Mobility of the foreign born population in the United States, 1995-2000: The role of gateway states

DRAFT

Katherine Hempstead
Rutgers University
March 25, 2005

Mobility of the foreign born population in the United States: the role of gateway states

Abstract

In recent years, there is evidence that the foreign born population is decentralizing. The 2000 census reveals a level of increased outmigration of the foreign born from traditional gateway states such as California and New York. Additionally, the percentage of new arrivals from abroad initially entering one of the "big six" destination states has declined from approximately 85 percent during the 1980s, to closer to 55 percent today (INS). (The "big six" are California, New York, Texas, Florida, Illinois and New Jersey) Together these two trends suggest that the importance of the gateway states as a destination for the foreign born population may be declining. The goal of this study is to examine recent mobility among the foreign born population and the role of the gateway states. Using the 2000 PUMS, I examine interstate migration, both in and out of gateway states. Results show that between 1995 and 2000, net domestic migration of the foreign both population to gateway states was negative. Yet the rate of outmigration from gateway states was actually lower than that from non-gateway states. In general, interstate migration was positively selected, but the characteristics of migrants to and from gateway states differed considerably. Intra-state migration accounted for a far higher proportion of moves than did interstate migration, and most intra-state migration occurred within gateway states. In short, the idea that gateway states are "losing their hold" on their foreign born population seems to be somewhat of an overstatement. While net migration to gateway states from other states is negative, gateway states are retaining their foreign born residents at a higher rate than other states, and these foreign born residents are far more likely to move within their states than to leave their states. Yet trends in international and domestic migration are clearly working to increase the foreign born population of non-gateway states relative to gateway states, and these migratory streams are also functioning to reduce differences in the characteristics of the foreign born population in these two areas. Before too long, the concept of a group of "gateway" states may come to seem somewhat less relevant.

"Because they are losing their hold on both U.S.-born and "secondary" foreign-born migrants, mature melting pot states such as California and New York are becoming even more reliant on new foreign-born immigrants as a source of population growth."

William Frey, August 2002
Frey, William H. Metropolitan Magnets for International and Domestic Migrants.
http://www.brookings.edu/es/urban/publications/200310_Frey.htm.

A. Introduction

The geographic concentration of the foreign born population is a well established feature of recent immigration. The concentration of major immigrant groups, such as Asians and Hispanics in several large states, particularly California and Texas, has been frequently noted (Gober, 2000; Liaw and Frey, 1998, U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2002). A group of seven "gateway states" (California, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Texas) have been identified as major initial destinations for new immigrants. Approximately seventy-five percent of new immigrants arriving during the 1980s and 1990s settled in a gateway state, and out migration from these states has not occurred to any great extent. Social, economic, and fiscal benefits, as well as costs, of the new immigration has therefore been quite unevenly distributed. Some gateway states perceived that the costs associated with their foreign born population were excessive; these concerns resulted in state initiatives such as California's infamous Proposition 187, and a lawsuit filed by a group of gateway states against the federal government, in which they claimed that fiscal pressures on particular states associated with inadequate control of undocumented immigration was deserving of compensation. While much of this activity has been specifically directed against undocumented immigrants, legal and illegal immigration is highly spatially correlated. There has also been a spirited academic debate about whether migration of the native born from gateway states has been linked to immigration, either as a result of labor market crowding, competition for public services, or for cultural reasons (Wright, Ellis, and Riebel, 1997; White and Yoshe, 1994; Walker, Ellis and Barff, 1992; Frey and Liaw, 1998; Hempstead, 2001; Hempstead, 2003).

However, recent evidence suggests that changes are occurring in the settlement patterns of the foreign born. It was widely reported that a number of gateway states had negative net migration rates for the foreign born population between 1995 and 2000 (Frey, 2002, 2003). This was true, for example, in California, New York, and New Jersey. Foreign born outmigrants from these states are drawn to many of the same destinations that are attractive to their native born counterparts – sunbelt destinations such as North Carolina, Nevada, and Arizona.   This relocation of the foreign born has captured the attention of the public and scholars alike(Singer, 2004). In particular, the rapid increase in Latino populations in Southern states has been documented . Suro and Singer (2002) have described the "hyper-growth" of Latino populations in eighteen metropolitan areas, eleven of which were in the Southeastern United States. Three of the top four metropolitan areas identified were in North Carolina (Smith, 2004). Some, such as William Frey, speculate that gateway states will soon serve as temporary homes to only the most recent immigrants (Frey, 2002). A recent report by the Pew Hispanic Center

notes that the undocumented population in non-gateway states increased from 400,000 to 3.9 million between 1990 and 2004 (Passell, 2005).

Traditional gateway states have been important to immigrants for employment as well as cultural reasons. The significance of the presence of co-ethnics in immigrant destinations has been examined among major new immigrant groups, namely Hispanics and Asians (McHugh, 1989; Waldinger, 2001). The importance of co-ethnics is thought to be less significant for better educated immigrants, which is one reason that long distance migration is more common among this population. Yet much of the new mobility of the foreign born population has brought low education and low income immigrants, particularly Latinos, to new destination states, creating new ethnic communities in these areas. This migration is strongly related to employment opportunities, and the expansion of the service sector in sunbelt states (Frey, 2003).

The notion of a rapidly decentralizing foreign born population is quite captivating. It took many decades for second wave immigrants to migrate in any appreciable numbers out of the traditional gateway cities of the Northeast. A less geographically concentrated foreign born population has been desired by many for fiscal as well as social reasons. Yet the recent mobility patterns of the foreign born population need closer inspection. What are the respective roles of gateway versus non-gateway states in migratory behavior of the foreign born? How have intrastate and interstate migration respectively contributed to recent mobility? What are the characteristics of the foreign born populations in gateway and non-gateway states, and how have recent trends in domestic and international migration affected their respective characteristics?

The goal of this study is to examine the role of gateway states in the recent mobility of the foreign born population, in part to consider whether gateway states are indeed "losing their hold" on their foreign born populations. The interstate migration of the foreign born population between gateway states and other states is examined, using both descriptive tables and logistic regression. This study does not formally model destination choices using labor force characteristics, distance, amenities, and other features included in standard migration models, but rather seeks to understand the characteristics of the foreign born population in gateway and non-gateway states, and to provide some insight into mobility between these two groups of states.

B. Data and Methods

Using the five percent Census 2000 Public Use Micro Sample (PUMS) , I examine inter-state migration both in and out of gateway states.   The seven gateway states are California, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts New Jersey , New York and Texas. "Non-gateway" states refers to the other 43 states. Puerto Rico and other American territories are excluded. Migration patterns between 1995 and 2000 were determined using the question on residence five years before the census. One disadvantage of this question is that intermediate moves are not included. Census figures are weighted by the PUMS population weights. Multivariate analysis of the probability of different kinds of moves used demographic and socioeconomic characteristics as well as year of entry and country

of origin data as predictors. The analysis was limited to the foreign born population, and foreign born residents under five years of age in 2000 were excluded.

C. Results

1. Mobility: Gateway versus non-gateway states

The disproportionate size of the foreign born population in gateway versus non-gateway states makes it nearly inevitable that more foreign born residents will move out of gateway states than move in from other states – creating a negative net domestic migration rate of -.35 percent annually, as compared with .86% for non-gateway states, as seen in Table 1. Interstate migration served to create a net transfer of foreign born residents from gateway to non-gateway states. While approximately 500,000 foreign born residents of non-gateway states moved to gateway states between 1995 and 2000, roughly 850,000 residents of gateway states moved to non-gateway states. Of those who lived abroad in 1995, almost 70% resided in a gateway state in 2000. Yet because the foreign born population of the non-gateway states is smaller, their rate of growth is higher. Including international migration, the total net migration rate for non gateway states is nearly six percent annually, as compared with approximately three percent for the gateway states.

The rate of growth of the foreign born population of non-gateway states is clearly higher than is that of the gateway states, and net exchanges between gateway and non-gateway states are negative. However this is largely a function of the larger base population of the gateway states, and to focus only on these negative exchanges presents but one aspect of the retention of foreign born residents by gateway states. For it is also the case that the gateway states retained a higher proportion of their foreign born population between 1995-2000. This can be seen in Table 2, which shows the mobility distribution of foreign born residents by year of entry cohort and by gateway state status in 1995. For each year of entry cohort, residents of gateway states in 1995 were approximately twice as likely to have remained in their state between 1995 and 2000 than were foreign born residents of non-gateway states. While the likelihood of interstate migration is higher for more recent year of entry cohorts, the relationship between non-gateway and gateway state residents is remarkably constant. This increase in interstate migration with recency of entry is at least in part reflective of the age distribution of the foreign born population by year of entry, and is not necessarily indicative of a large increase in interstate migration per se.

Another perspective on the foreign born population of gateway states can be gained by looking at the mobility distribution by place of residence in 2000. As seen in Table 3, the proportion of residents who resided in the same state in both 1995 and 2000 is higher among 2000 residents of gateway states as compared with 2000 residents of non-gateway states. For example, approximately fifteen percent of 2000 residents of non-gateway states resided in a different state in 1995, as compared with only about five percent of 2000 residents of gateway states. When the smaller share of new arrivals from abroad as a proportion of the foreign born population of gateway states is also taken into account, the greater stability of the foreign born population of gateway states is even more apparent. Among gateway states, approximately eighty-five percent of 2000 residents

were also state residents in 1995, as compared with only approximately 65% for non gateway states. By looking at the individual gateway states, a certain amount of variation can be observed. California, for example, had the lowest proportion of new entrants between 1990 and 2000, followed closely by New York. Florida stands out as an outlier in the other direction, with high proportions of new arrivals both from other states and from abroad.

Tables 4 and 4a provide some information about non-gateway states which have become particularly popular destinations for foreign born migrants, both domestic and international. Table 4 ranks the non-gateway states by the total number of foreign-born in-migrants, categorized into those migrating from gateway states, those migrating from other non-gateway states, and those migrating from abroad. Non-movers and intra-state migrants were excluded. It can be seen that in general foreign migration accounts for more growth in a given state's foreign born population than does domestic migration. One interesting exception is Nevada, which is the second leading state in terms of foreign born migrants from gateway states, but is not a particularly popular destination for migrants from abroad or from other non-gateway states. Nevada was also a very popular destination for native born migrants between 1990 and 2000. For most other states, there appears to be a strong association between number of migrants from abroad, from gateway states, and from non-gateway states. Table 4a ranks the top ten states in each of these categories, and it can be seen that there is a considerable amount of overlap between the groups. While many of the popular destinations are Southeastern and Western states, two Midwestern states, Ohio, and Michigan, are also included, as is one Northeastern state, Pennsylvania.

2. Characteristics of foreign born residents of gateway and non gateway states

As seen in Table 5, foreign-born residents of gateway and non-gateway states differ in some important ways. Perhaps the most significant difference is that foreign born residents of non-gateway states have higher average levels of educational attainment, and are more likely to come from Europe, Asia, or Africa than are those in gateway states. The distribution by year of entry differs somewhat, as befits the more rapid recent population growth of non-gateway states. There is little difference in age and marital status, and the difference in labor force status is relatively small. As is consistent with their higher level of educational attainment, foreign born residents of non-gateway states were more likely to be home owners than were residents of gateway states.

For more recent entry cohorts, the characteristics of foreign born residents of gateway and non-gateway states start to converge. For example, the proportion of foreign born residents that is European declined in non-gateway states with successive year of entry cohorts. This can be seen Table 6. This convergence is evident for Europeans, Asians, Mexicans, and Central Americans, but does not occur to any appreciable extent for Caribbeans, Africans, and South Americans. Additionally, differences in educational attainment between gateway and non-gateway states were smaller for more recent year of entry cohorts. This convergence is particularly evident for the proportion of foreign

born residents without a high school degree. Educational attainment is a valuable proxy for socioeconomic status and particularly earning potential.

3. Interstate migration
We have so far shown that gateway states have a higher rate of retaining their residents than do non-gateway states, although net migration rates between gateway and non-gateway states are negative. Further, we have shown that foreign born residents of non-gateway states are relatively more advantaged in terms of educational attainment than are those of gateway states, although differences between more recent entry cohorts are less significant. We now turn to the question of interstate migration of the foreign born. Although, as we have seen, interstate migration accounts for a relatively small share of mobility activity among the foreign born (which is also the case with the native born population) it is a relatively important type of mobility from the standpoint of population de-centralization. In general, interstate migration has been found to be positively selective. In considering the impact of interstate migration of the foreign born on both host and destination states, it is of interest to know how the characteristics of interstate migrants differ from non-migrants, and in particular to compare the characteristics of the gateway to non-gateway flow to other flows, particularly, the non-gateway to gateway flow. William Frey (2003), suggested that the new flow of foreign born migrants from gateway to non-gateway states had the potential to create what he called a "barbell economy", his term for an economy characterized by significant inequality in the income distribution. His view was that foreign born migrants to non-gateway states had disproportionately low educational attainment.

Table 7 shows the country of origin and educational attainment distribution for foreign born residents of gateway and non-gateway states by mobility status. There are some broad similarities between the two groups of states. Inter-state migrants appear to be positively selected in terms of educational attainment, and are more likely to be Asian, and are less likely to be from Mexico, as compared with the total foreign born populations of these two groups of states. Mexicans are disproportionately likely in both groups of states to engage in local moves, and are slightly more likely to make non-local in-state moves. While the degree to which this is true varies somewhat by the group of states and the country of origin, it s generally the case that Mexicans are relatively unlikely to be non-migrants or inter-state migrants, and are relatively likely to make in-state moves. For Europeans and Asians, the converse is more close to the truth. For Europeans this is probably at least in part a function of age, as a reasonable share of the European population, especially in non-gateway states, are pre-1980 immigrants, and are therefore more likely to be at an age when interstate migration becomes less likely, other than retirement migration, which may have occurred prior to 1995.

While the nature of the selection of interstate migrants is similar for gateway and non-gateway states, the characteristics of the base populations of these two groups of states differ. Therefore the characteristics of their respective interstate migrants differ as well. Interstate migrants from non-gateway states have higher educational attainment than do those from gateway states. In fact more than twenty percent of interstate migrants from non-gateway states have some degree of post-undergraduate education. Additionally,

interstate migrants from non-gateway states are more likely to be from Europe and Asia, and less likely to be from Mexico, other countries in Central America, South America, and the Caribbean as compared with interstate migrants from the gateway states.

Table 8 allows us to compare country of origin and educational attainment characteristics of these various interstate migration flows. With regard to country of origin, there are some interesting differences. Interstate migrants from gateway states who migrate to other gateway states are more likely to be Asian, Caribbean, and South American than are interstate migrants from gateway states overall. Significantly, these "gateway-to-gateway" migrants are far less likely to be Mexican than are migrants from gateway states to non-gateway states. With regard to the country of origin distribution of interstate migrants from non-gateway states, the differences are less significant, although it is the case that migrants to gateway states are somewhat more likely to be Asian, and somewhat less likely to be European, than are migrants to non-gateway states. The proportion which is Mexican does not vary much.

With regard to educational attainment, gateway state migrants differ noticeably depending on their destination. Migrants from gateway to non-gateway states are noticeably lower in educational attainment, with approximately 35% having less than a high school education. Those migrating to other gateway states, on the other hand, have higher levels of educational attainment. For non-gateway states, the differences are smaller, although migrants to gateway states have somewhat higher educational attainment than do migrants to other non-gateway states.

In the exchange between gateway and non-gateway states, therefore, the characteristics of the outflows and inflows are significantly different. Non-gateway states are receiving migrants from gateway states who have significantly lower levels of educational attainment and are more likely to be Mexican than are those who leave non-gateway states for gateway states. As noted, thirty-five percent of the inflow from the gateway states have no high school education, while this is true of only nineteen percent of migrants from non-gateway states to gateway states. The ratio of the exchange, as noted previously, is close to two to one, with non-gateway states receiving nearly twice as many migrants from gateway states as they send. If it persists, this interstate migrant pattern should serve over time to lessen the differences in the characteristics of the foreign born population of gateway and non-gateway states. This trend toward convergence in the characteristics of the foreign born is also reinforced by patterns in immigration from abroad. As Table 9 shows, country of origin and educational attainment characteristics of foreign born residents residing abroad in 1995 are very similar in gateway and non-gateway states.

Table 10 shows the results of three binomial logistic regressions which summarize the characteristics of migrants from gateway to non-gateway states. Model 1 estimates the probability of being a gateway to non-gateway migrant where the universe is all gateway state foreign born residents. As can be seen, compared with all gateway state residents, these interstate migrants are more likely to be young, are positively selected with regard to education, yet are significantly more likely to have an income below the federal

poverty level. As compared with Central Americans, the excluded category, these migrants are also significantly more likely to be African, and less likely to be from all other country of origin groups. State dummies reveal that gateway to non-gateway migrants are more likely to come from Massachusetts and Florida as compared with Illinois, the excluded category, and are less likely to come from California, Texas, New York and New Jersey.

Yet when compared with all interstate migrants from gateway states, as seen in Model 2, a somewhat different picture emerges. Those who migrate to a non-gateway state are young relative to those who migrate to other gateway states, but the differences are relatively small. With regard to educational attainment, it is evident that gateway to non-gateway migrants have lower levels of educational attainment than do those migrating to other gateway states. While gateway to non-gateway migrants are less likely to be unemployed relative to those migrating to gateway states, they are still more likely to have income below the poverty level. The results re: country of origin are quite similar to those from the first model. Some of the state findings are different, however. For example, as compared with gateway to gateway migrants, gateway to non-gateway migrants are significantly more likely to come from California and Texas relative to the excluded category, Illinois. This suggests that while the foreign born population of California and Texas are relatively unlikely to move to another state, when they do so they are disproportionately likely to choose a non-gateway state. For New York and New Jersey, interstate migrants are more likely to choose gateway destinations. Foreign born Floridians are more likely to move and are more likely to move to non-gateway states as compared to other gateway state residents.

Model three compares gateway to non-gateway migrants with all interstate migrants. It can be seen that the gateway to non-gateway group is relatively old when compared to interstate migrants as a whole, and additionally is negatively selected with regard to education, significantly more likely to be unemployed and to have below poverty income. Finally, these migrants are disproportionately likely to be Mexican when compared with interstate migrants as a whole.

Table 11 shows a similar trio of models for interstate migrants from non-gateway to gateway states. As compared with Table 10, the results from these three models do not differ as much from each other. As compared with all residents of non-gateway states, those who migrate to gateway states are younger, positively selected with regard to education, and are more likely to be unemployed and have below poverty level income. As compared with the excluded group, Central Americans, non-gateway to gateway migrants are more likely to be from Asia, the Caribbean, and South America. When compared with other interstate migrants from non-gateway states, those who go to gateway states are not significantly different with regard to age, but are positively selected in terms of educational attainment. While more likely to be employed, they do not differ significantly with regard to poverty level income. Finally, interstate migrants from non-gateway states who move to gateway states are more likely to be Asian, Caribbean, Mexican and South American, as compared with the excluded category, and less likely to be European or African.

Model 3 of Table 11 allows us to compare non-gateway to gateway migrants with the entire population of interstate migrants. As can be seen, these migrants are more likely to be young, well educated, and European or Asian as compared with interstate migrants as a group. The differences in unemployment or poverty level income are not significant. Comparing the results from Model 3 in Table 10 and Table 11 confirm what the descriptive analysis had suggested: the characteristics of the gateway to non-gateway flow versus the non-gateway to gateway flow are very different, with the latter group being more positively selected in terms of educational attainment and income as compared with the former.

Table 12 examines the characteristics of foreign born residents who were abroad in 1995 who reside in non-gateway states relative to those who reside in gateway states. While the descriptive results in Table 9 had suggested relatively minor differences, Table 12 shows that differences in educational attainment are statistically significant, and that migrants from abroad who reside in non-gateway states were less likely to be unemployed, which reflects economic conditions in non-gateway states as well as employment-related characteristics of migrants. Additionally, non-gateway states were significantly more likely to receive immigrants from Africa, and quite a bit less likely to receive immigrants from the Caribbean and South America, relative to the gateway states.

Finally, Table 13 models the determinants of being an interstate migrant of any type. Foreign born residents living abroad in 1995 are excluded. The results confirm once more that interstate migrants are younger and better educated than are foreign born residents as a whole, although they are also more likely to be unemployed and have income below the poverty level. Interstate migration shows a u-shaped pattern with regard to year of entry. Foreign born residents entering the United States between 1990 and 1994 were more likely to have migrated to another state between 1995 and 2000 than were those in the excluded group, those who entered before 1980. Foreign born residents entering between 1980 and 1989 were less likely to have migrated to another state as compared with the excluded group. Finally, the results of Table 13 lend support to initial descriptive findings regarding the likelihood of interstate migration among gateway state residents as opposed to non-gateway state residents. Those foreign born residents who resided in a gateway state in 1995 were significantly less likely to have moved to another state as compared with non-gateway state residents. The point estimate of .504 is very consistent with results from Table 2 which showed that residents of gateway states in 1995 were approximately half as likely as residents of non-gateway states to have moved to another state between 1995 and 2000

Discussion
Results presented here suggest that despite negative net exchanges, outmigration from gateway states occurred at a lower rate than did that from non-gateway states between 1995 and 2000. In general, interstate migration was positively selected, relative to intrastate migration. However, a far greater share of the mobility among the foreign born came from intra-state as opposed to inter-state migration, and much of this mobility occurs within gateway states. Thus the significance of the gateway states as a long run

immigrant destination remains, and a considerable amount of the mobility of the foreign born population is occurring within gateway states.

The characteristics of foreign born residents in gateway and non-gateway states are dissimilar, with the foreign born residents of non-gateway states being on average better educated and more likely to originate from Europe and Asia as opposed to Mexico. Caribbean and South American immigrants reveal a strong preference for gateway states, while Africans are more likely to reside in non-gateway states. Some of this pattern among Africans is due to refugee resettlement programs. Yet trends in international and domestic migration are working to lessen these differences between gateway and non-gateway states. New arrivals to gateway and non-gateway states differ less than the existing stock of foreign born in these two groups of states. Similarly, inter-state migration transfers relatively low education, largely Mexican immigrants to non-gateway states in exchange for better educated immigrants who are more likely to originate from Europe or Asia. Over time, these trends should serve to lessen differences in the foreign born populations of these two groups of states.

While interstate migration in general is positively selective, the base from which these migrants are selected is quite different when gateway states are compared to non-gateway states. So while interstate migrants from gateway states are above average educational attainment for gateway states, they are well below average for non-gateway states. Immigrants from abroad who choose non-gateway destinations are younger and better educated than those choosing gateway states, but these differences appear to be diminishing over time.

It is interesting to note that despite being positively selected with regard to educational attainment, interstate migrants as a group are disproportionately likely to be unemployed. This result is difficult to interpret as it reflects both employment-related characteristics of migrants as well as economic conditions in their destinations. While interstate migrants as a group are more likely to be unemployed, those migrating from gateway states to non-gateway states are not significantly more likely to be unemployed than gateway residents as whole, and are significantly less likely to be unemployed than are those gateway state residents who migrated to other gateway states. The employment orientation of the stream of migrants, both native born as well as foreign born to certain non-gateway states such as Nevada and North Carolina is well known, and has been described frequently in the popular media. The availability of work in these states is also linked to the rapid rise in their undocumented population.

For migrants from non-gateway states, however, the probability of being unemployed is higher both as compared to all residents of non-gateway states and also when compared to interstate migrants from non-gateway states who migrated to other non-gateway states. These migrants have noticeably higher levels of educational attainment as compared with all other interstate migrants, so it is interesting that they are the most likely to be unemployed. Among U.S. residents as whole, interstate migration is in general positively selected, and among the better educated is tied closely to job opportunities and often job transfers. These well educated foreign born migrants from non-gateway states may be

seeking positions in occupations where the job market is tighter, or perhaps they are having difficulty translating their post-secondary education received abroad to an appropriate employment situation in the United States. These migrants are also more likely than interstate migrants from gateway states to not be in the labor force, yet are less likely to be married. Future work should explore more fully the occupations and employment of these interstate migrants, and could perhaps shed more light on the somewhat unexpected combination of educational attainment and unemployment.

This exploration of interstate migration among the foreign born has in general not supported the notion that the gateway states are "losing their hold" on their foreign born population. Yet major trends are at work which, if continued, will ultimately reduce the population of gateway states relative to non-gateway states. Net migration rates between the two groups of states are negative. While there is more interstate migration among residents of non-gateway states, relatively little of it is directed to gateway states. Further, new immigrants from abroad are increasingly choosing non-gateway states as initial destinations. So while it is fair to say to say that gateway states are holding on to their populations of foreign born residents, little is occurring to increase the size of these populations. Over time, the importance of non-gateway states as initial and secondary destinations for immigrants appears to be growing, and the differences between the foreign born populations of gateway and non-gateway states appear to be diminishing.

References

Frey, William H. 2003. Metropolitan Magnets for International and Domestic Migrants. Living Cities Census Series, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. Washington, D.C.,: The Brookings Institution.

Frey, William H., 2002. Metro magnets for minorities and whites: Melting pots, the new sunbelt and heartland. Research Report No. 02-496, Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Population Studies Center.

Frey, William and Liaw, Kao-Lee. 1998. The impact of recent immigration on population redistribution within the United States. In, The immigration debate: Studies of the economic, demographic, and fiscal effects of immigration, edited by James P. Smith and Barry Edmonston. Washington, DC: National Academy Press: 388-448.

Gober, Patricia. 2000. "Americans on the move" Population Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau.

Hempstead, Katherine. 2001. Immigration and net migration in New York City, 1980-1990: A small area analysis. Policy Studies Journal, 29: 92-107.

Hempstead, Katherine. 2003. Immigration and native-born migration in New York City, 1985-1990. Population Research and Policy Review, 22: 333-349.

Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research, 2001. The new Latinos: Who they are, where they are. Albany, NY: Lewis Mumford Center, University of Albany.

Liaw, Kao-Lee, and William H. Frey, 1998. Destination choices of 1985-1990: Young immigrants to the United States: Importance of race, educational attainment, and labor force. International Journal of Population Geography, 4:49-61.

McHugh, Kevin E. 1989. Hispanic migration and population redistribution in the United States. Professional Geographer, 41(4): 429-439.

Passell, Jeffrey, Estimates of the size and characteristics of the undocumented population. Pew Hispanic Center, http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/44.pdf. March 21, 2005.

Singer, Audrey, 2004. "New Immigrant Gateways", Living Cities Survey Series, Washington D.C., The Brookings Institution, Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy.

Smith, Heather Anne. 2004. Housing, Hispanics, and Transitioning Geographies in Charlotte, North Carolina. Southeastern Geographer, 44:2, 216-35.

Suro, Roberto and Singer, Audrey. 2002. Latino growth in metropolitan America: Changing patterns, new locations. Census 2000 Survey Series. Washington DC: The Brookings Institute.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2002. Demographic trends in the 20th century. Census 2000 Special Reports CENSR-4. Washington D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.

Waldinger, Roger, 2001. "Strangers at the gates", in Waldinger, ed., Strangers at the gates, New immigrants in urban America. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Walker, R., Ellis, Mark, and Barff, Richard. 1992. Linked migration systems: Immigration and internal labor flows in states. Economic Geography, 68:238-48.

White, Michael, and Yoshe, Imai.1994. The impact of U.S. immigration upon internal migration. Population and Environment, 15:189-202.

Wright, Richard A., Ellis, Mark, and Reibel, Michael. 1997. The linkage between immigration and internal migration in large metropolitan areas in the United States. Economic Geography, 73:234-254.

Table 1. Migration of foreign born residents between gateway and non-gateway states,

Residence in 1995	Residence in 2000		
	Gateway	Non-gateway	Total
Gateway state (N)	18580000	854048	19430000
Percent	95.6	4.4	100
Non-gateway state (N)	481568	6859662	7341230
Percent	6.6	93.4	100
Lived abroad (N)	3590002	2186927	5776929
Percent	62.1	37.9	100
Total	22650000	9900637	32550000
Percent	69.6	30.4	100

Net Migration Rates		
Gateway states	Domestic	Total
1995-2000	-1.77%	15.29%
Annual	-0.35%	3.06%
Non-gateway states		
1995-2000	4.32%	29.69%
Annual	0.86%	5.94%

2000 PUMS, 5% sample. Gateway states are California, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Texas.

Table 2. Mobility of foreign born population between 1995 and 2000, by residence in 1995 and year of entry

	Year of entry			
	All foreign born		1990-1999	
Mobility	Other	Gateway	Other	Gateway
Stayed in residence	49.4	52.7	34	38.2
Moved within PUMA	8.1	1.8	10.4	2.2
Moved within state	27.9	38.1	37.2	49.6
Moved to another state	14.6	7.5	18.5	10

	Year of entry			
	1980-1989		Before 1980	
Mobility	Other	Gateway	Other	Gateway
Stayed in residence	45.8	49.4	63.3	67
Moved within PUMA	8.6	1.7	6.2	1.5
Moved within state	30.1	41.4	19.5	26.1
Moved to another state	15.5	7.5	11.1	5.5

2000 PUMS, 5% sample. Gateway states are California, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Texas. Excludes those not resident in United States in 1995. "PUMA" = Public Use Micro Area, geographical area used in 2000 PUMS.

Table 3. Mobility of foreign born population between 1995 and 2000, by residence in 2000

Residence in 2000	Residence in 1995				
	Same address	Same PUMA	Same state	Another state	Abroad
Non-gateway state	36.6	6	20.7	14.6	22.1
Gateway state	45.2	1.5	32.7	4.8	15.9
California	44.7	1	38.1	2.8	13.5
Florida	41.7	1.2	30.3	22.5	17.7
Illinois	43.3	0.7	31.9	5.5	18.6
Masachusetts	44.7	11.9	16.2	7.6	19.8
New Jersey	46.2	0.3	28.1	7.9	17.5
New York	53.5	0.3	28.1	3.1	15
Texas	40.2	3.3	31.1	6.4	19

2000 PUMS, 5% sample.
"PUMA" = Public Use Micro Area, geographical area used in 2000 PUMS

Table 4. Non-gateway states ranked by total foreign-born migrants, 1995-2000

	From gateway States	From other States	From Abroad	Total
Georgia	75299	40497	181663	297459
North Carolina	56297	36360	143338	235995
Arizona	57014	30461	145882	233357
Virginia	41100	43350	141325	225775
Washington	47920	33471	132759	214150
Michigan	33158	21404	123727	178289
Maryland	29314	35489	108312	173115
Colorado	42107	26907	101407	170421
Pennsylvania	43008	22027	102320	167355
Nevada	61733	18690	59969	140392
Ohio	22282	21784	77374	121440
Oregon	24979	19375	65585	109939
Connecticut	27528	9191	70847	107566
Minnesota	21874	17393	66037	105304
Tennessee	20019	18308	51333	89660
Indiana	22966	12260	53744	88970
Utah	18059	9570	46129	73758
Missouri	15945	13141	42856	71942
Wisconsin	17104	10101	43130	70335
South Carolina	13999	15333	37093	66425
Kansas	15829	12019	36832	64680
Oklahoma	13747	9127	36107	58981
Hawaii	9956	7389	32734	50079
Iowa	8303	6982	30498	45783
New Mexico	12711	7644	24861	45216
Kentucky	9232	9347	26387	44966
Alabama	8700	10896	25052	44648
Louisiana	12728	8505	20371	41604
Nebraska	9267	7655	20840	37762
Arkansas	11214	4830	19643	35687
District of Columbia	4356	8649	21579	34584
Rhode Island	8172	3567	16574	28313
Idaho	5849	5454	13888	25191
Mississippi	5743	5303	10112	21158
New Hampshire	5495	3463	10594	19552
Delaware	4858	4350	10312	19520
Alaska	4678	4961	6325	15964
Maine	2905	2685	6449	12039
West Virginia	1660	2857	4507	9024
Vermont	1862	1965	4880	8707

South Dakota	1153	2226	5000	8379
Montana	1851	2812	3256	7919
North Dakota	957	1732	2911	5600
Wyoming	1117	1803	2385	5305

Source: 5% 2000 PUMS, excludes intrastate migrants and non-migrants

Table 4a. Non-gateway states ranked by domestic and international foreign-born in-migrants, 1995-2000

Top ten receiving foreign born migrants from gateway states

		Interstate			
		From gateway	**From other**	**International**	**Total**
1	Georgia	**75299**	40497	181663	297459
2	Nevada	**61733**	18690	59969	140392
3	Arizona	**57014**	30461	145882	233357
4	North Carolina	**56297**	36360	143338	235995
5	Washington	**47920**	33471	132759	214150
6	Pennsylvania	**43008**	22027	102320	167355
7	Colorado	**42107**	26907	101407	170421
8	Virginia	**41100**	43350	141325	225775
9	Michigan	**33158**	21404	123727	178289
10	Maryland	**29314**	35489	108312	173115

Top ten receiving foreign born migrants from non-gateway states

		Interstate			
		From gateway	**From other**	**International**	**Total**
1	Virginia	41100	**43350**	141325	225775
2	Georgia	75299	**40497**	181663	297459
3	North Carolina	56297	**36360**	143338	235995
4	Maryland	29314	**35489**	108312	173115
5	Washington	47920	**33471**	132759	214150
6	Arizona	57014	**30461**	145882	233357
7	Colorado	42107	**26907**	101407	170421
8	Pennsylvania	43008	**22027**	102320	167355
9	Ohio	22282	**21784**	77374	121440
10	Michigan	33158	**21404**	123727	178289

Top ten receiving foreign born migrants from abroad

		Interstate			
		From gateway	**From other**	**International**	**Total**
1	Georgia	75299	40497	**181663**	297459
2	Arizona	57014	30461	**145882**	233357
3	North Carolina	56297	36360	**143338**	235995
4	Virginia	41100	43350	**141325**	225775
5	Washington	47920	33471	**132759**	214150
6	Michigan	33158	21404	**123727**	178289

7 Maryland	29314	35489	**108312**	173115
8 Pennsylvania	43008	22027	**102320**	167355
9 Colorado	42107	26907	**101407**	170421
10 Ohio	22282	21784	**77374**	121440

Source: 5% PUMS, 2000 Census, excludes intrastate migrants and non-migrants

Table 5. Characteristics of residents of gateway and non-gateway states, 2000

	Gateway	Non-gateway
Country of Origin (%)		
Europe	15.8	25.6
Asia	25.3	30.9
Mexico	30.9	24.8
Central America	7.0	5.6
South America	7.0	4.4
Caribbean	11.9	4.0
Africa	2.2	4.8
Year of Entry (%)		
1995-1999	20.9	27.6
1990-1994	18.1	17.6
1980-1989	28.9	22.9
Before 1980	32.2	31.9
Educational attainment (%)		
Less than high school	39.8	32.4
High school degree	19.6	20.6
Some college	19.5	21.3
Undergraduate degree	12.7	14.4
Post-graduate	8.4	11.3
Home owner (%)	51.0	57.2

Weighted data from 2000 PUMS 5%

Table 6. Characteristics of residents of gateway and non-gateway states by year of entry

		Before 1980	1980-1989	1990-1994	1995-1999
Country of Origin (%)					
Europe	**Non-gateway**	45.7	16.2	17.7	16.8
	Gateway	26.3	8.6	12.4	12.7
Asia	**Non-gateway**	28.2	37.3	32.9	27.2
	Gateway	21.5	28.6	26.8	25.1
Mexico	**Non-gateway**	12.2	24.9	30.1	35.1
	Gateway	26.4	31.7	33.7	34.1
Central America	**Non-gateway**	3.0	7.6	6.6	6.0
	Gateway	4.5	9.9	7.2	6.5
South America	**Non-gateway**	3.8	4.6	4.0	5.0
	Gateway	5.8	7.1	6.9	9.0
Caribbean	**Non-gateway**	4.6	4.9	3.7	2.8
	Gateway	13.9	12.0	10.8	9.4
Africa	**Non-gateway**	2.6	4.6	4.9	7.1
	Gateway	1.5	2.1	2.1	3.3
Educational attainment (%)					
Less than high school	**Non-gateway**	24.81	35.03	38.03	37.6
	Gateway	37	41.53	42.11	40.32
High school degree	**Non-gateway**	22.01	20.25	19.78	19.45
	Gateway	19.49	19.44	20.16	19.57
Some college	**Non-gateway**	25.08	21.69	18.24	17.1
	Gateway	21.47	20.14	17.94	16.18
Undergraduate degree	**Non-gateway**	15.83	13.09	12.65	14.69
	Gateway	13.02	12.04	11.77	14.12
Post-graduate	**Non-gateway**	12.27	9.93	11.3	11.17
	Gateway	9.02	6.85	8.02	9.81

Weighted data from 2000 PUMS 5%

Table 7. Characteristics of foreign born residents of gateway and non-gateway states, by residence in 1995 and mobility status

		Mobility Status			
		Local	Intra-state	Inter-state	
Gateway resident in 1995	**Stayer**	**Migrant**	**Migrant**	**Migrant**	**Total**
Country of Origin (%)					
Europe	18.8	18.6	11.8	16.1	15.9
Asia	25.1	14.0	23.6	29.9	24.7
Mexico	28.3	50.4	35.6	25.8	31.3
Central America	6.5	3.9	8.6	7.3	7.3
South America	6.4	3.8	6.8	7.1	6.6
Caribbean	13.3	7.3	11.7	10.7	12.4
Africa	1.8	2.1	1.9	3.1	1.9
Educational attainment (%)					
Less than high school	41.0	50.2	40.7	31.7	40.3
High school degree	20.3	19.8	19.4	18.6	19.8
Some college	19.7	17.1	20.6	20.9	20.1
Undergraduate degree	11.6	7.5	12.3	15.7	12.1
Post-graduate	7.4	5.5	7.0	13.2	7.7
Total	52.6	1.7	38.3	7.4	
Non-Gateway resident in 1995					
Country of Origin (%)					
Europe	33.6	26.0	23.1	26.3	28.9
Asia	32.8	18.1	32.6	41.4	32.8
Mexico	17.5	37.8	25.2	14.2	20.9
Central America	4.5	6.6	6.2	4.7	5.2
South America	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.0
Caribbean	4.1	4.8	3.8	4.4	4.1
Africa	3.5	2.6	5.1	4.7	4.1
Educational attainment (%)					
Less than high school	31.5	42.1	30.6	19.2	30.3
High school degree	22.4	23.0	20.2	16.2	21.0
Some college	22.1	19.7	23.3	23.9	22.5
Undergraduate degree	13.3	9.0	15.5	20.1	14.6
Post-graduate	10.7	6.3	10.4	20.6	11.7
Total	48.9	8.1	28.4	14.6	

Weighted data from 2000 PUMS 5%

Foreign born residents living abroad in 1995 are excluded

Table 8. Characteristics of foreign-born interstate migrants, 1995-2000

Origin:	Gateway state			Non-Gateway state		
Destination:	Gateway	Non-gateway	Total	Gateway	Non-gateway	Total
Country of origin (%)						
Europe	16.5	15.9	**16.1**	22.8	29.2	**26.3**
Asia	32.1	28.3	**29.9**	44.0	39.2	**41.4**
Mexico	16.5	32.4	**25.8**	14.4	13.9	**14.2**
Central America	6.4	7.8	**7.3**	4.3	5.1	**4.7**
South America	10.2	4.9	**7.1**	5.1	3.5	**4.2**
Caribbean	15.4	7.3	**10.7**	5.7	3.4	**4.4**
Africa	2.8	3.4	**3.1**	3.7	5.6	**4.7**
Educational attainment (%)						
Less than high school	26.5	35.4	**31.7**	18.9	19.4	**19.2**
High school degree	18.0	18.9	**18.6**	15.4	16.9	**16.2**
Some college	21.3	20.6	**20.9**	22.3	25.2	**23.9**
Undergraduate degree	18.6	13.6	**15.7**	20.9	19.5	**20.1**
Post-graduate	15.5	11.5	**13.2**	22.6	19.0	**20.6**
Total (row)	24.3	33.9		19.2	22.6	

Weighted data from 2000 PUMS 5%

Foreign born residents living abroad in 1995 are excluded

Table 9. Characteristics of immigrants living abroad in 1995 by gateway state status in 2000

Country of origin (%)	Type of state of residence in 2000	
	Gateway	Non-gateway
Europe	14.1	18
Asia	26.9	28.5
Mexico	31.2	32.7
Central America	6.9	5.6
South America	9.5	5.3
Caribbean	8.8	2.6
Africa	3.4	7.3
Educational attainment (%)		
Less than high school	38.5	35.8
High school degree	18.7	18.8
Some college	16	17.1
Undergraduate degree	15.6	15.8
Post-graduate	11.3	12.5

Weighted data from 2000 PUMS 5%
Foreign born residents living in the United States in 1995 are excluded

Table 10. Coefficients for a binomial logistic regression model of the determinants of interstate migration from gateway to non-gateway states, 1995-2000

	Model 1: All gateway state residents in 1995			Model 2: All interstate migrants from gateway states			Model 3: All interstate migrants		
	b	s.e.	e^b	b	s.e.	e^b	b	s.e.	e^b
Male	0.135	0.003	1.144	0.005	0.004	1.005	0.019	0.003	1.019
18-24 years	1.055	0.005	2.873	0.308	0.007	1.361 NS	-0.018	0.006	0.982
25-34 years	0.941	0.004	2.562	0.125	0.005	1.134	-0.067	0.004	0.935
35-44 years	0.486	0.004	1.625	0.071	0.005	1.074	-0.026	0.005	0.974
Less than high school	-0.587	0.005	0.556	0.271	0.007	1.311	0.632	0.006	1.881
High school only	-0.569	0.005	0.566	0.260	0.007	1.297	0.485	0.006	1.624
Some college	-0.543	0.005	0.581	0.210	0.007	1.233	0.344	0.005	1.410
Bachelor's degree	-0.401	0.005	0.670	-0.040	0.007	0.961	0.137	0.006	1.147
Married	0.066	0.003	1.068	0.098	0.004	1.103	0.058	0.003	1.060
Unemployed	-0.001	0.006	0.999 NS	-0.087	0.009	0.917	0.018	0.007	1.019
Not in labor force	-0.152	0.003	0.859	-0.152	0.004	0.859	-0.053	0.004	0.949
Income below poverty level	0.257	0.003	1.293	0.045	0.005	1.046	0.030	0.004	1.030
European	-0.092	0.005	0.912	-0.192	0.007	0.825	-0.420	0.006	0.657
Asian	-0.061	0.004	0.941	-0.366	0.006	0.693	-0.326	0.005	0.722
Caribbean	-0.667	0.006	0.513	-0.734	0.008	0.480	-0.237	0.007	0.789
African	0.321	0.008	1.379	0.111	0.012	1.117	-0.204	0.009	0.815
Mexican	-0.202	0.004	0.817	-0.259	0.008	0.772	0.475	0.006	1.608
South America	-0.496	0.007	0.609	-0.843	0.008	0.430	-0.352	0.008	0.703
California	-0.102	0.005	0.903	0.566	0.007	1.761			
Texas	-0.049	0.006	0.953	0.314	0.008	1.368			
Massachusetts	0.037	0.008	1.037	-0.290	0.011	0.749			
New Jersey	-0.161	0.007	0.851	-0.493	0.009	0.611			
New York	-0.076	0.006	0.927	-0.486	0.008	0.615			
Florida	0.181	0.006	1.199	0.214	0.009	1.239			
Intercept	-2.981	0.008		0.272	0.011		-0.899	0.008	

Source: 2000 PUMS 5%. Universe is foreign born residents aged 18-59 years. Excluded categories are age 45-59 years, Central American, post-graduate education, Illinois resident in 1995. All coefficients significant with p=.001 unless noted.

Table 11. Coefficients for a binomial logistic regression model of the determinants of interstate migration from non-gateway to gateway states, 1995-2000

	Model 1: All non-gateway state residents in 1995			Model 2: All interstate migrants from non-gateway states			Model 3: All interstate migrants		
	b	**s.e.**	e^b	**b**	**s.e.**	e^b	**b**	**s.e.**	e^b
Male	0.066	0.003	1.068	-0.004	0.005	0.996 NS	-0.019	0.004	0.981
18-24 years	0.968	0.007	2.631	-0.104	0.008	0.901	0.070	0.007	1.073
25-34 years	1.068	0.005	2.909	-0.009	0.007	0.991 NS	0.082	0.005	1.086
35-44 years	0.571	0.005	1.770	-0.002	0.007	0.998 NS	0.012	0.006	1.012 *p=.03*
Less than high school	-1.400	0.006	0.247	-0.379	0.008	0.685	-0.688	0.007	0.503
High school only	-1.248	0.006	0.287	-0.358	0.008	0.699	-0.528	0.006	0.590
Some college	-0.947	0.005	0.388	-0.321	0.007	0.725	-0.375	0.006	0.687
Bachelor's degree	-0.485	0.005	0.616	-0.121	0.007	0.886	-0.202	0.006	0.817
Married	-0.102	0.004	0.904	-0.135	0.005	0.874	-0.087	0.004	0.916
Unemployed	0.220	0.009	1.246	0.155	0.012	1.168	0.004	0.009	1.004 NS
Not in labor force	0.170	0.004	1.185	0.160	0.006	1.174	0.087	0.004	1.091
Income below poverty level	0.309	0.005	1.362	-0.002	0.007	0.998 NS	-0.002	0.005	0.998 NS
European	-0.136	0.007	0.873	-0.113	0.009	0.893	0.180	0.007	1.197
Asian	0.315	0.006	1.370	0.266	0.008	1.304	0.324	0.007	1.382
Caribbean	0.484	0.009	1.622	0.636	0.013	1.889	-0.262	0.009	0.770
African	-0.156	0.010	0.856	-0.183	0.013	0.833	-0.011	0.011	0.989 NS
Mexican	-0.150	0.008	0.861	0.305	0.010	1.356	-0.137	0.008	0.872
South America	0.325	0.010	1.384	0.526	0.013	1.691	-0.083	0.010	0.921
Intercept	-2.657	0.011		-0.073	0.014		-1.199	0.009	

Source: 2000 PUMS 5%. Universe is foreign born residents aged 18-59 years. Excluded categories are age 45-59 years, Central American, post-graduate education. State dummies included in Models 1 and 2, but not shown. All coefficients significant with p=.001 unless noted.

Table 12. Coefficients for a binomial logistic regression model of the determinants of international immigration to non-gateway to gateway states, 1995-2000

	b	s.e.	e^b
Male	0.062	0.002	1.064
18-24 years	0.284	0.004	1.328
25-34 years	0.181	0.003	1.199
35-44 years	0.103	0.004	1.108
Less than high school	-0.133	0.004	0.875
High school only	-0.030	0.004	0.971
Some college	-0.005	0.004	0.995 NS
Bachelor's degree	-0.093	0.004	0.911
Married	0.149	0.002	1.161
Unemployed	-0.234	0.005	0.791
Not in labor force	-0.160	0.002	0.853
Income below poverty level	0.087	0.002	1.091
European	-0.031	0.004	0.970
Asian	-0.137	0.004	0.872
Caribbean	-1.337	0.006	0.263
African	0.528	0.005	1.695
Mexican	-0.118	0.004	0.888
South America	-0.767	0.005	0.465
Intercept	-0.491	0.006	

Source: 2000 PUMS 5%. Universe is foreign born residents aged 18-59 years residing abroad in 1995. Excluded categories are age 45-59 years,

Excluded categories are age 45-59 years, Central American, post-graduate education. All coefficients significant with p=.001 unless noted.

Table 13. Coefficients for a binomial logistic regression model of the determinants of interstate migration, 1995-2000

	b	s.e.	e^b
Male	0.112	0.002	1.118
18-24 years	1.038	0.003	2.822
25-34 years	1.040	0.002	2.829
35-44 years	0.558	0.002	1.747
Less than high school	-1.041	0.003	0.353
High school only	-0.952	0.003	0.386
Some college	-0.793	0.003	0.453
Bachelor's degree	-0.470	0.003	0.625
Married	0.011	0.002	1.011
Unemployed	0.077	0.004	1.080
Not in labor force	-0.031	0.002	0.970
Income below poverty level	0.311	0.002	1.364
European	-0.056	0.003	0.946
Asian	0.068	0.003	1.070
Caribbean	-0.113	0.004	0.893
African	0.101	0.005	1.106
Mexican	-0.359	0.003	0.699
South America	-0.024	0.004	0.976
Entered U.S. 1990-94	0.143	0.002	1.154
Entered U.S. 1980-89	-0.048	0.002	0.953
Gateway resident 1995	-0.684	0.002	0.504
Intercept	-1.645	0.004	

Source: 2000 PUMS 5%. Universe is foreign born residents aged 18-59 years.

Those residing abroad in 1995 are excluded.

Excluded categories are age 45-59 years, Central American, post-graduate education.

All coefficients significant with p=.001 unless noted.