

# P<sup>3</sup> | PRODUCTIVITY AND PROSPERITY PROJECT

## Sunbelt Growth and the Knowledge Economy

June 2007

W. P. CAREY  
SCHOOL of BUSINESS

ASU ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

**DENNIS HOFFMAN, Ph. D.**

Professor of Economics,  
University Economist and  
Director, L. William Seidman  
Research Institute

**TIMOTHY HOGAN, Ph.D.**

Professor Emeritus, Department of  
Economics and Research Associate,  
Center for Competitiveness and Prosperity  
Research

# **SUNBELT GROWTH AND THE KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY: AN EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS**

**A Report from the Productivity and Prosperity Project (P3)**

**June 2007**

**Dennis Hoffman, Ph.D.**

Professor of Economics, University Economist,  
and Director, L. William Seidman Research Institute

**Timothy D. Hogan, Ph.D.**

Professor Emeritus, Department of Economics,  
and Research Associate, Center for Competitiveness and Prosperity Research

Center for Competitiveness and Prosperity Research  
L. William Seidman Research Institute  
W. P. Carey School of Business  
Arizona State University  
Box 874011  
Tempe, Arizona 85287-4011

(480) 965-5362

FAX: (480) 965-5458

EMAIL: [Dennis.Hoffman@asu.edu](mailto:Dennis.Hoffman@asu.edu)

[www.wpcarey.asu.edu/seid/](http://www.wpcarey.asu.edu/seid/)



ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

## **SUNBELT GROWTH AND THE KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY: AN EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS**

Policy makers in the Sunbelt have recognized that the traditional approach to economic development – a strategy of offering a lower cost of doing business to attract business relocation and using job growth as the metric of success – must be replaced in a world characterized by globalization and rapid technological change. While the fundamental goal for economic development has always been prosperity, the operational goal has shifted from providing jobs to increasing living standards. Dollar-denominated metrics – most often wages and/or per capita income – have supplanted or at least supplemented job growth as the target variables of regional development.

In many cases, the initial change in strategy was to shift the focus to attracting high-wage jobs – often characterized as “high tech” manufacturing. Over time, this approach has been broadened to recognize that the standard of living is fundamentally determined by the productivity of the regional economy and that high productivity and productivity growth comes from producing higher value products and services and by increasing efficiency in producing those goods and services. Based on this concept of economic development, the challenge facing policy makers is to attract high value-added economic activity and to create conditions conducive to high productivity and sustained productivity growth.

A popular way to characterize this approach to economic development is in terms of the “knowledge economy” or as a “knowledge-based economy.” A knowledge-based economic growth strategy often is defined broadly to incorporate innovation, research and development activities, and non-education aspects of human capital, but much of the discussion of the knowledge economy has focused on the link between economic growth and the stock of human capital as measured in terms of the college-educated population. Based on national datasets, empirical research clearly links economic growth and prosperity and college-educated population (see for example, Glaeser and Saiz 2003 and Moretti 2004), and one study actually asserts the “percentage of adults with a college degree is the single most important driver of economic growth” (Weissbourd and Berry 2004).

Over the past fifty years, the portion of the U.S. known as the Sunbelt has experienced rapid growth.<sup>1</sup> The Sunbelt’s share of the national population jumped from 28 percent in 1950 to 40 percent by 2000. At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the population of the Sunbelt nearly equals the combined population of the nation’s traditional Northeast and Midwest “core” regions – 110 million versus 118 million (Lang and Rengert 2001). Empirical research has implied that the non-economic factor of climate has been a significant determinant of this growth pattern (see, for example, Gallup, Sachs, and Mellinger 1999 and Glaeser, et. al. 2001). Some analysts have speculated that climate has historically been a substitute for human capital development (Quan and Beck 1987; Glaeser and Saiz 2003).

This paper explores whether a knowledge economy explanation for economic growth seems to fit with the growth experience of the Sunbelt during the 1990s. The issue is addressed through analysis of two different datasets. First, the education and income characteristics of the people moving to the Sunbelt region are examined using migration data from the 2000 census. Then we

look at the link between the knowledge economy metric of the share of college educated adults and economic growth in the Sunbelt in the 1990s using data for 116 Sunbelt MSAs.

### **A HIGHLY SELECTIVE REVIEW OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH**

The 2003 study of the link between education and urban growth by Glaeser and Saiz (2003) served as the initial motivation for the research on which this paper is based. Their analysis, which included a battery of control variables and regional fixed effects, found a strong link between the share of college-educated adults and population growth using primarily census data for a national set of MSAs for the 1970-2000 period. The results also showed positive effects of warm and dry climate measures. Of particular interest to the current project were the results of two sets of regression models in the study:

1. Two simple models of population growth as a function of the share of college graduates – one using the entire MSA sample and the other using only MSAs which had average January temperatures of 40 degrees+. The results showed the regression coefficient in the first model was four times as big as that for the “warm climate” sub-sample.
2. Models that included interaction effects between education and climate that also implied a weaker link between education and both MSA growth and MSA wage levels in warmer areas.

The 2003 Glaeser and Saiz investigation built upon an earlier study by Glaeser and Shapiro (2001) in which somewhat less sophisticated empirical analysis identified what were termed “three large trends that determined the recent growth of cities” – human capital, movement to warmer, drier places, and reliance on autos.

Empirical results from an earlier study of regional growth at least tangentially addressed the link between the knowledge economy and economic growth in the Sunbelt. Quan and Beck (1987) looked at the link between education and state economic growth, but their analysis focused on the relationships between per capita income, wages and employment and public expenditures on K-12 and higher education. They found positive links between education spending and the economic variables for Northern states but little evidence (with some results actually showing a negative relationship) of any link for Sunbelt states. In their conclusion, they argued their results were consistent with Sunbelt states relying on in-migration of persons educated in other states.

### **GROWTH AND EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT IN THE SUNBELT**

Some areas of the Sunbelt have achieved great economic success along with aggregate growth – metro areas like Atlanta and Charlotte are obvious examples. Other areas have experienced explosive population and job growth but have not done as well in raising the standard of living of their residents (at least in comparison with the national average). For example, McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX was the second fastest growing Sunbelt MSA in the 1990s, but income grew slower than the national average so that its per capita personal income figure fell from 48 percent of the national level in 1990 to 45 percent in 2000. And not all Sunbelt states have shared in the rapid growth experienced by the rest of the region. Four states (Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Oklahoma) trailed the national growth trend over the 1950 – 2000 period.

Focusing on the decade of the 1990s, the aggregate statistics presented in Table 1 show that the population of the 15-state Sunbelt region grew more than twice as fast as the Non-Sunbelt states between 1990 and 2000. The Sunbelt states also outpaced the rest of the nation in terms of aggregate economic growth – for example, the GDP of the Sunbelt region increased 78 percent over the decade compared with 60 percent for the Non-Sunbelt states. But the Sunbelt region was not as successful in terms of personal economic measures. The average per capita GDP in 2000 for the 15 state Sunbelt region was \$33,104 – 92 percent that of the Non-Sunbelt region, and per capita GDP growth for the Sunbelt states also lagged behind the rest of the nation during the decade.

The region as a whole surpassed the rest of the U.S. in terms of aggregate growth, but the pattern of growth during the 1990s was not uniform among the individual Sunbelt states. Some states like Arizona, California, and North Carolina had rapid aggregate growth and also managed 60+ percent increases in per capita GDP. Others like Nevada and South Carolina grew rapidly but had below average increases in per capita GDP. And at the other end of the scale, Louisiana lagged behind the Non-Sunbelt region in all four measures.

Turning to comparisons of the 15-state Sunbelt region with the rest of the nation in terms of the human capital metric often used in studies of the knowledge economy – the proportion of college

**TABLE 1**  
**GROWTH IN POPULATION, GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT**  
**AND PER CAPITA GDP, 1990 – 2000**

	<b>Population Growth</b>	<b>GDP Growth</b>	<b>Per Capita GDP</b>	<b>Per Capita GDP Growth</b>
Sunbelt States	18.9%	77.9%	\$33,104	49.7%
Alabama	10.1	61.2	25,764	46.4
Arizona	40.0	128.7	30,899	63.4
Arkansas	13.7	75.3	24,987	54.1
California	13.8	63.3	38,001	43.5
Florida	23.5	83.2	29,490	48.3
Georgia	26.4	108.5	35,533	65.0
Louisiana	5.9	40.5	29,430	32.7
Mississippi	10.5	65.8	22,592	50.0
Nevada	66.3	131.7	36,892	39.3
New Mexico	20.1	88.8	27,885	57.2
North Carolina	21.4	95.1	34,003	60.7
Oklahoma	9.7	55.5	26,012	41.8
South Carolina	15.1	71.2	28,044	48.8
Tennessee	16.7	84.9	30,733	58.5
Texas	22.8	89.3	34,876	54.2
Non-Sunbelt States	9.0	67.7	35,845	53.7
United States	13.2	71.8	34,642	51.8

Source: Computed by authors based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau and the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis.

graduates, the figures in Table 2 demonstrate that the share of those 25 and over with at least bachelor's degree in 2000 was lower for the Sunbelt region than in the Non-Sunbelt states. Looking particularly at younger adults (aged 25 to 39), the relative ranking remains the same – and while the proportion is higher among younger adults all across the nation, the gap between the Non-Sunbelt and Sunbelt regions is larger than for all adults.

The economies of some areas in the Sunbelt have clearly benefited from “knowledge economy”-based growth, but the statistics in Table 2 indicate that much of the region still lags far behind in developing knowledge-based resources. For example, a recent Milken Institute study of Arkansas' position in the knowledge-based economy ranked the state next-to-last in knowledge-economy resources, and the analysis also cautioned that several other Sunbelt states were in similar, if slightly better situations (Milken Institute 2004).

### U.S. DOMESTIC NET MIGRATION

Recent decades have witnessed steady north-to-south net domestic migration in the U.S. The impetus for this phenomenon has been the continuing decline of Midwest manufacturing as a source of lifetime employment coupled with preferences for a more temperate climate. The Sunbelt states have generally been the primary recipients of these domestic migration flows.

**TABLE 2  
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF THE POPULATION 25 AND OVER  
AND 25 TO 39, IN 2000**

	<b>Population 25 and over</b>	<b>Percent BA or more</b>	<b>Population 25 to 39</b>	<b>Percent BA or more</b>	<b>Difference 25-39 vs 25+</b>
Sunbelt States	78,980,254	23.0%	27,556,649	24.1%	1.1
Alabama	2,887,400	19.0	942,624	21.6	2.6
Arizona	3,256,184	23.5	1,123,657	23.5	0.0
Arkansas	1,731,200	16.7	545,770	18.3	1.6
California	21,298,900	26.6	7,859,690	26.5	-0.1
Florida	11,024,645	22.3	3,290,048	23.4	1.1
Georgia	5,185,965	24.3	1,983,774	27.2	2.9
Louisiana	2,775,468	18.7	932,770	20.3	1.6
Mississippi	1,757,517	16.9	591,157	18.1	1.2
Nevada	1,310,176	18.2	464,406	17.6	-0.6
New Mexico	1,134,801	23.5	369,089	20.7	-2.8
North Carolina	5,282,994	22.5	1,849,280	25.5	3.0
Oklahoma	2,203,173	20.3	682,826	20.9	0.6
South Carolina	2,596,010	20.4	874,969	22.0	1.6
Tennessee	3,744,928	19.6	1,256,971	22.6	3.0
Texas	12,790,893	23.2	4,789,620	23.6	0.4
All Non-Sunbelt States	103,231,385	25.5	34,014,715	29.3	3.9
United States	182,211,639	24.4	61,571,364	27.0	2.6

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Educational Attainment: 2000, August 2003, and 2000 Census IPUMS 5 percent files.

A Census report, *Domestic Net Migration in the United States: 2000 to 2004* (Perry 2006) reveals the progression of north to south migration continued in a pattern that prevailed throughout the 1990's. Eight of the top ten states for domestic net migration were Sunbelt states while California (partially Sunbelt) experienced significant net domestic out-migration.

Behind the aggregate net migration numbers, questions remain. What are the knowledge and skill characteristics of the people that dominate these population flows? What role does age play in the observed domestic net migration patterns? Quite simply, are the knowledge and skills of the people migrating from north to south different from the average state-to-state migrant? And is this north-to-south migration consistent with the arguments that knowledge and skill development will be an important catalyst for economic growth and prosperity?

Tables 3 and 4 summarize data extracted from the Census 2000 migration DVD. The data were sorted to compare attributes of people who migrated to the Sunbelt from outside the Sunbelt at some point between 1995 and 2000 (the top of Tables 3 and 4) with people who moved from the Sunbelt in the same time period (the bottom of Tables 3 and 4). It turns out that their characteristics are quite similar. The data suggest the educational attainment of people migrating north to south are essentially identical to those migrating south to north. For example, 34.9 percent of the north-to-south migrants had college degrees while 35.5 percent of the south-to-north migrants were college graduates. Similarly, 47.9 percent of the north-to-south migrants reported incomes in excess of \$50,000 while 49.5 percent of the south-to-north migrants reported incomes in excess of \$50,000. So, in the aggregate, it appears education and income earning skill characteristics are essentially randomly distributed across domestic migrants regardless of their (north vs. south) direction of movement.

But the aggregate analysis in Tables 3 and 4 ignores age differences that may prevail among the domestic migrants, and it assumes the Sunbelt is comprised of essentially a homogeneous set of states. We consider each in turn.

**TABLE 3  
MIGRATION TO AND FROM THE SUNBELT BETWEEN 1995 AND 2000  
BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT IN 2000**

Educational Attainment	Non-Hispanic White		Non-Hispanic Black		Other		Total	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
<b>To the Sunbelt</b>								
Less than high school	256,574	8.7%	64,491	16.5%	149,379	26.3%	470,444	12.0%
High school graduate or some college	1,583,933	53.6	240,453	61.6	253,950	44.7	2,078,336	53.1
College Degree	1,112,913	37.7	85,276	21.9	165,449	29.1	1,363,638	34.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,953,420</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>390,220</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>568,778</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>3,912,418</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>From the Sunbelt</b>								
Less than high school	175,193	8.9	32,787	14.8	142,849	29.7	350,829	13.1
High school graduate or some college	1,040,434	52.8	133,297	60.3	200,979	41.8	1,374,710	51.4
College Degree	755,891	38.3	55,082	24.9	137,238	28.5	948,211	35.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,971,518</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>221,166</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>481,066</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>2,673,750</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Migration DVD.

**TABLE 4**  
**MIGRATION TO AND FROM THE SUNBELT BETWEEN 1995 AND 2000**  
**BY HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1999**

Household Income in 1999	Not Hispanic		Hispanic		Total	
<b>To the Sunbelt</b>						
Under \$25,000	1,041,180	20.8%	162,200	29.6%	1,203,380	21.7%
\$25,000 to \$49,999	1,494,110	29.9	191,580	35.0	1,685,690	30.4
\$50,000 to \$74,999	1,065,820	21.3	101,510	18.5	1,167,330	21.1
\$75,000 or more	1,397,050	28.0	92,770	16.9	1,489,820	26.9
Total	4,998,160	100.0	548,060	100.0	5,546,220	100.0
<b>From the Sunbelt</b>						
Under \$25,000	692,350	20.3	136,980	27.5	829,330	21.2
\$25,000 to \$49,999	976,110	28.5	174,630	35.1	1,150,740	29.4
\$50,000 to \$74,999	735,500	21.5	94,660	19.0	830,160	21.2
\$75,000 or more	1,015,850	29.7	61,050	18.3	1,106,900	28.3
Total	3,419,810	100.0	497,320	100.0	3,917,130	100.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Migration DVD.

#### Age Issues

As is widely known, significant migration of people aged 55+ from north to south has been a continuing phenomenon. The Census 2000 report, *Internal Migration of the Older population: 1995 to 2000* (He and Schachter 2003) shows seven of the top 10 destination states for elderly interstate migrants were Sunbelt states. Nevada, Arizona and Florida received most of these elderly migrants. In many Sunbelt states this population flow of older people serves to boost local economies. In Nevada, as reported in the *Economist* (2006), the elderly population is serving as an important source of service industry labor. And across the Sunbelt, the migrating elderly are generally more educated and wealthier in comparison with national averages at the same age cohort – resulting in a positive tug on average educational attainment and income in the 25+ population for many Sunbelt states. The challenge of course is that the elderly provide little boost to the quality of skills in the working age labor force and may indeed result in increasing pressures for more service industry jobs. Further, as the Baby Boom generation ages, Sunbelt states will no doubt find themselves with increasing proportions of very elderly people – especially in the most attractive states for the elderly migrants, Arizona, Florida and Nevada.

#### Young and College Educated

A special Census 2000 report highlighted the migration patterns of the young (25-39), single and college-educated population for the period 1995 to 2000 (Franklin 2003b). The analysis reveals that seven of the ten states with the highest rates of net domestic migration among this group were Sunbelt states. These findings suggest that Sunbelt states added significantly to their numbers of young, college-educated people. However, the Sunbelt states also received most of the total net domestic migration so it may not be surprising that they saw significant increases in the number of young, single, educated people as well.

To examine how well the Sunbelt states did in attracting young, single and college educated migrants, Table 5 lists the 17 states, plus the District of Columbia, with net positive domestic in-migration for the young, single and college educated plus Massachusetts, New York and New Jersey. These last three states all experienced declines in this educated demographic that were



**TABLE 5  
DOMESTIC MIGRATION BETWEEN 1995 AND 2000**

	Young, Single and College Educated				Age 5 or Older	
	Inmigrants	Outmigrants	Number	Rate	Number	Rate
Nevada	13,651	6,863	6,788	281.8	233,934	151.5
Colorado	49,665	31,803	17,862	157.7	162,633	43.8
Georgia	63,306	38,639	24,667	150.5	340,705	48.6
Arizona	34,850	25,586	9,264	109.9	316,148	74.3
Oregon	24,296	17,940	6,356	103.5	74,665	24.6
Washington	39,469	27,800	11,669	96.5	75,330	14.3
California	170,270	97,233	73,037	92.7	-755,536	-24.6
North Carolina	44,925	37,706	7,219	50.2	337,883	48.4
Texas	74,350	57,537	16,813	48.7	148,240	8.1
Florida	69,053	58,599	10,454	40.1	607,023	44.0
Alaska	3,984	3,598	386	38.9	-30,498	-51.0
Virginia	58,572	52,097	6,475	38.4	75,730	11.9
Maryland	42,126	37,768	4,358	32.2	-19,723	-4.1
Minnesota	25,681	23,962	1,719	15.5	29,169	6.5
Tennessee	23,581	22,264	1,317	15.2	146,314	28.7
Illinois	69,250	65,416	3,834	12.4	-342,616	-29.7
Idaho	5,276	5,189	87	5.9	33,847	29.6
District of Columbia	25,428	25,320	108	2.5	-45,331	-81.7
Massachusetts	60,198	61,260	-1,062	-4.6	-54,708	-9.4
New York	113,055	119,666	-6,611	-11.3	-874,248	-48.8
New Jersey	43,138	45,922	-2,784	-13.0	-182,829	-23.7

Note: States in the list had a net migration rate for young, single, and college educated higher than the overall rate.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Special Migration Reports.

smaller than their overall net domestic migration losses. The 30 states that do not appear in Table 5 include seven Sunbelt states and 23 non-Sunbelt states. All of these saw outflows of the young, single and college educated in the late 1990's that were more negative than their overall rate of net migration.

The figures presented in Table 5 reveal the Sunbelt generally performed well in terms of net migration for this subpopulation, but they also show the absolute numbers of this group are small relative to total net migrants. Only 6,788 of the 233,934 net in-migrants to Nevada were in this young, single, and college-educated demographic, while Arizona realized 9,264 out of 316,148, and Florida only 10,454 out of 607,023. In contrast, California, Alaska, Maryland, Illinois, and the District of Columbia, increased their shares of young, single and college educated while actually having a net outflow of domestic migrants from 1995 to 2000.

While this special Census report chose to focus on young, unmarried college graduates, it makes more sense to take a somewhat broader look at all young college graduates as the subgroup most important for what is happening with an area's human capital resources. The numbers presented in Table 2 already demonstrated this desirable subpopulation is a smaller share of all young

adults in the 15-state Sunbelt region than in the Non-Sunbelt states. The net migration figures in Table 6 show that the Sunbelt states as a region gained a total of more than 200,000 young college educated individuals from the rest of the nation over the 1995-2000 period. And young, college-educated persons made up 13.9 percent of total net migration into the region – substantially higher than the 5.8 percent share this subpopulation made up of the 5+ population of the region in 2000. Still, even after adding gaining these “economically desirable” new residents at the expense of the Non-Sunbelt states, the proportion of college-educated young adults in the Sunbelt region remained substantially below the rest of the nation in 2000 (see Table 2).

Six of the 15 Sunbelt states actually had net out-flows of young, college-educated individuals, and for states like Florida, Nevada, and Arizona these potential knowledge economy workers made up a very small part of their population gains. In a few Sunbelt states, however, the young college educated in-migrants were a major positive factor – for Georgia and Texas in particular they constituted a large share of the states’ total net-migration – and California had a net gain of more than 80,000 young, college-educated individuals at the same time that the state’s overall net outflow was almost 800,000 over the 1995-2000 period.

**TABLE 6  
DOMESTIC MIGRATION OF YOUNG AND COLLEGE EDUCATED  
BETWEEN 1995 AND 2000**

	<b>In-migrants</b>	<b>Out-migrants</b>	<b>Net Migration</b>	<b>Percent of Total 5+ Net Migration</b>	<b>YCE Share of Total 5+ Population in 2000</b>
Sunbelt States	1,361,189	1,152,779	208,410	13.9%	5.8%
Alabama	35,512	47,552	-12,040	-	4.9
Arizona	84,306	59,235	25,071	7.9	5.6
Arkansas	19,485	21,380	-1,895	-	4.0
California	320,594	239,188	81,406	-	6.6
Florida	170,187	145,864	24,323	4.1	5.1
Georgia	151,572	101,960	49,612	14.3	7.1
Louisiana	30,400	51,950	-21,550	-	4.5
Mississippi	19,781	27,911	-8,130	-	4.1
Nevada	31,255	16,307	14,948	6.4	4.4
New Mexico	22,348	28,661	-6,313	21.9	4.5
North Carolina	127,276	97,213	30,063	8.7	6.3
Oklahoma	24,993	39,479	-14,486	-	4.4
South Carolina	49,855	48,229	1,626	1.3	5.1
Tennessee	69,399	63,410	5,989	4.2	5.3
Texas	204,228	164,438	39,790	29.9	5.9
All Non-Sunbelt States	2,017,952	2,226,362	-208,410	-	6.8
United States	3,379,141	3,379,141	0	-	6.3

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census IPUMS 5 percent files and 2000 Census Special Tabulations PHC-T-22, Gross and Net Migration Tables.

### Knowledge and Skills Across the Sunbelt

While considerable north-to-south migration has occurred, it is clear the migration patterns to and from individual Sunbelt states vary considerably. Table 7 depicts the distribution of domestic in-migrants into individual Sunbelt states by income and educational attainment. The frequencies reveal considerable heterogeneity across the Sunbelt. The states with the highest income in-migrants are California, Georgia, and Texas; the share of high income migrants exceeds the average state by 21.1 percent for California and Georgia and by 15.3 percent for Texas. All three of these states also reported shares of college educated among in-migrants over 20 percent above the average Sunbelt state. The states with the lowest income in-migrants are Arkansas, Mississippi and Oklahoma with the proportions of in-migrants with income above the \$50,000 level that lagged the average Sunbelt state by 21.7 percent, 13.9 percent and 19.5 percent respectively. In each of the lowest income states the proportion of in-migrants with college degrees was more than 20 percent below the average Sunbelt state.

Table 7 also reveals the income/skill correlation is not monotonic across the Sunbelt states. Arizona, Florida, and Nevada, the preferred destinations of many elderly in-migrants, all reported above average income frequencies with below-average college graduation frequencies overall, with Nevada the lowest frequency of college graduates among the Sunbelt states – yet reporting high-income frequency that was 10 percent above the average Sunbelt state. Similarly, New Mexico had a high frequency of college educated in-migrants but a below average frequency of high-income in-migrants.

**TABLE 7  
INCOME AND EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF DOMESTIC IN-MIGRANTS  
TO THE SUNBELT STATES BETWEEN 1995 AND 2000**

	Income > \$50,000: Non-Hispanic		Income > \$50,000: Total		Some College		College Degree	
		Dep*		Dep*		Dep*		Dep*
Alabama	42.5%	-7.8%	42.0%	-5.8%	31.3%	-1.4%	29.9%	-4.9%
Arizona	49.8	8.0	47.7	7.0	34.2	7.8	31.3	-0.5
Arkansas	35.9	-22.1	34.9	-21.7	30.2	-4.9	22.7	-27.8
California	55.9	21.3	54.0	21.1	29.8	-6.1	44.8	42.5
Florida	46.5	0.9	45.2	1.4	31.1	-2.0	29.6	-5.9
Georgia	54.8	18.9	54.0	21.1	30.6	-3.6	38.0	20.8
Louisiana	40.2	-12.8	39.8	-10.7	31.3	-1.4	31.0	-1.4
Mississippi	38.6	-16.3	38.4	-13.9	32.9	3.7	24.5	-22.1
Nevada	52.4	13.7	49.1	10.1	34.1	7.4	21.5	-31.6
New Mexico	42.7	-7.4	38.5	-13.7	32.4	2.1	35.0	11.3
North Carolina	49.8	8.0	48.4	8.5	30.4	-4.2	37.4	18.9
Oklahoma	36.8	-20.2	35.9	-19.5	34.0	7.1	24.4	-22.4
South Carolina	46.0	-0.2	45.4	1.8	32.2	1.4	32.3	2.7
Tennessee	44.6	-3.3	44.2	-0.9	30.6	-3.6	31.4	-0.1
Texas	55.0	19.3	51.4	15.3	31.0	-2.3	37.9	20.5
Average	46.1		44.6		31.7		31.4	

\* Departure from the average Sunbelt state

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Migration DVD.

Data for the in-migrant streams of young, college-educated individuals demonstrate similar patterns (Table 8). For the entire 15-state Sunbelt region, the proportion of high-income (\$50,000+) individuals was only slightly below that for the Non-Sunbelt region, but this aggregate measure is misleading as only two of the states – California and Texas – actually had proportions above the Non-Sunbelt average.

This examination of domestic migration data reveals that, while the Sunbelt has been the beneficiary of significant net domestic migration flows, these flows (with the exception of California, and to some degree Georgia and Texas) are not being accompanied by large numbers of people prepared to contribute to knowledge economy endeavors.

**TABLE 8  
YOUNG AND COLLEGE-EDUCATED DOMESTIC IN-MIGRANTS  
BETWEEN 1995 AND 2000**

	<b>YCE In- migrants</b>	<b>Percent of Total 5+ In- Migration</b>	<b>Percent With Incomes of \$50,000 or more</b>	<b>Departure from National Average</b>	<b>Departure from Sunbelt State Average</b>
Sunbelt States	1,361,189	13.0%	29.6%	-1.1%	
Alabama	35,512	10.9	24.3	-18.8	-17.9%
Arizona	84,306	10.6	27.8	-7.2	-6.2
Arkansas	19,485	7.8	26.1	-12.9	-11.9
California	320,594	21.6	36.7	22.4	23.7
Florida	170,187	9.1	25.8	-13.8	-12.9
Georgia	151,572	15.6	30.1	0.5	1.6
Louisiana	30,400	11.8	24.3	-19.0	-18.2
Mississippi	19,781	8.8	23.0	-23.2	-22.4
Nevada	31,255	6.8	23.6	-21.1	-20.3
New Mexico	22,348	11.0	21.1	-29.5	-28.7
North Carolina	127,276	13.7	26.3	-12.3	-11.3
Oklahoma	24,993	8.0	21.9	-27.1	-26.3
South Carolina	49,855	11.3	23.8	-20.6	-19.7
Tennessee	69,399	12.3	25.2	-15.9	-15.0
Texas	204,228	14.9	32.6	8.8	10.0
All Non-Sunbelt States	2,017,952	17.2	30.2	0.7	
United States	3,379,141	15.2	30.0		

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census IPUMS 5 percent files and 2000 Census Special Tabulations PHC-T-22, Gross and Net Migration Tables.

## **LOOKING AT THE “KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY” EXPLANATION FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH /PROSPERITY IN SUNBELT MSAs**

This section summarizes an initial look at alternative metrics of economic success and of the knowledge economy for the 116 MSAs in the Sunbelt that are included in the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s State of the Cities Data System.<sup>2</sup> The metro areas included in the dataset are very diverse – in terms of whatever characteristic one might choose – ranging from huge (Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA and Houston, TX) to small (Pine Bluff, AR and Enid, OK); rapidly growing (Las Vegas, NV) to declining (Alexandria, LA); rich (West Palm Beach-Boca Raton, FL) to poor (McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX), etc.

The analysis looked at four alternative measures of economic success:

1. *The growth rate of the MSA population over the 1990-2000 period* – The population growth measure was included to be consistent with the Glaeser and Saiz analysis. Glaeser and Saiz could argue either (a) they used on population growth because they were looking at “urban growth” not economic growth or (b) their analysis was in the context of looking at growing areas versus declining areas. But population growth is not really a good measure of economic growth – particularly for Sunbelt regions. In the entire sample of 116, only three MSAs suffered a decline in total population, and many of the poorest areas have grown rapidly.
2. *The growth rate of total employment for the 1990-2000 period* – Job growth has more validity as a measure of economic growth. Historically, it has been one of the primary metrics used to measure regional economic growth by policy makers, economic development professionals, and economists. However, it does not do an adequate job of monitoring what is happening to the standard of living of area residents.
3. *Per capita personal income in 2000* – For this analysis per capita personal income was chosen as the proxy measure for the material standard of living of area residents.
4. *The growth rate of per capita personal income for the 1990-2000 period* – The growth rate of per capita personal income serves as a metric for the change in the material standard of living.

The following discussion focuses on the two income-related measures and secondarily on employment growth. Population growth is included to mirror Glaeser and Saiz. Table 9 lists the simple correlation coefficients between each of the four metrics. These figures show a very high correlation between population growth and employment growth. The coefficients also indicate positive correlations between per capita income and all three growth measures, but a negative relationship between income growth and population growth; although none are statistically significant at a .05 confidence level. The correlation statistics indicate that income level, income growth, and employment growth were not highly correlated among the set of 116 Sunbelt MSAs.

The three alternative education-related variables used in the analysis are (1) the share of college graduates in the adult (25+) population in 2000, (2) the growth rate of that share over the 1990-2000 period, and (3) the ratio of net in-migrants to the MSA ages 25 to 39 in 2000 who were single and college graduates to the population of the MSA ages 5+ in 2000.<sup>3</sup> This statistic was computed from data produced for the special Census 2000 report (Franklin 2003b) discussed earlier. (Hereafter for sake of brevity, this ratio is referred to as the YSCMR – sorry no “cute”

acronym.) Table 9 also lists the simple correlation coefficients between the three education metrics and also between each of the three and the four economic measures. The correlation coefficients imply that the share of college graduates and growth of that share are not closely related, but somewhat surprisingly (at first glance anyway) that there is a statistically significant negative relationship between share of college graduates and the YSCMR. Upon closer examination of the data, it appears that this is a result of out-migration of young, single college-educated adults from “college towns” like Austin. On the other hand, the figures show a modest positive (statistically significant at the .05 percent level of confidence) correlation between the YSCMR and growth in the share of college graduates.

### Simple Correlation Evidence on the Link between Education and Economic Growth

The correlation coefficients between the three education metrics and the four economic measures provide mixed signals. All of the coefficients are positive, but not all statistically significant. The highest correlation is found between the share of college graduates and per capita income. This could be interpreted simply as the result of a higher proportion of college grads with higher incomes or more broadly in terms of a “knowledge economy”- based argument – a more productive/innovative workforce produces a higher standard of living. The correlations are more modest between the other two education variables and per capita income but still statistically significant – providing more support for the “knowledge economy” argument. Similar positive and significant coefficients are found between both the share of college graduates and growth in that measure and job growth – supporting the idea that a more educated workforce promotes aggregate economic growth. Unfortunately, these simple statistical tests do not indicate the presence of strong links between the education measures and per capita income growth – a result not supporting the “knowledge economy” hypothesis.

**TABLE 9**  
**SIMPLE CORRELATION MATRIX, 116 SUNBELT METROPOLITAN AREAS**

	<b>PG</b>	<b>EG</b>	<b>PCI</b>	<b>PCIG</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>SCG</b>
EG	<b>0.920</b>					
PCI	0.192	0.096				
PCIG	-0.079	0.047	0.104			
SC	<b>0.281</b>	<b>0.241</b>	<b>0.647</b>	0.108		
SCG	<b>0.284</b>	0.345	<b>0.227</b>	0.144	0.058	
YSCMR	0.180	0.102	<b>0.257</b>	0.140	<b>-0.270</b>	<b>0.277</b>

PG: population growth rate, 1990-2000

EG: employment growth rate, 1990-2000

PCI: per capita personal income, 2000

PCIG: per capita personal income growth rate, 1990-2000

SC: share of college graduates, age 25 or older, 2000

SCG: share of college graduates growth rate, age 25 or older, 1990-2000

YSCMR: young, single, college-educated net migrants, age 5 or older, 1995-2000

Note: Coefficients with statistical significance at the .05 level are in bold.

Source: Computed by authors.

### Ranking the Sunbelt MSAs

The second approach employed in the analysis was to rank the Sunbelt MSAs on the basis of each of the four economic variables and then to look at the top MSAs based on each criterion – to see who they were, whether the same MSAs appeared on multiple lists, and to look for commonality and diversity in their characteristics.

Five MSAs were highly ranked on the basis of all four metrics – Atlanta, GA, Austin-San Marcos, TX, Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC, Dallas, TX, and Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, NC. And for the three true economic variables (excluding population growth), Nashville, TN was among the top 25 on all three lists. Table 10 shows how these areas ranked in terms of the three education measures. All six areas were above average on all three education measures, with the exception of Dallas for the growth in share of college graduates – but it was in the top 10 in terms of the prevalence of college graduates and in the top three in attracting young, single college grads. To a lesser extent, this pattern prevailed for the three MSAs with the highest rankings in terms of share of college graduates – while their growth rates in share of college graduates was above average they were not as highly ranked in terms of this variable. Conversely, Raleigh-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC had the second-highest growth rate, but it was lower than the other leaders in terms of the share of college graduates.

### Glaeser and Saiz-like Regression Models

Our initial attempts at multivariate regression analysis using the Sunbelt MSA database mirrors some of the regression models estimated by Glaeser and Saiz. We estimated two alternative regression equations for each of our four measures (Tables 11a through d). In each of the four sets, equation A includes only the percent college educated in 1990 and the log of the 1990 level of the respective dependent variable. Equation B includes initial percent college educated, the log of the initial level of the dependent variable, the log of heating degree days, the log of

**TABLE 10  
SIX METROPOLITAN AREAS RANKED IN THE TOP 25  
ON ALL THREE ECONOMIC VARIABLES**

MSA	College Degree, Age 25+		Growth of Share of College Graduates, 1990 to 2000		YSCM Ratio	
	Share	Rank	Share	Rank		Rank
Atlanta, GA	32.1%	7	22.7%	29	8.4	1
Austin-San Marcos, TX	36.7	5	19.6	46	1.8	19
Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC	26.5	21	35.1	2	7.2	2
Dallas, TX	30.0	10	11.6	94	5.0	3
Nashville, TN	26.9	19	25.6	17	3.8	7
Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, NC	38.9	2	22.8	28	2.0	16
Median Sunbelt MSA	22.3		16.7		-0.6	

Source: Computed by authors based on data from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, State of the Cities Database.

average precipitation, the unemployment rate, and the shares of the labor force in (a) manufacturing, (b) trade, and (c) professional services.

Looking first at the regression results for equation A, the coefficient for the education variable was positive and statistically significant only in the equations for the two income variables. Not surprisingly the positive and significant coefficient for initial income level in Table 11c implies a strong connection between the 1990 income level and at its level in 2000. The high value of adjusted R<sup>2</sup> for the equation also emphasizes the strength of that relationship. For the income change equation (Table 11d) on the other hand, the negative and significant coefficient for initial income level implies convergence over the period with faster income growth in lower-income MSAs. It should also be noted that the value of adjusted R<sup>2</sup> shows the percent of college educated was able to explain little of the pattern of income change among Sunbelt MSAs – at least in the simpler regression model.

**TABLE 11  
REGRESSION RESULTS**

**a) Population Growth – Log (2000 Population) – Log (1990 Population)**

	(A)		(B)	
	Coefficient	Standard Error	Coefficient	Standard Error
Percent College Graduates 1990	0.1791	0.1798	<b>1.0441</b>	<b>0.3156</b>
Log(1990 Population)	<b>0.0303</b>	<b>0.0094</b>	0.0162	0.0123
Log(Average Heating Degree Days)			<b>-0.0277</b>	<b>0.0134</b>
Log(Average Precipitation)			<b>-0.0382</b>	<b>0.0158</b>
Unemployment Rate - 1990			<b>-1.6072</b>	<b>0.7303</b>
Percent Employment by Industry				
Manufacturing			-0.2827	0.2023
Trade			0.1736	0.5296
Professional Services			<b>-1.1299</b>	<b>0.3505</b>
Observations	116		113	
Adjusted R-squared	0.106		0.294	

**b) Employment Growth – Log (2000 Employment) – Log (1990 Employment)**

	(A)		(B)	
	Coefficient	Standard Error	Coefficient	Standard Error
Percent College Graduates 1990	0.3969	0.2176	<b>0.7654</b>	<b>0.3156</b>
Log(1990 Employment)	-0.0479	0.0646	<b>-0.2132</b>	<b>0.1034</b>
Log(Average Heating Degree Days)			-0.0070	0.0134
Log(Average Precipitation)			-0.0067	0.0158
Unemployment Rate - 1990			-0.7268	0.8594
Percent Employment by Industry				
Manufacturing			-0.3826	0.2355
Trade			0.2801	0.6165
Professional Services			-0.7231	0.4080
Observations	116		113	
Adjusted R-squared	0.012		0.079	



**TABLE 11 (continued)**

**c) Income Level – Log (2000 Per Capita Income)**

	(A)		(B)	
	Coefficient	Standard Error	Coefficient	Standard Error
Percent College Graduates 1990	<b>0.3339</b>	<b>0.1209</b>	0.2410	0.1814
Log(1990 Population)	<b>0.8979</b>	<b>0.0359</b>	<b>0.8211</b>	<b>0.0511</b>
Log(Average Heating Degree Days)			<b>0.0365</b>	<b>0.0077</b>
Log(Average Precipitation)			<b>0.0364</b>	<b>0.0091</b>
Unemployment Rate - 1990			-0.5296	0.4244
Percent Employment by Industry				
Manufacturing			-0.2040	0.1163
Trade			0.1615	0.3044
Professional Services			-0.1559	0.2015
Observations	116		113	
Adjusted R-squared	0.895		0.924	

**d) Income Growth – Log (2000 Per Capita Income) – Log (1990 Per Capita Income)**

	(A)		(B)	
	Coefficient	Standard Error	Coefficient	Standard Error
Percent College Graduates 1990	<b>0.3339</b>	<b>0.1209</b>	0.2410	0.1814
Log(1990 Employment)	<b>-0.1201</b>	<b>0.0359</b>	<b>-0.1789</b>	<b>0.0511</b>
Log(Average Heating Degree Days)			<b>0.0365</b>	<b>0.0077</b>
Log(Average Precipitation)			<b>0.0364</b>	<b>0.0091</b>
Unemployment Rate - 1990			-0.5296	0.4244
Percent Employment by Industry				
Manufacturing			-0.2040	0.1163
Trade			0.1615	0.3044
Professional Services			-0.1559	0.2015
Observations	116		113	
Adjusted R-squared	0.082		0.341	

Note: Coefficients with statistical significance at the .05 level are in bold.

Source: Computed by authors.

For the more complex version (Equation B), the results with respect to the percent college educated was reversed. Positive and statistically significant coefficients were found in the population growth (Table 11a) and employment growth (Table 11b) but not in the income equations. In the population change equation, no significant link was indicated between initial population size and the growth rate, but for the employment and income change equations, the negative and significant coefficient implies convergence with faster growth in the smaller MSAs.

As in the Glaeser and Saiz analysis, all the explanatory variables except the education variable were included in the equations as controls, with the major focus of the exercise to look at the impact of the stock of human capital (as measured by percent college educated) on economic growth. However, it is interesting to note in passing the differences in the results with respect to

the climate variables. Glaeser and Saiz used a national sample for their analysis and found that “warm, dry places grew much more quickly than cold, wet places.” (2003, p. 10) Since our sample included only Sunbelt MSAs, we were not sure what to expect, and the results varied among the four sets of equations. In the population change equation (Table 11a) – equivalent to the Glaeser and Saiz models – the two climate variables had negative and significant coefficients – consistent with their results. In the employment growth equation, no statistically significant links were indicated. But in the two income equations, the coefficients of both climate variables were positive and significant – implying higher levels of per capita income and faster income growth in warmer, wetter places (the Southeast) versus warmer, drier places (the Southwest).

### COMMENTARY

A review of domestic migration data reveals that while the Sunbelt has been the beneficiary of significant net domestic migration flows, these flows (with the exception of California, and to some degree Georgia and Texas) are not necessarily being accompanied by large numbers of people prepared to contribute to knowledge economy endeavors. Interestingly, the net population flows received by States such as Arizona, Florida and Nevada may indeed provide net benefits – even if they come from an elderly demographic. The challenge will be whether these States can continue to benefit as the Baby Boom generation ages.

The data relating to the migration of the subpopulation of young, single, college-educated adults at the MSA level show that some Sunbelt MSAs were just as appealing to this demographic group as the leading cities in other parts of the U.S. Based on comparisons in terms of the YSCMR (recall this is the ratio of net migration of young, single, college educated persons to the total 5+ population), Sunbelt MSAs like Atlanta (8.4 per 1,000 persons 5+), Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill, NC-SC (7.2), and Dallas (5.0) compare favorably with Denver (8.2), San Francisco (7.2), Portland (5.4), Seattle (5.3), and Washington, DC (3.6). But only 39 percent of the entire set of Sunbelt MSAs in the dataset had positive net migration of this subpopulation prized by proponents of the knowledge economy.

Another potentially negative trend for proponents of the knowledge economy was the widening of the gap among Sunbelt MSAs with respect to share of college graduates. Berry and Glaeser (2005) found a divergence in human capital levels across U.S. cities, and a similar situation occurred within the Sunbelt region in the 1990s. The variance for the proportion of college educated in the adult population across the 116 Sunbelt MSAs in the dataset increased from 27.0 in 1990 to 35.3 in 2000.

Initial analysis of the experience of the Sunbelt with respect to the link between a college-educated workforce and economic growth/success produced mixed results. Simple correlation statistics showed a strong relationship between the share of college graduates and per capita personal income, and a modest link with employment growth, but no statistically significant correlation with income growth. Similar mixed signals were found in examination of the rankings – all but two of the top MSAs in terms of income had above-average shares of college graduates, but 16 of the top 25 in terms of income growth were below average in terms of share of college grads.

Except for the correlation between share of college grads and per capita income, the degree of explanatory power (measured by  $R^2$ ) of the education variable in explaining variance in the economic measures was small – two to 12 percent depending on the particular combination of variables. Of course, this kind of result is not unusual in cross-section analysis. For example, the  $R^2$  for the regression model of share of population growth as a function of share of college graduates in the Glaeser and Saiz analysis was .11. Unfortunately, this level of explanatory power is not particularly encouraging to policy makers searching for the right economic development strategy.

The results of our initial regression analysis also provided only minimal support for the link between percent college educated and economic growth. Of the three “true” economic variables included in the analysis, the education variable was indicated to have a positive and significant impact only in the case of employment growth (for the more complex model including a set of control variables), and the equation was only able to explain about eight percent of the variance in employment growth across the sample of Sunbelt MSAs.

In summary, the results of this initial exploratory analysis show some support for proponents of the knowledge economy. At the same time, they fail to show that expanding the college-educated workforce is the only ingredient necessary to insure economic success as some boosters of the knowledge economy seem to believe.

Clearly the Sunbelt is a diverse set of states and MSAs facing the same challenges as do many areas in the rest of the nation. Considerably more work will need to be done to understand these challenges and to fully understand what determines where knowledge economy workers will choose to locate and how much they will add to regional economies.

## ENDNOTES

The research on which this paper is based is part of a broader research agenda, known as the Productivity and Prosperity Project (for brevity often referred to by the acronym “P3”), supported by Arizona State University through its Office of the University Economist. Its mission is to study the determinants of regional growth and prosperity with a focus on innovation and the knowledge economy. Those interested in learning more about the project can look at its website: [www.asu.edu/P3](http://www.asu.edu/P3). The authors wish to thank Ms. Burcu Eke for the many hours that she spent tabulating the IPUMS and other data used in the analysis and performing the statistical tests whose results are presented in the paper.

1. The geographic area defined as the Sunbelt for this study is based on U. S. Census Bureau definition. It is composed of 13 states (North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona) plus Clark County, NV (Las Vegas), and a nine-county region of Southern California (Imperial, Kern, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Ventura). Some parts of the analysis are based on state-level data. In those cases the Sunbelt region is defined to include the 13 states plus all of the states of California and Nevada.
2. The 116 MSAs in the dataset include two multi-state MSAs for which some portion of the area lies outside the formal Census definition of the Sunbelt region. In some cases, HUD’s State of the Cities database included two or more PMSAs that are part of a single CMSA as separate observations. The authors have chosen not to include a complete list of the 116 MSAs but would be happy to provide one on request. All of the data in the dataset were compiled from the HUD database, with the exception of the per capita personal income data compiled from the BEA REIS CD and the climate measures from the U.S. Census Bureau’s *City-County Databook*.
3. Data for this variable was not available in the Census report for seven MSAs in the dataset.
4. This situation is partly the result of the positive relationship between city size and living costs. Unfortunately, it was not possible to adjust the nominal income figures because cost of living indexes for all the MSAs in the dataset were not readily available.

## REFERENCES

- C. R. Berry and E. L. Glaeser, "The Divergence of Human Capital Levels Across Cities," *HIER Discussion Paper No. 2091*, Harvard University, September 2005.
- R. C. DeVol, K. Klowden, J. Collins, and L. Wallace, *Arkansas' Position in the Knowledge-based Economy*, Milken Institute, September 2004.
- R. S. Franklin, "Domestic Migration across Regions, Divisions, and States," *Census 2000 Special Report*, U. S. Census Bureau, August 2003.
- R. S. Franklin, "Migration of the Young, Single, and College Educated: 1995 to 2000," *Census 2000 Special Report*, U. S. Census Bureau, November 2003.
- J. L. Gallup, J. D. Sachs, and A. D. Mellinger, "Geography and Economic Development," *International Regional Science Review*, 22 (1999), pp. 179-232.
- E. L. Glaeser, J. Kolko, and A. Saiz, "Consumer City," *Journal of Economic Geography*, 1 (2001), pp. 27-50.
- E. L. Glaeser and A. Saiz, "The Rise of the Skilled City," *HIER Discussion Paper No. 2025*, Harvard University, December 2003.
- E. L. Glaeser and J. Shapiro, "Is there a New Urbanism? The Growth of U.S. Cities in the 1990s," *HIER Discussion Paper No. 1925*, Harvard University, June 2001.
- W. He and J. R. Schachter, "Internal Migration of the Older Population: 1995 to 2000," *Census 2000 Special Report*, U. S. Census Bureau, August 2003.
- R. E. Lang and K. M. Rengert, "The Hot and Cold Sunbelts: Comparing State Growth Rates, 1950-2000," *Fannie Mae Foundation Census Note 02*, April 2001
- E. Moretti, "Estimating the Social Return to Higher Education: Evidence from Longitudinal and Repeated Cross-Section Data," *Journal of Econometrics*, 121 (2004), pp. 175-212.
- "Of gambling, grannies and good sense: The baby-boomers retire," *The Economist*, July 22, 2006.
- M. J. Perry, "Domestic Net Migration in the United States: 2000-2004," *Current Population Report P25-1135*, U.S. Census Bureau, April 2006.
- M. J. Perry, "State to State Migration Flows: 1995 to 2000," *Census 2000 Special Report*, U. S. Census Bureau, August 2003.
- N. T. Quan and J. H. Beck, "Public Education Expenditures and State Economic Growth: Northeast and Sunbelt Regions," *Southern Economic Journal*, 54 (October 1987), pp. 361-376.

J. R. Schachter, "Migration by Race and Hispanic Origin: 1995 to 2000," *Census 2000 Special Report*, U. S. Census Bureau, October 2003.

R. Weissbourd and C. Berry, *Changing Dynamics of Urban America*, CEOs for Cities, March 2004.

## THE PRODUCTIVITY AND PROSPERITY PROJECT

The Productivity and Prosperity Project: An Analysis of Economic Competitiveness (P3) is an ongoing initiative begun in 2005, sponsored by Arizona State University president Michael M. Crow. P3 analyses incorporate literature reviews, existing empirical evidence, and economic and econometric analyses.

Enhancing productivity is the primary means of attaining economic prosperity. Productive individuals and businesses are the most competitive and prosperous. Competitive regions attract and retain these productive workers and businesses, resulting in strong economic growth and high standards of living. An overarching objective of P3's work is to examine competitiveness from the perspective of an individual, a business, a region, and a country.

## THE CENTER FOR COMPETITIVENESS AND PROSPERITY RESEARCH

The Center for Competitiveness and Prosperity Research is a research unit of the L. William Seidman Research Institute in the W. P. Carey School of Business at Arizona State University. The Center administers the Productivity and Prosperity Project: An Analysis of Economic Competitiveness (P3), and the Office of the University Economist. These ongoing initiatives began in 2005 and are sponsored by university president Michael M. Crow.

Specializing in applied economic and demographic research with a geographic emphasis on Arizona and the metropolitan Phoenix area, the Center also conducts research projects under sponsorship of private businesses, nonprofit organizations, government entities, and other ASU units.



CENTER FOR COMPETITIVENESS AND PROSPERITY RESEARCH  
L. WILLIAM SEIDMAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
W. P. CAREY SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AT ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

PO Box 874011 | Tempe, AZ 85287-4011 | P (480) 965-3961 | F (480) 965-5458 | [wpcarey.asu.edu/seid](http://wpcarey.asu.edu/seid)