



Analyzing Migration Decisions: The First Step--Whose Decisions?

Author(s): Ralph R. Sell

Source: *Demography*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (Aug., 1983), pp. 299-311

Published by: Springer on behalf of the Population Association of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2061244>

Accessed: 21-01-2018 05:43 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Population Association of America, Springer are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Demography*

ANALYZING MIGRATION DECISIONS: THE FIRST STEP—WHOSE DECISIONS?

Ralph R. Sell

Department of Sociology, The University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627

Abstract—Many theories of geographic mobility assume that the change-of-residence process includes a substantial degree of choice. This paper classifies stated reasons for moving from the 1973 through 1977 Annual Housing Survey into forced, imposed, and preference-dominated categories. About 25 percent of residential mobility and 40 percent of migration occurred under conditions of substantial constraint. Mobility was most often constrained by family dynamics; for migration, occupational relocations frequently imposed the decision-to-move process and determined destinations. The volume of constrained movement indicates that its impact upon individuals, population dynamics, and voluntaristic theories of mobility deserves greater consideration.

Geographic mobility is most often studied using one of several decision-making models, based on theories of human capital (DaVanzo, 1981), place utility (Brown and Moore, 1970; Michelson, 1977), value-expectancy (DeJong and Fawcett, 1981; Sell and DeJong, 1978), and/or residential satisfaction (Rossi, 1955; Speare et al., 1975). Common to these models is a goal-directed social-action approach to behavior (Davis, 1949) in which the change-of-residence process is typically explained as a progression from locational dissatisfaction, to a desire to move, and finally migration or mobility. This process is considered applicable because contemporary population dynamics are hypothesized to reflect the increasing impact of noneconomic goals and residential preferences (DeJong, 1977; Fuguitt and Zuiches, 1975; Heaton et al., 1979). However, information from several sources indicates that substantial mobility is not determined by such residential preferences and other relatively volitional elements.

For example, Rossi's study of residential mobility found that 39 percent of

movers by-passed the desire to move stage. Rossi classified these as forced moves and noted: "Although it is doubtful that this figure is representative . . . , the possibility that a significant portion of the high level of residential mobility is composed of such forced moves should be seriously considered" (Rossi, 1955, p. 134). After reviewing additional evidence for the second edition of his book, he still felt justified in estimating that one-third of residential mobility is involuntary (Rossi, 1980, p. 34). In support of this estimate, a desire to move was lacking for 30 percent of a sample of Pennsylvania movers (Sell and DeJong, 1983), and 29 percent of respondents in Rhode Island changed residences without a wish to move (Speare et al., 1975). The size of the data sources used in these analyses precluded estimation of the frequency of involuntary mobility in many contexts, especially long distance migration.

In sum, previous research has not adequately considered the range of applicability of volitional decision-making models. The U. S. Annual Housing Survey (AHS) remains unique among recent rep-

representative surveys because it asks the main reason for moving for household heads (Long and Hansen, 1979). In this paper these reasons are used to make inferences about change-of-residence contexts for both migration and residential mobility. Households in these various contexts are described, with emphasis given to those with constrained mobility choices.

DATA AND METHODS

Specifically, the annual national sample public use tapes of the 1973–1977 AHS were used. Sample sizes range from about 50,000 households in 1973 to about 70,000 in 1977 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1975, App-28; 1978, App-42). Preliminary analysis found inconsequential annual variation, and surveys were concatenated. Origin and destination residential categories permit identification of migration as (a) intermetropolitan, (b) interstate nonmetropolitan to nonmetropolitan, (c) metropolitan to nonmetropolitan, and (d) nonmetropolitan to metropolitan changes of residence. Residential mobility represents intrametropolitan and intrastate nonmetropolitan moves.¹

Reasons for Moving

Respondents in households moving during the previous 12 months were asked, "What is the main reason . . . (head) moved from his previous residence?" Responses were interviewer coded into one of 31 categories (29 in 1973). AHS procedures designated the husband as the head of household for husband-wife couples, and only reasons for household heads were obtained. Consequently, intrahousehold aspects of decision making were not measured.

Before proceeding, two methodological points concerning reasons for moving will be addressed. The first involves the validity of these reasons for household situational indicators; the second involves the impact of household dynamics upon frequency estimates.

Analyzing behavior through analysis of stated reasons has several limitations. First, persons frequently either do not know their motives or may express ex post facto rationalizations. Second, stated reasons are subject to normative vocabularies which vary over time and across social situations. Mills (1940) once suggested that "individualistic, sexual, hedonistic, and pecuniary vocabularies of motive" are dominant in contrast to earlier religiously based vocabularies. To the extent that marriage and household formation are related to sexual behavior, the AHS reasons confirm Mills' observation. Finally, the AHS could confuse measurement even further because respondent-wives frequently provide reasons for their husbands.

With respect to reasons for moving, these issues can be addressed because the 1977 AHS allowed comparison of the distribution of reasons from households in which the head was the respondent with those having respondent wives. If men engage in a substantial amount of ex post facto rationalization and/or if the situations surrounding moves are inherently ambiguous, it is unlikely that wives could provide reliable reasons for their husbands. However, if important aspects of a change of residence are apparent to both household members and/or if this situation has been deliberated, then responses from either household member would be equivalent. The AHS husbands and wives were not each others' spouses, but to the extent that each independently represented married-couple households, these distributions should be the same.

With one exception, differences were small (results not shown).² The second largest among 28 comparisons was a difference of 3 percentage points, where migrant husbands were more likely to state that they moved for a change of climate. The one exception is an important one: Wives were more likely by 11 percentage points to state that a migration occurred because of a job transfer.

Two categories of explanations might account for this anomaly. First, wives' reasons may be invalid. Husbands who are fired or otherwise terminated may lie and tell their wives they were transferred; or wives may be less likely to tell census interviewers of their husbands' terminations and instead use the more innocuous "job transfer." A compensating difference in either the "new job" or "other employment" category should then occur, but this was not found. Wives may routinely state "job transfer" under several circumstances, but I know of no explanation why that would occur. The argument can also be turned around in that perhaps husbands were less likely to respond that they were transferred, but the same difficulties occur.

There is a second explanation. The two distributions should only be comparable if the populations represented were in fact the same. It is possible that transferred husbands were less likely to be interviewed because of the nature of their occupations.³ For example, in their descriptions of corporate life both Kanter (1977) and Margolis (1979) suggested that occupational relocations and long hours on the job were related. Kanter also noted the low labor force participation of relocated wives, making them more available for an interview. Although insufficient to account for the 11-point difference, wives were more likely by 8.6 percentage points to be the respondent. This second explanation is consistent with no compensating reasons for moving. If this plausible explanation for the husband/wife differences in the distribution of reasons for moving is accepted, then AHS reasons are reliable measures of change-of-residence situations for household heads.

Some qualifications are in order. The above analysis was limited to consistent husband-wife couples. In the remainder of this paper, estimates of various types of mobility are made for other categories of households. Reliability and validity

issues are more complex if household structure changes along with a change of residence.⁴

Household Dynamics and Reasons for Moving

The AHS determined if the head of household had the same status at the pre-move location. This is important for estimating the distribution of mobility contexts. Persons and pre-move and post-move household heads each have different distributions of reasons for moving, both because of the relative position within a household structure and because of changes in the distribution of household heads accompanying mobility (Rossi, 1980, p. 47).⁵

In the post-move distribution, 24.6 percent were not heads of households prior to moving (Table 1).⁶ The marginals provide the distribution of moving reasons for post-move households, showing the distortions if this were taken to represent the pre-move distribution. This is conventionally recognized, and census publications restrict reasons to households with the same head at both locations. This alters rather than solves the problem, as it excludes 25 percent of the post-move households. In particular, that procedure underestimates the impact of family dynamics. Almost half of the newly formed households in Table 1 result from marriage, divorce, separation, and simple desire to establish an independent household.

A VOLITIONAL TYPOLOGY OF REASONS FOR MOVING

I now turn to a classification of the stated reasons for moving which measures the degree of constraint present during the mobility decision process. An intermediate "imposed" category was added to Petersen's (1958) polar types of forced and free (renamed "preference dominated"). This parallels Rossi's (1980, p. 34) typology of induced, derivative, and voluntary residential mobility. The conventional separation of employ-

Table 1.—Household Heads' Reasons for Moving by Origin Status, United States, 1973–1977

Reason for Moving	Head of Origin Household		Total
	% Yes (N in 1,000s)	% No (N in 1,000s)	
Displaced	4.6 (2,424)	1.5 (255)	3.8 (2,679)
Natural disaster	0.5 (257)	0.1 (11)	0.4 (269)
Job transfer	6.8 (3,590)	2.6 (441)	5.8 (4,031)
Entered/left armed forces	0.7 (390)	1.5 (250)	0.9 (639)
To attend school	1.2 (623)	4.5 (777)	2.0 (1,400)
Separated, divorced or widowed	3.3 (1,727)	6.2 (1,165)	4.1 (2,892)
Newly married	2.0 (1,035)	17.3 (2,969)	5.7 (4,004)
To take a new job	7.8 (4,074)	6.5 (1,121)	7.4 (5,194)
Other: employment	1.6 (853)	0.9 (163)	1.5 (1,016)
Commuting reason	3.2 (1,662)	2.4 (412)	3.0 (2,074)
To establish own household	2.3 (1,193)	26.1 (4,495)	8.2 (5,688)
Wanted to rent residence	0.6 (324)	1.0 (178)	0.7 (502)
Wanted to own residence	9.8 (5,167)	2.6 (447)	8.0 (5,614)
Needed larger or better dwelling	23.1 (12,148)	4.1 (712)	18.4 (12,860)
Family increased or decreased	1.0 (525)	0.5 (81)	0.9 (607)
Less expensive dwelling	6.5 (3,394)	2.0 (336)	5.3 (3,729)
Retirement mobility	0.4 (229)	0.0 (7)	0.3 (236)
Neighborhood overcrowded	1.0 (519)	0.2 (42)	0.8 (561)
Wanted better neighborhood	4.2 (2,224)	1.1 (181)	3.4 (2,405)
Schools	0.7 (355)	0.6 (104)	0.7 (459)
To be closer to relatives	2.7 (1,410)	1.2 (202)	2.3 (1,612)

Table 1.—Continued

Reason for Moving	Head of Origin Household		Total
	% Yes	% No (<i>N</i> in 1,000s)	
Wanted change of climate	1.2 (612)	0.7 (119)	1.0 (732)
Retirement migration	0.8 (443)	0.1 (16)	0.7 (460)
Family and other	14.0 (7,383)	15.2 (2,609)	14.5 (10,092)
Total	75.4 (52,562)	24.6 (17,195)	100.0 (69,757)

NOTE: See footnote 6.

ment, family, housing, and neighborhood reasons was maintained where possible.

Forced Mobility

Forced changes of residence represent situations in which the choice to not move is severely circumscribed because: (a) social control agents could be used to effect a move, or (b) death or injury might occur without a change of residence. The AHS reasons measuring forced mobility are: (a) displaced due to public or private action and (b) changed residence because of a natural disaster.

Although lacking representative estimates, there is information on various forced change-of-residence situations. Native American relocations, the Relocation Administration during the 1930s, the Tennessee Valley Project, Urban Renewal, and the Federal Interstate Highway System all resulted in many forced relocations (Donnermeyer, 1975; Schorr, 1975; Wolf, 1969). Individual households also are forced to move. The Public Housing Administration (1958) found that 25 percent of their residents moved at the request of management, often because of changes in eligibility. Mortgage foreclosures also force substantial mobility (Herzog and Earley, 1970). Lee and

Hodge (1981) used AHS data to study metropolitan displacement, expecting that such moves would be more likely among certain subgroups. Displacement rates were higher among the elderly and the poor, but not uniformly higher among black and female household heads. Newman and Owens (1982) likewise studied displacement with data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics. Their findings agreed with those of Lee and Hodge regarding poverty and race, but diverged for age and sex of household. Lee and Hodge's conclusion seems apt: "A new theoretical model incorporating involuntary movement needs to be developed if we are to understand completely the residential behavior of poor and powerless groups" (p. 27). Finally, natural disasters such as earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, and volcanoes still force moves in the same fashion as Petersen's (1958) primitive migration.

Imposed Mobility

Mobility is categorized as imposed if the situation surrounding the move was such that important aspects of the decision were largely determined by decision units or social processes external to the household itself. In particular, mobility

is imposed if external constraints result in a process clearly in violation of the typical progression outlined in the introduction. AHS reasons measuring employment-related imposed mobility are: job transfers, moves to enter or leave the armed forces, and moves to attend college. Those related to family dynamics are: marriage, separation, divorce, and death of a spouse.

Job-related migration is treated as the archetype of decision-making mobility behavior (DaVanzo, 1981). However, most studies inquiring about the circumstances surrounding job-related migration find many job transfers (Long and Hansen, 1979; Saben, 1964; Sell, 1983). Although relocated employees often had at least the formal possibility of declining the move, so that a forced designation is not appropriate, the start of the decision process, the pressure to move, and destination selection are most often determined externally. The suggestion that transfers are inappropriately modeled by preference-dominated mobility theories has been made previously by Fredrickson et al. (1980) in their discussion of residential preferences and migration intentions.

Mobility related to armed forces activities is imposed, for the most part, even though some persons join the military to satisfy a residential preference, most typified by the "join up and see exotic places" slogans of recruitment campaigns. Similarly, a move to attend college or university is resultant behavior in the sense that residential location did not form the goal of the migration decision.

Changes of residence resulting from marriage, separation, divorce, and widowhood are also not voluntary to the degree assumed by decision-making models (Rossi, 1980, p. 24). Most often, such moves are rather directly imposed by the separate household and marriage rules normative in the United States (Harbison, 1981). Of course, sometimes the decision on whether or not to move may be a contributing factor in the vital

event itself, such as a divorce precipitated by a spouse's refusal to relocate. Although I am aware of no data on this point, I assume here that the change of residence is more often resultant.

Preference-Dominated Mobility

Preference-dominated changes of residence are those in which an endogenously generated choice process applies. Reasons denoting preference-dominated employment-related changes of residence were: (a) to take a new job or to look for work; (b) other employment; and (c) commuting reasons. Reasons measuring preference-dominated situations related to family and housing dynamics range (as listed in Table 1) from "to establish own household" to "retirement mobility." Most deal with changes in family size and housing needs. Retirement mobility (but not migration) has been included as a similar adjustment of housing needs and costs. Preference-dominated reasons related to neighborhood environment include: desires for a better neighborhood or schools and neighborhood overcrowding. "Other" preference-dominated reasons are "wanted to be closer to relatives," "wanted a change of climate," and retirement migration.

These preference-dominated reasons will not be discussed because research routinely considers them as volitional moves. Thorough reviews of both this general literature (DeJong and Gardner, 1981; Ritchey, 1976; Shaw, 1975) and the specific role of preferences in nonmetropolitan population growth are readily available (Brown and Wardwell, 1980; DeJong, 1977; Fuguitt and Zuiches, 1975). These reviews provide strong support for the widespread applicability of the voluntaristic approach in the study of both migration and residential mobility.

The typology includes 85 percent of all the AHS moving reasons. Omitted were the "other family," "other" and "reasons for moving not stated."

FINDINGS

Frequency of Forced, Imposed, and Preference-Dominated Moves

Table 2 presents results for household heads by residential mobility, migration, and the head's origin status. From 1973 to 1977 almost 3 million moves occurred in which the post-move head of household was forced to move.⁷ Most were relatively short distance residential mobility and did not result in the formation of a new household. Even more mobility—about 13 million moves—was imposed. Imposed residential mobility was most likely precipitated by family dynamics, and more often than not, households were formed in the process. Although almost one million migrations occurred for similar reasons, employment-related imposed migration was

more prevalent. Most of these were occupational relocations.

The remaining categories of Table 2 represent volitional decision-making situations. About 78 percent of residential mobility and 60 percent of migration are relevant for decision models. Preference-dominated situations are somewhat more likely to occur when a household head remained the head throughout the process.

Table 3 presents estimates of the number of persons associated with the various mobility situations. To make these estimates it was assumed that: (a) persons becoming household heads in conjunction with the change of residence moved alone; (b) persons maintaining household head status moved with household members present in the AHS; and (c) the reasons for moving for per-

Table 2.—Household Heads by Volitional Typology of Reasons for Moving, Mobility, and Origin Household Head Status, United States, 1973–1977

Volitional Typology	Residential Mobility			Migration		
	Head of Origin Household		Total (N in 1,000s)	Head of Origin Household		Total
	% Yes	% No		% Yes	% No	
Forced	7.6 (2,536)	2.3 (249)	6.3 (2,785)	1.2 (146)	0.5 (17)	1.1 (163)
Imposed						
Employment related	2.5 (830)	3.0 (333)	2.6 (1,163)	32.1 (3,773)	32.6 (1,135)	32.2 (4,908)
Family dynamics	7.0 (2,353)	32.4 (3,565)	13.3 (5,918)	3.5 (409)	16.3 (569)	6.4 (977)
Preference dominated						
Employment related	8.8 (2,938)	6.6 (729)	8.3 (3,667)	31.1 (3,651)	27.8 (966)	30.3 (4,617)
Housing and family	64.5 (21,530)	52.9 (5,823)	61.6 (27,353)	12.1 (1,427)	12.4 (432)	12.2 (1,858)
Neighborhood	7.8 (2,606)	2.1 (228)	6.4 (2,834)	4.2 (492)	2.9 (99)	3.9 (591)
Other	1.8 (609)	0.7 (77)	1.5 (686)	15.8 (1,856)	7.5 (261)	13.9 (2,117)
Total	75.2 (33,402)	24.8 (11,004)	100.0 (44,406)	77.2 (11,752)	22.8 (3,479)	100.0 (15,231)

Table 3.—Persons Moving by Volitional Typology and Mobility Stream, United States, 1973–1977

Volitional Typology	Percentage Migration (N in 1,000s)				Percentage Residential Mobility (N in 1,000s)				Grand Total
	Metro to Nonmetro	Nonmetro to Metro	Inter-metro	Interstate Nonmetro	Migration Totals	Intrastate Nonmetro	Intra-metro	Mobility Totals	
Forced	1.5 (141)	1.5 (115)	0.9 (163)	1.8 (60)	1.3 (479)	7.9 (2,613)	7.1 (5,397)	7.4 (8,010)	5.8 (8,489)
Imposed									
Employment related	26.5 (2,525)	32.4 (2,420)	38.0 (6,701)	33.6 (1,126)	33.7 (12,772)	4.7 (1,574)	1.6 (1,195)	2.5 (2,769)	10.6 (15,541)
Family dynamics	3.8 (358)	4.5 (335)	3.6 (640)	3.1 (104)	3.8 (1,437)	7.8 (2,577)	8.0 (6,013)	7.9 (8,590)	6.8 (10,027)
Preference dominated									
Employment related	28.2 (2,682)	39.9 (2,976)	27.4 (4,827)	33.5 (1,120)	30.6 (11,605)	12.7 (4,222)	6.3 (4,787)	8.3 (9,009)	14.1 (20,614)
Housing and family	17.2 (1,633)	8.5 (635)	13.9 (2,456)	6.9 (231)	13.1 (4,955)	60.3 (20,018)	67.3 (50,837)	65.2 (70,855)	51.7 (75,810)
Neighborhood	6.9 (658)	2.5 (185)	4.4 (773)	1.5 (49)	4.4 (1,665)	4.6 (1,542)	8.3 (6,282)	7.2 (7,824)	6.5 (9,489)
Other	15.9 (1,517)	10.6 (794)	11.7 (2,069)	19.6 (658)	13.3 (5,038)	1.9 (635)	1.3 (988)	1.5 (1,623)	4.5 (6,661)
Total	6.5 (9,514)	5.1 (7,459)	12.0 (17,629)	2.3 (3,349)	25.9 (37,951)	22.6 (33,181)	51.5 (75,499)	74.1 (108,680)	100.0 (146,631)

NOTE: Certain assumptions have been made to estimate the number of persons; see text.

sons in (b) were the same as their household head's.

The data in Table 3 represent about 147 million individual changes of residence, an average of about 30 million per year. During the five years analyzed, over 8 million local movers and about one-half million migrants were forced to move. In some contexts, household heads and dependent family members may not have the same reasons for moving, but evictions or threats of death from natural disasters apply with equal force to all household members. During this period, job-related relocations imposed changes of residence for over 15 million persons. Although it is more tenuous to uniformly ascribe the same moving reason to all members of relocated households, it nonetheless indicates the frequent impact of nonhousehold decisions. The remaining categories err in the direction of suggesting a greater degree of volition than actually existed. Children are legally required to move with their parents, and dependent spouses are often functionally required to do so as well.

Table 3 also presents volitional differences across mobility streams. The interstate nonmetropolitan stream included the highest proportion of forced migrants, although in absolute terms the number was small. Employment-related imposed migration was most likely, both relatively and absolutely, in intermetropolitan migrations; fully 38 percent were imposed, in contrast to 27 percent for preference-dominated. For both the metropolitan to nonmetropolitan and the counterstream, this relationship was reversed. Preference-dominated employment migration was most likely, although not to the degree to which imposed migration was overrepresented in the intermetropolitan flow. Within the interstate nonmetropolitan stream, imposed and preference-dominated employment migrations were almost of equal frequency.

Disregarding employment-related mi-

gration, preference-dominated migration was most frequent in the metropolitan to nonmetropolitan direction; about 40 percent occurred within that context. Some of this migration may be part of exurban population dispersion, as the AHS used fixed 1970 metropolitan boundaries. Nevertheless, many persons migrate substantial distances to obtain desired housing and neighborhood amenities (Johnson and Purdy, 1980).

The differences across the volitional typology between the two residential mobility streams were slight, with the exception of employment-related mobility. The AHS does not allow a distinction between short and long distance intrastate nonmetropolitan moves, and the somewhat higher proportion of employment-related mobility shown in Table 3 is the result of that deficiency.

Characteristics of Households in the Typology

Both the structural tradition in demography and the lack of suitable data influence migration studies to infer motivations of migrants from characteristics (Shryock, 1969). Within validity limits of ex post facto reasons for moving, the present analysis had no need to resort to such inferences. Table 4 presents characteristics descriptive of categories in the volitional typology. The large sample size assures statistical significance, but the standard deviations make clear the substantial overlap in characteristics. Inferring the motivational contexts of mobility decisions from characteristics would induce substantial error.

Judging from *F*-ratios, the average age of the head of household showed most variation across the typology but was not consistently related to the degree of volition. The oldest category was "preference-dominated: other," including many retirement migrations. The next oldest were forced movers, suggesting a dualism of circumstances among older movers. The standard deviations for the ages of these two categories were the largest,

Table 4.—Characteristics of Households by Volitional Typology, United States, 1973–1977

Household Characteristic	Volitional Type							F-ratio ^a
	Imposed			Preference Dominated				
	Forced	Employment	Family	Employment	Housing	Neighborhood	Other	
Average age of household	40.7 (17.2)	31.3 (10.2)	32.0 (13.4)	32.3 (10.9)	34.1 (13.9)	37.5 (14.8)	48.5 (18.8)	754.0
Number of children under 6	.40 (.74)	.39 (.69)	.21 (.51)	.38 (.69)	.47 (.76)	.35 (.65)	.26 (.63)	157.3
Number of children 6 to 17	.69 (1.3)	.51 (1.0)	.31 (0.8)	.44 (1.0)	.49 (1.0)	.66 (1.1)	.43 (0.9)	77.5
Number of persons 65+ in household	.17 (.44)	.02 (.15)	.05 (.29)	.02 (.14)	.08 (.31)	.11 (.38)	.37 (.64)	544.3
Number of persons in household	3.0 (1.9)	2.8 (1.5)	2.2 (1.1)	.26 (1.5)	2.8 (1.6)	2.9 (1.6)	2.5 (1.5)	172.7
Highest grade completed	11.8 (3.5)	15.1 (2.4)	13.5 (2.6)	14.4 (3.2)	13.2 (3.1)	13.2 (3.1)	12.3 (3.5)	510.2
Family income (thousands, 1977 dollars)	10.4 (8.3)	15.2 (10.7)	13.3 (9.4)	13.5 (9.9)	13.4 (9.9)	13.6 (10.1)	11.5 (9.6)	98.6
Head's income (thousands) ^b	6.1 (6.5)	11.7 (9.5)	8.4 (7.1)	9.4 (7.7)	8.8 (7.8)	8.8 (8.0)	5.2 (6.9)	249.5
Percentage not employed ^b	33.0 (47)	16.0 (37)	14.6 (35)	9.3 (29)	18.8 (39)	22.7 (42)	50.0 (25)	374.7
Percentage nonwhite	16.6 (37)	7.4 (26)	9.9 (30)	6.4 (24)	15.3 (36)	14.3 (35)	7.2 (26)	138.0
Percentage female heads	31.5 (46)	11.8 (32)	24.6 (43)	16.8 (37)	25.1 (43)	26.8 (44)	29.0 (45)	151.2
Percentage husband-wife households	49.8 (50)	67.7 (47)	58.2 (49)	61.2 (49)	57.8 (49)	56.0 (50)	57.7 (49)	56.8
Percentage renters	84.5 (36)	70.8 (45)	75.1 (43)	77.4 (41)	60.7 (49)	68.5 (46)	60.9 (49)	279.0
Percentage nonmetro destinations	30.6 (46)	31.1 (46)	30.1 (46)	35.4 (48)	26.8 (44)	21.2 (41)	39.6 (49)	84.8

NOTE: Standard deviation given in parentheses.

^aAll F-ratios are statistically significant at the .05 level.^bNot asked in 1973.

also showing that the two extremes of constraint were not concentrated by age. Persons changing residence either because of imposed family or job-related situations were younger than those moving for other reasons; preference movers were a bit older but spread across a wider range of ages.

Similarly, and probably reflecting the age composition, average education was lowest for forced movers and the “preference-dominated: other” category. Persons with changes of residence imposed by their employment had the most schooling. Differences in average family income parallel those in education. As with age, inferring circumstances from either education or income would be tenuous. The other characteristics in Table 4 also support the preceding statement.

Selected differences deserve mention on other grounds. The proportion of female-headed households was greatest for those forced to move. Such households were also overrepresented among the preference-dominated categories of housing, neighborhood, and other, while underrepresented in the two employment-related categories. This is in contrast with the findings of Lee and Hodge (1981). However, their findings were based on displacement rates, which suppress the dualistic nature of the circumstances surrounding changes of residence for female-headed households. For nonwhites the situation is similar, although less clear. Nonwhites are underrepresented in job-related mobility of both an imposed and a preference-dominated variety.

CONCLUSIONS

The frequent use of mobility decision-making models has not been misguided. For the majority of local moves and migrations, the decision to move was free from excessive constraint. Although most migrations were preference-dominated and most were also job-related, it is significant that most were not both

job-related and preference-dominated. Thus the stereotypical migration decision-making model which combines both elements is not appropriate for the majority of migration contexts. Although this paper found preference-dominated moves to be in the majority, it must be emphasized that many changes of residence—about 25 percent of mobility and 40 percent of migration—occurred under conditions of substantial constraint.

In addition to a concern for understanding individual and household change-of-residence decisions, mobility and migration are studied because of their impact upon communities and population distribution. To evaluate such impacts, destination selection as well as initiating circumstances must be considered. The AHS data dictated emphasis upon the start of the mobility process because the basic question asked why persons moved and not why they moved to a particular location.

Nonetheless, such decision contexts provide insights into how destinations were determined, the family and economic forces influencing these processes, and, in part, how communities were influenced as a result. For example, whether or not alternative locations are possible and whether time is available for deliberations about alternatives influences the degree to which destination frequencies have the potential to map locational preferences. Most local moves did not perforce require rapid decisions, suggesting that new homes and neighborhoods were probably selected in an informed and deliberative manner. Thus housing markets within local areas are likely to reflect locational preferences.

The case for locational preferences as a determinant of community growth and decline is less certain. In forced and imposed residential mobility, most persons had some control over destination selection, but for most imposed job-related migration, the acceptance of the move determined the destination; and these destinations were by and large

“selected” by someone other than the migrant. Although the contexts represented by this category were several, they each were sufficiently frequent to allow separate treatment. With respect to relocations, for example, the effect of corporate decisions might vary according to more general economic conditions. It could be that when jobs are hard to find, refusal of transfers is less likely, thereby leading to a greater impact of organizational choices. In contrast, with plentiful job alternatives, employment-related moves are likely to reflect locational preferences.⁸ To date, analysis of the effects upon population dynamics of various organizational contexts—e.g., corporate, military, and public sectors—has been limited. The findings of this paper show how frequently migration decisions are as much institutional as they are individual decisions. Future research should more fully consider the impact of such institutional forces upon demographic phenomena.

NOTES

¹ The treatment of all intrastate nonmetropolitan moves as residential mobility is not conventional. AHS coding does not allow separate treatment of long and short distance moves in this case.

² This analysis was limited to husband-wife households in which the current head was also the head of the previous household. For a list of measured reasons, see Table 1. The following reasons were collapsed because of low frequencies among migrants: (a) widowed, separated, divorced, newly married, family increased, and to establish own household; (b) neighborhood overcrowded, neighborhood changed, needed less expensive dwelling, wanted better house, wanted better schools, displaced private or public, wanted to rent, wanted more convenience, and natural disaster. The 28 comparisons represent 14 categories of reasons by migration and residential mobility.

³ The AHS contains no occupational information.

⁴ Intrafamily deliberations and their impact upon migration has been sparsely researched. Although wives and husbands agreed about husbands' reasons for moving, this does not suggest that wives would state that these were their own reasons. In fact, there is evidence that in many cases wives move to remain with their husbands (Kenkel, 1965).

⁵ In an analysis of interstate migration based on

the 1974–1976 AHS, Long and Hansen (1979) report reasons for moving for household heads and persons. Their procedure for persons applied “the reason for moving given by the household head to all persons in that household” (p. 5). It is not clear from their presentation exactly how the previous head of household issue was resolved. Either it was ignored—in which case their tabulations for persons include persons who were not with the post-move household head at the time of his move—or they have followed the Census Bureau procedure of tabulating reasons for moving based on households with the same head both at the origin and the destination location (e.g., U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1978, p. 3, fn. 1). As the data in Table 1 show, about 25 percent of post-move household heads were not the head at their previous residence, although for interstate migration this percentage is probably less.

⁶ The following combinations of reasons were made in Table 1: (a) displaced public and displaced private, for displaced; (b) wanted better neighborhood and neighborhood changed, for wanted better neighborhood; (c) other family and other, for family and other.

⁷ This paper is based on a concatenation of five Annual Housing Surveys. Since certain persons move more often than others (Morrison, 1971), it is likely that some persons are more often forced to move. Hence frequencies actually refer to moves during the period and not to the number of persons who moved. Contrariwise, the AHS at most measures only one move per year. Also related to the “chronic mover” phenomenon, this underestimates the number of moves. The relative contributions of these counterbalancing sources of error are unknown.

⁸ I thank an anonymous reviewer for this suggestion.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by a grant (#SES-7923699) from the National Science Foundation. I wish also to thank Mary Ellen Saunders for her computer analyses and Dale Dannefer for many helpful suggestions. Several reviewers contributed substantially to the structure and readability of this paper, and I thank them for this contribution.

REFERENCES

- Brown, David L. and John M. Wardwell (eds.). 1980. *New Directions in Urban-Rural Migration*. New York: Academic Press.
- Brown, Lawrence A. and Eric G. Moore. 1970. *The Intra-urban Migration Process: A Perspective*. *General Systems Yearbook* 15:109–122.
- DaVanzo, Julie. 1981. *Microeconomic Approaches to Studying Migration Decisions*. Pp. 90–129 in Gordon F. DeJong and Robert W. Gardner

- (eds.), *Migration Decision Making*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Davis, Kingsley. 1949. *Human Society*. New York: Macmillan Company.
- DeJong, Gordon F. 1977. Residential Preferences and Migration. *Demography* 14:169–178.
- DeJong, Gordon F. and James T. Fawcett. 1981. Motivations for Migration: An Assessment and a Value-Expectancy Research Model. Pp. 13–58 in Gordon F. DeJong and Robert W. Gardner (eds.), *Migration Decision Making*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- DeJong, Gordon F. and Robert W. Gardner. 1981. *Migration Decision Making*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Donnermeyer, Joseph F. 1975. *Forced Migration: A Bibliography on the Sociology of Population Displacement and Resettlement*. Exchange bibliography #880. Monticello, Il.: Council of Planning Librarians.
- Fredrickson, Carl, Tim B. Heaton, Glenn V. Fuguitt, and James J. Zuiches. 1980. Residential Preferences in a Model of Migration Intentions. *Population and Environment* 3:280–297.
- Fuguitt, Glenn V. and James J. Zuiches. 1975. Residential Preferences and Population Distribution. *Demography* 12:491–504.
- Harbison, Sarah F. 1981. Family Structure and Family Strategy in Migration Decision Making. Pp. 225–251 in Gordon F. DeJong and Robert W. Gardner (eds.), *Migration Decision Making*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Heaton, Tim, Carl Fredrickson, Glenn V. Fuguitt, and James J. Zuiches. 1979. Residential Preferences, Community Satisfaction, and the Intention to Move. *Demography* 16:565–573.
- Herzog, John P. and James S. Earley. 1970. *Home Mortgage Delinquency and Foreclosure*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Johnson, Kenneth M. and Ross L. Purdy. 1980. Recent Nonmetropolitan Population Change in Fifty-year Perspective. *Demography* 1:57–70.
- Kantner, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kenkel, William F. 1965. The Family Moving Decision Process. Pp. 178–193 in William F. Kenkel (ed.), *Family Mobility in Our Dynamic Society*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Lee, Barrett A. and David C. Hodge. 1981. Social Differentials in Metropolitan Residential Displacement. Paper presented at the 1981 meeting of the Population Association of America, March 25–28, Washington, D.C.
- Long, Larry H. and Kristen A. Hansen. 1979. *Current Population Reports P-23, No. 81. Reasons for Interstate Migration*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Margolis, Diane Rothband. 1979. *The Managers*. New York: William Morrow and Company.
- Michelson, William. 1977. *Environmental Choice, Human Behavior, and Residential Satisfaction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1940. *Situated Actions and Vocabularies of Motive*. *American Sociological Review* 5:904–914.
- Morrison, Peter A. 1971. Chronic Movers and the Future Redistribution of Population: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Demography* 8:171–184.
- Newman, Sandra J. and Michael S. Owen. 1982. *Residential Displacement in the U. S. 1970–1977*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.
- Petersen, William A. 1958. A General Typology of Migration. *American Sociological Review* 23:256–266.
- Public Housing Administration. 1958. *Mobility and Motivations: Survey of Families Moving from Low-Rent Housing*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Ritchey P. Neal. 1976. Explanations of Migration. Pp. 363–404 in *Annual Review of Sociology*. Vol. 2. Palo Alto, Ca.: Annual Reviews Inc.
- Rossi, Peter. 1955. *Why Families Move*. Glencoe, Il.: The Free Press.
- . 1980. *Why Families Move*. 2nd Edition. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage.
- Saben, Samuel. 1964. Geographic Mobility and Employment Status: March 1962–March 1963. *Monthly Labor Review* 87:873–892.
- Schorr, Philip. 1975. *Planned Relocation*. Lexington, Ma.: Lexington Books.
- Sell, Ralph R. 1983. Transferred Jobs: A Neglected Aspect of Migration and Occupational Change. *Work and Occupations* 10(2):179–206.
- Sell, Ralph R. and Gordon F. DeJong. 1978. Toward a Motivational Theory of Migration Decision Making. *Journal of Population: Behavioral, Social and Environmental Issues* 1:313–335.
- Sell, Ralph R. and Gordon F. DeJong. 1983. Deciding Whether to Move: Mobility, Wishful Thinking and Adjustment. *Sociology and Social Research* 67:146–165.
- Shaw, R. Paul. 1975. *Migration Theory and Fact*. Philadelphia: Regional Science Research Institute.
- Shryock, Henry. 1969. Survey Statistics on Reasons for Moving. *Proceedings of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population*. Vol. IV: 2820–2835. Liege: IUSSP.
- Speare, A., A. Goldstein, and W. H. Frey. 1975. *Residential Mobility, Migration, and Metropolitan Change*. Cambridge, Ma.: Ballinger Publishing Co.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1975. *Current Housing Reports # H-150-73D. Housing Characteristics of Recent Movers for the U.S. and Regions: 1973*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1978. *Current Housing Reports # H-150-78D. Housing Characteristics of Recent Movers for the U.S. and Regions: 1978*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Wolf, Eleanor. 1969. *Change and Renewal in an Urban Community: Five Case Studies of Detroit*. New York: Praeger.