Draft

Pan-Ethnic Diversity in U.S. Latino Enclaves

by

Juan Onésimo Sandoval
Department of Sociology
Northwestern University
1810 Chicago Avenue
Evanston, IL 60208
j-sandoval@northwestern.edu

Bienvenido Ruiz
Department of Sociology
Northwestern University
1810 Chicago Avenue
Evanston, IL 60208
b-ruiz@northwestern.edu

ABSTRACT

Building upon recent theoretical developments in pan-ethnic identity, we study pan-ethnic diversity in Latino enclaves in the U.S. We find that Latino pan-ethnicity finds spatial expression in many American neighborhoods, contributing to selective residential distribution. Using data from the 1980, 1990 and 2000 Census, we sort enclaves (defined as Census tracts where 25 percent or more of residents are Latino) according to Latino concentration, diversity and predominant ethnic group. After measuring Latino resident diversity using a Theil diversity index of four major national origin groups (Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and all other Latinos), we first verify the reality of pan-ethnic enclaves and estimate the predomince of pan-ethnic diversity in these neighborhoods. Next, investigate how neighborhood diversity is related to Latino concentration, regional location, demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, and the ethnic identity of the enclave. The evidence points to: (1) an overall increasing trend in neighborhood pan-ethnicity for the period between 1980 and 2000; (2) a negative relationship between neighborhood Latino concentration and pan-ethnic diversity, net of immigration; (3) pan-ethnic convergence and diversity is affected by the ethnic majority in a neighborhood.

Introduction

The growing diversity of the U.S. population has produced a renaissance in the corpus of race scholarship, and, accordingly, race has become a paramount concern for many scholars studying neighborhood change and diversity. In response to the impressive growth of the U.S. Latino and Asian populations since 1980, these categories are more likely to turn up in analyses of race and of space. The Asian and Latino categories have paved the way to important findings regarding social inequality in general. But more recent approaches recognize the importance that distinct ethnicities play in social interaction, and even acknowledge that researchers relying on pan-ethnic constructs have ignored the differences that exist *within* each of those broad groupings. These differences include (but of course are not limited to) identity, culture, language and citizenship status.

In the the past few decades, Latino neighborhoods have been included in analyses of urban social and economic differences along with white and black majority neighborhoods with increasing frequency. However, the meaningfulness of the "Latino" or "Hispanic" categories are problematic since they refer to a heterogenous construct. Given the influence these categories have on our social scientific knowledge, the diversity concealed by pan-ethnic categories like "Asian" and "Latino" merit greater investigation by scholars concerned with urban change and with the impact of recent immigration on community change and stability.

A more clear concept of pan-ethnicity provides a unique angle from which to study the complex social construction of race. Studies by Waters (1994 and 1999), Okamoto (2003) and Padilla (1985), for example, have shown how social boundaries can expand or contract at the interception of race and ethnicity. As the meanings of ethnicity shift and evolve under the influence

of racial and pan-ethnic categories (Omi and Winant 1994), inter-ethnic[1] social boundaries are becoming more important for scholars trying to understand and explain urban social phenomena.

This paper examines the diversity and emerging pan-ethnicity of Latino enclaves in the U.S., building upon other works that propose the theoretical relevance of pan-ethnicity. Our own positon is that the layering effect ethnicity may have on race and vice-versa may provide a better understanding of urban social phenomena. Our primary interest is not difference between racial categories but rather the intra-diversity found in the Latino race-like category that is often used in social science research. Pan-ethnic Latino communities may, in fact, already be a reality. We explore how Latino pan-ethnicity can be a useful concept in understanding demographic change in metropolitan communities, posing that diversity in Latino neighborhood reflects these changes. More concretely, we assess how the distinct ethnic identity of Latino enclaves, their socioeconomic characteristics and regional location have influenced the developmennt of pan-ethnic diversity. Below, we first theorize the relationship between Latino ethnicity, pan-ethnicity and communities in the U.S., then outline the research questions that guided this study. Following this, we discuss the methodology and research design used to assess and iterpret diversity in Latino neighborhoods. Finally, we present empirical findings and summarize our interpretations of those findings.

Pan-ethnicity and Residential Patterns

A growing literature has emerged regarding pan-ethnicity, especially among Asians and Latinos in the U.S. (Jones-Correa and Leal 1996, Lopez and Espiritu 1990, Itzigsohn and Dore-Cabral 2000, Okamoto 2003, Padilla 1985). As Lopez and Espiritu noted in their seminal article in 1990, the burgeoning concept of pan-ethnicity has become an important element in the study of race

[1] (The term "ethnic" usually denotes distiniction according ancestry groups; in the U.S. the term often refers to a country of origin abroad, but also to pan-ethnic categories like "Latino" or "Hispanic." Here we use the term "ethnic" in reference only to identities based on country of origin.)

relations and how they continuously change. In their own study, they define pan-ethnicity as "the development of bridging organizations and the generalization of solidarity among subgroups of ethnic collectivities that are often seen as homogeneous by outsiders" (1990:198). In this article, and in another influencial study by Okamoto (2003), identities are the primary force underlying pan-ethnicity as an organizing principle of social relations and collective action. Thus, a common thread in theories of pan-ethnicity is the development of identities in a societal context that reduces the social distance between hetorogeneous groups. One advantage of the concept of pan-ethnicity is that it connotes solidarity across ethnic groups while also acknowledging diversity.[2]

While pan-ethnicity remains grounded on identity, we argue that *space* is also a valid dimension for analyzing pan-ethnicity. Unlike previous treatments of pan-ethnicity as a phenomenon of identity, we approach the subject through the spatial proximity that exist among discrete groups. In proposing that pan-ethnicity is an outcome that can be observed demographically, our guiding question is a more rudimentary one: Where can we find Latino pan-ethnicity in the United States today?

Rather than being self-generating, group identities are (re)produced in the larger context of intergroup relationships, especially in the contact with out-groups (Lopez and Espiritu 1990). As a result of these interactions, members of a group will find common ground with some ethnic groups but feel more socially distant to others. One way of assessing the effect of intergroup distance is through the residential distribution of those groups. Distribution in the built environment has long been a tangible side of social relations among ethnic and racial groups in American cities, a phenomenon perhaps best exemplified by the persistent residential segregation between whites and African Americans. Pan-ethnic boundaries are another level of organization that has traditionally

[2] However, some studies suggest that pan-ethnic identity is more elusive than the generalized use of the terms would suggest. For instance, Jones-Correa and Leal (1996) find that a small minority of U.S. Latinos use pan-ethnic terms only (3 percent) or first among others (11 percent) for self-identification.

operated in American cities, where residential patterns can be a function of pan-ethnic solidarity across ethnic groups. In major American cities, for example, many Chinatowns are well known for their pan-ethnicity (Skeldon 1995). Kim and White (2005) identified a "panethnic effect" that accounts for current greater residential proximity among subgroups of a given pan-ethnic category (in their case, black, white, Native American, Asian or Latino) than between these categories. We take this general indication of selective spatial distribution as a clue to investigate if pan-ethninc residential space takes the form of neighborhoods shared by heterogeneous Latino groups. More concretely, we start by testing the empirical reality of pan-ethnic space in the form of diverse Latino enclaves. Our first objective is explorative: to find pan-Latino neighborhoods and to determine the frequency of their occurrence.

Latinos constitute the largest population grouped in a pan-ethnic category, comprising numerous ethnic groups which are largely based on national origins abroad. To be sure, mixed Latino neighborhoods have been described in qualitative studies (Pessar 1995; Ricourt and Danta 2003). However, when dealing with Latino ethnicity, demographers and other social scientists all too commonly rely on a homogenizing concept invoked by the Census term "Hispanic." This is especially true when broader "ethnic" categories like Asian and Latino are contrasted to race (referring to, say, whites and blacks). As consequence, little attention has been paid to diversity in latino populations, except perhaps at the national level. By overlooking this "layered" identity (pan-ethnicity) even as they attempt to account for race and ethnicity, scholars have so far missed the opportunity to identify the full implications of a Latino population that is growing in both size and diversity. Thus, we set out to explore here the contribution of both Latino ethnicity and pan-ethnicity to changing the organization of space.

As a demographic unit, the neighborhood provides a rich unit of analysis for our purpose because of the availability of data regarding national origin for the Latino population in recent

(1980, 1990, and 2000) U.S. Census. Traditionally, analyses of neighborhood-level change and diversity have been restricted their to the white, black, Asian and Latino categories. A blunt concept of "Latino neighborhood" is also problematic for studies of ethnic enclaves because it obscures both the differences *between* many distinctively ethnic spaces (for example, enclaves with a high concentration of a single national-origin group, like Mexicans or Puerto Ricans) and the Latino diversity *within* those neighborhoods. By infusing the term Latino with pan-ethnic meaning, we attempt to preserve the validity of the term as a descriptor of intergroup affinities.

In sum, the demographic effects of Latino pan-ethnicity remain largely unexplored. Moving away from broad racial groupings, we focus our analysis on pan-ethnicity at the neighborhood level to study the dynamics of intra-group diversity and the fluidity of change or stability in the neighborhood. We argue that this approach could potentially yield valuable insight into the demographic changes taking place in many U.S. cities, and also build upon previous understandings of pan-ethnic identity.

Data and Analysis

The data used in this study come from the 1980, 1990 and 2000 U.S. Census and are cover tracts in the 50 incorporated states. We rely on the Census tract as our own spatial unit of analysis, the "neighborhood." The Census provides tract-level demographic information for the national population, including national-origin ethnicity of residents based on self-identification. These data allow us to examine the ethnic composition of every tract and their trends across two decades.

Our first task is to look for spaces that are shared by heterogeneous groups through the formation of pan-ethnic enclaves. In particular, we focus on those neighborhoods we define as Latino enclaves: tracts where 25 percent or more of residents self-identified ethnically as a member of any Latino group found in the Census. In 2000, 58.5 percent of all "Hispanics" in the Census

were of Mexican origin or ancestry, 9.6 percent were Puerto Rican and 3.5 percent Cuban (Guzmán 2001). The remaining 28 percent in the "other Hispanic or Latino" Census category include those identified by national origin or ancestry as Dominican, Costa Rican, Guatemalan, Nicaraguan, Salvadoran, other Central American, Argentinean, Bolivian, Chilean, Colombian, Ecuadorian, Paraguayan, Peruvian, Uruguayan, Venezuelan, other South American, Spaniard, and "all other Hispanic." We classified the enclaves into five categories describing the predominant group in tract (that is, 50 percent or more of Latino residents): Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, "other" majority, and "no single majority" among the preceding four. We settled for these five categories because of the predominance of the first three ethnicities among Latinos, and also because of the reduced numbers of enclaves for any of the smaller groups.

After defining and classifying a universe of Latino enclaves, our analysis turns to the diversity found in those enclaves. Local diversity is measured along two dimensions: vertical (the concentration of all Latinos) and horizontal diversity (Latino ethnic diversity). We define three types of vertical enclaves according to the percent of the population in a tract that is Latino: hyper-concentrated (75% or more of residents were Latino); mega-concentrated (74% to 50%); and burgeoning enclaves (25% to 49%). Thus, all tracts in our analysis belong to one of these concentration categories. In 1980 there were 4,160 such neighborhoods, 6,268 in 1990, and 9,137 in 2000.

Latino ethnic heterogeneity can best describe the pan-ethnic character of a social unit. Thus, ethnic (horizontal) diversity is our measure of neighborhood pan-ethnicity. Conceived this way, pan-ethnicity remains true to its meaning of inclusiveness. Horizonal diversity is operationalized as a Theil diversity index (also known as entropy score; see Iceland 2004; Massey and Denton 1988) based on the four main ethnic categories:

$$E_i = \left| \sum_{r=1}^{n} \frac{(\log(P_{(i)}) * P_{(i)}}{(\log_{(n)})} \right| * 100$$

where:

E_i= Diversity index for tract i

$P_{(i)}$ = Proportion of the tract population that belongs to ethnic group r

n = the total number of ethnic categories

Scores range from 0 to 100, where 0 is completely homogeneous and 100 is completely heterogeneous. A score of 0 means that all residents belong to a single ethnic group, whereas a score of 100 means each of the groups in the tract is of equal size. We define four types of enclaves according to their horizontal diversity: "very diverse" ($E \geq 70$) "diverse" ($50 \geq E < 70$), "somewhat diverse" ($30 \geq E < 50$), and "not very diverse" ($E < 30$). There were, in fact, 873 Latino enclaves with diversity scores of 50 or more in 1980, 1,501 in 1990, and 3,016 in 2000. Given the relative frequency of diverse enclaves, we can readily confirm the existence of a plurality of diverse (that is, pan-Latino) neighborhoods. But, how is this Latino diversity related to concentration and to ethnicity?

As a first step we use the above descriptive typologies of latino enclaves to sort out the trends across the three Census timepoints. We assess the overall trends in Latino concentration and diversity in these enclaves, according to predominant group (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban or other); this is done to evaluate the gross relationship between vertical and horizontal Latino diversity, and between diversity and the tracts' "ethnicity." We also compare the net *change* in tract diversity scores between 1980 and 2000 by ethnicity and by concentration type in order to assess the ethnic and concentration effects on pan-ethnic settlement. Has diversity increased or decreased in U.S. Latino enclaves? Is this trend driven by increasing Latino concentration or enclave creation? Has pan-ethnicity increased uniformly or selectively according to ethnic type?

The concept of pan-ethnicity suggests three overarching hypotheses regarding these questions:

(1) *Diversity in Latino enclaves will tend to grow with time*. As "an essential part of ethnic change" (Lopez and Espiritu 1990:198), pan-ethnic identity is a kind of group consciousness that only develops with time in the context of all social groups. Implicit in these statements of "change" and "development" is that pan-ethnicity is not instantanous or pre-existing, but rather emerges in a process subjected to time lag. In their study of pan-Latino identification, Jones-Correa and Leal (1996) reason that Latino identity is an American construct because, although relatively rare, primary pan-ethnic self-identification (for example, using a term like "Hispanic," "Latin" or "Hispano") is a function of youth, distance from the immigration experience and education. As heterogeneous groups come in contact with each other in the national context and assimilate the idea of pan-ethnic solidarity and identity, Latinos may become more open to live alongside members of other subgroups. As a corollary, more mature Latino communities will show more pan-ethnic diversity than new ones.

(2) *The ethnic character of an enclave (its predominant national-origin group) contributes to its pan-ethnic trends*. That is, since pan-ethnicity evolves in historical processes, Mexican, PR, Cuban and pan-Latino enclaves have distinct diversification trends because their residents' pan-ethnic identification is a product of their unique histories and ethnic/racial identities. Given the great variations between and within the Latino subgroups in class, citizenship status, language, longevity, generational status, regional origins, political orientations, regional distribution and racialization (Bean and Tienda 1987; Duany 2003; Portes and Rumbaut 1996; Waters and Eschbach 1995; De Genova and Ramos-Zayas 2003), some groups may be more inclined to live near other groups or in pan-ethnic Latino environments than others.

(3) *Increasing concentration of Latinos contributes to local diversity*. Mass Latino immigration has contributed to increasing diversity among the Latino population at the national level (Guzmán 2001), and ethnic enclaves are commonly associated with a high proportion of immigrants. If newcomers settle in a finite number of enclaves, pan-ethnic affinity predicts that existing Latino enclaves will be the their preferred destination, therefore linking pan-ethnic diversity to immigration and local Latino concentration. Besides the diversifying effect of immigration, pan-ethnic affinity suggests that Latino in-migrants (those who relocate within the U.S.) may find other Latino enclaves to be an attractive destination. Conceivably, this dispersion of ethnic groups could also lead to the pan-ethic diversification of enclaves.

As a demographic trend, pan-ethnic diversity is also subjected to many factors operating at the local level. To account for the effects of neighborhood ethnic majority, Latino concentration and other tract-level characteristics on diversity, we rely on multi-variate analyses. The first of these is an OLS regression model of diversity score on neighborhood socioeconomic and demographic characteristics (rate of poverty among Latino househods, proportion of Hispanic househods with income above $35,000, unemployment rate among Latino adults, the rate of housing vacancies, proportion of foreign born—as proxy measure of proportion of immigrants—proportion of high school graduates, plus dummy variables indicating the enclave's ethnic majority), and dummy variables for urban location (rural, urban or suburban—see Table 1). A second model controls for regional effects by means of dummy variables for metropolitan area according to Census MSA (the metro areas included had at least 30 Latino enclaves).

[Table 1 about here]

A separate multi-variate analysis is conducted as an OLS regression of *change* in tract Latino diversity on *change* in the above demographic and socioeconomic variables between 1980 and 2000 [note: diversity score change is calculated as $(E_{2000} - E_{1980}) \times \ln 4$]. Dummy variables are

included in a change model that accounts for ethnic-related demographic trends. Tracts were categorized according to changes in their predominant ethnic group between 1980 and 2000, and denote switching majorities (for example, tracts switching from no majority to a Mexican majority), or continuous majorities (no change in ethnic majority; for example, continuously Mexican throughout the period). Two additional variables were introduced to control for tracts where continuous patterns of diversification (enclaves where $E_{2000} > E_{1990} > E_{1980}$) or homogenization (where $E_{2000} < E_{1990} < E_{1980}$) were observed across the two decades.

Findings

The global mean diversity score for all enclaves was 0.33, 0.34 and 0.45 in 1980, 1990 and 2000, respectively (see Table 1). Thus, a net overall *increase in diversity* is observable in neighborhoods we define as enclaves (those in which 25 percent of residents or more are in the U.S. Census "Hispanic" category) for this period. Table 2 describes the distibution of those enclaves by concentration types and by predominant ethnic group. The proportion of hyper-concentrated Latino enclaves has increased slowly but steadily, from 15 to 17 to 19 percent, while the proportion of tracts with burgeoning or mega concentration has remained relatively constant. The emergence of enclaves varies remarkably by ethnic group, perhaps reflecting shifting immigration trends by national origin. Of the four ethnic categories, the number of Cuban and Puerto Rican enclaves showed overall decrease between 1980 and 2000 (from 715 to 686, and from 179 to 131, respectively). The other two ethnic categories, Mexican and pan-Latino, show significant growth in numbers for the same period (129% and 234%, respectively). As well, the proportion of all enclaves having pan-Latino majorities increased from 3% in 1980 to 5% in 2000. The increment in number of enclaves is most pronounced among those in the "majority other Latino" category: the period between 1980 and 2000 saw a ten-fold increase in their number.

[TABLE TWO]

Table 3 describes the distribution of vertical and horizontal diversity enclave types among all Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban majority enclaves. Although the proportion of "very diverse" neighborhoods has remained constant, overall diversity has increased in these ethnic-specific enclaves. The modal enclave type shifted from "not very diverse" (55%) to "moderately diverse" (62%) between 1990 and 2000. Similarly, the "diverse" category has steadily increased its proportion from 13 to 15 to 20%. Thus, the sharpest shift has been from homogeneous "not very diverse" enclaves to "moderately diverse" and "diverse." By 2000 homogeneous neighborhoods made only 16% enclaves, down from 55 percent in 1990.

[TABLE THREE]

Table 4 shows the distribution of neighborhood diversity type in enclaves of each of the major ethnic groups, focusing on mega- and hyper-concentrated enclaves only. In this period, diversity increased in high-concentration enclaves of the three groups. Also, ethnic homogeneity (as indicated by the "not very diverse" category) decreased in this period in all three national-origin majority enclaves, becoming rare in PR enclaves (2%) and not found among Cuban enclaves by 2000. While in 1980 and 1990 the modal Mexican hyper or mega enclave was "not very diverse", by 2000 only 15% belonged to the most homogeneous category. In 2000, the remaining Cuban mega and hyper enclaves exhibit the highest degree of diversity, as 97% of them were "diverse" or "very diverse." While both Mexican and Puerto Rican hyper- or mega-concentrated enclaves have emerged during this period, contributing to their absolute numbers, these high concentration enclaves have also become more diverse. The modal Puerto Rican hyper or mega enclave has shifted from "somewhat diverse" (54% in 1980) to diverse (57% in 2000); the modal Mexican enclaves shifted from "not very diverse" (74% in 1980) to moderately diverse (66% in 2000). The

generality of the trend towards increasing diversity in Latino enclaves is reflected in Table 5: the diversity score increased between 1980 and 2000 for every ethnic enclave type.

[Tables 4 and 5 about here]

Table 6 describes the distribution of tracts according to their change in diversity score between 1980 and 2000, by predominant group in 2000 (the "pan-Latino" category denotes enclaves with no single majority Latino group). Neighborhoods of every ethnic type saw net increases in diversity: that was the case for 62% of Mexican-majority enclaves, 82% of PR, 78% of Cuban and 77% pan-Latino. This change was most pronounced among of Puerto Rican enclaves, as 455 out of 686 Puerto Rican tracts, or 66%, showed 10 or more points increase in their diversity score, suggesting that these spaces are particularly attractive to other Latinos. By comparison, the proportion of Cuban enclaves with 10 or more points increase in diversity score is 44%, and 40% for Mexican enclaves. 62% of pan-Latino enclaves show 10-point plus gains in diversity score. Although these pan-Latino tracts were, by definition, already diverse in 1980, they also seem to attract diversity, perhaps by attracting diverse newcomers. However, it is not clear if their diversity increases reflect settlement of diverse immigrants from abroad or Latino in-migration. On the other hand, Mexican majority neighborhoods were most likely to become more homogeneous. About one in ten Mexican enclaves lost 25 or more diversity points, compared to 3% for Puerto Rican enclaves, 2% for Cuban enclaves, and 4% for pan-Latino enclaves.

[TABLE SIX]

Table 7 shows a distribution of the change in diversity score for Latino enclaves already established in 1980. Older Mexican and Puerto Rican enclaves were even more prone to increase diversity than 2000 enclaves: 77% of 1980 Puerto Rican enclaves, and 54% of 1980 Mexican enclaves showed 10 or more points increase in diversity score. 1980 Cuban enclaves also show positive balance in diversity change. Interestingly, only a small minority (5%) of 1980 pan-Latino

neighborhoods exhibit a 10-point plus gain in diversity. By contrast, the majority of 2000 pan-Latino enclaves showed high gains in diversity (see Table 6). Thus, it seems that *established* Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban enclaves attract increasingly diverse Latino groups, and many of the newly pan-ethnic majority enclaves are former Puerto Rican, Mexican and Cuban enclaves. In fact, of the 215 enclaves that switched from a national-origin majority in 1980 to a pan-ethnic majority in 2000, 163 were Puerto Rican, 31 Mexican and 21 Cuban. Given that Puerto Rican immigration has slowed down considerably in this period (especially compared to most other Latino groups—see Lobo, Flores and Salvo 2002), the sharply increased diversity in 1980 Puerto Rican enclaves suggests a different pattern of ethnic succession, one in which an ethnic group is succeeded by a pan-ethnic majority. By contrast, the number of Cuban-majority enclaves also decreased between 1980 and 2000, but the great majority of these Cuban enclaves identified in 2000 (121 of 131) were also Cuban enclaves in 1980.

[TABLE SEVEN]

Table 8 describes the distribution of diversity score gains by Latino concentration neighborhood type in 2000. Overall, most enclaves (62%) became more diverse. Hyper-concentrated Latino tracts have seen larger increases in diversity than less concentrated mega and burgeoning enclaves. 56% of hyper-concentrated, 42% of mega-concentrated, and 34% of burgeoning enclaves have gained 10 or more diversity score points. Local Latino concentration then appears to be linked to an increasing trend in pan-ethnicity.

[TABLE EIGHT]

Table 9 presents the OLS regression of diversity scores for Latino enclaves on neighborhood economic characteristics, demographics and location. In 2000, neighborhood Latino diversity, our measure of spatial pan-ethnicity, is negatively correlated with both Latino poverty and neighborhood affluence (model 1). Similarly, Latino unemployment has a negative effect on

diversity. These effects remain significant after controlling for enclave metropolitan location in model 2, suggesting that both affluence and poverty among Latinos depress local diversity. Significant regional differences in Latino diversity are observed among most of the 11 metropolitan locations coded (model 2). For instance, in 2000, Sacramento Latino enclaves were less diverse than enclaves located outside the 11 metro areas, while enclaves in Denver, San Francisco, Dallas, Boston, Los Angeles, Houston, Miami, New York and Chicago were more diverse. Therefore, we can also observe that most of these metropolitan areas attract pan-Latino diversity. Also, both urban and suburban enclaves show higher diversity than rural enclaves.

[TABLE NINE]

The percent of immigrants in a tract population, as measured by the proportion of foreign-born, contributes to Latino diversity (Table 9, model 1). However, this effect is accounted for in 2000 by metropolitan location. Latino concentration shows a robust negative effect on neighborhood Latino diversity. The level of education among local adults has a net positive effect. The ethnic identity of a neighborhood also appears to affect its Latino diversity. Pan-Latino neighborhoods consistently show the highest degree of diversity since 1980 ("pan-Latino" is the category for enclaves where the majority of Latinos falls under the "other" national origin category, as opposed to Mexican, Puerto Rican or Cuban; "no-majority" denotes Latino enclaves where no single category of Latinos represents the majority; this is the reference category for ethnic majority dummies in models 1 and 2). 2000 Mexican and Cuban enclaves show lower levels of Latino diversity than both pan-Latino and no-majority Latino enclaves. Puerto Rican enclaves had lower diversity than no-majority neighborhoods in 1980 and 1990, although their diversity level becomes similar to non-majority Latino tracts (and thus higher than Mexican and Cuban tracts) by 2000.

Model 3 in Table 10 displays the results of OLS regressions of change in Latino diversity score between 1980 and 2000 on change in neighborhood socioeconomic characteristics and ethnic

demographic trends for tracts that remained enclaves throughout this period. Model 4 introduces fixed regional effects on score change. Among the factors contributing to decrease in local diversity in this period are Latino concentration, the proportion of immigrants, and both poverty and affluence among Latinos. However, the increase in the proportion of Latinos with high school degrees or higher was independently associated with increase in diversity. Increases in a tract's household vacancy rate are also positively associated with change in diversity. Single group majority neighborhoods that retained their ethnic majorities (Mexican, Puerto Rican or Cuban) saw increases in diversity for this period, with the largest increases found in PR enclaves. Among enclaves switching ethnic majorities between 1980 and 2000, those becoming no-majority Latino tracts increased in their diversity, and even those becoming Mexican majority enclaves increased it.

[Tables 10 and 11 about here]

Table 11 shows model 3 and 4 regressions of change in diversity applied to all 2000 Latino enclaves, and thus includes recently emerged enclaves. Among 2000 enclaves, growth in the proportion of foreign born contributes independently to diversity (Table 11) while in the continuous enclaves (Table 10) it does not. However, growth in the proportion of Latinos in an enclave is positively correlated in both continuous enclaves (Table 10) and in the larger sample of 2000 enclaves, suggesting that increase in diversity is driven by the formation of enclaves (that is, increase in local Latino concentration) rather than immigration itself.

Discussion

The total number of Latino enclaves has increased notably, almost doubling between 1980 and 2000 (by comparison, the total "Hispanic" population in the 50 states more than doubled in this period, from 14.6 million to 35.3 million—USDC 1981; USDC 2002). The distribution of Latino enclaves among concentration types has changed little since 1980, when 56% were "burgeoning,"

29% mega- and 15% hyper-concentrated (see Table 2), suggesting that the overall segregation of Latinos in these enclaves has not increased. While this measure of vertical diversity has remained relatively constant, pan-Latino (horizontal) diversity has increased appreciably for every type of Latino enclave. One highly diverse kind of enclave, those with "pan-Latino" majorities, has increased in number and in the prorportion. Another kind of enclave showing high diversity, "other" Latino majority neighborhoods, has also proliferated.

Thus, by two measures, Latino neighborhood pan-ethnicity has increased since 1980: many pan-Latino enclaves have emerged, and the average enclave has increased in Latino diversity. This trend is in stark contrast to other trends in racial and ethnic integration across pan-ethnic lines: the residential integration between blacks, whites, Latinos and Asians is slight in comparison to pan-ethnic integration found in Latino enclaves for the same period. For instance, Iceland, Weinberg and Steinmetz (2002) found that Hispanics and Asian/Pacific Islanders experienced overall increases in most measures of segregation between 1980 and 2000, while blacks became generally less segregated. Therefore, the convergence of Latino subgroups in pan-ethnic cannot be attributed to a more general trend of intergroup mixing. But this general trend supports the hypothesis that pan-ethnicity develops in time.

We also find that diversification varies widely according to the ethnic character of an enclave. While continuously Mexican, Cuban and Puerto Rican enclaves have become more diverse (Table 10), Mexican neighborhoods remained the least diverse in 2000, followed by Cuban neighborhoods (Table 9). The largest relative increases in diversity scores were seen in Puerto Rican enclaves, which reached diversity scores similar to "other Latino" majority neighborhoods by 2000. The fact that these ethnic differences in trends are net of immigration and other factors suggests that pan-ethnicity is related to country of origin.

Overall Latino concentration suppresses pan-ethnic diversity, net of the immigrant composition of the neighborhood. The collection of other local factors we have looked into here have mixed contributions to diversity. The proportion of immigrants does have a significant effect, but this effect went from the largest among other factors in 1980 to non-significant in 2000 (see Table 9). From the analysis of change in diversity, we observe that growth in the proportion of foreign-born is negatively associated with diversity among 2000 Latino enclaves, but not among older enclaves (see Tables 10 and 11). Thus, we infer that Latino pan-ethnicity thrives in less concentrated enclaves and in more recently emerging enclaves. . .

We realize that the U.S. Census tract which we rely on as unit of analysis is an imperfect measure of ethnic community or affinity. For instance, within any given tract, uneven spatial distributions of residents according to Latino subgroups is possible even if the tract is a bona fide pan-ethnic enclave. So, we may be missing spaces more meaningful as "neighborhoods," and even enclaves within our "enclaves." Another problem is the singularity of a multiethnic category like "other Latino," which could mask further local diversity on account of groups not listed individually in the calculation of diversity score indexes, or even real enclaves of groups not accounted for (that is, groups other than Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and Cubans). However, we opted for a "other Latino" category as a compromise because of the limited numbers of enclaves of each of the groups other than the three largest groups …

Although this exploration of Latino neighborhoods provides some evidence that pan-ethnicity contributes to a neighborhood's composition, there is much room for improving on this analysis by further specifying the nexus between social proximity, solidarity and identities on one hand, and residential proximity on the other. How does the layering of many ethnic and racial identities contribute to the construction of racial categories in contemporary social settings? Can a

local "identity" be constructed, and can it be pan-ethnic? Is there a unique pan-ethnic identity that is emerging that is distinct or different from the racial categories that we use as social scientists? Our hope is that as this line of inquiry matures we get a better grasp of the multiple possible dimensions of pan-ethnicity.

References

Correa-Jones, Michael, and David L. Leal. 1996. Becoming "Hispanic": Secondary Panethnic Identification Among Latin American-Origin Populations in the United States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18 (2):214-254.

Espiritu, Yen Lee. 1993. Asian American Panethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities. Temple: Temple Univ Press.

Guzmán, Betsy. 2001. *Census 2000 Brief: The Hispanic Population*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Commerce Census Bureau.

Hirschman, Charles, Richard Alba, and Reynolds Farley. 2000. The Meaning and Measurement of Race in the U.S. Census: Glimpses into the Future. Demography 37 (3):381-393.

Itzigsohn, Jose, and Carlos Dore-Cabral. 2000. Competing Identities? Race, and Ethnicity and Panethnicity Among Dominicans in the United States. Sociological Forum 12 (2):225-247.

Jones-Correa, M. and D. L. Leal (1996). "Becoming "Hispanic": Secondary Panethnic Identification Among Latin American-Orgin Populations in the United States." Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences **18**(2): 214-254.

Lee, S. J. (1996). "Perceptions of Panethnicity Among Asian American High School Students." Amerasia Journal **22**(2): 109-125.

Lopez, David, and Yen Espiritu. 1990. Panethnicity in the United States: A Theoretical Framework. Ethnic and Racial Studies 13 (2):198-224.

Okamoto, D. G. (2003). "Toward A Theory of Panethnicity: Explaining Asian American Collective Action." American Sociological Review **68**(6): 811-842.

Padilla, F. M. (1985). Latino Ethnic Consciousness: The Case of Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans in Chicago. Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame.

Waters, M. (1994). "Ethnic and Racial Identities of Second-Generation Black Immigrants in New York City." International Migration Review **28**: 795-820.

Waters, M. (1999). Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities. Boston, Harvard University Press.

Table 1. Description of Variables

		1980 (N = 4,160)		1990 (N = 6,268)		2000 (N = 9,137)	
		mean value	standard deviation	mean value	standard deviation	mean value	standard deviation
dependent variable:	Diversity score	0.333	0.196	0.343	0.200	0.450	0.147
neighborhood economics:							
	Latino poverty rate	0.267	0.148	0.290	0.151	0.249	0.130
	Prop. income >35K	0.057	0.060	0.157	0.084	0.456	0.173
	Latino unemployment	0.060	0.037	0.087	0.044	0.061	0.038
	Housing vacancy rate	0.071	0.056	0.091	0.075	0.073	0.068
neighborhood demographics:							
	Prop. foreign-born	0.229	0.160	0.267	0.178	0.293	0.165
	Prop. Latino	0.508	0.202	0.516	0.212	0.522	0.210
	Prop. HS graduates	0.347	0.157	0.411	0.168	0.458	0.170
	Mexican majority (1 = yes, 0 = no)	0.685		0.706		0.716	
	PR majority (1 = yes, 0 = no)	0.172		0.123		0.075	
	Cuban majority (1 = yes, 0 = no)	0.043		0.025		0.014	
	Pan-Latino (1 = yes, 0 = no)	0.031		0.038		0.047	
	Other Latino group majority (1 = yes, 0 = n	0.069		0.107		0.148	
Location (1 = yes, 0 = no):							
	Central city	0.625		0.566		0.541	
	Suburban	0.244		0.260		0.288	
	Sacramento	0.006		0.005		0.007	
	Denver	0.012		0.011		0.014	
	San Francisco	0.043		0.034		0.037	
	Dallas	0.018		0.022		0.032	
	Boston	0.005		0.007		0.009	
	Los Angeles	0.248		0.240		0.215	
	Houston	0.027		0.035		0.040	
	Miami	0.040		0.037		0.034	
	Philadelphia	0.007		0.006		0.007	
	New York	0.182		0.155		0.135	
	Chicago	0.053		0.047		0.047	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. 1980 - 2000 Census tract tabulations by the authors

Table 2. Concentration Type Distribution of Latino Enclaves, by Predominant Group in the Tract

	1980							
	Burgeoning*		Mega**		Hyper***		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Majority Mexican	1,558	55	760	27	533	19	2,851	100
Majority Puerto Rican	418	58	251	35	46	6	715	100
Majority Cuban	66	37	64	36	49	27	179	100
Majority Other Hispanic	193	67	80	28	14	5	287	100
Pan-Latino	93	73	34	27	1	1	128	100
Type Totals	2,328	56	1,189	29	643	15	4,160	100

	1990							
	Burgeoning		Mega		Hyper		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	%
Majority Mexican	2,419	55	1,151	26	858	19	4,428	100
Majority Puerto Rican	431	56	276	36	66	9	773	100
Majority Cuban	30	19	41	26	87	55	158	100
Majority Other Hispanic	416	62	199	30	54	8	669	100
Pan-Latino	158	66	55	23	27	11	240	100
Type Totals	3,454	55	1,722	27	1,092	17	6,268	100

	2000							
	Burgeoning		Mega		Hyper		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	%
Majority Mexican	3,423	52	1,756	27	1,365	21	6,544	100
Majority Puerto Rican	435	63	205	30	46	7	686	100
Majority Cuban	20	15	21	16	90	69	131	100
Majority Other Hispanic	763	57	438	32	147	11	1,348	100
Pan-Latino	260	61	125	29	43	10	428	100
Type Totals	4,901	54	2,545	28	1,691	19	9,137	100

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. 1980 - 2000 Census tract tabulations by the authors.

* 25 to 49% of population in Burgeoning enclaves is classified as Latinos

** 50 to 74% of population in Mega-enclaves is classified as Latinos

*** 75% or more of population in Hyper-enclaves is classified as Latinos

Table 3. Latino Diversity in Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban Enclaves, by Concentration Type

year	Latino Concentration	Latino Diversity*									
		Not Very Diverse		Somewhat Diverse		Diverse		Very Diverse		totals	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1980	**Burgeoning**	977	48	681	33	330	16	54	3	2,042	100
	Mega	582	54	339	32	139	13	15	1	1,075	100
	Hyper	468	75	124	20	34	5	2	0	628	100
	total	2,027	54	1,144	31	503	13	71	2	3,745	100
1990	**Burgeoning**	1,355	47	992	34	470	16	63	2	2,880	100
	Mega	856	58	347	24	242	16	23	2	1,468	100
	Hyper	729	72	188	19	90	9	4	0	1,011	100
	total	2,940	55	1,527	28	802	15	90	2	5,359	100
2000	**Burgeoning**	390	10	2,417	62	973	25	98	3	3,878	100
	Mega	375	19	1,212	61	358	18	37	2	1,982	100
	Hyper	436	29	912	61	135	9	18	1	1,501	100
	total	1,201	16	4,541	62	1,466	20	153	2	7,361	100

*Diversity scores are 0-29 in "not very diverse" enclaves, 30-49 in "somewhat diverse", 50-69 in "diverse", and 70+ in "very diverse" enclaves.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau. 1980 - 2000 Census tract tabulations by the authors.

Table 4. Distribution of Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban Mega and Hyper Enclaves by Latino Diversity Type

year	majority group	Latino Diversity*									
		Not Very Diverse		Somewhat Diverse		Diverse		Very Diverse		totals	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1980	**Mexican**	959	74	250	19	81	6	3	0	1,293	100
	Puerto Rican	77	26	159	54	54	18	7	2	297	100
	Cuban	14	12	54	48	38	34	7	6	113	100
	total	1,050	62	463	27	173	10	17	1	1,703	100
1990	**Mexican**	1,531	76	383	19	93	5	2	0	2,009	100
	Puerto Rican	52	15	97	28	177	52	16	5	342	100
	Cuban	2	2	55	43	62	48	9	7	128	100
	total	1,585	64	535	22	332	13	27	1	2,479	100
2000	**Mexican**	751	15	3,436	66	938	18	54	1	5,179	100
	Puerto Rican	14	2	192	30	365	57	69	11	640	100
	Cuban	0	0	1	2	28	68	12	29	41	100
	total	765	13	3,629	62	1,331	23	135	2	5,860	100

*Diversity scores are 0-29 in "not very diverse" enclaves, 30-49 in "somewhat diverse", 50-69 in "diverse", and 70+ in "very diverse" enclaves.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau; 1980 - 2000 Census tract tabulations by the authors.

Table 5. Mean Diversity Scores of Latino Enclaves, by Predominant Latino Group

	1980	1990	2000
Majority Mexican	23	22	37
Majority Puerto Rican	39	49	55
Majority Cuban	46	53	55
Majority Other Hispani	49	50	54
No Majority	68	72	73

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. 1980 - 2000 Census tract tabulations by the authors.

Table 6. Distribution of Change in Diversity Score from 1980 to 2000, by Predominant Latino Group in 2000

		Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		Pan-Latino	
	Point Change in Diversity Score	Number of Tracts	percent	Number of Tracts	percent	Number of Tracts	percent	Number of Tracts	percent
	-25 or more	621	9.5	17	2.5	3	2.3	15	3.5
	-20 to -24	149	2.3	10	1.5	0	0.0	3	0.7
(Tracts Became	-15 to -19	252	3.9	10	1.5	2	1.5	8	1.9
Less Diverse)	-10 to -14	342	5.2	17	2.5	4	3.1	11	2.6
	-5 to -9	498	7.6	29	4.2	7	5.3	28	6.5
	0 to -4	654	10.0	38	5.5	13	9.9	33	7.7
(No Change)	0	1	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	0 to 4	732	11.2	50	7.3	18	13.7	29	6.8
	5 to 9	693	10.6	59	8.6	26	19.8	36	8.4
(Tracts Became	10 to 14	713	10.9	65	9.5	21	16.0	40	9.3
More Diverse)	15 to 19	572	8.7	69	10.1	18	13.7	46	10.7
	20 to 24	495	7.6	81	11.8	9	6.9	40	9.3
	25 or more	822	12.6	240	35.0	10	7.6	139	32.5
	totals	6,544	100	686	100	131	100	428	100

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; 1980 - 2000 Census tract tabulations by the authors

Table 7. Distribution of Change in Diversity Score from 1980 to 2000, by Predominant Latino Group in 1980

		Mexican		Puerto Rican		Cuban		Pan-Latino	
	Point Change in Diversity Score	Number of Tracts	percent	Number of Tracts	percent	Number of Tracts	percent	Number of Tracts	percent
	-25 or more	19	0.7	6	0.8	1	0.6	8	6.3
	-20 to -24	14	0.5	1	0.1	0	0.0	13	10.2
(Tracts Became	-15 to -19	32	1.1	1	0.1	0	0.0	21	16.4
Less Diverse)	-10 to -14	84	2.9	5	0.7	1	0.6	24	18.8
	-5 to -9	153	5.4	12	1.7	8	4.5	19	14.8
	0 to -4	290	10.2	29	4.1	23	12.8	17	13.3
(No Change)	0	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	0 to 4	369	12.9	48	6.7	25	14.0	15	11.7
	5 to 9	356	12.5	60	8.4	43	24.0	5	3.9
(Tracts Became	10 to 14	442	15.5	95	13.3	27	15.1	3	2.3
More Diverse)	15 to 19	350	12.3	88	12.3	23	12.8	2	1.6
	20 to 24	316	11.1	97	13.6	15	8.4	0	0.0
	25 or more	426	14.9	272	38.0	13	7.3	1	0.8
	totals	2,851	100	715	100	179	100	128	100

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; 1980 - 2000 Census tract tabulations by the authors

Table 8. Distribution of Change in Diversity Score from 1980 to 2000, by Neighborhood Concentration Type in 2000

		Burgeoning		Mega		Hyper		Total	
	Point Change in Diversity Score	Number of Tracts	percent	Number of Tracts	percent	Number of Tracts	percent	Number of Tracts	percent
	-25 or more	522	10.7	193	7.6	91	5.4	806	8.8
	-20 to -24	150	3.1	57	2.2	10	0.6	217	2.4
(Tracts Became	-15 to -19	230	4.7	81	3.2	26	1.5	337	3.7
Less Diverse)	-10 to -14	315	6.4	122	4.8	50	3.0	487	5.3
	-5 to -9	463	9.4	177	7.0	70	4.1	710	7.8
	0 to -4	517	10.5	275	10.8	134	7.9	926	10.1
(No Change)	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.2	3	0.0
	0 to 4	548	11.2	293	11.5	174	10.3	1,015	11.1
	5 to 9	476	9.7	283	11.1	189	11.2	948	10.4
(Tracts Became	10 to 14	384	7.8	275	10.8	267	15.8	926	10.1
More Diverse)	15 to 19	330	6.7	214	8.4	220	13.0	764	8.4
	20 to 24	295	6.0	180	7.1	192	11.4	667	7.3
	25 or more	671	13.7	395	15.5	265	15.7	1,331	14.6
	totals	4,901	100	2,545	100	1,691	100	9,137	100

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; 1980 - 2000 Census tract tabulations by the authors

Table 9. Regressions on Diversity Scores for Latino Enclaves

	indepedndent	model 1			model 2		
	variable	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000
ighborhood							
economics:	Latino poverl	-0.021	-0.038 *	-0.066 ***	0.046 *	0.019	-0.078 ***
		(0.022)	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.015)
	Prop. income	-0.037	0.072 *	-0.108 ***	-0.201 ***	-0.055 *	-0.143 ***
		(0.046)	(0.028)	(0.011)	(0.043)	(0.026)	(0.011)
	Latino unemp	0.107	-0.142 **	-0.129 ***	-0.009	-0.070	-0.136 ***
		(0.060)	(0.044)	(0.031)	(0.058)	(0.042)	(0.030)
	Housing vaca	-0.006	0.058 *	-0.041 *	0.024	0.100 ***	-0.035
		(0.042)	(0.027)	(0.019)	(0.040)	(0.026)	(0.019)
ighborhood							
nographics:	Prop. foreign	0.389 ***	0.316 ***	0.116 ***	0.250 ***	0.143 ***	0.013
		(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.009)	(0.020)	(0.015)	(0.010)
	Prop. Latino	-0.251 ***	-0.227 ***	-0.137 ***	-0.215 ***	-0.189 ***	-0.130 ***
		(0.012)	(0.010)	(0.006)	(0.012)	(0.009)	(0.006)
	Prop. HS gra	0.253 ***	0.139 ***	0.182 ***	0.311 ***	0.194 ***	0.161 ***
		(0.019)	(0.014)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.014)	(0.009)
	Mexican maj	-0.181 ***	-0.186 ***	-0.110 ***	-0.180 ***	-0.188 ***	-0.076 ***
		(0.009)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.004)
	PR majority	-0.012	0.030 ***	0.024 ***	-0.065 ***	-0.016 *	0.007
		(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.005)	(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.005)
	Cuban major	-0.086 ***	-0.003	0.019 *	-0.012	0.011	-0.032 **
		(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.010)	(0.021)	(0.016)	(0.011)
	Pan-Latino	0.207 ***	0.225 ***	0.220 ***	0.169 ***	0.197 ***	0.204 ***
		(0.015)	(0.010)	(0.006)	(0.014)	(0.010)	(0.006)
location:	Central city	0.032 ***	0.054 ***	0.028 ***	0.008	0.031 ***	0.022 ***
		(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.003)
	Suburban	0.058 ***	0.058 ***	0.028 ***	0.027 ***	0.023 ***	0.014 ***
		(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.004)
	Sacramento				-0.005	0.005	-0.059 ***
					(0.026)	(0.023)	(0.012)
	Denver				0.222 ***	0.190 ***	0.074 ***
					(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.009)
	San Francisco				0.122 ***	0.123 ***	0.037 ***
					(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.006)
	Dallas				-0.056 ***	0.029 *	-0.010
					(0.016)	(0.012)	(0.006)
	Boston				0.090 **	0.095 ***	0.042 ***
					(0.029)	(0.020)	(0.011)
	Los Angeles				0.081 ***	0.138 ***	0.051 ***
					(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.003)
	Houston				-0.021	0.071 ***	0.052 ***
					(0.013)	(0.009)	(0.006)
	Miami				0.005	0.116 ***	0.154 ***
					(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.008)
	Philadelphia				-0.111 ***	-0.089 ***	0.022
					(0.026)	(0.021)	(0.013)
	New York				0.085 ***	0.109 ***	0.105 ***
					(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.005)
	Chicago				0.207 ***	0.172 ***	0.066 ***
					(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.005)
	constant	0.376 ***	0.399 ***	0.525 ***	0.341 ***	0.355 ***	0.527 ***
		(0.018)	(0.016)	(0.011)	(0.017)	(0.015)	(0.011)
N		4,137	6,232	9,103	4,137	6,207	9,103
R-squared		0.5128	0.5486	0.4985	0.5857	0.6094	0.5442
Adjusted R-squared		0.5112	0.5476	0.4978	0.5833	0.6079	0.5430
F		333.8	581.2	695.0	242.3	403.5	451.7
d.f.		13	13	13	24	24	24

Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

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

Table 10. Regressions on Change in Diversity Scores in Continuous Latino Enclaves between 1980 and 2000

indepedent variable		model 3		model 4	
change in rate of:					
	Latino poverty	-0.103	***	-0.084	***
		(0.023)		(0.022)	
	Income >35K	-0.143	***	-0.075	***
		(0.018)		(0.018)	
	Unemployment	0.348	***	0.216	***
		(0.051)		(0.050)	
	Housing vacancy	0.135	**	0.104	**
		(0.040)		(0.039)	
	Foreign born	0.030		0.014	
		(0.025)		(0.026)	
	Latino population	-0.028		-0.060	***
		(0.017)		(0.017)	
	HS graduates	0.288	***	0.226	***
		(0.023)		(0.024)	
Neighborhood Ethnic Trend:					
	Mexican-no change	0.101	***	0.130	***
		(0.007)		(0.008)	
	PR-no chage	0.146	***	0.149	***
		(0.010)		(0.010)	
	Cuban-no change	0.114	***	0.121	***
		(0.015)		(0.022)	
	switch to Mexican	0.004		0.091	***
		(0.021)		(0.022)	
	switch to no majority	0.152	***	0.169	***
		(0.013)		(0.012)	
	diversiying tract	0.164	***	0.159	***
		(0.005)		(0.007)	
	homogenizing tract	-0.217	***	-0.194	***
		(0.009)		(0.009)	
location:					
	Central city	0.009		0.029	***
		(0.007)		(0.008)	
	Suburban	-0.038	***	-0.011	
		(0.008)		(0.005)	
	Sacramento			-0.112	***
				(0.032)	
	Denver			-0.139	***
				(0.020)	
	San Francisco			-0.113	***
				(0.013)	
	Dallas			-0.007	
				(0.017)	
	Boston			-0.037	
				(0.033)	
	Los Angeles			-0.073	***
				(0.006)	
	Houston			0.024	
				(0.014)	
	Miami			-0.026	
				(0.020)	
	Philadelphia			0.017	
				(0.030)	
	New York			0.004	
				(0.010)	
	Chicago			-0.144	***
				(0.012)	
constant		0.046	***	0.025	*
		(0.012)		(0.012)	
N		3,829		3,829	
R-squared		0.5442		0.5810	
Adjusted R-squared		0.5423		0.5780	
F		284.5		195.2	
d.f.		16		27	

Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

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

Table 11. Regressions on Change in Diversity Scores between 1980 and 2000 (2000 Latino Enclaves)

indepedent variable		model 3	model 4
change in rate of:			
	Latino poverty	-0.068 ***	-0.061 ***
		(0.015)	(0.015)
	Income >35K	-0.107 ***	-0.072 ***
		(0.013)	(0.013)
	Unemployment	0.131 ***	0.058
		(0.035)	(0.035)
	Housing vacancy	0.069 *	0.095 **
		(0.030)	(0.030)
	Foreign born	-0.096 ***	-0.118 ***
		(0.021)	(0.021)
	Latino population	-0.033 *	-0.038 **
		(0.014)	(0.014)
	HS graduates	0.253 ***	0.253 ***
		(0.013)	(0.013)
Neighborhood Ethnic Trend:			
	Mexican-no change	0.040 ***	0.075 ***
		(0.005)	(0.006)
	PR-no chage	-0.001	-0.002
		(0.002)	(0.002)
	Cuban-no change	0.049 **	0.066 ***
		(0.016)	(0.019)
	switch to Mexican	-0.101 ***	-0.058 ***
		(0.012)	(0.012)
	switch to no majority	0.114 ***	0.123 ***
		(0.010)	(0.010)
	diversiying tract	0.216 ***	0.209 ***
		(0.004)	(0.004)
	homogenizing tract	-0.222 ***	-0.208 ***
		(0.006)	(0.006)
location:			
	Central city	0.021 ***	0.029 ***
		(0.006)	(0.006)
	Suburban	-0.025 ***	-0.009
		(0.006)	(0.006)
	Sacramento		-0.054 **
			(0.020)
	Denver		-0.068 ***
			(0.014)
	San Francisco		-0.079 ***
			(0.010)
	Dallas		0.038 ***
			(0.010)
	Boston		0.032
			(0.020)
	Los Angeles		-0.043 ***
			(0.005)
	Houston		0.045 ***
			(0.009)
	Miami		-0.003
			(0.013)
	Philadelphia		0.101 ***
			(0.022)
	New York		0.037 ***
			(0.007)
	Chicago		-0.105 ***
			(0.009)
constant		0.073 ***	0.040 ***
		(0.008)	(0.009)
N		8,323	8,323
R-squared		0.5407	0.5622
Adjusted R-squared		0.5398	0.5608
F		611.1	394.5
d.f.		16	27

Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

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