

Migration of Natives and the Foreign Born: 1995 to 2000

Issued August 2003

Census 2000 Special Reports

CENSR-11

By
Marc J. Perry
and
Jason P. Schachter

Census 2000 showed that the foreign-born population in the United States was 31.1 million, a 57-percent increase from the 1990 figure of 19.8 million. This group constituted 11.1 percent of the population in 2000, the highest percentage since 1930, when they composed 11.6 percent of the total population.¹ As the country's foreign-born population—already the largest in history—continues to increase in size, understanding how its migration and mobility patterns fit into, and partially shape, the overall migration patterns within the United States will be increasingly important.

This Census 2000 Special Report examines migration patterns of natives and the foreign born, aged 5 years and over. The report's first section focuses on overall mobility patterns by nativity. The next section examines migration from abroad, while the final section looks at patterns and differences between natives and the foreign born in state-to-state and county-to-county migration. Particular attention is given to the redistribution of the foreign-born population within the United States.

GEOGRAPHIC MOBILITY

The foreign born were more mobile than natives.

Between 1995 and 2000, the foreign born were more likely to have moved than natives (Table 1). Fully 57.4 per-

cent of the foreign-born population reported living in a different residence in 2000 than in 1995, compared with 44.3 percent of natives.² Given that the likelihood of moving generally peaks during the late twenties, then declines, and that the foreign-born population is more likely to be of those ages than the native population, some of this difference could be due to differing age structures.³

The foreign born were more likely to have moved from abroad, while natives were more likely than the foreign born to have moved from another state. Natives had a higher interstate migration rate than the foreign born (8.6 percent versus 6.7 percent). The foreign born, however, had a higher rate of intracounty migration (25.7 percent versus 24.8 percent).

² The estimates in this report are based on a sample of the population. As with all surveys, estimates may vary from the actual values because of sampling variation or other factors. All comparisons made in this report have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 90-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted.

All mobility and migration data in this report are for the population 5 years old and over in 2000. Movers are defined as those who did not live in their residence 5 years previously. Thus previous residence is measured 5 years before the census and does not track any other potential moves made within that 5-year period. Similarly, the residence 5 years ago question does not measure those who moved away from a place of residence and later returned to that same residence during that 5-year period.

³ See U.S. Census Bureau, 2001, *Geographical Mobility: March 1999 to March 2000*, by Jason Schachter, Current Population Reports P20-538, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, available at www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/p20-538.pdf.

¹ U.S. Census Bureau, 1999, *Profile of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 1997*, by Dianne A. Schmidley and Campbell Gibson, Current Population Reports P23-195, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Common Migration Terms

Movers can be classified by type of move and are categorized as to whether they moved within the same county, to a different county within the same state, to a different county from a different state or region, or were movers from abroad. *Migration* is commonly defined as moves that cross jurisdictional boundaries (counties in particular), while moves within a jurisdiction are referred to as *residential mobility*. Moves between counties are often referred to as *intercounty* moves, while moves within the same county are often referred to as *intracounty* moves. Further, migration can be differentiated as movement within the United States (*domestic*, or *internal*, migration) and movement into and out of the United States (*international* migration). International migration includes migrants from Puerto Rico and other U.S. outlying areas. Foreign-born movers from abroad also include migrants, such as students, who are not necessarily immigrants (documented or undocumented).

Natives and foreign born. For this report, *natives* are people who were born in the United States, Puerto Rico, or other U.S. territories, or born

abroad of an American parent or parents. The *foreign born* are all other residents born outside the United States, including both naturalized United States citizens and those who are not citizens of the United States.

Secondary migration refers to domestic migration of foreign-born migrants after their initial arrival to the United States. The migration question in Census 2000 asked for residence 5 years ago; any intermediate moves were missed. Consequently, the captured move was not necessarily the first after arriving in the United States, and the eventual destination for a migrant from abroad could differ from the initial point-of-entry to the United States.

Net migration is the difference between immigration and outmigration during a given time period. A positive net, or *net immigration*, indicates that more migrants entered the area than left the area during that time period. A negative net, or *net outmigration*, means that more migrants left the area than entered it.

Recent arrivals and noncitizens were highly mobile.

Recent arrivals to the United States had higher mobility rates than foreign-born people who entered before 1980, and mobility rates declined as length of time in the United States increased (Table 1). This pattern is consistent with the fact that more recent arrivals were younger, on average, than people who arrived decades ago.⁴ Foreign-born people who arrived in the United States before 1980 actually had a lower mobility rate than natives—due perhaps to the foreign born being older.

⁴ See U.S. Census Bureau, 1999, *Profile of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 1997*, by Dianne A. Schmidley and Campbell Gibson, Current Population Reports P23-195, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, available at www.census.gov/prod/99pubs/p23-195.pdf.

Interestingly, among foreign-born movers, those who entered before 1970 were more likely to have made an interstate move than those who entered after 1970. Year of entry is also important in terms of country of origin, as more recent immigrants tended to come from Asia and Latin America, while older waves of immigration came largely from Europe.

Similar differences were found for citizenship status, which was not surprising given that year of entry to the United States and the likelihood of becoming a naturalized citizen are strongly related. In 2000, roughly 40 percent of the foreign-born population aged 5 and over were United States citizens. Their mobility rate of 39.6 percent was far lower than the rate for noncitizens (69.6 percent) and was lower than the overall rate of 44.3 percent

for natives. Foreign-born noncitizens were more likely than foreign-born citizens to have made an intracounty move within the United States and less likely to have made an interstate move.

Africans had the highest mobility rate; Europeans had the lowest.

Foreign-born people from Africa had a mobility rate of 68.3 percent, meaning that this percentage of the African-born population changed their usual residence (house or apartment) between 1995 and 2000. This rate surpasses the rate of 62.8 percent for the foreign born from Mexico (Table 1). The European foreign-born population was the least mobile, at 47.0 percent. Of the foreign born, individuals from Africa were most likely to have moved to the United States between 1995 and 2000.

Table 1.
Type of Move for Natives and the Foreign Born: 1995 to 2000

(Data based on a sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf)

Item	Population aged 5 years and over in 2000	Same residence (non-movers)	Number of movers						Percent moving					
			Total	Within the United States				From abroad ¹	Total	Within the United States				From abroad ¹
				Total	Same county	Different county, same state	Different state			Total	Same county	Different county, same state	Different state	
Total	262,375,152	142,027,478	120,347,674	112,851,828	65,435,013	25,327,355	22,089,460	7,495,846	45.9	43.0	24.9	9.7	8.4	2.9
Nativity														
Native	231,666,088	128,946,394	102,719,694	100,849,171	57,530,090	23,294,651	20,024,430	1,870,523	44.3	43.5	24.8	10.1	8.6	0.8
Foreign born	30,709,064	13,081,084	17,627,980	12,002,657	7,904,923	2,032,704	2,065,030	5,625,323	57.4	39.1	25.7	6.6	6.7	18.3
Year of Entry														
1990-2000	12,779,451	2,758,771	10,020,680	4,760,259	3,165,279	754,264	840,716	5,260,421	78.4	37.2	24.8	5.9	6.6	41.2
1980-1989	8,464,762	4,020,788	4,443,974	4,222,333	2,835,580	707,729	679,024	221,641	52.5	49.9	33.5	8.4	8.0	2.6
1970-1979	4,686,752	2,810,619	1,876,133	1,788,342	1,162,388	329,442	296,512	87,791	40.0	38.2	24.8	7.0	6.3	1.9
1960-1969	2,536,828	1,771,910	764,918	729,677	452,236	138,502	138,939	35,241	30.2	28.8	17.8	5.5	5.5	1.4
1950-1959	1,371,466	1,044,543	326,923	313,590	180,188	63,966	69,436	13,333	23.8	22.9	13.1	4.7	5.1	1.0
Before 1950	869,805	674,453	195,352	188,456	109,252	38,801	40,403	6,896	22.5	21.7	12.6	4.5	4.6	0.8
Citizenship														
Citizens	12,483,968	7,540,355	4,943,613	4,646,539	2,922,839	890,038	833,662	297,074	39.6	37.2	23.4	7.1	6.7	2.4
Noncitizens	18,225,096	5,540,729	12,684,367	7,356,118	4,982,084	1,142,666	1,231,368	5,328,249	69.6	40.4	27.3	6.3	6.8	29.2
Country of Birth														
Mexico	9,011,998	3,356,916	5,655,082	3,892,596	2,915,841	504,703	472,052	1,762,486	62.8	43.2	32.4	5.6	5.2	19.6
Other Latin American	6,846,775	2,937,031	3,909,744	2,797,848	1,919,266	440,815	437,767	1,111,896	57.1	40.9	28.0	6.4	6.4	16.2
Canada	811,401	406,344	405,057	271,507	140,619	57,397	73,491	133,550	49.9	33.5	17.3	7.1	9.1	16.5
Europe	4,864,701	2,589,407	2,275,294	1,512,638	856,262	304,858	318,126	796,048	46.8	30.5	17.6	6.3	6.5	16.4
Asia	8,130,832	3,449,458	4,681,374	3,135,731	1,855,501	646,840	666,782	1,512,251	57.6	39.0	22.8	8.0	8.2	18.6
Africa	869,401	275,239	594,162	329,155	181,040	65,658	82,457	265,007	68.3	37.9	20.8	7.6	9.5	30.5
Other	173,956	66,689	107,267	63,182	36,394	12,433	14,355	44,085	61.7	36.3	20.9	7.1	8.3	25.3

¹Includes movers from foreign countries, as well as movers from Puerto Rico, U.S. Island Areas, and U.S. minor outlying islands.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000.

When restricting analysis to moves made within the United States, the foreign born from Mexico were most likely to have made an intra-county move (74.9 percent of their 3.9 million moves within the United States) and least likely to have made an interstate move (12.1 percent). Among the foreign born, individuals from Africa and Canada were most likely to have moved between states.

Collectively, these results indicate differences between natives and the foreign born in both their likelihood of moving and the types of move made. The findings also highlight the diversity within the foreign-born population with regard to year of entry, citizenship status, and country of origin.

MIGRATION FROM ABROAD

Migration from abroad was concentrated in gateway states.

Among recent waves of immigration, most foreign-born migrants to the United States initially settled in one of six “gateway” states: California, New York, Texas, Florida, Illinois, and New Jersey.⁵ According to Census 2000, each of these six states had more than 1 million foreign-born people; together, these gateway states contained 21.3 million foreign-born people, roughly two thirds of the country’s foreign-born population.

⁵ U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. 2000. *Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1998 (M-367)*.

Growth in a state’s foreign-born population occurs through movement from abroad or through foreign-born migrants’ secondary migration from elsewhere in the United States after their initial arrival. Differentiating between these two kinds of movements is often difficult because a foreign-born mover from abroad could move to one location in the United States, then move to another (or perhaps move several times) during the 5-year period. For example, a foreign-born person living in Georgia in 2000 who reported living abroad in 1995 could have moved to Georgia in 1999 after initially moving to Florida in 1996. Instead of counting as a Florida-to-Georgia domestic migrant, this person would be characterized as

having come to Georgia directly from abroad.

Between 1995 and 2000, 5.6 million foreign-born people moved to the United States from abroad. California received the largest number of foreign-born movers from abroad, with just fewer than 1.2 million (Table 2). This was followed by New York (584,000), Texas (564,000), Florida (477,000), Illinois (287,000), and New Jersey (258,000).

By comparison, about 1.9 million natives moved to the United States from abroad between 1995 and 2000. The states which received the most native migrants from abroad were similar to those of the foreign born, but with some differences. California received the largest number (218,000), followed by Florida (176,000), Texas (162,000), and New York (137,000). Many of the native movers could have been associated with the U.S. armed forces or, particularly in the case of New York and Florida, could have moved from Puerto Rico, which is included in the “from abroad” category in this report.

Migration from abroad serves an important role in redistributing population in the United States. First, migration from abroad may offset net domestic migration loss for some states that experienced large outmigration between 1995 and 2000. Second, after initial arrival to the United States, many movers from abroad then relocate to different areas of the country. These moves may potentially result in changes to the demographic, social, and economic make-up of those destination areas. This

state-to-state migration is discussed in the next section.

STATE-LEVEL MIGRATION

Most gateway states with domestic net outmigration of natives also had net domestic outmigration of the foreign born.

While all six gateway states were receiving large numbers of movers from abroad between 1995 and 2000, four of the six states (California, New York, Illinois, and New Jersey) simultaneously were experiencing substantial net outmigration to other states. In recent years, considerable attention has been placed on the relationship between migration flows of natives and the foreign born. A resorting of native and foreign-born populations could occur in the United States if the outmigration from immigrant gateway states is made up primarily of natives.

For three of the four gateway states that experienced net domestic migration loss (New York, California, and Illinois), however, this outmigration included a sizable foreign-born component (Table 2). Indeed, for both New York and California, net domestic outmigration rates for the foreign born exceeded the rates for natives. New Jersey was the only gateway state to have net outmigration of natives but net immigration of foreign born.

Georgia and Nevada were both among the top gainers of foreign-born individuals from other states.

Internal migration of the foreign-born had a dramatic impact on several areas of the country. In

terms of net migration, Nevada had the highest rate (276.0), while North Carolina (187.0), Georgia (178.1), and Arkansas (155.0) also had high rates.⁶ In addition, a number of midwestern states also had high net migration rates of the foreign born, including Minnesota, Nebraska, and Indiana. In terms of net gain of foreign-born migrants from other states, Florida received the most between 1995 and 2000: 89,000, some of whom were likely retiree migrants. The states with the next largest net foreign-born migration from other states were Georgia (59,000) and Nevada (55,000).⁷

California and New York were the major “exporters” of the foreign born to other states.

As the leading destinations for migrants from abroad, California and New York played important roles in the redistribution of the foreign-born population in the United States. Both California (237,000) and New York (205,000) experienced by far the largest net outmigration of their foreign-born populations to other states, followed by Illinois (24,000), and Hawaii (11,000), and the District of Columbia (10,000).⁸

⁶ The net migration rates in this report are based on an approximated 1995 population, which is the sum of people who reported living in the area in both 1995 and 2000, and those who reported living in that area in 1995 but lived elsewhere in the United States in 2000. The net migration rate is equal to 1,000 times net migration (immigration minus outmigration) divided by the approximated 1995 population. Differences between North Carolina, Georgia, and Arkansas were not statistically significant.

⁷ The difference between Georgia and Nevada was not statistically significant.

⁸ The difference between Hawaii and the District of Columbia was not statistically significant.

Table 2.
Net Migration of Natives and the Foreign Born: 1995 to 2000

(Data based on a sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf)

Area	Natives			Foreign born		
	Net domestic migration		From abroad ²	Net domestic migration		From abroad ²
	Number	Rate ¹		Number	Rate ¹	
Total	-	-	1,870,523	-	-	5,625,323
Northeast	-1,075,547	-24.6	367,733	-195,111	-31.7	1,199,598
New England	-88,134	-7.5	110,761	5,849	5.3	258,826
Maine	3,330	2.9	5,197	310	10.1	5,316
New Hampshire	27,091	25.2	5,334	812	19.8	11,274
Vermont	2,399	4.4	2,838	-145	-7.9	4,555
Massachusetts	-56,324	-10.8	53,543	1,616	2.6	152,179
Rhode Island	2,320	2.7	8,920	916	9.1	16,626
Connecticut	-66,950	-23.5	34,929	2,340	8.0	68,876
Middle Atlantic	-987,413	-30.8	256,972	-200,960	-39.7	940,772
New York	-669,102	-46.3	136,979	-205,146	-59.4	583,769
New Jersey	-186,933	-28.6	54,140	4,104	3.4	257,625
Pennsylvania	-131,378	-11.8	65,853	82	0.2	99,378
Midwest	-564,474	-9.9	282,699	23,285	8.8	775,171
East North Central	-517,695	-13.0	198,287	-4,884	-2.3	575,469
Ohio	-114,627	-11.1	44,607	-2,313	-8.9	75,978
Indiana	11,490	2.1	23,229	10,135	84.0	51,920
Illinois	-318,776	-31.0	66,671	-23,840	-19.1	287,160
Michigan	-98,660	-11.2	41,740	6,730	17.3	117,922
Wisconsin	2,878	0.6	22,040	4,404	30.9	42,489
West North Central	-46,779	-2.7	84,412	28,169	57.2	199,702
Minnesota	11,658	2.7	18,404	17,511	102.6	66,101
Iowa	-32,636	-12.2	9,676	-376	-6.2	28,484
Missouri	42,397	8.5	25,432	3,656	35.8	41,931
North Dakota	-23,495	-38.4	3,518	-1,712	-172.4	3,698
South Dakota	-12,347	-17.6	3,209	-121	-13.1	3,916
Nebraska	-20,160	-13.1	7,713	4,807	101.0	20,569
Kansas	-12,196	-5.2	16,460	4,404	47.6	35,003
South	1,544,372	18.7	769,361	255,427	40.0	1,845,918
South Atlantic	1,217,230	29.1	463,241	217,891	59.8	1,097,300
Delaware	15,044	22.6	7,324	2,339	73.4	9,984
Maryland	-29,128	-6.6	41,798	9,405	23.7	105,509
District of Columbia	-35,515	-72.2	10,333	-9,816	-157.3	20,066
Virginia	59,364	10.0	71,818	16,366	39.7	133,633
West Virginia	-9,778	-5.8	4,441	-976	-60.3	3,893
North Carolina	293,525	43.5	56,956	44,358	187.0	139,381
South Carolina	124,151	35.6	25,563	8,054	111.9	33,815
Georgia	281,312	42.1	69,145	59,393	178.1	174,276
Florida	518,255	44.3	175,863	88,768	42.6	476,743
East South Central	218,189	14.3	87,306	15,005	64.2	110,628
Kentucky	31,571	8.7	18,979	2,556	52.3	27,002
Tennessee	135,615	27.1	29,547	10,699	111.0	48,425
Alabama	25,158	6.3	23,636	665	11.0	25,076
Mississippi	25,845	10.1	15,144	1,085	38.7	10,125
West South Central	108,953	4.3	218,814	22,531	9.0	637,990
Arkansas	35,049	14.8	14,085	7,067	155.1	19,572
Louisiana	-72,193	-17.7	22,199	-3,566	-36.2	19,827
Oklahoma	14,559	4.8	20,380	2,328	25.2	34,781
Texas	131,538	8.2	162,150	16,702	7.3	563,810
West	95,649	2.1	450,730	-83,601	-8.5	1,804,636
Mountain	591,543	41.1	141,940	132,677	111.4	387,425
Montana	-4,681	-5.6	4,441	-485	-34.2	2,443
Idaho	33,830	31.0	7,757	17	0.3	13,209
Wyoming	-12,024	-26.1	3,112	-503	-53.4	2,125
New Mexico	-29,159	-18.7	14,599	-786	-6.3	24,107
Arizona	275,814	72.7	41,380	40,334	87.4	141,602
Colorado	131,528	37.8	35,731	31,105	134.0	98,984
Utah	17,270	9.4	18,333	8,026	79.7	46,330
Nevada	178,965	133.0	16,587	54,969	275.9	58,625
Pacific	-495,894	-15.4	308,790	-216,278	-24.9	1,417,211
Washington	55,300	11.5	48,924	20,030	43.7	126,743
Oregon	63,538	22.4	17,822	11,127	53.5	65,539
California	-518,187	-22.6	218,046	-237,349	-30.4	1,189,612
Alaska	-31,040	-54.7	6,835	542	17.8	5,729
Hawaii	-65,505	-67.4	17,163	-10,628	-55.5	29,588

- Net domestic migration, both number and rate, are by definition zero for the United States.

¹The net domestic migration rate in this report is based on an approximated 1995 population, which is the sum of people who reported living in the area in both 1995 and 2000, and those who reported living in that area in 1995 but lived elsewhere in 2000. The net domestic migration rate is the 1995 to 2000 net domestic migration divided by the approximated 1995 population and multiplied by 1,000.

²Includes movers from foreign countries, as well as movers from Puerto Rico, U.S. Island Areas, and U.S. minor outlying islands.

Note: A negative value for net migration or the net migration rate is indicative of net outmigration, meaning that more migrants left an area than entered it. Positive numbers reflect net immigration to an area.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000.

Characteristics of California's Foreign-Born In- and Outmigrants

California, the country's most populous state, has in recent decades been the leading destination for migrants from abroad. During the 1990s, California also experienced high net domestic outmigration, with a total net outflow of 756,000 between 1995 and 2000, roughly one-third of whom were foreign born.

As described earlier, California was by far the top destination for foreign-born movers from abroad, with over 1 million who lived abroad 5 years previously. Though most of California's foreign-born population did not move or moved within state during the 5-year period, California was still the lead actor in redistributing the foreign born to other states, with over 400,000 domestic outmigrants. Though the number of foreign born who moved to California from other states was almost half the number who left (203,000), California remained one of the most attractive states for domestic foreign-born in-migrants.

Did the characteristics of the foreign born who left California differ from those of foreign-born people who moved to the state? Did these migrant groups differ from those who came from abroad and foreign-born who did not leave the state of California (nonmovers and intrastate movers) between 1995 and 2000?

The foreign born who left California to other states differed significantly from the foreign born who moved to California, as shown in Table 3. Foreign-born outmigrants from California tended to be younger, were more likely to be Hispanic or noncitizens, and reported less education, and poorer English language ability than the foreign born who moved to California between 1995 and 2000. A large share of foreign-born migrants to California from other states were Asian (44.5 percent) and reported at least a college degree (36.8 percent). The characteristics of foreign-born California outmigrants tended to be more similar to California "stayers," though they were more likely to be young, Hispanic, male, poor, and noncitizens.

The foreign born who moved from abroad to California were younger (mean age of 30) than the foreign born who moved to California from other states, left California, or stayed in California between 1995 and 2000. The movers from abroad were more likely to have a college degree than the resident foreign-born population of California, but the movers from abroad were also more likely to be poor, report limited English language ability, or be noncitizens (95 percent). This comparison illustrates how immigrants are sometimes overrepresented at the top and bottom of the socioeconomic spectrum, relative to the total foreign-born population.

California's largest flows of foreign-born migrants to other states were to Nevada (48,000), Texas (42,000), Arizona (36,000), and Washington (27,000). California's role as a source of population redistribution was not limited to neighboring states in the West: Georgia had higher net foreign-born migration from California than from much closer immigrant gateway states such as Florida or New York.

North Dakota (172.4) and the District of Columbia (157.3) had the highest rates of foreign-born outmigration to other states.⁹

⁹ The difference between North Dakota and the District of Columbia was not statistically significant.

North Dakota's foreign-born population is small and its net outmigration may be associated with retirement. Most of the District of Columbia's foreign-born outmigration (13,000 of 21,000) was to the adjacent states of Virginia and Maryland.

The origins of the growing foreign-born populations in North Carolina, Georgia, and Nevada were both domestic and international.

The foreign-born populations in North Carolina, Georgia, Nevada, and Arkansas grew by 200 percent or more between 1990 and 2000. The foreign-born population grew by 274 percent in North Carolina,

233 percent in Georgia, and 202 percent in Nevada. Migration, both internal and from abroad, was the source of these increases.

Nevada was one of the few states that had more foreign-born in-migrants from other states (73,000) than foreign-born movers from abroad (59,000). The bulk of these foreign-born domestic migrants came from California (48,000).

While most foreign-born individuals who moved to North Carolina were living abroad in 1995 (139,000), another 76,000 moved from another state. However, comparing residences only in 1995 and

Table 3.
Characteristics of California's Foreign-Born Population by 1995 to 2000 Migration Status: 2000

(Data based on a sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf)

Characteristic	In California in 1995		Outside California in 1995	
	Stayed in California	Moved to other states	Moved from other states	Moved from abroad ¹
Total (aged 5 and over)	7,369,943	439,854	202,505	1,189,612
Mean age (years)	40.6	34.5	37.5	29.7
Median household income	\$46,316	\$39,304	\$55,814	\$40,000
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION				
Race/Hispanic Origin				
White alone, not Hispanic	13.4	12.0	23.2	14.4
Black alone, not Hispanic	0.9	2.1	2.4	1.4
Asian alone, not Hispanic	27.1	23.3	44.5	30.2
Hispanic	55.6	59.6	25.8	50.1
Other	3.0	2.9	4.1	4.0
Sex				
Male	49.3	54.9	51.7	51.8
Female	50.7	45.1	48.3	48.2
Education (aged 25 and over)				
Not a high school graduate	45.7	45.4	33.6	37.3
High school graduate	16.2	17.5	14.3	14.8
Some college or associate degree	19.0	16.9	15.3	14.5
College graduate or more	19.1	20.2	36.8	33.3
English Language Ability				
Very well	36.4	37.2	55.2	23.3
Well	27.6	25.9	24.7	22.9
Not well	24.0	25.8	14.0	27.8
Not at all	12.0	11.1	6.1	26.0
Citizenship				
Citizens	45.0	32.3	42.4	4.8
Noncitizens	55.0	67.8	57.6	95.2
Poverty Status in 1999				
Not in poverty	82.7	79.6	85.7	70.4
In poverty	17.3	20.4	14.3	29.6

¹Includes movers from foreign countries, as well as movers from Puerto Rico, U.S. Island Areas, and U.S. minor outlying islands.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000.

2000 could mean that many of the new arrivals from abroad initially came to a state other than North Carolina and subsequently moved there during that 5-year period. Of the foreign-born migrants who moved to North Carolina from other states, 16,000 came from California, followed by the other

gateway states of New York, Florida, and Texas.

The top origins for foreign-born domestic migrants to Georgia included the six gateway immigration states. The highest number of foreign-born immigrants came from California (19,200), New York (14,100) and Florida (13,800), and Texas (9,200), while high numbers

also came from New Jersey (4,000) and Illinois (3,600).¹⁰ In addition to 96,000 foreign born immigrants from other states, Georgia also had 174,000 foreign-born migrants move there from abroad.

Native and foreign-born migration followed similar patterns, with some exceptions.

Many states experienced similar domestic migration patterns for their native and foreign-born populations. States with net immigration of natives from other states usually had net immigration of foreign born, too. Similarly, states with net outmigration of natives to other states also had net outmigration of foreign-born migrants.

There were some notable exceptions, however. Idaho, which had a large net domestic migration of natives from other states, saw very little net migration of foreign-born individuals from other states (Table 2) although it did experience foreign-born migration from abroad. Likewise, New Jersey and Michigan had considerable outmigration of natives but had net immigration of foreign born from other states.

Some states had net domestic outmigration of both natives and foreign-born people, including such major native and foreign-born origin states as California and New York. For both of these states, net domestic outmigration rates were higher for the foreign born than for natives. It is important to keep in mind that movers from abroad—both native and foreign born—counterbalanced much of the domestic outmigration from these and other states.

¹⁰ The differences between New York and Florida, and New Jersey and Illinois, were not statistically significant.





Figure 1. Net Domestic Migration of Natives and the Foreign Born: 1995 to 2000

(Data based on a sample. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf)



COUNTY-LEVEL MIGRATION

County-level net domestic migration rates for both native and foreign-born migrants are mapped simultaneously in Figure 1, revealing migration patterns not evident at the state level. The four cells in the matrix represent the four combinations of positive and negative net domestic migration rates for natives and the foreign born. Counties shaded dark blue had net immigration of both natives and foreign born. Light blue counties had net domestic outmigration of natives but net domestic immigration of foreign born. Dark yellow counties had net domestic immigration of natives but net domestic outmigration of foreign born. Finally, counties shaded light yellow had net domestic outmigration of both natives and foreign born.

Counties shaded dark blue, indicating net immigration of both natives and the foreign-born population, are found in many of the country's fastest-growing areas: the southern Atlantic coast states, the Ozarks of southwest Missouri and northwest Arkansas, and fast-growing metropolitan areas in Texas, the Rocky Mountain states, and the Pacific Northwest.

Several different groupings of counties shaded light blue and light yellow, indicating areas with net outmigration of natives, are visible. One band stretches across New York and Pennsylvania south through Appalachia. A second large band starts in Montana and covers much of the Great Plains region through the Dakotas, Nebraska, western Kansas, and west Texas.

The sizable number of midwestern counties shaded light blue (net outmigration of natives and net immigration of foreign born)

highlights the emergence of the foreign-born population as a potentially important source of immigrants for a region with a history of net domestic outmigration. The migration of foreign-born people to the Midwest from elsewhere in the country and from abroad is a relatively recent phenomenon, one that could mitigate some of the population loss that has occurred in many of these counties in recent decades.

Several populous counties—like Richmond County, New York (Staten Island), and Monmouth County, New Jersey—had net domestic outmigration of natives that was counterbalanced by foreign-born net domestic immigration. This situation was uncommon, however. In many cases sizable net outmigration of natives was not offset by net immigration of foreign-born individuals.

SUMMARY

Census 2000 data reveal several findings concerning the mobility and migration patterns of natives and the foreign born in the United States:

- The country's foreign-born population, particularly noncitizens and recent arrivals from abroad, had a high rate of geographic mobility between 1995 and 2000.
- Six "gateway" states (California, New York, Texas, Florida, Illinois, and New Jersey) accounted for roughly 60 percent of the 5.6 million foreign-born who moved to the United States from abroad between 1995 and 2000.
- Three of these gateway states—New York, California, and Illinois—also had considerable outmigration of their foreign-

born populations to other states between 1995 and 2000. This secondary migration served to redistribute some of the foreign-born population away from the immigration gateway states into nearly all other states.

- Domestic migration patterns of both foreign-born and native migrants were, broadly speaking, quite similar, with generally common destinations. Many of the states in the South Atlantic and Mountain divisions that had net immigration of natives also had net immigration of people who were foreign born. Other states, including California, New York, Illinois, and Hawaii, had net outmigration of both natives and foreign born.
- Some states in the Midwest had net outmigration of natives but net immigration of the foreign-born population.
- Numerous counties in the Midwest had net domestic outmigration of natives but net domestic immigration of foreign-born migrants. Fast-growing regions of the country often had net immigration of both natives and foreign-born people.

As the size of the foreign-born population in the United States increases in numerical and percentage terms, understanding the migration patterns of this mobile and fast-growing group will become increasingly important for understanding the country's overall migration picture. These patterns hold particular significance for those areas where net immigration of foreign-born migrants runs counter to long-established patterns of net outmigration. Migration, both internal and international, remains a critical factor in determining the population growth

or decline of many areas; consequently, new migration patterns may reveal potential new sources of population growth.

ACCURACY OF THE ESTIMATES

The data contained in this report are based on the sample of households who responded to the Census 2000 long form. Nationally, approximately 1 out of every 6 housing units was included in this sample. As a result, the sample estimates may differ somewhat from the 100-percent figures that would have been obtained if all housing units, people within those housing units, and people living in group quarters had been enumerated using the same questionnaires, instructions, enumerators, and so forth. The sample estimates also differ from the values that would have been obtained from different samples of housing units, people within those housing units, and people living in group quarters. The deviation of a sample estimate from the average of all possible samples is called the sampling error.

In addition to the variability that arises from the sampling procedures, both sample data and 100-percent data are subject to nonsampling error. Nonsampling error may be introduced during any of the various complex operations used to collect and process data. Such errors may include: not enumerating every household or every person in the population, failing to obtain all required information from the respondents, obtaining incorrect or inconsistent information, and recording information incorrectly. In addition, errors can occur during

the field review of the enumerators' work, during clerical handling of the census questionnaires, or during the electronic processing of the questionnaires.

Nonsampling error may affect the data in two ways: (1) errors that are introduced randomly will increase the variability of the data and, therefore, should be reflected in the standard errors; and (2) errors that tend to be consistent in one direction will bias both sample and 100-percent data in that direction. For example, if respondents consistently tend to underreport their incomes, then the resulting estimates of households or families by income category will tend to be understated for the higher income categories and overstated for the lower income categories. Such biases are not reflected in the standard errors.

While it is impossible to eliminate error from an operation as large and complex as the decennial census, the Census Bureau attempts to control the sources of such error during the data collection and processing operations. The primary sources of error and the programs instituted to control error in Census 2000 are described in detail in *Summary File 3 Technical Documentation* under Chapter 8, "Accuracy of the Data," located at www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf.

All statements in this Census 2000 report have undergone statistical testing and all comparisons are significant at the 90-percent confidence level, unless otherwise noted. The estimates in tables, maps, and other figures may vary from actual values due to sampling

and nonsampling errors. As a result, estimates in one category may not be significantly different from estimates assigned to a different category. Further information on the accuracy of the data is located at www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf. For further information on the computation and use of standard errors, contact the Decennial Statistical Studies Division at 301-763-4242.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

More detailed information on decennial migration products, including additional tables and other product announcements, is available on the Internet and can be accessed via the Census Bureau's decennial migration Web page at www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/migration.html.

The decennial migration Web page contains additional detailed migration tables not included in this report, a schedule of upcoming migration data releases, and other migration-related Census 2000 Special Reports.

For more information on decennial migration products, please contact:

Population Distribution Branch
Population Division
U.S. Census Bureau
301-763-2419

or send e-mail to pop@census.gov.

For a more detailed discussion of the foreign-born population, see *Profile of the Foreign Born Population in the United States: 2000*, available at www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/p23-206.pdf.

Information on other population and housing topics is presented in the Census 2000 Brief and Special Reports Series, located on the U.S. Census Bureau's Web site at www.census.gov/population/www/cen2000/briefs.html. These series present information about

race, Hispanic origin, age, sex, household type, housing tenure, and other social, economic, and housing characteristics.

Census 2000 information and data can also be accessed via the Census 2000 Gateway Web page at

www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html.

For more information about Census 2000, including data products, call our Customer Services Center at 301-763-INFO (4636) or e-mail webmaster@census.gov.