GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE DESTINATION CHOICES OF LABOR MIGRANTS: MEXICAN MIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES IN THE 1990s

Mark A. Leach
Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
Population Research Institute
The Pennsylvania State University

and

James Bachmeier
Department of Sociology
Center for Research on Immigration, Population and Public Policy
University of California, Irvine

Paper presented at "Migration: A World in Motion,"
A Multinational Conference on Migration and Migration Policy
Maastricht, Netherlands, 18-20 February, 2010

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE DESTINATION CHOICES OF LABOR MIGRANTS: MEXICAN MIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES IN THE 1990s

Abstract

The geography of Mexican immigration to the United States dramatically shifted in the 1990s with greater settlement occurring in new destination regions with little history of immigration. This research assesses gender differences in destination choices of Mexican immigrants that arrived in the United States in the late 1990s. We hypothesize that female immigrants choose destinations with more diverse or "mature" Mexican-born populations relative to male immigrants due to greater availability of and access to migration resources. We use 1990 and 2000 Census data and conditional multinomial logistic regression models to predict the probability of destination choice among recent Mexican immigrants. As expected, we find that both prior settlement and Mexican-born maturity are more important for female immigrants than for male immigrants. We also find, however, empirical distinctions between the effects of population maturity and the amount of previous immigration, which are closely tied in the social causation literature.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE DESTINATION CHOICES OF LABOR MIGRANTS: MEXICAN MIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES IN THE 1990s

Introduction

Change in the geography of Mexican migration to the United States occurred in dramatic fashion during the 1990s. Geographic dispersion is evident in the fact that only 10 percent of the Mexican-born population in the United States resided outside the five traditional destination states[1] in 1990 whereas over 30 percent did so by 2007 (Durand, Massey et al. 2005; Ruggles, Sobek et al. 2008). The changes were fueled by growing migration streams across the U.S.-Mexican border, a greater proportion of which bypassed traditional destination regions and headed directly to non-traditional regions of settlement (Grieco 2003; Durand, Massey et al. 2005; Passel and Suro 2005; Lichter and Johnson 2009). Change in settlement patterns means that recently-arrived Mexican migrants now settle in places that are much more varied in terms of social and demographic contexts, economic activities, and prior histories of immigration.

A burgeoning literature on settlement in new destinations has emerged, largely studying the size and characteristics of the migration streams (Passel and Zimmerman 2001; Kandel and Cromartie 2004; Durand, Massey et al. 2005; Leach and Bean 2008; Lichter and Johnson 2009) and impacts on migrants and native populations at the local level (Zúñiga and Hernández-León 2005; Massey 2008), but research has yet to fully investigate processes of settlement or, more specifically, factors related to Mexican migrants' destination choices in the context of geographic dispersion. Consequently, we have little understanding of whether Mexican migration has changed such that

[1] Arizona, California, Illinois, New Mexico and Texas

migration theory needs to be adjusted to account for new geographic patterns or whether well-known mechanisms of labor migration remain intact and factors that have long attracted immigrants to traditional U.S. destination regions now operate in new settlement areas.

The present study assesses whether Mexican immigrant U.S. destination choices in the late 1990s occurred in predictable ways according to theories of labor migration. We specifically investigate differences between male and female new arrivals in the kinds of places they chose. To do so, we analyze characteristics of destination regions and their intersection with individual attributes that most influence the probability that Mexican immigrants choose a destination region over all other destinations. We focus specifically on differences between male and female Mexican immigrants given well-known patterns of Mexican immigration by gender. Our investigation is guided by the migration theory of cumulative causation and network migration theory while keeping in mind economic explanations of migration. In addition to explaining the new geographic patterns, our study is novel in that it assesses social causation theory from the perspective of U.S. destination regions whereas such theories are based largely on studies in migration-sending communities in Mexico.

Our study proceeds as follows: We first review predominate theories of international labor migration and the importance of gender in such processes. We also review prior research on immigrant destination choices and the primary factors that lead an immigrant to choose one destination over others. And to further place our study in the context, we discuss the most common explanations recently put forth by scholars for change in the geography of Mexican immigration and consider their implications for

immigrant destination choices. We use U.S. Census PUMS data and conditional multinomial logistic regression to model the destination choices of Mexican immigrants who arrived in the United States between 1995 and 2000. Our analyses reveal that Mexican immigrants, both men and women, generally choose places with more prior immigration and more mature Mexican-born populations. After controlling for individual attributes and regional demographic and economic characteristics, however, female immigrants choose places with more prior migration and more mature populations relative to male immigrants for whom such factors have no effect. In spite of a strong association, however, Mexican-born population maturity appears to be more important for female destination choices than the amount of prior immigration into a place. This result points to important empirical and theoretical distinctions between migration processes in sending communities in Mexico, on which social causation theories have been largely developed, and dynamics in U.S. destination regions.

Background and Theoretical Framework

Scholars of international migration generally agree that no one overarching theory can explain why people migrate and where migrants go when they leave their country of origin (Massey 1999). Rather, recent research has increasingly relied upon more complex models that combine multiple theoretical perspectives and include factors at various levels of analysis to explain migration (Fussell and Massey 2004; Bachmeier and Bean 2008). Rather than duplicate existing reviews of the vast migration literature (see / Fussell, 2004 #337; Massey, 1997 #336; Massey, 1999 #12} we focus only on those theories that guide our analyses (for example, our analyses do not assess segmented labor market theory (Piore 1979) or world systems theory (Sassen 1988; Sassen 2000) so we do not include them in the present discussion). Neoclassical

economic theory explains that migration results from individual cost-benefit analyses of wage differentials between places (Massey and Espinosa 1997). As such, the theory predicts that those in their working years and with more work experience likely will receive the greatest benefit from migration and do so. New economic theory upholds households rather than individuals as the key unit of analysis such that household members who are most likely to maximize household income, typically working-age males in the Mexican case, migrate and others, women and children, stay behind (Stark 1991; Massey and Espinosa 1997). Both neoclassical and new economic theories are useful in pointing to individual characteristics such as age, skills and marital status as explaining individual migration decisions.

Both theories, however, fail to explain why international migration often occurs between countries that do not have the greatest wage differentials. Dual labor market theory (Piore 1979) and world systems theory (Sassen 1988; Sassen 2000) consider other factors in migration origins and destinations beyond wage differentials to explain migration. Dual labor market theory explains that labor market segmentation in destination countries creates demand for international labor migrants to fill jobs that native workers cannot or do not want. World system theory points to the economic ties between countries and a country's position in the global economy as determining migration origin and destinations. For countries at the top of the global economic hierarchy such as the United States, economic restructuring that has shifted its primary economic activity from manufacturing to high-end services and management has created concomitant demand for low-end services. Saskia Sassen (2000) argues that such dynamics have been concentrated in cities such as New York and Los Angeles

where headquarters of global corporations are located and a concentration of capital generates demand for low-end services such as domestic workers, carwashes and yard maintenance that international labor migrants readily fill. In considering other factors beyond wages, such theories highlight the importance of regional economic activity and occupational structures in differentiating potential immigration destination regions.

Some scholars have noticed, however, that migration frequently becomes disjointed from economic conditions and may continue in spite of worsening job opportunities and declining wages in migration destinations. Building on the original work of Gunnar Myrdal (1957), Reichert, Massey and many other colleagues (1980; 1981; 1986; 1987; 1994) developed the cumulative causation theory of migration which emphasizes changes in the social structure of migration-sending communities as migration become more prevalent. For example, separated families eventually seek to reunite in the United States or migration may become a rite of passage for young men. In addition, once migration starts, migration networks form and facilitate exchanges of information and resources between experienced migrants and those who have yet to leave a community, which in turn prompts more migration by reducing the costs and risks of migration.

An important aspect of network migration is that, by definition, migration resources are moderated through social relationships, which makes migration decisions subject to who one knows and one's access migration resources. As migration becomes more prevalent in a community, migration streams mature in predictable ways according to the costs and risks of migration, whether real or perceived. Massey's (1986; 1994) research shows that married, male heads of households in Mexican

communities typically left first for the United States because they were perceived as having the greatest earnings potential to maximize household income. Once they obtain jobs and housing and passed back information and resources, they recruited their younger brothers, sons and nephews to migrate and work in their same occupation or industry. Once the prevalence of migration was high and the costs and risks of migration reduced to a minimum, the final stage of migration occurred when families decided to permanently settle and women and children migrated to reunite with their male family members already in the United States.

Gender thus has been a key dimension of Mexican migration. Massey and his colleagues have been criticized, however, for oversimplifying the role of gender in Mexican migration and depicting female migration as an inevitable development in the maturation of migration streams (Pedraza 1991; Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994; Menjívar 2000). This perspective argues that, because they migrate first, men become the gate-keepers of network resources and that women's migration is subject to their support. The growth of a migration stream may increase the supply of migration resources, as predicted by migration network theory, but male migrants may resist women joining them in the United States, whether because they do not deem migration as safe or because they want to assert their patriarchal authority (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994). For women to migrate they must gain access to male-controlled network resources or subvert male networks via female migration networks (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994; Hagan 1998)

We find several implications for immigration to U.S. destination regions and for individual destination choices specifically in the migration theories previously discussed.

A wealth of research shows that individual characteristics such as age, gender, education and marital status matter for Mexican migration decisions (Ranney and Kossoudji 1983; Portes and Bach 1985; Massey, Goldring et al. 1994; Cerrutti and Massey 2001; Marcelli and Cornelius 2001). Research also shows that migrate choose different kinds of destination places according to their personal attributes (Gurak and Kritz 2000; Bauer, Epstein et al. 2005; Scott, Coomes et al. 2005; Diaz McConnell 2008). Such research supports dual labor market and world systems theories in showing that immigrants are more likely to choose larger cities with relatively higher wages and more educated native residents (Scott, Coomes et al. 2005). Research on immigration to U.S. destination regions also supports cumulative causation and network migration theory. Immigrants tend to settle in places where more previous migration occurred (Bachmeier and Bean 2008; Leach and Bean 2008) and where relatively larger co-national populations reside (Gurak and Kritz 2000; Bauer, Epstein et al. 2005; Scott, Coomes et al. 2005; Diaz McConnell 2008).

We are particularly interested in the effect of a migrant's gender on their destination choice destination choice. While Mexican men are generally more likely to migrate to the United States than Mexican women, research has not disentangled the relationship between gender and destination choice. As previously discussed, research shows that female migrants from communities in Mexico typically follow previous male migrants once a migration stream has matured and settlement in the United States is more prevalent (Massey 1986; Massey, Goldring et al. 1994; Cerrutti and Massey 2001). We thus expect female migrants to choose destination regions with more "mature" Mexican immigrant communities; that is, where the Mexican-born population

generally has more experience in the United States and exhibits support for family reunification in larger presence of women and children.

Data and Methods

Our data come from the Integrated Public-Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) for the 1990 and 2000 decennial U.S. Censuses (Ruggles, Sobek et al. 2008). Census microdata consist of a five-percent representative sample of the *de facto* population present in the United States at the time of each Census. One of the well-known benefits of Census microdata is that they provide ample sample sizes of minority groups and immigrants. For our analyses, we select Mexican-born persons, ages 18 to 64, not in the military, and who resided in the United States in 2000 and stated that their residence in 1995 was in Mexico. Our sample thus consists of recently-arrived, working-age Mexican immigrants, which allows for analyses of their destination choices upon arrival in the United States.[2]

We define destination region as the Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), identified by the Census Bureau, in which an immigrant resided in 2000. If an MSA had a sample of 70 or fewer Mexican-born persons we exclude it and the Mexican immigrants residing there from the analysis to ensure reliable estimates of regional characteristics. We identified 48,849 person-records that represent over one million Mexican immigrants who arrived in the United States and settled in metropolitan areas between 1995 and 2000. Our sample is distributed across 147 metropolitan areas or possible destination regions from which the migrants could choose. A limitation of conditional multinomial logistic regression, further described below, is that it does not

[2] An oft-raised criticism of the five-year migration time period is that a person could have migrated within the United States after arriving in an initial destination. This is not expected to be common given Mexican immigrant's reliance on social networks in their initial destination and should not significantly affect the results.

allow for the use of sample weights which is necessary when using PUMS data given that it is not a simple random sample of the U.S. population. To be sure our parameter estimates are representative of the population of recently arrived Mexican immigrants, we replicate each of the 48,000 person records according to its sample weight and create a new dataset with the number of records equal to the sum of the sample weights. We then draw a simple random sample of approximately 13,000 person-records from the replicates dataset for our analyses due to the computationally-intensive model estimation procedure.

The primary goal of our analyses is to assess gender differences in the kinds of destination regions that Mexican immigrants chose in the late 1990s. To do so, we use a combination of individual and regional characteristics to predict the probability that a migrant chose the destination in which they reside relative to the other 146 possible destinations included in the analyses. At the individual level, the independent variable of primary interest, of course, is sex, for which we use a dummy variable that is coded 1 for female immigrants and 0 for males. We control for other individual-level characteristics including age, age squared, years of education, a dummy variable that indicates a migrant speaks any English, and a dummy variable that indicates a migrant is married.

At the regional level, we are interested mostly in the effects of cumulative causation and migration networks on a migrant's destination choice. To assess the effects of cumulative causation, we use the relative size of a Mexican-born migration flow, from either U.S. or Mexican origins, into a destination region between 1985 and 1990. We calculate this as the number of working-age Mexican-born residents in a

region in 1990 who resided in a different U.S. metropolitan region or in Mexico in 1985, divided by the total population of the region in 1990, and multiplied by 1,000 for the number of migrants per 1,000 population. We thus expect the size of a migration flow in the 1980s to exert a positive effect on the probability of settlement for immigrants arriving in the latter half of the 1990s. To the extent that the size of a prior migration stream indicates migration maturation and support for female migration in U.S. destination regions as in migration-sending communities in Mexico, size of flow should positively affect female migration to a greater degree than for male migrants.

When assessed at destination, however, Mexican immigration flows may not develop in the same ways that migration matures when observed in migration origins. In migration-sending communities, Massey and his colleagues (Reichert and Massey 1980; Massey 1986; 1994) showed that the relative amount of migration that has occurred in a place generally determines who migrates. The larger a migration flow the more likely that women and children participate. In other words, the amount of migration is concomitant with the maturity of migration flows in migration origins. In context of geographic change in Mexican immigration, however, women who only recently arrived in the United States may be among the first immigrants to settle in a new destination region if the purpose of their migration is to reunite with their spouses who have significant experience elsewhere in the United States (Hernández-León and Zúñiga 2000; Zúñiga and Hernández-León 2001). In this case, the amount of prior migration would be minimal yet the Mexican-born population would appear more mature due to the U.S. experience of the Mexican-born men and the settlement of women and possibly their children.

Following Bachmeier and Bean (2008), we thus distinguish conceptually the amount of prior migration from the maturity of a Mexican-born population in our analyses. We create a measure of Mexican-born population maturity for each destination region using five variables that describe the U.S. experience and general support of female migration. The five variables are 1) the percent of a regional population that is Mexican born, 2) percent of a regional Mexican-born population that had been in the United States for more than 20 years, 3) percent of a regional Mexican-born population that had been in the United States for less than 10 years (excluding those who migrated between 1995 and 2000), 4) percent of a regional Mexican-born population that are female, and 5) the percent of Mexican-born females in a region who reside with their own children. Whereas Bachmeier and Bean include the relative size of the U.S.-born Mexican origin population, we exclude this variable because supplementary analysis showed it has a relatively weaker association with the other five variables.

We use factor analysis, which we further describe below, to combine the five variables into one composite score for Mexican-born population maturity. We do not lag the variables used to calculate migration maturity because the kinds of migration resources and support available in a place likely depends on the population that is present at a time closest to when settlement occurs. We thus use 2000 Census data to calculate each variable but exclude the new arrivals that are in our sample. Our measure of maturity therefore approximates the characteristics of the Mexican-born population present in a place in 1995, with the exception of those who migrated out of a region between 1995 and 2000. We expect that the maturity of a Mexican immigrant

population has a greater effect on female immigrants than male because female migrants generally require greater social support to migrate and settle in a place. Less mature communities may have more sojourner outlooks and are less likely to support family reunification or migration to places where employment opportunities for female immigrants have not yet developed.

We also control for a variety of regional variables that capture economic activity in 1990 and population change during the 1990s. A list of the regional control variables and descriptive statistics can be found in Table 2.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is useful to assess the degree to which one or more unobserved latent variables explain variation in two or more observed measures (Kim and Mueller 1978). The number of unique latent variables, or factors, to emerge from an analysis can range from one, in the case that all the observed variables included in an analysis measure the same concept, to the total number of observed variables, which occurs when there is little to no variance in common across the variables and thus no latent variable in common that determines them. The first factor listed in the output always explains the greatest amount of common variance, and each subsequent factor explains less variation than the previous. The amount of common variance that each factor explains is measured by its eigenvalue. Analysts typically use as a rule of thumb that factors with eigenvalues close to or greater than 1 explain a significant amount of common variance that the observed variables share. In our case, we expect that the five variables that describe a regional Mexican-born population are explained by a common latent variable that we have called maturity. If this is the case the first factor should

have a large eigenvalue above 1 and the second through fifth factors will have eigenvalues significantly lower than 1.

Along with the number of factors, one can describe the underlying concept that each factor represents using the factor loadings of each variable on each factor. Factor loadings are analogous to correlation coefficients and describe the strength and direction of the association between an observed variable and a latent factor. Loadings with absolute values of 50 or higher indicate a strong association. We thus expect not only that one underlying concept will emerge from the analysis, represented by only one factor with a relatively high eigenvalue, but that all five regional variables will be strongly associated with the latent factor which we call maturity.

If the factor analysis results are consistent with our expectations, we can then use the factor loadings to create a scale score of regional Mexican population maturity, for use in a regression model that predicts immigrant destination choices.

Conditional Multinomial Logistic Regression Models

We employ conditional multinomial logistic regression (CMLR) to predict the probability that an immigrant selected their chosen destination relative to all other possible destinations. CMLR is commonly used to assess the determinants of migration destination choices under the assumption that a migrants' choice has the maximum utility or benefits them to the greatest degree relative to other destination options (see Bartel 1989; Kritz and Nogle 1994; Bauer, Epstein et al. 2005; Scott, Coomes et al. 2005; Diaz McConnell 2008). We use CMLR to model the probability that a Mexican immigrant chose the destination region in which they reside relative to all other possible destinations given their individual attributes and regional characteristics. The

unobserved utility for immigrant *i* who chooses destination region *j* is determined by the equation

$$U_{ij,95-00} = \beta_1 STREAM_{90} + \beta_2 MATURITY_{95} + \sum_{k=3}^{K} \beta_k Z_{kj} + \gamma_1 (STREAM_{90} * SEX_i) + \gamma_2 (MATURITY_{95} * SEX_i) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_{3l} (STREAM_{90} * X_{li}) + \gamma_{4l} (MATURITY_{95} * X_{li}) + \sum_{k=5}^{K} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \gamma_{kl} Z_{kj} X_{li} + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

where *STREAM* is the relative size of the regional Mexican immigration flow between 1985 and 1990 (we also include a squared term in the model, not shown, to account for ceiling effects in the growth of migration flows (Bachmeier and Bean 2008)), $MATURITY_{95}$ is the scale score that results from the factor analysis, SEX_i is the sex of individual *i*, the *Z*s are other region-level control variables, the *X*s are the other individual-level control variables, the *β*s are the first-order region-level parameter estimates, the *γ*s are parameter estimates for interaction terms between the region-level and the individual-level variables[3], and ε_{ij} is a randomly distributed error term.

If the non-error term in the utility equation above is represented as V_{ij}, the probability that immigrant *i* chooses destination region *j* is given as

$$P_{ij} = \frac{e^{V_{ij}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{J} e^{V_{ij}}},$$

which is the familiar multinomial logit model (Scott, Coomes et al. 2005). The parameter estimates in the utility function are obtained by maximizing the log-likelihood function

[3] Note that there are no first-order individual-level effects in the model. Such parameters cannot be estimated because they are constant across an individual's possible destination choices. In other words, there are no independent effects of individual attributes on one's destination choice. Rather, the intersection of individual attributes such as skills and regional characteristics such as wages, industry composition, and social support maximizes the utility of one destination over another for different individuals.

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{J} D_{ij} log P_{ij}$$

where D_{ij} is a dichotomous variable for individual *i* and destination region *j* that indicates an individual's chosen destination region. In other words, the model estimates the probability that an immigrant would choose each possible destination and then maximizes *L* given each immigrant's chosen destination under the assumption that their chosen destination maximizes their utility. To do so, we match the attributes of each destination region to each immigrant person-record and create a data set that contains 147 (the total number of destination regions) person-region-records for each individual in the sample. The variable *D* is coded one for the person-region-record that matches an individual with their actual chosen destination and zero for all other potential destination regions not chosen.

Even though we reduce the sample size, 146 comparisons between destination regions per individual in the sample remains computationally intensive. Following Scott, Coomes and Izyumov (2005), we randomly select ten alternative destination regions for each individual so that only ten comparisons are made per individual. Several authors have shown that the parameter estimates based on a reduced set of randomly selected alternative destination regions remains robust relative to estimates using all possible destination regions (Ben-Akiva and Lerman 1985; Train 1993; Scott, Coomes et al. 2005).

If β_1 in the full model is positive and statistically significant, the model will be consistent with our hypothesis, based on the theoretical concept of cumulative

causation, that greater prior migration in 1990 into a place increases the probability that more migrants will settle there between 1995 and 2000.

Results

Descriptive Results

We provide in Table 1 percentages and mean values for variables that we include in the multivariate analyses. The table includes both individual and destination region characteristics for Mexican migrants who settled in U.S. metropolitan areas between 1995 and 2000. The average recently-arrived Mexican immigrant in our sample is more likely to be male, relatively young, have low educational attainment, poor English skills, and not married, all of which are consistent with general knowledge about Mexican immigrants. General differences between male and female immigrants are also consistent with existing knowledge and reflect differences in the mechanisms of male and female migration as discussed above. Women migrants tend to be slightly older, have fewer English skills, likely due to less migration experience to the U.S., and are much more likely to be married given that family reunification rather than economic reasons is a major factor in their migration.

General differences in the characteristics of the destination regions in which male and female immigrants settled also follow our expectations. Focusing on prior Mexican migration and the composition of Mexican-born populations, female immigrants settled in places that had received more in-migration ten years prior relative to male immigrants. The fact that both genders settled in places that had received more than 10 Mexican-born migrants per 1,000 population ten years prior is supportive of our expectation that cumulative causation plays a role in immigration to U.S. destinations as it does in sending communities in Mexico. Also similar to dynamics in sending

communities, female immigrants chose destination regions with more prior in-migration. Women settled in places that had received about 2 more migrants per 1,000 population than the places where male immigrants settled. Gender differences in size of prior in-migration flow likely indicate some combination of differences in costs and risks of migration, delayed female migration and family reunification, and/or greater access to migration networks.

Likewise, female immigrants settled in places with characteristics that reflect more mature Mexican-born populations according to the five variables we use to measure the size, U.S. experience, and gender and age compositions of a Mexican-born population. Relative to male destination regions, female immigrants chose places that had larger Mexican-born populations (7.2 versus 6.1 Mexican-born persons per 1,000 population), had more experience in the United States (higher percentage in the United States 20+ years and lower percentage in the United States 5 to 10 years), and was comprised of relatively more women (44.1 versus 42.9) and children (27.1 versus 26.1). Similar to the size of a prior in-migration flow, such differences reflect female immigrants' requirements (or preferences) for more developed migration networks to facilitate their migration and settlement.

We now turn to multivariate analyses to assess whether and how prior migration and Mexican-born population composition affects male and female destination choices in light of other economic and demographic factors that are likely to affect immigration destination choices, for which we also provide summary statistics in Table 1. First, we use factor analysis both to assess the relationships between our five measures of the composition of a Mexican-born population and to combine them into a single scale

score that represents maturity. This is necessary because they are likely to be highly correlated and cannot be included in one regression model together due to multicollinearity issues.

Table 1. Characteristics of Recently-Arrived Mexican Immigrants and the U.S. Metropolitan Destination Regions in which They Settled, Ages 16 to 64, 1995 – 2000.

	Total		Male		Female	
	Percent/ Mean	(S.E.)	Percent/ Mean	(S.E.)	Percent/ Mean	(S.E.)
Individual Characteristics						
Percent Female	39.3	(0.002)	--	--	--	--
Age	28.0	(0.044)	27.3	(0.053)	29.1	(0.075)
Years of Education	8.7	(0.019)	8.6	(0.023)	8.7	(0.031)
Percent Speaks Any English	57.2	(0.002)	59.6	(0.003)	53.6	(0.004)
Percent Married	34.3	(0.002)	22.2	(0.002)	52.9	(0.004)
Desination Region Characteristics						
Size of Mexican Migration Stream per 1,000 Population, 1990	11.3	(0.047)	10.5	(0.058)	12.6	(0.077)
Mexican-Born Population Maturity, 1995*						
Percent Mexican Born of Total Regional Population	6.5	(0.023)	6.1	(0.028)	7.2	(0.039)
Percent Arrived in U.S. 20+ Years of Mexican-Born Population	23.8	(0.047)	22.9	(0.059)	25.2	(0.074)
Percent Arrived in U.S. 5-10 Years of Mexican-Born Population	43.9	(0.057)	45.0	(0.074)	42.3	(0.09)
Percent Female of Mexican-Born Population	43.4	(0.024)	42.9	(0.03)	44.1	(0.039)
Percent Living with Own Children of Mexican-Born Females	26.5	(0.021)	26.1	(0.026)	27.1	(0.033)
Total Population (log), 1990	14.5	(0.005)	14.5	(0.006)	14.4	(0.008)
Annual Earnings (log) per Working-Age Adult, 1990	8.2	(0.002)	8.2	(0.002)	8.1	(0.003)
Employment Growth per 1,000 1990 Population, 1990-2000	94.2	(0.472)	96.8	(0.608)	90.0	(0.747)
Foreign-Born Population Growth per 1,000 1990 Population, 1990-2000	84.0	(0.154)	83.0	(0.2)	85.6	(0.242)
Percent Bachelor's Degree+ of Working-Age Adults, 1990	8.4	(0.011)	8.5	(0.014)	8.2	(0.018)
Percent Black of Working-Age Adults, 1990	11.1	(0.033)	11.4	(0.042)	10.5	(0.051)
Industry						
Percent Employed in Agricultural Industry, 1990	2.2	(0.012)	2.1	(0.015)	2.3	(0.02)
Percent Employed in Construction Industry, 1990	6.2	(0.006)	6.2	(0.008)	6.3	(0.01)
Percent Employed in Service Industry, 1990	11.1	(0.017)	11.1	(0.022)	11.1	(0.028)
Source: Authors' calculations using IPUMS Census data						
* The recently-arrived Mexican immigrants in our sample are excluded from the calculation of the percentages. The measures thus approximate the characteristics of the Mexican-born population in 1995, excluding Mexican-born out-migrants between 1995 and 2000.						

Factor Analysis

Following Bachmeier and Bean (Bachmeier and Bean 2008), we employ factor analysis to assess the maturity of the Mexican-born population in each destination region. To ease interpretation of the factor loadings, we subtract the percent of the Mexican-born population that arrived in the United States five to ten years ago from 100, transforming the measure into the percent that arrived 10 years or more. This

makes all five variables positively correlated with maturity. The results of the factor analysis are provided in Table 2. Consistent with our expectations, the upper part of the table shows that the first factor explains almost two-thirds of the total variation in the five measures across Mexican immigrant destination regions. By comparison, Factor 2 explains only thirteen percent of the variance. Its eigenvalue is also well below the general rule of thumb of 1.0, indicating that it does not explain a significant portion of the variance. Empirically, the five measures thus appear to be explained largely by one latent variable.

The lower part of Table 2 shows the factor loadings, which range from 0 to 100 and are analogous to correlation coefficients, on each variable included in the analysis. The percent of recent arrivals and presence of children are most strongly associated with Mexican-born population maturity. Conceptually, the relative size of a Mexican-born population, the U.S. experience of its members, and its gender and age composition, not surprisingly, are all closely related to one another. Mirroring the dynamics of out-migration in sending communities, the more mature an immigration flow into a place becomes, the more likely immigrants are to settle which, in turn, causes the immigrant population to grow and increases the U.S. experience of settlers. As the costs and risk of migration decline, women join the immigration flow and the male to female ratio of the immigrant population declines. Likewise, immigrants bring their children from Mexico and also have children born in the United States.

Reflecting the percentages for the five measures in Table 1, destination regions that female immigrants chose have higher maturity scores (0.6 on scale from 0 to 1) relative to male immigrant destinations (0.3). This, again, is supportive of the notion

that female immigrants choose, and likely require, places where migration flows are more developed, migration resources more available, and earlier arrivals are more supportive of female migration. The fact female immigrants chose places that received more migration previously, shown in Table 1, and have more mature Mexican-born populations is not surprising. The growth of a migration stream into a place should go hand in hand with the development of migration infrastructure and the availability of migration resources and support. In fact a simple correlation analysis reveals that sizes of prior in-migration flows and the maturity of Mexican-born populations are strongly associated with a statistically significant Pearson correlation coefficient just above 0.8. In turning to multivariate regression models, we thus consider whether population maturity and prior migration affect destination choices in similar ways for male and female immigrants.

Table 2. Factor Analysis Results for Maturity of Mexican-Born Population within Destination Regions, 1995

Factors	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
1	3.64	3.00	0.73	0.73
2	0.64	0.18	0.13	0.86
3	0.46	0.28	0.09	0.95
4	0.17	0.08	0.03	0.98
5	0.09	0.00	0.02	1.00
				Loadings for Factor 1
Percent Mexican Born of Total Regional Population				74
Percent Arrived in U.S. 20+ Years of Mexican-Born Population				86
Percent Arrived in U.S. 10+ Years of Mexican-Born Population				90
Percent Female of Mexican-Born Population				87
Percent Living with Own Children of Mexican-Born Females				89

Logistic Regression Analyses

Tables 3 and 4 show results for conditional choice multinomial logistic regression models that predict the probability that a migrant settled in their chosen destination relative to all other destination regions. In Table 3, Models 1a considers only the effect of the size of a prior Mexican-born in-migration flow and its interaction with gender on the probability of destination choice. Model 2a assess the combined effect of prior in-migration flow and gender while controlling for other demographic and human capital attributes. In Model 3a we remove the individual characteristics other than gender and add regional variables to the model along with their interactions with gender. Finally, Model 4a includes all the region attributes and interaction terms with all individual attributes. Models 1b through 4b in Table 4 are similar except we include Mexican-born population maturity rather than size of prior in-migration flow. For all the models, the estimated coefficients have no intuitive meaning regarding the probability of destination choice other than direction and statistical significance (i.e., larger, positive coefficients are interpreted as greater probability of choosing a destination relative to alternative destinations).

As expected, both prior in-migration flow and population maturity, in general, exert strong positive effects on the probability that a Mexican immigrant chose a given destination region. In spite of the high correlation between the two variables, however, the models also reveal that the two variables affect male and female destination choices somewhat differently and cannot serve as proxies for one another, as might be the case for dynamics in sending communities. In Table 3, Model 1a shows that Mexican immigrants in general are more likely to select destination regions where larger Mexican-born in-migration occurred in the late 1980s (coefficient equal to 1.47). This is

consistent with the cumulative causation thesis that earlier immigration to a destination region begets more migration. A statistically-significant negative coefficient on the squared term (-1.14) indicates a ceiling effect such that once an immigration flow into a region has reached a certain size it becomes relatively less attractive to new arrivals.

The interaction effect between size of prior in-flow and a female dummy variable is not statistically significant, which indicates that the size of a prior in-flow does not vary between the destination choices of male and female immigrants. In other words, female immigrants do not choose regions with larger prior in-migration flows. This is unexpected to the extent that dynamics of network migration in destination regions mirror those in sending communities. Studies in sending regions show that women migrate only when a migration flow has become large relative to when men migrate.

Models 2a and 3a assess whether the general relationship between size of prior in-flow and destination choice is explained by either individual attributes or other regional characteristics. When controlling for individual attributes, Model 2a shows that the main effect of prior in-flow remains strong (coefficient equal to 1.69) and that its effect does not vary by age, education or English ability. In other words, all Mexican immigrants prefer regions where prior Mexican migration has occurred in the past, not just those who are perceived as more vulnerable such as women, the young and old, or those without English language skills. As with gender, this is not expected given the greater migration resources needed by more vulnerable migrants. Significant at the 0.1 level, marriage seems to make a small difference such that married immigrants chose places with slightly smaller prior in-flows.

Similarly, regional characteristics do not explain Mexican immigrant preferences for regions with larger prior in-flows (coefficient equal to 1.55 in Model 3a). Regional demographic and economic dynamics, though, clearly play a role in immigrant destination choices, *ceteris paribus*. Mexican immigrants tend to choose more populous destination regions and regions with more dynamic local economies (higher average earnings and greater employment growth). As with size of prior in-flows, there are few regional effects that vary by gender with the exceptions being average earnings and size of a regional black population, both of which may indicate a greater propensity to settle in more traditional destinations in the Southwest.

When we include interaction terms between the regional attributes and all the individual-level variables in Model 4a, however, the general effect of prior in-flows decreases by two thirds (from 1.55 to 0.57, comparing Models 3a and 4a) and becomes statistically not significant. Also, the effect of prior in-flow on probability of female immigrants' destination choices more than doubles (from 0.10 to 0.25) and becomes statistically significant. Given similar individual attributes and accounting for other regional factors, women prefer destination regions with relatively more prior Mexican-born in-migration relative to male immigrants, just as we expect according to network migration theory. Reviewing other statistically significant effects in Model 4a, we find that older immigrants and those with relatively better English skills prefer regions with larger prior in-flows and married immigrants are more likely to choose places with less prior in-migration.

Models 1b through 4b in Table 4 show the effects of Mexican-born population maturity on destination choice. The models indicate that Mexican immigrants generally

are more likely to choose destination regions with more mature Mexican-born populations (coefficient equal to 0.23 in Model 1b). There are, however, distinct gender differences in the effect of population maturity. The effect of population maturity among women is almost twice as strong as that of male immigrants without considering any other individual or regional differences. The relationship remains strong after controlling for individual differences in age, education, English skills and marital status (Model 2b). Unlike the effect of prior flow, the effect of population maturity also varies by other individual characteristics. Immigrants with relatively higher educational attainment and married immigrants generally are more likely to choose destination regions with more mature populations, not what we expected according to network migration theory, while immigrants with English skills tend to prefer places with less mature populations as such places likely require more contact with the local native population.

When controlling for gender differences in the influence of regional characteristics in Model 3b, we find that the strong positive relationship between population maturity and probability of destination choice remains, male immigrants are more likely choose regions with more mature populations (coefficient equal to 0.27) whereas female immigrants are likely to choose places with even more mature populations than those chosen by male immigrants (0.20 on the maturity-female interaction). Other regional effects operate similar to size of prior in-migration flow. Male Mexican immigrants generally chose regions that were more economically dynamics with higher earnings and job growth whereas female immigrants chose places with relatively lower earnings and employment growth had no effect on female

destination choices, again consistent with the notion that female Mexican immigrants are less likely to respond to economic conditions in a place.

Finally, similar to Model 4a, the main effect of population maturity in Model 4b – representing the effect for male immigrants – declines to close to zero yet the maturity-female interaction effect remains positive and statistically significant when controlling for all the individual-regional interactions. All else equal, female immigrants prefer, or are limited to, destination regions with more mature Mexican immigrant populations. This is entirely consistent with our expectations that female immigrants require migration networks that are more established and diverse and choose destination regions accordingly. The model also shows that the effect of population maturity also varies by marital status and English language skills. Those who speak English in all likelihood have more migration experience and have established network ties in more traditional destinations. Similarly, married immigrants are also more likely to settle in regions with more mature populations.

Table 3. Conditional Multinomial Logistic Regression Model Predicting Probability of Destination Choice with Size of Mexican-Born In-Migration Flow in 1990, Mexican Immigrants, Ages 16-64, Arrived in United States between 1995 & 2000

	Model 1A[a]		Model 2A[b]		Model 3A[c]		Model 4A[d]	
Size of Flow, 1990	1.47	***	1.69	***	1.55	***	0.57	
Size of Flow Squared, 1990	-1.14	***	-1.27	***	-1.10	***	-0.39	
Population (log), 1990					1.21	***	1.53	***
Mean earnings (log) per working-age adult, 1990					0.28	***	0.37	**
Employment growth, 1990 - 2000					0.46	***	0.24	
Foreign-born growth, 1990 - 2000					0.16	***	0.28	*
Percent bachelor's degree or higher, working-age adults, 1990					-0.47	***	-0.47	**
Percent black, working-age adults, 1990					0.13	***	-0.31	*
Percent employed in agricultural industry, 1990					0.00		0.55	***
Percent employed in construction industry, 1990					-0.26	***	-0.05	
Percent employed in service industry, 1990					-0.06	***	-0.07	
Size of Flow * Female	0.04		0.08		0.10		0.26	***
Size of Flow^2 * Female	0.11	**	0.05		0.03		-0.13	
Population * Female					0.01		0.02	
Earnings * Female					-0.20	***	-0.16	***
Employment growth * Female					0.00		0.00	
Foreign-born growth * Female					0.00		-0.06	
Percent BA+ * Female					0.01		0.05	
Percent Black * Female					-0.11	***	-0.08	**
Percent Ag * Female					-0.06		-0.02	
Percent Construction * Female					-0.02		-0.03	
Percent Service * Female					-0.01		0.01	
Size of Flow * Age			0.00				0.06	**
Size of Flow^2 * Age			0.00				-0.05	**
Population * Age							-0.01	
Earnings * Age							0.01	
Employment growth * Age							0.02	*
Foreign-born growth * Age							0.00	
Percent BA+ * Age							-0.01	
Percent Black * Age							0.03	***
Percent Ag * Age							-0.01	
Percent Construction * Age							-0.01	
Percent Service * Age							0.00	
Size of Flow * Age Squared			0.00				0.00	**
Size of Flow^2 * Age Squared			0.00				0.00	**
Population * Age Squared							0.00	
Earnings * Age Squared							0.00	
Employment growth * Age Squared							0.00	**
Foreign-born growth * Age Squared							0.00	
Percent BA+ * Age Squared							0.00	
Percent Black * Age Squared							0.00	***
Percent Ag * Age Squared							0.00	
Percent Construction * Age Squared							0.00	
Percent Service * Age Squared							0.00	
(Models 2a & 4a results continued on next page)								
Source: Authors' calculations using IPUMS Census data								
*** p-value<.01; ** p-value<.05; * p-value<0.10								

a Model includes only Size of Mexican Migration Flow and interaction with Female dummy variable

b Similar to Model 1A with controls for other individual-level variable interactions

c Similar to Model 1A with controls for other region-level variable interactions

d Full model with individual-level and region-level interactions

Table 3 (cont.). Conditional Multinomial Logistic Regression Model Predicting Probability of Destination Choice with Size of Mexican-Born In-Migration Flow in 1990, Mexican Immigrants, Ages 16-64, Arrived in United States between 1995 & 2000

	Model 1A[a]	Model 2A[b]	Model 3A[c]	Model 4A[d]
Size of Flow * Years Education		-0.01		-0.01
Size of Flow^2 * Years Education		0.01		0.01
Population * Years Education				0.00
Earnings * Years Education				-0.02 ***
Employment growth * Years Education				0.00
Foreign-born growth * Years Education				0.00
Percent BA+ * Years Education				0.00
Percent Black * Years Education				-0.01 ***
Percent Ag * Years Education				-0.03 ***
Percent Construction * Years Education				0.01 *
Percent Service * Years Education				0.00
Size of Flow * English		-0.02		0.31 ***
Size of Flow^2 * English		-0.04		-0.24 ***
Population * English				-0.17 ***
Earnings * English				0.09 **
Employment growth * English				-0.05
Foreign-born growth * English				-0.13 ***
Percent BA+ * English				0.09 **
Percent Black * English				0.08 **
Percent Ag * English				-0.14 ***
Percent Construction * English				-0.09 ***
Percent Service * English				0.08 ***
Size of Flow * Married		-0.10 *		-0.28 ***
Size of Flow^2 * Married		0.14 **		0.30 ***
Population * Married				-0.05
Earnings * Married				-0.04
Employment growth * Married				0.00
Foreign-born growth * Married				0.11 ***
Percent BA+ * Married				-0.13 ***
Percent Black * Married				-0.03
Percent Ag * Married				-0.07
Percent Construction * Married				-0.01
Percent Service * Married				-0.03

Source: Authors' calculations using IPUMS Census data

*** p-value<.01; ** p-value<.05; * p-value<0.10

a Model includes only Size of Mexican Migration Flow and interaction with Female dummy variable

b Similar to Model 1A with controls for other individual-level variable interactions

c Similar to Model 1A with controls for other region-level variable interactions

d Full model with individual-level and region-level interactions

Table 4. Conditional Multinomial Logistic Regression Model Predicting Probability of Destination Choice with Mexican-Born Population Maturity in 1995, Mexican Immigrants, Ages 16-64, Arrived in United States between 1995 & 2000

	Model 1B[a]		Model 2B[b]		Model 3B[c]		Model 4B[d]	
Mexican-Born Population Maturity, 1995	0.24	***	0.28	***	0.27	***	0.12	
Population (log), 1990					1.33	***	1.43	***
Mean earnings (log) per working-age adult, 1990					0.32	***	0.30	*
Employment growth, 1990 - 2000					0.38	***	-0.01	
Foreign-born growth, 1990 - 2000					0.33	***	0.37	***
Percent bachelor's degree or higher, working-age adults, 1990					-0.45	***	-0.38	**
Percent black, working-age adults, 1990					-0.03		-0.36	**
Percent employed in agricultural industry, 1990					0.22	***	0.54	***
Percent employed in construction industry, 1990					-0.16	***	-0.06	
Percent employed in service industry, 1990					0.01		-0.01	
Maturity * Female	0.19	***	0.15	***	0.20	***	0.15	***
Population * Female					0.03		0.06	*
Earnings * Female					-0.12	***	-0.11	***
Employment growth * Female					-0.01		-0.02	
Foreign-born growth * Female					-0.03		-0.06	**
Percent BA+ * Female					0.02		0.06	
Percent Black * Female					-0.11	***	-0.13	***
Percent Ag * Female					0.00		0.03	
Percent Construction * Female					0.00		-0.01	
Percent Service * Female					0.00		0.04	
Maturity * Age			-0.01				0.00	
Population * Age							0.00	
Earnings * Age							0.01	
Employment growth * Age							0.03	***
Foreign-born growth * Age							0.00	
Percent BA+ * Age							-0.01	
Percent Black * Age							0.02	**
Percent Ag * Age							0.01	
Percent Construction * Age							-0.01	
Percent Service * Age							0.00	
Maturity * Age Squared			0.00	***			0.00	
Population * Age Squared							0.00	
Earnings * Age Squared							0.00	
Employment growth * Age Squared							0.00	***
Foreign-born growth * Age Squared							0.00	
Percent BA+ * Age Squared							0.00	
Percent Black * Age Squared							0.00	**
Percent Ag * Age Squared							0.00	
Percent Construction * Age Squared							0.00	
Percent Service * Age Squared							0.00	
(Models 2b & 4b results continued on next page)								

Source: Authors' calculations using IPUMS Census data

*** p-value<.01; ** p-value<.05; * p-value<0.10

a Model includes only Mexican-Born Population Maturity and interaction with Female dummy variable

b Similar to Model 1B with controls for other individual-level variable interactions

c Similar to Model 1B with controls for other region-level variable interactions

d Full model with individual-level and region-level interactions

Table 4 (cont.). Conditional Multinomial Logistic Regression Model Predicting Probability of Destination Choice with Mexican-Born Population Maturity in 1995, Mexican Immigrants, Ages 16-64, Arrived in United States between 1995 & 2000

	Model 1B[a]		Model 2B[b]		Model 3B[c]		Model 4B[d]	
Maturity * Years Education			0.00	*			0.01	
Population * Years Education							0.00	
Earnings * Years Education							-0.01	***
Employment growth * Years Education							0.00	
Foreign-born growth * Years Education							0.00	
Percent BA+ * Years Education							0.00	
Percent Black * Years Education							-0.01	*
Percent Ag * Years Education							-0.03	***
Percent Construction * Years Education							0.01	
Percent Service * Years Education							0.00	
Maturity * English			-0.06	***			0.07	**
Population * English							-0.18	***
Earnings * English							0.10	***
Employment growth * English							-0.06	
Foreign-born growth * English							-0.08	***
Percent BA+ * English							0.12	***
Percent Black * English							0.08	**
Percent Ag * English							-0.10	***
Percent Construction * English							-0.07	**
Percent Service * English							0.09	***
Maturity * Married			0.07	***			0.10	***
Population * Married							-0.08	**
Earnings * Married							-0.01	
Employment growth * Married							0.02	
Foreign-born growth * Married							0.05	
Percent BA+ * Married							-0.13	***
Percent Black * Married							0.03	
Percent Ag * Married							-0.08	*
Percent Construction * Married							-0.01	
Percent Service * Married							-0.05	*
Source: Authors' calculations using IPUMS Census data								
*** p-value<.01; ** p-value<.05; * p-value<0.10								
a Model includes only Mexican-Born Population Maturity and interaction with Female dummy variable								
b Similar to Model 1B with controls for other individual-level variable interactions								
c Similar to Model 1B with controls for other region-level variable interactions								
d Full model with individual-level and region-level interactions								

When we include both size of flow and Mexican-born population maturity in the same model (Table 5), the coefficients for both the main effect of size of flow and its interaction with female become statistically not significant while the effect of maturity on female destination choices remains statistically different from that of male immigrants. The Model 4C results illustrate that, unlike in sending communities, the size of a

migration flow and its demographic composition of a Mexican-born population are not interchangeable terms for the same concept. To the extent that demographic composition serves as a proxy for the kinds of migration resources available to and general support of female immigrants, population maturity is more important than simply large migration flows.

Table 5. Conditional Multinomial Logistic Regression Model Predicting Probability of Destination Choice with Size of Mexican-Born Migration Flow and Mexican-Born Population Maturity, Mexican Immigrants, Ages 16-64, Arrived in United States between 1995 & 2000

	Model 4C	
Size of Flow, 1990	0.59	
Size of Flow Squared, 1990	-0.34	
Mexican-Born Population Maturity, 1995	-0.14	
Population (log), 1990	1.52	***
Mean earnings (log) per working-age adult, 1990	0.39	**
Employment growth, 1990 - 2000	0.21	
Foreign-born growth, 1990 - 2000	0.29	*
Percent bachelor's degree or higher, working-age adults, 1990	-0.40	**
Percent black, working-age adults, 1990	-0.31	*
Percent employed in agricultural industry, 1990	0.57	***
Percent employed in construction industry, 1990	-0.03	
Percent employed in service industry, 1990	-0.06	
Size of Flow * Female	-0.05	
Size of Flow^2 * Female	0.10	
Maturity * Female	0.13	**
Population * Female	0.04	
Earnings * Female	-0.11	**
Employment growth * Female	-0.01	
Foreign-born growth * Female	-0.04	
Percent BA+ * Female	0.05	
Percent Black * Female	-0.08	**
Percent Ag * Female	0.01	
Percent Construction * Female	-0.02	
Percent Service * Female	0.02	
Size of Flow * Age	0.13	***
Size of Flow^2 * Age	-0.10	***
Maturity * Age	-0.04	***
Population * Age	-0.01	
Earnings * Age	-0.01	
Employment growth * Age	0.02	**
Foreign-born growth * Age	-0.01	
Percent BA+ * Age	-0.01	
Percent Black * Age	0.03	***
Percent Ag * Age	-0.02	*
Percent Construction * Age	-0.01	
Percent Service * Age	-0.01	
Size of Flow * Age Squared	0.00	***
Size of Flow^2 * Age Squared	0.00	***
Maturity * Age Squared	0.00	***
Population * Age Squared	0.00	
Earnings * Age Squared	0.00	
Employment growth * Age Squared	0.00	***
Foreign-born growth * Age Squared	0.00	
Percent BA+ * Age Squared	0.00	
Percent Black * Age Squared	0.00	**
Percent Ag * Age Squared	0.00	
Percent Construction * Age Squared	0.00	
Percent Service * Age Squared	0.00	
(Results continued on next page)		
Source: Authors' calculations using IPUMS Census data		
*** p-value<.01; ** p-value<.05; * p-value<0.10		

Table 5 (cont.). Conditional Multinomial Logistic Regression Model Predicting Probability of Destination Choice with Size of Mexican-Born Migration Flow and Mexican-Born Population Maturity, Mexican Immigrants, Ages 16-64, Arrived in United States between 1995 & 2000

	Model 4C	
Size of Flow * Years Education	-0.04	***
Size of Flow^2 * Years Education	0.02	**
Maturity * Years Education	0.02	***
Population * Years Education	0.00	
Earnings * Years Education	-0.01	**
Employment growth * Years Education	0.00	
Foreign-born growth * Years Education	0.00	
Percent BA+ * Years Education	0.00	
Percent Black * Years Education	-0.01	**
Percent Ag * Years Education	-0.03	***
Percent Construction * Years Education	0.01	*
Percent Service * Years Education	0.00	
Size of Flow * English	0.18	
Size of Flow^2 * English	-0.14	
Maturity * English	0.02	
Population * English	-0.15	***
Earnings * English	0.09	**
Employment growth * English	-0.05	
Foreign-born growth * English	-0.11	***
Percent BA+ * English	0.08	**
Percent Black * English	0.06	*
Percent Ag * English	-0.12	***
Percent Construction * English	-0.08	***
Percent Service * English	0.08	***
Size of Flow * Married	-0.78	***
Size of Flow^2 * Married	0.58	***
Maturity * Married	0.36	***
Population * Married	-0.07	
Earnings * Married	0.12	**
Employment growth * Married	-0.02	
Foreign-born growth * Married	0.13	***
Percent BA+ * Married	-0.15	***
Percent Black * Married	0.01	
Percent Ag * Married	0.02	
Percent Construction * Married	-0.01	
Percent Service * Married	-0.01	
Source: Authors' calculations using IPUMS Census data		
*** p-value<.01; ** p-value<.05; * p-value<0.10		

Discussion and Conclusions

Much recent research is devoted to the changing settlement patterns of Mexican migration during the 1990s. While the places of settlement have changed, our results indicate that processes of Mexican immigration and settlement in U.S. destination regions continue to occur in predictable ways according to migration theory. The

migration theory of cumulative causation predicts that migration decisions eventually become socially driven and increasingly independent of economic forces. As such much research has shown that Mexicans who live in migration-sending communities with higher rates of out-migration are more likely to migrate to the United States. Viewing similar processes in U.S. destination regions that receive new Mexican arrivals, we expected to find similar outcomes such that new arrivals are more likely to go to places where previous immigrants have settled given their reliance on network resources and support. Our results show this to be the case such that Mexican immigrants who arrived in the late 1990s were generally more likely to choose destination regions where relatively larger immigration flows had occurred in the late 1980s.

The forces of cumulative causation, however, do not affect individual immigrants equally. In migration-sending communities, some migrants may possess the financial resources and necessary skills to migrate early in the development of a migration stream when few other migrants have left, migration resources are scarce, and the costs and risks of migration are high. Other community members require information and financial resources passed back from experienced migrants through migration networks to successfully migrate. Once such resources become more readily available, a migration stream gains momentum as a broader cross-section of a community migrates. Given that financial resources, skills, and social power and status are not distributed evenly across community members, especially within households, previous research shows that migration streams change in composition as they develop and gain momentum.

Gender is a key dimension by which migration streams change. For a less skilled, less experienced person to migrate, not only must migration resources be available in a community but one must also have access to such resources through one's social networks. Research shows that women experience greater difficultly gaining access to migration networks due to being generally perceived as higher risk and having less potential in the labor market. Women thus migrate later in the development of migration streams once the costs and risks of migration have declined, settlement and family reunification becomes more common, and female migrants are provided access to network resources that are controlled predominately by earlier male migrants. In migration-sending communities, the relative size of a migration stream and the demographic composition of a stream are closely related and indicate the maturing of migration networks in general.

While we expected the dynamics of migration to exhibit similar outcomes in U.S. destination regions such that Mexican immigrants generally choose places where more previous settlement had occurred and where the Mexican-born population is more mature, we also expected to find a disjuncture between the demographic composition of an immigrant population and the amount of prior settlement with regard to male and female settlement. We argued above that settlement in relatively newer destination regions may be driven not only by labor demand but also may indicate the culmination of family migration and reunification that began years earlier. As such, a new migration stream, if mostly due to labor demand for and recruitment of male immigrants, may have grown very rapidly in the 1990s but never "mature" to support female settlement. Settlement in other places maybe be due both to labor demand and a desire to reunite

families in a place with lower costs of living and relatively better amenities than traditional destination regions now offer. Such place may not necessarily have larger previous migration while the Mexican-born population may appear to be more mature due to internal migration of experienced immigrants within the United States. In this case, one would expect greater support of new female arrivals from Mexico.

While both size of prior migration and Mexican-born population maturity exhibit similar influences on Mexican immigrant destination choices separately, including both in the same model, while highly correlated, shows the greater importance of population maturity for female immigrants. Whereas female immigrants did not choose places with more or less prior migration than male immigrants, they chose destination regions with more mature Mexican-born populations relative to their male counterparts.

References

Bachmeier, J. and F. D. Bean (2008). Recent Mexican Migration to U.S. Labor Markets: Cumulative Causation Dynamics at Metropolitan Destinations. Population Association of America. New Orleans, LA.

Bartel, A. P. (1989). "Where Do the New U.S. Immigrants Live?" Journal of Labor Economics 7(4): 371-91.

Bauer, T., G. S. Epstein, et al. (2005). "Enclaves, Language, and the Location Choice of Migrants." Journal of Population Economics 18(4): 649-662.

Ben-Akiva, M. and S. R. Lerman (1985). Discrete Choice Analysis: Theory and Application to Travel Demand. Cambridge, MIT Press.

Cerrutti, M. and D. S. Massey (2001). "On the Auspices of Female Migration from Mexico to the United States." Demography 38(2): 187-200.

Diaz McConnell, E. (2008). "The US Destinations of Contemporary Mexican Immigrants." International Migration Review 42(4): 767-802.

Durand, J., D. S. Massey, et al. (2005). The New Geography of Mexican Immigration. New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States. V. Zúñiga and R. Hernández-León. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

Fussell, E. and D. S. Massey (2004). "The Limits to Cumulative Causation: International Migration from Mexican Urban Areas." Demography 41(1): 151-171.

Grieco, E. (2003). The Foreign Born from Mexico in the United States. US in Focus. Washington, D.C., Migration Policy Institute. Accessed on the internet at http://www.migrationinformation.org/usfocus/display.cfm?ID=163 on 9/19/2008.

Gurak, D. T. and M. M. Kritz (2000). "Context Determinants of Interstate Migration of U.S. Immigration." Social Forces 78(3): 1017-1039.

Hagan, J. M. (1998). "Social Networks, Gender, and Immigrant Incorporation: Resources and Constraints." American Sociological Review 63(1): 55-67.

Hernández-León, R. and V. Zúñiga (2000). ""Making Carpet by the Mile": The Emergence of a Mexican Immigrant Community in an Industrial Region of the U.S. Historic South." Social Science Quarterly 81: 49-66.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (1994). Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Kandel, W. and J. Cromartie (2004). New Patterns of Hispanic Settlement in Rural America. Rural Development Research Report No. 99, Economic Research Service. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Kim, J.-O. and C. W. Mueller (1978). Factor Analysis: Statistical Methods and Practical Issues. Newbury Park, Sage Publications.

Kritz, M. M. and J. M. Nogle (1994). "Nativity Concentration and Internal Migration among the Foreign-Born." Demography 31(3): 509-24.

Leach, M. A. and F. D. Bean (2008). The Structure and Dynamics of Mexican Migration to New Destinations in the United States. New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration. D. S. Massey. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

Lichter, D. T. and K. M. Johnson (2009). "Immigrant Gateways and Hispanic Migration to New Destinations." International Migration Review 43(3): 496-518.

Marcelli, E. A. and W. A. Cornelius (2001). "The changing profile of Mexican migrants to the United States: New evidence from California and Mexico." Latin American Research Review 36(3): 105-131.

Massey, D. S. (1986). "The Settlement Process Among Mexican Migrants to the United States." American Sociological Review 51(5): 670-84.

Massey, D. S. (1999). Why Does Immigration Occur? A Theoretical Synthesis. Handbook of International Migration. C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz and J. DeWind. New York, Russell Sage Foundation: 34-52.

Massey, D. S., Ed. (2008). New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
Massey, D. S., R. Alarcón, et al. (1987). Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.
Massey, D. S. and K. E. Espinosa (1997). "What's Driving Mexico-US migration? A Theoretical, Empirical, and Policy Analysis." American Journal of Sociology 102(4): 939-999.
Massey, D. S., L. Goldring, et al. (1994). "Continuities in Transnational Migration: An Analysis of Nineteen Mexican Communities." American Journal of Sociology 99(6): 1492-1533.
Menjívar, C. (2000). Fragmented Ties: Salvadoran Immigrant Networks in America. Berkeley, University of California Press.
Myrdal, G. (1957). Rich Lands and Poor. New York, Harper & Row.
Passel, J. S. and R. Suro (2005). Rise, Peak and Decline: Trends in U.S. Immigration 1992-2004. Washington, D.C., Pew Hispanic Center. Accessed online June 15, 2007 at http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/53.pdf.
Passel, J. S. and W. Zimmerman. (2001). "Are Immigrants Leaving California? Settlement Patterns of Immigrants in the Late 1990s." Retrieved September 18, 2003, 2003, from http://www.urban.org.
Pedraza, S. (1991). "Women and Migration - the Social-Consequences of Gender." Annual Review of Sociology 17: 303-325.
Piore, M. J. (1979). Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor and Industrial Societies. London, Cambridge University Press.
Portes, A. and R. L. Bach (1985). Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States. Berkeley, University of California Press.
Ranney, S. and S. Kossoudji (1983). "Profiles of Temporary Mexican Labor Migrants to the United States." Population and Development Review 9(3): 475-493.
Reichert, J. (1981). "The Migrant Syndrome: Seasonal U.S. Wage Labor and Rural Development in Central Mexico." Human Organization 40: 56-66.
Reichert, J. and D. S. Massey (1980). "History and Trends in United-States Bound Migration from a Mexican Town." International Migration Review 14(4): 475-491.
Ruggles, S., M. Sobek, et al. (2008). "Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Version 4.0 [Machine readable database]." 2008, from www.ipums.org.
Sassen, S. (1988). The Mobility of Labor and Capital. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Sassen, S. (2000). Cities in a World Economy. Thousand Oaks, CA, Pine Forge Press.
Scott, D. M., P. A. Coomes, et al. (2005). "The Location Choice of Employment-Based Immigrants Among U.S. Metro Areas." Journal of Regional Science 45(1): 113-145.
Stark, O. (1991). The Migration of Labor. Cambridge, MA, Blackwell Publishers.
Train, K. (1993). Qualitative Choice Analysis: Theory, Econometrics and an Application to Automobile Demand. Cambridge, MIT Press.
Zúñiga, V. and R. Hernández-León (2001). A New Destination for an Old Migration: Origins, Trajectories, and Labor Market Incorporation of Latinos in Dalton, Georgia. Latino Workers in the Contemporary South. A. D. Murphy, C. Blanchard and J. A. Hill. Athens, The University of Georgia Press: 126-35.
Zúñiga, V. and R. Hernández-León (2005). New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.