228	844
Asian	142	502	910	188

Source: 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census and 2006 American Community Survey (ACS) Integrated Public Use Micro Samples

Note: "U.S. educated" refers to youth born in the United States and foreign-born youth that arrived in the U.S. more than 10 years before the date of interview.

Appendix Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Hispanic 15-to-17 Year-Olds, 2006

characteristic	new settlement area	traditional Hispanic area
N	2,626	12,626
age (years)	16.0	16.0
male	52%	51%
recent immigrant[a]	22%	13%
early childhood immigrant[b]	10%	8%
native born	67%	80%
no parent in household	11%	10%
single parent household	30%	34%
both parents in household	59%	56%
household head high school dropout	41%	39%
household head high school completer	27%	30%
household head some college	32%	31%
in poverty	23%	25%
ever married	3%	1%
female with child	1%	1%
no siblings in household	23%	21%
one sibling in household	30%	31%
two siblings in household	26%	28%
three+ siblings in household	21%	21%
Mexican origin	61%	69%
Puerto Rican	11%	6%
Cuban	3%	3%
Guatemalan	2%	2%
Honduran	1%	1%
Nicaraguan	1%	1%
Salvadoran	5%	3%
other Central American	1%	0%
Colombia	2%	1%
Ecuadorian	1%	1%
Peruvian	1%	1%
other South American	2%	1%
Dominican	2%	3%
other Hispanic	8%	8%

Source: 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census and 2006 American Community Survey (ACS) Integrated Public Use Micro Samples

[a]Arrived in the U.S. less than 10 years before the date of interview.

[b]Arrived in the U.S. more than 10 years before the date of interview.

Appendix Table 3. Hispanic 15-to-17 Year-Olds by Metropolitan Area, 2006

new settlement metros (33)	
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	53,842
Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	21,846
Washington, DC/MD/VA	26,375
Las Vegas, NV	23,908
Orlando, FL	19,717
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	17,618
Atlanta, GA	15,469
Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT	10,798
Portland-Vancouver, OR	8,127
Seattle-Everett, WA	8,023
Tacoma, WA	2,899
Kansas City, MO-KS	6,660
Oklahoma City, OK	5,905
Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, SC	5,724
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN	5,708
Lakeland-Winterhaven, FL	4,121
Grand Rapids, MI	4,031
Raleigh-Durham, NC	3,995
Reno, NV	3,974
Fort Myers-Cape Coral, FL	3,948
Salem, OR	3,451
Baltimore, MD	3,186
Norfolk-VA Beach-Newport News, VA	3,078
Naples, FL	3,060
Omaha, NE/IA	2,983
Jacksonville, FL	2,854
Fayetteville-Springdale, AR	2,632
Daytona Beach, FL	2,573
Indianapolis, IN	2,491
Sarasota, FL	2,253
Provo-Orem, UT	2,236
Wichita, KS	2,144
Fort Pierce, FL	2,010
Tulsa, OK	1,927
Rockford, IL	1,649
	291,215

Traditional Hispanic metros (44)	
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	259,845
Orange County, CA	52,312
New York-Northeastern NJ	113,848
Nassau Co, NY	18,488
Bergen-Passaic, NJ	12,794
Jersey City, NJ	11,091
Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon, NJ	7,531
Newark, NJ	15,551
Riverside-San Bernadino, CA	104,451
Chicago-Gary-Lake, IL	84,812
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, IN	4,284
Houston-Brazoria, TX	79,585
Brazoria, TX	3,643
Phoenix, AZ	60,405
Miami-Hialeah, FL	52,691
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood-Pompano Beach, FL	18,229
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Delray Beach, FL	9,271
San Antonio, TX	46,858
San Diego, CA	46,786
El Paso, TX	33,715
McAllen-Edinburg-Pharr-Mission, TX	32,099
Fresno, CA	29,219
San Jose, CA	20,387
Austin, TX	19,623
Bakersfield, CA	19,203
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito, TX	18,436
Albuquerque, NM	17,297
Sacramento, CA	17,203
Ventura-Oxnard-Simi Valley, CA	17,157
Tucson, AZ	16,848
Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, CA	14,293
Stockton, CA	14,010
Modesto, CA	12,038
San Francisco-Oakland-Vallejo, CA	11,315
Oakland, CA	25,945
Laredo, TX	11,102
Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Lompoc, CA	8,280
Merced, CA	8,199
Corpus Christi, TX	7,788
Las Cruces, NM	7,000
Vallejo-Fairfield-Napa, CA	6,769
Salinas-Sea Side-Monterey, CA	6,006
Yuma, AZ	5,991

other metros (23)	
Denver-Boulder-Longmont, CO	25,892
Philadelphia, PA/NJ	16,173
Boston, MA	11,934
Lawrence-Haverhill, MA/NH	3,917
Lowell, MA/NH	1,611
Milwaukee, WI	7,615
Detroit, MI	7,365
Providence-Fall River-Pawtucket, MA/RI	7,190
Hartford-Bristol-Middleton-New Britain, CT	6,740
Cleveland, OH	5,950
Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee, MA	5,924
Yakima, WA	5,571
Greeley, CO	3,879
Colorado Springs, CO	3,775
Richland-Kennewick-Pasco, WA	3,618
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA/NJ	3,543
Rochester, NY	3,431
Bridgeport, CT	3,094
New Haven-Meriden, CT	2,970
Reading, PA	2,768
Pueblo, CO	2,321
Trenton, NJ	2,234
Worcester, MA	1,973
Boulder-Longmont, CO	1,655
Lancaster, PA	1,330
	142,473

Table Hispanic 15-to-17 Year-Olds by Metropolitan Area, 2006 (cont.)

new settlement metros (33)	Traditional Hispanic metros (44)		other metros (23)
	Odessa, TX	5,680	
	Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	4,745	
	Santa Fe, NM	4,288	
	Lubbock, TX	4,032	
	Santa Cruz, CA	3,421	
	Amarillo, TX	3,236	
	Kileen-Temple, TX	3,174	
	San Luis Obispo-Atascad-P Robles, CA	2,884	
	Waco, TX	2,706	
	Newburgh-Middletown, NY	2,349	
	Yuba City, CA	1,726	
	Bryan-College Station, TX	1,647	
		1,422,286	