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### Immigrants by Year of Admission
#### United States and New York City
#### 1946-1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Period</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>ANNUAL AVERAGE</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>ANNUAL AVERAGE</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
<th>NEW YORK CITY AS A % OF THE UNITED STATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Immigrants</td>
<td>19,239,242</td>
<td>614,900</td>
<td>153,725</td>
<td>3,206,299</td>
<td>129,077</td>
<td>32,269</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1949</td>
<td>614,900</td>
<td>153,725</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>470,597</td>
<td>47,060</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>2,499,288</td>
<td>249,927</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>575,570</td>
<td>57,557</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>4,336,001</td>
<td>433,600</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>684,819</td>
<td>85,602</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1989*</td>
<td>4,726,165</td>
<td>590,771</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>562,988</td>
<td>112,598</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1994</td>
<td>3,849,159</td>
<td>769,832</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data are not available for New York City for 1980 or 1981; U.S. and N.Y.C. are compared only for 1982-89. The full decade (1980-89) figure for the U.S. was 5,853,404.

Sources: Unpublished INS data, 1946-81 and Annual Immigrant Tape Files, 1982-94 U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service
Population Division • New York City Department of City Planning

---

### Immigrants Admitted to New York City
#### 1946–1994*

*Data for 1980 and 1981 are not available for New York City

---
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OVERALL FLOWS

- Immigration to New York City in the 1990-94 period stood at 113,000 annually, a 32% increase over the average of 86,000 in the 1980s.

- The city received 15 percent of all immigrants to the U.S., unchanged from the 1980s.

- While immigration to New York increased, it was still lower than the highs at the turn of the century. Flows to New York State (information for New York City is not available) in the first decade of this century stood at 260,000 immigrants annually, compared to only 170,000 annually in the 1990s.
Immigrants Admitted by Area of the World
New York City and the United States
1990–94
AREA OF THE WORLD

- The Caribbean accounted for 33% of the flow to New York City, down from 40 percent in the 1980s.

- Immigration from the Hispanic Caribbean (primarily from the Dominican Republic) increased in the 1990s, accounting for 20 percent of the flow to the city. Both the share and number of nonhispanic Caribbean immigrants (primarily from Jamaica and Haiti) declined during this period.

- Asia accounted for 26 percent of all immigrants.

- The share of European immigrants has more than doubled, from 9% in the 1980s to 22% in the 1990s.

- South America accounted for 12% of the flow and Africa for 2%.

- Traditionally, immigrants to the city have been disproportionately from the Caribbean and South America relative to the nation, which has been more likely to get immigrants from Asia and Mexico (Other North America).
Top Source Countries of Immigrants
New York City and the United States
1990–94

New York City
Total = 562,988

- Dominican Republic 19.6%
- China, Total 10.6%
- Jamaica 5.8%
- Guyana 5.5%
- Former Soviet Union 11.8%
- Other 46.7%

United States
Total = 3,849,159

- Mexico 10.8%
- China, Total 8.6%
- Philippines 7.4%
- Vietnam 7.3%
- Other 59.5%

Immigrants Admitted from the Top 20 Source Countries to New York City and the United States
1990–94

New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Immigrants</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>110,140</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Soviet Union</td>
<td>66,301</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China, Total</td>
<td>59,798</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>32,918</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>30,764</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>19,537</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>17,378</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad &amp; Tobago</td>
<td>15,878</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>14,957</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>14,486</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>13,980</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>12,403</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>11,309</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>9,556</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>8,626</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>7,465</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>6,275</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>6,182</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>5,935</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>4,827</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Immigrants</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Top 20 Source Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>416,769</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China, Total</td>
<td>331,630</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>286,152</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>282,625</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Soviet Union</td>
<td>247,764</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>199,014</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>169,367</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>110,531</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>104,083</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>89,414</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>84,937</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>81,312</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>74,942</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>74,004</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>60,797</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>56,979</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>54,683</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>49,405</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>46,121</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>45,106</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOP SOURCE COUNTRIES TO NEW YORK CITY AND TO THE U.S.

- The top senders of immigrants to New York City were the Dominican Republic (20%), the former Soviet Union (12%), China (11%), Jamaica and Guyana (6% each).

- Compared to the 1980s, immigration to the city from the former Soviet Union increased by nearly 900 percent. Flows from the Dominican Republic increased by over 50 percent.

- Jamaica saw a 27% decline in immigration to the city, dropping from second place in the 1980s to fourth place in the 1990s. Part of this decline was due to the increased proclivity of Jamaican immigrants to settle outside the city.

- Ireland and Bangladesh moved into the list of top 20 sending countries to the city in the 1990s.

- Poland, which ranked 18th on the top sender list to the city in the 1980s, now ranks 6th.

- The source country composition of immigrants to New York City is unique, relative to that for the nation. Mexico, the number one source of immigrants to the U.S., and Vietnam, the fourth largest, were not among the top 20 source countries of immigrants to New York City.

- El Salvador, Iran, Canada, and Cuba were the other top 20 source countries for the U.S. that were not on New York City’s top 20 list.

- Recent immigrants were much younger than the general population. The median age of an immigrant to New York City was 27 years, compared to 34 years for the general population.

- Female immigrants increasingly outnumber male immigrants to the city.

- The occupational distribution of immigrant males was similar in some respects to that for all males in the city. The percentages in professional (18%) and service (18%) occupations were similar to the percentages for all city residents.

- Among females, the occupational distribution was substantially different from that for all city residents. The percentage of female immigrants in professional (30%) and service (24%) occupations were well in excess of the percentages for all city workers.
Average Annual Nonfamily Immigration by Class of Admission
New York City: 1982-89 and 1990-94

Diversity Immigrants Admitted by Country of Birth
New York City: 1990–94

Total Diversity Immigrants = 34,996
IMMIGRATION LAW

• Immigration law was overhauled in 1990. The new law:
  maintained the priority given to family reunification.
  placed an increased premium on skilled employment. Nearly 11,000 immigrants entered
  with employment visas every year in the 1990s compared to 6,700 in the 1980.
  made provisions for "legalization dependents," spouses and minor children of formerly
  undocumented immigrants who were amnestied under the 1986 Immigration Reform and
  Control Act (IRCA). Nearly 2,300 immigrants came to the city annually under this pro-
  vision in the 1990s.
  sought to expand the sources of immigration through a "diversity program." Nearly 7,000
  "diversity" immigrants came to the city annually in the 1990s, compared to under 400 in
  the 1980s. In the 1990s, flows from Ireland, Poland, Japan, and Bangladesh increased as
  a result of the diversity program (lower figure).

• Immigration to the city also increased as a result of the growth in refugee flows, which
  increased from 4,400 annually in the 1980s to 15,000 in the 1990s.

• IRCA resulted in "seed immigration" from Senegal, Ghana, Nigeria, Mexico, Guatemala,
  Egypt, and Bangladesh. These nations gained a foothold in the city, from which further
  immigration has emanated in the 1990s.
Immigrants Admitted by Borough
New York City: 1990–94

- Brooklyn 35.4%
- Bronx 13.6%
- Staten Island 1.5%
- Manhattan 19.7%
- Queens 29.9%

Total Immigration = 562,988
SETTLEMENT PATTERNS BY BOROUGH

- Nearly two-thirds of all entering immigrants in the 1990-94 period settled in Brooklyn and Queens. Manhattan absorbed 20 percent of the flow, 14 percent settled in the Bronx, and 2 percent settled in Staten Island.

- The Dominican Republic alone accounted for 40% of the flow to Manhattan and to the Bronx.

- Immigrants from the former Soviet Union comprised 25% of the flow to Brooklyn.

- While no country dominated the flow to Queens or Staten Island, China was the largest sender, accounting for 12 percent of the flow to Queens and 11 percent to Staten Island.
Residential Settlement of Immigrants by ZIP Code
New York City: 1990-94

Source: Annual Immigrant Tape Files, 1990-94, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service
Population Division • New York City Department of City Planning
NEIGHBORHOODS OF SETTLEMENT

- The top three immigrant-receiving neighborhoods in the city in the 1990-94 period were Washington Heights (28,800) and Chinatown and vicinity (19,100) in Manhattan, and Gravesend-Homcrest (15,800) in Brooklyn.

- Other neighborhoods in Brooklyn that absorbed more than 10,000 immigrants during this period were Bay Ridge-Bensonhurst, Flatbush, Sheepshead Bay-Brighton Beach, Crown Heights, Midwood, and Sunset Park-Industry City.

- In the borough of Queens, Flushing, Astoria, Elmhurst, Corona, and Woodside each received more than 10,000 immigrants between 1990-94.
Residential Settlement of Dominican Immigrants by ZIP Code
New York City: 1990-94

DOMINICANS 1990-94
- 6,000 and over
- 3,000 to 5,999
- 1,000 to 2,999
- 250 to 999
- Under 250

Source: Annual Immigrant Tape Files, 1990-94, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service
Population Division • New York City Department of City Planning
SETTLEMENT PATTERNS OF DOMINICAN IMMIGRANTS

• The Dominican Republic, the leading source of immigrants to New York City, sent 110,100 immigrants in the 1990-94 period. This represented a 52 percent increase over the annual flows in the 1980s.

• Forty-one percent of these immigrants (44,600) settled in Manhattan, 28 percent in the Bronx, 18 percent in Brooklyn, and 14 percent in Queens.

• As a result of the surge in immigration, there has been an increase in the Dominican character of northern Manhattan, which absorbed over one-third of the Dominican flow in the 1990s. Washington Heights alone absorbed 23,700 immigrants, or 22 percent of the Dominican flow to the city, followed by Hamilton Heights (six percent), and Inwood (five percent).

• Due to a lack of available housing in northern Manhattan, there has been a continuous flow of Dominicans to the west Bronx. In the 1990-94 period, many entering Dominican immigrants went directly to the west Bronx neighborhoods of Highbridge (4,200), Morris Heights (3,800), University Heights (3,500), and Tremont-East Tremont (2,800).

• Other major neighborhoods of settlement were Corona in Queens and Williamsburg in Brooklyn.
Residential Settlement of Immigrants from the Former Soviet Union by ZIP Code
New York City: 1990-94

Source: Annual Immigrant Tape Files, 1990-94, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service
Population Division • New York City Department of City Planning
SETTLEMENT PATTERNS OF IMMIGRANTS FROM THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

• During the period 1990-94, 66,300 immigrants from the former Soviet Union made their home in New York City. This constituted a ten fold increase from the annual flow in the 1980s.

• Brooklyn alone absorbed 75 percent of the flow. The major neighborhoods of settlement included Gravesend-Homecrest (10,200), Sheepshead Bay-Brighton Beach (8,900), Bay Ridge-Bensonhurst (7,400), and Midwood (6,600). These four Brooklyn neighborhoods together accounted for one-half of the total flow of former Soviets to the city.

• Flows to these neighborhoods resulted in a significant demographic impact. For example, the 10,200 immigrants from the former Soviet Union who entered Gravesend-Homecrest between 1990-94 comprised seven percent of the neighborhood's 1990 population, and 71 percent of its 1990 Russian/Ukrainian inhabitants.

• Flows in the 1990-94 period to Sheepshead Bay-Brighton Beach, Midwood, and Bay Ridge-Bensonhurst constituted two-thirds or more of the 1990 Russian/Ukrainian population in these neighborhoods.

• Queens absorbed 12,200 or 18 percent of immigrants from the former Soviet Union. Forest Hills-Kew Gardens received 3,500 while 2,400 settled in Rego Park.
Residential Settlement of Chinese* Immigrants by ZIP Code
New York City: 1990-94

CHINESE 1990-94

- 3,500 and over
- 2,000 to 3,499
- 1,000 to 1,999
- 250 to 999
- Under 250

*Includes Mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong

Source: Annual Immigrant Tape Files, 1990-94, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service
Population Division • New York City Department of City Planning
SETTLEMENT PATTERNS OF IMMIGRANTS FROM CHINA

- China (includes the mainland, Hong Kong, and Taiwan), the third largest sender to the city, sent 60,000 immigrants, a 33 percent increase over the annual flows in the 1980s. These immigrants were nearly evenly distributed between Manhattan (35 percent), Queens (34 percent), and Brooklyn (26 percent).

- The largest number settled in Chinatown: this neighborhood alone absorbed nearly one-quarter of the entire Chinese flow. The 14,600 Chinese who settled there between 1990 and 1994 constituted 12 percent of the neighborhood's 1990 population and 30 percent of its Chinese population.

- In Queens, over 4,200 Chinese immigrants settled in Flushing, while Elmhurst absorbed 2,900 immigrants. Flushing saw the borough's largest increase in Chinese immigration compared to the flow in the 1980s.

- Sunset Park-Industry City saw the largest increase in Chinese settlement in Brooklyn: it absorbed 3,100 immigrants between 1990-94. Other neighborhoods that absorbed a large number of Chinese immigrants were Bay Ridge-Bensonhurst (2,100) and Gravesend-Homecrest (1,900).

- The "Total Chinese" flow is heavily dominated by those born in Mainland China who comprised 79 percent of the "Total Chinese" entering between 1990 and 1994; those from Hong Kong accounted for 13 percent while Taiwanese constituted only eight percent.

- Chinatown was the principal destination for immigrants from Mainland China and Hong Kong, absorbing 27 percent and 22 percent, respectively, of their flows between 1990 and 1994. In contrast, Taiwanese immigrants gravitated toward Flushing, which settled 22 percent of the flow.
Percent Change in Population by Decade
Actual and Hypothetical Change
New York City: 1950–1990

[Diagram showing percent change by decade with actual change and change without immigration indicated]

Actual Change  Change, without immigration
IMPACT OF IMMIGRANTS ON THE CITY'S POPULATION

- Given the substantial out-migration from the city, immigrant flows have helped shore up the city's population over the past four decades.

- Between 1970 and 1980, the city lost over 10 percent of its population. Were it not for the entry of 783,000 immigrants in the 1970s, the city's population would have declined by 20 percent.

- With the 856,000 immigrants who entered in the 1980s, the city's population grew by 3.5%. In the absence of these immigrants, the city's population would have seen a decline of close to 9 percent.

- Immigrant fertility also greatly affects the city's population growth. In general, immigrants are more youthful and have higher fertility. For example in 1990, foreign-born women constituted 29 percent of all women in the city but accounted for 43 percent of all births to city residents.

- As of 1995, while an estimated 33 percent of the city's population was foreign-born, an additional 20 percent were the U.S.-born offspring of immigrants. Thus, immigrants and their children comprise a majority of the city's population.
Population Change for Top U.S. Cities*
1970–1990

*With a population over 500,000 in 1950

Foreign-Born Population in Major Cities*
1970 and 1990

*With a population over 500,000 in 1950