Immigrant Context and Opportunity:

New Destinations and Socioeconomic Attainment among Asians in the United States[1]

Eunbi Kim

Chenoa Flippen

University of Pennsylvania

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Abstract

Immigrant populations, who were once overwhelmingly concentrated in a handful of immigrant gateways, are now living in dozens of new destinations, particularly throughout the Southeast and Midwest. This pattern and its implications for immigrant incorporation have received a great deal of attention, but the vast majority of it has focused on Hispanics. This paper seeks to understand the relationship between settlement patterns and socioeconomic attainment among Asians. Our main objective is to ascertain how immigrant context shapes income, occupational status, and homeownership, and whether the impact of new vs. traditional settlement areas is mediated through variation in local labor and housing markets. To address these issues we combine individual- and metro-level information from the 2010 American Community Survey. Results suggest that Asians in new destinations face an important tradeoff between income and homeownership, and that differences across contexts are largely attributable to metropolitan labor and housing market conditions, rather than the immigrant context per se. However, there are important differences among Asians by sex, and a comparison with whites suggests that inequality differs across new and more established immigrant settlement areas.

Sociology has long been concerned with the impact of context on individual behavior, including various aspects of socioeconomic attainment. Within immigration scholarship, there is likewise a long tradition of considering how the context of reception shapes the process of immigrant adaptation. Most of this research focuses on broad, macro-economic and macro-social aspects of context, such as the implications of deindustrialization and increasingly punitive immigration policies on successive immigrant cohorts (Massey and Bartley 2005; Portes and Borocz 1989). However, recent shifts in the geographic settlement patterns of immigrants have invited more attention to how the conditions of local areas shape variation in outcomes *within* groups.

Recent years have witnessed a dramatic dispersal of the immigrant population. According to Singer (2004), the number of recent arrivals to the United States who settle in new immigrant destinations has grown rapidly since 1980. Immigrant populations, which were once overwhelmingly concentrated in a handful of established metropolitan areas, are now living in dozens of new destinations, particularly throughout the Southeast and Midwest (Wilson and Singer 2011). This pattern and its implications for immigrant incorporation have received a great deal of research attention, but the vast majority of it has focused on Hispanic immigrants, with relatively little research on Asians (Massey 2008).

The relative dearth of research on new Asian destinations is problematic for several reasons. First, the Asian population is large and growing rapidly. According to the 2010 Census, 5.6% of the U.S. population is of Asian origin, with a large proportion foreign-born and recently arrived. Second, their dispersal since 1980 has been just as dramatic as that of Hispanics (Frey 2011). Traditionally, Asian populations were concentrated in three major metropolitan areas, namely Los Angeles, New York, and San Francisco. However, a large share of new Asian immigrants dispersed during the past decade to other metro areas such as Washington D.C., Raleigh, NC and Dallas, TX. The new Asian-gaining metro areas are less geographically concentrated than Hispanic new destinations and include metros in the West as well as in the South. Third, Asians average relatively high socio-economic status, even among recent immigrants. Most of the literature on the contextual influences on immigrant adaptation implicitly assumes immigrant disadvantage; studies are often at least partially motivated by the question of whether low-skill and non-white immigrants are better able overcome the challenges of labor market disadvantage and discrimination in contexts with sizeable co-ethnic communities to draw on for support. Or, put differently, research has attempted to assess whether there is a penalty for being an early entrant into an area unaccustomed and perhaps poorly equipped to deal with disadvantaged immigrants. How context shapes the adaptation of groups that are relatively advantaged has not received adequate consideration.

This paper seeks to examine the link between Asian settlement patterns and their spatial and socioeconomic assimilation. Our first objective, after delineating between traditional and new Asian

destinations, is to examine differences among Asians' labor and housing market outcomes according to metropolitan context. That is, we analyze whether residents of new and traditional areas experience different levels of income, occupational status, and homeownership after controlling for individual demographic, human capital, and immigration characteristics. Income and occupational status are two of the most common barometers of socioeconomic attainment, while homeownership is often considered a hallmark of middle class status, central to the process of wealth accumulation, and especially among immigrants, an indicator of stability and incorporation into U.S. society. A second main objective is to explore whether observed differences in socioeconomic outcomes across locales relate to the immigrant context per se, or whether they reflect differences across contexts in local labor and housing market conditions. Our third objective is to compare Asian outcomes with those of non-Hispanic whites (hereafter referred to simply as "whites"). Examining the interaction between race and metro areas provides important insight into how immigrant context shapes inequality. And finally, labor market outcomes are highly stratified by sex, and racial inequality is also markedly different for men and women. We therefore also explore sex differences in the relationship between context and Asian labor market outcomes and inequality with whites.

Theoretical Background

Immigration scholars have long sought to understand the impact of context in shaping immigrant outcomes. The Chicago School, in particular, drew attention to the importance of social structure in shaping human behavior and the social problems associated with immigration. In Thomas and Znaniecki's seminal *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (1918–1920), the authors emphasized the disintegrative impact of migration on social networks and community cohesion. The resulting social disorganization was framed as an important source of the poor outcomes previously attributed to immigrants' inferior cultural attributes. While much of the subsequent work that the theory inspired focused on how neighborhood attributes relate to crime and deviance (see Sampson 1993; Shaw and McKay 1942), interest in the link between the larger social context and immigrant adaptation reemerged with new force following the post-1965 growth in immigration from Asia and Latin America. In particular, Portes and colleagues (Portes and Borocz, 1989) introduced the concept of context of reception, which together with conditions of exit such as individuals' human capital and class backgrounds, is argued to be a crucial determinant of new immigrants' life chances. Portes and Borocz emphasized three aspects of the context of reception that have a profound impact on immigrant outcomes: the size and nature of the co-ethnic community, governmental response to immigration, and the absence or presence of discrimination or hostile reaction from the native population.

First, a large body of literature documents the salience of co-ethnic communities for the

adaptation of subsequent arrivals. Ethnic communities provide new arrivals with social networks and enhanced access to information (Portes and Stepck 2003; Waldinger 1996), which can enhance labor and housing market prospects. In certain cases, ethnic communities are large enough to form residential and business enclaves. The relationship between ethnic enclaves and immigrant incorporation has been the subject of considerable debate. On the one hand, in enclaves recent immigrants have ready access to employment even without English language skills and cultural knowledge of U.S. society. Enclaves have been argued to provide comfort and solidarity to new immigrants, potentially offering enhanced employment opportunities and informal training in return for cheap labor (Portes and Jensen 1989; Portes and Wilson 1980; Portes and Zhou 1992). On the other hand, enclave wages are highly polarized, with business owners faring relatively well and laborers often earning less than similarly skilled co-ethnics working outside the enclave economy (Sanders and Nee 1987). While the impact of enclave economies on labor market prospects may be open to debate, in the realm of housing an established co-ethnic community is argued to help immigrants gain access to the information necessary to navigate the lending and real estate industries, facilitating homeownership (Flippen 2010).

A second critical aspect of the context of reception centers on the governmental response to immigration. Some groups, such as refugees and other politically favored populations, receive active government assistance in resettlement while others face a neutral or frequently punitive governmental response. Likewise, governmental policies relating to immigrants have been more favorable in some historical periods than others. While this perspective has largely been applied to explain national origin differences in incorporation processes, there has been growing attention to the variation across local areas in governmental and institutional response to immigration. For instance, the approach to immigration enforcement varies substantially across metropolitan areas, shaping population outcomes (Parrado 2012). Likewise, large co-ethnic communities may shape the behavior of local institutions such as schools, departments of motor vehicles, banks and real estate agencies, and so on, making them better equipped and more adept at servicing immigrant communities. This too potentially enhances immigrant access to jobs and housing in areas with a longer history of immigrant settlement.

The third key component of the context of reception is the presence or absence of discrimination. Greater hostility from the native majority could impede the status attainment of immigrants in innumerable ways in both labor and housing markets. Relatively large and rapidly growing minority populations may heighten the sense of competition and threat among natives, resulting in more restricted access to employment and housing opportunities. On the other hand, areas of the country with little prior history of immigration by definition tend to be more homogeneous, and are often characterized by a rigid black-white divide to a greater degree than more

diverse areas of the country.   In such a context, natives might react more negatively to the influx of diverse newcomers, though it is also possible that new immigrant destinations could be marked by less fixed boundaries between new immigrants and other groups, or fewer preconceived notions or stereotypes held by the majority.   Whether ethnic and racial minorities experience or perceive more discrimination in new or traditional immigrant gateways thus remains an open question.

New destinations and the context of reception

The vast majority of writing on the context of reception has focused on cross-national comparisons.   Thus, one reason that Cubans average better outcomes than Mexicans is the active government assistance they received, and longstanding Chinese communities helped new co-ethnic entrants in ways that were not available to otherwise similar entrants from newer Asian immigrant-sending nations (Portes and Borocz 1989; Zhou 1997).   Far less research has addressed how more localized variation in the context of reception can shape the course of incorporation *within* groups. A large part of the neglect of cross-locale variation in adaptation was due to the historically high degree of concentration of immigrants in a handful of receiving areas. For most of U.S. history immigrants have been highly concentrated in particular areas, such as the Irish in the Northeast and Midwest, Mexicans in the Southwest, and Asians in a handful of Western and Northeastern cities. That is, the vast majority of immigrants historically settled in large cities in Northeast or West which not only offered numerous employment opportunities but also had established ethnic communities (Alba and Nee 1999; Massey 1985).

However, in recent decades the geographical pattern of immigrant settlement has become more varied and, while traditional gateways remain major receivers of new immigrants, an increasing number have been attracted into non-traditional destinations, particularly in the Midwest and South (Frey 2011; Singer 2004; Wilson and Singer 2011).   Approximately a third of immigrant populations in the United States now reside outside of traditional settlement areas, and cities in Colorado, Georgia, Nevada, and North Carolina are experiencing some of the fastest immigrant growth rates in the country.

This dispersal presents new opportunities for study.   A long literature outside of immigration studies points to differences across and within regions in opportunity structures. According to neoclassical theorists in economics, regional income inequality is an inevitable byproduct of uneven development, but eventually disappears as the economy reaches maturity with high employment rates and wage levels (Gerrard 1989; Kuznets 1955; Smith 1975). One mechanism contributing to the more even distribution of resources is internal migration; because population tends to flow from lower- to higher-opportunity areas, equilibrium will eventually result.   While subsequent work has argued that regional inequality is more durable, and can persist even in mature, developed economies (Coughlin and Mandelbaum 1988; Maxwell and Hite 1992), both perspectives

acknowledge the importance of regional imbalances in opportunity structures to population movements (Bernat 2001; Nissan and Carter 1993).[2] The more than 30-year trend of Rustbelt to Sunbelt migration seemingly contradicts this pattern. While considerable convergence has occurred over time across major U.S. regions, the South still averages lower wages and occupational prestige than other regions. While scholars emphasize the importance of employers and firms, who seek to relocate to regions with lower operating costs (particularly lower wages, land values, and diminished union presence), in driving these patterns (Kemeny and Storper 2012), they nevertheless have important implications for the impact of context on immigrant adaptation. Because many new destinations are in lower wage settings, it is important to factor in these differences when assessing the impact of immigrant context on incorporation.

In recent years a number of studies have examined immigrant populations' socioeconomic outcomes in new gateways. However, virtually all of them focus on Hispanic populations. Stamps and Cohon (2006), for instance, showed that educational attainment is higher among Hispanic children in new destinations than among their peers in more traditional areas, though only among recently arrived immigrants. When examining differences in wage and occupational outcomes across contexts, Kochhar et al. (2005) emphasize the importance of new destinations' industrial structures, even within regions such as the South. And finally, Flippen (2010) finds that Hispanic homeownership rates are higher in metropolitan areas which are racially more integrated and have established co-ethnic communities.

Asian settlement patterns and implications for status attainment

While scholars have begun to compare the process to immigrant incorporation across new and traditional destinations for Hispanics, research on Asians remains extremely limited. Asian immigration to the United States dates back to at least the 1840s, when Chinese laborers were attracted to the West Coast by the Gold Rush. Migrants from China and Japan were important sources of labor in the West for much of the latter half of the 19th century, as were Koreans and Filipinos to a lesser extent. While the west coast was the point of entry for most Asian immigrants at the time, exclusion and mistreatment encouraged many to try their fortunes in large urban areas in the East (Zhou 1992). Several decades of restrictive immigration legislation, including the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, 1908 Gentlemen's Agreement with Japan, and National Origins Quota acts of the 1920s, dramatically restricted Asian entry into the United States. Many Asian communities survived during this period, but did not generally expand. The 1965 Hart Celler Immigration Act, however, marked a major turning point in U.S. immigration history, particularly for Asians. By

---

[2] A parallel line of research compares economic outcomes among workers in different cities. Kemeny and Storper (2012), for instance, show that workers in larger cities average higher wages than their counterparts in smaller metros, while Urahn et al. (2013) show enduring differentials in social mobility across metro areas.

removing the national origins quotas and explicit bans on Asian immigration, the act opened the door to immigration from Asia, which increased 600 percent between the early and late 1960s. The national origins of the U.S. Asian population also further diversified with the influx of migrants from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos following the Vietnam War, as well as skilled and unskilled labor migrants from other parts of the region.

Most of the post-1965 wave of Asian immigrants settled in the large cities in the West and the Northeastern region that had longstanding Asian populations (Logan, Alba, and Zhang 2002; Min 2006). Indeed, Asians show a remarkable level of geographical concentration, with more than one-third living in just three metro areas (Los Angeles, New York, and San Francisco), and more than half living in the top ten destinations (Census 2010).[3] However, while the Asian population remains highly concentrated, they too have experienced dramatic dispersion in recent decades. While absolute gains in Asian population have been largest in traditional gateways, growth rates in a number of new destinations, particularly in the South, have been explosive in recent years (Massey, 2008). At the same time, metro areas in the West such as Phoenix, Las Vegas, and Riverside also attracted large numbers of Asians from nearby traditional destinations (Frey 2011). To illustrate, the Asian population of Las Vegas grew over 638 percent between 1990 and 2010, from just under 19,000 Asian residents to nearly 120,000. Charlotte, NC saw a 536 percent increase, from 7,000 to over 37,000 during the same period.

Asians are in many ways following the same path as Hispanic immigrants and white and black natives. Many of the fastest growing Hispanic and Asian metros overlap, such as Richmond, VA, Raleigh, NC, and Indianapolis, IN. However, Asian populations are also growing in parts of the Southwest and south Florida that had large pre-existing Hispanic populations. And Hispanics are growing rapidly in some metros that do not seem to be attracting large numbers of Asians, such as Louisville, KY and Nashville, TN. Also, Asian movement into the South has been even larger than for other groups. To use population change between 1995 and 2000 as an illustration, the next migration rate (NMR) into the South was 18.7 for whites, 20.8 for blacks, and 28.7 for Hispanics. It was highest, however, among Asians, who registered a 31.9 NMR for the South. More than three hundred thousand Asians also entered the South directly from abroad during the period (Schatner 2003). Indeed, new Asian immigrant destinations and new Asian destinations are generally one and the same, both because such a large share of the Asian population is foreign born and because native and foreign born populations have shown similar patterns of dispersal over time.

---

[3] The term "Asian" encompasses numerous diverse ethnic groups that do not share cultural or linguistic backgrounds. Each group has its own unique immigration history, which is reflected in variation in clustering patterns by national origin, with some groups heavily over-represented in particular areas (e.g., Chinese, Filipinos and Koreans are concentrated in Los Angeles; Chinese and Asian Indians are over-represented in New York, and so on). Nevertheless, the largest Asian groups, namely Chinese, Asian Indians, Filipinos, Vietnamese, Koreans, and Japanese, are fairly evenly distributed in the top Asian destinations.

Although the growth of new Asian destinations has been just as noteworthy as the growth of new Hispanic destinations, they remain seriously understudied (Waters and Jimenez 2005). Even more than Hispanics, Asians are leaving high-wage, high-occupational status, and high cost-of-living metro areas and settling in more affordable but lower wage metros. Like Hispanics, they are leaving labor markets where competition between similar skilled co-ethnics is intense, for regions with very different labor market structures. Given that no clear consensus exists as to whether Hispanics are better or worse off in new destinations than more traditional receiving areas, the link between immigrant context and status attainment among Asians remains an open question. Moreover, as a relatively advantaged immigrant and minority population, it is also intriguing to explore how the impact of a co-ethnic community may differ between Asians and other groups.

Accordingly, this paper seeks to compare the socioeconomic attainment of Asian men and women in new immigrant destinations with their counterparts in more traditional receiving areas. As a first step, we refine a definition of new and traditional destinations and explore the potential for selectivity in migrant destinations. Singer (2004) showed that immigrants in non-traditional gateways tend to come from more disadvantaged areas in Asia or Latin America, have lower English skills, and are less likely to naturalize than those residing in established settlement areas. We thus first explore differences across destinations in the average characteristics of Asian residents, and in larger metro level characteristics. Second, we examine whether residence in a new settlement area predicts Asian immigrants' income, occupational standing, and homeownership once individual and household level human capital, demographic, and immigration characteristics are controlled. Third, we also examine whether immigrant context continues to exert a unique effect on Asian status attainment once the characteristics of local labor and housing market conditions are taken into account. That is, we explore whether earnings and homeownership differentials across locales are a simple function of metro level wages and housing costs, or whether a unique penalty or benefit can be attributed to immigrant context. Finally, we compare Asian status attainment outcomes with those of whites and evaluate whether residence in new vs. traditional destinations is beneficial for Asians in terms of narrowing the socioeconomic deficit (or enhancing the advantage) relative to whites.

Data and Methods

Data for the analysis come from the 2010 American Community Survey (ACS). We restrict the sample to Asian and non-Hispanic white individuals aged 25 to 64 to capture prime working ages and exclude settlement decisions that might be connected with retirement. We likewise restrict the sample in the models of income and occupational status to those who were working and reported positive income in 2010. And finally, we restrict the sample to residents of the 146 metro areas with at least 5,000 Asians in 2010, which yields a total sample of 28,487 Asian men, 27,202 Asian women,

and 34,323 Asian households. Sample sizes for whites are 292,565, 261,615, and 401,521 for men, women, and households, respectively.

We combine the individual and household level information with metropolitan-level indicators of local area conditions that are constructed by aggregating the individual and household information to the metropolitan level. We also draw on data from 1990 and 2000 decennial census (5% sample) and 2010 ACS (1-yr) to help construct our definition of traditional and new destination areas.

Model specification

Our three dependent variables, income, occupational status, and homeownership, are key indicators of status attainment. Income is defined as the total personal earned annual income reported in the year prior to the survey, logged. Occupational status is measured with the Duncan Socioeconomic Index (SEI), which assigns a prestige score to occupations based on educational attainment and income using an occupational classification scheme from 1950 (Duncan 1961). Scores range from 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating greater prestige. Finally, homeownership is a household level dummy variable that equals 1 if a household owns their residence and 0 otherwise.

The main explanatory variable of interest in our analysis is type of Asian settlement area. We distinguish between three types: established Asian settlement areas, new Asian destinations, and other areas (see Appendix A for a list of the metros included in each category). Our definition combines three dimensions: absolute size, relative share of the total population, and growth between 1990 and 2010. We argue that both absolute and relative size is important for differentiating the ethnic context of reception. In large metropolitan areas, even sizeable Asian populations capable of generating a sense of community may represent a small share of the total population. Inversely, in smaller metro areas, smaller absolute numbers may nevertheless represent a large enough share of the total population affect the character of the receiving context. These two dimensions, absolute size and relative share, also change over time, potentially giving rise to new destinations.

Accordingly, we define traditional destinations as metros that either had more than 50,000 Asians in 1990 or had between 10,000 and 50,000 Asians in 1990 *and* exceeded the national average for percent Asian (2.8 percent) by at least 1.5 times. The category thus includes areas such as San Francisco, where the more than 424,000 Asians residents in 1990 represented over 15 percent of the total population, as well as Stockton, CA, where the 30,000 Asians resident in 1990 represented more than 10 percent of the population. It also includes metros such as Philadelphia, where the Asians' share of the total population was slightly below the average in 1990, but which nevertheless had nearly 67,000 Asian residents in that year.

New areas of destination are defined as non-traditional areas that had an Asian growth rate of over 200% between 1990 and 2000 *and* in which the share Asian in the total population reached at least half of the national average in 2010 (5.6). This category includes metros such as Raleigh, NC,

whose Asian population grow more than 533 percent between 1990 and 2010, from under 9,000 to nearly 47,000, or 4.7 percent of the total population. It also includes Phoenix, AZ, where the 25,000 Asian residents comprised 1.9 percent of the population in 1990, while the more than 92,000 Asian residents in 2010 represented 4.0 percent of the population.

We classify all other metros that do not qualify as either traditional or new destinations but had at least 5,000 Asians in 2010 as "other" Asian settlement areas. This category includes metros such as Miami, where the nearly 18,000 Asian residents comprised 1.4 percent of the population in 1990, and the 28,000 Asian residents in 2010 accounted for 1.8 percent of the population. It also includes Cincinnati, OH, whose Asian population grew 265 percent between 1990 and 2010 (from 7,000 to 19,000), but still remained a relatively modest 2.0 percent of the total population in 2010.

We also include a number of controls for the demographic, human capital, and family structure characteristics that predict status attainment, including age, squared age, educational attainment, immigration status, having moved within the previous year, marital status, the presence of children, and (for the model of homeownership) the sex and employment status of the household head, as well as total family income. Age is measured continuously from 24 to 65, while educational attainment is captured in four mutually exclusive dummy variables: high school graduate or lower (reference), some college, college graduate, and those with more than a college degree. To capture immigration status, we construct four mutually exclusively dummy variables that capture nativity and period of arrival among immigrants: the native born (reference), immigrants who arrived prior to 1980, immigrants who arrived between 1981 and 2000, and immigrants who arrived in 2001 or later. Because recent entrants to a community may average different labor and particularly housing market outcomes, we also include a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent had moved within the previous year. Additional dummy variables distinguish between those who are married and others, and between those who have children residing in the household and others. The models of homeownership include dummies for whether the household head is male and employed vs. either unemployed or not in the labor force, and total family income (logged).

Contextual-level variables include total population size, occupational composition (the share of population employed in managerial or other professions), median total personal income (logged), and region. The analysis of homeownership also includes controls for metropolitan homeownership rates, median housing values, and the share of housing built in 2000 or later. The share of population employed in managerial professions is defined using the ACS Occupation Codes (OCC), which ranges from Management, Business, Science, and Arts Occupations to Military Specific Occupations. Region is divided into three categories: Northeast/Midwest, South, and West, following the U.S. Census classification system.

Our analytic strategy is first to assess the role of immigrant context in shaping socioeconomic

outcomes within the Asian population. This entails describing variation in both dependent and independent variables across contexts. We next estimate OLS models of income and SEI and logistic regression models of homeownership. In each of these models, we first estimate effects controlling only for individual and household level predictors, in order to assess the impact of context on socioeconomic attainment net of potential differences across contexts in the composition of the Asian population. We then add metropolitan area controls to ascertain whether local labor and housing market conditions explain potential differences across immigrant destinations, or whether significant differences remain even net of these factors.

The second stage in the analysis assesses the link between context and the distance separating Asians from whites. Accordingly, we estimate the same models described above, now pooling data for Asians and whites. To measure distance from whites the models include a control for being Asian as well as interactions between race and area of residence. [4] This also helps assess the role of unmeasured aspects of metropolitan context in structuring observed relationships.

All analyses are conducted separately for men and women, to examine potential sex differences in the link between context and socioeconomic outcomes. Because the clustering of individuals and households within metropolitan areas violates the independence assumption in standard regression, we estimate robust standard errors.

Descriptive Results

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics of our dependent variables by metro typology and sex for Asians aged 25 to 64. Both men and women residing in traditional destinations average higher earnings than the counterparts in non-traditional (new and other) destinations, while SEI does not seem to vary systematically across metro types. For instance, among men, mean personal income is $68,725 in traditional areas, relative to $65,670 in new destinations and $62,686 in other areas. However, among men average SEI scores are very similar in traditional (52.7), new (54.0), and other (53.2) destinations. Among women there is slightly more variation in SEI across contexts, with those in traditional settlement areas averaging the highest (51.7) and women in other areas averaging the lowest (48.5) scores. For homeownership, the pattern is reversed; Asian residents have higher chances of owning a home in non-traditional areas than in traditional gateways. In particular, individuals living in new areas are most likely to own a house (66.9%).

[Table 1 about here]

---

[4] We also tested for interactions between the metro typology and individual and household level indicators, but did not find a consistent pattern of results, suggesting that most of the differences stem from compositional effects and not from differences in the determinants of socioeconomic standing.

The differences observed in Table 1 could be attributable to several factors, including selective migration to non-traditional areas. In particular, if less educated or more recent immigrants were disproportionately drawn to new destinations, earnings and other disparities might reflect individual level characteristics rather than contextual level influences. Table 2 therefore presents descriptive statistics for individual-level independent variables for the Asian sample. While the age and sex composition does not vary appreciably across the metro types, Asian residents of new and other destinations do have more polarized educational characteristics than those of traditional destinations. That is, among new and other destinations, the share of both the least educated (those with a high school degree or less) and most educated (those with a professional degree) are over-represented relative to traditional destinations. For instance, while the least and most educated each represent roughly 24 percent of Asians in traditional areas, in new destinations 27 percent fall into the least educated group and 28 percent into the most educated. Likewise, new and other destinations are average smaller native born and larger recent immigrant populations than traditional settlement areas. The share of recent movers (i.e., those reporting a change in location during the previous year) is also slightly higher in non-traditional destinations. Asian residents of non-traditional areas are also slightly more likely to be married and have co-resident children than their counterparts in traditional settlement areas. And finally, the employment rate among household heads aged 25 to 64 in three metro types is also slightly higher in new (84.6) and other (85.1) destinations than in traditional (83.0) settlement areas. Family incomes follow the same pattern as the individual incomes reported in Table 1, with the highest average in traditional and lowest average in other destinations.

To document differences in local area conditions Table 2 also reports descriptive statistics for contextual-level independent variables. It shows that traditional areas have more favorable labor market conditions while new settlement areas have more favorable housing market conditions. Specifically, the share of people who are employed in managerial and professional occupations is larger in traditional destinations (7.3 percent) than in new (6.6 percent) and other (5.9 percent) destinations. The same pattern obtains for median personal income, which is higher in traditional settlement areas ($33,557) than new ($30,658) and other areas ($27,580). In terms of homeownership, however, non-traditional areas seem to provide their residents with more benefits. First, while only 64.1% of people in traditional areas own their home, more than 70% of those residing in non-traditional areas do so. This likely reflects the dramatically lower average cost of housing in new and other destinations ($208,820 and $170,336, respectively) compared to traditional settlement areas ($346,429). New and other areas also average a larger supply of new housing (roughly 18 percent) relative to traditional areas (14.5 percent). Traditional areas are also overrepresented in the West, while new and other destinations are far more likely to be located in the South and Northeast/Midwest.

12

[Table 2 about here]

Multivariate Results

Table 3 presents results from eight OLS regression models estimating the relationship between context and socioeconomic background on our two labor market related dependent variables, income and SEI, by sex. In each case, we estimate two models, one with only individual socioeconomic controls (columns 1, 3, 5, and 7) and the other including contextual level predictors (columns 2, 4, 6, and 7).

Focusing first on income, results show that both Asian men and women pay a penalty for residing in new and other destinations relative to traditional gateways. Column 1 shows that even after accounting for social background characteristics residence in new and other destinations reduces men wages by 7 and 12 percent, respectively, relative to residence in traditional gateways. The penalty is similar among women (column 3), with earnings 11 and 15 percent lower in new and other metros, respectively, than in traditional areas. The income penalty does not translate into lower SEI, however. Column 5 shows that the SEI of Asian men does not vary by immigrant context. For women, in contrast, SEI is significantly lower in other areas than traditional gateways. Thus, while gender differences are not extensively explored in the immigrant settlement literature there is some evidence of variation by gender in terms of occupational opportunities.

The importance of gender is also highlighted in the estimates obtained for the impact of socioeconomic background on income and SEI. In general, results show that, not surprisingly, those with more education average higher income and SEI than those with lower education.   However, the returns are lower among women, especially among those with a college degree or above. Likewise, marriage is associated with higher earnings among Asian men but not among Asian women, while the presence of children is associated with higher wages for men but lower wages and occupational standing among women.

[Table 3 about here]

However, it is noteworthy that for both men and women all of the negative effects associated with residence in non-traditional areas is explained by the labor market conditions of those areas. That is, when we add controls for metro-level labor market conditions both earnings and occupational status are indistinguishable across metro types for both Asian men and women.   This suggests that the beneficial effects of residence in established metro areas reflect the greater concentration of high-quality jobs available in these contexts, rather than the protective effect of a well-established co-ethnic

community per se.[5]

We next turn to the connection between metro context and homeownership among Asians. Table 4 presents the results from logit model predicting homeownership among Asian household heads aged 25 to 64. Results indicate that even after accounting for demographic and human capital characteristics, Asian households in new destinations are 1.79 (Exp(0.58)=1.786) times more likely to own a home than their peers in traditional settlement areas, with similar results obtaining for those residing in other destinations (0.59). However, as was the case for income and SEI disparities across metro types, these effects disappear once metro-level housing market conditions such as the median housing values and the share of housing that is owner occupied and new (i.e., built after 2000) are taken into account in model 2. [6] It is important to note that this finding among Asians is contrary to that found in previous research on African American and Hispanic new destinations. Among these groups, homeownership tends to be lower in new destinations than among co-ethnics in more traditional settlement areas even after controlling for metro level housing conditions (Flippen 2010), suggesting that new destinations pose particular barriers to homeownership for minorities. The absence of this negative effect thus represents and important difference between Asians and other ethno-racial minorities.

[Table 4 about here]

The next set of analyses investigates variation in the socioeconomic positions of Asians relative to whites according to area of settlement. Table 5 presents the results of OLS regression models estimating the determinants of income and SEI for a sample that includes Asians and whites between the ages of 25 and 64, separately by sex. The models include interaction terms between Asian race and the metro typology. Results indicate significant gender differences in the earnings gap between Asians and whites by area of destination.

Focusing first on the role of context in shaping men's wages (column 1), results show that similar to Asians in Table 4 white men's wages are on average 14 and 22 percent lower in new and other Asians destinations, respectively, relative to traditional Asian settlement areas. Moreover, Asian

---

[5] Because individual-level predictors of income and occupational status are well established in the literature and are not the primary focus of the current analysis, the impact of these controls will not be discussed at length. It suffices to say that factors such as age, education, family structure, and migration history all predict income and occupational status in the expected direction. Likewise, our metropolitan controls also produce the expected results, with individual wages and occupational status positively related to median personal income and the share of the labor force in professional occupations, respectively.

[6] Once again, the individual and housing market influences on homeownership are not the main focus of our analysis. However, the controls predict homeownership in the expected direction.

men in traditional destinations earn 7 percent less than comparable white men in those same metro areas. However, the interaction terms indicate that the gap between Asian and white men is significantly smaller outside of traditional areas of settlement, in both new and other destinations.   In fact, the race gap is essentially eliminated in new (-0.08 + 0.08) and other (-0.08 + 0.11) destinations. Interestingly, while controlling for metropolitan characteristics reduces the size of the coefficients, it does not eliminate the pattern of results.

The opposite pattern is evident for Asian women. As was the case with men, white women in new and other destinations average lower wages relative to their peers in traditional areas (-.11 and -.19, respectively in column3). However, Asian women in traditional destinations average 13 percent higher wages than comparable white women in those areas. In contrast to men, the relative position of Asian and white women does not vary by immigrant context.   Once again, controlling for metropolitan characteristics reduces the size of the coefficients but does not change the pattern of results.

Results for the models predicting SEI show a number of differences from those predicting income. Consistent with the results for wages, white men and women exhibit lower SEI in new and particularly other Asian destinations compared to whites in traditional Asian destinations (-.31 and -1.86 among men and -.78 and -1.72 among women in new and other destinations, respectively (columns 5 and 7)). However, Asians in traditional settlement areas average higher SEI scores than their white peers among both men and women.   Once again there are important gender differences across contexts in the gap between Asians and whites.   Specifically, while Asian women's advantage over their white counterparts does not vary across immigrant settlement contexts, among men the gap is significantly larger in new and other destinations relative to traditional gateways. In traditional settlement areas Asian men average 2.74 points higher SEI than white men, but the average gap is 4.06 points (2.74 + 1.33) in new destinations and 5.31 (2.74 + 2.59) in other metros. As before, controlling for metropolitan characteristics explains a larger part of the association between immigrant context and SEI among whites, but the Asian advantage remains.

The complexity of the connection between immigrant context and socioeconomic standing also extends to the analysis of racial disparities in homeownership, reported in Table 6. Column 1 reports results from the model controlling only for household-level characteristics, and shows that whites are more likely to own a home in new and other destinations than in traditional destinations (0.62 and 0.70, respectively). The pattern is the same for Asian households since neither the main effect or the interaction terms show any significant differences from the white experience. However, when we account for metropolitan characteristics (and the housing stock characteristics that make homeownership more difficult in traditional Asian destinations) in model 2 the higher homeownership rates in non-traditional areas among whites fall to insignificance. For Asians, on the other hand,

results show that after accounting for metro conditions, Asians in fact more likely to own a home than comparable whites in traditional Asian destinations (.20). However, the interaction terms show that the homeownership advantage over whites that Asians enjoy in traditional settlement areas is significantly smaller, and essentially zero, in new destinations (0.20 – 0.15) and other Asian settlement areas (0.20 – 0.22). That is, within equally affordable housing markets in traditional settlement areas Asians enjoy a significant homeownership advantage over similarly situated whites, but that advantage is not present in new and other destinations. Thus, there is some indication that, at least in the realm of housing, there are relative disadvantages to residence in new destinations for Asians, as was previously found to be the case for Hispanics and African Americans (Flippen 2010).

[Table 6 about here]

Conclusions

The dramatic dispersal of immigrant origin groups outside of traditional gateways and emergence of new destinations across parts of the country previously unaccustomed to large immigrant populations has brought renewed attention to the role of context in shaping the path of immigrant incorporation. The overwhelming majority of this work has focused on Hispanics, to the serious neglect of Asian origin groups. Asians as a group are relatively unique among the racial and ethnic minorities in the United States. Highly selective migration flows and a high-achieving second generation have translated into a population that averages better educational and labor market outcomes than the general U.S. population. However, *within* educational categories there is evidence that Asians continue to face discrimination in the labor market, at least among men. Thus whether and how Asians may benefit from contexts with large co-ethnic communities and histories of immigration, and how these benefits differ from less advantaged groups, remain open and important questions.

This study examined these issues drawing primarily on data from the 2010 ACS. After defining traditional, new, and other areas of settlement, we examined whether labor market (specifically income and occupational status) and homeownership outcomes were related to metro immigrant context. The main question was whether Asians paid a penalty for leaving traditional settlement areas. To answer the question we compared absolute outcomes in traditional and non-traditional settlement areas, as well as whether differences remain after accounting for other metro level contextual characteristics. We also consider not only differences across locales within the Asian population, but also differences across contexts in the extent of inequality with whites, as well as differences by sex.

The results show considerable heterogeneity in the connection between context and

16

socioeconomic standing with considerable variation by gender and whether one considers income, SEI, or homeownership. Moreover, somewhat different results are obtained depending on whether we focus on within-group differences or comparison with whites. While wages in non-traditional destinations are lower than in immigrant gateways, occupational status (with the exception of Asian women in other areas) is not. And housing is far less expensive outside of Asian gateways, affording higher rates of homeownership. Moreover, when metro-wide labor and housing market differences are taken into consideration, there appears to be no particular advantage or disadvantage among Asians to living outside of traditional areas of settlement.

When we consider not only Asians relative to one another according to metro context, but also inequality between Asians and whites, the picture is likewise markedly different for labor market and housing outcomes, but this time in the opposite direction. That is, while Asians in new destinations are no better off than Asians in traditional areas once local labor and housing market considerations are taken into account, Asian men's deficit in earnings relative to whites is lower and their advantage in occupational status is higher in non-traditional metros. These benefits are offset, however, but a narrowing in the Asian advantage in homeownership in new and other destinations, once metro level housing conditions are controlled. The labor markets of traditional Asian receiving areas are often saturated with workers in the niches in which Asians concentrate. In this environment, Asian men pay a wage penalty relative to white men that does not appear to be present in non-traditional destinations. In housing, on the other hand, the benefits of greater access to information and greater institutional outreach to minority communities make homeownership relative to whites easier in traditional than non-traditional areas.

The results also hint at important gender differences in the link between context and socioeconomic outcomes. First, the wage disadvantage evident among Asian men relative to whites is reversed among women. However, Asian women do not get the same boost relative to whites from residence in new and other destinations that men do. Thus, as with the unequal payoff to education, marriage, and childbearing, Asian women may receive a lower return to internal migration than their male peers. Further research is needed to explore potential differences by marital status; it is possible that the greater tendency of wives to relocate in accordance with their husbands' careers, could undermine the benefits from leaving immigrant niche areas.

It is also worthwhile to consider what these findings portend for national-level inequality between Asians and whites. Here the results are somewhat contradictory. On the one hand, Asian dispersal to lower wage environments will tend to narrow the national pay advantage held by Asians today. On the other hand, movement out of niche labor markets into areas with fewer other Asians seems to lower the wage penalty paid by *comparably educated* Asians (at least for men). Taken together, these two trends could contribute to growing convergence in Asian and white occupational

and housing outcomes, for both better and worse.

REFERENCES

Alba, Richard D., and Victor Nee. 1999. Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration. In *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, edited by C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz, and J. DeWind, 137-161. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Alba, Richard D., John R. Logan, and Brian J. Stults. 2000. "The Changing Neighborhood Contexts of the Immigrant Metropolis." *Social Forces* 29 (2): 587-621.

Bernat, G. Andrew. 2001. "Convergence in State per Capita Personal Income, 1950–99." *Survey of Current Business* 81: 36–48.

Borjas George J. 1990. *Friends or Strangers: The Impact of Immigration on the Economy.* New York: Basic Books.

Clark, William AV. 2009. "Changing Residential Preferences across Income, Education, and Age: Findings from the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality." *Urban Affairs Review* 44(3): 334-355.

Coughlin, Cletus C. and Thomas B. Mandelbaum. 1988. "Why Have State per Capita Incomes Diverged Recently?" Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review: 24-36.

Crowder, Kyle, South Scott J. 2005. "Race, Class, and Changing Migration Patterns between Poor and Nonpoor Neighborhoods." *American Journal of Sociology* 110(6): 1715-1763.

Crowder, Kyle, South Scott J, and Chavez Erick. 2006. "Wealth, Race, and Inter-Neighborhood Migration." *American Sociological Review* 71: 72-94.

Flippen, Chenoa A. 2010. "The Spatial Dynamics of Stratification: Metropolitan Context, Population Redistribution, and Black and Hispanic Homeownership." *Demography* 47(4):845-868.

_____. 2013. "Relative deprivation and internal migration in the United States: A comparison of black and white men." *American Journal of Sociology* 118: 1161-1198. PMCID: PMC480654.

Frey, William H. 2011. The New Metro Minority Map: Regional Shifts in Hispanics, Asians, and Blacks from Census 2010. Metropolitan Policy Program. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. pp.1-18.

Garner, Catherine L. and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 1991. "Neighborhood Effects on Educational Attainment: A Multilevel Analysis." *Sociology of Education* 64(4): 251-262.

Gerrard, Bill. 1989. Classical Economics and the Keynesian Revolution. In Companion to the History of Modern Science, edited by G.N. Cantor, J.R.R. Christie, M.J.S. Hodge, and R.C. Olby. London: Routledge. pp. 479-493.

Kemeny, Thomas and Michael Storper. 2012. "The Sources of Urban Development: Wages, Housing, and Amenity Gaps Across American Cities." *Journal of Regional Science* 52(1): 85-108.

Krysan, Maria and Bader Michael. 2007. "Perceiving the Metropolis: Seeing the City through a Prism

of Race." *Social Forces* 86(2): 699-727.

Kuznets, Simon. 1955. "Economic Growth and Income Inequality." *American Economic Review* 45(1): 1-28.

Lichter, Daniel T. and Kenneth M. Johnson. 2009. "Immigrant Gateways and Hispanic Migration to New Destinations." *International Migration Review* 43(3): 496–518.

Logan, John R., Richard D. Alba and Shu-Yin Leung. 1996. "Minority Access to White Suburbs: A Multiregional Comparison." *Social Forces* 74: 851-881.

Logan, John R., Richard D. Alba, and Wenquan Zhang. 2002. "Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles," *American Sociological Review* 67(2): 299–322.

Massey, Douglas. 1985. "Ethnic Residential Segregation: A Theoretical and Empirical Review." *Sociology and Social Research* 69(3): 315-350.

Massey, Douglas. 2008. *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Massey, Douglas and Nancy A. Denton. 1985. "Spatial Assimilation as a Socioeconomic Outcome." *American Sociological Review* 50: 94-105.

Massey, Douglas and Katherine Bartley. 2005. "The Changing Legal Status Distribution of Immigrants: A Caution." *International Migration Review* 39(2): 469-484.

Massey, Douglas and Katherine Bartley. 2005. The changing legal status distribution of immigrants: A caution. *International Migration Review* 39(2): 469-484.

Massey, Douglas. 2008. *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Maxwell, Philip and James C. Hite. 1992. "The Recent Divergence of Regional Per Capita Incomes: Some Evidence from Australia." *Growth and Change* 23: 37-53.

Mendenhall, Ruby, Stefanie DeLuca and Greg Duncan. 2006. "Neighborhood Resources and Economic Mobility: Results from the Gautreaux Program" *Social Science Research* 35:892-923.

Min, Pyong Gap (ed.). 2006. *Asian Americans: Contemporary Trends and Issues*, Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Nissan, Edward and George H. Carter. 1993. "Income Inequality across Regions over Time." *Growth and Change* 24: 303–319.

Park, Robert E., Ernest W. Burgess, and Roderick D. McKenzie. 1925. *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Parrado, Emilio. 2012. "Immigration Enforcement Policies, the Economic Recession, and the Size of the Local Mexican Immigrant Population." *ANNALS of the Academy of Political and*

Social Science: Immigration and the Changing Social Fabric of American Cities 641: 16-37.

Portes, Alejandro and Leif Jensen. 1989. "The Enclave and the Entrants: Patterns of Ethnic Enclave in Miami before and after Mariel." *American Sociological Review* 54: 929-949.

Portes, Alejandro and Kenneth Wilson. 1980. "Immigrant Enclaves: An Analysis of the Labor Market Experiences of Cubans in Miami." *American Journal of Sociology* 86: 295-319.

Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1992. "Gaining the Upper Hand: Economic Mobility among Immigrant and Domestic Minorities." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15(4): 491-522.

Portes, Alejandro and Jozsef Borocz. 1989. "Contemporary immigration: theoretical perspectives on its determinants and modes of incorporation." *International migration review* 23(3): 606-630.

Rosenbaum, James E. and Stefanie DeLuca. 2008. "Does Changing Neighborhoods Change Lives? The Chicago Gautreaux Housing Program." In *Social Stratification: Race, Class and Gender in Sociological Perspective*, edited by David Grusky. Westview Press. Pp. 393-399.

Sakamoto, Arthur, Kim Goyette, and ChangHwan Kim. 2009. "Socioeconomic Attainments of Asian Americans." Annual Review of Sociology 35:255–276.

Sampson, Robert J. 1993. "The Community Context of Violent Crime." In *Sociology and the Public Agenda*, edited by William Julius Wilson. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. Pp. 267-74.

Sanders, Jimy and Victor Nee. 1987. "Limits of Ethnic Solidarity in the Enclave Economy." *American Sociological Review* 52: 745-773.

Schachter, Jason P. 2003. Migration by Race and Hispanic Origin: 1995–2000. Census 2000 Special Report. Washington, D.C.: Census Bureau.

Shaw, Clifford R. and Henry D. McKay. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Singer, Audrey. 2004. The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. pp.1-36.

Smith, M. Estellie. 1975. "A Tale of Two Cities: The Reality of Historical Differences." *Urban Anthropology* 4: 61-72.

South, Scott J., Kyle Crowder, and Jeremy Pais. 2008. "Inter-Neighborhood Migration and Spatial Assimilation in a Multi-Ethnic World: Comparing Latinos, Blacks, and Anglos." *Social Forces* 87(1):415-444.

Thomas, W. I. & Znaniecki, F. 1918-20. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Urahn, Susan K., Travis Plunkett, Erin Currier, Diana Elliott, Sarah Sattelmeyer, Denise Wilson. 2013. "Mobility and the Metropolis: How Communities Factor Into Economic Mobility." A Report from the Pew Charitable Trusts.

Waters, Mary C., and Tomas R. Jimenez. 2005. "Assessing Immigrant Assimilation: New Empirical

and Theoretical Challenges." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31: 105-125.

Wilson, Jill H. and Audrey Singer. 2011. Immigrants in 2010 Metropolitan America: A Decade of Change. Metropolitan Policy Program. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. pp.1-13.

Zhou, Min. 1992. *Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of an Urban Enclave*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

_____. 1997. Segmented assimilation: Issues, controversies, and recent research on the new second generation. *International migration review* 31(4): 975-1008.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Dependent Variables by Metro Typology and Sex: Asians Aged 25-64

	All	Traditional	New	Other
Men				
Income (mean)	$67,590	$68,725	$65,670	$62,686
SEI (mean)	53.0	52.7	54.0	53.2
N	28,487	20,101	6,143	2,243
Women				
Income (mean)	$49,435	$51,662	$44,227	$42,677
SEI (mean)	51.1	51.7	49.8	48.5
N	27,202	19,499	5,575	2,128
Household heads				
Own home (%)	64.1	63.1	66.9	65.8
N	34,323	24,168	7,445	2,710

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables: Asians Aged 25-64

	Traditional	New	Other
Individual-level variables			
Age (mean)	43	42	42
Male (%)	50.8	52.4	51.3
Educational attainment (%)			
High school or less	24.1	27.0	28.8
Some college	17.5	15.9	17.3
College degree	34.3	29.3	25.6
Professional degree	24.1	27.8	28.4
Migrant status (%)			
Native-born	19.7	14.9	15.3
Migrated prior to 1980	15.8	14.7	16.0
Migrated 1981-2000	47.6	48.5	45.2
Migrated after 2001	16.9	22.0	23.5
Moved within previous year (%)	14.1	16.3	15.6
Married (%)	71.4	74.5	75.4
Presence of children (%)	55.0	57.1	57.9
N	39,600	11,718	4,371
Household level variables (for homeownership models)			
Household head employed (%)	83.0	84.6	85.1
Total family income (mean)	$100,615	$88,691	$85,752
N	24,168	7,445	2,710
Metro-level variables			
% employed in managerial/prof. (mean)	7.3	6.6	5.9
Median income (mean)	$33,557	$30,658	$27,580
Population size (mean)	2,560,104	707,368	525,385
Region (%)			
Northeast/Midwest	19.1	46.9	34.4
South	9.5	34.4	44.3
West	71.4	18.8	21.3
% owner occupied housing (mean)	64.1	70.2	71.3
Median house value (mean)	$346,429	$208,820	$170,336
% housing built in 2000 or later (mean)	14.5	18.2	18.4
N	21	64	61

Table 3. Coefficients from OLS model predicting personal income and Duncan Socioeconomic Index (SEI)

	Income				SEI			
	Asian Men		Asian Women		Asian Men		Asian Women	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Metro type (ref=traditional settlement area)								
New dest.	-0.07 *	0.00	-0.11 **	-0.03	0.48	0.84	-0.73	-0.56
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.59)	(0.94)	(0.48)	(0.51)
Other dest.	-0.12 **	0.01	-0.15 **	-0.02	0.28	1.23	-1.53 **	-1.08
	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.71)	(1.27)	(0.48)	(0.68)
Individual-level controls								
Age	0.09 **	0.09 **	0.08 **	0.08 **	-0.03	-0.01	0.16	0.17
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Age squared	0.00 **	0.00 **	0.00 **	0.00 **	0.00 †	0.00 †	0.00 **	-0.01 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Education (reference: High school)								
Some college	0.31 **	0.31 **	0.34 **	0.34 **	10.98 **	11.00 **	11.77 **	11.85 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.52)	(0.53)	(0.39)	(0.40)
College	0.74 **	0.74 **	0.72 **	0.71 **	28.29 **	28.14 **	23.13 **	23.07 **
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.62)	(0.59)	(0.47)	(0.48)
Adv. Degree	1.16 **	1.15 **	1.09 **	1.07 **	41.35 **	41.08 **	37.04 **	36.83 **
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.64)	(0.55)	(0.83)	(0.78)
Migration status (reference: Native-born)								
Mig. Pre-1980	0.05 **	0.05 **	0.10 **	0.10 **	2.07 **	1.73 *	0.25	-0.02
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.65)	(0.67)	(0.54)	(0.62)
Mig. 1981-2000	-0.15 **	-0.16 **	-0.14 **	-0.14 **	-3.29 **	-3.71 **	-4.97 **	-5.30 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.51)	(0.45)	(0.33)	(0.41)
Mig. after 2001	-0.41 **	-0.42 **	-0.43 **	-0.44 **	-5.64 **	-6.01 **	-9.42 **	-9.75 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.55)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.54)
Moved w/in year	-0.05 *	-0.05 *	-0.08 **	-0.08 **	-0.13	-0.09	-0.48	-0.44
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.38)	(0.36)	(0.32)	(0.32)
Married	0.19 **	0.19 **	0.00	0.00	2.09 **	2.03 **	1.26 **	1.22 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.36)	(0.37)	(0.26)	(0.27)

(continues)

Table 3. Coefficients from OLS model predicting personal income and Duncan Socioeconomic Index (SEI) (continued)

	Income				SEI			
	Asian Men		Asian Women		Asian Men		Asian Women	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Child in hhold	0.06 **	0.06 **	-0.03 **	-0.02 **	-0.28	-0.28	-0.96 **	-0.93 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.27)	(0.27)
Metro-level contextual variables								
Median personal income (log)		0.53 **		0.38 **				
		(0.06)		(0.06)				
Total pop (logged)		-0.01		0.01		0.41		0.30
		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.40)		(0.26)
Region (ref=West)								
Northeast/Midwest		-0.03 †		-0.03		0.61		0.90
		(0.02)		(0.02)		(0.72)		(0.62)
South		-0.05		-0.05 **		1.02		0.94 *
		(0.03)		(0.02)		(0.92)		(0.46)
% employed in managerial/prof. occupations						0.33 †		0.18 *
						(0.18)		(0.08)
Intercept	8.29 **	2.94 **	8.49 **	4.33 **	36.98 **	27.67 **	39.59 **	33.22 **
	(0.13)	(0.68)	(0.11)	(0.68)	(2.24)	(6.38)	(2.60)	(3.47)
n	28487	28487	27202	27202	28487	28487	27202	27202
Adjusted R-sq	0.2876	0.294	0.226	0.2291	0.4193	0.4214	0.3867	0.3876

**p<0.01, *p<0.05, †p<0.1

Table 4. Coefficients from logit model predicting homeownership among Asian household heads aged 25-64

	(1)			(2)		
Metro type (ref=traditional settlement area)						
New dest.	0.58	(0.11)	**	-0.07	(0.05)	
Other dest.	0.59	(0.11)	**	-0.09	(0.08)	
Individual-level controls						
Age	0.13	(0.01)	**	0.13	(0.01)	**
Age squared	0.00	(0.00)	**	0.00	(0.00)	**
Male	0.06	(0.03)	†	0.07	(0.04)	*
Education (reference: High school)						
Some college	0.27	(0.05)	**	0.28	(0.04)	**
College	0.39	(0.05)	**	0.41	(0.05)	**
Adv. Degree	0.20	(0.08)	*	0.19	(0.08)	*
Migration status (reference: Native-born)						
Mig. Pre-1980	0.35	(0.05)	**	0.33	(0.05)	**
Mig. 1981-2000	-0.06	(0.05)		-0.06	(0.05)	
Mig. after 2001	-1.37	(0.08)	**	-1.39	(0.06)	**
Moved w/in year	-1.13	(0.08)	**	-1.16	(0.08)	**
Married	0.46	(0.03)	**	0.44	(0.03)	**
Child in hhold	0.32	(0.05)	**	0.32	(0.05)	**
Employed	0.18	(0.05)	**	0.17	(0.04)	**
Total family income	0.00	(0.00)	**	0.00	(0.00)	**
Metro-level contextual variables						
Total pop (logged)				-0.02	(0.02)	
Region (ref=West)						
Northeast/Midwest				-0.17	(0.04)	**
South				-0.02	(0.06)	
% homeowners				0.03	(0.00)	**
Median house value				0.00	(0.00)	**
% housing built in 2000 or later				0.01	(0.00)	**
Intercept	-4.41	(0.26)	**	-5.98	(0.60)	**
n	34323	0.2405		34323	0.2520	
Pseudo R2	0.2405			0.2520		

**p<0.01, *p<0.05, †p<0.1

Table 5. Coefficients from OLS model predicting personal income and SEI: Whites and Asians age 25-64, by sex

	Income					SEI			
	Men		Women			Men		Women	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Metro type (ref=traditional settlement area)									
New dest.	-0.14 **	-0.07 **	-0.11 **	-0.04 *		-0.31	0.51	-0.78 *	-0.40
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)		(0.34)	(0.35)	(0.33)	(0.26)
Other dest.	-0.22 **	-0.09 **	-0.19 **	-0.06 **		-1.86 **	-0.32	-1.72 **	-0.89 **
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)		(0.35)	(0.44)	(0.34)	(0.31)
Asians in New dest.	0.08 *	0.08 **	0.01	0.01		1.33 *	1.13 †	0.18	0.00
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)		(0.66)	(0.60)	(0.61)	(0.57)
Asians in Other dest.	0.11 **	0.11 **	0.04	0.04		2.59 **	2.59 **	0.09	0.05
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)		(0.80)	(0.77)	(0.70)	(0.68)
Individual-level controls									
Age	0.10 **	0.10 **	0.08 **	0.08 **		0.54 **	0.53 **	0.47 **	0.47 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)		(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Age squared	0.00 **	0.00 **	0.00 **	0.00 **		-0.01 **	-0.01 **	-0.01 **	-0.01 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)		(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Asian	-0.07 **	-0.08 **	0.13 **	0.13 **		2.74 **	2.94 **	1.95 **	2.17 **
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)		(0.58)	(0.47)	(0.40)	(0.31)
Education (reference: High school)									
Some college	0.25 **	0.25 **	0.26 **	0.25 **		11.44 **	11.38 **	7.48 **	7.47 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)		(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.24)	(0.24)
College	0.63 **	0.62 **	0.57 **	0.55 **		26.53 **	26.31 **	17.77 **	17.63 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)		(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.23)	(0.23)
Adv. Degree	0.93 **	0.91 **	0.87 **	0.86 **		37.65 **	37.36 **	26.93 **	26.78 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)		(0.30)	(0.34)	(0.28)	(0.28)
Migration status (reference: Native-born)									
Mig. Pre-1980	-0.15 **	-0.14 **	-0.06 *	-0.05 *		-3.83 **	-3.98 **	-4.61 **	-4.77 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)		(0.51)	(0.48)	(0.60)	(0.53)
Mig. 1981-2000	-0.30 **	-0.29 **	-0.26 **	-0.25 **		-7.90 **	-8.16 **	-10.02 **	-10.26 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)		(0.38)	(0.35)	(0.41)	(0.36)

(continues)

Table 5. Coefficients from OLS model predicting personal income and SEI: Whites and Asians age 25-64, by sex (continued)

	Income				SEI			
	Men		Women		Men		Women	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Mig. after 2001	-0.43 **	-0.43 **	-0.47 **	-0.47 **	-8.97 **	-9.27 **	-12.21 **	-12.52 **
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.40)	(0.38)
Moved w/in year	-0.08 **	-0.08 **	-0.06 **	-0.06 **	-0.56 **	-0.58 **	-0.90 **	-0.93 **
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Married	0.26 **	0.25 **	-0.03 **	-0.03 **	3.09 **	3.10 **	2.37 **	2.38 **
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.10)	(0.11)
Child in hhold	0.09 **	0.09 **	-0.11 **	-0.11 **	-0.21 *	-0.16	-1.04 **	-1.00 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.09)
Metro-level contextual variables								
Median personal income (log)		0.53 **		0.44 **				
		(0.04)		(0.04)				
Total pop (logged)		0.01		0.02 **		0.65 **		0.45 **
		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.14)		(0.11)
Region (ref=West)								
Northeast/Midwest		0.00		-0.03 †		-0.02		-0.05
		(0.01)		(0.02)		(0.30)		(0.25)
South		0.02		0.00		1.10 **		1.33 **
		(0.01)		(0.02)		(0.34)		(0.23)
% employed in managerial/prof. occupations						0.41 **		0.26 **
						(0.10)		(0.06)
Intercept	8.10 **	2.49 **	8.43 **	3.62 **	21.38 **	8.35 **	32.95 **	23.99 **
	(0.04)	(0.43)	(0.04)	(0.33)	(1.14)	(2.16)	(0.96)	(1.55)
n	321052	321052	288817	288817	321052	321052	288817	288817
Adjusted R-sq	0.2642	0.2702	0.164	0.1683	0.3552	0.3571	0.2613	0.2632

**p<0.01, *p<0.05, †p<0.1

Table 6. Coefficients from logit model predicting homeownership: Whites and Asian household heads

	(1)			(2)		
Metro type (ref=traditional settlement area)						
New settlement area	0.62	(0.14)	**	0.06	(0.05)	
Other settlement area	0.70	(0.13)	**	0.03	(0.05)	
Asians in New dest.	0.02	(0.08)		-0.15	(0.08)	†
Asians in Other dest.	-0.08	(0.09)		-0.22	(0.09)	*
Individual-level controls						
Age	0.09	(0.01)	**	0.09	(0.01)	**
Age squared	0.00	(0.00)	**	0.00	(0.00)	**
Male	-0.01	(0.01)		0.00	(0.01)	
Asian	0.07	(0.08)		0.20	(0.04)	**
Education (reference: High school)						
Some college	0.24	(0.02)	**	0.27	(0.02)	**
College	0.48	(0.02)	**	0.52	(0.02)	**
Adv. Degree	0.38	(0.03)	**	0.41	(0.03)	**
Migration status (reference: Native-born)						
Mig. Pre-1980	-0.06	(0.06)		0.08	(0.05)	
Mig. 1981-2000	-0.52	(0.09)	**	-0.41	(0.08)	**
Mig. after 2001	-1.67	(0.10)	**	-1.61	(0.09)	**
Moved w/in year	-1.56	(0.05)	**	-1.57	(0.04)	**
Married	0.91	(0.03)	**	0.90	(0.03)	**
Child in hhold	0.22	(0.03)	**	0.22	(0.03)	**
Employed	0.24	(0.02)	**	0.23	(0.02)	**
Total family income	0.00	(0.00)	**	0.00	(0.00)	**
Metro-level contextual variables						
Total pop (logged)				-0.01	(0.01)	
Region (ref=West)						
Northeast/Midwest				0.03	(0.02)	
South				0.01	(0.03)	
% homeowners				0.04	(0.00)	**
Median house value				0.00	(0.00)	**
% housing built in 2000 or later				0.00	(0.00)	
Intercept	-3.99	(0.23)	**	-6.06	(0.32)	**
n	435844			435844		
Pseudo R2	0.2566			0.2688		

**p<0.01, *p<0.05, †p<0.1

Appendix A. List of all the metros in the typology of Asian destinations (continues)

Traditional destinations

Boston, MA-NH	Salinas-Sea Side-Monterey, CA
Chicago, IL	San Diego, CA
Fresno, CA	San Francisco-Oakland-Vallejo, CA
Honolulu, HI	San Jose, CA
Houston-Brazoria, TX	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Lompoc, CA
Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA	Seattle-Everett, WA
Modesto, CA	Stockton, CA
New York-Northeastern NJ	Tacoma, WA
Philadelphia, PA/NJ	Ventura-Oxnard-Simi Valley, CA
Riverside-San Bernardino,CA	Washington, DC/MD/VA
Sacramento, CA	

New destinations

Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	Lansing-E2 Lansing, MI
Anchorage, AK	Las Vegas, NV
Ann Arbor, MI	Lexington-Fayette, KY
Appleton-Oshkosh-Neenah, WI	Lincoln, NE
Atlanta, GA	Madison, WI
Atlantic City, NJ	Milwaukee, WI
Austin, TX	Minneapolis-St2 Paul, MN
Bakersfield, CA	Monmouth-Ocean, NJ
Baltimore, MD	New Haven-Meriden, CT
Bellingham, WA	New Orleans, LA
Biloxi-Gulfport, MS	Oklahoma City, OK
Binghamton, NY	Olympia, WA
Bloomington, IN	Orlando, FL
Bridgeport, CT	Pensacola, FL
Bryan-College Station, TX	Phoenix, AZ
Champaign-Urbana-Rantoul, IL	Portland, OR-WA
Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC	Providence-Fall River-Pawtucket, MA/RI
Colorado Springs, CO	Raleigh-Durham, NC
Columbus, OH	Reno, NV
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	Richmond-Petersburg, VA
Danbury, CT	Rochester, MN
Denver-Boulder, CO	Rochester, NY
Des Moines, IA	Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT
Detroit, MI	Springfield-Holyoke-Chicopee, MA
Fayetteville-Springdale, AR	Stamford, CT
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood-Pompano Beach	State College, PA
Gainesville, FL	Tampa-St2 Petersburg-Clearwater, FL
Galveston-Texas City, TX	Trenton, NJ
Hartford-Bristol-Middleton- New Britain	Tucson, AZ
Jacksonville, FL	Wichita, KS
Kileen-Temple, TX	Wilmington, DE/NJ/MD
Lafayette-W2 Lafayette, IN	Worcester, MA

Appendix A. List of all the metros in the typology of Asian destinations (continued)

Other destinations

Akron, OH

Albuquerque, NM

Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA/NJ

Augusta-Aiken, GA-SC

Baton Rouge, LA

Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange,TX

Birmingham, AL

Boise City, ID

Bremerton, WA

Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY

Charleston-N2Charleston,SC

Chico, CA

Cincinnati-Hamilton, OH/KY/IN

Cleveland, OH

Columbia, MO

Columbia, SC

Dayton-Springfield, OH

Daytona Beach, FL

El Paso, TX

Eugene-Springfield, OR

Fayetteville, NC

Fort Myers-Cape Coral, FL

Fort Wayne, IN

Grand Rapids, MI

Greensboro-Winston Salem-High Point, NC

Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson SC

Hamilton-Middleton, OH

Harrisburg-Lebanon--Carlisle, PA

Hickory-Morgantown, NC

Indianapolis, IN

Kalamazoo-Portage, MI

Kansas City, MO-KS

Knoxville, TN

Lakeland-Winterhaven, FL

Lancaster, PA

Little Rock--North Little Rock, AR

Louisville, KY/IN

McAllen-Edinburg-Pharr-Mission, TX

Melbourne-Titusville-Cocoa-Palm Bay, FL

Memphis, TN/AR/MS

Merced, CA

Miami-Hialeah, FL

Mobile, AL

Nashville, TN

Norfolk-VA Beach--Newport News, VA

Omaha, NE/IA

Pittsburgh, PA

Provo-Orem, UT

St2 Louis, MO-IL

Salem, OR

San Antonio, TX

Santa Cruz, CA

Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA

Sarasota, FL

Spokane, WA

Syracuse, NY

Toledo, OH/MI

Tulsa, OK

Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, CA

West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Delray Beach

Yuba City, CA