To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by John Fleming Thigpen III entitled "Migration Behavior of Young Adults Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Agricultural Economics.

Frank O. Leuthold

Frank O. Leuthold, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Charles L. Cleland

Robert H. Cole

Accepted for the Council:

L. Evans Peel

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

MIGRATION BEHAVIOR OF YOUNG ADULTS REARED IN PUTNAM COUNTY, TENNESSEE

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

John Fleming Thigpen III

June 1981

3051878

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express appreciation to the many persons who have provided the funds, facilities, and guidance in the preparation of this thesis. A special debt of gratitude is owed Dr. Frank Leuthold, Committee Chairman, for his assistance and guidance throughout the study, and to committee members Dr. Robert Orr and Dr. Charles Cleland for their support during the construction of this manuscript.

Many thanks are extended to the secretarial staff of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology for typing the preliminary draft of this thesis, and to B. J. Klepser for the final draft.

Finally, I would like to thank Jenny Atas for the motivation and encouragement that helped to make this thesis a reality.

ABSTRACT

In the present study data concerning 272 young adult men and 267 young adult women reared in Putnam County, Tennessee were analyzed. Data were obtained from a 1975 survey of household heads residing in Putnam County on their adult aged children reared in Putnam County. Questions asked of parents of the young adults were designed to generate information linking migration patterns and present residence to socio-economic characteristics such as occupation, family income, education, level of living, age, number of children, and marital status.

The objectives were: (1) to determine the frequency of primary migration and return migration; (2) to determine socio-economic characteristics of males and females by migration pattern and present residence; and (3) to determine reasons for the various types of migration patterns with special emphasis on return migration.

Primary migrants were found to have the highest total family income average, the greatest average number of home items, and the greatest average years of education of the three categories. With regard to employment, return migrant males had a very large proportion in the unemployed category. Return migrants, except for age or age related characteristics, were very similar to nonmigrants. Both males and females residing in Putnam County had, on the average, the fewest years of education and number of children. Educational differences of both migration pattern and present residence were rather small for both men and women.

Attachment to family, for both primary and return migrants, was

found to be a key factor in subsequent migration. Migrants who marry natives of Putnam County have a higher chance of returning to live in Putnam County. Also, the later the age of first migration, the greater was the probability of returning to Putnam County for the men surveyed.

CRANES CREST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Literature Review	3
	Objectives	9
	Methodology	9
II.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUNG ADULT MALES BY MIGRANT TYPE	13
	Total Family Income by Migrant Type	13
	Occupational Category by Migrant Type	15
	Level of Living by Migrant Type	15
	Educational Category by Migrant Type	17
	Age Category by Migrant Type	20
	Number of Children by Migrant Type	20
	Marital Status by Migrant Type	23
	Age First Left Putnam County by Migrant Type	23
	Place Spouse Reared by Migrant Type	26
III.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUNG ADULT MALES AND FEMALES BY PRESENT RESIDENCE	28
	Occupational Category by Residence of Males	29
	Occupational Category by Residence of Females	29
	Educational Category by Residence of Males	32
	Educational Category by Residence of Females	34
	Age Category by Residence of Males	34
	Age Category by Residence of Females	34
	Number of Children by Residence of Males	38
	Number of Children by Residence of Females	38
	Place Spouse Reared by Residence of Males	39
	Place Spouse Reared by Residence of Females	39
IV.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	44
	Conclusions	46
LIST OF REFERENCES		47
VITA		50

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	U. S. Population Change by Residence, 1970 and 1973	7
2.	Total Family Income Category by Migrant Type of 272[a] Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975	14
3.	Occupational Category by Migrant Type of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee	16
4.	Level of Living Index by Migrant Type of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee[a]	18
5.	Educational Category Distribution by Migrant Type of 272[a] Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee	19
6.	Age Category by Migrant Type of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975	21
7.	Number of Children by Migrant Type of 238 Married Males[a] Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975	22
8.	Marital Status by Migrant Type of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee	24
9.	Age First Left Putnam County by Migrant Type of 137[a] Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975	25
10.	Place Spouse Reared by Migrant Type of 212 Married Males Raised in Putnam County, Tennessee	27
11.	Occupational Category by Present Residence of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee	30
12.	Occupational Category by Percent Residence of 267 Females Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee	31
13.	Educational Category by Present Residence of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975	33
14.	Educational Category Distribution by Present Residence of 267 Females Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975	35
15.	Age Category by Present Residence of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975	36

TABLE PAGE

16. Age Category by Present Residence of 267[a] Females Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975 37

17. Number of Children by Present Residence of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975 39

18. Number of Children by Present Residence of 267[a] Females Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975 40

19. Place Spouse Reared by Present Residence of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975 42

20. Place Spouse Reared by Present Residence of 267 Females Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975 43

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The United States is a nation composed largely of migrants and progeny of migrants. While immigration to the U. S. is still a major event in population change and the structure of the society, internal migration is a more important event affecting population change and composition of the population in most regions of the country. Prior to the 1960-1970 decade the primary trend of internal net migration in the United States was from the rural areas to metropolitan areas. However, during the late 1960's a reversal of this trend appeared. Although population experts were initially skeptical of this reversal and its impact on population change, the skepticism began to give way to acceptance of this as a continuing trend in American society (Brown and Wardwell, 1980, p. 19).

> Today, net migration has taken over, in most areas, as the prime determinant of local population change. Rural out-migration has declined while urban out-migration has increased sharply; convergent and low levels of natural increase have caused population growth rates to be more responsive to variations in migration. High fertility no longer masks the population decline associated with net out-migration, and net in-migration is now the primary component of growth, not a supplement of natural increase.

Often a sizeable proportion of the urban-rural migrants are return migrants, or those who have moved from a rural to a metropolitan area and are returning to their original area.

Those who are interested in influencing migration and those who are concerned with providing increased services due to in-migration and continued services for areas of out-migration need better information

concerning why people migrate. While use of census data and vital statistics provide good data on net trends, these data fail to identify who migrates or to distinguish return migrants from primary migrants. Although return migrants share many characteristics with people who have not migrated and those who migrate and never return, they may also have some unique qualities that make them different.

Tennessee's population has changed considerably over the past few decades. In 1970 the rural population of the state was 41.2 percent of the state total (Bureau of Census, 1970). During the 1950-1960 and 1960-1970 periods, Tennessee experienced population increases of 8.4 percent and 10.0 percent, respectively. This was less than the nation, as a whole, which had increases of 18.5 percent and 13.3 percent, respectively in these decades. The increase in Tennessee's population was due to natural increase in both decades, however, as migration figures show Tennessee had a net out-migration of 7.8 percent for the 1950-1960 decade and 1.2 percent net out-migration in the 1960-1970 decade (Leuthold, 1972).

Putnam County, located on the Cumberland Plateau in the Southern Appalachian Mountains, was chosen for this study for several reasons. The primary reason was because return migration was predicted to be high. During the 1950-1960 period Putnam County had a population decline of 2.1 percent, but during the 1960-1970 period the population increased by 21.4 percent (Tennessee Statistical Abstract, 1980). Putnam County had an estimated 14.0 percent net out-migration in the 1950-1960 decade and an estimated 12.0 percent net in-migration in the 1960-1970 decade. The condition of migration turnaround from fairly high net out-migration to fairly high net in-migration was a primary indication that a

substantial number of return migrants would be found among the residents of Putnam County (Leuthold, 1970).

Putnam County was not the only Tennessee county experiencing a reversal in migration pattern, although the magnitude was one of the largest among Tennessee counties. In the 1950-1960 decade only nine Tennessee counties experienced net in-migration, but during the 1960-1970 decade, this number more than tripled to 28 counties (Leuthold, 1972). During the 1970-1975 period an estimated 83 of Tennessee's 95 counties experienced a net in-migration. The state, as a whole, had an estimated net in-migration of 2.9 percent in the five year period (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1976).

Literature Review

Migration is one of the most important factors affecting population change. It has been stated that the volume of migration varies with the diversity of people in an area (Lee, 1965:52). The population of the United States, one of the most diverse in the world, supports this statement in that, on an average, one of every five persons changes residence every year (Lee:47). This subject has been of interest to demographers for a long time. In 1850, for example, census questions concerning place of birth were introduced (Lee, 1975:283). Migration has been defined as "the permanent movement of persons over a significant distance" (Peterson, 1975:41). Migrants can be classified into several different categories. Primary migrants were defined in the Censuses of 1960 and 1970 as persons living in different states of divisions from those in which they were born. Return migrants were described as persons living in the state of birth at the time of the Census, but residing

in another state five years prior to the Census (Lee, 1974:284-285). Nonmigrants were those who did not move across state or division boundary.

Certain characteristics are related to a person's likelihood of migration. Propositions have been put forth relating migration and different personal characteristics. Age, sex, marital status, physical health, mental health, intelligence, occupation, and motivation were discussed by Dorothy Swain Thomas's 1938 Research Memorandum on Migration Differentials (Campbell and Johnson, 1976:130). The varying degrees of those qualities have an effect on the possibility of migration. The factors of migration can be categorized as "push" and "pull," or circumstances at home that repel and those abroad that attract (Peterson, 1969:317) and grouped into either a social or economic category.

Everett S. Lee (1965) summarized the factors of migration under four headings: (1) factors associated with the area of origin, (2) factors associated with area of destination, (3) intervening obstacles, and (4) personal factors. The factors associated with the areas or origin and destination may be positive, negative, or indifferent while the intervening obstacles located between the two geographic points are negative in their influence on migration. The personal factors involved are the degree to which the factors vary from person to person and from different stages of the life cycle in an individual (Lee, 1965:51). Social reasons for migration include such factors as desire to be near family or friends, improved community services, retirement, and aesthetic reasons. Economic issues are primarily job related such as a higher paying job or a transfer of an employee.

The components that comprise these economic and social, "push" and "pull" categories vary as to the type of migration. Primary migration historically has been influenced by job related and economic factors, while return migrants have more often cited social reasons as the main motive for their moves (Leuthold and Kailasam, 1977:33; Campbell and Johnson, 1976:134; Farmer, 1967; Howard, 1969). The "counterstream" movement, consisting of both primary and return migrants, varies by region as to the main factors of migration. In a Maine study "counterstream migrants" were shown to be quality of life oriented (Ploch, 1978:293), whereas the population turnaround of Tennessee's Cumberland Plateau, from an area of overall out-migration to in-migration, has been attributed primarily to increased manufacturing (Beale, 1978:27).

When persons migrate, they tend to form certain patterns of movement. E. G. Ravenstein (1885:167) was the first to put forth the proposition of migration "streams" and "counterstreams." In 1885 he noted that "each main current of migration produces a compensating counter current." His concept was that migration is composed of an original "current" of migration in a certain direction and a corresponding "countercurrent" flowing in an opposite direction. Size of the streams is not the determining factor, as some counterstreams are larger than the original stream at a later point in time.

In later years different terminology has been used to describe the occurrence of migration movement in the direction opposite the original. Campbell and Johnson (1976) record several of the terms used to describe this occurrence such as "countermovement" and "remigration" (Peterson, 1969:261), "back flow" (Bogue, 1969:765), "reverse stream" (Eldridge, 1965:445), and "reverse migration" (Davis, 1973).

Counterstream migration often consists of both primary migrants and return migrants since those going opposite the original stream can be coming into the area for the first time or natives returning home. Reasons for migration may vary greatly for persons in the two categories.

The general migration pattern in the United States prior to 1970 and especially the South has been rural to urban. Since that time the exodus of blacks from the increasingly mechanized agricultural South to the industrialized North (Campbell, Johnson, Strangler, 1974:514) and the general trend of urban population increase and rural decline has begun to reverse itself. As shown in Table 1, during the 1970-1973 period, nonmetropolitan areas gained 4.2 percent in population through net migration compared to only 2.9 percent for metro areas (Beale, 1978:518). The reasons for this change in migration patterns are both social and economic and the migrants are of both the primary and return types.

In a study of return migration to the Upper Cumberland Plateau region of Tennessee it was found that return migrants composed a large part of the "counterstream" that characterized the reversal of migration patterns during 1960-1970 and 1970-1980 decades (Leuthold and Kailasam, 1979:33). While return migrants listed noneconomic reasons for moving more often than primary migrants, they were still heavily influenced by job opportunities and other economic factors (Campbell and Johnson, 1976:134). Da Vanzo and Morrison (1978) term the factors affecting this move as "location-specific capital" referring to "any or all of the diverse factors that 'tie' a person to a particular place."

> When a person who has migrated moves again, he or she should favor some former place of residence as the destination because the person has location-specific capital there (1978:8).

TABLE 1. U. S. Population Change by Residence, 1970 and 1973

Residence	Population 1973	Population 1970	Increase 1970-73	Increase 1970-73	Increase 1960-70
	Thou.	Thou.	Pct.	Thou.	Thou.
Total	209,851	203,301	3.2	1,632	3,001
Metro[1]	153,252	149,002	2.9	486	5,997
Nonmetro	56,599	54,299	4.2	1,146	-2,996
Nonmetro					
Adjacent counties[2]	29,165	27,846	4.7	722	-724
Nonadjacent counties	27,434	26,452	3.7	424	-2,273

[1]Metro status as of 1974.

[2]Nonmetro counties adjacent to Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1976.

CRANES CREST

The combination of economic, social, and environmental factors that compose an area's location-specific capital is dynamic and varies from location to location.

The recent increase in counterstream migration and return migration is a topic where more research is needed in order to better understand urban-rural migration (Sikes and Price, 1974:33; Campbell and Johnson, 1976:128). This phenomenon, described by Brown and Wardwell (1980) as the "population turnaround," in rural America is widespread. During the 1970's relatively few nonmetropolitan counties continued to experience out-migration and population decline. The reasons behind the nonmetropolitan population turnaround were classified by Brown and Wardwell into three main categories: (1) economic decentralization; (2) preference for rural living; and (3) modernization of rural life. Many nonmetropolitan counties have experienced this incresae of in-migration. Reduction in the differences between metro and nonmetro areas is due to such factors as rural electrification, modern water and sewage systems, telecommunications, improved roads, better schools, and recreational facilities. Other factors that have had an effect on the resurgence of nonmetropolitan population increases are community colleges, declining real income differentials, development of small and large scale industry, deconcentration of manufacturing, development of retail and service industries, and increased labor force participation of women in nonmetropolitan areas (Brown and Wardwell, 1980:29-30).

In Tennessee two studies, similar to the Putnam County study, were done utilizing comparable methodology. One concerning the migration patterns of residents of Hamblen County, Tennessee, also a high

in-migration county, showed reasons for in-migration falling into either work connected reasons or social reasons, mainly having relatives living in the county. In addition, occupational changes occurred in conjunction with migration, with an increase in factory workers and a decrease in unemployment (Howard, 1969). Another study was an analysis of residents in Jackson County, Tennessee in which information from parents was gathered concerning their adult-aged children reared in Jackson County. Migration was widespread as 74 percent of male and 78 percent of female young adults met the conditions necessary to be classified as migrants. Return migration was also clearly evident. Of the residents residing at that time in Jackson County, 40 percent of the males and 42 percent of the females had earlier migrated out and subsequently returned to the county (Farmer, 1967:41).

Objectives

The purpose of this project was to present an analysis of migration behavior of young adults reared in Putnam County, Tennessee. Several distinct objectives were: (1) to determine the frequency of primary migration and return migration; (2) to determine socio-economic characteristics of males and females by migration pattern and present residence; and (3) to determine reasons for the various types of migration patterns with special emphasis on return migration.

Methodology

The research was designed to gather demographic and socio-economic data on young adults reared in Putnam County, Tennessee. Data were collected on adult-aged (age 20 years and older) sons and daughters

through a questionnaire administered to several hundred Putnam County heads of households in the summer of 1975. Of the 440 interviews completed on adult-aged children, data on 272 male and 267 female adult-aged children of these residents were obtained.

A sequential random sampling technique was utilized to select the sample of residents. Putnam County was segmented into separate rural and urban areas by use of a 1974 Tennessee highway map. The city of Cookeville and towns of Monterey, Allgood, and Baxter comprised the urban sector which was divided into 159 land segments. Segments were numbered and selected at random. Each individual household unit was plotted on each segment selected, and interviews were made of every fourth household unit, based on a random starting point. Surveys were conducted in 24 segments of the 159 urban segments. Similarly, in the rural area interviews were conducted in every second dwelling unit of 20 selected rural segments of a total of 163. The different proportions of persons interviewed in the urban and rural segments was made to produce the correct balance between rural residents and urban residents in Putnam County's population.

Migration, for the purpose of this study, was defined as a move across the Putnam County line for a period of at least six months, excluding a change of residence for an education or military service reason. The young adults surveyed were classified into one of three migration groups: (1) nonmigrants, those persons reared in Putnam County and who never migrated according to the definition; (2) return migrants, those persons reared in Putnam County who had migrated and resided in Putnam County at the time of the survey; and (3) primary migrants, those persons reared in Putnam County who migrated and were not a resident in

Putnam County at the time of the survey.

Questions asked of the parents of the young adults were designed to generate information linking migration history and place of present residence with various characteristics of the young adults such as occupation, income, education, level of living, age, number of children and marital status. Data were obtained from parents whose familiarity with their offspring varied. Thus, caution should be taken to remember that this information was not obtained first hand from the individuals analyzed. Some information was not available because the respondent did not know the needed information. This was particularly true for information on family income.

Both raw data and categories were coded and analyzed. Total family income was divided into four income categories. An arithmetic mean was used as a measure of central tendency as there were no extremely large total family incomes to make this number artificially high. A level of living index was created utilizing a list of 20 selected home improvement items. These items were: telephone, two or more telephones, refrigerator, deep freezer, automatic clothes washer, electric or gas range, clothes dryer, television, color television, wall-to-wall carpeting, piped in hot water, hot water heater, flush toilet, bath or shower, two or more bathrooms, dishwater, stereo, air conditioning, central air conditioning, and air conditioning in car. Categories were created to represent a scale of level of living according to the number of home items present. Parents had a good knowledge of home items their children had.

Primary occupation was classified into the following nine categories: (1) farmer; (2) factory; (3) trade (carpenter, mechanic, electrician, truck driver, beautician, etc.); (4) unskilled (laborer,

dishwasher, waitress, etc.); (5) student; (6) housewife (women not employed outside the home); (7) semi-professional (secretary, bookkeeper, payroll clerk, salesman, banker, etc.); (8) professional (doctor, lawyer, teacher, etc.); (9) unemployed. Where noted in the tables some occupational categories were combined again in the analysis. While actual number of years of education were coded and analyzed, educational categories were also constructed to make the distinction between completion of grade school, high school, and college work.

Analysis of data was done through The University of Tennessee Computing Center utilizing Statistical Analysis System 79. Statistical differences between all nominal data categories of independent variables were tested using Chi-square tests, while ordinal data categories were tested for significance utilizing analysis of variance and F tests. The level of significance used in each case was the 0.05 level of confidence for rejecting the "null hypothesis" of no relationship between migration pattern and socio-economic characteristics, or independent variables. Differences at the 0.95 level of probability were termed statistically significant. Presentation in the tables involves percentage distribution. Caution should be used when making conclusions concerning return migrants because of the somewhat few numbers of return migrants. Both analysis of percentages and statistical differences are made more difficult because of small numbers of individuals (N-36) in the return migrant category for men.

CRANES CREST

CHAPTER II

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUNG ADULT MALES BY MIGRANT TYPE

Socio-economic characteristics of young adults reared in Putnam County were analyzed by bivariate cross-tabulation with migration pattern. Data on 272 men were analyzed in this section. These men were classified into three categories: (1) nonmigrants; (2) return migrants; and (3) primary migrants. Migrant categories were cross-tabulated with the following socio-economic characteristics: total family income, occupation, level of living, education, number of children, marital status, age first left Putnam County, place where spouse was reared, and whether spouse moved to Putnam County before marriage.

Total Family Income by Migrant Type

The percentages of nonmigrants, return migrants, and primary migrants by total family income category are shown in Table 2. Data were available on 252 of the 272 men surveyed. Nonmigrants and return migrants had similar levels of income, on an average, while primary migrants had a much higher level of income. Primary migrants possessed a mean income of $11,700 compared with $8,217 for nonmigrants and $8,684 for return migrants.

Only 6.4 percent of the primary migrants were in the low income category. Nonmigrants had 11.9 percent in the high income category compared with 6.5 percent of return migrants and 25.5 percent of the primary migrants. Analysis of variance on income showed a significant

TABLE 2. Total Family Income Category by Migrant Type of 272[a] Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975

Annual Income Category (dollars)	Migrant Type		
	Nonmigrant (n=126)	Return Migrant (n=32)	Primary Migrant (n=94)
	Percent		
5,999 and below	31.7	18.7	6.4
6,000 - 8,999	25.4	40.6	26.6
9,000 - 14,999	31.0	34.4	41.5
15,000 +	11.9	6.3	25.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean (dollars)	8,217	8,684	11,700

[a]The total of the three categories does not equal 272 due to missing data on 20 individuals. F value on males in the three categories [$F = 11.32$, $F_{.95}(2,249) = 3.04$]. F values computed on raw data.

difference between the three migrant categories. The analysis, computed on noncategorized income, resulted in an F value of 11.32, which was statistically significant.

Occupational Category by Migrant Type

Occupations, while coded in nine categories, were grouped into seven categories for purposes of analysis. Table 3 presents the percentages by occupational category.

There were several differences found between the three migrant categories. Nonmigrants were represented by the greatest percentage of farmers of the three migrant groups with 12.6 percent compared with 2.8 percent of return migrants and only 1.0 percent of primary migrants. Nonmigrants also had the largest portion in the student/military category. Primary migrants showed a larger percentage in the professional/semi-professional occupational category, 31.7 percent, than nonmigrant or return migrants, 16.3 percent and 11.1 percent, respectively. The highest proportion of return migrants was in the unemployed category, 30.6 percent. Both nonmigrants and primary migrants were more involved in the work force with only 11.1 percent and 3.0 percent, respectively, in the unemployed category. The differences in occupation by migration pattern were statistically significant. A Chi-square value of 46.66 was obtained when a 25.19 value was needed for the 0.05 level of significance.

Level of Living by Migrant Type

The level of living index score was the total of the number of 20 selected home improvement items. The percentages of young adult males

TABLE 3. Occupational Category by Migrant Type of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee

Occupational Category	Migrant Type		
	Nonmigrant (n=135)	Return Migrant (n=36)	Primary Migrant (n=101)
	Percent		
Unemployed	11.1	30.6	3.0
Unskilled	17.8	16.7	13.9
Factory	16.3	27.8	26.7
Trade	14.1	8.3	15.8
Farmer	12.6	2.8	1.0
Student/Military	11.9	2.8	7.9
Professional/Semi-Professional	16.3	11.1	31.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-square value computed with student/military category omitted.

Chi-square value for males in all three groups [$x^2 = 46.66$, $x^2_{(10\ d.f._{.95})} = 25.19$].

by category on level of living index score are shown in Table 4. Both nonmigrants and return migrants had a greater percentage of respondents in the eight or less category, 36.3 percent and 19.4 percent, respectively, compared to 11.9 percent for primary migrants. Nonmigrants and return migrants also displayed similar averages for number of home items with means of 12.3 and 12.8 home items per household, respectively, compared to a mean of 14.2 for primary migrants. The difference between these three groups on number of items was significant at the 0.05 level.

Overall, the results are comparable to those obtained from the family income section, in that the nonmigrants' and return migrants' results were consistently lower than primary migrants' results with regard to income and level of living.

Educational Category by Migrant Type

In Table 5 the percentages of young adult males by education category and migration pattern are shown. Primary migrants showed a somewhat higher level of education; they had a slightly lower percentage in the 0-7 years of education category, 7.0 percent, compared to nonmigrants, 10.6 percent, and return migrants, 17.1 percent. Primary migrants had slightly larger percentage in the 13 or more years of education category, 25.0 percent, compared with nonmigrants and return migrants, 18.9 percent and 20.0 percent, respectively. Primary migrants also had the greatest average years of education, 11.4 years, compared with 10.6 years for nonmigrants and 10.1 years for return migrants. However, an F test for statistical significance on years of education failed to show a statistically significant difference.

TABLE 4. Level of Living Index by Migrant Type of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee[a]

Home Items (number)	Migrant Type		
	Nonmigrant (n=135)	Return Migrant (n=36)	Primary Migrant (n=101)
	Percent		
8 or less	36.3	19.4	11.9
9 - 12	23.0	33.3	27.7
13 - 16	32.6	27.9	33.7
17 +	8.1	19.4	26.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean (number)	12.3	12.8	14.2

[a]The 20 selected home items were: telephone, two or more telephones, refrigerator, deep freezer, automatic clothes washer, electric or gas range, clothes dryer, television, color television, wall-to-wall carpeting, piped in water, hot water heater, flush toilet, bath or shower, two or more bathrooms, dishwasher, stereo air conditioning, central air conditioning, and air conditioning in car.

F values between three groups [$F = 6.56$, $F_{.95}(2,269) = 3.04$].

TABLE 5. Educational Category Distribution by Migrant Type of 272[a] Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee

Educational Category (years)	Type of Migrant				
	Nonmigrant (n=132)	Return Migrant (n=35)	Primary Migrant (n=100)	Total (n=267)	U. S.[b] 1975
	Percent				
0 - 7	10.6	17.1	7.0	10.1	11.6
8	22.0	22.9	14.0	19.1	10.3
9 - 11	15.2	5.7	15.0	13.9	15.6
12	33.3	34.3	39.0	35.6	36.2
13 +	18.9	20.0	25.0	21.3	26.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	10.6	10.1	11.4	10.8	12.3*

[a]The total of the three categories does not equal 272 due to missing data on five individuals.

[b]U. S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the U. S.: 1972 (100th Edition), Washington, D. C., 1979.

The F value was computed on raw data using full years of education.

The F value on males in the three migrant groups [$F = 3.00$, $F_{.95}(2,213) = 3.04$].

*Median school years completed.

Age Category by Migrant Type

The percentages by age categories are shown in Table 6. Nonmigrants had the greatest proportion in the under 24 age category, 26.7 percent, as compared with return migrants, 5.6 percent, and primary migrants, 6.9 percent. Nonmigrants also showed the smallest percentage in the 45 years or more category, 12.6 percent, while return migrants and primary migrants had 36.1 percent and 18.8 percent, respectively, in this age category.

Nonmigrants had the lowest mean age, 32.3 years, while return migrants possessed the greatest average age at 41.3 years. Primary migrants had a mean age of 36.2 years. The difference in age by migration category was statistically significant. The fact that the relationship between primary and return migrants is a sequential one undoubtedly had a large impact on the age difference. To quote Campbell and Johnson, 1976, p. 134: "Since a migrant cannot be a return migrant until after he has been a nonreturn (primary) migrant, returnees must be older."

Number of Children by Migrant Type

The percentages of males by number of children categories are shown in Table 7. Although there was not a statistically significant difference, both return and primary migrants had a greater proportion in the three or more children category and a smaller proportion in the zero children category. Nonmigrants had the least number of children on the average, 1.6 children, as compared with return migrants, 1.9 children, and primary migrants, 2.0 children. The age difference of the men was

TABLE 6. Age Category by Migrant Type of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975

Age Category (years)	Migrant Type		
	Nonmigrant (n=135)	Return Migrant (n=36)	Primary Migrant (n=101)
	Percent		
Under 24	26.7	5.6	6.9
25 - 29	24.4	11.1	21.8
30 - 34	13.3	25.0	22.8
35 - 39	11.9	11.1	11.9
40 - 44	11.1	11.1	17.8
45 +	12.6	36.1	18.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	32.3	41.3	36.2

F value computed on ungrouped years of age of males in the three groups [$F = 11.88$, $F_{.95}(2,271) = 3.04$].

TABLE 7. Number of Children by Migrant Type of 238 Married Males[a] Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975

Number of Children	Migrant Type		
	Nonmigrant (n=98)	Return Migrant (n=34)	Primary Migrant (n=96)
	Percent		
0	21.4	17.6	18.8
1 and 2	60.2	50.0	51.0
3 +	18.4	32.3	30.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean (number)	1.6	1.9	2.0
Mean Age	32.3	41.3	36.2

[a]Unmarried respondents were removed from the analysis.

The number of children categories of 1, 1, 2, 3, and 4+ were used to compute the F value.

[$F = 2.95$, $F_{.95}(2,225) = 3.04$].

possibly the greatest contributing factor on number of children since nonmigrants were younger than those in the two migrant categories.

Marital Status by Migrant Type

The percentages by marital status are shown in Table 8. A difference is apparent as nonmigrants had 28.9 percent in the single category while return and primary migrants had 5.6 percent and 5.0 percent single, respectively. Nonmigrants also displayed a smaller percentage in the divorced category as compared to return migrants and primary migrants. A significant difference was found through use of a Chi-square test in marital status.

Age First Left Putnam County by Migrant Type

Return migrants and primary migrants were examined to determine differences in the age at which they first left Putnam County. Nonmigrants were omitted, since by definition they had not migrated from the country. The percentages by age first left Putnam County are shown in Table 9. Return migrants had a smaller proportion in the age 19 or less category, 30.6 percent, than primary migrants, 45.5 percent, and a larger proportion in the 24 or older category, 41.6 percent, compared to primary migrants, 20.7 percent. The average age that migrants first left the country shows return migrants with a mean age of 23.7 years and primary migrants 21.6 years. Thus, those who left Putnam County and later returned migrated at a somewhat leter age than primary migrants. Although the difference of two years doesn't appear to be large, a statistically significant difference was found between the two groups on age they first left Putnam County. Viewing the data from

TABLE 8. Marital Status by Migrant Type of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee

Marital Status	Migrant Type		
	Nonmigrant (n=135)	Return Migrant (n=36)	Primary Migrant (n=101)
	Percent		
Single	28.9	5.6	5.0
Married	67.4	86.1	87.1
Divorced	3.7	8.3	7.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-square value between males in all three groups [$x^2 = 28.26$, x^2 (d.f. 4 $_{.95}$) = 9.49].

TABLE 9. Age First Left Putnam County by Migrant Type of 137[a] Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975

Age First Left	Migrant Type	
	Return Migrant (n=36)	Primary Migrant (n=101)
	- - - - - - - - - Percent - - - - - - - - -	
19 or less	30.6	45.5
20 - 23	27.8	33.8
24 +	41.6	20.7
Total	100.0	100.0
Mean (years)	23.7	21.6

[a]The total of the two categories does not equal 272 due to omission of the 135 nonmigrants.

F for males in the two groups [$F = 3.99$, $F_{.95}(2,128) = 3.07$].

another perspective shows that 41.7 percent of those leaving at age 24 or later returned, compared with only 20.8 percent of those leaving at a younger age.

Place Spouse Reared by Migrant Type

The percentages of migrant types of place spouse was reared are shown in Table 10. Analysis of data in this table show the percentage for return and nonmigrants were similar. Nonmigrants and return migrants both showed a very strong tendency to marry someone reared in Putnam County, 73.3 percent and 67.7 percent, respectively, compared with only 27.8 percent for primary migrants. Conversely, nonmigrants and return migrants both showed a small percentage of marriage to women reared in other Tennessee counties and other states. A significant difference was found between the three migrant categories. The analysis shows that nonmigrants and return migrants were most likely to marry women reared in Putnam County, while primary migrants were much more likely to marry persons reared in areas outside Putnam County.

TABLE 10. Place Spouse Reared by Migrant Type of 212 Married Males Raised in Putnam County, Tennessee

Place Spouse Reared	Migrant Type		
	Nonmigrant (n=90)	Return Migrant (n=31)	Primary Migrant (n=91)
Putnam County	73.3	67.7	27.4
Adjacent County	15.5	12.9	23.1
Other Tennessee County	5.6	9.7	17.6
Other State	5.6	9.7	31.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-square value between males in all three groups [x^2 = 46.91, x^2 (6 d.f. $_{.95}$) = 12.59].

CHAPTER III

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUNG ADULT MALES AND FEMALES BY PRESENT RESIDENCE

The socio-economic characteristics of 272 men and 267 women reared in Putnam County, Tennessee were analyzed through cross-tabulation with place of present residence. The place of present residence was coded into three categories: (1) Putnam County; (2) other Tennessee county; and (3) other state. Cross-tabulated with present residence categories were the characteristics of occupation, education, age, number of children, and the place where spouse was reared.

Analysis of young adults by present residence is valuable in contrasting primary migrants, that is, those presently residing in other Tennessee counties and other states with nonmigrants and return migrants, that is, those residing within the Putnam County area. Another important area of the analysis is the opportunity to examine short distance primary migrants, such as those grouped in the other Tennessee county category, and the longer distance primary migrants included in the other state category. Although the geographic location of Putnam County makes feasible the possibility of another Tennessee county move being equidistant or greater distance than a move out of the state of Tennessee, the psychological barrier imposed by a state boundary provides a significant reason for the different categorical groupings.

Occupational Category by Residence of Males

The percentages of males by occupational category from each of the present residence categories are presented in Table 11. Those residing in Putnam County had the greatest proportion engaged in farming as a primary occupation with 10.5 percent as compared with 2.0 percent of those residing in other Tennessee counties and none for those residing in other states. Putnam County residents also had the greatest percentage in the unemployed category, 15.2 percent, followed by those in other Tennessee counties, 3.9 percent, and other states, 2.0 percent. The other Tennessee counties category possessed the greatest percentage in the combined professional and semi-professional category, 41.2 percent, while those in the other state category had 32.0 percent and those in Putnam County had 15.2 percent in this occupational category.

When the Chi-square test was computed for the three groups, a statistically significant difference was found to be present on occupation makeup. Putnam County male residents, consisting of return migrants and nonmigrants, were more likely to be farmers and unemployed and were less likely to have been engaged in a professional or semi-professional career than those residing in other counties in Tennessee and other states.

Occupational Category by Residence of Females

The percentages of females in the occupational categories by their present residence are shown in Table 12. The combined professional and semi-professional category also contains those involved in a trade.

TABLE 11. Occupational Category by Present Residence of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee

Occupational Category	Residence			
	Putnam Co. (n=171)	Other Tennessee Co. (n=51)	Other State (n=50)	All Areas (n=272)
	- - - - - - - - - - Percent - - - - - - - - - -			
Farmer	10.5	2.0	---	7.0
Factory	18.7	21.6	32.0	21.4
Trade	12.9	15.7	16.0	14.0
Professional/ Semi-Professional	15.2	41.2	32.0	21.3
Unskilled	17.6	11.8	16.0	16.2
Student/Military	9.9	3.9	12.0	9.2
Unemployed	15.2	3.9	2.0	10.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-square value between males in all three groups [x^2 = 36.43, x^2 = (12 d.f. $_{.95}$) = 21.03].

TABLE 12. Occupational Category by Percent Residence of 267 Females Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee

Occupational Category	Present Residence			
	Putnam Co. (n=135)	Other Tennessee Co. (n=61)	Other State (n=58)	All Areas (n=254)*
	- - - - - - - - - - - Percent - - - - - - - - - - -			
Factory	21.5	16.4	3.5	16.2
Professional/ Semi-Professional[a]	20.0	21.3	15.5	19.3
Unskilled	11.1	9.8	10.3	10.6
Housewife[b]	47.4	52.5	70.7	53.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[a]Professional/semi-professional category includes those in the trade category.

[b]Housewife category includes those in the farmer and student categories.

Chi-square value between females in all three groups [x^2 = 15.83, x^2 (8 d.f. $_{.95}$) = 15.51]. Chi-square computed with trade as separate category.

*The total of the three categories does not equal 267 due to missing data on 13 individuals.

The housewife category was enlarged to contain women in the farmer and student categories. Females residing in other states had the greatest percentage in the housewife category, 70.0 percent, as compared to Putnam County, 47.4 percent, and other Tennessee counties, 52.5 percent. The other state category had the least percentage involved in the factory category with only 3.5 percent compared to 16.4 percent of those in other Tennessee counties and 21.5 percent in Putnam County.

A significant difference between the three resident categories and occupation of the young adult women surveyed was found when a Chi-square test was utilized. Other state residents differed from the Putnam County and other Tennessee county residents mainly through a smaller percentage in the factory category and a greater percentage in the housewife category. This difference represents less overall participation in the work force for females who resided outside Putnam County.

Educational Category by Residence of Males

In Table 13, the educational categories of males by residence are presented. Putnam County residents had a greater percentage in the lower educational categories and smaller percentage in the higher categories than did those in other Tennessee counties and the other state categories. Putnam County residents also possessed the lowest mean years of education, 10.5 years, as compared with those in other Tennessee counties, 11.7 years, and other state category, 11.1 years. There was a significant difference between the three groups of men on the years of education based on the F value although the size of difference is not great.

TABLE 13. Educational Category by Present Residence of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975

Educational Category (years)	Present Residence			
	Putnam Co. (n=167)	Other Tennessee Co. (n=50)	Other State (n=50)	All Areas (n=267)*
	- - - - - - - - - - - - Percent - - - - - - - - - - - -			
0 - 7	12.0	6.0	8.0	10.1
8	22.1	8.0	20.0	19.1
9 - 11	13.2	16.0	14.0	13.9
12	33.5	42.0	36.0	35.6
13 +	19.2	28.0	22.0	21.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean Years	10.5	11.7	11.1	10.8

[a]The total of the three categories does not equal 272 due to missing data on five individuals.

F value between males in the three groups [$F = 3.28$, $F_{.95(2,264)} = 3.04$].

Educational Category by Residence of Females

The percentages of females by present residence and educational category are shown in Table 14. The percent of persons in each category was very similar for the three groups. The primary exception of education was the other state category where 25.9 percent had some college as compared with only 14.7 percent of Putnam County residents and 16.7 percent of other Tennessee counties' residents. There was not, however, a statistically significant difference between the three groups.

Age Category by Residence of Males

The number of children, marital status, education and to a lesser degree all of the characteristics of the residents are affected by the respondent's age. Table 15 shows the percentage in the different age categories by present residence of males. Some 22.2 percent of those in Putnam County were in the under 24 years of age category compared with only 7.9 percent of those residing in other Tennessee counties and 6.0 percent in the other state category.

With respect to mean age, Putnam County male residents were only slightly younger, 34.1 years, than other Tennessee counties, 34.4 years, and other states, 38.0 years. There was not a statistically significant difference between the three groups of male residents on age.

Age Category by Residence of Females

Table 16 shows the age categories of females reared in Putnam County. The results are comparable to age difference shown in Table 17 for males. Although there was no statistically significant difference

TABLE 14. Educational Category Distribution by Present Residence of 267 Females Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975

Educational Category (years)	Present Residence			
	Putnam Co. (n=136)	Other Tennessee Co. (n=60)	Other State (n=58)	All Areas (n=254)[a]
	- - - - - - - - - - - - Percent - - - - - - - - - - - -			
0 - 7	7.4	3.3	3.4	5.5
8	17.6	20.0	24.1	19.7
9 - 11	19.1	15.0	13.8	16.9
12	41.2	45.0	32.8	40.2
13 +	14.7	16.7	25.9	17.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean Years	11.0	11.4	11.3	11.1

[a]The total of the three categories does not equal 267 due to missing data on five individuals.

F value between females in the three groups [$F = 0.76$, $F_{.95(2,251)} = 3.04$].

TABLE 15. Age Category by Present Residence of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975

Age Category (years)	Present Residence		
	Putnam County (n=171)	Other Tennessee County (n=51)	Other State (n=50)
	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - Percent - - - - - - - - - - - - - -		
Under 24	22.2	7.9	6.0
25 - 29	21.6	29.4	14.0
30 - 34	15.8	23.5	22.0
35 - 39	11.7	9.8	14.0
40 - 44	11.1	13.7	22.0
45 +	17.6	15.7	22.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean (Years)	34.1	34.4	38.0

F value for males in the three groups [$F = 2.54$, $F_{.95}(2,269) = 3.04$].

TABLE 16. Age Category by Present Residence of 267[a] Females Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975

Age Category (years)	Present Residence		
	Putnam County (n=171)	Other Tennessee County (n=61)	Other State (n=59)
	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Percent - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -		
Under 24	25.5	18.0	10.2
25 - 29	21.3	26.2	18.6
30 - 34	14.2	19.7	13.6
35 - 39	8.5	9.8	18.6
40 - 44	10.6	6.6	17.0
45 +	19.9	19.7	22.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean (Years)	34.5	33.9	36.9

[a]The total of the three categories does not equal 267 due to missing data on six individuals.

F value for females in all the three groups [$F = 2.15$, $F_{.95}(2,258) = 3.04$].

between the three resident categories, the under 24 years category was proportionately represented greater by Putnam County residents, 25.5 percent, than was other Tennessee counties or other states' residents, 18.0 percent and 10.2 percent, respectively. The mean age for residents ranged from 33.9 years for other Tennessee counties residents, 34.5 years for Putnam County residents, and 36.9 years for other states' residents.

Number of Children by Residence of Males

As is shown in Table 17, there is not a great deal of difference for the men in number of children by residence category. The mean number of children was 1.6 for Putnam County residents, 2.0 for other Tennessee counties' residents, and 2.1 for other states' residents. There was not a significant difference between the categories on number of children.

Number of Children by Residence of Females

The percentage of females by age category and place of present residence are shown in Table 18. Although the Putnam County category had a smaller percentage of persons in the three or more children category, 20.8 percent, compared to those in other Tennessee counties, 26.7 percent, and other states, 31.6 percent, there was not a significant difference between the groups. Further, the mean number of children for each category was nearly identical to the corresponding averages for men shown in Table 17. Female Putnam County residents had a mean of 1.6 children compared with 1.9 children for those in other Tennessee counties and 2.1 children for those in other states.

TABLE 17. Number of Children by Present Residence of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975

Number of Children	Present Residence			
	Putnam Co. (n=132)	Other Tennessee Co. (n=48)	Other State (n=48)	All Areas (n=228)[a]
	Percent			
0	20.4	18.8	18.7	19.7
1 and 2	57.6	50.0	52.1	54.8
3 +	22.0	31.2	29.2	25.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	1.6	2.0	2.1	1.8

[a]Total n of all areas does not equal 272 due to removal of unmarried respondents and missing data.

[b]Totals do not equal 100.0 due to rounding errors.

F value between males in the three groups [$F = 2.47$, $F_{.95(2,225)} = 3.04$].

TABLE 18. Number of Children by Present Residence of 267[a] Females Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975

Number of Children	Present Residence			
	Putnam Co. (n=130)	Other Tennessee Co. (n=60)	Other State (n=57)	All Areas (n=247)[a]
	Percent			
0	20.0	20.0	12.3	18.2
1 and 2	59.2	53.3	56.1	57.1
3 +	20.8	26.7	31.6	24.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	1.6	1.9	2.1	1.8

[a]The total of the three categories does not equal 267 due to missing data on five individuals and the omission of the 15 unmarried individuals.

F value for females in the three groups [$F = 2.30$, $F_{.95}(2,244) = 3.04$].

Place Spouse Reared by Residence of Males

Young adult males tended to be married to a spouse from the same geographical area as that in which they resided. Data in Table 19 show that 77.7 percent of married male Putnam County residents married spouses also reared in Putnam County. Some 47.7 percent of other Tennessee county married men residents married spouses from other Tennessee counties and 67.6 percent of other state residents married a spouse who was also reared in another state. There was a significant difference, as determined by the Chi-square value on place where spouse was reared for the three categories.

Place Spouse Reared by Residence of Females

Results of the females on place of spouse residence, as shown in Table 20, were similar to that for males. They tended to marry someone from their area. For example, 68.0 percent of Putnam County residents, 56.1 percent of other Tennessee county residents, and 76.7 percent of residents in other states married spouses reared in the same area as their present residence. Females showed a slightly greater tendency to follow this pattern than did males. There was a statistically significant difference on place where spouse was reared for the three categories.

TABLE 19. Place Spouse Reared by Present Residence of 272 Males Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975

Place Spouse Reared	Present Residence		
	Putnam Co. (n=112)	Other Tennessee Co. (n=63)	Other State (n=37)
	- - - - - - - - - - - Percent - - - - - - - - - - -		
Putnam County	77.7	41.3	21.6
Other Tennessee County	9.8	47.6	10.8
Other State	12.5	11.1	67.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi-square value between males in the three groups [x^2 = 92.46, x^2 (4 d.f. $_{.95}$) = 9.49].

The total of the three categories does not equal 272 due to omission of the nonmarried individuals and missing data on 14 individuals.

TABLE 20. Place Spouse Reared by Present Residence of 267 Females Reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, 1975

Place Spouse Reared	Present Residence		
	Putnam Co. (n=125)	Other Tennessee Co. (n=66)	Other State (n=30)
	- - - - - - - - - - Percent - - - - - - - - - -		
Putnam County	68.0	31.8	20.0
Other Tennessee County	14.4	56.1	3.3
Other State	17.6	12.1	76.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Total n does not equal 267 due to omission of unmarried respondents and missing data.

Chi-square value between females in all three groups [$x^2 = 94.59$, x^2 (4 d.f. $_{.95}$) = 9.49].

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Data on 272 young adult men and 267 young adult women reared in Putnam County, Tennessee, were analyzed on migration pattern. Data were obtained through a 1975 survey from personal interviews with a random sample of residents of Putnam County regarding children who were age 20 and over. These data were utilized to analyze the relationship between migration behavior and socio-economic characteristics. Distinct objectives were: (1) determine the frequency of primary migration and return migration; (2) determine socio-economic characteristics by migration pattern and present residence; and (3) to determine reassons for the various types of migration with a special emphasis on return migration.

In analyses of 272 males by migrant type, primary migrants, that is those who left Putnam County and did not return, tended to have the higher total family income than return migrants and nonmigrants. Nonmigrants were most likely of the three migrant groups to be farmers and return migrants had a relatively large proportion in the unemployed category, 3.0 percent.

Primary migrants had a greater average number of selected home items and average years of education than nonmigrants and return migrants.

Several characteristics of migrants were undoubtedly related. Nonmigrants had the youngest average age, the smallest average number,

and greater proportion of single respondents while both migrant categories were older, had more children and more were married.

Primary migrants, on an average, first left Putnam County at a somewhat earlier age than did return migrants. Young adult men first leaving at age 24 or later had twice the probability of returning, 40 percent, compared with those leaving at an earlier age.

Both nonmigrants and return migrants showed a much stronger tendency to marry a spouse from Putnam County than did primary migrants. Primary migrants were much more likely to marry a spouse who was reared outside of Putnam County than were the other migrant types.

Of the present residence categories males in Putnam County were more likely to be employed as farmers as compared with those from other Tennessee counties and other state categories. Putnam County residents also had the highest unemployment percentage and the lowest percentage in the combined professional and semi-professional occupational category.

Females presently residing in Putnam County had the greatest proportion of those actively involved in the work force, with smallest percentage in the housewife category followed in order by the other Tennessee counties and other state categories.

Both males and females presently residing in Putnam County had, on an average, the fewest years of education and number of children, and were youngest for the present residence groups.

Male Putnam County residents had the highest proportion of men marrying a spouse reared in the same place of present residence. Females from the other state category showed the highest proportion of

the female group to marry a spouse reared in their current place of residence.

Conclusions

Return migrants, except for age or age related characteristics, were very similar to nonmigrants. Primary migrants were quite distinct from return migrants and nonmigrants. Hence, migrants cannot be viewed as a homogeneous category. Return migrant male category may have contained some "social losers" as determined by high unemployment. Those who marry natives of Putnam County have a higher chance of returning to live in Putnam County if they migrate. Thus, attachment to family, for both primary migrants and return migrants, may be a key factor in migration behavior. Natives who marry nonnatives less frequently return to Putnam County and thus may mean residing closer to "home" of spouse.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Beale, Calvin L. 1978. The Revival of Population Growth in Nonmetropolitan America. ERS 605. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

Bogue, Donald J. 1969. Principles of Demography. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Brown, David L., and John M. Wardwell. 1980. New Directions in Urban-Rural Migration: The Population Turnaround in Rural America. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Campbell, Rex, and Daniel Johnson. 1976. "Propositions on Counterstream Migration." Rural Sociology, 41 (Spring): 127-145.

Campbell, Rex, Daniel Johnson, and Gary Stragler. 1974. "Return Migration of Black People to the South." Rural Sociology 39 (Winter): 514-527.

DaVanzo, Julie, and Peter A. Morrison. 1978. Dynamics of Return Migration: Descriptive Findings from a Longitudinal Study. Rand Paper P-5913; Palo Alto, California: The Rand Corporation.

Davis, Dewitt. 1973. "Reverse Migration by Blacks to the South: A Possible Conceptual Framework." Discussion Paper Number 38; The Ohio State University, Department of Geography, Columbus, Ohio.

Eldridge, H. T. 1965. "Primary, Secondary, and Return Migration in the United States 1955-1960." Demography 2: 444-455.

Farmer, Charles M. 1967. "Young Adults Reared in Jackson County, Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Howard, James E. 1969. "Migration Patterns of Residents in a High In-Migration County, Hamblen County, Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Lee, Ann S. 1974. "Return Migration in the United States." Demography 11 (February): 283-300.

Lee, Everett S. 1965. "A Theory of Migration." Demography 12 (November): 47-57.

Leuthold, Frank O. 1972a. Population Changes in Tennessee from 1930 to 1970. University of Tennessee Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 398. The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Leuthold, Frank O. 1972. "Migration of Persons to a High Net In-Migration East Tennessee County." Tennessee Farm and Home Science Progress Report 84 (October, November, December): 26-28.

Leuthold, Frank O., and Ram Kailasam. 1979. "Return Migration to the Upper Cumberland Plateau." Tennessee Farm and Home Science 109 (January, February, March): 32-33.

Peterson, William. 1975. Population. New York: Macmillan and Company.

Ploch, Louis A. 1978. "The Reversal in Migration Patterns--Some Rural Development Consequences." Rural Sociology 43 (Summer): 293-303.

Ravenstein, E. G. 1885. "The Laws of Migration." The Journal of the Royal Statistical Society 48 (June): 167-227.

Ravenstein, E. G. 1889. "The Laws of Migration." The Journal of the Royal Statistical Society 52 (June): 241-301.

Sikes, Melanie, and Daniel Price. 1974. Rural-Urban Migration Research in the United States. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bethesda, Maryland.

United States Bureau of the Census. 1970. City and County Data Book. Washington: Government Printing Office, p. 449.

United States Bureau of the Census. 1976. Current Population Reports. Series P-26, Number 75-42, Washington: Government Printing Office, pp. 3-4.

United States Department of Commerce. 1960. United States Census of the Population. Volume 1, "Characteristics of the Population," Chapter A, Table I.

University of Tennessee. 1980. Tennessee Statistical Abstract. Center for Business and Economic Research, College of Business Administration, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville (July): 14-16.

VITA

John Fleming Thigpen III was born in High Point, North Carolina, on December 20, 1951. He was reared in Scottsville, Virginia and graduated from The Blue Ridge School in Dyke, Virginia in June 1971. He attended Guilford College from fall 1971 until spring 1972. He was employed as a sales representative and part-time farmer in Shelbyville, Tennessee until the fall of 1976. He then entered The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, graduating in June of 1971 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Agricultural Economics. The following fall he entered the Graduate School of the same university in Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology on a Workship. He was awarded a Graduate Research Assistantship in the winter of 1979 and graduated with a Master of Science degree in Agricultural Economics in June 1981.

He is presently planning to pursue a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Rural Sociology at the University of Kentucky as a Research Assistant. He is a member of Gamma Sigma Delta, the Honor Society of Agriculture, and the Rural Sociological Society.