UCLA
UCLA Public Law & Legal Theory Series

Title
Black Pioners, Intermetropolitan Movers, and Housing Desegregation

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/65b4101h

Authors
Sander, Richard H
Kucheva, Yana

Publication Date
2022

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Black Pioneers, Intermetropolitan Movers, and Housing Desegregation

Yana Kucheva
Associate Professor of Sociology
The City College of New York

and

Richard Sander
Professor of Law
University Of California – Los Angeles

Contact Information:
Yana Kucheva
Department of Sociology
The City College of New York
160 Convent Avenue, NAC 6/108D
New York, NY 10031
Tel. (212) 650-7493
ykucheva@ccny.cuny.edu

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to acknowledge the financial support of the Stanford Center on Poverty and Inequality, the Stanford University Institute for Research in the Social Sciences, the UCLA Ziman Center for Real Estate, the Learning Fund, and the City University of New York for covering the access fees to the Federal Statistical Research Data Center Network and other costs associated with this research. Any opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Census Bureau. All results have been reviewed to ensure that no confidential information is disclosed.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Abstract

During the first two-thirds of the 20th century, millions of Black rural Southerners moved to cities – usually to the ghettoized urban cores of cities – in the phenomenon known as the Great Migration. By 1960, however, the Black population was substantially urbanized and began to migrate in large numbers from one metropolitan area to another. This migration has been little studied. Using restricted census data, we find that intermetropolitan Black movers were far more likely than Black movers within metropolitan areas to settle in predominantly White neighborhoods. These movers are thus a valuable, and hitherto overlooked, barometer of how, over time and across different regions of the country, the openness of housing to Black entry changed and evolved.

Keywords: residential mobility; intermetropolitan mobility; racial segregation.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Introduction

The Great Migration – the fifty-year era during which some six million African-Americans moved from the rural South to the urban North – is such an epochal event in Black history that it can crowd out our consideration of other important Black American migrations, such as the migration of rural, southern Blacks to southern cities in the fifty years after the Civil War, the return migration of many northern Blacks to the South during the Great Migration, and the substantial immigration during the last third of the twentieth century of Blacks from Africa and the West Indies. In this article, we examine what has been perhaps the most overlooked African American migration of all: the movement of Blacks from one metropolitan area to another over the period from 1960 through 2000. During this period, millions of already urbanized African Americans migrated to a new metropolitan area. Over half of these migrants moved from one non-Southern metropolitan area to another. Social scientists have traditionally thought of Blacks moving to cities during the Great Migration as likely to follow a "port of entry" settlement pattern, joining friends and relatives in segregated enclaves so that their arrival tended to reinforce patterns of racial segregation (Lemann 1990; Cutler et al. 1998). It is reasonable to suppose, however, that young, northern, urbanized and often college-educated Blacks, moving between large metropolitan areas in the later decades of the twentieth century, might behave quite differently and might, indeed, be forerunners and agents of change in Black residential patterns. This paper explores that idea and finds that tracking this cohort generates important insights into how residential segregation changed after the passage of fair housing laws in the 1960s.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

In making the dynamics of Black migration in the 1960-2000 period comprehensible, we think a couple of analytic distinctions are helpful. One is to distinguish three different zones of Black residence: "core" areas, "border" areas, and "outlying" areas. We define "core" areas as metropolitan census tracts that are, in a given census year, part of an established Black district. "Border" areas are census tracts that are within two miles of some "core" census tract. "Outlying" areas are all census tracts that are neither "core" nor "border." Our second distinction divides urban Black movers into two groups: those moving within a metropolitan area (incumbent movers) and those who are recent arrivals to a given metropolitan area (newcomer movers).

Black moves into mostly White neighborhoods occurred on a large scale in all urban areas during the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s (Sander et al. 2018). What crucially varied was the degree to which this Black migration was highly concentrated in a few neighborhoods near existing Black districts, or instead was dispersed across many neighborhoods, including neighborhoods that were far from existing Black districts. The former pattern tended to lead to racial transition and resegregation; the latter often led to sustained, long-term integration. What determined the degree to which Black moves into White areas were dispersed or concentrated? We suggest that a key aspect driving black in-migration into majority White neighborhoods far away from Black districts (that is, "outlying" areas) was whether Black movers were newcomers to a metropolitan area. Newcomers were much more likely than incumbent Blacks to move to neighborhoods far from existing Black districts. This meant that Black newcomers to a metropolitan area not only tended to be dispersed, but also created more nodes of incipient integration that might attract the incumbent Black population. Therefore, we can learn much

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

about changes in American housing segregation over the 1960-2000 era by considering the process of intermetropolitan geographic mobility among Black households.

History of urban segregation, fair housing law, and migration

Our standard narratives about Black migration and urban segregation are relatively simple. Blacks began migrating to cities in very large numbers around World War I and soon experienced uniquely high levels of segregation. Measured segregation levels were strikingly stable from 1930 through 1970. Rates of segregation fell gradually after 1970, but to most observers the continuity of segregation was more striking than any decline (Massey and Gross 1991; Massey and Denton 1993; Logan et al. 2004). Even the significant increase in Black suburbanization in the 1970s did not generally produce, in the largest metro areas, the excepted drops in segregation. (Lake 1981; Logan and Schneider 1984; Alba and Logan 1991; Logan and Alba 1993, 1995; Logan et al. 1996; Farley and Frey 1994).

A range of recent work, generally drawing on better data, shows that patterns of Black migration and segregation are more complex than the standard narrative suggests. While dissimilarity levels were high and constant across all urban areas from 1930 to 1970, this period covers two very distinct eras. From 1930 until the late 1940s, Black residential districts had fairly stable boundaries. Black districts were often hemmed in by effective restrictive covenants and prices in Black neighborhoods tended to be much higher than in comparable White neighborhoods (Weaver 1948; Vose 1959; Cutler, Glaeser, and Vigdor 1999; Kucheva and Sander, 2014). After the Supreme Court's decision in *Shelley v. Kraemer*, which made such covenants unenforceable in court, Black districts began to expand rapidly, often into areas covered by racial covenants and relative Black housing prices began to decline (Kucheva &

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Sander 2014). Housing discrimination remained prevalent in White neighborhoods, so Black expansion occurred block by block, in neighborhoods adjacent to existing Black districts, and often facilitated by real estate agents (generally known as "blockbusters") who specialized in racial transitions (Helper 1969; Satter 2009). The dramatic increase in Black movement to adjacent White neighborhoods during the 1950s and 1960s almost always produced resegregation, so segregation levels themselves did not decline (Duncan and Duncan 1955; Taeuber and Taeuber 1965). Around 1970, Black out-migration from ghettos accelerated, but in two distinct ways. Black suburbanization was on the rise and average measured segregation levels declined for the first time. However, much of the suburbanization in the 1970s did not represent genuine racial integration but reflected rather expanding Black districts spilling beyond central-city boundaries. Moreover, the declines in segregation that occurred after 1970 were very unevenly distributed, with the Black/White index of dissimilarity (on a 0-to-100 scale) falling by fewer than five points during the 1970s in most major metropolitan areas but falling by over fifteen points in several (Sander, Kucheva, and Zasloff 2018).

Despite little change in the segregation as measured by the index of dissimilarity in most major metropolitan areas, Blacks contemplating moves in the 1970s faced a very different fair housing environment than before. In 1952, a dozen fair housing groups around the country formed the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing. By the early 1960s, there were hundreds of member organizations and by the late 1960s, well over one thousand (Saltman 1978). The proportion of Whites who agreed "it would make a difference" if a Black household with "just as much income and education as you" moved in next door fell from 62% in 1942 to 21% in 1968 (Pettigrew 1973). In the early 1950s, a few cities passed laws prohibiting discrimination in publicly funded housing. By 1961, many cities and a few states had adopted

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

laws banning discrimination in at least some private-sector housing, and the number steadily expanded throughout the 1960s (Collins 2004, 2006). In 1968, the federal government took two substantial steps against housing discrimination in private markets. In April, Congress passed, and President Johnson signed, the Fair Housing Act (FHA), which broadly prohibited discrimination based on race, religion, and national origin in most of the private market. Two months later in *Jones v. Mayer*, the Supreme Court reinterpreted ambiguous wording in the Civil Rights Act of 1866 to find, in it, another broad prohibition of racial discrimination in private housing markets. Although compromises made to gain passage of the FHA severely limited the enforcement power of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Justice had power under the legislation to bring suits against housing market actors engaged in a "pattern or practice" of discrimination, and by the early 1970s dozens of suits had been brought against major actors in the housing field (Sander et al. 2018).

The first systematic, nationwide study of levels of housing discrimination, using Black and White housing testers, occurred in 1977 (Yinger 1995). The discrimination rates it measured were consistent with both optimistic and critical views of the impact of fair housing laws. On the one hand, it appeared that discrimination rates had declined sharply from rates measured in the 1960s; on the other, it revealed that discrimination was still common. When 1980 census data revealed that in most major cities, segregation had barely declined in the 1970s, many observers judged the FHA a failure. Such sentiments helped precipitate the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, which, among other things, created new enforcement mechanisms that made it easier for individual complaints of discrimination to produce significant investigations and adjudications. National testing audits in 1989 and 2000 found further declines in discrimination rates, and 1990

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

and 2000 census data showed continuing, though on average quite small, declines in segregation levels (Ondrich, Stricker, and Yinger 1998; Turner et al. 2002; Oh and Yinger 2015).

We give this history to illustrate that in each decade after 1950, there were developments that could plausibly have significantly increased the ability of African Americans to move into the White housing market, not as part of a block-by-block expansion along the "border" of existing Black districts, but into outlying White areas where long-term integration was a far more plausible outcome. Our key starting hypothesis is that intermetropolitan Black movers, because they were not tethered to any "starting" location within Black districts, were more likely than other Black movers in general to move to outlying areas and were thus a more sensitive barometer of changes in the ease with which such moves could be made.

During the era when restrictive covenants flourished – the 1930s and most of the 1940s – virtually all Black movement occurred within "core" areas (as described in our Introduction and more precisely defined in the Methods section, below). Black districts became denser but generally did not expand much (Weaver 1948; Cutler et al. 1999; Kucheva and Sander 2014; Sander et al. 2018). In the years after *Shelley*, however, Blacks seeking less expensive housing and better neighborhood amenities moved increasingly into "border" neighborhoods. Border neighborhoods receiving a substantial number of Black in-migrants were very likely to themselves eventually become "core" neighborhoods, at least through 1990. In contrast, "outlying" neighborhoods receiving significant Black in-migration (a very rare occurrence before 1970) were very unlikely to become core neighborhoods (Sander et al. 2018).

Distinguishing between core, border, and outlying neighborhoods is also helpful in conceptualizing housing opportunities for urban African Americans. In the decades before *Shelley*, urban Blacks faced high barriers to entry anywhere outside core tracts. In the years after

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Shelley, patterns of Black entry into at least some border tracts became well established and essentially universal in urban America, but this applied only to some border tracts (e.g., those in which blockbusters were operating). Barriers to African Americans in "outlying" tracts, however, continued to be intense – certainly in the 1950s, and, in the view of some observers, even to the present (Hirsch 1983; Sugrue 1996; Charles 2003; Logan et al. 2004; Wilkes and Iceland 2004; Vesselinov 2008; Bell 2013; Rugh and Massey 2014).

Of course, the geographic mobility of Black households was never shaped only by discrimination. When households move within metropolitan areas, their choices are heavily influenced by their current location. Established commuting patterns, stable job locations, school enrollment, the nearby presence of family and friends, connection to places of worship and other neighborhood institutions – all of these influences militate in favor of shorter compared to longer moves. Households moving within metropolitan areas tend to move short distances not only because they want to preserve existing connections to social networks and especially kin (Boyd 2008; Dawkins 2006; Kan 2007; Spring et al. 2017) but also because their social networks are likely to give them more and better information about alternative housing options close to their existing homes (Krysan and Crowder 2017). In fact, the strongest predictor of the destination of a mover is the location of one's current home.

Public census data has quite limited information on the point of origin of movers, so research in this area has often relied on other sources. A 1978 Urban Institute study, drawing on a survey of 1,500 households in 43 metropolitan areas, found that two-thirds of all intra-metropolitan moves were to destinations less than five miles from the point of origin. Moves for Black households in central cities were even more concentrated (Goodman 1978). In a study of some three hundred moves within Omaha in the late 1970s, Clark (1986) found that over 60% of

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

the destinations picked by Whites were less than three miles from the point of origin, but over 70% of the destinations picked by Blacks were less than two miles from the point of origin. More recently, using national PSID samples from 1997 through 2009, Quillian (2014) found that the average distance of intra-metropolitan moves was 2.95 miles for Whites and 2.7 miles for Blacks. Quillian notes that "distance from origin is by far the best overall predictor of tract of destination, with probability of destination declining sharply with distance" (Quillian 2014). South and Deane (1990) also find that, conditional on home ownership and other demographic characteristics, Blacks are less likely than Whites to move at all. Importantly, Crowder, Pais, and South (2012) note that although nationally, most intra-metropolitan movers stay within neighborhoods dominated by their own racial or ethnic group, this is much less true in metropolitan areas that have smaller Black populations, newer housing stock, growing economies, and higher Black/White integration.

Households moving from one urban area to another – say, from New York to Chicago, or Indianapolis to Buffalo – are necessarily different from intraurban migrants in one key respect: they are leaving behind not only their home, but also their neighborhood and metropolitan area. True, many intermetropolitan migrants are simply returning to a home area they left some years earlier; others are moving to join some friend or family member. But intermetropolitan movers often have no necessary starting point in their search for a home, and are therefore less likely, on average, to be influenced by the pull of past neighborhood ties in deciding where to live.

This locational indeterminacy of intermetropolitan movers is particularly interesting when one considers the evolution of Black mobility in the last half of the twentieth century. As we noted earlier, Blacks moving from the rural South to the urban North during the Great Migration had strong reasons to move into Black "core" areas. Moving from an environment in

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

which all social interactions were dominated by Jim Crow and racial caste, and usually unfamiliar with living in an urban environment, these movers would seem unlikely candidates to pioneer in White neighborhoods (Lehman 1990). However, by the 1950s, a large and growing fraction of the Black population was already in the North and familiar with northern housing markets. As the Great Migration sharply slowed in the late 1960s, Black intermetropolitan migration became more prominent as a source of Black "new arrivals" in urban areas (see Table 1).

Migration within the United States has, of course, been a rich area of research for labor economists and demographers. As data sources have improved, a number of economists have shown that interstate migrants tend to choose destinations where they will obtain higher returns on their individual skills (Borjas, Bronars, and Trejo 1992), though interstate migration has been in gradual decline since around 1980 (Molloy, Smith, and Wozniak 2011). Similar kinds of questions have driven the literature on intermetropolitan migration by African Americans. Boustan (2016) considers whether Blacks leaving the South during the Great Migration experienced significant income gains after adjusting for the higher prices in their destination cities and finds that they did. Crowder, Tolnay, and Adelman (2001) observed the growing scale of intermetropolitan Black migration during the 1970s and 1980s and theorized that the destinations of migrants would tend to be areas where Black outcomes were improving at the time of migration. Focusing on the migration of adult Black males, they used IPUMS data to identify migrants changing metropolitan areas in the 1975-80 and 1985-90 periods. They found that most Black intermetropolitan migrants moved to areas where most trend lines for African Americans were more positive than in the metropolitan areas left behind. They also found that

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Black migrants were more likely to end up in suburban locations (by about a 2:1 margin) than those who stayed within their home metropolitan area.

Our analysis brings together the literature on intermetropolitan migration and the literature on residential segregation with a view to understanding when Black movers were able to move to neighborhoods away from established Black districts. We are interested in three particular aspects of Black household mobility:

1) Was the neighborhood of destination a "core," "border," or "outlying" census tract? In other words, how can we roughly classify the destination in the Black housing system: as an established tract in a Black district; as a tract relatively close to established Black areas that was likely, if it experienced significant Black in-migration, to become part of the Black core; or as a tract sufficiently far from established Black areas to both represent a bolder form of pioneering for the moving Black household, and a neighborhood likely to remain largely White for quite a while, at least in the expectation of the moving household.
2) Was the moving African American household one who had lived within the metropolitan area for at least five years, or had the householder lived outside the metropolitan area five years earlier (i.e., "incumbent" or "newcomer")? If the latter, had the household previously lived in the South, or outside the South? Black movers from the South were, especially in the early years of our coverage, likely to arrive from rural areas; Black movers from the North or West were almost certainly coming from urban areas and were thus "intermetropolitan" movers.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

3) What were the general socioeconomic characteristics of the household? We are interested in knowing how moving behavior varied by the age and education of the household head, the income of the household, and whether the household included children.

Data and methods

The core analyses of this paper use restricted versions of the 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000 Decennial Censuses that we obtained with special permission through the Federal Statistical Research Data Center Network (RDC). For some supplementary analyses, we also used the restricted version of the 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS). Analyses examining the racial makeup of inter-metropolitan migrants and their neighborhood destinations are impossible to do with public-release census data. Tabulated public census data only provide information for large groups within census tracts, thus preventing the identification of Black movers, especially in census tracts with few such movers. IPUMS microdata are not available for areas smaller than PUMAs, which average well over one hundred thousand residents, and even this geographic detail is not available before 1990. National surveys, such as the PSID and NLSY, provide rich information on migration but do not have either the sample size or the chronological breadth to let us understand how Black urban migration patterns have evolved through the fair housing era, or to study differences across and within metropolitan areas.

The Federal Statistical Research Data Center (RDC) program sponsored by the Census Bureau and a community of research universities thus offers unique advantages. Through the RDC mechanism, the Census provides secure access to microdata with detailed geographic identifiers. Thus, all the questions asked in the Census long form can be tied, at the person and household level, to the census tract level or even the block level. Because such detailed data may

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

be vulnerable to re-identification, the RDC process significantly limits what analyses can be disclosed and imposes other constraints on the research process. Many of these files have only become available to researchers comparatively recently, with the 1960 files completed in 2015. We believe ours is the first study of Black migration patterns to make use of them.

Using the restricted Census microdata, we constructed census-tract-level and metropolitan-level measures for our analysis. To avoid the problem of changing metropolitan boundaries, we used the 1980 definitions of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) and restricted our analyses to households and census tracts within the 1980 boundaries of SMSAs. In all of our analyses using the 1960 and 1970 Censuses, the Black and White populations exclude individuals who are of Hispanic descent based on place of birth, parents' place of birth, mother's tongue, and Spanish surname. In all of our analyses using the 1980, 1990, and 2000 Censuses, the Black and White populations exclude individuals who are of Hispanic descent based on self-reported Hispanic ethnicity.

For supplementary descriptive analyses on intermetropolitan migration, we rely on publicly available IPUMS Decennial Census and ACS data (Ruggles et al. 2022).

Multinomial regression of household-level mobility

We model household-level mobility using a multinomial regression analysis. The dependent variable in our regressions takes on three possible values: whether the household head moved into a "core," a "border," or an "outlying" census tract over the fifteen months prior to each census.

We define "core" areas as tracts where the population that reported moving into their unit at least fifteen months before the census was at least 25% Black. We chose the 25% threshold

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

(rather than a majority-Black threshold) because many medium-sized and small metropolitan areas, especially in the West, had few or no tracts that were majority Black. Defining "core" tracts as at least 50% Black does not significantly modify the results of our analysis, so we opted to present results with the 25% threshold as it allowed us to include more (and a wider variety of) metropolitan areas in our analysis. We define "border" tracts as those less than two miles from a "core" tract where at least 50% of the population which had lived there for more than a year is non-Hispanic White. "Outlying" tracts are majority non-Hispanic White and more than two miles away from a "core" tract. In the Results section below, we also discuss results with alternate distance thresholds of 1 mile and 3 miles.

We used census tracts rather than blocks in classifying neighborhoods because our definition requires that we consider when individuals moved into their current housing -- a variable which is only available in the long-form sample Decennial Census data, which in turn does not sample enough households within each block to produce reliable race-specific estimates of migration at the block level.

Unlike a longitudinal dataset, where one can follow migrating households from their census tract of origin to their destination, the decennial census observes households only at a point of time and – for the period we examine – has only two, imperfect questions about mobility behavior. These are "When did you move into your current residence?" (with five to six possible time periods for answers); and "Where did you live five years ago?" (for movers, answers are aggregated to at least the city level). These questions limit and shape our analysis in important ways. First, our multinomial regressions only include householders who moved into their current residence in the fifteen months before each Census. By limiting the analysis to the most recent movers, we maximize the likelihood that the demographic characteristics measured in the census

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

are those that characterized the movers when they moved. For similar reasons, we measured all census tract characteristics only for the population who had lived in a census tract at least fifteen months. We thus try to keep the characteristics of recent migrants from distorting our measures of the characteristics of the tracts that they enter.

Second, given that we can only measure whether someone moved into their current metropolitan area within the five years prior to each census, our approach to identifying "newcomers" versus "incumbents" can create anomalies. If a household moved from New York to a Chicago "core" tract in 1956, and to an "outlying" tract in 1959, our analysis of 1960 census data would count them as a "newcomer" who located in an "outlying" tract, even though this mover's initial move was to a "core" tract. Thus, while our analysis is distinguishing the behavior of newcomers from long-term incumbents, it is not always observing a newcomer's initial location in a metropolitan area. Note, however, that it is possible to observe one's place of residence one year prior to data collection using the American Community Survey. We thus re-ran all of our analyses with the 2006-2010 restricted version of the ACS as it measures inter-metropolitan mobility using a one-year window. These results are very similar to the ones we obtain with Decennial Census data. We discuss them in the Results section below.

Our multinomial regressions include an extensive list of independent variables that measure characteristics related to mobility at the household level and also measure structural factors at the metropolitan level. We control for the age of the household head, the marital status of the household head, and whether the household included children. We control for these life cycle household-level factors because they play an important role in mobility decisions (Clark 2013; Clark et al. 2006; Courgeau 1990; Long 1988; Rossi 1980). We also control for human capital factors, such as educational attainment and household income, that may make it easier for

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Black households to attain residence in a majority White neighborhood. We also control for whether the household owned or rented its housing: first because, in the absence of measures of wealth, homeownership status captures access to resources over and above income; and second because there were well-documented efforts during the 1950s and 1960s by fair housing organizations to "recruit" Black homeowners to White suburbs, and we are interested in whether these efforts show up in the data (Grier and Grier 1960; Northwood and Barth 1965).

Our metropolitan-level structural controls are population size, percent Black, Black/White index of dissimilarity, whether the area is in the South, industry mix, and the proportion of housing built in the last ten years. Previous research on the locational attainment of Black households has shown that when Blacks in metropolitan areas with higher segregation move, they end up in more segregated neighborhoods (Crowder et al. 2012). Moreover, larger metropolitan areas with large concentrations of Black populations and metropolitan areas with heavier emphasis on manufacturing employment are more likely to have entrenched segregation patterns compared to smaller metropolitan areas with smaller Black populations (Farley and Frey 1994; Logan et al. 2004). Conversely, military employment and new housing construction are likely to facilitate the mobility of the Black population into White neighborhoods (Farley and Frey 1994; South and Crowder 1997; Crowder et al. 2012). We were unable to model our multinomial regression as a multi-level model with different levels for household moves and metropolitan characteristics. While we recognize the multi-level features of our data, our multilevel models did not converge with the available software within the RDC. We recognize that, as a result, our standard errors may be underestimated. Full descriptive statistics for our multinomial regressions are in Appendix Table 1.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Results

Descriptive patterns of Black mobility

We begin with a national picture, considering the entire metropolitan U.S. As Table 1 shows, Black migration patterns changed sharply over the second half of the twentieth century. Rural Blacks made up over forty percent of newcomers to the urban North and West in the late 1950s but constituted less than a tenth of newcomers by the late 1980s. Increasingly, the newcomers arriving in metropolitan areas were themselves residents of the metropolitan North and West. Where did they locate? Table 2 shows the distribution of Black moves across core, border, and outlying areas for two groups: incumbent households (where the householder lived in the metro area five years ago), and newcomer households (where the householder lived anywhere else five years ago). As a base reference point, consider the moves of Black incumbent households just before the 1960 census. Sixty-six percent of these moves landed in Black core areas, thirty percent were to border areas, and four percent were to outlying areas. This reflects the dynamics of Black mobility in the 1950s and 1960s in the aftermath of the *Shelley* decision. Blacks in 1960 were highly segregated in all metropolitan areas, but virtually all Black districts were expanding rapidly into some adjacent White tracts, with the expansion usually occurring on a block-by-block basis. The 66/30 ratio provides some notion of just how rapidly this expansion was occurring. A very large percentage of Black movers were moving to border, transitional areas. The much smaller share of incumbent Blacks moving to outlying areas (four percent) – even though those "outlying" areas typically comprised over two-thirds of the metropolitan housing market – suggests how unusual it was in 1960 for incumbents to pioneer far from established Black districts. It also suggests that our distinction between "border" and "outlying" tracts is capturing a very real difference in the geography of Black migration.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Even in the 1959-60 moves, we can see a clear contrast between the pattern of "incumbent" moves and those of "newcomers." Newcomers are significantly less likely to move to core neighborhoods, more likely to move to border areas, and much more likely (by a factor of more than two) to move to outlying areas. This is in accord with our initial hypothesis: Black newcomers in a metropolitan area, without the constraint of a "starting location" are more likely to pioneer in neighborhoods further from existing Black enclaves.

The 1969-70 data show a small shift by incumbents away from core and border areas towards moves to outlying areas. New arrivals show a similar proportional increase in moving to outlying areas – but since new arrivals are starting from a higher base in 1959-60 (nine percent), the absolute size of the increase (five points) is much larger. The implication is that by the late 1960s, relative to the late 1950s, the cost to Black households of moving to outlying areas had declined noticeably.

The most dramatic shift in mobility patterns, however, occurs in the 1970s. By 1979-80, the proportion of newcomers who move to outlying areas has more than doubled, to one-third of all moves. To put this in context, only about 7% of Blacks in metro areas outside the South were living in "outlying" areas in the 1970s, and "outlying" tracts in the North and West were, on average, only about 1% Black. In the South, the picture was somewhat more complicated. Many suburban counties included older rural communities with significant Black enclaves, but as farms were converted to suburban tracts, Black populations in Southern outlying areas were generally declining in the 1950s and 1960s, with 10% of the Black population living in "outlying" areas in 1970. All this means that by the late 1970s, Black newcomers in metropolitan areas were moving into White neighborhoods far from any heavily Black area at a rate that sharply broke from historical patterns.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

The moves of incumbent Blacks also shifted towards outlying areas by 1979-80. As in the 1960s, the shift of incumbent Blacks in the 1970s was proportionally similar to the newcomers (i.e., more than a doubling of the settlement rate in outlying areas) but much smaller in absolute terms, because it started from a smaller base.

The 1980s saw a continuation of the trend of the 1970s. By 1989-90, a plurality of Black newcomers moved to outlying areas, constituting thirty-eight percent of all moves. Incumbent moves to outlying areas rose modestly, to about one-sixth of all moves. For both groups, the increase in moves to outlying areas came mainly at the expense of moves to "core" areas, even though the overall size of Black "core" areas generally continued to increase.

In the 1990s, these trends reversed themselves. The proportion of Black "new arrival" moves landing in outlying areas declined sharply, to levels below those seen twenty years earlier. The new arrivals instead moved into "core" areas in significantly larger numbers. Yet, as we will explore below, this shift largely reflected more general migration patterns. By the late 1990s and 2000s, large-scale gentrification was underway in many urban areas, with middle-class Blacks and Whites, along with many recent immigrants, settling in neighborhoods close to urban centers and often reversing decades-long population declines (Ehrenhalt 2012).

Another way of exploring the implications of Table 2 is shown in Table 3. Here we focus on three groups of metropolitan areas: (1) major metro areas in the Northeast and Midwest that experienced only small declines in segregation after 1970; (2) metro areas in the South that, after 1970, experienced substantial population growth and became exemplars of the "New South": and (3) metro areas in the Southwest and West that had among the largest drops in segregation after 1970. For each of these areas, we report, for the 1960-2000 period, the rate at which newcomer Blacks and incumbent Blacks moved to outlying areas relative to the rate at which non-Blacks

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

moved to those areas. There are four striking patterns in this data. First, there is a discontinuous jump in Black relative moves to outlying areas between the late 1960s and the late 1970s, consistent with the idea that the ability of Blacks to move into outlying areas increased sharply over that interval. Second, in all areas, relative Black mobility into outlying areas is much higher for Black "newcomers" than for Black "incumbents." Third, since this table measures Black migration relative to non-Black migration, we can see that across these three groups of metro areas, the relative mobility of Blacks to outlying areas steadily approached, through the end of the century, non-Black levels.

Fourth, there are important regional differences. We chose these areas to illustrate how much patterns of Black movement to outlying areas varied, even within a broad national pattern of increased mobility. In the northern metro areas (New York, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and Milwaukee), Black migration from the South slowed sharply around 1970, as did economic growth. This was the period of the emerging "Rustbelt." Intermetropolitan Black movers in the 1970s and 1980s generally did not choose these northern metro areas as a destination, so although those who did arrive moved to outlying areas in increasing numbers, those numbers were still too small to meaningfully change metropolitan demographic patterns. Segregation levels, as measured by the index of dissimilarity, dropped only slightly in these areas (Sander et al. 2018).

The pattern was significantly different in the South, especially in those southern urban areas that led regional trends (in Table 3, these are Atlanta, Nashville, Dallas-Ft. Worth, and Greensboro-Winston-Salem). As noted earlier, the Black presence in outlying areas actually shrank in the 1960s, as old rural communities were developed into suburbs. But after 1970, the decades-long pattern of net Black migration to the North reversed itself, with large numbers of

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

educated, northern Blacks moving to Southern metro areas (Frey 2004). As our analysis shows, they disproportionately moved to largely White "outlying" areas, far from established Black neighborhoods, and the pattern deepened in the 1980s and 1990s. Segregation in the urban South fell significantly more over the 1970-2000 interval than in the urban North, especially in areas attracting a lot of intermetropolitan migrants.

A third pattern is visible in the Southwest and West, particularly in large metro areas that grew rapidly and had, at the start of our period, relatively small Black populations. The metro areas captured in Table 3 are Portland, San Antonio, San Diego, and Seattle. These areas attracted large numbers of Black newcomers, and because their incumbent Black populations were modest, the movement of newcomers to outlying areas had a particularly powerful influence on the overall distribution of the Black population in the metro area (Sander et al. 2018). Each of these metro areas experienced fairly dramatic declines in segregation levels over the 1970-2000 period and, as Table 3 illustrates, by 2000, the difference in the rate of moves to outlying areas between Blacks and non-Blacks was small indeed.

Multinomial regressions of Black migration and neighborhood destinations

Our discussion up to this point has assumed that the critical difference between newcomers and incumbents is the latter's ties to past, local residential locations. Our multinomial regressions, by modeling the three-way distinction of neighborhood destination (core, border, or outlying) in terms of a range of household- and metropolitan-level characteristics, allow us to examine the characteristics of movers more deeply. Table 4 reports regression results predicting a household's move to an outlying, border, or core neighborhood, with a separate regression for each of the decades we examine. The coefficients suggest that Blacks were much more likely to

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

pioneer in outlying areas when the household comprised a married couple with children, when the householder was college-educated, and when the metropolitan area had a relatively smaller Black presence. Households were much less likely to pioneer into an outlying tract in metropolitan areas that were very segregated (or where the index of dissimilarity exceeded 80 points on a 0-to-100 scale) and in metropolitan areas with more older housing units. On the other hand, greater employment in the public sector and in the military after 1970 corresponds to greater likelihood of pioneering into an outlying tract.

Several coefficients change in important ways over the forty years we examine. Migrants from the South, for example, are much less likely to be pioneers in 1959-60 and 1969-70, but this difference then disappears. This makes sense. As we noted earlier, migrants from the rural South were generally likely to move into core areas and connect with friends and relatives who had migrated earlier. As the Great Migration slowed in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the composition of migration from the South shifted towards urbanized Blacks – whose willingness to pioneer would plausibly be much more similar to Blacks from urban areas in the North and West.

Notably, the coefficients suggest that older migrants and homeowners (as opposed to renters) were more likely to pioneer in outlying areas in 1959-60 and 1969-70, but the direction of these coefficients flipped in the 1970s and beyond. This fits with the accounts we mentioned earlier, to the effect that much Black mobility into outlying neighborhoods in the 1950s and 1960s was midwived by activists in fair housing organizations (Grier and Grier 1965; Northwood 1960). Black pioneers were often recruited for moves, and middle-aged homeowners would logically fit this bill. If the explosion of pioneering that commences in the 1970s stemmed from a growing perception by Black movers that White housing markets had become more open,

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

it is plausible that the composition of those movers would become more heterogeneous, and that younger, highly educated renters would make up a large share of pioneers.

Another coefficient which changed direction in the 1980s and beyond is the coefficient on percent employment in manufacturing. While we do not have a ready explanation as to why that might be, it is possible that by the 1980s with the decline in manufacturing especially in the most segregated Northern metropolitan areas, this variable may no longer capture the same dimension of entrenched racial borders as it did before.

For comparison purposes over time, in Table 5, we present predicted probabilities for the key independent variable in our multinomial regression model – newcomer to SMSA. In a model with no controls, the rate at which Black newcomers settle in outlying areas rises from 13% in 1970 to 34% in 1980. In our model with extensive controls, the rate rises from 11% in 1970 to 31% in 1980. This tells us that even though Black new arrivals had somewhat distinctive demographic characteristics, the most important factor that led them to settle in outlying areas was *their status as new arrivals*. True, incumbent Blacks with particular demographic characteristics (i.e., in 1980 being college-educated) were much more likely than other incumbents to move to outlying areas, but the dramatic rise in Black moves to outlying areas was crucially fueled by the moves of newcomers.

Border vs. Outlying Areas

As we have explained, our methodology takes all census tracts outside black "core" areas and divides them into border areas (majority White within two miles of a core tract) and outlying areas (majority White more than two miles away from a core tract). The two-mile boundary is, of course, somewhat arbitrary. Our goal is to distinguish between, on the one hand, Black pioneer

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

moves from the core that were relatively short, often condoned and expected by Whites after *Shelley v. Kraemer*, sometimes facilitated by blockbusters, often concentrated, and usually leading to eventual resegregation – all factors we associate with the border – and pioneering moves that went beyond these areas, occurring in neighborhoods that were predominantly non-Black and expected to remain so, and not part of a collective action by other pioneers that was likely to lead to resegregation.

After completing our initial analyses, we experimented with other definitions, and in the appendix (Appendix Table 2) we present results that break tracts into bands that are 0-1, 1-2, 2-3, and 3 or more miles from Black core areas. These results suggest that our intuition in selecting a two-mile standard was sound. Census tracts in the 0-1 mile band look particularly "border-like"; tracts further away gradually take on more of the characteristics of outlying areas, and a reasonably good break between the two patterns occurs at the two-mile threshold. Importantly for our results, the increase in Black movement to outlying areas is more striking when we use a broader definition of the border. That is, the likelihood that a Black move to an outlying area is a "newcomer" move rises steadily as we expand our definition of "border" areas, which is fully consistent with our general theory of how "incumbents" and "newcomers" behave.

We do not mean to imply in our discussion that just because a census tract was located in a "border" area meant that it was readily open to Black in-migration in the 1950s and 1960s. During this era, and to a substantial extent afterwards, only a handful of neighborhoods in the border of a typical city experienced substantial Black entry. In the terminology of the day, these "invasions" of White tracts were highly circumscribed by a range of institutional forces, and their concentrated focus on a few areas was part of what made them relatively safer moves for pioneers. Being close to existing core areas was, thus, a necessary but not sufficient condition for

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

large-scale Black entry.

Metropolitan newcomers

As we discussed in the Data and Methods section above, our definition of a metropolitan newcomer is somewhat broad because until and through the 2000 count, the census only asked about place of residence five year prior to each count. We therefore re-ran our models using the 2006-2010 American Community Survey, which enabled us to identify newcomers as those living outside their current metropolitan area one year prior to being interviewed by the ACS. Presumably, for these movers, their current place of residence is much more likely to be their first residence in their current metropolitan area. The results are remarkably similar to the ones we obtain using five-year mobility histories (see Table 4). For example, in the 2006-2010 ACS, the probability of a newcomer making a pioneering move into an outlying neighborhood is 29% without controls for socioeconomic characteristics. When we control for these, the probability decreases to 24%. These numbers are not only in line with the numbers using the 2000 census but also in line with the trend since 1990 of modestly decreasing pioneering to outlying neighborhoods. This test thus supports the robustness of our models.

Conclusion

This article develops and combines several new insights into how Black/White integration comes about. We begin with the idea of focusing on the settlement patterns of Blacks who are new arrivals in metropolitan areas. Past research has ignored the possibility that migrating Blacks played an important role in pioneering into White neighborhoods, perhaps because Black migration to urban areas is usually cast in terms of the Great

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Migration, and it does indeed appear to be true that rural Blacks migrating to northern cities predominantly settled in established Black districts (what we call the "core"). However, even by 1960, intermetropolitan Black migration had become the most important source of "new arrivals" in Northern and Western cities, and by 1980 intermetropolitan Black moves dominated moves by rural Southerners. These intermetropolitan Black movers, perhaps because they were not moored to any "starting point" in deciding where to live in the urban areas they moved to, were far more likely than incumbent Blacks to pioneer in White neighborhoods, particularly in outlying neighborhoods that were far from established Black districts. This makes intermetropolitan Black movers particularly good barometers of how black freedom of movement within metropolitan areas changed as civil rights advanced and as White attitudes towards racial integration softened.

Our analyses show quite dramatic changes in the rate at which newcomer Blacks moved to "outlying" areas over the 1960-2000 period, with a particularly large, discontinuous jump in the 1970s. The broad pattern is consistent with available data on the attitudes of Whites. Whites became gradually but steadily more accepting of integration over the entire 1960-2000 period (Sander et al. 2018). The discontinuous jump in Black mobility during the 1970s suggests that fair housing laws played an important, probably crucial role. Many states and local governments passed fair housing laws in the early 1960s, but the laws generally had limited coverage and weak enforcement mechanisms, and enforcement actions were extremely rare (Collins 2004, 2006). The near-simultaneous Congressional passage of the federal Fair Housing Act and the Supreme Court's ruling in *Jones v. Mayer*, both in the spring of 1968, created national fair housing standards that soon led to official changes in policy by real estate broker organizations and active enforcement

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

by the Justice Department by 1970 (Zasloff 2016). Audit studies suggest that many forms of housing discrimination dropped sharply in the 1970s (Ross 2004; Sander et al. 2018). Our analyses support the hypothesis that changing fair housing policies had a powerful and rapid effect upon on-the-ground mobility patterns.

By the late 1970s, fully one-third of all intermetropolitan Blacks were moving to outlying White areas – neighborhoods that were unlikely to experience subsequent resegregation. As we have seen, areas in the new South and West that were important post-1970 destinations for intermetropolitan Blacks saw especially dramatic departures from past patterns of Black movement. The key to desegregation – at least in the 1970s and 1980s – seemed to lay in the behavior, freedom of action, and volume of Black pioneers. The example of intermetropolitan Black migrants can help us think about the nature and source of Black pioneering, and plausibly could inform constructive policies to further the goal of genuine desegregation.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

References

Alba, R. D., & Logan, J. R. (1991). Variations on two themes: Racial and ethnic patterns in the attainment of suburban residence. *Demography,* 28, 431–453.

Bell, J., (2013). *Hate Thy Neighbor: Move-In Violence and the Persistence of Racial Segregation in American Housing*, New York: NYU Press.

Borjas, G., Bronars, S., & Trejo, S. (1992). Self-selection and internal migration in the United States. *Journal of Urban Economics,* 32, 159-185.

Boustan, L. P. (2016). *Competition in the promised land: Black migrants in northern cities and labor markets*. Princeton University Press.

Boyd, M. L. (2008). The role of social networks in making housing choices: The experience of the Gautreaux Two Residential Mobility Program. *Cityscape*, 10(1), 41–63.

Charles, C. Z. (2003). The dynamics of racial residential segregation." *Annual Review of Sociology,* 29, 167–207.

Clark, W. A. V. (1980). Residential mobility and neighborhood change: some implications for racial residential segregation. *Urban Geography,* 1(2), 95-117.

Clark, W. A. V. (1986) *Human migration*. London: Sage.

Clark, W. A. V. (2013). Life course events and residential change: Unpacking age effects on the probability of moving. *Journal of Population Research*, 30, 319–334.

Clark, W. A. V., Deurloo, M., & Dieleman, F. (2006). Residential mobility and neighborhood outcomes. *Housing Studies*, 21, 323–342.

Collins, W. J. (2004). The housing market impact of state level anti-discrimination laws, 1960-1970. *Journal of Urban Economics,* 55(3), 534-564.

Collins, W. J. (2006). The political economy of state fair housing laws before 1968. *Social*

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Science History, 30(1), 15-49.

Courgeau, D. (1990). Migration, family, and career: A life course approach. In P. Baltes, D. Featherman, & R. Lerner (Eds.), *Life-span development and behavior* (Vol. 10, pp. 219–256). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Crowder, K., Pais, J., & South, S. (2012). Neighborhood diversity, metropolitan constraints, and household migration. *American Sociological Review,* 77, 325-353.

Crowder, K., Tolnay, S., & Adelman, R. (2001). Intermetropolitan migration and locational improvement for African American males, 1970-1990. *Social Science Research,* 30, 449-472.

Cutler, D., Glaeser, E., & Vigdor, J. (1999). The rise and decline of the American ghetto. *Journal of Political Economy,* 107, 455-506.

Dawkins, C. J. (2006). Are social networks the ties that bind families to neighborhoods? *Housing Studies*, 21, 867–881.

Duncan, O. D., & Duncan, B. (1955). A methodological analysis of segregation indexes. *American Sociological Review*, 20(2), 210-217.

Ehrenhalt, A. (2012). *The Great Inversion and the Future of the American City.* New York: Random House.

Farley, R., & Frey, W. (1994). Changes in the segregation of whites from blacks during the 1980s: Small steps towards a more integrated society." *American Sociological Review,* 59, 23-45.

Goodman, J. (1978). *Urban Residential Mobility: Places, People, and Policy.* Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.

Grier, E., & Grier, G. (1960). *Privately Developed Interracial Housing: An Analysis of*

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Experience. Los Angeles: University of California.

Helper, R. (1969). *Racial Policies and Practices of Real Estate Brokers*. University of Minnesota Press.

Hirsch, A. R. (1983). *Making the second ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago, 1940-1960.* Cambridge University Press.

Kan, K. (2007). Residential mobility and social capital. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 61, 436–457.

Krysan, M., & Crowder, K. (2017). *Cycle of Segregation: Social Processes and Residential Stratification*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Kucheva, Y., & Sander, R. (2014). The misunderstood consequences of Shelley v. Kraemer. *Social Science Research,* 48, 212-233.

Lake, R. (1981). *The New Suburbanites*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers.

Lehman, N. (1991). *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Logan, J. R., & Alba, R. D. (1993). Locational returns to human capital: Minority access to suburban community resources. *Demography*, 30, 243–268.

Logan, J. R., & Alba, R. D. (1995). Who lives in affluent suburbs? Racial differences in eleven metropolitan regions. *Sociological Focus*, 28, 353–364.

Logan, J. R., Alba, R. D., McNulty, T., & Fisher, B. (1996). Making a place in the metropolis: Residential assimilation and segregation in city and suburb. *Demography,* 33, 443–453.

Logan, J. R., & Schneider, M. (1984). Racial segregation and racial change in American suburbs, 1970-1980. *American Journal of Sociology,* 89(4), 874-888.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Logan, J. R., Stults, B. J., & Farley, R. (2004). Segregation of minorities in the metropolis: Two decades of change. *Demography,* 41, 1-22.

Long, L. (1988). *Migration and residential mobility in the United States*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. A. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Massey, D. S., & Gross, A. (1991). Explaining trends in racial segregation, 1970-1980. *Urban Affairs Quarterly,* 27, 13-35.

Molloy, R., Smith, C. L., & Wozniak, A. (2011). Internal migration in the United States. *Journal of Economic Perspectives,* 25 (3), 173-96.

Northwood, L.K., and Barth, E. (1965). *Urban desegregation: Negro pioneers and their white neighbors.* Seattle: University of Washington.

Oh, S. J., & Yinger, J. (2015). What Have We Learned from Paired Testing in Housing Markets? *Cityscape*, *17*(3), 15.

Ondrich, J., Stricker, A., & Yinger, J. (1998). Do real estate brokers choose to discriminate? Evidence from the 1989 housing discrimination study. *Southern Economic Journal*, 880-901.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1973). Attitudes on race and housing: a social-psychological view. In *Segregation in Residential Areas, eds. Amos H. Hawley and Vincent P. Rock.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.

Quillian, L. (2014). *Race, class, and location in neighborhood migration: A multidimensional analysis of locational attainment.* Unpublished manuscript, Department or Sociology, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Rossi, P. H. (1980). *Why families move*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Ruggles, S., Flood, S., Goeken, R., Schouweiler, M., & Sobek, M. (2022) IPUMS USA: Version 12.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS.

Rugh, J. S., & Massey, D. S. (2014). Segregation in post-civil rights America: Stalled integration or end of the segregated century? *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, *11*(2), 205-232.

Saltman, J. (1978). *Open Housing: Dynamics of a Social Movement*. New York: Praeger Press.

Sander, Richard, Kucheva, Yana, and Zasloff, Jonathan. 2018. *Moving Toward Integration: The Past and Future of Fair Housing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Satter, Beryl, 2009. *Family Properties: Race, Real Estate, and the Exploitation of Black Urban America*. New York, NY: Metropolitan Books.

South, S. J., & Crowder, K. D. (1997). Residential mobility between cities and suburbs: Race, suburbanization, and back-to-the-city moves. *Demography*, 34, 525–538.

South, S., & Deane, G. (1993). Race and residential mobility: Individual determinants and structural constraints. *Social Forces* 72, 147-167.

Spring, A., Ackert, E., Crowder, K., & South, S. (2017). Influence of proximity to kin on residential mobility and destination choice: Examining local movers in metropolitan areas. *Demography,* 54, 1277-1304.

Sugrue, T. (1996). *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Taeuber, K. E., & Taeuber, A. F. (1969). *Negroes in Cities: Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Change.* New York, NY: Atheneum.

Turner, M. A., Ross, S. L., Galster, G. C., & Yinger, J. (2002). *Discrimination in*

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

metropolitan housing markets: National results from Phase I HDS 2000. Washington, DC: US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Vesselinov, E. (2008). Members Only: gated communities and residential segregation in the metropolitan United States. *Sociological Forum*, 23 (3), 536-555).

Vose, C. (1959). *Caucasians Only: The Supreme Court, the NAACP, and the Restrictive Covenant Cases*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Weaver, R. (1948). *The Negro Ghetto*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Wilkes, R., & Iceland, J. (2004). Hypersegregation in the twenty-first century. *Demography*, *41*(1), 23–36.

Zasloff, J. (2016). The secret history of the Fair Housing Act. *Harvard Journal on Legislation*, a-278.

Yinger, J. (1995). *Closed doors, opportunities lost: The continuing costs of housing discrimination*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Table 1 Place of origin of Black domestic movers arriving from outside current county or metropolitan area, 1960-2010

Destination	Source Region	1960[a,b]	1970[a]	1980	1990	2000	2010
Metro areas in the North and West	Non-metro South	42%	31%	11%	9%	4%	4%
	Metro South	28	29	21	20	20	18
	North and West	31	40	69	72	76	78
Metro areas in the South	Non-metro South	77	32	23	24	16	32
	Metro South		29	47	40	47	45
	North and West	23	39	30	37	37	23

Notes: Authors' calculations from publicly available IPUMS Decennial Census and ACS data.
[a] The percentages for 1960 and 1970 are based on inter-county mobility. The percentages for 1980-on based on inter-metropolitan mobility.
[b] In the publicly available 1960 IPUMS Decennial Census data, it is not possible to disaggregate mobility by both region and metro/non-metro status. The 1960 non-metro and metro South percentages for migrants to the North and West are interpolated based on rates of mobility from the South to the North and West in the 1950 and 1970 Census.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Table 2 Distribution of Black moves in U.S. metropolitan areas across three zones

	% of Black moves, in the fifteen months before each census, to each zone					
	SMSA incumbents			SMSA newcomers		
Census year	Core	Border	Outlying	Core	Border	Outlying
1960	66	30	4	55	36	9
1970	64	31	6	52	35	14
1980	56	28	16	35	33	32
1990	56	27	17	31	32	38
2000	60	24	16	40	31	29
2010	61	22	17	44	27	29

Notes: Authors' calculations from restricted Decennial Census data.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Table 3 Relative Black mobility to outlying areas by newcomer status and year

Newcomer Black movers relative to all non-Black movers [a]	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000
North	0.11	0.11	0.21	0.27	0.29
South modernizing	0.27	0.16	0.51	0.71	0.74
Southwest and West desegregating	0.36	0.41	0.76	0.78	0.90
Incumbent Black movers relative to all non-Black movers [b]	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000
North	0.05	0.06	0.13	0.13	0.15
South modernizing	0.18	0.14	0.34	0.44	0.53
Southwest and West desegregating	0.25	0.25	0.54	0.63	0.78

Notes: Authors' calculations from restricted Decennial Census data. The metro areas in the North are New York, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and Milwaukee. The South modernizing metro areas are Atlanta, Nashville, Dallas-Ft. Worth, and Greensboro-Winston-Salem. The South and West desegregating metro areas are Portland, San Antonio, San Diego, and Seattle.

[a] Proportion of moves made by Black newcomers to outlying areas divided by the proportion of moves made by the non-Black population to outlying areas.

[b] Proportion of moves made by Black incumbents to outlying areas divided by the proportion of moves made by the non-Black population to outlying areas.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Table 4 Multinomial logistic regressions of geographic moves by Black householders

	1960 odds ratios	1970 odds ratios	1980 odds ratios	1990 odds ratios	2000 odds ratios	2006-2010 odds ratios
Omitted category: Moves into core areas (census tracts >25% Black)						
Moves into outlying areas (majority White census tracts more than 2mi away from a core tract)						
Newcomer to SMSA	2.327***	2.052***	2.145***	2.348***	1.864***	1.664***
	(0.060)	(0.052)	(0.044)	(0.035)	(0.025)	(0.066)
Residence in the South 5 years ago	0.774***	0.751***	0.973	0.935**	1.097***	1.086
	(0.027)	(0.025)	(0.022)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.075)
Age	1.002*	1.003***	0.990***	0.988***	0.994***	0.992***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)
Household structure (Omitted: Married couple with at least one child)						
Single householder with child	0.492***	0.535***	0.519***	0.587***	0.598***	0.677***
	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.010)	(0.027)
Married couple with no children	0.803***	0.842***	1.132***	1.115***	1.057*	1.096
	(0.024)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.026)	(0.063)
Single householder	0.533***	0.567***	0.797***	0.846***	0.800***	0.837***
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.033)
Education (Omitted: Householder does not have HS diploma)						
HS diploma	0.979	1.211***	1.628***	1.525***	1.538***	1.265***
	(0.030)	(0.035)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.028)	(0.055)
Some college	0.901*	1.770***	2.364***	2.149***	2.110***	1.489***
	(0.042)	(0.063)	(0.048)	(0.043)	(0.038)	(0.063)
College +	1.161*	3.401***	4.153***	3.318***	3.476***	2.036***
	(0.073)	(0.154)	(0.111)	(0.088)	(0.075)	(0.099)
Household income (in '000s)	0.944***	1.021***	1.029***	1.016***	1.005***	1.004***
	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Owner	2.360***	1.853***	1.017	1.042*	1.465***	0.962
	(0.069)	(0.053)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.035)
Metropolitan characteristics						
Logged MSA population (in '000,000s)	0.880***	0.763***	0.845***	0.745***	0.723***	0.879***
	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.008)
MSA percent Black	0.917***	0.915***	0.920***	0.933***	0.921***	0.937***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
MSA Index of Dissimilarity >80	0.242***	0.301***	0.409***	0.687***	0.712***	0.545***
	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.008)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.022)
Current MSA in South	1.330***	1.310***	1.282***	0.978	0.887***	0.589***
	(0.068)	(0.063)	(0.033)	(0.029)	(0.023)	(0.045)
MSA percent employment in manufacturing	0.989***	0.982***	1.004**	1.020***	1.018***	1.055***
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.003)
MSA percent employment in public sector	1.017***	1.029***	1.038***	1.019***	1.035***	1.033***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.005)
MSA percent employment in military	0.973***	1.012***	1.028***	1.013***	1.007***	1.004
	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.004)
MSA percent units built in last ten years	1.005**	0.997	1.033***	1.062***	1.054***	1.030***

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Not in sample for SMSA moves [a]			1.270***			
			(0.023)			
Constant	1.734***	2.579***	0.581***	0.414***	0.694***	0.393***
	(0.194)	(0.307)	(0.046)	(0.029)	(0.039)	(0.041)
Moves into border areas (majority White census tracts less than 2mi away from a core tract)						
Newcomer to SMSA	1.261***	1.309***	1.434***	1.522***	1.406***	1.278***
	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.026)	(0.022)	(0.017)	(0.045)
Residence in the south 5 years ago	0.856***	0.777***	0.922***	0.850***	0.936***	0.955
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.059)
Age	0.998***	0.995***	0.989***	0.988***	0.994***	0.992***
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)
Household structure (Omitted: Married couple with at least one child)						
Single householder with child	0.923***	0.846***	0.718***	0.778***	0.775***	0.807***
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.029)
Married couple with no children	0.985	1.034	1.144***	1.131***	1.079***	1.174**
	(0.015)	(0.021)	(0.025)	(0.028)	(0.025)	(0.061)
Single householder	0.898***	1.005	1.131***	1.160***	1.069***	1.078*
	(0.015)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.022)	(0.017)	(0.038)
Education (Omitted: Householder does not have HS diploma)						
HS diploma	1.054***	1.101***	1.319***	1.285***	1.292***	1.091**
	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.037)
Some college	1.173***	1.348***	1.665***	1.558***	1.585***	1.326***
	(0.026)	(0.030)	(0.026)	(0.025)	(0.023)	(0.043)
College +	1.246***	1.961***	2.552***	2.143***	2.212***	1.721***
	(0.040)	(0.065)	(0.056)	(0.049)	(0.041)	(0.067)
Total household income (in '000s)	1.023***	1.021***	1.018***	1.012***	1.003***	1.002***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Owner	1.933***	2.112***	1.048**	0.837***	1.168***	0.875***
	(0.031)	(0.037)	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.029)
<u>Metropolitan characteristics</u>						
Logged MSA population (in '000,000s)	0.873***	0.798***	0.687***	0.683***	0.648***	0.870***
	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.007)
MSA percent Black	0.944***	0.963***	0.972***	0.973***	0.977***	0.969***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
MSA Index of Dissimilarity >80	0.475***	0.446***	0.804***	1.142***	1.236***	0.797***
	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.026)
Current MSA in South	0.761***	0.849***	0.985	1.160***	1.055*	1.327***
	(0.023)	(0.029)	(0.023)	(0.032)	(0.025)	(0.088)
MSA percent employment in manufacturing	0.981***	0.978***	1.000	1.013***	1.011***	1.050***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
MSA percent employment in public sector	1.009***	1.010***	1.022***	1.008***	1.038***	1.050***
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.005)
MSA percent employment in military	0.988***	1.000	1.022***	1.012***	1.004**	1.044***
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.003)
MSA percent units built in last ten years	0.966***	0.960***	0.997**	1.019***	1.023***	1.004***

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Not in sample for SMSA moves [a]			1.057***			
			(0.015)			
Constant	17.520***	18.390***	2.170***	1.200**	1.001	0.402***
	(0.970)	(1.393)	(0.139)	(0.072)	(0.047)	(0.036)
Observations [b]	170,000	127,000	225,000	222,000	283,000	84,000
Log-likelihood	-524,100	-530,900	-1,354,000	-1,778,000	-2,031,000	-1,602,000

Note: Authors' calculations from restricted Decennial Census data. Standard errors in parentheses. Regressions include only Black householders who moved to a new housing unit in the fifteen months prior to each census or the one-year period before their ACS interview. See Appendix Table 1 for descriptive statistics of all variables.

[a] The Census Bureau coded at random the place of residence of each householder five years prior to the census for only half of the 1980 long-form sample.

[b] The number of observations is rounded to the nearest 1,000 per Census Bureau disclosure rules.

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Table 5 Predicted probabilities of moving to an outlying tract by year for Black newcomers to a metropolitan area

	Model with no controls		Model with household-level and metropolitan-level controls	
	Probability	Standard error	Probability	Standard error
1960	0.09	0.001	0.08	0.002
1970	0.14	0.002	0.11	0.002
1980	0.32	0.003	0.24	0.002
1990	0.38	0.002	0.29	0.002
2000	0.29	0.002	0.25	0.002
2006-2010	0.29	0.006	0.24	0.005

Notes: Probabilities based on multinomial regression in Table 4.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Appendix Table 1 Descriptive statistics, Black householders, disaggregated by year and type of move

	1960		1970		1980		1990		2000		2006-2010	
Pioneering move 2mi+ from a Black enclave	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Age	37.41	13.1	35.09	12.93	32.17	11.33	33.78	11.16	35.88	12.01	37.48	12.66
Married couple with child	0.54	0.50	0.46	0.50	0.31	0.46	0.24	0.43	0.23	0.42	0.18	0.38
Single female householder with child	0.10	0.30	0.14	0.35	0.18	0.38	0.25	0.43	0.26	0.44	0.28	0.45
Single male householder with child	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.12	0.03	0.16	0.05	0.22	0.06	0.23	0.06	0.24
Married couple no child	0.20	0.4	0.18	0.38	0.13	0.33	0.12	0.33	0.09	0.29	0.08	0.26
Single female householder	0.07	0.25	0.09	0.29	0.14	0.35	0.15	0.36	0.18	0.38	0.19	0.39
Single male householder	0.08	0.28	0.11	0.31	0.22	0.41	0.19	0.39	0.19	0.39	0.21	0.41
Less than HS diploma	0.73	0.45	0.42	0.49	0.20	0.40	0.15	0.36	0.13	0.33	0.09	0.29
HS diploma	0.17	0.38	0.30	0.46	0.31	0.46	0.27	0.44	0.25	0.43	0.23	0.42
Some college	0.07	0.25	0.17	0.37	0.31	0.46	0.38	0.49	0.38	0.49	0.42	0.49
College +	0.04	0.19	0.12	0.32	0.18	0.38	0.20	0.40	0.24	0.43	0.25	0.43
Total household income (in ‘000s)	3.30	2.58	7.19	6.03	15.87	14.17	27.96	29.35	42.99	48.24	46.88	47.10
Owner	0.25	0.43	0.28	0.45	0.21	0.41	0.16	0.37	0.25	0.43	0.16	0.37
Newcomer to SMSA	0.43	0.50	0.43	0.49	0.24	0.43	0.45	0.50	0.40	0.49	0.15	0.36
Residence in the South 5 years ago	0.46	0.50	0.44	0.50	0.26	0.44	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.50	0.48	0.50
MSA population (in '000,000s)	24.01	30.97	20.68	27.45	17.82	19.61	35.03	44.35	37.76	46.28	324.88	467.44
MSA percent Black	13.79	8.83	13.98	8.67	14.76	8.81	14.86	8.68	14.84	8.87	13.60	7.60
MSA Dissimilarity index	0.77	0.09	0.77	0.10	0.72	0.11	0.64	0.10	0.61	0.10	0.65	0.08
Current MSA in South	0.40	0.49	0.43	0.50	0.52	0.50	0.54	0.50	0.53	0.50	0.49	0.50
Not in the SMSA mover sample					0.45	0.50						
Unweighted N	9,000		9,800		42,000		50,000		55,000		15,000	

	1960		1970		1980		1990		2000		2006-2010	
Pioneering move less than 2mi from a Black enclave	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Age	37.47	12.72	35.53	13.34	33.00	12.63	34.25	11.94	35.73	12.58	37.27	13.12
Married couple with child	0.44	0.50	0.36	0.48	0.23	0.42	0.17	0.38	0.17	0.38	0.12	0.32
Single female householder with child	0.14	0.35	0.20	0.40	0.24	0.42	0.32	0.47	0.30	0.46	0.31	0.46
Single male householder with child	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.12	0.03	0.16	0.05	0.22	0.06	0.24	0.06	0.24
Married couple no child	0.20	0.40	0.16	0.37	0.09	0.29	0.09	0.28	0.07	0.25	0.06	0.24
Single female householder	0.11	0.31	0.14	0.34	0.18	0.38	0.17	0.38	0.20	0.40	0.23	0.42
Single male householder	0.09	0.29	0.13	0.34	0.24	0.43	0.20	0.40	0.20	0.40	0.22	0.42

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Less than HS diploma	0.70	0.46	0.50	0.50	0.28	0.45	0.23	0.42	0.18	0.38	0.12	0.33
HS diploma	0.18	0.38	0.30	0.46	0.32	0.47	0.3	0.46	0.28	0.45	0.26	0.44
Some college	0.08	0.27	0.14	0.34	0.27	0.44	0.33	0.47	0.36	0.48	0.42	0.49
College +	0.04	0.19	0.07	0.25	0.13	0.34	0.15	0.35	0.18	0.38	0.2	0.40
Total household income (in '000s)	3.75	2.81	6.83	5.94	13.20	11.75	22.55	22.83	34.87	40.66	37.47	40.26
Owner	0.21	0.41	0.27	0.45	0.18	0.38	0.12	0.33	0.19	0.40	0.11	0.32
Newcomer to SMSA	0.28	0.45	0.27	0.44	0.16	0.36	0.30	0.46	0.32	0.46	0.11	0.31
Residence in the South 5 years ago	0.28	0.47	0.34	0.47	0.23	0.42	0.49	0.50	0.53	0.50	0.57	0.50
MSA population (in '000,000s)	32.57	35.70	34.17	37.77	22.21	24.69	33.34	44.72	35.09	45.88	301.67	457.42
MSA percent Black	13.32	7.99	15.28	7.59	17.53	9.04	17.76	8.87	19.48	9.53	16.16	8.56
MSA Dissimilarity index	0.80	0.08	0.80	0.09	0.75	0.11	0.68	0.11	0.63	0.11	0.66	0.08
Current MSA in South	0.25	0.44	0.30	0.46	0.46	0.50	0.53	0.50	0.59	0.49	0.58	0.49
Not in the SMSA mover sample					0.45	0.50						
Unweighted N	53,000		40,000		64,000		63,000		73,000		19,000	

	1960		1970		1980		1990		2000		2006-2010	
Non-pioneering move	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Age	38.09	13.44	36.27	14.33	35.72	14.4	36.82	13.8	37.37	13.7	38.83	13.69
Married couple with child	0.41	0.49	0.3	0.46	0.18	0.39	0.14	0.35	0.14	0.35	0.11	0.31
Single female householder with child	0.16	0.37	0.25	0.43	0.35	0.48	0.43	0.49	0.39	0.49	0.38	0.49
Single male householder with child	0.01	0.12	0.02	0.12	0.03	0.17	0.06	0.23	0.07	0.25	0.07	0.25
Married couple no child	0.19	0.39	0.14	0.35	0.07	0.26	0.07	0.25	0.06	0.23	0.05	0.21
Single female householder	0.13	0.33	0.16	0.36	0.17	0.37	0.14	0.35	0.17	0.38	0.20	0.40
Single male householder	0.10	0.3	0.13	0.34	0.2	0.4	0.16	0.37	0.17	0.38	0.20	0.40
Less than HS diploma	0.76	0.43	0.59	0.49	0.42	0.49	0.35	0.48	0.27	0.44	0.17	0.37
HS diploma	0.16	0.36	0.28	0.45	0.32	0.46	0.30	0.46	0.31	0.46	0.31	0.46
Some college	0.06	0.24	0.10	0.30	0.20	0.40	0.27	0.44	0.32	0.46	0.39	0.49
College +	0.03	0.16	0.03	0.17	0.06	0.24	0.08	0.27	0.11	0.32	0.14	0.34
Total household income (in '000s)	3.21	2.5	5.59	4.73	10.78	12.68	18.89	21.52	30.28	40.72	33.6	34.53
Owner	0.12	0.33	0.15	0.36	0.14	0.34	0.12	0.32	0.16	0.37	0.11	0.31
Newcomer to SMSA	0.21	0.41	0.21	0.40	0.09	0.28	0.17	0.38	0.20	0.40	0.07	0.26
Residence in the South 5 years ago	0.47	0.50	0.44	0.50	0.21	0.41	0.45	0.50	0.47	0.50	0.53	0.50
MSA population (in '000,000s)	27.13	29.02	33.92	32.77	34.08	29.91	52.99	57.25	63.12	65.72	252.31	396.09
MSA percent Black	16.78	8.79	17.52	7.19	18.87	7.51	18.73	8.48	19.59	9.34	17.10	8.42

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

MSA Dissimilarity index	0.81	0.09	0.83	0.08	0.79	0.09	0.71	0.10	0.67	0.10	0.68	0.08
Current MSA in South	0.42	0.49	0.40	0.49	0.40	0.49	0.46	0.50	0.51	0.50	0.54	0.5
Not in the SMSA mover sample					0.45	0.50						
Unweighted N	107,000		77,000		120,000		108,000		154,000		49,000	

Notes: Authors' calculations from restricted Decennial Census data. Statistics include only Black householders who moved to a new housing unit in the fifteen months prior to each census or the one-year period before their ACS interview. Number of observations rounded to the nearest 1,000 per Census Bureau disclosure rules.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Appendix Table 2 Multinomial logistic regression of pioneering moves by Black householders, 1960-2010

	1960 odds ratios	1970 odds ratios	1980 odds ratios	1990 odds ratios	2000 odds ratios	2006-2010 odds ratios
Omitted category: move to a core tract						
Pioneer move more than 3 miles away from core tract						
Newcomer to SMSA	2.479***	2.329***	2.279***	2.628***	1.982***	1.824***
	(0.072)	(0.066)	(0.050)	(0.042)	(0.029)	(0.074)
Not in sample for SMSA moves [a]			1.317***			
			(0.027)			
Residence in the south 5 years ago	0.752***	0.742***	1.008	0.991	1.139***	1.099
	(0.031)	(0.029)	(0.025)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.078)
Age	1.003***	1.007***	0.990***	0.989***	0.994***	0.993***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Household structure (Omitted: Married couple with at least one child)						
Single householder with child	0.477***	0.503***	0.488***	0.583***	0.584***	0.597***
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.011)	(0.025)
Married couple no child	0.793***	0.765***	1.109***	1.096***	1.039	1.003
	(0.027)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.028)	(0.058)
Single female householder	0.391***	0.415***	0.699***	0.823***	0.754***	0.664***
	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.019)	(0.022)	(0.017)	(0.031)
Single male householder	0.658***	0.578***	0.768***	0.797***	0.779***	0.721***
	(0.033)	(0.028)	(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.033)
Education (Omitted: Householder does not have HS diploma)						
HS diploma	0.930**	1.265***	1.558***	1.515***	1.492***	1.359***
	(0.034)	(0.042)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.031)	(0.069)
Some college	0.838***	1.778***	2.316***	2.124***	2.048***	1.777***
	(0.047)	(0.074)	(0.052)	(0.046)	(0.041)	(0.086)
College +	1.120	3.388***	4.151***	3.240***	3.493***	2.639***
	(0.082)	(0.176)	(0.120)	(0.092)	(0.083)	(0.143)
Total household income (in '000s)	0.939***	1.022***	1.030***	1.016***	1.005***	1.005***
	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Owner	2.339***	1.869***	1.092***	1.193***	1.666***	1.322***
	(0.079)	(0.062)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.049)
Metropolitan characteristics						
MSA population (in '000,000s)	0.993***	0.993***	0.997***	0.997***	0.994***	1.001***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
MSA percent black	0.903***	0.907***	0.903***	0.916***	0.924***	0.948***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
MSA Dissimilarity index	0.000***	0.000***	0.001***	0.004***	0.006***	0.001***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Current MSA in South	1.791***	1.552***	1.846***	1.541***	0.791***	0.424***
	(0.086)	(0.072)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.020)	(0.033)
Constant	337.3***	343.4***	117.4***	30.54***	21.39***	76.34***
	(43.89)	(46.57)	(8.88)	(2.06)	(1.26)	(11.83)
Pioneer move 2 to 3 miles away from core tract						

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Newcomer to SMSA	2.294***	1.786***	2.039***	2.084***	1.692***	1.504***
	(0.108)	(0.079)	(0.065)	(0.050)	(0.037)	(0.093)
Not in sample for SMSA moves [a]			1.158***			
			(0.037)			
Residence in the south 5 years ago	0.771***	0.667***	0.878***	0.861***	1.011	0.867
	(0.050)	(0.041)	(0.031)	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.094)
Age	0.999	0.994***	0.983***	0.983***	0.992***	0.989***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
Household structure (Omitted: Married couple with at least one child)						
Single householder with child	0.545***	0.649***	0.578***	0.645***	0.669***	0.730***
	(0.042)	(0.040)	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.019)	(0.046)
Married couple no child	0.863***	1.055	1.259***	1.192***	1.127***	1.141
	(0.048)	(0.060)	(0.048)	(0.048)	(0.045)	(0.102)
Single female householder	0.631***	0.716***	0.942	1.037	0.938**	0.920
	(0.054)	(0.052)	(0.035)	(0.040)	(0.031)	(0.063)
Single male householder	0.710***	0.925	0.952	0.942*	0.896***	0.924
	(0.060)	(0.062)	(0.031)	(0.034)	(0.029)	(0.064)
Education (Omitted: Householder does not have HS diploma)						
HS diploma	1.211***	1.275***	1.892***	1.459***	1.546***	1.291***
	(0.069)	(0.067)	(0.061)	(0.049)	(0.049)	(0.095)
Some college	1.331***	2.392***	2.708***	2.116***	2.070***	1.652***
	(0.104)	(0.141)	(0.092)	(0.070)	(0.063)	(0.115)
College +	1.316**	4.425***	4.298***	3.206***	3.245***	2.449***
	(0.150)	(0.316)	(0.177)	(0.130)	(0.115)	(0.191)
Total household income (in '000s)	0.976**	1.028***	1.030***	1.016***	1.004***	1.004***
	(0.009)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Owner	2.743***	2.004***	0.804***	0.742***	1.076***	0.946
	(0.140)	(0.097)	(0.026)	(0.025)	(0.028)	(0.056)
Metropolitan characteristics						
MSA population (in '000,000s)	0.998**	0.994***	0.993***	0.993***	0.992***	1.001***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
MSA percent black	0.906***	0.924***	0.932***	0.949***	0.950***	0.976***
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.003)
MSA Dissimilarity index	0.001***	0.001***	0.003***	0.008***	0.027***	0.002***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.001)
Current MSA in South	1.469***	1.882***	2.132***	1.536***	1.022	0.703***
	(0.117)	(0.136)	(0.071)	(0.062)	(0.037)	(0.081)
Constant	24.03***	21.97***	13.51***	6.595***	2.375***	10.16***
	(5.844)	(4.636)	(1.453)	(0.632)	(0.209)	(2.337)
Pioneer move 1 to 2 miles away from core tract						
Newcomer to SMSA	1.544***	1.481***	1.595***	1.783***	1.543***	1.335***
	(0.052)	(0.045)	(0.041)	(0.035)	(0.028)	(0.068)
Not in sample for SMSA moves [a]			1.122***			
			(0.026)			
Residence in the south 5 years ago	0.843***	0.706***	0.911***	0.899***	0.980	0.932

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

	(0.039)	(0.030)	(0.026)	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.085)
Age	0.998	0.993***	0.984***	0.986***	0.993***	0.990***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Household structure (Omitted: Married couple with at least one child)						
Single householder with child	0.765***	0.770***	0.649***	0.737***	0.725***	0.795***
	(0.034)	(0.030)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.017)	(0.042)
Married couple no child	0.871***	1.066	1.252***	1.225***	1.074**	1.154*
	(0.033)	(0.041)	(0.040)	(0.041)	(0.037)	(0.089)
Single female householder	0.759***	0.868***	1.119***	1.160***	1.039	1.107*
	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.032)	(0.036)	(0.027)	(0.063)
Single male householder	0.862***	0.972	1.126***	1.057*	0.985	1.082
	(0.045)	(0.044)	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.026)	(0.062)
Education (Omitted: Householder does not have HS diploma)						
HS diploma	1.134***	1.223***	1.621***	1.346***	1.356***	1.210***
	(0.043)	(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.067)
Some college	1.372***	1.756***	2.216***	1.701***	1.765***	1.625***
	(0.072)	(0.072)	(0.056)	(0.042)	(0.041)	(0.085)
College +	1.587***	3.238***	3.586***	2.478***	2.699***	2.111***
	(0.113)	(0.170)	(0.114)	(0.079)	(0.075)	(0.126)
Total household income (in '000s)	1.008	1.031***	1.027***	1.014***	1.004***	1.004***
	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Owner	2.222***	2.268***	0.783***	0.723***	1.099***	0.829***
	(0.078)	(0.072)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.023)	(0.041)
Metropolitan characteristics						
MSA population (in '000,000s)	0.994***	0.994***	0.988***	0.992***	0.992***	1.000***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
MSA percent black	0.900***	0.931***	0.951***	0.954***	0.971***	0.972***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
MSA Dissimilarity index	0.000***	0.001***	0.017***	0.055***	0.059***	0.014***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)
Current MSA in South	0.972	1.381***	1.333***	1.479***	0.934**	0.875
	(0.056)	(0.071)	(0.036)	(0.051)	(0.028)	(0.085)
Constant	518.9***	51.19***	7.975***	3.282***	1.955***	3.677***
	(73.272)	(7.640)	(0.720)	(0.262)	(0.136)	(0.702)
Pioneer move less than 1 mile away from core tract						
Newcomer to SMSA	1.233***	1.246***	1.354***	1.442***	1.365***	1.248***
	(0.018)	(0.022)	(0.027)	(0.023)	(0.019)	(0.051)
Not in sample for SMSA moves [a]			1.015			
			(0.016)			
Residence in the south 5 years ago	0.841***	0.798***	0.920***	0.835***	0.945***	0.899
	(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.063)
Age	0.998***	0.996***	0.991***	0.989***	0.994***	0.992***
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)
Household structure (Omitted: Married couple with at least one child)						
Single householder with child	0.952***	0.874***	0.743***	0.783***	0.796***	0.830***

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.035)
Married couple no child	1.007	1.014	1.090***	1.066**	1.070***	1.208***
	(0.016)	(0.022)	(0.027)	(0.030)	(0.028)	(0.072)
Single female householder	0.887***	0.999	1.106***	1.167***	1.092***	1.109**
	(0.019)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.029)	(0.022)	(0.050)
Single male householder	0.969	1.064**	1.108***	1.093***	1.058***	1.050
	(0.021)	(0.026)	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.021)	(0.048)
Education (Omitted: Householder does not have HS diploma)						
HS diploma	1.052***	1.083***	1.214***	1.229***	1.235***	1.034
	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.040)
Some college	1.169***	1.311***	1.452***	1.409***	1.439***	1.207***
	(0.027)	(0.031)	(0.026)	(0.025)	(0.023)	(0.045)
College +	1.217***	1.753***	2.172***	1.842***	1.902***	1.488***
	(0.041)	(0.063)	(0.053)	(0.047)	(0.039)	(0.068)
Total household income (in '000s)	1.029***	1.021***	1.014***	1.010***	1.003***	1.001***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Owner	1.849***	2.106***	1.175***	0.929***	1.204***	0.952
	(0.030)	(0.039)	(0.021)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.036)
Metropolitan characteristics						
MSA population (in '000,000s)	1.002***	0.999***	0.989***	0.991***	0.990***	1.000***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
MSA percent black	0.953***	0.968***	0.991***	0.989***	1.001**	0.999
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
MSA Dissimilarity index	0.005***	0.002***	0.023***	0.194***	0.122***	0.046***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.002)	(0.015)	(0.008)	(0.009)
Current MSA in South	0.682***	0.598***	0.663***	0.881***	0.662***	0.887
	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.014)	(0.025)	(0.016)	(0.066)
Constant	69.75***	137.6***	11.69***	2.325***	2.146***	2.467***
	(4.952)	(11.497)	(0.787)	(0.146)	(0.111)	(0.361)
Observations [b]	170,000	127,000	225,000	222,000	283,000	84,000
Log-likelihood	-611,188	-647,250	-1,764,383	-2,381,158	-2,648,000	-2,139,000

Note: Authors' calculations from restricted Decennial Census data. Standard errors in parentheses. Regressions include only Black householders who moved to a new housing unit in the fifteen months prior to each census or the one-year period before their ACS interview. See Appendix Table 1 for descriptive statistics of all variables.

[a] The Census Bureau coded at random the place of residence of each householder five years prior to the census for only half of the 1980 long-form sample.

[b] The number of observations is rounded to the nearest 1,000 per Census Bureau disclosure rules.

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590

Appendix Table 3 Predicted probabilities of making a pioneering move by year given newcomer status to SMSA

	3+ miles		2-3 miles		1-2 miles		<1 miles	
	Probability	Standard error	Probability	Standard error	Probability	Standard error	Probability	Standard error
1960	0.068	0.001	0.021	0.001	0.041	0.001	0.295	0.002
1970	0.083	0.001	0.027	0.001	0.062	0.001	0.276	0.003
1980	0.180	0.002	0.061	0.001	0.097	0.002	0.200	0.003
1990	0.229	0.002	0.068	0.001	0.113	0.001	0.193	0.002
2000	0.187	0.001	0.060	0.001	0.095	0.001	0.186	0.002
2006-2010	0.192	0.005	0.063	0.003	0.094	0.004	0.160	0.005

Notes: Probabilities based on multinomial regression in Appendix Table 2.

Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4275590