Several states in the Great Plains Region of the United States have experienced rapid growth of their Hispanic and Asian populations during the 1990s. Immigration, internal migration within the US, and natural increase had each contributed to this growth. This paper examines the growth of the Asian and Hispanic population in the 99 counties of Iowa between 1990 and 2000 as well as the spatial distribution of the two groups for 2000. The data are then disaggregated by ethnic subgroup and the growth rates examined for each subgroup within the Asian and Hispanic categories. Finally, the percentage of the population residing in metropolitan versus nonmetropolitan counties for 1990 and 2000 is compared for each ethnic subgroup to determine if the subgroup is becoming more or less concentrated in metropolitan areas. The results indicated that not only did Hispanics have a higher overall growth rate than their Asian counterparts during the 1990s, but they were more dispersed throughout Iowa as of 2000. The most rapidly growing Asian subgroups during the 1990s were the Indians and Vietnamese. These two groups also displayed rapid gains in the percentage of their populations residing in metropolitan counties. The Japanese population in Iowa actually experienced a decline, while Koreans, Filipinos, and Chinese grew at the Asian average. Mexicans and Other Hispanics had comparable overall growth rates and similar distributational patterns. Over the study period, the Hispanic population diffused down the urban hierarchy while Asians continued to be concentrated in metropolitan counties.
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An average American's contact with Hispanics and Asians prior to the 1980s was overwhelmingly limited to the immigrant gateway states of California, Texas, New York, New Jersey, Florida, and Illinois (Frey, 1995; Lieberson and Waters, 1989; Massey et. al., 1994). Even by 2000, it was estimated that these six states housed 70.5 percent of the immigrant population, but only 39.3 percent of the nation's total population (Camarota, 2001). Liaw and Frey (1998) found that for adult (20-34) immigrants entering the US between 1985 and 1990 that 58.9 percent of Asians and 77.0 percent of Hispanics located in one of these six states. Similarly, Zavodny (1999) examined the destination choices of recent immigrants between 1989 and 1994 and found that 69.3 percent of Chinese, 74.5 percent of Dominicans, 86.1 percent of Mexicans, 67.9 percent of Filipinos, and 58.9 percent of Vietnamese chose one of the immigrant gateway states. Outside of these six states, only the larger metropolitan areas had any significant numbers of Hispanics or Asians prior to the 1980s. However, during the past two decades, in many regions of the US previously unattractive to foreigners, a demographic amalgamation seems to be occurring where whites, Asians, and Hispanics are intermingling to a greater extent than in previous decades.

This paper will examine the distribution of the Hispanic and Asian populations by county for the state of Iowa for 1990 and 2000 (see Figure 1 for map of Iowa counties).
The purpose of this paper is not to decipher why Asians and Hispanics have chosen to migrate to Iowa, but to acknowledge the different spatial distributions of these two minority groups within the state of Iowa. The paper is divided into six sections. Section two reviews the literature related to immigration and the secondary internal migration of Asians and Hispanics within the United States as well as the effect of the meat processing industry in the Midwest and its relationship to the distribution of the Asian and Hispanic populations. Section three discusses
the methodology used in the study. Section four is devoted to the geographical distribution of Asians and Hispanics in Iowa. Suggestions for further research are presented in the conclusion. The United States Bureau of the Census (2001) has recently released the 2000 census results of the racial composition of the American population for all fifty states. Unfortunately, data concerning place of birth of the foreign born in 2000 are unavailable as of yet, and therefore it was not possible to determine when the foreign population arrived in the state of Iowa or whether their moves were internal within the United States or directly from the foreign country.

Background

Immigration and Internal Migration Patterns in the US

Several changes have occurred in the demography of the United States in the past several decades. First, the predominant source regions of immigrants have changed from Europe to Latin America and Asia (Gould and Findlay, 1994). Higher economic growth rates and lower population growth for European countries after World War II led to a decline of European immigrants while high population growth rates in Asian and Latin American countries stimulated emigration from these countries (Castles and Miller, 1993). For example, in 1950, over two-thirds of the immigrants to the United States were from Europe, 25.0 percent from the Western Hemisphere (excluding Canada), and 6.0 percent from Asia. By the 1980s, only 13.0 percent of immigrants originated from Europe, whereas 47.0 percent and 37.0 percent originated from the Western Hemisphere and Asia, respectively (Borjas, 1994). Secondly, the Caucasian population of the United States has decreased its fertility level. As a result, the labor force has grown faster than the population making it necessary for immigration and the concomitant natural increase to fuel the labor market (Farley, 1997).

The effect of immigration on regions of the US cannot be fully understood without also considering the internal migratory movements of the US born population (Frey, 1995). During the 1980s, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, Washington, and Arizona each had high migration gains from both immigration and net migration. They were therefore not only the fastest growing states, but were becoming more ethnically diverse. New York, Texas, New Jersey, Illinois, and Massachusetts suffered a net loss of internal migrants but were able to offset these losses with immigration and were thus becoming less ethnically/racially diverse. High out migration states were those that lost more internal migrants than could be recouped by immigration and included Iowa, Louisiana, Ohio, Michigan, and Oklahoma. Given the loss of internal migrants in the high out migration states, the aging of the American workforce, the restructuring of older industries in Ohio and Michigan, the decline of the oil industry in Oklahoma and Louisiana, and the conversion of family farms to large agribusinesses in Iowa, it is likely that these states will become even more reliant on immigrant labor, and thus should become more ethnically/racially diverse in the near future.

Few studies have been devoted to either the immigration to nontraditional ports of entry or the internal migration patterns of Asians and Hispanics after initial settlement in the US. Although, McHugh (1989) examined the redistribution of the Hispanic population through internal exchanges between states, he only focused on the largest flows while ignoring redistribution patterns in the Southeast (excluding Florida) and the states of the Great Plains. Harrison and Bennett (1995) in their analysis of internal migration patterns of immigrants as of 1990 found that 12.7 percent of Asians who immigrated to the United States between 1985 and 1990 had moved between states while only 6.8 percent of Hispanics were interstate movers during this period of time. However, they did not examine which states gained from this interaction. It is likely that during the 1990s, Hispanics have recorded more crossing of state borders once in the US than Asians given the
Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) which legalized approximately three million illegal aliens, most of whom were from Mexico (Baker, 1997). Durand, Massey, and Charvet (2000), one of the few studies devoted to immigration into nontraditional states, suggest that the diffusion of Mexicans between 1990 and 1996 away from California and Texas was a result of an economic recession as well as an effect of IRCA which gave Mexicans the freedom to move within the US and pursue more lucrative economic opportunities.

Rogers and Henning (1999) examined the internal migration patterns of both US-born and foreign-born Asian and Hispanic populations between the four census regions for both 1980 and 1990. The foreign-born were least likely to leave the West, and more likely to leave the other three census regions than their US-born counterparts in both 1980 and 1990. The West was also more attractive to the foreign-born leaving other census regions than for the US-born, resulting in an increased concentration in the west of the foreign-born. However, by the late 1980s, Latin American immigrants were less likely to remain in the West and more likely to remain in the Midwest, giving rise to a dispersion of the foreign-born Hispanic population throughout the US. Gober (1999) examined the distribution of twelve foreign-born groups by states as of 1985 and 1990 to determine whether they became more dispersed or concentrated over the five years. Mexicans, Filipinos, Chinese, Vietnamese, Salvadorans, Jamaicans, and Dominicans became less concentrated while Cubans, Koreans, and Indians became more concentrated. Frey and Liaw (1999) examined the internal migration of US-born and foreign-born Asians and Hispanics between 1985 and 1990 for 280 metropolitan areas. They found little evidence of geographical dispersion of any of the four groups.

Neuman and Tienda (1994) studied the secondary migration patterns of the nearly 3.0 million illegal immigrants who received amnesty in 1986. Becoming legal could likely spawn an outflow of individuals who were being protected by ethnic enclaves in the traditional ports of entry. Whereas, 60.0 percent of legal immigrants resided in the six gateway states of California, New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Florida, and Texas, 90.0 percent of those applying entered through one of these six states. For all immigrants claiming amnesty, 25.0 percent had moved to another state, and the authors argue that in general with the exception of Asians, Europeans, and Canadians, amnesty individuals were becoming more dispersed throughout the United States. One of the most significant findings is that the likelihood of participating in secondary migration increases as length of residence increases. Given the relatively short period of time since amnesty was granted, it is likely that as legalized immigrants, a percentage of them will seek opportunities outside of the state of entrance.

Asians and Hispanics in Iowa

It would appear that the 1990s has ushered in a restructuring of the traditional concentration of ethnic minorities in select locales. It seems necessary to reexamine immigrant internal migration since the 1990s given that states previously noted for the lack of immigrants such as Kansas, Iowa, South Carolina and Georgia have experienced an influx of Asians and Hispanics during the 1990s (Isserman, 2001). It is impossible to ignore the contribution of Mexican immigrants, whether legal or illegal, to many regions in the US, but equally important are the redistribution patterns of US born persons of Mexican extraction. A strong internal migration exchange of US born Mexicans had already developed between the Southwest and Midwestern/Great Plains states in the early decades of the twentieth century, but this exchange became more notable in the 1980s and early 1990s (Saenz and Cready, 1996; Haverluk, 1997, 1998).

Whether migrants are foreign or US-born, they often found opportunities in the Midwest more lucrative in the 1990s than in the traditional states of immigrant settlement. Surprisingly, Hispanics and certain Asian groups are not
attracted to employment opportunities in the agricultural sector in these states, but instead are employed in low-wage manufacturing and services (Griffith, 1995). Low unemployment rates in the Midwest, as well as outmigration of young adults as a result of the restructuring of agriculture (Hobbs and Weagley, 1995, Easterlin, 2000) have left numerous job opportunities requiring low skill levels that have attracted Hispanic and Asian migrants to the smaller cities of the Midwest and the traditionally white states such as Nebraska and Iowa.

According to Huffman and Miranowski (1996), employment opportunities in manufacturing in the Midwest were attractive to not only Hispanics but also Asians because there is less competition for these jobs in these areas than in the large ethnic enclaves of the traditional immigrant ports of entry. Additional benefits include the lower costs of living and amenities such as low crime rates.

A decline in the family farm and the growing agribusiness in Midwestern states have shifted employment from farms to low-wage labor-intensive manufacturing. One industry that lends itself well to non-unionized, low wages is the meat-packing industry. One of the problems associated with the meat-packing industry is the inability to keep the lowest paid and most hazardous jobs staffed due to a high turnover rate. Contrary to the perception that immigrants are taking jobs away from Americans in food-processing industries, the reality is that most of these jobs are not attractive to the resident population (Durrenberger and Thu, 1996; Broadway, 1995). In general, two shifts in meat-processing have occurred since 1959 (Broadway and Ward, 1990). There has been a shift away from metropolitan areas toward
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more rural areas, and away from the Midwest and the Northeast to the Great Plains and the Southeast. Drabenstatt, Henry, and Mitchell (1999) found that in the Great Plains in general there is a greater shift towards more remote rural counties for meat-packing plants during the 1990s. They attribute the new geographical shift to the search for low cost labor and the desire to be closer to the livestock herds which have undergone a general shift from the eastern cornbelt to the western cornbelt and Great Plains States. Huffman and Miranowski (1996) found that during the 1980s and early 1990s that immigrants in Iowa were not attracted to the larger cities or to rural areas during the 1980s but to nonmetropolitan counties where most of the meat processing industry was located. Employment opportunities in food industries in Iowa declined by 15.1 percent inside SMSAs and by 31.8 percent in rural counties while experiencing a 2.6 percent gain in nonmetropolitan areas.

The impact of these changes in meat packing on migration was seen by Cantu (1995) who studied a small rural community in Iowa, where the expansion of its food processing plant in the late 1980s stimulated an influx of Hispanic population. Surprisingly, most of the Hispanic migrants were legal residents of the United States who sought employment opportunities in Iowa. Martin, Taylor and Fix (1996) cite three stages of arrivals of Asians and Hispanics to Iowa: (1) in the 1970s, US born male Hispanics from either Texas or California along with immigrants from Mexico arrived; (2) in the 1980s, Asian refugee families
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arrived and Hispanic males who had arrived in the 1970s
brought their families to Iowa; and (3) illegal immigrants
arrived from Mexico through informal channels
established by friends and relatives already employed by
the plant. As a result of this process and the links set up
between migrants and friends and relatives in other areas
of the country, approximately 2,000 Hispanics and 1,000
Asians were working in food processing industries in
Iowa in the mid 1990s, representing approximately 17.0
percent of the Hispanic and 10.0 percent of the Asian
labour force in Iowa.

**Discussion**

**Overall Population Change in Iowa 1980-2000**

The percentage population change by county for
1980-1990 and 1990-2000 is examined to
provide a backdrop against which the
growth and distribution of the Asian and
Hispanic populations in Iowa can be
understood. Iowa's population decreased
by 8.3 percent from 1980 to 1990, but
rebounded by 9.1 percent during the
1990s for a total of 2,926,324 in 2000.
When disaggregated by county, 92
counties out of a total of 99 lost
population between 1980 and 1990,
whereas only 45 lost population between
1990 and 2000 (Figures 2 and 3).
Of the seven counties that
experienced growth during the 1980s,
five were clustered around the city of
Ames (Story, Dallas, Polk, Warren, and
Marion); while Johnson and Henry in the
eastern part of the state are part of the
Iowa City metropolitan area. Generally,
counties within close proximity of
Interstate 80 fared the best during the
1980s. A total of 49 counties lost between 10.0 and 17.1
percent of their 1980 populations, with the heaviest losses
occurring in the northern half of the state and the southern
tier of counties. The restructuring of agriculture to
large-scale agribusiness is reputed to be responsible for this
decline in population (Hobbs and Weagley, 1995). During
the 1990s, 44 counties recorded population growth, with
the highest growing counties, like the 1980s, located in
Ames and the Iowa City metropolitan area. The
nonmetropolitan counties of the north central part of the
state continued with the greatest population losses during
the 1990s.

**Distribution of Asian and Hispanic Populations throughout Iowa**

The turnaround in population growth during the 1990s in
Iowa was not credited to the white population which grew

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Asians</td>
<td>36635</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians</td>
<td>5641</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>6161</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2272</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>5063</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>8211</td>
<td>148.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7813</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 Percentage Growth of Asian Population in Iowa by Subgroup, 1990-2000 and Percentage of All Asians by Subgroup for 1990 and 2000*
by only 2.4 percent, but to both foreign-born and US-born Asians and Hispanics that increased by 43.8 percent and 152.6 percent, respectively, offsetting the sustained decrease in population that occurred during the 1980s. Due to the net internal out migration of the white population from Iowa, particularly of persons in the prime mobility years, more jobs were available than there were persons to fill them, and thus, Iowa now depends on immigration to supply its labor market. This process is likely to continue into the 21st century since it has been estimated that Iowa will need an additional 310,000 workers by 2010 (CNN.com, 2000).

The total gain of Hispanics for all of Iowa during the 1990s was 49,826. Every county, except Cass which lost three Hispanics during the decade, had a gain of Hispanics between 1990 and 2000 (no map included). Polk County led the gain with a total of 10,038 Hispanics. The following counties netted between 1,000 and 10,000 Hispanics between 1990 and 2000: Black Hawk (1,544); Buena Vista (2,452); Crawford (1,344); Dallas (2,156); Johnson (1,605); Linn (1,389); Louisa (1,215); Marshall (3,210); Muscatine (2,123); Pottawattamie (1,483); Scott (2,284); and Woodbury (6,873). Only four counties failed to gain at least 10 additional working age Hispanics over the decade: Cass, Ida, Mitchell, and Ringgold. The total growth of the Asian population in Iowa was only 11,159 individuals. Polk received 4,149 of these individuals (37.2 percent). Two other counties, Linn (1,156) and Scott (1,226) netted over 1,000 Asians during the 1990s. Even with
The overall growth of the Asian population in Iowa during the 1990s, it is surprising that counties actually had less Asians in 2000 than in 1990.

A better understanding of the geographical distribution of Asian population in Iowa during the 1990s, is provided by using rates instead of total numbers. Figures 4 and 5 display the Hispanic and Asian population per 1,000 persons by county for Iowa in 2000. The categories are held constant between the two groups to illustrate not only the widespread distribution of the Hispanic population in comparison to the Asian population, but also the greater number of Hispanics than Asians in most counties. The under 5 per 1,000 category consisted of 81 counties for Asians versus only 28 for Hispanics. Only ten counties had between 6-10 Asians per 1,000 persons versus 34 for Hispanics. The number of Asians per 1,000 population declines very rapidly after 10 per 1,000 persons with only 6 counties in the 11-25 and three counties in the 26-50 category in comparison to 25 and six counties for Hispanics in these two categories, respectively. The Hispanic population has an additional category, the 51-75 range, which includes Muscatine (70.1), Louisa (71.6), Marshall (50.9), Crawford (56.7), Woodbury(52.5), and Buena Vista (74.6). Contrary to expectations, only Muscatine and Woodbury are classified as metropolitan counties signifying the attraction of Hispanics to nonmetropolitan counties. For Asians, Buena Vista (28.9), Story (41.9), and Johnson (33.0) show the highest concentrations although these numbers are well below the highest for the Hispanics. No area of the state stands out as a low concentration of Hispanics, signifying a more dispersed population than Asians in Iowa.
Tables 1 and 2 display the growth of the Asian and Hispanic population in Iowa disaggregated by ethnic group between 1990 and 2000. For Asians, the Vietnamese (148.8%) experienced the greatest growth followed by Indians (86.7%). Japanese (-9.0%) was the only group to experience a decline in population during the 1990s, and was most likely a result of the overall decline in Japanese immigration since the 1940s. In contrast, Indians have made a substantial increase in immigration since the 1960s. However, unlike their Chinese, Filipino, and Korean counterparts who have had a history of immigration predating the 1960s, Indian immigration to the United States is a relatively recent phenomenon (Leonard, 1997). In addition, Indians tend to have higher educational levels than any of the other Asian groups, and may therefore be more likely to seek out employment opportunities in states that have traditionally been overlooked by other Asian groups. The spectacular increase in the Vietnamese population is more likely a result of relocation from within the US than a transfusion of new immigrants given that most Vietnamese were refugees who settled in the US in the 1970s.

As a result of the rapid increase of Indians and Vietnamese during the 1990s, both of these groups captured a greater percentage of the Asian population in Iowa by 2000 (Tables 1 and 2). Vietnamese, the fourth largest Asian group in 1990 (11.3% of Asians in Iowa) became the largest group in 2000 (19.6%). Indians remained at third place but increased their representation from 11.9 percent of all Asians in 1990 to 15.4 percent in 2000. Mexicans and Other Hispanics experienced comparable growth rates, 150.8 and 158.1 percent, respectively, between 1990 and 2000 suggesting that the factors responsible for the growth processes were the same for the two groups. However, without data on actual migration and fertility for Mexicans and Other Hispanics, this is for now speculative. As a result of the comparable population growth rates for Mexicans and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Hispanics</td>
<td>82,473</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>61,154</td>
<td>150.8</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanics</td>
<td>21,219</td>
<td>158.1</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Percentage Growth of Hispanic Population in Iowa by Subgroup, 1990-2000 and Percentage of All Hispanics by Subgroup for 1990 and 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Metro 1990</th>
<th>Metro 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Asians</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Hispanics</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanics</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Percentage of Population Located in Iowa by County Type for White, Asian, and Hispanic Population for 1990 and 2000
Other Hispanics during the 1990s, the ethnic composition of the Hispanic population in Iowa remained largely unchanged between 1990 and 2000. Mexicans accounted for 74.6 percent of the 1990 Hispanic population in Iowa and 74.2 percent in 2000.

**Distribution by Metropolitan versus Nonmetropolitan Counties**

The white, Hispanic and Asian population for both 1990 and 2000 are displayed in Table 3. In 2000, only 44.0 percent of the white population was found in the ten metropolitan counties of Black Hawk, Dallas, Dubuque, Johnson, Linn, Polk, Pottawattamie, Scott, Warren, and Woodbury, whereas 56.8 and 67.4 percent of the Hispanic and Asian population was located, respectively. Separate trends concerning the distribution of the population by county status are evident for each of the three groups. Whites maintained a stabilized percentage of population in both types of counties between 1990 and 2000. The shift from an agricultural to an urban lifestyle would have been mostly complete by the 1990s. Asians became slightly more concentrated in metropolitan counties during the 1990s, while Hispanics dispersed down the urban hierarchy.

The increased concentration of Asians in metropolitan areas may be a result of recent immigration to the United States. Hispanics have had a longer residence time in the United States and would more likely be US citizens than their Asian counterparts, thereby having a longer time to disperse from ethnic enclaves in the metropolitan counties. Whereas, 72.0 percent of Asians in Iowa in 1990 were of foreign-birth, only 19.4 percent of the Hispanic population in Iowa was foreign-born (US Bureau of the Census, 1992). Metropolitan counties have large populations (at least in the central county), tend to have more diversified economic structures, higher incomes, and opportunities for education as well as other amenities. Moreover, Asians are more likely to have the skills or educational levels that allow them to compete more favorably in the labor market than the average Hispanic (Borjas, 1994; Cheng and Yang, 1998). In addition, the turnover in Asian population may be quite substantial, particularly in smaller university towns, while Hispanics who have moved to a metropolitan area to be close to friends and relatives may later move down the urban hierarchy.

When the Asian and Hispanic populations are further disaggregated by ethnic group, Vietnamese (89.5%) had the highest percentage of their population in 2000 residing in metropolitan counties, followed by Indians with 69.3 percent. More impressively, these two groups only had 63.8 and 56.6 percent, respectively, of their 1990 populations residing in metropolitan counties. It is most likely that in the case of the Vietnamese, those new arrivals in Iowa, as well as perhaps some Vietnamese residing in nonmetropolitan counties in 1990, went to the metropolitan counties where ethnic enclaves were already established. For the Indian population, the increased percentage of the population residing in metropolitan areas may have more to do with increased growth in professional occupations and to increased enrollments at the University of Iowa and Iowa State University. Between 1990 and 2000, Chinese, Filipino, and Japanese maintained comparable percentages of their populations residing in metropolitan areas (within 2.0 percent), whereas, Koreans experienced a 4.9 percent increase. Mexicans and Other Hispanics only had 56.0 and 59.2 percent, respectively, of their 2000 populations located in metropolitan counties, and both of these groups experienced a slight decline in metropolitan populations between 1990 and 2000. It is likely that Mexicans, who have had a longer residence time in Iowa than other groups, have diffused down the urban hierarchy. For other Hispanics, it may be that nonmetropolitan counties with large numbers of Mexicans would also provide a base for other members of the Hispanic population. Hispanics would be likely to move
into counties where lower-skilled employment opportunities were readily available (Farley, 1997; Waters and Eschback, 1995).

**Conclusion**

Asians and Hispanics were found as of 2000 in every county of Iowa. However, Hispanics were more successful at filtering down the urban hierarchy than Asians who continued to concentrate in metropolitan counties. It must be remembered that this analysis is a crude interpretation of data for racial groups by urban-rural residence as well as a general distribution by county, and in no way is suggestive of a dissimilarity index applied to certain residential areas within a community (for example Massey and Fischer, 1999). Ethnic enclaves in cities often have their own informal economies that provide employment opportunities for minorities and immigrants.

Future research needs to be done in other regions of the United States that have been experiencing increased immigration since the 1990s of ethnic groups previously under represented to determine what aggregate characteristics of these regions are attractive to different groups. One case study of a city in Georgia offers an example. Mexicans had been moving to this city since the late 1980s to work in the carpet and poultry industries and have transformed the ethnic composition of neighborhoods, the workforce, and the school system in little over a decade (Hernandez-Leon and Zuniga, 2000). Another case study involving the poultry processing industry was undertaken by Horowitz and Miller, (1999) in a small town in Delaware. This industry typically relied on African-Americans until the late 1980s when jobs in the tourist industry lured African-Americans away from this type of work. The poultry processing jobs attracted Mexicans and Guatemalans and within a decade the small town was transformed into a Hispanic enclave. Perhaps even more importantly, additional studies need to be conducted using individual characteristics of Asians and Hispanics to gain an understanding of what motivates different individuals to move to nontraditional regions and how these individuals differ from those who remain in ethnic enclaves of the traditional receiving states of the immigrant population.
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