Immigrant Incorporation and Fertility in New Hispanic Destinations

Daniel T. Lichter, Cornell University

Kenneth M. Johnson, University of New Hampshire

Richard H. Turner, Cornell University

Allison Churilla, University of New Hampshire

Immigrant Incorporation and Fertility in New Hispanic Destinations

Introduction

The post-1990 period ushered in a new pattern of population redistribution among the nation's Hispanics (Massey 2008). In 1990, for example, almost 90 percent of the Hispanics lived in just 10 states (U.S. Census Bureau 1973). Since then, the centrifugal drift of Hispanics has been both dramatic and unprecedented – in several ways. The Hispanic population has spread geographically from traditional gateway states to new destinations, especially in the South and Midwest (Lichter and Johnson 2009; Leach and Bean 2008). Hispanics historically have been among the nation's most urbanized populations (e.g., over 90 percent lived in metropolitan areas in 2000). But, more recently, Hispanic population growth has shifted down the urban size-of-place scale; many small and medium-sized metropolitan areas are now magnets for new immigrants (Singer 2000; McConnell 2009). The post-1990 period also has been marked by substantial Hispanic suburbanization (Iceland and Nelsen 2008) and new growth in rural communities, especially in the South and Midwest (Donato et al. 2007; Lichter and Johnson 2006).

The current focus on new immigration and migration of Hispanics is understandable, while at the same time deflecting attention away from another demographic source of Hispanic population growth – fertility. High fertility has been a significant but often underappreciated second-order effect of rapid Hispanic immigration. Indeed, Hispanic natural increase (fueled by high fertility and low mortality rates) now accounts for more than one-half of Hispanic population growth nationally. Between 2000 and 2005, for example, natural increase accounted

for 58 percent of the Hispanic population growth in nonmetro areas and 55 percent in metro areas (Johnson and Lichter 2008). Yet, despite its clear demographic significance, the literature on the spatial patterning of Hispanic fertility – which fuels spatial differences in natural increase – is surprisingly small and underdeveloped (see Kandel and Cromartie 2004).[1]

In this paper, we evaluate comparative patterns of Hispanic fertility in new Hispanic destinations and established Hispanic gateways. Data from the 2005-2007 files of the *American Community Survey* (ACS) are used to address three specific objectives. First, we document recent patterns of Hispanic fertility, while illustrating the usefulness of the new fertility question (i.e., whether women had a birth in the past 12 months) now available annually on the ACS.[2] Second, we document whether childbearing in new destinations is concentrated disproportionately among culturally and economically disadvantaged Hispanic groups. Third, we address whether patterns of differential fertility (e.g., by immigrant status, education, etc.) are consistent with new theoretical models of Hispanic assimilation and cultural incorporation (Parrado and Morgan 2007). Specifically, we estimate logistic regression models that account for differences in observed rates of Hispanic fertility (vis-à-vis other racial minorities and non-Hispanic whites) in new and established Hispanic areas. Here we address the question of whether differential fertility is located in the demographic makeup of Latinas (i.e., social characteristics hypothesis), in the cultural context of Hispanics in new destinations (i.e., immigrant and ethnic composition of receiving areas), or both.

---

[1] Between 2000 and 2005, there were 6.4 births for every death in the nonmetro Hispanic population. This ratio was even higher in metro areas—7.8 births per death. This ratio contrasts sharply with the overall US birth-to-death ratio of 1.1 in nonmetro areas and 1.5 in metro areas (Johnson and Lichter 2008).

[2]Detailed information about childbearing (e.g., by generation, residence, or national origin) is unavailable from birth registration system and the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). Birth certificates include only a limited amount of social and demographic information about the child, mother, and father. Moreover, the NCHS does not provide a comparison group of women who did not give birth during the year, which is important in estimating behavioral models of fertility.

The Spatial Patterning of Hispanic Fertility

Nationally, the Hispanic population has much higher rates of fertility, teen childbearing, and out-of-wedlock fertility than native-born whites, a fact that presumably reflects and reinforces the pace of cultural and economic incorporation (Bean and Tienda 1987; Landale and Oropesa 2007; Tienda and Mitchell 2006). Recent nationally-representative fertility estimates (i.e., 2005) from the National Center for Health Statistics reveal exceptional fertility among Hispanic women (Martin et al. 2007). For example, the total fertility rate (TFR) among Hispanics was 2.89 in 2005, compared with 1.84 among non-Hispanic whites. Childbearing also begins much earlier among Hispanics; the average age at first birth was 23.1 and 26.2, respectively, among Latina and white women. Earlier childbearing is also reflected in that fact that 14.1 percent of Hispanic births occur to teens compared with only 7.3 percent among non-Hispanic whites. Not surprisingly, nonmarital fertility (i.e., the percentage of births to unmarried women) is much higher (48.0 percent) among Hispanics than whites (25.3 percent), and has recently ticked upward. Fertility rates also are especially high among foreign-born Hispanics (DeLeone, Lichter, and Strawderman 2009).

Many scholars argue that the high and changing fertility rates observed among Hispanics are linked in fundamental ways to acculturation and intergenerational mobility (Santelli et al. 2009; Oropesa and Landale 2000). For example, a recent study of Hispanic immigrant fertility by Parrado and Morgan (2008) reported much higher estimates of "children ever born" among Hispanics immigrants (especially Mexicans) than whites, but more importantly, significant declines in fertility across generations. Cultural explanations of high fertility typically emphasize familism as a "core element of Hispanic culture" (Landale and Oropesa 2007:396).

Familism – as measured by fertility and family formation – is arguably the linchpin of changing cultural patterns and assimilation among most Hispanic groups, including Mexicans (Bean et al. 2000; Landale and Oropesa 2007; Wildsmith 2004). Presumably, assimilation is marked by shifts from familism (e.g., early marriage, prenatal norms, extended kin relations and coresidence, and traditional gender roles) to individualism, which will be expressed behaviorally in Hispanic declining fertility rates. Parrado and Morgan (2008) argue that converging fertility patterns with natives provide direct evidence of cultural assimilation.

Of course, trends and differentials in Hispanic fertility will ultimately be played out differently in different local community settings. Historically, traditional gateways have buffered the social and economic impacts associated with Hispanic immigration in America (Massey 2008b). Local institutions have developed over time to serve new arrivals (e.g. bilingual classrooms, immigrant or culturally-sensitive health clinics, reproductive health and family planning services, ethnic churches, social and political clubs). Anti-immigrant sentiments among natives are also more muted in established gateways, where natives are used to interacting with culturally-diverse populations that often speak a different language and have different customs. The implication is that cultural expressions of familiism, such as high fertility, are reinforced or perhaps even amplified in traditional gateways. Under these circumstances, fertility rates would be expected to be very high in established Hispanic gateways.

The context of Hispanic reception obviously is much different in new destinations. To be sure, Hispanic migration to new destinations can be boundary spanning, stitching together origin and receiving Hispanic populations, while engendering aspects of both assimilation and dissimilation (Jiménez 2007; Lee and Bean 2007). For example, new Hispanic arrivals, especially immigrants, may be different from acculturated co-ethnics who have been long-time

residents and from native-born Anglos, differences that may take decades or generations to eliminate. At the same time, the migration process itself, partly because of its selective nature and partly because of adaptation or assimilation (e.g., upward mobility in the new destination), may also be associated with increased dissimilation from the origin community. Assimilation implies that differences between natives and new in-migrants in the destination will narrow over time and generation, while dissimilation implies that differences between natives and out-migrants from the origin or sending communities will grow over time.

Current Study

Our conceptual framework is more narrowly focused on spatial differences in period fertility rates among Hispanics and other racial and ethnic groups. Specifically, we distinguish between the so-called "sub-cultural hypothesis" and "social characteristics hypothesis" of fertility (Bean and Tienda 1987). The sub-cultural hypothesis locates higher Hispanic fertility in familism, which emphasizes the traditionally pronatalistic family values and gender roles found in origin countries (e.g., Mexican and other parts of Latin America). The social characteristics hypothesis attributes high fertility rates among Hispanics to their demographic risk profile (e.g., low education).

For our purposes, the sub-cultural perspective implies several specific hypotheses. *First*, Hispanics – both in established and new destinations – are expected to have higher rates of fertility than other racial and ethnic groups. This will be the case even after controlling for social and economic characteristics (e.g., education) associated with fertility.

Second, a subcultural perspective implies that Hispanic fertility will be higher among immigrants than among Hispanic natives, especially if cultural and structural assimilation proceed from greater exposure to majority values and behavior.

Third, we expect that fertility levels in new destinations will be intermediate between fertility rates in traditional Hispanic gateways and fertility rates of whites (or of non-Hispanics) in destination communities (see Bean et al. 2000; Lindstrom and Saucedo 2007). Newly-arrived Hispanics presumably bridge the social and cultural boundaries that divide origin from receiving communities. Hispanics in new destinations adapt (or even assimilate) by assuming the childbearing norms of receiving areas and rejecting the higher fertility norms of the origin.

Fourth, fertility levels in new destinations will be shaped by the cultural context of receiving communities, i.e., the size and composition of the Hispanic population. Higher shares of Hispanics – especially higher shares of Hispanic immigrants – will be positively associated with Hispanic fertility. The growth of foreign-born Hispanics presumably "replenishes" the Hispanic population, promotes in-group exposure and social interaction, and reinforces cultural expressions of "Hispanicity" and ethnic solidarity (including higher fertility).

The social characteristics hypothesis provides an alternative to the subcultural hypothesis. This hypothesis locates Hispanic-non-Hispanic differences in fertility in differences in sociodemographic characteristics, especially those that are associated with fertility, such as age, marital status, education, and income. For example, native-foreign-born differences in fertility will reflect differences in the selectivity of immigration and migration (e.g., selectivity of young people into new destinations). Of course, high Hispanic fertility also may reflect incomplete structural assimilation in this country, i.e., fertility remains high (vis-à-vis natives) because of persistent inequality (e.g., education, occupation, residence patterns, etc.). The substantive

implication is that fertility differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanic whites can be "explained" completely by differences in social characteristics. Our working hypothesis here is that the effects of Hispanicity (or cultural factors, such as nativity) will be attenuated or eliminated if these differences are taken into account (i.e., controlled in a multivariate analysis).

Although this working hypothesis can be applied broadly, some important distinctions exist between traditional gateways and new destinations. If migration into new destinations is highly selective of upwardly mobile or native-born Hispanics – those with good education, language skills, and job skills – then fertility rates may be comparatively low (vis-à-vis Hispanics in established areas) and similar to the non-Hispanic populations in the communities they join. Social characteristics may thus "explain" less of the higher Hispanic fertility in new destinations than in established areas. New destinations, by definition, are also comprised in high percentages of in-migrants (both of native-born and foreign-born Hispanics). Previous studies have documented the so-called *disruption effect* (i.e., migration is disruptive, which affects family formation, sexual activity, and conception) on fertility (Lindstrom and Saucedo 2007). It therefore is important to separate the lower fertility in new destinations due to social characteristics from the disruptive effects of migration.

Data and Methods

The country was divided into three areas based on Hispanic settlement patterns: traditional gateways, new destinations, and other areas. The traditional gateways are defined as the 10 states with the largest total Hispanic populations in 1990: California, New York, Texas, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Massachusetts. Close to 9 out of 10 Hispanic Americans resided in one of these states at that time. The new destinations are those

public use microdata areas (PUMAs) located outside of the gateway states that had a Hispanic population percentage in 2005-2007 equal to or exceeding the median (5 percent) for all PUMAs in those years. Other areas are simply the PUMAs outside of the gateways that do not meet the criterion for a new destination.

Analysis

See Attached Preliminary Tables

References

Afable-Munsuz Aimee, and Claire D. Brindis. 2006. "Acculturation and the Sexual and Reproductive Health of Latino Youth in the United States." *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive* Health 38(Dec.):208-219.

Alba, Richard D., and John R. Logan. 1993. "Minority Proximity to Whites in Suburbs: An Individual-Level Analysis of Segregation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98:1388-427.

Alba, Richard D. and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Anselin, Luc. 1988. *Spatial Econometrics: Methods and Models*. Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht.

Banerjee, S, B. Carlin, and A. Gelfand A 2004. *Hierarchical Modeling and Analysis for Spatial Data.* Chapman and Hall.

Bijwaard, G. 2008. "Modeling the Migration Dynamics of Immigrants: the Case of the Netherlands. *Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper TI 2008-070 /4.* Tinbergen Institute and the Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Bean, Frank D., C. Gray Swicegood, and Ruth Berg. 2000. "Mexican-American Fertility: New Patterns and Interpretations." *Social Science Quarterly* 81:404-420.

Brown, Susan; Jennifer Van Hook and Jennifer E. Glick. forthcoming. "Generational Differences in Cohabitation and Marriage in the U.S." *Population Research and Policy Review,* 27:531-550.

Carter, Marion. 2000. "Fertility of Mexican immigrant women in the U.S.: A closer look." *Social Science Quarterly* 81:1073-1086.

Crowley, Martha, and Daniel T. Lichter. 2009. "Social Disorganization in Latino Boomtowns?" *Rural Sociology* 73, forthcoming.

Crowley, Martha, Daniel T. Lichter, and Zhenchao Qian. 2006. "Beyond Gateway Cities: Economic Restructuring and Poverty among Mexican Immigrant Families and Children." *Family Relations* 55:345-360.

DeLeone, Felicia Yang, Daniel T. Lichter, Robert Strawderman. 2009. "Decomposing Trends in Nonmarital Fertility among Latinas." Under review for publication.

Donato, Katharine M., Charles Tolbert, Alfred Nucci, and Yukio Kawano. 2007. "Recent immigrant settlement in the nonmetro United States: Evidence from internal census data." *Rural Sociology* 72:537-559.

Durand, Jorge, Douglas S. Massey, and Chiara Capoerro. 2005. "The new geography of Mexican immigration," in Víctor Zúñiga and Rubén Hernández-León (eds.), *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 1-20.

Frank, Reanne and Patrick Heuveline. 2005. "A Crossover in Mexican and Mexican-American Fertility Rates: Evidence and Explanations for an Emerging Paradox." *Demographic Research* 12:77-103.

Frey, Richard. 2008a. Latino *Settlement in the New Century.* Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

------. 2008b. *Latinos Account for Half of U.S. Population Growth Since 2000.* Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

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

Fu, Vincent Kang. 2008. "Interracial-Interethnic Unions and Fertility in the United States." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70:783-795.

Fuguitt, Glenn V., Tim B. Heaton, and Daniel T. Lichter. 1988. "Monitoring the Metropolitanization Process." *Demography* 25:115-128.

Gordon, Milton M. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Guzmán, Betsy, and Eileen Diaz McConnell. 2004. "The Hispanic population: 1990-2000 growth and change." *Population Research and Policy Review* 21:109-128.

Iceland, John, and Melissa Scopilliti. 2008. "Immigrant residential segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas, 1990-2000." *Demography* 45-79-94.

Hall, Matthew. 2009. "Interstate Migration, Spatial Assimilation, and the Incorporation of U.S. Immigrants" *Population, Space, and Place* 15:57-77**.**

Jiménez, Tomas R. 2007. "Weighting the Costs and Benefits of Mexican Immigration: The Mexican-American Perspective." *Social Science Quarterly* 88:599-618.

Jiménez, Tomas R. 2008 "Mexican Immigrant Replenishment and the Continuing Significance of Ethnicity and Race." *American Journal of Sociology* 113:1527-1567.

Jiménez, Tomas, and Fitzgerald 2007. "Mexican Assimilation: A Temporal and Spatial Reorientation." *De Bois Review* 4:337-354.

Jensen, Leif. 2006. *New Immigrant Settlements in Rural America: Problems, Prospects and Policies*. Reports on America. Volume 1 (3). Durham, New Hampshire: Carsey Institute, University of New Hampshire.

Johnson, Kenneth M., and Daniel T. Lichter. 2008. "Natural Increase: A New Source of Population Growth in Emerging Hispanic Destinations." *Population and Development Review* 34:327-346.

Jonsson Stefan H., and Michael S. Rendall. 2004. "The fertility contribution of Mexican immigration to the United States." *Demography* 41:129-150.

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

Landale, Nancy S., and R.S. Oropesa. 2007. "Hispanic Families: Stability and Change." *Annual Review of Sociology* 33:381–405

Landale, Nancy S., R. Salvador Oropesa, and Christina Bradatan. 2006. "Hispanic Families in the United States: Family Structure and Process in an Era of Family Change." Pp. 138-175 in Marta Tienda and Faith Mitchell (eds.), *Hispanics and the Future of America*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Leach, Mark A., and Frank D. Bean. 2008. "The structure and dynamics of Mexican migration to new destinations in the United States," in D. S. Massey (ed.), *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 51-74.

Liaw, Kao-Lee, and William H. Frey. 2007. "Multivariate Explanation of the 1985–1990 and 1995–2000 Destination Choices of Newly Arrived Immigrants in the United States: The Beginning of a New Trend?" *Population, Space and Place* 13:377-399.

Lichter, Daniel T., J. Brian Brown, Zhenchao Qian, and Julie M. Carmalt. 2007. "Marital Assimilation among Hispanics? Evidence of Declining Cultural and Economic Incorporation? *Social Science Quarterly* 88:745-765.

Lichter, Daniel T., and Kenneth M. Johnson. 2006. "Emerging rural settlement patterns and the geographic redistribution of America's new immigrants." *Rural Sociology* 71:109-131.

------. 2009. "Immigrant Gateways and the Hispanic Migration to New Destinations." *International Migration Review*.

Lindstrom, David P., and Silvia Giorguli Saucedo. 2007. "The Interrealtionship Between Fertility, Family Maintenance, and Mexico-U.S. Migration." *Demographic Research* 17: 821-858.

Marrow, Helen B. 2005. "New Destinations and Immigrant Incorporation." *Perspectives on Politics* 3:781-799.

Martin, Joyce A., Brady E. Hamilton, Paul D. Sutton, Stephanie J. Ventura, Fay Menacker, Sharon Kirmeyer, and Martha L. Munson. 2007. Births: Final Data for 2005. National Vital Statistics Reports, Volume 56, Number 6 December 5, 2007.

Massey, Douglas S. (ed.). 2008a. *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

------. 2008b. "Assimilation in a New Geography." Pp. 343-353 in *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Massey, Douglas S., and Chiara Capoferro. 2008. "The Geographic Diversification of American Immigration," in D. S. Massey (ed.), *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 25-50.

Massey, Douglas S., Andrew B. Gross and Kumiko Shibuya. 1994. "Migration, Segregation, and the Geographic Concentration of Poverty." *American Sociological Review* 59:425-445.

McConnell, Eileen Diaz. 2008. "The U.S. Destinations of Contemporary Mexican Immigrants." *International Migration Review* 42: 767-802.

Morgan, S.Philip. 1996. "Characteristic Features of Modern American Fertility." *Population and Development Review* 22: 19-63.

O'Connell, Martin, and Gretchen Gooding. 2009. "Estimates about Fertility and Grandparents from the ACS, The CPS, C2SS, and Census 2000." Accessed 1/31/2008 at http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/Grand-Fert-report-final.doc

Oropesa, R.S., Daniel T. Lichter, and Robert N. Anderson. 1994. "Marriage Markets and the Paradox of Mexican-American Nuptiality." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55:889-907.

Parrado, Emilio A., and S. Philip Morgan. "Intergenerational Fertility among Hispanic Women: New Evidence of Immigrant Assimilation." *Demography* 45:651-671.

Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 530:74-96.

Rindfuss, Ronald R., and James Sweet. 1977. *Postwar Fertility Trends and Differentials in the United States*. New York: Academic Press.

Saenz, Rogelio. 2004. *Latinos and the Changing Face of America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Saenz, Rogelio and Cruz C. Torres. 2003. "Latinos in Rural America." Pp. 57-70 in *Challenges for Rural America in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by D. L. Brown and L. E. Swanson. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Santelli, John S., A.F. Abbraido-Lanza, and A. J. Melnikas. 2009. "Migration, Acculturation, and Sexual and Reproductive Health of Latino Adolescents." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 44(Jan.):3-4..

Singer, Audrey. 2004. *The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways.* The Living Cities Census Series. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

South, Scott J., Kyle Crowder, and Erick Chavez. 2005a. "Migration and Spatial Assimilation among U.S. Latinos: Classical Versus Segmented Trajectories." *Demography* 42:497-521.

------. 2005b. "Exiting and Entering High-Poverty Neighborhoods: Latinos, Blacks and Anglos Compared." *Social Forces* 84:873-900.

South, Scott J., Kyle Crowder, and Jeremy Pais. 2008. "Inter-neighborhood Migration and Spatial Assimilation in a Multi-ethnic World: Comparing Latinos, Blacks and Anglos." *Social Forces* 87:415-443.

Stamps, Katherine and Stephanie A. Bohon. 2006. "Educational Attainment in New and Established Latino Metropolitan Destinations." *Social Science Quarterly* 87:1225-1240.

Telles, Edward E., and Vilma Ortiz. 2008. *Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Tienda, Marta, and Faith Mitchell, Editors. 2006. *Multiple Origins, Uncertain Destinies.* Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.

U.S. Census Bureau. 1993. *We the American . . . Hispanics*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce.

White, Michael J., and Sharon Sassler. 2000. "Judging Not Only By Color: Ethnicity, Nativity, and Neighborhood Attainment." *Social Science Quarterly* 81:1015-31.

Wildsmith, Elizabeth. 2004. "Race/ethnic Differences in Female Headship: Exploring the Assumptions of Assimilation Theory." *Social Science Quarterly* 85:89-106.

Yamaguchi, K. 1998. "Mover-stayer models for analyzing event nonoccurrence and event-timing with time-dependent covariates: an application to an analysis of remarriage." *Sociological Methodology* 28: 327-361.

Zúñiga, Víctor, and Rubén Hernández-León (eds.). 2005. *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Table 1. General Fertility Rates, by Destination type, 2005-2007

Race	New Destinations	Traditional Destinations	Other Areas	All Areas
Hispanic	92 (60,040)	73 (338,883)	93 (20,273)	77 (419,196)
Non-Hispanic	54 (590,074)	50 (918,507)	53 (788,575)	52 (2,297, 156)
NH white	52 (433,128)	48 (664,380)	51 (651,029)	50 (1,748,537)
NH black	60 (114,662)	55 (146,543)	63 (114,488)	59 (375,693)
NH Asian	60 (34,364)	54 (93,682)	63 (16,127)	56 (144,173)
NH other	65 (7,918)	58 (13,901)	74 (6,930)	64 (28,749)
Total	58 (650,114)	56 (1,257,391)	54 (808,848)	56 (2,716,353)

N's in parenthesis

\

Table 2. General Fertility Rates, 2005-2007, by Destination Type and Race

	New Destinations				Traditional Destinations				Other Areas				All Areas			
Race	Metro Areas	Non-Metro Areas	Not Known	Total	Metro Areas	Non-Metro Areas	Not Known	Total	Metro Areas	Non-Metro Areas	Not Known	Total	Metro Areas	Non-Metro Areas	Not Known	Total
Hispanic	91	104	87	92	72	85	81	73	91	98	90	93	75	93	84	77
Non-Hispanic	53	58	61	54	49	56	53	50	52	55	55	53	51	56	56	52
NH white	50	56	60	52	47	55	53	48	50	54	54	51	48	54	55	50
NH black	59	68	57	60	55	63	63	55	63	62	65	63	58	64	63	59
NH Asian	60	57	62	60	54	66	59	54	65	60	40	63	56	59	52	56
NH other	54	73	85	65	57	60	57	58	64	78	79	74	57	71	78	64
Total	57	61	62	58	56	61	59	56	53	56	56	54	55	58	58	56

Table 3. General Fertility Rates, 2005-2007, by Destination Type and Hispanic Group

	New Destinations				Traditional Destinations				Other Areas				All Areas			
Race	Metro Areas	Non-Metro Areas	Not Known	Total	Metro Areas	Non-Metro Areas	Not Known	Total	Metro Areas	Non-Metro Areas	Not Known	Total	Metro Areas	Non-metro Areas	Not Known	Total
Mexican	105	112	94	105	81	83	83	81	111	103	110	109	84	94	89	85
Cuban	64	54	47	63	44	47	49	44	59	170	69	78	46	87	52	47
Puerto Rican	78	89	64	78	57	121	122	59	64	75	54	65	62	94	79	63
Other Hispanics	75	78	86	75	61	88	67	62	75	93	72	78	63	86	72	65
Total	91	104	87	92	72	85	81	73	91	98	90	93	75	93	84	77

Table 4. General Fertility Rates, Hispanics, by Indicators of Assimilation

	New Destinations	Traditional Destinations	Other Areas
Nativity:			
Foreign born	100	78	113
American born	81	68	75
Migration status:			
Recent migrant from abroad	55	81	111
Recent migrant from gateways	113	105	68
Time of Arrival:			
Arrived in US before 1990	59	45	63
Arrived in US from1990-to 1999	102	88	116
Arrived in US in 2000 or later	130	117	140
Citizenship status:			
US citizen by birth	78	67	74
Naturalized citizen	70	50	65
Non-citizen	113	91	135
English language ability:			
Speaks only English	74	63	69
Speaks English "very well"	87	70	84
Speaks English "well"	88	72	99
Does not Speak English well	103	77	134
Does not Speak English	131	103	161

Table 5: Logistic Regression Models of Fertility in Past Year, 2005-2007

	New Destinations	Traditional Destinations	Total
Age:			
Lt 20 years old	1.925***	1.695***	1.959***
20-24	6.090***	4.594***	5.727***
25-34	5.783***	4.777***	5.641***
35-50 (reference)			
Race:			
Hispanic	1.385***	1.317***	1.317***
Black	1.532***	1.458***	1.527***
Asian	0.963	0.907***	0.913***
Other	1.190***	1.151***	1.256***
White (reference)			
Foreign born	0.894***	0.927***	0.928***
Language ability:			
Speaks only English	0.864***	0.894***	0.880***
Speaks English very well	1.040	1.005	1.004
Speaks English well	1.008	1.017	1.024
Speaks English but not well	0.907**	0.925***	0.931***
Does not speak English (reference)			
Married	4.840***	5.255***	5.051***
Parity	0.734***	0.677***	0.700***
Education:			
Less than high school (reference)			
High school	0.901***	0.985	0.936***
More than high school	0.782***	0.856***	0.828***
Below poverty line	2.365***	2.403***	2.426***
Hispanic Area:			
Gateway (reference)			
New destination	----	---	1.063***
Other area	---	---	1.038***
Metro Status:			
Metro (reference)			
Nonmetro	1.044***	1.073***	1.036***
Unknown metro status	1.094***	1.060**	1.049***
PUMA characteristics:			
Percentage Hispanic	1.002**	1.000	1.000
Percentage Poor	0.994***	0.998**	0.993***
-2loglikelihood	250,757	475,041	1,022,110
Cox & Snell R-squared	0.055	0.052	0.054
Nagelkerke R-squared	0.153	0.149	0.153

* 0.1 significance ** 0.05 significance *** 0.01 significance

Table 6: Logistic Regression Models of Hispanic Fertility in Past Year, 2005-2007

	New Destinations	Traditional Destinations	Total
Age:			
Lt 20 years old	1.276***	1.749***	1.638***
20-24	4.300***	4.509***	4.411***
25-34	3.773***	4.258***	4.094***
35-50 (reference)			
Hispanic Group:			
Mexican (reference)			
Cuban	0.749**	0.611***	0.640***
Puerto Rican	0.942	0.885***	0.895***
Other Hispanic	0.790***	0.829***	0.823***
Foreign born	1.022	1.006	1.013
Language ability:			
Speaks only English	0.891*	0.869***	0.864***
Speaks English very well	1.079	0.964	0.981
Speaks English well	1.010	0.991	0.992
Speaks English but not well	0.949	0.935***	0.940***
Does not speak English (reference)			
Married	2.697***	3.747***	3.482***
Parity	0.658***	0.629***	0.638***
Education:			
Less than high school (reference)			
High school	0.890***	1.000	0.973*
More than high school	0.705***	0.811***	0.785***
Below poverty line	2.418***	2.452***	2.442***
Hispanic Area:			
Gateway (reference)			
New destination	---	---	1.148***
Other area	---	---	1.105***
Metro Status:			
Metro (reference)			
Nonmetro	1.024	1.128***	1.072***
Unknown metro status	0.954	1.106**	1.040
PUMA characteristics:			
Percentage Hispanic	1.002	0.999**	0.999*
Percentage Poor	1.000	1.003**	1.002
-2loglikelihood	32,945	156,415	200,868
Cox & Snell R-squared	0.065	0.060	0.061
Nagelkerke R-squared	0.142	0.148	0.146

* 0.1 significance ** 0.05 significance *** 0.01 significance