Immigration Reflections in the Population Profiles of US Urban Areas:
Pattern and Process with Particular Attention to Mid-Size MSAs

Lawrence Brown, Tamar Mott, Edward Malecki
Department of Geography
Ohio State University

Once seen as a largely bi-coastal phenomenon, immigration effects on the population composition of US urban areas are creeping inland. A map of the change in the foreign born between 1990 and 2000 shows changes of 75% or higher in states such as Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, and Kentucky; and changes of less than 25% in New York, New Jersey, California, and Florida (Clark 2003: 39). Similarly, the *Rise of New Immigrant Gateways* (Singer 2004) identifies six types -- Former, Continuous, Post World War II, Emerging, Re-Emerging, and Pre-Emerging -- where 16 of the 21 cities comprising the more recent three groups are inland cities; only two of the remaining five would be considered a port of entry; and in the earlier groups, only five are a major port city and traditional gateway. Further, *Latino Growth in Metropolitan America* (Suro and Singer 2002) divides MSAs into Established Latino Metros, New Latino Destinations, Fast Growing Latino Hubs, and Small Latino Places where the three more dynamic categories are entirely comprised of mid-sized or smaller MSAs. Nevertheless, our knowledge of immigration impacts on the population profiles of MSAs -- e.g., the percent of an MSA's population that is foreign born, which foreign born groups are represented in an MSA, the proportional representation of each foreign born group, socio-economic characteristics of the foreign born, etc -- is largely confined to Los Angeles, New York, and Miami (Alba, Logan, and Stults 2000; Allen and Turner 1997, 2002; Beveridge 2002; Clark and Blue 2004; Jackson 1981; Johnston, Poulsen, and Forrest 2003; Logan, Alba, and Zhang 2002; Mollenkopf 1999; Newbold 2004; Poulsen, Forrest, and Johnston 2002; Waldinger 2001).

As a step towards addressing this lacuna, the 49 MSAs that are greater than 1 million in population size are examined in terms of the foreign born population profile of each, using sixteen regions of origin from the US Census of Population 2000 -- North, West, South, East Europe; East, South Central, Southeast, West Asia; East, Middle, North, South, West Africa; Caribbean; Central and South America (Appendix I) -- and the percent of population that is foreign born.[1] Standard procedures are employed to first identify patterns of co-location among the foreign born as a basis for reducing the data set to its *latent* dimensions via principal components analysis; then, MSAs are grouped on the basis of principal component scores. Observations include the full range of MSAs from Louisville at 1.0 million to New York at 21.2 million, but there is a distinct break at Philadelphia (6.2 million), which we consider the top of our mid-size range. Only San Francisco (7.0 million), Washington (7.6 million), Chicago (9.2 million), Los Angeles (16.4 million), and New York are larger.

The second step of this paper turns to processes that underlie the observed MSA profiles. Particular attention is given to the role of resettlement programs and agencies, which have been entirely neglected in understanding the urban geography of immigration.

Foreign Born Profiles of US Urban Areas

---

[1]   We are not alone in recognizing this need. Scott, Coomes, and Izyumov (2005), for example, examine more cities (298) but only for employment-based migrants and the top ten source countries within that group. Also, their focus is on the choice decision rather than MSA profiles.

Variables used in our analyses are the percent of an MSA's foreign born population that is represented by each of the sixteen region-of-origin groups, plus the percent of that MSA's population that is foreign born. Table 1 presents the means for these variables across all 49 MSAs that comprise our observations. On average 10.6 percent of the population of each MSA is foreign born, but this ranges from 2.6 percent in Cincinnati, Louisville, and Pittsburgh to 40.2 percent in Miami. The most important region of origin is Central America, which primarily consists of Mexicans; this averages 29.1 percent and ranges from 1.7 percent of the total foreign born in Buffalo to 73.2 percent in San Antonio. The next most important region of origin is Southeast Asia, which is dominated by immigrants from the Philippines but also includes Vietnam as a large component; this averages 11.2 percent of the total foreign born and ranges from 1.0 percent in Miami to 29.8 percent in Norfolk. East Europe (dominated by Poland but also includes Russia and Ukraine as large components), East Asia (dominated by China), South Central Asia (dominated by India), and the Caribbean (dominated by Cuba, Dominican Republic, and Jamaica) fall at the 6-8 percent level.[2] The range on these is, for East Europe, from 1.2 percent in San Antonio to 31.0 percent in Cleveland; for East Asia, from 0.9 percent in Miami to 19.1 percent in Seattle; for South Central Asia, from 1.1 percent in Miami to 13.0 percent in Cincinnati; and for the Caribbean, from 0.6 percent in San Francisco to 55.2 percent in Miami. How does it happen that some MSAs are exceedingly low for many foreign born groups, e.g., Miami; while a broader range of foreign born groups are represented in other MSAs, e.g., Cincinnati, Providence?

Also relevant is the coefficient of variation, the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean. A value less than approximately 0.67, the expectation for one standard deviation, indicates wide representation of the foreign born group among MSAs; a value greater than 0.67, approximately, indicates clumpiness of representation. Only seven of the sixteen foreign born groups are below the 0.67 threshold; nine above; and some are really egregious. The latter include South Europe (1.4), West Asia (1.0), East Africa (1.2), Middle Africa (1.0), West Africa (1.0), and the Caribbean (1.5). How does it happen that some groups of the foreign born appear only in some places and not others, whereas other groups are more ubiquitous?

In summary, simply recounting these basic statistics indicates how very complex is the urban geography of the foreign born and immigration in the United States.

We now turn to identifying patterns of co-location among the foreign born as a basis for reducing the data set to its *latent* dimensions via principal components analysis. This employs the percent of an MSA's foreign born population that is represented by each of the sixteen region-of-origin groups, plus the percent of each MSA's population that is foreign born. Five dimensions are identified, each of which embodies regions of origin which appear synchronously (Table 2). These dimensions account for 75 percent of the variance within the data set.

The first dimension (I) indicates that immigrants from Northern Europe (United Kingdom dominant, Ireland a large component), Western Europe (Germany dominant, France a large component), and Eastern Europe are found together and, to some degree, also with East Asians and South Central Asians. Generally, these are MSAs with a lower percent of foreign born and fewer Central Americans.

The second dimension (II) indicates that immigrants from South Central Asia are found together with ones from all of Africa -- East (Ethiopia dominant), Middle (no dominant country), North (Egypt

---

[2]   The US Census of Population includes Hong Kong and Taiwan with China.

dominant), South (South Africa dominant), and West (Nigeria dominant). To a lesser degree, East Asians also are found.

The third dimension (III) indicates that immigrants from the Caribbean (Cuba, Dominican Republic, Jamaica dominant) and South America (Colombia dominant) are found in MSAs with a high proportion of foreign born. Generally not found in these places are immigrants from East Asia, Southeast Asia (Philippines dominant, Vietnam a large component), and to a lesser degree from South Central Asia.

The fourth (IV) dimension indicates that immigrants from Southern Europe (Italy dominant) are found to some degree with those from West Africa, and this occurs in places that have lower levels of Central American (Mexico dominant) immigrants.

The fifth principal components dimension (V) shows immigrants from West Asia (Israel, Lebanon, and Iraq dominant) appearing together with immigrants from South Central Asia and East Europe, and this occurs in MSAs that have a lower level of immigrants from Southeast Asia.

We now turn to grouping MSAs on the basis of principal component scores that reflect the degree to which an MSA is represented by each of the five dimensions, using SPSS's Quick Cluster algorithm. Six clusters were derived. Table 3 presents the values at the cluster center for each of the principal components; this might be considered as the average score on each principal component for members of each cluster. Hence, higher values, and especially those at 1.0 or above are seen to define the nature of the cluster.

Cluster 1 contains two MSAs -- Cleveland and Detroit. The profile of these MSAs is indicated to be strongly differentiated by West Asians (Iraq dominant, Lebanon a large component), to a somewhat lesser degree by Eastern Europeans (Poland dominant, Yugoslavia a large component) and South Central Asians (India dominant) and by the lack of immigrants from Southeast Asia. Foreign born from Northern Europe (United Kingdom dominant) and Western Europe (Germany dominant) also are noticeable elements of the profile. Detroit has the largest population of Arab-Americans in North America (Hassoun 1999), with 17.5 percent of the West Asian population; originally this group was attracted by job opportunities in the automobile industry (Seikaly 1999). Cleveland also has a high proportion of West Asians, with 5.1 percent of the West Asian population, but is particularly dominated by Eastern Europeans (31 percent) from a broad range of countries. Aside from the strong base created by immigration at the beginning of the twentieth century, there were large influxes after World War II related, for example, to the 1956 Hungarian Revolution (Papp 1981) and the breakup of Yugoslavia in the 1990s (Smith 2002).

Cluster 2 contains twenty-one MSAs -- Austin, Chicago, Dallas, Denver, Grand Rapids, Greensboro, Houston, Kansas City, Las Vegas, Los Angeles, Memphis, Milwaukee, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, Phoenix, Portland, Sacramento, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, San Diego, San Francisco. Cluster analysis indicates that no principal component stands out for profiling this group. It is noteworthy, however, that all cities in Cluster 2 are included among the 26 highest MSAs when they are ordered in terms of the percent of their population from Central America, which is primarily Mexico.[3] Hence, we profile this

---

[3]   Among the top twenty-six MSAs in terms of Central American foreign born, only Charlotte, Raleigh, Atlanta, Nashville, and Indianapolis (in that order) are not included in Cluster 2 and all appear in Cluster 4.

cluster as strong in Mexican representation. Further, that no principal component stands out for this group suggests a set of MSAs where Central Americans are mixed in with a broad variety of other regions of origin and thus permeate US society in a way that other groups do not.

Cluster 3 contains eleven MSAs -- Boston, Buffalo, Hartford, Jacksonville, Louisville, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Rochester, St Louis, Seattle. The profile of these MSAs is indicated to be strongly differentiated by Northern (United Kingdom dominant), Western (Germany dominant), and Eastern Europeans (Poland, Russia, and Ukraine dominant), a lack of Central Americans (including Mexicans), lower levels of foreign born, and to a lesser degree East Asians and South Central Asians. In many ways this is akin to Cluster 1 but it does not include as strong a representation of West Asians and has a lesser representation of Central Americans. Most of these cities are located in the American Manufacturing belt and were the focus of early twentieth immigration from Europe.

Cluster 4 contains nine MSAs -- Atlanta, Charlotte, Cincinnati, Columbus, Indianapolis, Minneapolis, Nashville, Raleigh, Washington. The profile of these MSAs is indicated to be strongly differentiated by South Central Asians, all African origins (with West Africa and East Africa dominating), and to a lesser extent, East Asians. Government resettlement programs and Asian businesses have been prominent in affecting immigration to Cluster 4 MSAs. Columbus, for example, is where Honda's North American operations were established in the late 1970s; it has received a marked influx of East African refugees through the US Office of Refugee Resettlement; and Ohio State University is a major attraction for Asians. Except for Cincinnati, these places also appear as *New Latino Destinations* (Suro and Singer 2002, Appendix A), indicating the affinity between this cluster and Cluster 2. For Cluster 4 MSAs, furthermore, the African portion of the foreign born is higher than for MSAs in any other cluster.

Cluster 5 contains five MSAs -- Miami, New York, Orlando, Tampa, West Palm Beach. The profile of these MSAs is indicated to be strongly differentiated by Caribbean (Cuba dominant, Dominican Republic a large component) and South American (Columbia dominant, Ecuador a large component) immigrants, by a high level of foreign born in the population, and by a lack of East Asians, Southeast Asians, and to a lesser degree, South Central Asians. Proximity of these MSAs to the Caribbean and South America is an obvious factor here. In this regard, it is interesting to see that immigration from Central America takes a different route then that from the Caribbean. This reflects the overland accessibility provided Mexicans by the lengthy US-Mexico border, compared to the closer proximity of Florida when crossing the Caribbean -- leading to different destination choices and different MSA profiles. Strength of the Cuban component dates to the Cuban Revolution and resettlement programs initiated by the Eisenhower administration in 1959 and the Kennedy administration in 1961 (Boswell 1985). The Dominican stream, initiated in the late 1960s, is related to political upheavals.

Cluster 6 contains one MSA -- Providence. The profile of this group is indicated to be strongly differentiated by Southern Europeans (Portugal dominant) and West Africans (Other West Africa, which includes Liberia, dominant), a lack of Caribbean and Central American migrants, and a low level of foreign born. South Central Asians are present, but less important in this profile. The Southern Europe component here is largely Portuguese. They were initially recruited by the whaling industry in the mid-1800s, though heavier migration occurred in the early twentieth century, and continued (State of Rhode Island General Assembly nd). The West African component includes Cape Verde, whose people also were recruited for the whaling industry and Liberians who came as refugees in the late twentieth century (Corkery 2003; Smith 2003).

The findings reported in this section are largely description and classification, primarily providing a

gazetteer-type knowledge. This is important given the lack of information about variation in the foreign-born profiles of US MSAs. But in addition, general differences among the clusters also emerge.

One such motif pertains to urban areas that have been prominent over a longer time span, are primarily located in the American Manufacturing Belt, were the target of pre-World War II immigration from Europe, and remain so today. MSAs falling within this theme are Cleveland and Detroit (Cluster 1); Boston, Buffalo, Hartford, Jacksonville, Louisville, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Rochester, St Louis, and Seattle (Cluster 3); and Providence (Cluster 6).

A second motif pertains to urban areas which experienced a marked inflow of Caribbean and South American immigrants. This is represented by Cluster 5 -- Miami, New York, Orlando, Tampa, and West Palm Beach.

A third motif pertains to urban areas which are associated with high levels of Central American, primarily Mexican, immigrants. This is represented by Cluster 2 -- Austin, Chicago, Dallas, Denver, Grand Rapids, Greensboro, Houston, Kansas City, Las Vegas, Los Angeles, Memphis, Milwaukee, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, Phoenix, Portland, Sacramento, Salt Lake City, San Antonio, San Diego, and San Francisco.

Motif four pertains to urban areas that have become immigrant destinations more recently, often are the target of refugee resettlement programs and other agency efforts, and often have major Asian business establishments and/or strong universities. These MSAs include Atlanta, Charlotte, Cincinnati, Columbus, Indianapolis, Minneapolis, Nashville, Raleigh, and Washington (Cluster 4).

Mechanisms of Immigration

There are many known mechanisms by which immigrants have arrived to the United States and particular MSAs. Most have been written about extensively, and hence, we simply note these and provide a few examples of their working in terms of differentiating the foreign born profiles of MSAs. By contrast, the numerous resettlement programs, which expanded dramatically in the half-century since World War II, have been given very little attention and, accordingly, are discussed in greater detail. An important difference is that known mechanisms of migration tend to replicate the settlement patterns of past immigrants, who represent origins similar to those of the new immigrants, whereas resettlement programs often change those patterns because the foreign born groups are not represented by earlier immigrants and because the MSAs targeted are often non-traditional destinations for immigrants.

Among the well-documented mechanisms of migration are employment opportunities in agriculture and manufacturing which have historically encouraged movements to the US. Chinese migration to the West Coast in the mid-nineteenth century, for example, provided labor for completing the transcontinental railroad, and Japanese arrived at the West Coast in the 1890s to work in the railroad and coal mining industries (Dinnerstein and Reimers 1999). In the early 1900s, Filipinos migrated to Hawaii and California to work as sugar planters and later, between the first and second World Wars, both San Francisco and Seattle emerged as regional centers where immigrants provided an essential labor supply for agribusiness (Fujita-Rony 2003). Beginning in the 1880s, East Europeans and West Asians settled in Eastern and Midwestern parts of the US to work as common laborers in iron and steel production, coal mining, construction, slaughtering, meat packing, and textile-garment manufacturing (Hassoun 1999; Morawska 1995). Southern Europeans and West Africans, recruited by the whaling industry, settled in the Northeast during the 1850s and 1860s (State of Rhode Island General Assembly nd). More recently,

the US has been seen as draining off the best of the population from other countries, particularly lesser developed ones, a phenomenon once referred to as the *brain drain* (Grubel 1966; Grubel and Scott 1966). Indeed, by the mid-1970s, one-fifth of all US physicians were immigrants, and there were more medical graduate students from India and the Philippines than African American physicians. Moreover, by the mid-1980s, over half of all doctoral degrees in engineering awarded by US universities were earned by foreign born students (Rumbaut 1994).

Educational institutions also attracted Asian populations in the early 1900s. Filipinos took advantage of the University of Washington, the premier educational institution of the Northwest Region, while San Francisco was a pivotal site of study for scholars from Chinese-American communities (Dinnerstein and Reimers 1999; Fujita-Rony 2003). More recently, in the wake of the Tiananmen Massacre of 1992, the United States passed legislation allowing students to apply for permanent resident status. As a result, in recent decades Chinese immigration has swelled and been dominated by skilled laborers, entrepreneurs, and students who bring a great deal of intellectual and financial capital (Spellman 2002). Education remains a strong draw for people from all countries, as we know, and many who attend US institutions remain.

Another much studied phenomenon is immigrant networks whereby new migrants tend to settle in or near places where their predecessors are, following the paths of relatives, friends, acquaintances, and community members who moved earlier. Often known as *migration chains*, early studies in geography include Hagerstrand (1957) who examined the reverberating flow of Swedish migrants to North America. More recently, Massey and Espana (1987) discuss these networks within the context of *social capital theory*. They define migrant networks as a web of social ties that links potential migrants in sending communities to people and institutions in receiving areas. Acts of migration at one point in time systematically alter the context within which future migration decisions are made, greatly increasing the likelihood that later decision makers will choose to immigrate and that they will choose destinations similar to those of earlier migrants, thus creating a circular and cumulative causation (Massey 1990; Massey, Arango, Hugo, Kouaouci, Pellegrino, and Taylor 1993).

US policy also has shaped the immigrant flows to the US. One dimension of this reflects discrimination and/or hostility. For example, immigration laws such as the Chinese exclusion Act of 1882 were created to decrease the flow of Chinese population to the US, and Japanese-Americans were placed in internment camps during World War II. These particular directions were reversed by the 1965 Immigration Act, which led to increased inflows of Asians, among others. It established a system whereby visas were distributed according to a preference list that favored close relatives of US citizens and those with desired occupational skills. It also broadened the definition of refugees to include victims of natural disasters, religious, and political persecution. The Bracero program, which was active from 1942 to 1964, permitted Mexican males to migrate to the US temporarily to work in agriculture. The Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), completed in 1986, offered amnesty to illegal residents who had entered the US before 1982, creating a pool of some three million permanent residents and prospective citizens, who would eventually stimulate more Mexican immigration by way of family reunion (Zolberg 1999). Proximity to the US has also encouraged migration streams such as those from Northern Mexico to the Southwest and the Caribbean to Florida.

Resettlement Programs and Agencies

Universal standards for the protection of refugees were established in the early 20th century, and following World War I, the refugee issue became regarded as a something that needed international

attention (UN High Commissioner for Refugees 2000). Accordingly, after WWI the League of Nations created a special High Commission for Refugees which facilitated their movement from Europe. Polish, Turkish, Russian, and Balkan refugees were aided in this manner. Many of these populations settled in major industrial centers of the Eastern and Midwestern parts of the US, where previous groups of the same nationalities had settled during the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Indeed, during the period 1880-1924, approximately 70 percent of Slav, Lithuanian, Latvian, and Jewish (included as a separate group!) immigrants settled in just eight major urban-industrial centers -- Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, New York, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and Boston (Morawska 1995). These people found work as common laborers in iron and steel production, coal mining, construction, slaughtering, meat packing, textile-garment manufacturing, and the like. After WWII, the US passed the Displaced Persons Act (1948). As a result, large clusters of immigrants from Europe settled in existing centers of population for its various nationalities; Cleveland, for example, experienced an influx of people from Poland, Slovenia, Croatia, and Hungary, among others (Cizmic 1994, 1996; Pozun 2001; Smith 2002). By 1951, 24,200 Polish newcomers settled in Pennsylvania, with Pittsburgh gaining nearly 2,500 of these (Burstin 1989). And in response to the Hungarian Uprising in 1956, the first of a series of refugee acts were passed (Lynch and Simon 2003). A large number of these refugees moved to Cleveland and Pittsburgh, cities where Hungarians had previously moved after the suppression of Hungary's war of independence in 1848 (Papp 1981).

It should be evident, then, how immigration in the late nineteenth century laid a spatial foundation by which immigration in the early twentieth century was channeled and, in turn, these together channeled European migration following World War II. Especially for refugees, the mechanisms are migration chains, established communities, and persons/families within them who *sponsor* immigrants and provide a mechanism for assimilation. Facilitating this process are a multitude of government, but especially non-government ecumenical agencies, discussed below, who connect(ed) refugees with destinations. Hence, for many nationalities, present-day MSA profiles of the foreign born reflect earlier settlement patterns, as new immigrants and refugees are drawn in by existing communities.

A similar but somewhat different scenario is provided by the Cuban Refugee Emergency Center, created under President Eisenhower in 1959, President Kennedy's Cuban Refugee Program of 1961, and the 1962 Migration and Refugee Assistance Act. Cubans already had a history in Miami, dating at least to the 1890s when a small population of approximately 25 was reported, and by spring 1932 there were over a thousand exiles from Cuba (Sicius 1988). Given this Cuban community, in the 1960s the majority of Cuban refugees were initially resettled in the Miami/Dade County area, but it later became apparent that the locale could not support such a heavy increase in population. Accordingly, the federal government began to direct refugees away from Miami, assisted by programs that helped Cuban immigrants adjust to living conditions in the US through job placement and welfare assistance. If individuals or households refused to settle in areas other than south Florida, they were denied further federal assistance, and 61 percent of the 495,000 new Cubans registered between 1961 and 1981 were relocated in this manner. Groups were resettled in, for example, Chicago, New Orleans, Los Angeles, New York City; and Elizabeth, Union City, West New York, and other New Jersey cities. However, once Cuban-Americans adjusted to living in the United States, learned English, and were able to become independent of federal assistance, many relocated back to Miami (Thomas 1967; Boswell 1985). That this resettlement program fell short of its goals is not unheard of. For example, Asians have been historically resettled in Hawaii and states along the Pacific Coast, but these populations are increasingly dispersing to cities that traditionally received few Asian immigrants. Examples include sizable communities of Vietnamese in New Orleans and Houston and Hmongs (largely from Laos) in Minneapolis (Zhou and Gatewood 2000). Regarding the latter, resettlement of the Hmongs was originally directed to scattered communities (e.g.,

Columbus Ohio, Philadelphia, Portland, Seattle, Wausau Wisconsin), but secondary migration led to strong clusters in California (40% of US Hmongs, especially its Central Valley and Fresno), Minnesota (26%, especially Minneapolis-St. Paul), and Wisconsin (19%, especially Milwaukee) (Yau 2005).

The foundation for today's asylum adjudication process was provided by the Refugee Act of 1980, including development of an Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) within the Department of Health and Human Services (*http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/*). ORR assists refugees in obtaining economic and social self-sufficiency, largely by funding a wide variety of programs run by national voluntary, non-governmental agencies.

Such voluntary agencies, often referred to as VOLAGs, have long played a major role in US immigration. The oldest international migration and refugee resettlement agency in the US is the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS) (*http://www.hias.org*). It was founded in 1881 in New York City, in response to the pogroms of Russia and Eastern Europe. Many Jews from this area were relocated to the Midwest, originally with a rural farming focus, but increasingly to urban areas. HIAS later played a major role in the rescue and relocation of Jewish survivors of the Holocaust, and of Jews from Morocco, Ethiopia, Egypt, and communist Eastern Europe. Most of the Jewish African populations were resettled in Israel (Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society 2004), while Eastern European and Russian Jews have been resettled both there and in the United States -- particularly in the Midwest and East Coast, where communities from earlier resettlement efforts, and spontaneous migrations, had already formed (Morawska 1995). The six largest cities in 1999 that participated in HIAS' program to resettle refugees from the former Soviet Union were New York City, San Francisco, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Boston (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2002).

In 1934 the Protestant Churches created the American Committee for Christian German Refugees, and in 1936 the National Catholic Welfare Conference established the Catholic Committee for Refugee Victims of Nazi Persecution. The Catholic organizations also aided immigrants at Ellis Island and along the Mexican border where, in the 1930s, refugees were escaping religious persecution in Mexico. The American Fund for Czechoslovak Relief, the Tolstoy Foundation, and the Polish Immigration and Refugee Committee were created following WWII. Moreover, in 1975 the American Council for Nationalities Service, and in 1979 the World Relief Organization (a branch of the Evangelical Churches) and Young Mens Christian Association (YMCA) became involved in refugee resettlement. While many of these agencies gave assistance to refugees of their denomination that were escaping persecution and resettling in the US, they ultimately opened their doors to all denominations (Wright 1981). Currently, most refugee resettlement in the United States is handled by ten voluntary agencies -- Church World Service (CWS), Ethiopian Community Development Council (ECDC), Episcopal Migration Ministries (EMM), Hebrew Immigration Aid Society (HIAS), International Rescue Committee (IRC), Immigration and Refugee Services of America (IRSA), Lutheran Immigration on Refugees Services (LIRS), United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), World Relief Corporation (WR), and the State of Iowa Bureau of Refugee Services (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2003).

National voluntary agencies, such as those just described, have played a major role in the disbursal of refugees throughout the United States. Eastern Europeans were resettled in Atlantic Coast cities where they had disembarked -- New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. Jewish populations tended to remain in these locales, whereas the Polish often moved to newer cities of industrializing America -- Buffalo, Detroit, Milwaukee, Chicago, and Cleveland, in that order (Golab 1977). Immigrants from Hungary and Czechoslovakia also migrated inland to these cities (Ward 1971) while Poles, Slovaks, Croatians, Slovenes, and Ukrainians favored Pennsylvania where industrialization was occurring in the form of coal

mining, early iron and steel production, railroads, and the manufacturing of glass, cement, and chemicals (Golab 1977). Additionally, Pittsburgh was one of 100 US towns and cities linked to a national and international network to resettle Jewish displaced persons after WWII, and in July 1946 forty Polish orphans were sent to the Holy Family Institute in Elmsworth, just outside Pittsburgh (Burstin 1989).

During the Cuban Revolution, the Catholic Welfare Bureau, Children's Service Bureau, Jewish Family and Children's Service, and the United HIAS services resettled Cubans in the Miami/Dade County area. Later, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Church World Service, International Rescue Committee, and United HIAS Services were asked to help direct the resettlement of Cubans outside the Miami area. As noted previously, these groups were settled in Chicago, New Orleans, Los Angeles, New York City; and in Elizabeth, Union City, West New York, and other New Jersey cities (Thomas 1967).

The Indochinese resettlement process also was a responsibility of voluntary agencies, beginning about 1975. They operated as autonomous entities and used networks throughout the United States to find sponsors for these refugees. States west of the Mississippi received the highest refugee densities, as did the four states where transit camps were located -- California, Pennsylvania, Arkansas, and Florida. Nineteen percent of all refugees were settled in California (Desbarats 1985), and many small cities also received refugees. The Diocese of Green Bay, an agency associated with the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, has resettled approximately 5,400 refugees since 1975, mainly from Vietnam and Laos, but also from Moscow, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Ukraine, Somalia, Cuba, and Bosnia. Agencies in Lowell (Cambodian Mutual Association of Greater Lowell) and Fall River (Cambodian Community of Greater Fall River) Massachusetts have received grants to resettle Cambodian refugees in their cities, while agencies in Milwaukee Wisconsin (Lao Family Community Inc.) and the Twin Cities (Association for the Advancement of Hmong Women) have received grants to aid with the resettlement of Laotian and Hmong refugees (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2001).

With regard to African refugees, Atlanta, Nashville, Louisville, Columbus, Minneapolis, and Memphis have served as the primary Somali refugee settlement areas, but smaller cities such as Portland Maine also received these refugees. In fact, between 1982 and 2000, the Catholic Charities Maine office of Refugee/Immigrant Services resettled approximately 315 Somalis in greater Portland (Nadeau 2003). Additionally, Ethiopian refugees have been sponsored by the United Methodist Church in Northern California, congregations in Reno Nevada, and resettlement agencies in San Francisco, Seattle, and San Jose -- leading to an influx to these locales (McSpadden 1987).

The ability of agencies to resettle refugees is dependent on being able to find sponsors, money, and human assistance for resettlement efforts. They also receive support from the US Department of State working with the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) of the US Department of Health and Human Services. In considering which voluntary agencies should be allocated monies, the State Department considers the following objectives (U.S. Department of State 2005):

(i)   Can the agency provide a language, appropriate reception, and placement program?.
(ii)   Is the location of the agency conducive to the attainment of economic self-sufficiency (national agencies may have numerous locations)?
(iii)   Does the agency maximize the use of private resources and programs?
(iv)   Does the agency coordinate with ethnic and other community-based organizations or through consultation with state and local public agencies involved in assisting refugees?
(v)   Can the agency provide all required services (i.e., case management, medical treatment, and housing placement) within the appropriate time-frame?

Table 4 shows the amount of such distribution for 1998 by state. Particularly interesting in this table are the states that receive relatively high allocations but are not traditionally thought of as immigrant destinations, especially current-day resettled immigrants who often come from Southeast Asia, Northern Africa, former Soviet Republics, and the like -- falling into this category for us are Colorado, Georgia, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. This is another indication, then, of the enormous impact by resettlement programs and agencies on the foreign born profiles of US MSAs and their surrounding areas.

Returning to current-day profiles of MSAs in terms of the foreign born, it is relevant to make a distinction between refugees whose nationalities have been well represented in population profiles, and those who are not. Earlier, we noted that refugees of the former group tend to mimic existing settlement patterns due to mechanisms such as migration chains and established communities which sponsor refugees and provide a mechanism for assimilation. By contrast, refugee groups who are not (well) represented in the host population establish *new* settlement patterns! This is an essential distinction that separates World War II displaced persons, who were largely from Europe, from the majority of subsequent refugees such as those from Cuba, many Southeast Asian nationalities related to the Vietnam War (e.g., Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam), Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Somalia, Liberia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, and refugees from remote republics of the former USSR (e.g., Azerbaijan, Belarus, Moldova, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan) (Appendix II).[4]

Further, refugees who change the US map of the foreign born have a multiplier effect through migration chains and their own community's ability to sponsor more such immigrants. Accordingly, while Columbus Ohio will never be the Queens neighborhood described in *Crossing the BLVD* (Lehrer and Sloan 2003), in the twenty-first century we find ourselves with burgeoning refugee communities of Laotians, Cambodians, Hmong, Ethiopians, Somalis, and Rwandans -- not to mention many other ethnic groups that are spontaneous migrants such as Indians, Koreans, Mexicans, and Nigerians. We conclude, then, that while refugees constitute only a portion of total immigration, approximately 8 percent in 2000 for the US (Martin and Widgren 2002: 12), their effects on changing the foreign born profiles of MSAs and other communities, and on changing the fabric of society, are disproportionately large.

Concluding Observations

This paper has undertaken the task of beginning to balance our knowledge and understanding of immigration flows to US urban areas by shifting the focus to mid-size MSAs, rather than the very largest MSAs and/or major ports of entry. This shift reflects what has been occurring since the late 1980s whereby immigration effects on the population composition of US urban areas is creeping inland and down the urban hierarchy.

Our first task was largely description and classification. The forty-nine MSAs with greater than 1 million in population were partitioned into six groupings based on the national-origin profile of their foreign born population and the proportion of foreign born overall. National-origin profile was gauged in terms

---

[4] The twentieth century shift of immigrant stock from predominately European to predominately Asian and Latin American has a similar effect of course. But in the case of non-refugee spontaneous immigrants, the choice of destination is theirs, whereas agencies make the destination choice for refugee immigrants and thus directly shape a dimension of the geography of the foreign born.

of sixteen regions -- North, West, South, East Europe; East, South Central, Southeast, West Asia; East, Middle, North, South, West Africa; Caribbean; Central and South America.

While the exercise primarily serves to provide gazetteer-type knowledge, some general differences among the groups were noted. One motif pertains to urban areas that have been prominent over a longer time span, are primarily located in the American Manufacturing Belt, were the target of pre-World War II immigration from Europe, and remain so today. A second motif pertains to urban areas which experienced a marked inflow of immigrants from the Caribbean and South America. A third motif encompasses urban areas associated with high levels of Mexican and other Central American in-migration. The fourth motif pertains to urban areas that have become immigrant destinations more recently, often as targets of refugee resettlement programs, or which have major Asian business establishments and/or strong universities. It is also noteworthy that different types of MSAs, in terms of the nationality profile of their foreign born, generally are interspersed with one another, rather than clustered.

The second task of the paper considered processes underlying the observed patterns. Most mechanisms of migration have been exhaustively studied and are well known -- employment opportunities in agriculture and manufacturing; educational opportunities which draw students world wide, who then remain in the US; migration chains through a wide variety of immigrant networks; and US policy. By contrast, immigration research has given virtually no attention to the role of programs and agencies directly engaged in resettlement, either of refugees or of immigrants related to employment opportunities/needs. In terms of refugees, examples considered here include public entities such as the League of Nations and United Nations High Commission for Refugees, Cuban Refugee Program, and Office of Refugee Resettlement; also, ecumenical entities such as the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, Catholic Committee for Refugee Victims of Nazi Persecution, Polish Immigration and Refugee Committee, and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

Ideally, we would have directly linked mechanisms of migration and resettlement programs to MSA profiles. While we were able to do this circumstantially in terms of particular aspects of a profile, we realize that a more complete study is needed and should be a next step in this research agenda.

Another important observation is that the known mechanisms of migration are likely to replicate the settlement patterns of past immigrants who represent origins similar to those of the new immigrants, whereas resettlement programs are more likely to change those patterns because the foreign born groups are not represented by earlier immigrants and because the MSAs targeted are often non-traditional destinations for immigrants. Hence, it is relevant to make a distinction between refugees whose nationalities have a long-standing representation in US population profiles, and those who do not. Refugees of the former group tend to mimic existing settlement patterns due to migration chains, established communities which sponsor refugees and provide a mechanism for assimilation, and the like. By contrast, refugee groups who are not (well) represented in the US tend to establish new settlement patterns. This distinguishes World War II displaced persons, who were largely from Europe, from the majority of subsequent refugees from Cuba, many Southeast Asian nationalities related to the Vietnam War, Somalia, Ethiopia, Haiti, Liberia, refugees from remote republics of the former USSR (e.g., Azerbaijan, Kazakstan, Tajikistan), El Salvador, Dominican Republic, Afghanistan, Bhutan, etc. Given the importance of resettlement agencies and resettlement programs in this scenario, a major priority of future research should be to better understand how these entities impact the geography of the foreign born (in the US), and incorporate that aspect into a broad framework by which these processes can be better understood and tracked.

References

Alba, Richard D, John R Logan, Brian J Stults. 2000. "The Changing Neighborhood Contexts of the Immigrant Metropolis", *Social Forces* 79: 587-621.

Allen, James P and Eugene Turner. 1997. *The Ethnic Quilt: Population Diversity in Southern California* Northridge: Center for Geographical Studies, California State University at Northridge.

Allen, James P. and Eugene Turner. 2002. *Changing Faces, Changing Places: Mapping Southern Californians* Northridge: Center for Geographical Studies, California State University at Northridge.

Beveridge, Andrew A. 2002. "Immigrant Residence and Immigrant Neighborhoods in New York, 1910 and 1990", in Pyong Gap Min, ed., *Mass Migration to the United States: Classical and Contemporary Periods*. Walnut Creek California: Alta Mira Press, pp. 199-230.

Boswell, Thomas D. 1985. "The Cuban Americans", in Jesse O. McKee, ed., *Ethnicity in Contemporary America: A Geographical Appraisal*. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing, pp. 139-80.

Burstin, Barbara S. 1989. *After the Holocaust: The Migration of Polish Jews and Christians to Pittsburgh*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Cizmic, Ivan. 1994. *History of the Croatian Fraternal union of America: 1894-1994*. Zagreb, Golden Marketing.

Cizmic, Ivan. 1996. "Emigration and emigrants from Croatia between 1880 and 1980", *GeoJournal* 38: 431-36.

Clark, William A.V. 2003. *Immigrants and the American Dream: Remaking the Middle Class*. New York: Guilford.

Clark, William A.V.. and Sara A. Blue. 2004. "Race, Class, and Segregation Patterns in U.S. Immigrant Gateway Cities", *Urban Affairs Review* 39: 667-88.

Corkery, Michael. 2003. "War-Weary Liberians Find Peace in Providence", *The Providence Journal*. October 2, 2003.

Debarats, Jacqueline. 1985. "Indochinese Resettlement in the United States", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 75: 522-38.

Department of State Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration Office of Admissions. 2004. Reception and Placement Program, Proposal Guidance.

Dinnerstein, Leonard and David M. Reimers. 1999. *Ethnic Americans: A History of Immigration* New York: Columbia University Press.

Fujita-Rony, Dorothy B. 2003. *American Workers, Colonial Power: Philippine Seattle and the Transpacific West, 1919-1941*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Golab, Caroline. 1977. *Immigrant Destinations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press

Grubel, Herbert G. 1966. "The Brain Drain: A U.S. Dilemma", *Science* 154: 1420-24.

Grubel, Herbert G. and Anthony Scott. 1966. "The Immigration of Scientists and Engineers to the United States, 1949-61", *The Journal of Political Economy* 74 (4): 368-78.

Hagerstrand, Torsten. 1957 "Migration and Area. Survey of a Sample of Swedish Migration Fields and Hypothetical Considerations on Their Genesis", in David Hannenberg, Torsten Hagerstrand, and Bruno Odeving, eds., *Migration in Sweden: A Symposium*. Lund Sweden: C.W.K.Gleerup, Lund Studies in Geography, Series B, pp. 27-158.

Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society. 2004. *http://www.hias.org/Offices/Israel.html*.

Hassoun, Rosina. 1999. "Arab-American Health and the Process of Coming to America: Lessons From the Metropolitan Detroit Area", in Michael W. Suleiman, ed., *Arabs in America: Building a New Future*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 157-76.

Jackson, Peter. 1981. "Paradoxes of Puerto Rican Segregation in New York", in Ceri Peach, Vaughan Robinson, and Susan Smith, eds., *Ethnic Segregation in Cities* London: Croom Helm, pp. 109-26.

Johnston, Ron, Michael Poulsen, and James Forrest. 2003. "Ethnic Residential Concentration and a 'New Spatial Order'?: Exploratory Analyses of Four United States Metropolitan Areas, 1980-2000", *International Journal of Population Geography* 9: 39-56.

Lehrer, Warren and Judith Sloan. 2003. *Crossing the BLVD: Strangers, Neighbors, Aliens in a New America*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Logan, John R, Richard D Alba, and Wenquen Zhang. 2002. "Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles", *American Sociological Review* 67: 299-322.

Lynch, James P. and Rita J. Simon. 2003. *Immigration the World Over*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Martin, Philip and Jonas Widgren. 2002. "International Migration: Facing the Challenge" *Population Bulletin* 57-1.

Massey, Douglas S. 1990. "Social Structure, Household Strategies, and the Cumulative Causation of Migration", *Population Index* 56: 3-26.

Massey, Douglas S. and Felipe Garcia Espana. 1987. "The Social Process of International Migration", *Science,* 237: 733-38.

Massey, Douglas S., Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouaouci, Adela Pellegrino, and J. Edward Taylor. 1993. "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal", *Population and Development Review* 19: 431-66.

McSpadden, Lucia A. 1987. "Ethiopian Refugee Resettlement in the Western United States: Social Context and Psychological Well-being", *International Migration Review* 21: 796-819.

Mollenkopf, John H. 1999. "Urban Political Conflicts and Alliance: New York and Los Angeles Compared", in Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind, eds., *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 412-22.

Morawska, Ewa. 1995. "East Europeans on the Move", in Robin Cohen, ed., *The Cambridge Survey of World Migration*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 97-102.

Nadeau, Phil. 2003. "The Somalis of Lewiston: Community Impacts of Rapid Immigrant Movement into a Small Homogeneous Maine City", Brown University Center for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, working paper.

Newbold, Bruce K. 2004. "Segmented Paths and the Differential Role of Primate Immigrant Centers", *Geographical Analysis* 36: 21-37.

Papp, Susan M. 1981. *Hungarian Americans and Their Communities of Cleveland*. Cleveland: Cleveland State University, Ethnic Heritage Studies Series.

Poulsen, Michael, James Forrest, and Ron Johnston. 2002. "From Modern to Post-modern?: Contemporary Ethnic Residential Segregation in Four US Metropolitan Areas", *Cities* 19: 161-72.

Pozun, Brian J. 2001. "President Kucan Visits Cleveland", *Central Europe Review* 3-18: May 21. *http://www.ce-review.org/01/18/slovenianews18.html*.

Rumbaut, Ruben G.. 1994. "Origins and Destinations: Immigration to the United States Since World War II", *Sociological Forum* 9: 583-682.

Scott, Darren M., Paul A. Coomes, and Alexei I. Izyumov. 2005. "The Location Choice of Employment-Based Immigrants Among U.S. Metro Areas," *Journal of Regional Science* 45: 113-145.

Seikaly, May. 1999. "Attachment and Identity: The Palestinian Community of Detroit", in Michael W. Suleiman, ed., *Arabs in America: Building a New Future*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 25-38.

Sicius, Francia J. 1988. "Cubans in Miami: An Historic Perspective", Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Florida Historical Society, Miami: May 13, 1988

Singer, Audrey. 2004. *The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways* Washington DC: Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, Brookings Living Cities Series.

Smith, Gregory. 2003. "New Influx of Refugees Expected from Liberia", *The Providence Journal*, November 5, 2003.

Smith, Robert L.. 2002. "Census 2000: Melting Pot Bubbles Over", *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*; June 16, 2002.
Spellman, William M. 2002. *The Global Community: Migration and the Making of the Modern World*. United Kingdom: Sutton Publishing.

State of Rhode Island General Assembly. nd. *Rhode Island History, Chapter VII: Boom, Bust, and War, 1900-1945. http://www.rilin.state.ri.us/, http://www.rilin.state.ri.us/studteaguide/RhodeIslandHistory/ rodehist.html*.

Suro, Roberto and Audrey Singer. 2002. *Latino Growth in Metropolitan America: Changing Patterns, New Locations*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy and the Pew Hispanic Center, Brookings Census 2000 Survey Series.

Thomas, John F. 1967. "Cuban Refugees in the United States", *International Migration Review* 1: 46-57.

UN High Commissioner for Refugees. 2000. *The State of the World's Refugees.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1998. *Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) Annual Report to Congress -- 1998, Discretionary Grants*.   http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/policy/ 98arc2.htm#_Toc471880633

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2001. *Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) Annual Report to Congress -- 1999, Discretionary Grants. http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/policy/ 99arc7.htm#_Toc519582084*.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2002. *Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) Annual Report to Congress --1999, Voluntary Agency Match Grant Program. http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ orr/policy/99arc4.htm#voluntary*.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2003. *Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) National Voluntary Agencies. http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/orr/partners/volunteer.htm*.

U.S. Department of Justice. 2003. *2001 Statistical Yearbook of the Immigration and Naturalization Service*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of State. 2005. *Bureau of Population; Refugees and Migration,. FY 2005 Reception and Placement Proposal Guidance.*

Waldinger, Roger. 2001. *Strangers at the Gates: New Immigrants in Urban America* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ward, David. 1971. *Cities and Immigrants: A Geography of Change in Nineteenth Century America*. New York: Oxford University Press

Wright, Robert G. 1981. "Voluntary Agencies and the Resettlement of Refugees", *International Migration Review* 15: 157-74.

Yau, Jennifer. 2005. "The Foreign Born Hmong in the United States", *Migration Information Source of the Migration Policy Institute, US in Focus*, *http://www.migrationinformation.org/USfocus/ display.cfm?id=281*.

Zhou, Min and James V. Gatewood. 2000. "Mapping the Terrain: Asian American Diversity and Challenges of the 21st Century", *Asian American Policy Review* 9: 5-29.

Zolberg, Aristide R. 1999. "Matters of the State: Theorizing Immigration Policy", in Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind, eds., *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 71-93.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient Variation	Observations	Low	Place	High	Place
NEurope	4.1%	1.7%	0.408	49	1.2%	Miami	8.3%	Pittsburgh
WEurope	5.1%	2.5%	0.499	49	1.5%	Los Angeles	11.1%	Cincinnati
SEurope	3.8%	5.4%	1.420	49	0.5%	Dallas	31.6%	Providence
EEurope	8.1%	6.3%	0.777	49	1.2%	San Antonio	31.0%	Cleveland
EAsia	8.5%	4.0%	0.473	49	0.9%	Miami	19.1%	Seattle
SCAsia	6.4%	3.0%	0.474	49	1.1%	Miami	13.0%	Cincinnati
SEAsia	11.2%	6.4%	0.573	49	1.0%	Miami	29.8%	Norfolk
WAsia	2.5%	2.4%	0.949	49	0.8%	Greenesboro, Miami	17.5%	Detroit
EAfrica	1.3%	1.5%	1.175	49	0.1%	Miami	8.0%	Minneapolis (also Columbus (7.8%))
MAfrica	0.1%	0.1%	1.034	49	0.0%	Las Vegas	0.6%	Raleigh (also Charlotte, Washington)
NAfrica	0.8%	0.4%	0.574	49	0.3%	Chicago, Miami, San Francisco	2.7%	Nashville
SAfrica	0.3%	0.2%	0.490	49	0.1%	Chicago	0.9%	Cincinnati
WAfrica	1.5%	1.5%	0.972	49	0.1%	Salt Lake City	7.3%	Providence
Caribbean	7.1%	10.3%	1.445	49	0.6%	San Francisco	55.2%	Miami
CAmerica	29.1%	20.6%	0.708	49	1.7%	Buffalo	73.2%	San Antonio
SAmerica	4.9%	4.2%	0.848	49	1.4%	Sacramento	18.8%	Orlando
%FB	10.6%	7.8%	0.737	49	2.6%	Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, Louisville	40.2%	Miami

-17-

Table 2: Principal Components and Loadings (Varimax Rotation)

Variable	Component I	II	III	IV	V	Communality
NEurope	**0.896**	0.100	0.107	0.013	-0.018	0.825
WEurope	**0.858**	-0.019	-0.151	-0.117	0.093	0.782
SEurope	0.248	0.084	0.216	**0.807**	0.137	0.785
EEurope	**0.667**	-0.149	-0.165	0.284	**0.377**	0.718
EAsia	**0.394**	**0.389**	**-0.514**	0.091	-0.194	0.616
SCAsia	**0.392**	**0.548**	-0.372	0.006	**0.369**	0.729
SEAsia	0.151	0.035	**-0.435**	-0.017	**-0.765**	0.799
WAsia	0.299	0.065	-0.232	0.123	**0.641**	0.573
EAfrica	0.068	**0.722**	-0.227	-0.077	-0.217	0.631
MAfrica	-0.023	**0.845**	-0.011	-0.036	0.073	0.722
NAfrica	0.344	**0.639**	0.068	-0.238	0.107	0.599
SAfrica	0.376	**0.478**	0.073	**-0.579**	-0.014	0.711
WAfrica	-0.103	**0.843**	0.038	**0.392**	0.024	0.878
Caribbean	0.037	-0.103	**0.930**	0.123	-0.006	0.893
CAmerica	**-0.771**	-0.247	-0.312	**-0.417**	-0.015	0.928
SAmerica	0.003	0.062	**0.945**	0.084	-0.014	0.905
%FB	**-0.638**	-0.325	**0.426**	0.080	0.023	0.701
% Variance	29.234	17.231	13.813	8.263	6.721	
Cumulative	29.234	46.464	60.277	68.540	75.261	

Bold indicates variables employed for interpretation, generally >0.40

Table 3: MSA Cluster Centers

Cluster Center On	Cluster					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
PC Score I	1.112	-0.642	1.138	-0.051	0.070	-1.153
PC Score II	-0.534	-0.556	-0.090	1.684	-0.500	1.092
PC Score III	-0.881	-0.511	-0.023	-0.034	2.413	0.974
PC Score IV	0.647	-0.213	0.567	-0.673	-0.311	4.554
PC Score V	2.793	-0.158	-0.266	0.076	0.070	-0.374
Number of Cases	2	21	11	9	5	1

Table 4: Office of Refugee Resettlement, Obligations by State: FY 1998

State	CMA	Social Services	TANF Services	Targeted Assistance	Total
Alabama	$216,284	$201,618	$0		$417,902
Arizona	6,766,000	1,690,760	74,927	588,726	9,120,413
Arkansas	27,000	93,968	0		120,968
California	30,250,615	13,564,832	3,268,597	8,389,193	55,473,237
Colorado	2,764,305	1,017,638	63,837	291,481	4,137,261
Connecticut	1,427,430	752,960	43,757		2,224,147
Delaware	99,855	75,000	0		174,855
Dist. Columbia	2,204,030	536,010	0	333,723	3,073,763
Florida	21,471,000	16,889,960	966,253	6,121,527	45,448,740
Georgia	4,652,000	2,551,327	134,868	1,053,650	8,391,845
Hawaii	200,161	100,000	0		300,161
Idaho	1,229,000	417,990	0		1,646,990
Illinois	10,366,000	3,517,187	855,362	1,535,522	16,274,071
Indiana	292,000	351,458	0		643,458
Iowa	2,262,000	1,405,833	239,765	284,082	4,191,680
Kansas	695,462	470,925	76,125		1,242,512
Kentucky	0	0	0	339,487	339,487
Louisiana	500,000	505,348	11,988		1,017,336
Maine	403,000	195,255	29,971		628,226
Maryland	2,284,000	1,149,544	0	231,602	3,665,146
Massachusetts	10,900,103	2,152,140	344,662	453,309	13,850,214
Michigan	6,475,000	2,289,541	547,264	479,120	9,790,925
Minnesota	5,331,000	2,535,707	312,594	795,894	8,975,195
Mississippi	1,099,971	75,000	0		1,174,971
Missouri	3,735,000	1,678,901	44,956	569,110	6,027,967
Montana	51,784	100,000	3,896		155,680
Nebraska	1,593,867	544,399	0	194,865	2,333,131
Nevada	0	0	0		0
New Hampshire	849,000	261,497	44,956		1,155,453
New Jersey	4,459,000	1,670,512	179,824	269,112	6,578,448
New Mexico	666,766	539,771	29,971	267,478	1,503,986
New York	18,002,000	11,675,649	319,187	6,817,623	36,814,459
North Carolina	1,787,000	939,247	89,912		2,816,159
North Dakota	1,426,000	338,441	61,140	132,405	1,957,986
Ohio	5,676,077	1,176,445	0	356,092	7,208,614
Oklahoma	510,000	231,124	0		741,124
Oregon	5,010,736	1,495,506	160,643	966,154	7,633,039
Pennsylvania	4,843,000	2,230,242	299,706	588,726	7,961,674
Rhode Island	305,360	102,979	32,968		441,307
South Carolina	105,000	103,557	0		208,557
South Dakota	356,106	190,337	46,454		592,897
Tennessee	635,000	1,128,138	0	284,942	2,048,080
Texas	6,402,000	3,829,016	224,780	1,905,637	12,361,433
Utah	1,532,086	742,835	0		2,274,921
Vermont	439,098	206,536	59,941		705,575
Virginia	2,918,000	1,512,573	67,434	557,324	5,055,331
Washington	13,912,000	5,064,471	1,240,185	1,564,516	21,781,172
West Virginia	5,000	75,000	0		80,000
Wisconsin	1,908,888	698,867	124,078		2,731,833
Total	$189,044,984	$89,076,044	$10,000,000	$35,371,300	$323,492,328

Notes:
CMA indicates Cash and Medical Assistance
Social Services indicates Social Services
TANF indicates Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
Targeted Assistance indicates Funds and Other Services for Refugees in Local Areas of High Need
Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children & Families. 1998: Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) Annual Report to Congress
http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/policy/98arc2.htm#_Toc471880633

Appendix I: Regions and Place of Birth for the Foreign Born: United States 2000

Total:	31,107,889	India	1,022,552	**Oceania:**	168,046
Europe:	4,915,557	Iran	283,226	Australia - New Zealand:	83,837
North Europe:	974,619	Pakistan	223,477	Melanesia	32,305
United Kingdom	677,751	Other South Central	75,457	Micronesia	16,469
Ireland	156,474	**Southeast Asia:**	3,044,288	Polynesia	35,194
Sweden	49,724	Cambodia	136,978	Oceania, n.e.c.	241
Other North Europe	90,670	Indonesia	72,552	**Americas:**	16,916,416
West Europe:	1,095,847	Laos	204,284	**Latin America:**	16,086,974
Austria	63,648	Malaysia	49,459	**Caribbean:**	2,953,066
France	151,154	Philippines	1,369,070	Barbados	52,172
Germany	706,704	Thailand	169,801	Cuba	872,716
Netherlands	94,570	Vietnam	988,174	Dominican Republic	687,677
Other West Europe	79,771	Other Southeast Asia	53,970	Haiti	419,317
South Europe:	934,665	**West Asia:**	658,603	Jamaica	553,827
Greece	165,750	Iraq	89,892	Trinidad and Tobago	197,398
Italy	473,338	Israel	109,719	Other Caribbean	169,959
Portugal	203,119	Jordan	46,794	**Central America:**	11,203,637
Spain	82,858	Lebanon	105,910	Mexico	9,177,487
Other South Europe	9,600	Syria	54,561	Costa Rica	71,870
East Europe:	1,906,056	Turkey	78,378	El Salvador	817,336
Czechoslovakia	83,081	Armenia	65,280	Guatemala	480,665
Hungary	92,017	Other West Asia	108,069	Honduras	282,852
Poland	466,742	Asia, n.e.c.	38,652	Nicaragus	220,335
Romania	135,966	**Africa:**	881,300	Panama	105,177
Belarus	38,503	**East Africa:**	213,299	Other Central America	47,915
Russia	340,177	Ethiopia	69,531	**South America:**	1,930,271
Ukraine	275,153	Other East Africa	143,768	Argentina	125,218
Bosnia - Herzegovina	98,766	**Middle Africa**	26,900	Bolivia	53,278
Yugoslavia	113,987	**North Africa:**	190,491	Brazil	212,428
Other East Europe	261,664	Egypt	113,396	Chile	80,804
Europe, n.e.c.	4,370	Other North Africa	77,095	Colombia	509,872
Asia:	8,226,254	**South Africa:**	66,496	Ecuador	298,626
East Asia:	2,739,510	South Africa	63,558	Guyana	211,189
China	1,518,652	Other South Africa	2,938	Peru	278,186
Japan	347,539	**West Africa:**	326,507	Venezuela	107,031
Korea	864,125	Ghana	65,572	Other South America	53,639
Other East Asia	9,194	Nigeria	134,940	**North America:**	829,442
South Central Asia:	1,745,201	Sierra Leone	20,831	Canada	820,771
Afghanistan	45,195	Other West Africa	105,164	Other Northern America	8,671
Bangladesh	95,294	Africa, n.e.c.	57,607	**Born at sea**	316

Notes: Czechoslovakian includes the Czech Republic and Slovakia, China includes Hong Kong and Taiwan,

n.e.c. = "not elsewhere classified".

Source: US Census Bureau. 2000. PCT19. Place of Birth of the Foreign Born. *Summary File 3 – Sample Data.* http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=01000US&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U&-_lang=en&-redoLog=false&-mt_name=DEC_2000_SF3_U_PCT019&-format=&-CONTEXT=dt

Appendix II: Refugees and Asylees Granted Permanent Residence Status
by Region and Country of Birth, Selected Periods from 1946 to 2001
Countries With At Least One Percent of Total Refugees for the Time Period

Region and Country of Birth	1991-2001 Total	%	1981-90 Total	%	1971-80 Total	%	1961-70 Total	%	1951-60 Total	%	1946-50 Total	%
All countries	1129772	100.0	1013620	100.0	539447	100.0	212843	100.0	492371	100.0	213347	100.0
Europe	**482390**	**42.7**	**155512**	**15.3**	**71858**	**13.3**	**55235**	**26.0**	**456146**	**92.6**	**211983**	**99.4**
Austria									11487	2.3	4801	2.3
Azerbaijan	12548	1.1										
Belarus	26129	2.3										
Bosnia-Herzegovina	60894	5.4										
Czech/Czech Rep							5709	2.7	10719	2.2	8449	4.0
Estonia											7143	3.3
Germany									62860	12.8	36633	17.2
Greece									28568	5.8		
Hungary							4044	1.9	55740	11.3	6086	2.9
Italy									60657	12.3		
Latvia									16783	3.4	21422	10.0
Lithuania									8569	1.7	18694	8.8
Moldova	13039	1.2										
Netherlands							3134	1.5	14336	2.9		
Poland			33889	3.3	5882	1.1	3197	1.5	81323	16.5	78529	36.8
Romania	15827	1.4	29798	2.9	6812	1.3	7158	3.4	12057	2.4	4180	2.0
Russia	65162	5.8										
Soviet Union [1]	92154	8.2	72306	7.1	31309	5.8			30059	6.1	14072	6.6
Spain					5317	1.0	4114	1.9				
Ukraine	120869	10.7										
Uzbekistan	20638	1.8										
Yugoslavia [1]	10464	0.9			11297	2.1	18299	8.6	44755	9.1	9816	4.6
Asia	**371339**	**32.9**	**712092**	**70.3**	**210683**	**39.1**	**19895**	**9.3**	**33422**	**6.8**	**1106**	**0.5**
Afghanistan	9982	0.9	22946	2.3								
Cambodia			114064	11.3	7739	1.4						
China [2]					13760	2.6	5308	2.5	12008	2.4		
Hong Kong							2128	1.0				
Indonesia							7658	3.6	8253	1.7		
Iran	25677	2.3	46773	4.6								
Iraq	25617	2.3			6851	1.3						
Laos	37785	3.3	142964	14.1	21690	4.0						
Thailand	23412	2.1	30259	3.0								
Vietnam	217208	19.2	324453	32.0	150266	27.9						
Africa	**58555**	**5.2**	**22149**	**2.2**	**2991**	**0.6**	**5486**	**2.6**	**1768**	**0.4**	**20**	**0.0**
Egypt							5396	2.5				
Ethiopia [3]	18746	1.7	18542	1.8								
Somalia	19321	1.7										
Oceania	**310**	**0.0**	**22**	**0.0**	**37**	**0.0**	**21**	**0.0**	**75**	**0.0**	**7**	**0.0**
North America	**210029**	**18.6**	**121840**	**12.0**	**252633**	**46.8**	**132068**	**62.0**	**831**	**0.2**	**163**	**0.1**
Caribbean	177683	15.7	114213	11.3	251825	46.7	131557	61.8				
Cuba	167299	14.8	113367	11.2	251514	46.6	131557	61.8				
Central America	31747	2.8										
Nicaragua	22836	2.0										
South America	**6793**	**0.6**	**1986**	**0.2**	**1244**	**0.2**	**123**	**0.1**	**74**	**0.0**	**32**	**0.0**

[1] **Prior to 1992, data include independent republics; beginning in 1992, data are for unknown republic only.**

[2] **Includes People's Republic of China and Taiwan.**

[3] **Prior to 1993, data Include Eritrea.**

Source: U.S. Department of Justice 2003, Table 30