Is Social Mobility Spatial?
Immigrant Destionation Choice and
Second Generation Outcomes,
1940-70 and 1970-2000

Jamie Goodwin-White

Is Social Mobility Spatial?   Immigrant Destination Choice and Second Generation Outcomes, 1940-1970 and 1970-2000

Abstract

Following Vigdor's (2001) demonstration of the transmission of locational advantage to the children of the Great Migration, I undertake a similar analysis to ascertain the significance of immigrants' location choice on second generation educational and wage outcomes in adulthood. I create pseudo immigrant parent-second generation child generation cohorts for 1940-70 and 1970-2000 from the IPUMS, and construct selection models of parental internal migration on the following generation's relative outcomes. Preliminary results show that historical patterns of selective internal migration by immigrants explain wage and educational outcomes into the second generation. The ways in which historical settlement patterns have been selective of wage inequality is stronger in the latter period from 1970-2000. Although parental location matters more for second generation educational gains in 1940-70, the second generation workers of 2000's wage parity with others is heavily determined by their parents' previous location choices, especially among those who are non-white.

Introduction

A resurgence of interest in immigrant's residential choices has been precipitated by the post-1990s moves of immigrants to a broader array of US destinations, either as initial or secondary moves (Kandel and Parrado 2005, Singer 2005, Hall 2009, Goodwin-White 2012). Many of the young children of these immigrants will come of age in locations not chosen by themselves, and which their parents chose (as all migrants do) with regard to their backgrounds, their networks, and their opportunities for social and economic stability or progress.   A more theoretical angle is provided by spatial assimilation and locational attainment perspectives (Logan et al 1999; Alba, Logan and Stults, 2002) which stress that intergenerational immigrant integration is

contingent upon immigrants' settlement patterns and existing patterns of racial/ethnic inequalities in local labor markets (which may be changed in turn).

These issues have a seeming precedent with another American history of intergenerational spatial and social mobility. Vigdor's 2001 analysis of the children of the Great Migration looked to connect parental characteristics to child outcomes in terms of High School graduation and wages – and to do so via the selectivity exercised through parental locational choice. Vigdor's findings were that the characteristics of parents are transmitted to children in part through selective migration – and this finding provided further evidence for the ways in which segregation works through the segregation of similarly-selected intergenerational settlement patterns. In this paper, I follow Vigdor in asking questions about whether and how immigrants' locational choices affect second generation relative education and wage outcomes 30 years later. Have immigrants bequeathed advantageous places (relative to other locations) within stratified local labor markets to their children through secondary migration? Does the migration of the second generation itself look differently selective? And does the importance of parental location choice (and immigrant geographies) change between 1970 and 2000?

This analysis adds an additional dimension to analyses of intergenerational immigrant economic assimilation through placing the second generation within an internally-differentiated US labor market of historical construction. It also allows for the disaggregation of static and changing place characteristics and individual parental characteristics in their effects upon second generation outcomes. Developing the spatial assimilation debate requires continual attempts at better understandings of the variation in local configurations of education, jobs, and wages within which immigrants and the second generation find themselves. Although not longitudinal,

the continuity of place and individual characteristics (including information on internal migration and parental birthplace) provides a cross-sectional opportunity to examine these questions over a longue durée of America's immigration history.

Using the Integrated PUMS and corrected MSA equivalent boundaries, I construct pseudo-cohorts of immigrant secondary migrants in 1940 and 1970 and a second generation young adult (by nativity) cohort born and resident in the previous generation's MSA of in-migration in 1970 and 2000. Controlling for gender, age, residence, and (for the wage models) educational background, I attempt to correlate the migrant characteristics transmitted through secondary migration with the average (relative) educational and wage outcomes in the same MSA of a new generation's young adults (born of immigrant parents). The return to the coefficients and decomposition of individual and place effects allows for a geographic aspect of the transmission of social mobility to be observed. Are inequalities being transmitted in part through the selectivity of secondary migration and residence? Or is secondary migration a means of escaping the worst ethnic penalties in some local labor markets?

Initial results show that parental characteristics are heavily selective of a second generation's characteristics through internal migration choice. Interestingly, the importance of selective destination choice became more important during the 1970-2000 period than in the 1940-1970 period. In short, at the same time that geographical mobility became increasingly important for the native-born population it also became critical for the economic assimilation of the second generation. In part, immigrants have selected positive locations for their children's economic assimilation – at least those who were able to benefit from such choices themselves. The historic immigrant geographies of the US, and the ways in which local inequalities intersect

with immigrants' locational choices, both within and between generations, are thus a critical piece of the economic and spatial assimilation puzzle.

Background

It is reasonably common to speak of moving in order that one's children have better opportunities, both immediately and later in life. This would involve complicated consideration of where one's offspring would likely fare best, as well as the interaction of   One thing we know is that economic and social mobility in the US vary both by race and ethnicity. Labor market and educational opportunities are also spatially variant, and we theorise that individuals respond to these differences through internal migration.   Migrants may be moving in response to conditions that they anticipate for their children as they mature, or in response to conditions they have seen change or perceive on the horizon. We can then see that internal migration patterns may reflect not only differential opportunities but also reveal historical shifts in spatially-varying local labor market conditions, as others have found.   This may especially be the case for immigrants, who are often considered to operate with more constrained location choices. Do the destination choices of immigrants affect the wages and educational outcomes of the next generation? Is there intergenerational selectivity to destination choice, and if so, how is it constituted? Has the relationship between spatial and social mobility changed over time? This paper makes use of endogenous switching regression models, the 1940, 1970, and 2000 US Integrated Public Use Microdata Samples, and place and individual variables on immigrants and their children, their internal migration decisions, and their educational and wage outcomes to answer these questions. I hope to show that further exploration of these issues is possible and promising, and also that the initial results provided here shed

some light on the processes through which immigrant's locational choices change and produce the spaces within which their children will experience economic outcomes.

Data and Analytical Strategy

Table 1 displays the top metropolitan areas for immigrants (and specifically for Mexican immigrants, as the largest current nationality in the US) in 1940, 1970, and 2000. For each year, the 20 metropolitan areas with the greatest proportions of 1) non-US born and 2) Mexican-born populations are listed, with the percentage of the metropolitan area they represent in parentheses. Table 1 makes clear the westerly shift of the immigrant population over the decades in question, as well as the east coast prevalence of non-Mexican immigrants.

Table 2 displays the top 10 internal migration flows of 1) all immigrants and 2) Mexican immigrants in the five years preceding 1940, 1970, and 2000 who made a move at least at the level of the county. As inter-county moves are specified, many of the top flows occur *within* a consolidated metropolitan area and thus the top moves are within the top metropolitan areas for immigrant populations (especially in 1940). Here, the bracketed figures indicate what proportion of all moves made by that group in that period were constituted by the particular flow. Again, an earlier East Coast dominance is also obvious, with most Mexican flows being between much more western parts of the US. By 2000, most Mexican flows are focused on leaving the LA metro area or circulation around the LA area and its surrounding counties.

The samples involve individual and place characteristics compiled for a 1970 and 2000 second generation population. In each case, first generation immigrants and the characteristics of the places where they lived were measured in the earlier time period (1940, for the 1940 immigrant/1970 second generation cohort; and 1970 for

the 1970 immigrant/2000 parent cohort). The "parent" sample in each case thus includes immigrants (aged between 18 and 48) who had moved into a US metro area in the previous five years (from 1935 in 1940 and from 1965 in 1970).[1] Relevant metropolitan area variables for 1940 and 1970 include average levels of education for immigrants (measured in years), proportion of the population born outside of the US, and proportion of employment that is manufacturing-based. Given the dominance of the Mexican-origin population, I also include a proportion of the population that is Mexican-born, and further interact this variable with the percent foreign-born and average educational level variables.

Characteristics of the second generation and relevant place characteristics are taken from the second time period (1970 in the 40/70 cohort, and 2000 in the 70/00 cohort). For the second generation sample, I include those 18-48 year olds with at least one immigrant parent and positive wage and hours data, born in metro areas that had members of the parent generation 30 years earlier (who had moved there in the previous five year period). This is an approximation of a cohort that could have matured into the labor force following their immigrant parents' generation move into it in the preceding generation. Immigrants and the second generation are matched on metro area that a plausible immigrant "parent" moved into in the five years preceding the earlier period of the cohort, with the second generation sample being born in the same metro area. This follows the methodology established by Vigdor (1991) for assessing similar questions for African Americans in the US. The cohort periods are also designated by the fact that each time point has critical data on parental birthplace and internal migration available at a metro level in the IPUMS. In a sense, this method looks not at individual incorporation trajectories of pairs of immigrants and

---

[1] This is taken from the IPUMS provided variable on residence five years ago.

their own children, but at the ways in which the migration and location decisions of an immigrant generation relate to the average educational and wage profiles of a second generation in those chosen locations.

Models

In each case, OLS regression models have the effect of regressing second generation wage and educational outcomes of the second generation (in 1970 and 2000) on the city-level averages of immigrant parent-generation migrants 30 years previously. The second step examines the selection effect of internal migration or locational choice directly by through means of a Heckman-type instrumental variable probit model. The selectivity parameter comes from taking the unmeasured variance in internal migration and using it as a covariate in the OLS wage or educational outcome models. In a simple variant of the intergenerational models proposed by Vigdor (2001), following Borjas (1995), I first estimate the following OLS:

$$y_{ict}+1 = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{ct} + \beta_2 \theta_{ct} + \beta_3 X_{ct-1}\theta_{ct...} (+ \varepsilon_{ijct}),$$

regressing racial and educational outcomes of the second generation born in city c (y_{ict+1}) on the characteristics of the immigrant generation migrants to the same city a generation previously (X_{ct}) and the share of immigrant migrants to the city (θ_{ct}), again in the earlier generation. Characteristics of second generation individuals include a categorical age variable and gender as controls. The average educational level of immigrants in the earlier time period (immigrant 'parent' generation) is included for the measurement of intergenerational selection effects. The following variables measured at the metropolitan area-level at both time periods: immigrant proportion of

the population, proportion of employment in manufacturing, and full interaction of these terms. In a second iteration, I include variables measuring the percent of the population that is Mexican-born. This is both because this is the largest immigrant proportion in both 1970 and 2000, and also because it identifies a population whose educational and wage outcomes are of concern during this period. The explicit selection models that follow in Table 4 thus report on the importance of the latent variable of the internal migration and destination choice of the second generation.

Results

I. Intergenerational OLS models:

Parent generation location choice affects second generation economic outcomes

Table 3 shows the results for the main covariates of the OLS models. [2] A strong link is demonstrated between the parental characteristics of a previous generation, especially with regard to the immigrant composition of places they inhabited through internal migration. Average levels of immigrant education in the city in the earlier generation are positively associated with second generation wages. This effect is small (although in part this is because of the continuous units of both education and log wages). It is significant and increases between the 1940/70 and 70/00 cohorts. City averages of immigrant educational levels in the previous generation are also positively associated with second generation high school diplomas, although this effect is again small and is stronger in the 1940/70 cohort than then 1970/00 cohort (in part because high school diplomas become more prevalent in the latter period). The proportion of manufacturing jobs in the 1940 metro of the parent's generation has

---

[2] Age category covariates are not reported here for parsimony as they are small and as expected. Women do significantly less well than men in terms of wages, although this effect is halved in the 1970-00 period. Second-order interactions are reported only as significant above first-order effects.

a positive and significant effect on second generation wage and educational outcomes in 1970, and especially on their high school completion rates. This is the commonly-told story of the importance of immigrant manufacturing jobs for allowing their children to stay in school. The effect on wages is redoubled when we look at the proportion of manufacturing jobs remaining for this cohort in 1970 (%man70). For the wages of the 2000 second generation cohort, however, parent generation city-level manufacturing jobs in 1970 are strongly and significantly negative. In part, the importance of manufacturing jobs for strong wages and social mobility had changed. In part, of course, so had the array of cities where manufacturing jobs were located. At any rate, the shift is very strong. I will discuss this further in the second set of models that focus on internal migration selection amongst the second generation themselves.

The immigrant concentration covariates are the most theoretically interesting for the purposes of this paper, given their importance to the spatial assimilation debate. Did immigrant parents who migrated to places with greater immigrant concentration give the next generation a leg up or a leg down? And to what extent does the increasing share of immigrant concentration that is Mexican-born matter? The clearest answer can be found in looking specifically at the effects of places parents moved into in the %fb40 variable. (This is similar to Vigdor's analysis of African American parents moving to African American concentrations in the same time period.) For the earlier cohort, immigrant concentration in the parent generation was positively and significantly associated with second generation wages in the subsequent generation. This effect is stronger for Mexican immigrant concentrations when the %mex40 variable is introduced in the second iteration. However, immigrant concentrations in the second generation are strongly negatively associated with

wages. In other words, parents who moved into immigrant concentrations in 1940 bettered wage outcomes for the second generation – but the second generation did worse by being in 1970s immigrant metros. By the latter time period, the immigrant concentrations of the 1970 parent generation are negatively associated with second generation wages (although somewhat positively with their high school completion). However, the immigrant concentration of their own residence in 2000 is significantly positive for second generation wage outcomes. For high school completion, the clearest indications are given in the model iterations including percent Mexican. The percent of the population that is Mexican diminishes high school graduation levels of the second generation in 1940, but is obviously critically important for getting second generation high school graduates in 1970. The effect remains positive and significant if diminished for the 1970-2000 cohort.

It is difficult to interpret these intergenerational effects precisely. As we see in Table 1, immigrant concentrations in 1940 are not those of 1970, and immigrant concentrations in 1970 are not those in 2000, and the latent variable in these models (to be examined in the selection models that follow) is the internal migration patterns of the second generation themselves, as seen in Table 2.

II. Endogenous switching regression models:

Relating second generation internal migration selection and changing geography

The significance of Vigdor's models is that endogeneity was theoretically tied up in parental selection of locations in the aftermath of the Great Migration and shifting residential patterns of African Americans. This is also relevant and true for immigrants and their offspring. There are additional related issues. First, the continuing significance of racial wage gaps and spatial variance in these continues both for African Americans and other non-whites. Educational gaps also persist for immigrants and many of the second generation. And the importance of manufacturing jobs, shifts away from them and their implications for social mobility are also important for both groups. Perhaps most importantly, the intersections of changing patterns of residence and jobs for both groups are inadequately understood. Although much work has been done on the disadvantageous location of African Americans in parts of the US that were declining economically, these shifts are less discussed for the immigrant stock of the US (in part because the emphasis remains strongly on changing immigrant concentrations in and of themselves in deference to the continuing interest in spatial assimilation).

I do not answer significantly to the significance of changing US economic geographies for the fortunes of the foreign stock population in the US over the course of the 20th century in this paper. The data and models included here are cross-sectional, minimally-specified with regard to detailed place and individual characteristics, and only very nominally intergenerational. That said, extending Vigdor's analysis to immigrants and the second generation, while based in similar interests, raises several key questions. Why does the relationship between

characteristics of parental location (especially in terms of immigrant concentration) and second generation economic outcomes change? Examining the latent migration selection of the second generation themselves is an important part of answering this question. And what is different about immigrant concentrations in 1940, 1970, and 2000? Again, this is a promising question for future research. But for the moment, analysing the shifts of second generation economic outcomes against the backdrop of generational changes in metropolitan-level immigrant concentrations, manufacturing employment, and the selection of internal migration to these conditions focuses immigrant geographies away from simple ideas of moving to and from immigrant concentrations and toward ideas of changing economic contexts.

The selection equation is specified as follows:

$$Z_i^* = w_i'\alpha + \varepsilon_i,$$

where z_i indicates the selection variable (in this case, an inter-metropolitan area move of second generation individual i), w_i is a vector of covariates for each individual, α is a vector of coefficients for the selection equation and ε is the error term. The covariates are similar to those in the OLS models above, except that here I am focusing on second generation selectivity in internal migration. As such, the parent generation covariates are not included. A variable indicating whether or not the second generation individual is of Mexican descent (has at least one Mexican-born parent) is included in order to examine *ethnic* wage gaps for the largest second generation nativity group. The selection variable here indicates whether a second generation individual (again, these are second generation individuals born in metropolitan areas to which same nativity immigrants had moved into in the

preceding generation) has made a metro-level move in the preceding five year period. Metro-level covariates include proportion of the population that is immigrant, proportion Mexican-born, and an interaction term, as well as proportion of manufacturing employment (in addition to individual-level controls for Mexican parentage and gender). The rho coefficients indicate that the differences between the movers and stayers equations are significant, indicating that the unmeasured variance in second generation internal migration is significantly associated with wage outcomes.

In the earlier cohort, having a Mexican-born parent was associated with lowered wages for both movers and stayers, but the effect is nearly doubled for those second generation Mexicans who did not undertake internal migration. This relationship is significantly stronger in 2000, with extremely negative ethnic wage penalties for those who do not move. Significant ethnic wage penalties for second generations of Mexican parentage are abated considerably although not completely through internal migration. Interestingly, gender wage penalties for the second generation follow a similar if weaker pattern, whereby women face slightly smaller wage gaps with men if they undertake internal migration. The immigrant concentration of the metro seems to play no significant role for those who have moved in the past five years. However, amongst those of the second generation who have lived in the same metropolitan area for the past five years, the proportion immigrant is negatively associated with wages in 1970 – and positively associated with them in 2000. In part, of course, this is because immigrant concentrations in 1970 are different places from immigrant concentrations in 2000.

Discussion

The model results have demonstrated the significance of locational choice (and the selection effect of this in one generation) have on educational and wage outcomes in a subsequent generation. The key difference between the first-stage OLS models and the second-stage selection models is the incorporation of the selective internal migration of the second generation themselves. The models have thus incorporated two different types of internal migration selection. The first involves the implicit endogeneity of location choice set in place by a previous generation, as established by the sample itself. The second is the selective component of internal migrations made by the second generation themselves (evident in the selection models). The critical analytical angle is the interplay between these. Parents both migrate selectively and pass the outcomes of these locational choices to their children. A subsequent (or any) generation thus inherits past locational choices and responds to them in turn.

One of the most striking findings of the analysis thus far is that the immigrant population of a 1940 metro chosen by a parent generation has extremely positive effects on second generation wages in 1970. The same pattern is no longer true by the time we look at a 2000 second generation. It is negative and intensified if we concentrate on the proportion of the population from the largest Mexican immigrant group rather than simply the overall foreign-born proportion. The spatial assimilation angle here would be confusing: did immigrant concentrations go from being positive things to negative ones? Did parents who moved into immigrant-concentrated metros better educational and wage outcomes for the next generation in 1970, but the second generation moving into immigrant concentrations do worse? Or is this a clear indication that the relation between second generation locational choice and

immigrant concentrations is negative? Is the story that by 1970 metros with high

concentrations of immigrants drive down second generation wages?

My initial conclusions are that the story is considerably more complicated than

this.   Looking at both sets of models, and examining the coefficients on the

manufacturing variable, one thing that becomes evident is that the places that were

1970s immigrant concentrations – whether in the 1940-70 cohort or the 1970-2000

cohort—were simply not good places for second generation (or perhaps any) wages.

The proportion foreign-born had a negative effect on wages for people who remained

in them in 1970, but was positive for those who stayed in them in 2000. That said,

some of the 1970 Mexican concentrations were critical in terms of producing high

school graduates among the second generation. Those who stayed in manufacturing

areas in 2000 did better, but those who stayed in them in 1970 fared worse. The

selection models also show that internal migration was a way for those of Mexican

descent to abate wage penalties with others, especially in 2000. All of these findings

point to the fact that we need more detailed consideration of how and why places

mattered for individual and group outcomes over time than we currently have, and

than is offered by focus on places as simply varying concentrations of immigrants. In

large part, this is because shifting historical geographies of the US mean that

immigrant concentrations are neither nominally nor substantively the same from one

generation to another – and this relationship itself is dynamically undergirded by

selection exercised through internal migration patterns.

Table 1–

Top twenty foreign-born and Mexican-born metro areas

	1940 Immigrant	Mexican	1970 Immigrant	Mexican	2000 Immigrant	Mexican
1	NY(35)	El Paso(21)	Miami(25)	El Paso(13)	Miami(52)	Laredo(29)
2	El Paso(24)	San Antonio(8)	El Paso(17)	San Antonio(4)	Jersey City(39)	McAllen(29)
3	Boston(22)	Phoenix(4)	NY(15)	Fresno(4)	LA(37)	El Paso(26)
4	Providence(21)	Galveston(3)	San Francisco(12)	Salinas(3)	San Jose(35)	Brownsville(24)
5	Worcester(21)	Corpus Christi(3)	Honolulu(12)	Ventura(3)	NY(34)	Yuma(22)
6	Bridgeport(21)	Fresno(2)	Salinas(12)	Corpus Christi(3)	San Francisco(33)	Salinas(20)
7	Hartford(21)	LA(2)	LA(12)	LA(3)	Laredo(31)	Visalia(19)
8	Manchester(20)	San Diego(2)	Hartford(12)	Santa Barbara(3)	Orange County(31)	Las Cruces(18)
9	Duluth(20)	Stockton(2)	Boston(11)	Stockton(2)	McAllen(30)	Merced(17)
10	San Francisco(20)	Austin(2)	Providence(10)	Bakersfield(2)	Salinas(30)	LA(16)
11	Springfield(20)	San Jose(2)	San Jose(9)	Riverside(2)	El Paso(29)	Yakima(15)
12	Cleveland(19)	Topeka(1)	New Haven(9)	San Diego(2)	Bergen(26)	Fresno(15)
13	Detroit(19)	Houston(1)	Santa Barbara(9)	San Jose(1)	Brownsville(26)	Santa Barbara(14)
14	Chicago(18)	Sacramento(1)	Worcester(9)	Sacramento(1)	Ft. Lauderdale(26)	OC(14)
15	New Haven(18)	Amarillo(1)	Springfield(9)	Phoenix(1)	Yuma(25)	Santa Cruz(13)
16	Rochester(18)	Pueblo(1)	Chicago(8)	San Francisco(1)	Oakland(25)	Ventura(13)
17	Stockton(17)	San Francisco(1)	Fresno(8)	Austin(1)	Merced(25)	Bakersfield(13)
18	Seattle(17)	Dallas(1)	Trenton(8)	Chicago(1)	Visalia(23)	Riverside(12)
19	Rockford(16)	Waco(.5)	San Diego(8)	Dallas(1)	San Diego(23)	Modesto(12)
20	Trenton(16)	Cedar Rapids(.5)	Ventura(8)	Davenport(.5)	Fresno(22)	San Diego(11)

Table 2–
Top 5-year internal migration flows[345]

	1940 Immigrant	Mexican	1970 Immigrant	Mexican	2000 Immigrant	Mexican
1	NY-NY(20)	ElP-LA(15)	NY-Mia(3)	TX-LA(13)	LA-LA(9)	LA-Riv(2)
2	Bos-Bos(4)	SAnt-LA(4)	NY-NY(3)	TX-Chi(9)	NY-NY(8)	LA-LV(2)
3	SF-SF(3)	NY-LA(4)	NY-LA(2)	PA-ElP(5)	Dal-Dal(3)	LA-Atl(1)
4	Det-Det(3)	LA-SJ(4)	CA-NY(2)	AZ-LA(4)	DC-DC(3)	LA-OC(1)
5	Phil-Phil(2)	Can-Ytn(4)	NY-FtL(1)	TX-SD(4)	Phx-Phx(2)	LA-Chi(1)
6	Chi-Chi(2)	SF-SF(4)	NJ-NY(12)	CA-Chi(3)	SF-SJ(2)	Riv-LA(1)
7	NY-LA(2)	SAnt-ElP(3)	NJ-Mia(1)	TX-Riv(2)	Bos-Bos(1)	Riv-OC(1)
8	Chi-LA(2)	SF-LA(3)	TX-LA(1)	TX-Fres(2)	SF-Oak(1)	LA-Phx(1)
9	NY-Mia(1)	DC-NY(3)	FL-NY(1)	NM-LA(2)	SF-SF(1)	LA-Den(1)
10	SF-LA(1)	Riv-LA(3)	PA-NY(1)	PA-LA(1)	LA-Riv(1)	Syr-NY(1)

---

[3] These tables report the top flows among those who made a move at a least a county level. Thus the prevalence of moves that remained in the same large metropolitan area.
[4] 1970 data only give a previous place of residence at a state level. Although these reported flows at a county-level or greater the previous residence reported is at a state level.
[5] NY= New York, NJ=New Jersey, SF= San Francisco, LA= Los Angeles, Bos=Boston, Det=Detroit, Phil=Philadelphia, Chi= Chicago, Mia=Miami, ElP=El Paso, SAnt= San Antonio, SJ= San Jose, DC= Washington DC, Riv=Riverside, FtL=Ft.Lauderdale, Fres=Fresno, Phx=Phoenix, Can=Canton, Ytn=Youngstown, Dal= Dallas, Oak=Oakland, Den=Denver, Syr=Syracuse

Table 3 –

OLS for wages and education, 1940-70 and 1970-2000
(key coefficients only)

	40-70 lwage	+ %mex	40-70 hsgrad	70-00 lwage	+%mex	70-00 hsgrad
%fb40/70	1.8***	1.3**	-.016	-2.5***	-3.2***	.36^
%man40/70	.33	-.24	.27^	-2.2***	-1.7***	.06
Immedavg 40/70	1.9e-08	-2.4e-08	7.4e-07**	-3.3e-07***	-2.9***	3.9e-08**
female	-66***	-.66	.01	-.28***	-.28***	.02***
%fb70/00	-2.3**	-.38^	-1.2^	1.8***	2.0***	-.25**
%man70/00	.77*	.84**	-.47***	-.26	-.06	-.11^
%mex40/70		.69*	-1.5**		.42	.51
%mex70/00		-.29^	3.4***		-.92^	.47***

Table 4 – Endogenous switching regressions

logwage70	Movers (rho .9599**)	Stayers (rho-.028*)
Mex	-.204**	-.389**
female	-.85***	-.918***
%fb70	-.38	-1.61^
%fbmex70	2.19*	2.66*
%mex70	-4.47***	-5.00***
%manuf70	ns	-1.36**
logwage00	Movers (rho 1.33)	Stayers (rho .05)
Mex	-.09	-.898*
female	-.295***	-.318***
%fb00	.00	2.275*
%fbmex00	-1.15*	2.69
%mex00	-.34	-4.23***
%manuf00	.73	4.31**

References

Alba, Richard, John Logan, and Brian Stults. 2002. "The Changing Neighborhood Contexts of the Immigrant Metropolis." *Social Forces* 79: 587-621.

Borjas, G. 1995. "Ethnicity, Neighborhoods, and Human Capital Externalities," *American Economic Review* 85: 365–390.

Ellis, Mark and Jamie Goodwin-White. 2006. "1.5 generation internal migration in the US: dispersion from states of immigration?" *International Migration Review* 40: 899-926.

Goodwin-White, Jamie. 2012. "Emerging Immigrant Geographies: Racial Wages and Migration Selectivity". Social Science Quarterly 93(3): 779-98.

Heckman, Jay, and Guilherme Sedlacek. 1990. "Self-selection and the distribution of hourly wages." *Journal of Labor Economics* 8: 329-63.

Kandel, William, and Emilio Parrado. 2005. "Hispanic Population Growth, Age Structure, and Public School Response in New Immigrant Destinations." In Smith and Furuseth, eds, *The New South: Latinos and the Transformation of Place*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Logan, John, Richard Alba, Tom NcNulty, and Brian Fisher. 1999. "Locational Returns to Human Capital: Minority Access to Suburban Community Resources." *Demography* 30: 243-68.

Vigdor, Jacob. 2001. "The Pursuit of Opportunity: Explaining Selective Black Migration." *Journal of Urban Economics* 51, 391-417.

Vigdor, Jacob. 2002. "Locations, Outcomes, and Selective Migration." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 84(4): 751-5.