

Propensities for Return Migration for Race/Ethnic Groups Across Nonmetropolitan and Metropolitan Counties

by

**Beth A. Wilson, Young-Taek Kim
E. H. Berry, and Michael B. Toney**

**Paper for presentation to the Consortium of Utah Demographers
Utah State University
March 25, 2005**

Introduction

Leaving a community is generally a difficult undertaking for a family or individual. Yet five percent or 15 million Americans leave one county to live in another yearly (<http://www.census.gov>.) Prior research has shown that repeat migration makes up a large share of these migrations. Although a rich body of research emerged on repeat migration (Goldstein 1952; DaVanzo and Morrison 1981) little recent research has built on this important area of migration investigation. DaVanzo and Morrison (1981) distinguished between two forms of repeat migration, return and onward respectively. Onward migration entails movement to a community in which the migrant had not previously lived whereas return migration involves going back to a prior place of residence. This research focuses on return migration. We are above all interested in comparing propensities of return migration for Hispanics, Blacks and non-Hispanic White. Comparisons of the repeat migration of these groups are lacking, particularly with panel data.

Location specific capital and place attachment perspectives help guide the research. Age, marital status, education, length of residence, home ownership, church attendance, school enrollment and employment status are introduced in a multivariate analysis that compares differences in return rates for these groups. A second focus is on whether members of these groups differ in their rates of return to metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties. This is a place characteristic that is prominent in migration literature. Data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, NLSY79, collected in 20 interviews between 1979 and 2002 are used to measure migration and to provide control variables that are measured at the time when the migrant moved from an origin; that origin then becomes a potential future return destination. The respondents in the NLSY79 transit the ages during which migration rates are their highest, ages 18-29, and have now aged well into the mid-years when migration rates are low.

Return Migration:

Return migration, although a subcategory of all migrations, is an elaborate process that may be defined in various ways. In their authoritative article on repeat migration, Morrison and DaVanzo (1986) indicate that the different forms of repeat deserve singular attention in research because of their unique relationships with social and economic factors that shape migration. They found that return migrants, especially those who returned soon after leaving a place, were comparatively less educated and less skilled and less likely to plan ahead than were onward migrants. The definition of return migration may be restricted by classifying migrations on the basis of whether the move is to a particular house or to a specific local community of prior habitation, or, the definition may be wide-ranging by categorizing moves as to whether they are returns to larger geographical units such as a states, regions or countries.

Further, definitions of migration often include a time dimension indicating that migration entails a permanent change of residence. Yet, prior research indicates that repeat migration usually involves a series of short-term residences and that a large share of return migrations occurs soon after leaving a place (DaVanzo and Morrison 1981). Census based analyses of return migration are limited to measures based on state of residence at three points in time, namely current residence, state of residence five years ago, and state of birth. This measurement is deficient because places of residence between those points in time are not identified and repeat migration, and particularly return migrations, tend to occur in rapid successions (DaVanzo and Morrison 1981; Eldridge 1965). As a consequence, a large number of return migrations are not detected with census and typical cross sectional survey data.

Cromartie and Stack (1989) further complicate the issue of return migration by suggesting that migrants be classified on the extent of prior contact with a destination and note that migrants whose kin previously resided in a destination area ought to be considered return migrants if evidence indicates they are returning to a homeplace that is important in the migrants' family history even when the area has not been home to the particular migrant.

Racial and Ethnic comparisons of migration patterns

Comparisons of the various facets of migration for racial and ethnic groups are important because, as Massey and Mullan (1984) maintain, migration is critical in determining their spatial assimilation which in turn affects the

groups' overall socioeconomic assimilation. Relatedly, Sandefur and Jeon (1991) note that migration is vitally important to race and ethnic groups because it shapes their involvement in distant labor markets thereby impacting the career paths of members of minority groups. As such, migration may be genuinely viewed as an adjustment of individuals and families to differential opportunity levels, with opportunities defined broadly to include the economic and social structure of areas, existing in various places. Further, if members of some groups are spatially separated from areas of greatest opportunities, or concentrated in areas with limited opportunities, their prospect for upward mobility is limited. Indeed, the Great Migration of Blacks from the South after the civil war and the large number of Blacks recently returning to the South attests to the importance of migration for members of race and ethnic groups in American society (Falk, Hunt, and Hunt 2004; Tolnay???)

Numerous factors may account for race and ethnic differences in facets of migration. Differences in historical settlement patterns influence the ability of groups to learn about and respond to distant opportunities (Kobrin and Speare 1983; Sandefur and Jeon 1991). Newbold (1997) notes that discrimination, differences in education levels, skills and cultural preferences for migration or types of places to live could influence the overall migration and migration types for race and ethnic groups in American society. The higher tendency for Blacks and Hispanics to live near close relatives seems likely to help shape their overall migration and their inclinations for return migration (Liaw, and Frey 2003; Logan, and Spitze 1994).

Interaction between race/ethnicity and return migration patterns

Return migration is a potentially important facet in the analysis of race and ethnic migration because higher rates of return migration for some groups than for others may signal a less effective use of migration as a strategy for socioeconomic advancement (DaVanzo and Morrison 1981). A high frequency of return migration would curtail the development of population nodes throughout the society and in so doing help sustain a limited migration pattern. Although research on the return of blacks to the south is impressive, there remains a gap in research that precisely compares their rates with rates of return for Hispanics, and non-Hispanic Whites, particularly at the county level and with panel data. For example, the panel data used by Davanzo and Morrison (1981) did not include enough Blacks or Hispanics to make race and ethnic comparisons. In an analysis of interstate migration based on the 1960 and 1970 censuses Long and Hansen (1975) found that Whites born in the South but living outside that region were several times more likely to return to the South than were Blacks. More recent research shows a shift in the migration patterns of Blacks with increases in the number returning to the south now standing out as a prominent facet of Black migration (Falk, Hunt and Hunt 2004). Newbold's (1997) state and regional level analysis of 1990 census data revealed higher overall rates of return migration within the United States for Blacks than for Whites and especially for returning to the South.

Sandefur and Jeon (1991) observe that straightforward comparisons that include Hispanics have been problematic with census data because procedures used to identify them have not been consistent over time, a challenge compounded by the other migration-defining limitations inherent in census data. McHugh (1989) also laments the lack of research on the internal migration of Hispanics and points to the need for research on long term Hispanic residents as well as on recent Hispanic immigrants. More recent research has shown that long term Hispanic residents and native born Hispanics are playing an important role in the establishment of population nodes outside the traditional Hispanic settlement areas (Leach, Bean and Brown 2004; Zuniga, and Hernandez-Leon 2002). As part of their census-based comparisons of earnings of Chicano return and onward migrants Shumway and Hall (1996) found Chicanos were much more likely to make a return than onward migration.

A number of socio-demographic characteristics of individuals are known to shape their propensity to migrate (Shaw 1975). Race and ethnic groups are also known to differ with respect to their socio-demographic characteristics. Furthermore, there are contradictory findings in prior research with respect to the extent to which return migrants differ from nonmigrants and other types of migrants (DaVanzo 1976; Lee 1973; Von Reichert

2002). DaVanzo and Morrison found that return migrants, especially those who returned after a short absence, are less educated, less skilled and more likely to be unemployed than are other categories of migrants. On the other hand, in their analysis of census data Falk, Hunt and Hunt (2004) found black return migrants were of higher socioeconomic status than blacks remaining in the north and the blacks they were joining in the south. They referred to black return migrants as the “best of the brightest.” Von Reichert (2002) found that Montana’s return migrants were very similar to the people they were returning to be amongst. Age, marital status, education, length of residence, home ownership, school enrollment and employment status were selected for as controls in our analysis because of their importance in prior studies and they possibly denote a level of location-specific capital (DaVanzo 1983) and/or attachment to places when migrants leaves them.

The need for utilizing county-level data to understand repeat migration

While DaVanzo and Morrison (1981) and Morrison and Davanzo (1986) utilized labor market areas to define migration as between multi-county labor markets, this research examines migration across county lines. The county is a common unit for measuring migration but is largely missing in studies of return migration. It is the smallest spatial unit that individuals can reasonably identify when asked to name past places of residence and some have noted that of the identifiable units it is the one in which one’s daily social life tends to be most intense (Shryock 1964). Admittedly, any scheme that uses boundaries for defining migration are arbitrary since the size of the geographical unit and whether residences are evenly dispersed or concentrated in the center or near the boundaries may influence the amount and character of migrations (Long 1988). Yet Sanderfur and Jeon (1991) note that similarities in migration patterns at the interregional and interstate levels for race and ethnic groups may conceal differences that exist for smaller spatial units, hence the use of counties is appropriate.

A key part of our approach is the use of measures for the time when migrants leave a county to which a return might occur in the future. We limit the measurement of control variables to this point in time to keep the focus on this early time in the migration sequencing and to delineate a feasible scope for the study. We recognize that some returns are caused by circumstances that happen after leaving a place but questions regarding them are outside the rationale for this study. Indeed, Falk, Hunt and Hunt (2004) note that destinations that once seemed to be “the promised land” can become hostile and generate return migration. Others note that individuals age and experience other changes that may lead them to return to a prior residence even if there are no significant changes in the character of the places (Von Reichert 202). Regardless, we view repeat migration as possibly involving a chain of effects with the time of leaving a place as one logical point in time to be methodically analyzed. The fact that a large share of returns are made within a short time of leaving a place may suggest that measurements taken at the time of departure can help explain return migration (DaVanzo and Morrison 1986). Sandefur and Jeon (1991) convey that they did not include some variables they considered potentially important determinants of migration, such as martial status, since only end of interval measures that could be endogenous with migration are available in census and cross sectional survey data. DaVanzo (1983) points out that factors prior to the specific one-period over which migration is usually measured might help explain whether migration happens and where the migrants go and speculates that return migrations may be products of events that began before the migrants left the residence to which they return.. DaVanzo (1983) uses years of residence in dwelling unit at prior residence and finds that migrants with longer durations of residence in prior places of residence are more likely to return than are migrants who left places after living in them for fewer years. Duration of residence represents the level of location-specific capital in her analysis and the results support her hypothesis that high levels of location-specific capital when leaving places help explain returns to them. Our design is also similar to the research on international migration that examines the status of immigrants when they leave for the United States as a determinant of whether they will return or how long they will remain in the host country (Lindstrom 1996).

We rely on location- specific capital and place attachment for analytical guidance. In its most generic expression location-specific capital (DaVanzo and Morrison 1981) incorporates many aspects of the place attachment perspective. Location-specific capital refers to “concrete assets and other features specific to a place that are more

valuable to a the person if he lives there rather than somewhere else. . .” (DaVanzo and Morrison 1981 p 87). Similarly, a main point of place attachment is that members of some groups are more likely to develop strong attachments to some kinds of communities. For example, Smith (2002) maintains that place attachment of Hispanics to rural areas left behind is extraordinarily deep and that the identity and bonds are lasting. Place attachment more clearly emphasizes the idea that non-concrete assets, such as subjective sentiments and emotional bonds, developed in small communities tend to be stronger than bonds to cities (Wirth 193??; Smith 2002). These perspectives offer a rationale for expecting different rates of return migration for race and ethnic groups, for higher return rates for migrants departing nonmetropolitan than for migrants leaving metropolitan communities, and for the need to control a number of socioeconomic factors.

Based on prior location specific and place attachment perspectives and past empirical studies largely suggesting that the migration of Blacks and Hispanics might be limited because of their socioeconomic status, discrimination, and fewer population nodes due to past migration patterns, and deep attachments to relatives and small places we test two research hypotheses. First, we expect higher rates of return migration for members of Hispanics and Whites than for non-Hispanic Whites to exist after accounting for the influences our control variables. Secondly, we expect the differences between the likelihood of Hispanics and Blacks returning to both nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties to be higher than for Whites.

Data and Methods:

The NLSY79 is a panel of 12,686 respondents who were between the ages of 14 and 22 at the time of the first interview in 1979. The panel is comprised of three subsamples: a nationally representative cross-sectional sample of 6,111 respondents; a supplemental sample comprised of 1480 Hispanics, 2172 Blacks and 1643 poor non-Blacks/non-Hispanics (referred to as poor Whites); a sample of 1,280 respondents who were enlisted in the military. The military subsample and the poor white portion of its subsample were dropped from the NLSY79 for funding reasons after the 1984 and 1990 interviews, respectively. There were 7,724 respondents in the twentieth round of surveying in 2002 for a retention rate of 78 percent for eligible respondents. This is the lowest retention rate for any of the 20 surveys and there is less than a two percentage point difference in retention rates between the subsamples for any survey year. For this analysis we limit analysis to respondents who were 18 years old or older and whose primary activity at the beginning of the migration interval was in the labor force.

Measuring Migration:

The NLSY79 has not been used in recent analysis of internal migration. Reagan and Olsen (2000) employed this data set to follow 571 immigrants and to analyze the economic and demographic factors associated with returns to their countries of birth. They note that the NLSY79’s tracking of individuals from one interview to the next over many years provides rare information for measuring return migration. In our research a two stage procedure is used. In the first stage migrations between interviews conducted between 1979 and 2000 are identified without regards to whether they are return migrations. In the second stage, more fully described below, a search is undertaken to determine if and when return migrations occur for the migrations identified in stage one. We use Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) codes on a confidential file, available through a contractual agreement with the US Department of Labor, to track migration between counties of residence in the United States. The FIPS county codes are used to compare counties of residence from one interview to the next between 1979 and 2000, to identify migrations, county of residences at two adjacent interviews do not match. These 18 migration intervals migration intervals were one-year in length until the NLSY79 interview schedule was changed to the every other year after 1994. This procedure yielded 13,380 migrations by our study population of young adult whose primary activity was in the labor force when they migrated (Table 1). The migrations were distributed unevenly over the 19 migration intervals with the largest number, 1,426 migrations, occurring between the 1986 and 1987 interviews. The smallest number of migrations, 322 migrations, occurs during the 1991-92 interval, the interval following the dropping of the poor white portion of a subsample. Variations in the yearly migrations are expected given the pace at which the panel experiences migration producing life events and then enter ages during which migration rates are

low. Comparisons of the NLSY79 migration rates with rates for matching age groups in the CPS reveal similar patterns of yearly changes and particularly low rates for the early 1990s (Lee 2002; Toney and Sweargen 1985). It is important to note that person-periods associated with the 13,380 migrations are the basic units of analysis and that many respondents have more than one person-period. Our procedure is similar to the one used by DaVanzo and Morrisson (1981) with the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID). They utilized a person-year as the unit on analysis to investigate whether a particular type of migration occurs during one-year intervals. Each respondent has as many units of analysis as there are time intervals. Our person-periods are produced by migrations that render respondents at risk of “canceling their earlier migration” with a return. Each respondent has as many person-periods as they have migrations and each person-period represents a time interval during which a return migration may or may not ensue. The length of the interval last from the beginning of the person-period interval in which the migration occurs until a return happens or until the date of the last interview in 2002.

Measuring Return Migration - the dependent variables:

For each of the 13,380 migrations, or person periods, we compared counties of residence at subsequent interviews, including the 2002 interview, to determine if and when a return migration to the county of residence at the beginning of the person period takes place. This is a cumbersome but straightforward procedure. When a county is left a person- period with a risk of return migration to the county of residence at the beginning of the period is produced and a search for a return is begun by comparing the county of residence at the beginning of the person period with counties of residence at subsequent interview dates. If a match of FIPS codes is found that search is ended and a new person- period is established along with a new search to determine if the county from which the return is made becomes a subsequent county of a return migration. Similarly, if an onward migration is made a new person-period is produced and counties of residence at subsequent interview dates are checked to ascertain if the respondent returns to the county of residence from which the onward migration was launched. If a FIPS code is missing at the time of an interview we continued to search the file to determine if the residence codes are resumed at any of the following interview dates. In these cases we skipped over the missing interview dates and defined a return migration as occurring if the prior county’s code reappeared and inferred that the return occurred during the year in which the county’s FIPS code reappeared. This procedure revealed 4,194 return migrations for an overall return migration rate of 31.3 percent, 31.3 percent of the 13,380 migrations were followed by a return migration. We find, as Morrison and DaVanzo (1981) found, that a large share of the return migrations occur quickly, 41.4 percent occur by the next interview.

Table 1 also shows the return migrations and when they occurred in relation to the person-periods that produced the risk of return migration. The migrations made in the 1979-80 person-period interval was followed by 18 interviews at which a return migration could be identified. The number of interviews at which a return can happen obviously declines with each succeeding interview. Migrants who left during the 1998-2000 interval have only one subsequent interview date, 2002, which can be checked to determine if a return migration has taken place. A pattern of decline in rate of return with increases in length of absence, measured with number of subsequent interviews, is observed for the all of the person-periods. Whereas 13 percent of the migrations were followed by a return by the next interview, less than 2 percent of the migrants remaining absent longer than the fifth interview returned and a fraction of a percentage point return to a county they left more than ten years ago. To further illustrate, only 2 of the 329 migrants still away in 1990 after leaving during the 1979-80 interval returned during the 1990-91 person period. Using this information we construct four categories of return migration, Ever Return, Quick Return, Delayed Return and Belated Return as illustrated in Table 1. Rates for the categories of return migration are computed based on the number of respondents remaining away from a residence at the beginning of subsequent migration intervals. Given that a large proportion of return migrations occur quickly, within a year, we opted to code returns occurring by the next interview after 1994 as quick although the interval is two years instead of the one year. In the multivariate analysis we include length of interval as a control variable to account for this.

Independent Variables:

Race/ethnicity is our main independent variable with Hispanics, non-Hispanic Black and non-Hispanic Whites as its categories. In this study the non-Hispanic Whites are referred to as Whites. Asian and other race/ethnic groups are excluded because their numbers are too small for statistical analysis. The coding of our eight control variables and their relationship to race/ethnicity are shown in Table 2. For the variables that can change we emphasize that they were measured at the beginning of the person periods, at the time of departure rather than at the time of some subsequent return. This is important to our effort to determine if characteristics at the time of leaving a place might help to explain return migration and, above all, whether race/ethnic differences in likelihood of return migration exist once these characteristics are controlled.

Notably, there are significant differences between Hispanic, Blacks and Whites on all of the control variables. Hispanics and Blacks are slightly younger than Whites and higher proportions of Hispanics and Blacks are female. Whites are more likely to have attended college and to have graduated from college than Hispanics and Blacks and less likely to have dropped-out-of high school. A much higher percentage of the person-periods by Blacks are by never married Blacks than are the person-periods by Hispanics or Whites. Hispanics and Whites have about equal person-periods by married respondents and the three groups have nearly equal proportions of person-periods contributed by respondents whose marital status at the time of the migration was divorced, separated or widowed. Whites were more likely to own a home in the county being left than were Hispanics or Blacks and Whites had lived fewer years in the counties from which they migrated than Hispanics or Blacks. A higher proportion of the person-periods by Whites than for Hispanics or Blacks were during the one-year intervals. This is undoubtedly because of the dropping of the poor white subsample after the 1991 survey. A higher proportion of the person-periods by Hispanics and Blacks were nonmetropolitan counties of departure than were those by Whites. Overall, these compositional differences are very similar to differences found in other data sets and point to the need to control for their possible influences.

Analytical Method:

After transforming the data from individuals into person-period, age, educational level, marital status, home ownership, and length of residence at different time periods influence spells of return to a place left behind at a previous migration. Those time varying variables (X_p) of individual (i) at different time period (j) may differently affect the probability of quick, delayed, and belated return to the place of prior residence. Time invariant variables such as race and sex were included in the model. Those variables are measured at the beginning of the interval to predict migration or lack thereof at the end of the time interval. The migration itself is a two-year time period since interviews were conducted yearly between 1979 and 1993 but biyearly between 1994 and 2000 (1 year versus 2 year interval period). Given the above, the probability of the event occurrence can be expressed as follows (Singer and Willett 2003; p.370).

$$h(t_{ij}) = \Pr[T_i=j | T_i \geq j \text{ and } X_{1ij} = x_{1ij}, X_{2ij} = x_{2ij}, \dots, X_{pij} = x_{pij}]$$

This study employed a logistic estimation. Four dichotomized dependent variables including ever return, quick, delayed, and belated returns to the place left are created for the logit estimation. We also separated the logit analysis by return to place left at metro and nonmetro areas. Within the separate analysis, we examined the association between the independent variables and three dichotomized dependent variables including ever return, quick, and non-quick returns.

Findings:

Migrations by Hispanics and Blacks are more likely to be followed by a return migration than are migrations by Whites at the bivariate level as shown in Table 2. During the 19 migration intervals between 1979 and 2000 Hispanics made 1,743 migrations, Blacks made 2,777 migrations and Whites made 8,860 migrations. By 2002 Hispanics had canceled 35 percent of their migrations with return migrations, Blacks had canceled 36 percent of their migrations, and Whites canceled 29 percent of their migrations. These differences in ever return migration

rates are statistically significant. Blacks and Hispanics are also more likely than Whites to return to make a quick return migration and delayed return migrations but the percentages of the groups making a belated return migration is equal. Just over 4 percent of the members of each group return to a county they left five or more years ago. These bivariate results are also consistent with our hypothesis of higher rates of return migration for Hispanics and Blacks than for Whites.

Of core interest in this study is to more fully test the hypothesis that Hispanics and Blacks are more likely than Whites to return to prior places of residence. To accomplish this we present five logistic models in Table 3 that compare the probabilities of return migration of Hispanics and Blacks with the probabilities for Whites. The basic model shows Hispanics 1.28 times as likely as Whites to make a return migration and that Blacks are 1.36 times as likely as Whites to return to a county left between 1979 and 2000. These differences are significant at the .001 level. The odds ratio for Hispanics and Blacks of making quick and delayed returns are significantly higher than for Whites and are near the differences between the groups found with ever returning. Among those who are still away five or more interviews later, Blacks are 1.24 times as likely to return as Whites and is statistically significant. The odds ratio of 1.17 for Hispanics to make a belated return is not statistically significant.

After adjusting for age and sex in Model II the odds of Hispanics and Blacks making return migrations are slightly higher than those reported for Model I and still statistically significant. Also, the higher odds for Hispanics to make belated return migrations become statistically significant and the higher odds for Blacks, (1.43) remain significant. The odds of ever returning to a county of prior residence are again significantly higher for Hispanics and Blacks after adding education and marital status to the lot of control variables in Model III. With these variables added to the controls the odds for Hispanics and Blacks are slightly reduced but the differences are still significant beyond the .001 level for the ever return category. The odds of a quick return for Hispanics and Blacks compared to Whites is reduce from Models I and II but still significant at the .01 level. The odds of a quick return drop from 1.31 in the basic model to 1.19 for Hispanics and from 1.26 to 1.13 for Blacks. In contrast, the odds for delayed and belated returns are higher in model III than in Model I. As with the first two models, the odds of Hispanics and Blacks making a delayed return are significantly higher than the likelihood of Whites making a delayed return. The odds of returning for Blacks who have been gone from a county for five or more becomes significant at the .01 level while the odds of a belated return by Hispanics (1.27) is not significantly different from the likelihood of Whites making a belated return.

In Model IV two factors, whether the migrant owns a home at the beginning of the person-period and length of residence in the county at time of out-migration, known to indicate strong ties to a place of residence are added to the list of control variables. Still, the odds of ever returning to the county that was left, although somewhat reduced, are higher for Hispanics and Blacks than for Whites. The odds of Hispanics ever returning is 1.21 and for Blacks the odds are 1.28 when these two factors are controlled along with the controls entered in the former models.

Interestingly, the odds of a quick return drop considerably in Model IV to where the odds of Blacks making a quick return (1.09) is not significantly higher than the likelihood of a quick return by whites. The odds of a quick return by Hispanics (1.16) are significant at the .05 level. The odds of a delayed return are higher for Hispanics and Blacks than for Whites with odds ratios of 1.22 and 1.36 respectively. As for belated return migrations, the higher odds for Blacks than for Whites (1.27) remain significant and the odds of Hispanics making a belated return migration (1.24) is not significantly higher than the likelihood of whites returning after long absences. The odds for ever returning, quick returns, delayed returns and belated returns are scarcely changed when length of migration interval is added in model V. The differences in the odds of returns across quick, delayed and belated categories are intriguing. Whereas the odds for ever returning and belated returns are significantly higher for Hispanics and Blacks than for Whites with each model there are a few instances when they are not significantly higher for the quick and belated returns. Overall, the results in these five models strongly support our hypothesis of higher rates of return migration by Hispanics and Blacks than for Whites.

Because several prior studies indicate particularly strong ties by Hispanics and Blacks to rural places we test to determine if Hispanics and Blacks have higher odds of returning to both nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties. We also wanted to incorporate a place characteristic into our analysis because place characteristics are important in nearly all migration models. Table 4 present our five models with odds for Hispanics and Blacks to return to nonmetropolitan counties compared to the likelihood of White returns to nonmetropolitan counties along with similar odds for the groups to return to metropolitan counties. The results are not totally as expected.

Hispanics have significantly higher odds than Whites of ever returning to a nonmetropolitan county with each of the models. Their odds of ever returning are 1.44 in the basic model and 1.38 with all of our control variables entered in Model V. The odds of Blacks ever returning to a nonmetropolitan county are not significant in any of the models. Their odds of returning to a nonmetropolitan county is barely above 1.0 in Model V. The results are quite different with ever returns to metropolitan counties. At the time of departure from nonmetropolitan counties the odds of Hispanics and Blacks returning are significantly higher than they are for Whites. In the basic model the odds are 1.24 for Hispanics and 1.40 for Blacks. The odds are slightly higher for Model II with age and sex controlled than for the basic model or for models with more controls added. With all of the controls added in Model V the odds of Hispanics returning to a former metropolitan county of residence are 1.16 and for Blacks the odds of ever returning are 1.33 times the odds of Whites returning.

Hispanics also have higher odds than Whites of making quick return migrations after leaving nonmetropolitan counties. Again, their odds are significantly higher in each of the five models. In Model I the odds of returning by the time of the next interview are 1.61 times the likelihood of Whites making a quick return to a nonmetropolitan county. The odds of a quick return are 1.45 times the likelihood of a quick return after controlling for all of our factors in Model V. Blacks are not more likely than Whites to make a quick return to a nonmetropolitan county than are Whites. As for odds of quickly returning to metropolitan counties, Hispanics and Blacks have significantly higher odds than White in Models I and II. The odds for a quick return remain significant for Blacks in Model III but not for Hispanics. The odds for Hispanics to quickly to a metropolitan county are not significantly different from the likelihood of Whites returning when homeownership and length of residence are added as controls in Model IV and when length of migration interval is added in Model V.

Finally, we turn to testing whether Hispanics and Blacks who have been away from nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties beyond one year are more likely to return than are Whites who have been away this long. The odds of making a non-quick return to nonmetropolitan counties are significantly higher for Blacks than for Whites in the basic model and in Model II when only age and sex are introduced as controls. The odds of a non-quick return to nonmetropolitan counties are higher for Hispanics in Model II but not in any other model. The odds of Blacks making a non quick return migration to a nonmetropolitan county is not significant with models III, IV, and V. Conversely, the odds of a non quick return to metropolitan counties is higher for Hispanics and Blacks than for Whites in each of the five models. In Model I Hispanics are 1.21 times as likely as whites to make a non quick return to former metropolitan counties of residence and 1.21 as likely in Model V, when all of our control variables included in the analysis. The odds of Blacks making a non quick return to metropolitan counties are considerably higher than the likelihood for Whites to return after more than a two years of absence. In model I the odds for Black returning to metropolitan counties are 1.41 times the likelihood of return migrations to metropolitan counties by Whites. The odds for Blacks compared to Whites are 1.43 in Modes IV and V and significant beyond the .001 level. Generally, these results show consistently higher odds of returning to nonmetropolitan counties for Hispanics than for Whites but not for Blacks. Hispanics and Blacks have higher odds than Whites for returning to metropolitan counties. Engagingly, the odds for Hispanics to return to nonmetropolitan counties are most pronounced with quick returns whereas the higher odds for Black than for Whites to return to metropolitan counties are more pronounced with non quick return migrations.

Discussion/Conclusions: to be added

References: (Incomplete listing)

- Singer J. D., and Willett, J. B. (2003). Applied longitudinal data analysis: modeling change and event occurrence. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Cromartie, J. and C.B. Stack. 1989. "Reinterpretation of Black Return and Non-Return Migration to the South." *Rural Sociology* 39:514-528.
- DaVanzo, J. 1983. "Repeat Migration in the United States: Who Moves Back and Who Moves On?" *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 65:552-559.
- DaVanzo, J.S. and P.A. Morrison. 1981. "Return and Other Sequences of Migration in the United States." *Demography* 18: 85-101.
- Falk, W.W., L.L. Hunt, and M.O. Hunt. 2004. "Return Migrations of African-Americans to the South: Reclaiming a Land of Promise, Going Home, or Both?" *Rural Sociology* 69:490-509.
- [Http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/migrate.html](http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/migrate.html).
- Long, L.H. and K.A. Hansen. 1977. "Selectivity of Black Return Migration to the South." *Rural Sociology* 42:317-331.
- McHugh, K.E. 1987. "Black Migration Reversal in the United States." *Geographical Review* 77(2): 171-182.
- Newbold, K.B. 1997. "Race and Primary, Return, and Onward Interstate Migration." *Professional Geographer* 49:1-14.
- Sandefur, G.D. and J. Jeon. 1991. "Migration, Race and Ethnicity, 1960-1980." *International Migration Review* 25(2): 393-407
- Shaw, R.P. 1975. *Migration Theory and Fact*. Philadelphia: Regional Science Research Institute.
- Shumway, J.M. and G. Hall. 1996. "Self-Selection, Earnings and Chicano Migration between Return and Onward Migrants." *International Migration Review* 30:979-994.
- Smith, J.S. 2002. "Rural Place Attachment in Hispano Urban Centers." *Geographical Review* 92:3.
- Tolnay, S.E., K.D. Crowder, and R.M. Adelman. 2000. "Narrow and Filthy Alleys of the City?: The Residential Settlement Patterns of Black Southern Migrants to the North." *Social Forces* 78:989-1015
- Von Reichert, C. 2002. "Returning and New Montana Migrants: Socio-economic and Motivational Differences." *Growth and Change* 33:133-151.
- Zuniga, V. and R. Hernandez-Leon. 2002. "A new Destination for an Old Migration: Origins, Trajectories, and Labor Market Incorporation of Latinos in Dalton, Georgia." In A.D. Murphy, C. Blanchard and J.A. Hill (eds.) *Latino Workers in the Contemporary South*. The University of Georgia Press: 126-35.