William H. Frey

Race, Class and Poverty Polarization across Metro Areas and States: Population Shifts and Migration Dynamics

No. 93-293

Research Reports

Population Studies Center
University of Michigan

William H. Frey

Race, Class and Poverty Polarization across Metro Areas and States: Population Shifts and Migration Dynamics

No. 93-293

Research Report
September 1993

William H. Frey is Research Scientist and Associate Director for Training at the University of Michigan Population Studies Center, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1993 Joint Statistical Meetings, San Francisco, California, August 10, 1993. The data for this paper were prepared from Summary Tape Files of the 1980 and 1990 U.S. Censuses and from the 5 percent Public Use Microdata Sample of the 1990 U.S. Census. The author is grateful to Cathy Sun for assisting him with data preparation, and to Elaine L. Fielding for offering helpful suggestions.

Table of Contents

List of Tables and Charts

Race, Class and Poverty Polarization across Metro Areas and States: Population Shifts and Migration Dynamics

William H. Frey
Population Studies Center
The University of Michigan
1225 South University Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Introduction

Future growth and distribution of the nation's total population will be increasingly linked to demographic changes in minority groups (Fix and Passel, 1991; US Bureau of the Census, 1992). Heightened immigration from Latin America and Asia, as well as the population gains among native-born minorities, has led to a wide growth advantage for minorities viz the majority white population--30.9 percent versus 4.4 percent in the 1980s. Yet, these national growth disparities play out quite differently across regions and metropolitan areas (Frey, 1993). Although minorities have dispersed to a greater degree than in earlier decades, the bulk of minority growth is still heavily concentrated in the South and West and in select metropolitan areas. Only nine metro areas accounted for over half of the 1980s minority growth, while more than two-thirds of all metropolitan areas have lower minority percentages than the nation as a whole (24.4 percent). This emergence of majority-minority distinctions across metropolitan areas and regions suggests a widening of spatial disparities on other socio-economic dimensions related to race.

This paper analyzes US census findings to identify links between the race-selective redistribution pattern across regions and metropolitan areas--and distribution shifts on two socio-economic measures: poverty status, and education attainment. It will address the following three questions:

(1) Are distinct geographic distribution patterns emerging by poverty status and education attainment?

(2) How are these linked to recent race and ethnic demographic shifts?

(3) What is the role of immigration versus internal migration in accounting for poverty population shifts?

The first two questions will be evaluated by examining 1980-90 population changes across regions and metropolitan areas for categories of poverty status, education attainment, race, and Hispanic status. These data were compiled at the Population Studies Center according to consistent metropolitan area (CMSA, MSA, and NECMA counterpart) definitions as defined by the Office of Management and Budget on June 30, 1990. Because detailed metropolitan area migration data have not yet been released for the 1990 census, question 3 will be addressed with inter-state migration and migration from abroad tabulations of the 5 percent 1990 census Public Use Microdata Sample file.

In addressing these questions, we are interested not only in if racial redistribution shifts are linked to poverty- and education-selective redistribution, but also how these linkages occur. For example, some of this linkage could be merely "compositional." (Because blacks and Latinos have higher average poverty levels and lower educational attainment than do whites and Asians, the former groups'

redistribution patterns could drive the observed status-selective shifts). On the other hand, considerable evidence based on the 1970s suggests that redistribution patterns differ within minority groups according to education and immigrant status (Long, 1988; Bartel, 1989; and Tienda and Wilson, 1992). This is particularly the case with blacks (Cromartie and Stack, 1989; Johnson and Roseman, 1990). The fact that income returns differ sharply by education attainment (Economic Report of the President, 1992) suggests that the geography of opportunities will differ by education segments within races.

We also wish to identify the kinds of areas which are attracting different population subgroups. Although much attention has been given to inner city poverty in the nation's largest metropolitan areas (Bane and Jargowsky, 1988; Kasarda, 1988), a large share of the total poverty population resides in smaller and nonmetropolitan parts of the country (Fuguitt et al., 1989). Are the new minority population shifts altering this pattern?

Likewise, the traditional attraction that large metropolitan areas held for the most educated segments of the population may be breaking down as there emerges a sharper distinction between areas specializing in old-line manufacturing and consumer services, on the one hand, and those who specialize in more "knowledge-based" industries, on the other (Noyelle and Stanback, 1984; Frey, 1990). In a few large areas, dual economies are developing which should simultaneously attract highly-educated professionals as well as low-skilled immigrants (Mollenkopf and Castells, 1992).

Minority-Majority Population Shifts

An overview of the nation's minority-majority population shifts over the 1980s can be seen from the data in Table 1. Historically, immigrants have located in traditional "port-of-entry" areas or areas with already large concentrations of their ethnic group. Native-born minorities have tended to travel well-worn migration paths, where friends and family attachments took precedence over economic opportunities. As a consequence, minority distribution and redistribution patterns are quite distinct from those of the white majority.

As shown in Table 1 (left panel), almost half of the nation's majority (non-Latino) white population is located in the North (i.e., Northeast and Midwest census regions) and more than one half are located outside of large metropolitan areas (i.e., with 1990 populations exceeding one million). Among the combined minority population, less than one third are located in the North, and two thirds are located in large metropolitan areas.

These disparities have been reinforced over the 1980s, primarily due to the recent shifts of the three major minority groups. (See right panel of Table 1). Latino gains are most heavily concentrated in the largest West and South metropolitan areas--representing the dominant destinations for Mexican immigrants. Asian gains are most directed to large metropolitan areas in all three regions. Blacks, departing from past patterns, are relocating away from small and northern metropolises--as a consequence of 1970s and 1980s economic pushes--to both large metropolitan areas in the South and various parts of the West. White 1980's shifts also departed from past patterns--showing a net relocation out of the North toward Sunbelt metropolitan areas. However, the rates of white change are far smaller than those for the minority population which grew at seven times the rate of whites, nationally.

These new, distinct majority-minority growth patterns are best illustrated by individual metropolitan area growth. Data (not shown) indicate that metro areas receiving the greatest numerical white growth over the 1980-90 decade, were completely different areas than those experiencing greatest growth in the combined minority populations (Frey, 1993). The former included: Dallas-Ft. Worth, Atlanta, Phoenix, Tampa-St. Petersburg, and Seattle. The latter included: Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco, Miami and Houston. Growing economic opportunity fueled the white migration stream to the former areas, whereas minority immigration flows were responsible for much of the latter areas' 1980-90 growth. The distinct growth patterns observed for white majority and minority populations, coupled with their large differences on measures of poverty and education attainment (see Table 2), suggest that the new race- and immigrant-selective redistribution patterns may be linked to spatial disparities on the socio-economic dimensions.

Region and Metro Area Redistribution by Poverty and Education Status

Before examining these race-status redistribution links, we first present the overall distribution and population shift patterns for the total population by poverty status and education attainment. (See Table 3). The poverty status data make plain that the 1990 region and metropolitan distribution of the poverty population differs from that part of the population not classed in poverty. The former population is more heavily distributed in smaller and nonmetropolitan areas, especially in the South. Despite the recent emphasis on inner city poverty, the nation's nonpoverty population is disproportionately located within large metropolitan areas, especially in the North and West. Moreover, even sharper poverty-nonpoverty disparities are evident when observing 1980-90 growth shares (third and fourth columns of Table 3), which serve to accentuate the large metro/small and nonmetro distribution disparities--particularly in the South and West regions.

This is because the nonpoverty population became redistributed across geographic categories to a greater degree than the poverty population. The dominant pattern for the former group was the relocation away from the North region toward predominantly large metropolitan areas in the South and West. In contrast, the poverty population showed a smaller redistribution across categories and one that was not as oriented to large metropolitan areas.

In light of the race redistribution discussed above, these poverty status shifts do not suggest a racial "composition" effect. This is because the geographic areas gaining from the recent nonpoverty redistribution are precisely those areas gaining in minorities (Latinos and blacks) that exhibit highest poverty rates. Clearly there is some selectivity by poverty status within racial groups affecting these patterns. This is discussed below.

Turning to the geographic distribution by education status categories, Table 3 (right panel) shows 1990 distributions and 1980-90 growth distributions for college graduates and for those with lesser educations--among persons aged 25 and older. Here again there are sharp distribution disparities. College graduates are far more likely to be located in large metropolitan areas, within each region, than those with lesser educations. Yet it is the less educated segment of the population which shows greatest redistribution over the 1980-90 period--characterized by a sharp relocation away from the North region toward and large and small metropolitan areas in the South and West.

Because of the relatively stagnant redistribution of the college graduate population, these shifts serve to improve the North regions' high educational composition viz the other two regions. In particular, large northern metropolitan areas

attracted 29 percent of the nation's 1980-90 growth in college graduates in contrast to only 8.5 percent of those with lesser educations. In contrast, the Sunbelt (South and West regions) attracted 80 percent of national gains in the non-college graduate population but only 56 percent of its growth in college graduates. These growth patterns are more consistent with the "compositional" effects linked to the racial redistribution discussed above.

Poverty, Education and Minority Status

Links between race and socio-economic status selective geographic redistribution can be assessed in Tables 4 and 5. Table 4 displays geographic distribution patterns by poverty status--separately for whites, blacks, Latinos, and Asians (Note: In Tables 4 and 5 as well as Charts 1, 2 and 3, the "white" population does not exclude non-Latino whites.) These data make plain the geographic distribution disparities by poverty status are not simply linked to racial composition. That is, within both the white and black population there exists significant geographic distribution disparities by poverty status.

Both the 1990 population and the 1980-90 growth distributions of the white population (upper left quadrant of Table 4) are similar to the patterns shown for the total population in Table 3. Hence, the sharp redistribution of nonpoverty whites out of the North and into larger metropolitan areas of the South and West contribute to the overall pattern, and are distinct from the more stable redistribution pattern of the white poverty population. Among blacks (upper right quadrant) the nonpoverty 1980-90 growth distribution shows some similarity with that for whites. Poverty blacks are also less prone to become redistributed across geographic categories--though unlike the situation of nonpoverty blacks or poverty whites--poverty blacks appear to be relocating from large northern metropolitan areas to the smaller-sized areas in the same region.

The Latino poverty population is somewhat more concentrated in smaller and nonmetropolitan areas of the South than the nonpoverty population which is more well represented in larger metropolitan areas. Still, in contrast to whites and blacks, the geographic distributions between the Latino poverty and nonpoverty population are not substantial. The same can be said of the 1980-90 growth patterns. Hence, more so than the white or black population, Latinos exert a "compositional" effect on national poverty distributions. That is, because the Latino population is more likely than other populations to locate and grow in the West as well as large southern metropolitan areas, the increases in these areas' poverty populations (shown in Table 2) can be attributed heavily, to a large degree, to the presence of the Latino population.

Even more so than the Latinos, Asians show small geographic distribution disparities between the poverty and nonpoverty populations. Asian poverty populations are somewhat more likely to locate in smaller sized metropolitan areas. These tendencies are exacerbated slightly by stronger recent growth of the nonpoverty population in large South and West metropolitan areas. However, as with Latinos, the Asian population's impact on national poverty distributions is largely compositional. Unlike Latinos, Asian average poverty levels are almost as low as whites and, therefore, have a minimal impact on overall distribution disparities by poverty status.

The links between racial geographic distribution and education distribution patterns show strong similarities to those just discussed regarding race and poverty (see Table 5). That is, sharpest within race distribution disparities are shown for whites and blacks. This holds, as well, for 1980-90 redistribution shifts. Hence, national geographic disparities between college graduates and those with less than college educations, to a large extent, reflect patterns and recent shifts of the white and black population. Both

Latinos and Asians show some geographic disparities by education status (with college graduates more concentrated in North and South metropolitan areas, for both groups). However, their impact on national distribution disparities is largely compositional.

Metro Areas with Greatest Growth

Another perspective on assessing 1980-90 population shifts by poverty and education attainment status is a focus on individual metropolitan areas. Metro areas that show large gains or declines in total population might be expected to show those patterns, as well, for different population subgroups--particularly if they are large, diverse metropolises. Yet, the above review of broad regional and area type patterns suggests that this may not be the case. The distinct distribution patterns for poverty viz nonpoverty and college graduate viz noncollege graduate population segments imply that different individual metro areas may gain or lose populations for these segments--in some cases, as a consequence of their racial compositions.

The upper portion of Chart 1 contrasts the largest individual metro area gaining in poverty and nonpoverty populations, respectively, over the 1980-90 decade. It is noteworthy that only eight metro areas appear on both "top 15" lists and that only two--Los Angeles and Dallas-Ft. Worth--appear among the "top six" on each. Metros gaining large poverty populations tend to be those with a large Latino or black presence as well as "port-of-entry" areas for recent immigrants. They include smaller-sized border areas such as McAllen and El Paso, Texas as well as northern manufacturing areas with large numbers of poverty blacks (Detroit, Milwaukee). The metros gaining most in nonpoverty population represent a broader array of places including national and regional financial centers (San Francisco-Oakland, Atlanta), government centers (Washington, D.C.) as well as resort and retirement areas (Tampa-St. Petersburg, Orlando).

Chart 2 displays the fastest growing poverty and nonpoverty areas, broken down by race. As with the earlier regional distribution patterns, both whites and blacks display distinct within race differences in the areas that attract their poverty versus nonpoverty populations. Among whites, only four areas--Los Angeles, Dallas-Ft. Worth, Phoenix, and Tampa-St. Petersburg--appear on both "top 10" lists. Among blacks, only two areas--Miami, and Dallas. Worth--appear on both lists. While the white gainers mirror the total population patterns discussed above, the differences between poverty gainers and nonpoverty gainers for blacks are noteworthy. The list of black poverty gainers is dominated by areas with declining economies over the 1980s (e.g., Detroit, Houston, New Orleans, Cleveland) indicating that these gains result from higher poverty rates among resident (rather than in-migrating) blacks. In contrast, many areas growing in their nonpoverty black populations appear to be migration magnets for the rising black middle class population (e.g., Atlanta, Washington, D.C., San Francisco-Oakland).

Unlike the case with whites and blacks, there is a strong overlap in the list of areas that gain Latino poverty and nonpoverty populations. This is consistent with our evaluation of regional distribution patterns, above. As a consequence of this and the higher average poverty levels among Latinos, six metro areas on both lists (of Latino poverty and nonpoverty population gainers) are among the seven largest poverty gainers, overall (Chart 1).

Finally, among Asians, large numbers of poverty and nonpoverty residents have accrued to the three metros--Los Angeles, New York, and San Francisco-Oakland. Beyond that, areas with relatively small Asian populations--such as Fresno, Sacramento

and Stockton, CA as well as Boston and Minneapolis--have attracted significant increases in poverty Asians. This can be attributed to the selective immigration of poorer Asians originating from Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to these areas (Frey and Farley, 1993). In contrast, nonpoverty Asians are increasing their size in Washington, D.C., Chicago, and Texas (Houston, Dallas-Ft. Worth), in addition to other West-region areas.

Turning to educational attainment, the lower portion of Chart 1 contrasts metro areas with greatest 1980-90 gains in college graduates with the metro areas that gained most of the lesser educated population. Although there is a strong overlap of areas on both lists (nine of 15 areas), this overlap occurs primarily with South and West region metro areas (New York is the lone North region exception). The remaining areas, among top college graduate gainers, are all in the North region whereas the remaining "less than college graduate" gaining areas are all in the Sunbelt. This is consistent with our earlier analyses showing the continued draw of college graduates to large northern metropolises, and the sharp redistribution of the less educated population to larger and moderate sized Sunbelt areas.

A good part of the attraction, for college graduates, can be attributed to the industrial structures of the particular northern and Sunbelt areas listed in Chart 1. These include large corporate and "advanced service" centers at both the national and regional levels with occupational structures heavily weighted toward professionals and managers (Noyelle and Stanback, 1984; Frey, 1993). Alternatively, several of the Sunbelt areas on the list of "less than college graduate" gainers are retirement centers, consumer service centers, and areas that have attracted large numbers of immigrants.

Replicating these comparisons for different race groups (Chart 3) we find that national distinctions between "college graduate" and "less than college graduate" gainers are primarily attributable to whites. That is, the list of white college graduate gainers is dominated by either northern, East Coast, or national advanced service or financial center metros--whereas areas gaining in "less than college graduate" whites are dominated by Sunbelt cities with large immigrant components, or that serve as resort and retirement magnets (Atlanta being an exception). Of the "top 10" white gainers on each category there is an overlap of only four metros--Los Angeles, Dallas-Ft. Worth, Atlanta, and Seattle. Each of these ranks lower on the list of "college graduate" gainers than on the alternative list.

Among blacks, Latinos and Asians there is very little distinction between the list of metros gaining in college graduate populations and gaining in less than college graduate populations. Most of these areas appeared on the earlier lists of greatest "nonpoverty population" gainers, suggesting that the college graduate/less than college graduate distinction is a less meaningful one for these populations. This is understandable for blacks and Latinos, since each group has a relatively low percentage of college graduates (11.4 percent and 9.2 percent, respectively, in contrast to 20.3 percent for the US population). Yet even among Asians with its high college graduate population (36.6 percent), there is little distinction, by education attainment, in the list of areas attracting large numbers of them.

Race-Status Links in Geographic Distribution

The analyses presented thus far suggest tentative answers to the two questions raised at the outset of this paper. First, there do exist distinct geographic distribution patterns for population segments classed by poverty and education attainment status. Second, the sharp geographic distribution differences between the minority and white

majority populations do affect geographic distributions on the two socio-economic dimensions.

The questions of how race geographic distributions are linked to socio-economic status distribution reflects both selectivity and compositional influences among the different racial groups. That is, among both whites and blacks there appear to be distinct distribution patterns occurring for poverty/nonpoverty and college graduate/non-college graduate segments of each group. Among Latinos and Asians, this distinction is less-clear cut and these groups' influences on overall socio-economic distributions appear to be largely "compositional" (e.g., areas with large numbers of Latinos will tend to have high and increasing poverty levels). These tentative conclusions draw from our examination of broad regional and metropolitan redistribution patterns over the 1980-90 period, and from identifying metropolitan areas that register the greatest gains for each race and socio-economic group.

We now present additional analyses that establish: (a) that there is a strong potential for existing "compositional effects"--attributable to minorities--on metropolitan area characteristics; and (b) that the compositional effects on metropolitan area poverty status, and educational attainment status differ for blacks, Latinos and Asians. To establish that there is a strong potential for racial composition effects to operate on many metropolitan attributes, we have calculated inter-metropolitan area indices of dissimilarity between the majority white population and each minority group (see Table 6). Although dissimilarity indices are often used to measure the degree of neighborhood residential segregation within a metropolitan area (see Frey and Farley, 1993), our use of this measure indicates the extent to which each minority group is segregated from majority whites across metropolitan areas.

The top panel of Table 6 makes plain that there is substantial inter-metropolitan segregation between groups. For example, the 1990 index for Latinos is 51.6. This means that 51.6 percent of the Latino metropolitan population would have to locate to another metropolitan area in order to be distributed exactly like the majority white population. The indices for the other minority groups are somewhat lower (44.8 for Asians and 29.9 for blacks) but all are substantial. The fact that 31.3 percent of the combined minority population would have to relocate across metropolitan areas in order to be distributed like majority whites is significant. Equally noteworthy is that these dissimilarity indices have retained their same levels or increased since 1980. This means that the high levels of minority growth over the 1980s has not served to disperse the minority population any more greatly across metropolitan areas than was the case at the beginning of the decade.

This stability in minority concentration within specific metropolitan areas is reinforced further in the dissimilarity indices shown for specific race-poverty status, and race-education attainment status subgroups (middle and lower panels of Table 6). It is especially noteworthy that the overall levels of segregation for each race do not differ substantially by poverty or education status category, or across years. For blacks, in particular, inter-metropolitan area segregation remains at about 30 percent irrespective of status category or year. Among Latinos and Asians, segregation levels are reduced, slightly, for their poverty populations and, to a somewhat greater extent, for their college graduate populations. Nonetheless, the indices on Table 6 make plain there is a sharp and consistent metropolitan concentration of minority populations that hold, at least the potential, for exerting "compositional effects" on other metropolitan-level status measures.

We now evaluate, more explicitly, how these group's metropolitan area compositions affect metropolitan area poverty and education attainment levels. To do so, we calculated zero-order correlations, across metropolitan areas, between metro area race and status compositions, on the one hand, and metropolitan area poverty percentages and college graduate percentages, on the other. These analyses are shown in Table 7.

The correlations with metropolitan area poverty percentages (left-hand panel) indicate strong negative correlations between a metropolitan area's majority white percentage and its percent poverty population in both 1980 and 1990. In contrast, metropolitan poverty percentages are positively correlated with metropolitan percent black and metropolitan percent Latino in both years. Latino correlations with poverty are stronger than those for blacks and, unlike the black correlations, do not decline between 1980 and 1990. Metropolitan poverty concentration appears to be relatively unaffected by the percent of Asians as evidenced by the weak negative correlations between poverty percentage metropolitan percent Asian in both 1980 and 1990.

While these overall correlations between a metropolitan area's racial composition and poverty percentage appear to support a "compositional effect" pertaining to whites, blacks and Latinos, a more refined analysis shows that this is not necessarily the case. As indicated earlier, we found a selective redistribution of poverty and nonpoverty populations within white and black racial groups. This suggests that a metropolitan area racial composition, for these groups, is less important than its composition of poverty whites or poverty blacks. The correlations in Table 7 bear this out to be true. That is, a metropolitan area's poverty percentage is positively related to the percent of poverty whites in the area in both 1980 and 1990, but negatively related to the percent of nonpoverty whites in the area for both years. The distinction is not quite as clear cut with respect to blacks because metropolitan area poverty levels are positively related to a percent of poverty and nonpoverty blacks. Nevertheless, the correlations between the metropolitan poverty percentage with percent poverty blacks are higher than those with percent nonpoverty blacks--and both relationships have become reduced in 1990. In contrast, a metropolitan area's poverty percentage is strongly correlated to its percent of poverty Latinos as well as its percent of nonpoverty Latinos--and these relationships become stronger over time. This confirms our contention that presence of Latinos in a metropolitan area exert a strong compositional effect on its poverty level.

A similar set of correlations were computed between metropolitan area racial compositions and the area's percent college graduates (right-hand panel of Table 7). These correlation coefficients are generally much more modest than those shown for metropolitan poverty percentages. Greatest associations appear within the education categories of whites, such that a high percent of college graduate whites increases the overall percent of college graduates in the metropolitan area--where the reverse is true for the percent of other whites. A modest positive correlation has begun to emerge between percent college graduate blacks and the percent college graduates in the metropolitan areas. Further, a relatively strong positive correlation exists between percent college graduate Asians and percent college graduates in an area. Other than these, compositional effects of race and status groups display a relatively weak relationship to a metropolitan area's college graduate percentage.

Immigration and Internal Migration Streams

The last question to be addressed in this paper is the relative importance of immigration versus internal migration in accounting for poverty population gains across areas. As indicated above, we will draw from newly tabulated 1990 census migration

data at the state level since metropolitan area-migration tabulations are not yet available. The strong compositional impact of the Latino population on metropolitan areas experiencing largest poverty population gains (shown above), suggests that immigration may play a large role in distributing the poverty population. Our analysis of the new migration tabulations shows that this is, in fact, the case. (These observations are drawn from the Appendix A migration table, "Poverty Population by Race--Net Migration for US States--1985-90" which disaggregates recent net migration change by race, internal migration and migration from abroad status; and the companion Appendix B table for the non-poverty population.)

Over the 1985-90 period, California attracted 403,000 poverty in net migrants. This represents the sum of 445,000 migrants from abroad and a net out-migration of 42,000 internal poverty migrants. Among the abroad poverty immigrants, 274,000 were Latinos and 107,000 were Asians. California represents, by far, the state with the largest poverty immigration population. Florida (with 173,000) is second and New York and Texas (62,000 and 60,000) come next. An additional nine states gained between 30,000 and 60,000 poverty migrants, and seven states lost poverty migrants through net migration.

The strong impact of immigrant minorities on the poverty migration influx to California also typifies poverty gains for New York and Texas, both of which registered net losses of internal poverty migrants over the period. Yet, Florida's poverty gains are more equally divided between immigrants and internal net in-migrants from other states. This is also the case for Washington and Arizona which rank fifth and sixth, respectively, in total poverty net in-migration over the 1985-90 period.

To get a sense of how internal migration streams redistribute poverty populations differently than the flows from abroad, Chart 4 indicates the largest state-to-state migration stream exchanges for the poverty and nonpoverty populations, and by race. The upper panel of Chart 4 makes plain that the state of Florida gains large numbers of poverty and nonpoverty migrants in its exchanges with New York, New Jersey, and Texas. Yet other large poverty exchanges do not involve Florida but transfer significant (largely white) poverty populations between California and its neighboring states and from New Jersey to Pennsylvania, Illinois to Wisconsin, and New York to North Carolina. Except for the latter exchange, these patterns indicate a tendency for largely white poverty populations to be spreading out from highly urbanized states to adjacent territory.

These overall poverty exchanges are, largely, replicated for the white majority population (middle panel of Chart 4). Moreover, as with the total population, white poverty exchanges occur for different states, by and large, than for the white nonpoverty population. This is not the case for the combined minority exchanges (third panel) where the largest exchanges of poverty migrants occur between the same combinations of states as those for nonpoverty migrants. This provides further support for our contention that distinct poverty and nonpoverty geographic distribution patterns are more evident within the white population than within the minority population.

Conclusion

This paper has evaluated new data from the 1990 census to assess the extent to which minority-majority geographic distribution patterns are related to distribution shifts by poverty and education attainment status. We found that there are sharp distribution and redistribution differences between the nation's poverty population and its nonpoverty population. We also found differences in the geographic shifts for

college graduates and those with less education. The fact that the three major minority populations--blacks, Latinos, and Asians--remain highly concentrated in distinct regions and metropolitan areas plays a large influence on the redistribution patterns of other socio-economic groups. Yet, we discover appreciable differences within the white and black populations, according to poverty and education attainment status, in the way they sort themselves geographically. Such divisions are less likely to occur within the Latino and Asian population. The high concentration of Latinos and immigrants, in particular, influence the size and growth of poverty populations in specific metropolitan areas and states.

These results are obtained from an examination of distribution changes in the resident population of each group based on 1980 and 1990 census data. An initial analysis of newly released migration stream tabulations suggests that more complex processes are redistributing poverty populations across metropolitan areas and states. Separate patterns of geographic exchange appear to be occurring among: white internal migrants, minority internal migrants, and immigrants from abroad. For states gaining the largest poverty populations via migration, immigration from abroad constitutes the greatest source of gain.

References

Bane, Mary Jo and Paul A. Jargowsky. February 1988. "Urban Poverty Areas: Basic Questions Concerning Prevalence, Growth and Dynamics." Paper prepared for the Committee on National Urban Policy, National Academy of Sciences.

Bartel, Ann P. 1989. "Where Do the New Immigrants Live?" Journal of Labor Economics, vol. 7(4) pp. 371-391.

Beale, Calvin L. June 1988. "Americans Heading for the Cities, Once Again." Rural Development Perspectives, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 2-6.

Cromartie, John, and Carol B. Stack. 1989. "Reinterpretation of Black Return and Nonreturn Migration to the South, 1975-1980." The Geographical Review, vol. 79, pp. 297-310.

Economic Report of the President. 1992. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Fix, Michael and Jeffrey S. Passel. 1991. The Door Remains Open: Recent Immigration to the United States and a Preliminary Analysis of the immigration Act of 1990 (PRIP-UI-14). Washington, D.C.: Program for Research on Immigration Policy, The Urban Institute.

Frey, William H. 1990. "Metropolitan America: Beyond the Transition." Population Bulletin, Vol. 45, No. 2., Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau.

Frey, William H. and Alden Speare, Jr. 1988. Regional and Metropolitan Growth and Decline in the United States. 1980 Census Monograph. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Frey, William H. 1993. "People in Places: Demographic Trends in Urban America" in Jack Sommer and Donald A. Hicks (eds.), Rediscovering Urban America: Perspectives on the 1980s. U.S. Department of H.U.D., Office of Policy Development and Research, Washington, D.C., Chapter 3.

Frey, William H. and Reynolds Farley. "Latino, Asian and Black Segregation in Multi-ethnic Areas: Findings from the 1990 Census Research Report 93-278, Ann Arbor, MI: Population Studies Center, The University of Michigan

Fuguitt, Glenn V., David L. Brown, and CAlvin L. Beale. 1989. Rural and Small Town America. 1980 Census Monograph. New York: Russell Sage.

Johnson, James H., Jr. and Curtis Roseman. 1990. "Increasing Black Outmigration from Los Angles." The Role of Household Dymanmics and Kinship Systems." Annals of the American Association of American Geographers, vol. 80(2), pp. 205-222.

Kasarda, John D. 1988. "Jobs, Migration, and Emerging Urban Mismatches." Urban Change and Poverty, Michael G. McGeary and Laurence E. Lynn, Jr. (eds.). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, pp. 148-198.

Long, Larry. 1988. Migration and Residential Mobility in the United States. 1980 Census Monograph. New York: Russell Sage.

Mollenkopf, John H. and Manuel Castells (eds.). 1992. Dual City: Restructuring New York. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Noyelle, Thierry J. and Thomas M. Stanback, Jr. 1984. The Economic Transformation of American Cities. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Allanheld.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. "Population Projections of the United States by Age, Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin: 1992 to 2050." Current Population Reports. P-25, NO. 1092.

Table 1: 1990 Population Distribution and 1980-90 Growth Shares across Region and Metro Area Categories by Race - Latino Status

Race/ Metro Area Categories	Distribution of 1990 Population						Distribution of 1980-1990 Growth					
	Total	White Majority[a]	All Minorities[b]	Blacks	Latinos	Asians	Total	White Majority[a]	All Minorities[b]	Blacks	Latinos	Asians
NORTH												
Large Metro	25.3	25.1	25.9	32.0	20.7	23.7	7.8	-12.2	19.9	25.7	17.1	25.2
Other Metro	10.3	12.3	4.0	4.9	2.6	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9	5.7	2.7	4.2
Nonmetro	9.1	11.5	1.5	1.1	1.2	1.5	-0.2	2.6	-1.8	1.8	0.9	1.3
SOUTH												
Large Metro	11.3	9.7	16.4	18.9	16.2	9.6	23.2	26.4	21.2	31.4	19.3	11.3
Other Metro	12.8	12.5	13.8	18.8	9.9	4.5	17.0	27.6	10.6	17.7	8.3	4.7
Nonmetro	10.0	10.2	9.4	14.8	4.1	1.3	4.9	9.2	2.3	1.6	1.9	1.1
WEST												
Large Metro	13.6	11.3	20.6	7.9	32.2	39.9	29.7	23.3	33.6	12.2	37.5	42.4
Other Metro	4.4	4.0	5.5	1.2	8.8	12.4	9.1	11.6	7.6	3.1	8.9	7.9
Nonmetro	3.3	3.4	2.9	0.3	4.2	3.4	4.5	7.4	2.7	0.9	3.3	1.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
REGION												
North	44.6	48.9	31.4	38.0	24.6	29.0	11.5	-5.6	21.9	33.1	20.7	30.7
South	34.1	32.4	39.6	52.5	30.2	15.3	45.1	63.3	34.2	50.7	29.5	17.2
West	21.2	18.7	29.0	9.4	45.2	55.7	43.3	42.3	43.9	16.2	49.7	52.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
METRO CATEGORY												
Large Metro	50.2	46.1	63.0	58.8	69.1	73.1	60.7	37.6	74.7	69.2	73.9	78.9
Other Metro	27.4	28.8	23.3	25.0	21.4	20.8	30.1	43.2	22.1	26.5	19.9	16.8
Nonmetro	22.3	25.1	13.7	16.2	9.6	6.1	9.2	19.2	3.2	4.3	6.1	4.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
US Population (10000s)	24871	18813	6058	2999	2235	727						

[a]Non-Latino White population
[b]All race grouups other than Whites, and Latino Whites

Table 2: 1980-90 Population Changes by Poverty and Education Attainment Status for Whites, Blacks, Latinos and Asians

Population Characteristics	Whites[c]	Blacks	Latinos	Asians
Poverty Population[a]				
1980	17276	7590	3370	471
1990	19025	8441	5403	997
Percent Change	10.1	11.2	60.3	111.7
Nonpoverty Population[a]				
1980	166909	17872	10965	3151
1990	175786	20222	15989	6071
Percent Change	5.3	13.1	45.8	92.7
Percent in Poverty				
1980	9.4	29.8	23.5	13.0
1990	9.8	29.4	25.3	14:1
College Graduates[b]				
1980	19542	1100	515	701
1990	28445	1905	1028	1579
Percent Change	45.6	73.2	99.6	125.2
Less than College Grad.[b]				
1980	94575	12015	6222	1423
1990	103578	14856	10199	2738
Percent Change	9.5	23.6	63.9	92.4
Percent College Grad.				
1980	17.1	8.4	7.6	33.0
1990	21.5	11.4	9.2	36.6

[a]Persons for whom poverty status is determined (in 1000s)
[b]Persons aged 25 and above (in 1000s)
[c]Does not exclude Latino Whites

Table 3: 1990 Population Distribution and 1980-90 Growth Shares across Region and Metro Area Categories by Poverty and Education Attainment Status

Region/ Metro Area Categories	Distribution by Poverty Status[a]				Distribution by Education Status[b]			
	1990 Population		1980-90 Growth		1990 Population		1980-90 Growth	
	Poverty	Nonpoverty	Poverty	Nonpoverty	Coll. grad	Other	Coll. grad	Other
NORTH								
Large Metro	21.3	26.0	5.8	7.7	30.1	24.8	29.0	8.5
Other Metro	8.3	10.5	8.1	2.5	9.6	10.3	8.6	6.4
Nonmetro	8.9	9.0	4.9	-2.0	6.0	9.9	4.0	4.8
SOUTH								
Large Metro	10.5	11.5	15.9	25.6	13.8	10.8	16.2	17.8
Other Metro	15.0	12.4	17.4	17.4	11.9	12.9	12.8	17.7
Nonmetro	15.6	9.1	8.1	3.6	5.6	11.0	4.6	10.2
WEST								
Large Metro	11.7	14.0	21.6	32.7	16.6	12.7	18.6	21.5
Other Metro	4.7	4.3	11.0	8.8	4.1	4.3	4.1	8.0
Nonmetro	4.0	3.2	7.4	3.7	2.5	3.3	2.1	5.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
REGION								
North	38.5	45.5	18.7	8.2	45.5	45.1	41.7	19.8
South	41.1	33.1	41.4	46.6	31.2	34.7	33.6	45.6
West	20.4	21.4	39.9	45.2	23.2	20.2	24.8	34.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
METRO CATEGORY								
Large Metro	43.5	51.5	43.2	66.1	60.3	48.3	63.8	47.7
Other Metro	28.0	27.2	36.5	28.6	25.7	27.4	25.4	32.2
Nonmetro	28.5	21.3	20.3	5.3	14.0	24.3	10.8	20.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
US Population (10000s)	3174	21034			3231	12656		
Percent Growth			+15.9	+8.7			+49.9	+13.7

[a]Persons for whom poverty status is determined
[b]Persons aged 25 and above

Table 4: 1990 Population Distribution and 1980-90 Growth Shares across Region and Metro Area Categories by Education Attainment Status for Whites, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians[a]

Region/ Metro Area Categories	Distribution by Poverty Status[a]					Distribution by Poverty Status[b]			
	1990 Population		1980-90 Growth			1990 Population		1980-90 Growth	
	Poverty	Nonpoverty	Poverty	Nonpoverty		Poverty	Nonpoverty	Poverty	Nonpoverty
WHITES					**BLACKS**				
NORTH					NORTH				
Large Metro	17.2	25.6	-12.5	-6.5	Large Metro	30.2	33.3	21.9	25.5
Other Metro	10.6	11.7	8.6	2.4	Other Metro	5.3	4.6	13.9	1.7
Nonmetro	13.8	10.6	10.0	-3.4	Nonmetro	1.0	0.8	2.0	0.4
SOUTH					SOUTH				
Large Metro	8.2	10.6	15.4	30.1	Large Metro	16.0	20.4	23.3	35.5
Other Metro	14.1	12.3	23.8	24.8	Other Metro	20.5	18.0	20.7	16.6
Nonmetro	15.8	9.2	14.8	6.7	Nonmetro	20.2	12.5	8.0	3.4
WEST					WEST				
Large Metro	10.6	12.6	15.4	29.6	Large Metro	5.7	8.8	6.8	13.5
Other Metro	4.9	4.1	12.6	10.7	Other Metro	0.9	1.2	2.9	3.1
Nonmetro	4.8	3.3	11.9	5.6	Nonmetro	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
LATINOS					**ASIANS**				
NORTH					NORTH				
Large Metro	21.3	20.3	10.8	18.2	Large Metro	23.1	23.6	25.0	24.7
Other Metro	2.8	2.3	3.0	2.1	Other Metro	5.8	3.3	6.3	3.0
Nonmetro	1.2	1.1	1.2	0.6	Nonmetro	2.1	1.3	1.8	1.1
SOUTH					SOUTH				
Large Metro	14.4	17.1	18.8	20.7	Large Metro	7.6	9.9	7.2	12.2
Other Metro	13.2	8.9	12.9	6.7	Other Metro	5.7	4.1	5.1	4.2
Nonmetro	6.2	3.3	4.0	0.7	Nonmetro	1.6	1.1	1.2	1.1
WEST					WEST				
Large Metro	26.8	34.3	32.8	40.6	Large Metro	37.1	41.0	37.9	44.8
Other Metro	9.3	8.7	11.5	7.9	Other Metro	14.0	12.3	13.8	6.9
Nonmetro	4.8	4.0	5.1	2.5	Nonmetro	3.0	3.4	1.7	1.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[a]Persons for whom poverty status is determined
[b]Persons aged 25 and above

Table 5: 1990 Population Distribution and 1980-90 Growth Shares across Region and Metro Area Categories by Education Attainment Status for Whites, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians[a]

Region/ Metro Area Categories	Distribution by Education Status[a]			
	1990 Population		1980-90 Growth	
	Coll. grad	Other	Coll. grad	Other
WHITES				
NORTH				
Large Metro	29.8	24.1	28.6	-1.8
Other Metro	10.4	11.7	9.5	8.2
Nonmetro	6.6	11.8	4.8	7.9
SOUTH				
Large Metro	13.2	9.7	15.6	17.3
Other Metro	12.0	12.6	13.4	21.8
Nonmetro	5.7	11.0	5.0	13.6
WEST				
Large Metro	15.5	11.6	16.6	17.2
Other Metro	4.1	4.1	4.1	8.9
Nonmetro	2.7	3.5	2.4	6.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
LATINOS				
NORTH				
Large Metro	23.5	21.3	23.7	17.9
Other Metro	3.1	2.2	3.1	2.2
Nonmetro	1.1	1.1	0.9	0.8
SOUTH				
Large Metro	24.2	17.2	25.2	19.9
Other Metro	10.5	9.7	10.7	8.7
Nonmetro	2.3	4.1	1.8	2.3
WEST				
Large Metro	26.3	31.5	26.3	35.7
Other Metro	6.3	8.6	5.9	8.8
Nonmetro	2.7	4.3	2.4	3.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Region/ Metro Area Categories	Distribution by Education Status[b]			
	1990 Population		1980-90 Growth	
	Coll. grad	Other	Coll. grad	Other
BLACKS				
NORTH				
Large Metro	34.0	32.7	35.2	26.5
Other Metro	4.2	4.6	3.8	5.1
Nonmetro	0.8	1.1	0.8	1.7
SOUTH				
Large Metro	23.9	18.6	27.1	24.3
Other Metro	17.3	18.4	15.5	18.2
Nonmetro	7.4	15.4	4.6	11.8
WEST				
Large Metro	11.0	7.8	11.5	9.5
Other Metro	1.2	7.1	1.4	2.3
Nonmetro	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
ASIANS				
NORTH				
Large Metro	29.5	20.6	28.1	22.6
Other Metro	4.5	2.6	4.0	2.3
Nonmetro	1.3	1.1	1.2	0.9
SOUTH				
Large Metro	10.9	8.8	12.3	10.8
Other Metro	4.5	4.0	4.8	3.9
Nonmetro	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.2
WEST				
Large Metro	39.2	41.9	41.8	45.9
Other Metro	7.4	15.5	5.5	9.9
Nonmetro	1.6	4.3	1.2	2.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[a]Persons for whom poverty status is determined
[b]Persons aged 25 and above

Table 6 Inter-metropolitan Indices of Dissimilarity with Majority White Population, 1980 and 1990

Group	Dissimilarity with Majority Whites[a] 1980	1990
All Minorities	29.5	31.3
Blacks	30.2	29.9
Latinos	51.8	51.6
Asians	32.6	44.8
Blacks		
Poverty	32.3	30.7
Nonpoverty	29.9	30.8
Latinos		
Poverty	52.6	48.4
Nonpoverty	52.0	52.1
Asians		
Poverty	41.1	42.3
Nonpoverty	46.9	46.7
Blacks		
College Grads	31.3	32.5
Not Coll. Grads	30.9	30.6
Latinos		
College Grads	45.8	45.7
Not College Grads	53.1	53.2
Asians		
College Grads	44.1	44.8
Not College Grads	49.6	49.7

[a] Indices of dissimilarity compare each group's distribution across 280 metropolitan areas with that of the majority White (Non-Latino White) population. The index ranges between 0 (complete similarity) to 100 (complete dissimilarity). It can be interpreted as the percent of the group's population that would need to change metropolitan residence in order to be distributed like majority Whites.

Table 7: Zero-order Correlations with Metro Area Percent Poverty Population and Percent College Graduates, 1980 and 1990[a]

Metro Area Attributes[b]	Correlations with Metro Area Percent Poverty Population 1980	1990	Metro Area Attributes[b]	Correlations with Metro Area Percent College Graduates 1980	1990
Percent Majority Whites	-.697	-.623	Percent Majority Whites	+.007	+.017
Percent Blacks	+.428	+.227	Percent Blacks	-.074	-.021
Percent Latinos	+.507	+.573	Percent Latinos	-.007	-.061
Percent Asians	-.028	-.093	Percent Asians	+.172	+.185
Percent Poverty Whites[c]	+.603	+.688	Percent Coll. Grad. Whites[c]	+.980	+.972
Percent Nonpoverty Whites[c]	-.734	-.680	Percent Other Whites[c]	-.524	-.563
Percent Poverty Blacks	+.504	+.345	Percent Coll. Grad. Blacks	+.152	+.216
Percent Nonpoverty Blacks	+.376	+.160	Percent Other Blacks	-.081	-.040
Percent Poverty Latinos	+.581	+.644	Percent Coll. Grad.Latinos	+.135	+.100
Percent Nonpoverty Latinos	+.459	+.518	Percent Other Latinos	-.025	-.080
Percent Poverty Asians	-.022	+.071	Percent Coll. Grad. Asians	+.344	+.459
Percent Nonpoverty Asians	-.060	-.113	Percent Other Asians	+.099	+.096

[a]N = 280 metro areas (MSAs, MSAs and NECMAs)

[b]Indicates the percent of the total metro area population comprised of population group shown.

[c]Does not exclude Latino Whites.

Chart 1: Metro Areas with Greatest 1980-90 Population Increases by Poverty and Education Attainment Status

Growth Rank	1980-90 Increase (1,000s)	Metro Areas	Growth Rank	1980-90 Increase (1,000s)	Metro Areas
Poverty Population			**Non-Poverty Population**		
1.	529	Los Angeles	1.	2419	Los Angeles
2.	233	Houston	2.	810	San Francisco-Oakland
3.	162	Dallas-Fort Worth	3.	778	Dallas-Fort Worth
4.	134	Miami	4.	664	Atlanta
5.	116	Detroit	5.	659	Washington, D.C.
6.	101	Phoenix	6.	623	New York
7.	73	San Diego	7.	561	San Diego
8.	67	Fresno	8.	500	Phoenix
9.	60	McAllen-TX	9.	420	Seattle
10.	60	San Antonio	10.	396	Miami
11.	57	Milwaukee	11.	394	Tampa-St. Petersburg
12.	54	Minneapolis-St. Paul	12.	362	Houston
13.	54	El Paso-TX	13.	340	Orlando
14.	52	Pittsburgh	14.	318	Sacramento
15.	51	Sacramento	15.	273	Minneapolis-St. Paul
College Graduates			**Less than College Graduate**		
1.	996	New York	1.	1482	Los Angeles
2.	727	Los Angeles	2.	457	Dallas-Fort Worth
3.	460	San Francisco-Oakland	3.	392	San Francisco-Oakland
4.	385	Chicago	4.	358	Houston
5.	370	Washington, D.C.	5.	328	Atlanta
6.	301	Boston	6.	327	Phoenix
7.	298	Philadelphia	7.	315	San Diego
8.	282	Dallas-Fort Worth	8.	302	Miami
9.	232	Atlanta	9.	279	Tampa-St. Petersburg
10.	178	Seattle	10.	259	Washington, D.C.
11.	174	Houston	11.	243	Seattle
12.	170	San Diego	12.	204	New York
13.	158	Minneapolis-St. Paul	13.	196	Sacramento
14.	153	Detroit	14.	195	Orlando
15.	140	Baltimore	15.	182	Las Vegas

[a]Abbreviated names for CMSAs, MSAs or (in New England) NECMA counterparts as defined by OMB June 30, 1990.

Chart 2. METRO AREAS WITH GREATEST 1980-90 POPULATION INCREASES BY POVERTY STATUS FOR WHITES, BLACKS, LATINOS AND ASIANS

POVERTY POPULATION			NON-POVERTY POPULATION		
Growth Rank	1980-90 Increase (1000s)	Metro Area[a]	Growth Rank	1980-90 Increase (1000s)	Metro Area[a]
	WHITES			WHITES	
1.	120	Los Angeles	1.	704	Los Angeles
2.	90	Houston	2.	518	Dallas-Ft Worth
3.	74	Miami	3.	428	Atlanta
4.	63	Dallas-Fort Worth	4.	412	Phoenix
5.	59	Phoenix	5.	342	Tampa-St.Petersburg
6.	46	El Paso, TX	6.	337	San Diego
7.	37	Pittsburgh	7.	327	Washington, DC
8.	34	Brownsville, TX	8.	316	Seattle
9.	32	McAllen, TX	9.	272	Orlando
10.	29	Tampa-St. Petersburg	10.	250	San Francisco-Oakland
	BLACKS			BLACKS	
1.	81	Detroit	1.	465	New York
2.	60	Houston	2.	189	Atlanta
3.	53	Miami	3.	174	Washington, DC
4.	43	Dallas-Ft Worth	4.	139	Los Angeles
5.	39	Milwaukee	5.	135	Miami
6.	31	New Orleans	6.	90	Dallas-Ft Worth
7.	24	Cleveland	7.	81	Philadelphia
8.	19	Minneapolis	8.	61	Baltimore
9.	18	Baton Rouge, LA	9.	59	Norfolk, VA
10.	15	Shreveport, LA	10.	52	San Francisco-Oakland
	LATINOS			LATINOS	
1.	471	Los Angeles	1.	1437	Los Angeles
2.	121	Houston	2.	540	New York
3.	95	Miami	3.	332	Miami
4.	85	New York	4.	228	San Francisco-Oakland
5.	72	Dallas-Ft Worth	5	189	Chicago
6.	59	McAllen, TX	6.	187	Houston
7.	55	San Diego	7.	183	Dallas-Ft Worth
8.	52	El Paso, TX	8.	164	San Diego
9.	49	Phoenix	9.	105	Washington, DC
10.	48	San Antonio	10.	89	Phoenix
	ASIANS			ASIANS	
1.	97	Los Angeles	1.	641	Los Angeles
2.	56	New York	2.	410	New York
3.	45	San Francisco-Oakland	3.	408	San Francisco-Oakland
4.	23	Fresno, CA	4.	105	Washington, DC
5.	21	Sacramento	5.	91	San Diego
6.	15	Stockton, CA	6.	88	Chicago
7.	15	Boston	7.	65	Seattle
8.	15	Minneapolis-St Paul	8.	64	Honolulu
9.	14	Seattle	9.	63	Houston
10.	12	San Diego	10.	59	Dallas-Ft Worth

[a] Abbreviated names for CMSAs, MSAs, or (in New England) NECMA counterparts as defined by OMB, June 30, 1990.

Chart 3. METRO AREAS WITH GREATEST 1980-90 POPULATION INCREASES BY EDUCATION ATTAINMENT FOR WHITES, BLACKS, LATINOS AND ASIANS

COLLEGE GRAD POPULATION			LESS THAN COLLEGE GRAD POPULATION		
Growth Rank	1980-90 Increase (1000s)	Metro Area[a]	Growth Rank	1980-90 Increase (1000s)	Metro Area[a]
	WHITES			**WHITES**	
1.	709	New York	1.	453	Los Angeles
2.	466	Los Angeles	2.	273	Dallas-Ft Worth
3.	312	Chicago	3.	264	Phoenix
4.	311	San Francisco-Oakland	4.	240	Tampa-St Petersburg
5.	270	Washington, DC	5.	196	Atlanta
6.	266	Boston	6.	180	Seattle
7.	246	Philadelphia	7.	180	San Diego
8.	236	Dallas-Ft Worth	8.	163	Houston
9.	182	Atlanta	9.	161	Miami
10.	154	Seattle	10.	155	Orlando
	BLACKS			**BLACKS**	
1.	122	New York	1.	319	New York
2.	59	Washington, DC	2.	122	Los Angeles
3.	46	Los Angeles	3.	113	Miami
4.	40	Atlanta	4.	111	Atlanta
5.	38	Chicago	5.	108	Washington, DC
6.	33	Philadelphia	6.	82	Dallas-Ft Worth
7.	23	Dallas-Ft Worth	7.	70	Houston
8.	22	San Francisco-Oakland	8.	70	Philadelphia
9.	21	Detroit	9.	66	Chicago
10.	21	Houston	10.	62	Detroit
	LATINOS			**LATINOS**	
1.	76	New York	1.	984	Los Angeles
2.	72	Los Angeles	2.	434	New York
3.	47	Miami	3.	269	Miami
4.	26	San Francisco-Oakland	4.	163	Houston
5.	15	Chicago	5.	162	San Francisco-Oakland
6.	15	Washington, DC	6.	134	Chicago
7.	15	Houston	7.	124	Dallas-Ft Worth
8.	14	Dallas-Ft Worth	8.	109	San Diego
9.	14	San Antonio	9.	86	San Antonio
10.	14	San Diego	10.	68	Phoenix
	ASIANS			**ASIANS**	
1.	186	Los Angeles	1.	290	Los Angeles
2.	137	New York	2.	186	San Francisco-Oakland
3.	117	San Francisco-Oakland	3.	181	New York
4.	38	Washington, DC	4.	49	Honolulu
5.	29	Chicago	5.	43	San Diego
6.	24	Honolulu	6.	37	Washington, DC
7.	20	San Diego	7.	34	Chicago
8.	20	Boston	8.	32	Seattle
9.	19	Houston	9.	26	Houston
10.	17	Dallas-Ft Worth	10.	25	Sacramento

[a] Abbreviated names for CMSAs, MSAs, or (in New England) NECMA counterparts as defined by OMB, June 30, 1990.

Chart 4: Largest 1985-90 Interstate-Migration Exchanges* and Migration Streams from Abroad for Poverty and Non-Poverty Populations

POVERTY POPULATION				NON-POVERTY POPULATION			
Rank	Losing State	Gaining State	Migrants	Rank	Losing State	Gaining State	Migrants
TOTAL POPULATION - LARGEST INTERSTATE MIGRATION EXCHANGES							
1.	NY	FL	31,601	1.	NY	FL	262,013
2.	NJ	FL	13,701	2.	NY	NJ	121,949
3.	IL	WI	12,279	3.	NJ	FL	103,861
4.	NJ	PA	11,422	4.	IL	FL	63,352
5.	CA	OR	10,170	5.	TX	CA	62,056
6.	CA	WA	9,918	6.	OH	FL	60,841
7.	CA	AZ	9,677	7.	MI	FL	58,967
8.	CA	NV	8,851	8.	PA	FL	57,392
9.	NY	NC	7,386	9.	NY	CA	54,875
10.	TX	FL	7,096	10.	TX	FL	53,029
WHITE MAJORITY POPULATION - LARGEST INTERSTATE MIGRATION EXCHANGES							
1.	NY	FL	14,005	1.	NY	FL	192,077
2.	CA	OR	8,395	2.	NJ	FL	79,691
3.	NJ	PA	8,388	3.	NY	NJ	72,551
4.	NJ	FL	8,054	4.	OH	FL	57,718
5.	CA	WA	7,334	5.	MI	FL	56,150
6.	CA	AZ	5,371	6.	IL	FL	55,202
7.	IL	WI	5,339	7.	PA	FL	54,209
8.	MA	FL	5,309	8.	MA	FL	48,721
9.	CA	NV	5,105	9.	MA	NH	48,498
19.	TX	AR	3,871	10.	TX	CA	42,190
COMBINED MINORITIES - LARGEST INTERSTATE MIGRATION EXCHANGES							
1.	NY	FL	17,596	1.	NY	FL	69,936
2.	IL	WI	6,940	2.	NY	NJ	49,398
3.	NJ	FL	5,647	3.	DC	MD	35,203
4.	NY	NC	5,643	4.	NJ	FL	24,170
5.	NY	MA	4,955	5.	TX	CA	19,866
6.	TX	CA	4,491	6.	NY	CA	15,588
7.	NY	VA	4,369	7.	TX	FL	13,789
8.	CA	AZ	4,306	8.	NY	VA	12,851
9.	NY	NJ	4,176	9.	NY	NC	12,379
10.	TX	FL	3,906	10.	LA	TX	12,331
TOTAL POPULATION - LARGEST MIGRATION FROM ABROAD							
1.	ABRD	CA	445,150	1.	ABRD	CA	1,017,329
2.	ABRD	NY	153,872	2.	ABRD	NY	440,301
3.	ABRD	TX	120,658	3.	ABRD	FL	283,535
4.	ABRD	FL	98,210	4.	ABRD	TX	238,757
5.	ABRD	IL	47,082	5.	ABRD	NJ	175,343
6.	ABRD	MA	43,993	6.	ABRD	IL	148,572
7.	ABRD	NJ	35,096	7.	ABRD	VA	126,498
8.	ABRD	PA	26,682	8.	ABRD	MA	104,503
9.	ABRD	AZ	26,350	9.	ABRD	MD	93,086
10.	ABRD	WA	25,107	10.	ABRD	WA	70,155

*Based on 1990 U.S. Census "residence in 1985" question: Interstate Migration Exchanges = Migration Stream from Losing State to Gaining State minus the Stream in reverse direction, migration Streams from Abroad = Immigration Stream to State from Abroad.

WILLIAM H. FREY - UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
(313) 998-7141 FAX (313) 994-7415

APPENDIX A

POVERTY POPULATION BY RACE – NET MIGRATION FOR US STATES – 1985-90

	Total			Non-Latino Whites			All Minorities***			Blacks			Latinos			Asians			
	Net1*	Abroad	Net2**	Net1	Abroad	Net2	Net1	Abroad	Net2	Net1	Abroad	Net2	Net1	Abroad	Net2	Net1	Abroad	Net2	
AL01	13845	5371	19216	11025	2253	13278	2820	3118	5938	2901	933	3834	312	359	671	-471	1906	1435	AL01
AK02	-10064	658	-9406	-8869	297	-8572	-1195	361	-834	-136	38	-98	-491	254	-237	-258	145	-113	AK02
AZ04	24708	26350	51058	17218	3472	20690	7490	22878	30368	1607	485	2092	6494	19057	25551	264	3287	3551	AZ04
AR05	11120	2253	13373	11748	549	12297	-628	1704	1076	-648	460	-188	660	426	1086	-361	818	457	AR05
CA06	-41832	445150	403318	-38497	57839	19342	-3335	387311	383976	-7965	7760	-205	-9114	274237	265123	15366	107436	122802	CA06
CO08	105	13620	13725	-1789	4443	2654	1894	9177	11071	344	981	1325	1497	4608	6105	-292	3585	3293	CO08
CT09	-16391	14229	-2162	-15387	3286	-12101	-1004	10943	9939	-1774	813	-961	761	9056	9817	-110	1161	1051	CT09
DE10	887	1320	2207	1250	253	1503	-363	1067	704	-365	183	-182	-22	342	320	39	567	606	DE10
DC11	-1185	4933	3748	2383	1083	3466	-3568	3850	282	-3740	835	-2905	-21	2041	2020	163	1121	1284	DC11
FL12	74367	98210	172577	44218	15210	59428	30149	83000	113149	9992	17363	27355	20276	63371	83647	1031	5458	6489	FL12
GA13	22726	15082	37808	8106	3327	11433	14620	11755	26375	12754	3078	15832	2835	5520	8355	-550	3368	2818	GA13
HI15	-6373	7406	1033	-1766	894	-872	-4607	6512	1905	-725	96	-629	-594	614	20	-3164	5974	2810	HI15
ID16	1897	3132	5029	1933	1200	3133	-36	1932	1896	-1	20	19	127	1628	1755	-250	276	26	ID16
IL17	-61488	47082	-14406	-29880	12816	-16864	-31808	34266	2458	-23490	1812	-21678	-4691	21672	16981	-3008	10935	7927	IL17
IN18	6549	6710	13259	5850	2511	8361	699	4199	4898	645	302	947	171	1372	1543	-397	2467	2070	IN18
IA19	1051	5073	6124	19	1157	1176	1032	3916	4948	1352	440	1792	247	630	877	-623	2904	2281	IA19
KS20	1416	6921	8337	1188	1812	3000	228	5109	5337	1879	799	2678	317	1397	1714	-2309	2866	557	KS20
KY21	7468	4244	11712	7206	2530	9736	262	1714	1976	667	497	1164	-28	378	350	-313	742	429	KY21
LA22	-28695	7164	-21531	-17390	1818	-15572	-11305	5346	-5959	-7899	744	-7155	-2291	1689	-602	-743	2970	2227	LA22
ME23	4156	1059	5215	3961	658	4619	195	401	596	100	0	100	33	127	160	178	274	452	ME23
MD24	-2038	15644	13606	-5335	4184	-1151	3297	11460	14757	2841	2735	5576	1388	4065	5453	-683	4824	4141	MD24
MA25	-1795	43993	42198	-10386	10451	65	8591	33542	42133	1127	3833	4960	5535	20614	26149	1973	9280	11253	MA25
MI26	-399	17843	17444	-1502	8472	6970	1103	9371	10474	393	1234	1627	1413	1913	3326	-1159	6120	4961	MI26
MN27	8748	12340	21088	216	2972	3188	8532	9368	17900	5203	522	5725	2645	808	3453	55	8010	8065	MN27
MS28	3964	1680	5644	4925	195	5120	-961	1485	524	-630	558	-72	-244	300	56	-57	627	570	MS28
MO29	11527	7855	19382	11840	2102	13942	-313	5753	5440	-1344	770	-574	777	1274	2051	28	3672	3700	MO29
MT30	1730	1755	3485	882	900	1782	848	855	1703	75	0	75	416	223	639	-17	435	418	MT30
NE31	1295	2115	3410	-50	861	811	1345	1254	2599	1308	51	1359	-222	337	115	-32	837	805	NE31
NV32	14330	7065	21395	8487	793	9280	5843	6272	12115	1342	499	1841	3834	4251	8085	520	1566	2086	NV32
NH33	-927	1604	677	-1156	783	-373	229	821	1050	-243	0	-243	315	354	669	4	467	471	NH33
NJ34	-53147	35098	-18051	-39464	6863	-32601	-13683	28233	14550	-7765	2935	-4830	-3712	18760	15048	-1488	7251	5763	NJ34
NM35	24	6597	6621	-109	993	884	133	5604	5737	107	234	341	1343	4632	5975	-748	546	-202	NM35
NY36	-91453	153872	62419	-32403	37489	5086	-59050	116383	57333	-29133	27524	-1609	-30036	63545	33509	-3040	32892	29852	NY36
NC37	31752	7905	39657	16644	2049	18693	15108	5856	20964	11905	1566	13471	1763	1686	3449	871	2502	3373	NC37
ND38	-3922	1035	-2887	-3375	695	-2680	-547	340	-207	55	0	55	-34	0	-34	-196	330	134	ND38
OH39	7139	17746	24885	452	6440	6892	6687	11306	17993	5841	1191	7032	1406	3661	5067	-666	6520	5854	OH39
OK40	1554	6714	8268	391	1417	1808	1163	5297	6460	183	413	596	-356	1770	1414	-341	3171	2830	OK40
OR41	18175	13648	31823	15752	3984	19736	2423	9664	12087	302	385	687	1544	4441	5985	371	4837	5208	OR41
PA42	7405	26682	34087	4193	5978	10171	3212	20704	23916	-746	1563	817	3865	10171	14036	880	9442	10322	PA42
RI44	1685	6575	8260	346	1081	1427	1339	5494	6833	-305	808	503	1748	3493	5241	-22	1586	1564	RI44
SC45	10011	3411	13422	7342	1470	8812	2669	1941	4610	1976	780	2756	328	324	652	265	888	1153	SC45
SD46	904	917	1821	1567	782	2349	-663	135	-528	-43	0	-43	93	0	93	-63	126	63	SD46
TN47	21419	5610	27029	16336	2241	18577	5083	3369	8452	4719	783	5502	479	429	908	-125	2178	2053	TN47
TX48	-60649	120658	60009	-41121	11611	-29510	-19528	109047	89519	-2260	4085	1825	-15493	89636	74143	-1058	15443	14385	TX48
UT49	10730	7696	18426	10436	3471	13907	294	4225	4519	481	99	580	-158	1722	1564	-1024	2384	1360	UT49
VT50	3735	578	4313	3509	160	3669	226	418	644	232	26	258	-35	37	2	132	355	487	VT50
VA51	13744	17193	30937	3394	4572	7966	10350	12621	22971	10122	1887	12009	534	5967	6501	-212	4920	4708	VA51
WA53	27652	25107	52759	20312	6285	26597	7340	18822	26162	1956	903	2859	4450	7845	12295	919	10119	11038	WA53
WV54	1177	869	2046	2016	444	2460	-839	425	-414	-580	76	-504	202	47	249	-223	244	21	WV54
WI55	17609	11907	29516	8129	1906	10035	9480	10001	19481	7423	200	7623	451	1732	2183	1101	8035	9136	WI55
WY56	-6246	735	-5511	-4995	465	-4530	-1251	270	-981	-40	28	-12	-717	100	-617	-157	139	-18	WY56

*Net1 = Internal migration within the US **Net2 = Internal migration + migraton from abroad *** All minorities =Total population - Non-Latino whites
(Note: Blacks, Latinos and Asians do not sum to All Minorities because these are not mutually exclusive categories and because additional races are not shown)

WILLIAM H. FREY - UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
(313) 998-7141 FAX (313) 994-7415

APPENDIX B

NON-POVERTY POPULATION BY RACE – NET MIGRATION FOR US STATES – 1985-90

	Total			Non-Latino Whites			All Minorities***			Blacks			Latinos			Asians			
	Net1*	Abroad	Net2**	Net1	Abroad	Net2	Net1	Abroad	Net2	Net1	Abroad	Net2	Net1	Abroad	Net2	Net1	Abroad	Net2	
AL01	12088	23817	35905	23128	14587	37715	-11040	9230	-1810	-10636	4275	-6361	1097	1510	2607	-1409	3384	1975	AL01
AK02	-39327	8496	-30831	-37895	4492	-33403	-1432	4004	2572	42	476	518	444	720	1164	-897	2689	1772	AK02
AZ04	182896	52258	235154	165004	24765	189769	17892	27493	45385	5792	1643	7435	11112	18841	29953	1191	6743	7934	AZ04
AR05	20149	8799	28948	26854	5412	32266	-6705	3387	-3318	-6229	1110	-5119	675	1075	1750	-1525	1367	-158	AR05
CA06	174262	1017329	1191591	115473	212953	328426	58789	804376	863165	18888	25587	44475	-10787	453835	443048	51455	330324	381779	CA06
CO08	-65641	41877	-23764	-58404	24711	-33693	-7237	17166	9929	251	3996	4247	-4562	6033	1471	-2521	7107	4586	CO08
CT09	-21885	51755	29870	-25040	21639	-3401	3155	30116	33271	1609	6211	7820	2549	16233	18782	-212	7781	7569	CT09
DE10	21205	6326	27531	15416	3137	18553	5789	3189	8978	4728	536	5264	584	1201	1785	515	1420	1935	DE10
DC11	-57826	17644	-40182	-15017	5758	-9259	-42809	11886	-30923	-36044	4074	-31970	-3789	5612	1823	-2987	2557	-430	DC11
FL12	1011201	283535	1294736	849126	88219	937345	162075	195316	357391	51534	43199	94733	101800	138338	240138	11022	19003	30025	FL12
GA13	272390	70155	342545	186523	31662	218185	85867	38493	124360	71371	13994	85365	9424	10285	19709	4916	14362	19278	GA13
HI15	-20065	38875	18810	-8410	10548	2138	-11655	28327	16672	-2351	2323	-28	-1085	2048	963	-8335	24817	16482	HI15
ID16	-26780	5540	-21240	-24892	3304	-21588	-1888	2236	348	-86	120	34	-1140	1360	220	-940	724	-216	ID16
IL17	-258843	148572	-110271	-205383	52083	-153300	-53460	96489	43029	-30318	6369	-23949	-10622	53430	42808	-12011	37203	25192	IL17
IN18	-6377	24212	17835	-5138	14485	9347	-1239	9727	8488	-1293	1398	105	976	2501	3477	-1129	5847	4718	IN18
IA19	-98774	9061	-89713	-96734	4401	-92333	-2040	4660	2620	-674	344	-330	100	1095	1195	-1635	3258	1623	IA19
KS20	-25798	21817	-3981	-25126	11898	-13228	-672	9919	9247	-1344	2372	1028	3409	3466	6875	-2242	4085	1843	KS20
KY21	-34713	19292	-15421	-26664	13208	-13456	-8049	6084	-1965	-6302	2655	-3647	-563	1049	486	-1077	2574	1497	KY21
LA22	-225290	17439	-207851	-170929	9198	-161731	-54361	8241	-46120	-39583	2094	-37489	-8344	3039	-5305	-6496	2907	-3589	LA22
ME23	30368	7716	38084	29411	6177	35588	957	1539	2496	-50	305	255	516	485	1001	-89	757	688	ME23
MD24	122973	93086	216059	49580	35566	85146	73393	57520	130913	61943	20255	82198	7787	16301	24088	4259	21893	26152	MD24
MA25	-107805	104503	-3302	-113449	45322	-68127	5644	59181	64825	1786	11213	12999	3057	28213	31270	1620	21101	22721	MA25
MI26	-109419	53243	-56176	-95833	30393	-65240	-13786	22850	9064	-12211	2978	-9233	-550	4543	3993	-1918	15111	13193	MI26
MN27	1283	23599	24882	-2610	12951	10341	3893	10648	14541	4547	1059	5606	1766	1693	3459	-2612	7800	5188	MN27
MS28	-21268	10302	-10966	-4274	6912	2638	-16994	3390	-13604	-13910	1605	-12305	-1251	474	-777	-1553	1248	-305	MS28
MO29	13876	24360	38236	19453	15623	35076	-5577	8737	3160	-2368	2647	279	399	1917	2316	-3248	4130	882	MO29
MT30	-47353	3200	-44153	-44416	2322	-42094	-2937	878	-2059	-435	96	-339	-1091	221	-870	-744	492	-252	MT30
NE31	-33831	10474	-23357	-33256	6417	-26839	-575	4057	3482	-243	1418	1175	-10	1077	1067	-1133	1549	416	NE31
NV32	155674	22847	178521	130549	8131	138680	25125	14716	39841	7509	1059	8568	14104	9037	23141	2343	4703	7046	NV32
NH33	58254	8958	67212	55322	6654	61976	2932	2304	5236	1244	234	1478	854	1082	1936	913	1109	2022	NH33
NJ34	-95174	175343	80169	-111467	48335	-63132	16293	127008	143301	18	19596	19614	-512	60490	59978	18059	49689	67748	NJ34
NM35	-7340	17097	9757	4055	9345	13400	-11395	7752	-3643	-2874	1182	-1692	-7166	4713	-2453	-990	1704	714	NM35
NY36	-690691	440301	-250390	-475681	119022	-356659	-215010	321279	106269	-109033	88939	-20094	-86301	135226	48925	-24419	112303	87884	NY36
NC37	208884	50889	259773	185791	28098	213889	23093	22791	45884	17123	8490	25613	2737	5328	8065	1972	9018	10990	NC37
ND38	-50041	4875	-45166	-47776	3465	-44311	-2265	1410	-855	-770	465	-305	-775	305	-470	-225	450	225	ND38
OH39	-118606	48436	-70170	-112810	28232	-84578	-5796	20204	14408	-3564	3992	428	-800	3359	2559	-2092	12624	10532	OH39
OK40	-131904	23730	-108174	-116822	14960	-101862	-15082	8770	-6312	-4329	2507	-1822	-2955	2848	-107	-4460	3210	-1250	OK40
OR41	73346	23675	97021	65855	12072	77927	7491	11603	19094	1395	279	1674	4775	5383	10158	-222	5934	5712	OR41
PA42	-83208	64598	-18610	-73716	33014	-40702	-9492	31584	22092	-9938	5118	-4820	3704	10205	13909	-4464	16711	12247	PA42
RI44	3469	14117	17586	248	5683	5931	3221	8434	11655	617	1897	2514	2015	4326	6341	551	2293	2844	RI44
SC45	77286	23373	100659	75846	13926	89772	1440	9447	10887	505	4818	5323	1743	1848	3591	-970	2955	1985	SC45
SD46	-22905	3482	-19423	-21533	2290	-19243	-1372	1192	-180	-500	464	-36	-20	82	62	-698	546	-152	SD46
TN47	93432	22890	116322	85502	14043	99545	7930	8847	16777	4832	3063	7895	2598	1161	3759	231	4641	4872	TN47
TX48	-276748	238757	-37991	-220833	81869	-138764	-56115	156888	100773	8737	21088	29825	-52934	97387	44453	-10037	39520	29483	TX48
UT49	-49068	16545	-32523	-44371	10879	-33492	-4697	5666	969	-114	375	261	-2126	2573	447	-1848	2718	870	UT49
VT50	12196	3593	15789	11696	2850	14546	500	743	1243	30	120	150	-66	198	132	283	493	776	VT50
VA51	177498	126498	303996	128171	61377	189548	49327	65121	114448	32536	15450	47986	11276	24024	35300	5318	26826	32144	VA51
WA53	189301	72681	261982	168832	34794	203426	20669	37887	58556	2594	3984	6578	10051	10113	20164	5490	23661	29151	WA53
WV54	-78577	3350	-75227	-74001	2209	-71792	-4576	1141	-3435	-3197	244	-2953	-708	122	-586	-380	750	370	WV54
WI55	-54012	18670	-35342	-51008	10470	-40538	-3004	8200	5196	90	471	561	923	2965	3888	-3922	4766	844	WI55
WY56	-52762	1976	-50786	-48547	1477	-47070	-4215	499	-3716	-1325	76	-1249	-2318	182	-2136	-718	241	-477	WY56

*Net1 = Internal migration within the US **Net2 = Internal migration + migraton from abroad *** All minorities =Total population - Non-Latino whites
(Note: Blacks, Latinos and Asians do not sum to All Minorities because these are not mutually exclusive categories and because additional races are not shown)