

Did Hispanic In-Migration lead to non-Hispanic Displacement in Rural America?

William Kandel, ERS-USDA

Emilio Parrado, University of Pennsylvania

Angel Bugushev, American University

September 2008

Extended abstract for the 2009 Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America

Extended abstract

Hispanic population growth in rural areas has received extended attention since the 2000 Census revealed unanticipated and extraordinary patterns of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan Hispanic population growth and dispersion throughout all U.S. regions. Since the end of the Second World War, the majority of U.S. Hispanics have resided in a handful of large cities throughout the nation and in rural areas of the Southwest. Recent attention to new Hispanic destinations has explored the dimensions of Hispanic population growth in Birmingham, Alabama, Louisville, Kentucky, and similar unexpected harbingers of urban ethnic diversity (Suro and Singer 2002).

However, Hispanics are also becoming a widely felt presence throughout many rural regions of the nation. In fact, over the past decade, their *rates* of nonmetro county population increase exceeded that of metro counties as well as the rates of all other racial and ethnic groups in both county types (Kandel and Cromartie 2004). This unusual growth has, for the first time in U.S. history, shifted half of all nonmetropolitan Hispanics outside the nonmetropolitan portion of the Southwest, comprised of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas.

Hispanic population trends do not occur in a vacuum but coincide to some degree with population redistribution of non-Hispanic Whites and Blacks. In particular, areas across the Southeast have been attracting significant numbers of internal native-born migrants from Northern cities. Especially significant has been the movement of Blacks to the American South, a pattern that has been labeled the “new great migration” (Frey 2004). Frey (1996) has argued that outflows of metropolitan native born residents represent their response to immigrant population growth and labor market competition, using the term “Balkanization” to describe this process. Additional studies have supported and refuted (Kritz and Gurak 2001) his findings.

Scholars have also examined labor market competition between minority groups and particularly the economic fortunes of native-born non-Hispanic Blacks most likely affected by Hispanic population growth in new areas and growing Hispanic presence in new industrial sectors (Lim 2001; Borjas 2004)

The interaction between these population movements – particularly Hispanic in-migration and non-Hispanic outmigration – is not clearly understood. On the one hand, there is concern that Hispanics might be displacing other racial and ethnic groups, thereby limiting their opportunities for economic and social advancement (Borjas 2006). On the other hand, there appear to be some evidence that some or all racial and ethnic groups might be moving in consonance and that the attractiveness of new immigrant destination areas might apply to other groups as well (Card and DiNardo 2000). A limitation of this research from the perspectives of nonmetropolitan counties, which comprise roughly four fifths of all U.S. territory, is the focus of this research almost exclusively on metropolitan areas.

This analysis contributes to the literature investigating the impact of rapid Hispanic population growth on the U.S. economy by directly testing the displacement effect of Hispanic in-migration on rural Blacks and Whites. Specific contributions include a focus exclusively on rural areas; separate analyses for non-Hispanic Blacks and non-Hispanic Whites; and micro-level

models that illustrate how specific individual characteristics contribute to migration processes controlling for meta demographic profiles.

We use data from the 5% PUMS of the 2000 Census which provides us with a sufficiently large sample size to analyze subgroups within specific racial and ethnic groups for rural areas. Our geographical unit of analysis is the PUMA which allows us to distinguish between rural and urban areas of residence. The analysis relies on information about place of residence 5 years before the Census to construct rates of in and out-migration by racial and ethnic group. We then use this information to construct a typology of PUMA destination areas focusing on the Hispanic population that distinguishes between established and growing, established and not growing, new destinations, and Non-Hispanic areas. In addition, we also construct a similar typology for Blacks that also distinguishes between established and growing, established and not growing, new destinations, and Non-Black areas. Following previous analyses at the county level, we construct these typologies based upon the distribution of PUMA-level population growth for Hispanics, Blacks, and the total population (Kandel and Parrado 2006).

The main objective of this analysis is to address the extent to which incoming low-skilled Hispanics displaced low-skilled Whites and Blacks. Our empirical strategy is to first map patterns of in and out-migration across groups to identify visually the extent of overlap or dispersion of trends in population movement by race and ethnicity. We then use individual-level information to describe the socioeconomic characteristics of Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics leaving, staying and moving into different areas of destination. We compare these socioeconomic characteristics to understand who leaves, stays, and enters particular areas.

We then model residential location decisions by racial and ethnic group. The dependent variable is whether a person moved out, stayed or moved into a particular area. Individual level predictors include socioeconomic characteristics. The models also include as predictor our PUMA typology. This design allows us to assess whether residence, for instance in a new Hispanic PUMA of destination, has a positive or negative effect on the geographic mobility of Whites and Blacks and how these propensities vary in conjunction with socioeconomic characteristics.

References

Borjas, George J. 2004. "Increasing the Supply of Labor through Immigration: Measuring the Impact on Native-Born Workers." Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies Backgrounder, May 2004.

_____. 2006. "Native Internal Migration and the Labor Market Impact of Immigration." Journal of Human Resources 41(2): 221-58.

Card, David and John E. Dinardo. 2000. "Do Immigrant Inflows Lead to Native Outflows?" NBER Working Paper No. W7578. Boston, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Frey, William H. 1996. "Immigration, Domestic migration, and Demographic Balkanization in America: New Evidence for the 1990s." Population and Development Review 22(4): 741-763.

_____. 2004. "The New Great Migration: Black Americans' Return to the South, 1965-2000." Washington, DC: Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, The Brookings Institution.

Suro, R., and A. Singer. 2002. "Latino Growth in Metropolitan America: Changing Patterns, New Locations." Washington, DC: Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, The Brookings Institution and The Pew Hispanic Center.

Kandel, William and Emilio Parrado. 2006. "Rural Hispanic Population Growth: Public Policy Impacts in Nonmetro Counties." in W. Kandel and D. Brown (eds.) Population Change and Rural Society. Berlin: Springer.

Kandel, William and John Cromartie. 2004. New Patterns of Hispanic Settlement in Rural America. Rural Development Research Report 99, Economic Research Service, USDA.

Kritz, Mary M., and Gurak, Douglas T. 2001. "The Impact of Immigration on the Internal Migration of Natives and Immigrants." Demography 38(1): 133-145.

Lim, Nelson. 2001. "On the Backs of Blacks? Immigrants and the Fortunes of African Americans." In *Strangers at the Gates*, edited by Roger Waldinger. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.