

POVERTY MIGRATION FOR US STATES: IMMIGRATION IMPACTS

William H. Frey, Population Studies Center, University of Michigan
William H. Frey, PSC, 1225 S. University Ave., Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Key Words: US Census, Migration

Recent studies of 1990 US census migration data have shown that immigration to the US is affecting internal migration patterns in unprecedented ways (Frey, 1993; 1994a; 1994c; 1994d; 1994e). A significant feature of the new immigration-influenced internal migration is relevant to the resident low income poverty populations of High Immigration States. Because recent immigration is heavily weighted toward minority and developing country origins, and is disproportionately represented among less well off and relatively unskilled populations (Borjas and Freeman, 1992), these immigrants are prone to compete with native workers for low-skilled jobs and will serve to bid down their wages. Moreover, the arrival, in large numbers, of immigrant ethnic minorities changes the cultural milieu and perceptions of social costs for whites and more established, assimilated minorities that can lead to their out-migration.

This paper focuses specifically on how immigration affects internal migration of the US poverty population. How does it impact on the populations of High Immigration States? How does it affect the overall pattern of inter-state poverty migration? From a State's perspective, the out-flow of native-born poor migrants may partially offset the welfare and social service costs of poor immigrant inflows. Also, these immigration-internal migration links are relevant to recent studies of US immigration policy. Studies show that modest or mixed impacts of immigration on native worker employment or income loss tend to overlook the possibility of an out-migration response (Fix and Passel, 1994).

Analyses in this paper will employ tabulations of the full migration ("residence 5 years ago question") sample of the 1990 census to address the following questions: (1). How do the magnitudes of poverty population out-migration from High Immigration States, compare with those for States with relatively small numbers of immigrants? (2). How does a State's immigration level affect its internal poverty migration when other social and economic migration determinants are taken into account?

A Migration Classification of States

This analysis will employ a typology, developed in an earlier study (Frey, 1994a),

which classifies States on the basis of their dominant migration source of change. (See Figure 1.) States classed as "High Immigration States" include the six States with largest 1985-90 migration from abroad, where the immigration component overwhelms net internal migration (California, New York, Texas, New Jersey, Illinois, Massachusetts). Each of these States tends to have large existing settlements of earlier immigrants from Latin America and Asia. The six States classified as "High Internal Migration States" (Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, Washington, Arizona) displayed greatest net increases in their migration exchanges with other States over the 1985-90 period. Moreover, in each case, these internal migration gains significantly exceeded those of the immigration component. (This is the case for Florida, as well, despite its strong attraction for immigrants.) These internal migration magnets are located, largely, in the South Atlantic and the Pacific and Mountain divisions. Their allure lies with their growing economies and, in most cases, climatic and other amenities. Finally, a third class of States include five "High Out-migration States"--Louisiana, Michigan, Ohio Oklahoma and Iowa. These States displayed greatest out-migration in their exchanges with other States and were not recipients of large immigration from abroad.

Poverty Out-migration from High Immigration States

To what extent did the poverty population move out of High Immigration States during the 1985-90 period? The data shown in Table 1 indicate a fairly consistent pattern. That is, each of the six High Immigration States showed declines in their poverty population as a result of net internal migration; and in four of the six (New York and Massachusetts excepted), the poverty population out-migration rates were greater than those for the non-poverty population.

The latter observation is consistent with the unique "downwardly selective" out-migration that appears to be responding to large waves of poverty immigrants in these States (see columns 1 and 2). In contrast, the poverty status selectively patterns for the High Internal Migration States and High Out-migration States conform more closely to the

"circulation of elites" model. That is, the net migration losses in each of the five High Out-migration States are more accentuated for the non-poverty than poverty populations in those States. Likewise, the net migration gains for four of the High Internal Migration States are larger for their non-poverty populations. (The higher poverty gains for North Carolina and Washington reflect the fact that these are destinations for "return" and "spillover" poverty migrants from high Immigration States.)

Finally, the last three columns permit an assessment of how migration from abroad and internal migration contribute to overall change in each State's poverty population. The upper panel makes clear that in five of the six High Immigration States, internal migration served to substantially reduce poverty population gains. California gains approximately nine times as many poverty migrants from abroad as it loses via internal out-migration to other States. However, internal out-flows reduce New York's poverty gains through immigration by almost two-thirds, and Texas' poverty gains from abroad by almost one-half. Moreover, in New Jersey and Illinois poverty out-migration to other States exceeds their poverty gains from abroad.

Immigration as a Determinant of Poverty Out-migration

Does a State's immigration level exert an independent impact on poverty out-migration? This question is addressed in a series of regression equations where the dependent variables are States net migration levels for the period 1985-90, specific to different demographic sub-groups (by poverty status, race and education attainment). The independent variables for these regressions include the State's 1985-90 immigration level, a geographic regional classification (dummy variables for the Northeast region, the Midwest region, the South Atlantic division, the Mountain division and the Pacific division, where parts of the South, which are not included in the South Atlantic division, represent the omitted category); five variables reflecting the metropolitan area's economic structure (unemployment rate of 1985, per capita income in 1985, percent of change in manufacturing employment and percent of change in service employment for the period 1985-90, and the State's AFDC level); percent of State's population that was non-Latino white and black in 1985 (for use in the equations for whites and blacks); percent of "new immigrant minorities" in the State (percent Latinos and Asians); and the log of the State's population size in 1985. All of the migration and population data were

drawn from the 1980 and 1990 US censuses. The economic characteristics were drawn from the State and Metropolitan Area Data Book, 1991, compiled by the US Bureau of the Census.

Shown in Table 2 are the regression equations for the net migration for poverty populations and non-poverty populations if the 51 States (including District of Columbia). Separate equations are shown for the total population, for the white population, and for the black population, aged 5 and above in 1990. The results are consistent with expectations in showing that immigration exerts a significant negative effect on net poverty migration for each demographic subgroup except for college graduates. Moreover, the immigration effect is not significant in explaining net migration for the non-poverty populations of each group except college graduates where the effect is positive (reflecting, perhaps, the "dual labor market" character of high immigration areas).

In sum, these regression results are consistent with the overall analyses presented in this paper. The recent focused immigration to a few selected "port-of-entry" States appears to be effecting a consistent pattern of poverty out-migration among the native-born resident populations of these States. The results of this analysis are strong and consistent enough to warrant additional investigations into the nature of immigrant competition, or labor market mechanisms that are contributing to this pattern.

REFERENCES

- Borjas, George J. and Richard Freeman. 1992. Immigration and the Work Force. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Filer, Randall K. 1992. "The Effect of Immigrant Arrivals on Migratory Patterns of Native Workers." Pp. 245-270. in George J. Borjas and Richard B. Freeman (eds.), Immigration and the Work Force. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fix, Michael and Jeffrey Passel. 1994. "Immigration and Immigrants' Setting the Record Straight." Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Frey, William H. 1993. "Inter-state Migration and Immigration for Whites and Minorities, 1985-90: The Emergence of Multi-ethnic States." Research Report No. 93-297. Ann Arbor, MI: Population Studies Center, University of Michigan.

Frey, William H. 1994a. "The New White Flight." American Demographics (April), pp. 40-48.

Frey, William H. 1994b. "College Grad, Poverty Blacks Take Different Migration Paths." Research Report No. 94-303. Ann Arbor, MI: Population Studies Center.

Frey, William H. 1994c. "Immigration and Internal Migration "Flight": 1990 Census Findings from California" Research Report No. 94-306. Ann Arbor, MI: Population Studies Center.

Frey, William H. 1994d. "Immigration and Internal Migration "Flight": from U.S. Metro Areas: 1990 Census Findings by Race, Poverty and Education." Research Report No. 94-304. Ann Arbor, MI: Population Studies Center.

Frey, William H. 1994e. "Immigration and Internal Migration for US States: 1990 Census Findings by Poverty, Status and Race." Research Report No. 94-320. Ann Arbor, MI: Population Studies Center.

Long Larry 1988. Migration and Residential Mobility in the United States. New York: Russell Sage.

Walker, Robert, Mark Ellis and Richard Barff. 1992. "Linked Migration Systems: Immigration and Internal Labor Flows in the United States." Economic Geography, Vol. 68, pp. 234-248.

White, Michael J. and Yoshie Imai. 1993. "The Impact of Immigration upon Internal Migration." Population and Environment. Vol. 15(3), pp.189-209.

Table 1: Immigration and Internal Migration Components of Change, 1985-90, for Poverty Populations of High Immigration States, High Internal Migration States, and High Out-Migration States.

State	Rates of Migration from Abroad *		Rates of Internal Migration *		Components of Poverty Population Change		
	Poverty	NonPoverty	Poverty	NonPoverty	Total Migration	Migration From Abroad	Internal Migration
<i>I High Immigration States</i>							
California	14.1	4.3	-1.5	0.7	402,727	450,777	-48,050
New York	7.7	3.1	-4.6	-4.8	64,691	156,873	-92,182
Texas	4.6	1.9	-2.3	-2.1	62,443	122,970	-60,527
New Jersey	7.4	2.6	-10.4	-1.4	-15,355	37,815	-53,170
Illinois	4.1	1.6	-5.3	-2.7	-13,420	48,206	-61,626
Massachusetts	9.4	2.1	-0.3	-2.2	41,848	43,403	-1,555
<i>II High-Internal Migration States</i>							
Florida	7.0	2.7	5.6	9.6	180,002	100,224	79,778
Georgia	2.0	1.4	2.7	5.4	38,397	16,045	22,352
North Carolina	1.2	1.0	4.2	3.9	40,362	9,159	31,203
Virginia	3.3	2.5	2.2	3.5	29,968	18,030	11,938
Washington	5.6	1.8	6.0	4.7	52,872	25,559	27,313
Arizona	5.4	1.8	5.3	6.6	52,718	26,407	26,311
<i>III High Out-Migration States</i>							
Louisiana	0.8	0.7	-3.2	-7.5	-21,060	6,560	-27,620
Ohio	1.4	0.6	0.3	-1.4	20,598	16,583	4,015
Michigan	1.8	0.7	0.2	-1.5	20,266	18,468	1,798
Oklahoma	1.6	1.0	-0.2	-5.4	6,019	7,076	-1,057
Iowa	2.0	0.5	0.8	-4.3	7,531	5,389	2,142

* Rates per 100, 1990 population

Source: 1990 Census Full Migration Sample Compiled at Population Studies Center, University of Michigan.

Table 2: Net Internal Migration, 1985-90 by Poverty Status Regressed on State Attributes

Total, Whites and Blacks^a

(Standardized Regression Coefficients)

State Attributes ^b	Total		Whites		Blacks	
	Poverty	Non- Poverty	Poverty	Non- Poverty	Poverty	Non- Poverty
REGION ^c						
Northeast	-.27	-.10	-.12	-.13	-.62*	-.50*
Midwest	-.11	-.02	-.06	-.11	-.38*	.23
South Atlantic	.18	.29*	.17	.32*	.16	.35*
Mountain	.10	.12	.12	.01	-.18	-.09
Pacific	.13	.24	.17	.11	-.16	.09
UNEMPLOYMENT	-.16	-.21	-.10	-.15	-.31*	-.34*
MFG GROWTH	.14	.16	.19	.22	.12	-.04
SERVICE GROWTH	.39*	.40*	.40*	.42*	.23*	.18
INCOME	-.29*	-.00	-.35*	.07	-.20	.21
AFDC	.23	-.18	.19	-.22	.35	-.21
% WHITES	----	----	-.04	.25	----	----
% BLACKS	----	----	----	----	-.22	-.49
% LATINOS & ASIANS	-.23*	-.13	-.22	.11	-.13	-.16
IMMIGRATION	-.47*	.07	-.52*	.09	-.45*	-.09
POP SIZE (LOG)	.17	.02	.18	.01	.20	.12
R ²	.62	.52	.67	.55	.53	.55

^aPersons aged 5 and above in 1990

^bSee text for attribute definitions

^cOmitted category includes the remainder of the South region (other than South Atlantic)

*Significant at .1 level