

IN the Spotlight:

Older Age Groups Expanding Fastest

The recently released Census 2000 data on the age composition of Indiana's population invites analysis and some speculation.

Figure 1 shows the changes in population by age group. The greatest change, both in number of people and percent change, was 246,000 (43%) in the 45 to 54 age group, those born 1946 to 1955. This was the great baby boom. The next youngest group, also part of that demographic surge, was born between 1956 and 1965. These Hoosiers were 35 to 44 years old in


2000 and represent an increase of 142,000 (17%).

However, if we examine the percentage changes, older Hoosiers also had impressive gains. Those 75 to 84 (born 1916 to 1925) grew by 20%, and those 85 and older (born 1915 and earlier) increased by 28%.

These changes help us understand many of the economic forces of the 1990s in Indiana. Greater pressure on the health care industry is one obvious consequence of the high growth rates for our older population. At the same

(continued on page 2)

Figure 1: Changes in Indiana's Age Groups, 1990-2000
Older age groups growing faster than young age groups



INSIDE *this issue:*

- **IN THE SPOTLIGHT** 1
Older Age Groups Expanding Fastest
- **IN BUSINESS** 3
Defining High-Tech Jobs: A Response to Cyberstates
- **IN THE NEWS** 4
Residential Building Permits Cannot Predict the Future
- **IN THE WORKFORCE** 6
Region One: Northwest Indiana
- **IN THE DETAILS** 8
Looking at Hoosier Income in Real Terms
- **IN LOCAL AREAS** 11
Indiana Employment Snapshot

**Indiana
Unemployment
Rate for
June 2001:
3.3%**

IN the Spotlight

(continued from page 1)

time, these age groups have been influencing the housing market with increased demand for less time- and personal energy-consuming residences. Meanwhile, the growth of the population ages 35 to 54 has spurred development of larger homes, restaurants, and time-using activities (including leisure as well as commuting).

The casual observer might see in Figure 1 evidence of more out-migration by young Hoosiers between the ages of 25 to 34. But the 84,000 (9%) decline in this age group actually represents fewer births from 1965 to 1976 than in the 10 years preceding that decade.

If one is looking at these data for migration indications, the most intriguing data are found in Figure 2.

Domestic Migration Rebound in Indiana

More people moved from other states to Indiana than moved from Indiana to other states between 1999 and 2000, according to IRS migration data. This turnaround followed two consecutive years of domestic out-migration: more people moving from Indiana to other states than moving from other states to Indiana.

In the early 90s, Indiana attracted large numbers of new residents from other states. Then in the mid-90s, net domestic migration began to drop and actually became negative between 1997 and 1999 (see Figure 1 on the back cover). Data for the most recent year show that once again, the Hoosier state has gained more new residents than it lost to other states.

(continued on back cover)

In 1990, Indiana had 915,000 people age 25 to 34. Normally, without migration, we would expect this number to fall, due to deaths. But by 2000, there were 961,000 people age 35 to 44 in Indiana. This increase of 46,000 can only be explained by net


in-migration. (It is possible that the count in 1990 for people 25 to 34 was far worse than the count of people 35 to 44 in 2000, but this is unlikely.) Certainly, no one was born into this group in the last decade.

Likewise, the population age cohort 35 to 44 in Indiana in 1990 was 819,000 and declined to 817,000 people ages 45 to 54 in 2000. This small change (-2,000) also suggests net in-migration of adults to Indiana, as it is likely that this age group experienced more than 2,000 deaths over the decade. When we have full age-specific death data for the past decade, as well as migration data from Census 2000, more definitive conclusions can be reached.

Until then, it is tempting to believe that Hoosiers who left in the 1980s as young adults returned to their native state in the 1990s. Or perhaps the growth observed is in-migration of others who have found job opportunities or residential opportunities attractive in Indiana.

Figure 2: Indiana Population by Age, 1990 and 2000

Early Census data indicate in-migration in younger age groups



Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Defining High-Tech Jobs: A Response to Cyberstates

Every year, the American Electronics Association (AEA) releases a set of rankings (Cyberstates) that attempt to rate the high-tech nature of each state through change in the number of jobs, exports, R&D funding, etc. This article focuses on the jobs that are included and excluded in their definition of high-tech. Essentially, AEA's high-tech jobs definition is restricted to the electronics industry — but this is misleading. Among just a few of the technology sectors *not* included in the AEA definition, but which *are* included in other reports and studies from credible non-profit and government organizations, are:

- Industrial Inorganic Chemicals
- Drugs (pharmaceuticals)
- Industrial Organic Chemicals
- Agricultural Chemicals
- Engines & Turbines
- Motor Vehicles & Equipment
- Aircraft & Parts
- Guided Missiles, Space Vehicles & Parts
- Medical & Dental Laboratories
- Engineering & Architectural Services
- Research & Testing Services

Considering the industry mix in Indiana that includes all of the sectors above, the AEA rankings can distort the high-tech jobs picture for Indiana. One of the more glaring examples is the omission of a cutting-edge company, Eli Lilly (which is in the process of adding 7,500 knowledge-based jobs to Indiana) or the Warsaw Cluster, considered the “Orthopedics Capital of the World.”

If we are to accept AEA's definition of high-tech, there is yet another important statistic in that report: Indiana's loss in these electronics jobs came almost entirely between 1994 and 1998. According to this study, Indiana generated 1,500 high-tech jobs between 1999 and 2000. Some of the job losses Indiana has sustained are being overcome by technology jobs at companies such as Virtual Financial Services, Powerway, RealMed, Interactive Intelligence, and Aprimo.

Last year, when the 2000 rankings from AEA came out, the Indiana Department of Commerce took an in-depth look at studies by a consulting group (RFA), an information provider (One Source) and a research group

(Bureau of Labor Statistics). Bottom line: depending on whose statistics and categories you use, the result is drastically different (see Table 1).

- According to the **AEA**, Indiana lost almost 7,000 high-tech jobs between 1989 and 1999.
- According to **RFA**, we gained more than 6,300.
- **One Source** found that Indiana gained nearly 48,000 high-tech jobs over that time span.
- The **Bureau of Labor Statistics** showed Indiana gaining just over 40,000 high-tech jobs.

These studies were more inclusive in their definition of high-tech. What is needed is an agreed upon definition of high technology, not what a trade association wants it to be. The AEA study shows us what is happening in a given state's electronics sector, but it is simply not accurate to equate that to a state's high-tech economy.

This article references results of an Indiana Department of Commerce study that can be found on the Web at www.ibrc.indiana.edu/incontext/june2000/.

Table 1: Four Perspectives on High-Tech Employment, 1989 and 1999

United States	AEA	RFA	One Source	BLS
1989 High-Tech Employment	4,049,398	3,830,998	13,033,440	9,029,400
1999 High-Tech Employment	5,008,666	4,817,666	14,834,912	10,416,100
Growth in High-Tech Employment 1989–99	24%	26%	14%	15%
Net Job Change 1989–99	959,268	986,668	1,801,472	1,386,700
Indiana	AEA	RFA	One Source	BLS
1989 High-Tech Employment	81,705	69,356	364,142	234,548
1999 High-Tech Employment	74,787	75,674	412,056	274,899
Growth in High-Tech Employment 1989–99	-8%	9%	13%	17%
Net Job Change 1989–99	-6,918	6,318	47,914	40,351

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

Residential Building Permits Cannot Predict the Future

Building permits filed throughout Indiana are reported on a monthly basis. It's tempting to use these numbers to predict business trends. Regrettably, building permit data do not tell us much about the future.

Personal income, for example, is one measure of Indiana's economic health. Annual real personal income, adjusted to 1996 dollars, is shown in Figure 1, along with annual building permits in units. Both measures mostly rise in response to general economic growth.

The building permits line shifts significantly, however, in two places. In 1991, permits were down compared to the preceding year. This decline did not foretell any decline in income the following year. The building permit decline was followed the next year by another rise in income.

Next, note the definite drop in building permits in 1997. If we were using building permits to predict the future, we would have been disappointed. In the next year, 1998, Indiana's income was up sharply.

But surely building permit filings affect employment in the construction sector. Again, we find that's not reflected in the data. Figure 2 shows Indiana's annual building permit totals in units, compared to annual average employment in construction.

The slip in building permit filings in 1991 had almost no effect on construction employment — indeed, employment climbed slightly the following year. As for the pronounced drop in building permits in 1997, there again appears to be no obvious link to the industry. Construction employment expanded again in the year after that building permit decline.

Local effects


Those statistics, though, were statewide, and they were annual. What if we look at local building permit activity on a monthly basis? Does that tell us anything useful about a local economy?

Sadly, no.

Consider two different Hoosier metro areas. Evansville has enjoyed moderate economic growth in recent years. In official Census 2000 results,

Figure 1: Indiana Building Permits and Income


Changes in building permits trends do not foretell income changes



Source: U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis

Figure 2: Indiana Building Permits, Statewide Construction Employment

Building permit activity does not predict changes in employment



Source: U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis

Vanderburgh, Posey and Warrick counties all saw population growth from 1990 to 2000. Evansville's metro area unemployment rate was below 3% for much of last year.

Terre Haute, on the other hand, has been struggling. Vigo County was one of the few Indiana counties to lose population from 1990 to 2000. The metro area unemployment rate ranged between 4% and 5% for much of the last 16 months, among the highest in the state.

Yet building permit data do not help us predict the different economic conditions in these two areas. In Evansville, monthly building permits trended downward through most of last year (see Figure 3). Despite this slowing of reported building permits, the metro area unemployment rate improved, from about 4% in January of last year to less than 3% at the end of the year. Construction employment in Evansville appears similarly unrelated to building permit activity.

In Terre Haute, too, building permit data have not told us much about the near-term future of the region's economy. Figure 4 shows monthly building permits reported for the Terre Haute metro area for the most recent 16 months, compared to the level of employment in the area's construction sector. The employment numbers stayed nearly constant, even though building permits exhibited a gentle decline. In fact, the only major change in the building permit data was the large increase in March 2001, followed by a comparatively strong April. But construction industry employment had started up in February. The building permit trend didn't predict a change in

employment; if anything, it was the other way around.

Building permit data may be useful for certain things. But anyone

interested in the course of Indiana's economy should be skeptical. As an economic forecasting tool, they are almost not useful at all.

Figure 3: Building Permits, Unemployment Rates: Evansville Metro Area

Declining building permits not accompanied by rising unemployment





Figure 4: Building Permits, Constr. Employment: Terre Haute Metro Area

Construction employment sometimes changes before change in permits



Region One: Northwest Indiana

The Area

Region One comprises seven counties in northwest Indiana. It is bordered on the north by Lake Michigan and on the west by the city of Chicago and Illinois. Northwest Indiana provides “Chicago living at Indiana prices,” according to the Northwest Indiana Forum. With its network of interstates and proximity to Chicago, the region is heavily traveled.

Population, Lifestyles

Nearly one in six Hoosiers live in this part of the state, with a regional population of 823,388. Two of the region’s seven counties — Lake and Porter — are among Indiana’s most populous.

Lake County dominates the region with its population of 485,000 people and is the second largest county in the state. Porter County has been one of the state’s fastest growing over the past decade, ranking ninth in the state


with 147,000 people. Jasper County also grew by 21% between censuses in 1990 and 2000. Overall, the region added 38,000 people to its resident population between 1990 and 2000.

Hispanics have long gravitated to this area outside Chicago — this region has 33% of the state’s Hispanic population. More than 71,000 Hispanics now reside in Region One, with more than 59,000 of those concentrated in Lake County. The majority population in all seven counties of the region continues to be white, although in counties such as Lake (66.7%) and La Porte (86.3%), that majority is shrinking. Most households are family households, comprising 71% of all household types. Married couple families are 52% of households, and 14% of households are female householders living with children or other relatives.

Commuting Patterns

More than 67,000 people commuted into the counties of this region for work. Lake County alone drew nearly 42,000 workers into the county, based on work and residence (commuting) data gleaned from state income tax returns for 1999. Lake County sent more than 33,000 of its residents over the state border to Illinois for work, while Porter County sent 21,453 people into Lake.

La Porte County’s strongest commuting partners were Porter County on the west and St. Joseph County on the east. Jasper sent the largest number of its residents, 2,701, to Lake County for work, with another 925 to Porter County and 655 to Illinois.




The other southern counties of this region varied somewhat in their commuting preferences. While Newton County had 1,686 of its residents working in Lake County, another 693 went to Jasper County and 641 to Illinois. Pulaski and Starke counties followed a different road, however, exchanging more workers with counties such as Marshall, White and Fulton counties. For details on commuting interaction, see STATS Indiana.

Industrial Mix, Jobs and Wages

The industrial base of this area is diverse, as shown by third quarter 2000 details from covered employment and wage data organized and analyzed by the Indiana Business Research Center (see Table 1). Region One has nearly 12% of all nonfarm employment in the state, and its wages are close to or higher than the statewide average. This region is still recognized as one of the largest steel-producing areas of the country, and wages continue to be highest in the manufacturing industries.

The services sector had the largest number of establishments (5,440) and



jobs (109,999). That sector was followed somewhat distantly by retail (65,046) and manufacturing (64,055). The highest wages, however, were in the durable goods manufacturing sector, with an annualized average of \$48,521. That average was more than \$7,000 higher than the average for that sector for the state as a whole.

Labor Force

The labor force is defined as people living in the region who are either employed or seeking employment. The annual average labor force estimates for last year (2000) show the region's unemployment rate at 4.3%. That rate was higher than Indiana's 3.2% and the nation's rate of 4.0%.

Further information can be gleaned from the following Web sites: STATS Indiana at www.stats.indiana.edu, the Indiana Department of Workforce Development at www.state.in.us/dwd, the Indiana Department of Commerce at www.state.in.us/doc, and the Northwest Indiana Forum at www.nwiforum.org.

Table 1: Covered Employment and Wages, 2000:3

Sector	Establishments	Jobs (Employment)	Average Wage Annualized: REGION	Average Wage Annualized: INDIANA	Average Employment per Estab.: REGION	Average Employment per Estab.: INDIANA
Total Nonfarm	15,880	324,975	\$30,105	\$30,416	20.46	21.33
Services	5,440	109,999	\$26,372	\$27,584	20.22	20.11
Retail Trade	3,709	65,046	\$15,579	\$15,892	17.54	19.22
Manufacturing	846	64,055	\$46,721	\$40,812	75.72	74.47
Durable Goods Manufacturing	571	50,146	\$48,521	\$41,256	87.82	80.19
Construction	1,830	19,980	\$38,890	\$34,860	10.92	10.60
Public Administration	247	18,599	\$26,813	\$29,088	75.30	47.78
Transportation & Public Utilities	859	17,565	\$39,684	\$36,808	20.45	24.42
Nondurable Goods Manufacturing	275	13,909	\$40,234	\$39,656	50.58	62.75
Wholesale Trade	1,154	13,698	\$36,232	\$38,852	11.87	11.31
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	1,365	11,153	\$27,311	\$37,588	8.17	10.85

Source: Indiana Department of Workforce Development and Indiana Business Research Center

Table 2: Fast Facts about Region One (from STATS Indiana County & Regional Profiles at www.stats.indiana.edu)

County	Population in 2000	Rank among 92 Counties	Percent Change 1990 to 2000	Median Age in 2000	Per Capita Income in 1999	Rank among 92 Counties, Per Capita Income	Housing: Percent Owner Occupied in 2000	Manufacturing: Percent of Nonfarm Employment in 1999	Services: Percent of Nonfarm Employment in 1999
Jasper	30,043	53	21.0	35.0	\$20,173	77	73.7	12.0	19.3
Lake	484,564	2	1.9	35.9	\$25,328	20	64.2	14.9	32.2
La Porte	110,106	14	2.8	37.1	\$23,538	39	67.6	19.7	27.3
Newton	14,566	82	7.5	37.3	\$18,835	88	74.5	25.9	13.3
Porter	146,798	9	13.9	36.3	\$28,584	9	72.7	17.4	27.4
Pulaski	13,755	84	7.6	37.8	\$22,030	57	70.4	20.7	17.8
Starke	23,556	65	3.6	37.0	\$16,793	91	69.3	17.8	23.5
Total	823,388	—	4.8	—	\$25,072	—	66.9	16.2	29.5

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis; Indiana Business Research Center

Looking at Hoosier Income in Real Terms

Indiana's **personal income** is one of the most closely watched statistics in the Hoosier state. Personal income includes the earning of workers and proprietors, including funds set aside in pre-tax pension, stock, or medical programs. Also included are rent, interest, and dividend receipts whether they show up in the mailbox or just accrue in an account. Finally, government transfer payments (for example: social security, welfare, and unemployment compensation) are added in.

This series is issued quarterly by the U.S. Department of Commerce (Bureau of Economic Analysis). State budget analysts use personal income numbers for their revenue forecasting efforts. Others convert these **nominal** data into **real** terms to examine the progress of the state's economy. Nominal or current dollars indicate amounts in terms of today's prices. Real or constant dollars attempt to represent consistent buying power over time. It is the best way to compare two periods in time by taking out the effect of inflation.

The conversion from nominal to real is usually done by using the U.S. **personal consumption expenditure (PCE) deflator**. There is no such figure for separate parts of the nation. An alternative adjusting number would be the **consumer price index (CPI)**, but that is not as inclusive a measure as the PCE.

Over the years shown, Indiana's total real personal income has more than doubled, now exceeding \$150 billion annually (see Figure 1). The **compound annual rate of growth** has been 2.5%. This number is computed

to yield a constant growth rate that would move smoothly from the starting point of the series up to the last value reported.

But, as is apparent in the data, the path has not been without bumps. In

Figure 2, the **quarterly growth rates (seasonally adjusted at annual rates)** are shown. These rates are based on the change from quarter to quarter after the data have modified to represent the seasonal patterns that

Figure 1: Real Personal Income in Indiana, 1969–2000

Real personal income more than doubled since 1969





Figure 2: Quarterly Percent Change in Real Personal Income, 1969–2000

Indiana personal income often swings widely from quarter to quarter



occur in the economy. They are raised to the fourth power (compounded for a year, just as an interest rate might be at a bank). This process keeps us working with annual numbers, but also gives added drama to the ups and

downs in Figure 2.

The **average (mean) growth rate** for Indiana's real personal income was 2.61%. This represents all the diverse rates shown in Figure 2 (and is higher than the smoothing, compound annual

rate of 2.5% discussed earlier).

As seen in Figure 2, the record of growth is very uneven. The economy does not follow a smooth path. However, some of these wilder fluctuations are caused by unusual factors. For example, federal government subsidy payments to farms can be very high in one quarter and disappear in the next. Likewise, workers and executives may receive bonuses in one quarter, and then income falls back to "normal" thereafter. These two factors can result in a huge advance being followed by an equally dramatic decline. Seasonal adjustment factors may not catch these elements, but seasoned analysts should not be deceived by the data.


The data in Figure 2 can be summarized in a **frequency distribution** or a **histogram** as shown in Figure 3. Here we find the mean or average growth rate of 2.61% falls almost in the middle of the **modal** group, that grouping of growth rates between 0.1% and 5.0%. The modal group is the one with the most observations. In this case, 61 of the 125 quarters between 1969:1 and 2000:2 fall in that group. The other categories fill out the chart with a fairly nice normal, bell-shaped pattern. (When a series of numbers has one or more very extreme values, the mean may not fall in the modal group.)

There were 29 quarters during which Indiana had declining real total personal income and 96 in which real total personal income grew. Which sectors contributed to these declines? Figure 4 offers the number of declining quarters of earnings for the

(continued on page 10)

Figure 3: Number of Quarters by Percent Change, Real Personal Income


Indiana had 96 growth quarters out of 125 total from 1969:1 to 2000:2



Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis

Figure 4: Number of Quarters with Income Declines, by Sector

Mining and manufacturing sectors had many negative quarters



Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis

IN the Details

(continued from page 9)

major nonfarm sectors of Indiana’s economy.

Although relatively small in the state’s economy — just 0.2% in 2000:2 — the federal military has shown the most negative role, with 76 down quarters in the 125 quarters of our study. Durable goods manufacturing, accounting for 14.6% of personal income, gave us 52 down quarters, while services, now 15.9% of the total, had but 20 down quarters.

With all this up and down movement, how tightly packed are Indiana’s real total personal income growth rates around the mean? That is not an idle statistical question. In effect, we are asking, “How volatile is the Indiana economy?”

The usual measure of dispersion or scatter is the **standard deviation**, which indicates whether a series of numbers is very tightly clustered (a low standard deviation) or widely dispersed (a high standard deviation). The standard deviation is calculated based on the difference between each observation and the mean. But the standard deviation alone cannot tell the story. For example, if the standard deviation is 3 and the mean is 10, we can expect to find 68% of the observations between 7 and 13. That is pretty widespread, compared to a standard deviation of 3 and a mean of 100, where 68% of all observations would be between 97 and 103.

Therefore, it is the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean that is of importance to answer our volatility

question. This value is called the **coefficient of variation**. In Figure 5, we see the mean growth rate, the standard deviation and an indicator of the coefficient of variation for the five sectors that account for 50% of Indiana’s total personal income.


Durable goods manufacturing has been the slowest growing sector with a mean growth rate just over 1% per year. However, durable goods also have the highest standard deviation. That combination gives them also the highest coefficient of variation among these sectors. The coefficient of variation can be read somewhat like a clock. The more vertical the line from the origin to the sector’s point on the chart, the higher the coefficient (about 11 in the case of durable goods).

The flattest line is in services, where the growth rate is about 4.5% and the standard deviation is less than 7%. This yields a coefficient of variation close to 1.5, which is the lowest of those shown. In effect, the most volatile sectors of the big contributors to the Hoosier economy are the manufacturing sectors. Retail trade, state and local government, and services, in that order, have lesser amounts of volatility.

These notes have explained some of the most common measures used to describe economic statistics. Exact calculations have not been described, but it is hoped that these notes offer some clarification for readers of *IN Context*. Questions about these and other data should be directed to the Indiana Business Research Center and the Indiana Department of Commerce. Contact information is listed on the back of this publication.

Figure 5: Steeper Slope of Line Indicates Higher Volatility in Income

Manufacturing sectors have slower growth, higher volatility than services



Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis


Indiana Employment Snapshot

Figure 1: June 2001 Unemployment Rates by County

The national unemployment rate* for June 2001 was 4.7%

State Unemployment Rate = 3.3%

- Above State Rate (42 counties)
- Approx. Equal to State Rate (+/- 0.3) (24 counties)
- Below State Rate (26 counties)



*Not seasonally adjusted

Source: Indiana Department of Workforce Development

Indiana County Rates

- Most Indiana county unemployment rates were level in June, compared to earlier in the year.
- More than half of Indiana's 92 counties posted June rates that were below their average rates in the earlier months of 2001.
- Even in Howard County, despite headlines about auto industry cutbacks in Kokomo, the average unemployment rate in the second quarter was only 4.7%, down from 6.2% in the first quarter of 2001.

HIGHEST COUNTY UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IN JUNE 2001:

- Orange: 7.8%
- Greene: 6.7%

LOWEST COUNTY UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IN JUNE 2001:

- Hamilton: 1.6%
- Boone: 1.7%

Indiana Metro Area Rates

- Among metro areas, Indianapolis continues to lead the state. Its June rate of 2.6% is well below the statewide average of 3.3%.

METRO AREA UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IN JUNE 2001:

- Indianapolis: 2.6%
- Lafayette: 2.7%
- Bloomington: 2.7%
- Evansville: 3.1%
- Muncie: 3.4%
- South Bend: 3.5%
- Fort Wayne: 3.6%
- Elkhart: 3.7%
- Gary: 4.0%
- Terre Haute: 4.3%
- Kokomo: 4.9%

Published monthly by a partnership of:

Indiana Business Research Center

Kelley School of Business
Indiana University
Bloomington Campus
501 North Morton Street, Suite 110
Bloomington, Indiana 47404
IUPUI Campus
801 West Michigan Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202-5151
E-mail: context@indiana.edu

Indiana Department of Commerce

One North Capitol
Suite 700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Managing editor: Terry Creeth

Contributing editors: Morton J. Marcus, Leslie Richardson, John Besl, Joan Morand, Carol Rogers, James Smith

Graphic designer: Julie Dales

Web: Carol Rogers, Julie Dales

Circulation: Nikki Livingston

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

KELLEY
School of Business



Indiana Department of Commerce



Domestic Migration

(continued from page 2)

International in-migration to the state remained steady in the '90s.

Indiana has consistently gained population in the most recent decade due to migration from foreign countries.

Where are they coming from and where are they going?

Illinois topped both lists of states sending people to and receiving people from the Hoosier state. Indiana gained more residents from Illinois than it lost to its western neighbor and also


experienced net gains in resident exchanges with Ohio, California, New York, Kansas and Pennsylvania.

Florida attracted large numbers of Hoosiers, making it the leader in net out-migration from Indiana. Other states that gained more residents from Indiana than they lost to Indiana were: Georgia, Tennessee, Arizona, North Carolina and South Carolina and Michigan.

Indiana swapped large numbers of residents with Kentucky and Texas but with little net change. In other words, in and out migration between these states and Indiana ran about even.

Figure 1: Net Migration to Indiana

Domestic migration rebounds after two years of out-migration



Source: U.S. Census Bureau and Internal Revenue Service

Indiana Business Research Center
Kelley School of Business
Indiana University
IUPUI Campus
801 West Michigan Street, BS 4090
Indianapolis, IN 46202-5151

Nonprofit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 4245
Indianapolis, Indiana