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Introduction

This brief descriptive analysis provides data and some graphic comparisons of changes in the number and percent of foreign-born populations in selected Ohio cities. It is based on data reported by the U.S. Census Bureau and the reader is referred to the following source for technical details about the data.


Though the Census Bureau report covers 1850 to 2000, data for Ohio cities is complete only from 1870 forward. The table at the end of this report provides the data for the Ohio cities and those that were chosen for comparison.

Chicago, Pittsburgh, and Indianapolis were chosen to compare with Cleveland and the other Ohio Cities. Chicago offers a comparison to a very large and older city in the Midwest, Indianapolis is a newer and growing city in the region, and Pittsburgh represents an older, highly industrialized city with many characteristics similar to Cleveland. Los Angeles is included because it represents the explosion of new foreign-born population from Latin America and Asia.

Graphs and descriptive analyses are presented for both the number of foreign-born persons and their percentage of the population.
Number of Foreign-Born Persons

Nationally, foreign in-migration accelerated with industrialization in the mid-to-late 1800s. Cincinnati grew through migration earlier than Cleveland or Columbus and experienced declining foreign migration until 1990.

While the number of foreign-born persons in the U.S. accelerated after 1970, Cleveland continued to decline in the number of foreign-born persons from 1920 to 1990 (from 240,000 to 21,000). However, much of this decline is the result of the suburbanization of the population, including those born abroad. Cuyahoga County had 88,761 foreign-born residents in 2000. Map 1 provides a map of the distribution of foreign-born population in the seven-county region around Cleveland. Nevertheless, as noted below, the percentage of the city’s population that was foreign-born also declined considerably until 1990.

The 1990s saw an increase in the number of foreign-born persons in all three Ohio cities, with the biggest gains occurring in Columbus, which more than doubled its foreign-born from 23,471 to 47,713. Columbus grew through migration, but it also grew through annexation, thus making comparisons with relatively fixed-area cities like Cleveland.

Figure 1: Number of Foreign-Born Persons, U.S., Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Columbus
Map 1: Cleveland-Akron-Lorain Area Foreign-Born Population Distribution in 2000

Foreign-Born Persons in the Seven County Cleveland-Akron-Lorain Area
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Largely due to declining numbers of foreign-born persons in Cincinnati, the cities of Akron, Dayton, Toledo, and Youngstown had comparable numbers of foreign-born population to Cincinnati by 1920. Akron, with significant annexation and development in the rubber industry there, saw a rapid increase between 1910 and 1920, increasing almost three-fold, from 13,249 to 38,021 in that decade.

**Figure 2: Number of Foreign-Born Persons, Ohio Cities**
Chicago’s foreign-born population, while always greater in magnitude than Ohio’s cities in this period, showed a similar pattern of growth and decline to that of the Cleveland (and the nation). There was growth into the middle of the 20th century and decline from 1950 to 1980. Chicago’s growth in foreign-born population in the twenty years between 1980 and 2000 was faster than any of the Ohio cities.

LA started to rapidly attract foreign migration in the post WWII period and that growth accelerated after 1980. More than 1.5 million residents of the city were foreign-born in 2000, more than triple the entire population of Cleveland that year.

Figure 3: Number of Foreign-Born, Comparison with Cities
Percent of Population

Among other major Ohio cities, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Toledo, and Youngstown showed the greatest proportions of foreign-born populations in the late 1800s and Cleveland and Youngstown retained much of those large percentages into the early-to-mid 1900s.

However by 1990 percentages in these two cities roughly equaled those in the other Ohio cities. Youngstown dropped below all the other cities in percent foreign-born population by 2000. Columbus has shown the greatest increase in the last three decades.

Figure 4: Percent Foreign-Born, Ohio Cities
The percent of the population that was foreign-born generally declined in the nation from 1870 to 1970, but increased afterward. Among the cities compared here, Los Angeles and Chicago showed much greater increases in the last 30 years than any of the three Ohio cities included in the comparison. Columbus, and to a lesser extent Indianapolis, showed more significant increases than Cleveland. Pittsburgh, Columbus, and Indianapolis, after trailing Cleveland for most of the period, caught or surpassed Cleveland in 2000.

Figure 5: Percent Foreign-Born, Comparisons with Selected Cities
Table 1: Foreign-Born Population in Selected Cities, 1870 to 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>5,567,229</td>
<td>6,679,943</td>
<td>9,249,547</td>
<td>10,341,276</td>
<td>13,515,886</td>
<td>13,920,692</td>
<td>14,204,149</td>
<td>11,594,896</td>
<td>10,347,395</td>
<td>9,738,091</td>
<td>9,619,302</td>
<td>14,079,906</td>
<td>19,767,316</td>
<td>31,107,889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>