



Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños  
Hunter College (CUNY)

POLICY REPORT | VOLUME 2 | NO. 2 | FALL 2008

# Puerto Rican Outmigration from New York City: 1995-2000

GILBERT MARZÁN, Bronx Community College, CUNY

ANDRÉS TORRES, Hunter College, CUNY

ANDREW LUECKE, Hunter College, CUNY

# Puerto Rican Outmigration from New York City: 1995-2000

**GILBERT MARZÁN**

Bronx Community College  
City University of New York

**ANDRÉS TORRES**

Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños  
Hunter College  
City University of New York

**ANDREW LUECKE**

Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños  
Hunter College  
City University of New York

## CONTENTS

2. Background
  - Historical Trends
  - Why Puerto Ricans Leave New York City
  - A Typology of Outmigrants
6. Data
6. Outmigrants and Stayers
8. Region of Destination
11. Borough of Origin
15. Source Boroughs and Receiving Regions
17. Discussion and Further Research
19. Appendix A
21. Appendix B
22. Notes

## BACKGROUND

Census data demonstrate that the United States Puerto Rican population has been undergoing long-term and sustained growth.<sup>1</sup> From the turn of the twentieth century to the beginning of the twenty-first century it grew from less than a thousand to 3.4 million and by 2006 had grown to 3,987,947.<sup>2</sup> Several aspects of this trend have been well-documented: (1) the rise in the U.S. Puerto Rican population as a proportion of all Puerto Ricans, such that it now equals the population on the island; (2) the end to New York City’s preponderance as the unique center of the Puerto Rican population in the U.S. (For example, as shown in Table 1, the share of the N.Y.C. Puerto Rican population as a proportion of all U.S. Puerto Ricans, declined from 88% in 1940 to 23% in 2000.); (3) the phenomenon of a vigorous return migration to Puerto Rico; and (4) the emergence of Florida and other areas as new poles attracting Puerto Rican migrants.

**TABLE 1. Puerto Rican Population of New York City, 1900–2000**

Year	Puerto Rican Population of N.Y.C.	Percent of Total N.Y.C. Population	Percent of total U.S. Puerto Rican Population
1900	300		— *
1910	600	—	36.6
1920	7,400	—	62.4
1930	44,900	—	85.0
1940	61,500	—	87.8
1950	246,000	3.1	81.6
1960	613,000	7.9	68.6
1970	846,700	10.7	59.2
1980	860,500	12.1	42.7
1990	896,800	12.2	32.9
2000	789,200	9.9	23.2

*Sources:* Andrés Torres, *Between Melting Pot and Mosaic: African Americans and Puerto Ricans in the New York Political Economy* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995), 65, Table 8; Carmen Whalen, “Colonialism, Citizenship, and the Making of the Puerto Rican Diaspora: An Introduction,” in Carmen Whalen and Víctor Vázquez-Hernández, eds., *The Puerto Rican Diaspora: Historical Perspectives*. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2005), 3, Table 1.2; Percent of total U.S. Puerto Rican Population 1940–1990 from *Puerto Rican New Yorkers in 1990* (The City of New York: Department of City Planning, 1994), 9, Table 1.1; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000 Census Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000, Table DP-1.

*Note:* Figures for 1910–1920 are for persons born in Puerto Rico; Figures for 1940 include only persons born in Puerto Rico; the 1950 and 1960 data include those of Puerto Rican birth or parentage; the 1970–2000 data include all Puerto Ricans, irrespective of generational status.

\**Note:* “The first year in which the U.S. Bureau of the Census listed Puerto Ricans as a separate group in its publications was 1910.” Thomas D. Boswell and Angel David Cruz-Báez, “Puerto Ricans Living in the United States,” in Jesse O. McKee, ed., *Ethnicity in Contemporary America: A Geographical Appraisal*. (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000), 183.

This project builds on the existing literature by broadening our knowledge about the outmigration of Puerto Ricans from New York City. Working with Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS) of the 2000 Census we will:

- Compare the socioeconomic background of all outmigrants to that of the Puerto Ricans who remained in N.Y.C. (stayers). Do outmigrant characteristics differ substantively from those who stay behind?

- Describe the outmigration flows during 1995–2000: where did Puerto Ricans go and what was the distribution of outmigrants by borough?
- Compare, by region of destination, the socioeconomic background of outmigrants. For example, what are the differences in educational level, household income, and occupation between those that moved to New England and those who migrated to Puerto Rico?
- Compare, by borough of origin, the socioeconomic background of outmigrants.

### Historical Trends

In the mid-twentieth century, well before the current preoccupation with immigration, one of the most significant episodes in the modern history of labor migration was inaugurated. A small Caribbean island, a territorial possession of a superpower, saw one-third of its population emigrate to the metropolis. Between 1940 and 1970, almost one million Puerto Ricans left their homeland for the agricultural fields and urban centers of the North. For every two persons added to Puerto Rico's population, one became a migrant.<sup>3</sup>

The story of that extended migration has taken twists, turns, and tangents. During the 1970s, although people continued to leave the island in large numbers, there was an almost offsetting number of return migrants from U.S. communities. These were middle-aged workers and retirees of the pre–World War II and early post–World War II generations looking to resettle in their homeland. There were also in this cohort of returnees a significant number of unemployed and displaced workers who had been sidelined by industrial restructuring and growing urban blight in northern cities, especially New York. The result was that the 1970s witnessed the lowest level of net outmigration from Puerto Rico since before World War II, some 66,000 people.<sup>4</sup>

In the 1980s, because fewer Puerto Ricans returned to the island while emigration from the island persisted almost at the same levels of the 1970s, Puerto Rico's net population exodus doubled that of the previous decade. The typical view is that economic conditions in Puerto Rico were less favorable compared to those in the U.S., explaining why Puerto Ricans kept leaving and why potential return migrants tended to stay in the U.S. during the 1980s.<sup>5</sup>

There was more of the same during the 1990s, but with a twist. Migrants from Puerto Rico were leaving for other regions beyond the traditional destination points, accentuating a geographic dispersion that was already beginning to show up in the 1980s. By century's end a major transformation had occurred in the population distribution of Puerto Ricans in the United States. Whereas in 1970 four out of five U.S. Puerto Ricans lived in the Northeast (and two-thirds in New York State), this number had fallen to about 60% in 2000 (and just above a third in New York State).<sup>6</sup>

Meanwhile there was an ongoing pattern of individuals and entire households engaged in repeated trips back and forth between the U.S. and the island. This back and forth movement was termed variously as circular migration, commuter migration, and *el va y ven*.<sup>7</sup> It has been a half-century of intense multidirectional activity, during which everyone seemed on the move, with major fragments of the population having lived in both Puerto Rico and the U.S.

### Why Puerto Ricans Leave New York City

For as long as there have been large urban centers there have been people leaving them, for reasons positive and negative. There is an ample body of research that tracks the

movement of these outmigrants, their destinations, and the underlying causes of their decisions to leave. The following brief survey reviews some of the key literature that addresses, either directly or indirectly, the central concerns of this report. We conclude the survey with a typology of migrants that we think is helpful in ordering the results of our descriptive study of Puerto Rican outmigrants from New York City.

As shown in Table 1, the Puerto Rican population in New York City has been relatively stable since 1970. Whatever growth that did occur was mostly due to births and not to immigration from Puerto Rico, which had been the case in prior decades.<sup>8</sup> The 1960s, in fact, was the last decade during which there was a net positive inflow of Puerto Ricans to the city from Puerto Rico.<sup>9</sup>

Another reason for the leveling off of the local population is the phenomenon of return migration among older Puerto Ricans who arrived in the city after World War II, the beginning of the Great Migration. The elderly want to reunite with family members, pursue dreams of a more tranquil and peaceful lifestyle, and spend their last years in their native homeland. Citizenship ensures ease of travel to visit children who stay behind, and retirees can lead relatively comfortable lives with their social security and pension benefits. Puerto Ricans within this cohort, we hypothesize, are in the *retirement* stage of the life cycle and are choosing to return to the island. Another subset of those returning to the island do so in midlife, as much for cultural reasons as to seek the amenities of a slower-paced lifestyle.<sup>10</sup>

Over time, the size of the Puerto Rican middle-income segment has gradually expanded, even as poverty has maintained its grip on a third or more of the population. Some of these middle-class households have benefited from rising educational levels that have gained them entrée into higher-paying jobs and professions. This is especially the case for U.S.-born Puerto Ricans, compared to their compatriots born on the island.<sup>11</sup>

Taking advantage of individual economic mobility these sectors have pursued the traditional path of *suburbanization*. Residence in the suburbs enhances access to the amenities of good schools, decent housing stock, social services and less crime, and employment options as well.<sup>12</sup> Moving to the suburbs may or may not be tied to employment opportunity. Some move to the metropolitan ring and continue to commute to their jobs in the city. Others leave the city following the growth of jobs in the suburbs. Since 1990 across the country, suburban employment growth has exceeded central-city employment growth in virtually all industrial sectors.<sup>13</sup> Suburbanization also seems to be influenced by household composition. Puerto Rican households comprised of married couples had a greater propensity to migrate than those of other types of marital status.<sup>14</sup> The end result of these forces was that between 1990 and 2000 the Puerto Rican population of the New York City Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA) increased from 1,290,135 to 1,325,778, a percent change of 2.8%.<sup>15</sup>

Over the years, the booming economy in other states (in the Southeast and West, for example) seems to have induced significant numbers of Puerto Ricans to leave the city. Workers—unskilled or skilled, male or female, single or attached—have identified industrial or occupational niches that would allow them to thrive, or at least make a modest living. During the later 1980s, blue-collar workers were the largest occupational group among males to leave New York City. Among females it was professional and managerial types who had the greatest propensity to leave. In this case, the motivating factor to leave is primarily economic opportunity: the desire to relocate to a place

where the possibility of upward mobility (or at least stability) is more favorable. There is another factor motivating these *opportunity-seekers*: the existence of affordable housing markets in the regions beyond metropolitan New York City. Even in New England and Pennsylvania, homeownership is within reach for working-class and middle-class Puerto Ricans who cannot purchase property in New York City.<sup>17</sup> In the Southeast, Midwest, and West these conditions generally prevail as well.

Another group of outmigrants were, in effect, *displaced* from the city by shrinking employment opportunities and limited affordable housing. Since the 1950s, New York City’s industrial foundation, originally production-based, was transformed into a largely service-based economy, then again into an information-processing center. Manufacturing and other low-skilled industries have been in steady decline. This had a serious impact on Puerto Ricans, who were heavily concentrated in these low-skilled and low-paying industries.<sup>18</sup> During the 1970s the principal outcome of the city’s economic restructuring for Puerto Ricans was labor displacement, manifested in a sharp decline in labor force participation and a rise in unemployment.<sup>19</sup> Other aggravating factors, such as poor housing, increased poverty, and poor quality of life have contributed to the dispersion of Puerto Ricans from New York City.<sup>20</sup>

**A Typology of Outmigrants**

In sum, there are four types of Puerto Rican outmigrants: retirees, suburbanites, opportunity seekers, and the displaced. Based on previous research studies and journalistic reporting, we suggest the following typology of outmigrants, indicating their corresponding census characteristics and likely areas of destination.

**Retirees**

- DESCRIPTION:** desire to spend golden years in place of birth; return to homeland; return to family.
- CHARACTERISTICS:** older age; born in Puerto Rico; greater Spanish fluency; lower educational and income level; generally not in the labor force.
- DESTINATION:** Puerto Rico.

---

**Suburbanites**

- DESCRIPTION:** perceptions of lifestyle improvement; better education for children; amenities; may commute to employment in N.Y.C.
- CHARACTERISTICS:** middle-aged; not born in Puerto Rico; higher education and income levels; greater English fluency; married household; high proportion of professional/managerial occupations; generally in the labor force.
- DESTINATION:** New York City Suburbs.

---

**Opportunity-Seekers**

- DESCRIPTION:** relocating for better job opportunities or perhaps for other upward mobility pathways (training, education); primarily responding to “pull” factors in the receiving area.
- CHARACTERISTICS:** younger age; high school (completed) education or higher; greater English-fluency; high employment level; relatively lower rate of marital status (youthfulness); no a priori reason to expect dominant patterns regarding other characteristics.
- DESTINATION:** Florida, All Other States (as defined in this study).

### **The Displaced**

- DESCRIPTION:** individuals/families having difficulty in the New York City employment markets and housing markets; primarily responding to “push” factors in sending areas.
- CHARACTERISTICS:** lower education and income levels; higher poverty level; greater Spanish language fluency; lower proportion of professional/managerial occupations.
- DESTINATION:** Smaller cities, primarily in the Northeast.

### **DATA**

The data set in this report consists of Puerto Ricans who, in the year 2000, were living anywhere outside of New York City and reported that they had lived in New York City in the year 1995. These are *outmigrants* who left their home in the city during 1995–2000.<sup>21</sup> To track their migratory pattern we stratified this population into seven *regions of destination* corresponding to the predominant areas that research and journalistic reporting have suggested Puerto Ricans to be moving to.<sup>22</sup> This is an attempt to provide a more finely-etched picture of outmigration patterns than prior studies that have tracked state-level or broader regional patterns. In particular, none have decomposed these movements to isolate the New York City suburban area which crosses state lines.

These regions of destination are: (1) the New York City Suburban Ring, (2) Florida, (3) Puerto Rico, (4) New England, (5) Pennsylvania, (6) Other New York State, excluding counties in N.Y.C. Suburban Ring, and (7) All Other States, excluding northern New Jersey counties not in N.Y.C. Suburban Ring, as defined in (1).<sup>23</sup>

Because of the way the census asks the questions about “Residence five years ago,” the following issues should be noted: some outmigrants may have moved more than once during the 1995–2000 interval; most variables discussed here generally refer to the individual’s or household’s status as of 2000, so a question about marital status, educational attainment, or homeownership refers to the year 2000, and not necessarily to when the individual left New York City.

### **OUTMIGRANTS AND STAYERS**

What are the key demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of outmigrants, and how do they compare to those who remained, the stayers?<sup>24</sup> Table 2 presents comparative information on both groups.

#### **Gender, Race, Age, Birthplace**

Most outmigrants during this period were females, their proportion (52%) slightly greater than that of males (48%). This is identical to the gender ratio among those who stayed in the city. Racial identification among outmigrants differed substantially compared to those who stayed. Fifty-three percent (53%) of outmigrants classified themselves as white compared to 37% among stayers. In the next largest racial category, some other race, the pattern was reversed. Almost half of stayers (47%) defined themselves in this manner, while a third of outmigrants (32%) defined themselves as some other race. There was little difference between the proportion of black stayers (8%) and black outmigrants (7%), as well as those who said they were of two or more races (7% in both groups). Regarding age, the most significant difference is that outmigrants have a larger senior cohort: 19% of them are aged 55 and older compared to stayers, of whom only 13% are of this age bracket. In the rest of the age cohorts, stayers are slightly younger than outmigrants. Regarding place of birth, there is only a slight difference between the two groups.

**Education, Language, Marital Status**

Outmigrants have a higher level of education completed (38% have at least some college, compared to 32% for stayers) but, with respect to English language fluency, they differed very slightly from their counterparts who remained behind. Only in the very small category of people who spoke English not well or not at all, was there any real gap (15% of outmigrants versus 12% of stayers). As to marital status patterns, half of the outmigrant population consisted of married couples (compared to 38% of stayers), and among leavers there was a smaller segment of those who were never married (27% compared to 38% of stayers). This comparison implies that those who left the city were more likely to live in traditional households than those who stayed.

**Employment and Occupation**

Estimates of employment patterns point to another difference between the two populations. Outmigrants tend to be more connected to the labor market (61% versus 56%), and to have a slightly lower (official) unemployment rate than stayers. Conversely those who remained in the city were more likely not to be in the labor force (35% versus 31%). As to occupational distribution outmigrants are distributed in the following pattern: service-collar (54%); blue-collar (25%); and white-collar (22%). They tend to be skewed more toward blue-collar jobs and less to service jobs than is the case for stayers, who are 21% blue-collar and 58% service-collar. White-collar workers appear to have a similar representation among outmigrants and stayers.

As to be expected, there is a sizeable gender differential in the occupational distribution. For example, among outmigrants we find that males

**TABLE 2. Puerto Rican Outmigrants and Stayers**

VARIABLES	All Outmigrants / Stayed in N.Y.C.	
	All Outmigrants	Stayed in N.Y.C.
<b>GENDER</b>		
Male	48%	48%
Female	52%	52%
<b>RACE</b>		
White	53%	37%
Black	7%	8%
Some Other Race	32%	47%
Two or More Races	7%	7%
<b>PLACE OF BIRTH</b>		
New York	57%	56%
Puerto Rico	36%	32%
United States	5%	9%
<b>AGE COHORT (AGE 20 AND OLDER)</b>		
20 to 29	29%	31%
30 to 39	30%	30%
40 to 49	16%	18%
50 to 54	6%	7%
55 and Older	19%	13%
<b>EDUCATION (AGE 25 AND OLDER)</b>		
Less Than HS	37%	39%
High School	25%	27%
Some College or College and More	38%	34%
<b>ENGLISH ABILITY (AGE 5 AND OLDER)</b>		
Well or Very Well	86%	87%
Not Well or Not at All	15%	12%
<b>EMPLOYMENT STATUS (AGE 20 TO 55)</b>		
Employed	61%	56%
Unemployed	8%	9%
Not in Labor Force	31%	35%
<b>OCCUPATIONAL GROUP (AGE 16 AND OLDER)</b>		
White Collar	22%	21%
Service	54%	58%
Blue Collar	25%	21%
<b>OCCUPATIONAL GROUP MALES (AGE 16 AND OLDER)</b>		
White Collar	19%	17%
Service	42%	49%
Blue Collar	38%	34%
<b>OCCUPATIONAL GROUP FEMALES (AGE 16 AND OLDER)</b>		
White Collar	24%	25%
Service	65%	67%
Blue Collar	10%	8%
<b>MARITAL STATUS (AGE 20 AND OLDER)</b>		
Married	50%	38%
Widowed	5%	3%
Divorced or Separated	18%	20%
Never Married	27%	38%
<b>POVERTY STATUS AND 125% OF POVERTY STATUS (AGE 20 AND OLDER)</b>		
Percent Below Poverty	31%	32%
Percent Below Poverty (125%)	37%	37%
<b>HOUSING TENURE</b>		
Ownership	48%	20%
Rental	49%	78%
<b>INCOME</b>		
Mean Household Income 1999 (Dollars)	\$45,186	\$38,597

(38%) are three and a half times as likely to be found holding blue-collar jobs as females (only 10% of whom hold such jobs). Also significant is the difference in service-collar jobs, which predominate among females (65%) but are much less dominant (42%) among males, with similar comparisons holding among female (67%) and male (49%) stayers.

### Income, Housing, and Poverty

The level of household income was appreciably higher among outmigrants (\$45,186) than stayers (\$38,597), and so was the extent of homeownership (48% versus 20%). However, 31% of leavers were living in poverty, compared to 32% of stayers, a negligible difference.

To conclude this assessment, we can say that there appears to be a degree of selectivity along dimensions of education, employment, income, and homeownership. Generally those who left the city during 1995–2000 were in a more favorable socioeconomic position than those who remained. This assessment generally accords with the profile of outmigrants who left New York City during the 1980s.<sup>25</sup>

## REGION OF DESTINATION

The census estimate is that 115,000 (or some 15% of the city’s Puerto Rican population) left during the second half of the 1990s. Table 3 disaggregates this population of leavers into seven key regions of destination. It may surprise readers that the single largest outmigrant stream moved not to tropical Puerto Rico (19%) or sunny Florida (20%), but to the cooler N.Y.C. metropolitan ring (26%).

TABLE 3. Outmigrants by Destination (N=114537)

N.Y.C. Suburban Ring	26%
Florida	20%
Puerto Rico	19%
New England	8%
All Other States	17%
Other New York State	5%
Pennsylvania	6%

In what ways are migrants to the different regions similar, and how are they different? Can we glean from the characteristics of the different flows a profile that corresponds to the typology of outmigrants that was provisionally laid out earlier (retirees, suburbanites, opportunity seekers, and the displaced)? Table 4 below presents the characteristics of the migrant streams that left for each of the seven receiving areas. In the following section is a description highlighting the key features of each group.

Synthesizing the patterns revealed in Table 4 (also detailed in Appendix A) and correlating them to the framework described earlier, it is apparent that Puerto Rico is the main receiving area for *retirees* and that the N.Y.C. Suburban Ring plays a similar role for *suburbanites*.

The data also suggest—though the connections are less clearly demonstrated—similar linkages for the *opportunity-seekers* and for *displaced* outmigrants. The former tend to leave for Florida and other parts of the country such as the Midwest and West. The latter tend to leave for New England and Pennsylvania.

### Retirees: Puerto Rico and Florida

As expected, the group leaving for Puerto Rico is characterized by many of the features that describe the retirement stream. This is a cohort made up of individuals who,

**TABLE 4. Regions of Destination**

<b>VARIABLES</b>	<i>N.Y.C. Suburban Ring</i>	<i>Florida</i>	<i>Puerto Rico</i>	<i>New England</i>	<i>All Other States</i>	<i>Other New York State</i>	<i>Pennsylvania</i>
<b>GENDER</b>							
Male	48%	48%	50%	46%	49%	47%	47%
Female	52%	52%	50%	54%	51%	53%	53%
<b>RACE</b>							
White	52%	60%	78%	35%	34%	46%	40%
Black	6%	5%	7%	6%	10%	8%	4%
Some Other Race	33%	30%	9%	53%	39%	36%	50%
Two or More Races	7%	4%	5%	6%	13%	10%	5%
<b>PLACE OF BIRTH</b>							
New York	73%	58%	23%	54%	69%	65%	60%
Puerto Rico	22%	33%	74%	36%	23%	29%	31%
United States	4%	6%	2%	8%	7%	6%	8%
<b>AGE COHORT (AGE 20 AND OLDER)</b>							
20 to 29	26%	26%	14%	39%	42%	42%	40%
30 to 39	40%	30%	20%	28%	31%	23%	28%
40 to 49	17%	17%	17%	10%	13%	17%	15%
50 to 54	5%	7%	8%	7%	5%	6%	6%
55 and Older	11%	20%	41%	16%	10%	12%	11%
<b>EDUCATION (AGE 25 AND OLDER)</b>							
Less Than HS	23%	39%	54%	52%	24%	48%	43%
High School	25%	25%	24%	22%	25%	22%	25%
Some College or College and More	52%	37%	22%	26%	51%	30%	33%
<b>ENGLISH ABILITY (AGE 5 AND OLDER)</b>							
Well or Very Well	92%	90%	66%	84%	92%	92%	85%
Not Well or Not at All	8%	9%	33%	16%	7%	7%	15%
<b>EMPLOYMENT STATUS (AGE 20 TO 55)</b>							
Employed	74%	68%	34%	43%	68%	49%	56%
Unemployed	5%	6%	12%	14%	6%	8%	15%
Not in Labor Force	21%	26%	53%	42%	26%	43%	29%
<b>OCCUPATIONAL GROUP (AGE 16 AND OLDER)</b>							
White Collar	31%	19%	17%	12%	22%	15%	14%
Service	50%	59%	48%	56%	56%	61%	51%
Blue Collar	19%	23%	35%	32%	22%	24%	35%
<b>OCCUPATIONAL GROUP MALES (AGE 16 AND OLDER)</b>							
White Collar	26%	17%	15%	11%	19%	15%	16%
Service	42%	42%	39%	46%	43%	49%	36%
Blue Collar	31%	40%	46%	43%	37%	36%	48%
<b>OCCUPATIONAL GROUP FEMALES (AGE 16 AND OLDER)</b>							
White Collar	35%	20%	20%	13%	25%	15%	11%
Service	57%	74%	60%	67%	68%	72%	68%
Blue Collar	8%	6%	20%	20%	7%	12%	21%
<b>MARITAL STATUS (AGE 20 AND OLDER)</b>							
Married	58%	52%	49%	33%	49%	29%	42%
Widowed	2%	6%	8%	5%	4%	4%	3%
Divorced or Separated	15%	19%	22%	25%	15%	19%	14%
Never Married	25%	22%	20%	38%	32%	47%	41%
<b>POVERTY STATUS AND 125% OF POVERTY STATUS (AGE 20 AND OLDER)</b>							
Percent Below Poverty	13%	19%	59%	42%	25%	54%	42%
Percent Below Poverty (125%)	16%	24%	68%	50%	29%	62%	49%
<b>HOUSING TENURE</b>							
Ownership	65%	49%	62%	15%	34%	30%	24%
Rental	34%	49%	28%	84%	64%	69%	73%
<b>INCOME</b>							
Mean Household Income 1999 (Dollars)	74,206	44,493	18,264	31,117	46,515	26,490	30,386

compared to individuals in cohorts destined for other regions, are: (1) most likely to be 55 years of age or older (41%); (2) most likely to have been born in Puerto Rico (74%); (3) most likely to have less than a high school education (54%); (4) least likely to speak English well or very well (66%); and (5) most likely to be out of the labor force (53%).

These are expected patterns, given that this is a cohort of relatively older movers, rural and working-class Puerto Ricans who generally came to New York during the period of the Great Migration of the 1940s and 1950s, and who decided to return to their place of birth. Another aspect of this population speaks to their vulnerable socioeconomic position. Three of every five persons who return to Puerto Rico, among whom there are surely a large number of retirees, live in conditions of poverty.

A look at the characteristics of outmigrants to Florida supports the notion of the Sunshine State as a secondary destination for retirees. Compared to all other outflows this group is closest to the profile of those going to Puerto Rico. It has a similarly high proportion of older-aged persons and of individuals born on the island and also of homeowners. A principal difference is in the area of English language fluency. Ninety percent of outmigrants to Florida speak English well or very well, compared to 66% of those going to Puerto Rico. This suggests that many of those who may be retiring to Florida were either born or raised in the U.S. Proximity to Puerto Rico, a tropical climate, and vibrant Latino culture make Florida a natural alternative for those who wish to remain on the U.S. mainland.

#### ***Suburbanites: Metro N.Y.C. and All Other States***

A second cohort of movers, which we have dubbed the suburbanite stream, has a set of characteristics quite distinct from the retirement stream. This can be discerned by examining the relative size of various indicators describing this outmigrant group, and comparing these indicators to their counterparts in the other cohorts. For example, outmigrants to the N.Y.C. suburban area were the: (1) most likely to be middle-aged (57% were of ages 30–49 and therefore in the most productive years of employment); (2) most likely to have been born in the State of New York (73%); (3) most likely to have had at least some college education (52%); (4) one of the most likely to speak English well (92%); (5) most likely to have white-collar jobs; and (6) the most likely to be employed (74%). They also had the highest mean household income (\$74,206) and the highest ratio of homeownership (65%). (Paradoxically, those returning to Puerto Rico had a similarly high ratio of homeownership (62%) though this is likely due to having inherited property that had been kept within their extended family, and also to the relatively less expensive real estate market on the island.)

This profile describes the group of movers who left the five boroughs for the counties contiguous to the city. These are the counties of Northeastern New Jersey, Long Island, and Southeastern New York. As noted earlier this was the destination of the single largest group of outmigrants during this period.

Those who left the city for regions westward (All Other States, comprising 17% of all outmigrants) also ranked fairly highly along several of the dimensions that we have associated with suburbanite characteristics: education, English language fluency, New York City-birth, white-collar occupations, and household income.

#### ***Opportunity-Seekers: Florida and All Other States***

We surmised earlier that opportunity-seekers are generally younger and more educated individuals pursuing better paying jobs and career mobility. Responding to the pull of

labor demand in other regions, they are willing to relocate over longer distances because of fewer family obligations (unmarried or married without children).

The cohort of outmigrants to All Other States (which encompasses the Midwest, West, and Southeast) reflects some of these characteristics: (1) seventy-three percent of them (the largest proportion of any cohort) are age 20 to 39; (2) fifty-one percent (almost identical to those going to suburban New York City) have some college or more; (3) more than nine out of ten (similar to the metro New York suburban group) speak English well or very well; (4) and two-thirds of them are employed (following the N.Y.C. suburbanites).

Outmigrants to Florida share some similar levels of these characteristics. There is a perceptible difference, though, regarding occupational distribution: those going to Florida having a greater representation of service workers, probably due, to the slightly higher proportion of women among this group than is the case for those going to All Other States. Curiously, although the All Other States cohort displays a higher household income than the Florida group, these outmigrants also show higher poverty and lower homeownership. This suggests that the Florida group has a more homogeneous class structure that those migrating westward.

***The Displaced: New England and Pennsylvania***

This is the group comprised of people being squeezed out of New York City’s employment and housing markets. We posited that compared to most other Puerto Ricans they would have lower educational levels and greater Spanish fluency, higher unemployment and poverty, and be found primarily in non-white-collar jobs. Our examination of outmigrant characteristics among those who left for New England and Pennsylvania indicates that the above supposition is true along the dimensions of unemployment, education, poverty, occupation, homeownership, and income. There is also some evidence of displacement to the Other New York State region, as well as for Puerto Rico. For example, the percentage of those below poverty were highest among those going to Puerto Rico (68%) and second-highest among those going to Other New York State (54%), as were mean annual income (\$18,264 for Puerto Rico and \$26,490 for Other New York State).

**BOROUGH OF ORIGIN**

Table 5 tells us the breakdown of outmigrants according to their borough of origin. The Bronx is the single largest source of movers (39%), followed by Brooklyn (27%). The next two largest senders were Queens and Manhattan who, at 16% and 15% respectively, were virtually the same in their importance as exporters of Puerto Ricans.<sup>26</sup> The unexpected pattern here is Queens, which has a slightly smaller base population of Puerto Ricans than Manhattan. However, it is known that Puerto Ricans in this borough have a proportionately larger middle-class segment than any other borough in New York City.<sup>27</sup> It is probable that movers from Queens are upwardly mobile individuals with income and educational levels sufficient to seek homeownership opportunities beyond the city.

**TABLE 5. Outmigrants by Borough of Origin (N=114537)**

Bronx	39%
Manhattan	15%
Queens	16%
Brooklyn	27%
Staten Island	2%

**TABLE 6. Borough of Origin**

<b>VARIABLES</b>	<b>Bronx</b>	<b>Manhattan</b>	<b>Queens</b>	<b>Brooklyn</b>	<b>Staten Island</b>
<b>GENDER</b>					
Male	48%	50%	49%	49%	41%
Female	52%	50%	51%	51%	59%
<b>RACE</b>					
White	51%	58%	53%	52%	58%
Black	8%	7%	6%	6%	6%
Some Other Race	34%	27%	30%	32%	26%
Two or More Races	6%	7%	9%	8%	5%
<b>PLACE OF BIRTH</b>					
United States	5%	6%	5%	5%	4%
New York	58%	50%	65%	56%	67%
Puerto Rico	36%	41%	28%	37%	27%
<b>AGE COHORT (AGE 20 AND OLDER)</b>					
20 to 29	27%	30%	28%	31%	31%
30 to 39	31%	29%	33%	28%	35%
40 to 49	17%	11%	17%	16%	14%
50 to 54	7%	7%	5%	6%	3%
55 and Older	19%	22%	18%	19%	16%
<b>EDUCATION (AGE 25 AND OLDER)</b>					
Less Than HS	37%	40%	24%	43%	30%
High School	26%	20%	27%	23%	19%
Some College or College and More	36%	39%	49%	34%	51%
<b>ENGLISH ABILITY (AGE 5 AND OLDER)</b>					
Well or Very Well	85%	83%	92%	85%	76%
Not Well or Not at All	15%	17%	8%	15%	23%
<b>EMPLOYMENT STATUS (AGE 20 TO 55)</b>					
Employed	60%	57%	72%	56%	69%
Unemployed	8%	8%	5%	9%	9%
Not in Labor Force	31%	35%	22%	35%	21%
<b>OCCUPATIONAL GROUP (AGE 16 AND OLDER)</b>					
White Collar	18%	28%	26%	18%	32%
Service	55%	50%	52%	55%	52%
Blue Collar	26%	21%	22%	27%	16%
<b>OCCUPATIONAL GROUP MALES (AGE 16 AND OLDER)</b>					
White Collar	15%	24%	24%	17%	31%
Service	44%	43%	40%	42%	38%
Blue Collar	41%	33%	36%	40%	31%
<b>OCCUPATIONAL GROUP FEMALES (AGE 16 AND OLDER)</b>					
White Collar	21%	34%	29%	19%	34%
Service	67%	58%	64%	68%	63%
Blue Collar	12%	8%	7%	13%	3%
<b>MARITAL STATUS (AGE 20 AND OLDER)</b>					
Married	48%	41%	58%	51%	56%
Widowed	5%	7%	3%	4%	7%
Divorced or Separated	18%	18%	17%	20%	13%
Never Married	30%	33%	22%	24%	23%
<b>POVERTY STATUS AND 125% OF POVERTY STATUS (AGE 20 AND OLDER)</b>					
Percent Below Poverty	34%	33%	17%	35%	20%
Percent Below Poverty (125%)	40%	39%	22%	41%	21%
<b>HOUSING TENURE</b>					
Ownership	46%	44%	58%	47%	59%
Rental	52%	53%	40%	48%	40%
<b>INCOME</b>					
Mean Household Income 1999 (Dollars)	42,249	46,401	61,519	38,584	53,465

In the following paragraphs, drawing upon the data in Table 6, we probe outmigrant profiles in the expectation of identifying the kinds of migrants that predominate among the outflows of each borough. Where are the retirees, suburbanites, opportunity-seekers, and displaced leaving from?

#### **Retirees: Manhattan, Bronx, and Brooklyn**

The outmigrant population from Manhattan had the largest percentages of those 50 years of age or older (29%) and those born in Puerto Rico (41%). It was tied with the population from Brooklyn as having the largest percentages of those not in the labor force (31%). Additionally, Manhattan's outmigrant population contained: the second-highest percentage of those with less than a high school degree (40%), after Brooklyn's (43%); the second-highest percentage who spoke English not well or not at all (17%), behind Staten Island's (23%); the third-highest poverty rate (33%), behind those from Brooklyn (35%) and the Bronx (34%); and the third-lowest mean annual household income (\$46,401), behind the populations that departed Brooklyn (\$38,584) and the Bronx (\$42,248).

Manhattan's aforementioned largest shares of those 50 and older, those born in Puerto Rico, and tie with Brooklyn for the highest percentage of Puerto Rico-born outmigrants mean that many of those who departed Manhattan for Puerto Rico belong to the *retirement stream*. The Bronx had the second-highest percentage of outmigrants over the age of 50 (25%) and Brooklyn the third-highest (25%). Most of these outmigrants also likely belong to retirement stream.

These numbers makes sense historically. Manhattan's Lower East Side, Washington Heights, and East Harlem were all major receptor sites for those rural and working-class Puerto Ricans who came to New York City prior to, during, and after the Great Migration of the 1940s and 1950s, as were Brooklyn's Williamsburg and Greenpoint neighborhoods, and the South Bronx. By the 1970s these areas were, in effect, Puerto Rican neighborhoods.<sup>28</sup>

#### **Suburbanites: Queens and Staten Island**

Queens's outmigrant population contained the largest percentages of: those between the ages of 30 and 49 (50%); those who spoke English well or very well (92%); those with the highest mean annual household income (\$61,519); and those who were employed (72%). It also contained the second-highest percentage of those born in the United States or New York (70%), behind the cohort from Staten Island (71%) and second-largest percentage of those who had some college education or more (49%), again behind the cohort from Staten Island (51%). The outmigrants who departed from Staten Island and Queens were by far the most U.S.- and New York-born and highly-educated. Another factor likely contributing to the movement of Puerto Rican residents to the suburbs from Queens and Staten Island is proximity. Queens abuts suburban Nassau County, which itself is adjacent to likewise suburban Suffolk County. The borough of Staten Island is near several suburbs in northern New Jersey.

Outmigrants from Queens also showed high instances of those characteristics that describe individuals who tend to be *suburbanites*. Queens is the likely source-borough for this stream. Individuals leaving this borough displayed: the highest percentage of middle-aged outmigrants; the highest percentage of fluent English speakers; the highest percentage of employed outmigrants; and by far the highest mean annual income. The outmigrant population of Queens finished a close second to that from Staten Island in two other categories that mark the suburbanization stream: Staten Island's

outmigrants had the largest percentage of U.S.- or New York-born individuals and the largest percentage of individuals with some college education or more.

It seems likely that Staten Island's portion of highly-educated, well-paid (\$53,465 annual mean household income), and U.S.- and New York-born Puerto Rican outmigrants, who share many characteristics with the suburbanite cohort originating in Queens, are migrating to destinations across the United States, in addition to migrating to the New York City Suburban Ring.

The data also suggest that Manhattan may be the source of a sliver of highly educated white-collar outmigrants heading for the suburbs. This is because Manhattan had the highest percentage of outmigrants with a college degree or more (25%), the second-highest percentage of white-collar outmigrants (28%), and was similar to Staten Island in having the highest percentage of female outmigrants engaged in white-collar work (34%).

#### **Opportunity-Seekers: Bronx and Brooklyn**

The outmigrant population from the Bronx had the second-highest percentage of those with a high school degree (26%), after that from Queens, while Brooklyn's had the third-highest percentage (23%). Outmigrant populations from the Bronx and Brooklyn had the second-largest percentages of those who spoke English very well or well (85%), behind that from Queens (92%).

Additionally, the outmigrant populations of Brooklyn and Staten Island contained the largest percentages of young adults (31% of each fell into the 20 to 29 age cohort), though all boroughs showed similar percentages in this category. Perhaps most significant, outmigrant populations from the Bronx and Brooklyn contained far larger percentages of blue-collar workers than other boroughs (26% and 27% respectively), a pattern that held for both genders. Though the Bronx's outmigrants contained the third-highest percentage of those who were employed (60%), Brooklyn's had the lowest percentage of employed individuals (56%). The outmigrant population from the Bronx contained the second-highest percentage of renters (52%), while Brooklyn's contained the third-highest (48%), both following the percentage of Manhattan's population who rented (53%).

Outmigrants from the Bronx and Brooklyn had relatively large proportions of those characteristics that describe the upwardly mobile *opportunity-seeker* stream, and seem to be the major source-boroughs for this population, though the data indicate that segments of this stream likely migrated from every borough.

In those categories where outmigrants from the Bronx and Brooklyn coincide with or trail those from the other boroughs (high school education, English fluency higher employment levels, and youth) there may be a number of explanations. One is that those in the suburbanization stream, who departed Queens, Staten Island, and Manhattan, bumped up the percentages in such categories as employment level and English fluency. Another is that Queens, Staten Island, and Manhattan were just as significant as or more significant than either the Bronx or Brooklyn in producing the opportunity-seeker stream. Further it is possible that there is major overlap between the demographic characteristics of the wealthier, better-educated, and oldest opportunity seekers and the lower-income, less-educated, and youngest cohort of the suburbanization stream.

At best, these are only conjectures inferred from the quantitative evidence available in this study. The link between our data and the hypothesized typology is not as clear for this outmigrant cohort as it is for the previous two cases of retirees and suburbanites. This is true also for the final group in our typology, the displaced.

**The Displaced: Brooklyn and Bronx**

By any measure, the outmigrant populations that departed Brooklyn and the Bronx were the poorest. Outmigrants from Brooklyn had by far the lowest mean annual household income (\$38,584) and the highest percentage of those living in poverty (41%). Those from the Bronx had the second-lowest mean annual income (\$42,249) and the second-highest percentage of those living in poverty (40%), making this borough a likely secondary source of the displaced. However, since former Bronxites also show a relatively higher mean annual household income and greater share of high school graduates, this may mean that many of them are *opportunity-seekers*. It also seems likely that there is some overlap between the better-off among the displacement stream and the worse-off among the opportunity-seeker stream. For some people it is a combination of pushing (rising cost of living in the city) and pulling (a serendipitous opportunity that reaches them by word of mouth, perhaps) that nudges them into exiting the city.

It is worth reminding the reader that we are talking about general patterns of association, not mutually exclusive linkages, along the three dimensions of borough of origin/migrant type/region of destination. For example, we do not deny that there were displaced outmigrants from Queens or retirees from Staten Island. By the same token, since the Bronx is the largest source-borough for the whole outmigration stream we are likely to find Bronxites well represented among the four types of leavers.

**SOURCE BOROUGHS AND RECEIVING REGIONS**

**Boroughs and Their Favorite Destinations**

In this section we break out the data on sending areas (Outmigrants by Borough of Origin) and receiving areas (Outmigrants by Region of Destination). Table 7 is a grid that describes the distribution of each borough’s outmigrant flow to the various destinations. It looks at the migrant flows from the point of view of the source-boroughs, answering the question: what proportion of each outmigrant flow ended up in the various regions of destination? For example, it tells us that of the Puerto Ricans that left Queens, the largest component (40%) went to the N.Y.C. suburbs and the smallest cohort (3%) went to Other New York State.

**TABLE 7. Distribution of Source-Borough to Regions of Destination (N=114537)**

	Borough as % of All Outmigrants	N.Y.C. Suburban Ring	Florida	Puerto Rico	New England	All Other States	Other New York State	Pennsylvania
Bronx	39%	28%	19%	19%	8%	13%	5%	8%
Manhattan	15%	21%	16%	26%	7%	20%	6%	4%
Queens	16%	40%	23%	7%	7%	17%	3%	4%
Brooklyn	27%	19%	21%	21%	9%	20%	4%	6%
Staten Island	2%	24%	15%	17%	4%	36%	3%	1%

The largest components of each outflow—that is to say, *where the strongest connections exist*—are as follows:

- Bronx: (28%) went to N.Y.C. suburbs; next largest (19%) to Florida and PR
- Manhattan: (26%) went to PR; next largest (21%) to N.Y.C. Suburbs and All Other States (20%)
- Queens: (40%) went to N.Y.C. suburbs; next largest (23%) to Florida

Brooklyn: (19%–21%) distributed to N.Y.C. suburbs, Florida, PR, and All Other States  
 Staten Island: (36%) went to All Other States; next largest (24%) to N.Y.C. suburbs

Summarizing the *strongest connections* between each source-borough and receiving area:

- Bronx → N.Y.C. Suburbs
- Manhattan → Puerto Rico
- Queens → N.Y.C. Suburbs
- Brooklyn → Four regions
- S.I. → All Other States

**Destinations and Their Most Important Source-Boroughs.**

Table 8 cross-tabulates receiving regions by source-borough. It looks at the migrant flows from the perspective of the receiving region and answers the question: what percentage of new immigrants of each receiving region comes from the various source-boroughs? This way of looking at the immigrant flow data tells us how important is each source-borough’s contribution to the overall size of newcomers (specifically, former New York City residents) to each region.

**TABLE 8. Composition of Destination by Source-Borough (N=114537)**

	Destination as % of All Outmigrants					
	Bronx	Manhattan	Queens	Brooklyn	Staten Island	
N.Y.C. Suburban Ring	42%	12%	24%	19%	2%	26%
Florida	38%	12%	19%	29%	2%	20%
Puerto Rico	40%	21%	6%	30%	2%	19%
New England	41%	14%	13%	30%	1%	8%
All Other States	31%	18%	16%	31%	5%	17%
Other New York State	41%	20%	11%	26%	2%	5%
Pennsylvania	52%	10%	10%	27%	.5%	6%

For example, it tells us that regarding the N.Y.C. Suburban Ring’s immigrants, 42% came from the Bronx and 24% came from Queens. Because the Bronx figures as the largest sending borough (39% of all outmigrants came from this borough, as we saw earlier in Table 5) it figures as the largest source-borough for all regions of destination. In the case of All Other States, the Bronx shares this status with Brooklyn. In the case of Pennsylvania, this predominance is such that ex-Bronxites form a majority (52%) of all newcomers to this state.

Identifying the two largest source boroughs—the largest contributors to the immigrant flow of each receiving area—leaves us with the following:

- N.Y.C. Suburban Ring. . . . Bronx, Queens
- Florida . . . . . Bronx, Brooklyn
- Puerto Rico . . . . . Bronx, Brooklyn
- New England . . . . . Bronx, Brooklyn
- All Other States. . . . . Bronx, Brooklyn
- Other New York State . . . Bronx, Brooklyn
- Pennsylvania. . . . . Bronx, Brooklyn

Because Bronx and Brooklyn heavily dominate as source-boroughs, it is not surprising to find these associations, and this analysis is therefore less informative than the prior discussion based on Table 7.

## DISCUSSION AND FURTHER RESEARCH

### *Suburbanization and Assimilation*

In terms of destination, the single largest group of outmigrants during the period under study consists of those Puerto Ricans who moved to the New York City Suburban Ring. We have also noted that others appear to be pursuing suburban-style living in more distant places (such as Florida and All Other States). This trend is confirmation of the argument that, for a significant fraction of the Puerto Rican Diaspora, the classic pattern of assimilation has been taking place, at least in the conventional understanding of that term. However, there is a caution to be raised in this regard.

Can it really be said that Puerto Ricans who relocate to the metropolitan ring are jettisoning their culture for the American mainstream? Despite the greater adoption of English with the passing of generations, Puerto Ricans still sponsor their own parades and social organizations in a number of towns and counties and generally resist the hyphenated (Puerto Rican-American) identity.<sup>29</sup> As has been the case with other middle-class minorities, movers to the suburbs often desire to congregate in areas populated by co-ethnics. It is quite possible that the tie between suburbanization and assimilation is not as strong as it once was in the mid-twentieth century when New York City's Irish, Jewish, and Italian residents were leaving. And as long as suburban residential segregation persists for African Americans and Latinos, and as long as minorities still find themselves concentrated in the relatively lower-income suburban areas, the economic and societal forces that historically "melted" Americans of European origin, will be too weak to replicate the assimilative process among non-European-origin minorities.

### *Suburbanization and the "Waning" of Puerto Rican New York*

Another aspect of Puerto Rican suburbanization touches upon the alleged "waning" of the Puerto Rican presence in New York City.<sup>30</sup> It seems likely that a sizeable component of the drop in inner-city Puerto Rican population during the 1990s is simply a reallocation of population to the outer ring, a feature of all the great migrations to New York City.<sup>31</sup> To what degree do Puerto Ricans living in the suburban ring commute to work as teachers, health care employees, civil servants, and small business owners? To what degree do they continue to participate in the social, economic, and cultural life of the city's Puerto Rican community? To the extent that the metropolis continues to be a center of economic, cultural, and political activity for many of these outmigrants then aren't declarations of Puerto Rican decline overdrawn?

It is likely that Puerto Ricans will continue to be an important presence for the foreseeable future in the New York City metropolitan area (the five boroughs and the suburbs). Perhaps it is thought that shifting compositions in the Latino population is a zero sum game. We see a dramatic expansion of Dominican, Mexican, and Colombian communities, for example, that deepens their imprint on the New York landscape. Perhaps some interpret this as coming at the expense of a decline in some other Latino component (i.e., Puerto Ricans). In reality, this speaks to the continuing enlargement of a Latino presence and contribution in the New York metropolitan context.

### *Displacement and the Poor*

For those at the other end of the socioeconomic spectrum—the displaced—leaving New York has not freed them from poverty conditions. Outmigrants to New England,

Pennsylvania, and Other New York State experience poverty at greater rates (42%, 42%, and 54% respectively) than is the case for typical New York Puerto Ricans who remained behind (32% among stayers, as reported in Table 2). For residents in smaller, de-industrializing Northeastern towns and cities, where they continue to face unemployment, crime, and poor housing, relocation did not deliver substantial improvements in socioeconomic wellbeing.<sup>32</sup>

This reality harkens back to the original Puerto Rican migration to New York City. During the postwar period the newcomers arrived just as the city was beginning to transition from a manufacturing-based economy. Is the experience of the 1940s and 1950s to be repeated today in cities such as Waterbury, Bridgeport, Springfield, and Bethlehem? These cities were already entering a post-industrial phase at this time. Absent a serious regional effort to revitalize these local economies there will be no viable prospects for stable livelihoods for these modern-day migrants of the Puerto Rican Diaspora.<sup>33</sup>

It is also troubling that those who end up in Puerto Rico encounter even higher levels of economic distress, as evidenced by high rates of poverty and unemployment. Whether this represents predominantly seniors who are retiring or younger displaced families is not clear from our data.

### ***Racial and Gender Dimensions***

Racial and cultural dimensions are other aspects deserving attention. To what extent do these factors *deter* outmigration among Puerto Ricans? Do non-white (those who self-define as black or some other race) Puerto Ricans with the economic wherewithal and educational background refrain from moving to the suburbs (or for that matter, refrain from opportunity-seeking relocation) because of fear of discrimination? Do those with language-dominance in Spanish behave similarly? We have seen evidence of differential racial self-identification among outmigrants. A much larger component of those going to Puerto Rico and Florida are white, in contrast to those going everywhere else (especially to New England and Other New York State). How much of this difference reflects subjective self-identification mediated by generational differences in conceptions of race? How much of this difference is objective? How different are these comparisons among those who self-identify as other? These questions are worth exploring in further work.<sup>33</sup>

The same applies to the gender dimension of the outmigration experience. We have reported the differential patterns with regard to occupational structures. Additional data, reported in the appendices, indicate that females are slightly more overrepresented among the flows to the high-poverty regions of destination (New England, Pennsylvania, and Other New York State). Is there an association to be discovered between single head-of-household females and poverty in this instance? On the other hand, males are slightly overrepresented among the cohort leaving for Puerto Rico, and Puerto Rico is where the highest rates of migrant poverty are to be found. It seems males tend toward Puerto Rico and females tend to stay in the Northeast. What might account for this?

### ***Further Research***

There are a number of directions for further research and the authors hope others will join in this effort. Some possible lines of exploration include:

- Examine the accuracy of our migrant typology by determining the major reasons for Puerto Rican outmigration from New York City. Since census data does not provide sufficient information at the individual level to conduct such a test (for

example, it doesn't directly ask why a person left his/her previous residence) in-depth interviewing and qualitative studies are the more appropriate method.

- Extend the period of analysis backward (1985–1990) and forward (2005–2010, with the upcoming census) to capture long-term patterns of outmigration from the city. Tracing changes in the city's economy and politics would help contextualize the forces driving outmigration.
- Compare the Puerto Rican story with Cuban, Dominican, and other Latino outmigration experiences. Are the reasons propelling other groups' movements the same, and are they going to similar regions? Similarly, it might be informative to conduct comparative analysis with African Americans.<sup>34</sup>

## **APPENDIX A: COMPARATIVE PROFILE OF OUTMIGRANTS WITH REGARD TO THEIR REGION OF DESTINATION (SEE TABLE 4)**

### **Gender, Race, and Place of Birth**

- Females predominate more strongly among outmigrant flows to New England (54%), Pennsylvania (53%), and Other New York State (53%). Males are half the population moving to Puerto Rico, the largest proportion of any outmigrant flow.
- The percentage of those who self-defined as white was highest among Puerto Rico (78%) and Florida (60%).
- For those who self-defined as some other race the proportion was highest among New England (53%), Pennsylvania (50%), and All Other States (39%).
- Among those who self-defined as two or more races the highest percentage was among All Other States (13%) and Other New York State (10%).
- For those who self-defined as black, the percentage was highest among All Other States (10%), Other New York State (8%), and Puerto Rico (7%).
- The majority of outmigrants were born in New York State (58%). These were followed by those born in Puerto Rico (36%) and those born in other parts of the U.S. (5%).
- The ratio of New York-born outmigrants is highest among the N.Y.C. suburban group (73%), followed by those born in All Other States (69%), and Other New York State (65%).
- The percentage of outmigrants who were born in Puerto Rico is highest among those who left for Puerto Rico (74%), New England (37%), and Pennsylvania (31%), respectively.

### **Age, Education, and Language**

- Among outmigrants (age 20 and older), the largest cohorts were as follows: 30 to 39 (30%), 20 to 29 (29%), and 55 and older (19%).
- Two-thirds of outmigrants to the N.Y.C. suburbs are 39 years or younger, and this proportion is similar for those who left for New England, Pennsylvania, and the rest of New York.
- At the other end of the age spectrum, almost half of outmigrants to Puerto Rico (49%) were 50 or older. No other region of destination approaches this proportion of more elderly outmigrants.
- More than a third (38%) of all outmigrants have at least some college, and more than a third (37%) never completed high school.
- The most highly educated group of migrants are those going to the N.Y.C. Suburban Ring (52% have either some college or college and more) and those going to All Other States (51% have some college or college and more).

- The majority of those going to Puerto Rico (54%) and New England (52%) have less than a high school education.
- Two-thirds of all outmigrants speak English very well; one out of twenty (5%) not at all.
- Outmigrants to N.Y.C. Suburban, to Other New York State, and to All Other States all speak English either very well or well (92% combined for each), in contrast to those moving to Puerto Rico, of whom only two-thirds (66%) speak English with this level of fluency.

#### **Employment Status and Occupation**

- Outmigrants who ended up in N.Y.C. Suburban (74%), Florida (68%), and All Other States (68%) evidenced the highest employment rates, in contrast to those moving to Puerto Rico (34%) and New England (43%) who had the lowest proportions.
- As to occupational distribution all outmigrants are distributed in the following pattern: service-collar (54%), blue-collar (25%), and white-collar (22%).
- The proportion of white-collar workers is highest among those who moved to N.Y.C. Suburban (31%), All Other States (22%), and Florida (19%) respectively. It is lowest among those outmigrants to New England (12%), Pennsylvania (14%), and Other New York State (15%).
- The ratio of service workers to all workers is highest among outmigrants to Other New York State (61%) and Florida (59%), and lowest among Puerto Rico (48%) and N.Y.C. Suburban Ring (50%).
- The ratio of blue-collar workers is highest among those moving to Puerto Rico (35%) and Pennsylvania (35%). It is lowest among those moving to N.Y.C. Suburban (19%) and All Other States (22%).

#### **Marital Status, Poverty, Housing Tenure, and Household Income**

- Half of all outmigrants 20 and over were married (49%), the next largest group consisting of persons never married (27%).
- It is among those outmigrants moving to the N.Y.C. suburbs and Florida where we see the highest rates of marriage (58% and 52% respectively).
- Those who have never been married form the largest proportion of those going to Other New York State (47%) and of those going to Pennsylvania (41%).
- It is among those going to Puerto Rico (22%) and Florida (19%) where we see the highest proportions of divorced or separated individuals.
- The incidence of poverty is highest among those leaving for Puerto Rico (59%) and to Other New York State (54%) and lowest among the N.Y.C. Suburban Ring (13%) and Florida (19%) cohorts.
- Looking at outmigrant residential status in their new homes in 2000, we find that those who moved to N.Y.C. suburbs (65%) and Puerto Rico (62%) were more likely than any other outmigrant stream to be homeowners.
- In contrast, those moving to New England (84%) and Pennsylvania (73%) were more likely than any other stream to be renters.
- Regarding mean household income, outmigrants to suburban New York City had the highest (\$74,206), followed by the All Other States (\$46,515), and Florida (\$44,493) cohorts.
- Outmigrants to Puerto Rico (\$18,264) and Other New York State (\$26,490) had the lowest incomes.

## APPENDIX B: COMPARATIVE PROFILE OF OUTMIGRANTS WITH REGARD TO THEIR BOROUGH OF ORIGIN (SEE TABLE 6)

### Gender, Race, and Place of Birth

- Females predominated most strongly among outmigrant flows from Staten Island (59%) and the Bronx (52%). Males were half the population departing from Manhattan, the largest proportion to depart from any borough.
- Percentages of those who self-identified as white were highest among outmigrants who departed Manhattan and Staten Island (58% each).
- The largest percentages of self-identified members of some other race departed from the Bronx (34%) and Brooklyn (32%).
- The largest proportions of members of two or more races departed from Queens (9%) and Brooklyn (8%).
- The largest proportions of self-identified black outmigrants departed from the Bronx (8%) and Manhattan (7%).
- Most outmigrants were born in New York. The highest percentages of New York-born outmigrants departed from Staten Island (67%) and Queens (65%). The second-largest proportion of outmigrants was born in Puerto Rico, with the highest percentages having departed Manhattan (41%), Brooklyn (37%), and the Bronx (36%).

### Age, Education, and Language

- More than half of all outmigrants (age 20 and older) were between the ages of 20 and 39.
- The majority of those who departed from Brooklyn and Staten Island were between the ages of 20 and 29 (31% each), followed closely by those leaving Manhattan (30%), while the largest proportions of outmigrants between the ages of 30 and 39 departed from Staten Island (35%) and Queens (33%).
- The largest percentage of outmigrants aged 50 and older departed from Manhattan (29%), the Bronx (26%), and Brooklyn (25%).
- The largest percentages of outmigrants with less than a high school education departed from Brooklyn (43%), Manhattan (40%), and the Bronx (37%).
- The majority of outmigrants from Staten Island (51%) had some college education, a college degree, or a graduate or professional degree, while nearly half of those from Queens (49%) had the same credentials.
- The majority of outmigrants from Queens spoke English well or very well (92% combined), followed by those from Bronx and Brooklyn (85% combined for each), while relatively large percentages of those who left Staten Island (23%) and Manhattan (17%) spoke English poorly or not at all.

### Employment Status and Occupation

- Outmigrants from Queens and Staten Island were employed at much higher rates (72% and 69% respectively) than those from Brooklyn (56%), Manhattan (57%), and the Bronx (60%). These three latter boroughs also saw the departure of the largest percentages of those outmigrants not participating in the labor force (35%, 35%, and 31%, respectively).
- Nearly one-tenth of all outmigrants from Brooklyn and Staten Island were unemployed (9% each).
- The proportions of white-collar workers are largest among those who outmigrated from Staten Island (32%), Manhattan (28%), and Queens (26%).

- One half or more of all outmigrants from every borough worked in the service industry, with the Bronx and Brooklyn having the highest percentages (55% each).
- The largest proportions of blue-collar outmigrants departed from Brooklyn (27%) and the Bronx (26%).

#### **Marital Status, Poverty, Housing Tenure, and Household Income**

- The largest shares of married outmigrants departed from Queens (58%) and Staten Island (56%).
- The largest proportions of divorced or separated outmigrants departed from Brooklyn (20%) and the Bronx and Manhattan (18% each).
- The largest proportions of those who were never married departed from Manhattan (33%) and the Bronx (30%).
- Poverty levels were highest for outmigrants who departed from Brooklyn (35%) and the Bronx (34%) and lowest for those who left Queens (17%) and Staten Island (20%).
- The largest proportions of outmigrants who owned homes came from Staten Island (59%) and Queens (58%), while the largest proportions of renters departed from Manhattan (53%) and the Bronx (52%).
- Outmigrants who departed from Queens (\$61,519) and Staten Island (\$53,465) had the highest mean annual household incomes.
- Outmigrants with the lowest mean annual incomes came from Brooklyn (\$38,584) and the Bronx (\$42,249).

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> This report is part of a series of studies produced by the Center for Puerto Rican Studies that looks at various aspects of sociodemographic trends in the Puerto Rican Diaspora. These studies, accessible on the Centro website ([www.centropr.org](http://www.centropr.org)), examine issues of residential segregation, community formation, health status, and education. The authors thank Peter Lobo, Omar Ortiz, Joseph Pereira, Thalia MacMillan, and Gabriel Aquino for their assistance with this project, and Carlos Vargas-Ramos for his careful review of a prior draft.

<sup>2</sup> Edna Acosta-Belén and Carlos E. Santiago, *Puerto Ricans in the United States: A Contemporary Portrait* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2006), 83, Table 4.4. On 2006 population, U.S. Mainland American Community Survey retrieved March 11, 2008, at: <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

<sup>3</sup> Francisco L. Rivera-Batiz and Carlos E. Santiago, *Island Paradox: Puerto Rico in the 1990s* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1996), chapter 3.

<sup>4</sup> Acosta-Belén and Santiago, 2006, 81, Table 4.2.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 47.

<sup>6</sup> For 1970–2000 comparisons see Acosta-Belén and Santiago, 2006, 87, Fig. 4.2 and 90, Fig. 4.4.

<sup>7</sup> On Circular Migration: Marta Tienda and William Diaz, “Puerto Rican Circular Migration,” *New York Times*, August 28, 1987; Clara E. Rodríguez, “Circulating Migration,” *Journal of Hispanic Policy*, Vol. 3, January 1988, 5–9; Jorge Duany, *The Puerto Rican Nation on the Move* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 32–33. On commuter migration (posited by its theorists as a more intensive variation of circular migration): Carlos Antonio Torre, Hugo Rodríguez Vecchini, and William Burgos, eds., *The Commuter Nation: Perspectives on Puerto Rican Migration* (Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1994).

<sup>8</sup> Acosta-Belén and Santiago, 2006, 98.

<sup>9</sup> *Puerto Rican New Yorkers in 1990* (The City of New York: Department of City Planning, 1994), 109, 116.

<sup>10</sup> On migrating from New York City to Puerto Rico: Francisco L. Rivera-Batiz, “Puerto Rican

New Yorkers in the 1990s: A Demographic and Socioeconomic Profile,” 110–1, in Gabriel Haslip-Viera, Angelo Falcón, and Félix Matos Rodríguez, eds., *Boricuas in Gotham: Puerto Ricans in the Making of Modern New York City* (Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2004); Mireya Navarro, “FALLING BACK: A special report.; Puerto Rican Presence Wanes in New York,” *The New York Times*, February 28, 2000.

<sup>11</sup> On rising education levels and jobs: Acosta-Belén and Santiago, 2006, 124–6, Table 5.7; Rivera-Batíz and Santiago, 1994, 89, Table 6.6, 90; Rivera-Batíz, 2004, 119, Table 9, in Haslip-Viera, Falcón, and Matos Rodríguez, 2004. On the U.S.-born versus Puerto Rico-born comparison: “Puerto Ricans born in the 50 states made striking economic gains in the 1980s—so striking that, by one measure, their income now surpasses that of Hispanic residents generally and of American-born blacks, a new national study has concluded. But those who migrated to the mainland from Puerto Rico lag behind mainland-born Puerto Ricans in income, education and employment.” Sam Roberts, “Puerto Ricans on Mainland Making Gains, Study Finds,” *The New York Times*, October 19, 1994, 1.

<sup>12</sup> *Puerto Rican New Yorkers in 1990* (The City of New York: Department of City Planning, 1994), 117.

<sup>13</sup> John Kasarda, “Industrial Restructuring and the Changing Location of Jobs” in Reynolds Farley, ed., *State of the Union: America in the 1990s. Volume Two: Social Trends* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation: 1995).

<sup>14</sup> Matt Foulkes and K. Bruce Newbold, “Migration Propensities, Patterns, and the Role of Human Capital: Comparing Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Interstate Migration, 1985–1990,” *Professional Geographer*, 52 (1) 2000, 141.

<sup>15</sup> Bureau of the U.S. Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1) – 100-Percent data and Census 2000 Summary File (SF 1) 100-Percent Data retrieved June 3, 2008, at: <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

<sup>16</sup> *Puerto Rican New Yorkers in 1990* (The City of New York: Department of City Planning, 1994), 113.

<sup>17</sup> Gilbert Marzán, “Still Looking for that Elsewhere: Puerto Rican Poverty and Migration in the Northeast,” *CENTRO Journal*, forthcoming.

<sup>18</sup> On Puerto Ricans and the decline of manufacturing jobs in New York City see: Acosta-Belén and Santiago, 2006, 132; *Puerto Rican New Yorkers in 1990* (The City of New York: Department of City Planning, 1994), 109; Andrés Torres, *Between Melting Pot and Mosaic: African Americans and Puerto Ricans in the New York Political Economy* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995), 66, 87.

<sup>19</sup> Andrés Torres and Frank Bonilla, “Decline Within Decline: The New York Perspective,” 96, in Rebecca Morales and Frank Bonilla, eds., *Latinos in a Changing U.S. Economy: Comparative Perspectives on Growing Inequality* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1993).

<sup>20</sup> Acosta-Belén and Santiago, 2006, 95; Susan S. Baker, *Understanding Mainland Puerto Rican Poverty*. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press: 2002), 172; Jorge Duany and Félix V. Matos Rodríguez, “Puerto Ricans in Orlando and Central Florida,” Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños, Hunter College (CUNY), Policy Report, Vol.1, No.1, Spring 2006, 29.

<sup>21</sup> Our thanks to Dr. Joseph Pereira, Director of the CUNY Data Service, for providing us with a customized file of the 2000 Census PUMS file to work with. The dataset for outmigrants contains records for 5,412 persons. These were weighted to generate a more representative sample of outmigrants, totaling 114,537.

<sup>22</sup> Foulkes and Newbold, 2000, 134, 138–9, Figure 1; *Puerto Rican New Yorkers in 1990*. (The City of New York: Department of City Planning, 1994), 111, 120, Figure 9.1.

<sup>23</sup> Our definition of the suburban ring includes the following counties: Nassau and Suffolk (comprising Long Island); Westchester, Dutchess, Rockland, Orange, and Putnam (in Southeastern New York State), and fourteen counties in the northern half of New Jersey, stretching as far down as Mercer and Monmouth counties. The city of Trenton, for example, is located in Mercer

County. Excluded from this definition, and counted in standard definitions of the Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA) for New York City are two counties in Connecticut, New Haven and Fairfield. Our assumption is that these counties have a more logical association with the rest of New England. The remaining counties in Southern New Jersey (including the city of Camden) are included in the region All Other States. For discussions of how definitions of the New York City suburban boundary have evolved over time see: Andrew Beveridge, "Is There Still a New York Metropolitan," *Gotham Gazette*, January, 2003, accessed at <http://gothamgazette.com/article/demographics/20030113/5/125>.

<sup>24</sup> The data set sample for stayers is drawn from the 2000 PUMS and consists of Puerto Ricans who reported living in New York City during 1995–2000.

<sup>25</sup> Baker, 2002, Chapter 6; Department of City Planning, 1993, 117–8; Rivera-Batíz and Santiago, 1994, 146.

<sup>26</sup> These numbers are similar to New York City's Puerto Rican population proportions by borough, which for Census 2000 are as follows: Bronx 40%; Manhattan 15%; Queens 14%; Brooklyn 27%; and Staten Island 4%. Bureau of the U.S. Census, Census 2000 Summary File 2(SF 2) and Summary File 4 (SF 4) retrieved June 2, 2008, at: <http://factfinder.census.gov>.

<sup>27</sup> Ofelia García, José Luis Morín, and Klaudia Rivera, "How Threatened is the Spanish of New York Puerto Ricans? Language Shift with vaivén," 44–73, in Joshua A. Fishman, ed., *Can Threatened Languages be Saved? Reversing Language Shift Revisited* (Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters), 59.

<sup>28</sup> Acosta-Belén and Santiago, 2006, 85.

<sup>29</sup> Lourdes Torres, *Puerto Rican Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Study of a New York Suburb* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1997), 3, 4; Allison Steele, "Perth Amboy Names Street for Puerto Ricans," *The Star Ledger*, January, 24, 2008; "Annual Puerto Rican Parade Floats Through Newark," *The Star Ledger*, September 16, 2007; Seth Kugel, "Traditional Puerto Rican Music Finds a Home in New Jersey," *The New York Times*, November 23, 2003.

<sup>30</sup> Navarro, February 28, 2000. For two vigorously dissenting views on the "waning" thesis, see the chapters by Falcón and Rodríguez in Haslip-Viera, Falcón, and Matos Rodríguez, eds., 2004.

<sup>31</sup> On socioeconomic conditions for Puerto Ricans in Northeastern Towns: Francisco L. Rivera-Batíz and Carlos Santiago, *Puerto Ricans in the United States: A Changing Reality* (Washington D.C.: the National Puerto Rican Coalition, Inc., 1994), 34, 35, Table 3.7, 36, 47, 48, Table 4.5, 49; Acosta-Belén and Santiago, 2006, 137, Table 5.11, 138.

<sup>32</sup> Marzán, forthcoming.

<sup>33</sup> For an analysis of patterns of concentration and segregation throughout the Puerto Rican Diaspora see: Carlos Vargas-Ramos, "Settlement Patterns and Residential Segregation of Puerto Ricans in the United States," Hunter College (CUNY), Policy Report, Vol.1, No.2, Fall 2006.

<sup>34</sup> Kevin E. McHugh, "Black Migration Reversal in the United States," *Geographical Review*, 77 (2) April 1987, 173, 178, 180–2.





**Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños  
Hunter College (CUNY)**

695 Park Avenue, Room E-1429

New York, New York 10065

212.772.5686

[www.centropr.org](http://www.centropr.org)