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Abstract

Caribbean and adjacent Latin American countries are key sources of Hispanic immigrants to the U.S. There has been rapid growth in the older adult Hispanic populations both among immigrants in the U.S. and in their home countries of emigration. This paper supports hypothesis generation for international comparative Hispanic aging studies by comparing older adult sociodemographic characteristics of U.S. immigrants versus those in sending countries. The analysis also provides context for the global family of health and retirement studies in the region including the ongoing Caribbean American Dementia and Aging Study (CADAS) which is collecting harmonized data on healthy aging in Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, and Cuba. We analyze census microdata from these countries along with other major Hispanic Caribbean-adjacent sending countries including Mexico, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. We compare older adults in these sending countries to country-specific immigrant samples in the U.S. American Community Survey, focusing on socioeconomic differences such as education, as well as marital status and co-residence patterns related to caregiver availability. We also examine differences by citizenship and immigration age to further explore immigrant selectivity patterns. The highly varied experiences of these cohorts will help inform future comparative research on Hispanic healthy aging.

## Introduction and Background **TODO:** Rewrite this whole intro

In this paper we explore sociodemographic variation of U.S. older adult immigrants by country and cohort of emigration, and compare these U.S. immigrants to the corresponding cohorts of older adults in their home countries of emigration.

The paper is designed to support hypothesis generation for international comparative Hispanic aging studies. This includes providing background context for the global family of health and retirement studies in the region such as the ongoing Caribbean American Dementia and Aging Study (CADAS) which is collecting harmonized data on healthy aging in Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, and Cuba (Llibre-Guerra et al. 2021). We compare older adults in these sending countries to country-specific immigrant samples in the U.S. American Community Survey and Census, focusing on socioeconomic differences such as education, as well as marital status and co-residence patterns. We also examine differences by citizenship and immigration age to further explore immigrant selectivity patterns. The highly varied experiences of these cohorts will help inform future comparative research on Hispanic healthy aging.

## Literature Review

Latin American and Caribbean Countries (LACCs) are key sources of Hispanic immigrants to the United Sates (Passel 2024). In 2022, people of Mexican origin made up nearly 60% of the U.S. Hispanic population, totaling about 37.4 million. Puerto Ricans were the next largest group at 5.9 million, with an additional 3.2 million living on the island. Salvadorans, Cubans, Dominicans, Guatemalans, Colombians, and Hondurans each have populations exceeding 1 million in the United States (Noe-Bustamante 2023). These immigrant populations include a rapidly growing subgroup who are aged 60 and above, among whom there is wide variation in socioeconomic and care giving resources.

These international migration patterns are shaped by a complex interplay of factors, including labor market demands, educational opportunities, and political and economic instability (McAuliffe, Bauloz, and Kitimbo 2024; Valentine et al. 2017). In the North American context, Massey et al. posit that established social networks play a pivotal role in migration dynamics, with family reunification serving as a primary motivator (Silva and Massey 2014). This reunification imperative creates a self-perpetuating cycle of migration flows (Massey et al. 1994). Age also significantly influences migration patterns, with younger individuals typically dominating migrant populations. Mexican migrants exemplify this trend; despite recent cohorts showing a slight increase in average age, they remain predominantly youthful(Angel, Vega, and López-Ortega 2017). This persistent age pattern underscores migration’s enduring appeal to younger generations, even as sending countries’ overall populations age [**TODO:** Will, do you know any good papers to cite here? Maybe an HCAP paper?].

Other LACCs similarly exhibit diverse migration drivers and patterns, with specific political agreements further shaping these movements and creating unique migration landscapes across the region. Puerto Rico’s special status as a U.S. territory since 1898, for instance, has facilitated legal entry to the U.S. mainland for its residents[[1]](#footnote-21). Likewise, the Cuban Adjustment Act of 1966 and subsequent policies, such as the “wet foot, dry foot” policy (1995-2017), have significantly influenced Cuban migration to the United States (Duany 2017). These examples illustrate how political arrangements can create facilitated migration channels, potentially leading to what migration theorists term “migration systems” or “transnational social spaces” (Kritz, Lim, and Zlotnik 1992).

Economic factors underpin much of the migration from Latin America to the United States, exemplifying classic push-pull migration theory (Hanson, Orrenius, and Zavodny 2023). Economic insecurity in Latin American countries acts as a push factor (Capielo Rosario et al. 2023; Larotta Silva 2019), while periods of US economic growth further amplify wage differentials between the two regions (Bahar 2024). For instance, Colombian and Guatemalan workers in the U.S. earn $288-$299 for every $100 earned by their counterparts at home, while Nicaraguan migrants see an even larger differential (Clemens, Montenegro, and Pritchett 2009)[[2]](#footnote-22). However, these wage differentials are partially explained by positive selection, as migrants often possess characteristics associated with higher productivity and adaptability. This selection bias is further evidenced by research showing that immigrants tend to have longer life expectancies than native-born populations (Aldridge et al. 2018).

Alongside economic factors, political instability has been a significant driver of forced migration from Latin American countries to the United States, aligning with theories of refugee and asylum migration (FitzGerald and Arar 2018). Historical events underscore this trend. The Cuban Revolution of 1959, for instance, generated the largest refugee movement to the United States in history, resulting in approximately 1.4 million Cuban refugees (Duany 2017)[[3]](#footnote-23). Similarly, the Salvadoran Civil War (1979-1992) led to the displacement of about 1 million people, many of whom subsequently migrated to the U.S., often through irregular channels (Cervantes 2018). Guatemala and Honduras experienced similar trajectories of political instability, exacerbated by U.S. interventions in the mid-20th century (Jonas 2018; Pine 2008). These events led to substantial emigration waves, with Guatemalan immigrants in the U.S. increasing from 71,000 in 1980 to over 480,000 by 2000, and Honduran immigrants from 39,000 to 283,000 (Batalova 2021). Recent data underscores this trend: in the first 11 months of 2023, over 50% of approximately 412,000 asylum applications to the Department of Homeland Security came from Venezuela, Cuba, Colombia, and Nicaragua (“Nationwide Encounters U.S. Customs and Border Protection” 2024).

Much of the literature on Latin American migrants predominantly focuses on individuals who emigrated during periods of economic distress and political upheaval. However, there is a notable paucity of research examining those who opt to remain in their home countries under similar circumstances. Additionally, there is a shortage of comparative studies that analyze Latin American migrants in relation to both their counterparts who stayed in their home countries and themselves prior to migration, limiting our understanding of the full spectrum of migration outcomes and selectivity. We addresses this gap by conducting a comparative analysis of older adults from Latin American countries who have migrated to the United States and their counterparts who have remained in their countries of origin. By examining the sociodemographic characteristics of these populations, this research aims to elucidate the selectivity of migration processes and their long-term implications.

## Data and Methods

Census data for this study were obtained from IPUMS International (Ruggles et al. 2024). The current analysis draws on the latest harmonized census data available in IPUMS for Cuba (2012), the Dominican Republic (2010), Mexico (2010;2020), Puerto Rico (2010;2020), and the United States (2010; 2020)[[4]](#footnote-25). We on individuals aged 60 and above, grouping all people 90 and above into an open-ended category. **TODO:** (should we keep this but refer to a table in the appendix?) To ensure comparability, **we standardized means in the international censuses based on the U.S. sex-specific age distribution. We also applied weights provided by IPUMS to make the samples nationally representative.**

To produce table 1, we utilize the total number of age 60+ migrants from LACCs in the United States as of 2020 and their percentage of that migration, GDP per capita as of 2019 (“World Development DataBank” 2025), Infant Mortality Rates as of 1950 and 2019 (“CME Child Mortality Estimates” 2025; “World Population Prospects” 2024), and life expectancy at 60 (“Global Health Observatory” 2021).

When analyzing international censuses, we include variables age, percent married/cohabiting, and highest educational level obtained (**TODO:** using internationally standardized categorizations of less than primary, primary, secondary, and university), household size, and sex. When analyzing migrants in the US setting, we add additional variables on whether the individual speaks English, is a naturalized citizen, and the age and year they migrated to the US (see definitions in the appendix).

**TODO:** If we decide to keep predicted probabilities, should we include a list of variables and model used to produce them?

## Results and Comparative Analysis

**Table 1 observations:**

* **Mexico has the highest percentage of migrants to the U.S. at 43.99%.**
* Haiti has the lowest percentage of migrants at 0.04%, indicating limited migration compared to other countries in the dataset.
* **Our four countries of interest are the biggest migrant groups**
* **Puerto Rico leads with a GDP per capita of $36,779, which is much higher than other countries in the dataset.**
* Haiti has the lowest GDP per capita at $1,705
* Haiti had an extremely high infant mortality rate of 237.19 deaths per 1,000 live births in 1950
* Panama had the lowest rate in 1950 at 53.02 deaths per 1,000
* Haiti remains the highest in 2019 with a rate of 53.03 deaths per 1,000
* **The Dominican Republic has the lowest infant mortality rate in 2019 at just 4.14 deaths per 1,000**
* Costa Rica (24.52 years) and Chile (24.57 years) have relatively high life expectancy at age 60
* Haiti has the lowest life expectancy at age 60
* **Of our four countries:**
  + **Mexico contributes the largest number of migrants and has a relatively high GDP per capita ($13,790) but also a higher infant mortality rate in 2019 (10.79) compared to countries like Cuba (4.89).**
  + **The Dominican Republic has the lowest number of migrants (only 6.04% of the total).**
  + **Cuba has the lowest GDP per capita at $9,605**
  + **Mexico has the highest infant mortality rate**
  + Cuba has the lowest life expectancy at age 60 (21.57 years) even though it has a relatively low IMR
* Central American Countries:
  + These countries have lower GDP per capita and higher infant mortality rates compared to South American countries.

**TODO:** Identify which migrant groups moved to the US at the youngest ages comparatively Variations in migration motivations and experiences Disparities in socioeconomic outcomes and integration patterns Unique challenges faced by specific national groups

**TODO:** Questions to answer:

1. Which countries send the most skilled workers, which have the most educated people?
2. Differences in age, gender, and education levels among various national groups
3. Geographic distribution and settlement patterns within the United States
4. Healthcare access and outcomes Housing conditions
5. Who are the people who choose to stay, and why do they stay?

### Hispanic Migrants in the United States

Table 1 presents sociodemographics of migrants from these countries living in the U.S.

Things to talk about:

* Which migrant groups are most educated and likely to acculturate?
  + most/least likely to have a university degree
  + most/least likely to have learned English
  + most/least likely to become naturalized citizens
    - zoom in on how age at migration impacts these things
* Compare these groups to native born and migrants from non-hispanic countries
* Which groups are youngest, oldest?
* which groups are more likely to report being married?
* which groups are more likely to have migrated at younger ages, earlier cohorts?
* largest/smallest household size?

### Hispanics in their native Countries

Areas to focus on:

* comparing migrant in US directly to their native country counterparts
  + in the ways we outlined above, except without migration measures (obviously)
* compare men and women to each other

## Discussion

This study will provide a comprehensive sociodemographic comparison of older adult Hispanic populations both in their countries of origin and as immigrants in the United States. The analysis so far reveals significant variations in education levels marital status and migration patterns across different Hispanic subgroups. These findings have important implications for understanding the diverse experiences of Hispanic older adults and for informing policies related to healthy aging and caregiving. The ongoing analysis (to be reported in the full paper) is expanding this analysis to further examine patterns by immigration cohort, also using multivariate regression to better parse mechanisms underlying the observed differences.

That Mexican migrants have fewer years of formal education is a finding that other researchers have come across (Hanson, Orrenius, and Zavodny 2023).

The complexity of migration from Latin America to the United States is underscored by the region’s evolving migration landscape, which has seen a dramatic increase in intra-regional movement and return migration since 2010, challenging the traditional narrative of unidirectional flows to North America and Europe while still maintaining significant outward migration patterns (Tanco 2023). Additionally, this paper does not capture return-migrants to Latin America. Lastly, this research considers migrant populations and host countries pre-pandemic, which is markedly different than post-pandemic patterns (Hanson, Orrenius, and Zavodny 2023).

## Appendix

### Tables

### Definitions

**English Speaker:** We define an “English speaker” as anyone who says they speak English, including those who say “yes, but not well.”

**Education Levels:** In order to make education categories comparable to the US. We exclude those who received a GED from these categories.

* “**Less Than Primary**” includes individuals with education levels such as “grade 1” through “grade 5,” “kindergarten,” “no schooling completed,” or “nursery school, preschool.”
* “**Primary Completed**” includes those who completed grades 6 through 11, representing completion of primary education but not secondary school.
* “**Secondary Completed**” includes individuals with a “regular high school diploma,” partial college experience (e.g., “1 or more years of college credit, no degree” or “some college, but less than 1 year”), or those who attended up to the 12th grade without graduating, indicating completion of secondary education or partial college.
* “**University Completed**” includes individuals with higher education qualifications such as an associate’s degree, bachelor’s degree, master’s degree, doctoral degree, or professional degree beyond a bachelor’s, representing university-level education or higher. Each individual is assigned to one of these categories based on their reported education level.

**Household Size:** The household size is a measure of the respondent’s “own family” living in the household, including themselves.

* “Lives Alone” is defined as a household size of 1.
* “Lives with Child” refers to respondents who report one of their household members as one of their children.

**Married:** The US Census status classification identifies four major categories: never married, married, widowed, and divorced. These terms refer to the marital status at the time of the enumeration. The “married” category is defined as those who responded “married, spouse present,” implying that the spouse lives in the household.

In the International samples, we include those who responded in the following ways as “married.”

* “married, formally”
* “married, civil”
* “married or consensual union
* “married, religious”
* “married, civil and religious”
* “consensual union”

**Citizen:** U.S. citizen by naturalization.

**Hispanic:** People of Hispanic origin, according to the ACS, were those who indicated that their origin was Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or some other Hispanic origin. For this paper, we excluded anyone not born in Latin America from the “Hispanic” category.

**Latin America and Caribbean Countries:** Any country in Latin American, including north, central, and south america, as well as countries in the Caribbean that speak primarily Spanish.

The authors wish to acknowledge the statistical offices that provided the underlying data making this research possible: National Administrative Department of Statistics, Colombia; Office of National Statistics, Cuba; National Statistics Office, Dominican Republic; Department of Statistics and Censuses, El Salvador; National Institute of Statistics, Guatemala; National Institute of Statistics, Honduras; National Institute of Statistics, Geography, and Informatics, Mexico; U.S. Bureau of the Census, Puerto Rico; and Bureau of the Census, United States.
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1. Despite their high out-migration rate, Puerto Ricans in the United States send less money than Dominicans and Mexicans to their relatives back home. Possible explanations for this are the extensive public support system in place on the island and relatively higher standard of living compared to other LACCs. (Duany 2010) [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
2. Beyond wages, housing availability (Henao, Lis-Gutiérrez, and Balaguera 2023) and access to technology (Nevado-Peña, López-Ruiz, and Alfaro-Navarro 2019) significantly influence life satisfaction and migration decisions (Causa and Pichelmann 2020; Winkler 2016) [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
3. This record was recently surpassed 2021-23 (González 2024) [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
4. PR 2010 is a 1% sample, PR 2020 is 5%, US 2010 is 1%, and US 2020 is 5%. The 2010 and 2020 census data available through IPUMS International are limited to 1% and 5% samples, respectively. While the U.S. IPUMS database offers larger samples, it lacks certain variables, such as country of birth for the Dominican Republic. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)