Greater Boston is in the midst of a striking transformation. Over the past few decades, our economy has expanded, and our population has grown. And while our region has long had a reputation for being overwhelmingly white, this perception lags far behind reality. Nearly all of our recent population growth has been driven by immigrants, particularly immigrants of color, who have decided to call our region home. These demographic changes have occurred across the Commonwealth, but in Greater Boston these trends are especially pronounced.

This report unites lead researchers from the four free-standing research institutes at UMass Boston dedicated to the major communities of color (the Trotter Institute, the Gastón Institute, the Institute for Asian American Studies and the Institute for New England Native American Studies); the Economic and Public Policy Research team at the UMass Donahue Institute; and Boston Indicators, the research center at the Boston Foundation. Together we take an in-depth look at how the opportunities and challenges of rapidly changing demographics are playing out in our region today.

Inquiries related to race and Boston are nothing new. One might reasonably ask, therefore, how is this treatment of race different from so many others? First, past treatments of race have often been siloed to a single racial or ethnic group. This report considers four of these groups in detail, including, importantly, Native Americans who are commonly absent from other analyses. We also detail rich diversity within groups (i.e., disaggregating by nation of origin or ancestry), not just across them.

Second, this report puts a keen emphasis on place. What are our region’s new residential patterns and why? We maintain a central focus on Boston’s neighborhoods, and we accompany that focus with an examination of changes in the city’s exurbs and suburbs. Each section looks closely at region-wide trends within one racial group and then offers a close-up of these trends by conducting case studies of two specific geographies—one neighborhood within Boston and one city or town elsewhere in the region. A final section takes this same approach but focuses on “newly diverse communities” that have recently evolved from being predominantly white to having rich racial diversity across multiple groups. This final section also details rapid growth in the share of people and households who identify as multiracial.

Despite Greater Boston’s upward trends in population and economic growth, the positive effects of such growth are not felt evenly by all population groups or geographies. With that in mind, this report examines some of the inequalities that remain for people of color in terms of political representation, housing and educational attainment and income. The relative shares of people of color in leadership roles remain troublingly low, for example. The prohibitively high cost of housing in Greater Boston makes home ownership difficult for many, and is driving many low- and middle-income people out of the city. And while most racial groups have seen some gains in education and income, the pace of these gains varies significantly.

To appreciate (and enhance) what is changing for the better, and to address doggedly persistent opportunity gaps across the full demographic spectrum, we must consider the multifarious environs within the city of Boston and the Greater Boston region as well. The rest of this first section sets the stage for that, analyzing these demographic and socio-economic changes within a broader regional context.
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DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGE IN MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts has experienced steady population growth since 1990. The engine of this growth has been increases in the state’s non-white population. From 1990 to 2017, the state’s Latino population grew from under 5 to nearly 12 percent, the Asian American population grew from just over 2 to 6.6 percent and the black population from 4.6 to 7 percent.

While the whole state has gotten more diverse over this timeframe, much of this increasing diversity has been concentrated in Greater Boston, as shown in the two maps below. In 1990, Massachusetts had no cities or towns where the majority of residents were people of color. By 2017, 12 communities in Massachusetts were majority people of color.

Because most of the state’s racial and ethnic diversity is concentrated in eastern Massachusetts, we focus this report on analyzing how these rapid changes have played out within the Greater Boston region. Interestingly, while the region overall has gotten more diverse, the most significant demographic change that’s taken place in Greater Boston has been highly concentrated in the cities and towns that surround the city of Boston.

Boston suburbs that were once predominantly white have recently experienced dramatic growth among their populations of color, as shown in Figure 1.2. Cities that significantly increased in racial diversity form a dark blue ring around Boston, traversing places like Chelsea, Revere and Malden to the north, Waltham to the west, and continuing down the Route 128 corridor through Newton and Dedham, and extending south to Randolph and Brockton. In fact, outside of Boston the region’s non-white population grew 245 percent since 1990 compared to just 64 percent within Boston. Remarkably, not a single municipality in Greater Boston experienced an increase in its white population share from 1990 to 2017.

FIGURE 1.1
Massachusetts’ growing racial diversity has been concentrated in Greater Boston.

The non-white population share of every city and town in the region has increased since 1990, and more so in many suburbs than in Boston itself.

Percentage point increase in non-white population share. 1990 to 2017.


In the city of Boston, a similar trend emerges, with substantial growth in communities of color citywide, but growth that is especially concentrated in outlying neighborhoods. A cluster of core neighborhoods extending from Downtown through the South End and into Mission Hill and Jamaica Plain have seen a decline in people of color. This very likely is a result of an influx of young white professionals that parallels the gentrification and displacement of communities of color (Figure 1.3).

For interactive versions of these maps, please view this report online at www.bostonindicators.org.
In aggregate, Greater Boston grew by roughly 530,000 residents since 1990, and, as shown in Figure 1.4, this growth has been driven almost entirely by increases in non-white immigrants. Over this time period, the Asian American and Latino populations grew by 227 and 191 percent, respectively; with the addition of more than 256,000 Asian Americans and nearly 350,000 Latinos since 1990.

Over the same time period, we’ve experienced a sharp decline of nearly 350,000 white people. Because whites have been the dominant racial group in our region for decades, we do not have a separate section of this report analyzing these changes in more detail. But there’s no doubt that a key part of the story of our region’s changing demographics is the decline in the white population. This decline is driven by two trends: 1) more white people moving away from our region than coming here; and 2) white deaths now outnumbering white births. White deaths outnumbering births is actually an increasing national trend. Back in 2000 white deaths outnumbered white births in only four states. By 2016, white deaths outnumbered white births nationwide, and this was the case in 26 individual states. White deaths have outnumbered white births in Massachusetts every year since 2011.1

Even with these declines, whites remain the single largest racial group in our region, but they’re no longer a majority of Boston, having declined from 59 percent in 1990 to 44 percent in 2017 (Figure 1.5).

Breaking down these population changes by place of birth, instead of by race, as we do on the right-hand portion of Figure 1.4, demonstrates that nearly all of our region’s new population growth since 1990—90.8 percent—has come from international immigration to the region. Today, more than a quarter of the city of Boston (28 percent) is foreign-born, as is 19 percent of the full region.

While these numbers represent striking change over a short timeframe, it’s helpful to keep these changes in a broader historical context. Boston’s current 28 percent foreign-born share is not even a high water mark for the city. Back around the turn of the 20th century, more than a third of the city was foreign-born, as shown in Figure 1.6. After a slowing of immigration during the mid-20th century—due to earlier federal immigration restrictions and repeated global shocks like the Great Depression and two world wars—immigration to the United States, and to our region in particular, has returned close to these earlier levels.

One significant change in recent years has to do with where in the world new immigrants are coming from. Not only has the number of new immigrants to Greater Boston increased sharply in the past few decades, but immigrants are also coming from a broader cross section of the world. In 1990, six out of the top 10 countries of origin were in Europe; in 2017, no European country made the top 10 (Figure 1.7). Notably, residents from China, the Dominican Republic, India and Brazil make up much larger portions of the population today than they did in 1990.

There’s also wide variation across racial groups in terms of their respective shares of new immigrants. More than two-thirds (70 percent) of Asian Americans living in Greater Boston as of 2017 were foreign-born, a share that’s much higher than for any other group.
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FIGURE 1.6

Immigrants have long been central to Boston’s identity.
Foreign-born share of Boston’s population.

![Graph showing the foreign-born share of Boston's population from 1850 to 2020. The percentage ranges from 0% to 40%, with notable peaks in the 1910s and 1920s.]


FIGURE 1.7

But, where immigrants come from has been changing: In 1990, six of the top 10 countries of origin were from Europe; in 2017, no European country made the top 10.
Top 10 countries of origin for foreign-born residents. Greater Boston.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>34,608</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>China*</td>
<td>79,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>31,590</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>78,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>22,095</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>66,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>China*</td>
<td>18,556</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>54,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>18,332</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>53,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>18,044</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>31,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>16,612</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>29,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Russia/Other USSR</td>
<td>12,631</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>29,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>11,041</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>22,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>10,404</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>18,979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding Taiwan and Hong Kong

Latinos have the second-highest foreign-born share, at 39 percent. Smaller shares of our region’s white and black populations today are foreign-born, although this is changing rapidly for the black population. With increased immigration coming from countries like Haiti, Cape Verde and Jamaica, our region’s foreign-born share of the black population has almost doubled since 1990, increasing from 21 to 38 percent. Native American ties to Massachusetts go back centuries, even millennia; the larger community of Indigenous Peoples, however, has seen some immigration by Native People from Central and South America, and a longer-standing connection with First Nations from the Canadian Maritimes.

Despite the tremendous benefits of Greater Boston’s growing racial and ethnic diversity, significant challenges remain. Many people are reluctantly moving further outside of the city, in part because of rising housing costs in the urban core; large income and education gaps persist across groups; and representation by our local institutions of power often lags this new racial and ethnic diversity. In order to dig deeper into these trends, the bulk of this report analyzes how this rapid demographic change has been experienced across a few key dimensions:
1) Residential Patterns
2) Socioeconomic Conditions
3) Political, Business and Civic Representation

For the remainder of this overview section, we briefly consider change along these dimensions at the regional level. We then dive much deeper throughout the rest of this report into how these dynamics are playing out within different racial groups and several case study communities.

RESIDENTIAL PATTERNS

As shown earlier, not only is the city of Boston getting more diverse but many of the inner ring suburbs are as well. In fact, the pace of change is even greater for some of these cities and towns than it is for Boston. Take Malden, for instance, which we profile in the Newly Diverse Communities in Greater Boston section of this report. Back in 1990 Malden was almost 90 percent white. Today it represents a rich mix across different racial and immigrant groups. Malden is now 49 percent white, 23 percent Asian, 15 percent black and 10 percent Latino. Malden is also now 43 percent foreign-born.

A key reason why inner ring suburbs are diversifying so quickly is that housing costs have soared in the city core (Figure 1.8). Over the past decade, housing costs have risen throughout Massachusetts, but because they’ve risen most dramatically within Boston proper, many groups have ended up dispersing further out into the Greater Boston region.

People also often move out of Boston in order to purchase a larger home, especially when starting a family. And for those who own a home, the value of this home is often their single most valuable asset. As our region has diversified over the past 26 years, homeownership rates among communities of color have ticked upwards. While these modest increases represent some real progress, white households still own homes at the highest rates of any group. In 2017, 64 percent of white households in Greater Boston owned a home, more than twice the rates for black and Latino households (Figure 1.9).

Since more white families have higher incomes, one might expect them to own homes at higher rates. But it turns out that gaps in homeownership exist even when comparing households at similar income levels. More than two-thirds of middle-income (between $62,000 and $93,000/year) white households own homes in Greater Boston, while only about half of middle-income black, Asian American and Latino households do. This
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Homeownership gaps have become a self-perpetuating cycle, where families that own homes are able to pass that wealth on to their children, making it more likely that the next generation will also be homeowners, even if they themselves are in lower-paying jobs. And previous generations of white households were more likely to benefit from proactive wealth-building programs—like the GI Bill and targeted home lending programs—that were often less available to, and sometimes directly withheld from, non-white households.

Today, wealth-building programs are less directly racially discriminatory, but significant bias remains. The Massachusetts Community and Banking Council’s...
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(MCBC) annual report on home lending by race in Massachusetts found that in 2017, home loan denial rates in Greater Boston were much higher for blacks and Latinos than for whites. These gaps remain even when looking just at applicants of similar income levels. The MCBC report also found a high concentration of home loans granted to black and Latino buyers in just a few select Massachusetts cities and towns. Brockton is perhaps the most striking example in the report, accounting for 18.8 percent of all home loans to black borrowers statewide, even though Brockton accounts for just 1.7 percent of total statewide loans (Figure 1.10). This 18.8 percent share reflects a number of home loans going to new African American borrowers that is almost twice that in Boston, even though Boston is seven times larger than Brockton. Randolph, which is right next to Brockton, is also in the top five statewide in terms of its share of home loans going to black households. This data confirms findings from the African Americans in Greater Boston section of this report: an emerging cluster of African American families south of Boston, moving there to find affordable home ownership opportunities.

FIGURE 1.10
Non-white mortgages are concentrated in a few Massachusetts locations.

*1 in 5 home loans to African Americans in MA went to Brockton.
*This is almost 2x the number of loans for African Americans in Boston, which is seven times larger than Brockton.

SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS

As Greater Boston has grown more racially diverse, it has also grown more socio-economically polarized. Throughout this report we analyze polarization in terms of income levels and educational attainment and we track these trends both across racial groups and within them. Here we look at disparities in education, which persist across racial groups. While nearly 60 percent of Asian American adults and more than half of white adults have earned at least a bachelor’s degree, the share of Native American, black and Latino adults with that level of education is under 25 percent. Moreover, disparities in educational achievement between Asian Americans and whites and all other racial groups have increased in recent decades. The share of whites and Asian Americans with a bachelor’s degree or more has increased between 15 and 19 percentage points since 1990. The share of blacks, Latinos, and Native Americans with college degrees also increased, but by significantly less (Figure 1.11).

While in the aggregate Greater Boston is quite highly educated compared with other metro areas in the U.S., there are interesting patterns in educational attainment with the region’s foreign-born population. Greater Boston has a high concentration of immigrants who never earned a high school diploma and a large share of immigrants with a college degree or more. As shown in Figure 1.12 on the next page, foreign-born residents are roughly four times as likely as U.S.-born residents to have never finished high school. But that gap is much smaller for people with a bachelor’s degree or more. In fact, at 39.1 percent, our share of foreign-born residents with a college degree is significantly higher than this share for both native-born and foreign-born residents nationwide (31 and 32 percent, respectively). This is, in part, driven by the concentration of colleges and universities and high skill industries in the region.

Because higher levels of educational attainment often lead to higher incomes, it’s not surprising to see that our region has huge variations in income across groups. The growth of the knowledge and innovation economy in
recent decades, among other factors, has led to greater wage polarization in our economy. In Massachusetts, the median annual income for full-time workers with a bachelor’s degree outstripped that for workers with a high school diploma by $26,419 in 2017. Our analysis shows that income inequality has grown between racial and ethnic groups in the region since 1990. For many in the region, household income has remained either relatively stagnant or has fallen, while white households in both Boston and Greater Boston have seen median income increase by approximately $30,000 and $12,000, respectively (inflation adjusted).

Geography also plays a role in the income disparity within racial groups. Households in Greater Boston, which includes several affluent suburban communities, tend to have higher incomes than households in the city. This trend is particularly noteworthy among Asian American households. Asian Americans living in the suburbs tend to be much more affluent, earning more than double what they earn within the city limits.

While income varies across racial groups, it also varies significantly within these broad, often problematically defined, categories. In order to demonstrate these differences across races and within them, Figure 1.13 compares median household incomes for three Census-defined racial categories (White, Native American and Multiracial) and for nine other ancestry groups, representing three subsets within the African American, Latino and Asian American categories. Striking differences emerge. Over 80 percent of people

---

**FIGURE I.11**

**Educational attainment increased for all, but unevenly.**
Bachelor’s degree holders vs. those with less than a high school diploma. Greater Boston. 1990 and 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greater Boston has a large share of immigrants who never earned a high school degree and a relatively large share of immigrants with a college degree.


![Figure 1.12](image)


Income varies widely by race and ancestry.

Median household income for select race (in teal) and ancestry (in blue) groups. Greater Boston. 2017.

![Figure 1.13](image)

Source: 2017 American Community Survey.
families have much longer-standing roots in the U.S., often back to periods of Jim Crow and slavery). And Latino households in Greater Boston with ancestry in Mexico make more than twice what Puerto Rican households make.

Each of the subsequent sections of this report dives deep into similar examples of these wide intra-group differences.

**POLITICAL, BUSINESS AND CIVIC REPRESENTATION**

Another key theme we explore throughout this report is the concept of representation, analyzing how well institutions of authority are reflecting the new demographic composition of our communities. In some places we provide data comparing the racial composition of a given community with the racial composition of leadership within important institutions. In other places, especially throughout the case studies, we provide qualitative discussion of how representative communities feel on the ground.

In broad strokes we find that these institutions are lagging behind our region’s new racial diversity, often to troubling degrees. But we have seen some progress. Boston’s City Council has gotten significantly more diverse in recent terms, and some communities have increasingly strong nonprofit infrastructures providing critical supports in neighborhoods that are changing rapidly. Based on our local case studies it appears that elected leadership, staff in city government (including important front-line staff positions like teachers and firefighters) and business leadership have all been especially slow to evolve.

Because it’s challenging to find good region-wide data on all forms of representation, here we provide a couple of examples where useful data does exist: We analyze the racial composition of people in high-level political and business leadership roles and we analyze how representative the teaching force is in our K–12 public schools.

**REPRESENTATION IN HIGH-LEVEL LEADERSHIP ROLES**

Political, business and civic leadership in Greater Boston remains far whiter than the workforce overall. To demonstrate this, we analyzed the racial distribution within the highest-level “leadership” occupations as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, which clusters legislators and chief executive officers together. This legislators/CEOs category offers one useful way of looking at who is serving in the upper echelon of leadership roles within Greater Boston. As shown in Figure 1.14, white people remain overrepresented in high-level leadership roles in Greater Boston, while other racial and ethnic groups are underrepresented. Proportionally, Latinos have the lowest shares of leaders relative to their total in the labor force.

The above Census data are useful for giving a broad sense of who is serving in high-level leadership roles, but it has limitations. It lumps elected officials in together with CEOs, and it only counts elected officials who treat this work as an occupation, thereby excluding a number of elected roles in mid-sized and smaller municipalities. Absent a definitive data source on the racial identity of elected officials at all levels of government in Greater Boston, we analyzed data from an annual report done by the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) on the racial breakdown of our state legislature. As of January 2018, white people were overrepresented among our 200 elected state legislators—white people make up 72 percent of the state population compared to 87 percent of the state legislature. African Americans only represent 3 percent of the state legislature, Latinos make up 7 percent, and Asian Americans make up 2 percent. This NCSL data is from the previous legislative session. The November 2018 elections appear to have resulted in a modest increase in the number of non-white elected legislators in Massachusetts. Political and civic representation on a more local level will be discussed in depth in each of the following sections of this report.
FIGURE 1.14
People of color are underrepresented in high-level leadership roles.

![Bar chart showing representation in city government](image)


REPRESENTATION IN CITY GOVERNMENT
As our communities change, it’s important that the people staffing city and town government reflect the residents they are hired to serve. While we lack good uniform data on the makeup of all city staff, we do have useful data on the racial composition of our local teaching forces. Teacher diversity may be an especially important element of municipal government, as children spend much of their formative years inside of public schools. Teachers of color play an important role mentoring students with similar backgrounds and they often hold non-white students to higher expectations. A growing body of evidence suggests that these factors often have positive effects on academic outcomes and self-reported feelings of being cared for; especially among students of color. One recent study of low-income African American students found that having just one African American teacher in third, fourth or fifth grade helped decrease the probability of dropping out of high school by 39 percent.iii

Unfortunately, it appears that the staff running our public schools are not representative of the new racial diversity in many of our communities. Statewide, 40 percent of public school students are non-white, but only 8 percent of teachers are non-white. The teaching forces in this report’s case study communities are especially unrepresentative. Hiring within local school departments clearly has not kept pace with the new diversity in their schools. Figure 1.15, on next page, compares the racial background of students with teachers in each of our case study cities or towns, and we focus on the specific racial groups of interest for each case study. In Brockton, for instance, 58 percent of students are African American but only 7 percent of teachers are African American.

Since our analyses discuss a range of different racial groups in Boston and Malden, the graph compares total non-white shares of teachers and students for those two communities. It’s important to note that while Boston does have a large gap between non-white

---

students and non-white teachers, it has a much larger share of non-white teachers than any other school district in Massachusetts. Cambridge Public Schools have the second highest share of non-white teachers, but far behind Boston at only 24.1 percent. Perhaps even more strikingly, the Boston Public Schools employ almost half of all African American teachers statewide (47 percent in 2018).

Recognizing how unrepresentative the Massachusetts teaching force is, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education has undertaken a couple of new initiatives to help address this problem. It’s important to stress, however, that many different institutions—government, districts, schools, cities, colleges and universities, nonprofits—must work together in order to meaningfully close representation gaps in fields like education, business, government and the nonprofit sector. Employers should more proactively recruit candidates of color and provide better mid-career support and professional development for the people currently on staff. Further, K–12 schools and colleges and universities also need to provide higher quality education to young people in the first place, so that diverse pools of prospective candidates are looking for jobs in all sectors of the economy.

The story of racial and ethnic diversity in the Greater Boston region varies just as much as the region itself. In order to gain a greater understanding of the lived experiences of people of color in the area, the UMass Boston Collaborative of Asian American, Native American, Latino and African American Institutes (CANALA) collected data and conducted interviews with stakeholders throughout Boston’s neighborhoods and cities and towns in the area. Synthesizing data with experience will create a more complete picture to allow for future work that aims to provide services and policies across disciplines and create a more equitable and prosperous region for all residents.