Immigrant Educational Outcomes In New Destinations: An Exploration of High School Attrition

Mary J. Fischer
University of Connecticut
mary.fischer@uconn.edu

July 2009

Abstract:

This study examines how young immigrants are faring in New Destinations using individual level data from the 2000 IPUMS to assess the relative roles of race/ethnicity, nativity, country of origin, and place on the likelihood of not being enrolled in high school for youth aged 15-17. I find that place plays a nuanced role in the risk of non-enrollment that varies by nativity as well as other household characteristics. While children in general have higher risks of dropping out in New Destination communities relative to those in Established Immigrant communities, the risks to immigrant children are even greater. I find that Mexican and Guatemalan origin immigrants are particularly vulnerable, especially in places with the largest increases in the percent foreign born. The implications of these findings for both immigrants and their communities are discussed in the conclusion.

Keywords: immigration, new immigrant destinations, educational outcomes, high school dropout

Immigrant Educational Outcomes in New Destinations: An Exploration of High School Attrition

Immigration is arguably the most significant factor shaping our social, economic, and demographic future in the United States. According to recent census figures, immigrants currently comprise over 12 percent of the population, while nearly 1 in 5 school aged children is either an immigrant or the child of an immigrant (Capps, Fix, Murray, Ost, Passel, and Herwantoro 2005). However, the geography of this immigration is changing, with immigrants increasingly moving into areas that have previously had very little immigrant presence, many of which are small metropolitan or rural places (eg. Alba and Nee 2005; Bean and Stevens 2005; 2005; Kandell and Cromartie 2004; Lichter and Johnson 2006; Massey, Durand, and Malone 2002; Tienda and Mitchell 2006; Waters and Jimenez 2005). Predictably, the demographic impact of this immigration is being felt most immediately in the schools with burgeoning enrollments. New demands to offer services such as ESL that were not previously necessary in many of these communities have further burden these schools. These trends raise two important issues. First, how are these young immigrants faring in US schools? Second, does their well-being differ geographically? This study seeks to explore these questions using individual level data from the 2000 IPUMS to assess the relative roles of race/ethnicity, nativity, country of origin, household, and place characteristics on the likelihood of dropping out of high school for immigrant and native born youth aged 15-17.

Given the recency of immigration to new destinations and the age of these young immigrants, it is too early to get a sense of their economic trajectory. However, leaving high school is an early indicator of likely problems integrating into the workforce. High school

dropouts may go on to earn a high school equivalency, yet evidence suggests that this is not beneficial in terms of economic outcomes. (Cameron and Heckman 1993). Therefore dropping out of high school is an important indicator of how well a local education system is functioning to absorb immigrants and an early indicator of these young immigrant's job market prospects.

This analysis expands the literature on immigrant well-being in three main ways. First, by focusing on the entire US, this study estimates outcomes in both non-metro and metro new destinations. Previous findings of more rosy educational outcomes have focused on metro areas, which have more resources to adapt to social environment changes than rural communities.. Secondly, this paper will examine the role of race and ethnicity in immigrant trajectories, as well as patterns by detailed country of origin. Third, by focusing on a cohort of young immigrants, this study is less prone to the selectivity of immigration argument that may have biased findings of educational outcomes in previous new destination studies which have compared educational attainment for immigrants by destination type (Stamps and Bohon 2006).

Immigrant Assimilation and Educational Attainment

Although most would agree that parity with the native born on socioeconomic indicators –such as educational attainment— is a good indicator of assimilation, there are a variety of perspectives on how immigrants and their children get to this point. The historical view of immigrant assimilation corresponds well to the concept of straight-line assimilation, the idea that immigrants will make steady educational progress with greater time in the US (Gordon 1964; Lieberson 1963; Park and Burgess 1921). From this perspective, the main factor predicting educational attainment would be time in the US. Immigrants who arrive as young children, for

instance, would be expected to have greater educational attainment than those who arrive in adolescence, while the US born children of immigrants would be expected on average to have even higher average levels of educational attainment (Smith 2006). By the third generation and certainly the fourth, educational disparities relative to the native born should be largely eliminated.

This steady progress toward assimilation appears to have occurred among the descendants of earlier waves of immigrants to the US, who by a variety of measures had largely integrated by the middle of the century (Alba and Nee 2003; Lieberson and Waters 1988). In fact, Alba and Nee describe assimilation as the dominant experience among descendants of early immigrants to the US. However, the experience of these earlier immigrants does not necessarily mean that recent immigrants will experience the same upward trajectory. There is concern that factors distinguishing the recent wave of immigrants from those in the past may complicate the process of immigrant adaptation and assimilation, particularly for the most recent immigrants. Some of these factors include the sustained volume of immigrant flows and more recently, the movement of recent immigrants to non-traditional destinations.

One of the most commonly studied indicators of immigrant well-being is educational attainment. In contemporary immigration trends, we have observed a range of outcomes that vary by country of origin as well as by race (Kao and Thompson 2003). Broadly speaking, children from Asian immigrant groups usually perform strongly, while children from Latin American countries have generally fared more poorly in the educational system relative to native-born non-Hispanic whites. However, country of origin and other factors present

substantial variation in outcomes. Two theoretical frameworks have emerged to account for some of the diverging patterns among immigrant groups: the immigrant optimism hypothesis and segmented assimilation.

Immigrant Optimism

Kao and Tienda's immigration optimism theory is often cited as an explanation for the academic success of second generation Asian Immigrants (1995). This hypothesis focuses on differences among parents in conveying the importance of education to the next generation and suggests that it is the optimism of immigrant parents that spurs their off-spring into higher achievement in school. This theory would predict the best outcomes among second generation youth who benefit from the optimism and support of their immigrant parents, as well as their own English fluency. Using data from NELS, Kao and Tienda showed that immigrant and native parents behaved differently towards school; these differences translated into better outcomes for 2nd generation Asian origin youth. They also found that parent nativity accounted for much more of the variation in educational outcomes for Asian students compared to whites and other minorities, leading to the conclusion that nativity and country of origin are bigger factors in explaining educational outcomes for Asians relative to other immigrant groups.

Segmented Assimilation

The range of outcomes experienced by immigrants has led to the development of other explanations for immigrant assimilation. Portes and Zhou (1993) hypothesized that immigrants may take multiple paths to incorporation resulting in varying degrees of success for the second generation. These multiple pathways represented a segmented assimilation, which not only depend on human capital an immigrant possesses, but also the reception an immigrant may

receive from the host community. Immigrants with high levels of human capital who receive a favorable reception may find an easy pathway to upward mobility and assimilation for the second generation. Others with more limited resources may have more difficulties securing stable employment and sponsoring their children's successful movement into the education system–a vital factor in upward mobility. A third pathway is segmented assimilation, whereby immigrant parents seek to retain a close connection to the immigrant community for their children in order to limit their acculturation to American culture. This more nuanced theory of assimilation predicts divergent outcomes for immigrant groups based on their geographic location, access to co-ethnics, family SES, race, and place of birth.

Empirical evidence examining high school outcomes for immigrants provides support for all of the abovementioned theories (eg. Fry 2007; Hirschman 2001; Perreira, Harris, and Lee 2006). Using data from the 1990 IPUMS, Hirschman (2001) examined educational enrollment among 15-17 year olds by year of arrival in the US and country of origin. He found that many children from Asian immigrant groups appeared to conform to the 'immigrant optimism' hypothesis, with educational enrollment generally equal or exceeding their native born peers. Evidence of segmented assimilation was found among some Hispanic Caribbean origin groups whose educational outcomes were not improved with time in the US (Hirschman 2001). Also using IPUMS, Fry (2007) examines the likelihood of dropping out of school for immigrants in 1990 compared to 2000. Over this period, there was a decline in immigrant drop-outs, a finding that he attributes in part to improved human capital among immigrant parents. Perreira et al. (2006) also find strong evidence of segmented assimilation in their study with first generation

Hispanic and Asian immigrants generally making greater relative progress in educational attainment than subsequent generations.

Importance of Place and Educational Outcomes

Place level characteristics may play a considerable role in how immigrants are incorporated into US society. A great deal of the recent growth in immigrant population during the 1990s and beyond has occurred outside of traditional gateway cities and states towards places that have had little to no recent history of migration, so called 'new destinations'(Massey 2007). These places experiencing rapidly growing immigrant populations include metropolitan areas (Fischer and Tienda 2006; Suro and Singer 2002), micropolitan areas (Wahl, Breckenridge, and Gunkel 2007), and rural areas (Donato, Tolbert, Nucci, and Kawano 2008; Kandel and Cromartie 2004; Lichter and Johnson 2006). For instance, the non-metro settlement for Hispanics has nearly doubled since the 1980s as they have become the most rapidly growing demographic in these small communities (Donato, Tolbert, Nucci, and Kawano 2008; Kandel and Cromartie 2004). This growth has been taking place disproportionately outside of traditional settlement areas in the Southwest to the extent that by 2000, the majority of non-metro Hispanics resided outside of this region (Kandel and Cromartie 2004).

The impact of immigration is perhaps felt most profoundly in new destination communities in the school system, where previously lagging enrollments suddenly surge with the children of immigrants. Not only do school systems need to find classrooms and teachers to accommodate the growing student body, but they also need to train or recruit teachers who can

teach English as a second language. Most small school systems do not have the infrastructure or resources to accommodate the needs of immigrants and their children. Not surprisingly, several case studies cite strain on the public school system as a major issue in new destination communities (Fennelly 2005; Hernandez-Leon and Zuniga 2005; Shutika 2005; Wainer 2006). Wainer (2006) examined the impact of a rapidly growing Latino population in a multi-site study of three southern new destination communities in North Carolina, Georgia, and Arkansas. All three school systems were strained to meet the demands of the growing Latino population, which had lower graduation rates than any other student population. None of the states or local areas had the resources or infrastructure in place to train teachers how to teach to immigrant children and thus had a severe shortage of teachers who had training in bilingual and ESL education (Wainer 2006).

Some destinations are better equipped and/or more willing to put resources into the school system to help the children of immigrants (Griffith 2008; Jones-Correa 2008). In his study of four rural destinations, Griffith found variations in the community's response as filtered through the education system. In the two of the communities he studied, leaders seemed to embrace immigrants as a revitalizing force to stem their population decline and viewed the school system as a major component in their successful integration. As such, the director of the school system not only provided ESL courses but also learned about the cultures of the new immigrants and using this knowledge to stage programs that engaged immigrant groups with each other as well as with the larger community. The two other communities Griffith studied also offered ESL courses in the schools but did not go much beyond this basic provision.

There have been few larger scale studies of immigrant outcomes that have examined distinctions by new destination type. Stamps and Bohan (2006) compared the educational attainment of immigrant Hispanics in new and established metropolitan destinations using the 2000 IPUMS. They find educational attainment to be higher among immigrants in new metropolitan destinations compared to their counterparts in established metropolitan areas (Stamps and Bohon 2006). However, because their analysis included all Hispanic immigrants who arrived by the age of 12 (a population spanning many cohorts), their research focuses more on the selectivity of migration to new destinations rather than the effects of place upon immigrant outcomes.

Unlike the earlier times when the US was the recipient of large waves of immigrants, a high school diploma is now the minimum requirement for securing a foothold in the economic ladder of upward mobility for the next generation. One early indicator of future labor market struggles is dropping out of high school. Dropping out of high school precludes opportunities in the short term, such as attending college, but also sets the stage for longer term economic struggles. As mentioned earlier, research suggests that even those who return to obtain a GED or other high school equivalency have similar labor market struggles as those who never fulfill this credential (Cameron and Heckman 1993). Furthermore, the propensity to dropout of high school has linkages to geographic location, with cities hosting the majority of the nation's dropouts (Adelman 2002; Balfanz and Letgers 2004). However, while rural areas have lower overall dropout rates than urban or suburban areas, the dropout rates among those who are living beneath the poverty threshold are actually highest in rural areas (Provasnik, KwealRamani, Coleman, Gilbertson, Herring, and Xie 2007, see Table 2.4).

Although graduating from high school has become nearly universal, the attainment of this most basic educational credential still eludes sections of the US population. In 2000, 10.9% of those aged 15-24 had left high school without attaining a degree (Kaufman, Alt, and Chapman 2001). However, this rate was much higher among Blacks and Hispanics with 13.1% of the blacks aged 15-24 lacking a high school degree and 27.8% of Hispanics in the same age group without a degree (Kaufman, Alt, and Chapman 2001). The high rates for Hispanics are due in part to the inclusion of immigrants, some of whom may have never enrolled in school in the US. Indeed the dropout rate for Hispanics born outside of the 50 states was 44.2% compared to 14.6% for those born in the US to foreign born parents (Kaufman, Alt, and Chapman 2001). Focusing only on those who had been enrolled in high school in the previous year, dropout rates are much lower at 4.1% for non-Hispanic whites aged 15-24 compared to 6.1% for non-Hispanic blacks and 7.4% for Hispanics (Kaufman, Alt, and Chapman 2001). The current study focuses on the educational experiences of young immigrants aged 15-17 who have most likely immigrated with family members and have spent some time in the US educational system.

My investigation of immigrant outcomes in New Destinations will take place in several phases. I begin by examining non-enrollment in high school by country of origin and length of time in the US for immigrant children in 2000. First, I examine the immigrant optimism hypothesis by looking at the variations in leaving high school by country of origin and length of time in the US. I also look at the role of household characteristics in shaping immigrant outcomes. Second, I consider segregation assimilation theory, exploring place level factors in light of both individual and household characteristics associated with high school drop out

disparities. This theory would suggest that place level characteristics play a variable role in affecting immigrant outcomes. I am particularly interested in how immigrants are faring in New Immigrant destinations (defined below) and to ascertain what community level factors are associated with negative outcomes.

Data and Measures

The data for this paper come from individual level census files from 1990 (5%) and 2000 (5%) made available through the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) project (Ruggles, Sobek, Alexander, Fitch, Goeken, Hall, King, and Ronnander 2008). The analytical sample of immigrant and native children for whom educational outcomes are examined are restricted to those ages 15, 16, and 17 in 2000 for reasons that are discussed in greater detail below. The contextual measures described below are computed from the complete samples.

Geography of Immigrant Reception

Many of the non-traditional destinations to which immigrants have been moving during the 1990s and onwards are located outside of major metropolitan areas in rural and semi-rural places. As such, focusing on major metropolitan areas misses significant aspects of this new immigrant growth. A more useful geography for examination this phenomenon would encompass all areas. While counties would be ideal for accomplishing this goal, the individual level census data are not released at this level, but are instead released by Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMAs). PUMAs are geographic divisions within states containing roughly 100,000 residents but are not to exceed 200,000 residents (Ruggles et al. 2008). These divisions are

typically larger than counties, yet they do not cross state borders. Because PUMAs attempt to maintain similar population thresholds, their boundaries are not consistent across years, thereby creating challenges for multiyear comparisons. To address this problem, the IPUMS project has created consistent boundary PUMAs (CONSPUMAs) for 1980 to 2006 that can be used for multiyear comparisons (Ruggles et al. 2008). These consistent boundary PUMAs are somewhat larger than the original PUMAs, but do give us the 100% coverage of the US that is necessary for this paper and do not allow obtain population data from earlier time points to aid in determining areas that have rapidly growing immigrant populations.

The next task is characterizing the immigrant growth in these consistent boundary PUMAs during the 1990s. These are defined here based on two main factors: the percent change in the foreign born population from 1990 to 2000 and the initial percent of the population that was foreign born in 1990. New Destinations are places that have experienced at least a doubling in the foreign born population from 1990 to 2000, putting them in the top half of all constant PUMAs. In addition, less than 2% of the population in these places could be foreign born as of 1990 (bottom 25% percentile in that year) to help to ensure that these places are indeed new destinations as opposed to places with established foreign born populations that have received additional growth. Those places with greater than 2% of the population foreign born in 1990 and growth rates in the top 50% from 1990 to 2000 fall into a second category of Growing Established Foreign Born places. The third category of Established Maintaining Foreign Born places had a population greater than 2% foreign born in 2000, but had growth rates that were in the bottom 50% of all places from 1990 to 2000. The final category, Small Foreign Born places had less than 2% foreign born in 1990 and were in the bottom 50% of foreign born growth

during the 1990s. This strategy of examining the percent change in the foreign born population along with some minimal population threshold has been employed in several prior studies, though exact threshold changes differ depending on geography and time frame (eg. Johnson and Lichter 2007; Kandel and Parrado 2006; Kandel and Cromartie 2004).

In the regression models, the above mentioned categorical measure of new immigrant destinations will be used. To double check the robustness of the findings with these categories, separate models will be run using a continuous measure of percent change in the foreign born population to examine if rapid growth in the foreign born population indeed translates into worse educational outcomes for immigrant children net of other factors. The means for percent changes in the foreign born population from 1990 to 2000 are shown at the bottom of table 1. Across all PUMAs there was a 75.6% increase in the size of the foreign born population from 1990 to 2000. By definition, this growth rate varies by destination type (see the four right-most columns). The average growth rate in New Destination communities was nearly 150%, while Established Growing communities grew at 108% from 1990 to 2000. The average percent foreign born in these communities in 2000 was 3% and 15.6% respectively. Established Maintaining Foreign Born communities grew only 32.7% from 1990 to 2000, which is about the same average growth as was experienced in Small Foreign Born places. Of course, these communities differ considerably in their average percent foreign born, with over a quarter of the population being of foreign birth in Established Maintaining communities compared to 1.9% in Non-major Destinations.

Table 1 About Here

The primary dependent variable in this analysis, dropping out of high school, is coded 1 for any child between the ages of 15 and 17 who is reported to not be enrolled in school and does not have a high school degree. The reason for limiting this variable to age 17 is because after that age children are significantly less likely to reside with their parents. Without this co-residence, we are unable to observe household characteristics that would allow us to examine a wider range of factors associated with the risk of dropping out of high school. Table 1 shows the percent of high school dropouts aged 15-17 by nativity and by destination type for the foreign born. Overall, 4.2% of the children aged 15-17 in the 2000 IPUMS are not enrolled in high school. Among the native born, 3.6% are not enrolled in high school, compared to 10.8% foreign born. The next few columns show dropout percentages for 15-17 year olds in New Destinations by nativity, where a slightly higher percentage of native born children are dropouts than in the general native born population (4.1% compared to 3.6%). However, the percentage of dropouts among the foreign born in New Destinations is significantly higher than the foreign born, with slightly over 15.1% of 15-17 years not enrolled in school. This compares to a foreign born percent not in school of 13.4% in Growing Established Foreign Born places, 8.5% in Established Maintaining destinations, and 5.4% in Small Foreign Born places.

A more detailed breakdown of high school dropouts by race/ethnicity, gender, and destination type is shown in Table 2. Although males from each race/ethnicity have higher dropout rates than their female counterparts, the disparity is much greater among Hispanics. Across all PUMAs, 10.5% of Hispanic males aged 15-17 are not in school compared to 7.3% of females. This disparity is particularly dramatic in New Destination communities in which over

one in five Hispanic males is not in school (21.8%) compared to an also disturbingly high 13.6% of Hispanic females. Nativity is undoubtedly part of the explanation, but note that these levels are much higher than for Hispanics in Established Growing and Established Maintaining communities in which the foreign born has an even greater presence among Hispanic children in this sample. This suggests it is not merely nativity but also place that plays a role in immigrant outcomes, a proposition that will be explored in greater detail below.

Table 2 about here

This paper is centrally concerned with the well-being of immigrants. As such, nativity is a major factor of interest. The native born overall comprise 90.5% of the sample, while the foreign born are the remaining 9.5%. Identifying immigrant generation status is complicated for 2nd + generation immigrants because the census no longer asks about the nativity of individuals' parents. Therefore, we can only identify the 2nd generation accurately for those who are residing with their parents, which is far more typical of children under the age of 18. An alternative to identify generational status based on parents' nativity is to look at year of arrival for the foreign born, which allows for a comparison between immigrant children who have essentially lived their lives under US systems (particularly the US educational system) to those who came as older children and had some of their schooling in another country. Following Hirschman (2001), this paper separates children who immigrated before the age of 9 to those who immigrated after the age of 9. Those who immigrated to the US before the age of 9, sometimes referred to as the 1.5 generation, experienced most of their schooling in the US school system and would thus be expected to have better educational outcomes.

Overall, more than half of the foreign born population aged 15-17 in 2000 arrived in the US prior to the age of 9 (54.2%), while the remainder (45.8%) arrived after the age of 9. This relative balance of recent foreign born to later arrivals is roughly similar across destination type with the exception of Non-Major Destinations in which those who immigrated before the age of 9 are 66% of the foreign born population. The unweighted frequencies in Table 3 show the percent of high school dropouts by immigration status. Among those aged 15-17 who immigrated after the age of 9, 14.8% were not enrolled in school in 2000 compared to 7% of those who immigrated before the age of 9. Among the native born, only 3.7% had dropped out of school. This proxy estimate of the second generation reveals a dropout percentage of only 2.4%. It should be noted that this estimate excludes 2nd generation children who are not the child of the household head, which may skew it to include more advantaged households. Overall, with the exception of significantly better outcomes for the second generation, this pattern roughly mirrors findings from other research whereby educational outcomes improve each generation.

Table 3 About Here

Race/ethnicity is also an important factor to consider in assessing risk for dropping out of high school, particularly in combination with nativity. Non-Hispanic whites comprise 65% of the population aged 15-17, while Hispanics are the second largest group at 15% (see Table 1). Non-Hispanic blacks make up 12.9% of the population aged 15-17 in 2000, Asians are 3.5%, and others comprise 3.5% of the population. Following the row across to the last four columns shows the racial composition of the foreign born by destination type. In New Destinations,

40.6% of the foreign born are identified as Hispanic, while 30.7% are non-Hispanic white. Asians are the third largest group comprising 16,7% of the foreign born population in New Destinations. Non-Hispanic blacks are 7.1% of the foreign born population New Destinations. This finding is consistent with other research showing that these non-traditional destinations are particularly attractive to Hispanic origin immigrants. In addition to race and nativity, age and gender are also important predictors of educational outcomes. Older students are more likely to dropout than younger students, while males have higher rates of dropping out of school than do females. Table 3 shows that overall 4.6% of males had dropped out of high school compared to 3.8% of females.

Household characteristics

As status attainment models have long shown (Duncan, Featherman, and Duncan 1972), parent characteristics are strongly associated with educational outcomes. However, using the IPUMS makes it somewhat difficult to discern parent characteristics for children who are living in households in which their parent is *not* the household head— as all relationships for persons in the household are defined with respect to the household head. Therefore, I will focus on characteristics of the household so that I do not have to exclude those children who are not the child of the household head. Parental marital status is highly associated with dropping out of high school, with children from a married parent household being much more likely to remain in school than those from other household types. Table 1 shows the percent of 15-17 year olds living in households in which the head is married with a spouse present. Overall, 68.9% of 15-17 year olds lived in such households in 2000, with a slightly higher percentage of foreign born kids in this age group (70.6%) living in households in which the head is married compared to

68.7% of native born kids. Table 3 shows that children living in households with unmarried heads had over twice the dropout rate of those living in married couple households (6.7% compared to 3.1%).

Household socioeconomic characteristics are also associated with educational attainment. The measures used in this paper are whether the household head is college educated and whether the household is under the poverty line. Among children ages 15-17, 50.4% are living in households in which the head is college educated while approximately a quarter of all children aged 15-17 in 2000 were living in households below the poverty line (25.5%). For the foreign born, a little over a third (36.9%) live in a household whose head is college educated and their exposure to poverty is much higher than for native born youth with 43.7% living in poverty. However, average socioeconomic characteristics of foreign and native born youth vary considerably by destination type. PUMAs categorized as New Foreign Born destinations had a slightly lower percentage of children living in households with a college educated head at 43.8%. Interestingly, about the same percent of native born and foreign born kids in these places lived in households with a head who attended college (44% versus 42%). Despite these similarities in living with a college educated head, poverty rates diverge significantly with only about a quarter of native born living in poverty compared to 40% of foreign-born youth. A lower percentage of foreign-born children in both Established Growing and Established Maintaining places lived in households with a college educated head (38% and 36% respectively), while in Non-major Destinations over half of foreign-born children (56.4%) were living with a college-educated head. As may be expected, a smaller percent of foreign born youth live in poverty in non-Destinations (where their households are more likely to be college educated) than in Established Growing and Established Maintaining communities.

The final household characteristic examined here is the number of children under the age of 18 in the household. This measures the potential diffusion of resources within a household, and may compromise the educational attainment of the target child. While having a married or college educated head of household is expected to yield better educational outcomes, living in poverty and having more young children in the household are expected to produce worse educational outcomes. On average, children aged 15-17 lived in households with about two children under the age of 18 (including themselves). The average number of children was slightly higher for foreign born children at 2.6 with little variation by destination type[1].

Community Characteristics

In addition to examining the impact of immigration on educational outcomes using the new destination typology and the continuous measure of change in percent foreign born described above, I will also explore the impact of the community's racial/ethnic composition, poverty rates, and metropolitan status on educational outcomes. Metropolitan status is derived from the IPUMS measure METRO which categorizes each PUMA as being not in a metro area, in a metro area central city, in a metro area outside of the central city, in a metro with central city status unknown, or in a metropolitan status not identifiable (usually some mixture of metro and non-metro within the PUMA). About half of children age 15-17 lived in some type of metropolitan community in 2000, with 12.8% living in central cities, 28.7% living outside of the central city, and 8.6% living in mixed central city/suburban PUMAs. About 23% lived in non-metro PUMAs, while 27.3% lived in undetermined or mixed metro/non-metro PUMAs. Foreign

[1] All of the households in this sample will have at least one child under the age of 18 since the target child is included.

born children were far more likely to reside in metro PUMAs, with over a quarter residing in a central city PUMA (25.7%), another third living in suburban communities (32.6%), and 2.8% living in a mixed central city/suburban PUMAs. Only 8.3% of foreign born children overall were in non-metro PUMAs, with the remaining 31% of foreign born children residing in 'undetermined' metro status PUMAs. However, the metropolitan status of foreign born children varies considerably by metropolitan type. For instance, 44.6% of foreign born children aged 15-17 in New Destination communities resided in non-metro PUMAs, compared to 8.6% of foreign born children in Established Growing PUMAs and 4.5% in Established Maintaining PUMAs. Foreign born children in non-major destinations were also likely to reside in non-metro PUMAs (45%). In fact, New Destinations are almost by definition less urban as they represent movement away from traditional patterns of immigration in which most immigrants were concentrated in large gateway cities that have been host to many waves of immigrants (eg. Alba and Nee 2005; Bean and Stevens 2005; 2005; Kandell and Cromartie 2004; Lichter and Johnson 2006; Massey, Durand, and Malone 2002; Tienda and Mitchell 2006; Waters and Jimenez 2005).

The racial/ethnic composition of the consistent boundary PUMAs is shown in the bottom panel of Table 1. On average, foreign-born children reside in more racially and ethnically diverse PUMAs than do native born children. The average percent non-Hispanic white in native born children's communities is 71% compared to 56% for foreign born children. Not surprisingly, the average percent Hispanic in foreign-born children's communities is high at 22.5%, which is nearly double the average of 12.3% Hispanics in native born communities. The average community racial composition varies considerably for the foreign born by destination type. New Destinations are considerably 'whiter', with an average of 81% non-Hispanic white compared to 63% non-Hispanic white in Established Growing communities and 48.3% in

Established Maintaining communities. The average percent Hispanic is quite low at 2.7, while the average percent black is more substantial at 13.7%. As would be expected, the Hispanic presence is much more pronounced in Established Growing (18.3%) and Established Maintaining (27.9%) communities.

Methods

This paper employs a series of logistic regressions predicting the likelihood of dropping out for children aged 15-17 in 2000. The first set of models uses a nested approach to explore the likelihood of dropping out of high school first by immigrant generation and race/ethnicity in order to establish a baseline. Subsequent models add household characteristics and place characteristics, including destination type. The next set of models is similar but looks at the foreign born by detailed country of origin compared to the native born, employing the same nested model technique as before (individual, household, and place characteristics added in sequence). Each model in this second set is also shown separately by recency of immigrant arrival to test for differences by nativity in processes of assimilation. The standard errors in all models are corrected to adjust for possible unobserved heterogeneity by place using STATA's CLUSTER command.

Findings

A variety of factors shape the educational outcomes of immigrant youth. Length of residence in the US plays a significant role in explaining variations in leaving high school, but as I show below, the story is complicated both by nativity and place characteristics. Although most immigrants have better educational outcomes the longer their residency in the US, children from some groups actually fare worse over time. I also find that dropout rates are on average higher overall in New Destination communities (even after controlling for individual characteristics),

with immigrants from certain groups being disproportionately affected. Overall, the nuanced effects of nativity and place level characteristics is consistent with the theory of segmented assimilation.

Table 4 shows the results from a series of logistic regressions predicting the likelihood of dropping out of high school for 15 to 17 year olds in 2000. Model 1 contains individual demographic characteristics and will serve as a baseline to assess the role household and community characteristics play in shaping high school non-enrolment. Males and older teens are more likely to drop out of school. Consistent with expectations, native born immigrant children and non-native immigrant children who have been in the US longer are less likely to drop out than more recent arrivals. Those who immigrated after the age of nine are three and a half times more likely to drop out of high school than native born teens, while those who immigrated to the US before the age of nine are 1.6 times more likely to drop out of school. Net of nativity, only Asians are *less* likely to drop out of high school than whites, while Hispanics are the most likely to drop out of high school with over double the odds (2.12) of whites. Non-Hispanic blacks and 'others' are also more likely to drop out than are whites.

The next model adds in household characteristics. Living in a household in which the head has attended college significantly reduces the likelihood of dropping out of high school, with .382 the odds of dropping out compared to those living with heads who attended college. The marital status of the household head is also important. Children living in a household in which the head is married with spouse present have .559 the odds of dropping out relative to children in other types of households. On the other hand, living in a household that is under the poverty increases the odds of dropping out of high school by 87% compared to those in households over the poverty line. There is also an increased probability of dropping out in

households having more children under 18. The addition of these household characteristics to the models do not negate the impact of age or sex on the likelihood of dropping out. The charactersitcs only slightly reduce the coefficients for nativity; for example, recently arrived foreign born still have over three times the likelihood of dropping out of high school relative to the native born. Note, however, that the odds of dropping out for blacks have now reversed from Model 1 with the addition of household characteristics. This means net of household characteristics, blacks have 0.731 the odds of dropping out of high school compared to whites.

Community level characteristics are considered in the next model. Model 3 adds in the destination type. Net of individual and household characteristics, children residing in New Destination communities are 1.4 times more likely to drop out of high school than children in Established Maintaining communities. There are also increased odds of dropping out of high school for children in Established Growing and Non-Major destinations relative to Established Maintaining communities. Model 4 adds the metropolitan status of the community with only one significant value— a reduced odds of dropping out of high school for children living in suburban communities (metropolitan areas outside of a central city), which may indicate that these communities have more resources with which to help keep children in school. These models suggest that place plays a significant role in shaping educational outcomes net of students' immigrant status and household characteristics.

The final two models employ continuous measures of percent change in the foreign born population from 1990 to 2000 and a control for the percent foreign born as additional checks on the findings based on the new destination typology. Consistent with models 3 and 4, model 5

finds that children living communities with the fastest growth in the foreign born population had higher odds of dropping out of school net of other factors. Net of immigrant growth, children in places with higher percentages of immigrants have reduced odds of dropping out of school. These two factors combined are in line with the New Destination designation used in previous models—places with smaller percentages of foreign born but with high rates of growth have higher dropout rates. This model also shows marginal negative effects of central city status on an increased odds of dropping out of school, while children in non-metro and suburban places have lower odds of dropping out school relative to those in mixed metropolitan status communities.

Elements of the findings thus far are consistent with both the immigrant optimism and segmented assimilation hypotheses. Although the foreign born are more likely to dropout than the native born, the fact that the dropout likelihood is much higher among those who are more recent arrivals is consistent with the immigrant optimism hypothesis. The strong findings with respect to place characteristics, however, suggest that place characteristics such as urbanicity and the local context of migration need to also be considered. The importance of the context of reception are in line with the segmented assimilation hypothesis, but to examine this more fully we need to take a closer look at the country of origin characteristics. Table 5 explores the likelihood of dropping out for those ages 15-17 by detailed country of origin for the foreign born. The reference group in the first model is US born. Model 2 contains ONLY those aged 15-17 who arrived in the US before the age of 9, while Model 3 contains only those aged 15-17 who arrived after the age of 9. First looking at Model 1 we can see that first generation children from several Asian countries such as Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, Korea, Philippines, and India/SE Asia generally are significantly *less* likely to drop out of high school relative to the native born,

while children whose origins are in certain Latin American countries (ie. Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and other Central America) are significantly *more* likely than native born children to drop out of high school. Note that children from Mexico have particularly high odds of dropping out of high school that are *seven and half times* higher than native born children. This model also controls for age and gender, with males and older children also having higher odds of dropping out.

The segmented assimilation hypothesis would predict that some immigrant groups may do *less* well the longer they are exposed to US society depending on various factors such as family resources, community resources, and reception by the host society. This is in contrast to more straight-line views of assimilation, which would predict steady progress for immigrants corresponding with increased time in the US. The next two models are our baseline examination of this hypothesis containing only immigrants who arrived before age 9 (Model 2) and immigrants arriving after the age of 9 (Model 3). The straightline view of assimilation would predict that outcomes for those arriving after the age of 9 would be worse than for those arriving before the age of 9 (who experienced a higher proportion of their schooling in the US). Models 2 and 3 generally reveal better outcomes for each subgroup for those arriving before the age of 9 relative to those arriving after the age of 9. Thus prior to the introduction of other controls it seems that time in the US is associated decreased risk of dropping out for immigrants irrespective of country of origin.

Next I consider the impact of household factors on high school drop out rates. Model 4 shows the results for all children aged 15-17. For most immigrant groups, the addition of these

household characteristics reduces the estimated effect of country of origin on dropping out of high school. However, for children from Laos, Vietnam, Jamaica, and other West Indies/Caribbean the addition of household characteristics results in the a statistically significant decreased odds of dropping out of high school relative to whites (these coefficients were not statistically significant in Model 1). *This means that children from these groups fare better than their household characteristics would predict*. The household characteristics themselves operate in much the same way we observed in the previous analyses, with a decreased odds of dropping out for those from households in which the head is married and/or college educated and an increased odds of dropping out of high school for those coming from households in poverty and/or with more children under the age of 18.

Models 5 and 6 are restricted to immigrants arriving before the age of 9 or after the age of 9 respectively. Once household characteristics have been taken into account, children from Asian origin countries who arrived before the age of 9 are basically on par with native born children (with a few groups that are marginally less likely to drop out). This positive relationship between length of time in the country and high school enrollment is consistent with the immigrant optimism hypothesis. Household characteristics also explain some of the worse outcomes for early arriving children from Latin American origin households. For instance, the odds of dropping out of high school for Mexican immigrant children fall 37% once household characteristics are taken into account (from 7.548 to 4.735). Net of household characteristics, outcomes remain worse for many Hispanic origin children arriving after the age of 9. This is particularly true of children from Mexico, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and 'other' Central American countries for whom high school non-enrollment is predicted to be at least three times as high as

for native born whites (exp 1.103=3.013). This basic pattern of recent arrivals faring less well than immigrants that have been here longer is also consistent with the immigrant optimism hypothesis. However, contrary to this pattern (and consistent with the segmented assimilation hypothesis), there are several cases in which more recently arrived children are faring *better* than their earlier arriving counterparts net of household characteristics. This is the case for children from Vietnam, and in particular, other children from West Indies/Caribbean—who have (exp -1.062=.346) the odds of dropping out of high school relative to the native born.

The final three sets of models explores the impact of place characteristics on the effect of immigrant origin and time of arrival on the likelihood of dropping out of high school for 15-17 year olds. First looking at Model 7, we see that place characteristics appear to further reduce the importance of country of origin for many Asian subgroups (with the exception of China) from Model 4 containing only household characteristics. This suggests that the context of reception for several of these groups plays a positive role in shaping educational outcomes for immigrants from these groups. However, for several Hispanic origin groups, country of origin slightly increases the odds of dropping out net of family and place characteristics, suggesting a more nuanced reception for these immigrants depending on their country of origin and the community to which they have immigrated. As we observed in the previous models, living in places that experienced greater increases in the foreign born population is associated with increased odds of dropping out of school, controlling for the racial composition of the place, percentage foreign born, and metropolitan status. Those living in suburban and non-metro communities had lower odds of dropping out of high school relative to those in mixed metro communities. The impact of these place characteristics do not vary much by timing of arrival, as can be seen in Models 8

and 9 which show the effects of place is similar across the two groups. Instead, country of origin accounts for the bulk of the difference between early and later arriving immigrant children. This finding is consistent with the segmented assimilation hypothesis, which contends that interplay between ethnic groups and the larger community in which they are embedded will shape immigrant outcomes.

Because the addition of place characteristics seems to increase the importance of country of origin for Hispanic origin children, there may be interactive effects of living in new immigrant communities on the educational outcomes for foreign born children from certain groups. As such, interactions between change in percent foreign born and each of the Hispanic sub-group dummies were explored (model available upon request), two of which ended up being statistically significant. The final model in the table shows the result of the model retaining only these significant interaction effects for Mexican and Guatemalan children, which suggests that children from these subgroups living in fast growing immigrant destinations are particularly vulnerable to dropping out of high school. This finding is consistent with qualitative studies in new destination communities that revealed that many high immigrant growth communities are struggling to meet the demands of immigrants and, as the current results suggest, immigrant children are also struggling in these school systems.

Discussion

The purpose of this paper was to explore how young immigrants are faring in metro and non-metro new destinations by looking at high school non-enrollment among children ages 15 to 17. Dropping out of high school is an early indicator of future labor market troubles, as well as a sign of potential difficulties integrating immigrants into the school system. As expected,

children who immigrated to the US more recently (after the age of 9) have a likelihood of dropping out of high school that is over three times that of native born children and is double the likelihood of immigrant children who arrived before the age the 9. However, a more detailed analysis by country of origin reveals significant variation across immigrant groups, with children from Asian origin countries generally faring better than children from Latin American origin countries.

The picture becomes more complex once household factors are introduced into the models. For children from most immigrant groups, it appears that household characteristics are largely responsible for the differences in the likelihood of dropping out as country of origin becomes a less important predictor of risk. However, children from Laos, Vietnam, Jamaica, and other West Indies/Caribbean countries appear to be doing better in school than their household characteristics would predict (ie. their household characteristics would be associated with lower achievement). This finding is consistent with segmented assimilation, which predicts there will be variations in immigrant well-being that will vary both by nativity and host population reception (Portes and Zhou 1993). Immigrants from Laos and Vietnam are often refugees or asylum seekers, both of which tend to receive more favorable (or at least sympathetic) reception from the host community (Portes and Rumbaut 2006). Similarly, Jamaican and West Indian/Caribbean immigrants may also receive more favorable reception from the host community, particularly in contrast to African Americans with whom they share a common ancestry (Waters 1999).

Although it is usually the case that children who arrived in the US more recently (after the age of 9) have a higher risk of leaving school than earlier arrivals, this is not uniformly true across all countries of origin. In particular, after accounting for household characteristics, Vietnamese and West Indian immigrants who are more recent arrivals had lower odds of dropping out relative to the native born than their counterparts who had been living the US longer. These findings may suggest downward assimilation, whereby immigrant children who have more experience in the US are doing worse than their more recently arrived counterparts. Portes and Rumbaut find this mode of incorporation most commonly among the children of working class parents living in communities with weak co-ethnic ties (Portes and Rumbaut 2006).

This study also provides a more nuanced look at the effects of place on dropping out. For Asian subgroups, adding place characteristics seems to reduce the importance of nativity, while for several Hispanic subgroups the addition of place characteristics slightly increases the effects of country of origins. The latter finding suggests perhaps that there is an interactive effect between place and well being for these groups. Net of individual and household characteristics, children residing in New Destination communities are 1.4 times more likely to drop out of high school than children in Established Maintaining communities. As some case studies have already illustrated, New Destination communities may lack the infrastructure for accommodating the needs of first generation students. These problems may be particularly acute in smaller communities that tend to have fewer resources in general. Although it has been assumed that segregation for immigrants would be much lower in rural and small places, recent estimates of Hispanic segregation by Lichter and colleagues suggest this is not the case (Lichter,

Parisi, Grice, and Taquino 2008). Higher levels of segregation are likely to affect the degree of integration experienced by immigrant youth in the community. Segregation may also feed into poorer educational outcomes for Hispanic immigrants in these New Destination communities. There are also apparent differences in the risk of dropping out by metropolitan type, with those living in central city communities having increased odds of dropping out, while those in non-metro and suburban places have lower odds of dropping out. However, this is not the case in suburban New Destinations, where a significant positive interaction indicates a higher risk of dropout in New Destination suburbs (output available upon request). Suburban areas tend to be more heterogeneous than rural or metro areas in terms of educational outcomes to begin with and this heterogeneity in outcomes is likely extending to their ability to respond to immigrant influxes.

The results from the forgoing analysis suggest that immigrants generally face challenges in the educational system. However, these challenges seem particularly acute for Hispanic origin immigrant children in New Destination communities. Children from these groups already have an elevated risk of dropping out of high school, but their risk is further exacerbated by place characteristics. Mexican and Guatemalan children living in fast growing immigrant communities are particularly vulnerable. For each doubling in size of the immigrant community in their consistent PUMAS from 1990 to 2000, there is an additional 33 to 46% increase in the likelihood of dropping out of high school for Mexican and Guatemalan origin children respectively on top of already high dropout odds for children from these groups. With risks of leaving high school that are at least five times greater than native born whites, this research suggests that stronger

efforts should be made in fast growing immigrant communities to ensure that immigrant children at minimum graduate from high school.

A major challenge confronting many communities that host new immigrants is teacher training. As Wainer notes (2006), the establishment of credentialing programs in ESL or bilingual education could help take the pressure off of local municipalities that may struggle to attract teachers with these skills. Another problem facing numerous children of immigrants is that their own legal status can preclude opportunities to continue their education beyond high school (or even work legally in the US), which may reduce the incentive to graduate from high school. While legislators are aware of this problem, the failure to pass the Dream Act or similar legislation means that undocumented children of immigrants who live and attend K-12 public schools in the US do not qualify for reduced tuition to continue their education and cannot legally work in the US.

The current high rates of leaving high school will have repercussions that will be felt for years to come and in aggregate may signal the creation of a new underclass of laborers. As noted by others (eg. Hirschman 2001; Massey 2008), the changing opportunity structure of the US places a strong emphasis on education that was not present for previous generations of immigrants. As such, the social and economic fate of young people is now intricately tied to their educational outcomes. Leaving high school is associated with a lifetime of greater employment volatility and lower wages, which sets the demographic stage for worse educational and employment outcomes for the children of these immigrants. There are also potentially significant implications for the communities in which these immigrants live, particularly in some of the smaller places. Many of the rural New Destination communities would have experienced population declines if it were not for the influx of immigrants (Donato, Tolbert, Nucci, and

Kawano 2008; Kandel and Cromartie 2004). In these places, the children of immigrants are already a significant demographic in the school system. If these children were to stay in the community as adults, their relatively low levels of education would result in a less educated workforce in these places. Policymakers should be cognizant of this cycle and deploy resources strategically to counteract it. The most logical place for intervention is the school system, which can serve multiple roles in integrating new immigrants given that schools are natural hubs in the community.

Adelman, Clifford. 2002. "The Relationship between Urbanicity and Educational Outcomes." Pp. 35-59 in *Increasing Access to College: Extending Possibilities for All Students*, edited by W. G. Tierney and L. S. Hagedorn. New York: State University of New York Press.

Alba, Richard D. and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

—. 2005. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Balfanz, Robert and Nettie Letgers. 2004. "Locating the Dropout Crisis: Which High Schools Produce the Nation's Dropouts? Where are the Located? Who attends them?" Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD.

Bean, Frank D. and Gillian Stevens. 2005. *America's Newcomers And the Dynamics of Diversity*. New York: Russell Sage.

Cameron, Stephen V. and James J. Heckman. 1993. "The Nonequivalence of High School Equivalents." 11:1-47.

Capps, Randy, Michael Fix, Julie Murray, Jason Ost, Jeffrey S. Passel, and Shinta Herwantoro. 2005. "The New Demography of America's Schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act." Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Donato, Katherine M., Charles Tolbert, Alfred Nucci, and Yukio Kawano. 2008. "Changing Faces, Changing Places: The Emergence of New Nonmetropolitan Immigrant Gateways." Pp. 75-98 in *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*, edited by D. S. Massey. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, David L. Featherman, and Beverly Duncan. 1972. *Socioeconomic Background and Achievement*: Seminar Press.

Fennelly, Katherine. 2005. "Latinos, Africans, and Asians in the North Star State: Immigrant Communities in Minnesota." Pp. 111-136 in *Beyond the Gateway: Immigrants in a Changing America*, edited by E. M. Gozdziak and S. F. Martin. New York: Lexington Books.

Fischer, Mary J. and Marta Tienda. 2006. "Redrawing Spatial Color Lines: Hispanic Metropolitan Dispersal, Segregation, and Economic Opportunity." Pp. 100-137 in *Hispanics and the Future of America*, edited by M. Tienda and F. Mitchell. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Foner, Nancy. 2005. *In a New Land: A Comparative View of Immigration*. New York: New York University Press.

Fry, R. 2007. "Are immigrant youth faring better in US schools?" *International Migration Review* 41:579-601.

Gordon, Milton M. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*: Oxford University Press.

Griffith, David. 2008. "New Midwesterners, New Southerners: Immigration Experiences in Four Rural American Settings." Pp. 179-210 in *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*, edited by D. S. Massey. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hernandez-Leon, Ruben and Victor Zuniga. 2005. "Appalachia Meets Aztlan: Mexican Immigration and Intergroup Relations in Dalton, Georgia." Pp. 244-274 in *New Destinations: Mexican Immigrant in the United States*, edited by V. Zuniga and R. Hernandez-Leon. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hirschman, Charles 2001. "The Educational Enrollment of Immigrant Youth: A Test of the Segmented-Assimilation Hypothesis." pp. 317-336.
Johnson, Kenneth M. and Daniel T. Lichter. 2007. "Demographic Components of Population Change: Immigration and the Growing Hispanic Population in New Rural Destination."
Jones-Correa, Michael. 2008. "Race to the Top? The Politics of Immigrant Education in Suburbia." Pp. 308-340 in *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*, edited by D. S. Massey. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Kandel, William A. and Emilio A. Parrado. 2006. "Rural Hispanic Population Growth: Public Policy Impacts on Nonmetro Counties." in *Population Change and Rural Society*, edited by W. A. Kandel and D. L. Brown. Netherlands: Springer.
Kandel, William and John Cromartie. 2004. "New Patterns of Hispanic Settlement in Rural America." United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.
Kandell, William and John Cromartie. 2004. "New Patterns of Hispanic Settlement in Rural America." United States Department of Agriculture, Washington DC.
Kao, Grace and Jennifer S. Thompson. 2003. "Racial And Ethnic Stratificaiton In Educational Achievement And Attainment." Pp. 417-442, vol. 29.
Kao, Grace and Marta Tienda. 1995. "Optimism and Achievement: The Educational Performance of Immigrant Youth." *Social Science Quarterly (University of Texas Press)* 76:1-19.
Kaufman, Phillip, Martha Naomi Alt, and Christopher D. Chapman. 2001. "Dropout Rates in the United States: 2000." U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, DC.
Lichter, Daniel, Domenico Parisi, Steven MIchael Grice, and Michael Taquino. 2008. "Hispanics Residential Segregation in New Immigrant Destinations." in *Population Association of America Annual Meetings*. New Orleans.
Lichter, Daniel T. and Kenneth M. Johnson. 2006. "Emerging Rural Settlement Patterns and the Geographic Redistribution of America's New Immigrants." *Rural Sociology* 71:109-131.
Lieberson, Stanley. 1963. *Ethnic Patterns in American Cities*: Free Press of Glencoe.
Lieberson, Stanley and Mary C. Waters. 1988. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Massey, Douglas S. 2007. *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*. New York: Russell Sage.
—. 2008. *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Massey, Douglas S., Jorge Durand, and Nolan J. Malone. 2002. *Beyond Smoke and Mirrors: Mexican Immigration in an Era of Economic Integration* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Park, Robert Ezra and Ernest W. Burgess. 1921. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Perreira, K. M., K. M. Harris, and D. Lee. 2006. "Making it in America: High school completion by immigrant and native youth." *Demography* 43:511-536.
Portes, Alejandro and Ruben G. Rumbaut. 2006. *Immigrant America: A Portrait (3rd Edition)*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Portes, Alejandro and M. I. N. Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530:74-96.

Provasnik, Stephen, Angelina KwealRamani, Mary McLaughlin Coleman, Lauren Gilbertson, Will Herring, and Qingshu Xie. 2007. "Status of Education Rural America." US Department of Education, Washington DC.

Ruggles, Steven, Matthew Sobek, Trent Alexander, Catherine A. Fitch, Ronald Goeken, Patricia Kelly Hall, Miriam King, and Chad Ronnander. 2008. "Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 4.0." Minnesota Population Center.

Shutika, Debra Lattanzi. 2005. "Bridging the Community: Nativism, Activism, and the Politics of Inclusion in a Mexican Settlement in Pennsylvania." Pp. 103-132 in *New Destinations: Mexican Immigrant in the United States*, edited by V. Zuniga and R. Hernandez-Leon. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Smith, James P. 2006. "Immigrants and the Labor Market." *Journal of Labor Economics* 24:203-233.

Stamps, Katherine and Stephanie A. Bohon. 2006. "Educational Attainment in New and Established Latino Metropolitan Destinations." *Social Science Quarterly* 87:1225-1240.

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

Tienda, Marta and Faith Mitchell. 2006. "Hispanics and the Future of America." Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Wahl, Ana-María González, R. Saylor Breckenridge, and Steven E. Gunkel. 2007. "Latinos, residential segregation and spatial assimilation in micropolitan areas: Exploring the American dilemma on a new frontier." *Social Science Research* 36:995-1020.

Wainer, Andrew. 2006. "The New Latino South and the Challenge to American Public Education." *International Migration* 44:129-165.

Waters, Mary C. 1999. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. Cambridge: Harvard.

Waters, Mary C. and Tomas R. Jimenez. 2005. "Assessing Immigrant Assimilation: New Empirical and Theoretical Challenges." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31:105-125.

Table 1

Table 1. Individual, Household, and Community Characteristics of Persons Aged **15-17**, 2000

				New Destinations			Established Foreign Born	Established Foreign Born	Non-Destina Foreign Born
	All	Native Born	Foreign Born	All	Native Born	Foreign Born			
Individual Characteristics									
HS drop-out (age 15-17)	0.042	0.036	0.108	0.043	0.041	0.151	0.134	0.085	0.054
Age	15.999	15.994	16.053	16.002	16.000	16.086	16.052	16.051	16.050
Male	0.514	0.512	0.533	0.514	0.513	0.542	0.540	0.528	0.510
Native Born	0.914	1.000	0.000	0.976	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Foreign Born	0.086	0.000	1.000	0.024	0.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Immigrated before age 9	0.044	0.000	0.516	0.012	0.000	0.515	0.501	0.525	0.628
Immigrated after age 9	0.038	0.000	0.441	0.011	0.000	0.464	0.466	0.423	0.328
Non-Hispanic White	0.655	0.700	0.175	0.782	0.793	0.307	0.177	0.156	0.469
Non-Hispanic Black	0.130	0.135	0.070	0.159	0.161	0.071	0.062	0.076	0.051
Hispanic	0.145	0.110	0.526	0.024	0.015	0.405	0.547	0.528	0.204
Asian	0.034	0.020	0.185	0.007	0.003	0.167	0.175	0.194	0.210
Other	0.036	0.035	0.044	0.028	0.028	0.049	0.040	0.046	0.065
Household Characteristics									
Married head of household	0.689	0.687	0.706	0.700	0.700	0.694	0.725	0.691	0.753
Number of kids in househol	2.176	2.138	2.581	2.073	2.063	2.465	2.610	2.571	2.401
College educated head	0.504	0.516	0.369	0.438	0.439	0.421	0.375	0.355	0.564
Household under poverty li	0.255	0.238	0.437	0.266	0.263	0.401	0.417	0.458	0.363
Community Characteristics									
Metropolitan Status									
Undetermined	0.273	0.270	0.305	0.202	0.201	0.245	0.406	0.231	0.283
Non-Metro	0.227	0.240	0.083	0.488	0.489	0.446	0.086	0.045	0.450
Metro Central City	0.128	0.116	0.257	0.047	0.046	0.073	0.135	0.374	0.039
Metro Outside Central Ci	0.287	0.283	0.326	0.123	0.123	0.126	0.346	0.331	0.071
Metro Mixed	0.086	0.091	0.028	0.140	0.141	0.109	0.028	0.019	0.157
Racial Composition									
White	0.705	0.719	0.562	0.815	0.815	0.806	0.628	0.483	0.877
Black	0.111	0.110	0.121	0.131	0.131	0.137	0.109	0.130	0.086
Hispanic	0.123	0.113	0.225	0.023	0.023	0.027	0.183	0.279	0.015
Asian	0.034	0.031	0.062	0.007	0.007	0.008	0.050	0.076	0.006
Other	0.027	0.027	0.031	0.024	0.024	0.022	0.030	0.032	0.016
% Foreign Born	0.109	0.101	0.203	0.027	0.027	0.030	0.156	0.257	0.019
% Recent Foreign Born	0.019	0.018	0.033	0.006	0.006	0.007	0.031	0.037	0.003
% Change FB 1990-2000	0.756	0.762	0.691	1.271	1.265	1.493	1.084	0.327	0.318
% Household Poverty	0.230	0.229	0.243	0.252	0.253	0.248	0.213	0.267	0.246
N	615131	562212	52919	87797	85712	2085	22211	27903	720

Source: IPUMS 2000

Table 2

Table 2. High school dropouts ages 15-17 by race/ethnicity and gender by destination type, 2000

	White		Black		Asian		Hispanic		Other	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
All Pumas	0.033	0.030	0.049	0.036	0.021	0.022	0.105	0.073	0.049	0.049
New Destination	0.039	0.036	0.057	0.041	0.022	0.039	0.218	0.136	0.054	0.050
Established Growing	0.034	0.031	0.046	0.034	0.017	0.024	0.126	0.089	0.051	0.048
Established Maintaining	0.028	0.025	0.047	0.036	0.022	0.019	0.082	0.059	0.044	0.050
Non-FB Destination	0.040	0.035	0.061	0.041	0.064	0.014	0.111	0.048	0.055	0.048
N	206893	195753	40314	39484	10955	10159	46732	42741	11217	10883

Table 3

Table 3. Unweighted frequencies and percentages of high school dropouts

	%	N
Male	4.61	316,111
Female	3.75	299,020
Native Born	3.580	20,105
Foreign Born	10.770	5,701
Generational Status		
Immigrated after age 9	14.840	25629
Immigrated before age 9	6.950	27290
Second generation	2.360	60174
Third + generation	3.720	502038
Race/Ethnicity		
Non-Hispanic White	3.190	402,646
Non-Hispanic Black	4.270	79,798
Asian	2.120	21,114
Hispanic	8.980	89,473
Other	4.890	22,100
Household Characteristics		
Married head of household	3.050	423,570
Not Married Head of Household	6.730	191,561
College educated head	1.860	309,771
< College Education for Head	6.560	305,360
Household under poverty line	8.490	156,687
Household above poverty line	2.730	458,444
Community Characteristics		
Metropolitan Status		
Undetermined	3.940	52,731
Non-Metro	4.330	139,397
Metro Central City	5.430	78,621
Metro Outside Central City	3.300	176,594
Metro Mixed	4.530	167,788
Foreign born type		
Other Destination	3.950	51,688
Established Maintaining	3.800	236,362
Established Growing	4.580	239,284
New Destination	4.350	87,797

Table 4

Table 4. Logistic regression predicting the likelihood of dropping out of high school for 15-17 year olds by race/ethnicity

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Individual Level Characteristics												
Male	0.191	0.014 ***	0.190	0.014 ***	0.188	0.014 ***	0.189	0.014 ***	0.186	0.014 ***	0.186	0.014 ***
Age	0.656	0.013 ***	0.667	0.013 ***	0.668	0.013 ***	0.668	0.013 ***	0.669	0.013 ***	0.670	0.013 ***
Foreign Born												
Immigrated before age 9	0.493	0.038 ***	0.462	0.038 ***	0.488	0.038 ***	0.490	0.037 ***	0.529	0.037 ***	0.505	0.038 ***
Immigrated after age 9	1.253	0.058 ***	1.159	0.056 ***	1.168	0.054 ***	1.170	0.053 ***	1.192	0.051 ***	1.154	0.052 ***
Race/Ethnicity												
Non-Hispanic Black	0.273	0.035 ***	-0.314	0.033 ***	-0.305	0.036 ***	-0.316	0.036 ***	-0.316	0.036 ***	-0.370	0.039 ***
Hispanic	0.753	0.049 ***	0.235	0.053 ***	0.291	0.044 ***	0.284	0.043 ***	0.405	0.038 ***	0.467	0.035 ***
Asian	-0.929	0.087 ***	-0.982	0.078 ***	-0.915	0.074 ***	-0.916	0.074 ***	-0.811	0.074 ***	-0.769	0.070 ***
Other	0.351	0.053 ***	0.056	0.046	0.081	0.044 +	0.074	0.044 +	0.117	0.043 **	0.128	0.043 **
Household Characteristics												
Married head of household			-0.582	0.018 ***	-0.592	0.018 ***	-0.590	0.018 ***	-0.587	0.018 ***	-0.581	0.018 ***
Number of kids in household			0.073	0.012 ***	0.075	0.012 ***	0.075	0.012 ***	0.076	0.012 ***	0.078	0.012 ***
College educated head			-0.963	0.021 ***	-0.951	0.021 ***	-0.947	0.021 ***	-0.940	0.021 ***	-0.937	0.021 ***
Household under poverty line			0.624	0.023 ***	0.624	0.022 ***	0.616	0.022 ***	0.622	0.022 ***	0.629	0.023 ***
Community Characteristics												
New Destination					0.336	0.067 ***	0.320	0.069 ***				
Established Growing Destination					0.300	0.052 ***	0.297	0.050 ***				
Non-Major Destination					0.255	0.053 ***	0.236	0.054 ***				
(Ref. Established Maintaining)												
Percent Foreign Born in 2000									-1.562	0.251 ***	-0.578	0.446
% Change Foreign Born 1990-2000									0.207	0.024 ***	0.197	0.025 ***
Metropolitan Status												
Metro Central City							0.003	0.054	0.082	0.049 +	0.022	0.050
Metro Outside Central City							-0.132	0.044 **	-0.090	0.037 *	-0.112	0.037 **
Non-Metro							-0.027	0.039	-0.070	0.037 +	-0.071	0.036 *
(Ref. Mixed metropolitan status)												
Racial Composition												
Non-Hispanic Black %											0.344	0.136 *
Hispanic %											-0.681	0.178 ***
Asian %											-0.894	0.636
Other %											0.237	0.263
(ref. Non-Hispanic White)												
Constant	-14.164	0.204 ***	-13.845	0.201 ***	-14.065	0.201 ***	-14.017	0.207 ***	-13.899	0.206 ***	-13.941	0.208 ***
N	615131		615131		615131		615131		615131		615131	
Likelihood Ratio Chi-squared	4250.3		7854.9		9480.4		10025		10959		12041	

Table 5a

Table 5. Logistic regression predicting the likelihood of dropping out of high school for 15-17 year olds by detailed country of origin

	Model 1 All		Model 2 Arrive Before Age 9		Model 3 Arrived After age 9		Model 4		Model 5 Arrive Before Age 9		Model 6 Arrived After age 9	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Male	0.179	0.013 ***	0.144	0.014 ***	0.158	0.014 ***	0.180	0.014 ***	0.151	0.015 ***	0.164	0.014 ***
Age	0.668	0.013 ***	0.661	0.014 ***	0.668	0.013 ***	0.677	0.013 ***	0.673	0.014 ***	0.679	0.013 ***
Country of Origin for FB												
China	0.180	0.170	0.017	0.272	0.272	0.200	0.110	0.172	0.082	0.258	0.112	0.213
Hong Kong/Macao	-1.432	0.512 **	-0.682	0.503			-1.569	0.516 **	-0.701	0.499		
Taiwan	-1.212	0.383 **	-1.337	0.607 *	-1.117	0.476 *	-1.021	0.380 **	-1.027	0.603 +	-1.011	0.477 *
Japan	-1.031	0.373 **	-1.189	0.511 *	-0.775	0.571	-0.647	0.369 +	-0.772	0.498	-0.451	0.582
Korea	-0.759	0.188 ***	-0.868	0.265 ***	-0.586	0.321 +	-0.450	0.192 *	-0.455	0.267 +	-0.427	0.336
Cambodia	0.362	0.335	0.530	0.382	-0.441	1.038	-0.114	0.356	-0.032	0.404	-0.796	1.049
Laos	-0.294	0.364	-0.403	0.488	0.143	0.581	-0.787	0.377 *	-0.917	0.507 +	-0.567	0.540
Vietnam	-0.130	0.147	0.100	0.185	-0.357	0.208 +	-0.356	0.150 *	-0.187	0.185	-0.558	0.219 *
Philippines	-0.461	0.161 **	-0.813	0.262 ***	-0.143	0.204	-0.133	0.163	-0.424	0.271	0.111	0.200
Other east/southeast Asia	-0.002	0.178	0.093	0.210	-0.274	0.364	-0.348	0.182 +	-0.354	0.216 +	-0.521	0.375
India, other south Asia	-0.856	0.192 ***	-0.960	0.342 ***	-0.784	0.250 ***	-0.669	0.186 ***	-0.670	0.349 +	-0.682	0.239 ***
Middle East	0.033	0.175	-0.195	0.261	0.302	0.207	0.071	0.174	-0.072	0.268	0.196	0.210
Canada	0.045	0.179	-0.038	0.240	0.155	0.235	0.330	0.179 +	0.277	0.237	0.405	0.247
Mexico	2.020	0.072 ***	1.467	0.084 ***	2.438	0.055 ***	1.555	0.074 ***	0.975	0.088 ***	1.948	0.058 ***
Puerto Rico	0.899	0.098 ***	0.707	0.121 ***	1.148	0.126 ***	0.457	0.095 ***	0.242	0.122 *	0.702	0.126 ***
Cuba	0.524	0.111 ***	1.110	0.179 ***	0.178	0.186	0.344	0.117 ***	0.846	0.168 ***	0.027	0.188
Dominican Republic	0.386	0.157 *	0.250	0.258	0.493	0.213 *	-0.112	0.170	-0.244	0.272	-0.028	0.233
Haiti	0.259	0.214	0.460	0.271 +	0.081	0.329	-0.147	0.220	0.103	0.261	-0.379	0.341
Jamaica	-0.116	0.183	-0.311	0.240	0.060	0.307	-0.407	0.184 *	-0.511	0.247 *	-0.316	0.314
other West Indies/Caribbean	-0.266	0.204	-0.019	0.256	-0.656	0.376 +	-0.589	0.212 ***	-0.273	0.253	-1.062	0.386 ***
El Salvador	1.563	0.174 ***	0.934	0.220 ***	1.972	0.176 ***	1.163	0.187 ***	0.557	0.237 *	1.530	0.187 ***
Guatemala	1.876	0.165 ***	1.274	0.206 ***	2.294	0.192 ***	1.450	0.188 ***	0.901	0.234 ***	1.793	0.216 ***
Nicaragua	0.373	0.152 *	0.417	0.150 **	0.228	0.350	0.149	0.155	0.204	0.159	-0.077	0.384
Other Central America	1.155	0.129 ***	0.771	0.190 ***	1.453	0.166 ***	0.867	0.133 ***	0.518	0.195 ***	1.103	0.180 ***
South America	0.173	0.104 +	0.104	0.174	0.228	0.118 +	0.098	0.094	0.119	0.162	0.074	0.116
Great Britain	-0.354	0.317	-0.154	0.332	-1.002	0.729	0.058	0.322	0.313	0.336	-0.678	0.745
Other Northern/Western Europe	-0.437	0.260 +	-0.539	0.320 +	-0.313	0.339	-0.163	0.264	-0.160	0.329	-0.181	0.340
Southern Europe	0.097	0.193	-0.339	0.291	0.589	0.298 *	0.176	0.195	-0.214	0.292	0.584	0.292 *
Germany	-0.197	0.131	-0.235	0.148	-0.093	0.253	-0.029	0.129	-0.018	0.145	-0.059	0.260
Central/Eastern Europe	-0.002	0.192	-0.012	0.302	0.004	0.235	0.113	0.201	0.207	0.304	0.058	0.242
Former USSR	-0.364	0.154 *	-0.303	0.219	-0.414	0.183 *	-0.226	0.153	-0.109	0.226	-0.345	0.177 +
Africa	-0.210	0.184	0.035	0.300	-0.365	0.243	-0.267	0.192	0.163	0.295	-0.522	0.259 *
Oceania/Pacific Islands	-0.195	0.321	-0.331	0.520	-0.035	0.475	-0.144	0.319	-0.212	0.531	-0.093	0.462
US Born	reference		reference		reference		reference		reference		reference	
Household Characteristics												
Married head of household							-0.569	0.019 ***	-0.539	0.022 ***	-0.547	0.020 ***
Number of kids in household							0.054	0.013 ***	0.070	0.013 ***	0.064	0.013 ***
College educated head							-0.916	0.020 ***	-0.900	0.022 ***	-0.918	0.021 ***
Household under poverty line							0.611	0.024 ***	0.691	0.023 ***	0.638	0.025 ***
Community Characteristics												
Percent Foreign Born 2000												
% Change Foreign Born 1990-2000												
Central City												
Suburb												
Non-Metro												
(ref. Mixed Metro Status PUMA)												
Percent Black												
Percent Hispanic												
Percent Asian												
Percent other												
(ref. Percent White)												
Constant	-14.213	0.199 ***	-14.066	0.228 ***	-14.191	0.214 ***	-13.994	0.197 ***	-14.006	0.226 ***	-14.067	0.209 ***
N	615131		591038		586520		615131		591038		586520	
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Squared	4991.4		3332.3		6229.5		10237		9452.9		11838	

Source: IPUMS 2000 5% Sample

Table 5b

Table 5. Logistic regression predicting the likelihood of dropping out of high school for 15-17 year olds by detailed country of origin (cont

	Model 7			Model 8			Model 9			Model 10				
				Arrive Before Age 9			Arrived After age 9						Interaction % Cha	
	B	SE		B	SE		B	SE		B	SE		B	SE
Male	0.178	0.013	**	0.152	0.015	**	0.162	0.014	**	0.176	0.014	***		
Age	0.679	0.013	**	0.675	0.014	**	0.681	0.013	**	0.680	0.012	***		
Country of Origin														
Asian and Middle Eastern														
China	0.280	0.172	**	0.250	0.251		0.300	0.212		0.254	0.172			
Hong Kong/Macao	-1.354	0.512	**	-0.465	0.493					-1.378	0.512	**		
Taiwan	-0.798	0.417	+	-0.849	0.638		-0.781	0.485		-0.819	0.413	*		
Japan	-0.594	0.365		-0.740	0.495		-0.375	0.577		-0.598	0.365			
Korea	-0.340	0.193	+	-0.381	0.271		-0.267	0.331		-0.350	0.193	+		
Cambodia	-0.015	0.376		0.071	0.424		-0.742	1.055		-0.029	0.374			
Laos	-0.734	0.384	+	-0.877	0.503	+	-0.533	0.586		-0.741	0.382	+		
Vietnam	-0.214	0.153		-0.029	0.192		-0.440	0.216	*	-0.228	0.152			
Philippines	0.098	0.154		-0.237	0.263		0.351	0.196	+	0.076	0.155			
Other east/southeast Asia	-0.243	0.182		-0.261	0.212		-0.424	0.380		-0.258	0.182			
India, other south Asia	-0.561	0.193	**	-0.547	0.349		-0.566	0.252	*	-0.576	0.192	**		
Middle East	0.183	0.180		0.085	0.262		0.275	0.220		0.167	0.179			
North American														
Canada	0.355	0.179	*	0.312	0.238		0.421	0.247	+	0.349	0.179	+		
Mexico	1.691	0.056	**	1.125	0.068	**	2.029	0.050	**	1.432	0.080	***	0.285	0.062 ***
Puerto Rico	0.521	0.094	**	0.321	0.123	**	0.751	0.124	**	0.506	0.094	***		
Cuba	0.537	0.148	**	1.062	0.191	**	0.210	0.208		0.506	0.147	**		
Dominican Republic	0.049	0.165		-0.073	0.284		0.139	0.216		0.019	0.164			
Haiti	-0.084	0.225		0.201	0.256		-0.294	0.352		-0.101	0.225			
Jamaica	-0.301	0.185		-0.372	0.235		-0.200	0.319		-0.322	0.184	+		
other West Indies/Caribbean	-0.502	0.233	*	-0.150	0.285		-0.945	0.386	*	-0.523	0.231	*		
El Salvador	1.345	0.154	**	0.758	0.212	**	1.692	0.164	**	1.322	0.160	***		
Guatemala	1.618	0.140	**	1.066	0.205	**	1.948	0.169	**	1.318	0.184	***	0.378	0.170 *
Nicaragua	0.373	0.169	*	0.448	0.160	**	0.107	0.397		0.340	0.169	*		
Other Central America	0.978	0.129	**	0.623	0.196	**	1.225	0.174	**	0.963	0.130	***		
South America	0.221	0.101	*	0.278	0.166	+	0.194	0.121		0.202	0.100	*		
European and Other														
Great Britain	0.098	0.320		0.348	0.333		-0.626	0.743		0.094	0.320			
Other Northern/Western Europe	-0.150	0.267		-0.139	0.336		-0.170	0.342		-0.152	0.266			
Southern Europe	0.240	0.198		-0.150	0.294		0.662	0.298	*	0.230	0.198			
Germany	-0.058	0.129		-0.045	0.145		-0.091	0.261		-0.056	0.129			
Central/Eastern Europe	0.168	0.197		0.293	0.306		0.113	0.235		0.158	0.197			
Former USSR	-0.140	0.154		0.021	0.217		-0.272	0.185		-0.154	0.153			
Africa	-0.240	0.196		0.209	0.297		-0.487	0.265	+	-0.245	0.196			
Oceania/Pacific Islands	0.017	0.322		-0.076	0.526		0.069	0.477		0.006	0.321			
US Born	reference			reference										
Household Characteristics														
Married head of household	-0.563	0.019	**	-0.539	0.021	**	-0.547	0.019	**	-0.561	0.019	***		
Number of kids in household	0.062	0.012	**	0.076	0.013	**	0.071	0.013	**	0.062	0.012	***		
College educated head	-0.908	0.020	**	-0.891	0.021	**	-0.909	0.021	**	-0.907	0.020	***		
Household under poverty line	0.624	0.023	**	0.700	0.022	**	0.647	0.023	**	0.625	0.023	***		
Community Characteristics														
Percent Foreign Born 2000	0.239	0.546		-0.163	0.467		-0.058	0.494		0.277	0.510			
% Change Foreign Born 1990-200(	0.173	0.024	**	0.162	0.025	**	0.157	0.024	**	0.142	0.025	***		
Central City	0.045	0.049		0.057	0.050		0.020	0.048		0.040	0.047			
Suburb	-0.095	0.038	*	-0.101	0.039	*	-0.090	0.037	*	-0.097	0.037	**		
Non-Metro	-0.075	0.035	*	-0.077	0.034	*	-0.076	0.035	*	-0.071	0.035	*		
(ref. Mixed Metro Status PUMA)														
Percent Black	-0.026	0.122		-0.147	0.127		-0.051	0.120		-0.016	0.118			
Percent Hispanic	-0.780	0.212	**	-0.489	0.180	**	-0.487	0.188	*	-0.722	0.204	***		
Percent Asian	-1.960	0.974	*	-1.593	0.835	+	-1.631	0.894	+	-1.848	0.887	*		
Percent other	0.753	0.374	*	0.602	0.368		0.727	0.364	*	0.728	0.353	*		
(ref. Percent White)														
Constant	-14.052	0.203	**	-14.038	0.232	**	-14.109	0.215	**	-14.051	0.202	***		
N	615131			591038			586520			615131				
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Squared	12899			11336			15766			13881				

appendix a

Appendix A. Social Background Characteristics of FB and Native Born Youth Aged 15-17

		Foreign Born Child/StepChild of Head Ages 15-17	Married Couple Household	College Educated Head	Household Below Poverty	Non-Metro PUMA	Central City PUMA	Total
Asia								
	China	84	79.27	45.73	38.78	2.80	46.46	820
	Hong Kong/Macao	84.79	72.17	36.25	35.60	2.59	37.54	309
	Taiwan	82.71	71.26	75.00	32.01	2.80	13.32	428
	Japan	86.31	75.18	80.47	21.17	13.69	12.04	548
	Korea	91.58	80.66	71.88	20.90	9.01	16.12	1,675
	Cambodia	81.03	71.26	21.26	63.22	1.15	45.98	174
	Laos	78.1	76.64	20.07	62.04	8.39	44.53	274
	Vietnam	85.86	79.89	28.69	46.51	3.55	25.60	1,492
	Philippines	86.04	77.77	73.54	18.15	7.11	18.80	1,984
	Other east/southeast Asia	86.53	77.86	34.04	56.09	5.63	39.48	1,084
	India, other south Asia	89.6	86.88	64.05	31.44	4.02	26.79	1,616
	Middle East	87.11	77.34	59.90	36.73	3.62	26.79	1,187
Americas								
	Canada	92.5	79.96	70.09	15.60	14.61	10.46	1,013
	Mexico	**67.8**	70.66	10.86	58.60	11.71	22.74	**18,666**
	Puerto Rico	83.66	47.82	34.47	54.13	3.21	36.36	1,903
	Cuba	81.06	73.38	31.65	46.76	1.92	3.60	417
	Dominican Republic	84.21	45.90	25.22	52.62	0.70	58.55	1,146
	Haiti	79.33	56.53	26.14	46.35	1.22	29.48	658
	Jamaica	79.19	47.86	35.61	33.76	1.50	43.70	865
	other West Indies/Caribbean	80.15	51.97	34.85	39.24	2.12	52.12	660
	El Salvador	**71.7**	63.43	14.66	44.93	4.26	34.27	**1,173**
	Guatemala	**71.98**	61.21	15.93	50.00	6.37	33.41	**910**
	Nicaragua	86.02	66.09	35.06	40.04	1.72	15.52	522
	Other Central America	77.3	59.32	38.16	44.74	5.70	27.19	912
	South America	80.49	69.45	49.29	36.10	3.80	27.95	3,080
Other parts of world								
	Great Britain	94.31	74.19	77.03	12.60	12.80	10.98	492
	Other Northern/Western Europe	83.44	79.62	78.73	27.52	11.34	12.87	785
	Southern Europe	84.46	77.26	53.53	26.13	9.18	20.48	708
	Germany	84.73	71.74	68.38	25.85	22.48	9.94	2,495
	Central/Eastern Europe	88.89	81.33	50.54	25.23	4.32	30.56	1,296
	Former USSR	91.08	81.64	67.96	36.04	4.00	36.38	1,748
	Africa	81.99	61.55	64.46	37.72	3.39	29.24	1,238
	Oceania/Pacific Islands	84	79.64	57.09	28.73	9.82	16.36	275
	US Born	89.66	68.69	51.63	23.76	24.00	11.57	562,578
	Average		68.86	50.36	25.47	22.66	12.78	
	Total							615,131

Source: IPUMS 2000 5% Sample