Published in final edited form as:

Soc Curr. 2020 February ; 7(1): 46–70. doi:10.1177/2329496519869339.

Unequal Opportunity? Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Disparities in the Returns to Internal U.S. Migration

Christine Leibbrand¹

¹University of Washington, Seattle, USA

Abstract

Internal U.S. migration plays an important role in increasing individuals' access to economic and social opportunities. At the same time, race, ethnicity, and gender have frequently shaped the opportunities and obstacles individuals face. It is therefore likely that the returns to internal migration are also shaped by race, ethnicity, and gender, though we have relatively little knowledge of whether this is the case for contemporary internal U.S. migration. To explore this possibility, I use restricted, geocoded National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 data from 1979 to 2012. I find that white men gain the most economically from migrating, relative to black and Latino men. For women, migration is associated with stable or narrower racial and ethnic disparities in economic outcomes, with Latina women experiencing the largest economic benefits associated with migration and with black and white women exhibiting comparable economic returns to migration. Together, these findings indicate that migration may maintain or even narrow racial/ethnic disparities in economic outcomes among women, but widen them among men.

Keywords

internal migration; race/ethnicity; gender; stratification; National Longitudinal Survey of Youth

Introduction

Internal migration, across counties or states, for example, is an important means of increasing individuals' access to socioeconomic opportunities. Indeed, U.S. history is punctuated by numerous important migration events, including the westward migration of white settlers during the nineteenth century, the Great Migration of black and white southerners from the South to the North between 1915 and 1970 (Tolnay 2003), the Dust Bowl migration of southerners to the West (Gregory 1989), and, more recently, increasing migration to the U.S. South (Falk, Hunt, and Hunt 2004; Frey 2004; L. Hunt, Hunt, and Falk 2008; Tolnay 2003). Many of the individuals who migrated during these transformative migration events chose to migrate to improve their access to socioeconomic opportunities, a

Corresponding Author: Christine Leibbrand, Department of Sociology, University of Washington, 211 Savery Hall, Box 353340, Seattle, WA 98195, USA., cleibb@uw.edu.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

tradition that continues today as about 10 percent of the U.S. population moves each year, often for economic reasons (Spring, Tolnay, and Crowder 2013).

Considerable research has outlined the importance of internal migration for improving individuals' and families' socioeconomic outcomes (Greenwood 2015). However, this research rarely untangles race/ethnicity and gender effects in the relationships between contemporary¹ internal migration and socioeconomic outcomes. We have especially little insight into the potential benefits and costs of internal migration for black and Latina women. These are important gaps in our understanding because race/ethnicity and gender interact to profoundly shape a variety of experiences that may influence the outcomes associated with migration, including employer stereotypes and discrimination (Kennelly 1999; Pager, Bonikowski, and Western 2009; Pager and Shepherd 2008), the probabilities that individuals are tied movers who move to accompany a spouse (Cooke et al. 2009; Geist and McManus 2012; Jacobsen and Levin 1997; McKinnish 2008; Shauman and Noonan 2007), and discrimination in housing and rental markets (Charles 2003; Desmond and Shollenberger 2015; Massey and Denton 1993; Ross and Turner 2005). By neglecting race/ethnicity and gender effects, we may therefore be misestimating the returns to migration. This gap in our understanding also means that we have limited knowledge of the extent to which internal migration exacerbates or reduces racial/ethnic and gender disparities in outcomes. As the United States is becoming increasingly racially and ethnically diverse (Colby and Ortman 2015), these issues will only become more important for researchers and policymakers.

I endeavor to address these gaps in the literature by using National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79) data from 1979 to 2012 along with multilevel growth curve models to examine 12,686 individuals, their migration decisions, and their economic trajectories over approximately 33 years as they decide to migrate or remain in place. This research is focused on three central questions:

Do interstate migrants experience improved economic trajectories relative to nonmigrants in terms of their (1) weekly earnings?

How do these relationships vary by (2) race/ethnicity and (3) gender?

I find that black and Latino men gain less economically from migrating, relative to white men, and black migrant and nonmigrant men experience particularly disadvantageous economic trajectories. For women, migration is associated with stable or narrower racial and ethnic disparities in economic outcomes, with Latina women experiencing the largest economic benefits associated with migration and with black and white women exhibiting comparable economic returns to migration. Together, these findings indicate that our understanding of the returns to migration and migration's role in shaping disparities in outcomes is incomplete without attending to race, ethnicity, and gender effects.

¹A considerable literature examines interracial and, to a lesser extent, intergender differences in the returns to migration during the period of the Great Migration (about 1915–1970; Tolnay 2003).

Background

It has long been assumed that migration economically benefits individuals and families (Greenwood 2015; Lee 1966; Ravenstein 1885; White and Lindstrom 2005). Indeed, individuals are frequently motivated to migrate for economic reasons (Spring, Tolnay, and Crowder 2013) and expected economic benefits are important determinants of the location decisions of migrants (Borjas et al. 1992; Dahl 2002; Kennan and Walker 2010; Lee and Roseman 1999). Considerable research has shown that many of these migrants are successful in experiencing short- and/or long-term economic benefits associated with their decisions to migrate across counties, states, and/or labor markets (Clark and Withers 2002; Jolly 2015; Kennan and Walker 2010; Knapp, White, and Wolaver 2013; Krieg 1997; Yankow 2003).

Gender and Internal Migration

However, many of these studies only find benefits for or only study men and few untangle potential racial/ethnic *and* gender differences in the returns to migration² (Cooke et al. 2009; Flippen 2013; Geist and McManus 2012; Krieg 1997; McKinnish 2008; Shauman and Noonan 2007). This is problematic because race, ethnicity, and gender are likely to structure opportunities for economically beneficial migration and, as a result, the returns to migration. For example, the gender segregation of the labor force is likely to translate into worse economic outcomes for women and fewer opportunities for migration. This is because women tend to be employed in more geographically ubiquitous jobs and in jobs with fewer opportunities for migration, both of which are associated with lower earnings and, of course, lower probabilities of migration (Shauman and Noonan 2007). In addition, black, Latina, and white women all tend to be employed in occupations with similar and substantial percentages of females and these female-typed jobs claim significantly lower earnings than stereotypically “male” jobs, even after accounting for the skills and demands involved with particular occupations (Alksnis, Desmarais, and Curtis 2008; England 2005; Hegewisch et al. 2010; Reskin 1993). The lower average earnings of females’ occupations will likely translate into lower returns to migration. As such, the gender distribution of the labor force could have important associations with women’s economic outcomes broadly and with women’s opportunities for economically beneficial migration more specifically.

Research has also illustrated that migration tends to widen the income gap between male partners and female partners (the latter of whom are more likely to be tied movers who move to accompany a partner), thereby increasing “gender specialization” and reducing women’s wages, while increasing men’s wages and overall family income (Cooke et al. 2009; Geist and McManus 2012; McKinnish 2008; Shauman and Noonan 2007). These relationships hold even among women who continuously stay in the labor force (Cooke 2008; McKinnish 2008; Shauman and Noonan 2007). Although this could be seen as a rational decision among households to prioritize the highest-earner’s employment outcomes (given the lower

²The research on residential mobility, which refers to shorter distance mobility within counties or metro areas is also an important exception to this, though this study focuses on generally longer distance interstate migration, which is more likely to correspond to job changes (White and Lindstrom 2005) and changes in economic well-being.

average earnings of females), these findings illustrate that internal migration tends to correspond to different and disparate returns for males and females.

The Intersection of Race, Ethnicity, and Gender

However, the research mentioned above largely does not separately explore these relationships across race and ethnicity. This is problematic because the intersectionality literature illuminates the importance of attending to the ways in which individuals' identities and experiences are uniquely constructed by the intersection of their racial/ethnic, gender, sexuality, and socioeconomic identities, to name a few (Bowleg 2012; McCall 2005; Shields 2008). Moreover, these identities are not additively constructed. In other words, the advantages and disadvantages of one's race/ethnicity and gender do not simply add together, but rather are complexly intertwined to create distinctive experiences and identities that cannot be reduced to separate and distinguishable categories (Adib and Guerrier 2003; Browne and Misra 2003).

This intersectionality could have important implications for our understanding of the returns to internal migration by differentially structuring the benefits of migration for black, white, and Latinx women and men. For example, migration may be less likely to reinforce traditional gender roles in employment and harm economic outcomes among black women given that black women have exhibited higher average levels of college completion than black men for all cohorts born since 1915, while the same has only been true for whites born after 1960 (Bailey and Dynarski 2011). Although data on Latinxs' educational attainment is sparser and more recent, Bailey and Dynarski (2011) found that they exhibit similar, though slightly smaller, gender gaps in educational attainment relative to whites. Moreover, gendered income gaps tend to be smaller among blacks than among whites (Hogan and Perrucci 2007) and employment is more integral to black women's income security, while marriage is more integral for white women's income security (Willson 2003). Black and, to a lesser extent, Latina females are also less likely to be married than white females (Raley, Sweeney, and Wondra 2015) and, therefore, potentially more likely to migrate to improve their own economic outcomes. Thus, the tied mover status and its relationship with the returns to migration may be more central for white women and, potentially, Latina women than among black women. Cumulatively, these findings illustrate that while migration tends to correspond to larger gaps in economic outcomes for white women and men and declines in white women's economic outcomes, the same cannot be assumed for black women and men. The limited research, showing that gender gaps in socioeconomic outcomes among Latinx women and men are similar to those observed among whites, suggests that migration may also play a role in enhancing males' economic outcomes while harming females' economic outcomes among Latinx migrants, but virtually nothing is known about whether this is actually the case.

Research on racial and ethnic disparities in housing and economic outcomes further suggests the importance of attending to race and ethnicity when investigating these relationships. For example, blacks and Latinxs face housing market discrimination including discriminatory lending practices (Oliver and Shapiro 2006; Rugh and Massey 2010; Stuart 2003), exclusionary and nonexclusionary discrimination (Roscigno, Karafin, and Tester 2009; Ross

and Turner 2005), and lower housing values (Oliver and Shapiro 2006; Squires and Kubrin 2005). All of these obstacles may limit blacks' and Latinxs' abilities to harness housing capital, move into prosperous, economically dynamic (but potentially high-cost) areas, and obtain new jobs. If blacks and Latinxs are less able to afford moves to areas with increasing job opportunities as a result of housing market discrimination and stratification, their returns to migration will likely be lower given that obtaining a more remunerative job than the one an individual claimed in their origin area is an important mechanism behind experiencing returns to migration.

Blacks and Latinxs also face more obstacles in obtaining new jobs across businesses and industries and receiving promotions within industries because of discrimination in the job market and in job search processes (Kirschenman and Neckerman 1991; Pager 2003; Pager, Bonikowski, and Western 2009; Pager and Shepherd 2008). Indeed, black and Latino men are significantly and substantially less likely to receive job callbacks than equally qualified white men (Pager, Bonikowski, and Western 2009) and employers frequently stereotype Latinx and, especially, black employees as lazier, less competent, and criminal (Moss and Tilly 2001; Pager, Bonikowski, and Western 2009). Moreover, Latinxs tend to experience higher levels of discrimination if they have accents (Hosoda et al. 2012), and widespread stereotypes of Latinxs as illegal immigrants may harm Latinxs' employment outcomes, regardless of the legality of their residency (Markert 2010). Recent economic changes such as the decline of manufacturing and unions may also have particularly harmed blacks' access to economic opportunities, given that the manufacturing sector and unions have been especially important for blacks' economic outcomes and for reducing black/white economic disparities (Bound and Dresser 1999; Card 2001; McCall 2001). Although these studies do not directly explore the returns to migration, they indicate that a vital step in the process of experiencing returns to migration—obtaining a new job or being promoted and transferred to a different location—are likely to be more fraught with difficulties for black and Latinx migrants than for whites.

Furthermore, reasons for migrating may vary systematically across race and ethnicity, potentially shaping the returns to migration in disparate ways for different demographic groups. Although research has shown that economic motivations for migrating cut across race and ethnicity (Lee and Roseman 1999), research on migration to the U.S. South has shown that family locations, ancestral ties to place, and black population densities may be important motivators for blacks' decisions to migrate to the U.S. South (Falk 2004; L. Hunt, Hunt, and Falk 2008; M. Hunt, Hunt, and Falk 2012; Leibbrand et al. 2019; Stack 1996). Likewise, the location of family networks tends to be particularly important for the migration and location decisions of low-income individuals (Spring et al. 2017). Because blacks and Latinxs claim lower average incomes than whites, they may therefore be more predisposed to move for family-related reasons. If reasons for migrating vary systematically by race and ethnicity, it is possible that this too would shape disparities in the returns to migration.

The racial and ethnic dynamics outlined above highlight the importance of attending to race and ethnicity when examining the economic returns to migration. However, as mentioned above, gender is likely to interact with these experiences as well so that these relationships

are experienced differently for black and Latinx women and men. For example, black women's wages do not benefit as much from experience and seniority as black men's and white women's wages (England, Christopher, and Reid 1999), and black women have experienced declines in levels of job authority relative to black men over recent decades (Mintz and Krymkowski 2016). In contrast, Latina women have experienced improvements in job authority (Mintz and Krymkowski 2016). Black and Latina women are also more likely than white women to have been affected by the decline in the manufacturing sector, but less likely to have been affected than same-race/ ethnicity men (Bound and Dresser 1999; Card 2001; McCall 2001). In addition, white women have experienced larger improvements in terms of their access to a wide variety of occupations and their status in the occupational hierarchy than black and Latina women (Mintz and Krymkowski 2014). These disparities could have important consequences for the economic opportunities individuals face, including the job offers and promotions they receive, thereby influencing the economic benefits associated with migration.

Black and, to a lesser extent, Latina females are also more likely than white females to be single parents and individuals and employers frequently harbor stereotypes of black and Latina women as single parents, regardless of whether or not they actually have children (Kennelly 1999; Penner and Saperstein 2013). Because of this, black and Latina females may be exposed to uniquely high levels of discrimination in the job market because of their single-mother (or perceived single-mother) status, corresponding to fewer job opportunities and, as a result, lower returns to migration relative to black and Latino males and white females.³ At the same time, as mentioned above, whites exhibit greater gender gaps in income than blacks and Latinxs (Greenman and Xie 2008), white women are more likely than black and Latina women to be married and, potentially, tied movers, and employment tends to be less central to white women's economic security than to black women's economic security (Willson 2003). As such, migration may be more beneficial for black and Latina women's outcomes if black and Latinx households are more likely to prioritize women's economic outcomes and, as such, migrate for their jobs. Because of the variety of ways in which employment- and housing-related experiences are shaped by race/ethnicity and gender, the returns to migration are likely to be shaped in complex and unique ways by this intersection that have been neglected heretofore in the literature.

Influence of Duration

As mentioned above, numerous studies have shown that the returns to migration unfold over the months and years following a migration event. It is therefore important to study the returns to migration over the long term. Adopting a long-term focus may have particular benefits for understanding the migration outcomes of black and Latinx women and men and white women. For example, some research has found that female tied movers pay initial costs associated with migration, though these costs decline as the years since the migration

³.It is also possible that black and Latino males exhibit lower returns to migration than same-race females, as well as white males because of their own exposure to employer stereotypes. Specifically, employer and landlord stereotypes surrounding black and Latino males and incarceration limit job opportunities for black and Latino males, potentially lessening the probability that they experience the kind of advantageous job changes that correspond to positive returns to migration (Pager, Bonikowski, and Western 2009; Pager and Shepherd 2008).

event increase (Clark and Withers 2002; Cooke et al. 2009; Maxwell 1988; Spitze 1984). Likewise, it could take longer for the returns to migration to unfold for black and Latinx women and men because they may face obstacles in obtaining jobs, such as employer discrimination, stereotypes, and predominantly white job networks (Hosoda, Nguyen, and Stone-Romero 2012; Kennelly 1999; Kirschenman and Neckerman 1991; Moss and Tilly 2001; Mouw 2002; Pager 2003; Pager, Bonikowski, and Western 2009; Pager and Shepherd 2008). For black and Latina women, these gendered and racialized processes could interact to produce unique trajectories in the long-term benefits of migration.

Finally, because nonmigrants' residential tenure is, on average, considerably longer than migrants' residential tenure (see Table 3), examining economic trajectories over a long duration is particularly integral for understanding how the outcomes of nonmigrants unfold. This is valuable because internal migration research frequently focuses on the economic trajectories of migrants as the years since the migration event increase, but rarely provides a parallel examination of the long-term outcomes of nonmigrants. Yet, nonmigrants comprise a large and growing percentage of the U.S. population (Cooke 2011; Fischer 2002; Foster 2017; Molloy, Smith, and Wozniak 2017; Spring, Tolnay, and Crowder 2013) and they are disproportionately likely to be racial/ethnic minorities (Foster 2017; Spring, Tolnay, and Crowder 2013). Exploring how nonmigrants are faring over a long duration is therefore valuable for determining the economic well-being of nonmigrants over time, for comparing the outcomes of migrants and nonmigrants, and for better understanding how migration shapes racial/ethnic and gender disparities in outcomes.

Hypotheses

This study is informed by a desire to bring an intersectional and long-term perspective to internal migration research. Toward that end, I examine the relationship between interstate migration and weekly earnings trajectories, with special attention devoted to the ways in which race/ethnicity and gender structure these relationships. I hypothesize that

Hypothesis 1—Migration will be associated with higher initial and long-term weekly earnings for black, Latino, and white men. This is because previous research has illustrated that many individuals are motivated to migrate for economic reasons regardless of their race/ethnicity (Lee and Roseman 1999).

Hypothesis 2—Because of discrimination in the housing and labor markets, as well as the decline in manufacturing and unions, I expect that the returns to migration will be lower for Latino and black men relative to comparable white men in multivariate analyses.

Hypothesis 3—Once marital status and the presence of children are accounted for, I expect to see smaller racial/ethnic gaps in the returns to migration among women than among men. I anticipate this because employment tends to be more central to black and Latina women's and their household's economic security, suggesting that they may be more likely to move to enhance their own economic outcomes relative to white women.

Hypothesis 4—I expect Latina and white women to benefit less from migration than Latina and white men and to potentially even experience negative returns to migration, given

that gender gaps in economic outcomes tend to be larger for whites and Latinxs. I anticipate either smaller gender gaps in the returns to migration for blacks or for black women to benefit more from migration than black men given that blacks exhibit smaller gender gaps in economic outcomes and black women exhibit higher levels of educational attainment than black men, though black women tend to benefit less from lengthier job tenures relative to black men.

Data and Methods

To examine these relationships, I use the NLSY79 for the years 1979 to 2012, as well as the restricted, geocoded data associated with this sample. The NLSY79 is a nationally representative sample composed of 12,686 men and women who were between 14 and 22 years old at the beginning of the survey in 1979 and between 47 and 55 years old in 2012, the last year for which data are currently available. Respondents were interviewed annually between 1979 and 1994, and interviewed biennially thereafter. Each participant has therefore been observed up to 25 times between 1979 and 2012.

I exclude person-periods for individuals that are below 20 years old ($N = 28,930$), who have missing information on weekly earnings ($N = 86,572$) or who do not report positive, nonzero weekly earnings ($N = 34,580$).⁴ I also exclude person-periods for individuals who are enrolled in school ($N = 1,648$) to reduce the probability that young adults attending school full- or part-time are included in the analysis, given that these individuals are unlikely to be able to participate fully in the labor force. Finally, I exclude person-period observations from individuals that do not have full information for all of the covariates ($N = 13,219$). The final analytic sample contains 152,201 person-periods from 9,912 unique individuals. Thus, while I lose a large portion of the person-periods in my sample (about 48 percent) due to the restrictions outlined above, I still observe 78 percent of the individuals included in the NLSY79 at some point in their lives. Moreover, it is largely because of my focus on individuals who are employed and who are more than 20 years old that I do not observe the full sample. Nevertheless, my substantive conclusions remain the same when the sample is weighted to account for attrition.

Weekly Earnings

In each wave, respondents are asked to provide their hourly wages and weekly hours worked per week. I use the responses to these questions to assess how migration is associated with logged weekly earnings (adjusted to 2012 dollars), which are calculated from hourly wages multiplied by weekly hours worked, the result of which is then logged. I focus on weekly earnings because it provides a fuller sense of an individual's economic well-being than

⁴This means that individuals who exit the labor force and then reenter are only included during the years they participate in the labor force. I exclude observations for individuals who are not participating in the labor force because including nonemployed individuals would obscure the relationships I observe by making it unclear whether differences across race/ethnicity, gender, and migration status are due to nonemployment rather than migration's association with economic outcomes. Migration's association with nonemployment is deserving of its own, detailed treatment. However, I did examine how the relationships I observe differ when including individuals who were not employed in my regressions. I found that including nonemployed individuals does not substantively change my results, though my findings are somewhat *understated* by focusing on employed individuals. Specifically, when I include nonemployed individuals, I find that the initial returns to migration are larger, black/white gaps in income and the returns to migration are smaller for women, and black/white gaps in income and the returns to migration are larger for men.

hourly wages. Specifically, an individual's hourly wage rate provides important insights into their economic well-being and the quality of their job. However, if an individual is underemployed (i.e., works fewer hours than they prefer), these wages will not go as far. In addition, individuals may move into jobs with fewer (or more) hours, which would translate into lower (higher) cumulative earnings, even if a migrant's wage rate did not change when they moved into a new job. Some support for this possibility is found in the literature indicating that employment has become less stable over time (Kalleberg 2000), individuals are less likely to work with the same employer continuously (Kronberg 2013, 2014), and work schedules are increasingly tenuous and unpredictable (Kalleberg 2000, 2009). This is, in part, because of the economic shift toward service industries and a 24/7 economy (Lesnard 2008; McMenamin 2007; Presser 2003) and because companies are increasingly restructuring and downsizing (Baumol, Blinder, and Wolff 2003), disrupting employment trajectories. The number of hours an individual works each week therefore has important cumulative implications for an individual's earnings and is reflective of whether individuals are underemployed, which has important implications for economic well-being and job status and stability (Jensen and Slack 2003). Moreover, underemployment is a particularly prevalent experience for black and Latinx women and men and for white women (Slack and Jensen 2002). By exploring the relationship between internal migration and weekly earnings, I am therefore better able to understand the holistic costs and benefits of migrating rather than if I examined wages or work hours alone.

Focal Independent Variables

I focus on interstate migration because interstate migration is considerably more likely to correspond to changes in labor markets and employment than shorter distance migration, such as intercounty migration (Spring, Tolnay, and Crowder 2013; White and Lindstrom 2005). Nevertheless, I also examined intercounty moves and intercounty moves in which the individual moved 50 miles or more. However, the results for these moves are substantively very similar to the results for interstate moves, though the returns to intercounty moves of 50 miles or more are somewhat more modest than the returns to interstate moves, and the returns to intercounty moves not restricted by distance are more modest than either of these types of moves. The gender and racial dynamics in these models are, however, very similar (results available upon request).

My focal independent variables include (1) whether the respondent has ever engaged in an interstate move⁵ (if an individual moves across states for the first time in 1985, for example, this variable registers a 1 in 1985 and in every subsequent year, but registers a 0 in previous years because the respondent had never moved up to that point). This variable is created from the NSLY79's restricted, geocoded survey questions asking respondents for their states of residence. A move is therefore registered when individuals change states between survey waves. Consequently, the migrant group solely includes individuals who have *already* moved, while the comparison group of nonmigrants includes individuals who have not migrated up to the observation year in question but who may migrate at some subsequent point in their life. I do not define migrants and nonmigrants by whether they *will* ever move

⁵. Interstate moves do not distinguish between inter-metro and intra-metro moves.

because doing so would limit my ability to look at the associations between the migration event and economic returns following the migration event. Although nonmigrants who will migrate in the future may be more select individuals than nonmigrants who will never migrate, I endeavor to partially account for this selectivity by including a wide variety of covariates and nesting my observations within individuals.⁶ Moreover, the inclusion of individuals who will migrate in the future in the nonmigrant category should cause the differences I observe between migrants and nonmigrants to be more modest, likely leading my results to be conservative. I also include (2) the number of years the respondent has lived in their state of residence as a working adult participating in the labor force who is also 20 years old or older, this measure therefore captures labor market tenure in a state. (3) An interaction between the ever moved dummy variable and the years the respondent has lived in their state of residence as a working adult is included. Finally, I control for (4) the number of moves conducted to capture the influence of additional or onward moves on migrants, which tend to have a particularly large influence on wages and employment outcomes (Knapp, White, and Wolaver 2013; Tolnay and Eichenlaub 2006). Table 1 provides an example of what these variables would look like for a hypothetical nonmigrant who lives in New York and a hypothetical migrant who lives in New York at the beginning of the observation period, but who then engages in two interstate moves.

My strategy follows that used by Cooke et al. (2009), although Cooke et al. used the number of years since the migration event instead of years of labor market tenure in a state to assess the longitudinal returns to migration. I am interested in understanding how both migrants' and nonmigrants' wages and work hours change over time. The labor market tenure variable is therefore valuable because it allows me to tap how nonmigrants' wages and work hours change over time in addition to how migrants' wages and work hours change over time.

Covariates

A host of personal and familial characteristics are included in my models to help account for migrant selectivity, variations in characteristics across race/ethnicity and gender, and characteristics that might influence economic outcomes and the opportunities for migration. Specifically, I include the quadratic relationship with age (age and age-squared) and job tenure (years with the same employer) to account for the importance of age and job tenure for work experience and, as a result, wages and work hours. Moreover, individuals with greater job tenure may experience more opportunities for promotion-related migration. I also include the respondent's educational attainment and occupational status (whether the respondent has a "professional" job or not) to help address the fact that migrants tend to be socioeconomically selective individuals and that the characteristics of migrants could therefore explain their improved economic outcomes relative to nonmigrants. Differences in socioeconomic characteristics may also be important for explaining racial/ethnic and gender

⁶I also examined whether my results remained robust when I use marginal structural models with inverse probability weights. These models help account for selection into migration by creating weights which are calculated using baseline, lagged, and time-invariant characteristics to estimate the probability of selection into migration. Regressions are subsequently weighted using these weights. I find that my results remain substantively very similar when I use these models, suggesting that my results are not driven by observable migrant selectivity, though unobservable characteristics could still be playing into my results. I also examined whether my results differ when I use individuals who have not migrated yet but will migrate in the future as my reference group. Although my results were somewhat more modest using this group as a comparison, the main conclusions held.

disparities in outcomes. Similarly, a lagged measure representing the average wage gain over the three years prior to the observation year is included to control for the potentially steeper earnings trajectories of migrants prior to moving. I include a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent is in the armed forces, because these individuals tend to experience more frequent job-related relocations (less than 1 percent of the sample is in the armed forces, however). I also control for marital status and the number of children the respondent has, both of which may be important characteristics for explaining gender disparities in the returns to migration and racial/ethnic disparities among women, because of the higher probability that white women are married but the lower probability that white women are single mothers. Finally, I include variables indicating whether the respondent resides in a rural or urban location and the respondent's region of residence (South, Northeast, North Central, or West). These control variables help account for the varying opportunity structures across regions and urban/rural areas and help account for the possibility that migrants might earn more, in part, by migrating to urban areas and the economically expanding regions of the South and West.⁷

Analytic Strategy

To examine the relationships between internal migration and economic outcomes, I use multilevel growth curve models that include individual and county-level random intercepts. I thereby nest person-period observations within individuals and individuals within counties and, as a result, account for the nested non-independence of the error terms that occurs when including multiple observations for a single person in the regression models. I include county-level random intercepts to help address across-county variation. Growth curve models also allow individuals' slopes to vary over time (as the number of years in a state increase).

The equation below illustrates this analytic strategy. Specifically, y captures the outcome of interest for person i at time t in county j ; π_{0ij} and π_{1ij} represent the intercept and slope for individual i in county j , respectively; YrsofRes_{tij} represents the residential tenure at time t for individual i in county j (this measure allows individuals' slopes to vary as their residential tenure increases), βx_{tij} represents the influence of covariates on the relationship, and ϵ_{tij} represents the residual for individual i at time t in county j :

$$y_{tij} = \pi_{0ij} + \pi_{1ij} \text{YrsofRes}_{tij} + \beta x_{tij} + \epsilon_{tij}.$$

Multilevel growth curve models offer numerous advantages for this analysis. For example, they allow me to model variation across individuals over time. This is an important consideration given that migrants are more likely to be selective individuals and may exhibit different economic trajectories, variation that is likely to be better captured by allowing individuals' intercepts *and* slopes to vary. In addition, multilevel growth curve models better handle missing data than other types of models (Curran, Obeidat, and Losardo 2010), a consideration that is especially important when examining groups that might have smaller numbers of observations, such as migrant Latina females.

⁷I did not include a control for year because it was highly correlated (>.90) with age.

I separately analyze men and women because their employment experiences are likely to systematically vary. Within these gender-based models, I conduct interactions with race/ethnicity and my migration-related variables, including whether the respondent ever moved across a state by the survey wave, the years of residence in the state, the interaction between ever moved and the years of residence, and the number of moves the individual has undertaken since the beginning of the survey. The interactions between these migration-related variables and race/ethnicity allow me to assess whether migration is associated with different levels of returns for blacks and Latinxs, relative to same-gender whites. To facilitate the interpretability of these results and allow for comparisons in the returns to migration across race/ethnicity and gender, I separately graph predicted hourly wages and weekly hours worked (y axis) by years of labor market in a state (x axis), holding all covariates at their means, for black, Latinx, and white women and men.

Results

To give an initial sense of whether migration dynamics do differ across race, ethnicity, and gender, I show the proportions of migrants across race/ethnicity and gender in Table 2. As can be seen, blacks and Latinxs are less likely to migrate than whites, consistent with prior research (Foster 2017; Spring, Tolnay, and Crowder 2013), and women are slightly less likely to migrate than same-race men. These variations in the proportions of migrants across race, ethnicity, and gender help motivate an exploration of variations in the potential benefits and costs of migration for black, Latinx, and white women and men.

Descriptive statistics for female and male migrants and nonmigrants are presented in Table 3 below. Nonmigrant person-years represent individuals who have not migrated up to the observation year in question (although nonmigrant person-years do not exclude individuals who will migrate in the future), migrant person-years only include individuals who have migrated by the observation year in question. The descriptive statistics illustrate that migrants exhibit higher weekly earnings, greater lagged income growth, more years of schooling, and higher probabilities of being married and employed in professional jobs than nonmigrants. Predictably, nonmigrants claim higher levels of labor market and job tenure. Overall, these descriptive results provide an initial indication that migrants may be better off than nonmigrants, though this could be a result of the positive selectivity of migrants, rather than the influence of the migration event itself on individuals' access to economic opportunities.

Females

I next turn to the growth curve analyses to more robustly examine these relationships. Toward that end, Figure 1 presents predicted weekly earnings as labor market tenure increases for black, Latina, and white migrant and nonmigrant women.⁸ These results are derived from the fully specified multivariate growth curve models for females, with covariates held at their means (the full set of results is presented in Appendix Table A1). I focus on the multivariate results because there are a number of characteristics that are

⁸I graph labor market tenure up to 14 years to capture labor market tenure that is up to 2 SDs from the mean for migrants.

fundamental to the relationship between internal migration and economic outcomes, such as age, educational attainment, and marital status. I therefore solely present the bivariate results in Appendix Table A1 because these results present a highly incomplete picture of racial and ethnic differences in the returns to migration without the inclusion of other covariates.

I find that black, Latina, and white female migrants all earn significantly higher initial weekly earnings relative to nonmigrants. For black and white females, these weekly wage returns to migration only persist when women have spent up to two years in a state as a working adult. There is also an indication that the returns to migration become negative after black and white women have spent a significant amount of time in a state, with migrant white women earning significantly less than nonmigrant white women when they have worked in a state for 14 or more years and with black women exhibiting a similar, though nonsignificant, trajectory later in their labor market tenures. The returns to migration are therefore significant but short-lived for black and white women. In contrast, Latina migrants earn significantly more than Latina nonmigrants until they have spent 10 years as a working adult in a state, suggesting that they earn much more substantial, sustained returns to migration.

Moreover, women's wages are quite comparable across race and ethnicity for both migrants and nonmigrants, though disparities between black and white females' wages are nonsignificantly lower for migrants than for nonmigrants. In addition, Latina migrants earn significantly more than black and white female migrants at most levels of labor market tenure, while this does not hold for nonmigrants. These findings of higher wages for Latina migrants are similar to Alon and Haberfeld's (2007) findings that, in multivariate models, Latina women earned significantly *more* than white women, though Alon and Haberfeld did not examine these relationships across migration statuses.

Males

In multivariate models (Figure 2), migration is not associated with significant wage benefits among black or Latino men at any level of labor market tenure. However, for white men, migration is associated with significant increases in wages relative to nonmigrant white men when they have spent up to four years as a working adult in a given state. This is both because migration is associated with significantly higher hourly wages for white men, and with significantly greater work hours. In contrast, black and Latino men experience neither benefit associated with migration.

Given the higher earnings of white male migrants, racial and ethnic disparities in wages tend to be higher for migrants than for nonmigrants. Black/white wage disparities are especially large given that black males exhibit virtually no earnings growth as their labor market tenure increases, in direct contrast to the earnings growth experienced by white and Latino males over time and contrasting with the steady, but more modest earnings growth exhibited by black, Latina, and white females.

Gender Disparities in the Returns to Migration

Although my analyses have largely focused on intragender differences in the returns to migration by race, I am also interested in *intergender* differences in the returns to migration.

To explore these relationships directly, I conduct separate models for each racial/ethnic group and interact gender with my migration-related variables (results available upon request). As expected, I find that in multivariate growth curve models (controlling for all of the variables mentioned above), black, Latina, and white migrant and nonmigrant women earn less than same-race men ($p < .001$ for all models). Moreover, white women tend to benefit less from migration than white men: migration is associated with larger wage returns at the point of migration for white men and white men earn greater wage returns to onward moves. In contrast, black females earn significantly higher wage returns to onward moves than black males and there are otherwise no significant gender differences in the returns to migration for blacks. Black migrant and nonmigrant women also exhibit significantly steeper earnings trajectories relative to black males. In addition, Latina females experience considerably larger benefits associated with migration right after moving relative to Latino males, though they also earn lower returns to onward moves.

Supplementary Analyses

It is possible that the lower returns to migration I observe for black and Latino males are due to the higher probability that they have ever been incarcerated, as discussed above. I therefore included a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent had ever been to jail or prison in the regression analyses. Although having an incarceration history is associated with significantly lower weekly earnings, including this variable does not change any of the coefficients related to the returns to migration. A history of incarceration does slightly explain away the coefficient for “black” in the regressions for males, indicating that a small part of the reason black men exhibit lower weekly earnings than white men is because of their higher likelihood of having ever been incarcerated.

It is still possible that incarceration may play into the racial and ethnic disparities in the returns to migration I observe if individuals who have not been incarcerated experience employer discrimination because of employer assumptions that they have been incarcerated (Pager, Bonikowski, and Western 2009). Accounting for incarceration histories would not explain away this potential discrimination effect. Nevertheless, one’s actual incarceration history does not appear to explain racial and ethnic disparities in the returns to migration.

In addition, it is possible that the returns to migration vary in fundamental ways across marital status, race/ethnicity, and gender, and that racial and ethnic differences in the returns to migration may be suppressed without including marital status. If the latter is the case, the returns to migration may be lower among white women because they are more likely to be married and thus tied movers and higher among Latina and, especially, black women given their lower likelihoods of marriage. Excluding marital status from regressions analyses may therefore correspond to artificially low racial disparities in the returns to migration among women. To explore these possibilities, I first sequentially added marital status into my regressions to examine how it affected the coefficients associated with the returns to migration. I found that the exclusion of marital status from the regressions did not significantly suppress the relationships I observe. The lower probability that black men are married partially explains their lower wages relative to white men. However, that is the only focal relationship marital status influences in a meaningful way in my regressions.

I also interacted marital status with my migration-related variables and conducted separate regressions by race/ethnicity and gender to examine whether marital status differentially influenced the returns to migration for black, Latinx, and white women and men (Appendix Table B1). For all groups, marital status is associated with higher weekly earnings, although this increase in weekly earnings is higher for men than for same-race/ethnicity women. This gap is especially large for white women and men. In addition, I found that for all groups of women, marital status significantly lowered their initial returns to migration so that it is only single black and white women who experience returns to migration (married Latina women experience more modest, but still significant returns to migration). Marital status is also associated with shallower earnings growth for white and Latina women regardless of their migration status. However, this finding of shallower earnings growth for married individuals also holds for white and Latino men. Thus, being married tends to be associated with larger gender gaps in earnings than being single, and it tends to be associated with lower initial returns to migration for women. There are relatively few racial and ethnic differences in these relationships that suggest these relationships operate in substantially different ways across race and ethnicity. However, the fact that marital status is associated with especially large gender gaps in earnings for whites as well as with significantly lower wage growth and returns to migration for white women indicates that marital status may particularly limit white women's economic outcomes.

Discussion

Three central questions oriented this article: do interstate migrants experience improved economic trajectories relative to nonmigrants in terms of their (1) weekly wages? And how do these relationships vary by (2) race/ethnicity and (3) gender? With regard to the first question, I find that, among men, interstate migration is only associated with improved wage trajectories for whites. Although I had expected to find that migration would be associated with wage gains for black and Latino males (Hypothesis 1), the finding that white males tended to benefit more consistently from migration than other groups is supportive of Hypothesis 2 (that white males would benefit the most from migration).

For women, I find that all groups experience weekly wage returns to migration, but these benefits are largest and most enduring for Latinas. The finding that Latina and black women experience wage gains associated with migration while Latino and black men do not, indicates that the experiences of men and women from different racial/ethnic groups should not be conflated and that migration may shape racial and ethnic disparities in fundamentally different ways for women and men. Indeed, my findings support Hypothesis 3 that racial and ethnic disparities in the returns to migration will be smaller among females than among males. Furthermore, my findings for whites are consistent with Hypothesis 4 that white and Latina females would exhibit lower returns to migration than same-race/ethnicity males, although it is only partially supported in the results for onward moves for Latinxs. For blacks, migration tends to be associated with *larger* overall economic returns for black females relative to black males, as anticipated by Hypothesis 4.

Potential Explanations

The finding that white men tend to experience larger wage benefits associated with migration relative to black and Latino men is consistent with the possibility that discrimination in the job and housing market may limit black's and Latino's potential returns to migration. For example, it may take longer for black and Latino men to find jobs because of discrimination in the job search process (Pager and Shepherd 2008). Black and Latino men may also receive fewer promotions within and across firms because of largely white job networks and discrimination (Mouw 2002). Alternatively, research suggests that whites tend to be more risk averse than blacks and, particularly, Latinxs (Halek and Eisenhower 2001; Schooley and Worden 1996). White men may therefore only move if they feel certain that a move will benefit them. Black and Latino men could also be more likely to migrate for noneconomic reasons, such as a desire to move closer to family or a need to move due to housing disruptions.

As mentioned above, industrial restructuring, downsizing, and the rise of unstable work schedules could also derail black and Latino males' economic mobility (Kalleberg 2009; Kronberg 2014). This could lead to fewer opportunities for economically beneficial migration relative to white males who may be impacted by these changes to a lesser extent and who may also tend to benefit more from economic changes such as the rise of the technology sector (Moretti 2013). These explanations for racial/ethnic disparities among men are not mutually exclusive and could be operating simultaneously. The stagnant economic trajectories of migrant and nonmigrant black men are particularly concerning and the economic disparities between them and white men are large, suggesting these obstacles may be especially limiting for black men's economic outcomes.

These forces are likely to operate for black and Latina women as well. However, black and Latina women could still benefit similarly or even more from migrating than white women if they are less likely to leave the labor force or decrease their level of labor force participation prior to and/or following a move. For example, it is possible that black and Latina women are less able or willing to leave the labor force because their families tend to claim lower average incomes. Black and Latina women may therefore exhibit stronger ties to the labor force both before and after a move, enhancing their earnings and job mobility and thereby increasing their potential returns to migration. Nevertheless, these hypotheses have not been explored in this study. Future research should continue to examine why racial/ethnic and gender gaps in outcomes exist.

Contributions

These findings have important implications for internal migration research and for research on racial/ethnic and gender stratification. Contemporary internal U.S. migration research has rarely focused on how race/ethnicity *and* gender shape the unique migration outcomes of individuals. The economic returns to internal migration for black and Latina women are particularly understudied. However, my findings demonstrate the utility of employing an intersectional perspective. Without doing so, the smaller economic benefits associated with migration for black and Latino men are obscured, as is the potential for migration to reproduce and even produce inequality among this group. The especially large economic

benefits associated with migration for Latina women and the comparable wage benefits associated with migration for black and white women are also neglected by failing to account for the intersection of race/ethnicity and gender. These findings have important implications for understanding how racial/ethnic and gender disparities may be shaped, reinforced, and, for black and Latina women, even challenged. The findings for women also complicate the common narrative in the migration literature of migration as a means for allowing women to exit the labor force or otherwise decrease their labor force participation. Neglecting race/ethnicity and gender effects misses the possibility that black and Latina women frequently face different constraints, norms, stereotypes, obstacles, and opportunities than white women and that the economic and migration experiences of white women are not generalizable to those of black and Latina women.

Another contribution of my study is its utilization of a rich and uniquely long-term longitudinal data set that allows me to examine how the employment outcomes of migrants and nonmigrants are shaped over time. In doing so, I am able to differentiate initial shocks associated with migration, from the longer term associations between migration and economic outcomes and thereby examine how migration is associated with racial/ethnic and gender disparities in the long term.

In addition, many studies only examine migrants' economic trajectories as the time since the migration event unfolds. My ability to compare migrants and nonmigrants over time is therefore an important contribution that allows me to better assess the short- and long-term economic returns associated with migration compared with the counterfactual nonmigrant population as well as to better assess the benefits and costs associated with remaining in place. As the U.S. population has continued to migrate at progressively lower rates (Cooke 2011; Fischer 2002; Foster 2017; Molloy, Smith, and Wozniak 2017; Spring, Tolnay, and Crowder 2013), the investigation of how nonmigrants are faring is becoming increasingly important for understanding how the U.S. population is doing economically and why migration seems to be a less appealing or accessible option for individuals now than in the past. Indeed, my finding that interstate migration appears to hold relatively few benefits for black and Latino men is concerning and may suggest that migration propensities have been declining, in part, because of the costliness of migration. It is also concerning that migratory *and* nonmigratory black men experience no increase in their wages as their residential tenures increase. This finding supports research that shows that economic changes such as the decline of unions (Card 2001; McCall 2001), industrial restructuring (Bound and Dresser 1999; Card 2001; McCall 2001), and the rise of unstable schedules and employment trajectories (Kalleberg 2009; Kronberg 2014) have tended to disadvantage blacks' economic outcomes in especially pronounced ways. My research therefore contributes to this growing literature on racial disparities in employment mobility and instability, indicating that, even for black men who are continuously employed and even among those who are able to move across states, economic mobility is extremely limited. Indeed, the latter finding for migrants is especially surprising, highlighting that it is not merely black males who are stuck in place residentially who experience disadvantageous trajectories but also those who are highly mobile. This finding contributes to the spatial mismatch literature, which documents the extent to which blacks are geographically separated from job opportunities (Jackson 1987; Kain 1992; Kneebone and Holmes 2015; Wagmiller 2007), by illustrating that moving may

not be enough to improve access to high-quality, stable employment and that attempts to improve racial equity in economic opportunities should attend to issues surrounding job access at each stage in the process of obtaining a job, from physical access to job opportunities to discrimination in hiring and firing. Thus, my findings of stagnant wage trajectories for black males illustrate the policy and scholarly importance of ensuring that individuals are not left behind by the economic changes occurring, nor that these economic changes further exacerbate already vast racial inequalities.

Limitations

This study is subject to limitations. Although multilevel growth curve models offer important benefits over many other types of models, they cannot fully account for unobserved heterogeneity. This is problematic because, as mentioned above, migrants are a select group and they may exhibit characteristics that are difficult to measure and account for and that could also be associated with economic outcomes, such as higher propensities for risk-taking and/or greater ambition. My findings might therefore be subject to omitted variable bias. Moreover, this method does not allow for a causal analysis of the relationship between internal migration and economic outcomes. However, I do find a very similar set of results when I use marginal structural models with inverse probability weights, which better account for selection into migration, and when I use individuals who have not yet migrated but will migrate in the future as the comparison group (thereby helping to account for the unobserved selectivity of migrants). In addition, my aim is not to present a causal analysis of the effects of migration but rather to describe the associations between migration and economic outcomes for a diverse group of women and men. I also do not desire to explain away every characteristic associated with race/ethnicity and gender, because doing so would create an overly artificial situation in which the trajectories I describe for black, Latinx, and white women and men are less representative of individuals' experiences. As such, I hope to provide a starting point for understanding how race/ethnicity and gender shape the outcomes associated with migration and, as a result, how migration might be tied to racial/ethnic and gender disparities in economic outcomes.

My inability to explore individuals' motivations for moving is also a limitation of this study because we would likely see larger returns to migration for white males if, for example, white males are the most likely to migrate for employment-related reasons. Although this is a problematic limitation, there are a number of reasons to believe that blacks, Latinxs, and whites exhibit relatively similar motivations for moving. For example, Lee and Roseman (1999) demonstrated that the determinants of moving across states are similar for blacks and whites and, if anything, expected economic benefits are more important for determining the location choices of blacks. Likewise, Crowder (2001) found that migrants' characteristics are associated with expectations in similar ways for blacks and whites and that blacks are more likely to consider their economic standing when forming expectations surrounding mobility. If whites were more likely to migrate for economic reasons, we would expect that characteristics that are important for employment, such as educational attainment, income, and professional job status would be more strongly related to migration probabilities for whites than for other groups. Nevertheless, it is well-established that women are more likely to be tied movers than men, suggesting that the motivations for migrating might frequently

be different for women. As mentioned above, research on migration to the U.S. South and research on the migration decisions of low-income families also suggest that family ties may be important motivators for moving to the South (Falk 2004; L. Hunt, Hunt, and Falk 2008; Stack 1996; M. Hunt, Hunt, and Falk 2012) and for interneighborhood mobility (Spring et al. 2017), respectively. Given my inability to definitively explore reasons for moving, the potential role of motivations in influencing these results would be a valuable avenue for future research.

Finally, this is a sample of middle-aged individuals who were in their 20s and early 30s in the 1980s and who are, on average, in their late 40s and early 50s as of 2012. The relationships between migration and economic outcomes and the structuring influence of race/ethnicity and gender on these relationships may therefore be somewhat different among a younger cohort of individuals. For example, this cohort experienced deindustrialization in the 1980s when they were largely in their 20s and starting their careers, the tech boom of the 1990s when they were predominantly in their 30s, and the recession in the early and late 2000s when they were in their 40s and early 50s and established in their careers. These period effects could influence the relationships I observe. For example, deindustrialization may have prompted many young adults to move from declining areas and the tech boom may have facilitated greater migration to tech hubs on the coast. My controls for socioeconomic status, urban residence, and region attempt to account for the influence of some of these experiences. However, future research should investigate these relationships for more recent cohorts so the influence of period effects can be better accounted for. Longitudinal data collection should also remain a priority so that these relationships can continually be investigated. Indeed, migration has long been an important component behind the health and dynamism of the U.S. economy. The extent to which migration continues to enhance opportunities for the United States's increasingly diverse population will therefore be important for racial, ethnic, and gender equality and for the economic well-being of the population.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Stewart Tolnay, Kyle Crowder, Jerald Herting, the participants in the University of Washington Context Working Group, and the anonymous reviewers for their many valuable suggestions for this manuscript.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/ or publication of this article: Partial support for this research came from a *Shanahan Endowment Fellowship* and Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development training grant, T32 HD007543, as well as a Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development research infrastructure grant, P2C HD042828, to the Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology at the University of Washington.

Appendix A

Table A1.

Multilevel Growth Curve Model Regressions of the Relationship between Interstate Migration and Logged Weekly Wages (Adjusted to 2012 prices) by Gender.

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Females	Females	Males	Males
Focal independent variables				
Yrs of residence (state)	0.028 *** (0.002)	0.015 *** (0.001)	0.016 *** (0.001)	0.011 *** (0.001)
Ever moved (state)	0.136 *** (0.026)	0.039 * (0.018)	0.111 *** (0.023)	0.048 ** (0.018)
Ever Moved × Years of Residence	−0.006 ** (0.002)	−0.002 (0.002)	−0.007 *** (0.002)	−0.003 (0.001)
Number of interstate moves	0.005 (0.008)	0.004 (0.006)	0.025 *** (0.007)	0.013 * (0.006)
Race/ethnicity interactions				
White (ref.)	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Black	−0.117 *** (0.023)	−0.063 *** (0.016)	−0.190 *** (0.021)	−0.084 *** (0.016)
Latinx	−0.025 (0.027)	0.001 (0.019)	−0.049 * (0.024)	0.009 (0.019)
Years of Residence × Black	0.002 (0.002)	−0.003 * (0.002)	−0.016 *** (0.002)	−0.010 *** (0.001)
Years of Residence × Latinx	−0.002 (0.002)	−0.002 (0.002)	−0.013 *** (0.002)	−0.009 *** (0.002)
Ever Moved × Black	0.047 (0.047)	0.013 (0.033)	−0.090 * (0.040)	−0.046 (0.031)
Ever Moved × Latinx	0.146 * (0.060)	0.152 *** (0.042)	−0.105 * (0.050)	−0.074 (0.039)
Years Residence × Ever Moved × Black	−0.006 (0.004)	−0.002 (0.003)	0.010 *** (0.003)	0.006 * (0.002)
Years Residence × Ever Moved × Latinx	−0.000 (0.005)	−0.004 (0.003)	0.013 *** (0.004)	0.010 *** (0.003)
Number Moves × Black	0.028 (0.015)	0.026 * (0.011)	−0.036 ** (0.013)	−0.015 (0.010)
Number Moves × Latinx	−0.043 * (0.020)	−0.023 (0.014)	0.002 (0.017)	0.003 (0.013)
Covariates				
Age	0.039 *** (0.002)	0.049 *** (0.002)	0.066 *** (0.002)	0.050 *** (0.002)
Age ²	−0.000 *** (0.000)	−0.001 *** (0.000)	−0.001 *** (0.000)	−0.001 *** (0.000)
Lagged wage growth		0.040 ***		0.032 ***

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Females	Females	Males	Males
		(0.000)		(0.000)
Married		0.011 *		0.091 ***
		(0.005)		(0.005)
Number of children		-0.048 ***		0.008 ***
		(0.003)		(0.002)
Years of job tenure		0.022 ***		0.017 ***
		(0.001)		(0.000)
Years of education		0.060 ***		0.052 ***
		(0.002)		(0.002)
In military		-0.025		-0.023
		(0.037)		(0.048)
Professional job		0.072 ***		0.053 ***
		(0.005)		(0.005)
Urban area		0.052 ***		0.037 ***
		(0.006)		(0.006)
Northeast		Ref.		Ref.
North Central		-0.150 ***		-0.122 ***
		(0.013)		(0.014)
West		-0.055 ***		-0.026
		(0.013)		(0.014)
South		-0.127 ***		-0.089 ***
		(0.011)		(0.012)
Constant	1.669 ***	0.755 ***	1.444 ***	1.046 ***
	(0.038)	(0.041)	(0.036)	(0.038)
Variance components				
Between counties	0.010 ***	0.003 ***	0.007 ***	0.003 ***
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)
Rate of change (years of residence)	0.001 ***	0.001 ***	0.001 ***	0.001 ***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Between individuals	0.146 ***	0.102 ***	0.196 ***	0.156 ***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Covariance (individual, years of residence)	-0.152 ***	-0.346 ***	-0.133 ***	-0.354 ***
	(0.025)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.022)
Residual	0.217 ***	0.176 ***	0.157 ***	0.122 ***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Observations	74,676	74,676	77,525	77,525
Unique ID	4,867	4,867	5,045	5,045
BIC	118,855.584	102,088.388	104,398.994	84,879.036

Note. Standard errors in parentheses. BIC = Bayesian information criterion.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

 $p < .001$.

Appendix B

Table B1.

Fully Specified Mixed Effects Regressions of Relationship between Interstate Migration and Weekly Wages by Marital Status.

Variables	White women	Black women	Hispanic women	White men	Black men	Hispanic men
Focal independent variables						
Years of residence (state)	0.029 *** (0.002)	0.013 *** (0.002)	0.013 *** (0.003)	0.010 *** (0.002)	0.011 *** (0.002)	0.009 *** (0.003)
Ever moved (state)	0.114 *** (0.025)	0.100 ** (0.032)	0.186 *** (0.050)	0.090 *** (0.020)	0.015 (0.030)	-0.006 (0.041)
Ever Moved × Years of Residence	-0.005 (0.003)	-0.006 * (0.003)	-0.004 (0.005)	-0.000 (0.002)	-0.003 (0.003)	0.007 (0.004)
Number of interstate moves	0.026 *** (0.007)	0.022 * (0.009)	-0.025 (0.014)	0.015 * (0.006)	0.025 ** (0.009)	0.025 * (0.012)
Marital status interactions						
Married	0.032 * (0.015)	0.056 ** (0.021)	0.051 * (0.025)	0.193 *** (0.012)	0.140 *** (0.022)	0.148 *** (0.021)
Years of Residence × Married	-0.007 *** (0.002)	-0.003 (0.002)	-0.008 ** (0.003)	-0.009 *** (0.001)	-0.004 (0.002)	-0.007 *** (0.002)
Ever Moved × Married	-0.096 *** (0.024)	-0.117 *** (0.034)	-0.096 * (0.048)	-0.016 (0.020)	-0.001 (0.033)	0.009 (0.038)
Years of Residence × Ever Moved × Married	0.002 (0.003)	0.006 (0.004)	0.009 (0.006)	-0.002 (0.003)	0.005 (0.004)	0.002 (0.005)
Observations	41,939	20,019	12,427	43,303	20,337	13,680
BIC	83,532.157	32,603.643	23,616.025	65,823.753	31,749.372	20,343.926

Note. Standard errors in parentheses. Full set of covariates are included in these models. BIC = Bayesian information criterion.

*
 $p < .05$.

**
 $p < .01$.

 $p < .001$.

References

- Adib Amel and Guerrier Yvonne. 2003 "The Interlocking of Gender with Nationality, Race, Ethnicity and Class: The Narratives of Women in Hotel Work." *Gender, Work, and Organization* 10(4):413–32.
- Alksnis Christine, Desmarais Serge, and Curtis James. 2008 "Workforce Segregation and the Gender Wage Gap: Is 'Women's' Work Valued as Highly as 'Men's'?" *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 38(6):1416–41.
- Alon Sigal and Haberfeld Yitchak. 2007 "Labor Force Attachment and the Evolving Wage Gap between White, Black, and Hispanic Young Women." *Work and Occupations* 34:369–98.
- Bailey Martha and Dynarski Susan. 2011 "Gains and Gaps: Changing Inequality in U.S. College Entry and Completion." NBER Working Paper No. 17633. Retrieved July 26, 2019 (<https://www.nber.org/papers/w17633>).
- Baumol William, Blinder Alan, and Wolff Edward. 2003 *Downsizing in America: Reality, Causes, and Consequences*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Borjas George, Bronars Stephen, and Trejo Stephen. 1992 "Self-Selection and Internal Migration in the United States." *Journal of Urban Economics* 32(2):159–85. [PubMed: 12345051]
- Bound John and Dresser Laura 1999 "Losing Ground: The Erosion of the Relative Earnings of African American Women during the 1980s" Pp. 61–104 in *Latinas and African American Women at Work: Race, Gender, and Economic Inequality*, edited by Browne Irene. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bowleg Lisa. 2012 "The Problem with the Phrase Women and Minorities: Intersectionality-an Important Theoretical Framework for Public Health." *American Journal for Public Health* 102(7):1267–73.
- Browne Irene and Misra Joya. 2003 "The Intersection of Gender and Race in the Labor Market." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:487–513.
- Card David. 2001 "The Effect of Unions on Wage Inequality in the U.S. Labor Market." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 54(2):296–315.
- Charles Camille Zubrinsky. 2003 "The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:167–207.
- Clark William and Withers Suzanne. 2002 "Disentangling the Interaction of Migration, Mobility, and Labor-Force Participation." *Environment and Planning* 34(5):923–45.
- Colby Sandra and Ortman Jennifer. 2015 "Projections of the Size and Composition of the U.S. Population: 2014 to 2060." *Current Population Reports* P25–1143. Retrieved July 26, 2019 (<https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2015/demo/p25-1143.html>).
- Cooke Thomas. 2008 "Migration in a Family Way." *Population, Space, and Place* 14(5):255–65.
- Cooke Thomas. 2011 "It Is Not Just the Economy: Declining Migration and the Rise of Secular Rootedness." *Population, Space, and Place* 17:193–203.
- Cooke Thomas, Boyle Paul, Couch Kenneth, and Feijten Peteke. 2009 "A Longitudinal Analysis of Family Migration and the Gender Gap in Earnings in the United States and Great Britain." *Demography* 46:147–67. [PubMed: 19348113]
- Crowder Kyle. 2001 "Racial Stratification in the Actuation of Mobility Expectations: Microlevel Impacts of Racially Restrictive Housing Markets." *Social Forces* 79:1377–96.
- Curran Patrick, Obeidat Khawla, and Losardo Diane. 2010 "Twelve Frequently Asked Questions about Growth Curve Modeling." *Journal of Cognitive Development* 11(2):121–36.
- Dahl Gordon. 2002 "Mobility and the Return to Education: Testing a Roy Model with Multiple Markets." *Econometrica* 70(6):2367–420.
- Desmond Matthew and Shollenberger Tracey. 2015 "Forced Displacement from Rental Housing: Prevalence and Neighborhood Consequences." *Demography* 52(5):1751–72. [PubMed: 26286885]
- England Paula. 2005 "Gender Inequality in Labor Markets: The Role of Motherhood and Segregation." *Social Politics* 12(2):264–88.
- England Paula, Christopher Karen, and Reid Lori. 1999 "Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Wages" Pp. 139–82 in *Latinas and African American Women at Work: Race, Gender, and Economic*, edited by Browne Irene. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Falk William. 2004 *Rooted in Place: Family and Belonging in a Southern Black Community*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Falk William, Hunt Larry, and Hunt Matthew. 2004 "Return Migrations of African-Americans to the South: Reclaiming a Land of Promise, Going Home, or Both?" *Rural Sociology* 69:490–509.
- Fischer Claude. 2002 "Ever-More Rooted Americans." *City & Community* 1(2):177–98.
- Flippen Chenoa. 2013 "Relative Deprivation and Internal Migration in the United States: A Comparison of Black and White Men." *American Journal of Sociology* 118(5):1161–98.
- Foster Thomas. 2017 "Decomposing American Immobility: Compositional and Rate Components of Interstate, Intrastate, and Intracounty Migration and Mobility Decline." *Demographic Research* 37:1515–48.
- Frey William. 2004 *The New Great Migration: Black Americans Return to the South, 1965–2000*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institute.
- Geist Claudia and McManus Patricia. 2012 "Different Reasons, Different Results: Implications of Migration by Gender and Family Status." *Demography* 49(1):197–217. [PubMed: 22109084]

- Greenman Emily and Xie Yu. 2008 "Double Jeopardy? The Interaction of Gender and Race on Earnings in the United States." *Social Forces* 86(3):1217–44.
- Greenwood Michael. 2015 "Perspectives on Migration Theory—Economics" In *Handbook of Migration and Population Distribution*. Springer Retrieved July 26, 2019 (https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-017-7282-2_3).
- Gregory James. 1989 *American Exodus: The Dust Bowl Migration and Okie Culture in California*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halek Martin and Eisenhauer Joseph. 2001 "Demography of Risk Aversion." *The Journal of Risk and Insurance* 68(1):1–24.
- Hegewisch Ariane, Liepmann Hannah, Hayes Jeffrey, and Hartmann Heidi. 2010 "Separate and Not Equal? Gender Segregation in the Labor Market and the Gender Wage Gap." Institute for Women's Policy Research Briefing Paper Retrieved July 26, 2019 (<https://iwpr.org/publications/separate-and-not-equal-gender-segregation-in-the-labor-market-and-the-gender-wage-gap/>).
- Hogan Richard and Perrucci Carolyn Cummings. 2007 "Black Women: Truly Disadvantaged in the Transition from Employment to Retirement Income." *Social Science Research* 36(3):1184–99.
- Hosoda Megumi, Nguyen Lam, and Stone-Romero Eugene. 2012 "The Effect of Hispanic Accents on Employment Decisions." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 27(4):347–64.
- Hunt Larry, Hunt Matthew, and Falk William. 2008 "Who is Headed South? U.S. Migration Trends in Black and White, 1970–2000." *Social Forces* 87:95–119.
- Hunt Matthew, Hunt Larry, and Falk William. 2012 "'Call to Home?' Race, Region, and Migration to the U.S. South, 1970–2000." *Sociological Forum* 27(1):117–41.
- Jackson Kenneth. 1987 *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobsen Joyce and Levin Laurence. 1997 "Marriage and Migration: Comparing Gains and Losses from Migration for Couples and Singles." *Social Science Quarterly* 78(3):688–709.
- Jensen Leif and Slack Tim. 2003 "Underemployment in America: Measurement and Evidence." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 32(1):21–31. [PubMed: 14570432]
- Jolly Nicholas. 2015 "Geographic Mobility and the Costs of Job Loss." *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis and Policy* 15(4):1793–1829.
- Kain John. 1992 "The Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis: Three Decades Later." *Housing Policy Debate* 3(2):371–460.
- Kalleberg Arne. 2000 "Nonstandard Employment Relations: Part-Time, Temporary and Contract Work." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:341–65.
- Kalleberg Arne. 2009 "Precarious Work, Insecure Workers: Employment Relations in Transition." *American Sociological Review* 74(1):1–22.
- Kennan John and Walker James. 2010 "Wages, Welfare Benefits and Migration." *Journal of Econometrics* 156(1):229–38. [PubMed: 22844178]
- Kennelly Ivy. 1999 "'That Single-Mother Element': How White Employers Typify Black Women." *Gender and Society* 13(2):168–92.
- Kirschenman Joleen and Neckerman Kathryn. 1991 "We'd Love to Hire Them, but? The Meaning of Race to Employers" Pp. 203–32 in *The Urban Underclass*, edited by Jencks C and Peterson P. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Knapp Thomas, White Nancy, and Wolaver Amy. 2013 "The Returns to Migration: The Influence of Education and Migration Type." *Growth and Change* 44(4):589–607.
- Kneebone Elizabeth and Holmes Natalie. 2015 "The Growing Distance between People and Jobs in Metropolitan America." Washington, DC: Metropolitan Policy Program, The Brookings Institution.
- Krieg Randall. 1997 "Occupational Change, Employer Change, Internal Migration, and Earnings." *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 27:1–15. [PubMed: 12348188]
- Kronberg Anne-Kathrin. 2013 "Stay or Leave? Externalization of Job Mobility and the Effect on the U.S. Gender Earnings Gap, 1979–2009." *Social Forces* 91(4):1117–46.
- Kronberg Anne-Kathrin. 2014 "Stay or Leave? Race, Education, and Changing Returns to the External Labor Market Strategy, 1976–2009." *Work and Occupations* 41(3):305–49.

- Lee Everett. 1966 "A Theory of Migration." *Demography* 3(1):47–57.
- Lee SeongWoo and Roseman Curtis. 1999 "Migration Determinants and Employment Consequences of White and Black Families, 1985–1990." *Economic Geography* 75:109–33.
- Leibbrand Christine, Massey Catherine, Alexander J. Trent, and Tolnay Stewart. 2019 "Great Migration's Great Return? An Examination of Second-Generation Return Migration to the South." *Social Science Research* 81:117–31. [PubMed: 31130190]
- Lesnard Laurent. 2008 "Off-Scheduling Within Dual-earner Couples: An Unequal and Negative Externality for Family Time." *American Journal of Sociology* 114(2):447–90.
- Markert John. 2010 "The Changing Face of Racial Discrimination: Hispanics as the Dominant Minority in the USA—A New Power-Threat Theory." *Critical Sociology* 36(2):307–27.
- Massey Douglas and Denton Nancy. 1993 *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Maxwell Nan. 1988 "Economic Returns to Migration: Marital Status and Gender Differences." *Social Science Quarterly* 69(1):108–21.
- McCall Leslie. 2001 "Sources of Racial Wage Inequality in Metropolitan Labor Markets: Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Differences." *American Sociological Review* 66(4):520–41.
- McCall Leslie. 2005 "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs* 30(3):1771–1800.
- McKinnish Terra. 2008 "Spousal Mobility and Earnings." *Demography* 45(4):829–49. [PubMed: 19110900]
- McMenamin Terence. 2007 "A Time to Work: Recent Trends in Shift Work and Flexible Schedules." *CPS Monthly Labor Review*. Retrieved July 26, 2019 (<https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2007/12/art1full.pdf>).
- Mintz Beth and Krymkowski Daniel. 2014 "The Intersection of Race/Ethnicity and Gender in Occupational Segregation: Changes over time in the contemporary United States." *International Journal of Sociology* 40(4):31–58.
- Mintz Beth and Krymkowski Daniel. 2016 "The Ethnic, Race, and Gender Gaps in Workplace Authority: Changes over Time in the United States." *The Sociological Quarterly* 51(1):20–45.
- Molloy Raven, Smith Christopher, and Wozniak Abigail. 2017 "Job Changing and the Decline in Long-Distance Migration in the United States." *Demography* 54(2):631–53. [PubMed: 28236137]
- Moretti Enrico. 2013 *The New Geography of Jobs*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Moss Philip and Tilly Chris. 2001 *Stories Employers Tell: Race, Skill, and Hiring in America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Mouw Ted. 2002 "Are Black Workers Missing the Connection? The Effect of Spatial Distance and Employee Referrals on Interfirm Racial Segregation." *Demography* 39(3):507–28. [PubMed: 12205755]
- Oliver Melvin and Shapiro Thomas. 2006 *Black Wealth / White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. 10th anniversary ed. New York: Routledge.
- Pager Devah. 2003 "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *American Journal of Sociology* 108(5): 937–75.
- Pager Devah, Bonikowski Bart, and Western Bruce. 2009 "Discrimination in a Low-Wage Labor Market: A Field Experiment." *American Sociological Review* 74(5):777–99.
- Pager Devah and Shepherd Hana. 2008 "The Sociology of Discrimination: Racial Discrimination in Employment, Housing, Credit, and Consumer Markets." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:181–209.
- Penner Andrew and Saperstein Aliya. 2013 "Engendering Racial Perceptions: An Intersectional Analysis of How Social Status Shapes Race." *Gender & Society* 27(3):319–44.
- Presser Harriet. 2003 *Working in a 24/7 Economy: Challenges for American Families*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Raley R. Kelly, Sweeney Megan, and Wondra Danielle. 2015 "The Growing Racial and Ethnic Divide in U.S. Marriage Patterns." *Future Child* 25(2):89–109. [PubMed: 27134512]
- Ravenstein Ernst. 1885 "The Laws of Migration." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 48(2):167–235.
- Reskin Barbara. 1993 "Sex Segregation in the Workplace." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19:241–70.

- Roscigno Vincent, Karafin Diana, and Tester Griff. 2009 "The Complexities and Processes of Racial Housing Discrimination." *Social Problems* 56(1):49–69.
- Ross Stephen and Turner Margery A.. 2005 "Housing Discrimination in Metropolitan America: Explaining Changes between 1989 and 2000." *Social Problems* 52(2):152–80.
- Rugh Jacob and Massey Douglas. 2010 "Racial Segregation and the American Foreclosure Crisis." *American Sociological Review* 75(5):629–51. [PubMed: 25308973]
- Schooley Diane and Worden Debra. 1996 "Risk Aversion Measures: Comparing Attitudes and Asset Allocation." *Financial Services Review* 5:87–99.
- Shuman Kimberlee and Noonan Mary. 2007 "Family Migration and Labor Force Outcomes: Sex Differences in Occupational Context." *Social Forces* 85(4):1735–64.
- Shields Stephanie. 2008 "Gender: An Intersectionality Perspective." *Sex Roles* 59(5):301–11.
- Slack Tim and Jensen Leif. 2002 "Race, Ethnicity, and Underemployment in Nonmetropolitan America: A 30-Year Profile." *Rural Sociology* 67(2):208–33.
- Spitze Glenna. 1984 "The Effect of Family Migration on Wives' Employment: How Long Does It Last?" *Social Science Quarterly* 65(1):21–36.
- Spring Amy, Ackert Elizabeth, Crowder Kyle, and South Scott. 2017 "Influence of Proximity to Kin on Residential Mobility and Destination Choice: Examining Local Movers in Metropolitan Areas." *Demography* 54(4):1277–1304. [PubMed: 28681169]
- Spring Amy, Tolnay Stewart, and Crowder Kyle. 2013 "Moving for Opportunities? Changing Patterns of Migration in North America" Pp. 421–48 in *Handbook of Migration*, edited by White Michael. New York: Springer.
- Squires Gregory and Kubrin Charis. 2005 "Privileged Places: Race, Uneven Development and the Geography of Opportunity in Urban America." *Urban Studies* 42(1):47–68.
- Stack Carol. 1996 *Call to Home: African Americans Reclaim the Rural South*. New York: Basic Books.
- Stuart Guy. 2003 *Discriminating Risk: The U.S. Mortgage Lending Industry in the Twentieth Century*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Tolnay Stewart. 2003 "The African American 'Great Migration' and Beyond." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:209–32.
- Tolnay Stewart and Eichenlaub Suzanne. 2006 "Southerners in the West: The Relative Well-Being of Direct and Onward Migrants." *Social Forces* 84(3):1639–63.
- Wagmiller Robert. 2007 "Race and the Spatial Segregation of Jobless Men in Urban America." *Demography* 44(3):539–62. [PubMed: 17913010]
- White Michael and Lindstrom David. 2005 "Internal Migration" Pp. 311–46 in *Handbook of Population*, edited by Poston Dudley L. and Micklin Michael. New York: Springer.
- Willson Andrea. 2003 "Race and Women's Income Trajectories: Employment, Marriage, and Income Security over the Life Course." *Social Problems* 50(1):87–110.
- Yankow Jeffrey. 2003 "Migration, Job Change, and Wage Growth: A New Perspective on the Pecuniary Return to Geographic Mobility." *Journal of Regional Science* 43(3):483–516.

Figure 1.

The predicted relationship between interstate migration and weekly wages for women.

Source. National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79).

Note. Multivariate models hold covariates at their means. Predicted relationships are calculated using Stata 13's *margins* command to predict hourly wages as residential tenure increases by race/ethnicity and gender (full set of results from growth curve models are presented in Appendix Table A1, columns 1 and 2).

Figure 2.

The predicted relationship between interstate migration and weekly wages for men.

Source. National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79).

Note. Predicted relationships are calculated using Stata 13's margins command to predict hourly wages as residential tenure increases by race/ethnicity and gender (full set of results from growth curve models are presented in Appendix Table A1, columns 3 and 4).

Table 1.

Focal Independent Variables for a Hypothetical Migrant and Nonmigrant.

Observation Year	Migrant				Nonmigrant			
	Residence	Ever migrated	Residential tenure	Number of moves	Residence	Ever migrated	Residential tenure	Number of moves
1979	Lives in NY	0	0	0	Lives in NY	0	1	0
1980		0	1	0		0	2	0
1981	NY → CA	1	0	1		0	3	0
1982		1	1	1		0	4	0
1983	CA → OR	1	0	2		0	5	0
1984		1	1	2		0	6	0
1985		1	2	2		0	7	0

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 2.
Means and Standard Deviations for Percent Ever Migrated Interstate by Race/Ethnicity and Gender.

	White women	Black women	Latina women	White men	Black men	Latino men
Proportion Ever Migrated	0.3150 (0.4645)	0.2681 (0.4430)	0.2147 (0.4106)	0.3284 (0.4696)	0.2850 (0.4514)	0.2179 (0.4128)
N (person-years)	41,939	20,019	12,427	43,303	20,337	13,680

Table 3. Means and, in Parentheses, *SDs* for Outcome Variables and Covariates (in Person-Years) by Gender and Migrant Status.

	Female		Male	
	Migrant	Nonmigrant	Migrant	Nonmigrant
Outcome variables				
Logged weekly wages	6.140 (0.862)	6.070 (0.794)	6.601 (0.808)	6.447 (0.709)
Migration variables				
Years of labor market tenure (State)	4.948 (5.130)	8.318 (6.685)	4.973 (5.122)	8.160 (6.631)
Number of state moves	2.271 (1.375)	0 (NA)	2.206 (1.364)	0 (NA)
Covariates				
White (ref.)	0.622 (0.485)	0.541 (0.498)	0.618 (0.486)	0.535 (0.499)
Black	0.253 (0.435)	0.276 (0.447)	0.252 (0.434)	0.268 (0.443)
Latinx	0.126 (0.331)	0.184 (0.387)	0.130 (0.336)	0.197 (0.398)
Lagged wage growth	1.143 (5.346)	0.916 (4.956)	1.351 (6.867)	0.996 (5.746)
Age	33.340 (8.369)	31.851 (8.943)	33.183 (8.236)	31.264 (8.680)
Married	0.542 (0.498)	0.494 (0.500)	0.506 (0.500)	0.476 (0.499)
Number of children	1.090 (1.162)	1.071 (1.147)	0.796 (1.131)	0.779 (1.110)
Years of job tenure	3.608 (4.095)	4.921 (5.356)	4.068 (4.542)	5.085 (5.547)
Years of education	13.604 (2.414)	12.990 (2.159)	13.498 (2.716)	12.474 (2.183)
In military	0.008 (0.087)	0.001 (0.032)	0.001 (0.037)	0.001 (0.039)
Professional job	0.425 (0.494)	0.326 (0.469)	0.393 (0.489)	0.241 (0.428)
Live in urban area	0.776 (0.417)	0.766 (0.424)	0.774 (0.418)	0.759 (0.428)
Northeast (ref.)	0.149 (0.356)	0.178 (0.382)	0.156 (0.363)	0.177 (0.382)
North central	0.209 (0.406)	0.241 (0.428)	0.235 (0.424)	0.243 (0.429)
West	0.191 (0.393)	0.186 (0.389)	0.210 (0.407)	0.199 (0.399)
South	0.448 (0.497)	0.395 (0.489)	0.397 (0.489)	0.380 (0.485)
<i>N</i>	21,247	53,138	22,997	54,323
Unique ID	1,284	4,851	1,408	5,024

Source. National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79).