

Katherine J. Curtis White

Women in the Great Migration

Economic Activity of Black and White Southern-Born Female Migrants in 1920, 1940, and 1970

Using data from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS), this analysis examines the economic activity of black and white southern-born female migrants participating in the Great Migration. Labor force participation and occupational SEI scores are investigated with specific focus on racial differences within and between migrant groups. Black migrants had a higher probability of participating in the labor force, yet their employment was concentrated among the lower SEI occupations throughout the period. Racial differences also were observed among the influence of personal, household, and location characteristics on economic activity such that the positive associations were less pronounced, while the negative impacts were differentially felt among black migrant women; education was less beneficial, and the deterring effects of marital status were less pronounced for black migrants. Racial differences narrowed at the end of the Great Migration for the southern migrants, reflecting a pattern most similar to nonmigrant northerners and more advantageous than that observed for nonmigrant southern women.

From approximately 1910 through 1970, southerners caught “Northern Fever” (Grossman 1989: 3), abandoned their poor economic and social conditions, and headed north to reap the benefits of an expanding industrial market. This massive relocation of the black and white southern population has come to be known as the “Great Migration.” Some migrants thought of their relocation as a temporary solution to the changing southern economy. Others were beginning their lives anew in a place with greater social freedom and

more economic promise. Regardless of the specific motivation of individual migrants, the social arrangements of both the southern and northern regions of the United States observed today are partially a product of this historic migration.

Women were important participants in this demographic phenomenon, yet their experience has received little attention from social scientists. Instead, much focus has been directed toward male participants (Lieberson and Wilkinson 1976; Long 1974; Long and Heltman 1975; Tolnay et al. 2000, 2002), thus producing an imbalanced understanding of the motivations and impacts of the Great Migration. This study focuses on one significant consequence of the female experience: postmigration economic activity. Many scholars have examined contemporary female economic activity, its causes, correlates, and consequences (e.g., England et al. 1988; Kilbourne et al. 1994; Klerman and Leibowitz 1999) and racial differences in these factors (e.g., Browne 1997, 2000; Christopher 1996), while others have addressed the historic movement of women into the labor force (e.g., Goldin 1990; Oppenheimer 1970). These genres provide an intellectual foundation to the present study, where I emphasize the economic activity of a historic subsample.

In the following analysis, I use individual-level census data drawn from the 1920, 1940, and 1970 Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) (Ruggles and Sobek 2003) to examine economic differences between black and white southern-born female migrants after reaching their northern destinations. The primary objective is to estimate the extent and correlates of racial differences in economic migration outcomes over time. Further, I place the migrant racial differences in context by comparing the economic status of the southern migrant women to those of southern- and northern-born non-migrant women. By doing so, the impacts of migrant status and race on economic activity are simultaneously considered over a broad historical period. The contribution of this analysis lies in its gendered approach, focusing on historical female economic activity within the migration context.

The Migration Context

The Great Migration refers to the southern exodus of blacks and whites migrating to northern and western states between 1910 and 1970. The extent and flows of the migrant streams varied over time and corresponded with the economic opportunities available in both regions. Heavy migration occurred

during and following World War I and World War II, when the northern cities were experiencing an industrial boom and tighter immigration laws reduced the number of low-wage immigrant laborers. These factors pulled southerners north, while conditions at home helped push them out of the South. Push factors included the mechanization of agriculture, the devastating boll weevil infestation, and specific to black southerners, racially violent and economically repressive conditions of the Jim Crow South (Tolnay and Beck 1992). Combined, these push and pull factors sent southerners northward in search of improved conditions (for more extensive reviews see Fligstein 1981; Henri 1975; Mandle 1978).

Many of these migrants were displaced tenant farmers and sharecroppers. Although a large proportion ended up in the North, they often began their migration careers moving between southern farms and towns, trying their hand at urban employment (Alexander 1998; Moore 1991, 2000). Often, wives of black farmers would work in town as domestic servants, while their husbands and children toiled in the fields. They would return home to be greeted by a long list of household tasks, typically including fieldwork in addition to the usual cooking, cleaning, washing, and sewing.

This experience was much more common for black women. Although white women were responsible for house and fieldwork, they were less likely to be employed outside of the home. For example, in 1910, nearly six times as many black married farm women reported an occupation compared to white married farm women—40 percent of black farm owners and 60 percent of black farm renters reported occupations compared to 7 percent of white farm owners and 11 percent of white farm renters (Tolnay 1999). Moreover, it was white women who often employed the black women; the wealthier hired black cooks and housekeepers, while less well-off whites sent their laundry to black washerwomen (Hagood 1939). In general, women found fewer opportunities in the South than men. Some researchers have attributed this to the patriarchal structure of the South, where women occupied a lower stratum than their male counterparts (Jones 1995). Women had fewer rights and opportunities than men and also were more vulnerable to sexual and physical violence, where perpetrators included spouses and employers as well as strangers (Federal Writers' Project 1975 [1939]). Conditions in the South were poor but even poorer for black residents, especially for black women.

The intersection of race and gender created complex social conditions. Not only were black women afforded fewer rights and subject to greater

physical threats, but their personal lives were further complicated by their participation in the labor force. Unlike white women, who were perceived as wives and mothers, black women were often viewed as laborers by the dominant white group, both before and after the abolition of slavery (Jones 1995, 1988). Further, employment for black men typically was limited and unstable (Lieberson 1980; Lieberson and Wilkinson 1976). A black woman might still be employed while her husband could not find work. Although her income was economically beneficial to the household, her role as breadwinner challenged her husband's authority and the patriarchal order. Such situations were particular to black women and created much conflict within the home (Hagood 1939; Federal Writers' Project 1975 [1939]).

Once migrants made it to the North, their geographic mobility did not immediately or always subside. Researchers have noted much movement between the North and South (Berry 2000; Lemann 1992), often resulting in the recruitment of new northern-bound migrants (Trotter 1991). Because many families sent only one or two members north, frequent visits were made to those left behind. Some migrant men were later joined by their wives and children after finding employment and housing. Others permanently left their families. Still, some were single women who moved with their children or left all or some with relatives (Hine 1991). Regardless of whether they traveled with their families or left them behind, all were looking for opportunity and found little in the South.

While researchers have estimated some consequences of the Great Migration on both individuals and communities, they have focused largely on the male experience. Despite this limitation, a great deal of knowledge has been produced by previous work on the Great Migration. There are two general views regarding southern migrants, one historical and the other more contemporary. Historical work characterizes migrants as a relatively uneducated and morally slack population riddled with unstable families that created many problems for northern cities and their inhabitants (Drake and Cayton 1962 [1945]; Frazier 1932). More recent work has challenged this perspective, finding that migrants on average fared better than their nonmigrant counterparts on several characteristics, including employment, poverty and welfare status, and marital stability (Lieberson and Wilkinson 1976; Long 1974; Long and Heltman 1975; Tolnay 2001; Tolnay et al. 2000).

The limited information about female migrant experiences is restricted to comparisons between black migrants and nonmigrants in the North, most

of which are based on 1970 census data. In these studies, evidence shows that black migrants were less likely to go on welfare, exhibited greater marital stability, and were more likely to be employed (Lieberson and Wilkinson 1976; Long 1974), although they attained lower occupational status than native northerners (Lemke-Santangelo 1996; Tolnay 2001). When comparing white migrants to nonmigrants in the North, no general patterns are found (Long 1974), although slightly higher rates of poverty and welfare status were observed among white southern-born migrants.

This investigation is motivated by three key aspects of previous research. First, most work on the Great Migration focuses exclusively on males. This has produced a fascinating yet incomplete body of literature. Second, while many studies compare migrants to nonmigrants, comparisons of migrants have not been made. It seems likely that differences between black and white female migrants would exist, yet whether and how they do remains unanalyzed. Third, until recently data were not available to empirically assess the potentially varying consequences and patterns of migration over long periods of time. This analysis takes advantage of the newly developed IPUMS data for 1920, 1940, and 1970 to examine the entire period of the Great Migration. There were considerable changes in the economic and political climate over the course of the Great Migration period, and these data allow for the investigation of whether and how racial differences corresponded with these structural changes as migrants were leaving behind the South and its declining economic and stifling social circumstances.

Objectives and Potential Outcomes

While the social hierarchy left black southerners, especially black female southerners, at the bottom of the economic ladder, it is reasonable to suspect that the status of black migrants would improve once they reached the North. An expanding labor market and more progressive race relations gave promise to black female migrants. However, it is also reasonable to expect that female economic activity varied by race after migrating. Previous research, mainly focusing on males, has shown that racial differences in economic well-being existed within both the southern and northern regions of the United States. Some research has suggested that black and white southern migrants were motivated by somewhat different reasons, emphasizing the possibility of variation in the selection process of migrants and, therefore, variation

in postmigration outcomes (Tolnay and Beck 1992). Further, researchers assert that black and white migrants were received differently by northerners, where some argue black migrants were treated more harshly than white migrants (Lemann 1992) and discrimination in hiring was normative, especially prior to the civil rights era (Broussard 1993; Gottlieb 1991; Grossman 1989; Lemke-Santangelo 1996).

Although black migrants may have looked to the North as a land free of racial tension, they often faced a different, less-welcoming reality after their arrival (Hine 1991; Lewis 1991). Some black women even took a step or two down the occupational ladder in order to secure employment, some moving from southern teachers to northern laundresses (Grossman 1989; Martin 1993). Despite education levels or previous work experience, black female employment in the North often was limited to domestic service (Marks 1989). As one migrant noted, black women “found every door except the kitchen door closed to them” (Hine 1991: 139). While there is reason to suspect racial variation in postmigration economic activity, among the research that empirically compares black and white migrants to one another, few have systematically considered the female migrant.

Given the changing economic and political climate characterizing the early- and mid-twentieth-century United States, racial variation in economic activity is anticipated to diminish over time. Wartime demands during the 1940s fueled industrial development in the Northeast, parts of the Midwest, and along the coasts. As demands for production increased, employment opportunities for women similarly expanded. Although employers often invoked the “last hired, first fired” policy, women, black and white, were employed for at least a brief time during the war years (Grossman 1989; Hine 1991; Martin 1993). However, the mass introduction of a female labor force did not necessarily imply equal distribution across the occupational structure. Instead, black women most often were awarded the least desirable jobs, within firms and across industry. While white women could be found in clerical offices or at perfume counters, black women worked in the hog head, bone, and hair departments of packinghouses (Grossman 1989). Yet these conditions, and the accompanying occupational distribution, did not remain static throughout the Great Migration period. Opportunity for black women expanded during the 1940s and 1950s to include offices and stores (Gottlieb 1987). And the introduction of the civil rights legislation during the

1960s further reshaped the employment landscape, providing greater access to higher-status occupations for black women.

When considering these events, racial differences in labor force participation among migrant women are expected to dissipate over time, primarily because of an increase in white participation rather than a decline in black labor force activity. Opportunities sparked by wartime demand extended beyond the war years, and women continued to gain access to the labor market. And while black females have been active members of the labor force for much of U.S. history, researchers have demonstrated that one of the more marked transitions of twentieth-century female employment is the increased participation of white women (England and Farkas 1986; Goldin 1990; Oppenheimer 1970; Sobek 1997).

Previous research on historical female labor force participation has shown that although black women were more likely to be employed, white women were more likely to possess higher-status occupations. Therefore, it is expected that while most white migrant women of the Great Migration will not work, especially in the earlier periods, those who do work are likely to achieve higher occupational status than black migrants. However, the shift in labor policy regarding race toward the end of the Great Migration period is anticipated to influence the occupational distribution of race, such that the racial gap in occupational status should diminish as black women gain access to higher-status jobs. Though early in the occupational desegregation movement, the status gap between black and white women should begin to decrease by 1970 (Cohen 1998; Wilkie 1985).

Whether labor force participation is considered a “benefit” or evidence of an economic advantage versus disadvantage is debatable. Female labor force participation can imply either the *ability* to participate or the *need* to participate. Alternatively, the implications of occupational status remain consistent across time and groups: the ability to obtain prestige and status is desirable. Therefore, both indicators of economic activity are considered to assess variation in migrant access to and status within the occupational structure.

In the following analysis, I address three general questions clarifying the extent and correlates of racial variation in economic activity among female participants of the Great Migration. First, do the economic consequences of migration vary by race? More specifically, how do black southern-born female migrants compare to white female migrants in terms of economic

activity, considering both labor force participation and occupational status? Second, does the racial contrast in economic activity vary over time and, if so, how, and do the contributing factors of this variation also change over time? Finally, how do the racial differences observed for southern migrant women compare to those experienced by nonmigrant women? Otherwise stated, did migrants to the North experience improved racial differences in economic activity relative to southern and northern nonmigrants?

I organize the potential correlates of racial differences in economic activity according to personal, household, and location characteristics. Regarding personal factors, the “human capital perspective” argues that any differences in economic activity would be attributable to achieved personal characteristics such as education, while the “racial stratification model” attributes differences to ascribed personal characteristics such as race. According to the human capital perspective, migrants move from places with relatively lower wages and little economic opportunity to places with higher wages and greater economic opportunity (Greenwood 1981; Sjaastad 1962). Therefore, the occupational success or labor force experience of migrants at their destination can be attributed to achieved characteristics such as education. In contrast, the racial stratification model argues that differences between the migrant groups are due to ascribed rather than achieved characteristics and human capital characteristics behave differently by race (Alba and Logan 1991; Hogan and Featherman 1977; Logan and Molotch 1987; Siegel 1965; Tolnay et al. 2000). So while both southern blacks and southern whites may have moved to the North, white migrants were met with greater opportunity than their black counterparts due to race, regardless of achieved characteristics such as education. Further, according to the racial stratification model, any influence of education varies according to race with greater returns for the more privileged, dominant racial group.

Variation according to household characteristics is also of interest. Previous work on historical female employment has shown that marriage and the presence of children are negatively associated with labor force participation (Bose 2001; Sobek 1997), yet black women are consistently more likely to be employed than white women (Bose 2001; Lieberman and Wilkinson 1976; Long 1974; Sobek 1997). Researchers have attributed this pattern to household economic need, where black men have a lower probability of maintaining stable and lucrative employment (Bose 2001; Lieberman and Wilkinson 1976; Sobek 1997), and to social expectations of black women as laborers

(Jones 1988, 1995). Most black men worked low-status and low-paying jobs which placed greater financial responsibility on black women, although they too often secured only low-status and low-paying jobs (Lemke-Santangelo 1996; Lewis 1991). Given this literature, greater proportions of black migrant women are anticipated to participate in the labor force compared to white migrant women. Further, the presence of a spouse should decrease the likelihood of labor force participation less for black migrant women than for white migrant women.

Although children contributed to the household income in the southern farm setting, it is more likely that children were consumers rather than contributors in the northern environment. For example, in 1940, approximately 16 percent of black northern children between 15 and 18 years of age reported an occupation compared to 43 percent among black southern farm children (Tolnay 1999). Similar regional variation is observed in 1910, with 47 percent of black northern children and 80 percent of black southern farm children reporting an occupation. In contrast, research has demonstrated less divergence between employment among white children by geographic location (27 percent versus 17 percent in 1940, and 52 percent for both white northern and white southern farm children in 1910). These statistics illustrate the complex relationship between employment and race even among children. While some forces pushed black children toward employment, other factors kept them out of the labor force. Though economic need and social perceptions of black children as laborers may have encouraged their employment, discrimination, greater restrictions, and an unstable child labor market operated to squeeze black children out of the labor force (DuBois 1967; Perlmann 1987; Sobek 1997). Given these conditions, the deterrent effect of children is likely to have less of an impact on black female migrant labor force participation compared to white southern migrant women.¹

Location characteristics constitute the third block of potential correlates of economic activity. During the Great Migration period, and still in contemporary periods, the degree and variety of economic opportunity varied geographically. For example, Pittsburgh offered plenty of opportunity in the heavy manufacturing industry, while Chicago and Cleveland offered greater employment diversity and were, therefore, more conducive to female employment (Hine 1991). Further, destination selection varied according to race. Research has suggested that white migrants were more likely to move to the West, while black migrants tended to move to the Northeast, especially in

the early part of the Great Migration (Broussard 1993; Taylor 1998). Similarly, black migrants were likely to reside within central cities, whereas white migrants more often resided beyond the city (Berry 2000). Differential settlement patterns may have important consequences for economic activity. While not a specific focus of this analysis, the potential influence of location is considered.

Presumably, individuals migrate in order to improve their particular situations and, in this context, their economic situations. In addition to estimating the extent of racial differences in economic activity between black and white migrants, I examine whether the racial variation was lower among migrants by comparing racial differences between the migrant and non-migrant women. Lower levels of racial differences are expected among migrant women relative to southern nonmigrants due to the more expansive economic opportunities in the North, fewer constraints on black women, and personal attributes on which migrants were selected—such as education or motivation. Yet higher levels of racial differences might also be observed. The larger range in the northern occupational distribution may have operated to increase occupational inequality between black and white migrant women by differentially benefiting white migrants. Racial differences between southern migrant women may be smaller than those observed for northern nonmigrants for similar reasons. Here, the attributes on which migrants were selected may place them at an advantage compared to northern nonmigrants. In contrast, we might find larger racial differences among southern migrant women, perhaps due to characteristics of migrant social support systems within the North.

Data Source and Methodology

Racial variation in postmigration economic activity is addressed through analysis of the 1920, 1940, and 1970² Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS). These data provide nationally representative samples of all households in the United States at three time periods spanning the Great Migration. While the amount of migration information available in the IPUMS file is limited, one can identify migrants by comparing birthplace and current residence for all years. Unfortunately, these data do not allow one to trace multiple migrations or determine the exact timing and duration of migrations. In later years, including 1940 and 1970, the IPUMS contains informa-

tion on residence five years prior. Importantly, the IPUMS have been used in the most recent studies of the Great Migration (for example, Berry 2000; Gregory 1995; Lieberman and Wilkinson 1976; Long 1974; Tolnay 1999, 2001; Tolnay et al. 2000), thus establishing comparability with the present analysis.

The migrant sample is restricted to females born in the South who are living outside of the South at the time of the census. Individuals are categorized as southern-born if they reported a birthplace located within one of the census-defined southern regions. These regions consist of all former slave-holding states, including Delaware, Maryland, and Washington, DC. Consistent with previous studies of the Great Migration, an individual is considered a northern resident if she reported a current residence outside of the South at the time of the census. These definitions are consistent with previous studies of the Great Migration.

An age restriction is imposed for all analyses, limiting the sample to females aged 16 to 64 years, reflecting an eligible labor force pool. In addition, the sample excludes those not able to work due to school enrollment, disability, retirement, or imprisonment. This leaves 9,445 female southern-born migrants in 1920 (3,086 black and 6,359 white), 19,547 in 1940 (7,037 black and 12,510 white), and 37,245 in 1970 (13,278 black and 23,967 white). Descriptive statistics for each year sample, by race, are reported in table 1.

Two occupational indicators are used as dependent variables: labor force participation and occupational SEI score. In all years, individuals were considered participating in the labor force and coded "1" if they reported an occupation. Those not reporting an occupation or recorded as "not applicable" were categorized as not participating in the labor force and coded "0." Occupational SEI scores refer to Duncan's socioeconomic index based on the 1950 occupational classification codes (Duncan 1961). These scores traditionally are used in the mobility literature and in the recent research on the Great Migration. Duncan's SEI score reflects an individual's position within the occupational structure and is based on the average education and income levels for those holding a particular occupation.³

As described in the previous section, there are three blocks of covariates analyzed, reflecting personal, household, and location characteristics. Race, education, and age constitute the personal characteristics. Race is categorized as a dichotomous variable, where white women were coded "0" and black women were coded "1." Regarding education, within the IPUMS, years of education completed was reported in 1940 and 1970, while literacy (the ability

Table 1 Means, proportions, and standard deviations for female southern migrants, 1920, 1940, and 1970 IPUMS

	1920		1940		1970	
	Black <i>N</i> = 3,086	White <i>N</i> = 6,359	Black <i>N</i> = 7,037	White <i>N</i> = 12,510	Black <i>N</i> = 13,278	White <i>N</i> = 23,967
Personal characteristics						
Age	34.44 <i>11.43</i>	36.20 <i>12.80</i>	36.44 <i>11.55</i>	36.25 <i>12.54</i>	38.98 <i>13.05</i>	38.37 <i>13.42</i>
Literacy/education	0.93 <i>0.26</i>	0.98 <i>0.13</i>	9.48 <i>3.32</i>	11.57 <i>3.12</i>	12.20 <i>3.03</i>	13.06 <i>2.95</i>
Recent migrant	— <i>—</i>	— <i>—</i>	0.08 <i>0.28</i>	0.17 <i>0.38</i>	0.09 <i>0.29</i>	0.13 <i>0.34</i>
Household characteristics						
Marital and husband's employment status						
No spouse present	40.96	30.60	49.13	29.47	48.20	25.97
Jobless spouse present	1.07	1.95	4.07	4.12	1.69	0.91
Low SEI spouse present	42.26	27.17	32.54	23.73	16.47	11.04
High SEI spouse present	15.72	40.27	14.25	42.67	33.64	62.08
Number of children	0.83 <i>1.48</i>	1.40 <i>1.75</i>	0.90 <i>1.58</i>	1.20 <i>1.55</i>	1.63 <i>1.92</i>	1.33 <i>1.54</i>

Location characteristics						
Farm residence	1.39	20.71	1.65	14.34	0.47	1.92
Nonmetropolitan	11.34	33.21	5.80	25.96	3.87	19.70
Metro, suburb	12.05	10.52	17.43	21.23	17.11	49.29
Metro, central city	75.21	35.56	71.35	33.03	78.08	27.73
Metro, other	—	—	3.77	5.44	0.47	1.36
Northeast	47.18	18.51	46.93	17.73	36.31	13.44
Midwest	48.02	55.48	46.64	47.67	44.52	48.21
West	4.80	26.01	6.43	34.60	19.17	38.35
Dependent occupational variables						
Labor force participation	0.48	0.21	0.42	0.25	0.75	0.73
	<i>0.50</i>	<i>0.40</i>	<i>0.49</i>	<i>0.43</i>	<i>0.44</i>	<i>0.44</i>
SEI score	13.64	34.37	13.33	34.35	28.10	38.58
	<i>11.14</i>	<i>21.63</i>	<i>12.48</i>	<i>22.02</i>	<i>20.24</i>	<i>21.19</i>

Notes: In 1920, only literacy was reported, no cases qualified for other metro status, and recency of migration was not reported. All means significantly varied between racial groups for all years at the 0.01 level.

to both read and write) was reported in 1920 as a dichotomous variable. I also control for the influence of age in all years and recency of migration for 1940 and 1970, when data are available. Illiterate and having no years of education are the reference categories. Age is used in its original, continuous form, ranging from 16 to 64. Women were categorized as recent migrants if they resided in a different state five years prior to the time of enumeration, and older migrants are treated as the reference group.

Marital and husband's SEI status and number of coresident own children comprise the household characteristics. Marital and husband's SEI status are combined to create a categorical scheme reflecting the household composition and the potential economic activity of a spouse: (1) not married or no spouse present, (2) married with a jobless spouse, (3) married with a low SEI spouse, and (4) married with a high SEI spouse. Using the median SEI score in 1920, high-low divisions in husband's SEI were made at the 15-point mark.⁴ Women who are not married or have no spouse present are the omitted group. The number of coresident children is treated as a continuous variable, where zero is the reference value.

Location characteristics also are taken into account since labor markets and their accompanying employment opportunities vary by location or migrant destination. Mutually exclusive categories of metropolitan status and region are considered. The metropolitan status of the respondents was classified as farm, nonmetropolitan, metropolitan suburb, metropolitan central city, and other metropolitan. Dummy variables were constructed for the non-southern regions, identifying the Northeast, Midwest, and West. The Northeast includes New England and the Middle Atlantic region, while the East and West North Central regions were coded as the Midwest, and the Mountain and Pacific regions constitute the West.

Binary logistic regression techniques are used to analyze labor force participation due to the dichotomous structure of the dependent variable, and ordinary least squares (OLS) regression techniques are used for the analysis of the continuous dependent variable, occupational SEI score. Separate analyses are conducted for each year, where a sample weight is used for 1940 to adjust for oversampling. The 1920 and 1970 data do not require a weight as they are representative of the general population. Three general models are estimated for labor force participation for each of the three years in an effort to estimate the bivariate association between race and participation and the influence of the covariates on this association and to test for any inter-

actions between race and other personal, household, and location characteristics, thereby addressing potential racial variation in the influence of these factors. Similarly, three models are estimated for occupational SEI score in 1920, 1940, and 1970. Again, the bivariate association between race and SEI score is assessed, followed by an analysis of the covariates' influence and a test for interactions between race and other characteristics.

Finally, the estimated racial differences and predicted values for migrant women's labor force participation and occupational SEI scores are compared to those for southern and northern nonmigrant women to provide context to the racial patterns in female employment observed for migrant women in the North. By doing so, I investigate the intersection of migrant status and race and its influence on economic outcomes among women at three time points spanning the Great Migration.

Findings

Labor Force Participation

The results for the logistic regression analysis of labor force participation are reported in table 2.⁵ For ease of interpretation, the coefficients are transformed into odds ratios by exponentiating the beta generated by the logistic regression analysis. The odds ratio indicates the odds that the female migrants participate in the labor force. Using the race variable as an example, an odds ratio equal to one implies no difference in the odds of labor force participation between black and white female migrants. Odds ratios greater than one indicate that black migrant women are more likely to participate in the labor force than white migrant women. An odds ratio less than one indicates the reverse, such that white migrant women are more likely to participate in the labor force.

The baseline model in table 2 shows that in 1920, the odds of being employed were approximately 3.5 times higher for black migrant women than for white migrant women when no other characteristics are considered. As expected, black women had significantly higher odds of working throughout the period, although the difference decreased with each time point (2.2 times in 1940 and only 1.1 times in 1970).⁶

Whether higher participation rates among black female migrants are attributable to other personal, household, or location characteristics is ex-

Table 2 Results from multivariate logistic regression analysis of labor force participation for southern-born migrant women in 1920, 1940, and 1970

Variable	1920 (<i>N</i> = 9,445)			1940 (<i>N</i> = 19,547)			1970 (<i>N</i> = 37,245)		
	B	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	S.E.	Exp(B)
Baseline model									
Black	1.26***	0.05	3.53	0.79***	0.03	2.21	0.09***	0.02	1.09
Constant	-1.35	0.03	0.26	-1.12	0.02	0.33	0.99	0.01	2.68
Full model									
Black	0.91***	0.07	2.48	0.47***	0.04	1.60	0.20***	0.03	1.22
Not married, no spouse present ^a	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Married, jobless spouse present	-1.71***	0.23	0.18	-1.15***	0.09	0.32	-0.92***	0.10	0.40
Married, low SEI spouse present	-1.99***	0.07	0.14	-1.44***	0.05	0.24	-0.13***	0.04	0.88
Married, high SEI spouse present	-2.42***	0.07	0.09	-1.54***	0.04	0.21	-0.23***	0.03	0.79
Number of children	-0.29***	0.02	0.75	-0.35***	0.02	0.71	-0.10***	0.01	0.90
Literacy/education	0.04	0.14	1.04	0.06***	0.01	1.06	0.14***	0.00	1.15
Age	-0.01***	0.00	0.99	0.00*	0.00	1.00	-0.01***	0.00	0.99
Farm	-0.77***	0.12	0.46	-0.88***	0.09	0.42	-0.38***	0.10	0.68
Nonmetro ^a	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Suburb	0.18	0.11	1.20	-0.01	0.06	0.99	-0.12**	0.04	0.89
Central city	0.45***	0.07	1.57	0.20***	0.05	1.22	-0.05	0.04	0.95
Other metro	—	—	—	0.08	0.09	1.08	0.09	0.13	1.10

Northeast ^a	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Midwest	-0.28***	0.07	0.76	-0.26***	0.04	0.77	0.004	0.03	1.00
West	-0.26**	0.09	0.77	-0.14**	0.05	0.87	0.04	0.04	1.04
Recent migrant	—	—	—	-0.04	0.05	0.96	0.15***	0.04	1.17
Constant	0.51	0.19	1.67	-0.30	0.11	0.74	0.07	0.09	1.08
Full model with race interactions									
Black × married, jobless spouse present	0.91	0.49	2.48	-0.10	0.19	0.91	-0.27	0.19	0.76
Black × married, low SEI spouse present	0.13	0.14	1.14	0.53***	0.10	1.70	-0.09	0.07	0.91
Black × married, high SEI spouse present	0.56***	0.15	1.75	0.20*	0.09	1.22	0.24***	0.05	1.27
Black × number of children	0.04	0.05	1.04	0.05	0.03	1.05	-0.02	0.01	0.98
Black × literacy/education	0.02	0.32	1.02	-0.03*	0.011	0.97	0.03**	0.01	1.03
Black × farm	0.19	0.44	1.20	0.34	0.27	1.41	0.60	0.33	1.83
Black × suburb	0.25	0.18	1.29	0.52***	0.09	1.69	0.27***	0.07	1.31
Black × central city	-0.004	0.13	1.00	-0.42***	0.08	0.66	-0.38***	0.06	0.68
Black × other metro	—	—	—	-0.01	0.17	0.99	0.50	0.38	1.65
Black × Midwest	-0.30*	0.12	0.74	-0.51***	0.08	0.60	-0.27***	0.05	0.76
Black × West	0.19	0.22	1.21	0.17	0.12	1.19	0.12	0.06	1.13

Notes: In 1920, only literacy was reported, no cases qualified for other metro status, and recency of migration was not reported. All covariates are included in the “full model with race interactions” section, although coefficients for the covariates are not reported due to space limitations. Tests for interactions were conducted individually.

^a Indicates reference category.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

plored in the full model. The significant race difference persists across the sample period even after accounting for the covariates. For example, in 1920 the odds of being employed were approximately 2.5 times higher for black migrant women than for white migrant women after accounting for personal, household, and location characteristics. As expected, black women maintained higher odds of labor force participation in 1940 and 1970 although the differential decreased over the three time points; the odds of being employed were 1.6 and 1.2 times higher for black migrant women in 1940 and 1970, respectively, compared to 2.5 in 1920.

The estimated probability of labor force participation can be derived by fixing all control variables from the full model at their respective mean values and allowing the coefficient for race to vary, thus equating black and white migrants on all other covariates.⁷ In 1920, white migrants had a 16 percent probability of labor force participation compared to a 33 percent chance of participation for black migrants. In 1940, the margin narrowed with white migrants having a 22 percent probability and black migrants having a 31 percent chance of participating in the labor force. By 1970, the difference radically declined with white and black migrants having a 31 percent and 27 percent chance of labor force participation, respectively. This is a meager 4 percent difference compared to a 17 percent difference observed in 1920. These results are consistent with previous studies suggesting that white women's labor force participation increased dramatically during the twentieth century; migrant white women moved from a 16 percent to a 31 percent chance of employment. Importantly, black migrants' participation remained relatively stable during the sample period, declining slightly from a 33 percent to a 27 percent chance of participation between 1920 and 1970. This small difference implies that the dramatic increase in white migrant participation is not due to an equally substantial reduction in black migrant participation.

The covariates in the full model of table 2 show that husband's SEI status and number of children were statistically significant and negatively associated with labor force participation throughout the period. These results concur with previous literature (Bose 2001; Long 1974; Sobek 1997) finding that both variables decrease the likelihood of labor force participation, such that women with husbands and children are significantly less likely to work than women without them. However, the magnitude of the influence of the husband's status varies over the three time points, having the lowest

detering effect in 1970. The negative influence of children also varied over the period, having the smallest impact in 1970. Previous research on female labor force participation asserts that the increase in married women's and mothers' employment may be attributable to supply adjusting itself to suit the increasing demand for labor (Oppenheimer 1970); while married women and mothers were once an undesired potential labor supply, they became more desirable as demand increased. The experience of southern migrant women is suggestive of this pattern.

Notably, the influence of household characteristics varies by race. Tests for interactions between race and husband's status suggest that the negative impact of having a high SEI husband (and low SEI husband in 1940) is less pronounced for black women throughout the period. So while women with high SEI spouses are less likely to work, this is less true for black women. Such variation may be attributable to a heightened economic need among black women (Bose 2001; Lemke-Santangelo 1996; Lewis 1991; Sobek 1997), the social perception of black women as laborers (Jones 1988, 1995), or some combination of the two factors. While I have no measure of social perception, the data do shed light on racial variation in potential economic need. Husbands' mean SEI scores were dramatically lower for black women relative to white women, especially during 1920 and 1940 (14 versus 30, respectively). Yet, the difference declines to a 14-point gap by 1970 (24 versus 38). This is important when noting that the racial difference in the effect of the husband's status declines in later years, just as the coefficient for the multiplicative interaction term reduces by 1970 (0.56 in 1920 versus 0.24 in 1970). This suggests that the influence of the husband's SEI may have had a weaker effect for black women due to their spouses' considerably lower scores.

Household characteristics were not the only factors found to vary in their influence by race. The impacts of education and location on labor force participation also varied. Consistent with the human capital perspective, education was positively associated with employment, indicating that women with higher levels of education were more likely to be employed. However, consistent with the racial stratification perspective, the extent of the positive influence varies by race and over time, such that the positive influence of education was less pronounced for black migrants in 1940 and more pronounced in 1970. The reversal in the direction of the racial variation indicates that by the end of the Great Migration period, black women were experiencing greater returns to education, at least in terms of entrance into the labor force.

An interesting relationship between race, education, and employment emerges for the 1970 analysis. Here, education acts as a suppressor for race. Race is positively correlated with employment, as is education. Yet race and education are negatively related. After accounting for this negative association, the direct effect of race emerges and is considerably stronger than the effect observed in the baseline model. Also noteworthy is the increasing magnitude of the education coefficient (0.06 in 1940 and 0.14 in 1970). These findings suggest that the positive impact of education on labor force participation grew over the period, in both its direct influence on employment and its indirect association with race.

Regarding location, migrants residing in the Midwest and West were significantly less likely to find employment compared to those settling in the Northeast during the early part of the period. But by 1970, regional variation subsided. The same pattern is observed generally for metropolitan versus nonmetropolitan locations. At the beginning of the period, migrants residing in central cities were more likely to be employed than those in nonmetropolitan areas. In addition, the influence of regional and metropolitan status varied by race throughout the period. While migrants in the Midwest were less likely to be employed, black women had an even lower likelihood of finding employment. And while residing within a central city was positively associated with labor force participation, the positive influence was less prominent for black migrants. Overall, the influence of location varied by race such that the positive associations were less pronounced and the negative impacts were differentially felt among black migrant women.

Occupational SEI Scores

The analysis of labor force involvement suggests that black women were more likely to participate in the labor force throughout the Great Migration period. Yet entrance into the labor force does not necessarily imply access to all occupations. In fact, historical work concerning the black-white differences in general suggest that while black women were more likely to work, their employment was mainly concentrated in low-status occupations with little promise of advancement. I limit the analysis of occupational SEI scores to female migrants participating in the labor force. Before estimating the correlates of occupational status, it is useful to review the precise occupational distribution of black and white southern migrant women. The top five occu-

pations and their corresponding SEI scores are reported for employed black and white migrant women at each time point in table 3.

Comparisons of black migrant women to white migrant women within a given year reveal that while there is some overlap between the occupations, there are also important differences. For example, in 1920 operative and kindred workers and private household workers are within the top three occupations for both black and white migrant women. However, 40 percent of the total employed black female migrant population is concentrated in private household work compared to a mere 8 percent of the white female migrant population. Further, the remaining occupations reported among black women have an SEI score ranging between 11 and 18 points, while those among white migrant women range between 18 and 72 points. The variation in occupational distributions in 1920 results in a 28-point difference in average SEI score between black and white migrant women. And although the top five occupations change in 1940 and 1970, the general pattern persists; while modest gains in occupational status were made over the period, black migrant women were persistently concentrated in lower-status occupations, compared to white migrant women.

Having reviewed the nature and extent of racial variation in the occupation distribution, I next explore the various social factors contributing to the observed disparity. Bivariate results from the OLS regression are shown in the baseline model of table 4. In general, the results echo the observations reported in table 3 and indicate that while white migrant women were less likely to be employed, they held higher-status occupations than black migrants. To put the occupational disadvantage of black migrant women into better perspective, it can be compared to the average SEI scores for all employed migrant women in each time period. The 21-point deficit for black migrant women in 1920 and 1940 existed at a time when the average occupation SEI for all migrant women was approximately 24 points. And, the 11-point disadvantage in 1970 can be compared to an overall migrant average score of 33.

Race was significantly and negatively related to occupational SEI at each time point even when controlling for the other covariates. As reported in the full model of table 4, although the race effect in 1940 and 1970 is attenuated when considering other factors, the black migrant SEI deficit persists. Moreover, black female migrants were employed in lower-status occupations regardless of when they headed to the North, as expressed by the persistent

Table 3 Occupational distribution for employed southern-born migrant women in 1920, 1940, and 1970

1920					
White (<i>N</i> = 1,304)			Black (<i>N</i> = 1,471)		
Occupation	Percentage	SEI score	Occupation	Percentage	SEI score
Operative and kindred workers	10.6	18	Private household workers	40.0	7
Private household workers	7.7	7	Laundresses, private household	20.1	12
Teachers	7.1	72	Operative and kindred workers	5.6	18
Stenographers, typists, and secretaries	1.0	61	Service workers, except private household	5.0	11
Salespeople and sales clerks	6.9	47	Laundry and dry cleaning operatives	4.8	15
Average		41.0	Average		12.6
1940					
White (<i>N</i> = 3,040)			Black (<i>N</i> = 2,912)		
Occupation	Percentage	SEI score	Occupation	Percentage	SEI score
Operative and kindred workers	12.8	18	Private household workers	56.4	7
Private household workers	8.9	7	Operative and kindred workers	9.8	18
Salespeople and sales clerks	8.8	47	Service workers, except private household	5.7	11
Stenographers, typists, and secretaries	8.6	61	Housekeepers, private household	4.2	19
Waiters and waitresses	7.3	16	Laundry and dry cleaning operatives	3.9	15
Average		29.8	Average		14.0

1970					
White (<i>N</i> = 17,463)			Black (<i>N</i> = 9,903)		
Occupation	Percentage	SEI score	Occupation	Percentage	SEI score
Operative and kindred workers	14.9	18	Operative and kindred workers	16.2	18
Stenographers, typists, and secretaries	11.2	61	Private household workers	11.4	7
Clerical and kindred workers	9.6	44	Clerical and kindred workers	10.0	44
Salespeople and sales clerks	7.6	47	Service workers, except private household	6.5	11
Waiters and waitresses	5.9	16	Attendants, hospital and other institution	6.0	13
Average		37.2	Average		18.6

Table 4 Results from multivariate OLS regression analysis of Duncan's occupational SEI for employed southern-born migrant women in 1920, 1940, and 1970

Variable	1920 (<i>N</i> = 2,775)				1940 (<i>N</i> = 5,952)				1970 (<i>N</i> = 27,366)			
	B	S.E.	<i>R</i> ²	<i>df</i>	B	S.E.	<i>R</i> ²	<i>df</i>	B	S.E.	<i>R</i> ²	<i>df</i>
Baseline model			0.27	2,773			0.26	5,950			0.06	27,364
Black	-20.73***	0.64			-21.16***	0.47			-10.48***	0.26		
Constant	34.37	0.47			34.57	0.32			38.58	0.16		
Full model			0.30	2,762			0.42	5,937			0.34	27,351
Black	-19.37***	0.73			-15.03***	0.51			-7.49***	0.27		
Not married, no spouse present ^a	—	—			—	—			—	—		
Married, jobless spouse present	-3.62	3.37			-2.75*	1.29			0.21	1.22		
Married, low SEI spouse present	-2.97***	0.88			-2.41***	0.63			-2.12***	0.36		
Married, high SEI spouse present	2.43*	1.03			2.93***	0.58			2.40***	0.25		
Number of children	-1.67***	0.31			-0.63**	0.22			-0.78***	0.07		
Literacy/education	2.96	1.58			2.48***	0.07			3.77***	0.04		
Age	-0.05	0.03			0.22***	0.02			0.01	0.01		
Farm	-4.23*	1.67			-3.04**	1.30			-0.03	1.00		
Nonmetro ^a	—	—			—	—			—	—		
Suburb	-1.26	1.25			-0.24	0.74			1.86***	0.33		
Central city	-0.03	0.89			1.93**	0.64			2.68***	0.35		
Other metro	—	—			0.64	1.12			4.68***	1.03		

Northeast ^a	—	—	—	—	—	—
Midwest	0.61	0.73	-0.34	0.49	-2.12***	0.28
West	4.11***	1.07	-0.34	0.63	-1.42***	0.31
Recent migrant	—	—	-4.59***	0.63	1.12***	0.33
Constant	33.13	2.22	-3.50	1.38	-12.76	0.79
Full model with race interactions						
Black × married, jobless spouse present	10.01	6.75	6.90**	2.55	-0.68	2.42
Black × married, low SEI spouse present	11.68***	2.03	3.36*	1.32	1.16	0.65
Black × married, high SEI spouse present	-3.29	2.05	-1.63	1.24	-1.08*	0.46
Black × number of children	2.72***	0.58	1.96***	0.43	0.26*	0.13
Black × literacy/education	-12.50**	4.04	-2.90***	0.13	-0.55***	0.08
Black × farm	-1.09	5.32	4.60	3.70	1.26	2.74
Black × suburb	-0.90	2.04	0.09	1.07	-0.94	0.55
Black × central city	0.11	1.48	-1.37	0.91	0.87	0.51
Black × other metro	—	—	-3.98	2.03	-2.84	2.64
Black × Midwest	3.06*	1.37	2.89**	0.91	2.08***	0.46
Black × West	-4.30	2.24	-1.20	1.33	-0.37	0.52

Notes: In 1920, only literacy was reported, and no cases qualified for other metro status. All covariates are included in the “full model with race interactions” section, although coefficients for the covariates are not reported due to space limitations. Tests for interactions were conducted individually.

^a Indicates reference category.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

negative race coefficient across all three periods. However, the influence of race did decline, steadily having less than half of the impact in 1970 than 1920 ($\beta = -19.4$ in 1920 versus $\beta = -7.5$ in 1970). In 1920, a black female migrant with a modest SEI score of 14 points possessed the same characteristics as a white female migrant with a score of 33 points. Not until 1970 did the gap notably decrease, where white migrant women went from a 20-point to an 8-point advantage over black migrants.

Several other characteristics contributed to the variation in occupational SEI. Education was uniformly significant and positive in its association with occupational SEI scores, implying that those with a higher education were employed in higher SEI jobs. This is consistent with the idea that individuals with greater levels of human capital are more likely to achieve economic or occupational advantages. Yet counter to this perspective, education does not entirely or even dramatically explain the race differential. Instead, the difference in SEI scores by race persists after accounting for the effect of education.

Further, tests for interactions, also reported in table 4, reveal that the influence of education varied by race during each period, where black migrant women experienced lower returns to education compared to white migrant women, although the gap reduced considerably by 1970. In 1920, holding all else equal, being literate increased white female migrants' SEI scores by over 13 points but less than 1 point for black female migrants. Similarly, an additional year of schooling in 1940 meant a 4-point SEI increase for white migrants but a mere 1-point increase for black migrants. By 1970, the difference dramatically narrowed, such that white migrant women enjoyed a 4-point increase in SEI score for an additional year of school and black migrant women experienced a 3.4-point increase.

The inability of education to account for the race effect and the varying influence of education according to race may be attributed to differences in the extent and quality of education for black versus white students in the South. Not only were white southerners more likely to achieve higher levels of education, but black schools had shorter academic years and operated under limited resources, especially during the pre-civil rights era (Ashmore 1952; Thompson 1943; Tolnay 1999; see also Roscigno 1999, 2000 for discussions of contemporary racial inequality in educational resources). Thus, completion of grammar school may represent two different levels of achievement

for black and white southern students, leaving black students at a disadvantage. Unfortunately, the data do not allow for statistical analysis of variation in the quality of education.

Like the personal characteristics, household factors contributed to occupational SEI throughout the period. The directions of the associations for the various categories of the husband's SEI suggest that husbands and wives shared similar occupational statuses. For example, compared to women with no spouse present, women with low SEI husbands tended to have lower SEI occupations themselves, whereas women with high SEI spouses were likely to have high SEI jobs. Although women with a jobless spouse tended to have low SEI jobs in 1940, there was no evidence that they significantly differed from women without a spouse in 1920 or 1970. In essence, the presence of a spouse is associated with a woman's SEI score, and the nature of the association reflects the occupational standing of her spouse. Yet tests for interactions suggest that this relationship also varies by race, such that the negative influence of having a low SEI spouse was less pronounced for black women than white women in 1920 and 1940. And in 1970, the positive influence of having a high SEI husband was less prominent for black migrants. These findings indicate that the pattern of similar spousal SEI scores may not have applied as readily to black migrant women.

The other household factor, presence of children, operated in the anticipated manner. The number of children influenced the migrant women's SEI score, where it was negatively associated with occupational status throughout the sample period, indicating that children were detrimental to their mother's occupational status. Research on more contemporary female populations indicates that the negative impact of children may operate through interruptions in career trajectories that inhibit the mother's ability to move out of low-status occupations once reentering the labor force (Rosenfeld 1980). Results from this analysis suggest that the contemporary association may apply to more historical populations as well. Tests for variation in the association by race indicate that the negative influence of children is less pronounced for black women. So while children may negatively impact a woman's occupational status, perhaps through interrupted career trajectories or other mechanisms, they did less so for black migrants than white migrants during the Great Migration.

Although migrants were selecting different regions and settlement types

throughout the duration of the Great Migration, occupational SEI did not vary according to location until the end of the demographic phenomenon. By 1970, higher SEI scores were associated with more metropolitan areas and the Northeast region. And in contrast with the analysis of labor force participation, although this generally held for both black and white migrants, the negative influence of residing in the Midwest was less pronounced for black migrant women. Such findings imply that, for female migrants, destination may not have greatly influenced SEI until the end of the Great Migration, a time when women's employment generally had become more widespread.

The analysis of occupational SEI has two important implications for understanding the economic activity among historical migrant women. First, the observed racial differential in occupational SEI scores is not entirely explained by education or other personal, household, or location factors. Second, black migrants with social characteristics comparable to those of white migrants were employed in lower-status occupations, although the racial difference notably diminished by 1970. Further, many of the factors correlated with occupational SEI varied in their influence according to race, such that black migrant women were at a greater disadvantage when it came to accessing higher SEI occupations.

Racial Differences among Migrants and Nonmigrants

In an effort to assess whether migrants to the North during the Great Migration experienced improved racial differences in economic activity relative to nonmigrants, I estimate labor force participation and occupational SEI scores for southern and northern nonmigrants and compare them to those of the southern migrants. Such comparisons allow for the investigation of the intersection of migrant status and race and its influence on economic outcomes. Thus far, I have estimated whether the benefits of migration vary by race. Now I address whether any economic improvements vary by migrant status.

The nonmigrant comparison groups consist of women who were born and currently reside within the same region at the time of the census, either the northern or the southern region. Tests for statistical significance in race differences in labor force participation and occupational SEI scores were estimated through regression analyses and are reported in table 5. The migrant

Table 5 The race effect and adjusted race differences for the probability of labor force participation and value of Duncan's occupational SEI for migrant and nonmigrant women in 1920, 1940, and 1970

	1920		1940		1970	
	β^a	Δ^b	β	Δ	β	Δ
Labor force participation						
Southern migrants	0.9	16.3	0.5	9.0	0.2	-4.4
Southern nonmigrants	1.7	27.2	1.2	22.5	0.3	6.1
Northern nonmigrants	0.5	9.7	0.1	1.3	-0.2	-4.6
Duncan's occupational SEI						
Southern migrants	-19.1	-19.4	-12.1	-15.0	-7.9	-7.6
Southern nonmigrants	-17.8	-18.6	-7.0	-10.3	-10.5	-10.9
Northern nonmigrants ^c	-20.9	-19.4	-13.8	-13.0	-4.5	-4.5

^a The reported race effects are estimated for the pooled sample using the "full model" section in tables 2 and 4.

^b The adjusted race differences are derived from subtracting the predicted value of labor force participation and occupational SEI for black and white migrant women obtained from the regression equations estimated for the pooled sample using the full model in tables 2 and 4. A negative sign indicates a lower score among black women.

^c All between-group race differences were statistically significant at the 0.01 level with the exception of the southern migrant/northern nonmigrant occupational SEI patterns in 1920 (nonsignificant) and 1940 (p -value < .05).

groups were pooled and interaction terms for race and migrant status were tested using southern migrants as the reference category. Coefficients from the interaction terms for the respective migrant category were added to the main race effect (for southern migrants) in producing the estimates (β). The race difference for the predicted probability of labor force participation and occupational SEI were also calculated and reported in table 5 (Δ).⁸

Positive differences indicate higher participation or SEI scores among black women compared to white women, whereas a negative difference indicates lower participation or scores among black women. In general, while the southern migrants fell between the nonmigrants in terms of racial differences, the migrant pattern was generally more consistent with that observed for northern nonmigrants.

When estimating the predicted labor force participation, the southern migrant pattern is comparable to the southern nonmigrant pattern, yet different in important ways. Black southern migrants and nonmigrants began the

period with a 20 to 30 percentage point advantage in labor force participation over white migrant women, respectively, yet the difference dropped to 4 to 7 percentage points by 1970. However, unlike the southern nonmigrants, the reduced difference for migrants was negative, indicating that white migrant women were more likely to participate in the labor force than were black migrant women in 1970. This pattern also was observed among northern nonmigrant women in 1970. In contrast, black southern nonmigrants maintained a higher probability of employment throughout the period.

The racial patterns for the predicted occupational SEI scores further suggest a greater similarity between the southern-born migrants and the northern natives. Such correspondence likely reflects the different industrial structures in the North and South. Different types of jobs were available to residents of these different regions, and this variation is likely to have an impact on occupations regardless of migrant status. Like the southern-born migrants, although nonmigrant black women were more likely to work than white women, black women were employed in the lower SEI occupations. While the divergence between black and white female SEI scores remained relatively stable between 1920 and 1940 for all three groups analyzed, the disparity dramatically reduced by 1970 for both the migrants and northerners but persisted among the southern nonmigrants. Such findings suggest that black women who remained in the South were left behind as their northern counterparts, migrants and nonmigrants, began accessing higher SEI occupations.

Differences in SEI between the migrants and northern nonmigrants were negligible in 1920 but grew in magnitude over time. While there was little distinction among SEI score differences for women residing in the North during the early part of the Great Migration, southern migrants experienced a greater racial differential than nonmigrant northerners by the end of the period. Interestingly, this between-group differential emerges during a period when the race differential was declining within migrant and nonmigrant groups—note the move from a 20-point predicted difference in SEI score for migrant women in 1920 to an 8-point predicted difference in 1970. Nonmigrants experienced a similar gap reduction, where northerners fell from a 20-point to an 8-point predicted difference and southerners went from a 19-point to an 11-point predicted difference. This migrant differential in the northern context is likely attributable to either variation in personal characteristics or social networks associated with economic activity, such that

by 1970, southern migrants may have been negatively selected, thereby possessing lower “quality” characteristics, or may have had limited access to employment.

Discussion

A substantial portion of the southern population relocated to the North between 1910 and 1970. While all migrants may have hoped to escape economic poverty, black southerners were seeking additional freedom from social destitution. Much of their economic disadvantage could be attributed to the social mores dominating the South and underlying the patriarchal caste system. By abandoning this system, they hoped to gain access to greater economic opportunities and a more hospitable climate in which to enjoy them. Female migrants of the Great Migration are the focus of this study. Not only did southern women face a changing agricultural industry and severe racial stratification, but they also combated a gendered social system, where women often found themselves ranked well below their husbands and brothers in the social, economic, and occupational structure. This article addresses questions regarding whether these differences followed migrant women to the North and potential explanations for any observed racial variation in economic activity.

Evidence produced in this analysis sends a clear message that racial differences existed among the southern female migrants throughout the Great Migration period. Motivated by previous research and theory regarding variation in labor force participation and occupational status, the analysis included estimations of the influences of personal, household, and location characteristics. Analysis of female migrants reveals that while each of the various characteristics influenced economic activity, the impacts of race persisted throughout the period. Further, many of the factors varied in their influence according to race.

Overall, black women were more likely to be employed, yet white women tended to have higher-status jobs. Those relatively few white working migrants possessed considerably higher SEI occupations compared to black migrants. For example, in 1920 black migrants had a 33 percent chance of labor force participation whereas white migrants had a 16 percent chance of being employed. During the same decade, the predicted SEI score for white migrants was 33 points, while that for black migrants was less than 14 points.

Yet by 1970, there was a mere 4 percent difference in the chance of participating in the labor force and an 8-point difference in occupational SEI score between black and white migrants when holding all other factors equal.

However, not all factors were equal, nor were they equal in their influence on economic activity for both races. During at least one time point, the association between personal, household, and location characteristics and economic activity significantly varied by race. The positive influence of education on occupational status was less beneficial for black migrants throughout the period. Similarly, the impact of the spouse's SEI varied across racial groups for both labor force participation and occupational SEI. Regarding employment, the deterring effects of having a high SEI spouse were less pronounced for black women, indicating that black women with a resident high SEI husband were disproportionately more likely to work than were similarly situated white women. Concerning occupational status, the positive association between husbands' and wives' SEI scores was less prominent for black migrants, implying that while husbands and wives tended to share similar occupational status, this was less true for black women, such that black women tended to achieve higher SEI scores than their spouses. These findings contribute to previous work concerning household dependence on wives' employment (Lewis 1991) and the tensions created by such a challenge to gender role status (Lemke-Santangelo 1996).

Findings regarding labor force participation and the occupational distribution are generally consistent with previous research. Much of this analysis's contribution lies in placing female economic activity in the migration context. Results from racial differences comparisons between migrants and nonmigrants imply that while the southern migrants were met with greater economic opportunity, they also faced barriers to occupational mobility. Larger racial differences in occupational SEI scores were observed for the southern migrants compared to the southern nonmigrants in 1920 and 1940. This might be attributed to the more expansive occupational opportunities offered in the northern industrial market during the earlier years of the Great Migration. While allowing for greater labor force participation, the larger range in the occupational distribution may have operated to increase racial differences in SEI between black and white southern migrant women relative to their nonmigrating southern sisters.

The southern migrants exhibited larger racial gaps in labor force par-

ticipation than northerners across each time point and in occupational SEI in 1970. The larger race difference between southern migrant women and northern nonmigrant women may be related to the combined influence of social support systems. Historical accounts suggest that migrants relied on social support systems to find jobs once reaching the North (Grossman 1989, 1991; Knupfer 1996; Moore 1991; Trotter 1991). Such systems ranged in degree of organization and institutionalization, from the Urban League to women's clubs to relatives. The concentration of black women in the lower SEI occupations confirms that these network ties often served as links to low SEI occupations for black southern migrants. For instance, employers would selectively advertise low-status or only temporary jobs in black neighborhoods (Grossman 1991). While these agents provided the newly arrived migrant with much-needed direction—in the form of housing, employment, and etiquette—they too were limited in access to information and resources.

The present study moves the literature forward by focusing on women and by comparing migrant groups to one another. The results are theoretically important and should be extended in future research. For example, although the current study controls for the influence of location, it would be beneficial to explore the causes and consequences of destination selection. Here, researchers should address whether the selection of destinations varies by race and how or if this relationship alters the present findings concerning economic activity. Much of the literature on the Great Migration acknowledges a divergence in destination selection by race, yet these works fail to systematically estimate the differences or their causes and consequences. Analyses of destination should consider the influence of gender in addition to race since, as the present study shows, between 25 percent and 50 percent of the female southern-born migrant population did not have a spouse present. Therefore, women were not only seeking employment, but they were also choosing destinations.

Appendix A Main effects with tests for interactions from multivariate logistic regression analysis of labor force participation for southern-born migrant women in 1920, 1940, and 1970

	1920 (<i>N</i> = 9,445)			1940 (<i>N</i> = 19,547)			1970 (<i>N</i> = 37,245)		
	B	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	S.E.	Ex(B)	B	S.E.	Exp(B)
Full model with race interactions									
Black	0.89***	0.07	2.44	0.47***	0.04	1.61	0.21***	0.03	1.23
Married, jobless spouse present	-2.06***	0.32	0.13	-1.12***	0.12	0.33	-0.79***	0.14	0.46
Black × married, jobless spouse present	0.91	0.49	2.48	-0.10	0.19	0.91	-0.27	0.19	0.76
Black	0.88***	0.07	2.41	0.37***	0.05	1.44	0.22***	0.03	1.24
Married, low SEI spouse present	-2.08***	0.12	0.13	-1.76***	0.08	0.17	-0.09	0.05	0.91
Black × married, low SEI spouse present	0.13	0.14	1.14	0.53***	0.10	1.70	-0.09	0.07	0.91
Black	0.78***	0.07	2.19	0.43***	0.05	1.54	0.09***	0.04	1.10
Married, high SEI spouse present	-2.62***	0.09	0.07	-1.59***	0.05	0.20	-0.32***	0.04	0.73
Black × married, high SEI spouse present	0.56***	0.15	1.75	0.20*	0.09	1.22	0.24***	0.05	1.27
Black	0.88***	0.08	2.42	0.43***	0.05	1.54	0.23***	0.04	1.26
Number of children	-0.31***	0.03	0.73	-0.37***	0.02	0.69	-0.10***	0.01	0.91
Black × number of children	0.04	0.05	1.04	0.05	0.03	1.05	-0.02	0.01	0.98
Black	0.89***	0.32	2.43	0.77***	0.13	2.16	-0.11***	0.11	0.89
Literacy/education	0.02	0.28	1.02	0.07***	0.01	1.08	0.13***	0.01	1.14

Black × literacy/education	0.02	0.32	1.02	-0.03*	0.011	0.97	0.03**	0.01	1.03
Black	0.91***	0.11	2.48	0.46***	0.045	1.59	0.20***	0.03	1.22
Farm	-0.77***	0.12	0.46	-0.90***	0.097	0.41	-0.44***	0.10	0.64
Black × farm	0.19	0.44	1.20	0.34	0.27	1.41	0.60	0.33	1.83
Black	0.87***	0.07	2.40	0.36***	0.05	1.43	0.12***	0.04	1.13
Suburb	0.08	0.13	1.08	-0.17**	0.07	0.84	-0.15***	0.04	0.86
Black × suburb	0.25	0.18	1.29	0.52***	0.09	1.69	0.27***	0.07	1.31
Black	0.90***	0.07	2.47	0.73***	0.07	2.08	0.44***	0.05	1.55
Central city	0.45***	0.07	1.57	0.33***	0.06	1.39	0.06	0.04	1.06
Black × central city	-0.004	0.13	1.00	-0.42***	0.08	0.66	-0.38***	0.06	0.68
Black	—	—	—	0.47***	0.05	1.60	0.20***	0.03	1.22
Other metro	—	—	—	0.08	0.11	1.08	0.02	0.14	1.02
Black × other metro	—	—	—	-0.01	0.17	0.99	0.50	0.38	1.65
Black	1.07***	0.09	2.91	0.73***	0.06	2.08	0.34***	0.04	1.41
Midwest	-0.11	0.09	0.89	0.02	0.06	1.02	0.13**	0.04	1.14
Black × Midwest	-0.30*	0.12	0.74	-0.51***	0.08	0.60	-0.27***	0.05	0.76
Black	0.89***	0.07	2.44	0.45***	0.05	1.57	0.17***	0.04	1.18
West	-0.29**	0.10	0.75	-0.18**	0.06	0.84	0.002	0.04	1.00
Black × West	0.19	0.22	1.21	0.17	0.12	1.19	0.12	0.06	1.13

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Appendix B Main effects with tests for interactions from multivariate OLS regression analysis of Duncan's occupational SEI for employed southern-born migrant women in 1920, 1940, and 1970

Variable	1920 (<i>N</i> = 2,775)		1940 (<i>N</i> = 5,952)		1970 (<i>N</i> = 27,366)	
	B	S.E.	B	S.E.	B	S.E.
Full model with race interactions						
Black	-19.46***	0.73	-15.22***	0.52	-7.48***	0.27
Married, jobless spouse present	-9.24	5.08	-5.76***	1.70	0.54	1.70
Black × married, jobless spouse present	10.01	6.75	6.90**	2.55	-0.68	2.42
Black	-20.70***	0.76	-15.43***	0.54	-7.65***	0.28
Married, low SEI spouse present	-11.96***	1.79	-4.75***	1.11	-2.68***	0.47
Black × married, low SEI spouse present	11.68***	2.03	3.36*	1.32	1.16	0.65
Black	-18.97***	0.77	-14.80***	0.54	-7.01***	0.33
Married, high SEI spouse present	3.90**	1.38	3.39***	0.67	2.78***	0.30
Black × married, high SEI spouse present	-3.29	2.05	-1.63	1.24	-1.08*	0.46
Black	-20.60***	0.77	-15.87***	0.55	-7.85***	0.32
Number of children	-3.05***	0.43	-1.69***	0.32	-0.91***	0.10
Black × number of children	2.72***	0.58	1.96***	0.43	0.26*	0.13
Black	-7.20***	4.00	17.51***	1.51	-0.33***	0.88
Literacy/education	13.27***	3.69	3.94***	0.09	3.97***	0.05

Black × literacy/education	-12.50**	4.04	-2.90***	0.13	-0.55***	0.08
Black	-19.35***	0.74	-15.09***	0.517	-7.50***	0.27
Farm	-4.13*	1.74	-3.58**	1.367	-0.21	1.08
Black × farm	-1.09	5.32	4.60	3.70	1.26	2.74
Black	-19.25***	0.77	-15.05***	0.56	-7.21***	0.31
Suburb	-0.79	1.64	-0.28	0.86	2.00***	0.34
Black × suburb	-0.90	2.04	0.09	1.07	-0.94	0.55
Black	-19.44***	1.28	-14.15***	0.78	-8.02***	0.41
Central city	-0.07	1.04	2.38***	0.71	2.42***	0.38
Black × central city	0.11	1.48	-1.37	0.91	0.87	0.51
Black	—	—	-14.81***	0.53	-7.46***	0.27
Other metro	—	—	2.11	1.35	5.17***	1.13
Black × other metro	—	—	-3.98	2.03	-2.84	2.64
Black	-20.89***	1.00	-16.47***	0.69	-8.49***	0.35
Midwest	-1.25	1.10	-2.03**	0.72	-3.10***	0.35
Black × Midwest	3.06*	1.37	2.89**	0.91	2.08***	0.46
Black	-18.93***	0.76	-14.87***	0.54	-7.39***	0.30
West	5.20***	1.21	-0.06	0.70	-1.297***	0.35
Black × West	-4.30	2.24	-1.20	1.33	-0.37	0.52

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Notes

This work was supported by the Shanahan Fellowship through the Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology, University of Washington, and by Center Grant P30 HD05876 and Training Grant T32 HD07014 from the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health, through the Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin. The author acknowledges Stewart E. Tolnay for his guidance throughout the development of this article and Kyle D. Crowder, Avery M. Guest, Jerald R. Herting, Becky Pettit, and Koray Tanfer for their insightful comments, in addition to the helpful suggestions of the editor and three anonymous reviewers of *Social Science History*. Please direct all correspondence to Katherine J. Curtis White, Center for Demography and Ecology, 4412 Social Science Building, 1180 Observatory Drive, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706-1393, or kwhite@ssc.wisc.edu.

- 1 Alternatively, the employment situation of black women may have influenced their marital and childbearing status. For example, previous research asserts that female labor force participation is negatively associated with fertility behavior (Goldin 1977; Tolnay 1982) and that childlessness is a response to difficult economic conditions (Jensen 1973 and Mattessich 1979; Meeker 1977). Unfortunately, the causal order of the fertility behavior and economic activity relationship cannot be assessed adequately with the data used in this analysis.
- 2 “The 1970 Form 2 state sample” is used in the present analysis. This is a proportionally weighted stratified sample, and a 1-in-100 nationally representative sample of the U.S. population. Metropolitan and central city status is available for respondents in the state samples except for those residing in Arizona, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Utah; plus the rural parts of Arkansas, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, and West Virginia; and the urban parts of Connecticut and Maryland (Ruggles and Sobek 2003). Respondents without information on metropolitan status were excluded from the analysis.
- 3 Occupational income scores also were analyzed though not included in this article. Findings were consistent with SEI scores and were omitted to maintain comparability with previous studies. Occupational income scores reflect the median income earned by persons within that occupation using the 1950 occupational classification codes (Hauser and Warren 1997). While income and wage data are available through IPUMS, the research questions concern racial differences within an occupational status structure rather than wage disparities. Although clearly a worthwhile area of research, estimation of wage and income disparities does not fall within the scope of the current study.
- 4 The median SEI score for spouses was also 15 in 1940 and 18 in 1970.
- 5 Given space limitations, interaction coefficients are reported without the main effects for the analysis of labor force participation in table 2 and occupation SEI scores in table 4. In the text, I focus on whether the interaction was significant, thereby sug-

gesting whether the influence of a particular factor varied according to race. However, the magnitude of the variation is not easily interpreted without the main effects. Therefore, I have reported the main effects and the interaction coefficients in Appendix A and Appendix B for labor force participation and occupational SEI scores, respectively.

- 6 Tests for change in the race differential over time were conducted although not reported. Results indicate that differences over time are statistically significant, where the race effect persists, although with declining impact, throughout the observed period. During this supplementary analysis, sample weights were not used, education was standardized, and destination variables were limited to those consistent across all years. The standardized education values used in the pooled model were calculated through the following equation: (education value – mean)/standard deviation.
- 7 The predicted probabilities were obtained by using the following formula: $P_x = 1/(1 + e^{-L})$, where P_x is the predicted probability of labor force participation for group “x,” “e” is the constant, and “L” is the predicted log likelihood for the contrasted groups.
- 8 The predicted values for labor force participation and occupational SEI score for nonmigrants were derived from the same type of analysis conducted for the migrant women, such that the full model in tables 2 and 4 were estimated and solved for the nonmigrant groups.

References

- Alba, Richard D., and John R. Logan (1991) “Variations on two themes: Racial and ethnic patterns in the attainment of suburban residence.” *Demography* 28: 431–53.
- Alexander, J. Trent (1998) “The Great Migration in comparative perspective: Interpreting the urban origins of southern black migrants to depression-era Pittsburgh.” *Social Science History* 22: 349–76.
- Ashmore, Harry S. (1952) “Racial integration with special reference to education in the South: The present status of and general outlook for racial integration in education in the United States.” *Journal of Negro Education* 21: 250–55.
- Berry, Chad (2000) *Southern Migrants, Northern Exiles*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Bose, Christine E. (2001) *Women in 1900: Gateway to the Political Economy of the Twentieth Century*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Broussard, Albert S. (1993) *Black San Francisco: The Struggle for Racial Equality in the West, 1900–1954*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Browne, Irene (1997) “Explaining the black-white gap in labor force participation among women heading households.” *American Sociological Review* 62: 236–52.
- (2000) “Opportunities lost? Race, industrial restructuring, and employment among young women heading households.” *Social Forces* 78: 907–29.

- Christopher, Karen (1996) "Explaining the recent employment gap between black and white women." *Sociological Focus* 29: 263–80.
- Cohen, Philip N. (1998) "Black concentration effects on black-white and gender inequality: Multilevel analysis for U.S. metropolitan areas." *Social Forces* 77: 207–29.
- Drake, St. Clair, and Horace R. Cayton (1962 [1945]) *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1967) *The Philadelphia Negro*. New York: Benjamin Bloom, Inc.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley (1961) "A socioeconomic index for all occupations," in Albert J. Reiss Jr. (ed.) *Occupations and Social Status*. New York: Free Press: 109–38.
- England, Paula, and George Farkas (1986) *Households, Employment, and Gender: A Social, Economic, and Demographic View*. New York: Adeline.
- England, Paula, George Farkas, Barbara Stanek Kilbourne, and Thomas Dou (1988) "Explaining occupational sex segregation and wages: Findings from a model with fixed effects." *American Sociological Review* 53: 544–58.
- Federal Writers' Project (1975 [1939]) *These Are Our Lives: As Told by the People and Written by Members of the Federal Writers' Project of the Works Progress Administration in North Carolina, Tennessee, and Georgia*. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.
- Fligstein, Neil (1981) *Going North: Migration of Blacks and Whites from the South, 1900–1950*. New York: Academic.
- Frazier, E. Franklin (1932) *The Negro Family in Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldin, Claudia (1977) "Female labor force participation: The origin of black and white differences, 1870 and 1880." *Journal of Economic History* 37: 87–108.
- (1990) *Understanding the Gender Gap: An Economic History of American Women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gottlieb, Peter (1987) *Making Their Own Way: Southern Blacks' Migration to Pittsburgh, 1916–30*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- (1991) "Rethinking the Great Migration: A perspective from Pittsburgh," in Joe William Trotter Jr. (ed.) *The Great Migration in Historical Perspective: New Dimensions of Race, Class, and Gender*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 68–82.
- Greenwood, Michael J. (1981) *Migration and Economic Growth in the United States: National, Regional, and Metropolitan Perspectives*. New York: Academic.
- Gregory, James N. (1995) "The southern diaspora and the urban dispossessed: Demonstrating the census Public Use Microdata Samples." *Journal of American History* 82: 111–34.
- Grossman, James R. (1989) *Land of Hope: Chicago, Black Southerners, and the Great Migration*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (1991) "The white man's union: The Great Migration and the resonance of race and class in Chicago, 1916–1922," in Joe William Trotter Jr. (ed.) *The Great Migration in Historical Perspective: New Dimensions of Race, Class, and Gender*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 83–105.
- Guest, Avery M., and Stewart E. Tolnay (1982) "Childlessness in a transitional popula-

- tion: The United States at the turn of the century." *Journal of Family History* 7: 355–80.
- Hagood, Margaret Jarman (1939) *Mothers of the South: Portraiture of the White Tenant Farm Women*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Hauser, Robert M., and John Robert Warren (1997) "Socioeconomic indexes for occupations: A review, update, and critique." *Sociological Methodology* 27: 177–298.
- Henri, Florette (1975) *Black Migration: Movement North, 1900–1920*. Garden City, NJ: Anchor/Doubleday.
- Hine, Darlene Clark (1991) "Black migration to the urban Midwest: The gender dimension, 1915–1945," in Joe William Trotter Jr. (ed.) *The Great Migration in Historical Perspective: New Dimensions of Race, Class, and Gender*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 127–46.
- Hogan, Dennis P., and David L. Featherman (1977) "Racial stratification and socioeconomic change in the American North and South." *American Journal of Sociology* 83: 100–126.
- Jensen, Richard (1973) "Family, career and reform: Women leaders of the Progressive Era," in Michael Gordon (ed.) *The American Family in Social-Historical Perspective*. New York: St. Martins: 267–80.
- Jones, Jacqueline (1988) "Tore up and a-movin': Perspectives on the work of black and poor white women in the rural South, 1865–1940," in W. G. Haney and J. B. Knowles (eds.) *Women and Farming: Changing Roles, Changing Structures*. Boulder, CO: Westview: 15–34.
- (1995) *Labor of Love, Labor of Sorrow: Black Women, Work, and the Family from Slavery to the Present*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Kilbourne, Barbara Stanek, Paula England, George Farkas, Kurt Beron, and Dorteia Weir (1994) "Returns to skill, compensating differentials, and gender bias: Effects of occupational characteristics on the wages of white women and men." *American Journal of Sociology* 100: 689–719.
- Klerman, Jacob Alex, and Arleen Leibowitz (1999) "Job continuity among new mothers." *Demography* 36: 145–55.
- Knupfer, Anne Meis (1996) *Toward a Tenderer Humanity and a Nobler Womanhood: African American Women's Clubs in Turn-of-the-Century Chicago*. New York: New York University Press.
- Lemann, Nicholas (1992) *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Lemke-Santangelo, Gretchen (1996) *Abiding Courage: African American Migrant Women and the East Bay Community*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Lewis, Earl (1991) "Expectations, economic opportunities, and life in the industrial age: Black migration to Norfolk, Virginia, 1910–1945," in Joe William Trotter Jr. (ed.) *The Great Migration in Historical Perspective: New Dimensions of Race, Class, and Gender*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 22–45.

- Lieberson, Stanley (1980) *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants since 1880*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lieberson, Stanley, and Christy A. Wilkinson (1976) "A comparison between northern and southern blacks residing in the North." *Demography* 13: 199–224.
- Logan, John R., and Harvey L. Molotch (1987) *Urban Fortunes: The Political Economy of Place*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Long, Larry H. (1974) "Poverty status and receipt of welfare among migrants and non-migrants in large cities." *American Sociological Review* 39: 46–56.
- Long, Larry H., and Lynne R. Heltman (1975) "Migration and income differences between black and white men in the North." *American Journal of Sociology* 80: 1391–1409.
- Mandle, Jay R. (1978) *The Roots of Black Poverty: The Southern Plantation Economy after the Civil War*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Marks, Carole (1989) *Farewell—We're Good and Gone: The Great Black Migration*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Martin, Elizabeth Anne (1993) *Detroit and the Great Migration, 1916–1929*. Michigan Historical Collections Bulletin No. 40. Ann Arbor: Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
- Mattessich, Paul W. (1979) "Childlessness and its correlates in historical perspective." *Journal of Family History* 4: 299–307.
- Meeker, Edward (1977) "Freedom, economic opportunity, and fertility: Black Americans, 1860–1910." *Economic Inquiry* 15: 397–411.
- Moore, Shirley Ann (1991) "Getting there, being there: African-American migration to Richmond, California, 1910–1945," in Joe William Trotter Jr. (ed.) *The Great Migration in Historical Perspective: New Dimensions of Race, Class, and Gender*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 106–26.
- (2000) *To Place Our Deeds: The African American Community in Richmond California, 1910–1963*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Oppenheimer, Valerie Kincade (1970) *The Female Labor Force in the United States*. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California.
- Perlmann, Joel (1987) "A piece of the educational pie: Reflections and new evidence on black and immigrant schooling since 1880." *Sociology of Education* 60: 54–61.
- Roscigno, Vincent J. (1999) "The black-white achievement gap, family-school links, and the importance of place." *Sociological Inquiry* 69: 159–86.
- (2000) "Family/school inequality and African-American/Hispanic achievement." *Social Problems* 47: 266–90.
- Rosenfeld, Rachel A. (1980) "Race and sex differences in career dynamics." *American Sociological Review* 45: 583–609.
- Ruggles, Steven, and Matthew Sobek (2003) *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 3.0*. Minneapolis: Historical Census Projects, University of Minnesota.
- Siegel, Paul M. (1965) "On the cost of being a Negro." *Social Inquiry* 35: 41–57.
- Sjaastad, Larry A. (1962) "The costs and returns of human migration." *Journal of Political Economy* 70: s80–s93.

- Sobek, Matthew (1997) "A century of work: Gender, labor force participation, and occupational attainment in the United States, 1880–1990." PhD diss., University of Minnesota.
- Taylor, Quintard (1998) *In Search of the Racial Frontier: African Americans in the American West, 1528–1990*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Thompson, Edgar T. (1943) "Comparative education in colonial areas, with special reference to plantation and mission frontiers." *American Journal of Sociology* 48: 710–21.
- Tolnay, Stewart E. (1982) "Black fertility in decline: Urban differentials in 1900." *Social Biology* 27: 249–60.
- (1999) *The Bottom Rung: African American Family Life on Southern Farms*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- (2001) "The Great Migration gets underway: A comparison of black southern migrants and nonmigrants in the North, 1920." *Social Science Quarterly* 82: 235–51.
- Tolnay, Stewart E., and E. M. Beck (1992) "Racial violence and black migration in the American South, 1910 to 1930." *American Sociological Review* 57: 103–16.
- Tolnay, Stewart E., Kyle D. Crowder, and Robert M. Adelman (2000) "Narrow and filthy alleys of the city? The residential settlement patterns of black southern migrants to the North." *Social Forces* 78: 989–1015.
- (2002) "Race, regional origin, and residence in northern cities at the beginning of the Great Migration." *American Sociological Review* 67: 456–75.
- Trotter, Joe William, Jr. (1991) "Race, class, and industrial change: Black migration to southern West Virginia, 1915–1932," in Joe William Trotter Jr. (ed.) *The Great Migration in Historical Perspective: New Dimensions of Race, Class, and Gender*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 46–67.
- Wilkie, Jane Riblett (1985) "The decline of occupational segregation between black and white women." *Research in Race and Ethnic Relations* 4: 67–89.