

# **The relevance of regional contexts for migration decisions in the life course**

Johannes J. Huinink and Stefanie A. Kley

## **1. Introduction**

In migration theory it is well acknowledged that perceiving better opportunities elsewhere play a decisive role in migration decision-making. Particular in Europe, where economical conditions may differ substantially between areas, this is highly relevant. However, there are only few studies which explicitly bring regional-level aspects together with micro-level explanations of migration. The aim of this paper is to close this gap by using a life-course framework to explain the relevance of perceived opportunities for migration decision-making. We propose an analytical framework in which the relevance of perceived opportunities changes systematically according to the 'instrumental goals' for well-being people strive for in a particular phase of the life-course. Considering job-related events on the one hand and family-related on the other, the relevance of perceived opportunities is unveiled, while socio-demographic variables and social ties are also considered. We distinguish perceived opportunities in three main areas of life, education and work, partnership and family, and self realization by pursuing own interests. Migration decision-making is subdivided in the analytical phases of considering and planning to move. We refer to migration as moving beyond the city boundary, regardless how far the destination is. The data come from a survey in two German cities (Magdeburg and Freiburg), and were gathered via a two-wave panel design in 2006 and 2007. The sample consists of three different groups of respondents: persons who did not consider moving, persons who considered or planned to leave the city, and persons who recently moved to the city. We use nested binomial logistic regression models to (1) detect the relevance of perceived opportunities for considering and planning migration, biographical events, and social ties. Socio-demographic variables are also considered. Comparing two subgroups of respondents, those who expect job-related events and those who expect or just have experienced family-related events, we analyze (2) how the relevance of regional opportunities for considering and planning migration differs between these actors facing different life transitions. By a comparative analysis of motives reported from persons who moved to the two cities we additionally show (3) how the spatial distribution of opportunities affects migration flows.

## **2. Theory and stand of research**

At least implicitly, regional opportunity structures have been considered as important for migration decision-making from the very beginning of migration research (Ravenstein 1972 [1885; 1889]). The relationship between structural factors and inner-migration movements is, however, often reported as weak or even contrasting to expectations. Investigating migration between Eastern and Western Germany, for example, Schlömer and Bucher (2001) report only a weak relationship between the regional rate of unemployment and migration. Windzio (2004) analysed the relationship between the regional unemployment rate and migration on the basis of individual level data. He found even a negative relationship between the unemployment rate and rates of moving to other regions within Germany. For Finland has been shown (Kauhanen and Tervo 2002) that jobless persons more often leave regions where the unemployment rate is high than regions where it is low, as one would expect. But the destination of their move often is not a prosperous place. Prosperous regions attract movers with higher education compared to other regions, whereas the latter attract more persons due to social ties.

DeJong and Fawcett (1981) proposed to include peoples' expectations about achieving their goals at the place of residence into a micro-level theory of migration decision-making. In this concept migration is seen as a process starting with an intention to move, which is a consequence of a perception that important goals might be achieved better elsewhere than at the current place of residence. This corresponds to what Wolpert (1965; 1966) calls the 'place utility'. Kalter (1997) showed that Wolpert's concept of 'place utility' can be used to integrate structural factors into an action-theoretic model of migration. It was also Kalter (1997) who proposed to differentiate analytically the process of migration decision-making into the two phases of considering and planning a migration, rather than relying just on intentions to move. Previous research has also shown that the degree of dissatisfaction with the current place of living, which was often used as a proxy for the strength of the intention to move, is no good predictor of moving at all. More predictive is the perceived gap between goal related opportunities at the current place of living and elsewhere.

Distinguishing between considering and planning is also supported by research in psychology which has shown that decision-making consists of at least two phases. In the first phase, the pre-decisional phase, many aspects are just considered and may be dropped again easily without affecting future intentions (Heckhausen 1989). After a decision is taken people

will stick to their goals closely and put effort in realizing them, because giving up their purpose would be costly in economic and psychological terms, for instance because of a loss of invested time and money, or a loss of self-respect or other psychological damages (Gollwitzer 1996; Heise 1998). We regard people as being in a pre-decisional phase if they consider migrating, and as having decided to move if they have plans to do so. Realizing the move is a third phase of the migration-process (Kalter 1997) which follows decision-making. It is not part of this analysis. According to our concept migration can be conceived as a 'generative process' (Goldthorpe 2001) in that each earlier phase is a precondition of the following.

Migration is part of the individual life course and is strongly connected to other life events in various life domains (education, work, family etc.). Therefore, a life-course framework is useful. The life course is framed by institutions and therefore both the goals people strive for and the biographical events they experience are to some extent typical for certain phases (Huinink 2005). The life course can be conceived as an institutionally structured process of individual 'welfare production' by pursuing certain life goals in different life domains (Lindenberg 1996). We very broadly focus on three domains of pursuing goals for individual well-being: career, partnership and family, and self-realization by pursuing own interests. Migration then can be seen as a tool of actors to select the adequate structural opportunities to achieve those goals. One changes the place of living in the case that one perceives a lack in opportunities for pursuing these goals of well-being. And this depends on the particular goal or life event. We expect that for respondents facing job-related events the perceived opportunities for career are most important, while for respondents facing family-related events the perceived opportunities for family-life are most important.

We do not expect that just perceiving a lack in opportunities contributes substantially to the explanation of planning a move, because planning is more costly. Referring to research on migration during the life course (Wagner 1989; Mulder 1993), there is strong evidence that biographical events are triggers for moving. Expecting or experiencing biographical events, for instance getting a new job, a marriage, or the birth of a child in general can be reasons to move. Deciding to leave the city and making migration plans causes investments of time and money. Therefore, this step needs stronger reasons than just to consider a move. Getting a new job in another city, for instance, may trigger planning a move by putting some time-pressure on the decision of accepting versus not accepting the job and bearing cost of commuting or not.

Finally, the theoretical framework of migration decision-making should also explain destination-choices. A prosperous city that has a great diversity of opportunities to offer is expected to attract relatively more movers with motives related to perceived opportunities than a city that is situated in a less prosperous region. Attractive jobs, universities, housing, and the climate are examples for parts of the opportunity structure. Having friends and relatives in a certain city are attractors that are on the contrary not part of the opportunity structure of the place himself. Therefore, comparing the two cities we expect Freiburg more often to be chosen as destination due to perceived opportunities than Magdeburg.

### **3. Data, variables and method**

The data were gathered in two German cities, Magdeburg and Freiburg, by conducting computer assisted telephone interviews with about 2.900 respondents aged 18 to 50. There are four different strata in the sample:

1. respondents who moved to the city during the last twelve months. They are denoted as persons who recently moved to the city
2. respondents who have lived in the city for at least twelve months and who have recently considered leaving the city
3. respondents who have lived in the city for at least twelve months and who have plans for leaving the city
4. respondents who have lived in the city for at least twelve months and who neither consider nor plan to leave the city.

The initial survey was conducted from April to July 2006. The respondents were followed up and interviewed again one year after the main interview, so that we have information whether they have moved or not (so far). To analyze the decision-making process we will only use data of the initial wave. For the analysis we pooled the data of both cities. Apart from different economic conditions due to their location in East-Germany (Magdeburg) versus West-Germany (Freiburg) the two cities have much in common. They both have about 200,000 inhabitants; both have universities, and both are not located close to another big city within reasonable commuting distance.

As predictors to explain considering and planning a migration we used four categories of variables:

1. Variables measuring demographic attributes and household characteristics that are likely to affect migration behaviour: gender, age, level of education, fulltime employment, income, home-ownership, living together with a partner or with children, and place of residence. The level of education was coded into four categories: not yet completed schooling or vocational training, not yet completed university, (at least some) vocational training completed, and university completed. The reference category in the models is vocational training completed. Living together with a partner, which is also coded as a dummy-variable, includes married and cohabiting couples. Fulltime employment versus no fulltime employment was coded as a dummy-variable and refers to a minimum of 35 working hours a week. Income is measured per € 200. Besides of age which is continuous all remaining socio-demographic variables were coded as dummy variables (1 for true versus 0 for not true).
2. Biographical events expected to take place within the following six months: Beginning tertiary education, completing it, beginning a (new) job, leaving a job, starting to live with a partner, marriage and the birth of a child, separation or divorce. The anticipation of at least one of these events is coded as '1', versus '0' for no anticipation.
3. Perceived opportunities in town compared to other places with regard to work career, standard of living, finding a partner / partnership, family life, and pursuing own interests or hobbies. All were coded as dummy-variables: perceiving opportunities as better elsewhere versus not perceiving that. We refer to them as opportunity differentials.
4. Variables measuring the respondents' ties to other persons or to the city of residence: Migration experience, the degree of ties with the city, the partner's wish or necessity to leave the city, the recently occurred or expected migration of friends, having all or most friends in town, having all or most relatives in town. Migration experience was measured as whether a person had already lived in different towns or not. The strength of identification with the city was measured on a seven-point-scale; all other variables were coded as dummy-variables.

The method used is binomial logistic regression. Table 2 shows the nested models: The first model estimates the outcome 'considering or planning' to leave the city against the reference-group of respondents having neither considered nor planned to do so. The second model estimates the outcome 'planning' a move against the reference-group of respondents who only considered this.

In Table 3 there are two models shown that both estimate the outcome 'considering or planning' migration versus not considering this for two groups of respondents. For respondents in the first group the family is considered to be the most important area of life at the moment. These are respondents who live with a child or children under the age of six or who are expecting a birth. The second group consists of respondents for whom the career is expected to be the most important area of life at the moment, because they are anticipating to begin a job or to change jobs.

In Table 4 we use a binomial logistic regression to estimate the relevance of perceived opportunities as motives for choosing Freiburg versus Magdeburg as destination of migration. Therefore the most important motives for moving to the city, for which has been asked via an open question, were coded into four categories: motives related to (a) offered opportunities like getting a new job or getting a place at university at the destination, (b) goal-related perceived opportunities like a highly recommended university at the destination or a high rate of unemployment at the former place of living, (c) amenity-related perceived opportunities like a pleasant climate at the destination, (d) psychological dispositions like the wish to live in a big city, and (e) social ties like having family-members at the destination.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Descriptive results

Table 1 shows the distributions of the independent variables in the whole sample and in the investigated subgroups of respondents. The distribution of those not considering leaving the city, those considering it and those planning it according to the socio-demographic variables and variables referring to ties at the place of residence is as one would expect. For example, most of the respondents who live together with a partner do not consider leaving the city.

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics of predictors**

	Total	Not considering migration	Considering but not planning	Planning migration
	percentage in sample (quartiles)	row percentage (quartiles)	row percentage (quartiles)	row percentage (quartiles)
<i>socio-demographic variables</i>				
lives in Freiburg (ref. Magdeburg)	47.7	65.1	24.9	9.9
female	57.6	65.6	24.4	9.9
age	(25, 33, 42)	(26, 37, 43)	(24, 30, 40)	(23, 26, 31)
not yet completed school/ voc.training	5.8	43.2	37.0	19.7

	Total	Not considering migration	Considering but not planning	Planning migration
	percentage in sample (quartiles)	row percentage (quartiles)	row percentage (quartiles)	row percentage (quartiles)
not yet completed university	15.1	53.1	28.6	18.3
university completed	36.0	67.3	23.9	8.7
fulltime job	45.1	72.8	22.1	5.2
income in €	(600, 1048, 1700)	(700, 1200, 1800)	(550, 970, 1500)	(450, 720, 1200)
home-ownership	24.9	76.7	17.6	5.7
lives together with partner	47.2	75.4	19.5	5.0
lives with child(ren)	37.5	76.7	19.1	4.2
<i>biographical events in life course</i>				
anticipation of biographical event	32.3	48.5	29.6	21.8
<i>perception of opportunities better elsewhere</i>				
career prospects	43.3	49.1	33.7	17.2
standard of living	32.1	48.3	34.3	17.4
possibility to find a partner	5.9	36.7	39.5	23.8
partnership	7.8	32.4	37.1	30.4
family life	10.8	30.0	43.1	26.9
pursuing own interests	13.1	39.6	37.7	22.6
<i>ties with persons and the city</i>				
migration experience	73.5	63.2	25.5	11.3
ties with city, Magdeburg	(4, 5, 6)	(5, 6, 7)	(4, 5, 6)	(3, 4, 5)
ties with city, Freiburg	(5, 6, 6)	(5, 6, 7)	(4, 5, 6)	(4, 5, 6)
partner wants/has to move	14.5	41.0	36.8	22.3
migration of friends or relatives	21.4	41.2	31.9	26.8
all/most friends here	58.4	70.8	21.8	7.4
all/most relatives here	31.0	72.8	21.5	5.6
N	2411	1204	862	345
row percentage	100	65.1	24.9	9.9

Considering or planning migration is rather frequent among those who perceive better opportunities in regard to different life domains elsewhere. The same is true for respondents whose partner wants to or has to leave the city, and for those who have friends or relatives that moved away or are supposed to do so. Considering or planning migration is also rather frequent between respondents who anticipate at least one important biographical event.

#### 4.2 The relevance of perceived opportunities for migration decision-making

Perceiving better opportunities elsewhere for achieving goals in different life domains is highly relevant for considering or planning migration (Table 2). The odds ratios for considering or planning migration versus not considering this are increased by a factor between 1.8 and 2.6, depending on the life domain in which better opportunities are perceived elsewhere compared to the current place of living. The opportunity differentials in regard to finding a partner, to

family life, and to career prospects are most important. This is a very strong result taking into account that living together with a partner and children, and the wish or necessity of the partner to move are also considered in the model and have smaller effects.

**Table 2: Nested binomial logistic regressions of considering and planning migration**

	considering or planning migration versus not considering it		planning migration versus only considering it	
	odds ratio	std. err.	odds ratio	std.err.
<i>socio-demographic variables</i>				
lives in Freiburg (ref. Magdeburg)	1.045	0.456	0.353*	0.531
female	1.008	0.121	1.263	0.174
age	0.998	0.009	0.955***	0.015
not yet completed school/voc.training <sup>1)</sup>	1.713*	0.276	0.690	0.340
not yet completed university <sup>1)</sup>	0.901	0.200	1.087	0.262
university completed <sup>1)</sup>	1.288*	0.148	1.292	0.229
fulltime job	0.806	0.154	0.619**	0.245
income per €200	0.975*	0.015	1.016	0.026
home-ownership	0.643***	0.149	1.140	0.244
lives together with partner	0.673***	0.137	0.804	0.212
lives with child(ren)	0.799	0.155	0.987	0.264
<i>biographical events in life course</i>				
anticipation of biographical event	1.763***	0.125	3.604***	0.178
<i>perception of opportunities better elsewhere</i>				
career prospects	2.385***	0.127	1.344	0.191
standard of living	1.365**	0.133	1.340	0.182
possibility to find a partner	2.625***	0.259	1.851**	0.274
partnership	1.850**	0.241	1.673**	0.240
family life	2.549***	0.203	1.430	0.222
poss. to pursue own interests	1.881***	0.178	1.357	0.200
<i>ties with persons and the city</i>				
migration experience	1.022	0.154	1.484	0.244
ties with city, Magdeburg	0.762***	0.060	0.848**	0.078
interaction ties with city, Freiburg	1.015	0.084	1.238**	0.107
partner wants/has to move	2.188***	0.165	1.657***	0.195
migration of friends or relatives	2.022***	0.140	2.443***	0.172
all/most friends here	0.918	0.125	1.039	0.179
all/most relatives here	0.829	0.140	0.546***	0.226
constant	2.073	0.451	0.418	0.645
number of cases	1788		934	
degrees of freedom	25		25	
Wald Chi2	612.76		242.36	
model significance	0.000		0.000	
pseudo R2	0.248		0.210	

\* p<0.10, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

1) Reference: vocational training completed

The anticipation of biographical events increases the odds of considering or planning a move versus not considering this by a factor of 1.8. It is the most important factor, however, explaining planning migration for those who considered it already. Anticipating at least one



biographical event increases the odds for planning migration versus only considering it by a factor of 3.6. The contribution of perceived differentials in the opportunities to the explanation of planning a move versus only considering it is much weaker than that of anticipating biographical events. Only in respect to partnership perceived opportunities contribute significantly to the explanation of planning migration.

The wish or necessity of the partner to move, and the migration of friends or relatives, each roughly double the odds of considering or planning migration versus not considering a move. Having all or most friends or relatives in town does not change the odds for considering or planning to leave the city significantly. Social ties are also relevant for planning migration, especially the migration of friends or relatives. This is probably due to the fact that friends and relatives can help with the organization of the move. Interestingly, feelings of identification with the city deter citizens of Magdeburg more from planning a move than citizens of Freiburg. A possible explanation of this finding could be that subjective ties to the city are more relevant for migration issues in Magdeburg than for citizens of Freiburg because Magdeburg faced strong out-migration over years. Moreover one can assume that those who stayed in Magdeburg are a selective population in regard to a stronger identification with the city.

The socio-demographic variables show effects as expected from results of former studies. But it is interesting to see how these effects can be differentiated between the stages of considering and planning. For young people who have not yet completed school or vocational training the odds of considering or planning migration versus not considering is increased by 1.7, for persons who have completed university by 1.3 in comparison to persons who have completed at least some vocational training. Because there are no significant effects on planning migration, we can be sure that the educational status mainly has an effect on considering migration. The same is true for income, home-ownership, and living together with a partner, but the effects have different signs. There are some variables that only have an effect on planning migration. These are age and having a fulltime-job. The model furthermore reports smaller odds for people who are living in the more prosperous city, Freiburg, to plan a move.

#### **4.3 Life course related differentiation of the analysis**

We now differentiate our analysis and consider subgroups of respondent who are experiencing different kinds of life-course transitions. To analyse how the relevance of perceived opportunities depends on whether respondents are expecting job-related events compared to

those expecting or having experienced family-related events we selected two groups of respondents. The first group consists of respondents for whom the career is expected to be the most important area of life at the moment, because they are anticipating to begin a job or to change jobs. The second group consists of respondents for whom the family is expected to be the most important area of life at the moment. These are respondents who live with a child or children under the age of six or who are expecting a birth. In the first case we assume that the career currently is the most important life domain, in the second case we assume that this holds true for family life. The predictors in the models are the same as in the previous ones, apart from leaving out the item of selection - the anticipation of biographical events - and the perceived opportunities for finding a partner, due to the small number of cases.

For respondents who have children under the age of six or who are expecting a birth perceived opportunities for family life are most important (Table 3). Perceived opportunity differentials for pursuing own interests are also important but to a less extent. For respondents who anticipate starting a new job perceived opportunities for career are most important for considering or planning migration. Perceived opportunity differentials in other life domains do not contribute significantly to the explanation of considering or planning migration for respondents who anticipate the beginning or change of jobs.

**Table 3: Binomial logistic regressions of considering and planning migration**  
**Only Respondents with family or career as the currently most important life domain<sup>#</sup>**

	Family is most important considering or planning a move versus not considering it		Career is most important considering or planning a move versus not considering it	
	odds ratio	std. err.	odds ratio	std. err.
<i>socio-demographic variables</i>				
lives in Freiburg (ref. Magdeburg)	1.201	1.590	9.746*	1.376
female	0.489*	0.426	0.945	0.327
age	0.977	0.033	1.000	0.024
not yet completed university <sup>1)</sup>	0.528	1.165	1.119	0.499
university completed <sup>1)</sup>	2.458**	0.440	1.583	0.417
fulltime job	0.467*	0.462	1.523	0.464
income per €200	0.960	0.040	0.952	0.046
home-ownership	0.142***	0.513	1.289	0.424
lives together with partner	0.241***	0.489	0.706	0.389
lives with child(ren)	1.106	0.674	0.609	0.524
<i>perception of own opportunities better elsewhere</i>				
career prospects	1.839	0.377	2.885***	0.379
standard of living	0.998	0.390	1.671	0.359
partnership	1.357	0.696	1.909	0.750
family life	6.829***	0.673	2.301	0.622
pursuing own interests	3.792**	0.658	1.370	0.454

	Family is most important considering or planning a move versus not considering it		Career is most important considering or planning a move versus not considering it	
	odds ratio	std. err.	odds ratio	std.err.
<i>ties with persons and the city</i>				
migration experience	0.459	0.493	1.036	0.422
ties with city, Magdeburg	0.674**	0.162	0.904	0.175
interaction ties with city, Freiburg	0.998	0.288	0.627*	0.249
partner wants/has to move	2.775**	0.473	5.574***	0.558
migration of friends or relatives	1.003	0.441	2.684***	0.365
all/most friends here	0.556	0.367	0.847	0.354
all/most relatives here	0.339**	0.421	0.814	0.386
constant	171.045***	1.535	1.336	1.260
number of cases	256		326	
degrees of freedom	22		22	
Wald Chi2	132.81		106.16	
model significance	0.000		0.000	
pseudo R2	0.377		0.290	

\* p<0.10, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

# Family is most important: only respondents with children under the age of 6 or expecting a birth in the following 6 months; career is most important: only respondents who anticipate to begin a job or change jobs in the following 6 months and do not have children under 6 or expecting a birth

1) Reference: not yet completed school / vocational training or vocational training completed

#### 4.4 The relevance of opportunity structure for destination choice

The previous findings show that the perceived opportunity differentials matter in individual migration decision-making differently. They are important for initiating considering migration but less important for the following step to the planning phase, particularly in the case when a change in the job career is expected. There is strong evidence that the mechanisms observed are universal, as we expected due to theory and because the empirical findings have been the same in both cities. However, different opportunity structures are expected to influence the destination choice of movers. By comparing the motives reported from movers to Freiburg and movers to Magdeburg we are able to shed some light on the relevance of perceived opportunities for destination choice. Because Freiburg is a more attractive city than Magdeburg according to statistical figures (e.g. unemployment rate, number of college places, climate), we expect Freiburg to attract more movers with motives related to perceived opportunity differentials than Magdeburg. Five categories of motives are analyzed: motives related to (a) offered opportunities, (b) goal-related perceived opportunities, (c) amenity-related perceived opportunities, (d) psychological dispositions, and (e) social ties. In our model motives related to offered opportunities are the reference category.

We applied a logistic regression analysis estimating the odds of moving to Freiburg versus Magdeburg. The odds are significantly larger for movers who reported either of the two

categories of perceived opportunities. Psychological dispositions and social ties are no motives that differentiate movers to either of the two cities significantly.

**Table 4: Binomial logistic regressions of moving to Freiburg versus Magdeburg**

	Moving to Magdeburg odds ratio	Freiburg versus std.err.
<i>socio-demographic variables</i>		
female	0.975	0.215
age	1.026	0.021
not yet completed school/ voc.training <sup>1)</sup>	0.650	0.569
not yet completed university <sup>1)</sup>	0.866	0.323
university completed <sup>1)</sup>	1.945**	0.309
fulltime job	0.409**	0.365
income per €200	1.025	0.039
home-ownership	1.129	0.481
lives together with partner	0.836	0.277
lives with child(ren)	0.563	0.376
<i>reasons for choosing destination</i>		
amenity-related perceived opportunities <sup>2)</sup>	4.795***	0.395
goal-related perceived opportunities <sup>2)</sup>	3.879***	0.385
psychological dispositions <sup>2)</sup>	2.448	0.606
social ties <sup>2)</sup>	0.571	0.579
constant	0.433	0.634
number of cases	436	
degrees of freedom	14	
Wald Chi2	48.12	
model significance	0.000	
pseudo R2	0.080	

\* p<0.10, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

1) Reference: vocational training completed

2) Reference: offered opportunities

## Conclusion

The purpose of our analysis was to investigate the relevance of regional contexts for individual migration decisions. We developed a theoretical framework to explain how perceived opportunities are supposed to trigger migration decision making, and why the relevance of these opportunities may change systematically over the life course. Additionally, the role of biographical events in relationship with perceived opportunities has been discussed.

The analysis has shown that perceived opportunity differentials are especially important for considering migration and therefore trigger the start of the migration-process. The perception that opportunities for career and partnership or family are better elsewhere is even more important than the influence of the partner, of members of the family, or of friends. Also the perceived opportunity differentials to pursue own interests and hobbies contribute significantly to considering migration. For planning versus just considering migration biographical events

are the most important predictors, as expected. This supports the hypotheses that biographical events trigger planning migration.

The relevance of perceived opportunity differentials according to certain areas of life differs systematically with the phase in the life course. This was shown for two groups of respondents. For persons with little children or expecting a birth perceived opportunities for family life are most important, whereas for persons anticipating to begin a job or to change jobs perceived opportunity differentials for career are most important. The life course approach is therefore an adequate framework for analysis of the further investigation of the relationship between structural factors and migration.

A comparison of movers to either of the two cities showed that perceived opportunities are also playing a decisive role for destination choice. Prosperous regions are more likely to be chosen on the basis of perceived opportunities, apart from concretely offered ones. This result emphasizes the importance of perceived opportunities for migration as a 'generative process' in that considering and planning migration is besides of realizing it an integral part of the migration-process.

### **Acknowledgements**

The data for this research were collected with support provided from the German Science Foundation.

### **References**

- De Jong, G. and J. Fawcett (1981). Motivations for Migration: An Assessment and a Value-Expectancy Research Model. Migration Decision Making. Multidisciplinary Approaches to Microlevel Studies in Developed and Developing Countries. J. F. Gordon De Jong. New York, Pergamon Press: 13-58.
- Goldthorpe, J. H. (2001): Causation, Statistics, and Sociology. European Sociological Review, Vol. 17, No. 1: 1-20
- Gollwitzer, P. M. (1996). Das Rubikonmodell der Handlungsphasen. In: N. Birbaumer, D. Frey, J. Kuhl, W. Prinz and F. E. Weinert (Ed.): Enzyklopädie der Psychologie. Motivation, Volition und Handlung. Göttingen, Hofgrefe: 533-541
- Heckhausen, H. (1989): Motivation und Handeln. Berlin, Springer Verlag

- Heise, E. (1998). Die Rubikontheorie der Handlungsphasen. In: E. Heise (Ed.): Volitionale Handlungskontrolle: theoretische und empirische Analysen auf strukturalistischer Basis. Münster, Waxmann: 27-35
- Huinink, J. (2005): Räumliche Mobilität und Familienentwicklung. Ein lebenslauftheoretischer Systematisierungsversuch. In: A. Steinbach (Ed.): Generatives Verhalten und Generationenbeziehungen, Wiesbaden, VS: 61-81
- Kalter, F. (1997): Wohnortwechsel in Deutschland. Ein Beitrag zur Migrationstheorie und zur empirischen Anwendung von Rational-Choice-Modellen. Opladen, Leske + Budrich
- Kauhanen, M. and H. Tervo (2002): Who moves to depressed regions? An analysis of migration streams in Finland in the 1990s. *International Regional Science Review*, Vol. 25, No. 2: 200-218
- Lindenberg, Siegwart (1996): Continuities in the theory of social production functions. In: Ganzeboom, H. and S. Lindenberg (Ed.): *Verklarende Sociologie*. Opstellen voor Reinhard Wippler. Amsterdam, Thesis Publishers: 167-184
- Mulder, C. H. (1993): *Migration Dynamics: A Life Course Approach*. Amsterdam, Thesis Publishers
- Ravenstein, E. G. (1972 [1885; 1889]). Die Gesetze der Wanderung I und II. In: G. Széll (Ed.): *Regionale Mobilität*. Nymphenburger Verlagsgesellschaft: 41-64
- Schlömer, C. and H. Bucher (2001): Arbeitslosigkeit und Binnenwanderungen. Auf der Suche nach einem theoriegestützten Zusammenhang. *Informationen zur Raumentwicklung*, Heft 1/2001: 33-47
- Wagner, M. (1989): *Räumliche Mobilität im Lebensverlauf. Eine empirische Untersuchung sozialer Bedingungen der Migration*. Stuttgart, Enke
- Windzio, M. (2004): Kann der regionale Kontext zur "Arbeitslosenfalle" werden? Der Einfluss der Arbeitslosigkeit auf die Mobilität zwischen regionalen Arbeitsmärkten in Westdeutschland, *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, Heft 56: 257-278
- Wolpert, J. (1965): Behavioral Aspects of the Decision to Migrate. *Papers of the Regional Science Association*, Vol. 15: 159-169
- Wolpert, J. (1966): Migration as an Adjustment to Environmental Stress. *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. XXII, No. 4: 92-102