Location of recent immigrants: Lessons from New Jersey

Katherine Hempstead
Rutgers University
September 23, 2004
khempstead@cshp.rutgers.edu

Abstract:

New Jersey is a major immigration destination state, currently ranking fifth in the nation in terms of annual flows of new legal immigrants. New Jersey was also a major destination during the "second wave" of immigration that occurred in the late 19th/early 20th century. The foreign born population of New Jersey is diverse with respect to country of origin and year of entry, and is geographically decentralized when compared with other gateway states. This examination of New Jersey municipalities uses census data to analyze the settlement patterns of recent immigrants. Popular immigration destinations are characterized by below average population growth between 1970-1990, providing some support for the "replacement" theory of immigrant settlement. There are significant variations in destination by country of origin, and quite a bit of consistency with popular immigrant destinations from the early twentieth century.

DRAFT

Location of recent immigrants: Evidence from New Jersey

Introduction:

I. Introduction

The literature on immigrant settlement and adaptation describes well the tendency for new foreign born residents to reside near co-ethnics in largely urbanized areas (Piore, 1979). In fact, the geographical concentration of the foreign born population in the United States is notorious (Frey, 1998). While the social capital and labor market opportunities facilitated by ethnic enclaves is thought to be beneficial to new immigrants, there are some perceived disadvantages to these residential patterns. In particular, a highly concentrated immigrant population may have some adverse effects for receiving communities. The growth of ethnic enclaves in metropolitan areas has the potential to increase housing prices (Saiz, 2003; Borgas, 2002; Ley and Tutchener, 2001). The fiscal burden on local governments, school systems, and health clinics, for example, has been severe in some locations. The controversy surrounding California's failed Proposition 187, and the filing of law suits by the six leading immigrant host states against the federal government reveal some of the fiscal stresses and federalist arguments that can emerge when the effects of immigration are highly localized (Garvey and Espenshade, 1997; Clark, 1998).

The influx of immigration to certain states and metropolitan areas has been correlated with relatively high rates of negative net domestic migration. A debate remains in the literature over whether immigration and domestic migration are causally related. Some argue that immigrants "displace" native residents through labor market competition, upward pressure on housing prices, congestion of public services, and local tax increases, while others suggest that immigrants seek locations that were already in the process of losing population, and thus "replace" rather than "displace" the native born. On balance, empirical evidence has been more supportive of the replacement hypothesis. (Card, 2001; Card and DeNardo, 2000; Ellis and Wright, 1998; Filer, 1992; Frey 1995a, 1995b; Hempstead, 2001, 2004; Kritz and Gurak, 2001; White and Imai, 1994; Wright, Ellis and Reibel, 1997)

At the same time, many metropolitan areas have thus far been essentially passed over by this wave of immigration, and protest that this places them at a competitive disadvantage. Philadelphia is one prominent metropolitan area that has tried to develop policies to attract immigrants. Pittsburgh has taken similar steps. Even during the discussion of the depopulation of the Great Plains states and the resulting proposal for a "New Homestead

Act" which took place in Congress last year, the prospect of luring immigrants to the Plains with various incentives was raised. (Schaffer, 2000; New Homestead Act, 2003)

There are a number of reasons, therefore to speculate that a less geographically concentrated foreign born population might have some advantages for host environments, both for areas that currently may argue that they have too many immigrants as well as those areas that complain that they have too few. Yet it is fairly well established that immigrants themselves benefit from the existence of networks of co-ethnics, for both social, cultural, and economic reasons, at least during the early years of their tenure in the U.S. (Gross and Scmitt, 2003). The characteristics of U.S. immigration policy, with its emphasis on family reunification, also serves to concentrate co-ethnics residentially.

Recent research on immigrant settlement suggests some alternatives to traditional notions of ethnic concentration and dispersion. In particular, the traditional "straight line" assimilation model in which immigrants first reside in ethnic enclaves and later decentralize as they gain income and experience in the host society has been joined by several alternatives. The notion of "cultural pluralism" suggests that assimilation into the host society is not necessarily desired, but this is not necessarily inconsistent with residential decentralization. The concept of "heterolocalism" suggests that residential concentration may not be necessary to retain close ethnic ties (Zelinsky and Lee, 1998) Studies of immigrant settlement in major metropolitan areas suggests that decentralization and suburbanization occur in different ways for various country of origin groups, and that suburbanization and "assimilation" should not necessarily be equated . In California, the D.C. metro area, and other locations, suburbanization of new immigrants has occurred in ways which are highly ethnically concentrated (Alba and Logan, 1991; Allan and Turner, 1996; Newbold and Spindler, 2001; Li, 1998).

In very recent years, there has been some evidence that the foreign born population is dispersing. The 2000 census reveals a level of increased outmigration of the foreign born from traditional gateway states, particularly, California and New York. A negative net outmigration from gateway states that was once virtually all native born white now includes native and foreign born blacks, Hispanics and Asians. These foreign born outmigrants are drawn to many of the same destinations that are attractive to native born migrants – sunbelt destinations such as North Carolina, Las Vegas, and Phoenix. Additionally, the percentage of new arrivals from abroad initially entering one of the "big six" destination states has declined from approximately 70 percent to closer to 55 percent (Frey, 2003). Together these two trends suggest that the foreign born population may be becoming less centralized, as a result of both primary and secondary location decisions. (Strengthen)(INS and check Frey again)

In the context of these potential trends towards a more decentralized immigrant population, New Jersey constitutes an interesting location in which to examine immigrant settlement patterns. New Jersey is one of the big six gateway states, and has a sizable foreign born population. New Jersey's immigrants are diverse with respect to country of origin and year of entry. Further, New Jersey was an important destination during the second wave of immigration which occurred between approximately 1880 and 1920. Relative to other gateway states, New Jersey's immigrant population is geographically

decentralized and includes many secondary as well as primary migrants. While the state has experienced negative net migration of the native born population over the last decade, this outward flow has thus far not been joined by the foreign born.

This examination of immigrant location in New Jersey is designed to provide some insight into where recent immigrants locate and characteristics of immigrant destinations. The residential patterns of the foreign born population are analyzed at the municipality level, using data from the 2000 census as well as some historical census data. The goal of is to learn where recent immigrants reside, and what characterizes those municipalities which have experienced a large increase in their foreign born population. Further, we wish to know whether these characteristics differ for various country of origin groups, and how current immigrant location in New Jersey differs from that experienced during the "second wave" of immigration. Additionally, the 2000 PUMS 5% sample is used to analyze the inter-state and intra-state migration of the foreign born. Patterns of movement by the foreign born in and out of New Jersey are compared with those of the other gateway states, and the characteristics of the destinations of primary and secondary migrants are compared.

Data and methods

The STF3 file of the 2000 census was used to create municipality level data on the foreign born population by country of origin and year of entry. Additionally data from the 1950 and 1920 censuses were obtained to permit comparison between the third and second waves of immigration.

Results

New Jersey as a an immigrant destination

New Jersey has been an important destination state in the most recent wave of immigration, which dates from approximately 1965. Since the 1980s, New Jersey has ranked among the top six states in terms of annual numbers of new legal immigrants. Currently, the state ranks behind Texas, Florida, New York and California, but above Illinois and Massachusetts. In 2002, nearly 60,000 legal immigrants declared New Jersey to be their intended state of residence. This represents a slight increase over the approximately 50,000 new immigrants that New Jersey received on average each year during the 1990s. (Table 1)

Statistics on annual arrivals of legal immigrants come from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and are inaccurate in that they measure the bureaucratic event of obtaining permanent legal status rather than actual physical arrival in a particular locale. Often, "new" legal immigrants as measured by the INS have actually resided in their state of intended residence for a number of years, and at the same time there are other immigrants awaiting the processing of their application for permanent residence that are uncounted. Illegal immigrants are of course not included in these INS statistics. As seen

in Figure 1, there are noticeable year to year fluctuations in INS arrival numbers, and these can represent changes in policy and/or bureaucratic efficiency rather than true changes in immigration flows. However, the INS series on annual flows provides a usable proxy for the true annual flow of new immigrants, and is valuable both for its frequency of publication and the specificity of the geographic information (INS, 2003).

The INS data is the best available source for examining the flow of immigration, but for information on the stock of the foreign born population, the best source is the U.S. Census, which provides many detailed characteristics of the foreign born, including their year of arrival. New Jersey ranks fourth in terms of the proportion of the population which is foreign born, which was 14.9% in 2000. New Jersey was also an important destination state during the second wave of immigration, which took place primarily between 1880 and 1920, and there is some diversity with regard to year of entry among the foreign born population in the state. Of New Jersey's foreign born population, approximately 30% entered the U.S. prior to 1980, a little less than 30% entered between 1980 and 1990, and approximately 40% entered since 1990. So while the foreign born population is dominated by recent arrivals, and while the vast majority of the "second wave" is of course deceased, there remains some diversity in year of origin.

Like New York, New Jersey has a diverse population of immigrants in terms of country of origin as well as year of entry. Table 2 shows the distribution of new arrivals by country of origin for major destination states. While Mexicans clearly dominate in California, Texas and Illinois, and Cubans and Haitians dominate Florida, it can be seen that New Jersey and New York lack a dominant immigrant group. Yet this does not mean that country of origin groups for New Jersey and New York are similar. The largest group in New Jersey is Asian Indians (15%) while in New York it is Dominicans (9%) Census data also reveals the diversity in New Jersey's foreign born population. As can be seen in Table 3, roughly thirty percent of New Jersey's immigrants in 2000 come from Asia, and another thirty percent from Latin America, about fifteen percent each from the Caribbean and Europe and a small share (five percent) are from Africa.

INS data suggests that recent immigrants in New Jersey are less geographically concentrated than are those in the other gateway states. Table 4 shows the percent of new legal immigrants in 2001 whose intended residence is in various cities within the major gateway states. The percentage of immigrants residing in particular cities is higher for the other gateway states than for New Jersey. As an extreme example, nearly eighty percent of New York state's new arrivals in 2001 identified New York City as their intended place of residence. In fact, each destination state has a "super city" with the possible exception of Texas, where Houston and Dallas play fairly equally important roles. However, New Jersey is different from the other gateway states on this list, since its largest immigrant destination (Newark) does not rank high on the overall list of immigrant metropolitan areas (16^{th}), and only is home to about a quarter of the state's new legal residents in 2001.

Census data also suggests that the foreign born population is less geographically concentrated in New Jersey than in the other gateway states. This can be seen by a

comparison of the proportion of immigrants residing in their top twenty destinations. (Table 5 – *I didn't do this yet, except for California – not shown, but Herf is higher in CA*) New Jersey has many municipalities (approximately 560), and is the most densely populated state in the nation, meaning that there are many urbanized locations. Of New Jersey's municipalities, some have seen their foreign born population grow exponentially, while others have not.

During the 1990s, the Hispanic population of New Jersey increased considerably, particularly the Mexican population, which rose by 258%. Puerto Ricans remain the most sizable Hispanic group, and the population of Cubans declined. The Mexican population of five Central and Southern New Jersey counties quadrupled during the decade. Asian Indians were the fastest growing Asian population, and this group increased 110% during the 1990s (New Jersey Department of Labor, 2001). At the same time, New Jersey lost native born population during the 1990s. It ranked in the top four states in terms of negative net migration. Further, more than three quarters of New Jersey's outmigrants were native born whites. In a pattern found also in other immigrant gateway states such as New York and Illinois, most outmigrants chose homes in warmer "sunbelt" states such as North Carolina or Virginia where population density and the cost of living are all lower (Frey, 2003).

Municipality Analysis

Immigrant Concentration

Table 6 shows Herfindahl indices for the foreign born in New Jersey by broad country of origin and year of entry groups. As can be seen, while the foreign born population is more concentrated than the overall population, nevertheless immigrants in New Jersey are relatively decentralized. Overall, only thirty percent of the state's foreign born populations resided in the top ten municipalities, a number far lower than that for other major destination states. Yet results vary considerably by country of origin group and year of origin. Not surprisingly, Europeans are the most decentralized group, and are also the group for which the difference between the post-1990 and the pre-1990 is the greatest. In part this is because of the existence of the prior wave of immigration in New Jersey, which was overwhelmingly European. Asian immigrants are the second most decentralized group, and there is a four percentage point difference between the most recent immigrants and all others. This may be attributed the fact that this is in general a more educated group than are immigrants from Latin America, the Caribbean, and Africa, and are therefore more likely to reside in more expensive surbuban locations. Caribbean immigrants, who mostly come from the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Jamaica, are the most concentrated group, and there is a fairly large difference between the most recent Caribbeans as compared to prior entrants. This is generally true for Africans as well, although this group is less concentrated than are Caribbeans. Mexicans, other Central Americans, and South Americans arriving since 1990 are fairly equally concentrated, although the Herfindahl index is somewhat higher for Mexicans and South Americans. There is very little difference in terms of concentration for pre-1990 and post-

1990 immigrants in Mexico and the rest of Central America, probably because this is a relatively new source of immigrants, and pre-1990 group largely arrived during the 1980s. This is less true for South Americans, which is a larger and somewhat older foreign born population.

Immigrant Destinations

Table 7 lists the top ten municipalities of residence for the foreign born population in New Jersey entering after 1990. The first six on the list were also important destinations during the second wave of immigration. In fact the percent foreign born in Jersey City today is almost exactly the same as it was in 1890 – approximately 33 percent. West New York and New Brunswick were also major immigrant destinations during the second wave. Edison Township and Woodbridge are primarily suburban locations, which actually do not appear under their current form of incorporation in historical censuses.

The next set of tables shows the top ten destinations for various country of origin groups. As has been shown, the top ten list does not account for more than a third of post 1990 immigrants overall, and accounts for no more than sixty percent of even the most concentrated group. Yet examining the top ten lists for different country of origin groups provides a useful way to see where major components of these various populations are residing. One interesting finding from this analysis is that there is relatively little overlap in these lists. There is only one city which is on every country of origin group's top ten list, and that is Jersey City.

Table 8 shows the top ten destinations of Europeans and Asians, the two most decentralized and also wealthiest immigrant groups. It can be seen that Europeans are essentially located in North Jersey, while many of the Asian destinations are in Central Jersey. Yet Asians have destinations on their top ten list in every region of the state. It is also worth noting that many of the destinations on these lists, especially for Asians, are suburban rather than urban locations.

The destinations of Africans and Caribbeans arriving after 1990 are shown in Table 9. As can be seen, these groups are far more urbanized. There are only a few suburban destinations on these lists, and they tend to be relatively urban municipalities in close proximity to Newark, such as Irvington and East Orange City. Africans are somewhat more decentralized than Caribbeans, and a few locations outside of North Jersey appear on their list, notably Trenton and Edison. However, this is a relatively small immigrant population overall, and their population is largely concentrated in the top two destinations on their list – Jersey City and Newark. Caribbeans are entirely located in North Jersey and have almost completely urban destinations, with the exception of Irvington township, which is somewhat less urbanized. These groups also tend to reside in areas with large African American populations.

Table 10 shows the top ten destinations for Mexicans, other Central Americans, and South Americans arriving after 1990. As can be seen the Mexican and other Central American distributions are similar to each other in that they are both fairly well distributed within their top ten lists. Both groups have destinations in North and Central

Jersey – New Brunswick in particular is an important locale for both groups, but especially for Mexicans. Mexicans have a number of destinations in South Jersey, which is relatively unusual for new immigrants in the state in general. In part this may be attributed to Mexican involvement in South Jersey agriculture. Overall these two lists are more different from one another than one might expect, given that these populations are relatively similar in terms of their human capital and the kinds of work they do in the United States. South Americans, a larger and older immigrant population, are completely concentrated in North Jersey, particularly in Newark.

Overall, this comparative analysis of these lists reveals a considerable lack of overlap. As noted, only Jersey City appears on every group's list. In general, recent immigrants are most likely to live in urbanized areas in North Jersey, but there are some significant exceptions. Asians, for example, have many major Central Jersey locations, and are more suburbanized than most of the other groups. Europeans also claim some surburban destinations, but they are almost exclusively in North Jersey. Mexicans and Central Americans have a number of Central Jersey destinations as well, and Mexicans have some destinations in South Jersey. Both Mexicans and other Central Americans have a non-urban destination in their top ten list – Lakewood Township for Mexicans and Bound Brook borough for Central Americans. Maps 1 – 5 provide some visual perspective on these locations, showing the municipalities in the 95th and 90th percentiles for each country of origin group's distribution.

Characteristics of immigrant destinations

When considering the comparative characteristics of municipalities which are major immigrant destinations and all other destinations, it is desirable to try to exclude endogenous characteristics which may be affected by the influx of foreign born themselves. The unemployment rate, for example, is higher in immigrant destinations than in other municipalities, but this clearly does not mean that new immigrants are attracted to areas with high unemployment rates. At the municipality level, appropriate characteristics to compare are those that involve location, housing characteristics, and historical trends in population growth. While it would also be desirable to compare socioeconomic characteristics of the native born in immigrant destinations versus other municipalities, in general this is not available at the municipality level.

Table 11 shows a set of population related characteristics for all municipalities, all top ten foreign born destinations, and the top ten destinations for different country of origin groups. As can be seen, immigrant destinations have higher average population and much higher population density than do all New Jersey municipalities, and these differences are significantly for all region of origin groups when compared with all municipalities. Most interesting is the comparison in historical population change. While overall population change was positive between 1970 and 1980, 1980 and 1990, and 1990 and 2000, the results for immigrant destinations are quite different. In particular, population change between 1970 and 1980 was negative for all country of origin destination lists with the exception of that for Asians. The difference in population growth between 1970 and 1980 was statistically significant for the foreign born destinations as a whole, and for

Europeans, Caribbeans, Other Central Americans, and South Americans. Furthermore, population growth between 1980 and 1990 was considerably higher in immigrant destinations than for the state's municipalities as a whole, although this difference is not statistically significant. This is consistent with the idea that immigrants choose destinations which are experiencing population decline, probably as a result of out-migration. The rapid population growth between 1980 and 1990 is almost certainly attributable to immigration. The differential in the growth rate between 1990 and 2000 is far less pronounced.

Table 12 shows some other characteristics of all municipalities and immigrant destinations which are less immune from the impact of immigration itself. As such, they are useful primarily to compare destinations for different country of origin groups to each other. As can be seen, per capita income is higher in Asian and European municipalities than for those of other country of origin group. The rate of change in per capita income was in the thirty percent range for all groups with the exception of Mexicans, who also lived in the municipalities with the lowest average per capita income. Per capita income in the Other Central American category rose more than did that of the Mexican category during the 1990s. Median household size is somewhat larger in all the country of origin groups when compared to all municipalities with the exception of Asians, for whom it is lower. The unemployment rate in 2000 was lowest in the Asian immigrants' municipalities, and highest in the top ten for Caribbean and Mexican immigrants. The percent of housing units which are renter occupied and the percent which are multifamily is higher for all country of origin groups than for all municipalities. Of these country of origin groups, rates are lowest for Asians and Europeans.

The preceding tables provided a comparison between the top ten destinations for various categories of the foreign born and all municipalities. Yet when these characteristics are considered in a multivariate model that includes all municipalities, some differences are revealed. Table 13 shows a very simple OLS estimate in which the percent of municipality population which is foreign born with year of entry between 1990 and 2000 is regressed on population characteristics, the percent of housing which is multi-family, change in per capita income between 1990 and 2000, and a set of county dummies. Total population, population density, and population growth since 1990 are positively and significantly associated with the percent of municipality population which is the recent-entry foreign born. Population growth between 1980 and 1990, however, is significantly and negatively associated with the percent of population which is recent-entry foreign born. Population growth between 1970 and 1980 is not significant. This suggests that historical population growth patterns of the top ten destinations for the recent entry foreign born differ in some ways from their overall destinations. In general, percent rencent-entry foreign born is higher in municipalities that experienced lower than average population growth between 1980 and 1990, and population growth between 1970 and 1980 is not a significant predictor. This simple estimate explains a fairly high proportion of the variation in the percent recent-entry foreign born, and the inclusion of the county dummies increased the r-square by approximately fourteen percent. When compared to the omitted county (Warren) municipalities in Atlantic, Bergen, Middlesex, Morris, Somerset, and Union were significantly more likely to have recent-entry foreign born

residents, while those in Gloucester county were significantly less likely to have such residents.

When this model is estimated for specific region of origin groups, some other differences emerge. In general, these OLS estimates explain a good deal of the variation in municipality residence of the recent foreign born, although the location of Europeans is notably less well explained. As seen in Table 14, population is a positive and significant predictor for Asians, Africans, and South Americans, but is significant and negative for Europeans and other Central Americans. Interestingly, population density is a significant predictor for all region of origin groups, but is negative for Europeans, Asians, and Africans, and positive for all other groups. Population growth between 1980 and 1990 is significant and negative for Asians, Caribbeans, Mexicans, and Other Central Americans, but is positive for Africans and South Americans. Population growth between 1970 and 1980 is significant and negative for Africans and Mexicans, but is not significant and positive for any group. This again suggests that characteristics of the top ten destinations for different region of origin groups differs from characteristics of their overall destinations, but in ways that vary by region of origin. Immigrant destinations overall seem to be characterized by some measure of below average historical population growth, however, since for all groups save Europeans and South Americans, either the 1980-1990 change or the 1970-1980 change is negative and significant.

The county dummies reveal some interesting information as well. For some groups, such as Europeans and South Americans, a relatively small number of county dummies are significantly different from the omitted county. For Africans, on the other hand, nine of the twenty county dummies are significant, and seven are significant for Mexicans, suggesting that there are other characteristics of municipalities in these counties which affect location for these groups. It also the case that when county dummies are significant and positive for some groups, they are sometimes significant and negative for other groups. This is the case for Bergen, Essex, and Hudson counties, which have positive and significant coefficients for some combination of European, Asian and African immigrants, and negative and significant coefficients for Mexicans and/or Caribbeans. Somerset, Mercer, Middlesex, and Union counties have positive and significant coefficients for at least two groups. No county has a negative and significant coefficient for more than one group.

Present versus Past

The list of top ten destinations for recent immigrants in 2000 revealed that many of the most popular destinations were also very popular during the prior major wave of immigration, which occurred between 1880 and 1920. In fact, of the overall top ten list, only two destinations, Edison Township and Woodbridge Township, were not significant destinations during the second wave. However, it is also the case that these destinations did not exist under these names in 1920, or even 1950, or else failed to have populations exceeding 2,500. The other major destinations, however, had significant foreign born populations during the early twentieth century. Table 15 shows the top twenty destinations for the foreign born in 1920. As can be seen, quite a number of the municipalities that were ranked in the top ten in 2000 also ranked high in 1920. However

there are some notable exceptions. The foreign born population was more concentrated in 1920 than are recent immigrants in 2000. Nearly seventy percent of the foreign born lived in the top ten municipalities in 1920, as compared with only about a third in 2000. Further, since the 2000 statistic is based only on relatively recent arrivals, while the 1920 numbers are for the entire foreign born population, the difference in concentration between the two years is underestimated.

It is interesting that while many of these destinations popular in both time periods were major manufacturing centers in the early twentieth century, this is largely no longer the case. Immigrants residing in Newark or Paterson in 1920 tended to work in factories located within these cities, yet despite the absence of these employment opportunities, they remain popular destinations today. However, a comparison of INS and census data suggests that outmigration from Newark, and perhaps other similar locations, may be considerable. For example, data on 2001 flows suggest that approximately 15,000 new legal immigrants chose Newark as their intended destination. Yet of the 1990 to 2000 entry cohort, only about 33,000 resided in Newark. If the INS flow data was fairly similar throughout the 1990s, this implies that a substantial number of immigrants left Newark during the decade. The 2000 PUMS data will shed more light on this question.

Another interesting point is that there are a number of cities which were important destinations for immigrants during the second wave, but do not attract significant numbers of immigrants today. Notable on this list is Trenton, Camden, and Hoboken. A special report from the Census Bureau on the foreign born population provides consistent data on the population by nativity for five New Jersey cities who had all appeared at some time since 1880 on the list of 100 most populated urban places. Figures 2 and 3 show the trends in population and percent foreign born for these cities. Of these five cities, Camden and Trenton are the laggards with regard to immigration. The trend in percent foreign born shows one interesting difference – the foreign born population in Trenton and Camden peaked in approximately 1920, while for Newark, Jersey City and Paterson the peak came about thirty years prior. Of course, it is not clear what if anything these trends suggest about the prospect of increased immigration in Trenton and Camden, although the shape of the curves for the five cities is not all that different. The implication is that some feature of historical population growth may be an important determinant of an area's current attractiveness to immigrants.

Mobility of the foreign born

To examine the interstate and intrastate migration patterns of the foreign born, the five percent sample of the 2000 PUMS was used. Previously it was observed that some gateway states experienced a net loss of their more established foreign born population between 1990 and 2000. This was true of California, New York, and New Jersey. It was found that these foreign born outmigrants favored the same kind of destinations sought by domestic migrants during the 1990s – "New Sunbelt" states such as Georgia, Arizona, and North Carolina (Frey, 2003) However, a consideration of mobility patterns reveals a somewhat more complex pattern. While it is the case that more foreign born residents left gateway states than entered them between 1995 and 2000, the rate of interstate migration was actually lower for foreign born residents of gateway states than other states. This can be seen in Table 16, which shows the mobility distribution of foreign born residents by year of entry cohort by gateway state status in 1995. It can be seen that for each year of entry cohort the percent of residents who moved to another state was about half as high for gateway states as compared with other states. Of foreign born residents of NewJersey in 1995, approximately ten percent moved to another state between 1995 and 2000. This is in the middle range of gateway states. The interstate migration rate was lowest for residents of California in 1995, and highest for residents of Massachusetts.

Gateway states as a group received fewer interstate migrants as a group than did other states, as can be seen in Table 17. Among gateway states, New Jersey ranked near the top in terms of the percent of their foreign born residents in 2000 who had migrated from other states. Only Florida had a higher percentage. As can be seen, the percent of New Jersey's foreign born population who were interstate migrants was more than twice as high as that for New York. While for gateway states as whole, approximately fifty five percent of interstate migrants were residents of other gateway states, for New Jersey the percentage was close to seventy-five, largely because the great share of New Jersey's interstate migrants were residents of New York in 1995. In fact, over half of New Jersey's interstate foreign born migrants resided in New York in 1995. Former residents of California and Florida accounted for about seven and five percent, respectively. Pennsylvania was the source of nearly seven percent of interstate migrants to New Jersey, and no other state comprised more than a small fraction.

In general, there was more intrastate migration among the foreign born in gateway states as compared to other states, as seen in Table 17. Intrastate migration among New Jersey's foreign born population was similar to that of the other gateway states. Differences among region of origin groups were not large, although intrastate migration was somewhat lower among Europeans and Asians as compared with other groups. Destinations of the foreign born in New Jersey varied by mobility. Compared to the overall foreign born migrants, interstate migrants were more likely to locate in areas in Central and South Jersey . Additionally, they were more likely than the overall foreign born population to locate in suburban rather than urban locations. Those arriving from abroad, on the other hand, were more likely than the overall population to reside in urban areas in the north of the state, such as Jersey City or Newark. This can be seen in Table 18.

In general, educational attainment is higher among interstate migrants.

To do: destinations differ for inter, intra, abroad, stayers

Intrastate migration serves to decentralize FB population.

Discussion

Overall it is probably the case that this exploration of immigrant settlement in New Jersey has raised more questions than it answers. We have seen that immigrants are relatively deconcentrated geographically, and that different country of origin groups tend to reside in different municipalities. We have also seen that many of the most popular immigrant destinations lost population between 1970-1980, which lends some casual support to the "replacement" interpretation of the immigration-domestic migration relationship. When comparing the past to the present, there is clearly a lot of similarity in major immigrant destinations. This is interesting due to the great reduction in manufacturing activity in New Jersey cities during the twentieth century. While many of the same destination cities, such as Jersey City, are clearly popular with immigrants today as they were one hundred years ago, these cities are being used in different ways, particularly with regard to employment. It may be the case that immigrants living in these cities are commuting considerable distances.

Immigrants in New Jersey seem largely to settle in old former manufacturing centers that witnessed significant population loss since World War II. In many ways this wave of immigration is viewed as the salvation of cities like Elizabeth and Newark, whose prospects were very dismal as their tax base and population continued to decline. Yet the cities who want but do not get immigrants can also be described as tired former manufacturing centers who have seen their tax base and population decline throughout the latter half of the twentieth century. This would, in fact, be an accurate way to describe Trenton, Camden, and Philadelphia.

References

Alba, Richard and Logan, J.R. 1991. Variations on two themes: racial and ethnic patterns in the attainment of suburban residence. Demography 28:431-453.

Allen, J.P. and Turner, E. 1996. Spatial patterns of immigrant assimilatioan. The Professional Geographer. 48: 140-155.

Borjas G.J. 2002. Homeownership in the immigrant population. Journal of Urban Economics. 52:448-476.

Card, David. 2001. Immigrant inflows, native outflows and the local labor market impact of higher immigration. Journal of Labor Economics, 19:22-64.

Card, David, and DeNardo, John. 2000. Do immigrant inflows lead to native outflows? American Economic Review, 90:360-367.

Clark, W.A.V. 1998. The California Cauldron. New York: Guilford.

Ellis, Mark and Wright, Richard. 1998. The balkanization metaphor in the analysis of U.S. immigration. 1998. Annals of the Association of American Geographers 88:4(686-698).

Filer, R. 1992. The effect of immigrant arrival on migratory patterns of native workers. In G. Borjas and R. Freeman (Eds.). *Immigration and the work force* pp. 245-269. National Bureau of Economic Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Frey, William H. 1995a. Immigration and internal migration 'flight': A California case study. Population and the Environment, 16:353-375.

Frey, William H. 1995b. Immigration and internal migration "flight" from U.S. metropolitan areas: toward a new demographic Balkanization. Urban Studies 32:733-57.

Frey, William H. 1998. The diversity myth. American Demographics. June: 39-43.

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

Garvey, D. and Espenshade, T. 1997. State and local fiscal impacts of New Jersey's immigrant and native households. In Keys to successful immigration: Implications of the New Jersey experience, edited by T.J. Espenshade. Washington D.C.: Urban Institute Press.

Greenwood, M. and J. McDowell. 1999. Legal U.S. immigration: Influences on gender, age and skill composition. Kalamazoo: Upjohn.

Gross, D.M. and N. Schmitt. 2003. The role of cultural clustering in attracting new immigrants.Journal of Regional Science 43:2 p. 295.

Hempstead, Katherine. 2001. Immigration and net migration in New York City: A small area analysis. Policy Studies Journal, 30:2.

Hempstead, Katherine. 2004 (forthcoming). Immigration and native migration in New York, 1985-1990. Population Research and Policy Review.

Immigration and Naturalization Service. 2003. Legal Immigration, Fiscal Year 1999-2001. Office of Policy and Planning, Statistics Branch.

Kritz, Mary M. and Gurak, Douglas T. 2001. The impact of immigration on the internal migration of natives and immigrants. Demography. 38:133-145.

Ley D.; Tutchener J. 2001. Immigration, Globalisation and House Prices in Canada's Gateway Cities. Housing Studies. 16:199-223(25)

Li W. 1998. Anatomy of a new ethnic settlement: The chinese ethnoburb in Los Angeles. Urban Studies 35:497-501.

New Homestead Act. 2003. http://dorgan.senate.gov/legislation/homestead/summary.cfm

New Jersey Department of Labor. "Census Data Show New Jersey's Median Age Highest Ever and Increasing Diversity" May 23, 2001.
http://www.wnjpin.net/OneStopCareerCenter/LaborMarketInformation/lmi25/gdp/c2kpress.htm

Newbold, K. Bruce and Spindler, John. 2001. Immigrant Settlement Patterns in Metropolitan Chicago. Urban Studies. 38: 1903-1919.

Schaffer, Gwen. 2002. "Speaking a foreign language"
http://citypaper.net/articles/101900/cb.hallmonitor1.shtm

Saiz A. 2003. Room in the Kitchen for the Melting Pot: Immigration and Rental Prices. The Review of Economics and Statistics 85:502-521.

White, Michael and Imai, Y. 1994. The impact of U.S. immigration on the internal migration of the native-born population, 1981-1990. Population Research and Policy Review 17:2(141-166).

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.

Zelinsky W. and Lee B.A. 1998. Heterolocalism: an alternative model of the sociospatial behavior or immigrant communities. International Journal of Population Geography, 4:281-298.