Today’s Objectives

• Migration
  – Definitions
  – Models
  – Demographics
  – Summaries
  – Case Studies
Human Migration

Population Change =
Fertility + Mortality + Migration
MIGRATION

• More complex than birth and death

• No limits (unlike fertility and mortality)

• Migration has two regions (origin & destination)
What is migration?

EUROPE A FORTRESS? WHAT ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT?! CAN'T YOU SEE - THE DOOR IS OPEN WIDE!
What is migration?

• Move across town?
• Students move to university each year?

• Key variables
  – Space, distance, time, frequency
Migration Defined

Hang on! He says we've got to double check that you're not actually Slovakian migrant workers...
Migration Defined

- Permanent change in residence
- Migrants cross some political boundary
  - duration of stay usually > 1 year
  - total displacement of community affiliation
    - jobs, church, school…
- “mover” defined as in moving within a city
  - no crossing of political boundaries & only partial displacement of community affiliation
Examples

• Urban commuter: local, recurrent, no change in residence (may cross political boundaries – SB – Goleta)
• Student or “migrant” far worker: not local, recurrent no complete change of community affiliation
• “Circulation”: recurrent movement
  – Examples: SB-Goleta = migration
    • move across town ≠ migration
Basic concepts/measures

• **Gross migration**
  - $$\left[\frac{\text{people in} + \text{people out}}{\text{mid year population}}\right] \times 1000$$

• **Net migration:**
  - $$\left[\frac{\text{# incoming} - \text{# outgoing}}{\text{mid year population}}\right] \times 1000$$

• **In-migration:**
  - called “in-migration” within a country; “immigration” for those entering a country
  - $$\left(\frac{\text{# immigrants}}{\text{mid year population of destination}}\right) \times 1000$$

• **Out-migration:** “emigration” for those leaving a country; “out migration” within country
  - $$\text{# emigrants}/\text{mid-year population of origin}$$
Estimation Techniques

• For unavailable data

• Residuals Method: estimates “crude” net rate
  – net migration\( t_{1-2} = (P_{t=2} - P_{t=1}) - (B_{t=1-2} - D_{t=1-2}) \)
  – Population change in interval, minus natural increase

• Surviving cohort method:
  – using life tables; age-specific survival rates can be obtained for the age class in question
Migration Theories

- Ravenstein
- Lee (Push-Pull)
- Gravity Model
- Intervening Opportunity Model
- Chain Migration
Ravenstein

1st “Laws of Migration” 1870s-80s

- **Distance:** most short (local rural to urban) longer distances to larger cities
- **Gender:** females mostly short migration (marriage/mills) males more common longer
- **Technology:** as transport improves leads to greater volume of migration
- **Motive:** economic motives main justification
- **Residence:** rural residents more likely to be migrants
Patterns of migrants noted by Ravenstein

- **Stream:** migrants from a given rural area often make up a stream from some origin to same destination
  - also a counter-stream of returnees
- **Steps:** migrants more rural therefore local/small town then small town to major town (not directly rural to big city)
Lee’s Push-Pull Model (1940s)

An attempt to explain the patterns of migration

- **Migration** was a decision (individual or family) therefore depends on:
  - characteristics of the origins
  - characteristics of the destination
  - nature of intervening obstacles (e.g. cost, borders, …)
  - nature of the people
Lee’s Push-Pull Model

CHART 1
ORIGIN AND DESTINATION FACTORS AND INTERVENING OBSTACLES IN MIGRATION

Origin

Intervening obstacles

Destination

See text for explanation
Lee’s Push-Pull Model

- **Push/pulls can vary widely** – economic is probably most important
  - But also climate; quality of school, nearness to family, etc.

- A potential migrant takes into consideration a balance of the +’s and –‘s of origin + destination along with difficulty of intervening obstacles in deciding whether or not to migrate
Constraints: Lee’s Behavioral Model

• Lee’s Push-Pull Model does not account for the fact that some people have less ability to act on migration decisions
• Lee only looks at people’s desire to act according to their assessment or desirability
• People differ in their ability to act/migrate (no matter how desirable migration may seem)
  – e.g. poor people may not be able to migrate
Gravity Model

- Uses population of origin and destination as measures of diversity
- Distance a major obstacle
- Model empirically adjusted to account for special circumstances
- Very simplistic model:
  - does not account for other factors re: the O + D
  - assumes distance = obstacle i.e. cost
- Attraction may be economic; obstacle may not be distance (e.g. borders)
The Gravity Model

\[
\frac{\text{Population}_1 \times \text{Population}_2}{\text{distance}^2}
\]

- The gravity model is used to predict the movement of people, commodities, and ideas between two places. It is a modified version of Newton's Law of Gravitation (the attractive force between two bodies is directly related to their size and inversely related to the distance between them).

- larger places attract people, ideas, and commodities more than smaller places

- places closer together have a greater attraction for one another
Interaction between places:

Salisbury - Baltimore = 1,151
Baltimore - Cambridge = 985
Salisbury - Cambridge = 258
Salisbury - Berlin = 138
Baltimore - Berlin = 120
Berlin - Cambridge = 13

Population1 x Population2 / distance²
Intervening Opportunity Model

• Migrants are open to possible opportunities that may lie between origin and destination
• Example of “step” migration rural → urban (goal is job/city life)
  – migrant might stop in local town instead of going all the way to major city if he/she gets a job…
  – later, that resident might move to large city in search of opportunities
  – therefore a typical process is rural to small city to major city (except if major city dominates a country)
CHAIN MIGRATION

• Opportunities localized within cities
• Migrants use established transport routes or streams
  – flow of information about a destination back to origins
• Follows migrants path therefore → ↑ knowledge of destination (↓ obstacle ↑ attractiveness)
• Previous migrant helps later people follow this stream flow (e.g. international migration to the U.S. – (Mexico/Santa Barbara; Quebec/Lewiston, ME)
Counter Stream Migration

- When migrant finds destination not as attractive as imagined
- Usually smaller
  - except if origin and destination are similar
Summary

• Ravenstein’s observations about migration + migrants
  – distance; gender; technology; motive; residence
  – stream; steps

• Lee’s Push-Pull Model: decision-making
  – characteristics of origin, destination, obstacles, migrants
  – role of diversity and perception
  – problem of constraints

• Gravity Model → goal to predict volume

• Intervening Obstacle Model (better describe patterns)

• Chain Migration
Demographic Characteristics
Who Migrates?

“That’s the birds. We hibernate.”
Demographic Characteristics

Age

• Young adults: 2/3 of people in 20s in last 5 years!
  – 1/3 move to another county; 1/6 to another state
  – leave parental home for job, marriage
  – have few major ties to origin
  – little attachment to preexisting job
  – in good health
  – little major accumulation of stuff
  – females slightly younger than males

• Relatively little movement of retirement aged individuals
Demographic Characteristics

Gender

• High rural-urban migration in developing world now
• High migration to USA, Europe, rich Middle Eastern nations
• Majority of international migration is male
  – longer distances especially
Demographic Characteristics

Marital Status

- Divorced move most in USA – desire for “new” start -- fewer ties?
- Many migrants are young families and this may be especially true for long-distance international migration
Demographic Characteristics

Socioeconomic Characteristics

• Education: those with more formal education more likely to migrate
  – US college grads 2x more likely than HS drop out
  – Developing world rural → urban migration: those that migrate have more formal education
  – Increased education →↑ knowledge of possibilities at a distance
Demographic Characteristics
Migrant Occupations

• Unskilled have usually widely available local jobs so move is less necessary or shorter-- less change
• Unskilled probably have less $ therefore obstacles are larger
• Professionals such as MDs, dentists, vets, lawyers in private practices are less mobile since it's hard to set up a new practice
• In US, most migrants move for a new job
Demographic Characteristics

Migrant Ethnicities

• African-Americans in USA 1940-1970
  – 4.3 million African-Americans left “the South”
• Mostly rural to urban migration
• Well developed streams and chain migration
  – voluntary “Pull” but also “Push” as mechanization increases after Depression
Demographic Characteristics

Place Characteristics

• environmental attractions
• economic attractiveness
• social issues attraction
  – schools, crime, pollution, crowding, cost of living
Place Characteristics (cont.)

Place vs. Migrant Values

• Lifestyle preference for less crowding; more “nature”
  – metro areas have serious negatives (pushes)
  – ↑crime; pollution; crowding/traffic; high costs; ↓ schools
  – Rural-semi suburban has +/- opposite “Pulls”
  – Firms move out of city also for similar reason
Political-Economy

• Argues that the behavioral approach of Lee (et. al) only deals with part of the issue
• Migration is a human response that occurs when different modes of production/economy interact
  – especially wage labor/capitalist
Political-Economy (cont.)

- Familial mode vs. wage labor mode to explore how it affected fertility
- Theory holds that when capitalist modes or production appear; it dislocates traditional familial modes and migration is a consequence
- Capitalist factory will be located in place of most profit
- Labor has historically been seen as the movable factor of production
Political-Economy (cont.)

• This argument can help explain how “late capitalism’s” restructuring affects migration

• Some restructuring → movement of factories etc. to low wage areas outside a country

• Marxist: core-periphery
Zelinsky’s Migration Transition

• Four States of Transition
Zelinsky’s Migration Transition

• **Pre-Modern**
  – small in volume but lots of circulation type movements
  – Rural to rural migration dominates

• **Transitional (LDCs now in varying stages)**
  – Rural to Urban migration dominates: Urban Pull (jobs) & Rural Push
  – ↑ transportation tech. ↓ cost of long distance movement
Zelinsky’s Migration Transition

• **Post-Transitional:** “advanced societies”
  – ↑ circulation for leisure (summer homes etc.)
  – Rural → urban transition finished
  – International Labor Migration from LDCs to MDCs
  – High rate of International urban → urban (job relocation)

• **Future “post industrial”** (Is the Future here?)
  – communications technology may reduce need to migrate
  – “Rebound” of Urban → Rural migration
USA Immigration History

• Four Major Waves
Regional Origins of Immigrants to the United States, Selected Years

Source: Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1998 Statistical Yearbook
USA Immigration History

1st Wave: Pre-Revolution to 1820

- **High cost to migration** ~ 6 month wages for passage. ~1/3 came as indentured servants/artisans (5+ years to work off)

- **Law + Policy** (type of barrier)
  - +/- laissez-faire
  - Naturalization Act of 1790

- 1808 Congress bans importation of slaves
USA Immigration History

1st Wave: Pre-Revolution to 1820

- **Overall migration:** ~ 10,000/year in 18th century or fewer
- > 100,000 German **Protestants** and 250,000 Scotch-Irish Protestants from N. Ireland
- **English** pulled by promise of better land: 60% of population 1790
- > 600,000 **Africans** before 1808 (mostly Caribbean)
USA Immigration History
2\textsuperscript{nd} Wave: 1820-1870

- \textbf{↑ population} in W Europe as Dem. Trans. begins
- \textbf{Population characteristics}
  - \textbf{1820-1860} \(\sim\) >5 million; 40\% Irish; 1/3 German Catholic; rest British
  - Irish Potato Famine + 1848 German Revolution
    - large \% Catholic (by 1860, USA 10\% Catholic)
    - large \% end up in cities
- \textbf{Law + Policy}: strong anti-immigrant reactions 1840s-50s but no explicit laws against migration
USA Immigration History
3rd Wave: 1870-1940

• 1850-80s European political turmoil = push
  – population increase due to DT continues

• Huge increase in volume
  – 1880 = ~ 800,000/year
  – 1910 > 1,000,000/year
USA Immigration History
3rd Wave: 1870-1940 (cont.)

• Origins Change
  – 1860-1900 NW Europe ~ 70% (German, Irish, UK, Scandinavia) & SE Europe ~ 20% (Italy, Spain, Slavs, Jews)
  – 1900-1920 N+W Europe ~40%, S+E Europe ~40%
• S+E Europeans = Italians, Slavs, Jews
  – S. Italy ~3.8m 1899-1924
  – E.Europe (Poles, Russians, Czechs, Ukrainians…)
  – E. European Jews ~ 1.8m

• Impact
  – by 1900 most to industrial cities; NE
  – By 1920s immigrants ~ 15% of US population and ~25% of work force in industrial cities
USA Immigration History
3rd Wave: 1870-1940 (cont.)

• Laws/policies: Qualitative
  – Immigration Act of 1882: barred “undesirables” and immigration from China (1907 Japan)
  – 1897-1917 → immigrant test for reading
  – total migrant limit of 358,000 (1921)
USA Immigration History
3rd Wave: 1870-1940 (cont.)

- **Laws/policies: Qualitative**
  - Immigration Act of 1882: barred “undesirables” and immigration from China (1907 Japan)
  - 1897-1917 → immigrant test for reading
  - total migrant limit of 358,000 (1921)

- **Laws/policies: Quantitative**
  - 1921 National Origins “Quota” Act
  - 250,000 Jews fled Hitler; most barred because of E. European origin
USA Immigration History
4th Wave 1940 - Present

- Numeric patterns of legal immigrants 1940s →
  - very small number in 1930s → 1952
  - steady increase 1953 → current levels ~ 800,000/year
  - 2000 census → foreign born 31m → 10% of total population
  - net migration ~ 1/3rd of annual population growth in US
  - Increase in foreign born during 1990s
USA Immigration History
4th Wave 1940 - Present

• Origins
  – 1900-1920 Europeans ~85%
  – after 1920s proportions changed (NW Europe ~ 40%, Europe ~ 20%, Latin America ~ 20%, Canada ~ 20%)
  – 1960s increase in Latin American fraction (~40%)

• NW +SE Europe ~ 35%, Asian ~ 13%, Canada ~12%
USA Immigration History
4th Wave 1940 - Present

• Origins
  – 1970s, 1980s
    • Europe steadily decreasing to ~ 10%
    • Asian origin increasing to ~50%
    • Latin America ~ 40% legal – post Vietnam
  – 1990s
    • Latin American migration dominates: nearly 50% of total (legal)
USA Immigration History
4th Wave 1940 - Present

• **Reactions/Law + Policy**
  – reform of 1920s legislation in 1952
    • no ceiling on W. Hemisphere
    • quota ↑ slightly to 158,000 (85% to NW Europe)
    • preference order for quota migrants
USA Immigration History
4th Wave 1940 - Present

• **Immigration Act of 1965**
  – eliminated country of origin qualification –
  – preference for families (1st) and skills (2nd)
    • numerical ceiling ~ 170,000 (actual # larger due to families) for E. Hemisphere & 120,000 W. Hemisphere Immigration Reform & Control Act of 1986
    • employer sanctions for knowingly hiring illegals
    • illegally entered before 1982 + resident could get amnesty + permanent resident status
    • Ag. Workers can get resident status

• **Current political positions**
Contemporary International Migration

*%$%#$!!!

BILL PROUD

"Congratulations, you’ve sworn the Oath of British Citizenship."
Developing World Migration Causes

- Uneven development - economic, health, education, etc.
- Loosening of traditional social constraints
- Rapid population growth
- Political and economic marginalization
- Environmental Degradation
- Strife/war/persecution
Developing World Migration

Three flows: Individual determinants

• Rural (virtually all: Rural-rural)
  – Increasingly smaller % of migrants
  – Tend to be most destitute and marginalized

• Urban (both rural-urban and urban-urban)
  – High % of all migrants
  – Leaving farm work for urban industrial & service jobs
  – Tend to be better educated, wealthier than avg. in origin

• International
  – High % of all migrants
  – Leave low wages for high wages
  – Higher educated than avg. in origin area
  – Males dominate
Developing World Migration

• Rural-Rural Impacts
  (Guatemala emphasis)
  – Declining % but great ecological impact
  – Cause of perhaps most of all global deforestation
  – Perhaps improves food security and
  – Relieves population pressures (temporarily) but…
  – Continues marginalization of poor rural populations
Developing World Migration

Rural-Urban Impacts

- accounts for 1/3 – ½ of growth in cities in third world
  • overstretched city services
  • poor housing; water; sanitary; education; transportation…
- Receive
  • “Brain Drain” arrivals
  • Abundant labor for industry
International Migration Impacts
(Case of Mexico coming up later)

• Origin area
  – Demographic/Economic: Labor (shortages, loss of labor at key times)
  – Socio-economic: (“Brain Drain” of best and brightest)
  – Environmental: consumption patterns & land use change
International Migration Impacts
Origin Area

Remittances - $ sent back to origin by migrants
International Migration Impacts on Destination Area

Social Impacts

• Socio-cultural integration: low education levels; language
  – little need to use English in S. Texas or S. California

• Increase diversity of local culture
International Migration Impacts on Destination Area

**Economic Impacts**

- **Labor Market** – highly debated and equivocal
  - Most impacted are those in low-skill jobs
  - Yet little evidence that on average, immigrants depress average wages significantly

- **“Brain Drain”**
International Migration Impacts on Destination Area

Public Services (US example)

• Schools, health, and other public services, but…
• Immigrants pay more taxes than cost in public services
  – However, bulk of taxes are paid to Federal Government while most of public services are mostly state or local government expenditures
International Migration Impacts on Destination Area

Public Services (US example)

• Welfare – mostly not eligible for 5 years

• Schools
  – TFR difference
  – language difference
International Migration Impacts on Destination Area

Demographic Impacts (Case of US)

• Change in rate of growth nationally
  – low projection → 2050 population ~ 314m
  – middle projection → 2050 population ~ 404m
  – high projection → 2050 population ~ 553m
International Migration Impacts on Destination Area

Demographic Impacts (Case of US)

• Change in ethnic composition of population
  – 2000 census → foreign born 31m → 11% of total population
  – Increase in foreign born during 1990s
Demographic Impacts (Cont.)

• Current US population includes (2004)
  – 66% white/non-Hispanic
  – 4% Asian
  – 14.1% Hispanic
  – 13% Afro-American
Demographic Impacts (Cont.)

- Population projections for 2050
  - 53% white (non-Hispanic)
  - 14% Afro-American
  - 24% Hispanic
  - 8% Asian
Chain Migration

• Information flows between destination & village of origin

• Strong preference for Hispanic cultural milieus
  – e.g. wages better in Chicago than Texas; but more returnees from Chicago than Texas
  – negative factors of destination: cold climate; fast pace of life; racial discrimination; vice + crime in US cities

• USA legal climate not uniform
  – traditionally CA preferred to TX
  – But Proposition 187…
Migrant’s Characteristics

• Most not permanent: majority return ~1 year
• Predominately motivated by Push factors
• Predominately economic motives: few jobs in Mexico;
• Individual migrant
  – younger than USA (17-24 years old)
  – more male (but increasing % female)
  – less well educated
  – more likely to be married (ages 25-64) ~75%
  – earn less
• Special Case: Refugees

[Map of forced to emigrate in 2001 showing countries and refugee population]

Refugee population: People who have crossed a border, recognised as refugees in the sense of the UN (1951) and Organisation of African Unity (1969) conventions. People given humanitarian status or temporary protection also fall within this category.

http://mondediplo.com/maps/forcedtoemigrate
• **Voluntary:** International labor migration (legal and illegal)

![Figure 3: Annual net international migration totals and migration rates in the world's major areas, 1990-1995](image)
Countries with the highest percentage of migrant stock, 2000

- UAE
- Kuwait
- Jordan
- Israel
- Singapore
- Oman
- Estonia
- Saudi Arabia
- Latvia
- Switzerland

# Migration to the US: Regional Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percent change in the foreign-born population: 1990-2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Naturalized citizens as a percent of the foreign-born population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States</strong></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Migration to the US: State Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2000 Foreign born</th>
<th>Percent change in the foreign-born population: 1990-2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Naturalized citizens as a percent of the foreign-born population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Percent of total population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Migration to the US: State Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2000 Foreign born</th>
<th>Percent change in the foreign-born population: 1990-2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Naturalized citizens as a percent of the foreign-born population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Migration to the US: County Comparison

## Table 1.

Ten Places of 100,000 or More Population With the Highest Percentage Foreign-Born: 2000

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place and state</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of total population</th>
<th>90 percent confidence interval on percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States</strong></td>
<td>281,421,906</td>
<td>31,107,889</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.09 - 11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hialeah, Florida</td>
<td>226,419</td>
<td>163,256</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>71.5 - 72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td>362,470</td>
<td>215,739</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>59.0 - 60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale, California</td>
<td>194,973</td>
<td>106,119</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>53.7 - 55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana, California</td>
<td>337,977</td>
<td>179,933</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>52.8 - 53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City, California</td>
<td>103,621</td>
<td>54,213</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>51.4 - 53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte, California</td>
<td>115,965</td>
<td>59,589</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>50.5 - 52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>124,283</td>
<td>60,605</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>48.0 - 49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth, New Jersey</td>
<td>120,568</td>
<td>52,975</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>43.0 - 44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Grove, California</td>
<td>165,196</td>
<td>71,351</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>42.5 - 43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>3,694,820</td>
<td>1,512,720</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>40.7 - 41.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mexican Migration
Mexico 1821-1857

Mexico has lost ~½ its national territory to the USA since 1824

• Large-scale movement of Mexicans to US starting in 1880s
• Large increase of migration: 1910-1920
Mexico Migration History

• WWI → northward migration to USA
• 1920s a period of anti-immigration and violence in USA
• Depression years in USA → return stream
• WWII → labor need at even wider scale than WWI
• Bracero Program 1942
• End of Bracero Program in 1964
• Currently >103 million people
• Urban population ~ 74%
• Urban growth ~ 3%/year
• Major problem with under-employment
• Much migration in Mexico → USA has been circulatory (temporary migration)
• Also permanent migration and daily job commuting in border cities
Mexico Migration
Spatial Patterns

• Origins in Mexico:
  – Jalisco, Michoacan, Zacatecas, Guanajuato, & Chihuahua
  + Coahuila (each > 5%)

• Destination in USA:
  – Texas, California, Illinois, (each > 5%), also New York,
    New Jersey, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Oregon,
    Washington, Florida
Mexico Migration
Spatial Patterns

• Patterns of flow “channelization” 2 big flows
  – Eastern from Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, Tamaulipis, S.L. Potosi → Texas
  – Western from Sinaloa, Jalisco, Nayarit, Colima → California (AZ)

• Factors influencing this pattern
  – Transportation links with Mexico
  – Labor contracting patterns: initially RR labor and Ag
  – Networks of “Coyotes” concentrated in Texas and California
Bracero Program

• Purpose - to provide legal agricultural labor to Mexicans
  – Ended in 1964
  – Not intended as legal migration
    • most came, worked, and returned
  – 400,000/year in Bracero Program versus 60-70,000 Mexican migrants
End of Bracero Program

• Hundreds of thousands with experience of labor in USA
• Good contacts for jobs etc.
• Hundreds of thousands of Mexican families suddenly deprived of major income source
Border Industrialization Program

Purpose - To increase jobs lost from Bracero Program

• Maquiladoras: USA, Japanese, Korean industrial firms with plants
• 1990s - 1,000s of plants employing 100,000’s
• Border Towns increase growth > 6%/year
• Change w/ NAFTA