

Residential Mobility and Hispanic Segregation: Spatial Assimilation and the Concentration of Poverty, 1960–2014

Yana Kucheva

City College of New York

Any opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Census Bureau. This research was performed at a Federal Statistical Research Data Center under FSRDC Project Number 1712. All results have been reviewed to ensure that no confidential information is disclosed.

Abstract

This project analyzes the geographic mobility and residential segregation of Hispanic households in U.S. urban areas since the 1960s. I implement a set of discrete choice models of neighborhood mobility along multiple dimensions and use the predictions of the discrete choice models to explicitly connect household-level moves to aggregate patterns of residential segregation by both race/ethnicity and income. I use restricted geocoded decennial census and American Community Survey data for the period between 1960 and 2014 to examine changes over time in the determinants of mobility of households across neighborhoods and simulate segregation levels for the Hispanic population given different counterfactual scenarios of household residential mobility. My results show that residential mobility patterns for the Hispanic population interact with existing patterns of segregation by both race/ethnicity and income to reproduce and deepen segregation, especially for low-income Hispanic households. The findings of this project provide insights for policies, such as the Housing Choice Voucher program, which tries to decrease the concentration of poverty through the provision of expanded housing options. These programs may not reach their goals if they do not attend to the specific mechanisms that push Hispanic and African-American low-income households into much poorer neighborhoods than White households of similar means.

Introduction

Scholars of segregation have consistently pointed out that levels of racial and ethnic residential segregation are much higher than levels of segregation by income. Nevertheless, as levels of racial and ethnic segregation have declined or stayed about the same, income segregation has increased over time; this increase may have accelerated over the past decade, especially for Hispanic families with children (Bischoff and Reardon, 2013; Logan et al., 2020; Reardon et al., 2018). Even more troubling has been the increase in the number of high-poverty neighborhoods and the percent of the Hispanic and African-American population living in high-poverty neighborhoods after 2000 (Jargowsky, 2014; Kneebone and Holmes, 2016). The concentration of poverty has happened in an era of continued gentrification of central city neighborhoods, raising questions about whether even the modest progress toward integration by race and ethnicity since the 1970s would be erased by the restructuring of metropolitan patterns by race, ethnicity, and income since the turn of the century.

The persistence of residential segregation over time coupled with the geographic concentration of poverty has happened despite the relatively high residential mobility rates, especially for low-income households (Frost, 2020). This phenomenon occurs because the residential moves of households tend to reproduce existing patterns of segregation at the metropolitan level (Bruch, 2014; Bruch and Swait, 2019; Krysan and Crowder, 2017). However, although previous research has documented the neighborhood flows of both African-American and White households in considerable detail, data limitations have frequently hampered research on the residential mobility of Hispanic households in the aggregate but also by tenure, nativity, and socioeconomic status. Using restricted decennial census and American Community Survey (ACS) data, this project examines the interplay between racial/ethnic and income segregation specifically for the Hispanic population in the United States since the 1960s. I use discrete choice models of residential mobility to examine how the flows of Hispanic households within metropolitan areas have changed over time and simulate under what conditions lower segregation levels could be achieved. I implement analyses for the Hispanic population as a whole, but I also present estimates for low- and high-income Hispanic households. My results show that residential mobility patterns for the Hispanic population interact with existing patterns of segregation by both ethnicity and income to reproduce and deepen segregation, especially for low-income Hispanic households. I conclude the article with the implications of my results for federal housing policy in general and voucher mobility programs specifically.

Background

The Hispanic population is currently the largest ethnic minority group in the United States. It numerically exceeded the African-American population in 2003 and has only grown in size and diversity (Saenz, 2010). The diversity of the Hispanic population in terms of socioeconomic status, immigration status, language ability, and racial background make any analysis of the residential outcomes of Hispanic households challenging. That challenge exists because the residential experiences of low-income immigrant Hispanic groups have been markedly different from those of higher income groups who have lived in the United States for multiple generations. Adding to

the challenge is that U.S. immigration policy has become considerably more punitive, putting into question the future progress of even more affluent Hispanic groups (Massey, 2001; Massey and Denton, 1987; Tienda and Fuentes, 2014).

Descriptively, the research literature on residential segregation at the metropolitan level has consistently shown that the Hispanic population as a whole is more segregated from the White population compared with Asian Americans but less segregated compared with the African-American population (Iceland, 2004; Iceland, Weinberg, and Hughes, 2014; Iceland, Weinberg, and Steinmetz, 2002; Zubrinsky and Bobo, 1996). African-American Hispanics are more segregated from the White population than are White Hispanics (Denton and Massey, 1989; Iceland and Nelson, 2008; Logan, 2003), with Hispanics with darker skin color, as judged by the interviewers on a nationally representative survey, less likely to move to neighborhoods with a higher percentage of White residents (South, Crowder, and Chavez, 2005b).

Over time, the levels of segregation for the Hispanic population from the White population have remained relatively constant (Farley and Frey, 1994; Iceland, Weinberg, and Hughes, 2014; Iceland, Weinberg, and Steinmetz, 2002). What has increased, however, is the isolation of Hispanics at the neighborhood level, measured as the probability that a given Hispanic household shares residence in the same neighborhood as another Hispanic household (Farley and Frey, 1994; Iceland, Weinberg, and Hughes, 2014; Iceland, Weinberg, and Steinmetz, 2002). Scholars have typically attributed the increase in isolation for the Hispanic population to the continued immigration of Hispanics to the United States (Massey, 2001; Massey and Denton, 1987). More recently, scholars also developed the concept of “reverse incorporation” (Jones, 2019) to describe how the continued criminalization of undocumented immigrants poses unique challenges to the Hispanic population not only in terms of their future social mobility and homeownership rates but also in terms of their residential location in resource-rich environments (Asad and Rosen, 2018; Bean, 2016; Rugh, 2020; Rugh and Hall, 2016).

At the neighborhood level, the experiences of the Hispanic population have differed substantially by socioeconomic status. For example, poor Hispanic households are more likely to live in the same neighborhood with other poor households than similarly situated White households (Quillian, 2012). Lower income Hispanics have also been less likely to move away from high-poverty neighborhoods than the low-income African-American population and more likely to move from low-poverty to high-poverty areas than the White population (South, Crowder, and Chavez, 2005a). However, higher income Hispanics born in the United States have generally been able to move to neighborhoods that better correspond to their socioeconomic position (Iceland and Nelson, 2008). Hispanics with higher socioeconomic status and greater English fluency have also been more likely to live in neighborhoods with a greater percentage of White residents (Iceland and Nelson, 2008). In these respects, more affluent Hispanic households differ substantially from African-American middle-class households.

Where Hispanic and African-American households are similar, however, is the extent to which they move to neighborhoods where the percentage of their own-group neighbors is much higher than the metropolitan-level average for each group. For example, in Bruch and Swait’s (2019) analysis of residential moves in the Los Angeles (LA) area, the tendency for households to both move short

distances and to consider neighborhoods that they can afford led to both African-American and Hispanic households moving to neighborhoods where their own group was vastly overrepresented. These patterns did not apply to either the White or the Asian populations in the LA area (Bruch and Swait, 2019). In an analysis of the residential moves of low-income Hispanic households in Chicago, Carrillo et al. (2016) find that neighborhood affordability constraints coupled with the geographically concentrated social networks of Hispanic households led to short-distance residential moves from one disadvantaged neighborhood to another. In another study of the Chicago area, Krysan and Bader (2009) show that Hispanics knew nothing about twice as many communities than either the African-American or White respondents on a survey of neighborhood perceptions. However, Hispanic and White respondents had much more similar knowledge of Chicago communities than African-American respondents. Most differences between Hispanic and White respondents could be accounted for by socioeconomic characteristics, such as income, nativity, and years in the Chicago area (Krysan and Bader, 2009).

In sum, the literature on segregation and neighborhood mobility has established divergent pathways for the Hispanic population in terms of its co-residence with the White population and its segregation by income, phenotype, and generational status. On one hand, the segregation patterns of high-income Hispanic groups and White Hispanics are consistent with the so-called spatial assimilation framework for understanding segregation patterns, which predicts greater levels of co-residence in the same neighborhoods between the Hispanic and non-Hispanic White populations, as Hispanics become more similar socioeconomically to the White population (Alba and Logan, 1993; Charles, 2003; Iceland and Nelson, 2008; Iceland and Scopilliti, 2008; Iceland, Weinberg, and Hughes, 2014; Massey, 1985). On the other hand, some of the segregation experiences and mobility patterns of Hispanics have been consistent with the place stratification perspective of understanding segregation, which posits that discriminatory practices in the housing market would place Hispanics in disadvantaged environments even as they become more similar in English proficiency and socioeconomic status with the White population (Alba and Logan, 1993; Charles, 2003; Crowell and Fossett, 2018; Iceland and Nelson, 2008; Iceland and Scopilliti, 2008; Pais, South, and Crowder, 2012).

There is evidence to partially support both of these perspectives. For example, Bayer, McMillan, and Rueben (2004) show that socioeconomic differences between the White and Hispanic populations explain a large portion of segregation in the San Francisco Bay area in 1990. Nevertheless, Hispanics in metro areas with high levels of poverty are much less likely than the White population to live in non-poor neighborhoods regardless of their socioeconomic resources (Pais, South, and Crowder, 2012). Hispanics are also less likely than the White population to move from high- to low-poverty neighborhoods—again, controlling for socioeconomic resources (South, Crowder, and Chavez, 2005a). Hispanics in metropolitan areas with higher levels of Hispanic/non-Hispanic White segregation are less likely to convert their socioeconomic characteristics into greater residential co-residence with the White population (Crowell and Fossett, 2018). According to some discrimination measures, Hispanic renters experience more discrimination in the housing market than African-American renters (Oh and Yinger, 2015). Moreover, the decline in discrimination for the Hispanic population over time has been lower than the decline in discrimination for the African-American population (Oh and Yinger, 2015). Taken together, these

findings paint a pessimistic picture of the prospects of residential integration, especially for low-income Hispanic renters.

It is important to mention that both the spatial assimilation and place stratification theoretical perspectives of understanding segregation were originally developed to describe the residential segregation of the White and African-American populations in the United States and to describe the residential patterns of ethnic European immigrant groups in the first half of the 20th century (Alba and Logan, 1991; Charles, 2003; Duncan and Lieberman, 1959). Scholars have used the residential patterns of the Hispanic population to test theories about segregation given the indeterminate placement of Hispanics in the U.S. racial structure and the internal heterogeneity of the Hispanic population in terms of ancestry, citizenship, and phenotype (Crowell and Fossett, 2018; Iceland and Nelson, 2008). Others have also pointed out that Hispanics face unique challenges to their social and, by extension, geographic mobility due to recent changes in immigration laws, which have criminalized being undocumented (Menjívar, 2013; Tienda and Fuentes, 2014). Even if Hispanics become more socioeconomically advantaged as a group, they might not be able to convert these resources into residence in resource-rich neighborhoods if they are stereotyped as an ethnic group that is foreign to the United States (Carr, Lichter, and Kefalas, 2012; Tienda and Fuentes, 2014). In this article, I outline my empirical strategy given these theories of segregation.

Overview of Empirical Strategy

This project examines Hispanic residential segregation by demonstrating how the flows of households into neighborhoods combine in ways to weaken, reproduce, or worsen segregation by both race/ethnicity and income. Drawing inspiration from the literature on the determinants of geographic mobility of households across neighborhoods and from the literature on metropolitan-level segregation, I go a step further by using the predictions of my regression models to simulate what the segregation of the Hispanic population at the metropolitan level would have been had Hispanic households moved in different ways across census tracts. Studying the mechanism of allocating individuals to neighborhoods is an essential building block to understanding metropolitan-level changes in residential segregation over time. As Sampson and Sharkey (2008) note, “Individual decisions combine to create spatial flows that define the ecological structure of inequality.” Therefore, the contribution of this project is two-fold. First, I contribute to the literature on Hispanic neighborhood mobility by taking a long view of the mobility correlations for the Hispanic population since the 1960s. Second, I present simulations of metropolitan-level segregation for the Hispanic population as a whole but also for high- and low-income Hispanic households. The data quantify how household-level mobility translates to metropolitan-level changes.

I do so by first using discrete choice models of household-level mobility and then aggregating the predictions of these models to the metropolitan level. There is a relatively small but rapidly growing literature that has used this methodology to study geographic mobility (e.g., Bruch, 2014; Logan and Shin, 2016; Quillian, 2015; Schachner and Sampson 2020; Spring et al., 2017), including, specifically, the geographic mobility of Hispanic households previously discussed in the Background section (Bayer, McMillan, and Rueben, 2004, Bruch and Swait, 2019).

Discrete choice models of residential mobility have been used in the statistical literature on migration since the 1970s (McFadden, 1978). Intuitively, the use of these models amounts to asking why a household moved to a specific neighborhood, given all possible other neighborhoods to which that household could have moved but did not. The dependent variable is a binary variable that takes the value of “1” for the actual destination neighborhood of each household and the value of “0” for all possible other destinations to which a household could have moved but did not. The independent variables are the socioeconomic characteristics of each household’s actual and potential neighborhood destinations and interactions between household characteristics and neighborhood characteristics. Bruch and Mare (2012) provide an accessible methodological description of discrete choice models.

This project takes discrete choice models a step further because I have access to the entire long-form sample of households in the 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Censuses along with the entire sample of households interviewed in the 5-year 2010–2014 ACS samples. This research was performed at a Federal Statistical Research Data Center under FSRDC Project Number 1712, “Neighborhood Migration and the Reproduction of Residential Segregation.”

Because the census and the ACS have large samples of households, I can examine the residential mobility of smaller population subgroups, such as Hispanic homeowners and Hispanic renters, as well as high- and low-income Hispanic households. I can also simulate counterfactual residential mobility scenarios and have sufficient sample sizes to calculate standard segregation measures at the metropolitan level that directly connect household-level mobility to metropolitan-level segregation. My analyses proceed in two steps. I first implement discrete choice models of residential mobility to estimate the correlates of census tract in-mobility for the Hispanic population by year, tenure, and income. I then use these models to simulate counts of the Hispanic population across all census tracts in the United States under different counterfactual scenarios of neighborhood mobility. I aggregate the simulated counts of the Hispanic population across census tracts to compute to what extent the residential segregation of the Hispanic population from the non-Hispanic White population would change should the Hispanic population sort in different ways across neighborhoods. I also simulate how the exposure of the Hispanic population to neighborhood poverty or neighborhood affluence would alter with changes in how the Hispanic population moves across neighborhoods.

Methods

Estimation of Discrete Choice Models

I use conditional logistic regression to estimate the discrete-choice models. I estimate all regressions using data on recent movers. I define recent movers as all mobile households who moved in the 15-month period before each decennial census or in the year before the household’s ACS interview.¹ Unlike a longitudinal dataset, in which one can follow migrating households from their census tract of origin to their destination, the decennial census and the ACS observe households

¹ Given that the decennial census asks householders to report on their residential mobility as of April 1 of each census year, the most recent period of mobility in the decennial census includes all months in the prior year plus the first 3 months of each decennial census year, for a total of 15 months.

only at a point in time and have only two questions about mobility behavior. These are, “When did you move into your current residence?” (with five to six possible time periods for answers); and “Where were you living 5 years ago?” in the decennial census, and “Where were you living 1 year ago” for the ACS. These questions limit and shape my analysis in several ways. First, I focus only on recent movers. By limiting the analysis to the most recent movers, I maximize the likelihood that the demographic characteristics measured in the census or the ACS characterized the movers when they moved. For similar reasons, I constructed all census-tract-level measures in the analysis only for the population who had lived in a census tract for at least 1 year. I thus try to keep the characteristics of recent migrants from distorting the measures of the characteristics of the tracts that they enter. Second, I focus on the process of in-mobility into (rather than out-mobility out of) census tracts. Previous research that has examined both out-migration and in-migration has found that in-migration is far more important in reproducing patterns of racial and ethnic segregation (Ellen, 2000; Quillian, 2002, 2015). The lack of data on the prior unit of residence of each household, however, means that I cannot estimate the extent to which households are moving to either more diverse or less diverse census tracts nor the extent to which changes in tenure across moves relates to the racial/ethnic composition of the neighborhood to where households move.

Formally, I model the probability that a household head, i , chooses a particular neighborhood, j , in a metropolitan area, m , in the 15-month period before each census or the 1-year period before each ACS interview. I assume that neighborhood j is drawn randomly from a choice set (C_{im}) of many possible neighborhood destinations within that household’s current metropolitan area.² The probability of choosing a particular neighborhood is a function of neighborhood-level characteristics Z_{ijm} , which interact with household-level characteristics, X_i . All neighborhood-level variables and interactions with household-level variables contribute to a random utility function:

$$U_{ijm} = \beta Z_{ijm} + \gamma Z_{ijm} X_i + \epsilon_{ijm},$$

where ϵ_{ijm} is a random household, neighborhood, and metropolitan-area-specific term. The probability that household i chooses neighborhood j in metropolitan area m is as follows:

$$P_{ijmt} = \frac{\exp(\beta Z_{ijm} + \gamma Z_{ijm} X_i)}{\sum_{k \in C_{im}} \exp(\beta Z_{ik} + \gamma Z_{ik} X_i)}$$

I accumulate these probabilities across households in the following likelihood function:

$$L = \prod_i \prod_j \prod_m (P_{ijm})^{y_{ijm}}$$

The outcome variable, y_{ijm} , takes the value of “1” if neighborhood j in metropolitan area m is the destination of household i and “0” otherwise.

² A more realistic “choice set” would constrain further the potential neighborhood destinations for each household. Households not only have affordability constraints but also tend to move very short distances (Bruch and Swait, 2019). The discrete choice models in this manuscript control for neighborhood housing costs, but the type of cross-sectional data to which I have access do not allow me to also control for the distance that each household moved. Because Hispanic households have geographically constrained choice sets that amplify segregation (Bruch and Swait, 2019), the simulations in exhibits 4 and 5 (later in this article) may overestimate the potential for desegregation under different mobility counterfactuals.

Because every metropolitan area in the United States has at least a few dozen census tracts, estimating the likelihood function for each household in every census/ACS year can be computationally cumbersome. I therefore subsample alternatives within each household's choice set. Each household can only choose 5 percent of potential neighborhoods within their current metropolitan area. The choice set is randomly selected for each household. Households can only choose other neighborhoods within the same metropolitan area. This restriction presents some analytical challenges because a realistic choice set of neighborhoods would also allow a household to move to a different metropolitan area. My models do not take into account intermetropolitan mobility because it is unclear how to define the choice set for such migrants, but I do control for whether the household head is a recent arrival to their metropolitan area.

Please note that in the absence of data on preferences, the estimates of discrete choice models cannot be interpreted as capturing households' preferences for particular neighborhood characteristics. In addition, without data on the housing search behavior of households, discrete choice models only approximate how households choose where to live. Discrete choice models share these types of limitations with all traditional research in the residential mobility literature reviewed previously. They do, however, allow for a more realistic modeling approach to residential mobility because they allow for the inclusion of an extensive set of neighborhood-level and household-level covariates.

The analyses of this paper use restricted versions of the long-form 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Censuses along with 5-year ACS data for 2010–2014. A word of caution is warranted when comparing analyses for the Hispanic population before and after 1980, given changes in how the U.S. Census collected data on ethnicity. Before 1980, I identify Hispanic heads of households by combining the following variables: Hispanic surname, Spanish mother tongue, or a Spanish-speaking country of origin or parental origin. Starting with the 1980 Census, I used the question on Hispanic ethnicity to identify the Hispanic population. The Hispanic population in all analyses can be of any racial background.

I estimate all discrete choice models separately by year and by tenure for both substantive and practical concerns. First, homeowners and renters have vastly different yearly mobility rates. Also, they face different housing costs at the census tract level. Second, due to the computational requirements of the discrete choice models, it is challenging to pool models together because each household enters into the model as many times as it has possible census tracts from which to “choose” in a given metro area. In addition to estimating models by year and tenure, I also re-estimate all models for high-income Hispanic households (households in the top 20 percent of the national distribution of income) and low-income Hispanic households (households in the bottom 20 percent of the national distribution of income). These models of the Hispanic population by income allow me to simulate to what extent low-income versus high-income Hispanic households face different barriers to integration with the White population and how those barriers translate into the exposure of the Hispanic population to neighborhood poverty and neighborhood affluence.

Key Variables

The discrete choice models include several key variables as suggested by the prior literature on Hispanic segregation. First, I include the following tract-level variables: neighborhood racial/ethnic composition,³ neighborhood racial/ethnic turnover over the past 5 years,⁴ and percent foreign-born. The racial/ethnic composition variables are meant to model the degree of sorting of the Hispanic population into neighborhoods with co-ethnics. I include both the levels of racial/ethnic composition of a tract and changes in that composition over the past 5 years as previous research has shown that mobile households might be less likely to enter changing neighborhoods as opposed to those with stable racial/ethnic composition (Ellen, 2000; Sampson and Sharkey, 2008). Previous research has also shown that U.S.-born Hispanics tend to be dissatisfied with living in neighborhoods with growing foreign-born populations (Schachter, Sharp, and Kimbro, 2020). The discrete choice models therefore allow for the sorting of the Hispanic population based on both the racial/ethnic composition and the percent foreign-born population in a tract, along with changes over time in the trajectories of these variables.

In addition to the demographic composition of a tract, my models also control for each tract's socioeconomic characteristics and the composition of its housing stock. In particular, I create a variable that shows the difference between household income and neighborhood median income and a variable that shows the ratio of household income to median housing values for homeowners and median contract rents for renters, multiplied by 12. These variables are meant to control for the sorting of households across tracts based on income and housing affordability. The models also control for the percentage of tract units in single-family housing, the percentage of tract units built in the past 10 years, and whether each tract is in a central city because of the greater opportunities for homeownership in suburban as opposed to central-city census tracts (Owens, 2019). For all regressions after 1980, I create a variable that shows the distance to work for all employed household heads and code this value as 0 for those who are retired or unemployed. As is standard for all discrete choice models, I control for the number of occupied housing units in each tract and the turnover rate for neighborhood housing units⁵ because tracts with more occupied housing units and more residential turnover by definition experience more in-migration.

All models include a series of interaction terms between the characteristics of households and the characteristics of census tracts. In particular, I interact all variables that show the racial composition of a tract with an indicator of whether the household head has a married partner who is non-Hispanic⁶ because multiethnic households are more likely to move to integrated

³ The racial/ethnic composition variables are meant to approximate the composition of census tracts prior to the in-mobility of households over the most recent 15-month or 1-year period. In this way, the variables that describe the composition of census tracts precede temporally the most recent mobility or immobility “choices” of individual households.

⁴ I calculate this variable using the migration histories of household heads in the census tract. The racial turnover variable represents the percent African-American, Hispanic, or Asian households who had lived in the neighborhood for at least 1 year minus the respective percentage of households who had lived in the neighborhood for at least 5 years.

⁵ This variable measures the percentage of households who had lived in the tract for less than 1 year.

⁶ This variable cannot be coded for the Hispanic population for 1960 and 1970 given that the census assigned Hispanic ancestry to all members in a household headed by a Hispanic person. This variable is, thus, excluded from all discrete choice models for the Hispanic population for 1960 and 1970.

neighborhoods (Gabriel, 2016; Gabriel and Spring, 2019; Holloway et al., 2005; Wright, Ellis, and Holloway, 2011). I also include an indicator of whether the household head is a newcomer to their metropolitan area because intermetropolitan movers are more likely to move to neighborhoods with fewer co-ethnic neighbors (Sander, Kucheva, and Zasloff, 2018). My regressions also control for some standard indicators of integration, such as whether the household head is foreign-born and whether the household speaks only English at home, as such Hispanic households are more likely to live in neighborhoods with, respectively, greater and fewer percent co-ethnics (Iceland and Scopilliti, 2008).

Simulations Using the Estimated Parameters of the Discrete Choice Models

After I estimate the discrete choice models, I generate predictions of the probabilities of households sorting into a particular tract in a particular metropolitan area. I convert these probabilities into expected counts of households in each tract. I generate these expected counts on the basis of the full set of estimated coefficients in the discrete choice models and on the basis of different counterfactual household mobility scenarios. I conduct the following simulations:

1. Counts based on the full discrete choice model.
2. Counts based on a model for which the coefficients on tract racial composition and all household-level interactions with tract-level racial composition are set to 0.
3. Counts based on a model for which the coefficients on the tract's income and interactions between tract characteristics and household income are set to 0.

I use the counts from Simulation 1 to evaluate how well the predictions from my models match the observed segregation of the Hispanic population in U.S. metropolitan areas. If my models represent a good approximation of household sorting behavior, then the predicted counts from the full model should be close to the observed distribution of the population. I then compare the results from Simulations 2 and 3 to Simulation 1, as these comparisons answer the question of what would happen to Hispanic residential segregation if households do not sort across census tracts on the basis of tract racial/ethnic composition or tract income, respectively. Given the complexity of discrete choice models, the simulations are also a relatively intuitive way to demonstrate how segregation at the metropolitan level might change under different scenarios of household mobility.

In addition to the simulations described previously, the analysis includes two more simulations that compare how residential segregation for the Hispanic population would change if the Hispanic population moved across tracts in the same way as the non-Hispanic White population. Before I implement these simulations, I run the same discrete choice models described earlier but for the White populations in the Census and the ACS.⁷ I implement these simulations as follows:

4. Counts based on a model for which I apply the coefficients from discrete choice models of the non-Hispanic White populations to the mobility behavior of the Hispanic population.

⁷ The full specifications of the models are available in the appendix. Given space constraints and the focus of this paper on the Hispanic population, I have elected not to include the discrete choice models for the non-Hispanic White population in the main body of the article.

5. Counts based on a model for which I apply the coefficients from discrete choice models of high-income (or low-income) non-Hispanic White households to the mobility behavior of high-income (or low-income) Hispanic households.⁸

Simulations 4 and 5 show what would happen to residential segregation if Hispanic households sorted across census tracts in the same way as the non-Hispanic White population. Given that the literature on Hispanic segregation makes many explicit and implicit comparisons of the Hispanic population to non-Hispanic White households, simulations 4 and 5 also quantify how the mobility behavior of Hispanic households is different from or similar to that of non-Hispanic White households.

Once I generate the predicted counts of households in each census tract under each simulation scenario described previously, I use these counts to compute the dissimilarity index between Hispanic and non-Hispanic White households for simulations 1 through 5. The following formula defines the index of dissimilarity:

$$D = 1/2 \sum \left| \frac{N_{1i}}{N_1} - \frac{N_{2i}}{N_2} \right|,$$

where N_{1i} = number of Hispanic households in the i th tract, N_{2i} = number of non-Hispanic White households in the i th tract, N_1 = total number of Hispanic households in the metropolitan area, and N_2 = total number of non-Hispanic White households in the metropolitan area (White, 1983). The index of dissimilarity captures the evenness of the Hispanic population across census tracts in any given metropolitan area. It can be interpreted as the percentage of Hispanic (or non-Hispanic White) households who would need to move to a different tract so that the Hispanic composition of each tract matches the Hispanic composition of the metro area as a whole.

For simulation 5, I also use the simulated counts of Hispanic households to compute the exposure to poverty and the exposure to affluence for Hispanic households at the metropolitan level. I do this by computing the following interaction index:

$${}_x P_y^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{x_i}{X} \right] \left[\frac{y_i}{t_i} \right],$$

where x_i is the count of Hispanic households in the top (or bottom) quintile of the income distribution in the i th tract; y_i is the count of all non-Hispanic households in the top (or bottom) income quintile in the i th tract; x is the total number of Hispanic households in the top (or the bottom) income quintile in a given metropolitan area; and t_i is the total number of households in the top (or bottom) income quintile in a tract (Massey and Denton, 1988). The interaction index can be interpreted as the probability that a given Hispanic household in the top (or bottom) of the income distribution lives in the same census tract as another household in the top (or bottom) of the income distribution.

⁸ High-income households are those in the top 20 percent of the national income distribution in each respective census or ACS dataset. Low-income households are those in the bottom 20 percent of the national distribution in each respective census or ACS dataset.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Before presenting the discrete choice models’ results and the associated counterfactual scenarios, it is useful to examine some household mobility patterns descriptively over time. Exhibit 1 shows select statistics of the types of census tracts where Hispanic homeowner and renter households moved over time. Coinciding with the increase in the Hispanic population in the United States, Hispanic mover households moved to tracts with progressively more other Hispanic neighbors and fewer non-Hispanic White neighbors. The same increasing pattern also applies to the percent foreign-born in destination tracts.

There are some notable differences between Hispanic homeowners and renters in the composition of destination tracts. For example, renters are more likely to move to tracts with higher levels of poverty and to tracts in central cities. On the other hand, homeowners are more integrated with the non-Hispanic White population and are more likely to move to tracts farther away from concentrations of the African-American population.

Exhibit 1

Descriptive Statistics for Recent-Mover Hispanic Households by Year and Tenure (1 of 2)

Tract Characteristics	Owners					
	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2014
Percent Hispanic	17	19	23	26	30	31
Percent White	77	75	68	62	56	52
Percent African-American	5	5	6	8	8	10
Percent Asian	1	1	2	3	4	5
Percent Hispanic within 2 miles	14	15	17	20	25	27
Percent African-American within 2 miles	6	7	7	8	9	10
Percent Asian within 2 miles	1	1	2	3	4	4
Distance to tract that is at least 25% African-American (miles)	2.4	2.1	2.2	2.0	1.8	1.6
Percent foreign born	14	13	21	20	25	26
Percent households in poverty	17	13	13	12	12	14
Ratio of household income to tract median housing value	1.81	1.63	2.16	2.09	1.97	2.27
Percent of moves to a central city tract	73	48	40	44	39	41
N	17,000	18,000	35,000	38,000	74,000	37,000

Exhibit 1

Descriptive Statistics for Recent-Mover Hispanic Households by Year and Tenure (2 of 2)

Tract Characteristics	Renters					
	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	2014
Percent Hispanic	22	24	27	30	33	35
Percent White	67	65	60	56	48	45
Percent African-American	10	9	10	10	11	12
Percent Asian	2	2	2	4	4	5
Percent Hispanic within 2 miles	14	17	20	24	27	30
Percent African-American within 2 miles	13	12	12	10	11	12
Percent Asian within 2 miles	1	1	2	4	4	5
Distance to tract that is at least 25% African-American (miles)	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.7
Percent foreign born	28	19	25	25	30	31
Percent households in poverty	25	18	19	16	16	19
Ratio of household income to tract median rent	0.17	0.18	0.20	0.22	0.19	0.25
Percent moves to a central city tract	82	66	60	62	58	57
N	63,000	69,000	129,000	156,000	229,000	161,000

Notes: Recent movers are households who have moved in the 15 months before each decennial census or the year before each American Community Survey (ACS) interview. All tract-level variables were calculated only for households who have resided in the tract for more than 15 months in the decennial census and more than 1 year in the ACS. The numbers of observations and descriptive statistics are rounded according to census disclosure rules.

Sources: 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census long-form data; 2010–2014 American Community Survey 5-year dataset; Federal Statistical Research Data Center Project Number 1712; Disclosure Request Numbers 6408 and 6935

Discrete Choice Models

Exhibit 2 shows conditional logistic regressions of the determinants of household geographic mobility by tenure. Because results are qualitatively similar across years, I present only the regressions using the most recent dataset to which I have access, namely the 2010–2014 ACS. The full specifications of the models for 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 are available in the appendix. The coefficients in the exhibit are grouped to show the main effect for each tract-level characteristic followed by the household-level interaction effects with that particular tract-level characteristic. Because discrete choice models are fixed-effects models and the households' characteristics do not vary across potential neighborhood destinations, no main effects for household-level characteristics can be estimated.

Exhibit 2

Conditional Logit Regressions of Geographic Mobility, Hispanic Movers, 2010–2014 American Community Survey (1 of 2)

	2014 Owners	2014 Renters
Tract: Percent non-Hispanic White (omitted)		
Tract: Percent Hispanic	0.124*** (0.004)	0.100*** (0.002)
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person	-0.039*** (0.006)	-0.016*** (0.004)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	-0.053*** (0.007)	-0.033*** (0.003)
x Householder foreign-born	0.021*** (0.005)	0.019*** (0.002)
x Household speaks only English at home	-0.045*** (0.006)	-0.050*** (0.003)
x Household income (in thousands)	-0.000*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent African-American	0.029*** (0.004)	0.024*** (0.002)
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person	-0.007 (0.006)	-0.001 (0.003)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	-0.009 (0.007)	0.009** (0.003)
x Householder foreign-born	-0.004 (0.004)	-0.013*** (0.002)
x Household speaks only English at home	-0.000 (0.006)	-0.008** (0.002)
x Household income (in thousands)	-0.000*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent Asian	-0.021*** (0.006)	-0.016*** (0.003)
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person	-0.008 (0.008)	0.002 (0.005)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	0.025* (0.011)	0.045*** (0.004)
x Householder foreign-born	0.003 (0.007)	0.020*** (0.003)
x Household speaks only English at home	-0.021** (0.008)	0.003 (0.003)
x Household income (in thousands)	0.000*** (0.000)	0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent Hispanic within 2 miles	0.001 (0.001)	0.003*** (0.000)
Tract: Change in % Hispanic within 2 miles over the past 5 years	0.027*** (0.003)	0.027*** (0.001)

Exhibit 2

Conditional Logit Regressions of Geographic Mobility, Hispanic Movers, 2010–2014 American Community Survey (2 of 2)

	2014 Owners	2014 Renters
Tract: Percent African-American within 2 miles	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.000)
Tract: Log of distance to tract that is at least 25% African-American	0.012*** (0.003)	0.016*** (0.001)
Tract: Change in % African-American within 2 miles over the past 5 years	0.013*** (0.003)	0.010*** (0.001)
Tract: Percent Asian within 2 miles	-0.011*** (0.002)	-0.002* (0.001)
Tract: Change in % Asian within 2 miles over the past 5 years	-0.002 (0.005)	-0.001 (0.002)
Tract: Percent foreign-born	0.001 (0.001)	-0.000 (0.000)
Tract: Change in percent foreign-born	0.005*** (0.001)	0.003*** (0.000)
Tract: Ratio of household income to tract median housing value for owners or tract median rent for renters	-0.592*** (0.030)	-0.113*** (0.003)
Tract: Household income minus median tract income	-0.001 (0.001)	0.009*** (0.000)
Tract: Log of distance to work	-0.564*** (0.004)	-0.655*** (0.003)
Tract: Percent households in poverty	-0.005*** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.000)
Tract: Percent single-family detached housing	0.009*** (0.001)	-0.006*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent units in rental housing of 50+ units	-0.027*** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent of housing units built in the last 10 years	0.012*** (0.001)	-0.007*** (0.000)
Central city	-0.073*** (0.014)	0.003 (0.007)
Tract: 1-year household turnover	0.029*** (0.001)	0.043*** (0.000)
Tract: Log of total households	0.684*** (0.015)	0.573*** (0.007)
N (Households by Tract Alternatives)	1,766,000	9,081,000
Log-likelihood	-198,000	-854,000

*** $p < 0.001$. ** $p < 0.01$. * $p < 0.05$.

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. Recent movers are households who have moved in the year before their American Community Survey (ACS) interview. All tract-level variables were calculated only for households who have resided in the tract for more than 1 year. The number of observations and coefficients rounded according to census disclosure rules. For better model fit, all models include squared and cubed terms of the main effects of percent Hispanic, percent African-American, and percent Asian.

Source: 2010–2014 American Community Survey 5-year dataset; Federal Statistical Research Data Center Project Number 1712; Disclosure Request Number 6408

Exhibit 2 shows that even after controlling for an extensive number of both household-level and neighborhood-level characteristics, Hispanic households are more likely to enter tracts with a greater percentage of Hispanic residents. Over time, Hispanic movers have become somewhat more likely to enter neighborhoods where they constitute the majority of the population instead of tracts where they are in the minority; being foreign-born increases a Hispanic household's probability of entering a tract with a greater percentage of Hispanic residents. On the other hand, having a non-Hispanic married partner, speaking only English at home, and having a higher income decreases the probability of entering a tract with a greater percentage of Hispanic residents. These patterns align with previous research on Hispanic mobility and generally support the spatial assimilation perspective, which predicts greater contact with the White population for more affluent U.S.-born Hispanic households who speak only English at home.

Exhibit 2 also shows that changes over time in an area's Hispanic composition or an area's percentage of foreign-born residents are significant correlates of the mobility behavior of Hispanic households. In particular, Hispanic households are more likely to sort into a tract if the Hispanic population or the percent foreign-born within a 2-mile radius around the centroid of a focal tract is increasing. This finding implies that Hispanic households may sort into particular neighborhoods on the basis of changes that are already occurring in neighboring tracts.

Factors such as housing costs and distance to work appear to operate in the same direction for both renters and owners, with households moving less frequently to neighborhoods that are higher housing in costs or that are farther away from their place of work. On the other hand, homeowners compared with renters are more likely to move into neighborhoods with newer housing and with greater availability of single-family detached units. After 1990, homeowners also become more likely than renters to move to tracts outside of central cities.

The results in exhibit 3 delve a bit deeper into the residential sorting of high-income and low-income Hispanic households. Given that the results are qualitatively similar across years, I present only the regressions using the 2010–2014 ACS 5-year estimates. The regressions reveal some interesting differences in sorting across tracts for high-income and low-income households. First, it is only for high-income households that marriage to a non-Hispanic person predicts statistically significant lower levels of Hispanic residents in a destination tract. It is also only for low-income Hispanic households that being foreign-born predicts statistically significant higher levels of Hispanic residents in a destination tract. High-income Hispanic households, regardless of tenure, are also more likely to enter neighborhoods with lower levels of poverty. Only low-income Hispanic renters are more likely to move to central cities and to move to tracts with higher levels of poverty.

Exhibit 3

Conditional Logit Regressions of Geographic Mobility by Tenure, Hispanic Recent Movers, 2010–2014 American Community Survey (1 of 2)

	High-Income Owners	High-Income Renters	Low-Income Owners	Low-Income Renters
Tract: Percent non-Hispanic White (omitted)				
Tract: Percent Hispanic	0.133*** (0.011)	0.093*** (0.010)	0.057*** (0.015)	0.088*** (0.005)
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person	-0.036** (0.011)	-0.026* (0.011)	-0.007 (0.028)	-0.015 (0.009)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	-0.037* (0.017)	-0.062*** (0.011)	-0.031 (0.017)	-0.025*** (0.005)
x Householder foreign-born	-0.009 (0.010)	-0.007 (0.009)	0.034** (0.013)	0.013** (0.004)
x Household speaks only English at home	-0.029* (0.012)	-0.021 (0.011)	-0.071*** (0.016)	-0.061*** (0.005)
x Household income (in thousands)	-0.000*** (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.003** (0.001)	0.001*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent African-American				
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person	-0.004 (0.011)	-0.012 (0.011)	-0.047 (0.028)	-0.010 (0.008)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	-0.023 (0.017)	-0.012 (0.012)	-0.025 (0.016)	0.004 (0.005)
x Householder foreign-born	-0.017 (0.011)	-0.007 (0.009)	0.002 (0.012)	-0.016*** (0.004)
x Household speaks only English at home	0.007 (0.013)	0.024* (0.012)	0.036 (0.021)	0.030*** (0.005)
x Household income (in thousands)	0.008 (0.012)	-0.010 (0.011)	-0.005 (0.015)	-0.004 (0.004)
Tract: Percent Asian				
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person	0.023 (0.014)	-0.006 (0.013)	0.040 (0.023)	0.010 (0.006)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	-0.005 (0.013)	0.017 (0.013)	-0.036 (0.055)	0.006 (0.013)
x Householder foreign-born	0.004 (0.021)	0.042** (0.014)	0.041 (0.034)	0.045*** (0.007)
x Household speaks only English at home	-0.036* (0.015)	0.009 (0.013)	-0.005 (0.025)	0.001 (0.006)
x Household income (in thousands)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.004** (0.001)	-0.002*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent Hispanic within 2 miles	-0.006** (0.002)	-0.003* (0.002)	0.001 (0.002)	-0.003*** (0.001)
Tract: Change in % Hispanic within 2 miles over the past 5 years	-0.002 (0.008)	0.018* (0.007)	0.020* (0.009)	0.013*** (0.002)

Exhibit 3

Conditional Logit Regressions of Geographic Mobility by Tenure, Hispanic Recent Movers, 2010–2014 American Community Survey (2 of 2)

	High-Income Owners	High-Income Renters	Low-Income Owners	Low-Income Renters
Tract: Percent African-American within 2 miles	0.001 (0.007)	-0.009 (0.006)	0.023** (0.008)	0.008*** (0.002)
Tract: Log of distance to tract that is at least 25% African-American	0.006*** (0.001)	0.004** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	0.003*** (0.000)
Tract: Change in % African-American within 2 miles over the last 5 years	0.004 (0.006)	0.024*** (0.005)	0.031*** (0.007)	0.022*** (0.002)
Tract: Percent Asian within 2 miles	-0.009** (0.003)	0.005 (0.003)	-0.014* (0.006)	-0.003* (0.001)
Tract: Change in % Asian within 2 miles over the past 5 years	-0.006 (0.010)	0.007 (0.008)	-0.011 (0.018)	0.011* (0.005)
Tract: Percent foreign-born	-0.000 (0.002)	-0.000 (0.001)	0.001 (0.002)	-0.002** (0.001)
Tract: Change in percent foreign-born	-0.003 (0.003)	-0.001 (0.002)	0.008* (0.003)	0.003** (0.001)
Tract: Ratio of household income to tract median housing value or contract rent	-0.879*** (0.050)	-0.040*** (0.004)	0.008 (0.015)	0.011*** (0.003)
Tract: Household income minus median tract income	-0.004*** (0.001)	-0.008*** (0.001)	0.012*** (0.002)	0.027*** (0.001)
Tract: Log of distance to work	-0.562*** (0.008)	-0.620*** (0.008)	-0.620*** (0.018)	-0.694*** (0.006)
Tract: Percent households in poverty	-0.012*** (0.003)	-0.017*** (0.002)	0.004 (0.003)	0.006*** (0.001)
Tract: Percent single-family detached housing	0.014*** (0.001)	-0.010*** (0.001)	-0.006*** (0.002)	-0.004*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent units in rental housing of 50+ units	-0.020*** (0.001)	-0.005*** (0.001)	-0.035*** (0.002)	-0.004*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent of housing units built in the past 10 years	0.015*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.002)	-0.010*** (0.001)
Central city	-0.025 (0.032)	-0.028 (0.029)	-0.100* (0.041)	0.083*** (0.012)
Tract: 1-year household turnover	0.029*** (0.002)	0.039*** (0.002)	0.016*** (0.003)	0.044*** (0.001)
Tract: Log of total households	0.662*** (0.032)	0.596*** (0.028)	0.724*** (0.042)	0.580*** (0.012)
N (Households by Tract Alternatives)	473,000	624,000	172,000	2,754,000
Log-likelihood	-41,000	-49,000	-24,000	-275,000

***p<0.001. **p<0.01. *p<0.05.

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. Recent movers are households who have moved in the year before each American Community Survey (ACS) interview. High-income households are those in the top 20 percent of the national income distribution. Low-income households are those in the bottom 20 percent of the national income distribution. All tract-level variables were calculated only for households who have resided in the tract for more than 1 year. The number of observations and coefficients rounded according to census disclosure rules. For better model fit, all models include squared and cubed terms of the main effects of percent Hispanic, percent African-American, and percent Asian.

Sources: 2010–2014 American Community Survey 5-year dataset; Federal Statistical Research Data Center Project Number 1712; Disclosure Request Number 8177

The preceding results largely confirm many of the findings from previous studies in the literature on residential mobility for Hispanic households. They generally predict greater contact with the non-Hispanic White population for Hispanic households of higher socioeconomic status, for U.S.-born Hispanic households, and for Hispanic households who speak only English at home. These findings, therefore, are in line with predictions of the spatial assimilation perspective of housing segregation for the Hispanic population.

Simulations of Residential Segregation

Given the discrete choice setup of my analyses, I can further examine how household mobility translates into residential segregation at the metropolitan level. This analysis is important because it quantifies the extent to which the household-level results that appear to be consistent with the spatial assimilation perspective translate to actual integration at the metropolitan level as measured by either the index of dissimilarity or by the interaction index.

Exhibit 4

Index of Dissimilarity Between Hispanic and non-Hispanic White Households by Year, Observed and Simulated Values, Weighted Averages for All Metropolitan Areas

	Simulation 1:	Simulation 2:	Simulation 3:	Simulation 4:	Simulation 5:	Simulation 5:	
Observed	Full Model	Tract Racial Composition Coefficients and Interactions Set to 0	Tract Income Coefficients and Interactions Set to 0	Hispanic Population Moves in the Same Way as the White Population	High-Income Hispanic Households Move in the Same Way as High-Income White Households	Low-Income Hispanic Households Move in the Same Way as Low-Income White Households	
1960	0.51	0.52	0.43	0.55	0.37	0.50	0.48
1970	0.48	0.48	0.41	0.51	0.36	0.46	0.44
1980	0.52	0.52	0.46	0.53	0.39	0.49	0.46
1990	0.51	0.52	0.46	0.53	0.42	0.48	0.46
2000	0.52	0.53	0.48	0.53	0.43	0.49	0.47
2010–2014	0.56	0.56	0.52	0.57	0.48	0.55	0.53

Notes: High-income households are those with incomes in the top 20 percent of the national distribution for each respective year. Low-income households are those with incomes in the bottom 20 percent of the national distribution for each respective year.

Sources: 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census long-form data; 2010–2014 American Community Survey 5-year dataset. Federal Statistical Research Data Center Project Number 1712; Disclosure Request Number 6935

Exhibit 4 shows simulations 1 through 5 based on the discrete choice models in exhibits 2 and 3. Simulation 1—which predicts the dissimilarity index between the Hispanic and non-Hispanic White populations on the basis of the full discrete choice models—shows that the models estimated in exhibits 2 and 3 recreate observed segregation levels very accurately for all years in the analysis. For example, the average population-weighted index of dissimilarity between the Hispanic and the non-Hispanic White population was .51 in 1960. The simulated index of dissimilarity using the predicted probabilities of Hispanic mobility from the discrete choice models is .52. The respective numbers for the 2010–2014 ACS are both .56. Please note that I present population-weighted segregation indexes for all metro areas in the United States, which means that

the analyses incorporate more metropolitan areas as more metropolitan areas are defined over time. In supplementary analyses, I restricted these estimates to either the top 20 or top 50 metropolitan areas by population. The only notable difference between the analyses for all metropolitan areas is that large metropolitan areas have higher segregation levels; therefore, the corresponding counterfactual point estimates of segregation were also higher. Note, however, that the arithmetic differences between the counterfactual scenarios remained the same.

Simulation 2 in exhibit 4 shows what would happen to residential segregation between the Hispanic and non-Hispanic White population if the coefficients from the discrete choice models in exhibit 2 on the racial composition of a tract, the racial composition of the surrounding area, and all household-level interactions with tract-level racial composition are set to 0. Note that households might use tract racial composition as a proxy for other characteristics, such as schools, crime, and the future trajectory of property values (Ellen, 2000). The results of Simulation 2 are therefore indicative of both sorting on race/ethnicity and sorting on other factors correlated with race/ethnicity for which I could not control due to data limitations. These simulations describe only what segregation would be had movers moved to a different neighborhood over a single year. With that being said, the differences between simulation 1 and simulation 2 imply that had Hispanic households not sorted across tracts based on tract racial composition, the index of dissimilarity between them and the non-Hispanic White population would have been between 13 and 4 points lower depending on the census/ACS year with the difference between simulation 1 and simulation 2 becoming progressively smaller over time. The changes in the results for simulation 2 over time imply that the barriers to integration for the Hispanic population with the non-Hispanic White population have decreased.

Simulation 3 in exhibit 4 shows that income sorting for the Hispanic population across neighborhoods is not a significant source of the residential segregation of the Hispanic population from the non-Hispanic White population. If anything, eliminating sorting on income for the Hispanic population may, in fact, increase the residential segregation between the White and Hispanic populations.

Instead, the largest potential decrease in the segregation of the Hispanic from the non-Hispanic White population could come from changing the sorting of Hispanic households across tracts so that it fully matches the sorting of non-Hispanic White households across tracts on all tract characteristics included in the discrete choice models. The results from simulation 4 in exhibit 4 show that if Hispanic households moved in the same way as non-Hispanic White households, the dissimilarity index in 2014 would have been 8 points lower. As with the differences between simulation 1 and simulation 2, the differences between simulation 1 and simulation 4 have decreased over time. For example, the difference between simulation 1 and simulation 4 in 1960 was 15 points. The respective numbers for 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2014 were 15, 12, 13, 10, 10, and 8 points. These changes over time point to the narrowing of the differences between migration flows across neighborhoods for the Hispanic and non-Hispanic White populations. The results of this article are not in a position to pinpoint the precise mechanism behind these changes because simulation 4 is a composite measure of what could happen not only if one eliminates discrimination from the housing market but also assumes that the Hispanic population has the

same preferences for neighborhoods and the same information networks as the White population. What the results do demonstrate, however, is that even without changing any of the current socioeconomic characteristics of the Hispanic population, residential segregation could appreciably drop over a short period.

Simulation 5 in exhibit 4 is a variation of simulation 4; however, it shows how different segregation would have been if the Hispanic population in either the top 20 percent or bottom 20 percent of the national income distribution moved in the same way as the non-Hispanic White population in the top 20 percent or bottom 20 percent of the national income distribution. The most notable pattern in the last two columns of exhibit 4 is that the mobility patterns of low-income Hispanic households contribute more to the total segregation of the Hispanic population than the mobility patterns of the high-income Hispanic population. For example, if high-income Hispanic households moved in the same way as high-income, non-Hispanic White households, the dissimilarity index would have been 1 point lower in 2010–2014. In contrast, if low-income Hispanic households moved in the same way as low-income non-Hispanic White households, the dissimilarity index would have been 3 points lower in 2010–2014. I return to the significance of this result in the next section.

Simulations of Residential Segregation by Income

Exhibit 5

Indexes of Interaction, Weighted Averages for All Metropolitan Areas

	Low-Income Hispanic Households to All Low-Income Households			High-Income Hispanic Households to All High-Income Household		
	Observed Interaction Index	Simulation 1: Full Model	Simulation 5: Low-Income Hispanic Households Move in the Same Way as Low-Income White Households	Observed Interaction Index	Simulation 1: Full Model	Simulation 5: High-Income Hispanic Households Move in the Same Way as High-Income White Households
1960	0.25	0.24	0.22	0.25	0.25	0.27
1970	0.28	0.27	0.25	0.28	0.28	0.30
1980	0.34	0.33	0.29	0.24	0.24	0.26
1990	0.31	0.31	0.28	0.26	0.26	0.28
2000	0.31	0.30	0.28	0.24	0.24	0.26
2010–2014	0.29	0.29	0.27	0.29	0.30	0.31

Notes: High-income households have incomes in the top 20 percent of the national distribution for each respective year. Low-income households have incomes in the bottom 20 percent of the national distribution for each respective year.

Sources: 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census long-form data; 2010–2014 American Community Survey 5-year dataset; Federal Statistical Research Data Center Project Number 1712; Disclosure Request Number 7520

The simulations in exhibit 5 present the exposure of either low-income or high-income Hispanic households to either the entire low-income or high-income population. The results in exhibit 5 show that the exposure of the Hispanic population in the bottom 20 percent of the income distribution to other households in the bottom 20 percent of the income distribution

would be appreciably lower if the Hispanic population in the bottom 20 percent of the income distribution moved in the same way as the White population in the bottom 20 percent of the income distribution. Exhibit 5 also presents similar results for high-income Hispanic households or households who are in the top 20 percent of the national income distribution for each year. They also suggest that the White population in the top 20 percent of the income distribution is better able to translate its economic advantages into having other high-income neighbors than the Hispanic population in the top 20 percent of the national income distribution. The difference between simulation 1 and simulation 5 for low-income Hispanic households is greater than the difference between simulation 1 and simulation 5 for high-income Hispanic households.

The simulated dissimilarity indexes from exhibit 4, coupled with the interaction indexes from exhibit 5, therefore show that the geographic mobility of low-income Hispanic households is unique in its contribution to the geographic isolation of low-income Hispanic households among other low-income households and Hispanic households among other Hispanic households in general. These findings suggest that one of the mechanisms behind the concentration of poverty in neighborhoods where low-income Hispanic households live is that low-income Hispanic households are more likely to move to low-income neighborhoods than are low-income White households. These findings are similar to well-established patterns for the concentration of poverty in neighborhoods where African-American households live (Quillian, 2012, 2015). Note, however, that both low-income and high-income Hispanic households are, on average, exposed to poverty rates 2 to 3 percentage points lower compared with African-American households of similar incomes.

The findings in exhibit 5 also confirm Massey and colleagues' predictions about the interplay between racial segregation and socioeconomic inequality (Massey and Denton, 1993; Massey and Fischer, 2000). Just as the sorting of African-American households across neighborhoods on the basis of race has led to the concentration of poverty for the African-American population (Quillian, 2015), so has the sorting of Hispanic households across neighborhoods because low-income Hispanic households are less likely to distance themselves from low-income neighbors than are low-income non-Hispanic White households.

Discussion and Policy Implications

Differences in household mobility by race/ethnicity and income across neighborhoods are crucial to reproducing residential segregation over time. This manuscript quantifies exactly how much residential segregation would change should Hispanic households move in different ways across neighborhoods. Despite decreases in recent years, the United States still has high residential mobility rates, implying that changing how Americans move to new housing units can have an appreciable impact on residential segregation levels over a relatively short time. The results in this manuscript also demonstrate that neighborhoods are complex bundles of amenities and socioeconomic characteristics. Households therefore sort across neighborhoods on the basis of affordability constraints or the presence of co-ethnic neighbors and on the basis of recent changes in the racial/ethnic composition of a neighborhood, proximity to work, and the types of housing units available.

From a policy perspective, this is an important finding to consider, especially because low-income households of different racial/ethnic groups have different mobility experiences in the housing market. It is low-income households rather than high-income households that move in ways across neighborhoods that widen residential segregation. Although high-income Hispanic households have achieved greater integration with the White population, it is still an open question whether changes in discrimination levels, secular trends in the acceptance of integration by the White population, or policy initiatives that aim to change the mobility of households across neighborhoods can disrupt geographic mobility patterns by race/ethnicity and income. Although the simulations in this paper are an encouraging sign that Hispanic households now move in a lot more similar ways across neighborhoods compared with White households, what remains to be seen is if there are limits to whether and how much this trend can continue and whether it is amenable to policy interventions that are realistic from both a political and a cost perspective.

These are important points to consider, especially for Hispanic households. Previous research has shown that Hispanic households are underrepresented in federal housing programs. For example, the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program serves only 6 percent of eligible Hispanic households in contrast to 10 percent of eligible White households and 34 percent of eligible African-American households (Acevedo-Garcia, 2014). The underrepresentation of Hispanic households in housing programs—but also across the entire spectrum of the U.S. social safety net—is particularly troubling given that the percentage of Hispanics who spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing—a standard measure of housing unaffordability—increased from 42 percent in 2000 to 56 percent in 2017 (National Equity Atlas, 2020). According to the latest estimates, 41 percent of Hispanic children live in homes with high-cost burdens (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2019). A study of unauthorized Hispanic immigrants in Los Angeles has shown that the principal driver of housing cost burdens for the immigrant Hispanic population is their documentation status. Differences in housing cost burdens between authorized and unauthorized immigrants remain substantial even after controlling for factors such as education and length of residence in the United States (McConnell, 2013). Living in unaffordable housing reduces spending on other necessities such as food and health care and is a precursor to eviction, homelessness, and frequent residential moves that have substantial negative effects, especially for the long-term well-being of children (Desmond and Kimbro, 2015; Garriss-Hardy and Vrooman, 2005; JCHSHU, 2019). Because low-income Hispanic households are less likely than low-income White households to move into less poor neighborhoods, it is important to consider how the eligibility requirements of federal and local social safety net programs can better serve the low-income Hispanic population.

Since the passage of the federal Fair Housing Act of 1968, the federal government has had a dual mandate to eliminate discrimination in the housing market and undo historic patterns of segregation. Both federal and local policy has mostly focused on the first part of this mandate through programs that have addressed discrimination at the point of housing transactions or the point of interaction between customers and real estate professionals (Sander, Kucheva, and Zasloff, 2018). The 2015 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Final Rule reaffirmed that the federal government must “take the type of actions that undo historic patterns of segregation and other types of discrimination and afford access to opportunity that has long been denied” (HUD, 2015). As the Biden Administration is poised to reinstate the federal government’s commitment to fair

housing, it is important to think about how residential mobility programs can fulfill both mandates of the Fair Housing Act not only in terms of facilitating nondiscriminatory interactions between landlords and renters but also in terms of promoting mobility that results in declines in segregation at the metropolitan level. Mobility programs have the potential to not only promote moves to resource-rich environments, as they already have (Bergman et al., 2020; DeLuca and Rosenblatt, 2017), but also, under the right circumstances, translate into lower segregation at the metropolitan level (Sander, Kucheva, and Zasloff, 2018).

Unfortunately, the HCV program has been plagued by the same type of broader structural problems that have hampered the residential mobility of Hispanic households in the United States. It is non-Hispanic White households who have been able to use their vouchers in low-poverty neighborhoods at a rate greater than the availability of affordable units there (McClure, 2013). The reasons for this are multifold. First, landlords discriminate less against White voucher holders (Tighe, Hatch, and Mead, 2017). Second, voucher holders usually move short distances from their pre-program housing or can remain in their current housing unit (Feins and Patterson, 2005; Finkel and Buron, 2001; Galvez, 2010) for reasons as varied as unfamiliarity with lower poverty neighborhoods, racially and ethnically segregated information social networks, and the desire to remain close to friends, family, and social support institutions (Ellen, Suher, and Torrats-Espinosa, 2019). As Ellen et al. (2019) point out, the fact that voucher holders use social networks to find housing does not imply that they are made worse off by living close to friends and family. What it does imply is that for low-income Hispanic and African-American households who already disproportionately live in poorer neighborhoods compared with low-income White households—even in the absence of discrimination—the voucher program would still produce disparate impacts by race and ethnicity if it relies solely on individual renters to find housing through their existing social networks.

Federal housing policy cannot be explicitly race based or targeted at particular ethnic groups under current court doctrine (Sander, Kucheva, and Zasloff, 2018), but mobility programs can attend to many of the mechanisms that produce the underrepresentation of Hispanic households in more affluent neighborhoods. First, source of income discrimination laws may have a modest impact on desegregation, but they are an important tool for ensuring that voucher holders can access a larger pool of affordable housing (Freeman and Li, 2014). Second, voucher mobility programs that provide households with housing search assistance and financial support for mobility costs increase the likelihood that voucher holders move to resource-rich neighborhoods (Bergman et al., 2020; DeLuca and Rosenblatt, 2017). Finally, addressing the underrepresentation of Hispanic households in housing programs would also mean that federal and local housing policy must attend to the unique challenges that low-income Hispanic households have when accessing the social safety net. Not only is it the case that Hispanic households may not know that they are eligible for housing assistance (Carrillo et al., 2016), but they may fear that applying for any government benefits might jeopardize their immigration status or the immigration status of their family members (Bernstein et al., 2019). If housing programs are to better serve the Hispanic population, they need to grapple with broader changes in the U.S. immigration system, which has become more punitive over time.

Appendix

Appendix Exhibit 1

Conditional Logit Regressions of Geographic Mobility by Year, Hispanic Recent Homeowner Movers (1 of 2)

	1960 Owners	1970 Owners	1980 Owners	1990 Owners	2000 Owners
Tract: Percent non-Hispanic White (omitted)					
Tract: Percent Hispanic	0.187*** (0.017)	0.241*** (0.007)	0.247*** (0.005)	0.216*** (0.005)	0.243*** (0.005)
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person			-0.062*** (0.007)	-0.085*** (0.007)	-0.101*** (0.005)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	-0.052*** (0.007)	-0.022** (0.007)	-0.034*** (0.006)	-0.052*** (0.005)	-0.021*** (0.003)
x Householder foreign-born	0.139*** (0.014)	0.004 (0.007)	-0.018*** (0.005)	0.024*** (0.005)	0.029*** (0.003)
x Household speaks only English at home	-0.088*** (0.015)	-0.122*** (0.010)	-0.069*** (0.007)	-0.070*** (0.007)	-0.094*** (0.004)
x Household income (in thousands)	-0.018*** (0.001)	-0.005*** (0.001)	-0.002*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent African-American					
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person			-0.004 (0.007)	0.006 (0.007)	-0.004 (0.005)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	-0.027*** (0.008)	0.004 (0.008)	-0.003 (0.007)	0.017*** (0.005)	0.004 (0.004)
x Householder foreign-born	0.088*** (0.012)	-0.017* (0.008)	-0.036*** (0.005)	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.003)
x Household speaks only English at home	0.082*** (0.013)	-0.051*** (0.011)	0.001 (0.007)	-0.004 (0.007)	-0.001 (0.004)
x Household income (in thousands)	-0.006*** (0.001)	-0.002*** (0.001)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent Asian					
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person			-0.023 (0.013)	-0.015 (0.011)	-0.010 (0.007)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	0.021 (0.020)	0.047** (0.018)	0.016 (0.015)	0.078*** (0.009)	0.018** (0.006)
x Householder foreign-born	0.057 (0.043)	0.136*** (0.024)	0.037*** (0.011)	0.032*** (0.009)	0.041*** (0.005)
x Household speaks only English at home	-0.085 (0.048)	0.010 (0.023)	-0.071*** (0.014)	-0.020 (0.011)	0.054*** (0.008)
x Household income (in thousands)	0.004 (0.002)	0.004*** (0.001)	0.002*** (0.000)	0.000*** (0.000)	0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent Hispanic within 2 miles					
	0.012*** (0.001)	0.004*** (0.001)	-0.004*** (0.001)	-0.006*** (0.001)	-0.004*** (0.000)

Appendix Exhibit 1

Conditional Logit Regressions of Geographic Mobility by Year, Hispanic Recent Homeowner Movers (2 of 2)

	1960 Owners	1970 Owners	1980 Owners	1990 Owners	2000 Owners
Tract: Change in % Hispanic within 2 miles over the past 5 years	0.024*** (0.005)	0.027*** (0.004)	0.039*** (0.003)	0.061*** (0.003)	0.038*** (0.002)
Tract: Percent African-American within 2 miles	0.008*** (0.001)	0.004*** (0.001)	0.005*** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)
Tract: Log of distance to tract that is at least 25% African-American	-0.020** (0.007)	-0.014* (0.007)	-0.009* (0.005)	0.002 (0.004)	0.008** (0.003)
Tract: Change in % African-American within 2 miles over the past 5 years	0.037*** (0.005)	0.029*** (0.004)	0.020*** (0.003)	0.020*** (0.003)	0.022*** (0.002)
Tract: Percent Asian within 2 miles	0.006 (0.007)	-0.004 (0.006)	-0.026*** (0.003)	-0.001 (0.003)	0.001 (0.001)
Tract: Change in % Asian within 2 miles over the past 5 years	0.057** (0.019)	0.060** (0.020)	0.011 (0.007)	-0.019*** (0.005)	0.009* (0.004)
Tract: Percent foreign-born	0.005** (0.002)	0.006*** (0.002)	-0.002* (0.001)	-0.005*** (0.001)	-0.002*** (0.001)
Tract: Change in percent foreign-born	-0.005 (0.003)	0.001 (0.006)	0.005** (0.002)	0.008*** (0.002)	0.008*** (0.001)
Tract: Ratio of household income to tract median housing value	-0.463*** (0.046)	-0.890*** (0.053)	-0.685*** (0.039)	-0.523*** (0.033)	-0.411*** (0.020)
Tract: Household income minus median tract income	0.052*** (0.015)	-0.013 (0.008)	0.010** (0.003)	0.005*** (0.001)	0.003*** (0.001)
Tract: Log of distance to work			-0.533*** (0.008)	-0.490*** (0.004)	-0.513*** (0.003)
Tract: Percent households in poverty	-0.003 (0.002)	0.000 (0.002)	-0.010*** (0.001)	-0.014*** (0.001)	-0.009*** (0.001)
Tract: Percent single-family detached housing	0.036*** (0.001)	0.020*** (0.001)	0.009*** (0.001)	0.013*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent units in rental housing of 50+ units	-0.031*** (0.001)	-0.026*** (0.001)	-0.025*** (0.001)	-0.031*** (0.001)	-0.033*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent of housing units built in the past 10 years	0.000 (0.001)	0.005*** (0.001)	0.018*** (0.000)	0.015*** (0.000)	0.010*** (0.000)
Central city	0.230*** (0.036)	0.171*** (0.022)	0.067*** (0.017)	-0.058*** (0.016)	-0.149*** (0.011)
Tract: 1-year household turnover	0.045*** (0.001)	0.040*** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	0.030*** (0.001)	0.033*** (0.001)
Tract: Log of total households	1.422*** (0.021)	1.298*** (0.019)	1.383*** (0.015)	1.235*** (0.014)	1.210*** (0.010)
N (Households by Tract Alternatives)	428,000	535,000	986,000	972,000	2,274,000
Log-likelihood	-81,000	-91,000	-175,000	-183,000	-385,000

***p<0.001. **p<0.01. *p<0.05.

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. Recent movers are households who have moved in the 15 months before each decennial census. All tract-level variables were calculated only for households who have resided in the tract for more than 15 months in the decennial census. The number of observations and coefficients are rounded according to census disclosure rules. For better model fit, all models include squared and cubed terms of the main effects of percent Hispanic, percent African-American, and percent Asian.

Sources: 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census long-form data; Federal Statistical Research Data Center Project Number 1712; Disclosure Request Number 6935

Appendix Exhibit 2

Conditional Logit Regressions of Geographic Mobility by Year, Hispanic Recent Renter Movers
(1 of 2)

	1960 Renters	1970 Renters	1980 Renters	1990 Renters	2000 Renters
Tract: Percent non-Hispanic White (omitted)					
Tract: Percent Hispanic	0.120*** (0.006)	0.189*** (0.003)	0.211*** (0.002)	0.200*** (0.002)	0.203*** (0.003)
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person			-0.065*** (0.004)	-0.050*** (0.004)	-0.062*** (0.004)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	-0.045*** (0.003)	-0.016*** (0.003)	-0.022*** (0.003)	-0.026*** (0.002)	-0.023*** (0.002)
x Householder foreign-born	0.122*** (0.004)	-0.010** (0.003)	-0.039*** (0.002)	0.003 (0.002)	0.028*** (0.002)
x Household speaks only English at home	-0.087*** (0.004)	-0.098*** (0.006)	-0.096*** (0.003)	-0.091*** (0.003)	-0.087*** (0.002)
x Household income (in thousands)	-0.010*** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent African-American	-0.041*** (0.006)	0.034*** (0.003)	0.033*** (0.002)	0.031*** (0.002)	0.017*** (0.002)
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person			-0.005 (0.004)	0.010* (0.004)	-0.002 (0.003)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	0.000 (0.003)	0.012*** (0.003)	0.026*** (0.003)	0.025*** (0.002)	0.020*** (0.002)
x Householder foreign-born	0.029*** (0.004)	-0.046*** (0.003)	-0.036*** (0.002)	-0.031*** (0.002)	-0.018*** (0.002)
x Household speaks only English at home	0.053*** (0.004)	-0.042*** (0.005)	-0.012*** (0.003)	-0.022*** (0.003)	-0.007*** (0.002)
x Household income (in thousands)	-0.004*** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent Asian	0.073*** (0.013)	-0.063*** (0.007)	-0.019*** (0.004)	-0.023*** (0.004)	-0.041*** (0.004)
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person			0.007 (0.007)	-0.016** (0.006)	-0.019*** (0.005)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	-0.012 (0.007)	0.045*** (0.006)	0.026*** (0.005)	0.041*** (0.004)	0.045*** (0.003)
x Householder foreign-born	0.046*** (0.009)	0.119*** (0.007)	0.077*** (0.005)	0.051*** (0.004)	0.030*** (0.003)
x Household speaks only English at home	-0.064*** (0.010)	-0.006 (0.010)	0.002 (0.006)	0.010* (0.005)	0.024*** (0.003)
x Household income (in thousands)	-0.010*** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)
Tract: Percent Hispanic within 2 miles	0.007*** (0.001)	0.003*** (0.001)	0.002*** (0.000)	-0.001* (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)

Appendix Exhibit 2

Conditional Logit Regressions of Geographic Mobility by Year, Hispanic Recent Renter Movers (2 of 2)

	1960 Renters	1970 Renters	1980 Renters	1990 Renters	2000 Renters
Tract: Change in % Hispanic within 2 miles over the past 5 years	0.015*** (0.003)	0.036*** (0.002)	0.026*** (0.001)	0.036*** (0.001)	0.027*** (0.001)
Tract: Percent African-American within 2 miles	0.002*** (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.005*** (0.000)	-0.003*** (0.000)
Tract: Log of distance to tract that is at least 25% African-American	0.014*** (0.003)	0.015*** (0.003)	0.014*** (0.002)	0.016*** (0.002)	0.017*** (0.001)
Tract: Change in % African-American within 2 miles over the past 5 years	0.028*** (0.003)	0.006** (0.002)	0.017*** (0.002)	0.009*** (0.001)	0.010*** (0.001)
Tract: Percent Asian within 2 miles	-0.029*** (0.002)	-0.030*** (0.002)	-0.027*** (0.001)	-0.005*** (0.001)	-0.004*** (0.001)
Tract: Change in % Asian within 2 miles over the past 5 years	0.043*** (0.007)	-0.001 (0.007)	0.028*** (0.004)	0.003 (0.003)	0.000 (0.002)
Tract: Percent foreign-born	0.003*** (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)
Tract: Change in percent foreign-born	-0.000 (0.003)	0.013*** (0.002)	0.003*** (0.001)	0.006*** (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)
Tract: Ratio of household income to tract median contract rent	-0.069*** (0.004)	-0.111*** (0.003)	-0.091*** (0.002)	-0.074*** (0.002)	-0.046*** (0.002)
Tract: Household income minus median tract income	0.124*** (0.010)	0.044*** (0.005)	0.073*** (0.002)	0.022*** (0.001)	0.015*** (0.000)
Tract: Log of distance to work			-0.661*** (0.005)	-0.580*** (0.002)	-0.606*** (0.002)
Tract: Percent households in poverty	0.009*** (0.001)	0.010*** (0.001)	-0.006*** (0.001)	-0.008*** (0.001)	-0.005*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent single-family detached housing	-0.024*** (0.001)	-0.017*** (0.000)	-0.021*** (0.000)	-0.005*** (0.000)	-0.006*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent units in rental housing of 50+ units	-0.009*** (0.000)	-0.005*** (0.000)	-0.005*** (0.000)	-0.006*** (0.000)	-0.004*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent of housing units built in the past 10 years	-0.010*** (0.000)	-0.011*** (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)	-0.005*** (0.000)	-0.010*** (0.000)
Central city	0.087*** (0.023)	0.036** (0.012)	0.010 (0.009)	0.053*** (0.008)	0.017** (0.006)
Tract: One-year household turnover	0.031*** (0.001)	0.035*** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.045*** (0.001)	0.046*** (0.000)
Tract: Log of total households	1.252*** (0.010)	1.268*** (0.009)	1.231*** (0.007)	1.101*** (0.007)	1.086*** (0.006)
N (Households by Tract Alternatives)	3,074,000	3,266,000	5,187,000	5,102,000	8,091,000
Log-likelihood	-318,000	-364,000	-657,000	-756,000	-1,157,000

***p<0.001. **p<0.01. *p<0.05.

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. Recent movers are households who have moved in the 15 months before each decennial census. All tract-level variables were calculated only for households who have resided in the tract for more than 15 months in the decennial census. The number of observations and coefficients rounded according to census disclosure rules. For better model fit, all models include squared and cubed terms of the main effects of percent Hispanic, percent African-American, and percent Asian.

Sources: 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census long-form data; Federal Statistical Research Data Center Project Number 1712: Disclosure Request Number 6935

Appendix Exhibit 3

Conditional Logit Regressions of Geographic Mobility by Year, Non-Hispanic White Recent Homeowner Movers (1 of 2)

	1960 Owners	1970 Owners	1980 Owners	1990 Owners	2000 Owners	2014 Owners
Tract: Percent non-Hispanic White (omitted)						
Tract: Percent Hispanic	0.062*** (0.003)	0.035*** (0.003)	0.057*** (0.002)	0.032*** (0.002)	0.025*** (0.002)	0.013*** (0.002)
x Householder married to non-White person	0.072*** (0.022)	0.075*** (0.018)	0.099*** (0.005)	0.075*** (0.005)	0.056*** (0.003)	0.051*** (0.004)
x Household has children in a public school	0.025*** (0.003)	0.015*** (0.003)	-0.018*** (0.002)	-0.002 (0.003)	-0.013*** (0.002)	-0.018*** (0.003)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	0.012*** (0.003)	-0.016*** (0.003)	-0.031*** (0.003)	-0.039*** (0.002)	-0.031*** (0.002)	-0.029*** (0.003)
x Householder foreign-born	-0.034*** (0.005)	-0.003 (0.006)	0.003 (0.004)	0.005 (0.005)	0.011** (0.003)	0.011* (0.004)
x Household income (in thousands)	-0.012*** (0.000)	-0.003*** (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent African-American	0.022*** (0.002)	0.024*** (0.002)	0.022*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.001)	0.004** (0.001)	0.005*** (0.001)
x Householder married to non-White person	0.105*** (0.015)	0.084*** (0.013)	0.049*** (0.004)	0.047*** (0.004)	0.042*** (0.003)	0.031*** (0.004)
x Household has children in a public school	-0.005* (0.002)	-0.008*** (0.002)	-0.028*** (0.002)	-0.036*** (0.002)	-0.034*** (0.002)	-0.037*** (0.003)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	-0.019*** (0.002)	-0.016*** (0.002)	-0.003 (0.002)	-0.004* (0.002)	-0.004** (0.002)	-0.021*** (0.003)
x Householder foreign-born	0.011** (0.004)	0.012** (0.004)	-0.018*** (0.003)	-0.005 (0.004)	0.002 (0.003)	0.009* (0.004)
x Household income (in thousands)	-0.004*** (0.000)	-0.003*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent Asian	-0.017** (0.007)	-0.063*** (0.006)	-0.075*** (0.003)	-0.076*** (0.003)	-0.060*** (0.002)	-0.032*** (0.002)
x Householder married to non-White person	0.144*** (0.024)	0.139*** (0.020)	0.037*** (0.007)	0.042*** (0.006)	0.046*** (0.004)	0.038*** (0.005)
x Household has children in a public school	-0.050*** (0.006)	-0.021*** (0.006)	-0.020*** (0.004)	-0.023*** (0.004)	-0.032*** (0.003)	-0.004 (0.003)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	0.029*** (0.006)	0.030*** (0.006)	0.066*** (0.004)	0.067*** (0.003)	0.049*** (0.002)	0.010* (0.004)
x Householder foreign-born	0.059*** (0.010)	0.104*** (0.011)	0.118*** (0.006)	0.125*** (0.005)	0.151*** (0.004)	0.100*** (0.005)
x Household income (in '000s)	-0.003*** (0.001)	0.001*** (0.000)	0.002*** (0.000)	0.001*** (0.000)	0.000*** (0.000)	0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent Hispanic within 2 miles	-0.015*** (0.001)	-0.005*** (0.001)	-0.007*** (0.000)	-0.004*** (0.000)	-0.005*** (0.000)	-0.003*** (0.000)
Tract: Change in % Hispanic within 2 miles over the past 5 years	-0.015*** (0.002)	-0.010*** (0.002)	-0.002 (0.001)	-0.011*** (0.002)	-0.008*** (0.001)	-0.013*** (0.001)
Tract: Percent African-American within 2 miles	-0.006*** (0.000)	-0.004*** (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)	-0.003*** (0.000)	-0.001* (0.000)

Appendix Exhibit 3

Conditional Logit Regressions of Geographic Mobility by Year, Non-Hispanic White Recent Homeowner Movers (2 of 2)

	1960 Owners	1970 Owners	1980 Owners	1990 Owners	2000 Owners	2014 Owners
Tract: Log of distance to tract that is at least 25% African-American	0.022*** (0.002)	0.017*** (0.002)	0.025*** (0.001)	0.026*** (0.002)	0.024*** (0.001)	0.010*** (0.002)
Tract: Change in % African American within 2 miles over the past 5 years	0.009*** (0.001)	-0.006*** (0.001)	0.002** (0.001)	-0.009*** (0.001)	-0.004*** (0.001)	-0.014*** (0.001)
Tract: Percent Asian within 2 miles	0.001 (0.002)	-0.004* (0.002)	-0.004*** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.008*** (0.001)	-0.005*** (0.001)
Tract: Change in % Asian within 2 miles over the past 5 years	0.051*** (0.004)	0.016*** (0.004)	-0.006** (0.002)	-0.022*** (0.002)	-0.020*** (0.002)	-0.017*** (0.002)
Tract: Percent foreign-born	0.004*** (0.000)	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.019*** (0.000)	-0.015*** (0.001)	-0.010*** (0.000)	-0.006*** (0.000)
Tract: Change in percent foreign-born	-0.007*** (0.001)	-0.003* (0.002)	-0.002*** (0.001)	-0.004*** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)
Tract: Ratio of household income to tract median housing value	-1.643*** (0.012)	-2.068*** (0.013)	-2.397*** (0.012)	-1.829*** (0.010)	-1.610*** (0.009)	-1.532*** (0.013)
Tract: Household income minus median tract income	0.004* (0.002)	0.002 (0.002)	0.023*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.000)	0.006*** (0.000)	0.002*** (0.000)
Tract: Log of distance to work			-0.515*** (0.002)	-0.514*** (0.001)	-0.547*** (0.001)	-0.543*** (0.001)
Tract: Percent households in poverty	0.016*** (0.000)	0.013*** (0.001)	0.012*** (0.000)	-0.008*** (0.001)	-0.006*** (0.000)	-0.009*** (0.001)
Tract: Percent single-family detached housing	0.033*** (0.000)	0.012*** (0.000)	0.005*** (0.000)	0.002*** (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)	0.003*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent units in rental housing of 50+ units	-0.026*** (0.000)	-0.036*** (0.000)	-0.029*** (0.000)	-0.035*** (0.000)	-0.036*** (0.000)	-0.026*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent of housing units built in the past 10 years	0.004*** (0.000)	0.011*** (0.000)	0.017*** (0.000)	0.016*** (0.000)	0.012*** (0.000)	0.012*** (0.000)
Central city	0.007 (0.005)	-0.070*** (0.006)	-0.128*** (0.004)	-0.199*** (0.005)	-0.183*** (0.005)	-0.142*** (0.006)
Tract: 1-year household turnover	0.050*** (0.000)	0.039*** (0.000)	0.002*** (0.000)	0.025*** (0.000)	0.029*** (0.000)	0.024*** (0.000)
Tract: Log of total households	1.362*** (0.004)	1.358*** (0.005)	1.362*** (0.003)	1.159*** (0.004)	1.206*** (0.004)	0.678*** (0.006)
N (Households by Tract Alternatives)	10,930,000	7,280,000	12,740,000	9,642,000	13,910,000	9,123,000
Log-likelihood	-2,524,000	-1,558,000	-3,111,000	-2,335,000	-2,961,000	-1,397,000

***p<0.001. **p<0.01. *p<0.05.

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. Recent movers are households who have moved in the 15 months before each decennial census or the year before each American Community Survey (ACS) interview. All tract-level variables were calculated only for households who have resided in the tract for more than 15 months in the decennial census and more than 1 year in the ACS. The number of observations and coefficients are rounded according to census disclosure rules. For better model fit, all models include squared and cubed terms of the main effects of percent Hispanic, percent African-American, and percent Asian.

Sources: 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census long-form data; 2010–2014 American Community Survey 5-year dataset; Federal Statistical Research Data Center Project Number 1712; Disclosure Request Number 6408 and 6935

Appendix Exhibit 4

Conditional Logit Regressions of Geographic Mobility by Year, Non-Hispanic White Recent Renter Movers (1 of 2)

	1960 Renters	1970 Renters	1980 Renters	1990 Renters	2000 Renters	2014 Renters
Tract: Percent non-Hispanic White (omitted)						
Tract: Percent Hispanic	0.018*** (0.002)	0.007*** (0.002)	0.015*** (0.001)	0.022*** (0.001)	0.000 (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)
x Householder married to non-White person	0.101*** (0.011)	0.074*** (0.011)	0.080*** (0.003)	0.081*** (0.003)	0.063*** (0.003)	0.043*** (0.003)
x Household has children in a public school	0.056*** (0.002)	0.034*** (0.002)	0.033*** (0.002)	0.021*** (0.002)	0.012*** (0.002)	-0.007*** (0.002)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	-0.011*** (0.002)	0.005** (0.002)	-0.017*** (0.002)	-0.027*** (0.001)	-0.016*** (0.001)	-0.013*** (0.002)
x Householder foreign-born	-0.015*** (0.002)	0.026*** (0.003)	0.015*** (0.002)	0.029*** (0.003)	0.032*** (0.002)	0.008** (0.003)
x Household income (in thousands)	-0.006*** (0.000)	-0.003*** (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent African-American	0.016*** (0.001)	-0.004*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.001)	-0.007*** (0.001)	-0.016*** (0.001)	-0.004*** (0.001)
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person	0.092*** (0.007)	0.078*** (0.007)	0.054*** (0.003)	0.041*** (0.003)	0.040*** (0.002)	0.027*** (0.002)
x Household has children in a public school	0.015*** (0.001)	0.030*** (0.002)	-0.018*** (0.001)	-0.029*** (0.001)	-0.031*** (0.001)	-0.037*** (0.002)
x Householder newcomer to metro area	-0.019*** (0.001)	0.019*** (0.001)	0.018*** (0.001)	0.023*** (0.001)	0.018*** (0.001)	0.006*** (0.001)
x Householder foreign-born	-0.000 (0.002)	-0.018*** (0.002)	-0.006** (0.002)	-0.024*** (0.002)	-0.015*** (0.002)	-0.001 (0.002)
x Household income (in thousands)	-0.007*** (0.000)	-0.004*** (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)	-0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent Asian	0.026*** (0.003)	-0.032*** (0.003)	-0.025*** (0.002)	-0.057*** (0.002)	-0.059*** (0.002)	-0.020*** (0.001)
x Householder married to non-Hispanic person	0.080*** (0.012)	0.051*** (0.012)	0.052*** (0.005)	0.027*** (0.004)	0.027*** (0.004)	0.009** (0.003)
x Household has children in a public school	-0.128*** (0.004)	-0.135*** (0.004)	-0.086*** (0.003)	-0.077*** (0.003)	-0.140*** (0.003)	-0.091*** (0.003)
x Householder newcomer to metropolitan area	0.024*** (0.003)	0.098*** (0.003)	0.086*** (0.002)	0.102*** (0.002)	0.116*** (0.002)	0.050*** (0.002)
x Householder foreign-born	0.055*** (0.004)	0.064*** (0.005)	0.102*** (0.004)	0.108*** (0.003)	0.107*** (0.003)	0.101*** (0.003)
x Household income (in thousands)	-0.009*** (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)	-0.000* (0.000)	0.000*** (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.000*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent Hispanic within 2 miles	0.005*** (0.000)	0.003*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.004*** (0.000)	-0.004*** (0.000)	-0.006*** (0.000)
Tract: Change in % Hispanic within 2 miles over the past 5 years	-0.015*** (0.001)	-0.016*** (0.001)	-0.009*** (0.001)	-0.006*** (0.001)	-0.011*** (0.001)	-0.014*** (0.001)
Tract: Percent African-American within 2 miles	-0.002*** (0.000)	-0.003*** (0.000)	-0.005*** (0.000)	-0.005*** (0.000)	-0.005*** (0.000)	-0.004*** (0.000)

Appendix Exhibit 4

Conditional Logit Regressions of Geographic Mobility by Year, Non-Hispanic White Recent Renter Movers (2 of 2)

	1960 Renters	1970 Renters	1980 Renters	1990 Renters	2000 Renters	2014 Renters
Tract: Log of distance to tract that is at least 25% African-American	0.022*** (0.001)	0.020*** (0.001)	0.040*** (0.001)	0.037*** (0.001)	0.032*** (0.001)	0.019*** (0.001)
Tract: Change in % African-American within 2 miles over the past 5 years	-0.012*** (0.001)	-0.006*** (0.001)	-0.002*** (0.001)	-0.012*** (0.001)	-0.010*** (0.001)	-0.020*** (0.001)
Tract: Percent Asian within 2 miles	-0.012*** (0.001)	-0.011*** (0.001)	-0.015*** (0.001)	-0.006*** (0.001)	-0.006*** (0.001)	-0.006*** (0.000)
Tract: Change in % Asian within 2 miles over the past 5 years	0.004** (0.001)	0.006*** (0.002)	0.014*** (0.001)	-0.006*** (0.001)	-0.015*** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)
Tract: Percent foreign-born	-0.009*** (0.000)	-0.005*** (0.000)	-0.008*** (0.000)	-0.010*** (0.000)	-0.008*** (0.000)	-0.008*** (0.000)
Tract: Change in percent Foreign-born	-0.001 (0.001)	0.007*** (0.001)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.008*** (0.000)	-0.007*** (0.000)	-0.005*** (0.000)
Tract: Ratio of household income to tract median contract rent	-0.155*** (0.001)	-0.154*** (0.001)	-0.097*** (0.001)	-0.090*** (0.001)	-0.100*** (0.001)	-0.102*** (0.001)
Tract: Household income minus median tract income	0.105*** (0.002)	0.061*** (0.001)	0.069*** (0.001)	0.020*** (0.000)	0.018*** (0.000)	0.008*** (0.000)
Tract: Log of distance to work			-0.602*** (0.002)	-0.564*** (0.001)	-0.582*** (0.001)	-0.583*** (0.001)
Tract: Percent households in poverty	0.007*** (0.000)	0.004*** (0.000)	-0.007*** (0.000)	-0.006*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent single-family detached housing	-0.025*** (0.000)	-0.016*** (0.000)	-0.019*** (0.000)	-0.006*** (0.000)	-0.009*** (0.000)	-0.009*** (0.000)
Tract: Percent units in rental housing of 50+ units	-0.008*** (0.000)	-0.003*** (0.000)	0.001*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.000** (0.000)
Tract: Percent of housing units built in the past 10 years	-0.005*** (0.000)	-0.006*** (0.000)	0.001*** (0.000)	0.001*** (0.000)	-0.005*** (0.000)	-0.002*** (0.000)
Central city	-0.083*** (0.004)	-0.041*** (0.004)	-0.132*** (0.003)	-0.122*** (0.003)	-0.095*** (0.003)	-0.041*** (0.004)
Tract: One-year household turnover	0.029*** (0.000)	0.039*** (0.000)	0.000*** (0.000)	0.044*** (0.000)	0.046*** (0.000)	0.041*** (0.000)
Tract: Log of total households	1.245*** (0.003)	1.293*** (0.003)	1.277*** (0.002)	1.079*** (0.003)	1.108*** (0.003)	0.606*** (0.004)
N (Households by Tract Alternatives)	26,530,000	18,150,000	25,170,000	18,730,000	20,030,000	20,170,000
Log-likelihood	-4,930,000	-3,414,000	-5,453,000	-4,367,000	-4,206,000	-2,892,000

***p<0.001. **p<0.01. *p<0.05.

Notes: Standard errors are in parentheses. Recent movers are households who have moved in the 15 months before each decennial census or the year before each American Community Survey (ACS) interview. All tract-level variables were calculated only for households who have resided in the tract for more than 15 months in the decennial census and more than 1 year in the ACS. The number of observations and coefficients rounded according to census disclosure rules. For better model fit, all models include squared and cubed terms of the main effects of percent Hispanic, percent African-American, and percent Asian.

Sources: 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Census long-form data; 2010–2014 American Community Survey 5-year dataset; Federal Statistical Research Data Center Project Number 1712: Disclosure Request Number 6408 and 6935

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to acknowledge two anonymous reviewers and the journal editor for their thoughtful comments on the manuscript. The author also wishes to thank Benjamin Jarvis for graciously providing Stata code and guidance with the implementation of the discrete choice models and simulations. This research was generously supported by the CUNY-PSC program and the CUNY Faculty Fellowship Publication Program.

Author

Yana Kucheva is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology at the City College of New York.

References

- Acevedo-Garcia, Dolores. 2014. "Reflections on a Comparative Perspective on Segregation Within the United States." New York: New York University, Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy.
- Alba, Richard D., and John R. Logan. 1993. "Minority Proximity to Whites in Suburbs: An Individual-Level Analysis of Segregation," *American Journal of Sociology* 98 (6): 1388–1427.
- . 1991. "Variations on Two Themes: Racial and Ethnic Patterns in the Attainment of Suburban Residence," *Demography* 28 (3): 431–453.
- Annie E. Casey Foundation. 2019. *Kids Count* 2019. <https://datacenter.kidscount.org/>.
- Asad, Asad L., and Eva Rosen. 2018. "Hiding Within Racial Hierarchies: How Undocumented Immigrants Make Residential Decisions in an American City," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45 (11): 1857–1882.
- Bayer, Patrick, Robert McMillan, and Kim S. Rueben. 2004. "What Drives Racial Segregation? New Evidence Using Census Microdata," *Journal of Urban Economics* 56 (3): 514–535.
- Bean, Frank D. 2016. "Ethnoracial Diversity: Toward a New American Narrative," *The American Prospect*, February 11. <https://prospect.org/civil-rights/ethnoracial-diversity-toward-new-american-narrative/>.
- Bergman, Peter, Raj Chetty, Stefanie DeLuca, Nathaniel Hendren, Lawrence F. Katz, and Christopher Palmer. 2020. *Creating Moves to Opportunity: Experimental Evidence on Barriers to Neighborhood Choice*. NBER Working paper No. 26164. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Bernstein, Hamutal, Dulce Gonzalez, Michael Karpman, and Stephen Zuckerman. 2019. *One in Seven Adults in Immigrant Families Reported Avoiding Public Benefit Programs in 2018*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

- Bischoff, Kendra, and Sean F. Reardon. 2013. *Residential Segregation by Income, 1970–2009*. US 2010: Discover America in a New Century Report. Providence, RI: Russell Sage Foundation American Communities Project of Brown University.
- Bruch, Elizabeth. 2014. "How Population Structure Shapes Neighborhood Segregation," *American Journal of Sociology* 119 (5): 1221–1278.
- Bruch, Elizabeth, and Robert D. Mare. 2012. "Methodological Issues in the Analysis of Residential Preferences and Residential Mobility," *Sociological Methodology* 42 (1): 103–154.
- Bruch, Elizabeth, and Joffre Swait. 2019. "Choice Set Formation in Residential Mobility and Its Implications for Segregation Dynamics," *Demography* 56 (5): 1665–1692.
- Carr, Patrick J., Daniel T. Lichter, and Maria J. Kefalas. 2012. "Can Immigration Save Small-Town America? Hispanic Boomtowns and the Uneasy Path to Renewal," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 641 (1): 38–57.
- Carrillo, Laura, Mary Pattillo, Erin Hardy, and Dolores Acevedo-Garcia. 2016. "Housing Decisions Among Low-Income Hispanic Households in Chicago," *Cityscape* 18 (2): 109–150.
- Charles, Camille Z. 2003. "The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation," *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 167–207.
- Crowell, Amber R., and Mark Fossett. 2018. "White and Latino Locational Attainments: Assessing the Role of Race and Resources in U.S. Metropolitan Residential Segregation," *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 4 (4): 491–507.
- DeLuca, Stefanie, and Peter Rosenblatt. 2017. "Walking Away from the Wire: Housing Mobility and Neighborhood Opportunity in Baltimore," *Housing Policy Debate* 27 (4): 519–546.
- Denton, Nancy, and Douglas S. Massey. 1989. "Racial Identity Among Caribbean Hispanics: The Effect of Double Minority Status on Residential Segregation," *American Sociological Review* 54: 790–808.
- Desmond, Matthew, and Rachel Kimbro. 2015. "Eviction's Fallout: Housing, Hardship, and Health," *Social Forces* 94 (1): 295–324.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley, and Stanley Lieberson. 1959. "Ethnic Segregation and Assimilation," *American Journal of Sociology* 64: 364–374.
- Ellen, Ingrid Gould. 2000. *Sharing America's Neighborhoods: The Prospects for Stable Racial Integration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ellen, Ingrid Gould, Michael Suher, and Gerard Torrats-Espinosa. 2019. "Neighbors and Networks: The Role of Social Interactions on the Residential Choices of Housing Choice Voucher Holders," *Journal of Housing Economics* 43: 56–71.

- Farley, Reynolds, and William H. Frey. 1994. "Changes in the Segregation of Whites from Blacks During the 1980s: Small Steps Toward a More Integrated Society," *American Sociological Review* 59: 23–45.
- Feins, Judith D., and Rhiannon Patterson. 2005. "Geographic Mobility in the Housing Choice Voucher Program: A Study of Families Entering the Program, 1995–2002," *Cityscape* 8 (2): 21–47.
- Finkel, Meryl, and Larry Buron. 2001. "Study on Section 8 Voucher Success Rates. Volume I: Quantitative Study of Success Rates In Metropolitan Areas." Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- Freeman, Lance, and Yunjing Li. 2014. "Do Source of Income Anti-Discrimination Laws Facilitate Access to Less Disadvantaged Neighborhoods?" *Housing Studies* 29: 88–107.
- Frost, Riordan. 2020. *Are Americans Stuck in Place? Declining Residential Mobility in the US*. Research brief. Cambridge, MA: Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University.
- Gabriel, Ryan. 2016. "A Middle Ground? Residential Mobility and Attainment of Mixed-Race Couples," *Demography* 53: 165–188.
- Gabriel, Ryan, and Amy Spring. 2019. "Neighborhood Diversity, Neighborhood Affluence: An Analysis of the Neighborhood Destination Choices of Mixed-Race Couples with Children," *Demography* 56 (3): 1051–1073.
- Galvez, Martha. 2010. *What Do We Know About Housing Choice Voucher Location Outcomes? A Review of Recent Literature*. Washington, DC: What Works Collaborative.
- Garriss-Hardy, Beth, and Cheryl Vrooman. 2005. *School Stability and School Performance: A Review of the Literature (Report)*. Greensboro, NC: University of North Carolina, National Center for Homeless Education, SERVE Center.
- Holloway, Steven, Mark Ellis, Richard Wright, and Margaret Hudson. 2005. "Partnering 'Out' and Fitting In: Residential Segregation and the Neighborhood Contexts of Mixed-Race Households," *Population, Space and Place* 11: 299–324.
- Iceland, John. 2004. "Beyond Black and White: Residential Segregation in Multiethnic America," *Social Science Research* 33: 248–271.
- Iceland, John, and Kyle Nelson. 2008. "Hispanic Segregation in Metropolitan America: Exploring the Multiple Forms of Spatial Assimilation," *American Sociological Review* 73: 741–765.
- Iceland, John, and Melissa Scopilliti. 2008. "Immigrant Residential Segregation in US Metropolitan Areas, 1990–2000," *Demography* 45 (1): 79–94.
- Iceland, John, Daniel Weinberg, and Lauren Hughes. 2014. "The Residential Segregation of Detailed Hispanic and Asian Groups in the United States: 1980–2010," *Demographic Research* 31:593–624.

- Iceland, John, Daniel H. Weinberg, and Erika Steinmetz. 2002. *Racial and Ethnic Residential Segregation in the United States: 1980–2000*. U.S. Census Bureau Special Report, CENSR-3, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Jargowsky, Paul A. 2014. *Concentration of Poverty in the New Millennium: Changes in Prevalence, Composition, and Location of High Poverty Neighborhoods*. Arlington, VA: The Century Foundation; and Camden, NJ: Rutgers Center for Urban Research and Education.
- Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University (JCHSHU). 2019. *The State of the Nation's Housing, 2018*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Jones, Jennifer. 2019. "From Open Doors to Closed Gates: Intragenerational Reverse Incorporation in New Immigrant Destinations," *International Migration Review* 53 (4): 1002–1031.
- Kneebone, Elizabeth, and Natalie Holmes. 2016. *U.S. Concentrated Poverty in the Wake of the Great Recession*. Washington, DC: Brookings.
- Krysan, Maria, and Michael Bader. 2009. "Racial Blind Spots: Black-White-Latino Differences in Community Knowledge," *Social Problems* 56: 677–701.
- Krysan, Maria, and Kyle Crowder. 2017. *Cycle of Segregation: Social Processes and Residential Stratification*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Logan, John R. 2003. "How Race Counts for Hispanic Americans." Albany, NY: Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research.
- Logan, John R., Andrew Foster, Hongwei Xu, and Wenquan Zhang. 2020. "Income Segregation: Up or Down, and for Whom?" *Demography* 57: 1951–1974.
- Logan, John R., and Hyoung-jin Shin. 2016. "Birds of a Feather: Social Bases of Neighborhood Formation in Newark, New Jersey, 1880," *Demography* 53 (4): 1085–1108.
- Massey, Douglas S. 2001. "Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Conditions in U.S. Metropolitan Areas." In *America Becoming: Racial Trends and Their Consequences*. Vol. 1, edited by N. J. Smelser, W. J. Wilson, and F. Mitchell. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- . 1985. "Spatial Assimilation as a Socioeconomic Outcome," *American Sociological Review* 50: 94–106.
- Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 1988. "The Dimensions of Residential Segregation," *Social Forces* 67 (2): 281–315.
- . 1987. "Trends in the Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians: 1970–1980," *American Sociological Review* 52 (6): 802–825.

Massey, Douglas S., and Mary J. Fischer. 2000. "How Segregation Concentrates Poverty," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 23: 670–691.

McClure, Kirk. 2013. "Which Metropolitan Areas Work Best for Poverty Deconcentration with Housing Choice Vouchers?" *Cityscape* 15 (3): 209–236.

McConnell, Eileen Diaz. 2013. "Who Has Housing Affordability Problems? Disparities in Housing Cost Burden by Race, Nativity, and Legal Status in Los Angeles," *Race and Social Problems* 5 (3): 173–190.

McFadden, Daniel. 1978. "Modelling the Choice of Residential Location," *Spatial Interaction Theory and Planning Models*, A. Karlqvist, L. Lundqvist, F. Snickars, and J. Weibull (eds.). North Holland: Amsterdam 75-96.

Menjívar, Cecilia. 2013. "When Immigration Policies Affect Immigrants' Lives: Commentary," *Demography* 50 (3): 1097–1099.

National Equity Atlas. 2020. *Housing Burden*. Los Angeles, CA: USC Equity Research Institute.

Oh, Sun Jung, and John Yinger. 2015. "What Have We Learned from Paired Testing in Housing Markets?" *Cityscape* 17 (3): 15–60.

Owens, Ann. 2019. "Building Inequality: Housing Segregation and Income Segregation," *Sociological Science* 6: 497.

Pais, Jeremy, Scott J. South, and Kyle Crowder. 2012. "Metropolitan Heterogeneity and Minority Neighborhood Attainment: Spatial Assimilation or Place Stratification?" *Social Problems* 59 (2): 258–281.

Quillian, Lincoln. 2015. "A Comparison of Traditional and Discrete-Choice Approaches to the Analysis of Residential Mobility and Locational Attainment," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 660: 240–260.

———. 2012. "Segregation and Poverty Concentration: The Role of Three Segregations," *American Sociological Review* 77 (3): 354–379.

———. 2002. "Why Is Black-White Residential Segregation So Persistent? Evidence on Three Theories from Migration Data," *Social Science Quarterly* 31: 197–220.

Reardon, Sean F., Kendra Bischoff, Ann Owens, and Joseph B. Townsend. 2018. "Has Income Segregation Really Increased? Bias and Bias Correction in Sample-Based Segregation Estimates," *Demography* 55(6): 2129–2160.

Rugh, Jacob S. 2020. "Vanishing Wealth, Vanishing Votes? Latino Homeownership and the 2016 Election in Florida," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 46 (18): 3829–3854.

Rugh, Jacob S., and Matthew Hall. 2016. "Deporting the American Dream: Immigration Enforcement and Latino Foreclosures," *Sociological Science* 3: 1053–1076.

- Saenz, Rogelio. 2010. *Latinos in America 2010*. Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau.
- Sampson, Robert J., and Patrick Sharkey. 2008. "Neighborhood Selection and the Social Reproduction of Concentrated Racial Inequality," *Demography* 45 (1): 1–29.
- Sander, Richard H., Yana Kucheva, and Jonathan Zasloff. 2018. *Moving Toward Integration: The Past and Future of Fair Housing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schachner, Jared N., and Robert J. Sampson. 2020. "Skill-Based Contextual Sorting: How Parental Cognition and Residential Mobility Produce Unequal Environments for Children," *Demography* 57: 675–703.
- Schachter, Ariela, Gregory Sharp, and Rachel T. Kimbro. 2020. "(Can't Get No) Neighborhood Satisfaction? How Multilevel Immigration Factors Shape Latinos' Neighborhood Attitudes," *Socius* 6: 1–16.
- South, Scott J., Kyle Crowder, and Erick Chavez. 2005a. "Exiting and Entering High-Poverty Neighborhoods: Latinos, Blacks, and Anglos Compared," *Social Forces* 84 (2): 873–900.
- . 2005b. "Migration and Spatial Assimilation Among U.S. Latinos: Classical Versus Segmented Trajectories," *Demography* 42 (3): 497–521.
- Spring, Amy, Elizabeth Ackert, Kyle Crowder, and Scott South. 2017. "Influence of Proximity to Kin on Residential Mobility and Destination Choice: Examining Local Movers in Metropolitan Areas," *Demography* 54 (4): 1277–1304.
- Tienda, Marta, and Norma Fuentes. 2014. "Hispanics in Metropolitan America: New Realities and Old Debates," *Annual Review of Sociology* 40: 499–520.
- Tighe, J. Rosie, Megan E. Hatch, and Joseph Mead. 2017. "Source of Income Discrimination and Fair Housing Policy," *Journal of Planning Literature* 32 (1): 3–15.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 2015. "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Final Rule," *Federal Register* 80 (136): 42271–42371.
- White, Michael J. 1983. "The Measurement of Spatial Segregation," *The American Journal of Sociology* 88 (5): 1008–1018.
- Wright, Richard, Mark Ellis, and Steven Holloway. 2011. "Where Black-White Couples Live," *Urban Geography* 32: 1–22.
- Zubrinisky, Camille, and Lawrence Bobo. 1996. "Prismatic Metropolis: Race and Residential Segregation in the City of Angels," *Social Science Research* 25: 335–374.