Exploring the Impact of Large Immigrant Inflows on Regional Inequality in the United States

Andrea Assenza, Anshruta Thakur, Marlon Morales, Mauricio Vargas, Nikolas Papadatosa

Fall 2024

Overview

Research Question

Methodological Approach

Key Findings

Data Description
Sources

The two main data sources used in this study are:

1. Dependent variables from the 1990, 2000 Censuses + 2007 3 year ACS (2006-2008)
   - `https://usa.ipums.org/usa/`
2. **Data II:** Independent variables from "The China Syndrome" paper
   - **Author:** David H. Autor, David Dorn, and Gordon H. Hanson, 2013, "The China Syndrome: Local Labor Market Effects of Import Competition in the United States"
   - **Dorn Data:** `http://www.ddorn.net/data.html`

Data Description
Transformations

Main Results
Instrumental Relevance

Table 1: First-Stage 2SLS Results Comparing Instruments (Standard Card Instrument vs. Predicted Immigrant Growth Rate)

	Endogenous Variable: Immigrant Inflow (1980-2008)					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Partial F Statistic	8.9984	1.0693	0.1735	18.369	2.1906	9.9777
P-value	0.0027	0.3011	0.6770	0.0000	0.1389	0.0016
Constant	0.0504***	0.0206***	-0.3796***	-0.0057	-0.0027	-0.4928***
	(0.0099)	(0.0069)	(0.1408)	(0.0201)	(0.0225)	(0.1571)
Share of employment among the foreign-born population in 1980		2.3616***	1.2458**		1.6483***	1.1985***
		(0.5444)	(0.6288)		(0.3625)	(0.3144)
Share of employment in manufacturing in 1980			-0.2307*			-0.2105
			(0.1301)			(0.1329)
Share of employment among women in 1980			0.6430			0.7937*
			(0.3986)			(0.3962)
Share of the college-educated population in 1980			0.0599			0.0939
			(0.3496)			(0.3207)
Logarithm of total population in 1980			0.0181***			0.0182***
			(0.0058)			(0.0071)
Standard Card Instrument	0.3602***	-0.1460	0.0555			
	(0.1201)	(0.1412)	(0.1333)			
Predicted Immigrant Growth Rate				0.0391***	0.0129	0.0226***
				(0.0091)	(0.0087)	(0.0071)
R^2	0.2347	0.3296	0.3977	0.1131	0.3331	0.4242
Partial R^2	0.2347	0.0097	0.0012	0.1131	0.0148	0.0452

Notes: $N = 741$. Robust standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at the state level. A Partial F-statistic below 10 is typically considered weak evidence of instrument relevance. The p-value is calculated using a $\chi^2(1)$ distribution.
*** Significant at the 1 percent level.
** Significant at the 5 percent level.
* Significant at the 10 percent level.

Main Results
Causal Effect on Native Population Outcomes

Table 2: 2SLS Results for Various Native Population Outcomes Using the *Predicted Immigrant Growth Rate* as an Instrument

Native Population Outcome	Growth Rate of Wages			Growth Rate of Unemployment			Growth Rate of NILF		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Immigrant Inflow (1980-2008)	-0.4294*	-1.7339	-0.5402	0.2260***	0.7200	0.5059***	0.1127***	0.3164	0.4517**
	(0.2326)	(1.4898)	(0.4442)	(0.0570)	(0.4748)	(0.1547)	(0.0568)	(0.2721)	(0.1942)
Share of employment among the foreign-born population in 1980		3.2125	0.6921		-1.2165	-0.6535***		-0.5015	-0.5164*
		(2.6615)	(0.7209)		(0.7735)	(0.2469)		(0.4959)	(0.3047)
Share of employment in manufacturing in 1980			-0.4735**			0.1141			0.1963**
			(0.1949)			(0.0774)			(0.0961)
Share of employment among women in 1980			2.4377***			-0.1535			0.0652
			(0.7215)			(0.2538)			(0.3051)
Share of the college-educated population in 1980			-0.1724			0.0028			-0.1147
			(0.4267)			(0.1527)			(0.1445)
Logarithm of total population in 1980			0.0143			-0.0108**			-0.0067
			(0.0140)			(0.004)			(0.0053)
Constant Term	1.1695***	1.1783***	0.1352	-0.0222***	-0.0256	0.1297	-0.0693***	-0.0707***	-0.0578
	(0.0264)	(0.0551)	(0.2751)	(0.0044)	(0.0167)	(0.019)	(0.0073)	(0.0091)	(0.1360)

Notes: $N = 741$. Robust standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at the state level.
*** Significant at the 1 percent level.
** Significant at the 5 percent level.
* Significant at the 10 percent level.

Conclusions

Appendix


UCLA