

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and
Social Sciences

Great Plains Studies, Center for

Spring 2003

Changes in Asian and Hispanic Population in the Cities of the Great Plains, 1990-2000

Evelyn Ravuri

Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsresearch>



Part of the [Other International and Area Studies Commons](#)

Ravuri, Evelyn, "Changes in Asian and Hispanic Population in the Cities of the Great Plains, 1990-2000" (2003). *Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*. 642.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/greatplainsresearch/642>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Great Plains Studies, Center for at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and Social Sciences by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

CHANGES IN ASIAN AND HISPANIC POPULATION IN THE CITIES OF THE GREAT PLAINS, 1990-2000

Evelyn Ravuri

*Department of Geography
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859
ravurled@cmich.edu*

ABSTRACT—In several areas of the United States previously not known for foreign populations, the number of Hispanics and Asians have increased in the past two decades. I examined the percentage change for Hispanics and for Asians for 41 cities in the states of Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota between 1990 and 2000. Hispanics and Asians are then disaggregated by ethnic subgroup, and regression analysis is used to determine the characteristics of cities that attract or repel different subgroups for both 1990 and 2000. In 2000 Mexicans, Other Hispanics, and Vietnamese were attracted to cities with low income levels and cities with a flourishing meat-processing industry. Chinese, Koreans, and Indians were attracted to cities with a public university and high levels of income. Clearly, Hispanics and Vietnamese were attracted to different cities than were the other Asian groups. This most likely reflects the educational differences between the two groups.

KEY WORDS: Asians, ethnicity, Great Plains cities, Hispanics, meat-processing industry

Introduction

Results from the 2000 census reveal that the racial composition of the United States continues to become more heterogeneous. In 2000, 69.1% of the population reported their race as white, 12.5% as Hispanic, 12.1% as black, and 3.6% as Asian compared to 75.6%, 9.0%, 11.7%, and 2.7%, respectively, for 1990 (US Bureau of the Census 1992, 2001). The percentage decline in the white majority is a result of a change in the traditional immigration source regions as well as a decline in the fertility level of the white population (Bean and Bell-Rose 1999; Easterlin 2000). Europe, once the source region for the vast majority of immigrants, has receded to a very small percentage of total immigration to the United States since the 1960s, while Asian and Latin American countries have steadily increased their

share of the foreign-born population (Borjas 1994; Gould and Findlay 1994). Between 1980 and 1998 approximately 75.0% of the immigrants to the United States came from Asia and Latin America while only 20.0% originated from Europe (Pollard and O'Hare 1999).

Two processes accounted for the change in source regions for immigrants (Castles and Miller 1993). First, population growth in most European countries has declined since the earlier part of the 20th century while economic growth has accelerated, and thus there is less incentive for Europeans to seek their fortunes in the United States. Secondly, and in direct opposition to processes occurring in Europe, population growth in the developing countries has increased since the 1950s while economic circumstances have deteriorated for many individuals in the developing countries. Higher fertility levels among Asians and Hispanics, relative to the Caucasian population, and a greater percentage of adults in their prime child-bearing years, has further contributed to the decline in the percentage of the population that is Caucasian (Easterlin 2000). As a result of these demographic circumstances, the US population has changed dramatically in racial composition and is likely to continue to do so well into the 21st century (Farley 1997).

Immigration to the United States is highly focused on only a few states, known as ports of entry. As of 2000 these states, which included New York, New Jersey, Florida, California, Texas, and Illinois, housed 70.5% of all immigrants (Frey 2001). The attraction of immigrants to certain areas, particularly where there is an ethnic community, is an important factor that leads to the spatial concentration of immigrants from certain regions of the world (Walker and Hannan 1989; Allen and Turner 1996). Unfamiliarity with the cultural mores and the language of the host country, as well as discrimination from native-born or more established immigrant groups, may foster a need for immigrants to settle among their own ethnic group. This process is characteristic not only of the new immigrants of the late 20th century, who disproportionately came from Asia and Latin America, but also of several European ethnic groups who came in the 1800s and early 1900s. After a period of adjustment, immigrants or succeeding generations may leave the ethnic community and disperse themselves among the majority population (Gober 1999).

Since the early 1990s foreign-born as well as US-born Asians and Hispanics have been drawn to regions previously unattractive to these groups (Durand et al. 2000; Hernandez-Leon and Zuniga 2000; Kitano and Daniels 2001). One such region is the Great Plains, where some towns in Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas have experienced an influx of Hispanics and to

a lesser extent Asians associated with the growth of low-wage manufacturing and meat-processing industries (Benson 1994; Griffith 1995; Martin et al. 1996). An additional factor is the selection of several cities in the Great Plains by corporations from larger cities seeking lower operating costs but in areas that have infrastructure and a skilled, educated labor force to support the move. Cities such as Des Moines, IA, Sioux Falls, SD, and Lincoln, NE, fit this profile (Duncan et al. 1995). Given the educational achievements of most Asian groups, they would be well suited to positions in these cities.

This paper is divided into four sections. The background section focuses on immigration and internal migration patterns of Asians and Hispanics within the United States as well as a history of Asians and Hispanics in the Great Plains. The methods section provides the rationale for the use of the regression model to predict the relationship between the number of Asians or Hispanics in the cities of the Great Plains and certain characteristics of the cities. The results and discussion sections examine the growth and composition of Asians, Hispanics, and Caucasians in the 41 cities as well as the variables that predict the number of Asians and Hispanics in each of the cities of the Great Plains for 1990 and 2000.

Background

Concentration of Asians and Hispanics

The concentration of Asians and Hispanics in a few select states has been well documented in immigration and ethnic studies (Borjas 1994; Rogers and Henning 1999; Easterlin 2000). Liaw and Frey (1998) examined the destination patterns and predictor variables associated with young adult immigration between 1985 and 1990. They found that 65.0% of recent immigrants located in Texas, California, New York, New Jersey, or Florida. The most important predictor variable was the percentage of Asians or Hispanics, depending on the group examined, already residing in that state, illustrating the importance of the ethnic enclave in initiating an immigrant into the American lifestyle. Newbold (1999) studied the settlement patterns of two groups of immigrants in the 25 largest metropolitan areas as of 1980 and 1990. He compared arrivals between 1950 and 1959, who were predominantly European, with arrivals between 1965 and 1974, who were primarily immigrants from developing countries. Earlier arrivals were more sensitive to income levels in their choice of city than the later arrivals, who responded more to the ethnic stock in a particular city.

In a study of ancestry using the 1980 census, Lieberman and Waters (1989) found that people of European ancestry were more dispersed throughout the country than persons of Asian, African, or Hispanic ancestry. The authors used a dissimilarity index, which indicated the percentage of a certain ethnic or racial group that would have to relocate to another region of the country in order to obtain a proportion equal to that group's representation in the nation as a whole. The index ranges from 0, no segregation, to 100, total segregation. They found that the Germans and English, with dissimilarity indexes of 21 and 11, respectively, were more dispersed throughout the United States than later immigrant groups such as the Italians (37) and Poles (35). Asians and Latin Americans, most of whom were newer immigrants than their European counterparts, were more concentrated. The Mexican population had a dissimilarity index of 61, indicating a very high level of segregation, which reflects the propensity of Mexicans to settle in the Southwest. Chinese, Filipinos, and Japanese had high dissimilarity indexes of 42, 52, and 58, respectively, and these groups were overwhelmingly located in the Pacific states. Lieberman and Waters (1989) concluded that it is unlikely that the new immigrants will be able to disperse throughout the country like the earlier immigrants from Europe. However, this does not mean that the post-1965 immigrants remained concentrated at points of entry. Jensen (2001) found that it takes about three generations for new immigrants to disperse from their initial settlements. Whereas 65.0% and 61.0% of the first and second generations of Asians and Hispanics, respectively, resided in either western or northeastern states, only 36.0% of the third generation did so.

Funkhouser (2000) examined the concentration and spread of immigrants from Europe, Latin America, and Asia between 1980 and 1990. Most of the European ethnic groups had experienced dispersal and intermingling in what he termed primary networks, while most Asians and Hispanics experienced increased concentration. It has been well documented that Europeans have mostly been assimilated into the American lifestyle. However, Mexicans, another group with a long history in the United States, experienced a decline from 58.9% to 54.1% of their immigrant population residing in primary networks between 1980 and 1990, suggesting a slight decrease in concentration. Funkhouser (2000) admitted that his definition of primary network is misleading, given that an enclave for a metropolitan region is defined as 20,000 persons from a particular ethnic group. While concessions can be made for ethnic groups where the population does not reach 20,000 in any of the metropolitan areas, no adjustment is made for the increased number of cities that attained more than 20,000 persons from an

ethnic group. Certainly this definition of primary enclave should be modified since cities such as Wichita, KS, and Omaha, NE, in the Great Plains surpassed this figure for their Hispanic population in the 2000 census.

Dispersal of Asians and Hispanics

Although a high percentage of the Asian and Hispanic populations reside in only six states (Frey 2001), immigrants may search for alternative places to reside as they become assimilated into American life. This process may occur in one lifetime or with succeeding generations. Since the 1990s many regions of the United States that previously had a small percentage of foreign-born population experienced an increase in the number of Hispanics and Asians (Kent et al. 2001). Some of this increase was likely a result of direct immigration to the state in question from the source country, but a percentage of the movement was likely a result of secondary internal migration of an immigrant or a US-born Asian or Hispanic from another state. For example, Hempstead (2001) in her analysis of internal migration of immigrants noted that it was possible that the recession experienced in California (1990-94) spurred outmigration to other states. Given the large numbers of the Asian and Hispanic population in California, even a small percentage of outflow may have initiated or reinforced ethnic communities in cities of previously less-utilized states. Neuman and Tienda (1994) studied the secondary movements of illegal Mexican immigrants who applied for amnesty in 1986. They found that more than 25.0% of illegal immigrants in their sample migrated across a state line between last entry into the United States and the application for amnesty, resulting in a decreased concentration of Mexicans from the original area of settlement. The concentration of immigrants into specific regions often declines with duration of stay and educational level. Zavodny (1999) found in her study of recent legal immigrants to the United States between 1989 and 1994 that 76.0% were located in the six states of California, Florida, Texas, New York, New Jersey, and Illinois. Of the legal immigrants who came on an employment-based preference, only 64.5% took up residence in one of these six states.

Unfortunately, the dispersion and growth of Asians and Hispanics throughout the United States is virtually an unexplored topic. What little literature that is available is mainly concerned with the Hispanic population. However, Durand et al. (2000) found that beginning in the early 1990s, California declined in importance as a residence for foreign-born and recent immigrants, while previously nongateway states such as Iowa and Kansas captured a greater percentage share of Mexican immigrants between 1990

and 1996. The change in the geographical distribution of foreign-born Mexicans is linked to several factors. A recession in California made this state less attractive. Also, the 1986 Immigration Reform Act that legalized 2.9 million Mexicans allowed a freedom of movement not previously obtainable due to the possibility of detection by authorities (Baker 1997). Saenz (1991) examined the migration of US-born Mexicans (Chicanos) between a core region in the Southwest and what he termed the frontier states of the Midwest, which included Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, and South Dakota, between 1975 and 1980. He found that these states gained more Chicano immigrants from the Southwest than they lost to the Southwest. This exchange between the Southwest and Midwest was even more noticeable between 1985 and 1990, when the Midwest experienced a gain in net migration from the Southwest of both Mexicans born in the United States and Mexico (Saenz and Cready 1996).

Although much of the Hispanic population growth in nontraditional areas is a result of secondary migration, several locales have received direct immigration from Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean. Hernandez-Leon and Zuniga (2001) studied a small city in Georgia with low-wage manufacturing in the carpet and meat-processing industries; the city experienced tremendous growth in the Mexican population since the late 1980s. Of the immigrants who came to this small city in Georgia in the mid-1990s, the greatest percentage had come directly from Mexico, illustrating the effect of chain migration in the establishment of ethnic enclaves. Chain migration occurs when a certain immigrant group establishes itself in a community and then provides information concerning housing, employment opportunities, and social support systems to family members, friends, and coethnics, which further encourages migration to that particular locale. Another region that has experienced an influx of Mexican and Guatemalan immigrants to work in poultry-processing plants is the Delmarva Peninsula, which consists of Delaware and the eastern portion of Maryland. The poultry-processing industry previously relied on poorly educated African Americans for its labor force. However, since the late 1980s African Americans have found better jobs in the flourishing tourist industries, and the resulting dearth of workers for poultry processing attracted Hispanics with low educational and skill levels (Horowitz and Miller 1999).

McHugh (1989) found in an analysis of the Hispanic population's internal migration within the United States that a negative net migration loss was first detected for New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and California in the 1980 census. However, McHugh's (1989) study examined only 15 states, all of which were located in three general areas: the eastern

seaboard, the manufacturing belt, or the Southwest whereas exchanges in the other 35 states were totally ignored. Foulkes and Newbold (2000) studied the internal migration patterns of Hispanics between 1985 and 1990. They separated the data by ethnic group and traced patterns of migrants once they had settled in the United States. They found that Mexicans were moving throughout the Southwest, with a greater percentage of Mexicans going to states such as Wyoming and Colorado than prior to 1985. Puerto Ricans were found to be leaving New York and New Jersey for other states of the Northeast, while Cubans were returning to Florida.

History of Minorities in the Great Plains

The Great Plains region has traditionally been one of the slowest-growing regions in the United States (Kale 1975; Duncan et al. 1995). The decline in the importance of farming throughout the 20th century led to an exodus of people from this area, with a concomitant loss of economic activities (Hobbs and Weagley 1995). Rural areas in the Great Plains are predicted to continue on a downward population spiral well into the 21st century (Johnson 2001). However, overall, these states gained population during the 1990s, primarily by the growth of cities in the Great Plains (Duncan et al. 1995). Some of this gain in total population is likely a result of internal migration gains (Manson and Groop 2000).

Traditionally, the states of the Great Plains were among the least racially heterogeneous states (Duncan et al. 1995). However, rural areas in Kansas and Nebraska already had established concentrations of Mexicans in the earlier part of the 20th century, as a result of the need for agricultural and railroad workers (Del Castillo and De Leon 1996; Haverluk 1997). Even though cities of the Great Plains in general have had a more heterogeneous racial composition than nonmetropolitan and rural locales, these cities have lagged far behind in the percentage composition of minorities in comparison to other regions of the country. Overall, population growth in most regions of the United States has not kept up with employment growth, particularly in low-wage, low-skilled occupations (Murdock 1996). This deficit of workers has attracted Hispanics and Asians in search of opportunities outside the traditional ports of entry (Liaw and Frey 1998; Johnson et al. 1999). Not only will these immigrants and minority "migrants" from other states fill jobs in these cities, the specific demographics of these two populations should spur further population growth and likely a concomitant economic growth. These Asian and Hispanic migrants tend to be younger than the majority white population and to have a higher fertility level

(Easterlin 2000) that is likely fueling the population growth of many cities in the Great Plains.

Methods

The changing ethnic composition of 41 cities with a population exceeding 25,000 in the Great Plains states of Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota for Caucasians, Hispanics, and Asians is examined between 1990 and 2000. The data for this analysis were taken from the 1990 and 2000 censuses, and results for racial characteristics from the 2000 census (US Bureau of the Census 1992, 2001). I examine three aspects of racial/ethnic composition in these cities using descriptive and statistical analysis: (1) the racial composition of each of the cities in 1990 and 2000; (2) the percentage change in population for the Asian, Hispanic, and Caucasian groups between 1990 and 2000 in each of these cities; and (3) a disaggregation of Asians and Hispanics into subgroups (Mexicans, Other Hispanics, Chinese, Vietnamese, Indian, Filipino, and Korean) and a determination of the predictor variables that explain the distribution of each subgroup for 1990 and 2000.

Detailed data at the city level are not yet available for the 2000 census. Therefore, it is impossible to determine the percentage of the Asian or Hispanic populations that are native vs. foreign-born. It is quite likely that different variables will be predictors for the location of native-born vs. the immigrant subpopulations. The most obvious factor is the agglomeration of newly arrived immigrants in an already established ethnic community in a particular city. Another limitation is that no census data for 2000 are available yet to indicate gender or age of Asians or Hispanics by subgroup. Therefore, I assumed that all adults were economically motivated, active participants in the labor force, for both 1990 and 2000. These data, though incomplete, should provide an initial insight into the attraction of Asians and Hispanics to the Great Plains region, which has traditionally been overlooked by these two populations.

Regression analysis was the statistical technique that I chose to indicate what attracted or repelled Hispanics and Asians to and from the 41 cities studied in 1990 and 2000. Regression analysis is a statistical technique that indicates how much explanatory power can be attributed to a certain group of variables. The procedure requires a dependent variable, the one we wish to explain, and at least one independent variable, the one that predicts the outcome of the dependent variable. In this particular case, the method attempts to predict the number of Asians or Hispanics in 41 cities of

the Great Plains by knowing certain demographic or economic characteristics about each of the cities. The statistic used to measure the relationship is known as R^2 and can range anywhere from 0 to 1. The larger the number, the greater the predictive power attributed to the independent variable or variables. Each result is reported as an adjusted R^2 which takes into account the number of independent variables used in the regression and the number of observation units of the dependent variable.

The following variables were included in the regression equation for each of the seven subgroups: total population for 1990 or 2000, population growth between 1980 and 1990 or between 1990 and 2000, and per capita income for 1980 or 1990. In addition, two binary variables were used: one indicating whether a city has a public university and the other whether a large meat-processing facility is in operation. The meat-processing data were from Broadway's (1995) studies of this industry in the Great Plains. The public-university binary variable was deemed to be important for this analysis because a number of Asians pursue higher-education opportunities in the United States. Likewise, the meat-processing industry has attracted Hispanics and some Asian groups due to plentiful work and lower costs of living. The dependent variable (number of Asians or Hispanics) and the independent variable (total population) were converted to logarithms so that these variables conformed to a normal distribution.

The expected relationships in the regression analyses for the Asian and Hispanic/Vietnamese populations were as follows. The Vietnamese were grouped with Hispanics due to their low levels of education (Caplan et al. 1992). The circumstances of the Vietnamese population differ from those of the Chinese, Indian, Korean, and Filipino populations. The latter group immigrated to the United States mostly in response to economic motives (Zhou 2002), whereas the Vietnamese population was composed mostly of refugees (Sutter 1990). Although the first wave of Vietnamese refugees to the United States was well educated, the subsequent arrivals were less skilled and less educated (Caplan et al. 1992). The Vietnamese have been noted to gravitate toward towns and cities hosting large meatpacking facilities (Benson 1994).

For these 41 cities in the Great Plains, it is expected that those with larger total populations will have a greater number of Asians and Hispanics as of 2000. Median income was expected to be positive for all subgroups, given an economic rationale for migration. Education was predicted to be positive for the Asians, while no relationship was predicted for Hispanics and Vietnamese. Meat processing was predicted to increase the number of Hispanics and Vietnamese and to decrease the number of Asians. Popula-

tion growth was predicted to be positive, given that immigrants and ethnic minorities are likely fueling the growth process.

Results

Descriptive Analysis

Thirteen of 41 cities lost white population between 1990 and 2000, with eight of 41 (20%) of these cities located in Iowa (Table 1). Overall, Iowa has come to rely on immigrants to supply the labor force (Cable News Network 2000). However, Leavenworth, KS, was the only city to record a more than 10.0% percent loss of white population. These cities grew most rapidly in Caucasian population during the 1990s: Bellevue, NE (37.5%); Olathe, KS (37.9%); and West Des Moines, IA (40.4%) (Table 1). None of these cities exceeded 100,000 in total population.

In nearly all of the 41 cities in the study, the number of Hispanics increased between 1990 and 2000 (Table 2). In only 13 cities did the number of Hispanics fail to double. The percentage increase for each of these cities was as follows: Iowa City, IA (80.1%); Kearney, NE (67.6%); Topeka, KS (66.4%); Emporia, KS (66.2%); Cedar Rapids, IA (66.1%); Davenport, IA (59.6%); Manhattan, KS (49.8%), Ames, IA (35.8%), Leawood, KS (28.6%); Lawrence, KS (63.1%); Bettendorf, IA (24.9%); Mason City, IA (19.1%); and Leavenworth, KS (0.3%). It would appear that Hispanics were not attracted to university towns given that five of these 13 cities (Lawrence, Kearney, Iowa City, Ames, and Manhattan) are relatively slow-growing academic towns. The fastest-growing cities, in which the number of Hispanics at least tripled between 1990 and 2000, were Olathe, KS (341.9% increase); Omaha, NE (203.0%); Grand Island, NE (262.7%); Fremont, NE (557.6%); Sioux Falls, SD (440.6%); Sioux City, IA (252.8%); and Waterloo, IA (240.1%). The growth of Omaha, Grand Island, Sioux Falls, Sioux City, and Waterloo likely was linked to the presence of meat-processing industries (Broadway 1995; Griffith 1995).

In eight cities the Asian population at least doubled between 1990 and 2000 (Table 1). These cities included Overland Park, KS; Olathe, KS; Lincoln, NE; Davenport, IA; Sioux City, IA; West Des Moines, IA; Shawnee, KS; and Lenexa, KS. None of the cities with universities were among the fastest-growing cities, most likely because they have attracted Asians for the past several decades. West Des Moines led all cities in growth of Asian population with its increase of 230.7%. Five cities—Leavenworth, KS; Emporia, KS; Bismarck, ND; Fremont, NE; and Grand Forks, ND—lost Asian population during the 1990s.

TABLE 1
PERCENTAGE POPULATION CHANGE FOR CAUCASIAN, ASIAN, AND
HISPANICS IN 41 CITIES IN THE GREAT PLAINS, 1990-2000

City	Caucasian	Asian	Hispanic
<u>Iowa</u>			
Des Moines	-5.2	56.5	183.8
Cedar Rapids	6.8	90.8	66.1
Davenport	-3.1	113.8	59.6
Sioux City	-2.7	107.3	252.8
Waterloo	-2.6	55.7	240.1
Iowa City	-0.1	6.2	80.1
Council Bluffs	3.9	75.5	97.6
Dubuque	-2.0	3.4	146.2
Ames	4.4	21.3	35.8
West Des Moines	40.4	230.7	129.4
Cedar Falls	3.7	1.9	68.4
Bettendorf	9.1	34.1	24.9
Mason City	-1.5	76.6	19.1
Urbandale	21.2	13.0	154.1
Clinton	-7.5	69.2	127.3
<u>Kansas</u>			
Wichita	3.3	79.3	131.3
Overland	26.7	172.7	155.7
Topeka	-5.6	28.1	66.4
Olathe	37.9	142.1	341.9
Lawrence	17.2	16.2	63.1
Shawnee	20.4	102.1	130.8
Salina	1.8	54.7	171.9
Manhattan	15.3	42.1	49.8
Hutchinson	0.5	52.2	147.2
Lenexa	11.7	139.6	176.3
Leavenworth	-11.5	-20.0	0.3
Garden City	3.7	1.8	107.6
Leawood	38.0	71.8	28.6
Emporia	-7.5	-9.5	66.2
<u>Nebraska</u>			
Omaha	8.5	88.0	203.0
Lincoln	10.8	140.7	149.0
Bellevue	37.5	28.0	115.1
Grand Island	-1.6	27.4	262.7
Kearney	10.0	136.4	67.6
Fremont	2.7	-15.4	557.6
<u>North Dakota</u>			
Bismarck	9.5	-15.2	36.5
Fargo	15.6	95.0	137.2
Grand Forks	-2.4	-19.3	50.0
Minot	2.9	27.7	58.1
<u>South Dakota</u>			
Sioux Falls	16.7	84.6	440.6
Rapid City	4.5	14.0	35.8

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census 1992, Table 6, and U.S. Bureau of the Census 2001, Table DP-1.

TABLE 2
PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION THAT IS CAUCASIAN, ASIAN, OR
HISPANIC FOR 41 CITIES IN THE GREAT PLAINS, 1990 AND 2000

	Caucasian 1990	Caucasian 2000	Asian 1990	Asian 2000	Hispanic 1990	Hispanic 2000
<u>Iowa</u>						
Des Moines	89.2	82.3	2.4	3.5	2.4	6.6
Cedar Rapids	95.5	91.9	1.0	1.8	1.1	1.7
Davenport	89.1	83.7	1.0	2.0	3.5	5.4
Sioux City	92.6	85.2	1.5	2.8	3.3	10.9
Waterloo	86.6	81.6	0.7	0.9	0.8	2.6
Iowa City	91.1	87.3	5.6	5.6	1.7	2.9
Council Bluffs	97.8	94.8	0.4	0.6	2.4	4.5
Dubuque	98.4	96.2	0.6	0.7	0.6	1.6
Ames	89.9	87.3	6.9	7.7	1.6	2.0
West Des Moines	96.3	92.7	1.6	2.8	1.9	3.0
Cedar Falls	97.4	95.1	1.7	1.6	0.7	1.1
Bettendorf	96.8	95.0	1.0	1.4	2.2	2.5
Mason City	97.3	95.4	0.5	0.8	2.9	3.4
Urbandale	97.2	95.2	1.5	1.7	0.8	1.6
Clinton	96.5	93.8	0.5	0.8	0.7	1.7
<u>Kansas</u>						
Wichita	82.4	75.2	2.5	4.0	4.7	9.6
Overland	95.1	90.6	1.9	3.8	2.0	3.8
Topeka	84.9	78.5	0.9	1.1	5.4	8.9
Olathe	94.3	88.6	1.7	2.7	1.8	5.4
Lawrence	87.2	83.8	4.0	3.8	2.7	3.6
Manhattan	89.9	87.3	3.3	3.9	2.8	3.5
Hutchinson	91.5	88.6	0.4	0.6	5.4	7.7
Lenexa	94.7	89.5	1.8	3.6	1.7	3.9
Leavenworth	79.8	76.8	1.7	1.5	4.7	5.1
Garden City	78.3	68.8	4.1	3.5	25.0*	43.9*
Leawood	96.9	95.2	1.8	2.2	1.4	1.3
Emporia	89.2	78.6	3.1	2.7	7.6	21.5
<u>Nebraska</u>						
Omaha	83.9	78.4	1.1	1.7	1.1	7.5
Lincoln	94.6	89.2	1.5	3.1	1.5	3.6
Bellevue	89.4	85.8	2.4	2.1	3.9	5.9
Grand Island	96.0	86.7	1.3	1.3	4.8	15.9
Kearney	97.3	95.2	0.5	0.9	2.7	4.1
Fremont	98.7	95.3	0.4	0.6	0.7	4.3
<u>North Dakota</u>						
Bismarck	96.7	94.8	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.7
Fargo	97.1	94.2	1.3	1.6	0.7	1.3
Grand Forks	95.5	93.3	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.9
Minot	95.8	93.2	0.8	0.6	0.8	1.5
<u>South Dakota</u>						
Sioux Falls	96.8	91.9	0.7	1.2	0.6	2.5
Rapid City	88.2	84.3	1.0	1.0	2.2	2.8

* Garden City sums to more than 100.0 percent due to the overlap of Hispanics in racial categorization.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census 1992, Table 6, and U.S. Bureau of the Census 2001, Table DP-1.

The racial composition of the 41 cities from 1990 to 2000 varied (Table 2). Six cities had Caucasian populations below 80.0% in 2000: Wichita, KS (75.2%); Topeka, KS (78.5%); Omaha, NE (78.4%); Leavenworth, KS (76.8%); Garden City, KS (68.8%); and Emporia, KS (78.6%), compared to only two cities in 1990 (Leavenworth, KS, and Garden City, KS). Only seven cities were more than 95.0% Caucasian in 2000, two in Nebraska (Kearney and Fremont), four in Iowa (Dubuque, Cedar Falls, Mason City, and Urbandale), and one in Kansas (Leawood), compared to 19 in 1990. Each of the 41 cities in the study saw a decrease in the percentage of its Caucasian population between 1990 and 2000. This decrease was undoubtedly a result of the higher levels of immigration and internal migration and the higher rates of natural increase for the Asian and Hispanic populations in comparison to the Caucasian populations.

The Hispanic population in 2000 exceeded 10.0% in three of the cities (Emporia, KS; Grand Island, NE; and Sioux City, IA) and exceeded 5.0% in 10 cities, most likely the result of the recent arrival of Hispanics in the cities of the Great Plains. Ethnic enclaves, often maintained by chain migration from certain communities, can build a sizable stock of an ethnic group in a particular city (Logan et al. 2002). In contrast to their Hispanic counterparts, Asians made up more than 5.0% of the total population in only two of the cities, Iowa City, IA (5.6%), and Ames, IA (7.7%). Generally, Hispanics had greater source populations for migration in the cities of the Great Plains than did Asians. Five cities do not fit this profile: two in Kansas (Overland Park and Lawrence) and three in Iowa (Cedar Rapids, Iowa City, and Ames). Four of these cities are university towns, and it is likely that Asians, who would more likely be pursuing higher education than their Hispanic counterparts, would be more represented in these cities.

Regression Analysis

The regression equations for each of the Asian and Hispanic subgroups for 1990 and 2000 varied. Three aspects of the regression equations are of interest. First, each independent variable is examined to determine if it is statistically significant for each group in 1990 and 2000. The following independent variables were assessed to determine their power to predict the number of Asians and Hispanics in the 41 cities of the Great Plains: total population of the city; population growth of the city between 1980 and 1990 or between 1990 and 2000; the median income per person for each city; whether a city contained a public university; and whether there was a meat-processing facility in that city. Secondly, each of the subgroups was com-

pared with the others to determine similarities and differences among the determinants of population distribution for the 41 cities in the study in both 1990 and 2000. Third, the amount of variance explained for each of the subgroups between 1990 and 2000 was examined.

Total population of a city was highly significant in all regressions ($p < 0.01$). This is not surprising given that larger cities would tend, all else being equal, to attract greater numbers of Asians and Hispanics. Population growth between 1980 and 1990 was important in predicting the number of Indians ($p < 0.01$), Koreans ($p < 0.01$), Chinese ($p < 0.01$), and other Hispanics ($p < 0.05$) in the 41 cities that were studied. This indicates that Indians, Koreans, Chinese, and Other Hispanics were attracted to cities experiencing rapid growth during the 1990s, or at the very least, that they were responsible for this growth. The variable of education had a significant effect in predicting the number of Chinese and Indians ($p < 0.01$), Koreans ($p < 0.05$), and Other Hispanics ($p < 0.1$) in the cities studied in 2000, suggesting an attraction for higher education among these groups. The number of Indians and Chinese residing in each city in 2000 was also related to income ($p < 0.01$). Mexicans were attracted to cities with meat-processing facilities ($p < 0.05$ level), while Indians and Koreans ($p < 0.05$), and possibly Chinese ($p < 0.1$), were deterred from meat-processing areas. (See Table 3.)

In 2000 population growth predicted the number of Filipinos in each of the cities studied ($p < 0.05$ level). Unlike a percentage of Indians, Chinese, and Koreans who came to the United States specifically in pursuit of higher education, most Filipinos who arrived after 1965 had already completed their professional training before entering the United States (Kitano and Daniels 2000). Thus, it is reasonable to assume that Filipinos would be less likely to seek out cities in the Great Plains for opportunities in higher education, given that many of them already arrived in the United States with college degrees. Another difference between Filipinos, compared to Indians, Chinese, and Koreans, is that the latter groups tend to be more entrepreneurial. Filipinos rely heavily on outside agencies for employment. Many Filipinos are employed in the health professions, and cities growing rapidly would likely have increased opportunities in the healthcare field (Lott 1997; Logan et al. 2000).

The education variable was significant ($p < 0.01$) in 2000 for the number of Chinese, Indians, and Koreans in the cities of the Great Plains. This is likely due to a continual supply of students in cities with universities. Income was significant for Chinese, Indians, Koreans, and Mexicans in 2000. However, Mexicans were deterred from cities with high income levels, whereas the others were attracted to such cities. Income was a more

TABLE 3
LOGARITHMIC REGRESSIONS FOR SEVEN ETHNIC GROUPS IN THE CITIES OF THE GREAT PLAINS, 1990 AND 2000

	Constant	Population	Growth	Education	Income	Meat	R2	Adj. R2
2000								
Chinese	-6.501 (0.789)	1.661 *** (0.158)	4.41E-03 (0.004)	0.706 *** (0.124)	4.12E-05 *** (0.0)	-0.242 ** (0.118)	0.806	0.775
Filipinos	-3.54 (0.528)	1.129 *** (0.106)	5.75E-03 ** (0.003)	1.14E-01 (0.153)	-1.50E-06 (0.0)	-0.131 (0.079)	0.796	0.764
Indians	-6.162 (0.863)	1.588 *** (0.173)	4.82E-03 (0.005)	0.502 *** (0.136)	4.87E-05 *** (0.0)	-2.08E-01 (0.129)	0.764	0.727
Koreans	-4.482 (0.865)	1.267 *** (0.173)	2.79E-03 (0.005)	0.397 *** (0.136)	2.95E-05 ** (0.0)	-0.227 * (0.13)	0.653	0.599
Vietnamese	-5.123 (1.237)	4.59E-03 *** (0.248)	4.59E-03 (0.007)	5.73E-02 (0.195)	9.39E-06 (0.0)	0.581 *** (0.186)	0.666	0.614
Mexicans	-0.647 (1.049)	0.861 *** (0.21)	3.59E-03 (0.006)	-1.12E-01 (0.165)	-3.00E-05 * (0.0)	0.513 *** (0.157)	0.612	0.551
Other Hispanics	-1.079 (0.673)	0.814 *** (0.135)	2.03E-03 (0.004)	4.97E-02 (0.106)	-6.90E-06 (0.0)	4.37E-01 *** (0.101)	0.726	0.683
1990								
Chinese	-7.19 (0.942)	1.789 *** (0.182)	1.09E-02 *** (0.003)	0.848 *** (0.141)	6.61E-05 * (0.0)	-0.237 * (0.125)	0.776	0.742
Filipinos	-2.334 (0.1019)	0.848 *** (0.197)	3.10E-03 (0.003)	0.201 (0.152)	2.74E-06 (0.0)	-6.10E-03 (0.136)	0.393	0.301
Indians	-5.569 (0.958)	1.248 *** (0.183)	1.23E-02 *** (0.003)	0.755 *** (0.131)	1.12E-04 *** (0.0)	1.74E-02 (0.124)	0.753	0.713
Koreans	-4.542 (0.966)	1.343 *** (0.187)	9.10E-03 *** (0.003)	0.425 *** (0.144)	1.30E-05 (0.0)	-0.304 ** (0.129)	0.628	0.571
Vietnamese	-5.293 (1.706)	1.343 *** (0.33)	5.63E-03 (0.006)	5.43E-02 (0.259)	7.76E-05 (0.0)	0.515 ** (0.223)	0.533	0.455
Mexicans	-0.655 (1.2888)	0.796 *** (0.249)	4.98E-03 (0.004)	-6.40E-02 (0.192)	-4.10E-05 (0.0)	0.371 ** (0.172)	0.442	0.357
Other Hispanics	-1.414 (0.747)	0.857 *** (0.145)	7.81E-03 *** (0.002)	0.14 (0.112)	-3.40E-05 (0.0)	7.48E-02 (0.1)	0.6	0.539

*significant at 0.1 level
**significant at 0.05 level
***significant at 0.01 level

important factor for Indians ($p < 0.01$) and Chinese ($p < 0.05$) than for Koreans ($p < 0.1$), most likely due to the drawing of immigrants from the middle to upper classes in India (Leonard 1997). The meat-processing industry variable attracted Mexicans, Vietnamese, and Other Hispanics, while Chinese ($p < 0.05$) and Koreans ($p < 0.1$) were deterred from cities with meat-processing industries.

In each regression, more variance was explained by the independent variables for 2000 than for 1990. Filipinos showed the greatest change in the amount of variance explained, with an adjusted R^2 of 0.764 in 2000 vs. only 0.301 in 1990. Mexicans and Other Hispanics also showed substantial improvement in the proportion of variance explained (an adjusted R^2 of 0.551 and 0.683, respectively, for 2000 vs. an adjusted R^2 of 0.357 and 0.539, respectively, for 1990). The amount of variance explained by the independent variables for 2000, in comparison to 1990, increased only slightly for Koreans, Chinese, and Indians, suggesting that the 1990 predictors were good indicators of the 2000 distribution.

Discussion

Hispanics and Asians display different distributional patterns among the cities of the Great Plains. Asians (excluding Vietnamese) were attracted to cities with large public universities and high per-capita incomes, while being repelled by cities with meat-processing industries. Even if the majority of Asians in the cities of the Great Plains came as students beginning in the 1960s, it is also likely that a percentage of them found employment opportunities and diffused to other cities of the Great Plains.

Mexicans and Vietnamese would not be competitive with most Asians or Caucasians and were repelled by cities with high per-capita incomes. These two groups are not going against the economic rationale for migrating, they are simply locating in cities where the potential for employment is the greatest.

Hispanics and Vietnamese increased proportionately in cities with a meat-processing industry, and this is likely a result of the difference in the average skill level between these two groups and the rest of the Asian groups. As of 1988, over 50.0% of the legal immigrants from Asia were professionals (Cheng and Yang 1998), while Hispanics had the greatest percentage of their immigrant stock in the least-educated category (Liaw and Frey 1998). It would appear that Hispanics and probably the Vietnamese have taken advantage of opportunities in this low-wage manufacturing

industry, and given that their educational attainments are generally below those of Asians and Caucasian Americans (Farley 1997), the relationship is expected.

Unfortunately, my regression model did a relatively poor job of explaining the variance in numbers gained for the Mexican and Vietnamese populations, in contrast to the other groups. This suggests that other unstudied factors were involved. For the Vietnamese population, the ethnic community may be more important than the factors I examined in this model. For the Mexican population, it must be remembered that Mexicans were already moving into the Great Plains during the early part of the 20th century to work in agriculture and the railroad industry. Additional studies of Mexican and Vietnamese populations need to be conducted given their rapid growth in several cities of the Great Plains. For example, how does the presence of these two groups affect the movements of the native-born Caucasian population? Studies of the effect of immigration on the internal migration patterns of the native-born population are popular (Frey 1995, 1996). The argument is that high immigration areas push out low-skilled, non-Hispanic Caucasians who are unable to compete because wages have been driven below what is acceptable to the native-born. Kritiz and Gurak (2001) tested this demographic balkanization theory by expanding this model to include both the effect of immigrants on the native-born population and the effect of recent immigrants on the internal migration patterns of earlier immigrants. After controlling for individual characteristics, they found that the arrival of recent Hispanic immigrants spawned a net outflow of both native-born Caucasians and also earlier immigrants from Asia.

For the Asian population, the overall numbers in university cities grew relatively slowly in comparison to some of the other cities in the study. University towns have always been attractive to Asians, even though the percentage growth in these cities is less than in other cities. A majority of the Asian population in university cities is most likely temporary since these cities experience a large turnover in student population. Cities with a high percentage of the labor force in professions are the ones growing fastest for Asian populations, a fact that highlights the economic motive of migration. The growth and shift in the distribution of the Filipino population needs to be examined in fuller detail, given that different predictor variables were responsible for its distribution in 1990 and 2000 compared to the other Asian groups. Cities such as Lenexa, KS, Des Moines, IA, and Leawood, KS, provide interesting opportunities for study because of the growth of the Asian population in these cities.

This study presents only a brief glimpse at the changing ethnicity of the cities in the states of the Great Plains during the 1990s. The changes will become more apparent after the 2000 census has been more fully exploited by social scientists. Future studies must be concerned with the individual characteristics of the Asian and Hispanic populations, as well as with the aggregate characteristics that either attract or repel these individuals to or from certain areas, in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of changes taking place in the Great Plains.

References

- Allen, J.P., and E. Turner. 1996. Spatial patterns of immigrant assimilation. *Professional Geographer* 48:140-55.
- Baker, S.G. 1997. The amnesty aftermath: Current policy issues stemming from the legalization programs of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act. *International Migration Review* 31:5-27.
- Bean, F.D., and S. Bell-Rose. 1999. Introduction: Immigration and its relation to race and ethnicity in the United States. In *Immigration and Opportunity: Race, Ethnicity, and Employment in the United States*, ed. F.D. Bean and S. Bell-Rose, 1-28. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Benson, J.E. 1994. The effects of packinghouse work on Southeast Asian refugee families. In *Newcomers in the Workplace: Immigrants and the Restructuring of the US Economy*, ed. L. Lamphere, A. Stepick, and G. Grenier, 99-128. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Borjas, G.J. 1994. The economics of immigration. *Journal of Economic Literature* 22:1667-1717.
- Broadway, M.J. 1995. From city to countryside: Recent changes in the structure and location of the meat- and fish-processing industries. In *Anyway You Cut It: Meat Processing and Small Town America*, ed. D.D. Stull, M.J. Broadway, and D. Griffith. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Broadway, M.J., and T. Ward. 1990. Recent changes in the structure and location of the US meatpacking industry. *Geography* 75:76-79.
- Cable News Network. 2000. Iowa recruits immigrants to boost population. Retrieved July 2001, <http://www.cnn.com>.
- Caplan, N., J.K. Whitmore, and M.H. Choy. 1992. *The Boat People and Achievement in America: A Study of Family Life, Hard Work, and Cultural Values*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Castles, S., and M.J. Miller. 1993. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Cheng, L., and P.Q. Yang. 1998. Global interaction, global inequality, and migration of the highly trained to the United States. *International Migration Review* 32:626-53.
- Del Castillo, R.G., and A. De Leon. 1996. *North to Aztlan: A History of Mexican Americans in the United States*. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- Duncan, M., D. Fisher, and M. Drabenstott. 1995. Planning for a sustainable future in the Great Plains. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
- Durand, J., D.S. Massey, and F. Charvet. 2000. The changing geography of Mexican immigration to the United States: 1910-1996. *Social Science Quarterly* 81:1-15.
- Easterlin, R.A. 2000. Growth and composition of the American population in the twentieth century. In *A Population History of North America*, ed. M.R. Haines and R.H. Steckel, chap. 14. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Farley, R. 1997. Racial trends and differences in the United States 30 years after the civil rights decade. *Social Science Research* 26:235-62.
- Foulkes, M., and K.B. Newbold. 2000. Migration propensities, patterns, and the role of human capital: Comparing Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Rican interstate migration, 1985-1990. *Professional Geographer* 52:133-45.
- Frey, W.H. 1995. The new geography of population shifts. In *State of the Union, America in the 1990s*, vol. 2, *Social Trends*, ed. R. Farley, 271-336. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Frey, W.H. 1996. Immigrant and native migrant magnets. *American Demographics*, 18:37-53.
- Frey, W.H. 2001. Micro melting pots. *American Demographics* 23:20-23.
- Frey, W.H., and K.-L. Liaw. 1999. Internal migration of foreign-born Latinos and Asians: Are they assimilating geographically? In *Migration and Restructuring in the United States: A Geographic Perspective*, ed. K. Pandit and S. Davies Withers, 212-30. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Funkhouser, E. 2000. Changes in the geographic concentration and location of residence of immigrants. *International Migration Review* 34:489-510.

- Gober, P. 1999. Settlement dynamics and internal migration of the US foreign-born population. In *Migration and Restructuring in the United States: A Geographic Perspective*, ed. K. Pandit and S. Davies Withers, 231-49. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Gould, W.T.S., and A.M. Findlay. 1994. Population movements from the Third World to the developed world: Recent trends and current issues. In *Population Migration and the Changing World Order*, 115-25. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Griffith, D. 1995. Hay trabajo: Poultry processing, rural industrialization, and the Latinization of low-wage labor. In *Anyway You Cut It: Meat Processing and Small Town America*, ed. D.D. Stull, M.J. Broadway, and D. Griffith, 129-51. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Haverluk, T.W. 1997. The changing geography of US Hispanics, 1850-1990. *Journal of Geography* 96:134-45.
- Hempstead, K., 2001. Immigration, migration, and state redistributive expenditures. *Growth and Change* 32:23-42.
- Hernandez-Leon, R., and V. Zuniga. 2000. Making carpet by the mile: The emergence of a Mexican immigrant community in an industrial region of the US historic South. *Social Science Quarterly* 81:48-66.
- Hobbs, D., and R. Weagley. 1995. The agricultures of the Midwest and their demographic and economic environments. In *Beyond the Amber Waves of Grain: An Examination of Social and Economic Restructuring in the Heartland*, ed. P. Lasley, 29-52. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Horowitz, R., and M.J. Miller. 1999. Immigrants in the Delmarva poultry processing industry: The changing face of Georgetown, Delaware and environs. *Julian Samora Research Institute Research and Publications Occasional Paper Series*, 37.
- Jenson, L. 2001. The demographic diversity of immigrants and their children. In *Ethnicities: Children of Immigrants in America*, ed. R.G. Rumbaut and A. Portes, 21-56. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Johnson, J.H., K.D. Johnson-Webb, and W.C. Farrell Jr. 1999. Newly emerging Hispanic communities in the United States: A spatial analysis of settlement patterns, in-migration fields, and social receptivity. In *Immigration and Opportunity: Race, Ethnicity, and Employment in the United States*, ed. F.D. Bean and S. Bell-Rose, 263-310. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Johnson, T.G. 2001. The rural economy in a new century. *International Regional Science Review* 1:21-37.

- Kale, S. 1975. Small-town population change in the central Great Plains: An investigation of recent trends. *Rocky Mountain Social Science Journal*. 12:29-43.
- Kent, M.M., K.M. Pollard, and J. Mather. 2001. First glimpses from the 2000 US census. *Population Bulletin* 56:3-39.
- Kitano, H.H.L., and R. Daniels. 2001. *Asian Americans: Emerging Minorities*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kritz, M.M., and D.T. Gurak. 2001. The impact of immigration on the internal migration of natives and immigrants. *Demography* 38:133-45.
- Leonard, K.I. 1997. The new South Asian immigrants. In *The South Asian Americans*, 67-105. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Liaw, K.-L., and W.H. Frey. 1998. Destination choices of the 1985-1990 young adult immigrants to the United States: Importance of race, educational attainment, and labour market forces. *International Journal of Population Geography* 4:49-61.
- Lieberson, S., and M.C. Waters. 1989. The location of ethnic and racial groups in the United States. In *Demography as an Interdiscipline*, ed. J.M. Stycos, 162-92. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Logan, J.R., R.D. Alba, M. Dill, and M. Zhou. 2000. Ethnic segmentation in the American metropolis: Increasing divergence in economic incorporation, 1980-1990. *International Migration Review* 34:98-132.
- Logan, J.R., R.D. Alba, and W. Zhang. 2002. Immigrant enclaves and ethnic communities in New York and Los Angeles. *American Sociological Review* 67:299-322.
- Lott, J.T. 1997. Demographic changes transforming the Filipino American community. In *Filipino Americans: Transformation and Identity*, ed. M. Root, 11-20. London: Sage Publications.
- Manson, G.A., and R.E. Groop. 2000. US intercounty migration in the 1990s: People and income move down the urban hierarchy. *Professional Geographer* 52:493-504.
- Martin, P., J.E. Taylor, and M. Fix. 1996. Immigration and the changing face of rural America: Focus on the midwestern states. *JSRI Research and Publications Occasional Paper Series*, no. 21.
- McHugh, K.E. 1989. Hispanic migration and population redistribution in the United States. *Professional Geographer* 41:429-39.
- Murdock, S.H. 1996. The labor force: Implications for America's competitiveness. In *An America Challenged: Population Change and the Future of the United States*, 57-87. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Neuman, K.E., and M. Tienda. 1994. The settlement and secondary migration patterns of legalized immigrants: Insights from administrative records. In *Immigration and Ethnicity: The Integration of America's Newest Arrivals*, ed. B. Edmonston and J.S. Passel. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Newbold, K.B. 1999. Spatial distribution and redistribution of immigrants in the metropolitan United States, 1980 and 1990. *Economic Geography* 33:254-71.
- Pollard, K.M., and W.P. O'Hare. 1999. America's racial and ethnic minorities. *Population Bulletin* 54:3-48.
- Rogers, A., and S. Henning. 1999. The internal migration patterns of the foreign-born and native-born populations in the United States: 1975-80 and 1985-90. *International Migration Review* 33:403-29.
- Saenz, R. 1991. Interregional migration patterns of Chicanos: The core, periphery and frontier. *Social Science Quarterly* 72:135-48.
- Saenz, R., and C.M. Cready. 1996. The Southwest-Midwest Mexican American migration flows, 1985-1990. *Julian Samora Research Institute Research and Publications Institute Research Reports*.
- Sutter, V.O. 1990. *The Indochinese Refugee Dilemma*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- US Bureau of the Census. 1992. *General Population Characteristics 1990: Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota*. Washington, DC: US Bureau of the Census.
- US Bureau of the Census. 2001. *Profiles of General Demographic Characteristics. 2000 Census of Population and Housing: Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota*. Washington, DC: US Bureau of the Census.
- Walker, R., and M. Hannan. 1989. Dynamic settlement processes: The case of US immigration. *Professional Geographer* 41:172-83.
- Zavodny, M. 1999. Determinants of recent immigrants' locational choices. *International Migration Review* 33:1014-30.
- Zhou, M. 2002. The changing face of America: Immigration, race/ethnicity, and social mobility. In *Mass Migration to the United States: Classical and Contemporary Periods*, ed. P.G. Min. New York: Alta Mira Press.