

Children of Immigrants

The Changing Face of Metropolitan America



Brief No. 6

 URBAN INSTITUTE

Ajay Chaudry and Karina Fortuny

Over the past decade, the population of children of immigrants in the United States has continued to climb.¹ Most of these children and their families live in the country's large metropolitan areas, and their growth has continued to remake the nation's metros from the bottom up, with the very young leading a transformation of the country's metropolitan landscape. The early imprint of this growing and spreading diversity among the young in the large metros is a harbinger of the changes ahead for the makeup of the country as a whole.

This brief describes the latest trends of the U.S. child population living in the 100 largest metropolitan areas, with a particular focus on children living in immigrant families and those from racial and ethnic minority groups. Highlights of recent trends indicate that—

- The large majority (84 percent) of children of immigrants in the United States live in the 100 largest metropolitan areas.²
- In 2009, an estimated 14.1 million children of immigrants lived in the top 100 metros, a 26 percent increase from 11.2 million in 2000.
- Nearly half (49 percent) of all children of immigrants in the United States are concentrated in only 10 very large metro areas, many of which have been traditional immigrant destinations for generations.
- Children of immigrants have continued to rapidly spread to new destinations, especially southeastern and midwestern metropolitan areas: in 22 metros, this population grew by at least 50 percent, and in six metros the number of children of immigrants doubled in the past decade.
- Children of immigrants drove the growth in the child population under age 18 nationally and in the 100 largest metros: if it were not for children of immigrants, the child population in the top 100 metros overall and in most metros would have declined.
- In 2009, 31 of the 100 largest U.S. metros had majority-minority child populations mostly attributable to growth in children of immigrants. Overall, the minority share across the top 100 metros reached 51 percent by 2009, up from 45 percent in 2000.

- Hispanic children accounted for half (54 percent) of children of immigrants, but beyond Hispanics there is broad diversity, with large and increasing shares being non-Hispanic white and Asian (17 percent each) and non-Hispanic black (8 percent).

Immigration Trends in the Top 100 Metros

The population of children of immigrants continues to grow and spread in metropolitan areas across the United States

In the past decade, the United States and its metropolises have continued to see robust growth in their immigrant populations across all regions of the country. The U.S. foreign-born population increased from 31.1 million in 2000 to 38.5 million in 2009, an increase of 24 percent, during which their share of the overall U.S. population grew from 11 percent to nearly 13 percent (12.5 percent) of the overall population. Immigrants resided in large metros at higher rates than the general population, representing a larger and growing share of the population that increased from 14.7 percent in 2000 to 16.3 percent in 2009 in the country's top 100 metropolitan areas (figure 1).


Because children of immigrants represent an even larger proportion of the U.S. population under 18, these trends are even sharper for the child population in metros. The number of children of immigrants in the top 100 metros grew from 11.2 million in 2000 to 14.1 million in 2009 (84 percent of the 16.8 million children of immigrants in the United States). The children-of-immigrants share of the child population in the top 100 metros increased from 24 percent in 2000 to 29 percent by 2009 (figure 1 and appendix table 1).

Half of all children of immigrants in the United States live in just 10 large metros, but there has been more rapid rise in their numbers in newer, high-growth metros

Children of immigrants continued to be highly concentrated: as of 2009, 8.2 million children of immigrants, nearly half (49 percent) of the 16.8 million children of immigrants, lived in 10 major U.S. metropolitan areas



Figure 1. *Immigrant and Child-of-Immigrant Percentages of U.S. Population, Top 100 Metros, 2000 and 2009*



Source: Urban Institute tabulations from the IPUMS datasets drawn from the 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 5 percent sample, and the 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys.

Note: Metro-level estimates are derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application based on the U.S. Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Area and November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions.

(table 1). At the same time, however, the more rapid growth trend in many nontraditional immigrant metros that started in the 1980s and accelerated in the 1990s has continued over the past decade.

In 2000, two-fifths (40 percent) of all children of immigrants lived in just five metropolitan areas: Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, Miami, and Houston. These traditional immigrant destinations continue to be home to a large proportion of children of immigrants. However, while these five metros continued to mostly see increases over the past decade in the number of children of immigrants, their combined share of all children of immigrants declined to 35 percent by 2009. These five metros accounted for a fifth of the overall growth in the 100 largest metros over the decade. The 9 percent growth in the number of children of immigrants was below the growth rate of 26 percent across all the 100 metros. The next tier of the top 10 metros also experienced growth in their population of children of immigrants during the decade, and the growth rates in four of these metros—Dallas; Riverside; Washington, D.C.; and Phoenix—were above the overall growth rate for the top 100 metros.

The 10 fastest growing metros with 30,000 or more children of immigrants—Raleigh, Charlotte, Indianapolis, Nashville, Atlanta, Memphis, Columbus, Las Vegas, Cincinnati, and Richmond—experienced growth of 60 percent or more (figure 2).³ Of the 10 fastest growing metros, most are in the Southeast and Midwest, and

TABLE 1. *Top 10 Metropolitan Areas with the Largest Populations of Children of Immigrants, 2000 and 2009*


Metro	2009			2000			Growth rate
	Rank by size	Number	% of child population	Rank by size	Number	% of child population	
Los Angeles	1	1,913,000	60	1	1,980,000	60	-3
New York	2	1,880,000	43	2	1,718,000	40	9
Chicago	3	743,000	31	3	622,000	26	19
Houston	4	660,000	41	5	450,000	34	47
Miami	5	646,000	54	4	593,000	52	9
Dallas	6	613,000	35	7	377,000	27	63
Riverside	7	515,000	45	8	376,000	38	37
San Francisco	8	449,000	50	6	394,000	44	14
Washington, D.C.	9	441,000	34	9	303,000	26	45
Phoenix	10	384,000	34	11	227,000	27	69
Top 10 Metros		8,243,000	44		7,040,000	40	17
Top 100 Metros		14,070,000	29		11,187,000	24	26
U.S.		16,845,000	23		13,297,000	19	27

Source: Urban Institute tabulations from the IPUMS datasets drawn from the 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 5 percent sample, and the 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys.

Note: Metro-level estimates are derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application based on the U.S. Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Area and November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions.



Figure 2. Percent Growth for the 10 Metros with the Fastest Growing Population of Children of Immigrants, 2000–2009



Source: Urban Institute tabulations from the IPUMS datasets drawn from the 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 5 percent sample, and the 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys.

Note: Metro-level estimates are derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application based on the U.S. Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Area and November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions. The top 10 fastest growing metros have at least 30,000 children of immigrants.

nearly all are in states that had small immigrant populations 20 years ago but since then have experienced rapid growth in their immigrant populations.

Children of immigrants are keeping metros young

Just as the overall U.S. population under 18 has grown slowly over the past decade, with the entire growth attributed to children of immigrants (Fortuny and Chaudry 2011), the child population in many U.S. metros has experienced similar trends. The number of children of immigrants in the top 100 metros increased by 26 percent between 2000 and 2009, while the number of children with native-born parents actually declined (by nearly 400,000 children, or almost 1 percent). Thus, children of immigrants account for all of the 5 percent growth in the child population in metros since 2000, just as they accounted for the entire growth nationally. Also, the growth rate in the large U.S. metros (5 percent) was higher than the pace of growth in the U.S. child population overall (3 percent), thereby keeping metros relatively younger.

Children of immigrants are growing shares of the child population in many metros. As mentioned previously, the increases in children of immigrants across many metros prevented what otherwise would have been more widespread declines in the child population. In 30 percent (18 of 60) of metros with at least 30,000 children of immigrants,


the child population has declined since 2000, almost always due to declines in the number of children with native-born parents. In fact, the population of children with native-born parents declined in almost half (29 of 60) of the large metros. By contrast, the population of children of immigrants increased in nearly all (56 of 60) of the large metros.

As a result, the children-of-immigrants share of the child population climbed in nearly every large metro as well (figure 3). In 2009, children of immigrants accounted for more than 40 percent of all children in 16 metros, including a majority of the child population in San Jose (62 percent), Los Angeles (60 percent), McAllen (59 percent), and Miami (54 percent). Children of immigrants represented between 30 and 40 percent in 7 metros. Children of immigrants also accounted for a large share (44 percent) of children in the top 10 metros combined.

The role of children of immigrants in helping to maintain or bolster the growth of the child population can be seen across metros. Among metros with at least 30,000 children of immigrants, children of immigrants accounted for more than half of the growth in the child population in 34 of the 42 metros that experienced an overall net increase in their child population since 2000. They accounted for all of the growth in 12 metros (including Chicago, Minneapolis, Memphis, and San Francisco), fully offsetting the declines in numbers of children with native-born



Figure 3. *Share of Children with Immigrant Parents, by Metro, 2009*



Source: Urban Institute tabulations from the IPUMS datasets drawn from the 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys.

Note: Metro-level estimates are derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application based on the U.S. Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Area and November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions.

parents during the decade (figure 4). In Chicago, for instance, a 6 percent decline of 100,000 children with native-born parents was fully offset by an increase of 120,000 children with immigrant parents, leading to no net change in its child population. In Memphis, a smaller metro with a lower share of children of immigrants, a doubling in its children of immigrants from 15,000 to 31,000 helped to overcome a decline of 7,000 children with native-born parents since 2000.

Children of immigrants also accounted for more than half of the growth in 22 other metros. These metros were generally widely spread across the Southeast, Southwest, Mountain West, and Pacific West regions, including Denver, Nashville, Orlando, and Salt Lake City (figure 5). Denver, for example, experienced growth in populations of both children with native-born parents (21,000 more children) and children with immigrant parents (56,000), with the latter accounting for about three-fourths of the total growth since 2000. Nashville also saw robust growth in both groups of children for an overall growth of 18 percent (or 58,000 children) in its child population. This contrasts with Memphis, which saw little change in the size of its child population.

In 18 metros, there was a net decline in the overall number of children between 2000 and

2009. Many metropolitan areas in the Northeast and Midwest were among this group. Yet 15 of these metros, including Baltimore, Boston, Milwaukee, and St. Louis, saw an increase in the number of children of immigrants that at least partially offset the decline in children with native-born parents (figure 6). The Boston metropolitan area experienced a relatively sharp drop of 75,000 children with native-born parents, or nearly 10 percent of this group's total in 2000, which was mostly offset by an increase of 50,000 children of immigrants. St. Louis experienced a smaller decline in the number of children with native-born parents, losing 6 percent since 2000, but this decline was mitigated by the addition of 12,000 children of immigrants in that same time.


Children of Immigrants Are Bringing Diversity to Metro America

Children of immigrants are fueling the rapid increase in majority-minority metros across the United States

The broad-based increase in children of immigrants across large U.S. metros is adding tremendously to the racial, ethnic, and national origin mix of metropolitan areas. Of the top 100 metros, 31 had majority-minority child populations



Figure 4. *Growth in Number of Children by Parents' Nativity: Chicago, San Francisco, Minneapolis, and Memphis, 2000–2009*



Source: Urban Institute tabulations from the IPUMS datasets drawn from the 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys.

Notes: Metro-level estimates are derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application based on the U.S. Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Area and November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions. Numbers are rounded to the nearest thousand.


a. Includes children with unknown parental nativity.

by 2009, or white populations below 50 percent of all children in the metro (figure 7).^{4,5} This number has grown quickly over the past decade (from 24 metros in 2000), and several more metros will likely turn majority nonwhite in the coming years. An additional 20 metros had minority populations that were between 40 and 50 percent of the child population in 2009.

By 2009 nonwhite children reached majority status in metro America

When the racial and ethnic group populations are aggregated for all the top 100 metros, non-white children represent a majority of the child population in the country's largest metros (figure 8). The non-Hispanic white population in the top 100 metros declined to 49 percent in

Figure 5. *Growth in Number of Children by Parents' Nativity: Orlando, Denver, Nashville, and Salt Lake City, 2000–2009*




Source: Urban Institute tabulations from the IPUMS datasets drawn from the 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys.

Notes: Metro-level estimates are derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application based on the U.S. Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Area and November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions. Numbers are rounded to the nearest thousand.

a. Includes children with unknown parental nativity.



Figure 6. *Growth in Number of Children by Parents' Nativity: Boston, Baltimore, Milwaukee, and St. Louis, 2000–2009*



Source: Urban Institute tabulations from the IPUMS datasets drawn from the 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys.

Notes: Metro-level estimates are derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application based on the U.S. Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Area and November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions. Numbers are rounded to the nearest thousand.

a. Includes children with unknown parental nativity.

2009 from 55 percent in 2000. This trend further indicates how the sweeping demographic shift among youth across the country's many metropolitan areas foretells the broader extensions to the greater U.S. population in the coming years. By 2009, the white child population in the United States had already fallen to 56 percent from 62 percent in 2000 (Fortuny and Chaudry 2011).

The dramatic racial and ethnic shifts in the child population nationally were due to both large declines in the number of white children and large increases in the number of Hispanic and Asian children, with most of this growth among children of immigrants (Fortuny and Chaudry 2011). Within the top 100 metros, the number of Hispanic children grew by 3.1 million (32 percent) between 2000 and 2009, with 61 percent of the increase from children of immigrants and the remaining 39 percent from children of native-born parents. The population of non-Hispanic Asian children in the top 100 metros increased by more than 500,000 children (24 percent), with an even larger percentage of this growth due to children of immigrants (88 percent). Over the same period, the population of non-Hispanic white children in large metros declined by 1.5 million (6 percent).

Half of children of immigrants and a quarter of all children living in large metros are Hispanic children. Fifty-four percent of children of immigrants in the top 100 metros were Hispanic in 2009. In addition, 14 percent of all children with native-born parents in large metros were also Hispanic; taken together, Hispanic children with native and immigrant parents represented more than one-fourth of all children (26 percent). Of the top 100 metros, 10 metros, mostly in California and Texas, had a Hispanic majority among all children in 2009. Hispanic children remained highly concentrated: 46 percent of all Hispanic children in the United States lived in the 10 metro areas with the largest Hispanic child populations (Los Angeles, New York, Houston, Riverside, Chicago, Dallas, Phoenix, Miami, San Antonio, and San Diego).

Beyond Hispanics, Asian and white children accounted for 17 percent each of children of immigrants, non-Hispanic black for 8 percent, and children identified as being of two or more races for 3 percent.

Children of immigrants have diverse family origins. The rapid growth of the Hispanic and Asian children-of-immigrants population has transformed the composition of metros, and the extensive heterogeneity among children from immigrant



families has further amplified how much the population of children living in metropolitan America is changing. Children of Hispanic, Asian, white, and black immigrant parents all have diverse national origins (Fortuny, Hernandez, and Chaudry 2010). The growth in the number of Hispanic children has been substantially fuelled by children with Mexican parents, but at the same time the presence and growth of the population of children with parents from countries in Central America, South America, and the Caribbean is shaping the changing composition of children in many metros. Within the Asian immigrant population there is also broad diversity in family origins, including India, Philippines, China, Vietnam, and Korea among the top 10 origin countries, with no single country a dominant source. These diverse immigrant groups have also settled in different metropolitan areas (Fortuny, Hernandez, and Chaudry 2010).

The presence and growth of immigrant and minority families varies across metros

Large metros have a diverse mix of immigrant and native-born minorities, with some metros having a majority racial or ethnic minority group (figure 9), and others having a broad mix of multiple racial and ethnic groups (figure 10). Black children with native-born parents are highly concentrated in many southeastern metros, including Columbia, Jackson, Memphis, and New Orleans, where nearly 40 percent or more of children are black. These metro regions have also experienced increases in immigration in recent decades, and the children of immigrants are predominantly Hispanic but still constitute less than 10 percent of the overall child population. For instance, in 2009 about half (51 percent) of the child population of Memphis was black, with nearly all of this group having native-born parents (figure 9). This percentage had changed little since the 2000 U.S. Census. At the same time, the children of immigrants in Memphis doubled during these years, and growth among Hispanic children of immigrants accounted for all of this growth, increasing the Hispanic share from 3 percent to 6 percent.

Nine of the 10 metros where a majority of all children are Hispanic are concentrated in the states of California and Texas, along with Albuquerque, New Mexico. In 8 additional metros, the Hispanic share is above 40 percent. For example, in Tucson, near half (49 percent) of the child

population was Hispanic in 2009, an increase from 43 percent in 2000 (figure 9). Metros with predominantly Hispanic child populations show distinct variations in their percentages of immigrant and native families. In Tucson, more than 50 percent of Hispanic children have native-born parents and most of the population growth in Hispanic children has been to native-born parents. By contrast, in Los Angeles children of immigrant parents accounted for a larger share (two-thirds) of Hispanic children.

Other large metros have relatively high concentrations of children from multiple racial and ethnic groups (figure 10). Several metros had relatively high concentrations of both black and Hispanic children (with each accounting for at least 15 percent of all children), including most of the nation's largest metropolitan areas (e.g., Chicago, Dallas, Houston, Miami, New York, and Washington, D.C.), as well as other metros that have seen large population growth in recent years (e.g., Charlotte, Orlando, Raleigh, and Tampa). In some western metros (e.g., San Jose and San Francisco), children with Hispanic and Asian parents each represented large shares of the child population.


Conclusion

The United States has continued to see a profound and broad-based demographic transformation spurred by a tremendous wave of immigration that started in the 1980s and has carried through the first decade of the 21st century. This new wave of immigrants, the largest since the turn of the last century, has settled in many more metropolitan communities across all regions of the United States, including some that have received few immigrants in the past. Recent immigrants are more diverse than those who arrived in previous waves, and much more likely to be racial or ethnic minorities, with more than three-quarters from Latin American and Asian countries. This change in immigration patterns has led to sweeping changes in the composition and diversity of the metropolitan areas where these immigrants have settled.

The strongest indication of these dramatic demographic shifts can be seen in the growing population of children of immigrants, who make up 29 percent of children living in the 100 largest metropolitan areas and account for all of the




Figure 7. *Minority Share of Children, by Metro, 2009*



Source: Urban Institute tabulations from the IPUMS datasets drawn from the 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys.
Note: Metro-level estimates are derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application based on the U.S. Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Area and November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions.


Figure 8. *Race and Ethnicity of Children in the United States and the Top 100 U.S. Metros, 2009 (percent)*



Source: Urban Institute tabulations from the IPUMS datasets drawn from the 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys.
Note: Metro-level estimates are derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application based on the U.S. Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Area and November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions.




Figure 9. Race and Ethnicity of Children, Memphis and Tucson, 2009 (percent)



Source: Urban Institute tabulations from the IPUMS datasets drawn from the 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys.

Note: Metro-level estimates are derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application based on the U.S. Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Area and November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions.

Figure 10. Race and Ethnicity of Children, Chicago and San Francisco, 2009 (percent)



Source: Urban Institute tabulations from the IPUMS datasets drawn from the 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys.

Note: Metro-level estimates are derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application based on the U.S. Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Area and November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions.



growth in the child population in these metros and in the nation as a whole. The relatively higher proportion of children of immigrants among the youngest children and the relatively young age profile of recently arriving immigrants indicate that the demographic momentum will likely continue in the coming decade even if the wave of immigrants ebbs. These trends among the child population signify the vanguard of the broader demographic transformation of the U.S. population as it becomes increasingly diverse across the age spectrum and across the nation.

Today's immigrant families and their children have settled into and enlivened an increasingly diverse set of metropolitan communities, bringing to these metros new industries, workers, and innovators that help build and support local economies. However, many of these communities may lack the experience and resources to integrate large numbers of newcomers, or feel that these changes threaten their social cohesion. The growing heterogeneity of metros will likely affect communities in a variety of ways, and recent immigrant families' and children's experiences may vary widely. Children of immigrants represent an important potential resource for the nation and for their communities. If they can be successfully integrated into the economic and social life of the nation and their communities, they would offer much-needed human capital for future economic growth as valuable workers and entrepreneurs, consumers and taxpayers, and citizens. The changing demographics may also present challenges to communities to meet their education, health, and service needs, particularly communities that may need to adapt to the needs of a more diverse child population. The implications of the growing magnitude and changing mix of today's children of immigrants, and the challenges and opportunities they represent, are ones that local and national leaders will have to confront.

Notes

1. Brief data are taken from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) datasets data drawn from the 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 5 percent sample, and the combined 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys that together constitute a 2 percent sample of the U.S. population (Ruggles et al. 2010). An immigrant or foreign-born person is someone born out-

side the United States and its territories. People born in the United States, Puerto Rico, and other territories, or born abroad to U.S. citizen parents, are native born. Children with immigrant parents have at least one foreign-born parent. Unless stated otherwise, children with parents of unknown nativity (about 2 percent of U.S. children) are excluded.

2. Metro-level estimates are derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application based on the U.S. Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Area and November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions. See the methods box for more information.
3. Metro-level estimates of children of immigrants are presented for the metropolitan areas with at least 30,000 children of immigrants, 60 of the 100 largest metro areas. Data for the remaining 40 metros are presented only in aggregate due to small samples in the survey data. See the methods box for more information.
4. Throughout the brief, the racial and ethnic categories are mutually exclusive. See the methods box for more information.
5. Analysis of 2010 census data shows 35 majority-minority metros, or four more than the Urban Institute analysis of American Community Survey (ACS) data (Frey 2011). The Urban Institute estimates of children of immigrants are based on the latest ACS data (2008–2009). Although the 2010 Census includes information about race and ethnicity, the decennial census does not contain information on nativity and citizenship. Frey's (2011) analysis found that Virginia Beach, Columbia, Augusta, and Lakeland were additional metros that had fallen below a 50 percent white child population threshold in the 2010 census.

References

- Fortuny, Karina, and Ajay Chaudry. 2011. "Children of Immigrants: Growing National and State Diversity." Children of Immigrants Brief 5. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Fortuny, Karina, Donald J. Hernandez, and Ajay Chaudry. 2010. "Young Children of Immigrants: The Leading Edge of America's Future." Children of Immigrants Brief 3. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Frey, William. 2011. "America's Diverse Future: Initial Glimpses at the U.S. Child Population from the 2010 Census." Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Passel, Jeffrey S., and D'Vera Cohn. 2009. "A Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants in the United States." Washington, DC: The Pew Hispanic Center.
- Ruggles, Steven, J. Trent Alexander, Katie Genadek, Ronald Goeken, Matthew B. Schroeder, and Matthew Sobek. 2010. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0 [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis: Minnesota Population Center [producer and distributor].



Methods

Data Source

The primary data sources for the statistics in the Children of Immigrants brief series are the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) datasets (Ruggles et al. 2010). The IPUMS datasets are drawn from the 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 5 percent samples, and the 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys (ACS) that together constitute a 2 percent sample of the U.S. population.

Child-Parent Relationship

The IPUMS data identify one or both parents if the parent(s) are living in the same household as the child. The child-parent relationship in the IPUMS data is biological and social; for example, stepfathers and adoptive fathers are identified in addition to biological fathers. In a small number of cases, the child-parent relationship has been imputed using information about all household members. For more information on the child-parent relationship in the IPUMS data, see Family Interrelationships in the IPUMS documentation at <http://usa.ipums.org/usa/chapter5/chapter5.shtml>.

The child-parent relationship is not defined in the data for a small number of children. When the child is identified as a grandchild of the householder, the immigration status of the grandparent is used for determining the immigration status and citizenship of the parent (for about 2 percent of children in the sample). This leaves about 2 percent of children in the sample for whom the immigration status of the parents has not been determined.

Definitions

Immigrant or foreign-born persons are born outside the United States and its territories. Those born in Puerto Rico and other territories or born abroad to U.S. citizen parents are native born. Immigrants include both legal and unauthorized immigrants; the latter are undercounted in the official Census and ACS data. Demographers have estimated that unauthorized immigrants are undercounted by about 12.5 percent in these data sources (see Passel and Cohn 2009).

Children of immigrants or children of immigrant parents have at least one foreign-born parent in the household.

Children of native-born parents live with two parents who are both native born or a single parent who is native born.

Native-born children of immigrants are native-born children who have at least one foreign-born parent.

Racial/ethnic groups. The census survey asks two separate questions regarding race and ethnicity: respondents are asked to identify their race and indicate whether they are of Hispanic or Latino origin. Respondents can select more than one racial group. People of Hispanic origin may be of any race. Non-Hispanic blacks are those who identified themselves as black or African American only. Non-Hispanic Asians are those who identified themselves as Asian or Pacific Islander only. Non-Hispanic whites are those who identified themselves as white only. Respondents who identified as two or more races are grouped under “two or more races.”

Metropolitan Area Estimates

The metro-level estimates were derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application (<http://mcdc.missouri.edu/websas/geocorr2k.html>), which generates crosswalks between U.S. Census 2000 geographic areas. The MABLE/Geocorr2K online application was used to crosswalk the Census 2000 Primary Use Microdata Areas, the smallest level of geography available in the public use microdata, to the November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions. The metropolitan areas thus defined have the same boundaries for 2000 and 2008–2009. State rankings and metro-level estimates of children of immigrants are presented for the metropolitan areas with at least 30,000 children of immigrants, 60 of the 100 largest metro areas.

Data for the remaining 40 metros are presented only in aggregate due to small sample sizes in the survey data: Akron, OH; Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY; Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ; Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC; Baton Rouge, LA; Birmingham-Hoover, AL; Boise City-Nampa, ID; Bradenton-Sarasota-Venice, FL; Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY; Charleston-North Charleston-Summerville, SC; Chattanooga, TN-GA; Colorado Springs, CO; Columbia, SC; Dayton, OH; Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA; Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI; Greensboro-High Point, NC; Greenville-Mauldin-Easley, SC; Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA; Jackson, MS; Knoxville, TN; Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL; Lancaster, PA; Lansing-East Lansing, MI; Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR; Louisville-Jefferson County, KY-IN; Madison, WI; New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA; Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA; Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL; Pittsburgh, PA; Portland-South Portland-Biddeford, ME; Rochester, NY; Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA; Springfield, MA; Syracuse, NY; Toledo, OH; Tulsa, OK; Wichita, KS; and Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA.

APPENDIX TABLE 1. Number, Shares, and Change in Population of Children of Immigrants, Top 100 Metros, 2000 to 2009

Metro	2008-2009				2000				Growth	
	Rank by size	Number	% of metro population	Rank by share	Rank by size	Number	% of metro population	Rank by share	Number	% growth
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	1	1,913,000	60	2	1	1,980,000	60	1	-67,000	-3
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA	2	1,880,000	43	12	2	1,718,000	40	9	162,000	9
Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	3	743,000	31	23	3	622,000	26	22	121,000	19
Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	4	660,000	41	14	5	450,000	34	15	210,000	47
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL	5	646,000	54	4	4	593,000	52	5	53,000	9
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	6	613,000	35	18	7	377,000	27	20	236,000	63
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	7	515,000	45	8	8	376,000	38	12	139,000	37
San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	8	449,000	50	5	6	394,000	44	7	55,000	14
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	9	441,000	34	19	9	303,000	26	24	138,000	45
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	10	384,000	34	20	11	227,000	27	18	157,000	69
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	11	343,000	24	32	14	158,000	15	39	185,000	117
San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	12	322,000	44	9	10	293,000	42	8	29,000	10
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	13	269,000	61	1	12	226,000	54	3	43,000	19
Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	14	266,000	27	28	13	216,000	21	27	50,000	23
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	15	212,000	28	27	15	148,000	20	31	64,000	43
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	16	207,000	15	45	16	144,000	10	47	63,000	44
Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	17	194,000	40	16	22	111,000	33	16	83,000	74
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Roseville, CA	18	165,000	32	22	18	128,000	27	19	37,000	29
Denver-Aurora-Broomfield, CO	19	158,000	26	31	23	102,000	19	33	56,000	55
Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI	20	158,000	15	47	17	132,000	12	44	26,000	20
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX	21	153,000	59	3	19	115,000	60	2	38,000	33
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	22	144,000	18	43	26	91,000	12	43	53,000	58
Orlando-Kissimmee, FL	23	139,000	29	26	27	84,000	21	28	55,000	66
Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA	24	137,000	26	30	25	92,000	19	32	46,000	50
San Antonio, TX	25	123,000	22	35	24	94,000	20	30	29,000	31
Austin-Round Rock, TX	26	122,000	29	25	31	72,000	24	26	49,000	68
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	27	115,000	20	40	28	82,000	16	34	33,000	40
Fresno, CA	28	115,000	44	10	21	112,000	45	6	3,000	3
El Paso, TX	29	112,000	49	6	20	113,000	54	4	-2,000	-1
Bakersfield, CA	30	100,000	43	13	32	71,000	35	14	29,000	41
Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC	31	92,000	21	39	43	36,000	11	45	56,000	157
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	32	88,000	43	11	29	81,000	39	11	7,000	9
Baltimore-Towson, MD	33	86,000	14	48	36	53,000	8	50	33,000	62

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE 1. Number, Shares, and Change in Population of Children of Immigrants, Top 100 Metros, 2000 to 2009 (Continued)

Metro	2008-2009			2000			Growth			
	Rank by size	Number	% of metro population	Rank by share	Rank by size	Number	% of metro population	Rank by share	Number	% growth
Stockton, CA	34	85,000	45	7	33	64,000	39	10	21,000	32
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	35	74,000	22	38	30	77,000	20	29	-2,000	-3
Salt Lake City, UT	36	73,000	23	34	39	45,000	16	36	28,000	62
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	37	73,000	33	21	35	53,000	24	25	20,000	37
Raleigh-Cary, NC	38	65,000	23	33	54	25,000	13	42	40,000	159
Tucson, AZ	39	63,000	27	29	37	52,000	26	23	11,000	21
Modesto, CA	40	59,000	41	15	38	50,000	37	13	9,000	17
Honolulu, HI	41	58,000	30	24	34	62,000	31	17	-4,000	-6
Kansas City, MO-KS	42	58,000	12	52	41	37,000	8	52	21,000	58
Nashville-Davidson-Murfreesboro-Franklin, TN	43	57,000	15	46	57	23,000	7	53	34,000	146
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	44	52,000	14	50	44	33,000	9	49	19,000	56
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	45	51,000	19	41	40	40,000	15	38	11,000	27
Indianapolis-Carmel, IN	46	50,000	11	54	59	20,000	5	57	31,000	157
Columbus, OH	47	50,000	11	53	51	28,000	7	55	22,000	79
Albuquerque, NM	48	45,000	22	37	47	29,000	16	35	15,000	52
St. Louis, MO-IL	49	43,000	6	59	46	31,000	4	59	12,000	39
Oklahoma City, OK	50	42,000	14	49	50	28,000	10	46	14,000	48
Jacksonville, FL	51	42,000	13	51	52	26,000	9	48	16,000	63
Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH	52	40,000	8	58	42	36,000	7	56	4,000	12
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	53	38,000	9	56	45	31,000	8	51	6,000	20
Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY	54	36,000	22	36	55	25,000	15	37	12,000	47
Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	55	35,000	35	17	49	28,000	26	21	7,000	24
New Haven-Milford, CT	56	35,000	19	42	48	29,000	14	40	7,000	23
Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN	57	33,000	6	60	60	19,000	4	60	14,000	72
Worcester, MA	58	33,000	18	44	56	25,000	13	41	9,000	35
Richmond, VA	59	31,000	11	55	62	18,000	7	54	13,000	69
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	60	31,000	9	57	70	15,000	5	58	16,000	102
Other metros (61-100)		655,000	10			442,000	6		213,000	48
Top 100 metros		14,070,000	29			11,187,000	24		2,883,000	26

Source: Urban Institute tabulations from the IPUMS datasets drawn from the 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 5 percent sample, and the 2008 and 2009 American Community Surveys.

Notes: Metro-level estimates are derived using the Missouri Census Data Center's MABLE/Geocorr2K online application based on the U.S. Census 2000 Public Use Microdata Area and November 2008 Core Based Statistical Area definitions. Numbers are rounded to the nearest thousand. "Other metros" have fewer than 30,000 children of immigrants. See the methods box for more information.

 **URBAN
INSTITUTE**
2100 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Nonprofit Org.
US Postage PAID
Easton, MD
Permit No. 8098

Return Service Requested

URBAN INSTITUTE

2100 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Copyright © 2011

Phone: 202-833-7200

Fax: 202-467-5775

Web: <http://www.urban.org>

The children of immigrants research brief series provides timely information on children of immigrants, identifies important national and state trends and policy developments, and summarizes relevant research findings to help inform the public policy debate.

This brief was prepared with generous funding from the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Urban Institute, its board, its sponsors, or other authors in this series. Permission is granted for reproduction of this document, with attribution to the Urban Institute.

To download this document,
visit our web site:
<http://www.urban.org>.

For media inquiries, please
contact paffairs@urban.org.