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Why Do Immigrants Cluster?

• Culture
• Language
• Networks
• Labor market conditions

Figure 9
Geographic Concentration of Stock of Foreign-Born and Natives, Flow of Immigrants
1970–2000

Source: Author’s tabulations of Integrated Public Use Microsample Census and Immigration and Naturalization Service data.
Note: 48 contiguous states.
Location of Employment-Visa Immigrants, 1971-1980
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Location of Employment-Visa Immigrants, 1981-1990
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Skill Sorting of Immigrants and Natives, 2008

Figure 9: Educational Attainment of Immigrants and Natives
Immigrants and Local Labor Markets

• All legal immigrants are responsive to labor market conditions when deciding where to locate
• Immigrants are important for interregional equilibration of labor markets and labor market efficiency
• True of all groups, but particularly those explicitly admitted for employment reasons
• Other factors important too: location of similar immigrants (networks?, language?, culture?)
• Less important: regional differences in social welfare benefits
Consequences of Diversity
“Metrotypes”

• We classify metropolitan areas based on the characteristics of the immigrants in them:
  
  – Time in US
  – Education
  – Ethnicity
“Metrotypes”

- **New**: Areas with the most recently arrived immigrants.
- **Hispanic**: Where the great majority of immigrants are Hispanic. Mostly in California and Texas.
- **Educated**: Places in which over one-third of immigrants are college graduates.
- **Balanced**: Somewhat of a residual category. Most resembles the native population. Immigrants represent a mix of characteristics, in terms of their education, time in the US, and origin.
Results: Population Growth

Immigration is the sole or primary source of population growth in many metropolitan areas, primarily those with slow native population growth, and not necessarily those with rapid immigrant population growth.
Figure 1: Share of Population Growth Due to Immigration 2000-2007

Source: Authors' calculations from 2000 IPUMS and 2007 ACS data. See Appendix Table 1.
Note: Immigration includes the foreign-born and their children. See text for definition.
Results:
Effect on School Age-Population

A substantial fraction of schoolchildren in most metros are the children of immigrants. Nationally, virtually all of the growth in the school-age population is attributable to the native-born children of immigrants, with local variation tending to reflect more about native than immigrant demographics.
Figure 2: Nativity of School Age Children (2007) and Share of Growth Due to Immigration (2000-2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrotypes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Native Children of Immigrants</th>
<th>Immigrants</th>
<th>Natives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated</td>
<td>821%</td>
<td>321%</td>
<td>500%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>143%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>133%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Share of Growth Due to Immigration, 2000-07

Source: Authors' calculations from 2000 IPUMS and 2007 ACS data. See Appendix Table 2.
Note: See text for definition of native children of immigrants and immigrant children.
Results: Demographics

Immigration raises the ratio of men to women, particularly in certain areas and does the opposite in others.

Immigration generally lowers the average age of the population, though its overall effect on the age structure varies from place to place.
Figure 3: Male Share of Working Age Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recent Imm.-Native Diff.</th>
<th>All Imm.-Native Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors' calculations from 2007 ACS data. See Appendix Table 4.
Note: Includes only working-age individuals (age 18-65).
Figure 4: Age
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Source: Authors' calculations from 2007 ACS data. See Appendix Table 5.
Note: Immigrants include foreign-born and their children. See text for definition.
Figure 5: Share Who Are Working Age
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```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Recent Immigrants</th>
<th>All Immigrants</th>
<th>Natives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated Metrotype</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Source: Authors' calculations from 2007 ACS data. See Appendix Table 6.
Note: Immigrants include foreign-born and their children. See text for definition.
Results: Skills

While immigrants tend to have lower average educational attainment, English-language proficiency, and earnings than natives, there is enormous geographic variation in the skills they bring to the labor force.
Figure 6: Average Years of Education
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Source: Authors' calculations from 2007 ACS data. See Appendix Table 7.
Note: Includes only working-age individuals (age 18-65).
Figure 7: Share Who Are High School Dropouts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recent Imm.-Native Diff.</th>
<th>All Imm.-Native Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors' calculations from 2007 ACS data. See Appendix Table 8.
Note: Includes only working-age individuals (age 18-65)
Figure 8: Share Who Are College Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recent Imm.-Native Diff.</th>
<th>All Imm.-Native Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors' calculations from 2007 ACS data. See Appendix Table 8. Note: Includes only working-age individuals (age 18-65).
Figure 12: Wages (2008$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigrant/Native Ratio</th>
<th>Effect of Immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-$0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-$1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-$0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-$1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's calculations from 2007 ACS data. See Appendix Table 10.
Note: Includes only employed working-age individuals (age 18-65)
Results:
Poverty and Public Assistance

Despite higher poverty rates, immigrants have lower rates of welfare receipt than natives. Before the recent deep recession, they also had lower rates of unemployment, particularly in certain types of places.
Figure 13: Unemployment Rate
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Source: Authors' calculations from 2007 ACS data. See Appendix Table 11.
Note: Among working-age (18-65) individuals who are in the labor force.
Figure 14: Average Poverty Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>recently-immigrated - native diff.</th>
<th>all immigrants - native diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors' calculations from 2007 ACS data. See Appendix Table 12.
Note: Immigrants include foreign-born and their children. See text for definition.
Figure 15: Public Assistance Rates
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Source: Author's calculations from 2007 ACS data. See Appendix Table 13.
Note: Immigrants include foreign-born and their children. See text for definition.
Public Assistance in this figure is GA and TANF.
Policy Challenges

• Successful national immigration policies must recognize the spatial diversity of immigrants.
• It is not surprising that state and local policy have varying reactions to immigrants, given how different immigrant populations are across metropolitan areas.
• In the U.S., finding ways for federal policy to account for diversity of immigrants, particularly supporting those areas that are most adversely affected by immigration, may be key to breaking the current impasse in Washington.
Extra Slides
Source: Authors' calculations from 2007 ACS data. See Appendix Table 9.
Note: Includes only working-age individuals (age 18-65). English proficiency is defined as speaking English either "very well" or "fluently".
Data and Focus

• Use the 2007 American Community Survey, supplemented with the 2000 Census.

• Focus on metropolitan areas with over 150,000 immigrants.
  – Some “small” areas (McAllen TX)
  – All “big” areas (New York, Los Angeles)
  – Cover 77% of foreign-born population and 42% of native-born population.
Data Note: Native Kids of Immigrants

- Children are classified according to their parentage, not exclusively their birthplace.
- Kids are characterized as being “children of immigrants” if both parents are foreign-born, if their single resident parent is foreign-born, or if the head of household is foreign-born and there are no parents present.
- Children with at least one native parent are categorized as “children of natives”.
- Children born abroad not to U.S. citizens are, of course, also treated as immigrants.
- U.S.-born children of immigrants who were over the age of 18 at the time of the Census are treated as natives, because the Census does not collect information on the nativity of the parents of those living outside of their parents' household.
“New” Metrotype

- Areas with the most recently arrived immigrants.
- Nine places where immigrants who arrived within the past decade make up the greatest share of the local immigrant population.
- Atlanta, Austin, Charlotte, Dallas, Denver, Minneapolis, Orlando, Phoenix, and Salt Lake City.
“Hispanic” Metrotype

• Where the great majority of immigrants are Hispanic. Mostly in California and Texas.

• Bakersfield, El Paso, Fresno, Houston, Las Vegas, Los Angeles, McAllen, Miami, Oxnard, Riverside, Salinas, San Antonio, San Diego, Stockton, Tucson, and Visalia
“Educated” Metrotype

- Places in which over one-third of immigrants are college graduates.
- Baltimore, Boston, Detroit, Philadelphia, Raleigh-Durham, San Francisco, San Jose, Seattle, and Washington, DC.
“Balanced” Metrotype

• Somewhat of a residual category.
• Most resembles the native population.
• Immigrants represent a mix of characteristics, in terms of their education, time in the US, and origin.
• Bridgeport, Chicago, Hartford, New York, Portland, Providence, Sacramento, and Tampa.
Conclusions

• Immigration means different things in different places, although the debate tends to be focused on the aggregate level.

• Along most dimensions, there is more diversity among immigrants than among natives in each area and between areas.