한국인구학 제26권 제2호(2003년), pp. 197~219

연구논문

The Effects of Status Inconsistency between Spouses on Migration in the United States: Propensities and Rural-Urban Destination Selections*

Ji-Youn Lee** · Michael B. Toney*** · Helen E. Berry***

Using the panel data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 79, we test the effects of relative status inconsistency within American young couples on the direction of migration as well as on migration propensities. Key findings in this study indicate that only couples in which the wife's education is greater than the husband's education are less likely to migrate than couples for which the wife's status is as lower than the husband's. There are no differences in the propensity for rural couples to migrate to urban counties or for urban couples to migrate to rural counties based on status inconsistency between spouses. However, we find that there is the gendered difference in the effect of status inconsistency on the probability of family migration. A spouse's higher status has an impact on a wife's probability of migration but does not affect a husband's migration propensity in a comparable situation. These findings are most consistent with a gender role perspective on migration since increases in the wife's status have little effect on family migration, once the presence and age of children is controlled.

Key words: status inconsistency, gender, family migration, person-years

* This research is based on work supported by the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, under Agreement No. 2001-49200-01239 and Utah Agricultural Experiment Station Award No. 843.

** Korea National Statistics Office Seoul, Korea

*** Utah State University

I. INTRODUCTION

Migration is most common among young adults, primarily because of their high frequencies of life course events, such as changing school enrollment, employment status, and marital status (Jones, 1990). However, the decision to move is not always an individual choice; rather, migration is often made in a family context. In that context, it has long been assumed that mobility is designed, as Massey (1987) puts it, to balance the household's resources with its needs. Since the place in which people live is likely has pervasive influences on their economic, social, and personal lives, it is reasonable to expect that many individual and family characteristics will influence migration decisions.

Over the past several decades the migration decision has become more complicated in the United States due to the rise in female labor force participation. The associated increase in dual earner families means that there is a greater need to take the economic contributions and future earnings of the both partners into account, not just those of the traditional household head. Between 1970 and 1993, dual-earner couples increased from 39 percent to 61 percent of all married couples (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1998). Keddem (1984) examines a historical context of the growing employment of wives in American working-class families and finds that wives' labor force participation does not respond to changes in husbands' employment status, indicating that wives have become permanent added-workers and their income is an important benefit to their families.

Migration studies have documented that single-earner families are more likely to move than dual-earner families (Mincer, 1978; Long, 1974). Although the increases in wives' labor force participation raises the question of the role of gender in family migration decision-making, neoclassical economic approaches are often restricted to analyzing the rational action of the head (mainly male) of household. These explanations do not allow for the possibility that migration decisions are often made taking into account the whole family and thus are affected by marital power relations (Cooke and

Bailey, 1996).

Previous studies have not fully explored the effects of the relative status of wives and husbands within the context of power relationships on family migration in the U.S. The exception to this is Smits, Mulder and Hooijeijer (2003) whose work examines age and educational differences between males and females in the Netherlands and only examines long-distance migration. Their findings show that dual-earner couples and families shows that, when women work, the couple is less likely to move. Their research does not, however, examine direction of move (e.g. rural to urban) nor does their work consider differences in income between partners.

To address these limitations, this research will assess the relative importance of status inconsistency as a determinant of migration for young couples in the United States. Status inconsistency is defined by comparisons of the relative status of wives and husbands with respect to their education and income levels. Individual and household characteristics are included in a multivariate analysis of this relationship as part of a strategy for assessing the comparative importance of status inconsistency. A unique aspect of the study is a focus on testing the effects of relative status inconsistency within a marital dyad on the direction of migration as well as on migration propensities. Panel data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 79 (NLSY79) are utilized to empirically examine these relationships.

Ⅱ. THEORETICAL ISSUES

Discussions about family migration are extremely rich and diversified (Rossi, 1955; Cooke and Bailey, 1996). Most of the perspectives on family migration assume gender equality in decisions about whether or where to move the family although some recent perspectives allow for gender inequality (Smits, Mulder and Hooijeijer, 2003). Equality used here means that the family's overall welfare is the fundamental consideration in decision-making with little or no consideration given to the relative gains or

losses of individual members of the family. In this study we focus on a perspective that assumes gender equality and a second perspective that assumes gender inequality. Mincer's (1978) strict human capital model of migration and the related family resource theory assume gender equality, and ignore the potential influence of gender relations in decision-making and outcomes. The gender-role perspective focuses primarily on the effect of gender inequality and it's associated differentials in outcomes.

1. The Gender Equality Perspectives

The human capital and family resource approaches treat migration as a decision taken "for the good of the family," even though there may be individual economic losses involved. Mincer's model is based on a benefit-cost analysis of the migration decision, in which, "net family gain rather than net personal gain motivates migration of households" (Mincer, 1978:750). The sum of the two partners personal net utility gains are the net gain to the family. If that net gain is positive, moving is then optimal for the family even if either the wife or husband experienced net loss. In this perspective, the prevalence of male-centered family migration results from status inconsistencies whereby the husband's socioeconomic status is almost always significantly higher than the wife's. Migration rates for families with employed wives should be lower than for families with non-employed wives because gains made by the husband tend to be mediated by difficulties associated with finding suitable employment for the wife.

The deterrent effects of the wife's market earning power on migration are stronger when the wife's attachment is more permanent and her earning power is higher. Indeed, Smits, Mulder and Hooijeijer (2003) note that women's education & employment tend to deter migration while men's have the opposite effect. It is likely that, when educated husband's contributions to family income are significantly larger than the wife's, the family is more likely to move because the family's gains from migration are more likely to outweigh the wife's losses. When these couples consider migration, the woman's employment may be considered less important because of her lower

overall status (Mincer, 1978; Maxwell, 1988).

Jacobsen and Levin (2000) compare the economic return to migration for families and unmarried individuals in the U.S. by using data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation from 1983 to 1989. They find that migration has more negative effects on married women compared to married men. This is consistent with the Mincer model, but the big gainers from migration are single, particularly college-educated women, rather than married men. Jacobsen and Levin suspect that the era of the 1980s produced relatively favorable conditions for single women, as they were able to adapt to the increasing service orientation of the economy, in contrast with male workers. During that time, manufacturing sectors that held traditionally large number of male workers declined, and overall male worker's real wages also declined. The 1980s was also a good period for well-educated people, because economic returns on education increased.

The wife's status in dual-earner families may have an effect on geographic location choices. Cooke and Bailey (1996) note that since migration is generally toward growing job markets, women may actually find improved employment opportunities (see also Bonney and Love, 1991). Mincer (1978) postulates that living in a large urban area with diverstified labor markets reduces the degree to which both partners in a dual-carrier marriage must compromise their individual gains from migration. Regarding migration distance, Mincer further suggests "the deterrent effect of the wife's work status increases with distance, while the husband's education is positively related to the distance of migration" (771). Frank (1978) examines family location constraints and the geographic distribution of dual-earner families. He finds that female professionals are more likely to be living in large cites than male professionals, because large urban markets are more likely to satisfy the career needs of both spouses. Similarly, Marwell et al. (1979) found that families in which the wives were academic professionals are more likely to move to a metropolitan area than were families in which the husband was an academic professional.

Although the Mincer model does not assume stereotypes of homogeneous, cooperative, and altruistic families, it still treats migration as purely an

economic phenomenon. As Bielby and Bielby (1989) point out, the weakness of Mincer's approach is that the issue of power within a family is ignored. Family resource theory may more aptly describe the real power balance within families. Family resource theory states that the distribution of power within the marriage is an essential determinant in family decision-making. The main contribution of the family resource theory would be its recognition of more diverse resources of power (e.g. education, labor force experience, seniority, and the occupational prestige of the job) and of the effect of relative status between spouses within a family. In other words, any status inconsistency would reflect the results of a comparison made by a family based on the resources contributed to the family by husbands and wives respectively.

The family resource theory possesses some important differences from the notion of a strict economic utility-maximizing framework, but the theory shares the Mincer model's assumption that an individual's relatively low economic status makes them less influential in migration decisions. If so, then one would expect a lower prevalence of wives as movers tied to their husbands as the wives economic status rises. However, Bird and Bird (1985), in a study of more than one hundred married college administrators who had recently moved, find that approximately one-half of the moves benefited the husband's career at the expense of the wife's, while one-third of the moves benefited the wife at the expense of the husband. In only one-sixth of the moves did both spouses feel that the move had benefited both careers.

Shihadeh (1991) tests both the human capital model and the family resource theory with respect to migration decision using three "power variables" that measured the relative age, educational level, and occupational prestige level of husbands and wives in Canadian families. He then includes these variables in the analysis to test whether the inclusion of these variables are associated with family migration. None of the "power variables" are statistically significant, which leads Shihadeh to conclude that there is no support in the data for either the strict human capital model or for family resource theory. Husbands' human capital as measured by level of education and employment status before the move are positively related to

post-migration employment, but the same did not happen for their wives. He concludes that, "These findings shed serious doubt on any attempt to apply traditional economic models of migration to wives" (439), and suggests that more attention should be given to gender-role theory.

2. The Inequality Perspectives

Gender role theory is less theoretically and empirically well specified in relationship to migration than is the Mincer model. However gender role theory has been applied in some research on family migration, because many empirical studies explain that "the neat equality of (the) utility equation hardly applies to the apparent asymmetry of family migration decisions" (Shihadeh, 1991: 433).

Gender-role theory emphasizes the familial roles of men and women. That is, traditionally, women's roles tended to be more family oriented with less emphasis on economic contributions from participation in the labor force. Traditional gender-role practices tend to lead to a high degree of status inconsistency between husbands and wives since family strategies and decisions aim to increase the husband's status regardless of their impact on the wife's status. Although wives may be actively involved in the decision-making process, prior research suggests that there are gendered experiences of migration decision-making. Halfacree (1995) argues that the negative effect of family migration on the wife's economic status is not solely a function of status inconsistencies emanating from women's lower economic standing in relation to their spouses nor solely from within the household, but in the context of society as a whole.

Gender role theories argue that whether wives have a higher or lower socioeconomic status makes little difference in family migration decision-making. Family interests are dominated by the husband and because both women and men are socialized to place the husband's concerns first and the wife's goals second when it comes to critical household matters. In this model, there is a strong expectation that men should earn more income than the wife. Opportunity for the wife to surpass the husband in economic status

by migrating would actually hinder migration.

Empirical findings are mixed in demonstrating gender asymmetry in family migration. Duncan and Perrucci (1976) test whether women's labor force participation deters family migration and find that wives' higher occupational prestige and family income contribution did not depress rates. Ferber and Kordick (1978) indicated that earning-related consequences of migration are negative for wives because wives are "more likely to subordinate their careers to those of their husbands" (232). This assertion is echoed by Spitze (1984) who documents a negative relationship between education and returns to migration among married women in the late 1970s.

Morrison and Lichter (1988) consider the returns to migration of both single and married women by using the NLS data from 1968 to 1978 and find that women with greater human capital actually experience a drop in wage returns upon migration. Employing a constructed measure of job quality which includes a weighted average of wage and other job characteristics, they find that married women migrants experience an average 30 percent drop in their job quality measure when compared with those of stayers, while single women migrants experience a 13 percent drop compared to those of stayers.

If gender role theory explains family migration better than human capital-related theories, then the effect of children on migration must be considered. The constraining effect of children on the migration decision is widely documented, an effect produced in part because children anchor families to their communities through ties to schools, friends and relatives, and community organizations (Long, 1988). The effect of children on family migration depends on the children's age rather than the number of children present in a family. For example, Long (1972) finds that families with school-age children are the least mobile and families with pre-school-age children are among the most mobile.

Shauman and Xie (1996) examine sex differences and family constraints on the geographic mobility of scientists by using 1990 Census data. They argue that although the deterrent effect of children on migration is present in all scientists' families, there is a difference between men and women scientists. Consistent with gender-role theory, the negative effects of having children are

stronger and more significant for women than for men. As Hertz (1986) put it, "gender becomes a salient issue once children arrive" (145). Even though the partners are equally committed to their careers, the arrival of children may reinforce the socially expected role for a woman as a care giver.

3. Hypotheses

Despite the rich body of literature on family migration, little empirical research explicitly compares the gender inequality perspective with the gender equality perspectives. Two broad hypotheses are tested to assess whether the migration of families is more consistent with human capital or gender role theorizing. The first hypothesis, from a human capital perspective, is that families in which the wife has lower status than the husband will be more likely to migrate than families in which the wife's status is high as or higher than the husband's status. Since the destination of the migration is likely to more greatly influence one or the other spouse's employment opportunities, some migration directions are likely to be influenced by status inconsistencies. Specifically, since the likelihood of both partners finding work will be higher in urban than in rural areas, our second hypothesis is that lower female status will increase the probability of moving from urban to rural counties and decrease the probability of moving from rural to urban counties.

Theories of gender, as opposed to more human capital-oriented theory, would argue that whether wives have a higher or lower socioeconomic status makes little difference in patterns of family migration, because family interests are dominated by the husband (Bielby and Bielby, 1992; Halfacree, 1995). Thus empirical findings in this study showing impacts by status inconsistencies will be interpreted as supporting the human capital approach. Findings showing less influence by the wife's status will be interpreted as being more consistent with gender role perspectives.

Ⅲ. DATA AND METHOD

1. Data

Panel data from the NLSY79 are analyzed using logistic regression to test the effects of individual and household characteristics and status inconsistency on the propensity to migrate and on the direction of migration of young couples. Data from the NLSY79 include detailed information on marital status (both married and cohabiting couples are included in the analysis), family composition, family economic status, respondent's educational attainment and income level, and his/her spouse's or partner's. The measurement of these variables at the beginning of migration intervals is an important advantage offered by these longitudinal data.

To work more efficiently with the longitudinal data, the original data is converted into person-years. In this procedure, each observation of the subject becomes a separate case so that if there are nine observations of a particular person over 18 years, then each of the nine observations becomes a separate case. Thus, the person-year is best interpreted as being an individual, with all of that individual's characteristics measured for that year.

The migration interval is measured over two-year intervals with the first interval being 1980-1982, and the last of nine intervals, 1996-1998. The use of two-year intervals is preferable because the NLSY79 changed from annual interviews to bi-yearly interviews after 1994. This two-year interval allows consistent comparisons of migration rates between the beginning years and the most recent years of the panel.

The study sample is limited to young adult couples between 18 and 41, 41 being the oldest age group in the 1998 survey year. Because both geographical location and detailed status information for each spouse or partner are central to the study, an observation with incomplete geographical data or with a missing record for either main respondents or his/her partner is also eliminated. Since direction of migration is important to the study, only

those moves from rural to urban or from urban to rural are included. This procedure yields a sample of 22,753 person-years for couples. In the NLSY79 there are 35,749 person-years for the married or cohabiting couples. Since the number of missing values in the NLSY79 is higher for income related variables, only 63.6 percent of the total, or 22,753, have valid cases for all dependent and independent variables in this study.

2. Dependent Variables

There are two measures of migration employed in this study (see Table 1). The first dependent variable, migration status, simply indicates whether the county of residence at the beginning of a two-year interval is the same as at the end of the interval. (A county is a geographically based political entity for which the U.S. government and states collect many social and economic characteristics.) For the second measure, direction of migration, comparisons of the type of county of residence at the beginning of the two-year interval and at the end of the interval are made to determine the extent to which migration is between rural and urban destinations. To define urban, we use the U.S. Census Bureau designation of metropolitan area, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA). Non-SMSA, counties are, by definition, rural.

3. Explanatory Variables

Control variables, selected in accordance with prior migration research include, at the individual-level, age, race/ethnicity, education, and employment status. Two family-level variables, number of children and family income, are included as well. Also, since gender is a major concern of this study it is included as a control variable although our unit of analysis is the couple. This allow for us to account for the use of respondent characteristics as the individual control variables. In addition, prior research indicates possible response bias by gender in surveys whereby male respondents may be more likely to report higher status for themselves than for their wife since this is a

culturally desired situation in the United States. Coding for variables are shown in Table 1.

〈Table 1〉 Summary of the Dependent and Independent Variables

Dependent Variables[a]	
Migration Status	Migration and nonmigration
Direction of Migration	Non-SMSA-to-SMSA migration and SMSA-to-Non-SMSA migration
Independent variables[b]	
Individual level Variables	
Age	Less than 21 yrs, 21-25 yrs, 26-30 yrs, 31-35 yrs, and 36 yrs and older
Gender	Male and female
Race / Ethnicity	White, Black, and other
Education	Not a high school graduate, high school graduate, some college graduate, and bachelor's degree or more
Employment Status	Employed, unemployed, and out of labor force
Family level Variables	
Children	No child, 0-5 yrs, and 6-12 yrs
Family Income[c]	Less than $20,000, $20,000-$39,999, $40,000-$59,999, and $60,000 and over
Status Inconsistency Variables	
Educational Inconsistency	Wife < Husband and Wife >= Husband
Income Inconsistency	Wife < Husband and Wife >= Husband

a Measured at the end of migration intervals (Time t)
b Measured at the beginning of migration intervals (Time t-1)
c Converted values by the Consumer Price Index for 2002.

Status inconsistency generally means that, in multidimensional social status, individuals may occupy discrepant statuses between investments and rewards or between ascribed and achieved status. Studies have focused on the strain of status inconsistency present within individuals, but some researchers (see Hornung and McCulloug (1981) and Mueller, Parcel, and Pampel (1979)) extend this traditional concept to relative status within a marital dyad. In this

study, status inconsistency 'within a couple' refers to a discrepancy in achieved status between husbands and wives. To measure status inconsistency between spouses, couples are differentiated using information about both spouses' educational level and income level. The educational inconsistency variable is the wife's educational level subtracted from the husband's. The same reasoning is applied in the construction of an inconsistency variable based on income.

Both inconsistency variables in this study are dichotomized so that either the wife has lesser status, or the wife has equal or higher status than her partner (see Table 2). Dichotomizing the inconsistency variables likely overstates the number of cases in which a wife has more favorable income status than her husband, because if she earns only one dollar more than her husband she is classified as being higher status. We tested several measures for the income inconsistency variable including even quintal coding systems, but results are not much different from the current, more intuitively interpretable measure.

〈Table 2〉 Status Inconsistency between Husbands and Wives* by Migration Propensity and Migration Direction for NLSY79 Couples (N=22,753 two-year interval person-years)

	Migration Propensity		Rural to Urban		Urban to Rural	
	N	Percentage Migrated	N	Percentage Migrated to SMSA	N	Percentage Migrated to Non-SMSA
Educational Inconsistency						
Wife 〈 Husband	6,530	16.7	1,333	13.4	5,200	3.0
Wife 〉= Husband	16,223	14.2	4,086	11.3	12,134	3.0
Income Inconsistency						
Wife 〈 Husband	17,725	15.0	4,330	11.6	13,399	3.0
Wife 〉= Husband	5,028	14.7	1,089	12.9	3,035	3.2

* Husbands and wives includes cohabiting male and female partners.

Ⅳ. RESULTS

1. Descriptive Results

The differences in migration propensities and migration directions within couples whose wives have equal or higher status than their husbands are not great in the bivariate relationships reported in Table 2. Migration propensities are slightly higher when the husband's education or income status is higher than the wife's status on these two variables compared to rates for couples in which the wife's status is equal or higher than the husband's. In specific couples in which the wife has a lower education level have a migration propensity of 16.7 percent compared to 14.2 percent for couples where the wife's education level is as high or higher than the husbands. The difference is even less, 15.0 percent and 14.7 percent respectively, when status inconsistency is measured by comparing wife's income with her husband's income.

Similarly, the differences in selection of rural and urban destinations are not great. Rural couples with lower status for the wife than for the husband were slightly more likely to move to an urban county than were couples when the wife's education or income status was equal or greater than the husband's status (11.6 percent vs. 12.9 percent). The difference was greater when measured by education than when measured with income (13.4 percent to 11.3 percent). The selection of rural destinations by urban couples (3 percent) did not vary by status inconsistency when measured by education and the difference was small (3.2 percent) when measured by income. Overall, the direction of these bivariate relationships implies that a gender role explanation best fits the data. However, given the small size of the effect of status inconsistency on migration, the data may be seen as most consistent with a gender role explanation of migration. Since migration and status inconsistency may be related to numerous other factors it is important to examine the relationships in a multivariate context.

2. Results from logistic regression models

Logistic regression analyses are conducted to examine the effects of status inconsistency once other variables are controlled. The estimated coefficients are presented in the first column in Table 3. An odds ratio greater than 1 indicates that the odds of migration increases while the independent variable increases. The variables in the model both control and status inconsistency - collectively are not independent of the data, as indicated by the strong chi-square statistics of 454.4 (20 degrees of freedom).

The estimated coefficients for the control variables are consistent with the findings from prior research. Age deters the likelihood of migration, even when controlled for other variables. Migration propensities are higher for male than female respondents. Whites are significantly more likely to migrate across county boundaries than any other racial groups, as are the employed (as opposed to the unemployed). Those with bachelor's degrees, whether male or female, are more than half again as likely to report a move as those without a high school diploma. Those in higher income households are about one-third less likely to move than those in the lowest income group. Finally, in agreement with other family migration studies, those without children are more likely to migrate than are people with children and child's age is negatively associated with the probability of migration.

Of core interest to this study are the effects of the status inconsistency variables that test the hypothesis that couples with higher status husbands are more likely to migrate. This hypothesis is partly confirmed in the NLSY79: the presence of a wife with more education than her husband deters the likelihood of migration, but income inconsistency between spouses has no impact on the probability of migration. The implication is that the gender-role theory may explain more about migration when income is considered, but human capital theory may have more influence when education is examined. Regardless, when combined with the other results, this data suggests that gender status, whether for males or females, has an independent influence on migration.

〈Table 3〉 Odds Ratios of the Probability of Migration for Dual-Earner Couples

	All	Men	Women
Constant	.385	.397	.295
Age(Less than 21 yrs)			
21-25 yrs	.979	.837	1.055
26-30 yrs	.770**	.641*	.859
31-35 yrs	.603**	.521**	.648**
36 yrs and older	.411**	.360**	.434**
Gender(Male)			
Female	.835**		
Race/Ethnicity(White)			
Black	.903	.869	.937
Other	.828	.847	.824
Education(Not a high school graduate)			
High school graduate	1.061	.932	1.279*
Some college graduate	1.219**	1.293*	1.335**
Bachelor's degree or more	1.658**	1.875**	1.742**
Employment Status(Employed)			
Unemployed	1.325**	1.378*	1.295*
Out of labor force	1.614**	1.630**	1.601**
Children(No child)			
0-5 yrs	.751**	.773**	.732*
6-12 yrs	.746**	.761*	.734**
13-18 yrs	.835	.952	.758
Family Income(Less than $20,000)			
$20,000 to $39,999	.777**	.768*	.732*
$40,000 to $59,999	.674**	.685**	.650**
$60,000 and over	.683**	.681**	.651**
Educational Inconsistency(Wife < Husband)			
Wife >= Husband	.861**	1.029	.775**
Income Inconsistency(Wife < Husband)			
Wife >= Husband	.970	.967	.963
Model Chi-Square	454.4	221.6	252.4
Degrees of Freedom	20	19	19
Total Person-Years	22,753	10,050	12,703

( ) indicates reference category. *p<.05 **p<.01

To examine whether the pattern of explanatory variables differs by gender of the respondent, logistic regressions are run for husband respondents and wife respondents separately, and the results are presented in the second and third columns of Table 3. Overall, the results are very similar regardless of whether the information about the couple is provided by the husband or the wife. Among the control variables, the exception is that for men and women high school graduates the female has about one-fourth greater odds of a move while the male has about even odds. Though not a large statistical effect, this suggests that women with high school degrees have different experiences than do men. Similarly, women in the 21 to 25 year age group have even odds of a move, while the men in this group are less likely to move.

Regarding the status variables, when the husband reports for the couple, there is no difference in the couple's migration propensity regardless of whether wives have higher or lower status than husbands with other variables controlled. For women, however, the wife's higher educational attainment deters the likelihood of migration, but the wife's higher income status has no statistical effect.

The results from logistic regression analyses predicting the direction of migrations are reported in Table 4. Individual and family characteristics also substantially affect the direction of migration, but the results show that there are differences between individuals moving to metropolitan areas and individuals moving to rural places. The effect of the respondent's gender is significant only for migrants from SMSAs to non-SMSAs. Consistent with prior studies of race and ethnic differences in migration, Blacks and Other ethnic groups are more likely to move to urban places and less than half as likely to move to rural places than Whites.

For non-SMSA residents, education tends to be positively selective: the odds of leaving for an SMSA for the best-educated non-SMSA resident are 48.4 percent higher than the odds for least-educated non-SMSA resident. For SMSA residents, those with a high school diploma are significantly less likely to migrate to a non-SMSA than are residents who did not graduate from high school. The odds of making a move increase for those with more education, but are not statistically different from even.

〈Table 4〉 Odds Ratios of the Direction of Migration for All Dual-Earner Couple

	Migrate from non-SMSA to SMSA	Migrate from SMSA to npn-SMSA
Constant	.156	.135
Age(Less than 21 yrs)		
21-25 yrs	1.063	.915
26-30 yrs	.817	.828
31-35 yrs	1.029	.693
36 yrs and older	.549*	.342**
Gender(Male)		
Female	.965	.789*
Race/Ethnicity(White)		
Black	1.241	.401**
Other	2.225**	.279**
Education(Not a high school graduate)		
High school graduate	.990	.722*
Some college graduate	1.025	.877
Bachelor's degree or more	1.484*	.808
Employment Status(Employed)		
Unemployed	1.442*	1.051
Out of labor force	1.172	1.184
Children(No child)		
0-5 yrs	.875	.783*
6-12 yrs	.757	.967
13-18 yrs	.674	1.170
Family Income(Less than $20,000)		
$20,000 to $39,999	.961	1658*
$40,000 to $59,999	.901	.442**
$60,000 and over	1.311	.422**
Educational Inconsistency(Wife < Husband)		
Wife >= Husband	.837	1.063
Income Inconsistency(Wife < Husband)		
Wife >= Husband	1.105	1.053
Model Chi-Square	66.0	146.9
Degrees of Freedom	20	20
Total Person-Years	5,024	15,801

( ) indicates reference category. *p<.05 **p<.01

Unemployment substantially raises the likelihood of a move from rural to urban places, but the odds are even of a move from urban to rural or urban to rural, relative to the employed, for other groups. The odds of a move from rural to urban, though not statistically significant, decline with child's age, but increase for those moving from urban to rural.

It is interesting to note, that the effects of income are much stronger and more significant for urban out-migrants than for rural out-migrants. The proportion of rural couples migrating to urban areas is the same regardless of income. However, high income urban couples are much less likely to migrate to a rural area than are low income urban couples.

Our hypothesis that status inconsistency would influence the direction of migration is not supported by the findings. Whether the wife has lower or equal/higher education or income status as the husband has no statistical effect on the odds of migration.

V. CONCLUSION

In traditional families, the economic status of the household head, almost always the husband, has been viewed as the most important determining consideration in family migration decisions. Early studies revealed that the husband's present and expected earnings largely determined the family's socioeconomic status and overall wellbeing in a cost-benefit analysis that might take cost of living and a few other socioeconomic factors into account. Increases in female labor force participation by wives, including women in cohabiting households, over the past decades raises questions about the relative importance of husbands' and wives' socioeconomic status in migration decisions.

Key findings in this study indicate that status inconsistency, defined by comparing the husband's and the wife's education and income, has little effect on propensity of migration or direction of migration. Only couples in which the wife's education is greater than the husband's education are less likely to

migrate than couples for which the wife's status is as lower than the husband's. Couples in which the husband's income is higher than the wife's income do not migrate at a different propensity than couples in which the wife's income is as high or higher than the husband's income. There are no differences in the propensity for rural couples to migrate to urban counties or for urban couples to migrate to rural counties based on whether the wife's education or income is as high as or lower than the husband's.

Based on the overall results, we reject the hypothesis that families in which the wife has lower status than the husband will be more likely to migrate than families in which the wife's status is high as or equal to her husband's status. However, it is important to note that the lower migration for couples in which the wife had equal or higher education than the husband provides some support for this hypothesis. The hypotheses that lower female status will increase the probability of moving from urban to a rural county and decrease the probability of moving from rural to urban is also rejected. None of the empirical results were consistent with this hypothesis.

These results are important because they tend to indicate that the wife's status has no more influence on the migration of couples than does the husband's. Comparatively, the individual and family characteristics examined in traditional studies of migration have greater effects on migration than the status inconsistency variables examined here, at least once those other variables are controlled. These findings are most consistent with a gender role perspective on migration since increases in the wife's status have little effect on migration, once the presence and age of children is controlled.

Our research was limited to two categories of status inconsistency because of the small number of couples in which the wife has higher status than the husband. In the future analysis of larger data sets with a larger number of wives with higher status than their husbands would allow a more complete test of our broader hypotheses that status inconsistency influences aspects of migration.

REFERENCES

Bielby, William T. and Denise D. Bielby (1989), "I Will Follow Him: Causes and Consequences of Husbands' and Wives' Willingness to Relocate," Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association*, San Francisco, CA.

Bird, Gerald. A. and Gloria W. Bird (1985), "Determinants of Mobility in Two-Earner Families: Do Wives' Jobs Matter?" *Journal of Marriage and the Household* 47: 753-758.

Bonney, N., and J. Love, (1991), "Gender and Migration: Geographical Mobility and the Wife's Sacrifice," *The Sociological Review* 39:335-48.

Cooke, Thomas J. and Adrian J. Bailey (1996), "Family Migration and the Employment of Married Women and Men," *Economic Geography* 72(1): 38-48.

Duncan, R. Paul and Carolyn Cummings Perrucci (1976), "Dual Occupation Families and Migration," *American Sociological Review* 41: 252-261.

Frank, R.H. (1978), "Household Location Constraints and the Geographic Distribution of Female Professionals," *Journal of Political Economy* 86: 117-130.

Ferber, Marianne A. and Betty Kordick (1978), "Differentials in the Earnings of Ph.D.s," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 31: 227-38.

Halfacree, Keith H. (1995), "Household Migration and the Structuration of Patriarchy: Evidence from the USA," *Progress in Human Geography* 19: 159-182.

Hertz, R. (1986), *More Equal Than Others: Women and Men in Dual-Carrier Marriages,* Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Hornung, Carlton A. and Claire B. McCullough (1981), "Status Relationships in Dual-employment Marriages: Consequences for Psychological Well-being,". *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 43: 125-141.

Jacobsen, Joyce P. and Laurence M. Levin (2000), "The Effect of Internal Migration on the Relative Economic Status of Women and Men,"

Journal of Socio-Economics 29: 291-307.

Jones, H. (1990), *Population Geography,* London: Paul Chapman.

Keddem, Aliza M (1984), "The Integration of Wives into Wage-Work and the Working-Class Struggle to Maintain its Standard of Living," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR.

Long, Larry H. (1972), "The Influence of Number and Ages of Children on Residential Mobility," *Demography* 9: 371-82.

_____ (1974), "Women's Labor Force Participation and the Residential Mobility of Families," *Social Forces* 52: 343-48.

_____ (1988), *Migration and ResidentialMobility in the United States,* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Massey, Douglas (1987), "The Ethnosurvey in Theory and Practice," *International Migration Review* 21: 1498-1522.

Marwell, G., R.A. Rosenfeld, and S. Spilerman (1979), "Geographic Constraintson Women's Careers in Academia," *Science* 205: 1225-31.

Maxwell, Nan L. (1988), "Economic Returns to Migration: Marital Status and Gender Differences," *Social Science Quarterly* 69: 108-21.

Mincer, Jacob (1978), "Household Migration Decisions," *Journal of Political Economy* 86: 749-73.

Morrison, Donna R. and Daniel T. Lichter (1988), "Household Migration and Female Employment: the Problem of Underemployment Among Migrant Married Women," *Journal of Marriage and the Household* 50: 161-72.

Mueller, Charles W., Toby L. Parcel, and Fred C. Pampel (1979), "The Effect of Marital Dyad Status Inconsistency on Women's Support for Equal Rights," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56: 1121-39.

Rossi, Peter (1955), *Why Families Move: A Study in the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press

Shauman, Kimberlee A. and Yu Xie (1996), "Geographic Mobility of Scientists: Sex Differences and Household Constraints," *Demography* 33: 455-468.

Shihadeh, Edward (1991), "The Prevalence of Husband-Centered Migration:

Employment Consequences for Married Mothers," *Journal of Marriage and the Household* 55: 432-444.

Smits, Jeroen, Clara H. Mulder and Pieter Hooijeijer (2003), "Changing Gender Roles, Shifting Power Balance and Long-distance Migration of Couples," *Urban Studies* 40(3): 603-613.

Spitze, Glenna (1984), "The Effect of Household Migration on Wives' Employment: How Long Does It Last?" *Social Science Quarterly* 65: 21-36.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1998), "Married-Couple Families with Wives' Earning Greater than Husbands' Earning,"
http://www.census.gov/hhes/income/histinc/f19.html