

INTERSTATE MIGRATION AND THE TRANSITION TO CITIZEN

Karen A. Woodrow-Lafield

KarenWLafield@cs.com

DRAFT

Please do not cite without permission of the author

An earlier version was presented at the 2006 annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Los Angeles, California, March 30-April 2, 2006. This research was partially supported by grant R01 HD37279 from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) to Karen Woodrow-Lafield at Mississippi State University. The contents are solely the responsibility of the author and do not necessarily represent the official view of the NICHD or the National Institutes of Health. For further information, contact Karen Woodrow-Lafield by mail at 2308 Mt. Vernon Avenue #327, Alexandria, Virginia 22301, by phone 202-276-2818, or by email KarenWLafield@cs.com . Personal web page: <http://home.comcast.net/~karenwoodrowlafield>

INTERSTATE MIGRATION AND THE TRANSITION TO CITIZEN

Abstract

This analysis explores internal migration in the period between admission as lawful permanent resident and naturalization. Internal migration of foreign-born residents is more important to consider because the foreign-born population is more dispersed to communities not traditionally receiving immigrants. For adult immigrants of 1978-1991 who became U.S. citizens, the majority was living in the states of initial residence, but 22 percent had moved to another state. From logistic regression analyses, the likelihood of making this type of interstate migration varies by visa class of admission, manner of entry, initial residence, and place of origin. Men are more likely to have made this move than women, and this approach may be more revealing for their experiences. Further investigation is needed to explore the feasibility of this approach for supplementing existing sources on internal migration.

INTERSTATE MIGRATION AND THE TRANSITION TO CITIZEN

Introduction

Immigration has historically altered the balance of populations among states and metropolitan areas, accenting the political landscape with controversies about apportionment, funding allocations, and impacts of lawful and unauthorized immigration (Tienda 2002; Woodrow-Lafield 2001). As are native Americans, the nation's 31.1 million immigrants were highly geographically concentrated as of 2000 in six states (California (8.9 million), New York (3.9 million), Texas (2.9 million), Florida (2.7 million), Illinois (1.5 million), and New Jersey (1.5 million). The gateway cities of these gateway states, Los Angeles, New York City, Miami, Houston, and Chicago, hold their status as major immigrant receiving areas in part because they offer an array of opportunities for professionals and managers, skilled workers, and unskilled workers. New York City's population passed 8 million, and movers from abroad contributed to making this the first time since the 1930s that New York City led in city population growth (Perry and Mackun 2001). Hialeah and Miami showed foreign-born majorities in 2000, 72.1 percent and 59.5 percent, respectively, and four places in California (Glendale, Santa Ana, Daly City, and El Monte) also had between 51 percent and 55 percent foreign-born (Malone, Baljua, Costanzo, and Davis 2003). Historically a gateway city, New York City was the first choice of many European, Caribbean, African, Asian, and other immigrant groups over the past four decades (Foner 2000; Foner, Rumbaut, and Gold 2000; Salvo and Lobo 2004). Los Angeles (Waldinger and Bozorgmehr 1996) beckoned not only to Mexicans but also to Central Americans,

Asians, Middle Easterners, African Americans, and others. Miami became most known as a site for the majority of Cubans newly settling with later influxes of Haitians and South Americans (Grenier and Stepick 1992). With precarious status and permanence, Central American migrants were to be found in Houston, Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles (Hagan 1994; Repak 1995; and Lopez, Popkin, Telles 1996). The rich past of Chicago as receiving Polish and German immigrants gained a new accent with Mexican settlers in the 1990s (Paral and Norkewicz 2003), and a thriving Mexican community became visible in New York City in the 1990s (Smith 2005)..

Over a long period of time, the states receiving the majority of immigrants have shifted from the 1920 census scenario of “early traditional immigration” states as Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin that reflected the great European immigration waves (Passel and Zimmerman 2001). After low immigration during 1930-1960 due to restrictive laws, war, and economic and political factors, Eastern Hemisphere immigration increased pursuant to the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, and high migration from the Western Hemisphere increased more from family reunification after the 1977 amendments. Legal immigration from Mexico was already rising, and temporary agricultural workers known as Braceros were entering in the 1950s and 1960s (Donato 1994), and unauthorized migration, especially from Mexico, became significant in the 1970s (Passel and Woodrow 1984, 1987; Woodrow-Lafield 1998).

The accelerating Mexican immigration to Southwestern states, especially California and Texas, led to disproportionate population growth relative to Northeastern and other states. New York, New Jersey, Florida, and Illinois received substantial legal

immigration and some unauthorized migration, marking them among gateway states. Refugees were usually resettled in areas isolated from other immigration (Barringer, Gardner, and Levin 1993), but some moved closer to ethnic peers. Patterns of foreign-born settlement have persisted with three of every four foreign-born persons living in these key states. Over four decades, Mexican immigrants were dominant, followed by Filipinos and Chinese. Both lawful and unlawful residents may be sojourning or temporarily living here, and studies of Mexican migrants show the rate of return migration within one year was sharply lower as of 2000 than in the early 1980s, indicating longer stays, on average, more than three years (Massey 2005, 2006).

In three decades, the same ten states (the six plus Massachusetts, Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania) have been prominent in receiving immigrants admitted. The foreign-born population increased in every state over 1990-2000, even Maine, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming, which had the smallest foreign-born populations and were among several states (including also, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, and Pennsylvania) for which the foreign-born population actually decreased over 1980-1990. Surveys in the late 1990s indicated that California, New York, Illinois, and New Jersey were receiving less immigration from abroad than previously, and that California's share of the foreign-born population was leveling off for the first time since 1900 as Mexican and other migrants were settling (Passel and Zimmerman 2001; Urban Institute 2002; Durand, Massey, and Charvet 2000). The foreign-born population tripled over 1990-2000 in North Carolina, Georgia, and Nevada, states having moderate-sized foreign-born populations, and Arkansas' foreign-born population nearly tripled, increasing from

25,000 to 74,000. Overall, the South showed a 91 percent increase in the foreign-born population through both net internal migration of foreign-born and net immigration and settlement of foreigners from abroad (Kritz and Gurak 2004).

The 2000 census foreign-born population included primarily lawful permanent residents, 10-12 million non-naturalized aliens and 11 million naturalized citizens, and 7-9 million unauthorized residents, as well as 1-2 million lawful residents with temporary status. In predicting the implications of immigration for the 2000 census congressional apportionment, Woodrow-Lafield (2001) allowed for as many as 7 million unauthorized residents, which was ultimately the official estimate (INS 2003), considerably higher than the estimates in 2000 of x.x million of the Census Bureau () and 5.5 to 6.5 million of former Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) (), quickly altered to 6.5 to 7.5 million (2001). Bean et al. (2001) drew on early 2000 census results and uncertainty levels about unauthorized estimates to state a range of 8 to 9 million (Woodrow-Lafield 1998, 1999), consistent with calculations by Passel () at 8.5 million for 2000. The INS subsequently revised its estimate to 7.0 million for January 2000 (2003). For 2005, Passel (2005, 2006) estimated 11 million unauthorized residents, including nearly 5 million women and 1.7 million children, and he estimated 3 million native-born children of unauthorized parents for the six states.

Census counts have included quantities of unauthorized residents since 1980 census studies based on detailed data on the lawfully resident foreign-born population by state of residence (Warren and Passel 1987; Passel and Woodrow 1984, 1985). Various profiles have shown the majority of unauthorized residents living primarily in California with smaller numbers even for other highly populated states. California's share of the

unauthorized population apparently declined as the shares in New York, Texas, New Jersey, and Florida increased over the 1990s and this decade (Passel 1999; Passel 2002; Passel et al. 2004; U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service 2003). As early as 1994, annual net international migration allowed for higher unauthorized than authorized migrants for Nebraska, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Wyoming (Smith and Edmonston 1997: 60-61). Both these unauthorized migrants and other foreign-born persons are dispersing among both traditional and nontraditional receiving areas. The geographic distribution of unauthorized residents may shift over time due to migrant choices, changes in inflows, policies, and patterns of internal migration, possibly with family members who are lawful. Levels of demand for farm workers may be a factor in settlement of illegal migrants by state.

Although unauthorized residents may be regarded as temporary residents who are at constant risk of having to leave suddenly either through deportation or voluntarily to avoid deportation, to return to home community, or to seek better or safer opportunities (Wood 1999), unauthorized residents represent an increasing share of the foreign-born population since 1990 due to border enforcement policies and altered migrant behavior in staying for longer periods. Because internal migration of unauthorized residents is expected to differ from that of lawful residents, census measures of secondary migration are imperfect for legal residents.

Unauthorized population estimates at the state-level may or may not be based on assumptions or measures of internal migration of the lawfully permanent resident population. Some researchers assumed continuing patterns of geographic settlement for the unauthorized population according to the distribution of those legalized under the

Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (Fernandez and Robinson 1994; Espenshade 1996). The official estimates for unauthorized residents (INS 2003; Census Bureau 2006 *Statistical Abstract of the United States*) are based on a methodology that incorporated lawfully permanent residents according to initial residence at admission without allowing for internal migration (Rytina 2004). If there were net out-migration of the legally resident foreign-born for California, New York, or Illinois, for example, that would result in overestimating the legal estimate and underestimating the unauthorized estimate. If there were net in-migration of the legally resident foreign-born for Florida, for example, that would result in underestimating the legal estimate and overestimating the unauthorized estimate. In another study (Passel, Van Hook, and Bean 2005), calculations for state-level unauthorized estimates for 2000 allowed for internal migration of lawful permanent residents in 1995-2000, specifically, net outmigration for California, Illinois, Texas, and New York, but details were not given.

Transition – This study has theoretical value and policy relevance for the estimation of undocumented populations, for understanding migration relative to human capital and social capital, and for immigration impact areas with strong networks are attracting more family migrants, and whether they stay and assimilate because the magnitude of family immigration is diminished if they move along.

Policy debates about admissions for lawful permanent residence center on increasing employment-based immigrants and lowering family-based immigration (U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform 1995). The Immigration Act of 1990 resulted in increasing immigrant skill levels since the late 1980s (Jasso et al. 1999; Jasso 2004), but analyses of cross-sectional data pick up the unskilled contributions of unauthorized

residents (Borjas 1999). This discussion is related to weighing immigrant contributions and the composition as to skill levels over time (; Barrett 1996; Jasso et al. 2000; Jasso and Rosenzweig 1999). The extent and contexts of internal migration behavior of immigrants, i.e., moving to maximize labor force opportunities, are important for this and other policy debates.

This paper first reviews what is known of secondary migration of the foreign-born in the context of primary international migration patterns. An approach is then presented and explored for assessing patterns of secondary migration using administrative records for immigrants lawfully admitted as permanent residents, which constitutes the majority of the foreign-born population. Descriptive tabulations are presented as to residential location at time of admission for lawful permanent residence and for residential location at time of naturalization. How similar is the initial residential profile to the 1990 census profile of the foreign-born population and to the profile at naturalization? Considering residence at these time points, how extensive is secondary migration among those who became citizens? Is the residential distribution of secondary migrants different than for those who naturalized or for all immigrants, and is it more or less geographically concentrated? With multivariate methods, a preliminary assessment is made of the determinants of secondary migration for lawful immigrants. Based on this analysis, the paper addresses the theoretical importance of secondary migration of lawful residents in relation to opportunity and behavior. The findings are pertinent for policymaking on unauthorized migration. The conclusion includes discussion of the merits and feasibility of this approach.

Conceptualization and Theories

Geographic concentration, family reunification, shared opportunity goals, institutional support, secondary attraction as well as primary attraction

In explaining internal migration, push-pull theories and life course perspectives feature prominently. “Pushes” consist of lost or diminished employment opportunities, potential threats, or severing of family ties, and “pulls” are the perceived benefits or desired amenities that act as incentives to incur direct and indirect costs of migrating. The neoclassical economics explanation is that individual workers respond to labor market changes and migrate in search of opportunities. Migration patterns in the 1990s were in the context of high immigration, extensive housing construction and low interest rates, economic growth and low inflation, and high employment and labor demand. Nearly one of every two persons lived elsewhere in 1995 from his or her 2000 residence. Retirement migration to Florida continued, making that state first on net increase from internal migration. The pattern of black migration to the South that was visible in the 1960-1990 censuses was even more clearly demonstrated in the 2000 census as a major return migration to the Southern region that included highly educated individuals, especially to Georgia, Texas, and Maryland, at the expense of New York, California, and Illinois (Frey 2004a). In the late 1990s, as domestic migration was driving construction, services, and retail industries in the Southeast. The long term trend has been of internal migration from the Northeast and Midwest to the South (Gober 19xx), and this led to job creation, especially for immigrants, and foreign-born workers who outmigrated from California experienced wage increases (Passel and Zimmerman 2001).

2B The spatial concentration hypothesis posits the continuation of existing patterns of immigrant settlement in locations with existing immigrant communities.

(social capital, Yang, Kritz and Gurak) Is the Fb getting more concentrated? Iceland? Frey? Kritz? The foreign-born population became more segregated in certain metropolitan areas (Fischer et al. 2004). 5D Immigrants may choose among places according to geographic proximity, government intervention, presence of ethnics or family members, or knowledge gained through other contacts (Gurak and Kritz 2000). Initial settlement is more likely to geographic areas with ethnic communities due to selectivity as sponsored by family member, social networks that give choice, knowledge of opportunities in housing, labor force, and an existing economic infrastructure that has supported new workers in the past continues to afford opportunities. The strength of the association of ethnic concentrations with residential choice varies across admission categories, and employment-sponsored immigrants choose locations with peers more (Jaeger 2004). Check That study also found that immigrant preferences were focused on areas with declining native populations, increasing foreign-born populations, declining unemployment rolls, and increasing real wages. Composition of immigrants by visa category varied for states of intended residence as clusters of earlier immigrants naturalized and gained sponsorship rights and they brought family members under family preference categories and immediate relatives provisions. States with established foreign-born populations show higher percentages of immigrants under family-sponsored preferences, reflecting the presence of family networks, and examinations of percentages of immigrants under employment-sponsored preference categories shows less pronounced differences among states (Woodrow-Lafield, Xu, Poch, and Kersen 1999).

2D Influences for location choice include gateway city status (near a major international airport) city, proximity to the country of origin, and the language characteristics of an area, as well as job opportunities. Similarities appear for domestic migration patterns by nativity as certain areas became attractive with economic growth and opportunities, e.g., the South Atlantic and Mountain states in the late 1990s. In the Midwest, there were some indications of simultaneous native outmigration and foreign immigration. Illinois had net outmigration of both natives and foreign-born with neighboring states having net immigration of both domestic migration and migration from abroad (Franklin 2003; Perry and Schachter 2003).

2E Thus, ethnic concentrations or enclaves arise with possible consequences. With lower social contact with others, English acquisition may be slowed, and origin culture and language may persist. Immigrant entrepreneurship may thrive, and allying with others, immigrants may wield political strength. 3B Immigrant or ethnic concentration is more intense among those who speak a language other than English at home (Chiswick 2005).

Internal migration may occur for foreign-born persons as a consequence of public policies constraining initial choice of residential location. After placement in twelve cities through refugee resettlement programs, many Southeast Asian refugees made secondary migrations to various other areas, establishing ethnic communities (Poch 2002). Cuban refugees in the 1960s similarly moved around to establish ethnic neighborhoods in New Jersey and Florida. Funding for refugee assistance and settlement is designated to states receiving refugees (Federal Register 2003).

There was a shift in the 1970s and 1980s away from New York/New Jersey and Florida and towards California, as the new Latino and Asian immigrants were making different choices on state of residence. 5A Migration patterns evident in the 1970s and 1980s continued in the 1990s (Franklin 2003; Perry 2003; Perry and Schachter 2003; Schachter 2003; Schachter, Franklin, and Perry 2003; U.S. Census Bureau, PHC-T-24, 2003.) 5B The nation was in flux in the 1990s with high immigration, extensive housing construction, economic growth, high employment, labor demand, low interest rates, and low inflation.

Rewrite look at Frey 2004 Migration patterns in the 1990s were in the context of high immigration, extensive housing construction and low interest rates, economic growth and low inflation, and high employment and labor demand. Nearly one of every two persons lived elsewhere in 1995 from the 2000 residence. Retirement migration to Florida continued, making that state first on net increase from internal migration. The pattern of black migration to the South that was visible in the 1960-1990 censuses was even more clearly demonstrated in the 2000 census as a major return migration to the Southern region that included highly educated individuals, especially to Georgia, Texas, and Maryland, at the expense of New York, California, and Illinois (Frey 2004a). For the first time since 1900, California's share of the foreign-born population did not increase and that plateau was evident before the census (Passel and Zimmerman 2001). In a sharp shift to the trend since 1940, more people left California in the late 1990s than moved to California from elsewhere in the United States, and this loss was offset with movers from abroad to California.

2C Although concentration persisted in the six states, the six-state share declined 1990-2000 (75% to 68%). Immigration flows declined to traditional receiving states and slower growth in California. There was a dispersal of the foreign-born population as many immigrants in the 1990s settled or moved to “new growth” states in the Southeast and Rocky Mountain regions, especially North Carolina and Georgia. In the 1980s, big gainers of internal migrants were Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, Washington, and Arizona, reflecting the attraction and economic boom of the South Atlantic and West (Frey 1995). In the 1990s, Nevada, Arizona, Georgia, North Carolina, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Tennessee, and Arkansas had the greatest gains in number of foreign-born persons entered before 1990 (Frey 2002). 2F To the extent that the residential distribution for the foreign-born population shifts away from these traditional areas, a dispersion hypothesis posits they are seeking other opportunities, as, for example, undocumented migrants seem to have become more dispersed nationally in response to availability of unskilled jobs.

Excluding moves from abroad in 1995-2000, natives had higher residential mobility than the foreign-born, particularly because natives were more likely to have moved from one state to another than the foreign-born (Perry and Schachter 2003). The foreign-born population had higher intracounty migration than the native-born. Long resident immigrants who arrived before 1980 were less likely to have moved across states than those who arrived in the 1980s or 1990s. Noncitizens were more likely to have moved within county than naturalized citizens, but about 7 percent of each group made an interstate move. ***revise*** Africans and Mexicans were the most likely and Europeans were the least likely to have changed their usual residence in the five years

before the 2000 census. For Africans, interstate and intercounty migration rates were high and intracounty migration rate was moderately high. Mexicans were likely to make moves within county. These differences may be due to composition on immigration status, duration of residence, socioeconomic status, educational enrollment changes, or occupational mobility. The African foreign-born includes high shares of refugees and diversity immigrants and there has been continuing high skilled immigration from Africa (Lobo and Salvo 2001). As noted (Frey 2003), secondary migration flows in the later 1990s were diverse, including Hispanics, African Americans, and Asians as well as whites.

3A An educational hypothesis posits that more highly educated immigrants are more likely to move in a dispersal migration. Immigrants less highly educated and of lower socioeconomic status are less likely to migrate and they are more likely to rely on local networks for employment (). 3C The welfare hypothesis posits that migrants make decisions about leaving and locating elsewhere to maximize welfare benefits.

A persistent question is whether natives or immigrants are likely to migrate across jurisdictional boundaries to maximize their access to public welfare benefits. Although immigrant clusters are found in high-benefit states (Borjas 1998), initial settlement decisions may not be affected by state welfare benefits (Zavodny 1999). (Frey; Graefe 2004). In the post-PRWORA period, public welfare benefits are unavailable to post-1996 immigrants except certain groups (refugees, asylees). Those who immigrated before the effective date of PRWORA may be eligible depending upon rules in the state of residence. (See U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service 2002; various sources

including a database of the Urban Institute.) The task of assessing the new federalism is a morass of differing rules and easing of the initial restrictions that PRWORA imposed to prohibit most lawful permanent residents and all unauthorized immigrants from benefits receipt (Singer 2001; Aronson 1996). During the economic boom of the late 1990s, immigrants moved among states for reasons of jobs, opportunities, and family rather than the availability of welfare benefits (Passel and Zimmerman 2001), and, welfare reform policies may be influencing immigrants' search for economic opportunities across boundaries (Kaestner, Kaushal, and Ryzin 2001). DeJong Graefe!!! Hofferth

3D A legal status or transformation hypothesis covers the role of barriers or lack of barriers to migrating, because legal status permits migration (Reichert, Massey 1979). Over the 1990s, the Mexican population became more broadly dispersed in a "great transformation" that included access to opportunities and citizenship. More than twenty percent of naturalizing immigrants legalized under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 had moved by the time of naturalization (Rytina 2003). These immigrants who gained permanent residence through amnesty seemed less likely to move within the United States than other lawful immigrants between receiving lawful permanent residence and naturalization. Nevertheless, the broad dispersal nationally of Mexicans in the 1990s has been interpreted as one of the consequences of legalization of the majority of the Mexican population as of 1990 through domestic migration and sponsorship of family members (Durand, Massey, and Parrado 1999). For the period between the most recent entry and application for legalization, Neumann and Tienda (1994; 216) described secondary migration by those formerly illegal residents as "pervasive." Over one-quarter

made an interstate move, and those who entered at traditional gateway states for their ethnic group were less likely to move to another state. Place of entry was a major determinant of secondary migration, along with manner of entry and time since entry. The IRCA-legalized groups most likely to move were Asians and Africans.

The discussion of Neumann and Tienda (1994: 216-217) sets forth generalized statements for the legalized population that may apply for immigrants more broadly. Certain origin groups (from Mexico, El Salvador, Other Latin America, Africa, and Europe) may be likely to move to areas less residentially concentrated on their ethnicity, whereas Asians and immigrants from the Other category move to areas with greater residential concentrations of Asians and Other immigrants. Secondary migration leads to some small dispersion of immigrants beyond the six major settlement states. Illinois and other Midwest states seem to be gaining illegal immigrants through secondary migration. Family members often hold differing legal statuses, and sponsorship for immigrant visas is one way to regularize statuses. Although internal migration is without the formal constraints of international migration, some factors act to informally constrain internal migration. Individuals holding documents for lawful residence may stay at a place of residence rather than take unknown risks in new situations or those holding temporary work tional visa petition.

As both consequence and cause of internal migration, the clustering of individuals in ethnic enclaves and patterns of residential segregation are of interest. Some groups are more likely to be responsive to opportunity structures than others. The latest census showed hypersegregation of Hispanics in New York City and Los Angeles (Wilkes and Iceland 2004). On the other hand, there was net movement of Hispanics to areas of lower

segregation (Logan, Stults, and Farley 2004). Hispanic workers are more likely to move than native-born black workers within metropolitan Chicago (Mattoon 2003, citing research by Harry Holzer, John Quigley, and Steven Raphael). As they assimilate, Hispanics have tended to disperse more broadly (Frey 1995; Bartel 1989; McHugh 1989). Asians became more dispersed from traditional immigrant metropolitan areas as their skills and educational levels facilitated assimilation and they sought opportunities (Frey 1995). In rural sociology literature, considering amenities is critical in deciphering decisions on several levels (Irwin et al. 2004). In the international context, the role of social networks is a central influence as individuals weigh the risks and benefits of leaving communities for distant places and as stories about living in the destination countries are translated over time and among persons. The household as the unit for discussion about activities and migration of individual members becomes more significant with greater ease of global communications, financial exchange, and travel. As the processes of migration and settlement lead to multiple residence experiences and rising adaptation successes, children and women become more involved in migratory events and the collectively defined durations of stay shift toward permanence rather than transience (Roberts 1995; Massey, Goldring and Durand 1994). Many “new” immigrants have histories as nonimmigrants, refugees, asylees, or unauthorized residents (Jasso, Massey, Rosenzweig, and Smith 2000).

Earlier immigrants may migrate within the United States when their local labor market receives new immigrant workers with whom they are closely competing in the labor market. Generally, the effects of number of immigrants in a city or state are weak for depressing native wages (Smith and Edmonston 1997). Assertions are made of white

or native flight, that is, immigration to local labor markets sets off response in terms of internal migration flows of natives to other markets. This outmigration would dampen the economic impacts of immigration flows. The black box of immigration and internal migration by nativity for decisionmaking remains shrouded in mystery with the simplest truth being that the rate of growth of a local labor market may be key to residential choices of both immigrants and natives (Glaeser and Shapiro 2001).

Unit of analysis problem/ census data fuzzy

The life course perspective on migration seeks behavioral explanations in conjunction with educational attainment, career course, marriage and adulthood, and retirement. Studies of social behavior and demographic characteristics of the foreign-born population are complicated by the mixture of native-born and foreign-born individuals in families, households, family networks, and social networks. The U.S. foreign-born populations of the 1980s, 1990s, and currently are younger, on average, than the foreign-born populations in 1940-1980. Many are in the family stage of the life course and likely to have at least one child born after migration in addition to older children born in the origin country (Kahn 1994). The migration history may encompass multiple stays that index the family members on place of birth, nativity status, and legal status. For example, the family members of adults who gained legal status after immigration reform in the 1980s included both foreign and native born children and adults, and different statuses were represented within families (Woodrow-Lafield 1996). A common practice of parents is to leave one or more of their children in the origin community for an extended period during the process of migrating (Hondagneu-Sotelo

and Avila 1997; Suarez-Orozco, Todorova, and Louie 2001). Surveys have identified experiences of prolonged separation of children from parents, especially Central Americans, Haitians, Dominicans, and Mexicans, for whom smugglers are sought to avert border authorities for childrens' passage (Mena 2004; Thompson 2003).

Nonimmigrants, child with parent

Methodology and Data

This study explores a new approach as a resource for studying internal migration patterns for the lawfully resident foreign-born population based on comparing residence recorded at admission and at naturalization. The linked dataset for 1978-1991 cohorts with naturalization records offers retrospective data on mover status as dependent variable, having changed residence from the place of initial residence at application to a “new” state of residence at naturalization as place of destination. Creation of the dataset from 9.1 million immigrant records for fiscal years 1978-1992, excluding immigrants legalized under the Immigration Reform and Control Act, and 5.5 million naturalization records for fiscal years 1978-1996 is described elsewhere (Woodrow-Lafield 2002; Woodrow-Lafield et al. 2004).

Although an annual alien registration to report addresses existed until 1981 and nonimmigrant aliens are supposed to report address changes, DHS is unlikely to implement measures to track changes in residence for aliens (U.S. Government Accountability Office 2005). This dataset was created for developing models of immigrant naturalization with NICHD funding over 1999-2004. The data were provided to the principal investigator as an expert on a confidential, nonsharing basis through the former Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), now the Office of Immigrant

Statistics, Department of Homeland Security (OIS-DHS). A continuation project is intended to promote broader researcher access to immigrant and naturalization microdata files, 1972-2000. This project was responsive to an NICHD program announcement for research on U.S. immigration (PA-95-036) to encourage "maximum use of existing data on immigrants or the foreign born for analyses, and the linking of such data to administrative records ... to obtain a more accurate profile of immigrant experiences." Two INS Immigrant-Naturalization Cohorts (1977 and 1982) (Jasso 2004; Jasso and Rosenzweig 1995) were available in the mid-1990s, although Jasso and Rosenzweig (1986, 1990) earlier analyzed naturalization outcomes for a 1971 cohort sample (and DHS-OIS demographers looked at naturalization for a broader array of cohorts (Rytina 2003, 2004, 2005)).

Until recent longitudinal surveys, micro-level analyses of specific behavioral outcomes for immigrants, or lawful permanent residents, were rare. MMP? The Legalized Population Surveys gathered information about formerly undocumented aliens for the pre-legalization period and early period as temporary legal resident (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service 1992; U.S. Department of Labor 1996). Neumann and Tienda (1994) explored internal migration of legalized individuals through the administrative records-based Legalized Applicants Processing File. The New Immigrant Survey is beginning with a cohort sample (NIS-2003) of lawful permanent residents followed over time (Jasso, Massey, Rosenzweig, and Smith 2000, 2003) and these data may become useful for analyzing internal migration. (See <http://www.nis.princeton.edu> for background and publications based on NIS-2003 and the New Immigrant Survey-Pilot.) Check Powers et al.

Based on decennial census data on current place of residence and place of residence five years ago to identify moves within that period, the Census 2000 migration data present mobility/migration data include gross and net migration data for various levels of geography and demographic, family, or household characteristics and county-to-county migration flow data for counties and equivalent entities and some minor civil divisions (MCDs) by selected characteristics, as well as limited two-way cross tabulation. U.S. censuses and national surveys usually capture persons whose usual residence is the United States or, in the case of the monthly employment surveys, who are regularly working in the United States. Since 1994, the Current Population Survey (CPS) has included nativity and immigration data with similar items about current and previous place of residence except that in reference to the previous year. The sample expansion in 2000-2001 for measuring children's health insurance coverage by states enhances the value of geographic mobility data this decade. Administrative records are an additional resource for official state and county population estimates, especially identification of moves in a year through linkage of individual tax records filed in adjacent years.

The foreign-born population includes those persons born outside the United States and territories who do not have any claim to citizenship, i.e., derivative citizenship, and can gain U.S. citizenship only through naturalization. The U.S. foreign-born population is highly differentiated on lawful status and intended and actual durations of residence. Many admittees for temporary residence subsequently stay for longer periods and that may or may not have been their initial intention and statistics for departing nonimmigrants illustrate that durations of stay may last for more than a year (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service 1996; Grieco 2004). For both lawful and

unlawful residents, there are many subcategories, e.g., by nonimmigrant class of admission, by visa class of admission as lawful permanent resident, and, for unauthorized resident and by whether entered without inspection or violated terms of nonimmigrant status (Woodrow-Lafield 1998; Bustamante et al. 1998.)

Both the census and, with include all foreign-born residents, lawful and unlawful, and the decision to make an interstate migration differs by status. The constraint to the last move (within a five-year period or during the admission-naturalization period) carries unknown limitations. Another source is longitudinal panel surveys, the Panel Study of Income of Dynamics (South and Crowder 1998; South, Crowder, and Chavez 2005) and the Survey of Income and Program Participation (Hansen 1998; De Jong, Graefe, and St. Pierre 2005).

The dataset does not include the actual date at which an immigrant moved. The timing of the move is unknown. Thus, secondary migrants may be identified across regions or between states during the period as a lawful permanent resident before naturalization. Although these particular files included zip code data for more detailed geographic classification, that would be inconsistent with current statistical policy.

The primary focus is on 5.2 million adult immigrants of whom 1.8 million had naturalized as of 1996. This is because multi-person linkages were not possible and naturalization records are incomplete for children who may derive citizenship automatically when a parent naturalizes. (About 2.7 million naturalization records pertained to pre1978 immigrants, IRCA-legalized immigrants, and child immigrants.)

The variables are somewhat more limited than in surveys and censuses and include age, gender, visa class of admission, nonimmigrant status, marital status, cohort,

region of birth, and state or region of residence and destination. Visa class of admission is recoded into family-sponsored preference categories, employment-sponsored preference categories, parents or spouses as immediate relatives of U.S. citizens, and the reference category of refugee, asylee, or other). Gender is coded for male with female as the reference group. Age groups are coded as “21-29 years,” “30-39 years,” “40-49 years,” “50-59 years,” “60-69 years,” and the reference group of “70 years and older.” Marital status is coded for married with unmarried as reference group. Manner of entry is coded to indicate an immigrant adjusting from nonimmigrant status with the reference group as newly arriving. Cohort dummies correspond with admission cohorts for 1978 through 1990 with 1991 as reference group. For region of birth, this study utilizes categories based primarily on the United Nations classification (Woodrow-Lafield et al. 2000c). Origin countries were re-coded into nine (9) continents or sub-continents of origin with dummy variables set for Eastern Asia (China, Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and others), South-Eastern Asia (Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, and others), South-Central and Western Asia (India, Iran, Kuwait, Lebanon, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and so on), Africa, Oceania, Central and North America (Canada, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, and others), Caribbean (Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Jamaica, and others), and South America with Europe specified as the reference category. For some analyses, initial residence and residence at naturalization are coded for all states and the District of Columbia, and in most analyses, these are coded for the key states of California (reference), Texas, Illinois, Florida, New York, New Jersey, Other West, Other

South, Other Midwest, and Other Northeast. Based on month and years of admission and naturalization or end of observation, duration is calculated.

First, comparisons are made of the initial residential profile of immigrants with the geographic profile for new citizens at naturalization and with 1990 census profiles for the foreign-born population, foreign-born entered in the 1980s, and 1990 naturalized citizens, as similar populations. Second, the extent of secondary migration among lawful residents is assessed and comparison made for the residential profile of new citizen-movers with the initial residential profile. Patterns of interstate secondary migration are examined on the basis of the 50 states and District of Columbia and on the basis of six major states and four region categories. Is the residential distribution of secondary migrants different from that for all immigrants, and is it more or less geographically concentrated? The question is whether initial residence and residence at naturalization result from similar influences. Third, the analysis draws on two sets of logistic regression models to assess determinants of secondary migration or mover status: (1) for all adult immigrants with an assumption that non-naturalizing immigrants continued at the residence of initial record and (2) for only naturalizing immigrants. From the first set, results are probably conservative because internal migration is unmeasured for those who did not naturalize and those who moved and returned to the state or region of initial residence during the observation period. For the second set, the results represent less biased predictors of mover status. Finally, Cox proportional hazard models are estimated on mover status over duration of time until naturalization, forcing simultaneity of interstate migration with naturalization, although these results are cautiously interpreted

for examining covariates as to influencing the timing of naturalization while controlling for duration, subject to the proportionality assumption.

Two advantages of this approach are the explicit focus on those admitted for lawful permanent residence, accounting for the major group of foreign-born residents, and the capability to examine propensities for internal migration for immigrants admitted through various preference and other admission categories and according to other characteristics. This data affords a substantial number of cases with national representativeness with an assumption that an internal migration event did not occur for those immigrants who had not naturalized, and certain analyses focus only on internal migration among naturalized immigrants. One limitation is the restriction to adult immigrants. Second, there are potential selection biases in that those who did not naturalize may have migrated in different patterns than those who did naturalize plus they may have emigrated or died. Again, this study is exploratory of this approach

Similarly, port-of-entry cities and metro areas received so many immigrants in the 1980s that international migration accounted wholly for the population growth of Texas, New York, Illinois, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and California. Among these, only California had some gain in the 1980s from internal migrants (Frey 1995; Johnson 1996). States with internal migration gains in 1985-1990 Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, Washington, Arizona

The interplay of immigration-internal migration dynamics of the 1980s can be described succinctly: immigration was minority dominated and geographically selective, and internal migration was white dominated and nationwide (Frey 1995) with notable white gains in Florida and Georgia. Immigration may be associated with outmigration

patterns for the native-born (Frey 1995) in that many whites leaving are individuals with lower incomes and lesser education, and migration is to nearer states rather than more distant ones, suggesting native outmigration in search of employment. For metropolitan-nonmetropolitan America over three decades, domestic outmigration occurred for high immigration areas such as California with negative selectivity on educational levels to states with less immigration (Frey 2004b). . Metropolitan areas gaining the most domestic migrants were likely to be receiving few immigrants.

Illinois had net outmigration of both natives and foreign-born with substantial migration from abroad (Perry and Schachter 2003). Migration from abroad was more crucial for neighboring states' net immigration. Some other states lost more new citizens than were gained from other states, e.g., Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Wisconsin, Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Oregon, and Utah. Florida, Texas, and New Jersey gained new citizens and had net immigration of the foreign-born in 1995-2000. Both Mexican-born outmigration from California and gains to Florida and Texas from foreign-born domestic migration in the 1990s were apparent from earlier surveys (Passel and Zimmerman 2001; Johnson 2000). In addition to the three gateway states of Florida, Texas, and New Jersey having net domestic foreign-born migration and gaining new citizens by the time of naturalization, the same was true for Georgia, Nevada, Arizona, Colorado, Washington, and Virginia. Despite its gains of domestic foreign-born migration in 1995-2000, Minnesota lost more new citizens than were gained. North Carolina also lost slightly. Maryland and Alaska also gained new citizens.

Secondary migration leads to some small dispersion of immigrants beyond the six major settlement states. Illinois and other Midwest states seem to be gaining illegal immigrants through secondary migration.

RESULTS

Drawing from this linked immigrant-naturalization records dataset, Table 1 illustrates selected characteristics for 5.2 million immigrants 21 years and older at admission, and for the subset of 1.8 million immigrants who naturalized during the observation period. Three-quarters (74.6 percent) were married, which is logical as many were accompanying a principal beneficiary or joining a spouse. Much immigration is explicitly family oriented, and a sizable share of employment-sponsored immigration is implicitly family oriented as workers bring spouses and children with them.

Table 1 about here

With these regional categories, the greatest shares of immigrants were born in Central and North America (17.93 percent) or South-East Asia (17.66 percent), and fewer immigrants are from Europe than from either the Asian or Latin American continent.

Most adult immigrants were spouses and parents admitted as immediate relatives of U.S. citizens or refugees, asylees, or other. (Of course, large numbers of children were also admitted as exempt immediate relatives, children of US citizens, or as children of lawful permanent residents, or as derivative beneficiaries of other classes.) Among numerically limited categories, 2nd preference, for spouses and children of aliens, accounted for large numbers, along with 5th preference for siblings of citizens. More females than males appear among spouses of aliens (2nd preference), among spouses of employment-sponsored immigrants (3rd preference or 6th preference), and as immediate

relative parents of citizens. Immigrants often have a history of multiple residence periods or stays prior to the actual according lawful permanent residence. Prior immigration experience is found for 39 percent who were adjusting from a nonimmigrant status, but this is surely underestimated through omission of newly arriving immigrants who had prior nonimmigrant stays or undocumented experience. NIS results

Of immigrants admitted 1978-1991, more than three-quarters (79.8 percent) initially intended to reside in one of the six key states, especially California or New York, or in Virginia, Maryland, Massachusetts, or Pennsylvania, as another examination found for 1975-1996 (Woodrow-Lafield, Xu, Poch, and Kersen 1999). Higher shares of immigrants settled in Georgia and Nevada in recent years. Special legislation has led to concentrated geographic impacts, such as legalization of long-term unauthorized residents in the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. States with established foreign-born populations show higher percentages of immigrants under family-sponsored preferences, reflecting the presence of family networks, and examinations of percentages of immigrants under employment-sponsored preference categories shows less pronounced differences among states. Clusters of earlier immigrants naturalized and gained sponsorship rights and they brought family members under family preference categories and immediate relatives provisions.

The distributions of immigrants by state of initial residence and, for new citizens, by state at naturalization are actually *more similar* (ID=.06) than the distribution by initial residence to the 1990 census foreign-born population (ID=.08), 1990 foreign-born entering in the 1980s (.11), or 1990 naturalized citizens (ID=.08). The distribution of

naturalized citizens in the 1990 census is, however, *more dissimilar* to this distribution for immigrants at naturalization (ID=.10). Curiously, the index of dissimilarity for distribution at naturalization with the foreign-born population is “only” .07, although the ID is higher when comparing with recently arrived foreign-born (.11). This crude analysis suggests that initial residence and residence at naturalization are the result of similar influences for legal immigrants. However, the residential distribution for movers differs greatly from either initial residence (.50) or residence at naturalization (.50).

Is the residential distribution of secondary migrants different from that for all immigrants, and is it more or less geographically concentrated? The distribution of mover-new citizens is different and it is more geographically concentrated.

Table 2 about here

Reserving more detailed discussion of specific flows until later, we first examine patterns of not migrating, losses, gains, and net migration (Table 3). Among naturalizing immigrants, the majority continued to reside at their initial state of residence at the time of naturalization. Similarly, about 52 percent of foreign-born persons 5 years and older in the 2000 census had stayed in the same state as in 1995. Immigrants who initially settled in California (91.3 percent) and Florida (87.8 percent) were especially likely to have stayed. Immigrants initially living in Illinois (76.6 percent) showed a lower proportion still there at time of naturalization, and immigrants stayed on after naturalization more in gateway states.

The number making an interstate migration, 354,000, represents 22 percent of lawful permanent residents 1978-1991. At least 17.7 percent were living in a different state or regional grouping than initially. However, secondary migration across states among lawful residents is at a lower rate for this longer interval than for foreign-born residents in the census (percent for 1985-1990 and 47.9 percent for 1995-2000). For most cases, the interval between immigrant status and naturalizing is at least five years. Although individuals just accorded lawful permanent residence might seem at greater risk of moving in the initial adjustment period, there are strong reasons they may stay, such as presence of family members and ethnic networks, employer-sponsors, and financial and other costs of moving.

Nearly all states show some immigration and outmigration of lawful permanent residents. The majority of states show net outmigration of this lawful permanent resident population, or a negligible amount. There was net immigration of at least 1,000 for only 10 states. Many of the higher net migration rates are for states receiving small numbers of lawful permanent residents. For California, there was net immigration of permanent residents/new citizens, and New York and Illinois lost more new citizens than were gained although all three showed net outmigration of both natives and foreign-born persons for 1995-2000 (as for New Jersey in the 2000 census). Showing net outmigration of new citizens were most of these states that showed net outmigration of the foreign-born in 1995-2000--Ohio, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, Wyoming, West Virginia, and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia. State migration patterns are substantially consistent with internal migration of the foreign-born during 1995-2000. Several immigration gateway states had net domestic outmigration,

specifically, California, New York, Illinois, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, whereas New York, Texas, New Jersey, Illinois, and Massachusetts had for 1985-1990. From the 2000 census, California, New York, and Illinois showed net outmigration of foreign-born persons over 1995-2000. Foreign-born outmigration was substantial for New York and California with higher domestic outmigration rates for the foreign-born than for natives. There were both domestic foreign outmigration in 1995-2000 and outmigration of these new citizens in 1978-1991 for the states of Ohio, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, Wyoming, West Virginia, and Hawaii, plus the District of Columbia. One notable exception is net immigration of lawful permanent residents for California whereas there was net outmigration of the foreign-born in 1995-2000. The latter could be due to dispersal of IRCA legalized immigrants or job-seeking of both lawful and unlawful residents. When Frey compared pre-1990 entered foreign-born population counts in 1990 and 2000 censuses, Nevada, Arizona, Georgia, North Carolina, Texas, and Colorado had gained foreign-born “secondary migrants.” Apparent losses for many states may have been partly from mortality and improved coverage in the 2000 census. Gains and losses of secondary migration of the foreign-born were in consistent directions with internal migration of foreign-born over 1995-2000 for 29 states and DC, but New Mexico had foreign-born outmigration and another 20 states showed foreign-born immigration despite having fewer pre 1990 immigrants than in the 1990 census (Frey 2002?).

Table 3 about here

The Northeast and Midwest regions showed net losses of these lawful permanent residents and the South and West gained these new citizens. Looking at the gateway states, the majority of interstate movers were within the same region. Because many of the state-level flows are small counts, Table 4 restricts destination to region. New citizens initially in California generally moved to another Western state but some went to the South, the Northeast, and the Midwest. Scarcely any from states other than California moved outside the West. Lawful permanent residents who settled initially in New York or New Jersey were likely to move to another state in the Northeast, although some went to the South or the West. Some immigrants in California, Florida, Texas, and Illinois moved to states outside their initial region of residence.

Table 4 about here

Table 5 combines smaller states for Other West, Other South, Other Midwest, and Other Northeast. About 18 percent had made an interstate migration across these state or region categories, slightly less than based on individual states. Among those who moved from California, many went to other states in the West (27.5 percent), others in the South (15.3 percent), New York (11.5 percent), or Texas (11.2 percent). For 1995-2000 based on the census, from California, foreign-born migrants went to Nevada, Arizona, Washington, Colorado, and Utah in the West, Texas, Florida, Georgia, and North Carolina in the South, Illinois and Minnesota in the Midwest, and New York in the Northeast. From Texas, immigrants seemed to go to California (34.8 percent) or other states in the South (17.2 percent), especially Florida and Georgia as for the 1995-2000 period. From Illinois, immigrants showed choices of California (33.1 percent), other states in the Midwest (11.6 percent), such as Missouri, Iowa, Ohio, Michigan, and

Indiana as for 1995-2000, or other states in the South (11.1 percent), probably Florida, Texas, Georgia, and North Carolina as for the 1995-2000 period. From Florida, about as many were in other states of the South (20.7 percent) as in California (21.9 percent) at naturalization, and another 16.8 percent were in New York. In the 2000 census, foreign-born Floridians had also gone on to live in New Jersey, Texas, Illinois, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, or Maryland. Immigrants who were initially in New York or New Jersey showed migration to the other of these two states or to California, Florida, other states in the South, such as Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, or Maryland, or other states in the Northeast, such as Pennsylvania, Connecticut, or Massachusetts as for the 2000 census. A large share (54 percent) of immigrants settling in Western states other than California had moved to California by naturalization. Many of naturalizing immigrants from the Other South (29.2 percent), Other Midwest (30.7 percent), and Other Northeast (22.3 percent) had migrated to California by naturalization, but others of their counterparts had gone elsewhere. Iowa sought immigrants in the 1990s, and 60,000 foreign-born persons migrated from California, New York, and elsewhere to Iowa, but little of this migration seems to have been from this group of new citizens.

Table 5 about here

Turning to micro-level multivariate analysis of mover status with logistic regression modeling for all immigrants, males, and females (Table 6), several interesting findings appear. A measure of caution is needed here because the assumption is that nonnaturalizing immigrants have not moved, so effects may be conservatively estimated. Controlling for the effects of several independent covariates, demographic characteristics, visa class of admission, prior nonimmigrant experience, cohort, country of origin, and

initial state of residence, most of the effects are significant at .001 level. Younger immigrants are more likely to have moved by the time of naturalization. Having been a nonimmigrant is associated with greater likelihood of moving, and males are more likely to have moved. Married immigrants are *less* likely to have moved. Those having entered at earlier dates are more likely to have moved by the time of naturalization, and the economic difficulties of the early 1980s may have been a factor. This might also be spurious due to relationship of length of residence with naturalizing.

Table 6 about here

Family-sponsored immigrants, employment-sponsored immigrants, and immediate relatives were more likely to have moved than the reference group of refugees, asylees, and others. The latter have access to assistance programs and training so they may prefer to stay. Employment-sponsored immigrants were more likely to have done so, and this is very logical given their possession of valuable skills and education and that they are already positively selected on moving to maximize their employment. Asians and Africans were more likely to have made an interstate migration than other groups, and North American and Oceanian immigrants were less likely than other groups. South Americans were moderately likely to have moved. Caribbean immigrants were just slightly more likely to have moved than the reference group.

Initial place of residence is related to whether an immigrant has moved by the time of naturalization. If he or she were living in Illinois or elsewhere in the Midwest, an immigrant had greater chances of moving. Those immigrants who settled in the Northeast or the South were somewhat more likely to move than immigrants settling in Texas, Florida, New York, or Other West, although they were more likely to move than

immigrants living in California. Immigrants initially settling in Florida may be staying there more than other groups although they are still more likely to move along than those in California.

Among male immigrants, husbands and fathers of citizens were *less likely* to have moved by the time of naturalization. In addition, *Caribbean-born men were less likely to make an interstate migration*. Remaining effects were consistent with those in the pooled model. This includes the marital status effect which shows married male immigrants as less likely to have moved during the interval in alien status. Turning to results for female immigrants, the marital status effect and nonimmigrant experience effect are no longer significant. The effects for region of birth are similar to those in the pooled model, that is, Caribbean-born women are more likely to have moved than the reference group.

Logistic regression models were also estimated that included only immigrants having naturalized (Table 7). Certain variables are no longer significant (older age dummy variables (40-49 years, 50-59 years), Oceania-born dummy, and gender) significant only at the .05 level (age effects for 30-39 years and 60-69 years). Having nonimmigrant experience is associated with a *lesser* likelihood of having moved at naturalization. Asian and African immigrants are again more likely to have moved than the reference group of European immigrants, but *Caribbean and South American immigrants are now less likely to have moved* than the reference group. Caribbean and South American immigrants might be unlikely to move away from the gateway cities of Miami, New York, and Los Angeles. This effect for prior nonimmigrant experience may be overstated because U.S. experienced immigrants are more likely to naturalize

(Woodrow-Lafield et al. 2004) although it is intuitive that they might be more settled and unlikely to migrate to another state before naturalization.

Table 7 about here

Upon looking at results from gender-specific models for naturalizing immigrants, younger women are more likely to have moved, but similar men are not, and older men are less likely to move whereas women older than 50 years are more likely to have moved before naturalization. Immigrating under employment preferences seems most associated with migration for men, but women admitted under both employment preferences and as immediate relatives are likely to make an interstate move. The coefficients for countries or regions of origin and state or region of initial residence are similar to those in the pooled model except that male immigrants initially settling in the Northeast were very likely to make a move during this phase of lawful permanent residence. Once again, men born in the Caribbean appear less likely to have moved and similar women are more likely to have done so.

Cox model discussion

Table 8 about here

^{14A} (The reengineering of the 2010 census raises concerns for many researchers as to adequacy of the American Community Survey (Rogers, Willekens, and Raymer 2003; Grieco 2003). The ACS residence rules are also different from the usual residence criterion of the census in including individuals if they have been or expect to reside for at least two months.)

18A It is possible to control for selection biases, as in another study finding that among skill-based immigrants in the 1977 cohort, there was evidence of occupational downgrading, but spouse immigrants showed upgrading (Jasso and Rosenzweig 1995).

19A Researchers may seek to utilize the New Immigrant Survey if it continues as envisioned.

Discussion and Conclusions

Internal migration of the U.S. foreign-born population must be addressed with attention to family contexts and circumstances of migrating to and remaining in the United States. It seems that foreign-born residents may move for reasons similar to the reasons for which native-born residents move, particularly for securing better jobs. The directional patterns of internal migration of the foreign-born from state to state are somewhat shaped by the settlement concentrations in six states historically receiving immigrants. Domestic outmigration of natives has appeared as correlated positively with immigration from abroad, with nuances by educational background.

The results here are consistent with those of Jaeger (2004). Just as initial immigrant settlement is likely for areas with ethnic communities due to selectivity as sponsored by family members, facilitating social networks, and an economic infrastructure supportive of new workers, some secondary migration of immigrants is attributable to the same reasons as immigrants improve their situations. This study finds that employment-sponsored immigrants experienced more interstate migration, and this may result from their greater human capital allowing greater choice in economic opportunities and amenities, including availability of ethnics as peers.

As a consequence of several actual shifts plus legislative and policy changes, including increased family reunification applications, high numbers of immigrants eligible to apply for naturalization, adjustments under section 245i, applications for work authorization, and renewal of residence cards, immigration processing slowed and there were huge backlogs of applications for naturalization and immigration benefits in the late 1990s. The backlogs were substantially reduced in 2000-2001, but, as of December 2005, there were 843,000 adjustment-of-status cases were pending. In 2002, nearly two-thirds (679,305 or 64 percent and) of lawful permanent resident admittees were adjustments who had already been living in the United States an average of three to four years (Department of Homeland Security 2003, 2005).

This study probably captures only a fraction of internal migration of lawful permanent resident aliens in the first five to twenty years of residence. This study is a preliminary look, and further research could incorporate contextual measures for ethnic communities in states. There appears to be less cohesion for immigrants settling in some areas than for those settling in Florida or California who were more likely to stay in these states, and further modeling for specific origin groups might illustrate specific destination effects. Curiously, this study finds that Asians and Africans are more likely to move, as also evident for IRCA-legalized immigrants (Neumann and Tienda 1994). Cite other research on Asians? Refugees? Those immigrants having adjusted from nonimmigrant status may be less likely to have moved, but this is stated cautiously due to limitations of this analysis.

The U.S. foreign-born population is highly differentiated on lawful status and intended and actual durations of residence. Many admittees for temporary residence

subsequently stay for longer periods and that may or may not have been their initial intention and statistics for departing nonimmigrants illustrate that durations of stay may last for more than a year (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service 1996; Grieco 2004). For both lawful and unlawful residents, there are many subcategories, e.g., by nonimmigrant class of admission, visa class of admission as lawful permanent resident, and, for unauthorized resident, whether entered without inspection or violated terms of nonimmigrant status (Woodrow-Lafield 1998; Bustamante et al. 1998.)

In the case of secondary migration of the foreign-born according to immigration status, data sources are highly restricted. Cross-sectional sources mix lawful residents for permanent or temporary lengths of stay and unauthorized residents who may convert their status, stay at risk, or leave. Using linked administrative records as a longitudinal resource provides tracking from gaining resident status until naturalization, and reveals some internal migration to other states of residence. For unauthorized residents and their internal migration patterns, special studies may be of some value. Demographic details are accessible with cross-sectional sources for the foreign-born universe, but these do not allow disaggregation to authorized and unauthorized components. In particular, traditional census and survey data is preferable for studying intercounty and intracounty migration, particularly the latter for which the foreign-born population seems to show higher incidence.

These data may be less useful for studying women's migration than for studying men's migration. Among men, these results point to employment-sponsored immigrants as more likely to make interstate moves. Further investigation is needed before making

the argument that this approach has potential for usefully supplementing existing sources on internal migration. If these patterns are typical, some research on unauthorized estimation may lead to overestimates for California and Florida and underestimates for New York and Illinois.

REFERENCES

- Aronson, David (ed.). 1996. "Immigrants & Welfare." *Research Perspectives on Migration* 1 (September/October, 1). Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and The Urban Institute.
- Barrett, Alan. 1996. "Did the decline continue? Comparing the labor-market quality of United States immigrants from the late 1970s and late 1980s," *Journal of Population Economics* 9(1): 55-63.
- Barringer, Herbert R., Robert W. Gardner, and Michael J. Levin. 1993. *Asians and Pacific Islanders in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Publications.
- Bartel, A.P. 1989. "Where Do the New U.S. Immigrants Live?" *Journal of Labor Economics* 7(4):371-391.
- Borjas, George J. 1998. "Immigration and Welfare Magnets." Working Paper 6813, National Bureau of Economic Research. November.
- Brookings Institution. 2003. Living Cities Census Series.
<http://www.brookings.edu/es/urban/issues/demographics/demographics.htm>
- Bustamante, J., Jasso, G., Taylor, J.E. & Trigueros Legarreta, P. (1998). Characteristics of migrants: Mexicans in the United States, pp. 91-162 in: *Binational Migration Study, Migration between Mexico and the United States: Binational Study, Volume I, Thematic Chapters*, U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform and Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (<http://www.utexas.edu/lbj/uscir/binpapers/v1-2bust.pdf>).
- Butcher, K.F. and D. Card. 1991. "Immigration and Wages: Evidence from the 1980's," *American Economic Review* 81 (May): 292-296.

- De Jong, Gordon F., Deborah Roempke Graefe, and Tanja St. Pierre. 2005. Welfare Reform and Interstate Migration of Poor Families. *Demography* 42 (3): 469-496.
- Donato, Katharine M. 1994. U.S. Policy and Mexican Migration to the United States: 1942-1992. *Social Science Quarterly* 75(4): 705-729.
- Durand, Jorge, Douglas S. Massey, and Fernando Charvet. 2000. "The Changing Geography of Mexican Immigration to the United States: 1910-1996." *Social Science Quarterly* 81(1): 1-15.
- Durand, Jorge, Douglas S. Massey, and Emilio A. Parrado. 1999. "The New Era of Mexican Migration to the United States," *The Journal of American History* 86 (2): 518-536.
- Durand, Jorge, Douglas S. Massey, and Rene Zenteno. 2000. "Mexican Immigration to the United States: Continuities and Changes," *Latin American Research Review* 36 (1): 107-127.
- Ellis, Mark and Richard Wright. 1998. "When Immigrants Are Not Migrants: Counting Arrivals of the Foreign-Born Using the U.S. Census," *International Migration Review* 32 (1, Spring): 127-144.
- Espenshade, T. (ed.). (1994). *A stone's throw from Ellis Island*. University Press of America.
- Fernandez, E.W. and J.G. Robinson. 1994. Illustrative Ranges of the Distribution of Undocumented Immigrants by State. Technical Working Paper No. 8, Population Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.

Filer, R.K. 1992. "The Effect of Immigrant Arrivals on Migratory Patterns of Native Workers." In G.J. Borjas and R.B. Freeman (eds.), *Immigration and the Work Force*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Pp. 245-269.

Fischer, Claude S., Gretchen Stockmayer, Jon Stiles, and Michael Hout. 2004. Geographic Levels and Social Dimensions of Metropolitan Segregation. *Demography* 41 (1, February): 37-60.

Foner, Nancy. 2000. *From Ellis Island to JFK*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Foner, Nancy, Ruben G. Rumbaut, and Steven J. Gold. 2000. *Immigration Research for a New Century: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Franklin, Rachel S. 2003. *Domestic Migration Across Regions, Divisions, and States: 1995 to 2000*. Census 2000 Special Reports, CENSR-7. August.

Franklin, Rachel S. 2003. *Migration of the Young, Single, and College Educated: 1995 to 2000*. Census 2000 Special Reports, CENSR-12. November.

Frey, William H. 1994. "Immigration and Internal Migration from U.S. Metro Areas: 1990 Census Findings by Race, Poverty, and Education," Research Report No. 94-304. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Population Studies Center.

Frey, W.H. 1995a. "Immigration and Internal Migration "Flight": A California Case Study." *Population and Environment* 16(4): 353-375.

Frey, W.H. 1995b. "Immigration and Internal Migration "Flight" from U.S. Metro Areas: Toward a New Demographic Balkanization." *Urban Studies* 32 (4-5, May):333-357.

Frey, William H. 1995c. The New Geography of Population Shifts: Trends Toward Balkanization. Pp. 271-336 in *The State of the Union, Volume One, Social Trends*, Reynolds Farley (ed.), Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

Frey, William H. 1996. "Immigration, Domestic Migration, and Demographic Balkanization in America," *Population and Development Review* 22 (4): 741-763.

Frey, William H. 1998. "New Demographic Divide in the United States: Immigrant and Domestic 'Migrant Magnets,'" *Public Policy Perspectives* 9(4): 35-39.

Frey, William H. 1999. New Black Migration Patterns in the United States: Are They Affected by Recent Immigration? Pp. 311-344 in *Immigration and Opportunity: Race, Ethnicity, and Employment in the United States*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

Frey, William H. 2002. Census 2000 Reveals New Native-Born and Foreign-Born Shifts Across U.S. PSC Research Report, Report No. 02-520, August. Population Studies Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Frey, William H. 2004a. *The New Great Migration: Black Americans' Return to the South, 1965-2000*. Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, The Living Cities Census Series. The Brookings Institution: Washington, D.C. May.

Frey, William H. 2004b. Immigration, Domestic Migration and U.S. Metro Area Change: Contrasting the 1990s with the 1980s. Presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Boston.

Frey, William H. and Reynolds Farley. 1996. "Latino, Asian, and Black Segregation: Are Multiethnic Metros Different?" *Demography* 33 (1): 35-50.

Frey, William H. and Kenneth M. Johnson. 1998. "Concentrated Immigration, Restructuring, and the 'Selective' Deconcentration of the U.S. Population." In *Migration*

into Rural Areas: Theories and Issues, edited by Paul J. Boyle and Keith H. Halfacree.
London: Wiley.

Frey, William H. and Kao-Lee Liaw. 1998a. "Immigrant Concentration and Domestic Migrant Dispersal: Is Movement to Nonmetro Areas 'White Flight?'" *Professional Geographer* 50(2): 215-232.

Frey, William H. and Kao-Lee Liaw. 1998. The Impact of Recent Immigration on Population Redistribution within the United States," Pp. 388-448 in James P. Smith and Barry Edmonston (eds.). *The Immigration Debate*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Frey, William H. and Alden Speare, Jr. 1988. *Regional and Metropolitan Growth and Decline in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Funkhouser, Edward *International Migration Review*

Glaeser, Edward L. and Jesse M. Shapiro. 2001. City Growth and the 2000 Census: Which Places Grew, and Why? May. Washington: Center for Urban & Metropolitan Policy, Brookings Institution.

Graefe, Deborah. 2004. Why Poor Families Move: Welfare Rules, Life Course Transitions, and Local Area Economic Explanations. Presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Boston.

Grenier, Guillermo J. and Alex Stepick (eds.). 1992. *Miami Now!* Gainesville: University of Florida Press.

Grieco, Liz M. 2004. Office of Immigration Statistics, Department of Homeland Security, Washington, D.C.

Grieco, Liz M. 2003. Census 2010 and the Foreign-Born. Policy Brief No. 1, Migration Policy Institute, Washington, D.C.

Hagan, Jacqueline Maria. 1994. *Deciding to be Legal: A Maya Community in Houston*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hansen, Kristin A. 1998. *Seasonality of Moves and Duration of Residence*. Current Population Reports, Household Economic Studies, P70-66, October, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

He, Wan and Jason P. Schachter. 2003. Internal Migration of the Older Population: 1995 to 2000. Census 2000 Special Reports, CENSR-10, U.S. Bureau of the Census. August.

Hempstead, Katherine. 2003. Immigration and Native Migration in New York City, 1985-1990. *Population Research and Policy Review* 22 (4, August): 333-349.

Hobbs, Frank and Nicole Stoops. 2002. *Demographic Trends in the 20th Century*. Census 2000 Special Reports. Series CENSR-4, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. December.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette and Ernestine Avila. 1997. I'm Here, But I'm There: The Meanings of Latina Transnational Motherhood. *Gender and Society* 11(5): 548-571.

Jaeger, David A. 2004. Local Labor Markets, Admission Categories, and Immigrant Locational Choice. Presented at the IZA Annual Migration Meeting, Bonn, Germany.

Jasso, G., D.S. Massey, M.R. Rosenzweig, and J.P. Smith. 2003. The New Immigrant Survey in the US: The Experience Over Time. *Migration Information Source*, January 1. Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute.

Jasso, Guillermina, Douglas S. Massey, Mark R. Rosenzweig, and James P. Smith. 2000.

“The New Immigrant Survey Pilot (NIS-P): Overview and New Findings About U.S.

Legal Immigrants at Admission,” *Demography* 37 (1): 127-138.

Johnson, Hans. 1996. *Undocumented Immigration to California: 1980-1993*. San

Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.

Johnson, Hans 2000. *Movin’ Out: Domestic Migration to and from California in the*

1990s. California Counts, Population Trends and Profiles, Volume 2, Number 1, August,

Public Policy Institute of California.

Johnson, James H., Jr., Karen D. Johnson-Webb, and Walter C. Farrell, Jr. 1999. Newly

Emerging Hispanic Communities in the United States: A Spatial Analysis of Settlement

Patterns, In-Migration Fields, and Social Receptivity. Pp. 263-310 in *Immigration and*

Opportunity: Race, Ethnicity, and Employment in the United States, Russell Sage

Foundation, New York.

Kaestner, Robert, Neeraj Kaushal, and Gregg Van Ryzin. 2001. Migration

Consequences of Welfare Reform. Working Paper No.w8560, National Bureau of

Economic Research. October.

Kahn, J. 1994. Immigrant and native fertility during the 1980s: Adaptation and

expectations for the future. *International Migration Review* 28 (3 Fall): 501-520.

Kiaw, Koo-Lee and William H. Frey. Interstate Migration of Young American Adults in

1985-1990: An Explanation Using a Nested Logit Model. *Geographical Systems* 3:301-

334.

Kraly, Ellen Percy. 1995. U.S. Immigration and the Environment: Scientific Research

and Analytic Issues. Research Paper, U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform.

Lobo, A. Peter and Joseph Salvo. 2001. The African Brain Drain to the United States in the 1990s. Presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Washington, D.C.

Logan, John R., Brian J. Stults, and Reynolds Farley. 2004. Segregation of Minorities in the Metropolis. *Demography* 41 (1, February): 1-22.

Long, Larry. 1988. Migration and Residential Mobility in the United States. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lopez, David. E., Eric Popkin, and Edward Telles. 1996. Central Americans: At the Bottom, Struggling to Get Ahead. Pp. 279-304 in Roger Waldinger and Mehdi Bozorgmehr (eds.), *Ethnic Los Angeles*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Malone, Nolan, Kaari F. Baljua, Joseph M. Costanzo, and Cynthia J. Davis. 2003. *The Foreign-Born Population: 2000*. Census 2000 Briefs, C2KBR-34. December.

Massey, Douglas. 2006. The Wall That Keeps Illegal Workers In. *The New York Times*, April 4.

Massey, Douglas S. 2005. Beyond the Border Buildup: Towards a New Approach to Mexico-U.S. Migration. *Immigration Policy IN FOCUS*, Volume 4, Issue 7, Immigration Policy Center. September.

Massey, Douglas S. and Nolan Malone. 2002. Pathways to legal immigration. *Population Research and Policy Review* 21 (6, December): 473-504.

Massey, Douglas S., Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouaouci, Adela Pellegrino, and J. Edward Taylor. 1998. *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millenium*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Massey, Douglas S., L. Goldring, and J. Durand. 1994. "Continuities in Transnational Migration: An Analysis of Nineteen Mexican Communities," *American Journal of Sociology* 99(6):1492-1533.

Mattoon, Richard. 2003. Understanding Isolation and Change in Urban Neighborhoods: A Research Symposium. The Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, Chicago Fed Letter, June, Number 190b (cfljune2003_190b.pdf).

Mena, Jennifer. 2004. A Great Familial Divide. *Los Angeles Times*, June 23.

Neumann, Kristin E. and Marta Tienda. 1994. "The Settlement and Secondary Migration Patterns of Legalized Immigrants: Insights from Administrative Records," Pp. 187-226 in *Immigration and Ethnicity*, by Barry Edmonston and Jeffrey S. Passel (eds.), The Urban Institute Press, Washington, D.C.

O'Grady, Michael J. 1995. "Native and Naturalized Citizens and Non-Citizens: An Analysis of Poverty Status, Welfare Benefits, and Other Factors." Congressional Research Service Report for Congress. #95-276. EPW.

Paral, Rob and Michael Norkewicz. 2003. *The Metro Chicago Immigration Fact Book*. June. Institute for Metropolitan Affairs, Roosevelt University.
<http://www.roosevelt.edu/ima/>

Passel, Jeffrey S. 2006. *The Size and Characteristics of the Unauthorized Population in the U. S.: Estimates Based on the March 2005 Current Population Survey*. Pew Hispanic Center Report, March 7.

Passel, Jeffrey S. 2005. *Estimates of the Size and Characteristics of the Undocumented Population*. Pew Hispanic Center Report, March 21.

Passel, Jeffrey S. 2002. "New Estimates of the Undocumented Population in the United States," *Migration Information Source*, May 22, www.migrationinformation.org.

Passel, Jeffrey S. 1985. Report of the Expert Working Group on Immigration. U.S. Census Bureau.

Passel, Jeffrey S. 1986. Monthly Labor Review.

Passel, Jeffrey S. 1985. The Annals.

Passel, Jeffrey S. 1999. "Undocumented Immigration to the United States: Numbers, Trends, and Characteristics," Chapter 3 (pp. 27-111), *Illegal Immigration in America: A Reference Handbook*, David W. Haines and Karen E. Rosenblum, Greenwood Press.

Passel, Jeffrey S., and Karen A. Woodrow. 1984. "Geographic Distribution of Undocumented Immigrants: Estimates of Undocumented Aliens Counted in the 1980 Census by State," *International Migration Review* 18: 642-671.

Passel, Jeffrey S., and Karen A. Woodrow. 1985. "The Judicial Basis for Enumeration of Undocumented Aliens in the 1980 Census and Implications for 1990," *1984 Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Social Statistics Section*, pp. 464-469.

Passel, Jeffrey S. and Wendy Zimmerman. 2001. Are Immigrants Leaving California? Settlement Patterns of Immigrants in the late 1990s. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Perry, Marc J. 2003. *State to State Migration Flows: 1995 to 2000*. Census 2000 Special Reports, CENSR-8. August.

Perry, Marc J. and Paul J. Mackun. 2001. *Population Change and Distribution: 1990 to 2000*. Census 2000 Brief C2KBR-01-2, U.S. Census Bureau: Washington, D.C. April.

Perry, Marc J. and Jason P. Schachter. 2003. *Migration of Natives and the Foreign-Born: 1995 to 2000*. Census 2000 Special Reports, CENSR-14. August.

- Poch, Bunnak. 2002. Socioeconomic Adaptation of Immigrants from Mainland Southeast Asia: An Intergenerational Analysis. Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work, Mississippi State University.
- Repak, Terry A. 1995. *Waiting on Washington: Central American Workers in the Nation's Capital*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Roberts, Bryan R. 1995. "Socially Expected Durations and the Economic Adjustment of Immigrants." Pp. 42-86 in *The Economic Sociology of Immigration*, A. Portes (ed.). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Rogers, Andrei. 1990. "Requiem for the Net Migrant," *Geographical Analysis* 22(4): 283-300.
- Rogers, Andrei. 2003. Final Report, National Science Foundation (p. 6).
- Rogers, Andrei and Sabine Henning. 1999. The internal migration patterns of the foreign-born and native-born population in the United States: 1975-80 and 1985-90. *International Migration Review* 33(2): 403-
- Rogers, Andrei and James Raymer. 1999. Estimating the regional migration patterns of the foreign-born population in the United States: 1950-1990. *Mathematical Population Studies* 7(3): 181-216.
- Rogers, Andrei, Jani Little and James Raymer. 1999. Disaggregating the historical demographic sources of regional foreign-born and native-born population growth in the United States: A new method with applications. *International Journal of Population Geography* 5 :449-475.

Rogers, Andrei, Frans Willekens, and James Raymer. 2003. Imposing age and spatial structures on inadequate migration-flow datasets. *The Professional Geographer* 55(1): 56-69.

Rytina, Nancy F. 2003. Estimates of the Legal Permanent Resident Population and Population Eligible to Naturalize in 2002. Department of Homeland Security. May.

Rytina, Nancy F. 2002. IRCA Legalization Effects: Lawful Permanent Residence and Naturalization through 2001. Presented at "The Effects of Immigrant Legalization Programs on the United States: Scientific Evidence on Immigrant Adaptation and Impacts on U.S. Economy and Society," October 25, National Institutes of Health, sponsored by National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

2004

2005

Saenz, Rogelio and Alberto Davila. 1992. Chicano return migration to the Southwest: An integrated human capital approach. *International Migration Review* 26(4, Winter): 1248-1266.

Salvo, J. & Ortiz, R. (1992). The newest New Yorkers: An analysis of immigration into New York City during the 1980s. DCP #92-16. New York: New York City Department of City Planning. June.

Salvo, Joseph J. and Peter A. Lobo. 2004. *The Newest New Yorkers: 2000*. New York: New York City Department of City Planning.

Schachter, Jason S. 2003. *Migration by Race and Hispanic Origin: 1995 to 2000*. Census 2000 Special Reports, CENSR-13. October.

Schachter, Jason S., Rachel S. Franklin, and Marc J. Perry. 2003. *Migration and Geographic Mobility in Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan America: 1995 to 2000*.

Census 2000 Special Reports, CENSR-9. August.

Singer, Audrey. 2001. Living with Uncertainty: Welfare Reform and Latin American Immigrants in New York and Los Angeles. Pp. 21-26 in *Immigrants, Their Families, and Their Communities in the Aftermath of Welfare Reform*, edited by Audrey Singer, Research Perspectives on Migration, Volume 3, Number 1, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Singer, Audrey. 2003. At Home in the Nation's Capital: Immigrant Trends in Metropolitan Washington. Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

(<http://www.brookings.edu/es/urban/gwrp/publinks/2003/immigration.htm>).

Smith, James R. and Barry Edmonston. 1997. *The New Americans: Economic, Demographic, and Fiscal Effects of Immigration*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

South, Scott J. and Kyle D. Crowder. 1998. Leaving the 'Hood': Residential Mobility Between Black, White, and Integrated Neighborhoods." *American Sociological Review* 63: 17-26.

South, Scott J., Kyle D. Crowder, and Erick Chavez. 2005. "Migration and Spatial Assimilation Among U.S. Latinos: Classical Versus Segmented Trajectories." *Demography* 42(3): 497-522.

Suarez-Oroco, Carol and Irina Todorova, and Josephine Louie. 2001. The Transnationalization of Families: Immigrant Separations and Reunifications. Harvard Immigration Project, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education.

Suro, Roberto and Audrey Singer. 2002. Latino Growth in Metropolitan America: Changing Patterns, New Locations. http://www.pewhispanic.org/site/docs/pdf/final_phc-brookings_paper-appendix-tables.pdf

Thompson, Ginger. 2003. Littlest Immigrants, Left in Hands of Smugglers. *The New York Times*, November 3.

Tienda, M. (2002). Demography and the social contract. *Demography* 39:587-616.

United Nations. 1998. Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration, Revision 1. New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division, Statistical Papers Series M, N. 58, Rev. 1.

United Nations 1980. Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration. Statistical Papers, No. 58. Sales No. E.79.XVII.18.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security. 2003. *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics*. June.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. 2005. *Alien Registration: Usefulness of a Nonimmigrant Alien Annual Address Reporting Requirement is Questionable*. GAO-05-204. December.

U.S. General Accounting Office. 2004. Illegal Alien Schoolchildren: Issues in Estimating State-by-State Costs. GAO-04-733. June.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1996. *Characteristics and Labor Market Behavior of the Legalized Population Five Years Following Legalization*. Division of Immigration Policy and Research, by S.J. Smith, R.G. Kramer, and A. Singer.

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. 1992. *Immigration Reform and Control Act: Report on the Legalized Alien Population*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. 2002. The Triennial Comprehensive Report on Immigration. October.

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. 2003. *Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population Residing in the United States: 1990 to 2000*. January 31. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. 1997a. "INS Releases Updated Estimates of U.S. Illegal Population," Media Services, Office of Public Affairs, February 7, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. 1996. *Duration of Stay of Nonimmigrants Departing the United States*, Statistics Branch, Office of Policy and Planning.

The Urban Institute. 2002. *The Dispersal of Immigrants in the 1990s*. Immigrant Families and Workers, Facts and Perspectives, Brief No. 2. November.

Van Hook, Jennifer, Jennifer E. Glick, and Frank D. Bean. 1999. "Public Assistance Receipt Among Immigrants and Natives: How the Unit of Analysis Affects Research Findings," *Demography* 36 (1, February): 111-120.

Waldinger, Roger and Mehdi Bozorgmehr (eds.). 1996. *Ethnic Los Angeles*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Walker, R and M. Hannan. 1989. "Dynamic settlement processes: The case of U.S. immigration," *The Professional Geographer* 41(2): 172-183.

Warren, Robert. 1994. "Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population Residing in the United States, by Country of Origin and State of Residence: October 1992."

Presented at "California Immigration 1994," April 29, 1994. INS Statistics Division, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Washington, D.C.

Wilkes, Rima and John Iceland. 2004. "Hypersegregation in the Twenty-First Century," *Demography* 41 (1, February): 23-36.

Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A. 2002 "The Immigration-to-Naturalization Project: Inception, Guidelines, Analyses, and Possibilities," *2001 Proceedings of the American Statistical Association*, Section on Government Statistics [CD-ROM], Alexandria, VA: American Statistical Association.

Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A. 2001. "Implications of Immigration for Apportionment," *Population Research and Policy Review* 20(4):267-289.

Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A. 1999 "Labor Migration, Family Integration, and the New America During the Twentieth Century," Chapter 2 (pp. 13-26), *Illegal Immigration in America: A Reference Handbook*, David W. Haines and Karen E. Rosenblum, Greenwood Press.

Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A. 1998. "Estimating Authorized Immigration," *Migration Between Mexico and the United States: Binational Study, Volume 2, Research Reports and Background Materials*, Mexico-United States Binational Migration Study, Pp. 619-682, Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs and U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform. (<http://www.utexas.edu/lbj/uscir/binpapers/v2a-5woodrow.pdf>).

Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A. 1996. "Demographic Effects of Legalization," Working Paper, Bureau of International Labor Affairs, Division of Immigration Policy and Research, U.S. Department of Labor, Based on Final Report (revised March 1995).

Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A. and Ellen Percy Kraly. 2004. "Points of Departure: Emigration from the United States," presented at the 2004 annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Boston.

<http://paa2004.princeton.edu/download.asp?submissionid=41789>

Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A., Xiaohe Xu, Thomas Kersen, and Bunnak Poch. 2004. "Naturalization for U.S. Immigrants: Highlights from Ten Countries," *Population Research and Policy Review* 23.

Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A., Xiaohe Xu, Thomas Kersen, and Bunnak Poch. "Gender, Origin, Admission Criteria, and Naturalization Outcomes," Presented at the 2000 annual meeting of the Southern Demographic Association, New Orleans.

Woodrow-Lafield, Karen A., Xiaohe Xu, Bunnak Poch, and Thomas Kersen. 1999. "Geography and Settlement for U.S. Immigrants," presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Demographic Association, San Antonio.

Zavodny, Madeline. 1999. Determinants of recent immigrants' locational choices. *International Migration Review* 33(4, Winter): 1014-1030.