Onward Migration Differentials Among Hispanics and non-Hispanic Blacks and Whites

by

Beth A. Wilson

Western Carolina University

Department of Anthropology and Sociology

McKee 101

Cullowhee, NC 28723-9646

bwilson@wcu.edu

(828) 227-7268

Michael B. Toney, E. Helen Berry

Utah State University

Population Research Laboratory

0730 Old Main Hill

Logan, UT 84332-0730

mtoney@hass.usu.edu, eberry@hass.usu.edu

(435) 797-1230

Although movement to new and unfamiliar places is prominent in the conceptualization of migration, few studies have focused resolutely on this form of migration, referred to as onward migration. A larger body of research is focused on return migration, or the movement back to familiar places. This study utilizes the NLSY79 to build on the earlier panel based investigation of repeat migration by DaVanzo and Morrison, whose data did not allow for analysis of possible racial/ethnic differences in forms of repeat migration. Multivariable logistic regression is utilized to compare rates of onward migrations for Hispanics, non-Hispanic blacks and non-Hispanic whites while controlling other socio-economic and demographic variables. The most important finding of this study is significantly lower rates of onward migration for blacks and Hispanics than for whites.

INTRODUCTION

Migrants can be identified as internal or international; legal or illegal; voluntary or involuntary; or any number of other categories. When classified by number of moves, they are called either "primary" or "repeat," with primary migrants being those who make their first move away from their place of birth, but thereafter any further moves make the individual a repeat migrant. If the individual returns to their place of birth, or another place in which they have previously lived, they become return migrants; those whose repeat movement takes them to new and unfamiliar destinations are referred to as onward migrants (DaVanzo and Morrison 1981; Newbold 1997). This study is concerned with this onward form of migration. A larger body of research has focused on return migration than on onward migration with a sizeable amount of it focused on returns to the South by blacks (Falk, Hunt and Hunt 2004; Tolnay 2003; Long and Hansen 1977). However, national panel data based research on differences by race/ethnicity of onward migration, has been largely lacking due to the lack of suitable longitudinal data sets. This research compares the propensities of Hispanics, blacks and whites for onward migration. These comparisons are important because, as a large body of research, beginning with Goldscheider and Uhlenberg (1969) has shown, minority status alone may influence behavior. If there are differences between majority and minority groups when one controls for all other important determinants of onward migration, then minority status is a likely influence on the behavior, perhaps due to the unique historical and contextual experiences of the groups.

THEORETICAL FOCUS

Research classifies both onward and return migrants under the umbrella term, "repeat migrants," and it is repeat migration that accounts for most voluntary migrations within countries (DaVanzo and Morrison 1981; Goldstein 1964). DaVanzo and Morrison (1981)

found that 74 percent of all migrations in the United States were repeat migrations and that 45 percent of all migrations, and 64 percent of repeat migrations, were onward migrations. Onward migrations are distinct, and merit some focal attention, as do primary and return migration. Lee's classic description of the push-pull model of migration explains that a large proportion of migrants are moving to unfamiliar places, and that different groups are likely to have different rates of certain types of migration because push and pull factors are not equally relevant to all groups (1966).

The complexity of migration is reflected in research on repeat migration, which finds substantial differences in socioeconomic characteristics between individuals who never migrate, migrants who stay at their new locations, primary, onward, and return migrants. These findings also indicate a need for research that deals with each migration type separately, as well as for additional research that compares primary, onward, and return migration. Differences between the forms of migrants may result from a number of factors. Through a process of repeated selection, migrants who move onward should differ from those who do not in their motives, characteristics, and circumstances (DaVanzo and Morrison 1981). Shumway and Hall (1996) also find significant differences between return and onward migrants with respect to individual and location characteristics. DaVanzo and Morrison (1981) note that migration is a learning experience that helps shape whether an individual will migrate again, and whether the migration will be onward.

Generally, as with initial or primary migration, prior migrants who anticipate positive net benefits of migrating again are more likely to make a repeat migration (DaVanzo and Morrison 1981; Sjaastad 1962). DaVanzo and Morrison (1981) showed onward migrants to be younger, better educated, more highly skilled and better informed about opportunities and amenities at an array of possible destinations than are other migrants, or migrants who stay at their new locations. Further, at least for migrations

after short durations, the most educated were most prone to favor a new destination, while the less educated tended to retreat to areas where they lived before, and were likeliest to return migrate quickly. In other words, onward migrants are different from return migrants, and from former migrants who do not migrate again.

Much evidence indicates that migration is learned. Kandel and Massey (2002) document a culture of migration within which migration to the U.S. becomes a right of passage to adulthood in many Mexican communities. It is all but a truism that migration provides a means for individuals to attempt to escape less desirable local conditions (e. g. unemployment, environmental hazards, discrimination) and/or to seek opportunities in nearby or distant locations. As such, migration may be genuinely viewed as an adjustment of individuals to differential opportunity levels, with opportunities defined broadly to include the economic and social structure of places. If members of some groups are spatially separated from areas of greatest opportunities, or concentrated in areas with limited opportunities, their prospects for social mobility are limited. The question of why some migrants continue moving suggests options beyond merely a failed initial migration. As suggested by (Morrison and DaVanzo 1986) perhaps each move is merely a stage in a process that aims at arriving at a destination not yet achieved by any prior move.

WHY RACE/ETHNICITY?

Although results have been somewhat mixed, empirical studies show there are differences in the migration patterns of blacks, Hispanics, and whites (Long and Hansen 1977; Tarver and McLeod 1976). These differences are due to structural factors such as industrialization and war, as well as individual characteristics such as educational attainment, age and income level. Newbold (1997) compares primary, return and onward migration patterns of blacks and whites based on census data, and finds similarities with

respect to Southern and Western state migration patterns. However, this work cites data limitations, and does not include controls for factors such as education, which are known to influence the relationship between race and migration.

Examining census data from 1850 through 1990, Rosenbloom and Sundstrum (2001) find that black interstate migration in the U.S. only exceeded that of whites during the 1940s. South and Crowder (1997) assert that blacks are less likely than whites to move from cities to suburbs, while blacks are more likely to move from suburbs to cities, although it has also long been known that blacks are more likely than whites to move within urban areas but less likely to move longer distances. Correspondingly, Hispanics are more likely to live in metropolitan settings than whites (Therrien and Ramirez 2001). According to 2000 census data, more than 46 percent of Hispanics live within metropolitan areas.

Recent research shows young and more educated Southern blacks to be likely to be make return migrations, rather than to make onward or non-repeat migrations (Adelman, Morrett and Tolnay 2000; Falk, et al. 2004). Falk and colleagues' work claims that the pattern of black return migration to the South is not one that reflects major structural transformations in the larger society, but is movement that follows from the characteristics of personal situations that motivate a return to home. Less is known about the national migration patterns of the U.S. Hispanic population, despite the fact that their international migration behaviors are well documented. One study, Wilson-Figueroa, Berry and Toney (1991), finds Hispanic youth with higher socioeconomic backgrounds, who reside in counties with high rates of poverty, are less likely to migrate than high status Hispanic youth living in more prosperous areas. Their research suggests there are influences other than human capital and poverty triggering migration among this population.

The purpose of this study is to assess whether rates of onward migration differ among non-Hispanic blacks, Hispanics, and non-Hispanic whites. Control variables that are commonly used in analysis of the determinants of migration are employed in our first two logistic regression analyses. Change in socioeconomic status or characteristics are introduced in the third model. The availability of repeated measures of socioeconomic characteristics that allows for using beginning of migration interval measurements as well as measures of changes in characteristics is a major strength of panel data. Since differences in socioeconomic and demographic characteristics are known to exist between Hispanics, blacks and whites, the research is designed to determine if differences in rates of onward migration exist after these variables are controlled.

DATA AND RESEARCH METHODS

For purposes of this research, the NLSY79, geo-coded data will be utilized along with information on selected characteristics from the main NLSY79 data file. The NLSY79 is a nationally representative panel study begun in 1979 of youths age 14 to 22 in that year. Youths were re-interviewed yearly until 1994 when interviews began to be completed bi-annually instead of annually. The most recent round of interview data included in this study is from the 2002 round. Although the study began with 12,686 initial individuals, over-samples of some groups were dropped, but the core nationally representative sample remains and is re-interviewed with retention rates well-over 80 percent for the entire length of the study.

A repeat migration will constitute a change of residence from one county to another following any previous intercounty migration. Primary migrations themselves are not included as onward migrations. However, once a primary migration occurs, a migrant becomes ‘at risk’ of becoming a repeat migrant. Therefore, propensities for onward migration are computed by dividing the number of onward migrations by the total

number of person periods at risk of making a repeat migration during a given measurement interval. The analyses of this study pools twelve two-year migration intervals between 1980 and 2002. These two-year person periods are used due to the fact that interviews took place every other year after the 1994 interview. Long and Boertlein (1990) study the relative advantages of migration measures for different intervals and conclude one, two, and five-year intervals are the most appropriate to measure migration.

Definitions of onward migrations in this study are consistent with those used by DaVanzo (1983) in her analysis. An onward move is any non-return repeat move, a move whose destination apparently does not duplicate a previous area of residence. Operationally, onward migration status is defined in two steps. In the first step comparisons of the respondent's county FIPS codes at the beginning and end of the two-year migration intervals are made. If the FIPS codes do not match, a second step entails, determining if the FIPS code at the end of the interval matches a FIPS code in the migrants preceding residence history. These include county of birth, county of residence at age 14, and at the time of prior interviews. Since, as noted by Sandefur and Scott (1981), intra-county moves do not generally require disengagement from a given community, or lead to a change in jobs, this study does not regard an intra-county move as an instance of migration. In addition, information of intra-county movement is not provided in the NLSY79 data. If the counties are different between the beginning and the end of an interval, a migration is defined as having occurred. Multivariable logistic regression is utilized to compare the propensities for onward migrants by Hispanics, non-Hispanic blacks and non-Hispanic whites while controlling for socioeconomic and demographic factors.

In order to effectively explore the longitudinal data, and the changes that occur over time, the data set is transformed from person-level to person-period. In a person-level data set each person has one record and multiple variables contain the data from

each measurement occasion. In a person-period data set each person has multiple records, one for each measurement occasion (Singer and Willett 2003). The person-period data format has four types of variables: (1) an identification variable, (2) an index variable, indicating time period, (3) a time varying, and invariant independent variable, and (4) a time varying dependent variable (Kim 2004). In order to maintain continuity in the data set, since the NLSY79 began re-interviewing the panel every two years in 1994, instead of yearly, as before, each respondent can contribute up to 11 two-year person periods.

By transforming the data into a person-period format, the intervals become the unit of analysis, but continue to permit individual characteristics during the interval to be used as explanatory variables. Within each of the person-periods are detailed characteristics containing life course events that can be examined to help explain repeat migration over time. The events that happen during a particular interval are analyzed to investigate their potential impact on repeat migration during the corresponding intervals. In order to most accurately assess repeat migration by only those at-risk of repeat migration, person-period data lacking information among independent and dependent variables during the eleven intervals, those in the military, those less than 18 years of age, and non-interviewees are excluded. This procedure yields an N of 44,308 for this study.

EXPLANATORY VARIABLES

Given that rural black youths are more likely to remain with their parents, and more likely to leave the state upon exiting than rural white youth (Garasky and Haurin 2001), metropolitan or nonmetropolitan residence is included as a primary variable in the analysis. An age variable is included because age, and life cycle, are invariably related to migration patterns (Von Reichert 2002; Johnson 1999; Gordon and Molho 1995). Marital status, presence or absence of children, and gender variables are incorporated as men and women live the migration process differently; they have been found to have different

patterns of remittances, investments in communities of origin, and expectations about returning migration (Curran and Rivero-Fuentes 2003; Kandel and Massey 2002).

Whether onward migration occurs depends on the ex-residents educational level, and experiences of unemployment (DaVanzo and Morrison 1981). Therefore, both of these variables are included, as well as an income variable. Also whether an individual owns or rents a property of primary residence at a particular place has been viewed as an important determinant of his or her propensity to move because it is an indicator of investment in the community in which one lives (Green and Hendershott 2001; McHugh, Gober and Reid 1990). Moreover, the likelihood of migration is known to be highly associated with length or duration of residence in a community - accordingly this variable is controlled. Finally, because change in any one of the above factors is likely to be associated with an opportunity to move, change in employment status, marital status, or number of children is each included.

TABLE I: SUMMARY OF THE DEPENDENT AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Dependent Variable [a]	
Onward Migration	Onward vs not-onward migration (not-onward includes those who stayed plus those who return-migrated)
Independent Variables [b]	
Individual Characteristics	
Race/Ethnicity	Black, Hispanic and White
Age	Less than 21 yrs, 21-25 yrs, 26-30 yrs, 31-35 yrs, 36 yrs and older
Education	Less than high school, high school, some college, college
Duration of Residence	Less than 3 yrs, 3-6 yrs, 7-9 yrs, 10 or more yrs
Place	Metro or non-metro
Gender	Male and female
Marital Status	Never-married, married, divorced/widowed/ separated
Age of children	Less than one year, 1-6 years, 7 or more years, no children
Income[c]	Lowest quartile, second lowest, second highest, highest quartile
Employment	Employed or unemployed
Occupation	Less skilled or more skilled
Home Ownership	Owns home/ does not own home
Change Characteristics	
Marital Status	Stayed married, stayed single, married to single, single to married
Number of Children	Change or no change
Employment	Stayed employed, stayed unemployed, employed to unemployed, or unemployed to employed

[a] Measured at the during the person period (Time *t*)
[b] Measured at the beginning of migration intervals (Time *t*-1)
[c] Recalculated yearly

TABLE II: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	
Total Person Years (N)	44,308
	Percent
Age	
Less than 21 yrs	8.4
21-25 yrs	26.3
26-30 yrs	25.5
31-35 yrs	22.1
36 yrs and older	17.6
Gender	
Male	45.8
Female	54.2
Race/Ethnicity	
Black	21.6
Hispanic	17.2
White	61.3
Marital Status	
Never-married	36.8
Married	49.6
Divorced, widowed, separated	13.6
Length of Residence	
Less than 3 yrs	41.7
3-5 yrs	11.5
6-9 yrs	15.4
10 yrs and over	31.4
Education	
Less than 12 yrs	15.8
12 yrs	39.7
Some college	23.3
College	21.2
Employment Status	
Employed	76.7
Not employed	23.3
Income	
Lowest Quartile	23.7
Second lowest	24.2
Second highest	25.2
Highest Quartile	27.0
Place	
Metro	78.9
Nonmetro	21.1
Age of Children	
Less than 1 yr	7.8
1-6 yrs	28.6
7 yrs or greater	14.7
No children	49.0
Own Home	
Does not own	62.5
Does own	37.5

TABLE II, (CONTINUED)

Change in Status Characteristics	**Percent**
Marital Status	
Stayed married	45.6
Stayed single	41.8
Married to single	4.0
Single to married	8.6
Number of children	
Change	19.5
No change	80.5
Employment	
Stayed employed	62.5
Stayed unemployed	12.6
Employed to unemployed	14.1
Unemployed to employed	10.7

ANALYSIS

Table III shows clear differences in likelihood of onward migration by race/ethnic status. The overall rate of onward migration for whites is 11.7 compared to 7.9 and 5.7 for Blacks and Hispanics, respectively. Furthermore, for every category of the independent variables, whites are most likely to move onward; non-Hispanic blacks next most likely, although generally by up to one-quarter to one-half as likely as whites; Hispanics are least likely to move onward. The relationship between the control variables and onward migration is strikingly similar for each of the groups. For example, each of the groups have higher rates of onward migration at short durations of residence and the rate of onward migration is higher for those in nonmetro than in metro places.

TABLE III: RATES OF ONWARD MIGRATION FOR
BLACKS, HISPANICS AND WHITES BY SPECIFIED CHARACTERISTICS

	Black Total	Black % onward	Hispanic Total	Hispanic % onward	White Total	White % onward
Length of Residence						
>3 years	3774	10.1	2491	8.7	12219	15.0
3-5 years	1088	9.3	796	4.6	3191	11.2
6-9 years	1480	6.6	1230	4.2	4114	9.3
10 years <	3218	4.6	3088	3.6	7619	7.1
Place						
Metro	7919	7.0	6584	5	20472	11.2
Non-metro	1641	10.7	1021	8.7	6671	12.3
Age						
Less than 21 yrs	692	10.7	761	6.7	2282	16.2
21-25 yrs	2162	11.1	1902	7.5	7604	16.8
26-30 yrs	2421	7.8	1829	5.6	7054	11.9
31-35 yrs	2347	6.0	1761	4.5	5693	7.3
36 yrs and older	1938	4.3	1352	3.2	4510	4.8
Education						
Less than 12 yrs	1631	6.4	2009	4.1	3357	10.7
12 yrs	3936	7.2	2932	5.1	10718	8.9
Some college	2489	7.4	1892	6.4	5934	13.8
College	1504	10.3	772	8.3	7134	13.8
Gender						
Male	4233	7.8	3470	5.4	12580	11.6
Female	5327	7.5	4135	5.6	14563	11.4
Marital Status						
Never-married	597	9.2	682	4.5	8879	15.7
Married	2695	6.6	2595	4.2	14961	9.1
Divorced, widowed, separated	1708	5.0	1276	4.2	3303	10.9
Age of Children						
Less than 1 yr	597	9.2	682	4.5	2169	10.7
1-6 yrs	2695	6.6	2595	4.2	7376	8.4
7 yrs or greater	1708	5.0	1276	4.2	3514	5.4
No children	4560	9.0	3052	7.3	14084	14.7

TABLE III. Rates of Onward Migration for Blacks, Hispanic and Whites by Specified Characteristics. (CONTINUED

Selected Characteristics	Black Total	Blacks % onward	Hispanic Total	Hispanic % onward	White Total	White % onward
Own Home						
Does not own	7395	8.7	5094	6.6	15219	15.4
Does own	2165	4.0	2511	3.2	11924	6.5
Employment Status						
Employed	6828	7.2	5603	5.1	21535	11.0
Not employed	2732	8.8	2002	6.5	5608	13.2
Income						
Lowest Quartile	3537	7.2	1929	6.4	5044	14.5
Second lowest	2483	8.5	2114	5.2	6110	11.9
Second highest	1850	7.6	1842	5.5	7454	10.0
Highest Quartile	1690	7.3	1720	4.8	8535	10.7
Change in Status Characteristics						
Marital Status						
Stayed married	2764	7.0	3620	4.4	13832	8.8
Stayed single	5796	7.1	3111	5.4	9603	12.9
Married to single	351	7.4	302	5.0	1129	13.6
Single to married	649	15.3	572	12.9	2579	19.8
Number of children						
Change	1777	9.1	1662	5.8	5185	11.7
No change	7783	7.3	5943	5.4	21962	11.4
Employment						
Stayed employed	5372	7.1	4497	5.1	17828	11.1
Stayed unemployed	1596	7.0	1167	5.0	2840	12.2
Employed to unemployed	1456	7.2	1106	5.2	3707	10.7
Unemployed to employed	1136	11.3	835	8.6	2768	14.2

Moving to the logistic regression, three models are examined in Table IV to ascertain if whites have higher rates of onward migration than blacks and Hispanics after controls for the usual determinants of migration are introduced. The base model shows that blacks are 64% as likely as whites to move onward while Hispanics are 45% as likely to move onward.

The second model incorporates a number of known variables that encourage and discourage migration. These include length of residence, type of place of residence, age, gender, education, income, marital status, home ownership, age of children, employment status and income. Again, even with these several variables controlled, blacks are 67% as likely to make an onward move as are whites. Hispanics, although somewhat more likely with these variables controlled, are still only 53% as likely to move.

The third model, which takes into account change in marital status, number of children and unemployment, while still holding all of the control variables except the related unchanged marital status, number of children or employment status, shows virtually no change in the odds of black or Hispanic onward migration. The odds for blacks now become 68% while the odds for Hispanics become 52% those of whites. In other words, the findings remain consistent across the models, though within models, as differential variables are controlled.

Although not the focus of the study, it is interesting to note the relationship between change in marital status and onward migration. Those who changed from "single to married" were one and a half times as likely to be onward migrants as those in the "stayed married" group. Although past research has referenced change in martial status and migration (Mincer 1978; Falk et al. 2004), there are not studies focused on the type of change in marital status in conjunction with the direction of repeat migration. Therefore, finding these significant relationships in both logistic and descriptive analyses is important and will be interesting for future study. Also, Hispanics who make repeat

migrations onward do not fall into typical employment categorizations. According to Shaw (1975) unemployment acts as a push factor, in which an individual is more likely to leave an area in search of employment elsewhere. Furthermore, migration rates for those who are unemployed tend to be higher than for those who are employed (Mincer 1978). The descriptive analyses of the present study confirm findings like these in every area except for Hispanics. The statistics examined support findings like this for blacks and whites in terms of onward migration. Yet, when stratified by race/ethnicity, these figures show that "employed" Hispanics have higher rates of onward migration than those "not employed."

TABLE IV:LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING ONWARD MIGRATION

	Onward		Onward		Onward	
	Model I	(S.E.)	Model 2	(S.E.)	Model 3	(S.E.)
Constant	-2.043	0.019	-1.772	0.077	-1.963	0.077
Race/Ethnicity						
Black	.637**	0.043	.670**	0.045	.675**	0.045
Hispanic	.447**	0.054	.527**	0.056	.523**	0.056
(White)						
Length of Residence						
(>3 years)						
3-5 years			.869**	0.053	.864**	0.053
6-9 years			.780**	0.052	.774**	0.052
10 years <			.590**	0.045	.584**	0.045
Place						
(Metro)						
Nonmetro			1.299**	0.039	1.273**	0.04
Age						
Less than 21 yrs			1.091	0.059	1.103	0.04
(21-25 yrs)						
26-30 yrs			.755**	0.044	.772**	0.043
31-35 yrs			.563**	0.055	.581**	0.053
36 yrs and older			.422**	0.071	.411**	0.068
Education						
(Less than 12 yrs)						
12 yrs			1.170**	0.055	1.179**	0.055
Some college			1.685**	0.059	1.725**	0.059
College			2.182**	0.064	2.252**	0.063
Gender						
(Male)						
Female			1.002	0.035	0.963	0.034
Marital Status						
Never-married			.882**	0.048		
(Married)						
Divorced, widowed, separated			1.034	0.059		
Own Home						
(Does not own)						
Does own			0.534**	0.047	.525**	0.047

	Onward		Onward		Onward	
	Model I	(S.E.)	Model 2	(S.E.)	Model 3	(S.E.)
Age of Children						
Less than 1 yr			.853*	0.069		
1-6 yrs			.804**	0.049		
7 yrs or greater			.858*	0.072		
(No children)						
Employment Status						
(Employed)						
Not employed			1.184**	0.047		
Income						
Lowest Quartile			1.069	0.053	1.041	0.053
Second lowest			1.021	0.049	1.003	0.049
Second highest			0.967	0.047	0.957	0.048
(Highest Quartile)						
Change in Status						
Marital Status						
(Stayed married)						
Stayed single					.912*	0.045
Married to single					1.271**	0.083
Single to married					1.578**	0.056
Number of children						
(Change)						
No change					1.031	0.043
Employment						
(Stayed employed)						
Stayed unemployed					1.143*	0.056
Employed to unemployed					1.319**	0.052
Unemployed to employed					1.358**	0.052
Model Chi-Square		323.247	1840.17		1972.939	
Log Likelihood		27730.82	26213.89		26081.12	

FINDINGS

The most important finding of this study is significantly higher rates of onward migration for whites than for blacks and Hispanics – or lower rates of onward migration for blacks and Hispanics than for whites. This difference persisted in three models of a multivariate logistic regression showing that blacks and Hispanics are less likely to be onward migrants than whites, at highly statistical significance levels. Moreover, the odds only slightly increase for both blacks and Hispanics when other variables are controlled. This is an important finding because it indicates blacks and Hispanics are migrating to a smaller number of destinations. As Sandefur and Jeon (1991) indicate, this implies that their labor market is smaller and may thereby limit their chances of socioeconomic advancement, or pursuit of the full array of opportunities offered in American communities.

Illuminating that Hispanics and Blacks are less likely to migrate to new places is an important step in research on repeat migration. As stated earlier, the migration process provides means for individuals to escape less desirable local conditions and/or to seek opportunities in nearby or distant locations. As such, migration may be genuinely viewed as an adjustment of individuals to differential opportunity levels, with opportunities defined broadly to include the economic and social structure of places. If members of some groups are spatially separated from areas of greater opportunities, or concentrated in areas with limited opportunities, their prospect for upward mobility is thereby limited.

The absence of ethnic and racial comparisons of repeat migration has been an important breach in the body of research on repeat migration, particularly with panel data. Moreover, the deficiency of repeat migration research is particularly significant for Hispanics. A major reason for this gap is that the earliest panel data did not include enough Hispanics for meaningful comparisons. In analyzing the Hispanics of the NLSY79 researchers can better understand this growing minority.

These results lead to questions such as: does being more likely to make an onward move represent increased opportunity? Or, does being less likely to make an onward move represent 'negative selectivity?' Do these results mean that blacks and Hispanics are limited? Or, do they indicate that moving onward to new places is not as important, or desirable, to these minority groups as it is to whites? Those migrants who are pushed, and presumably exercise comparatively little choice, are described as 'negatively' selected; those who are pulled, and presumably chose to move, are seen as 'positively' selected (Falk, et al. 2004:491).

Although the U.S. is experiencing growth in its Hispanic population due to present international immigration, those members of the sample who identify themselves as Hispanic, were already in the U.S. when the survey began in 1979, prior to the more recent increase in immigration that is capturing much attention. However, considerable research refers to long term Hispanic residents as pioneers, revealing that earlier Hispanic immigrants and Hispanic natives are paving migration, career, and other paths that many recent immigrants are following (Zuniga and Hernandez-Leon 2002; Hernandez-Leon and Zuniga 2000). Thus, exploring the migration patterns of this group could lead to better understanding of how recent immigrants are dispersing themselves across American society.

REFERENCES

Adelman, R.M., C. Morett, and S.E. Tolnay. 2000. "Homeward Bound: The Return Migration of Southern-Born Black Women 1940 to 1990." *Sociological Spectrum* 20:433-463.

Curran, S.R. and E. Rivero-Fuentes. 2003. "Engendering Migrant Networks: The Case of Mexican Migration." *Demography* 40:289-307.

Current Population Reports, Special Studies Series Pp. 23-166. Washington DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

DaVanzo, J. 1983. "Repeat Migration in the United States: Who Moves Back and Who Moves On?" The Review of Economics and Statistics 65:552-559.

DaVanzo, J.S. and P.A. Morrison. 1981. "Return and Other Sequences of Migration in the United States." Demography 18: 85-101.

Falk, W.W., L.L Hunt, and M.O. Hunt. 2004. "Return Migrations of African-Americans to the South: Reclaiming a Land of Promise, Going Home, or Both?" *Rural Sociology* 69:490-509.

Garasky, S. and D.R. Haurin. 2001. "Locational Choice Upon First Exit from the Parental Household." Presented at the Population association of America's 2001 Annual Meeting in Washington DC: March 29-31.

Goldscheider, C. and P. R. Uhlenberg. 1969. Minority Group Status and Fertility." *American Journal of Sociology* 74(4):361-72.

Gordon, I.R. and I. Molho. 1995. "Duration Dependence in Migration Behavior: Cumulative Inertia versus Stochastic Change." *Environment and Planning* 27:1961-1975.

Green, R.K. and P.H. Hendershott. 2001. "Homeownership and Unemployment in the U.S." *Urban Studies* 38:1509-1520.

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 U.S. Historic South." *Social Science Quarterly* 81:49-66.

Johnson, K.M. 1999. "The Rural Rebound." *Reports on America* 1(3). Population Bureau, Washington D.C.

Kandel, W. and D.S. Massey. 2002. "The Culture of Mexican Migration: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis." *Social Forces* 80:981-1004.

Kim, Y.T. 2004. "*A Longitudinal analysis of Socioeconomic Difference in Obesity and Weight Change During the Early Adult Years.*" Dissertation, Department of Sociology, Utah State University.

Lee, E. 1966. "A Theory of Migration." *Demography* 3:47-57.

Long, J.F. and C.G. Boertlein. 1990. "Comparing Migration Measures Having Different Intervals" Pp. 1-11 in Perspectives in Migration Analysis. Current Population Reports, Special Studies Series Pp. 23-166. Washington DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Long, L.H. and K.A. Hansen. 1977. "Selectivity of Black Return Migration to the South." *Rural Sociology* 42:317-331.

McHugh, K.E., P. Gober, and N. Reid. 1990. "Determinants of Short- and Long-Term Mobility Expectations for Home Owners and Renters." *Demography* 27:81-95.

Morrison, P.A. and J. DaVanzo. 1986. "The Prism of Migration: Dissimilarities Between Return and Onward Movers." Social Science Quarterly. 67:504-16.

Mincer, J. 1978. "Family Migration Decisions." *Journal of Political Economy* 86:749-773.

Newbold, K.B. 1997. "Race and Primary, Return, and Onward Interstate Migration." *Professional Geographer* 49:1-14.

Rosenbloom, J.L. and W.A. Sundstrum. 2001. "Long-Run Patterns of Interstate Migration in the United States: Evidence from the IPUMS, 1850-1990." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Allied Social Science Association, New Orleans, LA, January 5-7.

Sandefur, G.D. and J. Jeon. 1991. "Migration, Race and Ethnicity, 1960-1980." *International Migration Review* 25(2): 393-407.

Sandefur, G.D. and W.J. Scott. 1981. "A Dynamic Analysis of Migration: An Assessment of the Effect of Age, Household and Career Variables." Demography 18: 355-368.

Shaw, R.P. 1975. *Migration Theory and Fact*. Philadelphia: Regional Science Research Institute.

Shumway, J.M. and G. Hall. 1996. "Self-Selection, Earnings and Chicano Migration between Return and Onward Migrants." International Migration Review 30:979-994.

Singer, J.D. and J.B. Willett. 2003. *Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis: Modeling Change and Event Occurrence.* Oxford University Press.

Sjaastad, L.A. 1962. "The Costs and Returns of Human Migration." *Journal of Political Economy* 70:80-93.

South, S.J. and K.D. Crowder. 1997. "Residential Mobility Between Cities and Suburbs: Race, Suburbanization, and Black-to-the-City Moves." *Demography* 34:525-39.

Stack, C. 1996. "Call to Home African Americans Reclaim the Rural South." New York: BasicBooks.

Tarver, J.D. and R.D. McLeod. 1976. "Trends in Distance of Movement of Interstate Migrants." *Rural Sociology* 41:119-126.

Therrien, M. and R.R. Ramirez. 2001. “The Hispanic Population in the United States.” Current Population Reports: U.S. Census Bureau.

Tolnay, S.E. 2003. “The African American "Great Migration" and Beyond.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:209-32.

Von Reichert, C. 2002. “Returning and New Montana Migrants: Socio-economic and Motivational Differences.” *Growth and Change* 33:133-151.

Wilson, T.D. 1993. “Theoretical Approaches to Mexican Wage Labor Migration.” *Latin American Perspectives* 20(3): 98-129.

Wilson-Figueroa, M., E.H. Berry, and M.B. Toney. 1991. Migration of Hispanic Youth and Poverty Status: A Logit Analysis.” *Rural Sociology* 56(2): 189-203.

Zuniga, V. and R. Hernandez-Leon. 2002. “A new Destination for an Old Migration: Origins, Trajectories, and Labor Market Incorporation of Latinos in Dalton, Georgia.” Pp. 126-135 in *Latino Workers in the Contemporary South*. Edited by A.D. Murphy, C. Blanchard and J.A. Hill. The University of Georgia Press.