86-70

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON POVERTY DISCUSSION PAPERS

ARE BLACK MIGRANTS FROM THE SOUTH TO THE NORTHERN CITIES WORSE OFF THAN BLACKS ALREADY THERE?

Stanley H. Masters

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

ARE BLACK MIGRANTS FROM THE SOUTH TO THE NORTHERN CITIES WORSE OFF THAN BLACKS ALREADY THERE?

by

Stanley H. Masters

The author is Visiting Associate Professor at the Institute for Research on Poverty on leave from Rutgers University, where most of the research was done. This study was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity. The opinions expressed herein are those of the author and should not be construed as representing the opinions or policy of any agency of the United States Government. The research also was supported in part by funds granted to the Institute by the Office of Economic Opportunity pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The author is indebted to Kate Tallmadge and Mildred Evans for computer programming, to Ronald Rudolph for research assistance, and to Patricia Koshel and Bette Mahoney of OEO and his colleagues at Rutgers and Wisconsin for advice and encouragement.

ABSTRACT

Are Black Migrants from the South to the Northern Cities Worse Off Than Blacks Already There?

by Stanley H. Masters

This study indicates that the economic problems of the urban Negro are much more serious than the relatively simple adjustment problems facing Negro migrants from the rural South. Among Negroes currently living in SMSA's outside the South, those born in the South have higher incomes and less unemployment than those born in the North. These results apply with and without standardizing for differences in age, years of school, and a number of other variables. Differences in the quality of education cannot explain these results, since the quality of schooling appears to be lower for Negroes educated in the South. Two possible explanations do achieve some empirical support. One hypothesis stresses differences in work effort between migrants and nonmigrants, while the other is based on differences in the relationship between schooling and natural ability for those born in the two areas.

In addition to lifetime migration, recent migration is also considered. Recent migrants, defined as those in an SMSA in 1960 but not in 1955, do have lower incomes than those who lived in SMSA's in both years. The results are stronger for whites then for Negroes, however, especially for earnings per week. If racial discrimination is greater when good jobs are involved and if recent migrants would have trouble getting such jobs regardless of race, then recent migration could be expected to have a greater effect on white incomes.

The findings indicate that programs aimed at easing the adjustment problems of migrants will lead to relatively little improvement in the incomes of urban Negroes. If the policy goal is to reduce the economic problems of ghetto residents, then the alternative approach of fighting racial discrimination appears to have a much greater potential payoff.

Are Black Migrants from the South to the Northern Cities Worse Off Than Blacks Already There?

Economists often look at migration as an investment and compare the income of migrants with that of people who remained behind. This study focuses on a different aspect of migration. It compares the migrants with those who were already at the destination point. Specifically, the study examines the migration of Negroes from the South to the Northern cities and, for all regions, from rural to urban areas. The income and labor-force status of these migrants are compared with the corresponding values for Negroes who were already in the cities.

By doing such a study, we can obtain at least a partial answer to the question, "How many of the problems facing northern (or urban) Negroes can be attributed directly to their migration from the South (or from rural areas)?" If we find that the migrants are much worse off than the nonmigrants, then it might make sense to set up special organizations in the cities to assist the newcomers. It might also be very important to improve the quality of schooling and counseling in the areas from which the migrants came.

The results of this study indicate, however, that the migrants are likely to be better off than the nonmigrants, at least once an initial adjustment period is passed.[1] If the migrants are better off than the long-term urban residents, then efforts to improve the situation of northern Negroes should probably focus on the general issue of discrimination rather than on special programs to assist migrants. In addition, we should not be too optimistic that the positions of northern Negroes will automatically

improve as the migration slows down. This last statement must be qualified, however, since a decrease in the size of the migration might still improve the position of northern Negroes if the relative size of the Negro and white communities has an important effect on the opportunities available to Negroes.

I. The Data and the Measures of Migration Status

This study is based on data from the 1/1,000 sample of the 1960 Census. With these data we can look at both lifetime and recent migration. Lifetime migrants are Negroes who were born in the South, but who are living in Standard Metropoliton Statistical Areas (SMSA's) outside the South in 1960. These migrants will be compared with all the Negroes living in nonsouthern SMSA's who were born outside the South.[2] These results will be compared with analogous results for whites. For whites, lifetime migrants are those who were born outside the United States and who are currently living in SMSA's outside the South. These migrants will be compared with all other whites living in nonsouthern SMSA's.

Recent migrants are those who were living in an SMSA in 1960, but not in 1955. They will be compared with those who were living in SMSA's in both 1955 and 1960.[3] For both recent and lifetime migration, the analysis is restricted to those who are at least eighteen years old, not students, not in the armed services, and not inmates of institutions.

Empirical results for lifetime migration are presented in the following section. In Section III we attempt to explain these findings. The results for recent migration are presented in Section IV.

II. Results for Lifetime Migration

Simple cross-tabulations for lifetime migration are presented in Table 1. We see that Negro lifetime migrants are generally better off than their comparison group. The only exceptions are the figures for family income and possibly labor-force participation.[4] On the other hand, white lifetime migrants are worse off in every case except weeks worked.

Both Negro and white lifetime migrants are usually older and have fewer years of school than the comparison group.[5] To determine the net effect of migration, we use regression analysis with independent variables for years of school, age, sex, family status, region, and type of community as well as migration status.[6] For dependent variables we use each of the economic variables from Table 1.

The regression coefficients for lifetime migration (with t-values in parentheses) are presented in Table 2. We see that the Negro lifetime migrants are better off than the comparison group in all respects except family income, where there is no appreciable difference between the two groups. The migrants are significantly better off than the nonmigrants (a) at the 95 percent level for poverty status and labor-force participation and (b) at the 90 percent level for annual earnings. White migrants are generally worse off than the nonmigrants, although not in unemployment and poverty status. Only the results for annual earnings and poverty status are statistically significant.

III. Explaining the Results for Lifetime Migration

Other things being equal, we expect migrants to have lower incomes than nonmigrants because of adjustment problems. For example, migrants are less

TABLE 1

ECONOMIC STATUS OF
LIFETIME MIGRANTS AND NONMIGRANTS[a]

	Negroes		Whites	
	Lifetime Migrants	Comparison Group	Lifetime Migrants	Comparison Group
For those in the labor force				
Annual earnings	$2,853	$2,736	$4,737	$5,104
Earnings per week	$69.5	$67.5	$110.1	$113.5
Weeks worked	39.8	39.0	46.9	46.4
Unemployment rate	11.2	12.6	5.1	4.5
Sample size	1,639	880	3,020	26,066
For the total sample				
Family income	$4,692	$4,926	$6,481	$7,504
Percent poor	27.9	28.5	15.6	10.0
Labor force participation rate	64.7	65.2	49.5	62.4
Sample size	2,533	1,349	6,107	41,756

[a]The unemployment rate and labor force participation rate are for the survey week of 1960. The other figures are for 1959. Poverty status is determined on the basis of the Orshansky definitions (see Mollie Orshansky, "Counting the Poor: Another Look at the Poverty Profile," Social Security Bulletin, Jan. 1965; and "Who's Who Among the Poor: A Demographic View of Poverty," Social Security Bulletin, July 1965) adjusted for 1959 prices.

TABLE 2

NET EFFECT OF LIFETIME MIGRATION

	Negroes	Whites
For those in the labor force[a]		
Annual earnings ($1,000)	.155	-.102
	(1.84)	(2.26)
Earnings per week	3.58	-1.85
	(1.19)	(1.51)
Weeks worked	.754	-.150
	(1.09)	(.87)
Unemployment	.012	.002
	(.83)	(.93)
Sample size	2,519	[a]
For the total sample		
Family income ($1,000)	-.003	-.061
	(.03)	(.88)
Poverty status	.030	.010
	(2.02)	(2.23)
Labor force participation	.033	-.008
	(2.25)	(1.38)
Sample size	3,882	47,863

Where unemployment = -1 if the person is unemployed
poverty status = -1 if the person is poor
labor force participation = -1 if the person is not in the labor force

[a]Due to financial constraints the results for whites are for the total sample with a dummy variable for labor force participation added. When similar results were obtained for Negroes, they did not differ appreciably from the results in column 1, where the sample is limited to those actually in the labor force.

likely to have the skills and experience for which employers are looking. For whites, the results in Table 2 are generally consistent with the view, but the results for Negroes are not. Originally I expected that the Negro lifetime migrants would be slightly worse off than the nonmigrants, (1) because of the normal adjustment problems and (2) because the quality of schooling for Negroes appears to be lower in the South.[7] Now we must seek explanations for why Negro lifetime migrants do better than nonmigrants.

Two possible explanations will be presented.[8] One stresses differences in work effort between migrants and nonmigrants while the other is based on differences in the relationship between schooling and natural ability for those born in different regions.

The first hypothesis starts with the assumption that many Negroes migrate to the North to seek greater economic opportunities. Therefore, they can be expected to work hard to take advantage of the better opportunities that do appear to exist for Negroes in the North.[9]

Although the economic opportunities for a Negro are great in the North relative to his opportunities in the South, the northern Negro's opportunities (at least for males) are still quite small relative to those available to the average white.[10] While the Negro migrant may focus on how much better his opportunities are in the North than they were in the South and work hard to take advantage of these opportunities, his children may react quite differently.

Succeeding generations are likely to be much more conscious of how limited their opportunities are relative to those of whites. Consequently, a job that looks good to the migrant, relative to what he could get in the South, may look quite unattractive to his son, who compares this job with the jobs whites

are able to get. Because of this difference in perspective, the extra income gained by working long hours, doing particularly strenuous physical labor, or participating in lengthy training programs may be much more important to the migrant than to succeeding generations. Consequently the succeeding generations may not be willing to work as hard as the migrants. If so, this lower work effort could explain why incomes appear to be higher for Negro lifetime migrants than for nonmigrants.

Since racial discrimination in the North is generally considered to be greater against males than against females, this work-effort argument should apply more to males then to females. Separate results for males and females have been calculated and are presented in Table 3. The results indicate that the superior position of migrants is due almost entirely to the results for males,[11] thereby providing some support for the work-effort hypotheses.[12]

There is a second possible explanation for the results for Negro lifetime migration. This explanation is based on differences in the relationship between schooling and natural ability for Negroes born in the South versus those born in the North. Table 4 shows the percentages in the various schooling categories for those born in the South (whether they are now living in the North or South) and for those born and living outside the South.

Note the much larger percentage in the lowest schooling category for those born in the South. If natural ability (I.Q., emotional stability, etc.) and years of school are correlated within each group and if natural ability is fairly evenly distributed between those born in the two areas, then those with a given number of years of school will have higher ability, on the average, if they are southern born. This difference in ability could then account for the better performance of the lifetime migrants.

TABLE 3

NET EFFECT OF LIFETIME MIGRATION FOR
NEGRO MALES AND FEMALES

	Males	Females
For those in the labor force		
Annual earnings ($1,000)	.360	-.222
	(3.10)	(1.99)
Earnings per week	9.01	-5.59
	(2.05)	(1.64)
Weeks worked	1.00	-0.20
	(1.23)	(.16)
Unemployment	.015	.002
	(.82)	(.07)
Sample size	1,548	971
For the total sample		
Family income ($1,000)	.024	.032
	(.14)	(.21)
Poverty status	.044	.026
	(2.07)	(1.26)
Labor force participation	.028	.017
	(1.72)	(.74)
Sample size	1,802	2,080

See Tables 1 and 2 for definitions. All are set up so that a positive coefficient means the migrants are better off. The t-values are in parentheses.

TABLE 4

SCHOOLING DISTRIBUTION OF NEGROES, 1960[a]

	Years of School			
	0-7	8-11	12	over 12
Born South	.494	.321	.130	.055
Born and live non-South	.174	.440	.279	.107

[a]The figures in this table have been calculated from the 1/1,000 sample of the 1960 Census. Students, inmates of institutions, members of the armed services, and those under 18 are all excluded since they are not included in the rest of the analysis.

If the quality of schooling is lower in the South, however, then this argument requires that the differences in natural ability be greater than the differences in the quality of the schools. Since the quality of schooling is undoubtedly most important for those with the most schooling, we can test our hypothesis of differences in natural ability by looking at results for those with different amounts of schooling. These results are presented in Table 5. We see that the superior position of the migrants applies mainly to those with less than twelve years of school. While this provides some support for our hypothesis of differences in natural ability, the support would be stronger if the results for those with less than eight years of school were larger relative to the results for those with eight to eleven years.

IV. Results for Recent Migration

If other factors are held constant, then the adjustment problems of migrants should be more serious the shorter the length of time since they migrated. While white lifetime migrants may have extra problems, like learning a new language, for Negroes the most important difference between recent and lifetime migrants is probably the length of time available for adjusting to the new type of community.[13] Therefore, at least for Negroes, we expect that recent migrants are more likely to suffer economic handicaps than lifetime migrants.

The results are consistent with this view. Recall that, based on the 1960 Census data, we have defined recent migrants as those who were living in an SMSA in 1960, but who did not live in any metropolitan area in 1955.

TABLE 5

NET EFFECT OF LIFETIME MIGRATION FOR NEGROES WITH DIFFERENT YEARS OF SCHOOL[a]

	Years of School			
	0-7	8-11	12	Over 12
For those in the labor force				
Annual earnings ($1,000)	.303	.216	-.086	.227
	(1.17)	(1.02)	(.53)	(.75)
Earnings per week	3.78	4.15	-0.63	11.10
	(.41)	(.55)	(.11)	(1.03)
Weeks worked	0.02	2.58	0.47	-4.53
	(.01)	(1.48)	(.35)	(1.82)
Unemployment	.001	.034	-.001	-.031
	(.03)	(.97)	(.02)	(.62)
Number of observations	658	1042	582	237
For the total sample				
Family income ($1,000)	.155	.123	-.262	-.307
	(.44)	(.42)	(1.15)	(.70)
Poverty status	.066	.041	-.005	-.014
	(1.45)	(1.06)	(.15)	(.25)
Labor force participation	.026	.049	.004	.046
	(4.63)	(1.32)	(.13)	(.83)
Sample size	1129	1608	829	316

[a]See Tables 1 and 2 for the definitions of the dependent variables. The regressions were run with a set of joint dummies for migration status and education, with the reference group being nonmigrants with 12 years of school. For 12 years of school, the regression coefficient for migrants and its t-value are reported. For the other educational categories, the coefficient for the nonmigrants is subtracted from the coefficient for the migrant. In all cases, a position number means the migrants are better off. Except for those with 12 years of school, the t-values represent the difference between the coefficients divided by the standard error of that difference.

Cross-tabulations for the recent migrants and their comparison group, those living in SMSA's in both 1955 and 1960, are presented in Table 6. For both Negroes and whites, the recent migrants are consistently worse off.

Regression results are presented in Table 7. After standardizing for differences in age, years of school, sex, family status, and type of community,[14] the net effect of recent migration is almost always negative and usually statistically significant, especially for whites. Note that recent migrants are at a greater relative disadvantage in weeks worked if they are Negro and in earnings per week if they are white. This latter finding suggests that racial discrimination may be greater when good jobs are involved and that recent migrants have trouble getting such jobs regardless of race. In this case, the adjustment problems of migration and the general problems of discrimination would not be additive.[15]

Conclusion

Last year, in proposing an outline for a federal urban policy, Daniel P. Moynihan included the following propositions:[16]

> It having long been established that, with respect to general codes of behavior, eleven precepts are too many and nine too few, ten points of urban policy may be set forth scaled roughly to correspond to a combined measure of urgency and importance.
>
> 1) The poverty and social isolation of minority groups in central cities is the single most serious problem of the American city today . . .
>
> 2) The federal government must assert a specific interest in the movement of people, displaced by technology or driven by poverty, from rural to urban areas.

This study strongly supports Moynihan's conclusion that the poverty problems of the urban Negro are much more pervasive then simply the adjustment

TABLE 6

ECONOMIC STATUS OF
RECENT MIGRANTS AND NONMIGRANTS[a]

	Negroes		Whites	
	Recent Migrants	Comparison Group	Recent Migrants	Comparison Group
For those in the labor force				
Annual earnings	$1,778	$2,510	$4,111	$5,042
Earnings per week	$49.0	$60.4	$95.8	$112.5
Weeks worked	33.4	40.4	45.1	46.5
Unemployment rate	12.8	9.6	5.7	4.3
Sample size	219	4,122	1,939	34,412
For the total sample				
Family income	$4,066	$4,301	$5,950	$7,334
Percent poor	39.6	35.3	14.2	11.6
Labor force participation rate	72.3	65.0	61.2	60.6
Sample size	303	6,337	3,169	56,826

[a]See Table 1 for a discussion of some of these variables.

TABLE 7

NET EFFECT OF RECENT MIGRATION[a]

	Negroes	Whites
For those in the labor force		
Annual earnings ($1,000)	-.324	-.410
	(2.70)	(7.17)
Earnings per week	-4.49	-7.84
	(1.10)	(5.24)
Weeks worked	-3.92	-0.64
	(3.53)	(2.98)
Unemployment	-.012	-.008
	(.55)	(2.83)
Sample size	4,341	--
For the total sample		
Family income ($1,000)	-.156	-1.314
	(.88)	(14.96)
Poverty status	.011	-.036
	(.40)	(6.37)
Labor force participation	-.162	-.015
	(1.66)	(2.14)
Sample size	6,640	59,995

[a]See Tables 1 and 2 for definitions. All are set up so that a positive coefficient means the migrants are better off. The t-values are in parentheses. Due to financial constraints, the results for whites are for the total sample with a dummy variable for labor force participation added.

problems facing Negro migrants from the rural South. Note that this conclusion is strengthened if the migration is relatively small and if it is declining. Only the recent Negro migrants are handicapped by their migration status, and, as Table 8 shows, recent migrants are a very small percentage of all urban Negroes. There is also some evidence that the Negro migration to the northern cities has diminished since 1960,[17] although we must remain cautious on this point until the migration data from the 1970 Census are available.

TABLE 8

NUMBERS OF MIGRANTS AND NONMIGRANTS (in 1,000's)[a]

	Migrants (1)	Comparison Group (2)	1/(1+2)
Negroes			
SMSA's outside the South			
Lifetime migration	2,533	1,349	65%
Recent migration	172	3,710	4
All SMSA's			
Recent migration	303	6,337	5
Whites			
SMSA's outside the South			
Lifetime migration	6,107	41,756	13
Recent migration	2,135	45,728	4
All SMSA's			
Recent migration	3,169	56,826	5
Negroes and whites			
SMSA's outside the South			
Lifetime migration	8,640	43,105	17
Recent migration	2,307	49,438	4
All SMSA's			
Recent migration	3,472	63,163	5

[a]Figures from the 1/1,000 sample of the 1960 Census.

APPENDIX A

Independent Variables Used in the Regressions

In the regressions for lifetime migration, dummy variables were used for the following groups:

1 Lifetime migrants

2 Recent migrants

3 Those with 0-7 years of school

4 Those with 8-11 years of school

5 Those with over 12 years of school

6 Those 18-25 years old

7 Those 46-65 years old

8 Those over 65 years old

9 Those in the Northeast

10 Those in the West

11 Those in the central cities of SMSA's of under 500,000 population

12 Those in the central cities of SMSA's of 500,000 to 1,000,000 population

13 Those not in a central city

14 Males

15 Those married with spouse present

16 Those with children under the age of 6

17 Those with children between 6 and 17

plus a variable (18) for the number of people in the family (maximum value of 12). For the recent migration regressions, the dummy for lifetime migrants is replaced by a dummy for those in the South.

Since the values of some of these independent variables may be affected by a person's economic position (as reflected in the values of the dependent variables), other regressions were run with the variables for family status (15-18) eliminated and the variables for type of community combined into one dummy for those in SMSA's of less than 1,000,000. The results for these regressions were very similar to the results presented in the text.

APPENDIX B

Alternative Hypotheses To Explain the Results for Negro Lifetime Migration

In Section II we showed that, for Negroes living in northern SMSA's, those born in the South (lifetime migrants) do better than those born in the North (nonmigrants). Two possible explanations were presented in Section III. Two other, somewhat less persuasive, arguments will be discussed in this appendix.

First, migrants probably move in disproportionate numbers to areas in the North where the economic opportunities are greatest. By moving to the most attractive areas, the migrants may gain a significant advantage over the nonmigrants. For recent migrations, this argument might be fairly important. For lifetime migration, however, the "nonmigrants" of the comparison group are likely to be quite mobile with regard to changing localities in the North. If so, then they need be at no disadvantage relative to migrants from the South and this argument breaks down.

The second argument is based on the fact that the migrants are not a random sample of the total population. Most likely they have above average ambition, energy, and self-confidence--at least relative to those who stayed behind in the South, where the economic opportunities are more limited. Quite possibly the migrants also have above-average intellegence. In comparing Negro lifetime migrants with nonmigrants who have lived all their life in the North, it is less clear whether such differences exist, especially since the long-term residents are mostly second- or third-generation migrants.

Since we are comparing first-generation migrants with a population that includes a large proportion of second- and third-generation migrants, we must consider how characteristics are transmitted from one generation to another. With regard to inherited characteristics (like intelligence?), there is a principle of regression toward the mean. For example, if the typical Negro migrant is more intellegent that the average Negro, then his children will be less intelligent than he is (on the average), although they will still be above the Negro average. If we assume that the Negro migrants of each generation are about equal in inherited ability and that they are above the Negro average, then this tendency for regression toward the mean could be at least a partial explanation for the finding that Negro lifetime migrants do significantly better than the nonmigrants. Note, however, that the argument can explain the regression results only to the extent that the differences in ability between migrants and nonmigrants do not lead to corresponding differences in schooling between the two groups.

NOTES

[1]Some earlier studies that have made somewhat similar comparisons, often as a side issue in connection with some other topic, are Karl E. and Alma F. Taeuber, Negroes in Cities: Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Change (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965); John F. Kain and Joseph J. Persky, "The North's Stake in Southern Rural Poverty," Rural Poverty in the United States (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968); Donald and Deborah Freedman, "Farm-Reared Elements in the Non-Farm Population," Rural Sociology, Vol. 21, No. 1 (March, 1956), pp. 50-61; Melvin Lurie and Elton Rayack, "Racial Differences in Migration and Job Search: A Case Study," Southern Economic Journal, Vol. XXXIII, No. 1 (July, 1966), pp 81-95; and John B. Lansing and James M. Morgan, "The Effect of Geographic Mobility on Income," The Journal of Human Resources, Vol. II, No. 4 (Fall, 1967), pp. 449-60.

[2]This comparison group is limited to those born in the United States.

[3]Note that a person can be both a recent and a lifetime migrant. For recent migration, the migrants and the comparison group will be defined in exactly the same way for both Negroes and whites.

[4]The interpretation of the results for labor-force participation and weeks worked depends on whether or not those who work less do so in voluntarily. To keep the exposition simple, we will assume, somewhat arbitrarily, that all differences between migrants and the corresponding comparison group are at least partly involuntary.

[5]An appendix that includes cross-tabulations of age and years of school by migration status is available from the author on request.

[6]See Appendix A for a complete list of the independent variables.

[7]For example see the data in the Coleman Report: J. S. Coleman et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), especially pp. 274-75.

[8]Two other, somewhat less convincing, hypotheses will be discussed in Appendix B.

[9]Results from the 1/1,000 sample supporting this statement are available from the author on request. These results are based on differences in money rather than real income, but the differences are quite substantial.

[10]For example, see the results in Giora Hanoch, "An Economic Analysis of Earnings and Schooling," Journal of Human Resources, Vol. II, No. 3 (Summer 1967), pp. 316-17.

[11]Note that the results for males will affect the female results for family income and poverty status.

[12]While the work-effort hypotheses is one explanation for the different results for Negro males and females, there is also another plausible hypothesis. There may be a much greater difference between skills learned in the South and those in demand in the North for Negro females than for males. Data on occupation by sex (available from the author on request) show little difference in the occupational distribution of Negro males between migrants and nonmigrants, but a considerable difference for Negro females, with female migrants more heavily concentrated in low-paying occupations like private household workers and less well represented in higher-paying ones like clerical workers. Quite possibly, this hypotheses and the work-effort hypotheses are both partially responsible for the difference in the results between males and females.

[13]Some lifetime migrants were born in southern cities so they do not have to adjust to urban conditions, but many recent migrants go to southern cities so they do not have to adjust to the North. We assume that the net effect of these two factors is small.

[14]See Appendix A for a complete list of the independent variables.

[15]Results by sex present some further evidence for this view. Among whites, recent migration is more of a handicap for males than for females (especially with regard to earnings per week), while the reverse is true for Negroes. If discrimination is greater against male Negroes and against female whites, then these results are consistent with the hypothesis that the handicaps of (recent) migration and discrimination are not additive.

[16]Daniel P. Moynihan, "Towards a National Urban Policy," The Public Interest, No. 16 (Fall 1969), pp. 8, 14.

[17]See the testimony of Calvin Beale in Population Trends, Part I, Hearings before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Urban Growth of the Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, 91st Congress (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969) especially pages 482 and 502. See also Kain and Persky, op. cit., especially pages 302 and 303.

Appendix C for

Are Black Migrants from the South to the Northern Cities Worse off than Blacks already There?

by Stanley H. Masters

TABLE 1

AGE AND YEARS OF SCHOOL FOR MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS

	Lifetime Migration				Recent Migration			
	Negroes		Whites		Negroes		Whites	
	Mig	N-Mig	Mig	N-Mig	Mig	N-Mig	Mig	N-Mig
Years of School								
0-7	35.3%	17.4%	38.5%	11.0%	28.7%	36.1%	9.8%	15.4%
8-11	40.0	44.0	35.6	37.4	38.0	38.2	30.4	36.6
12	17.9	27.9	15.2	31.9	24.1	18.2	35.9	29.2
over 12	6.8	10.7	10.7	19.7	9.2	7.5	23.9	18.8
Age								
18-25	11.5%	22.1%	3.2%	12.3%	45.5%	13.9%	30.5%	10.4%
26-45	48.1	50.2	19.9	46.1	39.3	48.0	46.3	43.0
46-65	32.1	22.1	45.0	31.5	14.9	29.4	16.9	33.6
over 65	8.3	5.6	31.9	10.1	0.3	8.7	6.3	13.0

TABLE 2

NET EFFECT OF NEGRO LIFETIME MIGRATION: RELATIVE TO THOSE LEFT BEHIND IN THE SOUTH*

Annual Earnings ($1,000)	.447	(11.04)
Earnings Per Week	13.50	(9.31)
Weeks Worked	-1.41	(3.11)
Unemployment	-0.28	(3.97)
Family Income ($1,000)	.765	(9.78)
Percent Poor	.121	(8.81)
Labor Force Participation	-.034	(2.61)
Sample Size	7,980	

*The results in this table are regression coefficients (and t-values) for the lifetime migration dummy in various multiple regressions. In most respects, the procedures are the same as for Table 2 in the text. The exceptions are (1) the sample is all Negroes born in the South and now living either in the South or in Northern SMSA and (2) due to financial constraint, the first four regressions were run for the total sample (with a dummy for labor force participation added) rather than just for those in the labor force.

TABLE 3

OCCUPATIONS OF NEGROES:
LIFETIME MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS

Occupation	Males		Females	
	Migrants	Non-migrants	Migrants	Non-migrants
Professionals	3.3%	6.3%	6.6%	7.9%
Managers	2.4	3.1	0.8	0.8
Clerical Workers	10.9	13.5	10.4	24.7
Sales Workers	1.9	3.2	2.2	3.0
Craftsmen	12.5	10.8	1.6	1.2
Operatives	30.9	28.8	21.3	20.8
Non-farm Laborers	20.0	15.4	0.8	1.8
Private Household Workers	0.5	0.3	30.2	23.0
Other Service Workers	16.8	17.3	25.4	16.6
Farmers	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
Farm Laborers	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.0