

Chapter 2

The Hispanic Diaspora and the Public Schools: Educating Hispanics

Richard Fry

Abstract Reflecting the geographic concentration of the Hispanic population in the Southwest, as recently as 1990 the bulk of Hispanic children were educated in public schools in 48 metropolitan areas. Schools in the Los Angeles and New York metropolitan areas alone educated more than one quarter of Hispanic students in the early 1990s. The Hispanic diaspora, however, has resulted in very large Hispanic public school enrollment growth in 30 “new settlement” metropolitan areas (such as Atlanta and Charlotte). The percentage of the nation’s Latino public school students that are educated in the schools of the new settlement areas has nearly doubled since 1993. The quality of public schools varies across states and metropolitan areas. On average, the public schools educating Hispanics in the 30 new settlement areas have different characteristics than the schools in the 48 traditional Hispanic metro areas. Examination of the rudimentary characteristics of the public schools educating Latinos in the new settlement areas suggests that the diaspora has not necessarily diminished the educational context of Hispanic youth. The new settlement public schools are more suburban. They tend to be smaller, are less likely to be high poverty schools (as measured by Title I status), and have smaller pupil-to-teacher ratios. At the school level, Hispanic students in the new settlement schools have more exposure to white students than their peers educated in schools in the traditional Hispanic metros. The impact of the Hispanic enrollment boom in the 30 new settlement metros was concentrated in about one-out-of-eight public schools. Compared to other public schools in the new settlement metros, the high Hispanic growth schools experienced abrupt changes since 1993. The highly impacted schools went from being majority white schools to majority minority schools by 2004. Unlike other schools, they grew substantially in size in spite of white student enrollment declines. These changes are noteworthy because although only about one-in-eight schools was affected, these schools educate 40% of Latinos in the new settlement areas.

R. Fry (✉)
Pew Hispanic Center, Washington, DC, USA
e-mail: rfry@pewhispanic.org

Introduction

In addition to its high growth rate, an important feature of recent Hispanic population dynamics has been its dispersion to new communities. The migration trends include not only movement to new settlement communities (e.g., Atlanta and Salt Lake City) as opposed to long-standing Hispanic communities (e.g., Los Angeles and Miami), but also movement to the suburbs within metropolitan areas. To date, researchers have performed very little formal analysis of the implications of these new residence patterns on the quality of public education for Latino children. This chapter quantifies the extent of dispersion and suburbanization of Hispanic public school students since the early 1990s. It then examines the basic characteristics of the new public schools educating Latinos and compares these to the characteristics of public schools that have traditionally educated Latinos. Given the long-standing concerns about the quality of the education that Latino children were receiving in over-burdened central city schools in the nation's largest cities, this analysis shows that the Hispanic diaspora could potentially improve the schooling context of Latino children.

The diaspora of Hispanics away from the southwest and other traditional immigrant gateway cities has drawn intense interest and been well-documented by scholars (e.g., 1, 2). Most of this literature has examined the migration of the entire Hispanic population; it has not focused on the growth of Hispanic children or students in the new settlement areas. The dispersion has not been neutral in terms of the characteristics of the new Hispanic residents. Research suggests that many of the Latino migrants into the new settlement areas are immigrants. "Thus, the increasing distribution of Hispanics, as a group, is driven mostly by the new geographical trends in settlement among Mexican and Central American immigrants" (3, p. 93.) Foreign-born Hispanics have different characteristics than native-born Hispanics. For example, foreign-born Hispanic adults are disproportionately male; in addition, the median age for foreign-born Hispanics is about 35, but it is about 17 for native-born Hispanics.¹

In regard to immigration from Mexico, Durand, Massey, and Capoferro (1, p. 15) report that "tabulations suggest that this shift away from traditional destinations was not led by a random cross-section of Mexican immigrants, but by a particular subset of migrants composed predominantly of working-age men working disproportionately in agriculture." The recent Mexican arrivals in the new destination states were less likely to be married than those in traditional states.

These considerations suggest that overall Hispanic population growth in the new areas need not have resulted in corresponding school enrollment growth. This chapter analyzes public school enrollments to assess the dispersion of Hispanic children; it examines how many schools in new settlement communities have experienced large Hispanic growth and discusses the consequences of that growth.

Case studies of the education of Latino children in new settlement areas have uncovered great challenges and indicate that schools have had difficulties incorporating their new students and developing the resources and curriculum to educate these new populations. "While scholars' findings point to a somewhat positive

overall environment for Latinos in the South (with significant exceptions), Latino public education in emerging immigrant communities has been quite troubled” (4, p. 12). Systematic analysis of the educational outcomes of Hispanic children in new destination areas versus traditional Latino areas has not been performed. Nor have evaluations of the instructional resources and student expenditures been undertaken.

This chapter carefully examines an important—albeit limited—set of public school characteristics to further our knowledge of the nature of the schools educating Hispanics. Are the public schools educating Hispanics in new settlement areas different from those educating Hispanics elsewhere? Many parents and educators believe that schools matter. Empirical research suggests that school conditions affect adolescent academic performance (5, 6). Part of an assessment of Hispanic education in the wake of the diaspora requires an investigation of the schools as well as student outcomes, family background, and public expenditures. This chapter provides a description of the basic characteristics of public schools educating Hispanic children and how they vary spatially.

Examining the educational attainment of foreign-born adult Latinos that came to the US during childhood (and thus are a product of US schools), Stamps and Bohon (7) report that Latino immigrants in new settlement areas are more educated than their counterparts in established Latino metros. One possible explanation is that new settlement areas offer greater economic rewards to highly educated Latinos and that, therefore, the more highly educated migrated to the new settlement areas. Alternatively, the more highly educated adult Latinos might have grown up and been educated in the new settlement areas, so perhaps the new Latino communities are conducive to Latino education relative to traditional Hispanic metros. The evidence presented in this chapter is consistent with this latter explanation. The public schools that Hispanics attend in new settlement areas, on average, have more favorable characteristics than the public schools that Hispanics attend in traditional Hispanic metros.

A less-heralded but also noteworthy shift in the residence patterns of Hispanics is their growing suburbanization. Suro and Singer (8, p. 7) summarize their findings in regard to the entire Hispanic population: “The Latinos, in short, are becoming suburbanites.” If Hispanic children are also becoming suburbanites, one might surmise that this would have fortuitous consequences for their education. On average, central city schools are believed to be more crowded, less adequately funded, have higher concentrations of poverty (9, 10), and are associated with less favorable student outcomes, for example, higher student dropout rates (11) and lower average scores in reading and mathematics assessments (12). Migration to the suburbs (or the areas the National Center for Education Statistics refers to as “the urban fringe of the metro area”) means that Latino children are potentially attending better schools. Again, little formal analysis has documented Hispanic children’s suburbanization and the implications for their education.

Following a discussion of the data source on public schools, the analysis documents the extent to which Hispanic students dispersed and suburbanized since the 1993–1994 school year. It then concentrates on the differences in the quality of

public schools educating Hispanics and whites. A necessary condition for differences is that students not attend the same public schools. A simple, standard measure suffices to show that suburban Hispanic and white students largely do not go to the same schools. Then differences in the typical characteristics of public schools are examined spatially.

Data

This analysis is based on the Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Surveys in the Common Core of Data (CCD) collected by the US Department of Education (13). These annual surveys are a census of public elementary and secondary schools. State education agencies submit the data. For school year 2004–2005, 93,295 schools reported enrolling students (14). In 2004–2005, Tennessee and Nevada did not report student enrollments by race/ethnicity. Idaho did not report such enrollments in school year 1993–1994. To facilitate comparisons over time, public schools in Tennessee, Nevada, and Idaho are omitted from the analysis. In school year 2004–2005, 90,389 public schools had students in 47 states and the District of Columbia.

Following recent analyses of residential dispersal of the entire Hispanic population, the analysis is limited to enrollment patterns and changes in urban metropolitan schools (2, 8). Hispanics are heavily urbanized, and urban metropolitan schools educated 86% of the nation's 9.1 million Hispanic public students in 2004–2005.²

Although rural schools outside of metropolitan areas are educating much greater numbers of Hispanic students, their relative importance in Hispanic public education is declining. In 1993–1994, nonmetropolitan rural schools educated 9% of Hispanic students. By 2004–2005, these schools educated 7% of Latino public school enrollment.³

Further simplification is possible by focusing on the 100 largest urban metropolitan areas in terms of Hispanic public school enrollments. The 100 largest Hispanic areas educated 82% of Hispanics in 2004–2005. Not much dispersion beyond the top 100 largest Hispanic urban metro areas has occurred as these areas educated 83% of Latinos in 1993–1994.⁴ The remainder of this chapter concentrates on the schooling of Latino public school students in the nation's 100 largest Hispanic areas (7.4 million Hispanic students in 2004–2005).

The Dispersion and Suburbanization of Hispanic Schooling

Dispersion

Over the 11-year period examined, Hispanic youth have dispersed considerably from traditional urban metro areas in the Southwest. The largest 100 Hispanic urban metro areas can be subdivided into traditional Hispanic urban metros, new

settlement metros, and other urban metros (Table 2.1 provides the full listing). Nearly half of the largest 100 Hispanic urban metros are traditional Hispanic metros and are in California, New York, Arizona, and Texas (sans Dallas-Fort Worth) or are traditional immigrant gateways including Chicago and Miami. As Table 2.2 shows, the 48 traditional Hispanic urban metro areas continue to educate the bulk of Hispanic students, but their share has markedly declined. In the 1993–1994 school year, public schools in traditional Hispanic areas educated 85% of Hispanic students. This share declined to 78% by 2004–2005.

Table 2.1 Hispanic public school enrollment in the top 100 Hispanic urban metropolitan areas

Metro	Hispanic enrollment		2004–2005 Hispanic enrollment rank	Percent growth in Hispanic enrollment 1993–2004	
	1993–1994	2004–2005			
New settlement areas					
1	Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	141,132	328,002	6	132
2	Washington-Arlington- Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	43,678	107,425	15	146
3	Orlando, FL	25,357	72,076	21	184
4	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	9,994	66,961	25	570
5	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	22,094	56,731	29	157
6	Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	14,931	41,483	36	178
7	Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA	11,419	36,375	37	219
8	Salt Lake City, UT	11,246	29,577	40	163
9	Minneapolis-St. Paul- Bloomington, MN-WI	7,409	26,376	44	256
10	Kansas City, MO-KS	7,367	22,817	49	210
11	Oklahoma City, OK	7,276	20,624	54	183
12	Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC	1,397	16,790	58	1,102
13	Naples-Marco Island, FL	4,695	14,811	62	215
14	Salem, OR	5,743	14,601	64	154
15	Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	3,563	13,363	68	275
16	Lakeland, FL	4,007	12,732	71	218
17	Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	3,303	12,279	74	272
18	Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	1,460	11,803	75	708
19	Wichita, KS	5,115	11,456	77	124
20	Indianapolis, IN	1,367	11,355	79	731
21	Sarasota-Bradenton-Venice, FL	3,565	10,959	80	207
22	Ogden-Clearfield, UT	4,456	10,859	82	144
23	Tulsa, OK	2,470	10,846	83	339
24	Fayetteville-Springdale- Rogers, AR-MO	777	10,466	86	1,247
25	Baltimore-Towson, MD	3,176	10,381	87	227

Table 2.1 (continued)

Metro	Hispanic enrollment		2004–2005 Hispanic enrollment rank	Percent growth in Hispanic enrollment 1993–2004
	1993–1994	2004–2005		
26 Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	3,981	8,709	92	119
27 Jacksonville, FL	3,086	8,672	93	181
28 Raleigh-Cary, NC	977	8,466	94	767
29 Rockford, IL	2,604	7,843	96	201
30 Provo-Orem, UT	2,063	7,772	98	277
Traditional Hispanic areas				
31 Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	932,383	1,290,083	1	38
32 New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ	537,809	705,441	2	31
33 Houston-Baytown-Sugar Land, TX	223,307	396,046	3	77
34 Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	199,839	374,434	4	87
35 Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	208,629	367,342	5	76
36 Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Miami Beach, FL	182,366	310,977	7	71
37 Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	99,443	240,012	8	141
38 San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	129,003	199,224	9	54
39 San Antonio, TX	148,891	188,836	10	27
40 McAllen-Edinburg-Pharr, TX	110,259	160,214	11	45
41 San Francisco- Oakland-Fremont, CA	93,987	145,623	12	55
42 El Paso, TX	114,015	139,059	13	22
43 San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	74,414	94,007	16	26
44 Fresno, CA	60,166	87,847	17	46
45 Brownsville-Harlingen, TX	63,745	77,131	18	21
46 Austin-Round Rock, TX	41,870	75,145	19	79
47 Bakersfield, CA	43,412	73,378	20	69
48 Sacramento-Arden-Arcade- Roseville, CA	36,455	68,180	23	87
49 Albuquerque, NM	46,023	59,873	26	30
50 Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	39,029	59,031	27	51
51 Tucson, AZ	38,790	58,837	28	52
52 Laredo, TX	37,588	51,490	30	37
53 Visalia-Porterville, CA	25,724	51,370	31	100
54 Stockton, CA	25,629	49,799	32	94
55 Corpus Christi, TX	44,991	47,477	33	6
56 Salinas, CA	30,071	47,367	34	58

Table 2.1 (continued)

Metro	Hispanic enrollment		2004–2005 Hispanic enrollment rank	Percent growth in Hispanic enrollment 1993–2004
	1993–1994	2004–2005		
57 Modesto, CA	18,099	44,817	35	148
58 Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Goleta, CA	23,587	35,549	38	51
59 El Centro, CA	23,212	28,878	42	24
60 Merced, CA	14,883	28,179	43	89
61 Yuma, AZ	13,099	25,724	45	96
62 Las Cruces, NM	16,105	21,913	52	36
63 Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	8,364	19,717	55	136
64 Vallejo-Fairfield, CA	9,437	17,530	57	86
65 Lubbock, TX	13,889	15,825	59	14
66 Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA	11,460	15,639	60	36
67 Odessa, TX	13,009	15,548	61	20
68 Madera, CA 8,039	13,343	69	66	
69 Hanford-Corcoran, CA	8,664	12,687	72	46
70 Amarillo, TX	7,579	12,614	73	66
71 Poughkeepsie-Newburgh- Middletown, NY	5,165	11,403	78	121
72 Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood, TX	7,055	10,929	81	55
73 Santa Fe, NM	8,379	10,263	88	22
74 Midland, TX	7,126	9,960	89	40
75 Waco, TX	5,823	9,480	90	63
76 Victoria, TX	7,267	8,924	91	23
77 San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA	3,998	7,778	97	95
78 Napa, CA	3,878	7,613	100	96
Other Areas				
79 Denver-Aurora, CO	51,764	107,470	14	108
80 Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	45,911	69,651	22	52
81 Philadelphia-Camden- Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	41,423	67,185	24	62
82 Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	15,307	31,372	39	105
83 Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	21,484	29,302	41	36
84 Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	13,413	24,276	46	81
85 New Haven-Milford, CT	13,177	24,161	47	83
86 Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI	10,419	23,079	48	122
87 Springfield, MA	15,694	22,099	50	41
88 Yakima, WA	14,468	22,075	51	53
89 Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	14,401	21,500	53	49

Table 2.1 (continued)

Metro	Hispanic enrollment		2004–2005 Hispanic enrollment rank	Percent growth in Hispanic enrollment 1993–2004
	1993–1994	2004–2005		
90 Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	8,640	17,789	56	106
91 Colorado Springs, CO	8,022	14,661	63	83
92 Worcester, MA	9,286	14,287	65	54
93 Kennewick-Richland- Pasco, WA	6,850	14,003	66	104
94 Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH	9,408	13,436	67	43
95 Reading, PA	5,703	13,138	70	130
96 Greeley, CO	6,693	11,492	76	72
97 Pueblo, CO	9,481	10,693	84	13
98 Rochester, NY	7,907	10,551	85	33
99 Lancaster, PA	4,832	7,979	95	65
100 Boulder, CO	3,688	7,627	99	107

Source: US Department of Education, Common Core of Data (CCD), Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey

Table 2.2 Hispanic urban metropolitan public school enrollment: top 100 Hispanic areas

Area type	1993–1994		2004–2005	
	Students	%	Students	%
Traditional Hispanic areas (48)	3,825,955	85	5,802,536	78
New settlement areas (30)	359,708	8	1,022,610	14
Other areas (22)	337,971	7	577,826	8
Total	4,523,634	100	7,402,972	100

Source: US Department of Education, Common Core of Data (CCD), Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey

Declining Hispanic populations in urban metro areas in California, Texas, and New York account for the waning importance of traditional Hispanic areas. Metro areas in each of these states educated relatively fewer Hispanics. The movement out of LA-Long Beach-Santa Ana schools can entirely account for the decline in California. Schools in this one urban metro area educated 21% of the nation’s Hispanics in the 1993–1994 school year. By 2004–2005, LA-Long Beach-Santa Ana educated 17% of Hispanic students.⁵

Not only did public schools in the 30 new settlement urban metro areas at least double their Hispanic enrollments (indeed, Fayetteville, AR public schools enrolled 13 times more Latinos in school year 2004–2005 than in school year 1993–1994), they also educated a rising proportion of the nation’s Hispanics. Public schools in the new settlement areas educated 8% of Hispanic urban metropolitan enrollments in 1993–1994. By 2004–2005, these areas educated 14% of Hispanics. With the

exception of Dallas-Fort Worth,⁶ these public schools are all outside California and the southwest; one obvious question is how public schools attended by Hispanics in the new settlement areas compare to public schools in the traditional Hispanic urban metros.

Suburbanization

A second recent significant Hispanic population development has been the dispersion of Hispanics within, rather than across, metropolitan areas. During the 1990s, all racial/ethnic groups began to move to suburban areas in greater numbers than ever before (15). Though blacks have shown the greatest increase in suburban residence, almost half of Hispanic persons are suburbanites.

Hispanic public school enrollments have also shifted from the central city to the urban fringe of the metro area (more commonly known as suburbia). In 1993–1994, 40% of Hispanic enrollment was educated in “urban fringe” schools (Table 2.3).⁷ By 2004–2005, this percentage had risen to 45%. The dispersal of students within an urban metropolitan area from 1993 to 2004 occurred in traditional Hispanic metros nearly as much as in the new settlement areas. In the 30 new settlement areas, however, Hispanic students were more likely than their peers in other metro areas throughout the country to be educated in schools in the urban fringe.

Table 2.3 Suburbanization of Hispanic public school enrollment: Top 100 Hispanic areas

Area type	1993–1994			2004–2005		
	Students	Students in urban fringe schools	% in urban fringe schools	Students	Students in urban fringe schools	% in urban fringe schools
Traditional Hispanic areas (48)	3,825,955	1,516,822	40	5,802,536	2,594,997	45
New settlement areas (30)	359,708	170,461	47	1,022,610	544,838	53
Other areas (22)	337,971	101,035	30	577,826	204,929	35
Total	4,523,634	1,788,318	40	7,402,972	3,344,764	45

Source: US Department of Education, Common Core of Data (CCD), Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey

The pace of suburbanization of Hispanic children should not be overemphasized. Almost half (46%) of the large Hispanic enrollment growth between 1993 and 2004 occurred in central city schools (Table 2.4). In comparison, white enrollment in central city schools declined over the period. Black and Asian enrollment in central city schools did increase from 1993 to 2004, but much more of the black (83%) and Asian enrollment growth (66%) occurred in urban fringe schools in comparison to Latinos (54%). Latino students were suburbanizing, but less so than other students.

Table 2.4 Suburbanization of public school enrollment: top 100 Hispanic areas

Race	1993-1994			2004-2005			% of growth that occurred in urban fringe
	Students	Students in urban fringe schools	% in urban fringe schools	Students	Students in urban fringe schools	% in urban fringe schools	
Hispanic	4,523,634	1,788,318	40	7,402,972	3,344,764	45	54
NH white	11,514,647	8,001,661	69	11,256,601	8,281,134	74	100
NH black	3,838,242	1,301,905	34	4,595,082	1,927,356	42	83
NH Asian	1,177,733	525,059	45	1,637,139	828,812	51	66
All students	21,179,866	11,680,842	55	25,065,053	14,477,530	58	72

Source: US Department of Education, Common Core of Data (CCD), Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey

Suburban Schooling

It is well known that Hispanics do not attend the same public schools as whites. Logan (16) reports that 78% of Hispanics went to majority minority public schools in 2000; only 11% of whites attended these same public schools. In part, Hispanics do not attend the same schools as whites because more whites reside in the urban fringe of the metropolitan area, rather than the central city. Although central city schools are more heavily minority, even Hispanics and whites that reside in the urban fringe do not attend the same schools.

Suburbanization is not the great equalizer in that suburban white and Hispanic students attend different schools. In the suburbs of the top 100 Hispanic urban areas, 75% of Hispanic students went to majority minority schools in 2004. In these same suburbs, 13% of white students went to these schools (Table 2.5). Again, spatial differences between Hispanics and whites contribute to this difference. Whites are more likely to reside and be educated in metros other than the 48 traditional Hispanic areas. As Table 2.5 reports, areas outside the 48 traditional Hispanic areas tend to have fewer students in majority minority schools.

Geographic differences are not the whole explanation, however, because within the same metropolitan area type, suburban whites and suburban Hispanics do not go

Table 2.5 Urban fringe students in majority minority schools, 2004–2005

Area type	Race	Urban fringe of top 100 Hispanic urban metropolitan areas	In majority minority schools	% majority minority schools
Top 100 Hispanic urban metropolitan areas	Hispanic	3,344,764	2,517,295	75
	NH white	8,281,134	1,106,454	13
	NH black	1,927,356	1,349,784	70
	NH Asian	828,812	359,284	43
	All students	14,477,530	5,363,584	37
Traditional Hispanic areas (48)	Hispanic	2,594,997	2,142,923	83
	NH white	3,222,458	719,864	22
	NH black	857,475	694,859	81
	NH Asian	498,212	278,604	56
	All students	7,208,516	3,855,786	53
New settlement areas (30)	Hispanic	544,838	291,584	54
	NH white	2,773,788	301,724	11
	NH black	799,310	524,619	66
	NH Asian	224,581	70,385	31
	All students	4,389,555	1,196,778	27
Other areas (22)	Hispanic	204,929	82,788	40
	NH white	2,284,888	84,866	4
	NH black	270,571	130,306	48
	NH Asian	106,019	10,295	10
	All students	2,879,459	311,020	11

Source: US Department of Education, Common Core of Data (CCD), Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey

to the same schools. In the 30 new settlement areas, for example, 54% of suburban Hispanics went to majority minority schools. In comparison, 11% of their white peers attended these schools.

It is not the case that in every metro area suburban whites were less likely to attend majority minority schools than suburban Hispanics.⁸ But in 82 out of the 100 top Hispanic metros, suburban whites were less likely than suburban Hispanics to attend majority minority schools. Consider, for example, the New York/Northern New Jersey/Long Island metro area. Over 70% of suburban Hispanics in the NY metro area enrolled in majority minority schools. Less than 10% of their suburban white peers attended these schools.

The Impact of Dispersion on Hispanic Education Conditions

The CCD does not have extensive information on the characteristics of schools. The rudimentary characteristics available suggest that the dispersion of students out of traditional Hispanic metros has tended to improve the educational context of Hispanic public school students. Table 2.6 shows the characteristics of the schools attended by the typical Hispanic student. Schools attended by Hispanics in the traditional Hispanic metros tend to be larger, poorer, more segregated, and have fewer instructional resources than schools attended by Hispanics in the new settlement metros.

The typical Hispanic student's school in the traditional Hispanic metros has 1,240 students. In comparison, the average Hispanic student's school in the new destination metros has 986 students.⁹ Although the relationship between school size and educational outcomes may not be linear, bigger schools are associated with higher student attrition rates and lower educational achievement (9, 17).

Hispanic students in traditional Hispanic metros are more likely to attend Title I schools. Title I funds are targeted on public schools with larger concentrations of low-income students. Nearly 75% of Hispanic students in traditional metros attend Title I eligible schools, in comparison to 58% of Hispanic students in the new settlement metros. Title I status has at least two direct implications. On the one hand, since Title I schools tend to be high-poverty schools, they tend to have lower achievement levels. On the other hand, Title I status implies additional Title I funding and the ability to offer supplemental services and school-wide programs.

A widely used measure of school segregation is the exposure index (18). The Hispanic-white exposure index is the percent of the student body that is white at the school of the average Hispanic student. As Table 2.6 reports, the Hispanic-white exposure score is 38 in new settlement areas and 18 in traditional Hispanic areas. The schools attended by Hispanics in new settlement areas are less segregated than the schools attended by Hispanics in traditional Hispanic areas.

In terms of instructional resources, Hispanic schools in new settlement areas seem to be better staffed than Hispanic schools in traditional Hispanic areas. The student-to-teacher ratio is about 17 at the school attended by the average Hispanic student in new settlement areas versus 20 in traditional Hispanic metros.

Table 2.6 Mean characteristics of schools attended by Hispanics: Top 100 Hispanic urban metropolitan areas, 2004–2005

Public schools attended by Hispanics	Characteristic										
	% Hispanic	% black	% white	% free/reduced lunch	Size	Student to teacher ratio	% Title I eligible	% Title I school-wide Title I	% magnet	% charter	% urban fringe
Traditional Hispanic areas (48)	65	11	18	56	1,240	19.6	74	58	11	2	45
New settlement areas (30)	37	19	38	56	986	16.6	58	49	11	2	53
Other areas (22)	44	17	35	59	840	17	74	55	1	4	

Source: US Department of Education, Common Core of Data (CCD), Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey

Note: These are the average characteristics of public schools, where the weight a school receives is the number of Hispanic students. Schools educating more Hispanics receive higher weight in computing the average.

Public School Changes in New Settlement Areas

The above comparison is simply based on the most recent characteristics of public schools in the 30 new settlement metros. It also is based on the average of the public schools. Some of the public schools in new settlement metros experienced very large changes since 1993–1994 that may have had an impact on the quality of education.

Although Hispanic enrollment in the new settlement metros nearly tripled from 1993–1994 to 2004–2005 (Table 2.2), public schools in the new settlement metros as a whole did not widely experience this increase. The increases in Hispanic enrollment heavily occurred at 1,400 public schools termed “high Hispanic growth” schools. By definition, these public schools gained at least 100 Hispanic students and at least doubled their Hispanic enrollment from 1993–1994 to 2004–2005. Of the 11,065 public schools in operation during 2004–2005 in the new settlement areas, about 13% experienced “high Hispanic growth.”¹⁰ This subset of public schools in the new settlement areas experienced the bulk of the Hispanic enrollment boom. As Table 2.7 shows, 44% of the increase in Hispanic enrollment in the new settlement areas occurred at these 1,400 public schools. The high Hispanic growth schools are consequential presently because they educate 40% of Hispanic students in the new settlement metros.

The rapid growth of Latinos at these public schools was accompanied by other changes as well (Table 2.8). While the size of the student population at most public schools remained stable, rapid Latino growth at the high Hispanic growth schools was accompanied by an increase in the size of the school. The typical high Hispanic growth school increased in size from 860 students in 1993–1994 to 986 students in 2004–2005. High Hispanic growth schools markedly increased in size in spite of the fact that white enrollments were declining. White enrollments were declining at most public schools from 1993–1994 to 2004–2005, but the declines were particularly marked at the high Hispanic growth schools. In 1993–1994, the typical high Hispanic growth school had 573 white students and was 64% white. By 2004–2005, these schools had 417 white students and whites had declined to 38% of the student body. Family affluence at the high Hispanic growth schools also markedly declined. In 1993–1994, 31% of the students at these schools qualified for free lunches under the National School Lunch Act. By 2004–2005, 48% of the students qualified for free lunches.

Thus, although dispersion generally has led to improvement in the measured characteristics of public schools educating Hispanics relative to the public schools in the traditional Hispanic metros, a subset of public schools in the new settlement metros have clearly undergone radical, and perhaps traumatic, changes in the past decade. These public schools are fewer than one-in-seven public schools in the new settlement metros, but they educated 40% of new settlement Hispanics in 2004–2005. How well these schools are coping with the influx of Latinos and meeting their educational needs deserves more investigation.

Table 2.7 Public school enrollment in the 30 new settlement urban metropolitan areas

Race	1993–1994		2004–2005		% of growth that occurred in high Hispanic growth schools
	Students	% in high Hispanic growth schools	Students	% in high Hispanic growth schools	
Hispanic	359,708	111,168	1,022,610	405,452	44
NH white	3,929,374	802,537	3,814,417	583,357	15
NH black	1,235,232	226,101	1,650,821	293,644	18
NH Asian	219,796	55,156	358,749	75,460	21
All students	5,795,732	1,204,526	6,920,414	1,369,349	20

Source: US Department of Education, Common Core of Data (CCD), Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey

Note: In the 2004–2005 school year there were 11,065 public schools in the 30 new settlement areas. “High Hispanic Growth School” refers to the 1,400 public schools that gained at least 100 Hispanic students and at least doubled their Hispanic enrollment from 1993–1994 to 2004–2005.

Table 2.8 Change in the mean characteristics of schools in 30 new settlement urban metropolitan areas

Characteristic							Student to teacher ratio
Public school type	Year	Hispanic enrollment	Black enrollment	White enrollment	% white	% free lunch	Size
Not a high Hispanic growth school	1993–1994	35	137	439	68	27	639
	2004–2005	62	153	363	56	35	621
High Hispanic growth school	1993–1994	79	162	573	64	31	860
	2004–2005	290	210	417	38	48	986

Source: US Department of Education, Common Core of Data (CCD), Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey

Note: Unlike Table 5, the average characteristics are the simple average for the schools. The average is not weighted by enrollment. A small school receives the same weight as a large school.

The Impact of Suburbanization on Hispanic Education Conditions

Though the magnitude of suburbanization of Hispanic students from 1993–1994 to 2004–2005 seems modest, suburbanization does seem to have improved the characteristics of the schools attended by Hispanic students. Table 2.9 reports the typical 2004–2005 characteristics of schools attended by Hispanic students in central city areas versus the urban fringe of the central city. Suburban schools are smaller, their student bodies have a smaller percentage qualifying for free/reduced price lunches, and they are more integrated: the typical Hispanic school in the suburbs is a school with 30% white student enrollment versus central city schools with 16% white student enrollment. The pupil-to-teacher ratio varies little across central city and suburban schools attended by Hispanics. Suburban schools attended by Hispanics are much less likely to be Title I eligible than their central city counterparts.

Suburban Hispanic students not only attend different schools than their suburban white counterparts, the average characteristics of Hispanic schools in the suburbs are inferior to the schools attended by suburban whites. Table 2.9 documents that the average urban fringe school attended by whites has fewer students, has fewer students eligible for the reduced/free lunch program, has fewer students per teacher, and is much less likely to be Title I eligible in comparison to the average characteristics of urban fringe schools attended by Hispanics. Although suburbanization does improve the educational context of Hispanic youth, on average, suburban Hispanics are not educated in schools with similar characteristics to suburban white schools.

Conclusions

Until 1990, schools in California, Texas, and New York largely dominated the public schooling of Hispanic youth. Public schools in these three states educated nearly seven-in-ten Hispanic public students. As a result of the changing settlement patterns of the Hispanic diaspora, these states no longer have a near monopoly on the education of Latino youth. These three large states tend to have large, urban public schools, and partly because Hispanics were concentrated in these states, Hispanics have been educated in public schools with distinct, generally unfavorable characteristics (10). While the diaspora presented public schools in new settlement areas with the challenge of educating Hispanic youth that they had little experience educating, it also resulted in Hispanics being educated in new school contexts that may be more favorable.

While the rise of Hispanic students in the South and other new settlement areas has drawn scholarly attention (e.g., 19), there has been little formal empirical analysis of the effect on public schools and the implications for Hispanic education. Perhaps not surprisingly, the dispersion of Hispanic enrollments in new areas of the country has not been evenly distributed across schools. Hispanic population growth has been concentrated in certain communities, and most public schools in the 30 new settlement areas did not experience a much different change than the national

Table 2.9 2004–2005 Mean characteristics of schools: Central city versus urban fringe areas

Characteristic										
	% Hispanic	% black	% white	% free/reduced lunch	Size	Student to teacher ratio	% Title I eligible	% school-wide Title I	% magnet	% charter
Central city public schools attended by Hispanics	64	13	16	59	1,182	18.8	80	67	13	3
Urban fringe public schools attended by Hispanics	54	11	30	54	1,163	19.1	61	42	5	1
Urban fringe public schools attended by whites	12	8	75	22	1,025	17.7	31	9	3	1
Traditional Hispanic areas										
Central city public schools attended by Hispanics	68	11	14	57	1,258	19.4	81	67	15	3
Urban fringe public schools attended by Hispanics	61	10	24	56	1,217	19.8	65	45	5	1
Urban fringe public schools attended by whites	19	7	67	22	1,125	18.2	36	11	2	2
New settlement areas										
Central city public schools attended by Hispanics	46	21	28	67	921	16.6	71	64	13	2

Table 2.9 (continued)

Characteristic		% Hispanic	% black	% white	% free/reduced lunch	Size	Student to teacher ratio	% Title I eligible	% school-wide Title I	% magnet	% charter
Urban fringe public schools attended by Hispanics		29	18	46	47	1,043	16.6	47	36	10	1
Urban fringe public schools attended by whites		9	10	75	26	1,051	18.1	26	11	4	1
Other areas											
Central city public schools attended by Hispanics		51	22	23	69	862	17.0	82	69	1	5
Urban fringe public schools attended by Hispanics		30	9	56	40	802	17.0	60	27	1	2
Urban fringe public schools attended by whites		5	6	85	15	854	16.4	33	4	3	1

Source: US Department of Education, Common Core of Data (CCD), Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey
 Note: These are enrollment weighted averages. Calculations for Hispanics put more weight on schools with more Hispanic students. Calculations for whites put more weight on schools with greater white enrollment.

trends in public education over the past 15 years (i.e., they slightly shrank in size, they became less white in both absolute and percentage terms, and their students grew slightly poorer as measured by eligibility for free school lunches). In the new settlement areas, fewer than one-in-seven public schools absorbed much of the Hispanic enrollment boom.

In terms of the kinds of public schools Latinos are attending in new settlement communities, on average, Latino students in new settlement areas are educated in schools with no worse measured characteristics than Latino students in traditional Hispanic metros. The typical Hispanic student educated in a new settlement metro is, in fact, more likely to attend a suburban school, a smaller school, and a more affluent school than his/her counterpart in a traditional Hispanic metro. That is not to say that Hispanics in new settlement areas are attending the same kinds of schools as white students. Hispanics in new settlement areas are much more likely to be educated at majority minority schools than white students in new settlement areas.

Comparing the educational conditions of Hispanic students in new settlement areas to those in traditional Hispanic areas indicates that the diaspora may not have had the dire consequences for Hispanic education that is oft asserted. The “proof of the pudding” is, however, not the characteristics of the schools but the educational outcomes of Hispanic public school students. Little formal analysis investigates the educational attainment (e.g., high school completion and college attendance) and educational achievement (e.g., English acquisition, standardized test scores, and curriculum) of Hispanic students educated in new versus traditional Hispanic schools. An examination of high school completion rates reveals that Hispanic youth in new settlement areas are less likely to finish high school than their Hispanic counterparts in traditional Hispanic metropolitan areas (20). However, white and African American youth also do not finish high school at the same rate if they are educated in the new settlement areas versus the traditional Hispanic areas. This suggests that the educational disparities that Latinos may encounter in their new metropolitan areas are not distinctly Latino but rather reflect long-standing educational disparities between different areas of the country. High school completion is far from the only metric of educational success, however, and more research is needed to understand how Hispanic youth are faring in new communities of settlement.

Acknowledgement The views expressed in this chapter are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Pew Hispanic Center or The Pew Charitable Trusts. The author appreciates the comments by Lindsay Lowell, Cordelia Reimers, Richard Santos, and the editors on an earlier draft.

Notes

1. Two-thirds of the Hispanics in 36 new settlement counties in the South were foreign born. Nationally, four-in-ten Latinos were born outside the United States. These immigrant men were less likely to be married than their counterparts elsewhere in the United States (21).
2. Though the terms urban and metropolitan are often used interchangeably, metropolitan areas, in fact, can include both rural and urban territory. Although the meaning of the term “suburbanization” is arbitrary, linguistic meaning would seem to dictate that rural areas not be

- included in the analysis. Thus, the focus is limited to schools in urban metropolitan areas, not just metropolitan areas.
3. This is consistent with trends in the settlement of the foreign-born population. Gurak and Kritz (22) note that the percentage of the foreign-born population residing in non-metropolitan areas has been declining.
 4. Fischer and Tienda (2) note the metropolitanization of Hispanics since 1980, when 77% of Hispanics resided in the 100 largest metro areas. By 2000, 79% of Hispanics lived in these areas.
 5. The relative decline of LA-Long Beach-Santa Ana may reflect the location decisions of recently arrived Mexican immigrants. Card and Lewis (23, p. 225) report that the “most important trend in the destination choices of new Mexican immigrants [is] the move away from Los Angeles.”
 6. The Dallas-Fort Worth metro is considered a “new settlement area” due to the inordinate growth of its Hispanic population since 1980 and the relatively recent settlement of Hispanics in that area. In regard to Dallas, Suro and Singer (8, p. 6) observe that it has not “played a longstanding role as a major gateway for Latino immigrants.”
 7. The term “urban fringe” reflects the school locale classification used by the National Center for Education Statistics. The locale reflects the location of the school’s buildings, not necessarily the residence of its students. “Urban fringe” refers to urban places or territories in metropolitan core based statistical areas that are not in the principal city of the CBSA (13).
 8. In some suburban areas (e.g., Fayetteville, Arkansas or Provo, Utah), there are no majority minority schools. In some suburban areas of Texas (e.g., McAllen or El Paso) all suburban schools are majority minority schools.
 9. Comparisons of the characteristics of public schools in the two areas are not biased by differences in the school level of Hispanic students. Hispanic students in new settlement areas are not much more likely than their counterparts in the traditional areas to be enrolled in primary schools as opposed to middle schools and high schools. About 56% of Hispanic students in new settlement areas and 54% in traditional Hispanic areas were enrolled in primary schools in 2004–2005.
 10. Not all 11,065 public schools can be categorized as a “high Hispanic growth school” or not. Some of the 11,065 schools in 2004–2005 did not exist in 1993–1994; they opened more recently. For a school to be deemed “high Hispanic growth,” it must have operated in both 1993–1994 and 2004–2005.

References

1. Durand, Jorge, Douglas S. Massey, and Chiara Capoferro. 2005. “The New Geography of Mexican Immigration.” In *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*, ed. Victor Zuniga and Ruben Hernandez-Leon, 1–20. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
2. Fischer, Mary J., and Marta Tienda. 2006. “Redrawing Spatial Color Lines: Hispanic Metropolitan Dispersal, Segregation, and Economic Opportunity.” In *Hispanics and the Future of America*, ed. Marta Tienda and Faith Mitchell, 100–137. Washington DC: National Academies Press.
3. Durand, Jorge, Edward Telles, and Jennifer Flashman. 2006. “The Demographic Foundations of the Latino Population.” In *Hispanics and the Future of America*, ed. Marta Tienda and Faith Mitchell, 66–99. Washington DC: National Academies Press.
4. Wainer, Andrew. 2004. *The New Latino South and the Challenge to Public Education: Strategies for Educators and Policymakers in Emerging Immigrant Communities.* Los Angeles, CA: Tomás Rivera Policy Institute.
5. Hanushek, Eric A., and Steven G. Rivkin. 2006. “School Quality and the Black – White Achievement Gap.” NBER Working Paper No. 12651. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

6. Pong, Suet-ling, and Lingxin Hao. 2007. "Neighborhood and School Factors in the School Performance of Immigrants' Children." *International Migration Review*, 41(1): 206–241.
7. Stamps, Katherine, and Stephanie A. Bohon. 2006. "Educational Attainment in New and Established Latino Metropolitan Destinations." *Social Science Quarterly*, 87(5): 1225–1240.
8. Suro, Roberto, and Audrey Singer. 2002. *Latino Growth in Metropolitan America: Changing Patterns, New Locations*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy.
9. Wirt, John, Susan Choy, Stephen Provasnik, Patrick Rooney, Anindita Sen, and Richard Tobin. 2003. *The Condition of Education 2003*. NCES 2003067. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
10. Schneider, Barbara, Sylvia Martinez, and Ann Owens. 2006. "Barriers to Educational Opportunities for Hispanics in the United States." In *Hispanics and the Future of America*, ed. Marta Tienda and Faith Mitchell, 179–227. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
11. Rumberger, Russell W. 1995. "Dropping out of Middle School: A Multilevel Analysis of Students and Schools." *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3): 583–625.
12. Wirt, John, Patrick Rooney, William Hussar, Susan Choy, Stephen Provasnik, Gillian Hampden-Thompson. 2005. *The Condition of Education 2005*. NCES 2005094. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
13. Shen, Quansheng. 2006. *Documentation to the NCES Common Core of Data Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey: School Year 2004–2005*. NCES 2006339. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
14. Sable, Jennifer, and Jason Hill. 2006. *Overview of Public Elementary and Secondary Students, Staff, Schools, School Districts, Revenues, and Expenditures: School Year 2004–2005 and Fiscal Year 2004*. NCES 2007309. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
15. Frey, William H. 2001. *Melting Pot Suburbs: A Census 2000 Study of Suburban Diversity*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy.
16. Logan, John 2004. *Resegregation in American Public Schools? Not in the 1990s*. Albany, NY: Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research, University at Albany.
17. Rumberger, Russell W., and Scott L. Thomas. 2000. "The Distribution of Dropout and Turnover Rates Among Urban and Suburban High Schools," *Sociology of Education*, 73(1): 39–67.
18. Logan, John. 2002. *Choosing Segregation: Racial Imbalance in American Public Schools, 1990–2000*. Albany, NY: Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research, University at Albany.
19. Hernandez-Leon, Ruben, and Victor Zuniga. 2005. "Applachia Meets Aztlan: Mexican Immigration and Intergroup Relations in Dalton, Georgia." In *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*, ed. Victor Zuniga and Ruben Hernandez-Leon, 244–274. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
20. Fry, Richard. 2008. "The Enrollment and Attainment of Hispanic Youth in the New Settlement Areas." Paper presented at the 2008 Population Association of America meetings, New Orleans, LA.
21. Kocchar, Rakesh, Roberto Suro, and Sonya Tafoya. 2005. "The New Latino South: The Context and Consequences of Rapid Population Growth." Paper presented at Immigration to New Settlement Areas, the Pew Research Center, Washington, DC.
22. Gurak, Douglas T., and Mary M. Kritz. 2005. "Immigrant Settlement Patterns in the United States in the 1990s: Can Existing Theories Explain the Changes?" Paper presented at the 2005 Population Association of America meetings, Philadelphia, PA.
23. Card, David, and Ethan G. Lewis. 2007. "The Diffusion of Mexican Immigrants During the 1990s: Explanations and Impacts." In *Mexican Immigration to the United States*, ed. George J. Borjas, 193–227. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.



<http://www.springer.com/978-1-4419-6681-0>

Latinos and the Economy
Integration and Impact in Schools, Labor Markets, and
Beyond

Leal, D.L.; Trejo, S.J. (Eds.)
2011, XII, 328 p., Hardcover
ISBN: 978-1-4419-6681-0