

GENDER DISPARITY IN MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS
OF MIGRANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University-San Marcos
In Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements

For the Degree
Master of ARTS

By

Zohra Khaki, B.A.

San Marcos, Texas
December, 2003

COPYRIGHT ©

By Zohra Khaki

2003

For my Family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to begin by thanking my parents for their constant support and encouragement throughout my academic career. Thanks to my brother Hakim for being the rock in every storm and for encouraging me to be the best that I can be. My deep appreciation to Massud for helping me establish myself at SWT and being a positive force in my life. We did it! Thanks also to Nahid, Karima, Nasser, Karim and Shogufa for your continuous support and your loving care. I love you guys!

I am very thankful for all three members of my thesis committee. My deep appreciation to Dr. Majumdar for sharing his expertise on this project. Thanks to Dr. Frost for being a great mentor and teaching one of the best classes at SWT. My appreciation to Dr. Caldwell for her enjoyable and enriching statistics and research classes. Thanks to Dr. Day for not only being a great mentor and chair but also a friend. Finally, thanks to Dr. Anderson for guiding me throughout my graduate degree with great advice.

This manuscript was submitted on September 11th, 2003.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTERS	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	3
Push and Pull Factors	
Economic Pull Factors	
Non-Economic Pull Factors	
Gender Disparity in Economic Motivations in Migration	
Diversity of People in an Area as a Pull Factor	
Metropolitan and Non-Metropolitan Migration as a Measure of Diversity	
Gender Disparity in Diversity as Motivations for Migration	
III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS	17
IV. DATA AND METHODOLOGY	19
Data	
Sample	
Variables	
Methods	
V. FINDINGS	33
Sample Description	
Bivariate Analysis	
Multivariate Analysis	
VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY	55

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES	Page
1 Frequency of Dependent and Independent Variables	37
2 Chi-Square Tests	41
3 Economic Reasons (Reduced and Full Models)	46
4 Non-Economic Reasons (Reduced and Full Models)	49

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Over the last few decades, a major social change has taken place regarding gender in the United States. The female labor force participation rates have doubled between 1950 and 1990 (Wyly, 1999). Even though this female movement into the labor force was partly motivated by a decline of household and family earnings (Wyly, 1999), it introduced women to the labor market. By entering the work force, women experienced two main advantages: knowledge about the system of the labor force and their own income. Having their own income meant more financial independence for females and allowed women to have more control over their lives and have more opportunities regarding their lifestyle. Even though “the feminization of the workforce has by no means erased barriers to opportunity” (Wyly, 1999), one can say that women have more freedom and independence than ever before.

Being economically independent allows women to be in charge of their lives to a higher degree. Today, women have more opportunities related to their education, their occupation and their geographic location. The increased financial independence and decreasing social constraints give women more freedom

regarding their lifestyles, including their place of residence. Although financial and social equality among men and women have increased, not much is known about the gender disparity in the migration decision-making process. It is therefore legitimate to ask the question whether female and male migrants are attracted by the same motivational factors similarly. This study will focus on gender disparity in two motivational factors: a) economic factors and b) diversity of the people at the area of destination.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In the last century substantial research has been conducted in the field of internal migration in the United States. Relationships between migration and socioeconomic factors, such as race, age and education have been investigated in depth (Krieg, 1997; Manson and Groop, 1999; Cushing, 1999; Kritz and Gurak, 2000; Jacobsen and Levin, 2000; Kritz and Gurak, 2001). However, there are two important aspects on which little attention has been paid by social scientists.

First, there is a lack of research on the motivation factors of internal migration. Few studies focus on the examination of the reasons for internal migration (Long, 1988; Schachter, 2000). Whereas Long's study focuses on age disparity in interstate and intercounty migration, Schachter's report examines the motivational factors related to the type of move including intercounty and intra-county. He also investigates the relationships between motivational factors and socioeconomic factors such as education, employment status, household income and poverty status. However, these studies did not focus on the gender disparity in motivational factors.

Gender disparity in migration decision-making has not been given adequate attention. Most studies about internal migration use samples from a combined male and female population (Long, 1988; Elliot, 1997; Manson and Groop, 1999). Studies on internal migration chose the male population as their subjects of investigation (Kritz and Gurak, 2000; Kritz and Gurak, 2001). However, there is little literature that offers comparative studies of women and men in their moving patterns (Krieg, 1997; Jacobsen and Levin, 2000).

Therefore, this study will examine the gender disparity in two motivational factors, which are economic factors and diversity of the people at the area of destination in internal migration in the United States. More specifically, the aim of this research is to determine whether the two mentioned factors have a similar impact on men and women in their migration decision-making process.

Push and Pull Factors

According to Ravenstein (1885), migration is a social process of populations, which move in currents according to the political and economic circumstances. In his Laws of Migration, he identifies several factors that affect the migration decision-making process. These factors, referred to as "push" and "pull" factors by social scientists, include existing laws, tax rates, climate and social environment. "Push" and "pull" factors can be found both in the area of origin and the area of destination and are defined by each person according to his/her preferences. Furthermore, according to Ravenstein (1885) "pull" factors

are defined as positive factors that cause in-migration; “push” factors are reasons for people to leave an area. Even though “push” and “pull” factors can be of economic, social, political or environmental nature, in most cases the economic factors are the primary motivators for people to migrate.

Ravenstein (1885) states that both short- and long-distance migration are primarily motivated by economic reasons and are directed toward “the great centers of commerce and industry, which absorb the migrants.” Based on Ravenstein’s empirical results, it is the combination of push and pull factors of both places of origin and destination that determines whether people decide to migrate.

Lee (1966) summarizes Ravenstein's theory of migration into four components that affect migration: factors of the area of origin, factors of the area of destination, intervening obstacles and personal factors. He presents a model that visualizes the first three components. According to Lee, the factors of origin and destination can be plus, minus or 0. Plus factors of an area are factors that are perceived as positive by an individual. They equal Ravenstein’s “pull” factors and tend to attract people towards an area. Second, minus factors are equivalent to Ravenstein’s “push” factors. These include all factors of an area that are perceived as negative and unattractive. Last, according to Lee (1966), zero factors are characteristics of an area that do not weigh into the migration decision-making process. Zero factors include all factors to which an individual is

indifferent. According to his/her preferences, each person defines which factor of the area of origin and the area of destination is a plus, a minus or a zero factor. This research focuses on the reasons of in-migration, which could be considered as plus factors at the area of destination. More specifically, this study aims to examine the effect of economic motivation factors and diversity of the people at the area of destination as pull or plus factors.

Furthermore, Lee (1966) also introduces an expected relationship between the volume of migration and diversity. Based on Lee, the volume of migration varies by two forms of diversity: diversity of areas in a given territory and diversity of people in an area. The first component of diversity refers to diversity of agriculture, climate and natural resources of an area. More specifically, he argues that the higher the level of diversity of the natural resources in a territory, the higher is the volume of migration. The second diversity component refers to "race or ethnic origin, education, income or tradition" (Lee, 1966). Lee argues that there is a positive relationship between the level of diversity of an area and the volume of migration into the same area.

Economic Pull Factors

Bartel's (1979) study deals with the role of job mobility in the migration decision-making process of men. He uses data from both the National Longitudinal Surveys (NLS) of Young and Mature Men and the Coleman-Rossi Retrospective Life History Study for his study. Whereas the NLS defines

migration as any movement to a different Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area or county, the Coleman-Rossi study defines migration as interstate migration. Bartel's findings support a relationship between job mobility and migration for two-thirds of all moves. Furthermore, he finds that 52 percent of the sample migrated because of economic reasons.

Krieg's (1997) study focuses on a comparison of occupational change and employer change and their impact on earnings after migration. Using longitudinal data from 1984, 1985 and 1986, he finds that migration is related to occupational and/or employer change. However, Krieg notes that it is not clear whether the change was voluntary or forced through a circumstance such as a loss of job. Comparing the earnings of non-migrants, intercounty migrants and interstate migrants, Krieg finds that although migrants often experience a loss in earnings immediately after the move, they become gainers in the long run. Whereas, non-migrants had an income increase of about 17 percent between 1983 and 1986, interstate migrants experienced an increase of 25 percent in their incomes. The biggest gainers in income were intercounty migrants who experienced an increase of 35 percent during the three-year period. Thus, an expectation of an earning increase could motivate migration.

Non-Economic Pull Factors

The Rustbelt to Sunbelt shift motivated social researchers to create various models in the late 1970s, which incorporated economic, social, political

and environmental factors of the migration decision-making process in order to capture the diversity of migration reasons (Long, 1988). Acknowledging the importance of social and family related motivations in the migration decision-making process, researchers gave "non-economic factors [received] increased attention" (Long, 1988).

Long's (1988) study investigates the relationship between motivational factors and internal migration using combined female and male sub-samples. According to Long, variations in migration to different areas are due to non-economic factors such as divorce, separation, climate and desired closeness to family.

Using data from Annual Housing Surveys of 1979, 1980 and 1981, Long (1988) examines both interstate and regional migration. He finds that 22.2 percent of all interstate migration is primarily motivated because of job transfers. Job searches are the primary motivator for 18.7 percent of all interstate migrants. Familial and environmental reasons are primary reasons for only 20.2 percent of all interstate migrants. Non-economic reasons in Long's (1988) study include desire to be closer to family, change of climate, separation and divorce. Even though Long's study examines both economic and non-economic reasons for migration, his findings support Ravenstein's theory of the mainly economic motivation of migration. He finds economic factors as the primary motivations

and non-economic factors are secondary motivations in the migration decision-making process.

Gender Disparity in Economic Motivations in Migration

Mincer's (1978) study focuses on gender disparity in migration decision-making processes. He examines gender disparity in migration rates and economic outcomes and pays increased attention to their marital status. For the purpose of this thesis, my primary focus will be on Mincer's findings related to gender. For all four age categories males have higher migration rates than females do. Whereas, migration rates are slightly higher for males than for females at the ages of 18 to 24, the gender gap steadily increases with age. In the last age category, the migration rates for males are almost double the rates of females.

Regarding income and employment opportunity, Mincer (1978) agrees with the previous research (Greenwood, 1975) where migration had a positive affect on the income of men. However, whereas migration seems to have a positive impact on the male population, it seems to decrease the employment and income opportunities of women. According to Mincer, women experience a decrease in both occupational status and income.

Another factor that Mincer (1978) investigates is the unemployment rate at the area of destination by gender, age and type of migration. For all three

migration distance categories including intra-county migration, intrastate migration and interstate migration, he finds that men have lower unemployment rates at destination compared to women. While, 4.3 percent of all male intra-county migrants over the age of 16 were unemployed at the area of destination, it was 5.8 percent for female migrants. This pattern is also present for intra-county and intercounty migration.

In sum, women tend to have slightly lower migration rates and incur more financial and occupational disadvantages from migration compared to men (Greenwood, 1975, Mincer, 1978). They also tend to have more problems getting back into the labor force, which is visible through both the labor force and unemployment rates (Mincer, 1978). Since females experience a financial disadvantage from migration, one might speculate that they have non-economic prospects as their main motivation.

Jacobsen and Levin (2000) offer another comparative study which examines the relationship between internal migration and the financial outcome for men and women. Similar to Mincer's findings, this study also shows that migration affects women's income in a negative way, whereas men experience an income increase. Jacobsen and Levin, however, argue that the income decrease for women is usually of a short duration. The phenomenon of an income decrease for women disappears after approximately two years after their move. Most women have no financial disadvantage after a two-year period.

Contrary to Mincer, Jacobsen and Levin determine single female migrants experience an increase in income. Jacobsen and Levin's study argues that single female migrants have an improvement in personal earnings in contrary to the other three categories such as single men, married men and married women, who experience a loss in income. Thus, this study tells us that migration is most advantageous to single females.

The existing research states that men and women have different financial and occupational outcomes from internal migration (Mincer, 1978; Jacobsen and Levin, 2000). Even though researchers agree that men have immediate financial gains, there seems to be a disagreement regarding the effect of migration on the earning and occupational opportunities for women. On the one hand, Mincer (1978) states that women have economic disadvantages, and, on the other hand, Jacobsen and Levin argue that this phenomenon is short term. They further state that women experience the biggest gains over a two-year period after the move.

The fact that men have immediate financial advantages after the move indicates a strong economic motivation for the move. It implies that men migrate mainly because of economic reasons. On the other hand, research states that the majority of women experience a short-term financial disadvantage. This fact implies that women may not migrate primarily because of economic reasons, but probably due to different reasons. It is therefore legitimate to conclude that there is a gender disparity regarding their motivations. It is important to distinguish

between the perceived "pull" factors and the actual "pull" factors. The priors are expected outcomes, which shape the motivation for migration and the latter are the actual outcomes of the migration. This study will focus on the subjectively perceived "pull" factors and the manner it varies for men and women.

Diversity of the People in an Area as a Pull Factor

As stated earlier in the study, Lee (1966) argues that diversity of people affects the migration decision-making process. He states that the higher the social, cultural and economic diversity of an area is, the higher is the migration into those areas. By dividing societies in two groups, areas with high diversity and areas with low diversity, it is expected that lower migration rates would prevail in areas where people are very alike and higher migration rates in areas where people are rather diverse (Lee, 1966). Even though Lee does not explicitly give reasons for this expected relationship, he states that areas with high diversity of people "implies the existence of groups that are specially fitted for given pursuits" (Lee, 1966). His basic argument is that diverse societies have a social structure that is more appealing to migrants than non-diverse societies do.

The division of societies by Lee (1966) is based on the level of skill specialization of an area. According to Lee, "[im]igrant groups specialize in particular occupations and become scattered throughout the country wherever the need for such work is found" (Lee, 1966). This statement consists of two important points. First, migrants have more occupationally specialized skills than

non-migrants. Because areas with high diversity of people have diverse job opportunities, migrants are likely to be attracted to these areas. Secondly, migrants are more willing to move to a place that has the specific job opportunities that match their skills compared to non-migrants. It is the combination of occupational opportunity and the geographic mobility of individuals that increases the likelihood of them migrating to areas with high diversity of people.

In 1933, Durkheim introduced his concept of the division of labor in society, which refers to the amount of specialization and the functionally integrated occupations in a society. He divided societies into mechanical and organic solidarities. Mechanical solidarity has a low level of job specialization and occupations are functionally less integrated. The solidarity of this social system is based upon similarities of work, values and ideas. The second type introduced by Durkheim, organic solidarity is based upon the diversity of people's skills. In this type of society peoples' occupations are very specialized and functionally integrated. This solidarity is based upon the need of diverse skills in order to maintain the quality of life.

Lee (1966) and Durkheim (1933) both divide societies in two categories according to their level of diversity. Areas with high diversity are expected to attract more migrants than areas with low diversity. This phenomenon is due to the supply and demand of certain jobs in area with high diversity. An

occupationally specialized migrant finds jobs that fit their skills in areas with diversity of people. Metropolitan areas are usually characterized by high diversity of occupational skills and of people. Non-metropolitan areas, on the other hand, are characterized by low skill diversity. Therefore, we can expect metropolitan areas to experience higher migration rates than non-metropolitan areas.

Metropolitan and Non-Metropolitan Migration as a Measure of Diversity

The past research related to metropolitan and non-metropolitan migration has been focusing on the direction of the migration movement. The broad question is whether the metropolitan to non-metropolitan migration stream is larger in size or whether more people migrate from non-metropolitan to-metropolitan areas (Frey, 1988; Frey, 1992). The metropolitan to non-metropolitan movement in the 1950's (Kim, 1983) was followed by a non-metropolitan to metropolitan movement in the 1970's and 1980's (Kim, 1983; Frey, 1988). In 1992, Frey stated that the new migration trend is from urban and suburban areas to rural areas.

Gender Disparity in Diversity as Motivations for Migration

Even though there has been a large amount of research conducted related to metropolitan and non-metropolitan migration, little is known about gender disparity in diversity of an area as a motivation of migration. As mentioned in the last section, Lee and Durkheim predicted a higher migration rate toward areas with high diversity. Lee's explanation for this prediction was the

bigger variety of jobs offered in highly diverse area that attracts especially occupationally more specialized workers such as migrants. Following this logic, we expect female migrants to have a larger non-metropolitan to metropolitan migration stream than male migrants. Our expectation is based on the employment opportunities in metropolitan areas.

Over one third of the jobs in the United States are service jobs, which include hotels and lodging, professional services, personal services, business services, automotive repair, amusement and recreation, health and legal services. (Du, Mergenhagen, Lee 1995). Service sector firms “rapidly expanded in sales, employment and number of establishments.” in the early 1990’s (Du, Mergenhagen, Lee 1995). Especially metropolitan areas have experienced a large growth of jobs in the service sector. It is a well-know fact that hospitals, as one service sector, are concentrated in metropolitan areas and are rather underrepresented in non-metropolitan areas (Johnson, Beale 1995). Molnar, Duffy, Claxton and Bailey (2001) argue that food banks and other feeding programs, which also belong to the service sector, have a higher density in urban areas than in rural areas.

Another characteristic of the service sector is its predominantly female occupation. Wyly (1999) explains the concept of gender disparity in jobs as “occupational sex segregation.” This concept refers to the segregation of females and males into certain types of jobs. While males have rather professional jobs,

females tend to have low-skilled service jobs. According to Wyly (1999), most service jobs are half to three-quarters female. Barco's (2000) study focuses on the gender pay gap and gives the "occupational sex segregation" as one of the main reasons for it. She argues that the main reason why women earn 74 cents on the dollar earned by men "is not discrimination against individual women but rather discrimination against women's occupations (Barko, 2000)." Over 55 percent of all employed women have "women jobs" such as teachers and child-care (Barko, 2000). In sum, females have predominantly service jobs and those jobs are offered more in metropolitan areas than in non-metropolitan areas. Thus the chances of women migrating to metropolitan areas are higher than for males.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As summarized in the previous paragraphs, motivational factors of internal migration have become an important topic of migration studies in the last couple of decades. However, social scientists have not extensively investigated gender disparity in motivational factors. The broad question is whether females and males vary regarding their motivational factors. More specifically, does gender disparity exist regarding economic factors and diversity of people in the area of destination as motivational factors? This study aims to examine these questions and determines following hypothesis:

Economic Motivation Factors

Null Hypothesis: Economic motivation factors do not affect the chances of migration differently for males and females.

Research: *Economic motivation factors do affect the chances of migration differently for males and females.*

Diversity of People in the Area of Destination

Null Hypothesis: Diversity of the people of the area of destination has a similar impact on the chances of migration for males and females.

Research: *Diversity of the people of the area of destination has a different impact on the chances of migration for males and females.*

CHAPTER IV

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Data

This study will use secondary data from the Current Population Survey (CPS) March Supplement of 2002. The CPS March Supplement is an annual survey that is conducted by the U. S. Census Bureau since over 50 years. It covers approximately 62,500 households and interviews all members of the selected households who are 15 years of age or older. While over 90 percent of all interviews are conducted by phone, the rest are conducted through home visits of the sample units. In order for the Census population projection to match the estimates of the population by race, age, sex, ethnicity and state, the CPS March Supplement has added a weight to the responses.

The CPS March Supplement 2002 dataset is especially appropriate for this study because it provides information on both the reasons for moving and the diversity of the people at the area of destination regarding the metropolitan status. Furthermore, it also contains data on many important socio-demographic characteristics such as age, race, marital status and occupation.

Overall, the Census Bureau offers three kinds of data sets of the CPS March Supplement 2002: family variable, person variable and household variable. Since this study focuses on individuals, person variables will be used to investigate the research questions. The sample size of the CPS March Supplement 2002 covered by the Census Bureau is 217,219 people.

Sample

Two aspects determine the sample size for this research study. The first selection criterion is the age of the respondents. For the purpose of this study, we will only consider respondents between the ages of 20 through 29. This selection is based upon Schachter's (2001) report saying that people in this age category have the highest moving rates. Compared to the other age categories, the moving rates of the individuals in this age category were more than twice as much. Approximately "one third of 20- to 29 year-olds moved in the previous year."

Second, only respondents who have made a move within the United States are being considered in this study. Since this research focuses on internal migration, international migration to the United States within the last year is not being considered. Although motivational factors of immigrants may overlap with those of internal migrants, migration to a foreign country consists of a complex decision-making process that is different from internal migration. These two selection criteria reduce the sample size to 24,969.

Variables

Eight variables have been selected to examine the hypothesis of this study. Two of the eight variables have been identified as the dependent variables: 1) Reason for moving and 2) Diversity of the People at the Area of Destination. The independent variable of this study is 3) Sex. The remaining five variables are socio-demographic control variables such as 4) Age, 5) Marital status, 6) Education, 7) Race/Ethnicity and 8) Occupation.

Dependent Variables

The two dependent variables of this research are diversity of the people at the area of destination and reason for moving. This study will investigate the impact of gender on each of the dependent variables: Reason for moving and Diversity of the People at the Area of Destination. The following section elaborates the dependent variables.

1) Reason for moving

The CPS March Supplement 2002 has one question that captures the reason for the migration: “What was your main reason for moving?” The responses of the people interviewed by the CPS staff are categorized into seventeen response categories. The answer categories include the following subjects: not in universe, change in marital status, to establish own household, other family related reasons, new job or job transfer, to look for work or lost job, to be closer to work/ easier commute, retired, other job related reason, wanted

own home- not rent, wanted new and better house/apartment, wanted better neighborhood/less crime, wanted cheaper housing, other housing reasons, to attend or leave college, change of climate, health reasons and other reasons.

For the purpose of this study the seventeen categories have been combined to main motivation for migration categories: Economic factors, Non-economic factors and Non-Movers. Economic factors capture the motivation to migrate due to financial or occupational reasons. The categories that define economic factors are: new job or job transfer, to look for work or lost job, to be closer to work/easier commute and other job related reasons. Non-economic factors include reasons that are not motivated by employment or financial prospects. They are: not in universe, change in marital status, to establish own household, other family related reasons, retired, wanted own home-not rent, wanted new or better house/apartment, wanted better neighborhood/less crime, wanted cheaper housing, other housing reason, to attend or leave college, change of climate, health reasons and other reasons. The last category includes individuals who did not migrate in the previous year.

2) Diversity of the People at the Area of Destination

The diversity variable was a recoded variable created by the Census Bureau. The following nine categories were created for this variable: non-mover, MSA to MSA, MSA to non-MSA, non-MSA to MSA, non-MSA to non-MSA, abroad to MSA, abroad to non-MSA, not in universe, and not identified. The term

MSA is the abbreviation for Metropolitan Statistical Area and is defined by the U.S. Census Bureau as a large population nucleus and with adjacent communities that have a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus. The MSA runs along county lines and consists of at least one county (Census Bureau, 2003). The term non-MSA refers to all other places that don't meet the criteria of an MSA.

For the purpose of this study, this variable has been recoded. The new categories created for this research are non-mover, move to MSA and move to non-MSA. The only category that has been kept like in the CPS is Non-mover. Since this study examines the motivational factors that affect the migration decision making process the focus is on the pull factors of the area of destination. It is therefore, reasonable to focus on factors affecting in-migration to an area. This means that this research focuses on the type of area people move to and does not consider the type of the area of origin. This is why the two categories MSA to MSA and non-MSA to MSA are combined into one category called "Move to MSA". Similarly, "Move to non-MSA" combines the two categories, indicating a move into a non-MSA including MSA to non-MSA and non-MSA to non-MSA. All respondents who checked one of the four categories: abroad to MSA, abroad to Non-MSA, not in universe or not identified in the CPS March Supplement 2002 have been taken out of the sample. Since this study focuses on internal migration, information on international migration will not be considered.

Independent and Control Variables

In addition to the two dependent variables, one independent socio-demographic variable and five control variables have been selected for this study. They include: 3) Sex, 4) Age, 5) Marital status, 6) Education, 7) Race/Ethnicity and 8) Occupation. Sex is treated as the focus variable of this study and is included in both the bivariate and the multivariate analysis. The remaining five variables are control variables that will be added in the multivariate analysis. The multivariate analysis will test the existence of the relationship between the focus variable and the dependent variables, while controlling for the five control variables. The following section is a description of each variable from the CPS March Supplement 2002, which will be used in this study.

3) Sex

Gender is a dichotomous variable with two categories: male and female.

4) Age

The question *"How old are you at the end of the survey week?"* is another demographic question of the CPS March Supplement 2002. Age is a continuous variable ranging from 20 through 29. This range was chosen because people in this age category have the highest migration rates compared to all other age categories (Schachter, 2001). About a third of the people in this age category move each year within the United States.

5) Marital Status

The variable marital status has been added as a control variable because past research shows that the marital status of an individual affects his/her chances of migration (Mincer, 1978; Jacobsen & Levin, 2000). The CPS has measured marital status by asking, *“Are you now married, widowed, divorced, separated or never married?”* When people answered married a follow-up question was asked about whether the spouse is absent or present and about the armed force status of the spouse. The categories of the CPS March Supplement 2002 will be recoded to two main categories: currently married and currently single. All respondents who said that they are either married, or separated will be treated as currently married. The rest including widowed, divorced and never married will be treated as currently single. In congruence with the past research, it is expected that single individuals are more likely to migrate than married people.

6) Educational Attainment

Educational attainment is one of the most basic control variables in migration decision-making research (Mincer, 1978; Bartel, 1979; Krieg, 1997; Solberg, 1999; Jacobsen & Levin, 2000). The educational attainment of the CPS 2002 sample was determined by asking, *“What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?”* The responses were categorized into seventeen different groups. These categories include: children, less than first grade through eleventh grade, twelfth grade- no diploma, high

school graduate- high school diploma, some college but no degree, associate's degree-occupation/vocation, associate's degree- academic program, Bachelor's degree (BA, BS, AB), Master's degree (MA, MS, MENG, MED, MSW, MBA), professional school degree (MD, DDS, DVM) and doctorate degree (PhD, EDD).

This study will use four different categories and will therefore create combinations of the preexisting CPS March Supplement 2002 categories. The four categories of this research will be: less than High School- no diploma, High school diploma, some college-no degree and college degree or more. The first category includes all respondents who have less than first grade through twelfth grade-no diploma. The second category represents those who have a high school diploma. This category will be taken from the CPS 2002 without any further changes. People with some college but no college degree belong to the third category. This group is also taken from the CPS 2002 without further changes. College degree or more is the last educational category. It includes all people who have an associate's degree, a bachelor's degree, a master's degree, a professional degree or a doctorate degree. According to the past research education increases the chances of migration (Bartel, 1979). It is therefore expected that people with higher educational attainment are more likely to migrate than people with little education.

7) Race/Ethnicity

Previous research (Greenwood, 1975) has shown that race affects the migration chances of people. Therefore, the race variable is one of the five control variables of this study. The CPS March Supplement 2002 makes a distinction between race and ethnicity/descent. The information on race and ethnicity will be combined to form a race/ethnicity variable for this study. The question “*What is your race?*” was asked in order to capture the race of the respondent. A total of four response categories are supposed to reflect the race of the sample including: White, Black, American Indian and Aleut or Eskimo and Asian or Pacific Islander. These four racial categories will be combined to three categories for this study. These are White, Black and Other.

The question “What is your origin or descent?” tries to capture the origin or ethnicity of the respondents. The CPS differentiated between ten different responses including Mexican-American, Chicano, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, Other Spanish, All other, Don’t know and not applicable. For the purpose of this research, ethnicity will be categorized as: Hispanic, non-Hispanic and missing. The Hispanic category will include: Mexican-American, Chicano, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, Other Spanish. All people who answered “all other” will belong to the non-Hispanic recode category. Information on respondents who answered either don’t know or not applicable will be treated as missing.

The newly created race/ethnicity variable will consist of four categories: White, Black, Hispanic and Other. White will include all people who responded to be white and non-Hispanic. Black will represent those respondents who are black and non-Hispanic. All people who responded that they are Hispanic will be included in the Hispanic category, regardless of their race. This means that all people who responded to be black, white and other as their race and Hispanic as their ethnicity will be treated as Hispanics. The last category of this variable is other, which will include all respondents who are non-white, non-black and non-Hispanic. The other racial category will represent non-Hispanic Indian-Americans, Aleuts, Eskimos, Asians and Pacific Islander. Due to the low number of cases in minority population such as non-Hispanic Asians, Native Americans, Aleut, Eskimos, and Pacific Islander, they are being combined to form the “Other” race/ethnicity category. Past research (Frey, 1985) showed that white people are the most likely to migrate compared to any other racial and ethnic group. It is therefore expected that whites have the highest likelihood of migration than blacks, Hispanics or other racial and ethnic groups.

8) Occupation

According to the past research (Kim, 1983), occupation affects the chances of individuals to migrate. This is why the occupation variable has been selected as one of the five control variables of this study. The CPS March Supplement 2002 interviewers asked all members of the selected households “What was/is your major occupation?” All responses were combined into sixteen

categories. These categories included the following occupations: children, executive/ administrative/ managerial occupations, professional specialty occupations, technicians/ related support occupations, sales occupations, administrative support occupations (including clerical service occupations), private household occupations, protective service occupations, service occupations (excluding household and protective), Farming/ Forestry/ Fishing occupations, precision production/ craft/ repair occupations, machine operators/ assemblers/ inspectors, transportation/ material moving occupations, handlers/ equipment cleaners/ helpers/ labors, Armed Forces- currently civilian and never worked.

For this research the occupations will be combined into four main occupational categories. In his study of the gender pay gap, Solberg (1999) used six categories including crafts, operatives, sales/management, professional/technological, service and clerical. Wyly (1999) categorized occupation into merely three groups: Manufacturing, Administrative Support and Service. This study will combine the two models and will use following categories for its research: professional/ technological occupations, service occupations, manufacturing and other. The professional/ technician category will include following CPS March Supplement categories: executive/ administrative/ managerial occupations, professional specialty occupations and technicians/ related support occupations. The second category “service” will consist of all the service occupations: sales occupations, administrative support occupations

(including clerical service occupations), protective service occupations and service occupations (excluding household and protective). Manufacturing is the third category of this study and will consist of: precision production/ craft/ repair occupations. All other occupations such as children, private household occupations, farming/ forestry/ fishing occupations, machine operators/ assemblers/ inspectors, transportation/ material moving occupations, handlers/ equipment cleaners/ helpers/ labors, Armed Forces- currently civilian and never worked belong to the “Other” category.

Methods

In order to examine the two hypotheses of this research, two types of analyses will be used: bivariate and multivariate. The bivariate analysis will test the relationships between reason for moving and gender and diversity of the people at the area of destination and gender. The most appropriate method is a chi-square analysis. This is because the dependent and independent variables are nominal in their levels of measurement. The two chi-square tests will be conducted for the following pairs of variables: a) the reason for moving and gender, and b) diversity of the people at the area of destination and gender.

Depending on the significance of the χ^2 , analysis at the multivariate level is proposed. The multivariate analysis allows the researcher to test a relationship between the dependent and the independent variables while controlling for other selected socio-demographic variables that might have an affect on the

dependent variable. More specifically, if the χ^2 test between motivation for moving and gender is significant; this would imply that gender affects the reason for moving. It is also possible that the selected control variables such as race/ethnicity, marital status, education and occupation cause variation in the chances of people migrating due to economic motivations. In order to determine whether the relationship between reason for moving and gender persists upon addition of the socio-demographic variables, multivariate analysis is necessary. If the coefficients of gender still remain significant after controlling for the socio-demographic variables, one can conclude that upon leveling the common causes of disparity among individuals, the relationship between economic motivation for moving and gender still matters. Because both dependent variables motivation for moving and diversity of the people at the area of destination, are trichotomous, multinomial logistic regression is the most appropriate method of analysis (DeMaris, 1995). The multinomial model is represented in the following equation:

$$\log \left(\frac{\Pi}{1 - \Pi} \right) = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \dots + \beta_K X_K$$

From this model, the log odds of the occurrence of the event, migration because of economic motivation and because of the diversity of the people at the area of destination can be determined for various settings of the independent variables. In a multinomial logistic regression, the probability of the occurrence of the event of interest is determined in comparison to that of a reference group. If we consider the motivation for migration, there are three categories: economic

motivation, non-economic motivation and non-mover. In this case, individuals who did not migrate in the previous year are the group of reference. Two multinomial regression models will be developed for each dependent variable contingent upon results from the bivariate analyses. The first model will predict the log odds of migrating due to economic motivations as opposed to remaining stationary in the past year. The second one will predict the log odds of migration due to non-economic motivations in the previous year as opposed to non-migration. The third model is designed to predict the log odds of migrating due to the high level of diversity of the people at the area of destination as opposed to not migrating. The last model will predict the log odds of migration due to the low level of diversity of the people at the area of destination in the past year as opposed to non-migration.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

Sample Description

The following section includes a description of each variable in this study. The description will be presented by dependent, independent and control variables.

Dependent Variables

The two dependent variables are a) reason for moving, and b) diversity of the people at the area of destination.

1) Reason for Moving

Table 1 shows that about 6,939 respondents (27.8%) have moved in the last year. Approximately 1,242 (5%) moved because of economic reasons. Another 22.8 percent of all respondents of this sample moved because of non-economic or other reasons. The majority (72.2%) of the sample of this study did not move in the previous year. This percentage of non-movers is somewhat close to the approximately 82 to 84 percent of non-movers that was reported by Schachter (2001). This means that our sample has a higher mover rate than the

samples of the CPS March Supplement 1990- 2000. This is not surprising since this study focuses on the ages between 20 through 29, which are the ages at which migration rates are at their peak.

2) Diversity of the People at the Area of Destination

About 18,030 (72.7%) did not move in the previous year. Approximately 5,419 (21.7%) moved to an MSA in the previous year and only 1,520 (6.1%) of the sample moved to a non-Metropolitan Statistical Area. This indicates that the larger portion of migrants moves to metropolitan areas and only small numbers move to non-metropolitan areas.

Independent and Control Variables

3) Sex

The sample (n=24,969) was almost equally divided by gender. About 46.9 percent of the respondents were males and 53.1 percent were females.

4) Age

The age composition of the sample for this study is evenly spread. More specifically, each one of the ten age categories has about 10 percent of the total number of respondents. The average age of this sample is 24.5 years.

5) Marital Status

About 9,300 (37.2%) of all respondents of this sample said that they are currently married. The majority of 15,669 responded as being currently single at the time of the interview. This means that more than half of the people (62.8%) of this sample were single at the time of the interview. This result is not very surprising because this sample consists of young people ranging from 20 through 29 years.

6) Educational Attainment

About a third of all respondents of this sample (31.2%) have twelve years of school attainment and graduated from high school. Another 28.7 percent attended some college. About 25.2 percent of the respondents in this sample have either a college degree or more. The smallest group regarding educational attainment is those with less than twelve years of educational attainment. About 3,714 respondents (14.9%) belong to this category.

7) Race/ Ethnic Origin

The largest group of the sample for this study is white, non-Hispanic people. With 17,041 (68.2%) respondents, whites constitute the majority of this sample. The second largest racial and ethnic group is Hispanics that consists of 3,416 (13.7%) respondents. This is followed by non-Hispanics Blacks. This group has 2,806 (11.2%) respondents. Only 1,706 (6.8%) respondents belong to the

other category, which represents non-Hispanic Indian-Americans, Aleuts, Eskimos, Asians, and Pacific Islanders.

8) Occupation

Individuals in the service sector make up the largest proportion of the occupational categories: 9,640 (38.6%). The second largest group consists of those who work in any profession other than, service, professional/technical or manufacturing. Approximately 7,883 respondents (31.6%) belong to this occupational group. Professionals and technical workers represent the third largest occupational category. Their group constitutes 5,237 (21.0%) people. The smallest occupational group consists of people in the manufacturing occupations. Only 2,209 (8.8%) respondents belong to this category.

Table 1: Frequency of Dependent and Independent Variables

Variable	Percentage	Mean/Average	Standard Deviation
Reason for Moving			
<i>Economic Reason</i>	5.0		
<i>Other Reason</i>	22.8		
<i>Non-mover</i>	72.2		
Diversity of the People at the Area of			
Destination	21.7		
<i>Move To MSA (more diverse)</i>	6.1		
<i>Move to Non-MSA (less diverse)</i>	72.2		
<i>Non-mover</i>			
Sex			
<i>Male</i>	46.9		
<i>Female</i>	53.1		
Age		24.5	2.918
Marital Status			
<i>Currently Married</i>	37.2		
<i>Currently Single</i>	62.8		
Education Attainment			
<i>Less than High School</i>	14.9		
<i>High School Degree</i>	31.2		
<i>Some College</i>	28.7		
<i>College Degree and more</i>	25.2		
Race/Ethnicity			
<i>White</i>	68.2		
<i>Black</i>	11.2		
<i>Hispanics</i>	13.7		
<i>Other</i>	6.8		
Occupation			
<i>Professional/ Technical</i>	21.0		
<i>Service</i>	38.6		
<i>Manufacturing</i>	8.8		
<i>Other</i>	31.6		

N= 24,969

Source. Current Population Survey, US Census Bureau, 2002.

Bivariate Analysis

The first part of the data analysis of this study is a set of chi-square tests. In order to examine whether there is a relationship between the two dependent variables and gender chi-square tests are performed on the reason for moving and gender, and the diversity of the people at the area of destination and gender.

Reason for moving

Table 2 shows that the chi-square test for the reason for moving and gender is highly significant with $\chi^2 = 17.376$ and a p-value of .000. This result supports the research hypothesis and rejects the null-hypothesis of the reason for move. This implies that there is a significant relationship between the reason for moving and gender. Whereas, 5.5 percent of all males moved because of economic reasons, about 4.5 percent of all female respondents move for the same reason. Similar to previous research (Mincer, 1978), men tend to migrate more because of economic reasons. Men are usually motivated to migrate because of financial and occupational opportunities. Women on the other hand tend to migrate because of non-economic reasons. Many married or tied women migrate along with their partners and experience quite frequently economic disadvantages (Mincer, 1978). Non-economic reasons, which include motivations such as housing, climate and family, may be considered as female oriented. This could explain the greater percentage of women (23.4%) migrating because of non-economic reasons compared to males (22.1%). The amount of non-movers of this sample is 72.4 percent of all men and 72.0 percent of all women of this

sample. Even though the actual number of female non-movers is higher than that of the male non-movers, their percentage is lower compared to the male percentage. This is due to the larger amount of female respondents in this sample.

The result of the chi-square analysis indicates the presence of an existing relationship between the reason of moving and gender. More specifically, it shows that gender does affect the reason for the moving of internal migrants in the US between the ages of 20 through 29. At this point it is imperative to test whether gender still affects the reason for moving significantly after accounting for socio-demographic factors like race, marital status or educational attainment have an indirect impact of the reason for move. In order to answer this question, the study will run a multi-nominal logistic regression analysis was conducted with reason for moving as the dependent variable and gender, marital status, educational attainment, race/ethnicity and occupation as the independent variables.

Diversity of the People at the Area of Destination

The chi-square analysis of the diversity of the people at the area of destination and gender is non-significant (p-value= .781). With $\chi^2 = .496$ and $df=2$, the result of this cross-tabulation is non-significant. This means that there is no significant relationship between gender and diversity of the people at the area of destination. More precisely, there is no gender disparity regarding the diversity of

the people at the area of destination of internal migrants who are between the ages of 20 through 29. A closer look at Table 2 shows that the percentages of female and male migrants to Metropolitan Statistical Areas and non-Metropolitan Statistical Areas are almost equal. About 22 percent of all male and female appear to migrate to Metropolitan Statistical Areas. Similarly, about 6 percent of all male and female seem to migrate to non-Metropolitan Statistical Areas. The similarities in the percentages of female and male migrants to areas of varying diversity, results in the non-significance of the chi-square analysis.

Even though the result of this chi-square analysis is non-significant, the distribution of the respondents is very interesting. As discussed earlier, the majority of the sample was non-movers. However, the remaining respondents of the sample (27.8%) did move in the previous year. More specifically, about 21.7 percent moved to a Metropolitan Statistical Area and only 6.1 percent moved to a non-Metropolitan Statistical Area. This means that the proportion of migrants to Metropolitan Statistical Areas is about three times as large as the proportion of those migrating to non-Metropolitan Statistical Areas. This could mean a migration trend to the urban areas. However, this study does not provide enough evidence to conclude a presence of gender disparity in migration to area with different levels of diversity.

Table 2: Chi-Square Tests

	Gender		Pearson Chi-Square	
	Males (%)	Females (%)	Value	df
Reason for Moving			17.376***	2
<i>Economic Reasons</i>	5.5	4.5		
<i>Non-Economic Reasons</i>	22.1	23.4		
<i>Non-Movers</i>	72.4	72.0		
Diversity of the People at the Area			.496	2
of Destination	21.6	21.8		
<i>To MSA (more diverse)</i>	6.0	6.2		
<i>To Non-MSA (less diverse)</i>	72.4	72.0		
<i>Non-Mover</i>				

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p< .001

N= 24,969

Source: Current Population Survey, US Census Bureau, 2002.

Multivariate Analysis

As elaborated in the previous section, the chi-square of the diversity of the people at the area of destination and gender was non-significant. Therefore, there will be no further analysis of diversity. The multivariate analysis will only be conducted for the reason for moving for economic reasons. Because the dependent variable is nominal with three categories, a multinomial logistic regression is the appropriate method of analysis.

For the purpose of this research study, two models will be created: the reduced and the full model. The reduced model will consist of the dependent variable predicted by the independent variable, i.e. gender. Furthermore, the four control variables marital status, education, race/ethnicity and occupation will be conducted to the full model. The variable age will not be considered in this multinomial logistic regression analysis, because it does not affect the results substantively¹.

Model 1- Reasons for Moving and Gender

Table 3 lists the odds of the occurrence of migration due to economic motivation for each independent variable. An $\exp(\beta)$ value greater than 1 indicates a positive relationship between the dependent and the independent variable. A value less than 1 indicates a negative relationship and a value of 1 indicates no relationship. The odds of occurrence of the event, i.e. migration due

¹ The coefficients of the independent variables remained stable, when a separate analysis was conducted using age as independent variable.

to economic motivation, will be expressed as a percentage for each explanatory variable:

$$\text{Percentage } (x) = 100(e^{\beta(x)} - 1)$$

Economic Reasons for Migration

The results of the two models of the multinomial regression analysis for economic motivation are tabulated in Table 3. In the reduced model, the odds of migration due to economic reasons as opposed to not migrating are about 21 percent higher for males as opposed to females. These odds increase to about 28 percent, after including the four control variables in the full model. Since gender remains significant in the full model, this means that males are more likely than females to migrate because of economic motivations accounting for socio-demographic factors such as: marital status, education, race/ethnicity and occupation. The stability in the significance of gender in predicting economic motivations for migration further corroborates the acceptance of the research hypothesis 1 and the rejection of the null hypothesis 1.

The Control Variables

The full model also gives an insight into the relationship between migration motivations and marital status, educational attainment, race and ethnicity and occupation of the individuals. Contrary to our expectations, it is apparent in Table 3 that individuals who are single are 23 percent less likely to migrate because of economic reasons as opposed to those who are married. One might conclude

from this result that the migration decision-making process of married people is more dependent on economic motivations than the migration decision-making process of single people.

As expected, Table 3 further shows that individuals who have a college degree or more are 77 percent more likely to migrate because of economic reasons compared to people with a high school degree. However, the odds of migration for people with less than high school degree and people with some college degree are not significant.

In congruence with our expectations, whites have the highest odds of migrating compared to other races. Table 3 shows that being black or Hispanic significantly reduces the odds of migrating because of economic reasons compared to not migrating. Blacks and Hispanics are 35 percent, 18 percent respectively less likely than whites to migrate due to of an economic reason. This implies that Blacks are the least likely to migrate followed by Hispanics. Race also reduces the odds for people who belong to the racial category; however, the reduction of the odds is not significant. The odds for individuals of other races to migrate due to economic reasons are only about 7 percent lower than for whites.

As illustrated in Table 3, belonging to any occupation other than professional or technical significantly reduces the odds of migration due to economic motivation. As expected, individuals with professional or technical jobs

seem to be the most likely to migrate because of economic reasons than any other occupational group. People who work in the service business are about 28 percent less likely to migrate due to economic reasons. Similarly, the odds of migration are about 30 percent lower for manufacturers than for professional and technical workers. Additionally, the odds of migration for those in other occupational categories are about 34 percent lower compared to those who work in professional or technical jobs.

Table 3: Economic Reasons (Reduced and Full Models)

Variable	Reduced Model		Full Model	
	Exp(β)	Standard Error	Exp(β)	Standard Error
Gender				
Male	1.214**	.059	1.278***	.059
Female ^a	—	—	—	—
Marital Status				
Currently Single			.870*	.062
Currently Married ^a			—	—
Educational Attainment				
Less than High School			.892	.107
Some College			.860	.086
College Degree or more			1.771***	.083
High School Degree ^a			—	—
Race/Ethnicity				
Black			.653***	.114
Hispanic			.823*	.091
Other			.927	.115
White ^a			—	—
Occupation				
Service			.727***	.081
Manufacturing			.706**	.124
Other			.661***	.089
Professional/Technical ^a			—	—
Model Chi Square			17.352***	327.564***

^a = Reference Group

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

N = 24,969

Source: Current Population Survey, US Census Bureau, 2002.

Non-Economic Reasons for Migration

Although gender disparity in non-economic reasons is not the focus of this study, the results of that analysis are briefly presented. The odds of migration due to non-economic reasons as opposed to non-migration for males as opposed to for females are significant in the reduced model and non-significant in the full model. According to Table 4, males are about 7 percent less likely to migrate because of non-economic reasons as opposed to non-migration as are females. Considering all four socio-demographic variables, marital status, educational attainment, race/ethnicity and occupation, the odds for males to migrate because of non-economic reasons is about 3 percent lower compared to females (Full Model, Table 3). However, this finding is not significant.

The Control Variables

Marital status has no significant effect on non-economic motivations of migration. Educational status has some significant effect on migration. The odds of migration due to non-economic reasons for those who have some college, but no college degree is significant and is about 16 percent lower than for those individuals with a high school degree. The race/ ethnicity categories show some interesting results. Blacks are significantly about 14 percent less likely to migrate because of non-economic reasons compared with whites. Similarly, people who belong to the other race category are about 20 percent less likely to migrate due to non-economic reasons as opposed to whites. The occupation variable shows a couple of significant results. The odds of migration due to non-economic

motivations for those in manufacturing and other occupations are about 13 percent and 25 percent lower respectively when compared to those in professional and technical occupations.

Table 4: Non-Economic Reasons (Reduced and Full Models)

Variable	Reduced Model		Full Model	
	Exp(β)	Standard Error	Exp(β)	Standard Error
Gender				
<i>Male</i>	.938*	.031	.968	.033
<i>Female</i> ^a	—	—	—	—
Marital Status				
<i>Currently Single</i>			.989	.032
<i>Currently Married</i> ^a			—	—
Educational Attainment				
<i>Less than High School</i>			1.029	.048
<i>Some College</i>			.848***	.040
<i>College Degree or more</i>			.984	.045
<i>High School Degree</i> ^a			—	—
Race/Ethnicity				
<i>Black</i>			.865**	.051
<i>Hispanic</i>			1.034	.044
<i>Other</i>			.806**	.065
<i>White</i> ^a			—	—
Occupation				
<i>Service</i>			.963	.045
<i>Manufacturing</i>			.876*	.067
<i>Other</i>			.758***	.049
<i>Professional/Technical</i> ^a			—	—
Model Chi-Square			17.352***	327.564***

^a = Reference Group

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

N = 24,969

Source: Current Population Survey, US Census Bureau, 2002.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study investigates the impact of gender on two migration motivations: economics and diversity of the people at the area of destination. The diversity research hypothesis was not supported in this research. This result implies that there is no gender disparity in the odds of migration due to the diversity of the people at the area of destination. The likelihood to migrate to highly diverse areas is similar for females and males. A possible reason for the absence of gender disparity might be the increased separation of residential and work locations. This does not necessarily mean that people are moving to metropolitan areas, instead it could mean that the movement is occurring around metropolitan areas. From this research, it is apparent that women and men are attracted to metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas similarly.

The similarity between males and females could also imply a move toward more equality between the two genders. Females seem to have similar amounts of job opportunities as males do. This could explain why females move to areas with more diversity in almost similar proportion as males. It should be noted that even though males and females are similarly attracted to highly diverse areas,

this does not, however, mean that they have job opportunities in the same occupational sectors.

The economic research hypothesis suggested different impact of economic motivations to migrate for men and women. This hypothesis was supported in bivariate and multivariate analyses. It was observed that the chances of men to migrate because of economic reasons are higher than that of females. Females tend to migrate because of non-economic reasons such as family, climate and housing. From the past research it is evident that married females are more likely to compromise with their partners and migrate despite experiencing a financial and occupational disadvantage (Mincer, 1978). It is therefore, not surprising that females in this study also tend to migrate because of non-economic reasons than economic reasons. The reasons for this gender disparity might be the existing gender gap in pay. This means that men are still paid more than women for the same kind of job. This gender pay gap affects the migration chances twofold. First the financial advantage makes men more likely to be able to afford a move compared to women. Second, men tend to have higher expectation regarding the financial outcomes from a move than do women. It is not surprising that men are more motivated by economic reasons than are females.

This research also showed that married people are more likely to migrate than single people. Even though this result was unexpected, it can be argued

that tied women tend to migrate because of their husband's decision to migrate rather than of personal economic advantages. This finding could have to do with the age of the sample (20-29). Young married people at that age might be more mobile due to economic reasons. They might be more willing to move to a place because of financial advantages. Single people between the ages of 20 through 29, on the other hand, might be less mobile because of the possibility of being in school. Because this finding is counter-intuitive, more research is needed on migration chances due to marital status differences for young adults.

As expected, highly educated people had the highest likelihood to migrate than all other educational categories. This is because more educated individuals have more employment opportunities. Education also makes individuals open to various employment possibilities in different locations.

Not surprisingly, whites have the highest odds of migration compared to any other racial and ethnic group due to economic motivation. White people tend to have more job opportunities and resources needed to migrate compared to compared to other racial groups.

As expected professional and technical workers were the occupational group with the highest likelihood of migration due to economic motivation. Individuals in high occupational statuses are the most likely to migrate because

they usually have the means and support to move compared to people in lower paying jobs.

Limitations of this Study

Even though this study focuses on the chances of migration of the US population, it is acknowledged that the data used is from the year prior to the interviews. This means that the decision to migrate is being predicted by independent variables measured after the event has taken place. This implies migration motivations of the past year being predicted by socio-demographic variables that are measured at the point of the interview. However, most of the socio-demographic variables in this study are stable. Variables such as race and gender are time invariant. It is also assumed that the occupational, educational and marital statuses of respondents would not have changed dramatically in the past year. Similarly, age would vary minimally- lower by one year at the most. Thus, independent variables are assumed to remain stable through the past year.

The diversity variable has been recoded for this study and the five original categories have been combined to three main categories. It is acknowledged that this combination of categories means a loss of the information about the area of origin. An exploratory analysis was performed to gauge the association of the original diversity variable that contains information on the place of origin. A chi-square test was conducted with the original five categories and gender. With a

$\chi^2 = 4.879$ and a p-value of .300, it can be concluded that the variable with the place of origin is independent of gender. Although this test provides further evidence that the place of origin may not be key to the migration decision-making process, it should be noted that the diversity variable is a proxy. Different results may be expected with a direct measure of diversity.

Future research in the field of migration motivation is strongly recommended by this study. Motivation to migrate because of the diversity of a place of destination was measured by a variable that distinguished between metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas. Due to the absence of a direct measure, diversity of the destination was indirectly constructed. There might be better measurements for diversity such as the racial and ethnic composition of the area of destination. A more refined variable is suggested to understand the full implication on the diversity factor. Also, future research should pay more attention to the distinction between residential and work area. Today, it is very likely to have individuals who live in a non-metropolitan area and work in a metropolitan area. These people might consider their move a move to a non-metropolitan area, since that is their place of residence. A distinction between these two variables would be very helpful in capturing the full effect of migration motivation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barko, N., 2000, *The Other Gender Gap*, American Prospect 11 (15), 61-63
- Bartel, A. P., 1979, *The Migration Decision: What Role Does Job Mobility Play?*,
The American Economic Review 69 (5), 775-786
- Cushing, B. J., 1999, *Migration and Persistent Poverty in Rural America*,
In Migration and Restructuring in the U.S.: A Geographic
Perspective (Kavita Pandit and Suzanne Davies Whithers, eds.), Roman &
Littlefield, 15-36
- Elliott, J. R., 1997, *Cycles within the System: Metropolitanisation and Internal
Migration in the US-1965-90*, Urban Studies 34 (1), 21-42
- DeMaris, A., 1995, *A Tutorial in Logistic Regression*, Journal of Marriage and the
Family 57, 956-968
- Du, F., Mergenhagen, P. and Lee, M., 1995, *The Future of Services*, American
Demographics 17, 30-41
- Durkheim, E., 1933, *Division of Labor in Society*
- Frey, W.H., 1985, *Mover Destination Selectivity and the Changing
Suburbanization of Metropolitan Whites and Blacks*, Demography 22,
223-43.
- Frey, W.H., 1988, *Migration and Metropolitan Decline in Developed Countries: a
Comparative Study*, Population and Development Review 14 (4), 595-628

- Frey, W.H. and Speare, A. Jr., 1992, *The Revival of Metropolitan Growth in the United States: An Assessment of Findings from the 1990 Census*, Population and Development Review 18 (1), 129-146
- Greenwood, M.J., 1975, *Research on Internal Migration in the United States: A Survey*, Journal of Economic Literature 13 (2), 397-433
- Gurak, D. T. and Kritz, M. M., 2000, *The Interstate Migration of U.S. Immigrants: Individual and Contextual Determinants*, Social Forces 78 (3), 1017-1039
- Gurak, D. T. and Kritz, M. M., 2001, *The Impact of Immigration on the Internal Migration of Natives and Immigrants*, Demography 38 (1), 133-145
- Jacobsen, J. P. and Levin L. M., 2000, *The Effects of Internal Migration on the Relative Economic Status of Women and Men*, The Journal of Socio-Economics 29, 291-304
- Johnson, K. M. and Beale, C. L., 1995, *The Rural Rebound Revisited*, American Demographics 17, 46-49
- Kim, J., 1983, *Factors affecting Urban-to Rural Migration*, Growth and Change 14 (3), 38-44
- Krieg, R.G., 1997, *Occupational Change, Employer Change, Internal Migration, and Earnings*, Regional Science and Urban Economics 27, 1-15
- Lee, E. S., 1966, *A Theory of Migration*, Demography 3 (1), 47-57
- Manson, G. A. and Groop R. E., 1999, *Gains and Losses of Migrants and Income through Intercounty Migration in the U.S. 1992-1993*, The Social Science Journal 36(1), 65-75

- Molnar, J.J., Duffy, P.A., Claxton, L. and Bailey C., 2001, *Private Food Assistance in Small Metropolitan Area: Urban Resources and Rural Needs*, Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare 28 (3), 187-209
- Long, L., 1988, *Migration and Residential Mobility in the United States*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- Mincer, J., 1978, *Family Migration Decisions*, The Journal of Political Economy 86 (5), 749-773
- Ravenstein, E. G., 1885, *The Laws of Migration*, J. Royal Statistical Society 48 (2), 167-227
- Schachter, J., 2001, *Geographic Mobility- Population Characteristics*, Current Population Reports, U.S. Census Bureau
- Solberg, E. J., 1999, *Using Occupational Preference in Estimating Market Wage Discrimination: the Case of the Gender Pay Gap*, The American Journal of Economics and Sociology 58 (1), 85-113
- Todaro, M. P., 1976, *Internal Migration in Developing Countries: a Review of Theory, Evidence, Methodology and Research Priorities*, Geneva: International Labor Organization
- Wyly, Elvin K., 1999, *Local Labor Markets and Occupational Sex Segregation in an American Metropolis*, Journal of Urban Affairs 21 (1), 1-33
- US Bureau of the Census, 2002, *Current Population Survey- March Supplement*, Source: www.census.gov

VITA

Zohra Khaki was born in Kabul, Afghanistan on January 19, 1978, the daughter of Alam-Tab Khaki and Mir Fateh Mohammad Khaki. After graduating from the Klenze Gymnasium, Munich, Germany, in June 1998 she started to pursue her Bachelor of Art degree in Sociology at the University of Heidelberg, Germany later the same year. She earned her Bachelor's degree in April 2001 and was then offered an internship position at Internet Globale, Montreal, Canada as a web-designer. In August 2001, she began her Master of Arts Program at the Sociology Department at Texas State University-San Marcos as a full-time graduate student. Throughout her graduate studies, she was employed by the School of Social Work and later on by the Department of Sociology as a part-time graduate research assistant. She accepted a manager position in a small business in Munich, Germany where she will start working in October 2003.

Permanent Address: Kafkastr. 44
 81737 Muenchen
 Germany

This thesis was typed by Zohra Khaki.