

Leaving Gateway Metropolitan Areas: Immigrants and the Housing Market

Gary Painter and Zhou Yu*

Immigration has long been a force that shapes the housing and labor markets in gateway metropolitan areas. Recently, the impact of immigration is being felt in an increasingly large number of metropolitan areas. This study focuses on the housing outcomes of households who currently live in the fourteen largest emerging gateways, with special focus given to those households that have left the six established gateway metropolitan areas. The findings suggest that those households that move from most gateway metropolitan areas have lower homeownership rates than do households that move from within the metropolitan area. At the same time, there is little evidence that immigrants do no worse than native-born households that migrate within the United States. The study also demonstrates that immigrant households that live in crowded conditions or have multiple workers in the household have better homeownership rates than similar native born households, and that younger immigrant households are more successful in attaining homeownership than are similar native-born households.

* Associate Professor and Doctoral Candidate, respectively. Lusk Center for Real Estate, University of Southern California Los Angeles, CA 90089-0626 or gpainter@usc.edu.

Introduction

Immigration has long shaped the labor and housing markets of “gateway” metropolitan areas (e.g., Borjas 1999; Franklin, Romine and Zwanzig 1999). These established gateway metropolitan areas are usually defined as the New York CMSA, Chicago CMSA, Miami CMSA, Los Angeles CMSA, San Francisco CMSA, and San Diego MSA because they have the largest numbers of settled immigrants and continue to receive the largest numbers of new immigrants (Frey 2002; Singer 2004). While immigration continues to shape these metropolitan areas, large numbers of immigrants are leaving established gateway metropolitan areas as well as migrating directly to new areas, labeled emerging gateways, from their country of origin.

Even though the primary destination of many immigrants leaving a gateway area is another gateway area (San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Miami all receive more than do any of the emerging gateways), the impact of the migration of immigrants to emerging gateways is substantial (Table 1).¹ Las Vegas received almost 39,000 immigrants from one of the six gateways during the period from 1995 - 2000, comprising 16 percent of the immigrant population in the metropolitan area. The southern metropolitan areas of Orlando, West Palm Beach, and Atlanta drew the largest percentage increase in the immigrant populations over this time period; all in excess of 6.8 percentage points. Washington, DC, Atlanta, Phoenix, and Dallas, all receive in excess of 22,000 immigrants that originated from these gateway metropolitan areas.

Table 1 about here

While these 14 metropolitan areas are a secondary destination of immigrants, they are also a popular destination of both domestic migrants (Table 2) and direct foreign

¹ The terms emerging gateways and secondary gateways are used interchangeably in this study.

immigration (Table 3) more generally. Eight of these metropolitan areas received more than 100,000 domestic migrants (Table 2). The relative ranking of these areas are similar in terms of the number of immigrants and native-born migrants. Las Vegas received the largest percentage increase in both groups of migrants. The largest difference across tables was Atlanta, which received a larger share of immigrants than native-born migrants. This large scale migration can have important effects on the housing market, as demonstrated by the analysis below.

Table 2 about here

Table 3 demonstrates that these emerging gateway metropolitan areas are also receiving a larger share of direct migration by immigrants than in past decades. The number of direct migrants to these emerging gateways has increased substantially over the decade of the 1990s when compared to the 1980s.² As confirmed by previous research (Frey 2002; Singer 2004), the gateway metropolitan areas continue to receive the largest number of direct migrants. At the same time, the secondary metropolitan areas that receive the largest share of direct migrants from foreign countries are not always the same areas that receive large shares of immigrants via domestic migration. Atlanta's immigrant population has received a large share of immigrants from both domestic and international sources, but places like Las Vegas, West Palm Beach, and Sacramento received a larger relative share from domestic migration.

Table 3 about here

It is well documented in the labor literature (e.g., Borjas 2001; Card 2001; Kritiz and Gurak 2001) and, more recently, in the housing literature that immigration can have

² The total number in 2000 was 1,912,841 in the emerging gateways or 3.7 percent of the total population in the emerging gateways, and 790,688 or 2.4 percent of the total in 1990. It should also be noted that the geography of the secondary gateways was larger in 2000 accounting for a small portion of the increase.

important impacts on the metropolitan areas that receive large numbers of immigrants. The recent literature in housing (e.g., Borjas 2002; Coulson 1999; Painter, Gabriel and Myers 2001) has begun to investigate the different factors that lead various immigrant groups to achieve homeownership, but these analyses have either been national in scope or have focused on the gateway metropolitan areas in which most immigrants live. While it is true that the majority of immigrants initially settle and reside in gateway metropolitan areas (Table 3), an increasing number are settling in the emerging gateway metropolitan areas or are moving there from the established gateway metropolitan areas.

In order to fill this void in the literature, this study compares housing outcomes, as measured by achievement of homeownership, of those households that have left the six largest gateway metropolitan areas with those from other areas to assess their impact on the destination metropolitan areas. In so doing, we are able to assess whether the extent to which immigrants are able to attain homeownership at levels equal to comparable native born households. Research on immigrant homeownership is likely to be very important as recent decades saw a large increase in immigrant population, with more than 40 percent of all immigrants arrived between 1990 and 2000. The concern in the literature (e.g., Borjas 2002; Coulson 1999) is that immigrants have not been as successful in attaining homeownership as have similar native born households. This study is also able to assess the impact of migration more generally in these metropolitan areas. Further, we are also able to address a number of hypotheses as to the performance of immigrants in the housing market related to living in crowded conditions, having multiple workers in the households, and the relative youth of immigrant households.

The findings suggest that those households that move from the established gateway metropolitan areas have lower homeownership rates than do households that move from within the metropolitan area. At the same time, there is only scant evidence that immigrants do worse than native-born households that are migrating domestically. The results also suggest that there are important differences in the success of immigrants in the housing market across the emerging gateway metropolitan areas. Finally, immigrants are found to be more successful than are native-born households when living in crowded conditions or having multiple workers in the household, and that the relative youth of immigrant households is less detrimental to homeownership.

Theoretical background

While it is agreed that immigrants have lower homeownership rates than native-born residents on average, researchers disagree on the long term importance of this gap. On the one hand, Borjas (2002) finds that immigrants have lower homeownership attainment than U.S.-born households and that the gap has widened between 1980 and 2000. Although locational decisions of immigrants explain a part of the homeownership gaps, changing national origin, which has led to a decline in the socioeconomic status of recent immigrants, is responsible for much of the enlarged homeownership gaps. In addition, Coulson (1999) finds that being an immigrant decreases homeownership probabilities. While aging and extended duration of U.S. residence would mitigate the homeownership gaps of immigrants, homeownership deficits remain after accounting for all other factors.

On the other hand, Painter *et. al.* (2001; 2003) suggest that immigrants disproportionately reside in selected gateway metropolitan areas where housing prices are

higher and homeownership rates are lower than in the rest of the country. Those studies find that there is no homeownership gap between native and foreign born households, after controlling for socioeconomic status, mobility, and immigrant length of stay in the United States. The newness of immigrants hinders their initial homeownership attainment, because new immigrants tend to be less settled and less adapted than native-born residents and established immigrants (Painter et al., 2001). Myers *et. al.* (1999; 1998) also finds that, although immigrants enter the U.S. with low homeownership, they are likely to elevate their homeownership to a level similar to that of U.S.-born residents after a couple decades of U.S. residence. Although these studies use different methods, the conflicting results suggest that it is difficult to study homeownership attainment of immigrants at solely the national level.

Not only does immigration affect labor and housing markets, migration (inter-metropolitan moves) profoundly shapes metropolitan areas. Demographers and labor economists have well studied the causes and implications of migration. It is largely agreed that both native born and immigrants respond in a similar way to employment opportunities and amenities when they decide to migrate (Newbold 1999). However, immigration history and cultural context are additional factors affecting migration behavior of immigrants (Foulkes and Newbold 2000; Greenwood, Klopfenstein and McDowell 2002). Meanwhile, several studies in the mid 1990s argued that immigrants have migrated in a way promoting ethnic fragmentation across metropolitan areas (e.g., Ellis and Wright 1998; Frey 1995; Rogers and Henning 1999). While the heated debate on the "demographic balkanization" thesis has subsided somewhat, researchers remain concerned with the potential adverse effect of immigrants on job opportunities of U.S.-

born population (e.g., Kritz and Gurak 2001; White and Imai 1994; Wright, Ellis and Reibel 1997). More specifically, it is not fully clear the extent to which native-born residents respond to the influx of immigrants and out-migrate to other metropolitan areas as a response to increased competitions in the labor market. Despite the ambiguous theoretical predictions above, it is likely that immigration is having significant impacts on migration destinations of all households.

During the 1990s new trends in domestic migration emerged. The traditional immigrant gateway metropolitan areas have continued to have large gains in foreign-born population in the 1990s, but they have also lost the most population to domestic migration (Frey 2003). Meanwhile, a growing number of foreign-born residents disperse from the gateways and move to secondary migration destinations or “domestic migrant magnets”(Frey 2002). In addition, many new immigrants have bypassed established gateways, especially those in California (Myers, Pitkin and Park 2004), and directly settled in the emerging gateways. As a result, the secondary migration destinations saw a large growth of both native-born and foreign-born population in 1990s (Singer 2004). Because of the distinctive socio-demographic characteristics of the foreign-born migrants, Frey (2002) again cautions that the arrivals of foreign-born migrants may aggravate residential separation and create “barbell economies” in the secondary migration destinations. While immigrant migrants have received much media attention (e.g., Cohen 2004; Kelley and Chavez 2004), there has been little detailed analysis on their housing outcomes in the emerging gateways.

In addition to examining housing outcomes of immigrant and domestic movers within the emerging gateway metropolitan areas, this study also investigates the

mechanisms through which they achieve homeownership after they move. Four hypotheses are tested here. The first one is that migration distance is an important factor in housing outcomes. The literature has documented that distance is an important deterrent to inter-metropolitan migration (Roseman 1971; Zax 1994). Clearly, inter-metropolitan movers would encounter more challenges than a move within the same metropolitan area. It is more difficult for these movers to find a residence in their migration destinations, which would in turn encourage them to be temporary renters. In addition, immigrants who directly migrate from foreign countries into the secondary migration destinations would face even greater constraints.

The second hypothesis concerns origin-destination housing price differentials. Higher housing prices deter in-migration to potential migration destinations (Gabriel, Shack-Marquez and Wascher 1993). Anecdotal evidence also suggests that immigrants are migrating out of high-housing-price area and moving away from gateway metropolitan areas because they can afford to become homeowners in their migrant destinations (Kelley and Chavez 2004). Everything else being equal, we would expect higher homeownership rates from those that move from a high house price area. However, it is unclear whether immigrants and native-born respond in the same way to the price differentials. Immigrants, for example, may be less likely to have acquired home equity or other forms of wealth in their previous destination.

The final hypotheses are related to the income and wealth constraints that immigrants face. It has been documented that immigrants are more likely to live in overcrowded houses upon arrival (Myers, Baer and Choi 1996). Some choose these living arrangements due to cultural preference, while most are resource constrained

(Myers and Lee 1996). Therefore, immigrants may be more likely to compromise living arrangements and pool resources in order to achieve homeownership. Similarly, immigrants may be more likely to choose to have multiple workers in the household in order to increase the likelihood of homeownership (Clark 2003; Haurin, Hendershott and Wachter 1997).

Data

This analysis relies on data from the 5 percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) file of the 2000 decennial censuses downloaded from *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series* (Ruggles and Sobek 2003). The 1990 5 percent PUMS data will also be used to cross-tabulate trends of migration. We select 14 metropolitan statistical areas (MSA) and consolidated metropolitan statistical areas (CMSA) as the study regions. These emerging gateway metropolitan areas are Atlanta MSA, Boston-Worcester-Lawrence CMSA, Dallas-Fort Worth CMSA, Denver-Boulder-Greeley CMSA, Houston-Galveston-Brazoria CMSA, Las Vegas MSA, Orlando MSA, Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City CMSA, Phoenix-Mesa MSA, Sacramento-Yolo CMSA, Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton CMSA, Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater MSA, Washington-Baltimore CMSA, West Palm Beach-Boca Raton MSA. These metropolitan areas have the largest numbers of immigrants and immigrant migrants next to the established gateways. In addition, previous research has identified these metropolitan areas as migration magnets or gateways (see, for example, Frey 2003; Singer 2004). These fourteen metropolitan areas have a similar proportion of U.S.-born residents and immigrants, comprising 18 percent of U.S.-born population and 21 percent of all immigrants in the U.S. Meanwhile,

12.7 percent of the residents in these metropolitan areas are immigrants, which is only slightly higher than the national average 11.1 percent in the year 2000.

While focusing on homeownership attainment in the 14 emerging gateway metropolitan areas, this analysis pays special attention to households who moved from six established gateway metropolitan areas.³ According to the 2000 Census, 50 percent of all U.S. foreign-born population lives in these six metropolitan areas, while less than 18 percent of all native-born population resides there. This translates into 26 percent of all residents in the gateway metropolitan areas are immigrants, 15 percentage points higher than the national average.⁴

The sample in this analysis includes all households in the 14 metropolitan areas that moved between 1995 and 2000, with a particularly focus on those moved from the six gateway metropolitan areas. The mover households either own or rent their current residence, excluding persons who reside in group quarters. The samples are limited to those householders that are aged between 18 and 64. In addition, the sample is classified into four race/ethnic groups, which are non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, non-Hispanic Asians and Pacific Islanders (Asians), and Latinos (Hispanics). Multiracial residents and those who do not belong to the aforementioned groups are excluded.⁵

³ Again, these metropolitan areas are Chicago-Gary-Kenosha CMSA, Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County CMSA, Miami-Fort Lauderdale CMSA, New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island CMSA, San Diego MSA, and San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose CMSA.

⁴ Three criteria of selecting established gateway metropolitan areas require the metropolitan areas to be in the following: 1. Top 10 metropolitan areas with the largest immigrant population; 2. top 20 metropolitan areas with the largest immigrant share of the metropolitan population; and 3. less than 45 percent of immigrant population in metropolitan areas are new arrivals (who arrived between 1990 and 2000). San Diego is identified as a Post-World War II gateway metropolitan area along with Los Angeles and Miami (Singer 2004). According to the 2000 Census, more than 21 percent of all residents in San Diego metropolitan area were born in foreign countries.

⁵ 2.6 percent of household observations are excluded by this restriction.

The independent variables used in the homeownership choice model include demographic factors (age group, race-ethnicity, marital status, number of persons in the household, number of workers in the household, migration origin and history), economic factors (household income, education level of the householder), and variables to capture local housing market conditions (housing price and rent).⁶ In addition, housing market conditions where movers moved from are included in the analysis. The use of this set of variables enables the researcher to capture factors that influence tenure choice based on the user cost of homeownership, the price differentials between migration origins and destinations, and factors related to preferences of households correlated with demographic characteristics such as the life cycle (e.g., Myers, Megbolugbe and Lee 1998; Skaburskis 1996).

There is no direct measure of wealth available in these data. Following Gyourko and Linneman (1996), our analysis uses the educational attainment of the householder as a proxy to indicate the future earning potential as well as the wealth of the household. Presumably, households with higher levels of education may have access to greater resources because of the support networks that they have established.⁷ In addition, we include a measure of earnings based on wealth that included interest, dividend, and rental income. The size of asset income can be used as a proxy to determine the extent to which households are constrained by down payment requirements.

⁶ This paper uses PUMA as the geographical unit of local housing market. The information regarding the housing price and rent is based on this unit. Housing price is measured as the 25th percentile home price and rent as the median rent in one PUMA. The use of these proxies follows Gyourko and Linneman (1996).

⁷ Hurst and Charles (2002) find that parental wealth is a very important predictor of homeownership, and that over 80% of white households borrow money from parents for a downpayment. Although these data do not reveal this information, education is likely to be correlated with the presence of greater parental wealth.

The standard housing tenure choice model is augmented with variables that are likely to be important predictors for homeownership for immigrants. These variables are typically linked to the level of assimilation into the host society. First, immigrants' duration of stay are included (e.g., Krivo 1995; Myers, Megbolugbe and Lee 1998) because the time spent in the United States is a proxy for assimilation. Second, English ability allows immigrants to expand their residential choices beyond their ethnic community and enhance their ability to achieve homeownership after migration. In addition, speaking English only at home also suggests a high degree of acculturation to the U.S. (Alba and Logan 1991). To that end, variables that describe whether the head of the household speaks only English in the home or speaks English well are included in the model.

Table 4 reports summary statistics of all movers in the 14 emerging gateway metropolitan areas. In this sample, 51 percent of U.S.-born households own their homes, which is 13 percentage points higher than that of foreign-born households. Households that are headed by an immigrant are likely to possess less education and income, but are more likely to be married. Immigrants are more likely to have moved from gateway metropolitan areas or directly from a foreign country. Finally, the table also reveals that the sample of immigrants in these cities is likely to be relatively recent immigrants, with 47 percent having entered in the past 10 years. This compares to 32 percent nationally that have entered in the decade of the 1990s.

Table 4 about here

Results

The empirical approach in this paper is to estimate models of housing tenure choice on a sample of recent movers. This approach has been argued by some to be appropriate (e.g., Boehm, Herzog Jr. and Schlottmann 1991; Ihlanfeldt 1981), because the choices of recent movers are likely to reflect equilibrium choices of households. At the same time, Painter (2000) has shown that this sample suffers from sample selection bias since the sample of recent movers is not representative of households in the entire metropolitan area. In this paper, this concern is less important because we are interested in analyzing the impact of immigrant groups that are migrating in order to assess the impact on the emerging gateway metropolitan areas. Thus, it is appropriate to compare them with a sample of movers from within the metropolitan to determine their relative success in the attainment of homeownership.

Table 5 presents the results of probit estimation of the housing tenure choice models. The results are consistent with the tenure choice literature. Among demographic and economic variables, higher ages, being married, having larger households, higher incomes, higher levels of education, lower house prices, and higher rents all increase the likelihood of owning a home. Minority households and immigrants are less likely to own a home, although there is no differentiation for Latino and Asian immigrants. These negative effects are smaller for Latinos and Asians, and the negative effect of immigrant status is greatly reduced and then eliminated after immigrants have been in the United States for 10 years. These results concerning the effect of immigrant length of stay are consistent with results from past decades (Borjas 2002; Coulson 1999; Painter, Gabriel and Myers 2001). Also evident in Table 5 is the importance of English skills in attaining

homeownership. Speaking English only or speaking English well predicts higher homeownership than for immigrants than do not speak English well. Presumably, better language skills enable greater access to mortgage markets.

Table 5 about here

Also consistent with past literature (Painter, Yang and Yu 2003; Roseman 1971), households that move in from outside the metropolitan area have worse housing outcomes than those that from within the metropolitan area. Once immigrant status is interacted with the migration variable in column 2, it is apparent that immigrants do no worse than native-born households moving from gateway metropolitan areas. At the same time, immigrants do slightly better than native born households when moving from other parts of the United States, but this point estimate is small (2.5 percentage points).⁸ Finally, immigrants moving from a foreign country are found to be the most disadvantaged in the housing market.

Next, we estimated models that both control for metropolitan level fixed effects, and identify the effects of moving from each of the 6 gateway metropolitan areas separately (Columns 3 & 4). Including the fixed effects enables us to control for locational amenities and other unobservable factors in both the origin and destination metropolitan areas that may predict homeownership. While the results clearly indicate that some metropolitan areas have higher homeownership (e.g., Atlanta, Denver, and West Palm Beach) than others (e.g., Boston, Houston, and Sacramento), after controlling for socioeconomic characteristics and the housing market variables, the other coefficients of the model are little changed from Column 1. However, there are differences across

⁸ The 2.5 percentage point calculation is obtained by converting the probit coefficients into a marginal probability for this coefficient estimate.

migration locations for those households that moved from the gateway metropolitan areas. Households that have moved from San Diego, Los Angeles, and New York have a lower likelihood of homeownership than those that have moved from Miami, Chicago, or San Francisco.

Next we included interaction terms to investigate if the immigrants have a disparate impact across the metropolitan areas in this sample. As is evident in Column 4 (Table 5), immigrants have the worst housing outcomes in Atlanta, Boston, and Philadelphia. Immigrants have very similar homeownership outcomes in the other metro areas in our sample. The results also reveal that there is no difference between immigrant and native-born households that move from the gateway metropolitan areas. This suggests that the negative impact of moving from a gateway is a result of being a migrant, not a result of being an immigrant who has made a similar inter-metropolitan move.

House price differentials

While all the gateway metropolitan areas are likely to be relatively high housing cost areas, there are likely to be important differences across the gateways. By controlling for origin housing prices, we can isolate the effect of the metropolitan housing price from other factors in the metropolitan area using the metropolitan level fixed effects. Presumably, there may be some advantage to moving from a high cost area, because of any equity that may have been acquired over the decade of the 1990s. Migrants from a foreign country are excluded because there is no housing cost information available.

Table 6 about here

The results (Table 6: Column 1) suggest that higher origin house prices and lower origin rent are associated with higher probabilities of homeownership in the destination

metropolitan area. This implies that migrants that move from higher housing price areas are more successful in the housing market after controlling for the metropolitan fixed effects.⁹ The results are slightly stronger for immigrants, although not statistically different from zero. This is somewhat surprising because immigrants are less likely to be previous homeowners entering the destination areas with home equity, but may be more likely to leave a more expensive area for a less expensive one because they have less long term ties to an area.

Other variables related to homeownership and to immigration

A number of other factors have been noted by past research as important for success in the housing market, and which may have differential effects for immigrants. First, we examined the impact of living in crowded conditions on the likelihood of owning a home.¹⁰ Living in crowded conditions is detrimental to the likelihood of owning a home (Table 6: Column 2). At the same time, immigrants that live in crowded conditions do better than do native born households. Finally, we found that Latino immigrants who live in crowded conditions are more likely to own than are Asian immigrants.

Another characteristic that may lead households to be able to own a home is having multiple workers in the household. Previous work on data from 1990 (Painter, Gabriel and Myers 2001), found that having multiple workers in the household after controlling for income lower the probability of homeownership. The standard

⁹The prices used here are not quality adjusted. The inclusion of the fixed effects will control for the mean level of quality of housing at the metropolitan level, as well as other amenities that may be capitalized into housing values. While imperfect as controls for quality adjustments, they are likely to capture much of what is omitted in the Census data.

¹⁰ Crowding is defined as number of persons per room.

interpretation of the previous results is that after controlling for the number of persons in the household and level of income earned by the household, needing more workers to earn equivalent income signified that a household with more workers had less resources available than do households where some members do not work. In these data, having multiple workers per household increases the likelihood of owning a home (Table 6: Column 3). This effect is largest for immigrants. The findings also suggest that Asian immigrant households are most likely to benefit from the presence of additional workers in the household, while Latino immigrants are unlikely to benefit.

At the same time, it is difficult to interpret the coefficient on the number of workers because it may be endogenous as households may choose to arrange their housing arrangements in order to own a home. It may be the case that the decade of the 1990s saw a rise in non-married households joining together in order to own homes. To test this hypothesis, we restricted our sample to married households (Table 6: Column 4). When this restriction is made, the main effect for number of workers is now negative as was the case in 1990. This suggests that there may have been significant changes in household living arrangements during the 1990s. While not investigated further in this analysis, this finding should be an important area for future research. Even in this sample, the number of workers is a positive predictor of homeownership of immigrants, with the largest effect for Asian immigrants.

Of additional concern to housing policy makers is the fact that immigrants are younger than native-born households. As demonstrated in Table 5, homeownership rises with age. As is evidenced in Table 6 (Column 5), the relative youth of immigrant households is not as detrimental to homeownership as it is for native-born households.

At the same time, there is a muted increase in homeownership rates as immigrant's age as well, suggesting that immigrants fare worse than native-borns in older age groups.

Results from the 1990 Census

We next estimated models from the 1990 Census to examine whether there have been significant changes over the decades of the 1980s and 1990s. There are a number of notable changes across decades (Table 7). As mentioned previously, the number of workers in a household is negatively associated with homeownership in 1990, unlike the results for 2000. Second, asset based income appears to be important in 1990 than in 2000. Next, status as an Asian does not lead to lower homeownership in 1990, but does in 2000.

Table 7 about here

The results related to migration and immigration also differ across periods. While status as a newly arrived immigrant is similarly negative across decades, status as a Latino immigrant adds additional likelihood that the household will not own a home. This appears to have disappeared in 2000. With respect to migration, moving from a gateway is not as detrimental to homeownership in 1990 as it is in 2000, although the results for immigrants moving from a gateway are similar to those in 2000. The biggest differences appear to be those households moving from Los Angeles and New York. It may be the case that migrants from those cities in 1980s were more likely to bring equity with them into destination areas than those who moved during the 1990s.¹¹ Finally, the results suggest that immigrants were less likely than native born households to be

¹¹ The run up in house prices that occurred in the East and West Coast cities in the late 1980s was followed by a dramatic pull back in home prices. In Los Angeles, for example, prices had not reached their peak until near the end of the 1990s. Thus, households would have had less equity if they moved during the 1990s than during the 1980s.

successful in attaining homeownership if they had migrated from Los Angeles and Miami in the 1990 data. In 2000, there was no difference between native and foreign-born households across gateway metropolitan areas.

Conclusion

Immigration continues to be one of the driving forces in the changing demographics in the United States. Because immigrants as a group have lower homeownership rates than native born households, many have been concerned about adverse impacts on the homeownership rates in metropolitan areas. Past research has focused on either the established gateway metropolitan areas, or has focused on the impact of immigration at the national level. At present, no studies have focused on the emerging gateway metropolitan areas that have received increasing numbers of immigrants, as well as many domestic migrants.

In focusing on these emerging gateways, this study was able to investigate not only the impact of immigration, but also the impact of migration domestically. The results suggest that overall, immigrants have worse housing outcomes than native born households, and that this deficit persists for about 10-15 years. This fact will be important in the near term because the immigrants in these cities are much more likely to have arrived in the 1990s than have immigrants in the nation. Leaving established gateways do not provide immigrant migrants a boost in homeownership attainment, at least in short run. Unlike previous research from past decades (Painter, Yang, and Yu, 2003), there were fewer differences in outcomes between Latino and Asian immigrants. As with previous research (e.g., Painter, Gabriel and Myers 2001), domestic migrants have lower homeownership rates than do those than migrate within a metropolitan area.

In this comparison, there is only scant evidence that immigrants that leave established gateways do worse than other domestic migrants. Finally, we find that domestic migrants from New York, Los Angeles, and San Diego did worse than domestic migrants from other parts of the country, and that domestic migrants from high house price and low rent areas have a higher probability of becoming homeowners in their migration destinations.

In addition to testing the impact of immigration and migration on the housing outcomes in the emerging gateways, this analysis also investigates a number of hypotheses that are important for immigration and housing. This analysis found that living in crowded condition is typically related to lower homeownership, but that immigrants, and in particular, Latino immigrants fare better than others in crowded conditions. Immigrants also have better homeownership rates than native born households when multiple workers are in the same household, and that the presence of multiple workers in a household has shifted from being a negative predictor of homeownership in the 1990 to being a positive predictor of homeownership in 2000. The findings with respect to crowding and multiple workers, although discussed anecdotally, have not, to our knowledge, been documented in the literature.

In sum, it does appear that both immigration and migration have at least short-term negative impacts on the homeownership rates in these emerging gateway metropolitan areas. Over time, the negative impact of immigrant status fades away as households assimilate into metropolitan areas. As immigration and migration provide engines of population growth and new labor market entrants, it remains a subject for future research what are the long term impacts on the housing and labor market of this large scale migration and immigration to these emerging gateway metropolitan areas.

An earlier version of this paper was presented in July 2004 at the AREUEA International Conference, Fredericton, Canada. The authors are thankful to Donald Haurin for his helpful comments. The authors also thank the Lusk Center for Real Estate for providing funding for this project. Zhou Yu appreciates the financial support of the HUD Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant (H-21390SG). Points of views or opinions in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the grantors.

References

- Alba, R., and J. R. Logan. 1991. Variations on Two Themes: Racial and Ethnic Patterns in the Attainment of Suburban Residence. *Demography* 28: 431-453.
- Boehm, T. P., H. W. Herzog Jr., and A. M. Schlottmann. 1991. Intra-Urban Mobility, Migration, and Tenure Choice. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 73(1): 59-68.
- Borjas, G. 2001. Does Immigration Grease the Wheels of the Labor Market? *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 2001(1): 69-134.
- Borjas, G. J. 1999. Immigration and Welfare Magnets. *Journal of Labor Economics* 17(4; 1): 607-637.
- 2002. Homeownership in the Immigrant Population. *Journal of Urban Economics* 52(3): 448-476.
- Card, D. 2001. Immigrant Inflows, Native Outflows, and the Local Labor Market Impacts of Higher Immigration. *Journal of Labor Economics* 19(1): 22-64.
- Charles, K. K., and E. Hurst. 2002. The Transition to Home Ownership and the Black-White Wealth Gap. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 84(2): 281-297.
- Clark, W. A. V. 2003. *Immigrants and the American Dream : Remaking the Middle Class*. Guilford Press: New York.
- Cohen, A. B. 2004. Home Buyers Ante up; in Las Vegas, the Big Gains Aren't Just in the Casinos, They're in the Housing Market, Los Angeles Times: Los Angeles.
- Coulson, N. E. 1999. Why Are Hispanic- and Asian-American Home-Ownership Rates So Low?: Immigration and Other Factors. *Journal of Urban Economics* 45(2): 209-227.
- Ellis, M., and R. Wright. 1998. The Balkanization Metaphor in the Analysis of U.S. Immigration. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 88(4): 686-698.
- Foulkes, M., and K. B. Newbold. 2000. Migration Propensities, Patterns, and the Role of Human Capital: Comparing Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Interstate Migration, 1985-1990. *The Professional Geographer* 52(1): 133-145.
- Franklin, J. J., J. A. Romine, and P. E. Zwanzig. 1999. The Effects of Immigration on Urban Communities. *Journal of Planning Literature* 13(4).
- Frey, W. H. 1995. Immigration and Internal Migration 'Flight' from Us Metropolitan Areas: Toward a New Demographic Balkanisation. *Urban Studies* 32(4/5): 733-758.
- 2002. Census 2000 Reveals New Native-Born and Foreign-Born Shifts across U.S.: Ann Arbor, MI, Population Studies Center at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- 2003. Metropolitan Magnets for International and Domestic Migrants: Washington DC, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, the Brookings Institute.
- Gabriel, S. A., J. Shack-Marquez, and W. L. Wascher. 1993. The Effects of Regional House Price and Labor Market Variability on Interregional Migration: Evidence from the 1980s. G. T. Kingsley, and M. A. Turner. editors. *Urban Opportunity Series*. Urban Institute Press; Distributed by University Press of America: Washington, D.C.; Lanham, MD.
- Greenwood, M. J., K. Klopfenstein, and J. M. McDowell. 2002. The Internal Migration of the U.S. Foreign Born as an Assimilation Process, Western Regional Science Association Annual Conference, 2002.

- Gyourko, J., and P. Linneman. 1996. Analysis of the Changing Influences on Traditional Households' Ownership Patterns. *Journal of Urban Economics* 39(3): 318-341.
- Haurin, D. R., P. H. Hendershott, and S. M. Wachter. 1997. Borrowing Constraints and the Tenure Choice of Young Households. *Journal of Housing Research* 8(2): 137-154.
- Ihlanfeldt, K. R. 1981. An Empirical Investigation of Alternative Approaches to Estimation of the Equilibrium Demand for Housing. *Journal of Urban Economics* 9: 97-105.
- Kelley, D., and C. Chavez. 2004. California Dreaming No More ; the Carranza Family, Like Many Latino Immigrants, Found Its Way into the American Middle Class by Leaving the Golden State, Los Angeles Times: Los Angeles.
- Kritz, M. M., and D. T. Gurak. 2001. The Impact of Immigration on the Internal Migration of Natives and Immigrants. *Demography* 38(1): 133-145.
- Krivo, L. J. 1995. Immigrant Characteristics and Hispanic-Anglo Housing Inequality. *Demography* 32(November): 599-615.
- Myers, D. 1999. Demographic Dynamism and Metropolitan Change: Comparison of Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and Washington, D.C. *Housing Policy Debate* 10(4): 919-955.
- Myers, D., W. C. Baer, and S.-Y. Choi. 1996. The Changing Problem of Overcrowded Housing. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 62(Winter): 66-84.
- Myers, D., and S. W. Lee. 1996. Immigration Cohorts and Residential Overcrowding in Southern California. *Demography* 33: 51-65.
- . 1998. Immigrant Trajectories into Homeownership: A Temporal Analysis of Residential Assimilation. *International Migration Review* 32(3): 593-625.
- Myers, D., I. Megbolugbe, and S. W. Lee. 1998. Cohort Estimation of Homeownership Attainment among Native-Born and Immigrant Populations. *Journal of Housing Research* 9(2): 237-269.
- Myers, D., J. Pitkin, and J. Park. 2004. California's Immigrants Turn the Corner: Los Angeles, Population Dynamics Research Group, University of Southern California.
- Newbold, K. B. 1999. Spatial Distribution and Redistribution of Immigrants in the Metropolitan United States, 1980 and 1990. *Economic Geography* 75(3): 254-271.
- Painter, G. 2000. Tenure Choice with Sample Selection: Differences among Alternative Samples. *Journal of Housing Economics* 9(3): 197-213.
- Painter, G., S. A. Gabriel, and D. Myers. 2001. Race, Immigrant Status, and Housing Tenure Choice. *Journal of Urban Economics* 49(1): 150-167.
- Painter, G., L. Yang, and Z. Yu. 2003. Heterogeneity in Asian American Homeownership: The Impact of Household Endowments and Immigrant Status. *Urban Studies* 40(3): 505-530.
- Rogers, A., and S. Henning. 1999. The Internal Migration Patterns of the Foreign-Born and Native Born Populations in the United States: 1975-80 and 1985-90. *International Migration Review* 33(2): 403-429.
- Roseman, C. C. 1971. Migration as a Spatial and Temporal Process. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 61: 589-598.
- Ruggles, S., and M. Sobek, et al. 2003. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 3.0*. Historical Census Projects, University of Minnesota, 2003: Minneapolis.

- Singer, A. 2004. The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways: Washington D.C., Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, Brookings Institution.
- Skaburskis, A. 1996. Race and Tenure in Toronto. *Urban Studies* 33(2): 223-252.
- White, M. J., and Y. Imai. 1994. The Impact of U.S. Immigration Upon Internal Migration. *Population and Environment* 15(3): 189-209.
- Wright, R. A., M. Ellis, and M. Reibel. 1997. The Linkage between Immigration and Internal Migration in Large Metropolitan Areas in the United States. *Economic Geography* 73(2): 234-255.
- Zax, J. S. 1994. When Is a Move a Migration? *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 24(3): 341-360.

Table 1. Immigrants Moved from Established Gateway Metropolitan Areas between 1995 and 2000

	Moved from						Total
	Chicago-Gary-Kenosh a, IL-IN-WI CMSA	Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA CMSA	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA CMSA	San Diego, CA MSA	San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA	
Moved to Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA	2,093	29,126	204	2,505	3,107	3,626	40,661
Orlando, FL MSA	1,223	2,185	1,581	13,035	334	408	18,766
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL MSA	669	1,066	6,646	9,055	114	451	18,001
Sacramento-Yolo, CA CMSA	358	6,744	149	802	862	11,617	20,532
Atlanta, GA MSA	2,328	9,971	1,596	14,536	552	2,162	31,145
Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO CMSA	855	11,755	303	2,539	892	1,402	17,746
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA	4,075	17,255	199	3,067	1,797	2,242	28,635
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA	1,546	1,668	927	9,045	271	451	13,908
Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, PA-NJ-DE-MD CN	606	3,016	624	16,614	764	1,561	23,185
Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA CMSA	1,287	10,501	175	2,850	2,030	3,657	20,500
Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV CMSA	1,837	8,302	730	17,116	1,118	2,735	31,838
Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA-NH-ME-CT CMSA	972	3,598	386	14,754	935	1,512	22,157
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA	3,074	11,074	417	5,357	1,505	2,643	24,070
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA	3,193	6,759	518	6,685	949	1,271	19,375
Total	24,116	123,020	14,455	117,960	15,230	35,738	330,519

Table 2. Population Moved from Established Gateway Metropolitan Areas between 1995 and 2000

	Moved from						Total
	Chicago-Gary- Kenosha, IL- IN-WI CMSA	Los Angeles- Riverside- Orange County, CA CMSA	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	New York- Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ- CT-PA CMSA	San Diego, CA MSA	San Francisco- Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA	
Moved to Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA	14,447	93,297	1,675	15,823	12,366	12,553	150,161
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL MSA	4,061	3,399	37,293	54,138	552	1,306	100,749
Sacramento-Yolo, CA CMSA	2,878	35,445	511	3,252	8,154	85,561	135,801
Orlando, FL MSA	8,807	6,515	12,007	48,195	2,038	1,952	79,514
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA	30,484	61,135	1,200	22,448	11,884	18,121	145,272
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA	12,784	6,096	7,097	49,973	1,983	2,739	80,672
Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO CMSA	11,655	34,689	1,477	13,634	7,440	13,489	82,384
Atlanta, GA MSA	21,534	25,235	10,468	55,395	5,170	9,461	127,263
Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA CMSA	8,226	42,184	686	12,262	13,157	25,054	101,569
Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA	7,233	12,000	4,023	114,152	3,522	6,943	147,873
Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV CMSA	13,950	28,922	4,699	87,504	10,373	14,912	160,360
Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA-NH-ME-CT CMSA	9,141	14,484	3,182	69,805	4,270	10,438	111,320
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA	19,221	31,385	2,817	17,712	7,556	10,602	89,293
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA	11,602	19,508	1,250	17,280	4,075	6,169	59,884
Total	176,023	414,294	88,385	581,573	92,540	219,300	1,572,115

Table 3. Total Population and Immigrants in the Gateway Metropolitan Areas, 2000

	New Arrivals (came in last 5 yrs.)			% New Arrivals in Total		
	Total Immigrants	% New Arrivals	Total Population	% Immigrants	Total Population	% New Arrivals in Total
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA CMSA	1,126,939	5,182,255	21.7	21,199,865	24.4	5.3
Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA CMSA	887,497	5,067,615	17.5	16,373,645	30.9	5.4
San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA	427,751	1,902,304	22.5	7,039,362	27.0	6.1
Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	341,808	1,558,152	21.9	3,876,380	40.2	8.8
Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI CMSA	367,825	1,466,940	25.1	9,157,540	16.0	4.0
Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV CMSA	273,939	980,621	27.9	7,608,070	12.9	3.6
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA	248,275	895,944	27.7	4,669,571	19.2	5.3
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA	274,385	784,642	35.0	5,221,801	15.0	5.3
Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA-NH-ME-CT CMSA	185,449	721,060	25.7	5,819,100	12.4	3.2
San Diego, CA MSA	110,308	606,254	18.2	2,813,833	21.5	3.9
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA	157,157	457,483	34.4	3,251,876	14.1	4.8
Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA	105,993	433,919	24.4	6,188,463	7.0	1.7
Atlanta, GA MSA	170,510	423,105	40.3	4,112,198	10.3	4.1
Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA CMSA	108,635	414,355	26.2	3,554,760	11.7	3.1
Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO CMSA	103,129	277,127	37.2	2,581,506	10.7	4.0
Sacramento-Yolo, CA CMSA	61,056	260,111	23.5	1,796,857	14.5	3.4
Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA	66,584	258,494	25.8	1,563,282	16.5	4.3
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA	55,045	233,907	23.5	2,395,997	9.8	2.3
Orlando, FL MSA	53,472	197,119	27.1	1,644,561	12.0	3.3
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL MSA	49,212	196,852	25.0	1,131,184	17.4	4.4

Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) - Sample Data

Table 3a. Total Population and Immigrants in the Gateway Metropolitan Areas, 1990

	New Arrivals (came in last 5 yrs.)			% New Arrivals in Total		
	Total Immigrants	% New Arrivals	Total Population	% Immigrants	Total Population	% New Arrivals in Total
Los Angeles-Anaheim-Riverside, CA CMSA	1,170,527	3,944,828	29.7	14,531,529	27.1	8.1
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT CMSA	852,940	3,553,958	24.0	18,087,251	19.6	4.7
San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA	325,636	1,250,693	26.0	6,253,311	20.0	5.2
Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	230,523	1,072,843	21.5	3,192,582	33.6	7.2
Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN-WI CMSA	199,041	909,669	21.9	8,065,633	11.3	2.5
Washington, DC-MD-VA MSA	161,697	484,449	33.4	3,923,574	12.3	4.1
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA	111,554	459,635	24.3	3,711,043	12.4	3.0
Boston-Lawrence-Salem, MA-NH CMSA	114,448	435,510	26.3	4,171,643	10.4	2.7
San Diego, CA MSA	119,134	428,810	27.8	2,498,016	17.2	4.8
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA	83,487	315,296	26.5	3,885,415	8.1	2.1
Philadelphia-Wilmington-Trenton, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA	59,789	305,262	19.6	5,899,345	5.2	1.0
Seattle-Tacoma, WA CMSA	45,510	201,982	22.5	2,559,164	7.9	1.8
Phoenix, AZ MSA	43,273	154,881	27.9	2,122,101	7.3	2.0
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA	21,771	146,003	14.9	2,067,959	7.1	1.1
Sacramento, CA MSA	34,172	140,465	24.3	1,481,102	9.5	2.3
Atlanta, GA MSA	36,938	115,642	31.9	2,833,511	4.1	1.3
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton-Delray Beach, FL MSA	21,896	105,303	20.8	863,518	12.2	2.5
Denver-Boulder, CO CMSA	22,301	93,895	23.8	1,848,319	5.1	1.2
Orlando, FL MSA	16,417	76,747	21.4	1,072,748	7.2	1.5
Las Vegas, NV MSA	17,435	70,333	24.8	741,459	9.5	2.4

Data Set: Census 1990 Summary Tape File 3 (STF 3) - Sample Data

Note: The geography is not always the same between 1990 and 2000

Table 4. Variable Summary Statistics (All Movers)

Variable	<u>Full Sample</u> <u>(Movers)</u>		<u>Native-borns</u>		<u>Foreign-borns</u>	
	Mean	Std Dev.	Mean	Std Dev.	Mean	Std Dev.
Ownership Rate	0.488	0.500	0.509	0.500	0.381	0.486
Age 18-24	0.097	0.296	0.097	0.297	0.095	0.293
Age 25-34	0.337	0.473	0.331	0.471	0.366	0.482
Age 35-44	0.298	0.458	0.296	0.456	0.311	0.463
Age 45-54	0.179	0.383	0.182	0.386	0.160	0.367
Age 55-64	0.089	0.285	0.094	0.291	0.068	0.251
Not Married, Male Head Of Household	0.236	0.425	0.237	0.425	0.233	0.423
Not Married, Female Head	0.290	0.454	0.310	0.463	0.190	0.392
No High School Diploma	0.131	0.338	0.093	0.290	0.325	0.468
High School Dip. W/ College	0.513	0.500	0.545	0.498	0.351	0.477
College Degree or Better	0.356	0.479	0.363	0.481	0.323	0.468
Number Of People In Household	3.065	1.860	2.929	1.763	3.753	2.163
Number Of Workers In Household	1.493	0.879	1.481	0.846	1.558	1.025
Household Income (1000s)	63.21	62.81	65.16	63.87	53.33	56.11
Interest, Dividend, and Rental Income (1000s)	1.775	11.719	1.928	12.268	1.000	8.371
The 25th Percentile Housing Price (log)	11.472	0.426	11.473	0.422	11.469	0.448
Not Speaking English Well	0.049	0.215	0.007	0.082	0.261	0.439
Speaking English Well	0.156	0.363	0.074	0.261	0.572	0.495
Speaking English Only at Home	0.795	0.403	0.920	0.272	0.168	0.374
Puma Median Rent (log)	6.536	0.165	6.535	0.163	6.545	0.175
Moved in Last 5 Yrs.	1	0	1	0	1	0
Moved within Metropolitan Area	0.625	0.484	0.648	0.478	0.508	0.500
Moved from Gateway	0.066	0.248	0.061	0.239	0.091	0.287
Moved from Outside Metropolitan Area Not Gateway	0.255	0.436	0.275	0.447	0.150	0.357
Moved from Foreign Country	0.055	0.228	0.016	0.126	0.252	0.434
White	0.662	0.473	0.752	0.432	0.206	0.405
Black	0.142	0.349	0.153	0.360	0.089	0.284
Asian	0.045	0.207	0.008	0.087	0.234	0.423
Latino	0.124	0.330	0.065	0.247	0.424	0.494
Immigrants	0.165	0.371	0	0	1	0
Came To U.S. In The Past 5 Yrs.	0.045	0.207			0.271	0.444
Came To U.S 5-10 Years Ago	0.034	0.180			0.203	0.402
Came To U.S 10-15 Years Ago	0.028	0.165			0.170	0.376
Came To U.S 15-20 Years Ago	0.023	0.150			0.139	0.345
Came To U.S 20-30 Years Ago	0.024	0.152			0.144	0.351
Came To U.S More Than 30 Years Ago	0.012	0.109			0.073	0.261
Current Residence						
Atlanta, GA MSA	0.087	0.281	0.091	0.287	0.066	0.248
Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA-NH-ME-CT CMSA	0.087	0.282	0.084	0.278	0.103	0.304
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA	0.113	0.317	0.111	0.314	0.124	0.329
Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO CMSA	0.057	0.231	0.059	0.236	0.045	0.207
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA	0.090	0.286	0.081	0.273	0.132	0.339
Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA	0.037	0.189	0.035	0.183	0.048	0.214
Orlando, FL MSA	0.039	0.194	0.039	0.195	0.037	0.189
Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA	0.076	0.265	0.082	0.274	0.048	0.213
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA	0.071	0.258	0.071	0.257	0.074	0.261
Sacramento-Yolo, CA CMSA	0.039	0.194	0.039	0.193	0.040	0.195
Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA CMSA	0.078	0.269	0.081	0.273	0.064	0.245
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA	0.052	0.222	0.055	0.228	0.037	0.188
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL MSA	0.023	0.151	0.022	0.146	0.031	0.173
Moved from						
Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI CMSA	0.008	0.087	0.008	0.089	0.006	0.079
Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA CMSA	0.017	0.130	0.014	0.117	0.034	0.181
Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA	0.004	0.061	0.004	0.060	0.004	0.064
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA CMSA	0.023	0.150	0.021	0.144	0.032	0.176
San Diego, CA MSA	0.004	0.064	0.004	0.065	0.004	0.064
San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA	0.010	0.100	0.010	0.100	0.010	0.100
Number of Observations	369,304		308,321		60,983	

Table 5. Estimation Results, 2000

Variable	Column 1		Column 2		Column 3		Column 4	
	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.
Intercept	-0.632 ***	0.102	-0.623 ***	0.102	-0.268 *	0.119	-0.342 **	0.120
Omitted: Age 25-34								
Age 18-24	-0.539 ***	0.010	-0.536 ***	0.010	-0.535 ***	0.010	-0.534 ***	0.010
Age 35-44	0.324 ***	0.006	0.322 ***	0.006	0.319 ***	0.006	0.321 ***	0.006
Age 45-54	0.419 ***	0.007	0.413 ***	0.007	0.405 ***	0.007	0.407 ***	0.007
Age 55-64	0.597 ***	0.009	0.591 ***	0.009	0.579 ***	0.009	0.582 ***	0.009
Omitted: Married								
Not Married, Male Head Of Household	-0.753 ***	0.006	-0.754 ***	0.006	-0.768 ***	0.006	-0.767 ***	0.006
Not Married, Female Head	-0.690 ***	0.006	-0.689 ***	0.006	-0.698 ***	0.006	-0.699 ***	0.006
No High School Diploma	-0.257 ***	0.008	-0.279 ***	0.008	-0.282 ***	0.008	-0.284 ***	0.008
Omitted: High School Dip. W/ College College Degree or Better	0.151 ***	0.005	0.151 ***	0.005	0.166 ***	0.005	0.166 ***	0.006
Number Of People In Household	0.037 ***	0.002	0.036 ***	0.002	0.034 ***	0.002	0.034 ***	0.002
Number Of Workers In Household	0.027 ***	0.003	0.027 ***	0.003	0.015 ***	0.003	0.016 ***	0.003
Household Income (1000s)	0.005 ***	0.000	0.006 ***	0.000	0.006 ***	0.000	0.006 ***	0.000
Interest, Dividend, and Rental Income (1000s)	0.001 ***	0.000	0.001 ***	0.000	0.001 ***	0.000	0.001 ***	0.000
The 25th Percentile Housing Price (log)	-0.164 ***	0.009	-0.164 ***	0.009	-0.150 ***	0.014	-0.154 ***	0.014
Puma Median Rent (log)	0.338 ***	0.022	0.339 ***	0.022	0.264 ***	0.026	0.284 ***	0.026
Race (Omitted: Non-Hispanic White)								
Black	-0.397 ***	0.007	-0.397 ***	0.007	-0.415 ***	0.007	-0.418 ***	0.007
Asian	-0.139 ***	0.013	-0.168 ***	0.029	-0.132 ***	0.029	-0.134 ***	0.029
Latino	-0.120 ***	0.010	-0.146 ***	0.012	-0.160 ***	0.012	-0.155 ***	0.012
Immigrants	-0.616 ***	0.036	-0.571 ***	0.041	-0.580 ***	0.041	-0.718 ***	0.044
Asian Immigrants			0.058	0.033	0.038	0.033	0.036	0.033
Latino Immigrants			0.070 ***	0.019	0.069 ***	0.020	0.028	0.020
Immigrant Status (Omitted: Come To U.S. in the Past 5 Yrs.)								
Came To U.S 5-10 Years Ago	0.302 ***	0.021	0.213 ***	0.023	0.224 ***	0.023	0.229 ***	0.023
Came To U.S 10-15 Years Ago	0.478 ***	0.021	0.388 ***	0.023	0.404 ***	0.024	0.413 ***	0.024
Came To U.S 15-20 Years Ago	0.593 ***	0.022	0.502 ***	0.024	0.524 ***	0.025	0.524 ***	0.025
Came To U.S 20-30 Years Ago	0.594 ***	0.022	0.504 ***	0.024	0.525 ***	0.024	0.520 ***	0.024
Came To U.S More Than 30 Years Ago	0.508 ***	0.026	0.437 ***	0.028	0.444 ***	0.028	0.429 ***	0.028
English Proficiency								
Speak English Well	0.083 *	0.032	0.083 *	0.032	0.081 *	0.032	0.083 *	0.032
Speak English Only at Home	0.206 ***	0.031	0.195 ***	0.031	0.178 ***	0.032	0.179 ***	0.032
Immigrants Speak English Well	0.121 **	0.035	0.128 ***	0.036	0.130 ***	0.036	0.139 ***	0.036
Immigrants Speak English Only at Home	0.158 ***	0.036	0.190 ***	0.038	0.196 ***	0.038	0.195 ***	0.038
Moved in Last 5 Yrs. (Omitted: Moved within Metropolitan Area)								
Moved from Gateway	-0.276 ***	0.010	-0.268 ***	0.011				
Moved from Outside Metropolitan Area Not Gateway	-0.291 ***	0.005	-0.295 ***	0.006	-0.412 ***	0.006	-0.407 ***	0.006
Moved from Foreign Country	-0.488 ***	0.015	-0.369 ***	0.020	-0.398 ***	0.020	-0.398 ***	0.020
Immigrants Moved from Gateway			-0.034	0.023				
Immigrants Moved from Outside Metropolitan Area Not Gateway			0.048 **	0.018	0.041 *	0.017	0.006	0.019
Immigrants Moved from Foreign Country			-0.236 ***	0.030	-0.243 ***	0.029	-0.252 ***	0.030
Current Residence (Omitted: Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV CMSA)								
Atlanta, GA MSA					0.233 ***	0.010	0.221 ***	0.011
Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA-NH-ME-CT CMSA					-0.176 ***	0.011	-0.188 ***	0.012
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA					-0.051 ***	0.011	-0.071 ***	0.011
Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO CMSA					0.487 ***	0.013	0.458 ***	0.013
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA					-0.100 ***	0.012	-0.133 ***	0.013
Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA					0.079 ***	0.014	0.028	0.015
Orlando, FL MSA					0.129 ***	0.014	0.086 ***	0.015
Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA					0.060 ***	0.011	0.051 ***	0.011
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA					0.169 ***	0.012	0.130 ***	0.012
Sacramento-Yolo, CA CMSA					-0.104 ***	0.014	-0.135 ***	0.015
Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA CMSA					-0.050 ***	0.011	-0.090 ***	0.012
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA					0.092 ***	0.013	0.055 ***	0.014
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL MSA					0.232 ***	0.017	0.184 ***	0.019
Moved from								
Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI CMSA					-0.245 ***	0.027	-0.228 ***	0.029
Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA CMSA					-0.432 ***	0.018	-0.421 ***	0.022
Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA					-0.164 ***	0.039	-0.174 ***	0.043
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA CMSA					-0.358 ***	0.016	-0.349 ***	0.018
San Diego, CA MSA					-0.491 ***	0.036	-0.489 ***	0.039
San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA					-0.204 ***	0.024	-0.194 ***	0.026
Immigrant Current Residence (Omitted: Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV CMSA)								
Atlanta, GA MSA							0.060 *	0.029
Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA-NH-ME-CT CMSA							0.082 **	0.027
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA							0.141 ***	0.025
Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO CMSA							0.202 ***	0.035
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA							0.203 ***	0.025
Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA							0.293 ***	0.034
Orlando, FL MSA							0.278 ***	0.036
Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA							0.005	0.033
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA							0.242 ***	0.029
Sacramento-Yolo, CA CMSA							0.205 ***	0.036
Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA CMSA							0.286 ***	0.030
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA							0.281 ***	0.036
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL MSA							0.257 ***	0.041
Immigrant Moved from								
Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI CMSA							-0.125	0.077
Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA CMSA							-0.064	0.039
Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA							0.040	0.099
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA CMSA							-0.040	0.038
San Diego, CA MSA							-0.023	0.097
San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA							-0.064	0.064
Number of Observations	369,304		369,304		369,304		369,304	
Pseudo-R ²	0.224		0.225		0.233		0.234	
Log likelihood	-198,458		-198,409		-196,233		-196,104	

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table 6. Estimation Results (Hypotheses Testing), 2000

Variable	Column 1		Column 2		Column 3		Column 4		Column 5	
	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.
Intercept	-1.143 ***	0.199	1.851 ***	0.122	-0.166	0.116	-0.377 *	0.178	-0.179	0.116
Crowding			-5.225 ***	0.031						
Immigrant Crowding			1.041 ***	0.097						
Asian Immigrant Crowding			0.257	0.134						
Latino Immigrant Crowding			1.336 ***	0.114						
Omitted: Age 25-34										
Age 18-24	-0.539 ***	0.011	-0.458 ***	0.010	-0.533 ***	0.010	-0.553 ***	0.016	-0.567 ***	0.010
Age 35-44	0.312 ***	0.006	0.231 ***	0.006	0.321 ***	0.006	0.288 ***	0.008	0.335 ***	0.006
Age 45-54	0.389 ***	0.007	0.298 ***	0.007	0.406 ***	0.007	0.324 ***	0.010	0.422 ***	0.007
Age 55-64	0.553 ***	0.010	0.501 ***	0.009	0.580 ***	0.009	0.498 ***	0.013	0.603 ***	0.010
Age 18-24: Immigrant									0.283 ***	0.028
Age 35-44: Immigrant									-0.090 ***	0.015
Age 45-54: Immigrant									-0.111 ***	0.019
Age 55-64: Immigrant									-0.172 ***	0.026
Omitted: Married										
Not Married, Male Head Of Household	-0.789 ***	0.007	-0.580 ***	0.007	-0.767 ***	0.006			-0.769 ***	0.006
Not Married, Female Head	-0.724 ***	0.006	-0.605 ***	0.006	-0.698 ***	0.006			-0.699 ***	0.006
No High School Diploma	-0.297 ***	0.009	-0.205 ***	0.008	-0.284 ***	0.008	-0.263 ***	0.011	-0.281 ***	0.008
Omitted: High School Dip. W/ College										
College Degree or Better	0.176 ***	0.006	0.145 ***	0.006	0.167 ***	0.006	0.194 ***	0.008	0.167 ***	0.006
Number Of People In Household	0.034 ***	0.002	-0.028 ***	0.002	0.034 ***	0.002	0.043 ***	0.002	0.034 ***	0.002
Number Of Workers In Household	0.018 ***	0.004	0.013 ***	0.004	0.011 **	0.004	-0.015 **	0.006	0.017 ***	0.003
Number Of Workers In Household: Immigrant					0.051 ***	0.012	0.116 ***	0.017		
Number Of Workers In Household: Asian					0.094 ***	0.018	0.138 ***	0.025		
Number Of Workers In Household: Latino					-0.076 ***	0.014	-0.089 ***	0.020		
Household Income (1000s)	0.006 ***	0.000	0.004 ***	0.000	0.006 ***	0.000	0.006 ***	0.000	0.006 ***	0.000
Interest, Dividend, and Rental Income (1000s)	0.001 ***	0.000	0.002 ***	0.000	0.001 ***	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001 ***	0.000
The 25th Percentile Housing Price (log)	-0.129 ***	0.015	-0.145 ***	0.015	-0.153 ***	0.014	-0.011	0.022	-0.153 ***	0.014
Puma Median Rent (log)	0.241 ***	0.029	0.161 ***	0.027	0.285 ***	0.026	0.066	0.040	0.285 ***	0.026
The 25th Percentile Migration Origin Housing Price (log)	0.205 ***	0.020								
Migration Origin PUMA Median Rent (log)	-0.209 ***	0.044								
Migration Origin House Price: Immigrants	0.070	0.055								
Migration Origin Rent : Immigrants	-0.229	0.123								
Race (Omitted: Non-Hispanic White)										
Black	-0.412 ***	0.008	-0.355 ***	0.008	-0.414 ***	0.007	-0.465 ***	0.012	-0.414 ***	0.007
Asian	-0.160 ***	0.032	0.018 ***	0.032	-0.161 ***	0.029	-0.127 **	0.045	-0.156 ***	0.029
Latino	-0.213 ***	0.012	-0.079	0.011	-0.210 ***	0.010	-0.283 ***	0.015	-0.207 ***	0.010
Immigrants	-0.040	0.514	-0.556 ***	0.036	-0.716 ***	0.032	-0.875 ***	0.044	-0.598 ***	0.028
Asian Immigrants	0.057	0.037	-0.063 ***	0.049	0.096 **	0.029	-0.312 ***	0.063	0.000	0.033
Latino Immigrants	-0.028	0.021	-0.343 ***	0.034	-0.137 **	0.043	0.153 ***	0.040	-0.057 **	0.018
Immigrant Status (Omitted: Come To U.S. in the Past 5 Yrs.)										
Came To U.S 5-10 Years Ago	0.276 ***	0.030	0.232 ***	0.024	0.225 ***	0.023	0.211 ***	0.029	0.228 ***	0.023
Came To U.S 10-15 Years Ago	0.486 ***	0.030	0.407 ***	0.025	0.425 ***	0.024	0.433 ***	0.029	0.443 ***	0.023
Came To U.S 15-20 Years Ago	0.621 ***	0.031	0.515 ***	0.026	0.549 ***	0.025	0.587 ***	0.031	0.576 ***	0.024
Came To U.S 20-30 Years Ago	0.645 ***	0.031	0.467	0.025	0.568 ***	0.024	0.584 ***	0.031	0.607 ***	0.024
Came To U.S More Than 30 Years Ago	0.667 ***	0.036	0.346 ***	0.029	0.497 ***	0.028	0.508 ***	0.037	0.559 ***	0.028
Moved in Last 5 Yrs. (Omitted: Moved within Metropolitan Area)										
Moved from Outside Metropolitan Area Not Gatr	-0.422 ***	0.009	-0.384 ***	0.007	-0.410 ***	0.006	-0.435 ***	0.009	-0.408 ***	0.006
Moved from Foreign Country			-0.343 ***	0.021	0.026	0.019	0.051 *	0.025	0.015	0.019
Immigrants Moved from Outside Metropolitan Ai	-0.058 *	0.025	-0.005 ***	0.020	-0.410 ***	0.020	-0.505 ***	0.028	-0.410 ***	0.020
Immigrants Moved from Foreign Country			-0.258 ***	0.031	-0.245 ***	0.030	-0.176 ***	0.039	-0.257 ***	0.030
Number of Observations	311,012		369,304		369,304		175,019		369,304	
Pseudo-R^2	0.225		0.316		0.233		0.178		0.233	
Log likelihood	-166,968		-175,088		-196,250		-90,607		-196,206	
	Excluding immigrants came in directly from a foreign country		Full Sample		Full Sample		Excluding married households		Full Sample	

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

** All models include metropolitan fixed effects

Table 7. Estimation Results, 1990

Variable	Column 1		Column 2		Column 3		Column 4	
	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.	Coeff.	Std. Err.
Intercept	-1.971 ***	0.095	-1.978 ***	0.095	-1.860 ***	0.128	-1.915 ***	0.128
Omitted: Age 25-34								
Age 18-24	-0.585 ***	0.011	-0.585 ***	0.011	-0.588 ***	0.011	-0.588 ***	0.011
Age 35-44	0.275 ***	0.006	0.275 ***	0.006	0.271 ***	0.006	0.271 ***	0.006
Age 45-54	0.357 ***	0.008	0.357 ***	0.008	0.348 ***	0.008	0.348 ***	0.008
Age 55-64	0.534 ***	0.010	0.534 ***	0.010	0.510 ***	0.010	0.511 ***	0.010
Omitted: Married								
Not Married, Male Head Of Household	-0.696 ***	0.007	-0.697 ***	0.007	-0.713 ***	0.007	-0.712 ***	0.007
Not Married, Female Head	-0.679 ***	0.007	-0.679 ***	0.007	-0.690 ***	0.007	-0.690 ***	0.007
No High School Diploma	-0.262 ***	0.009	-0.270 ***	0.009	-0.258 ***	0.009	-0.259 ***	0.009
Omitted: High School Dip. W/ College								
College Degree or Better	0.148 ***	0.006	0.148 ***	0.006	0.154 ***	0.006	0.154 ***	0.006
Number Of People In Household	0.027 ***	0.002	0.027 ***	0.002	0.021 ***	0.002	0.022 ***	0.002
Number Of Workers In Household	-0.036 ***	0.004	-0.036 ***	0.004	-0.048 ***	0.004	-0.048 ***	0.004
Household Income (1000s)	0.010 ***	0.000	0.010 ***	0.000	0.010 ***	0.000	0.010 ***	0.000
Interest, Dividend, and Rental Income (1000s)	0.010 ***	0.001	0.010 ***	0.001	0.010 ***	0.001	0.010 ***	0.001
The 25th Percentile Housing Price (log)	-0.440 ***	0.011	-0.441 ***	0.011	-0.453 ***	0.016	-0.454 ***	0.016
Puma Median Rent (log)	1.042 ***	0.024	1.046 ***	0.024	1.061 ***	0.030	1.073 ***	0.030
Race (Omitted: Non-Hispanic White)								
Black	-0.465 ***	0.009	-0.466 ***	0.009	-0.455 ***	0.009	-0.458 ***	0.009
Asian	0.049 **	0.018	0.057	0.036	0.042	0.036	0.038	0.036
Latino	-0.208 ***	0.013	-0.186 ***	0.015	-0.175 ***	0.015	-0.173 ***	0.015
Immigrants	-0.606 ***	0.047	-0.535 ***	0.055	-0.498 ***	0.055	-0.626 ***	0.059
Asian Immigrants			-0.037	0.042	-0.024	0.042	-0.006	0.042
Latino Immigrants			-0.078 **	0.027	-0.043	0.027	-0.061 *	0.028
Immigrant Status (Omitted: Come To U.S. in the Past 5 Yrs.)								
Came To U.S 5-10 Years Ago	0.323 ***	0.029	0.308 ***	0.035	0.321 ***	0.035	0.315 ***	0.035
Came To U.S 10-15 Years Ago	0.559 ***	0.030	0.544 ***	0.037	0.564 ***	0.037	0.556 ***	0.037
Came To U.S 15-20 Years Ago	0.680 ***	0.034	0.668 ***	0.040	0.671 ***	0.040	0.660 ***	0.040
Came To U.S 20-30 Years Ago	0.657 ***	0.032	0.643 ***	0.038	0.635 ***	0.038	0.618 ***	0.039
Came To U.S More Than 30 Years Ago	0.676 ***	0.039	0.654 ***	0.044	0.634 ***	0.044	0.616 ***	0.045
English Proficiency								
Speak English Well	0.023	0.039	0.022	0.039	0.027	0.039	0.026	0.039
Speak English Only at Home	0.112 **	0.037	0.122 **	0.037	0.113 **	0.038	0.110 **	0.038
Immigrants Speak English Well	0.152 **	0.045	0.141 **	0.045	0.118 *	0.046	0.128 **	0.046
Immigrants Speak English Only at Home	0.116 *	0.046	0.074	0.049	0.046	0.049	0.043	0.049
Moved in Last 5 Yrs. (Omitted: Moved within Metropolitan Area)								
Moved from Gateway	-0.165 ***	0.010	-0.164 ***	0.011				
Moved from Outside Metropolitan Area Not Gateway	-0.485 ***	0.006	-0.485 ***	0.006	-0.491 ***	0.007	-0.490 ***	0.007
Moved from Foreign Country	-0.451 ***	0.019	-0.439 ***	0.022	-0.459 ***	0.022	-0.461 ***	0.022
Immigrants Moved from Gateway			-0.011	0.031				
Immigrants Moved from Outside Metropolitan Area Not Gateway			-0.010	0.026	-0.026	0.026	-0.053 *	0.026
Immigrants Moved from Foreign Country			-0.044	0.041	-0.040	0.041	-0.051	0.041
Current Residence (Omitted: Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV CMSA)								
Atlanta, GA MSA					0.017 ***	0.012	0.007	0.013
Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA-NH-ME-CT CMSA					-0.228 ***	0.012	-0.244 ***	0.013
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA					-0.175 ***	0.012	-0.179 ***	0.012
Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO CMSA					0.110 ***	0.014	0.102 ***	0.015
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA					-0.284 ***	0.014	-0.305 ***	0.014
Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA					-0.135	0.019	-0.154 ***	0.020
Orlando, FL MSA					-0.005 ***	0.016	-0.041 *	0.017
Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA					0.121 ***	0.012	0.109 ***	0.012
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA					0.136	0.014	0.118 ***	0.014
Sacramento-Yolo, CA CMSA					0.013	0.015	0.001	0.015
Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA CMSA					0.013 ***	0.012	-0.002	0.013
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA					0.141	0.015	0.114 ***	0.015
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL MSA					-0.018 ***	0.019	-0.064 **	0.021
Moved from								
Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI CMSA					-0.223 ***	0.030	-0.205 ***	0.031
Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA CMSA					-0.244 ***	0.021	-0.228 ***	0.023
Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA					-0.296 ***	0.033	-0.259 ***	0.036
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA CMSA					-0.121 ***	0.017	-0.133 ***	0.018
San Diego, CA MSA					-0.502 ***	0.043	-0.486 ***	0.044
San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA					-0.178 ***	0.026	-0.163 ***	0.027
Immigrant Current Residence (Omitted: Washington-Baltimore, DC-MD-VA-WV CMSA)								
Atlanta, GA MSA							0.080	0.048
Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, MA-NH-ME-CT CMSA							0.150 ***	0.034
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX CMSA							0.042	0.035
Denver-Boulder-Greeley, CO CMSA							0.073	0.053
Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX CMSA							0.203 ***	0.032
Las Vegas, NV-AZ MSA							0.201 **	0.060
Orlando, FL MSA							0.404 ***	0.052
Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, PA-NJ-DE-MD CMSA							0.137 **	0.041
Phoenix-Mesa, AZ MSA							0.201 ***	0.045
Sacramento-Yolo, CA CMSA							0.119 *	0.047
Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA CMSA							0.169 ***	0.041
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA							0.365 ***	0.046
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL MSA							0.375 ***	0.052
Immigrant Moved from								
Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI CMSA							-0.177	0.097
Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA CMSA							-0.130 *	0.064
Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL CMSA							-0.274 **	0.094
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA CMSA							0.034	0.049
San Diego, CA MSA							-0.239	0.165
San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA CMSA							-0.143	0.082
Number of Observations		302,372		302,372		302,372		302,372
Pseudo-R^2		0.246		0.246		0.253		0.253
Log likelihood		-157,268		-157,263		-155,857		-155,810

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001