

Location Choices of New U.S. Immigrants

Sojeva T. Chuong

California State University, Sacramento

December 2006

Abstract

The purpose of the paper is to examine which factors contribute to the location choices of new U.S. immigrants. I focus my research to the resettlement patterns of new legal permanent residents in the 51 states during the year 2000. Using regression analysis I show that the density of foreign-born population already settled in a particular state makes it more attractive to new immigrants. Previous research has focused on the effects of immigrants on the economy, labor market and society as a whole. Other variables in my research include the real and lagged unemployment rate in each state. This paper attempts to shed more light into the issue of immigration throughout the United States. This study finds that the ratio of foreign-born and the real wage had a positive effect of the number of legal permanent residents locating to a certain state while unemployment and state gross product had a small effect.

JEL Codes: J61, J11

INTRODUCTION

As the flow of immigrants both legal and illegal grows, many are concerned about how immigration affects the economy. Therefore, immigration has sparked a very intense debate over their cost and benefits. A large number of immigrants and the children cannot help but have a significant impact on the cultural, political, and economic situation on their new country.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the foreign born population has grown dramatically over the past decade. In 2003, the foreign-born population consisted of 33.5 million, 11.7 percent of the total U.S. population. People have looked and examined the effects of immigrants on the labor market, wages, and the effects on native-born workers. One factor of interest is the resettlement patterns of the new immigrants in the United States. There are also many reasons explaining where and why these new immigrants choose to locate, such as a percentage of ethnic population that already resides in the area, geographic preferences, federal benefits and education level. Much research has been done to examining the effects, but little has been done looking at their resettlement patterns. One aspect of my research question is to understand the location choices of new legal permanent resident (LPRs) immigrants issued by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). They are foreign nationals who are granted the right to live in the United States in the year 2000. I wish to contribute to this issue by testing if the ratio of the foreign-born population and real wages in the 51 states affects the location choices of new U.S. immigrants.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Today's immigrants are more diverse than ever because people are coming from all over the world. According to the Center for Immigration Studies, the immigrant population within the U.S. grew by 11.3 million in the 1990s which is faster than any other time in history. Many

researches have looked at the impact of immigrants on the host country like the United States. In a survey article (Friedberg and Hunt, 1995) they conclude that immigrants have a large adverse impact on the wages and unemployment opportunities of the native-born population. Very little evidence of economic significance is presented in determining that immigrants drive down wages for native workers. Job opportunities and economic conditions play the largest role in people choosing to leave one region for another. Though it is interesting to look at the roles of immigrants in the labor market, we must understand why they choose to settle in specific spots throughout the nation.

Previous research on determining location choices of recent immigrants have concluded that many choose to locate in areas with higher presence of earlier immigrants. Bartel (1989) concludes that a foreign-born man has a larger probability to reside in an area where there is the same ethnic population. The author also finds that education plays a key role in location choices and immigrants migrate internally more frequently than natives in the United States. Similar to Bartel (1989), Dunlevy (1991) examines the settlement patterns of people from eleven different Latin and Caribbean nations who were granted legal permanent resident status from the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). There were differences between nations when determining the intended residence among the immigrants. There is a positive correlation between the new immigrant destination choices and the number of persons born in the same country already in the state. Zavodny (1999) also found that new recipients of legal permanent residents and refugees state that their intended place of residence is related to the amount of already foreign-born in the area. This issue of refugees is that they have little influence on where they choose to locate. The non-profit organizations that work with resettlement of refugees have

agreements with the U.S. Department of State. The Office of Refugee Resettlement tracks their secondary migration patterns.

Zavodny's (1999) findings imply that there are some differences among the choices of some of the groups similar to Dunlevy (1991) research. Different ethnicity groups tend to cluster in certain areas because of the number of similar foreign-born populations. Dunlevy (1991) also looks at the natural occurrence of immigration, in the case of the "Mariel Boatlift" some 25,000 immigrants already settled in their in their location and their pattern has already been determined. The presence of other foreign-born immigrants has a very strong influence of where new immigrants choose to settle. Some factors include the ease of settlement and access to services. Immigrants are often very vulnerable when migrating to a new country. The friends and family effect is also important, whereas immigrants who enter into the United States are often sponsored by friends and family already living in that city or state.

The research by Bartel (1989), Dunlevy (1991), and Zavodny (1999) indicate that immigrant location patterns are determined by the similar ethnic population that resides in the area. These authors concluded similar finding using different approaches. Bartel (1989) focuses uses data U.S. Census Bureau, more specific the Pubic Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) to measure the first location choices of male immigrants defined in the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA). Similar to Bartel (1989), Friedberg and Hunt (1995) show a table describing the earnings and immigrant density in the larges SMSAs. For example, San Francisco consist of 20% of the population are foreign born and their mean wage and salary income is a little less than \$50,000. Opposite to San Francisco is Miami, where about 32% of the population are foreign born and wage and salary income average is less than \$40,000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 1993). The U.S. Census Bureau provides key information about the people living in our nation.

Another source for data is the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) which Dunlevy (1991) and Zavodny (1999) both use. The department grants legal immigrants alien cards and also provide services to refugees who enter into the country. The difference between these two data sources is that the INS measures the initial choice of resettlement whereas the Census, measure immigrants already living in the area.

Zavodny (1999) also shows that immigrant location choices appear to be sensitive to welfare generosity. The author concludes that new refugees tend to settle in states the offer higher AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) and food stamps benefits. The amount of public benefits granted to immigrants varies from state to state, for example, California and Texas are more attractive because they are the most generous with benefits. Similar to Zavodny (1999), some research on the “welfare magnet” was done by Borjas (1999) and Kausal (2005). According the Borjas (1999) the “welfare magnet” hypothesis has several facets being that welfare programs attract immigrants who would of not come to the United States, or that immigrants see welfare as a safety net for when they don’t do well, to not return to their origin country, or that they place a heavy burden on states that are generous with their benefits. A key difference between the researches is that Borjas (1999) stated that data from California has the highest benefits; on the contrary, Zavodny (1999) did not include California in her analysis because the data might skew the results. California is a special case since it is comprised of both large numbers of illegal and legal immigrants. The results from California might drive the result from other states to be different. Borjas (1999) implies that California’s data “mirrors the national result.”

Borjas (1999) and Kausal (2005) both cite the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. This act denied legal non-citizens who came to the U.S.

after 1996 access to federal benefits for the first five years. Two main factors for this legislation are that states that offer welfare was attracting low-skilled immigrants and that they might be a liability on the states. This bears on my research because it was put into legislation to reduce the number to low-skilled immigrants from migrating. The act has lead to new patterns of immigration within the nation. Most immigrants migrate from countries that are poorer and less educated in the United States therefore many depend on federal help to survive. Many people are opposed to this legislation because many states offer different programs. For example, many states use their own funds to have programs to help new immigrants. These practices also vary among the states, and California is the only one who provided the most benefits.

In contrast to Borjas (1999), Kausal (2005) concludes that there is a weak effect on the location choices of new immigrants based on access to federal programs. Her studies differ from other research done on the “welfare magnet.” She tested the effects of polices that denied access for new immigrants. These policies are put into place in order to control the immigration influx. On the other hand Borjas (1999) suggests that there is a correlation between welfare participation rates and welfare benefit levels are larger among immigrants. They tend to cluster in states that have the most generosity, since immigrant behaviors are similar.

Lastly, research done by Scott, Coomes and Izyumov (2005) looked at the migration patterns of immigrants who were granted employment-based status from the INS. The authors found that immigrants of this kind tend to choose cites where there are less immigrants of their own nationalities. Since, this research is based on the individual characteristics, like age, marital status, or professional occupation the results are different compared to the other papers examined. There are some related concepts in this study to the others. For example, this paper analyses the location decisions for cites, similar to Bartel (1989). According to the authors, the

employment-based immigrants are more attracted to cities with nice weather, higher wages, and an educated population. The research presented can directly impact the immigrant related policy planning. Different from the other articles, these authors took specific countries and analyzed their patterns with occupation. They were able to determine which immigrants were not sensitive to the effects of location patterns. The authors imply that local and state government should pay attention to the patterns to make better decisions and to place and structure incentives for higher skilled immigrants into their region.

Various models and analysis were done in examining the location patterns of immigrants. Most commonly used was the multi-nominal logit model which measures the probability that an immigrant will choose i as their particular location, where “ i ” is a state or region (Bartel 1989; Kaushal 2005; and Scott, Coomes, and Izyumov 2005). Another model used was the simple regression model (Zavodny 1999 and Borjas 1999). The equations are used to investigate the determinants of where the new immigrants choose to settle. They measure the probability that person will choose a state that offers the maximum amount of benefits from the federal government.

In the issue of immigration is the “push factor” that makes the decision for someone to leave their country for another. Most immigrants decide to migrate for various reasons. International migration is occurring all over the world. Immigration is an important issue to be examined for further research. As immigration policy reforms remains a hot topic on capital hill, the effects are localized all over the nation. Whether there are impacts made to unemployment, wages, income, and access to federal benefits immigration will occur. There are many studies done examining the factors that determines the location choices of new immigrants into the United States. This research will improve and update the past research done on location patterns.

Using more recent data from the Office of Immigration Statistics and 2000 Census Bureau report, I am attempting to test whether these findings still hold true now. To what extent density of the foreign-born in the different regions and minimum wage effects the decisions. Since many immigrants are attracted to states that have higher wages than others, using the CPI index to measure the living standards also. In my research, I also want to address the attractions and reasons behind states that have a larger percentage of foreign born in their population?


ECONOMIC MODEL

In order to understand why people migrate from one place to another we must understand what is making them move. The United States often receive immigrants from countries that are poorer and have less education. Although some immigrants are highly skilled, a majority of immigrants are low-skilled. Labor market theory can be used to shed light on this decision. In the labor markets, labor is supplied by the households and demanded by the firms. We learn that the increase in supply lowers prices, where wages are the price of labor. The higher the wages, the higher to the labor supply.

The markets for unskilled labor are as illustrated in Figure 1. The demand for labor has an inverse relationship between the wage rate and the quantity of labor demanded. Therefore, the slope of the demand is downward sloping. There are a couple of effects that results from the negative relationship and they are the substitution effect and scale effect. The changes in labor demand are caused by the demand for the product and the prices of other resources. These factors will cause the slope to shift up or down. Another reason for the downward sloping of the labor demand curve is the law of diminishing returns. For example, if a firm were to hire more and more workers then each worker will contribute less output. The labor supply curve is an upward sloping because an increase in wage will cause some to work more, switch jobs, and

cause those individuals who are not in the labor force to enter the market. Changes in wage will increase the quantity of labor. In the case of immigration, labor is mobile from country to country and that is why we have migration. The last assumption is the when equilibrium occurs when the wages and employment of the market demand and supply intersect.

FIGURE 1: Supply and Demand



Immigrants are those who come from Country Two, where the wage rates are lower at equilibrium. They go to countries like the United States in where there is a demand who low-skilled and sometimes high skilled labor. Eventually the immigrants will return when the two countries equals out. For example, Country One is the United States, and Country Two is Mexico. People living in Mexico are earning at a lower wage, but in the same job in the United States has a higher wage. So they will immigrate into the U.S. looking for higher wage jobs. Even for unskilled labors there are some differences in wages that also exit. For example, the cost of living might be a factor which motivates people to leave their country for another. Wages

also differ between states and regions in the United States, while there is a federal minimum wage many states often have wages that are higher. California has sets one of the highest minimum wage rate which can attract immigrants. Many immigrants often earn close to the minimum wage.

In the case of the United States, immigrants have choices between different regions in which they choose to resettle. The average wage rates vary from city to city. For example, a new immigrant might make more money in the Los Angeles area compare to someone of similar background earning less in Fresno Country. Therefore the supply and demand of labor is different among regions. These differences depend on the working conditions in the area, for example the unemployment rate might affect the chances for a new immigrant to obtain a job in the area.

Wage is not the only factor to consider, when understanding the location choices of new immigrants. The number of foreign-born in the region might be a factor. For example, I would want to measure the density of foreign-born in a given state. Immigrants tend to cluster into regions where there are other foreign-born individuals.

EMPIRICAL METHODOLOGY

Data

I will be using various data sources in measuring the location choices of new U.S. legal permanent residents. This information will be obtained from the Office of Immigration Statistics which profiles immigrants in the following categories: legal permanent residents and naturalization. The office publishes a yearbook each profile the amount of immigrants into the United States. I will use cross section state-level data for the number immigrants who are issued legal permanent resident status in the year 2000. In order to find the percentage shares of my

variables, I use U.S. Census data for the population (foreign-born and total) in each state plus the District of Columbia. The minimum wage rate for each state is available through the Department of Labor. The Consumer Price Index (CPI) and the unemployment rate for each state are obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. I will be using the lagged unemployment rate to understand if immigrants have do have an impact on the job market.

Stylized Facts

For my cross section analysis I will be using one dependent variable. I will need to find the number of LPRs as a share of the state population. This will be my dependent variable in which I will be testing.

My other explanatory variables will be the real wages in the state, the ratio of foreign-born, unemployment rate and the gross state product per capita. These factors are going to help predict the effects on my dependent variable. If true, my findings will be that immigrants will tend to settle in states will higher ratioof foreign-born and higher real wages.


One of the independent variable is the ratio of foreign-born already living in the state, this is calculated by diving the number of foreign by the total state population. The real wages for the state is to help measure the standard of living and the minimum wage. To calculate the real wage we need to multiply the minimum wage by the national CPI divided by the state CPI and come up with a variable. Finally, I include the lagged unemployment rate from December 1999 to determine the ability and conditions for a new immigrant in trying to get a job. Another measure of economic conditions is to use the gross state product (GSP) divided by the total population per state. With the help of summary statistics we are able to examine the observations in the year 2000. The table uses data for 1999 and 2000.

TABLE 1: Summary Statistics for Variables

	Legal Permanent Residents per capita	Foreign-born Population per capita	Real Wage	Unemployment Rate	Gross State Product per capita
Mean	0.0020	0.0724	5.0887	3.8608	0.0344
Median	0.0016	0.0530	5.2693	3.8000	0.0324
Standard Deviation	0.0015	0.0565	0.0831	1.0020	0.0015

Source: U.S. Census, Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

FIGURE 2



From the summary statistics above for my dependent variable (LPRs per state) you can see that the percentage mean for the 51 regions is about less than 1 percent. This number is so small because of the data, the number of LPRs for that year is small compared to the state


population. The LPRs location in the states ranges from 216,447 (California) to 247 (Wyoming) and the state population ranges from 33,871,648 million to 493,782 million people. The median and standard deviation are also very small for my data set. The statistics gives of a nice estimate of how many LPRs decide to live in the states.

The histogram (figure 2) is not an even distribution. The states towards the end of the graph probably represent states like California, Florida, New York and Texas which has a larger percentage of LPRs deciding to locate in their state. On the other side, there are many states where there is small percentage share of LPRs. Those states probably represent the Midwest and the South. If the histogram was an even distribution that would mean that all the new immigrants are evenly spread out throughout the nation. My histogram follows the story that there is an uneven amount of immigrants going to certain states. A dummy variable is added in my research which excludes states California, Florida, New York and Texas have a larger flow of immigrants.

The ratio of foreign-born population (figure 3) is an important factor in studying the location choices of new LPRs in the United States. Since most immigrants tend to want to locate where there are people from similar or the same background. With the theory of supply and demand, immigrants will shift the supply of labor because with an increase in population, the supply of labor will also increase. Also, the demand will remain the same, since they are controlled by firms. This variable measures the migration and movement of labor in the labor market. Based o my data analysis I find that the there is a positive effect on my dependent variable. The probability of a new LPRs choosing to live in a state with a high percentage of FB is higher. With an increase in immigrants there will be an increase in supply in the labor market.

Overall, according to the model, when there is an increase in supply the wages will decrease because some are willing to work for lower wages.


FIGURE 3



The correlation between the new LPRs and the share of FB already living in that state is positive and strong. My correlation is number is very strong at .96. This means that the location choices of new immigrants is almost directed related to the number of FB residing in the given state. The LPRs and FB population per capita has a positive slope with the data scattered very closely along the line (figure 4). According to past findings, this correlations number is very consistent to what others have found. Immigrants tend to cluster or choose to locate where there are others from same or similar backgrounds. With the amount of assistance and programs

already established in some of these state, immigrants can find a much easier transition when other like them reside in the same region.

FIGURE 4



My next three variables that I will be examining are the real wage, unemployment rate in each state for the previous year and the GSP per capita. The real will be calculated using the minimum wage multiplied by the national CPI/ state CPI. If the ratio is less than one the we can assume that the minimum wage in the state then one can not buy as much on average nationally. By evaluating the real wage immigrants will tend to go places that either have higher wages. In the case of California, since the state offers more services to immigrants than any other state then the immigrants are attracted to living and working in California. This will cause the model to shift and change because there will be movement between the states.

The unemployment rate from December 1999 is another explanatory variable used to measure the states working conditions. For example, an immigrant might not want to locate in a state where there are higher unemployment rates. The unemployment rate can have a large impact on immigrants since many lack skill and education to obtain a good job.

The GSP per capita is calculated using the GSP from each state divided by the total population. This variable is a good indicator of the current economic conditions. Since immigrants will be working, they will be contributing to the amount of goods and services produced.

Regression Analysis

My research will involve a test to examine the location choices of new immigrants into the United States. I will be using a regression test to run a test on my dependent variable which is new LPRs per capita in a given state including the District of Columbia in 2000. To what extent do the location choices of new LPRs reflect the ratio of foreign-born population, real wage, and the unemployment rate from the previous year and GSP per capita.

With a regression equation I will be able to tell the story of the location choices of immigrants into the United States. There should be a positive effect on the LPRs to the ratio of FB in the states. The changes in the result will evaluate how much of a factor is the percentage of FB in the states. Immigrants also choose to locate where the real wages are higher. The regression should have a positive output for real wages. Also the unemployment rate will also have little or a negative effect on legal permanent residents. Since most immigrants are unskilled they will tend of cluster in states will higher unemployment rates. The unskilled will have more difficulties in finding the job in the new country. For the factor of gross state product, there should have a small positive effect because immigrants will enter into the workforce and help in

productivity per state. My regression equation for addressing the location choices of new LPRs in the U.S. is as follows:

$$LPR_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 FB_{i,t} + \beta_2 RW_{i,t} - \beta_3 URATE_{i,t-1} + \beta_4 GSP$$

RESULTS

TABLE 2: Regression Results for Legal Permanent Residents Location Choice Ratio

	A	B	C
Constant	-0.0005 (0.0004)	-0.0006 (0.0004)	-0.0006 (0.0004)
Foreign-born ratio	0.0261 (0.0011)	0.0250 (0.0011)	0.0238 (0.0012)
Real wage	0.0001 (7.35E-05)	7.54E-05 (7.10E-05)	5.57E-05 (6.02E-05)
Unemployment		-1.74E-05 (5.93E-05)	-4.01E-05 (4.71E-05)
GSP		0.0155 (0.0055)	0.0189 (0.0045)
R-squared	0.9252	0.9361	0.9369
Adjusted R-squared	0.9220	0.9306	0.9310
No. Observations	51	51	47

Standard errors are reported in parentheses.

The results from my regression analysis were strong. My R-squared value indicates that I explained approximately 93% of the data with my model. In the case of the location choices of new U.S. immigrant location choices, my variables that I predicted were conclusive. All my variables were significant except for the lagged unemployment rate, which was expected. The foreign-born ratio coefficient was positive which agrees with my model, that immigrants will

flow to states where there are already a high level of immigrants living in that given state. The coefficient for the real wage was also positive, which also agrees with my hypothesis. Another positive variable was the GSP per capita, which explains the economic conditions of the states in which immigrants choose to live. As immigrants enter into the workforce they will be contributing to the production of goods and services. The lagged unemployment rate had a negative outcome because many new immigrants are unskilled to enter the laborforce. Therefore, the transition to finding a job might take longer than expected. Many immigrants will be forced to take minimum wage jobs and also be unemployed for a period of time. Therefore, there is a negative result on the dependant variable.

The third regression is a dummy variable where we exclude states that had a population of less than 15 million. The states that we not used in the regression are California, Florida, New York and Texas, these states all share the same characteristics of a large number of LPRs choosing to live in the state. The foreign-born ratio coefficient changed in that the ratio does not have as large an effect of the dependant variable. The R-squared value increased in running the dummy variable.

CONCLUSIONS & EXTENSIONS

I return to my question of which factors contribute the location choices of new legal permanent residents in the U.S., I find that the ratio of foreign-born, real wage and the GSP are important. Most importantly is the strong correlation between the ratio of LPRs and the FB population. For example, a new immigrant would want to reside in California where there are other immigrants with the same background and also come from the same origin. My analysis and research proves this case the immigrants will tend to cluster in certain states. In my findings I did find a negative factor which is the unemployment rate in the states. This problem is

associated with the skills and education that new immigrants possess. Since most immigrants come from countries that are less developed than our country, they will contribute to the unemployment rate because there is a lack of skill and knowledge.

Another contributing factor of new immigrants living in the U.S. that I did not address is the effect of the welfare magnet. The welfare magnet measures the level of attractiveness of the states that offer more services to new immigrants. There is an inequality between states like California which offers more assistance compared to other states. Immigrants make up a large percentage of the population who are on government assistance. This factor is still in debate since there is the issue between providing help to legal and illegal immigrants.

The next step of this study would be to look into more detail as to where immigrants choose to live. The analysis could include looking into the difference between metropolitan areas and rural areas. In order to expand the research of immigrants, understanding their relocation patterns can help give insight for government and local officials

DATA APPENDIX

Legal Permanent Residents data was obtained from the Office of Immigration Statistics which maintain by the United States Department of Homeland Security. The OIS produces Yearbooks of Immigration Statistics. The profiles measures individuals who are granted lawful permanent resident in a given fiscal year. The flow of the data is by their state of residence including all 50 plus the District of Columbia.

Total State Population data was taken from the U.S. Census Bureau's Annual Estimates of the Population for the United States and Puerto Rico. The 2000 population is the base year that the census collects for the individual states. This measures the number of individuals living in the state.

Minimum Wage Rate by State was obtained from the Department of Labor's Office of Standard Programs Wage and Hour Division. The exact data was taken from the Minimum Wage Rate Historical Table which lists the wage rates for each given year. The data is measured in dollars and for states in which there is not required minimum wage rate, the federal wage rate was used.

Foreign-Born Population per State: The Foreign Born population by state was taken from a report done by Center For Immigration Studies. The report obtained the data using the U.S. Census 1990 and 2000 Public Use Micro Data (PUMS). The data measures individuals who are foreign born in a given state for the year 2000.

Unemployment Rate by State: The Unemployment Rate was obtained from the U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of Labor Statistics. The data is measured annually as a percentage of the population for the year 2000 and the average unemployment rate for the United States for that year was 4.0.

Consumer Price Index - For All Urban Consumers was obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the year 2000. The data's base period is 1982-84-100, the CPI is an index value that is measured both monthly and annually. CPI is a measurement that is done by regions which included the West, Midwest, South, and Northeast. The national CPI was also used.

Gross State Product (GSP) - Data was obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics for each state in the year 2000. The data is measure in dollars and includes all aspects of good and services produced.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bartel, A.P. (1989, October). Where do the New U.S. Immigrants Live? *Journal of Labor*

Economics, 7(4), 371-391. Retrieved September 12, 2006 from JSTOR Online Database.

This research examines the location choices for new immigrants in the United States during a given period of time. The findings include ethnic geographic concentrations, education and that internal migration mostly occurs among immigrants.

Borjas, G. J. (1999, October). Immigration and Welfare Magnets. *Journal of Labor Economics*,

17(4), 607-637. Retrieved September 18, 2006 from JSTOR Online Database.

The author tests the welfare magnets of states who offer more services and benefits to immigrants. When new immigrants enter the United States does their choice depends on the amount of programs available. This varies from state to state due different policies offered by the law.

Dunlevy, J.A. (1991). On the Settlement Patterns of Recent Caribbean and Latin Immigrants to the United States. *Growth and Change*, 54- 67. Retrieved September 18, 2006 from Gale Group Online Database.

This paper looks at the difference in location of the two nationalities who chose to reside in either Florida or New York. Using U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Services data, he found that Cubans choose Florida as their destinations compared to Dominicans names New York as their destination.

Friedberg, R.M. and J. Hunt. (1995). The Impact of Immigrants on Host Country Wages,

Employment and Growth. *The Journal of Economic Perspective*, 9(2), 23-44. Retrieved

September 7, 2006 from JSTOR Online Database.

This survey article examines various aspects of immigration affects on a host country like the United States. Many immigrants migrate for various reasons and their impact on the native wages are very small in the economy. The authors also look at the concentration of immigrants in certain cities with wages as a variable.

Kausal, N. (2005, January). New Immigrants' Location Choices: Magnets without Welfare. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 23(1), 59- 80. Retrieved September 26, 2006 from ABI/INFORM Global Database.

This article also studies the welfare magnets effects on new immigrant location choices. The magnets include the cost and benefits of states with welfare programs and the amount of recipients already in the area. There is also a strong influence from the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, which did not allow non citizens in the U.S. from federal benefits.

Scott, D.M., P.A. Coomes, and A.I. Izyumov. (2005). The Location Choice of Employment-Based Immigrants Among U.S. Metro Areas. *Journal of Regional Science*, 45(1), 113-145. Retrieved September 26, 2006 from Synergy Blackwell Journal Database.

This research investigates the difference in location choices of employment-based immigrants granted by the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Services. These immigrants differ because they are based on their professional skills and individual characteristics. While other examines the choices among states, this article choose to look at the metropolitan areas instead.

Zavodny, M. (1999). Determinants of Recent Immigrants' Location Choices. *International Migration Review*, 33(4), 1014-1030. Retrieved September 26, 2006 from JSTOR Online Database.

This article explores the destination choices of newly legal permanent residents and refugees entering the United States during 1989 to 1994. The determinants of preferences include the presence of other foreign born in the state, welfare benefits and economic conditions.