

12-22-2005

# Foreign Migration to the Cleveland-Akron-Lorain Metropolitan Area From 1995 to 2000

Mark Salling

*Cleveland State University*, [m.salling@csuohio.edu](mailto:m.salling@csuohio.edu)

Ellen Cyran

*Cleveland State University*, [e.cyran@csuohio.edu](mailto:e.cyran@csuohio.edu)

## How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Follow this and additional works at: [https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/urban\\_facpub](https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/urban_facpub)

 Part of the [Categorical Data Analysis Commons](#), [Databases and Information Systems Commons](#), [Geographic Information Sciences Commons](#), [Longitudinal Data Analysis and Time Series Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies Commons](#)

---

## Repository Citation

Salling, Mark and Cyran, Ellen, "Foreign Migration to the Cleveland-Akron-Lorain Metropolitan Area From 1995 to 2000" (2005). *Urban Publications*. 0 1 2 3 248.

[https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/urban\\_facpub/248](https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/urban_facpub/248)

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Urban Publications by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact [library.es@csuohio.edu](mailto:library.es@csuohio.edu).



Prepared by:  
Mark Salling, Ph.D.  
Ellen Cyran

As part of:  
The CSU Presidential Initiative  
For Economic Development

**Foreign  
Migration to  
the Cleveland-  
Akron-Lorain  
Metropolitan  
Area from  
1995 to 2000**



**Northern Ohio Data &  
Information Service  
(NODIS)**

2121 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44115  
<http://urban.csuohio.edu>



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The authors thank the Levin College's Dr. Ziona Austrian for reviewing an earlier draft, Susan Petrone for her editorial suggestions, and Olga Lee for formatting the final report. Any errors are the responsibility of the authors.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES .....</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>DATA AND METHODS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>THE NUMBER OF MIGRANTS FROM ABROAD, THEIR ORIGIN, AND CITIZENSHIP STATUS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
NUMBER OF MIGRANTS .....	5
PLACES OF ORIGIN .....	5
CITIZENSHIP STATUS .....	8
<b>COMPARISON OF CHARACTERISTICS OF FOREIGN MIGRANTS WITH DOMESTIC MIGRANTS, AND THE GENERAL POPULATION OF THE REGION .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>A. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Age .....	10
Gender .....	12
Household and Family Status .....	13
<b>B. HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
Home Ownership .....	17
Housing Value .....	18
Age of Housing .....	19
<b>C. SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS .....</b>	<b>21</b>
Educational Attainment .....	21
College Enrollment .....	22
Labor Force Participation .....	23
Unemployment .....	24
Income .....	25
Poverty .....	26
Occupations .....	27
Industries .....	30
<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>32</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: MAJOR COUNTRIES OF MIGRANTS .....	7
--	---

## LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: NUMBER OF MIGRANTS TO AND FROM THE REGION .....	6
FIGURE 2: CONTINENTS OF FOREIGN MIGRATION.....	6
FIGURE 3: MAJOR COUNTRIES OF MIGRANTS .....	7
FIGURE 4: CITIZEN STATUS OF FOREIGN MIGRANTS .....	9
FIGURE 5: AGE DISTRIBUTION OF FOREIGN MIGRANTS .....	11
FIGURE 6: GENDER OF MIGRANTS.....	12
FIGURE 7: MARITAL STATUS OF FOREIGN MIGRANTS, PERSONS AGE 15 AND OLDER .....	13
FIGURE 8: PERCENTAGE MARRIED, PERSONS AGE 15 AND OLDER.....	14
FIGURE 9: HOUSEHOLD TYPES.....	14
FIGURE 10: FAMILIES WITH (OWN) CHILDREN (UNDER 18).....	15
FIGURE 11: AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE .....	16
FIGURE 12: PERCENTAGE RENTER OCCUPIED.....	17
FIGURE 13: MEDIAN HOUSING VALUE, SPECIFIED OWNER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS.....	18
FIGURE 14: YEAR HOUSING WAS BUILT, FOREIGN MIGRANTS TO CAL AND GENERAL POPULATION OF CAL .....	19
FIGURE 15: YEAR HOUSING WAS BUILT, FOREIGN MIGRANTS .....	20
FIGURE 15: PERCENTAGE WITH A BACHELOR'S DEGREE OR HIGHER, PERSONS AGE 25 AND OLDER. 21	
FIGURE 16: PERCENTAGE ENROLLED IN COLLEGE, PERSONS AGE 18 AND OLDER .....	22
FIGURE 17: PERCENTAGE IN THE LABOR FORCE, CIVILIAN NON-INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS AGE 16 AND OLDER .....	23
FIGURE 18: UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, PERSONS 16 AND OLDER .....	24
FIGURE 19: 1999 MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME.....	25
FIGURE 20: POVERTY RATE .....	26
FIGURE 21: MAJOR OCCUPATION TYPES, FOREIGN MIGRANTS TO THE CAL AND THE GENERAL POPULATION OF THE CAL.....	28
FIGURE 22: MAJOR OCCUPATIONS, FOREIGN MIGRANTS.....	29
FIGURE 23: EMPLOYMENT IN MAJOR INDUSTRIES, ALL MIGRANT CATEGORIES IN THE CAL .....	30
FIGURE 24: MAJOR INDUSTRIES, FOREIGN MIGRANTS .....	31

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report is one of a series on migration to and from the region using the five percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) of the 2000 Census of Population and Housing and provides a description of foreign migrants moving to the Cleveland-Akron-Lorain (CAL) Consolidated Metropolitan Area (CMSA) from 1995 to 2000.\*

The report identifies the countries of origin of migrants and compares the demographic, socioeconomic, and housing characteristics of the foreign migrants to the CAL with other groups, including foreign migrants to Ohio and the nation, and, at times, to domestic migrants to and from the CAL.

Findings include the following:

1. With a net increase of more than 23,000 persons from abroad, foreign migration between 1995 and 2000 helped mitigate the 60,000-person net loss from domestic migration to approximately 37,000 persons lost through migration in the five-year period.
2. The largest single group of migrants to the region from outside the 50 states was Puerto Rico.
3. Aside from this population, the CAL's foreign migrants from this period were largely Eastern European or Asian.
4. Demographically, they were more likely to be older, married, and in families with children than foreign migrants to the rest of the nation. The CAL's foreign migrants were evenly split in gender, which was different from the pattern of mostly male foreign migrants to the state and nation.
5. In terms of housing, the CAL's foreign migrants were largely housing renters; and while those who owned their homes had, on average, housing valued higher than the region's average, they were less valued than those owned by movers to the region from other parts of the country.
6. Unemployment and poverty rates were higher than those of non-migrants in the CAL, though their poverty rate was essentially the same as that of the state's and nation's groups from this period.
7. Despite the higher unemployment rate, they were more likely to be in technical and higher skilled occupations, such as in computer and mathematical, education, science, and engineering categories, than either the region's non-migrants or foreign migrants to the nation as a whole.

---

\* For this report foreign migrants are anyone moving from outside the United States. For most purposes, migrants from Puerto Rico are included among the domestic migrant population. Foreign migrants include both U.S.-born and foreign-born populations who lived in another country in 1995. Almost a quarter of the foreign migrants to the region were born in the United States.



8. Though the region did not benefit from large numbers of migrants from abroad (compared to the rest of the nation), it did receive a generally more educated foreign population. They had higher percentages of persons with a bachelor's degree or higher than did the region's non-migrants, domestic migrants to or from the region, and other foreign migrants to the U.S. They were also more likely attending college in 2000 than the general population of the region and the other foreign migrants to the nation.

## INTRODUCTION

What do we know about the population that has recently moved to northeast Ohio from foreign lands? Based on releases of 2000 census data, local media have occasionally reported on recent migration from Russia and Asia, relating some of the basic numbers of such populations to the ethnic and cultural landscapes and institutions of the region.<sup>1</sup> Kaufman, Olson, and Kaufman<sup>2</sup> have described the factors that lead to attracting such migration and the implications for urban development. However, the detailed demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the most recent foreign migration to the region have not been explored despite the abundant data on the subject that is available from the 2000 census.

Thus this report, one of a series on migration to and from the region, provides a description of the foreign migrants moving to the Cleveland-Akron-Lorain (CAL) Consolidated Metropolitan Area (CMSA) from 1995 to 2000.<sup>3</sup>

## DATA AND METHODS

For this analysis we use data from the five percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) of the 2000 Census of Population and Housing. The PUMS data enable the researcher to calculate custom cross-tabulations and summary statistics of the population. Among the data available in PUMS is the location of the person five years earlier, in 1995. Thus we can generate the characteristics of persons who moved to the CAL between 1995 and the 2000 census, whether from other parts of the nation or from abroad. In addition we can identify people who lived elsewhere in the United States (including Puerto Rico) at the time of the census but reported that they lived in the CAL in 1995. Migrants reported in PUMS are therefore at least five years old in the 2000 census. For some comparisons, we also use tabulated 100 percent count data from the 2000 Census Summary File 1 and the 17 percent sample data from Summary File 3.

---

<sup>1</sup> For example see Smith, Robert L., "Census 2000: Melting pot bubbles over," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, June 16, 2002.

<sup>2</sup> Kaufman, Sanda, William Olson, and Miron Kaufman, *Immigration and Urban Development: Implications for Greater Cleveland*, Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University, March, 2003. [http://urban.csuohio.edu/rith\\_ratner/pubs/immigration.pdf](http://urban.csuohio.edu/rith_ratner/pubs/immigration.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> The CAL CMSA includes Ashtabula, Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain, Medina, Portage, and Summit Counties.

With a few exceptions we do not provide here an analysis of the distribution of these migrants within the state or CAL; we expect to provide that analysis in a later report.<sup>4</sup>

For this report, foreign migrants are anyone moving from outside the United States. Domestic migrants include all migrants within the United States or Puerto Rico. Foreign migrants include both U.S. born and foreign-born populations that lived in another country in 1995. Though a comparable set of data concerning those persons who moved abroad during this same period would be useful, detailed information about foreign out-migrants is not available from the census data used here. We do report the total number of migrants from the region to foreign lands based on Census Bureau's data on international migration.

We divide the analysis into two major sections. First, we describe the number of migrants from abroad and identify the continents and subcontinents and countries from which they came. Second, we compare the demographic, socioeconomic, and housing characteristics of the foreign migrants to the CAL with other groups, including foreign migrants to the state of Ohio and to the nation as a whole. For some portions of the analysis we also compare the CAL's foreign migrants to domestic migrants to and from the CAL and to the region's non-migrants and/or the entire 2000 population in order to draw attention to specific similarities or differences among these groups.<sup>5</sup>

Non-migrants may have moved during this period but not out of the region. We refer to the entire population of the region in 2000 as the "general population" in the discussion below.

We emphasize that the PUMS data in particular are based on a relatively small sample, and small numbers and small differences in numbers are subject to sampling error to a greater extent and are less reliable in representing the population than are larger numbers and differences. Thus we caution the reader to take care in interpreting relatively small numbers and percentages.

---

<sup>4</sup> While the PUMS data do not specify the same level of geographic detail for enumerated residents that other 2000 census data provide (such as census tracts and municipality), the PUMS data do specify larger geographic areas in which residents lived in 2000. These geographic areas are Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMAs) and represent combinations of census tracts, municipalities, townships, or counties in which, in aggregate, there are at least 100,000 persons. In addition, the Census Bureau combined PUMAs to whole counties (one or more) to create Migration PUMAs for reporting where migrants moved from. Thus, for each PUMA we know the Migration PUMA from which people moved. For this analysis we aggregate the region's PUMAs and Migration PUMAs to the eight-county metropolitan area.

<sup>5</sup> Another report in this series focuses on comparisons between the domestic in-and out-migrants from the region.

## **THE NUMBER OF MIGRANTS FROM ABROAD, THEIR ORIGIN, AND CITIZENSHIP STATUS**

### **NUMBER OF MIGRANTS**

We estimate migration of 10,413 persons moving from the CAL to other nations.<sup>6</sup> With an estimate from PUMS of 32,598 moving to the CAL from abroad, the region had a net gain in international migration of an estimated 23,740 persons during this period. Thus while the region lost approximately 60,000 in net migration with the remainder of the nation, some of that loss was mitigated by positive net international migration (see Figure 1). As a result, the region lost approximately 37,039 through total net migration.

### **PLACES OF ORIGIN**

A significant portion (15.9 percent) of the migrants to the region were from abroad. In fact, one in 100 (1.1 percent) of the region's total population in 2000 were recent foreign migrants. More than 2.7 percent of the nation's population had migrated to the U.S. since 1995. Thus the region had a lower rate of foreign migration than the nation. Most of this difference is due to the relatively large influx of migrants from Latin American countries into the Southwest and Southeast regions of the country (see Figure 2).

The CAL attracted a larger portion of European migrants than either the U.S. or Ohio. Ohio's foreign migrants included larger percentages of Asians and Africans. The nation had more foreign migrants from Latin America, mostly from Mexico (see Table 1 and Figure 3). The nation had a large foreign migration from Mexico (27 percent); Ohio (7.7 percent) and the CAL (5 percent) had relatively fewer of these migrants.

---

<sup>6</sup> We estimate the region's emigrants to other nations by using the net international migration estimate for 2000 that is provided by the Census Bureau (See <http://www.census.gov/popest/estimates.php> for information about these data; download the entire dataset at <http://www.census.gov/popest/counties/files/CO-EST2004-ALLDATA.csv>). We multiplied the Census Bureau's estimate of 4,748 migrants from the CAL to other countries in 2000 by five to estimate the five-year total from 1995 to 2000. Since this estimate of 23,740 would include children born between 1995 and 2000, we also subtract out the estimated number of those children by applying the percentage of the general population of the region that is in that age cohort (6.55%).

Figure 1: Number of Migrants to and from the Region




Figure 2: Continents of Foreign Migration





Table 1: Major Countries of Migrants

Country	Number Moving to:			Percent of Total Foreign Migrants to:		
	Nation	Ohio	CAL	Nation	Ohio	CAL
Ukraine	93,764	3,887	2,663	1.3	3.4	8.2
India	309,095	8,810	2,303	4.2	7.8	7.1
Germany	351,432	7,711	1,706	4.8	6.8	5.2
Mexico	1,963,155	8,770	1,636	26.9	7.7	5.0
China	196,524	5,481	1,618	2.7	4.8	5.0
Russia	112,487	3,229	1,554	1.5	2.8	4.8
Canada	289,293	6,134	1,402	4.0	5.4	4.3
Japan	253,385	6,649	1,122	3.5	5.9	3.4
Romania	28,643	1,507	1,056	0.4	1.3	3.2

Figure 3: Major Countries of Migrants



The countries with the largest number of emigrants to the CAL were the Ukraine (2,663) and India (2,303), together accounting for 15.3 percent of the migrants from abroad. The CAL also attracted a large proportion of persons from Russia and Romania relative to the nation and state.

Ohio also attracted a larger percentage of foreign migrants from Germany and Japan compared to either the nation or the CAL. The large number from Japan is probably partly because of the Japanese-owned Honda automobile manufacturing plant in Marysville, Ohio. Approximately 14 percent of Ohio's migrants from Japan in the 1995 to 2000 period located in the northwestern portion of Franklin County, not far from Marysville. Another large Japanese population of migrants is located near Wright-Patterson AFB (having 7.5 percent of Ohio's Japanese foreign migrants from the period).

Migrants from Germany also located in that part of the state (6.2 percent of the German migrants), and one area in the Cincinnati vicinity also attracted large percentages of the emigrants from Germany to Ohio (5.3 percent and 5.0 percent, respectively). The German migration to the CAL includes a substantial number who were born in the United States (50 percent) and some had apparently returned from military service abroad since 1990 – almost 15 percent were in active duty in that period, whereas less than three percent of the other migrants from abroad to the CAL had been on active duty in the decade.

Other concentrations include the almost 1,800 Ukrainian and Russian migrants who located in areas within Cuyahoga County. One area of concentration is in the south central suburbs of the county containing the cities of Brooklyn, Linndale, Parma, and Parma Heights; another is an area on the eastern side of Cuyahoga County.


Although not included among the foreign migrants, it is notable that the region attracted an estimated 4,216 persons from Puerto Rico, while 1,086 of the region's residents moved there between 1995 and 2000. The net increase of 3,130 persons easily constitutes the largest group of migrants from places outside the fifty states.

## **CITIZENSHIP STATUS**

Most foreign migrants from 1995 to 2000 were not U.S. citizens by the time of the 2000 census. Nationally 73 percent were not citizens (see Figure 4). Ohio and the CAL had larger proportions of their foreign migrants who were citizens by either having been born in the U.S., born in U.S. island areas such as Guam, or born to U.S. citizens abroad. Almost a third (31.6 percent) of foreign migrants to Ohio were born in the United States, compared to 20.3 percent

for the U.S. and 25 percent for the CAL. A small percentage of foreign migrants became naturalized by 2000 – 4.1 percent nationally, 3.1 percent in Ohio, and 4.4 percent in the CAL.

**Figure 4: Citizen Status of Foreign Migrants**



U.S. island areas include Puerto Rico, Guam, U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Northern Marianas. However, we include Puerto Rico as domestic migrants and thus are not included in this graph.



## **COMPARISON OF CHARACTERISTICS OF FOREIGN MIGRANTS WITH DOMESTIC MIGRANTS, AND THE GENERAL POPULATION OF THE REGION**

### **A. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS**


Several demographic attributes of the various migration groups are described here including age, gender, household size and composition, and marital status.

#### **Age**

Migrants from foreign countries are generally younger than other migrants. The median age of the nation's migrants from abroad in the last half of the 1990s was 27, compared to 35 for the entire population. The CAL's foreign migrants, while younger than the region's general population which was 36 in 2000, were slightly older than the nation's foreign migrants with a median age of 29.

Figure 5 illustrates that the CAL had an older profile of foreign migrants among the adult population than that of foreign migrants to the nation or state. It had larger percentages among the 30 and older age cohorts and smaller percentages in the 18 to 24 age groups. The CAL also had a higher percentage in younger children's ages.


Figure 5: Age Distribution of Foreign Migrants



### Gender

Most migrants from abroad to the nation and the state were male. However, the CAL had a larger percentage of female foreign migrants (see Figure 6). The percent female among foreign migrants was 51 percent for the CAL and approximately 46 percent for the state and nation.


Figure 6: Gender of Migrants




### Household and Family Status

Differences in age distributions among foreign migrants for the CAL, Ohio, and the nation are consistent with differences in the family types of foreign migrants to these three geographic areas. Figure 7 compares the marital status of foreign migrants to the nation, to Ohio, and to the region. A greater proportion of these migrants to the CAL were married than was the case for the nation and state. Figure 8 shows us that, compared to domestic in or out migrants to the CAL, a larger percentages of the migrants from foreign countries, among persons age 15 and older, were married (55 percent to 46 percent). Approximately 52 percent of the general population of this age group in the CAL was married in 2000.

**Figure 7: Marital Status of Foreign Migrants, Persons Age 15 and Older**




**Figure 8: Percentage Married, Persons Age 15 and Older**




Foreign migrants were also more likely to be in family households than was the general population in 2000 (see Figure 9). Whereas 66 percent of the general population for the CAL was in family households in 2000, 71 percent of the CAL's foreign migrants were in such households. For domestic migrants to the CAL and domestic out-migrants from the CAL, the numbers are 62 percent and 59 percent, respectively.

**Figure 9: Household Types**




The number of families with (their own) children (age 18 and under) was higher for foreign migrants (at 56.4 percent) than in or out migrants (at 52 percent and 48 percent, respectively). Of the foreign migrants in non-family households, 67 percent lived alone compared to 65 percent for domestic migrants and 52 percent for domestic out-migrants. For the general population in the CAL, 85 percent of those in non-family households were persons living alone in 2000.

**Figure 10: Families with (own) Children (under 18)**



Related to their being more likely to be married and in families with children, the number of persons per family was larger for foreign migrants, whether coming to the nation, to Ohio, or to the CAL, compared to the general population (see Figure 11). The larger family size for the nation likely reflects the Hispanic migrant population in the Southwest.

**Figure 11: Average Family Size**




## B. HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

Housing characteristics described here include home ownership, housing value, and age of housing.

### Home Ownership

Foreign migrants between 1995 and 2000 were usually renters, and a far greater proportion of them rented than either in-or out-domestic migrants or the general population (see Figure 12). For the general population, 66 percent of households owned their home in 2000; but for foreign migrants, only about 32 percent were owners. Domestic in and out migrants to and from the CAL were more likely to own their homes in 2000 -- about 46 percent.

Figure 12: Percentage Renter Occupied






### Housing Value

Recent migrants generally had homes with higher values than those who had not moved (see Figure 13). Of the foreign migrants who owned their home in the CAL in 2000, the median value of the homes was higher than the median value of homes in the general population (\$129,000 to \$118,000, respectively). The median housing value for domestic migrants to the region was \$136,000, and it was \$132,000 for domestic out-migrants from the CAL. Both of these values are somewhat higher than for the foreign migrants to the region or the state.

**Figure 13: Median Housing Value, Specified Owner-Occupied Housing Units**



### Age of Housing

More recent movers to and from the region also lived in newer housing than the general population, and this is apparent for the foreign migrants to the CAL as well (see Figure 14). However, reflecting the relative age of housing in regions such as Northeast Ohio versus the Southwest United States, the foreign migrants to the CAL tended to occupy older housing stock compared to foreign migrants to the nation and the state (see Figure 15). More than one fifth of the foreign migrants to the CAL lived in houses built before 1939, while nationally only 13 percent of foreign migrants lived in houses built before 1939; for Ohio's foreign migrants, 17 percent lived in houses built before 1939.

**Figure 14: Year Housing Was Built, Foreign Migrants to CAL and General Population of CAL**





Figure 15: Year Housing Was Built, Foreign Migrants



### C. SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS


The socioeconomic characteristics described here include educational attainment, enrollment in college, unemployment rate, labor force participation, median household income, poverty rate, occupation, and industry.

#### Educational Attainment

The CAL generally scored well in regard to educational attainment of its population (see Figure 15).<sup>7</sup> Ohio and the CAL had a greater number of foreign migrants age 25 and older with bachelor’s degrees or higher attainments compared to the nation. Forty-five (45 percent) of Ohio’s foreign migrants age 25 and older had a bachelor’s degree or higher, while 43 percent of those coming to the CAL and 34 percent of those migrating to the nation had a bachelor’s degree or higher.

In addition, the foreign migrants were slightly more educated than other migrants to the CAL. Forty-one percent of domestic migrants to the CAL had a bachelor’s or higher degree, and out migrants were even less educated with 39 percent having a bachelor’s degree or higher. Meanwhile, all these migrant groups were much more educated than the region’s non-migrants, as only 22 percent of them had a bachelor’s degree or more education.

**Figure 15: Percentage with a Bachelor’s Degree or Higher, Persons Age 25 and Older**




<sup>7</sup> Indeed, as can be seen in Figure 15 and contrary to assumptions by many in the region about a “brain drain” from the region, the region attracted a greater proportion of migrants to the region with a bachelor’s degree than it lost, a subject treated in more depth in the report on domestic migration.

## College Enrollment

In addition, based on college enrollments in 2000, the CAL's foreign migrants continued to acquire more education than the general population -- 19 percent of these persons age 18 and older were in college compared to seven percent of the general population of that age in the CAL. A substantial number (17 percent) of persons moving to the CAL from somewhere else in the nation were also enrolled in college. However, foreign migrants to the CAL were less likely to be enrolled in college in 2000 than were domestic out-migrants from the CAL (19 percent versus 21.5 percent).

In 2000, even though the state had a lower percentage of its population enrolled in college than the nation, Ohio attracted a higher proportion of foreign migrants pursuing a college education than either the nation or the CAL (22 percent versus 15 and 19 percent, respectively). Thus, the state and the region stood to benefit more than the nation from the educational aspirations of foreign migrants.


**Figure 16: Percentage Enrolled in College, Persons Age 18 and Older**



### Labor Force Participation

The civilian labor force participation rate for foreign migrants to the CAL was very slightly higher than the rate for foreign migrants to the nation (63.8 percent versus 61.4 percent), but it was also slightly lower than for the general population, which was 64.8 percent and, more significantly, lower than for both the CAL's domestic in-migrants and out-migrants (see Figure 17). Domestic in-migrants had the highest labor force participation rate at 74.5 percent. The CAL foreign migrant labor force participation rate was very similar to that for Ohio, which was 63.5 percent.

**Figure 17: Percentage in the Labor Force, Civilian Non-Institutionalized Persons Age 16 and Older**




## Unemployment

The unemployment rate for migrants of any of the groups was higher than for the non-migrants of the CAL. The rate for foreign migrants to the CAL (9.0 percent) was also higher than that for both domestic in-and out-migrants (6.8 and 7.3 percent, respectively) for the region (see Figure 18).

Ohio's foreign migrants' unemployment rate was not quite as high, at 7.8 percent, as the unemployment rate for foreign migrants to the CAL and the nation (9.0 and 9.5 percent, respectively).


Figure 18: Unemployment Rate, Persons 16 and older



## Income

Recent foreign migrants generally have lower household incomes than the non-migrant population (see Figure 19). The median household income for foreign migrants to the CAL was considerably lower than the median household income for the general population in 1999 -- \$37,700 versus \$42,215, or approximately 89 percent.<sup>8</sup> The ratio for the state was comparable, at 93 percent, but higher for the nation at 98 percent. In other words, although incomes were slightly higher in the CAL than the nation, the foreign migrants to the region were making less income than their counterparts who went to the other parts of the nation.

Figure 19: 1999 Median Household Income




<sup>8</sup> The 2000 Census asks and reports annual incomes from the previous year.



## Poverty

Approximately one fourth (26 percent) of foreign migrants to the nation, state, and CAL were below poverty in 2000. This rate is much higher than for either the general population or domestic in-and out-migrants (sees Figure 20). The overall poverty rate for the CAL was about 11 percent, and the in-and out-domestic migrant below poverty rate was about 14 percent.

**Figure 20: Poverty Rate**



## **Occupations**

The occupations among foreign migrants to the CAL approximate the major types of occupations of the general population of the region, although there are some important differences as well (see Figure 21). The largest major category among employed civilian foreign migrants to the CAL was production at 15.3 percent -- higher than that of the general population, which was 10.5 percent. Among the more specific occupations in this category were metalworks, assemblers, machinists, and electrical assemblers. These workers were also more concentrated in education, computer and mathematical, engineering, and science categories. On the other hand, the foreign migrants to the CAL were less likely to be among the managerial, administrative support, sales, construction, and repair occupations than the general population.

The percentage of foreign migrants in production occupations in Ohio, the nation, and the CAL's general population are about the same at 11 percent, while as noted above, the foreign migrants to the CAL had a higher proportion in this category at 15.3 percent (see Figure 21 and 22). The CAL (and Ohio to some extent in some categories) generally had higher proportions of foreign migrants in technical and higher skilled occupations such as the sciences, engineering, education, and computer and mathematical occupations. Nationally, foreign migrants are more likely to be in construction, building, and food occupations compared to those who came to the CAL.

Figure 21: Major Occupation Types, Foreign Migrants to the CAL and the General Population of the CAL






Figure 22: Major Occupations, Foreign Migrants



## Industries


The primary industry of employed foreign migrants was manufacturing, which is also true of all employed persons in the region, including those who arrived from other parts of the nation (see Figure 23). However, the percentage of foreign migrants in manufacturing (25 percent) was higher than the percentage for domestic in-migrants (16 percent), domestic out-migrants (15 percent), as well as non-migrants (20 percent).

**Figure 23: Employment in Major Industries, All Migrant Categories in the CAL**



In addition, foreign migrants to the CAL were more likely to be employed in the manufacturing and health care industries than foreign migrants to the state or nation (see Figure 24).

Figure 24: Major Industries, Foreign Migrants



## **SUMMARY**

Migration from abroad between 1995 and 2000 helped reduce the net loss of population to the region. It is also important to keep in mind that almost a quarter of these migrants were born in the United States and were likely returning after an absence since 1995 or earlier.

The largest single group of migrants to the region from outside the 50 states was Puerto Rico. But aside from this group, foreign migrants to the CAL during this period were largely Eastern European or Asian. Demographically, they were also more likely to be older, married, and in families with children than foreign migrants in the rest of the nation. In addition, while most foreign migrants to the state and nation were male, the CAL's foreign migrants were evenly split in gender.

Like other migrant group, they were also younger and had higher unemployment and poverty rates than non-migrants. The CAL's foreign migrants had essentially the same poverty rate as that of the state's and nation's foreign migrant groups from this period.

They were also more likely to be in technical and higher skilled occupations, such as the computer and mathematical, education, science, and engineering categories, than either the region's non-migrants or foreign migrants to the nation as a whole. They were also more prevalent in production occupations; but this category includes a wide variety of job types.

In terms of housing, the CAL's foreign migrants were largely housing renters; and while those who owned their homes had, on average, housing valued higher than the region's average, they were less valued than those owned by movers to the region from other parts of the country.

Though the region did not benefit from large numbers of migrants from abroad (compared to the rest of the nation), it did receive a generally more educated foreign population. They had higher percentages of persons with a bachelor's degree or higher than did the region's non-migrants, domestic migrants to or from the region, and other foreign migrants to the U.S. They were also more likely to be attending college in 2000 than the general population of the region and the other foreign migrants to the nation.