

Fiscal Research Program

**RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY
MIGRATION AND GEORGIA'S
LABOR FORCE**

**Amy Helling
Nevbahar Ertas**

**FRP Report No. 69
February 2002**



**Georgia State
University**

Andrew Young

School of Policy Studies

1215 UL, 404-651-3500, frp@gsu.edu

MSC 2A1240, Georgia State University, 33 Gilmer Street, SE Unit 2, Atlanta, Ga 30303-3082

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to David Sjoquist, Jeanie Thomas, Ben Scafidi and Kelly Edmiston for comments and ideas, and to Dr. Charlotte Steeh and her telephone survey staff at the Applied Research Center. The authors also gratefully acknowledge the financial support for this project provided by the Office of Planning and Budget.

Are Small Urban Centers Magnets For Economic Growth?

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	v
Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force	1
Review of the Literature on Residential Mobility, Migration and the Labor Force	2
Personal Attributes that Predict Residential Mobility	2
Age	2
Race	5
Educational Attainment	6
Occupation	7
Income	8
Employment Status	8
Attributes of Places	9
Economic Conditions	9
Amenities and Quality of Life	10
Other Causes of Residential Mobility	10
Industrial Restructuring	10
Immigration From Foreign Countries	10
Survey Results	13
Description of the Survey	13
Potential Bias in the Survey Sample	14
Residential Movers and Nonmovers	19
Age	21
Sex	22
Race	22
Educational Attainment	23

Are Small Urban Centers Magnets For Economic Growth?

Education in Georgia	24
Occupation	26
Industry	27
Household Income	28
Employment Status	29
New and Existing Jobs.....	30
Origins of Immigrants.....	31
Summary and Conclusions	32
Endnotes.....	35
References.....	36
Appendix. Survey	39

Executive Summary

This report, based on 749 telephone interviews completed in the fall of 2000 with Georgia residents who were working or looking for work at the time, provides a description of which workers moved within and to Georgia between 1995 and 2000. It begins by reviewing the literature, summarizing the personal characteristics, attributes of places, and other factors which influence residential mobility. Among the noteworthy results of the survey were the following:

- 42.2 percent of the sample (of Georgia residents in the labor force) moved within the last 5 years. This is below the overall U.S. rate of 44.1 percent between 1990 and 1995.
- 32.4 percent of movers in the sample came from outside the state. This is higher than the overall U.S. rate of 23.4 percent of movers relocating to another state between 1990 and 1995.
- Movers from outside the state were disproportionately between the ages of 25 and 34.
- A very high proportion of movers from outside the state have completed a bachelor's degree, and nearly one-third of them have attended school in Georgia. In particular, it seems noteworthy that 18 percent of respondents who moved from outside the state between 1995 and 2000 have attended college in Georgia.
- Movers from outside the state are a disproportionately small percentage of the lowest income group.
- The unemployment rate among all respondents who moved their residences between 1995 and 2000 was 9 percent, compared to 11.2 percent among nonmovers. Movers from outside the state had a 7 percent unemployment rate. Although a telephone survey like this may over represent the unemployed somewhat, the differences among the groups are of interest.
- 41.2 percent of currently employed respondents said their jobs did not exist before they took them. Movers from outside Georgia held a disproportionate share of these newly created jobs.
- If our sample is representative, over 13 percent of the state's workers have moved to Georgia in the last 5 years.

Changes in labor force migration in the future could have a tremendous impact on the state. Georgia has been a magnet in the recent past because of the economic opportunity it offered, its relatively high quality of life and its relatively low cost of living. Adverse changes to any of these factors may diminish the state's attractiveness as a destination for immigrants, as well as making it more likely that existing residents would leave. However, adding workers through immigration is not

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

entirely positive, as the finding that recent immigrants have lower unemployment rates than longer term Georgia residents illustrates. Thus, concerns raised by previous research that high levels of immigration to the state may disadvantage current members of the Georgia labor force remain valid.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

Jobs in Georgia are growing much faster than the rate of natural increase (the number of births minus the number of deaths) in the state's population. If all else remained the same under such conditions, there would be many more jobs than workers, but that is not the case. Who fills the additional jobs? There are three possibilities: Georgia residents who want to work, but are unemployed; Georgia residents who have not been working or looking for work, but enter the labor force to fill the new jobs; and people who move to Georgia from elsewhere. Georgia's rapid economic growth depends upon its workforce, and the number of persons moving to the state has been greater than the number leaving during this period of rapid growth. Thus it is important to understand which workers are moving to and within the state.

This report begins by briefly summarizing the relevant literature on the historic causes of labor force migration.¹ Then it describes the attributes of 749 surveyed Georgians participating in the labor force in the fall of 2000, according to their residential mobility, in order to address the following questions:

- Do current Georgia residents who moved recently, particularly those who came from outside the state, have different attributes than those who have been in place longer?
- How heavily does Georgia depend upon relocated workers, and in which occupations and industries are they concentrated?
- What proportion of workers are longer-term Georgia residents, and what proportion are recent migrants to Georgia?
- Do workers who move to Georgia have different levels of educational attainment than longer-term Georgia residents?
- Are many low-income households moving to or within Georgia?
- Where are workers who move to Georgia moving from?
- What share of Georgia workers were educated in Georgia?

Finally, this report uses the literature to draw conclusions about what these findings imply for state policy, and what issues need immediate attention or additional study.

Review of the Literature on Residential Mobility, Migration and the Labor Force

Table 1 shows the recent history of residential mobility in the United States, expressed in five-year and one-year moving rates. Five-year (one-year) moving rates reflect responses to the question "Did this person live in this house five (one) years ago?"² Overall, mobility rates in the U.S. have been declining slowly, but fairly steadily in the 1990s, as Table 1 indicates, and were lower in the early 1990s than in any recent five-year period except 1980-1985. Recent trends have also shown the proportion of shorter moves to be increasing (Schachter, 2000). However, there are indicators that point in opposite directions as well. Some of the most visibly successful movers--young, highly-paid technology workers--move frequently and over long distances, and one reporter finds "a widespread belief that we are on the eve of an upsurge in mobility, not just on a national scale, but globally" (Suro, 2000, p. 63).

Research on mobility has found that people's demographic and socio-economic attributes are useful in explaining some moves, while some are explained by attributes of the places people leave and the places they are attracted to. In addition, there are other factors, such as U.S. national immigration policy and enforcement, and the consequences for migration of growth or restructuring in particular industries. This section will discuss each of these factors in turn.

Personal Attributes that Predict Residential Mobility

Age

Plane (1993) points out that the age (or life stage) composition of a population is a stronger and better-understood predictor of mobility than any other demographic attribute, as well as being an easy variable to predict itself, given that the aging process is, as he says, "inexorable." Young adults are frequent migrants in their early years in the workforce, when they move to economic opportunity, a pattern that diminishes in middle age. Georgia has offered great economic opportunity in recent years, and Atlanta gained more migrants between the ages of 25 and 34 than did any other metropolitan area between 1985 and 1990 (Frey, 1995).

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 1. RECENT ONE-YEAR AND FIVE-YEAR MOBILITY RATES FOR THE U.S.

Mobility interval	Moving rate (Percent of population moving per interval)	Percent of movers by location of previous residence					Movers from abroad
		Different county					
		Total	Same county	Same state	Different state		
Five-year moving rates:							
1990-95	44.1	100.0	56.7	20.0	18.5	4.9	
1985-90	46.7	100.0	54.5	20.7	20.1	4.7	
1980-85	41.7	100.0	53.1	21.8	20.8	4.3	
1975-80	46.4	100.0	54.0	21.1	20.9	4.0	
1970-75							
1965-70	47.1	100.0	55.7	20.1	20.7	3.5	
1960-65							
1955-60	50.1	100.0	62.0	17.1	18.3	2.6	
One-year moving rates:							
1998-99	15.9	100.0	59.3	19.8	17.6	3.4	
1997-98	16.0	100.0	63.7	18.5	15.0	2.9	
1996-97	16.5	100.0	63.9	18.3	14.7	3.1	
1995-96	16.3	100.0	62.8	18.8	15.2	3.3	
1994-95	16.4	100.0	65.9	18.6	13.6	1.9	
1993-94	16.7	100.0	62.2	19.2	16.2	3.0	
1992-93	17.0	100.0	62.5	18.2	16.6	3.3	
1991-92	17.3	100.0	62.1	18.3	17.1	3.0	

Sources: Faber (2000a, 2000b), Long (1988), and Schachter (2000).

Moving rates decline with age for adults, as Table 2 shows for the five-year period 1990 to 1995.

Age also affects the distances that people move. Table 1 shows that in all recent five-year periods, over half of all movers of all ages stayed close to home, moving within the same county. Table 2 shows that long distance moves were most common among those in their twenties and those over 55.

Although there are many elderly workers (Table 4 shows that 2.8 percent of the U.S. civilian labor force was 65 years old or older in 1998), migration after age 65 often has different motivations. Frey (1995) observed that retired migrants move to amenities and low cost of living, unlike their working-age counterparts, who give employment opportunity a higher priority.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 2. FIVE-YEAR MOVING RATES FOR THE U.S. BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS, 1990-1995

Personal characteristics	Moving rate (Percent of population moving per interval)	Percent of movers by location of Previous residence				
		Total	Same county	Different county		Movers from abroad
			Same state	Different state		
Age:						
5 to 9 years	55.0	100.0	59.9	18.3	17.3	4.5
10 to 14 years	45.5	100.0	59.4	17.6	18.2	4.8
15 to 19 years	41.7	100.0	60.9	16.6	15.7	6.8
20 to 24 years	62.9	100.0	52.8	21.9	18.9	6.5
25 to 29 years	74.7	100.0	52.8	21.1	20.2	5.8
30 to 34 years	63.2	100.0	55.9	21.2	18.1	4.7
35 to 39 years	50.3	100.0	57.1	20.1	18.3	4.6
40 to 44 years	41.9	100.0	58.3	19.5	18.4	3.8
45 to 54 years	32.0	100.0	57.9	19.9	18.4	3.9
55 to 64 years	24.2	100.0	55.1	21.6	19.5	3.7
65 to 74 years	17.1	100.0	55.6	20.6	20.7	3.1
75 to 84 years	14.7	100.0	56.9	21.5	19.5	1.9
85 years and over	18.7	100.0	55.1	22.0	22.0	0.8
Sex:						
Male	44.6	100.0	55.8	20.1	19.0	5.1
Female	43.6	100.0	57.5	19.9	18.0	4.6
Race and Hispanic Origin:						
White, non-Hispanic	41.5	100.0	54.0	22.4	20.7	2.9
Black, non-Hispanic	47.6	100.0	66.4	15.1	15.1	3.4
Asian, non-Hispanic	54.0	100.0	47.8	13.9	14.1	24.2
Hispanic, all races	55.6	100.0	64.8	12.7	10.0	12.6
Education (for persons over age 25):						
Less than 9th grade	33.6	100.0	63.8	13.5	11.4	11.4
9th-12th grade, no diploma	38.2	100.0	65.9	17.7	12.4	4.0
High school graduate	37.5	100.0	60.7	19.6	16.5	3.2
Some college, or associate's degree	43.7	100.0	54.7	22.0	19.9	3.4
Bachelor's degree	48.4	100.0	47.7	23.5	23.6	5.0
Professional or graduate school or degree	42.8	100.0	42.3	23.2	28.5	6.1

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

Personal characteristics	Moving rate (Percent of population moving per interval)	Percent of movers by location of previous residence				
		Total	Same county	Different county		Movers from abroad
			Same state	Different state		
Family Income (in 1994, for persons over age 15):						
Less than \$10,000	49.2	100.0	63.4	16.5	14.9	5.2
\$10,000 to \$19,999	47.1	100.0	56.9	18.7	18.0	6.4
\$20,000 to \$29,999	46.5	100.0	56.0	19.9	19.5	4.6
\$30,000 to \$39,999	44.2	100.0	56.6	20.8	18.0	4.6
\$40,000 to \$49,999	41.1	100.0	56.7	21.0	18.9	3.4
\$50,000 to \$59,999	39.5	100.0	55.8	23.3	18.6	2.4
\$60,000 to \$74,999	36.4	100.0	53.8	23.3	20.0	2.9
\$75,000 and over	36.3	100.0	49.8	23.0	24.0	3.3
Employment Status:						
Employed	47.3	100.0	56.4	21.5	18.1	4.0
Unemployed	54.6	100.0	58.1	17.2	19.0	5.7
Not in the labor force	32.9	100.0	55.4	19.0	19.0	6.7

Source: Schachter (2000).

The human capital approach presents migration as an investment whose costs can be recovered if it is made early enough in life. For example, Yankow (1999) finds evidence of faster wage growth among young men migrating to other states than among those who do not move away.³ Long (1988) observes that the age at which adults migrate has historically been lower in prosperous periods. During periods of recession or depression people have tended to defer costly migration until prospects are brighter, making it more likely that the investment in relocation will be a good one. He also notes that “generational crowding” may depress migrations among large age cohorts like the baby boomers (persons born between 1946 and 1964), because the greater competition reduces the opportunities available to individual migrants.

Race

Richard Frey has written extensively on “demographic balkanization,” or “the spatial segmentation of the population by race, ethnicity, class and age across regions and metropolitan areas, driven by both internal and international migration.” (Frey, 1995, p. 271) According to much of this analysis, differences in the demographic profiles of U.S. regions are increasingly caused by racial and ethnic disparities, which

in turn result partly from immigration from foreign countries. In general, a high proportion of recent immigrants are non-white.

As Table 2 shows, non-Hispanic whites moved least in the U.S. between 1990 and 1995, followed by non-Hispanic blacks. Asians and Hispanics were the most mobile racial groups in the U.S. during this time period. High proportions of both of these groups, but particularly Asians, moved from outside the U.S. Schachter (2000) found that these differences in mobility would exist even if all groups had the same age distribution as non-Hispanic whites.

Though both race and foreign nativity help explain recent mobility patterns, domestic moves among white and black native residents of the U.S. are becoming more similar. Frey concludes that this is at least in part because of the known association between mobility and income. As a larger proportion of the black population has become middle class and college educated, more have made longer, job-related moves, including to the same fast-growing places that attract middle class whites. The Atlanta MSA leads all other metropolitan areas in the nation in absolute gains in black population (at nearly 160,000 persons) between 1990 and 1996 (Frey, 1998). The Atlanta MSA added approximately 321,000 to its white population during the same period, and leads the nation in this measure as well. Frey's analysis also shows Georgia as the state forecast to have the second highest future gain in black population between 1995 and 2025 (approximately 532,000), second only to Texas. However, there has also been some black "return migration" to smaller metropolitan areas and nonmetropolitan places in the south.

Educational Attainment

College educated workers are historically more likely to be part of a national labor market and to move long distances than those with less education. Between 1990 and 1995 those with bachelors degrees had the highest moving rate nationally, as Table 2 shows. Those adults with the lowest educational attainment moved least during those five years. Sandefur and Scott (1981) provide a succinct explanation. "Education is said to facilitate migration because it increases employment opportunities, expands an awareness of alternative opportunities in other geographical places, and inculcates skills which ease the severing and establishing of social ties."

(p. 357) However, this has been changing. Some research traces the origin of the change to foreign immigration.

Educational attainment among foreign immigrants is lower than among native-born Americans on average, though not dramatically so.⁴ With two exceptions,⁵ states experiencing high levels of foreign immigration in the recent past have also had net losses due to domestic migration. Frey (1995) argues that residents of states with high levels of international immigration move away to escape competition for jobs and housing and the high cost of assimilating foreign immigrants. He points to two sources of evidence of this. First, contrary to the usual pattern, noted above, many outmigrants from states receiving large numbers of foreign immigrants have not completed college. Second, these outmigrants also tend to relocate to adjacent states, rather than the high-growth "magnet" destinations that attract other migrants. Nationally, Table 2 shows that a large proportion of the least educated movers come from abroad. Georgia was not one of the top destinations for foreign immigrants in the 1980s; however, the ripple effects of migration by less educated workers had already reached Georgia by 1990. Sawicki and Moody (1997) show that in the late eighties a surprisingly large number of workers with low levels of education immigrated to the Atlanta metropolitan area.

Long (1988) notes that the greater mobility of college graduates over long distances means that many such moves balance one another out, while migration by less educated groups "is more nearly unidirectional and tends more clearly to follow established channels with comparatively small countercurrents." (p. 176)

Occupation

Much of occupation's effect on mobility is captured by income, but more specialized workers (those in search of relatively rare kinds of jobs) must search for work over a greater geographical area, and must often relocate in order to accept new work. Moving is made particularly likely and easy for professionals and managers who are intra-organizational transfers. "Employers prefer to transfer this class of labor from one location to another because of the costly training they have invested in these workers, the specialized knowledge they possess, and the difficulty of finding equivalent skilled labor in local labor markets. Migration for these workers has little

risk, may yield more salary increases and promotion than staying put, and is often subsidized by employer-paid moving expenses.” (Ellis, Barff and Renard, 1993, p. 169) This is consistent with Ellis, Barff and Renard's finding that professionals, technicians and salespeople have the highest migration rates, while those of operators and laborers and precision production and crafts workers are lowest.

Income

Migration among high-income people, many of whom are also highly educated professionals and managers, is greatly affected by the national labor market.⁶ As noted earlier, this group is mobile, and more likely than others to move long distances. Lower income workers were historically less likely to make long distance moves unless they had friends or family at the destination, though they were sometimes “pushed” out by unfavorable conditions in their original location. The 1990-1995 migration data show a dramatic change in this pattern. Moving rates in Table 2 *decline* as income rises, contrary to the historic pattern. Between 1990 and 1995, low-income people were more likely to move than those earning more. However, it remains true that higher income people are more likely to move out of state, as Table 2 shows.

Two factors that affect migrants' incomes are age and housing tenure. The previously described tendency for young people to migrate is important since younger workers typically earn less than they will later in their lives. Students in particular may appear poor, but leave poverty as soon as they go to work. Low-income households are also more likely to rent their residences, and renters move much more often than owners. (Renter five-year moving rates were 72 percent for 1990-1995, versus 31 percent for those owning their own homes.)

Employment Status

Unemployed persons move at a higher rate than those who have jobs. As Table 2 shows, however, the unemployed had shorter moves than did employed movers in 1990-1995. Many moves by the unemployed are within the same county. However, unemployed movers were more likely to have come to the U.S. from abroad than were those with jobs.

Attributes of Places

Economic Conditions

There is an extensive history of research (much of it surveyed in Bartik, 1993) showing that income and employment opportunities at the destination positively influence migration, and that migration in turn positively influences income and job opportunities, though estimates of these effects have varied widely. Bartik (1993) concludes that in the long run, migrants take 60 to 90 percent of the new jobs created in response to an influx of workers. He notes that persons whose relationships to the labor market are more marginal, or who are less mobile, ought to see greater than average benefits from such job growth, but this is because their "average" employment outcomes are so poor otherwise that they are still available for employment when labor markets tighten. He also notes that high-mobility areas (like Atlanta) are likely to see greater effect on mobility than on employment (i.e., more dramatic changes to the number of net migrants than to the numbers of jobs available). From the 1930s through the 1960s the majority of migrants moved from states with low per capita incomes to states with higher per capita incomes (Long, 1988). However, beginning in 1975-1980, the balance tipped, and a majority moved toward lower, rather than higher income states.

In a recent report using data from the National Science Foundation's National survey of Recent College Graduates conducted in 1993, the Southern Growth Policies Board looked at interstate migration of science and engineering graduates. These sought-after workers were attracted to state economies that were "high value-added, service-oriented, more research and development intensive, and...paying high wages for high skills..." (Tornatzky, Gray, Tarant and Howe, 1998, p. 22).

According to Long (1988) it was never conclusively demonstrated that the poor migrated to states offering more generous welfare benefits, although it is likely that this happened to some degree. However, he notes that welfare programs may inhibit mobility among low-income people both by providing income that would be ended by relocation and by prohibiting the accumulation of the savings necessary to relocate.

Amenities and Quality of Life

Although employment opportunities are clearly important, there is some evidence that quality of life also influences migrants. What amenities are important to attracting new residents and preventing valued workers from moving away? Georgia has one that is very important. John D. Kasarda, was quoted in *American Demographics* as saying, "In today's economy the only factor that ultimately distinguishes one geographic region from another is climate" (Suro, 2000, p. 62). Clark and Knapp (1996) report climate to be particularly important to the "young" elderly, aged 55 to 64.

A place's attributes can also prevent mobility among those who might otherwise relocate. The Southern Growth Policies board also concluded that when high school graduates attended college in their home state they were "more likely to seek employment in their home state as well" (Tornatzky, Gray, Tarant and Howe, 1998, p. 23). Georgia's HOPE scholarship program, established in 1993, has been one of the best-known state efforts to get students to attend college in their home state.

Other Causes of Residential Mobility

Industrial Restructuring

Frey observes that industrial restructuring in the 1980s favored "areas with diversified economies and, in particular, those engaged in advanced services and knowledge-based industries. Recreation and retirement centers also fared well." (Frey, 1995, p. 272) Much of this analysis was rooted in analysis of the trends of the previous decade (Stanback and Noyelle, 1982). Georgia was well positioned for growth due to migration in the 1980s according to this view, both because it had strength in a variety of sectors in its economy and because it was a southeastern headquarters city for a variety of advanced service and knowledge-intensive businesses, as well as being a state capitol and center of a federal region.

Immigration From Foreign Countries

The U.S. experiences fairly high levels of both legal and illegal immigration, although the number of legal immigrants admitted in 1998 was the lowest in a decade

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

at 660,477 (U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1999). Legal immigrants are aliens (foreign nationals) admitted to the country as permanent residents or who become permanent residents after entering the U.S. Because of their labor potential, Georgia employer interest groups lobby aggressively in favor of more lenient immigration policy (Moriarity, 2000).

U.S. immigration policy has changed substantially over the years. This century has encompassed the 1917-1964 “era of restriction” and the “era of liberalization” from 1965 to the present. The 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act repealed a previous system of quotas based on the immigrant's nation of origin, substituting a system that encouraged immigration to reunify families and admit persons possessing needed skills. Another important piece of national immigration policy was the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, which created sanctions against employers who employ illegal aliens, but also instituted a program to legalize illegal aliens residing in the U.S.

It is obviously difficult to obtain good estimates of the number of illegal immigrants in the U.S., however the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) estimated that there were between 4.6 and 5.4 million illegal immigrants living in the U.S. in 1996, or approximately 1.9 percent of the U.S. population (U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 2000).

The vast majority of legal immigrants were historically from Europe and Canada, but the 1990 Census of Population and Housing showed that only 26 percent of the foreign-born population of the U.S. was from these places, reflecting the changes already described in formal immigration policy, and large numbers of illegal immigrants from Latin America. According to the INS 1996 estimates, immigrants from Mexico made up approximately 54 percent of the population of illegal aliens in that year. The INS also estimated that this population grows by approximately 150,000 persons per year. Other countries supplying substantial numbers of illegal immigrants to the U.S. (at a rate of between 6-12,000 persons per year) include El Salvador, Guatemala, Canada, Haiti, Honduras and the Bahamas.

California has historically been the primary state of residence for undocumented foreign immigrants. The INS estimated that 83 percent of the

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

undocumented population lived in seven states in 1996, including California, Texas, New York, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey and Arizona, in descending order. Georgia placed 17th in this ranking. As described earlier, demographers have historically found that foreign immigrants, both legal and illegal, tend to follow “beaten paths” to particular areas, and to remain concentrated in space thereafter because of close ties to family and community in these places. Frey and others have written that areas of the U.S. having high proportions of foreign immigrants will grow increasingly different from the rest of the nation as a result.

Survey Results

This section of the report describes a telephone survey administered in the fall of 2000, including important caveats about interpreting its results, and how its respondents compared to the population they supposedly represented. It then provides summary tabulations of the results obtained from this survey, and briefly interprets these results.

Description of the Survey

The survey was conducted by telephone by the Applied Research Center (ARC) at Georgia State University. The ARC used random digit dialing to sample households in the state of Georgia with at least one member who was both 16 or older and either working for pay or looking for paid work in the week prior to being called. The ARC survey research lab uses a computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) system and employs about 50 trained interviewers. In computer-assisted telephone interviewing, a computer program is used to convert the survey questions to sequential computer screens to facilitate the interview and make coding easier and faster. The CATI system skips survey questions made irrelevant by the respondent's earlier answers, shortening the interview for respondents, and allowing interviewers to schedule recall appointments more efficiently. The survey, in CATI format, is included as the Appendix to this report.

In mid-September 2000, the ARC survey research laboratory undertook a pretest of 31 households. As a result of the pretest, we refined several questions and gave the interviewers a special training session to familiarize them with the purpose of the survey and its questions. Following the pretest, the surveys reported here were administered between September 28 and October 19, 2000. Interviews were conducted from 5 p.m. to 9 p.m. Mondays through Thursdays, from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Fridays and from 12 p.m. to 7 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays. A total of 749 interviews were completed. Since the valid sample included 1,958 telephone numbers, this represents a response rate of approximately 38 percent, as shown in Table 3.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 3. SURVEYS ATTEMPTED AND COMPLETED

	Number	Percent	Percent of valid sample
Total telephone numbers called	4,440	100.0%	
Telephone numbers reached and determined ineligible ^a	2,482	55.9%	
Telephone numbers potentially eligible (valid sample)	1,958	44.1%	100.0%
Numbers not reached (after an average of 15 calls)	185	4.2%	9.4%
Surveys completed	749	16.9%	38.3%
Surveys refused	842	19.0%	43.0%
Other noninterviews ^b	182	4.1%	9.3%

^aTo be eligible for an interview, a telephone number had to reach a household where at least one person over age 16 was working or looking for work. Many of the telephone numbers called were not in service, or reached businesses. All telephone numbers called were in Georgia exchanges.

^bOther noninterviews include: respondents who were out of town or otherwise unable to schedule an interview for the duration of the survey, and respondents unable to complete the interview because of sickness, inability to speak English, deafness, mental incapacity etc..

Potential Bias in the Survey Sample

The two main potential sources of bias in the survey's completed interviews are incomplete coverage and non-response. Incomplete coverage of the population sampled--all Georgia residents over the age of 16 and living in households who are in the labor force--may occur for several reasons with a telephone survey.

First, there are some households who do not have telephones. The National Telecommunications and Information Administration (1999) reported that between 89.95 percent and 92.85 percent of Georgia households had fixed-line telephones in December, 1998. Thus as many as 10 percent of Georgia households cannot be reached by random digit dialing. The NTIA study notes that the lowest income and least-educated households, rural black and Native American households, single-parent households, and persons under age 25 are less likely than others to have fixed-line telephone service. Tables 4, 5 and 6 indicate under representation of males generally, and to a lesser degree of individuals in households at both ends of the income distribution. While gender is not an important explainer of residential

TABLE 4. AGE AND SEX DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS AND THE 1998 U.S. LABOR FORCE^b

	Percentage by age group										Total	
	16 to 19 years	20 to 24 years	25 to 34 years	35 to 44 years	45 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 + years					
Labor Force												
U.S. Total 1998	137,673,000	6.0%	9.9%	23.8%	27.3%	20.6%	9.6%	2.8%				100.0%
Male (53.7%)	73,959,000	5.7%	9.8%	24.1%	27.4%	20.2%	9.8%	3.0%				100.0%
Female (46.3%)	63,714,000	6.3%	10.1%	23.6%	27.1%	21.0%	9.4%	2.5%				100.0%
Survey, 2000 ^a	706	5.5%	8.8%	24.6%	27.6%	23.5%	6.9%	3.0%				100.0%
Male (43.1%)	304	5.3%	6.3%	22.4%	33.2%	24.0%	6.6%	2.3%				100.0%
Female (56.9%)	402	5.7%	10.7%	26.4%	23.4%	23.1%	7.2%	3.5%				100.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau (1999).

^a Respondents who answered the question about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago.

^b Numbers and percentages for the U.S. are for the civilian labor force. Survey includes five military workers.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 5. RACE OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a AND THE 1990 GEORGIA LABOR FORCE^b

	Percentages		
	Georgia, 1990	Survey, 2000 ^a	
Labor force			740
Total white	74.5%	63.2%	
White male	40.9%	28.4%	
White female	33.6%	34.9%	
Total black	23.5%	27.8%	
Black male	11.0%	9.9%	
Black female	12.5%	18.0%	
Total other ^c	2.0%	6.5%	
Other ^c male	1.2%	3.5%	
Other ^c female	0.8%	2.9%	
No answer		2.5%	
Total	100.0%	100.0%	

Source: Georgia Department of Labor, Workforce Information and Analysis Division (1999).

^aRespondents who answered the question about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago.

^bNumbers and percentages for the U.S. are for the civilian labor force. Survey includes five military workers.

^cOn the survey, the *other* categories were Asian/Oriental, Native Indian/Eskimo/Aleut and multiracial. The Georgia 1990 data are from the 1990 Census of Population and Housing, and included no multi-racial category.

TABLE 6. HOUSEHOLD INCOMES OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a AND 1999 U.S. HOUSEHOLDS

	Under \$20,000	\$20,000- \$39,999	\$40,000- \$59,999
1999 U.S. households 133,816,000	14.9%	23.5%	20.5%
2000 survey households 455	11.9%	24.0%	27.7%
	\$60,000- \$79,999	\$80,000- \$99,999	\$100,000 and over
1999 U.S. households 133,816,000	15.3%	9.5%	16.1%
2000 survey households 455	15.4%	11.4%	9.7%

mobility, income is. The income group least represented in the sample is the highest, households with incomes of over \$100,000 per year.

Fixed-line telephone service penetration had been quite stable leading up to the 1998 survey reported above, but the falling price and increasing coverage offered by cellular telephones could have caused an additional number of households to give up their fixed-line telephones to rely solely on cellular telephones between December, 1998 and October 2000. However, Steeh and Cannon (2000) concluded that reliance on cellular telephones in place of fixed-line telephones was not yet widespread.

The sampling frame was made up of households, rather than workers. The survey was designed to randomize which worker within the household was interviewed, by asking to speak with the worker with the most recent birthday. This reduces the likelihood of oversampling those who work fewer hours, for example, but does not address differences in sampling probability due to household size. Thus, workers from larger households are potentially underrepresented in the sample, though this would not greatly impact the analysis.

Non-response problems include numbers not reached, refusals and other non-interviews. As Table 3 shows, numbers not reached were called back an average of 15 times in an effort to make contact. Although these telephone numbers could belong to eligible households, it seems plausible that at least some of these numbers might be out of service, meaning they were never part of the universe sampled. Of greater concern, 43 percent of potentially qualified respondents refused to answer our survey. Telephone surveys like this one, with persons who have not been contacted in advance or offered any incentives to participate are particularly subject to high refusal rates. There is a good chance that those who refused to participate in the survey are systematically different from those who did, though these differences may or may not be important to this analysis.

I speculate that refusals would be more likely from persons who place a high value on their time, including people with particularly time-consuming work and household responsibilities, high earners, and the self-employed. As already noted, members of the highest income households are underrepresented, as shown in Table

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 7. SELF-EMPLOYMENT AMONG SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a AND U.S. WORKERS^b, 1995

	U.S., 1995		Survey, 2000 ^a	
	Persons	Percent	Persons	Percent
Workers age 16 and over	124,900,000	100.0%	664	100.0%
Self-employed workers	10,482,000	8.4%	102	15.4%
Wage and salary workers	114,262,000	91.5%	560	84.3%
Unpaid family workers	155,000	0.1%	--	--
No answer	--	--	2	0.3%

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor (1995).

^aRespondents who answered the question about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago, were working, and answered the question whether or not they were self-employed.

^bNumbers and percentages for the U.S. are for employed civilians. Survey includes five military workers.

6. However, the self-employed seem to make up a surprisingly large proportion of our respondents, as Table 7 shows.

Finally, the 1990 Census showed that slightly over 2 percent of persons over age 5 in the Atlanta metropolitan statistical area did not speak English very well, and slightly over one percent of households were “linguistically isolated,” meaning no household member over age 14 spoke English well. We did not interview people who did not speak English, so this group was excluded entirely from our sample.

Thus I was most concerned about the following members of the Georgia labor force being under sampled in our survey: persons from very low-income households, particularly in minority communities; persons from households with many workers; young workers; self-employed persons, and persons who do not speak English. However, in comparison to larger populations it appears that most of these groups are reasonably represented in the sample. The most obvious biases in the sample are an undersupply of males, particularly white males, particularly under age 35, and an oversupply of females, particularly black females. However, as explained earlier, neither sex nor whether a person is white or black is usually a powerful explainer of residential mobility.

Residential Movers and Nonmovers

This section will discuss differences between three groups of survey respondents;

- those who have not moved their residence within the last five years (non-movers),
- those who have moved their residence at least once within the last five years (movers), and a subset of this last group,
- those who have moved their residence from outside Georgia within the last five years (movers from outside Georgia).

Table 8 shows the proportion of respondents to our survey reporting recent moves. Of the 740 people who answered the question on where they lived five years ago, Table 8 shows that 57.8 percent lived in the same place, making them non-movers. The other 42.2 percent reported that they had moved within the last five years, compared to 44.1 percent nationally between 1990 and 1995. All respondents to our survey were in the labor force. Table 2 shows that in general, persons in the labor force have higher mobility rates than others. This being the case, it appears from our survey that Georgians may move less frequently than the national average, since those in the labor force, who should move more often than the population as a whole, actually had moving rates below the national average five years ago. It should be noted, however, that the national average has been declining, as shown in Table 1.

Table 8 also indicates that 9.6 percent of survey respondents reported having moved within the last year. This is well below the national one-year rate of 15.9 percent for 1998-1999, suggesting either that (1) the sample may have missed people who move extremely often even though the responses seemed representative of the population on most dimensions, (2) that Georgia has one-year mobility rates well below those of the nation, or (3) that one-year moving rates have declined surprisingly rapidly in the past year both nationally and in Georgia.

Table 9 shows that 101 people, or 32.4 percent of movers within the last five years who responded to the survey, had come from outside Georgia. This is substantially higher than recent national five-year rates of moving across state lines shown in Table 1, which for 1990 to 1995 was 23.4 percent of all movers (18.5 percent from a different state and 4.9 percent from abroad).

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 8. LENGTH OF TIME SURVEY RESPONDENTS HAVE LIVED AT THEIR CURRENT RESIDENCES

Analysis categories	Time at Current Residence	Frequency	Percent of valid responses
Movers	Less than one year	71	9.6%
	One to less than five years	241	32.6%
Non-movers	Five or more years	428	57.8%
	Total responding	740	100.0%
	No answer	9	
	Total	749	

TABLE 9. ANALYSIS CATEGORIES

Analysis categories	Frequency	Percent of valid responses
Non-movers	428	57.8%
Movers	312	42.2%
Movers from outside Georgia ^a	101	13.6%
		(32.4% of movers)
Total responding to question	740	100.0%

^aIn addition to movers from outside Georgia, there were 192 movers who reported being from within Georgia, and 19 movers who did not report where they were from.

Thus, our survey paints the following picture: Georgians working or seeking work seem to move less often than Americans generally, particularly within the last year (1999-2000). However, current Georgia residents in the labor force who did move were somewhat more likely than their counterparts elsewhere in the U.S. to have moved from outside the state. The following section describes some of the attributes of movers and nonmovers, obtained from our survey.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

Age

Just as has historically been true, Georgia movers are concentrated between the ages of 16 and 35. Those moving from outside the state are somewhat older, only being disproportionately concentrated between the ages of 25 and 34. Relocating older persons can be seen in the national data in Table 2, and in our sample limited to Georgia residents in the labor force. Older workers could be attracted by Georgia's pleasant climate or be parents joining adult children already in the state's workforce.

TABLE 10. AGE BY RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a

Age	Nonmovers		All movers		Movers from Outside Georgia		Total
	Count (57.8 Percent)	Percent of Nonmov.	Count (42.2 Percent)	Percent of movers	Count (13.6 Percent)	Percent of movers by age	
16 to 19 years	21	5.2%	18	6.0%	3	16.7%	39
	53.8%		46.2%		7.7%		100.0%
20 to 24 years	22	5.4%	40	13.4%	11	27.5%	62
	35.5%		64.5%		17.7%		100.0%
25 to 34 years	67	16.5%	107	35.8%	38	35.5%	174
	38.5%		61.5%		21.8%		100.0%
35 to 44 years	119	29.2%	76	25.4%	24	31.6%	195
	61.0%		39.0%		12.3%		100.0%
45 to 54 years	123	30.2%	43	14.4%	15	34.8%	166
	74.1%		25.9%		9.0%		100.0%
55 to 64 years	38	9.3%	11	3.7%	3	27.3%	49
	77.6%		22.4%		6.1%		100.0%
65 and older	17	4.2%	4	1.3%	2	50.0%	21
	81.0%		19.0%		9.5%		100.0%
Total	407	100.0%	299	100.0%	96	32.1%	706

^aRespondents who answered the question about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

Sex

As noted earlier, gender does not have great power to explain mobility in the U.S. Although our sample is disproportionately female, the ratio of men to women is quite similar among nonmovers, movers, and movers from outside Georgia.

TABLE 11. SEX BY RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a

	Nonmovers		Movers				Total
	Percent (57.8 Percent)	Percent of Nonmov.	Percent (42.2 Percent)	Percent of movers	Movers from Outside Georgia Percent of movers by sex		
Men	180 56.3%	42.1%	140 43.8%	44.9%	43 13.4%	30.7%	320 100.0%
Women	248 59.0%	57.9%	172 41.0%	55.1%	58 13.8%	33.7%	420 100.0%
Total	428	100.0%	312	100.0%	101	32.4%	740

^aRespondents who answered the question about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago.

Race

Mirroring national trends, whites in Georgia are less likely to be movers than Georgia residents of other races. Whites made up 63.2 percent of our sample, but 68.0 percent of nonmovers. Highest moving rates were among multiracial persons, followed by black and Native American persons. However, moves from outside the state were disproportionately high only among Asians and Native Americans, both groups that represent very small shares of the state's labor force. A fairly substantial proportion of respondents (2.4 percent) declined to name their race.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 12: RACE BY RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a

Respondent's race	Nonmovers		Movers		Movers from Outside Georgia		Total
	Count (57.8 Percent)	Percent of Nonmov. (68.0%)	Count (42.2 Percent)	Percent of movers (56.7%)	Count (13.6 Percent)	Percent of movers by race (32.8%)	
White	291	68.0%	177	56.7%	58	32.8%	468
	62.2%		37.8%		12.4%		100.0%
Black	101	23.6%	105	33.7%	33	31.4%	206
	49.0%		51.0%		16.0%		100.0%
Asian	8	1.9%	6	1.9%	3	50.0%	14
	57.1%		42.9%		21.4%		100.0%
Native American	6	1.4%	5	1.6%	3	60.0%	11
	54.5%		45.5%		27.3%		100.0%
Multiracial	10	2.3%	13	4.2%	3	23.1%	23
	43.5%		56.5%		13.0%		100.0%
No answer	12	2.8%	6	1.9%	1	16.7%	18
	66.7%		33.3%		5.6%		100.0%
Total	428	100.0%	312	100.0%	101	32.4%	740

^aRespondents who answered the question about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago.

Educational Attainment

Moving rates in our sample appear fairly comparable to recent rates in the rest of the U.S. for those with less than a college education. Although moving rates in our survey are higher than recent national rates for those with college degrees only (see Table 2), they are lower for those with at least some graduate education. Thus nonmovers are concentrated among those with the least education, and those with the most. Although 57.8 percent of the sample were nonmovers, 64 percent of those without a high school diploma and 71.4 percent of those with some graduate education were nonmovers. Movers make up 53.1 percent of those whose education ended after college graduation, compared to 42.2 percent of the sample as a whole. Our sample also indicated that Georgia has a particularly high proportion of movers from outside the state among those whose highest educational attainment was a bachelor's degree, which may be another reflection of Georgia's attractiveness to young adults.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 13. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT BY RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a

Highest educational attainment	Nonmovers		Movers		Movers from Outside Georgia		Total
	(57.8 Percent)	Percent of Nonmov.	(42.2 Percent)	Percent of movers	(13.6 Percent)	Percent of movers by edu.	
Less than a high school graduate	48	11.2%	27	8.7%	5	18.5%	75
	64.0%		36.0%		6.7%		100.0%
High school graduate	129	30.2%	79	25.3%	18	22.8%	208
	62.0%		38.0%		8.7%		100.0%
Technical school, some college or associate's degree	110	25.8%	80	25.6%	26	32.5%	190
	57.9%		42.1%		13.7%		100.0%
Bachelor's degree	82	19.2%	93	29.8%	42	45.2%	175
	46.9%		53.1%		24.0%		100.0%
Some graduate school	15	3.5%	6	1.9%	1	16.7%	21
	71.4%		28.6%		4.8%		100.0%
Master's, professional or doctoral degree	43	10.1%	27	8.7%	9	33.3%	70
	61.4%		38.6%		12.9%		100.0%
Total	427	100.0%	312	100.0%	101	32.4%	739

^aRespondents who answered the questions about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago and what level of educational attainment they had attained.

Education in Georgia

It is not terribly surprising that those who moved within the last five years are less likely than nonmovers to have been to school in Georgia. This is most pronounced among those who moved from outside the state. However, nearly one-third of those moving to Georgia from outside the state within the past five years *did* attend school in Georgia at some time. This may represent return migration by previous Georgia residents, or first-time Georgia residents who have returned to college or graduate school as adults since arriving in the state.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 14. EDUCATION IN GEORGIA BY RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a

Did the respondent ever attend school in Georgia?	Movers						Total
	Nonmovers		All movers		Movers from Outside Georgia		
	(57.8 Percent)	Percent of Nonmov.	(42.2 Percent)	Percent of movers	(13.6 Percent)	Percent of movers by yes/no	
Yes	331	77.5%	191	61.8%	31	16.2%	522
	63.4%		36.6%		5.9%		100.0%
No	96	22.5%	118	38.2%	69	58.5%	214
	44.9%		55.1%		32.2%		100.0%
Total	427	100.0%	309	100.0%	100	32.4%	736

^aRespondents who answered the questions about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago and whether they had ever attended school in Georgia.

It is also evident from Table 15 that nearly two-thirds of all survey respondents who were Georgia residents in 2000 and had either lived in the same place in 1995 or moved from other parts of the state, had received some elementary education in Georgia schools. Nearly as many (59.5 percent) had gone to Georgia high schools. A much smaller proportion (38.9 percent) had been to college in Georgia. This is in part because a smaller proportion of respondents attended college. Thus it is noteworthy that the percentage of movers from outside the state who attended school in Georgia is higher (at 18 percent) than the proportion that attended elementary school. Given the age distribution of movers this is not unexpected. Many arrive in Georgia as young adults. However, the share of movers from out of state who had attended graduate school in Georgia is relatively low (2 percent), suggesting that Georgia's HOPE college scholarships, available only to undergraduates, might also play a role.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 15. LEVEL OF EDUCATION IN GEORGIA BY RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a

	Nonmovers and movers within Georgia		Movers from outside Georgia	
Attended elementary school in Georgia	401	64.8%	15	15.0%
Attended high school in Georgia	368	59.5%	14	14.0%
Attended college in Georgia	241	38.9%	18	18.0%
Attended graduate school in Georgia	48	7.8%	2	2.0%
Total attending any level of school in Georgia ^b	491	79.3%	31	31.0%
Total respondents	619	100.0%	100	100.0%

^aRespondents who answered the questions about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago and whether they had ever attended school in Georgia.

^bSince one person could attend multiple levels of school, the total is smaller than the sum of those reported in the categories.

Occupation

Nonmovers were disproportionately represented in the survey at the top of the occupational ladder, in managerial and professional specialty occupations (including engineers, scientists, doctors, dentists, teachers, lawyers and artists), and at the bottom (including operators, fabricators and laborers). Two occupational groupings (not counting military occupations) are disproportionately made up of movers in our sample; technical, sales and administrative support (the largest category in our survey and in the labor force nationally), and precision production, craft and repair (many probably involved in construction). In addition, a higher than expected share of movers from outside Georgia were in these two occupations and in managerial and professional specialty occupations.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 16. OCCUPATION BY RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a

Occupation	Nonmovers		Movers		Movers from Outside Georgia		Total
	(57.8 Percent)	Percent of Nonmov.	(42.2 Percent)	Percent of movers	(13.6 Percent)	Percent of movers by occ.	
Managerial and professional specialty	111	30.2%	66	25.0%	27	40.9%	177
	62.7%		37.3%		15.7%		100.0%
Technical, sales and admin. support	131	35.6%	118	44.7%	39	33.1%	249
	52.6%		47.4%		15.3%		100.0%
Service occupations	43	11.7%	30	11.4%	5	16.7%	73
	58.9%		41.1%		6.8%		100.0%
Precision production, craft, and repair	32	8.7%	25	9.5%	11	44.0%	57
	56.1%		43.9%		19.3%		100.0%
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	51	13.9%	20	7.6%	6	30.0%	71
	71.8%		28.2%		8.5%		100.0%
Military	--	--	5	1.9%	3	60.0%	5
	--		100.0%		60.0%		100.0%
Total	368	100.0%	264	100.0%	91	34.5%	632

^aRespondents who answered the questions about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago and their specific occupation.

Industry

According to our survey, movers are most over represented in finance, insurance and real estate, and to a lesser degree in manufacturing and wholesale and retail trade. Nonmovers are most concentrated in agriculture, construction (presumably not in the skilled trades, which had a high proportion of workers from outside Georgia) government, and transportation and public utilities. The percentage of movers from outside Georgia is well above average in both finance, insurance and real estate and government.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 17: INDUSTRY BY RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a

Industry	Nonmovers		Movers				Total
	(57.8 Percent)	Percent of Nonmov.	(42.2 Percent)	Percent of movers	Movers from Outside Georgia (13.6 Percent)	Percent of movers by ind.	
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining	6	1.7%	2	0.8%	0	0.0%	8
Construction	75.0%	6.9%	25.0%	4.2%	5	45.5%	36
Manufacturing	69.4%	10.5%	30.6%	11.6%	10	33.3%	68
Transportation and public utilities	55.9%	10.0%	44.1%	9.3%	8	33.3%	60
Wholesale and retail trade	60.0%	15.8%	40.0%	16.6%	15	34.9%	100
Finance, insurance and real estate	57.0%	5.8%	43.0%	9.3%	10	41.7%	45
Services	46.7%	42.7%	53.3%	42.5%	35	31.8%	264
Government	58.3%	6.6%	41.7%	5.8%	9	60.0%	39
Total	61.5%	100.0%	38.5%	100.0%	92	35.5%	620

^aRespondents who answered the questions about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago and were employed and gave the industry in which they were employed.

Household Income

Having moved in the last five years did not say much about a household's income in our survey, except among movers from outside the state. Nonmovers and in-state movers seemed to dominate alternating income categories by small margins. Movers from outside Georgia, however, are a disproportionately small percentage of the lowest income households, as the national data would predict, a disproportionately high percentage of households with incomes between \$40,000 and \$80,000 per year, and a roughly proportional percentage of the highest income households.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

TABLE 18. HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a

Income of respondent's household	Nonmovers		Movers				Total
			All movers		Movers from Outside Georgia		
	(57.8 Percent)	Percent of Nonmov.	(42.2 Percent)	Percent of movers	(13.6 Percent)	Percent of movers by inc.	
Less than \$20,000	31	12.1%	23	11.6%	3	13.0%	54
	57.4%		42.6%		5.6%		100.0%
\$20,000-\$39,999	60	23.3%	49	24.7%	13	26.5%	109
	55.0%		45.0%		11.9%		100.0%
\$40,000-\$59,999	70	27.2%	56	28.3%	20	35.7%	126
	55.6%		44.4%		15.9%		100.0%
\$60,000-\$79,000	35	13.6%	35	17.7%	12	34.3%	70
	50.0%		50.0%		17.1%		100.0%
\$80,000-\$99,000	38	14.8%	14	7.1%	7	50.0%	52
	73.1%		26.9%		13.5%		100.0%
\$100,000 or more	23	8.9%	21	10.6%	6	28.6%	44
	52.3%		47.7%		13.6%		100.0%
Total	257	100.0%	198	100.0%	61	30.8%	455

^aRespondents who answered the questions about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago and their household income.

Employment Status

Movers clearly have a slight employment advantage in our sample, with an unemployment rate of 9.0 percent, compared to 11.2 percent for nonmovers. Movers from outside Georgia did even better, with an unemployment rate of 7.0 percent.

TABLE 19. EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a

Employment status	Nonmovers		Movers				Total	
			All movers		Movers from Outside Georgia			
	(57.8 Percent)	Percent of Nonmov.	(42.2 Percent)	Percent of movers	(13.6 Percent)	Percent of movers from Outs. GA by emp.		
Employed	380	88.8%	284	91.0%	94	93.0%	33.1%	664
	57.2%		42.8%		14.1%			100.0%
Unemployed, but looking for work	48	11.2%	28	9.0%	7	7.0%	25.0%	76
	63.2%		36.8%		9.2%			100.0%
Total	428	100.0%	312	100.0%	101	100.0%	32.4%	740

^aRespondents who answered the questions about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

New and Existing Jobs

Taken all together, 41.2 percent of all current employees in the sample reported that they held a new position. "New" was defined on the survey as a position that had not been held by someone else previously. Thus the remaining 58.8 percent occupied positions someone else had held. There is little difference between movers and nonmovers in our sample on whether they were the first to take their jobs or replaced someone else. However, movers from outside Georgia took a higher proportion of newly created jobs than their share of the sample would have predicted. Whereas movers from outside Georgia represented 13.6 percent of the sample, they occupied nearly 17 percent of the newly created jobs occupied by survey respondents. Nearly half (48.4 percent) of all movers from outside Georgia held "new" jobs, compared to only 40.9 percent of nonmovers. This may reflect either an advantage these new residents have in obtaining newly created jobs, or a disadvantage they possess in trying to get existing jobs, or both.

TABLE 20. NEW AND EXISTING JOBS BY MOBILITY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a

Current main job is new or existed before respondent took it	Nonmovers		All movers		Movers			Total
	(57.8 Percent)	Percent of Nonmov. (40.9%)	(42.2 Percent)	Percent of movers (41.7%)	Movers from Outside Georgia (13.6 percent)	Percent of movers from Outs. GA (48.4%)	Percent of movers by emp. (39.1%)	
New	152	40.9%	115	41.7%	45	48.4%	39.1%	267
Existing	220	59.1%	161	58.3%	48	51.6%	29.8%	381
Total	372	100.0%	276	100.0%	93	100.0%	33.7%	648

^aRespondents who answered the questions about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago and were employed and answered the question about whether their job was new or existing.

Origins of Immigrants

Several patterns are noticeable among workers moving to Georgia from outside the state. First, about 31 percent come from the adjoining states of Florida (15 percent), Alabama (7 percent), Tennessee (5 percent), North Carolina (2 percent) and South Carolina (2 percent). The large number relocating from Florida could reflect the competition for jobs and housing in that state due to high levels of immigration from elsewhere in the U.S. and foreign immigration.

Thirty-nine percent of Georgia's immigrants in our sample come from states known as major destinations for foreign immigrants; Florida (15 percent), New York (8 percent), California (6 percent), Texas (6 percent), Illinois (3 percent), and New Jersey (1 percent). In addition, 12 percent of Georgia's movers from outside the state came directly from foreign countries. Thus taken together, it appears from our survey that as much as half of all workers relocating to Georgia from outside the state may be immigrants or have been influenced in their decision to relocate by an influx of immigrants.

TABLE 21. ORIGINS OF INMIGRANTS TO GEORGIA 1995-2000 FROM OUTSIDE GEORGIA AMONG SURVEY RESPONDENTS^a

Place of origin	Number	Place of origin	Number	Place of origin	Number
Florida	15	Illinois	3	Arkansas	1
Outside U.S.	12	Michigan	3	Kentucky	1
New York	8	Missouri	3	Louisiana	1
Alabama	7	Pennsylvania	3	New Jersey	1
California	6	Indiana	2	South Dakota	1
Texas	6	Massachusetts	2	Washington	1
Tennessee	5	Maryland	2	Wisconsin	1
Virginia	4	North Carolina	2	West Virginia	1
Colorado	3	Ohio	2	TOTAL	101
Hawaii	3	South Carolina	2		

^aRespondents who answered the questions about whether they lived at the same residential location as five years ago.

Summary and Conclusions

This survey finds that Georgians working or seeking work move less often than Americans generally, particularly within the last year. However, current Georgia residents in the labor force who moved were more likely than their counterparts elsewhere in the U.S. to have moved across state or national boundaries. One group that our survey does not include, of course, is those who have moved out of Georgia. It will be important to use the 2000 Census of Population and Housing to take a more comprehensive look at migration, including looking at whether outmigrants from the state have distinctive characteristics.

Georgia movers in the labor force appear to be mostly young (81 percent are under age 44), as is true elsewhere. The majority are white, but minorities are over represented relative to the makeup of the sample as a whole. About 40 percent possess college degrees, and 70 percent are in white-collar occupations, either as managers, professionals or in technical, sales or administrative support occupations. Fewer than 8 percent are laborers. Nearly three-quarters have household incomes between \$20,000 and \$80,000. Over two-thirds of all movers relocated from elsewhere in Georgia according to the survey. Of the remaining 32 percent from outside the state, half came either from foreign countries or from states with high levels of foreign immigration.

The unemployed were more likely to be nonmovers in our Georgia sample, unlike what is true nationally. This could be a concern if some of these nonmovers were “trapped” in places they could not find jobs. Nonmovers were more concentrated in the age ranges over 35, and among those at both ends of the educational spectrum—among those without any college and those with at least some graduate education. They were most concentrated in unskilled occupations, but also over represented in management and the professions and in service occupations. Nonmovers' household incomes were difficult to characterize as a group.

The sample suggests that workers moving to Georgia from outside the state have much in common with long-distance movers generally, and enhance the workforce. They are not primarily low skilled, poorly educated nor low-income, but

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

neither are they primarily from the highest levels of skill, education or income. Nearly one-third of them are at least partly a product of Georgia schools. Although they may displace longer-term resident workers indirectly, they are more likely than nonmovers to hold new jobs, not held by someone else previously.

One indication that movers, and especially movers from outside the state may be putting longer-term members of the labor force at a disadvantage is their lower unemployment rates. Movers from outside the state reported 7 percent unemployment, compared to 10 percent among instate movers and 11.2 percent among nonmovers. Movers from outside the state also seemed to take great advantages of Georgia colleges and universities, possibly because of the availability of HOPE scholarships. Further analysis of the survey data may shed additional light on this, and how state policy might respond.

This report does not discuss movement among locations within Georgia, but they vary greatly. Analysis of the 1985 to 1990 period (Sawicki, 1997) found that most of the state is losing potential workers, due to net outmigration. Given the importance of labor force to employers, this disadvantages many Georgia rural areas in their attempts to attract new employment opportunities. Yet at the same time the metropolitan Atlanta labor force grows at a high rate.

If our sample accurately represents the general population, over 13 percent of the state's workers have moved here from outside Georgia in the last five years. Thus, changes in labor force migration in the future could have a tremendous impact on the state. Georgia has been a magnet in the recent past because of the economic opportunity it offered, its relatively high quality of life and its relatively low cost of living. Adverse changes to any of these factors may diminish the state's attractiveness as a destination for immigrants, as well as making it more likely that existing residents would leave.

However, adding workers through immigration is not entirely positive, as the finding that recent immigrants have lower unemployment rates than longer term Georgia residents illustrates. Thus, concerns raised by previous research that high levels of immigration to the state may disadvantage current members of the Georgia labor force remain valid. There is also a widespread concern among demographers

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

nationally that foreign immigration by less educated, lower income persons is putting pressure on less educated, lower income workers in areas that receive many immigrants. Though Georgia has not historically been a gateway for immigrants, the state's growing population and increasing diversity will expand the "beaten path" effect, making more immigration likely in the future.

Endnotes

1. Residential mobility refers to persons relocating from one house to another. Migration generally refers to residential relocations of some distance, for example outside the county of previous residence. Immigrants to Georgia are those who moved *to* the state (rather than out of it, or within it), and include immigrants, who moved here from a foreign country.
2. A person who moved once a year for five years would be counted only once by the five-year question, but five times by five sequential one-year questions. For this reason, the one-year rates shown in Table 1 are much greater than 20 percent of the five-year rates.
3. Yankow (1999) specifically rejects the hypothesis that this effect is caused by self-selection of more able workers, although he finds evidence of this as well.
4. As of 1990, foreign-born men between the ages of 25 and 64 had 11.5 years of schooling on average, versus 13.1 year for native-born men. Foreign-born women had 11.1 years of schooling on average, versus 13.0 for native-born women. In general, there is greater variation among immigrants' educational attainment than among that of native-born U.S. residents (Chiswick and Sullivan, 1995). The average years of schooling among Asian, African, European and Canadian-born immigrants were well above the mean for native-born U.S. residents, and those from other Latin American countries were roughly the same as the U.S. mean (Chiswick and Sullivan, 1995). However, immigrants from Mexico had much lower educational attainment (7.4 years for men, 7.3 years for women) and also comprised about 22 percent of the foreign-born population of the U.S. in 1990, and over one-quarter of those immigrating to the U.S. between 1985 and 1990.
5. Both Florida and California recorded substantial gains from both international and domestic migration between 1985 and 1990. However, California's growth was primarily due to foreign immigration, and Florida's primarily to domestic migration.
6. Nonetheless, factors like state certification examinations, licensing, and reliance on an established client base and referrals tend to discourage mobility in a number of highly paid professions.

References

- Bartik, Timothy J. 1993. "Who Benefits From Local Job Growth: Migrants or the Original Residents?" *Regional Studies* 27(4): 297-311.
- Chiswick, Barry R. and Teresa A. Sullivan. 1995. "The New Immigrants." In *State of the Union: America in the 1990s. Vol. 2: Social Trends*, Reynolds Farley, ed., pp. 211-270. New York: Russell Sage Foundation,
- Clark, David and Thomas A. Knapp. 1996. "Personal and Location Specific Characteristics and Elderly Interstate Migration." *Growth and Change* 27(3): 327-53.
- Ellis, Mark, Richard Barff, and Beverly Renard. 1993. "Migration Regions and Interstate Labor Flows By Occupation in the United States." *Growth and Change* 24: 166-190.
- Faber, Carol S. 2000a. "Geographical Mobility, Population Characteristics: March 1997 to March 1998." *Current Population Reports*, P20-520. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.
- Faber, Carol S. 2000b. "Geographical Mobility, Population Characteristics: March 1998 to March 1999 (update)." *Current Population Reports*, P20-531. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.
- Frey, William H. 1995. "The New Geography of Population Shifts." In *State of the Union: America in the 1990s. Vol. 2: Social Trends*, Reynolds Farley, ed., pp.271-336. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Frey, William H. 1998. "Black Movement to the South, and Regional Concentration of the Races." University of Michigan Population Studies Center Research Report #98-412. Ann Arbor, MI: Population Studies Center.
- Georgia Department of Labor, Workforce Information and Analysis Division. 1999. *Georgia 1999 Population/Labor Force Data for Affirmative Action, Proportions Based on 1990 Census*.
- Long, Larry. 1988. *Migration and Residential Mobility in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Moriarity, Erin. 2000. "Mixed Medley." *Atlanta Business Chronicle* (July 28-August 3): 1B.
- National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). 1999. *Falling Through the Net: Defining the Digital Divide*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

- Plane, D.A. 1993. "Demographic Influences on Migration." *Regional Studies* 27(4): 375-383.
- Sandefur, Gary and Wilbur J. Scott. 1981. "A Dynamic Analysis of Migration: An Assessment of the Effects of Age, Family and Career Variables." *Demography* 18(3): 355-368.
- Sawicki, David S. 1997. "The Effects of Migration (Interstate and Interregional) on the State of Georgia's Labor Force." Unpublished.
- Sawicki, David S. and Mitch Moody. 1997. "The Effects of Intermetropolitan Migration on the Labor Force Participation of Disadvantaged Black Men in Atlanta." *Economic Development Quarterly* 11(1): 45-66.
- Schachter, Jason P. 2000. "Geographical Mobility, Special Studies: 1990 to 1995." *Current Population Reports*, P23-200. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.
- Stanback, Thomas M. and Thierry J. Noyelle. 1982. *Cities in Transition: Changing Job Structures in Atlanta, Denver, Buffalo, Phoenix, Columbus (Ohio), Nashville, Charlotte*. Totowa, NJ: Allanheld.
- Steeh, Charlotte and Brian Cannon. 2000. "Threat or Opportunity: Cellular Telephone Use By Households." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Portland, Oregon, May 18-21.
- Suro, Roberto. 2000. "Movement at Warp Speed." *American Demographics* 22(8): 61-64.
- Tornatzky, Louis G., Dennis Gray, Stephanie Tarant, and Julie E. Howe. 1998. *Where Have All the Students Gone? Interstate Migration of Recent Science and Engineering Graduates*. Research Triangle Park, NC: Southern Technology Council, Southern Growth Policies Board.
- Yankow, Jeffrey J. 1999. The Wage Dynamics of Internal Migration Within the United States. *Eastern Economic Journal* 25,3: 265-279.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor. 1995. *Employment and Earnings*. January.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 1999. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*.

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service. 1999. *Legal Immigration, Fiscal Year 1998*. Office of Policy and Planning, Statistics Branch Annual Report No. 2.

U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service web page. <http://www.ins.usdoj.gov/graphics/aboutins/statistics/illegalalien/index.html>. Accessed November, 2000.

Appendix. Survey

Q: sfirst

Hello, my name is _____. I'm calling from the Applied Research Center at Georgia State University. Your household was selected at random for participation in a short survey about Georgia's workforce. The information you give us will be used to better understand Georgia residents who work or want to work. I just need a minute of your time to help me choose the person in your household we would like to talk to. Have I reached a household?

1. Yes
2. No

Q: sget16

May I please speak with someone who is 16 years or older who lives there?

1. Yes, person on phone is over 16 → SKIP TO dnumadu
2. Yes, person goes to get someone → SKIP TO sintro2
3. No, no one available right now → SKIP TO scallbac
4. No, no one lives in house over 16 → DISPOSE
6. Language barrier, too ill, hearing impaired → SKIP TO scallbac

9. Refused → SKIP TO scallbac

Q: dnumadu

How many people age 16 years old or older, including yourself, are living in your household?

ENTER NUMBER

XX

PRESS ENTER WHEN DONE

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

Q: qwork

How many of these people either had a job or looked for paid work last week?

XX → IF ANSWER = 0 SKIP TO SAGREE
IF ANSWER = 1 SKIP TO qgetname
IF ANSWER >= 2 SKIP TO sgetname

98 DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED) Reask Question
99 NO ANSWER DISPOSE

Q: qgetname

Could you please give me THAT PERSON'S first name?

ENTER NAME AND THEN PRESS ENTER → SKIP TO sagechk

Q: sgetname

Of the people living in your household 16 years old or older who are working or were looking for work last week, could you please give me the first name of the person who HAD the most recent birthday?

IF THEY ASK: "WE DO THIS TO MAKE SURE THAT THE PERSON WE TALK TO IN EACH HOUSEHOLD IS RANDOMLY SELECTED."

ENTER NAME AND THEN PRESS ENTER → SKIP TO sagechk

Q: sagechk

Is this person 18 years old or older?

1. YES → SKIP TO sspeak
2. NO → SKIP TO slegal

Q: slegal

May I please speak with the legal guardian of this person?

1. LEGAL GUARDIAN IS AVAILABLE → SKIP TO sperm
2. LEGAL GUARDIAN IS NOT AVAILABLE → SKIP TO scallbac

Q: sperm

Hello, my name is _____. I'm calling from the Applied Research Center at Georgia State University. We are conducting a survey on Georgia's workforce. In order to make our selection procedure random we ask to speak with the person in the household who is either employed or was looking for paid work last week. Of those people we need to speak with the one who has had the most recent birthday. According to our information that is your 16 or 17-year-old son/daughter. The questions we will ask will be about your son/daughter's recent employment. May we have permission to speak with him/her?

1. YES → SKIP TO sspeak
2. NO → DISPOSE

Q: sspeak

May I please speak with that person?

1. Yes, person is on line → SKIP TO sagree
2. Yes, person goes to get respondent → SKIP TO sintro3
3. No, respondent is unavailable → SKIP TO scallback
4. No, person refuses for respondent → SKIP TO splead
5. No, respondent is on line, but REFUSES → SKIP TO scallback
6. Language barrier, too ill, hearing impaired, respondent out of town for duration of poll – DISPOSE

Q: sagree

Your number was selected at random and your answers will be completely confidential. If I ask a question you do not want to answer, just let me know and I'll go on to the next one. Please note, this interview may be monitored by my supervisor to insure that I am conducting it properly.

1. CONTINUE → SKIP TO scallback
2. REFUSE

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

Q: sintro 2

Hello, my name is _____. I am calling from the Applied Research Center at Georgia State University. We are conducting a very brief survey about the workforce in Georgia. I understand that you are 16 years old or older...Is that correct?

1. Yes → SKIP TO qemp
2. No → SKIP TO sget16
3. Call Back

9. Refused

Q: sintro3

Hello, my name is _____. I am calling from the Applied Research Center at Georgia State University. We are conducting a very short survey on the workforce in Georgia. I understand that you are 16 years old or older, and have had the most recent birthday and were employed or looking for work last week...Is that correct?

1. Yes → SKIP TO qemp
2. No → SKIP TO sget16

6. Language Barrier, too ill, hearing impaired → DISPOSED
9. Refused

Q: scallbac

What would be a better time to call back?

**** IF RESPONDENT ON PHONE:**

1. Refused. Do Not callback

CTRL-END to schedule callback

**** IF RESPONDENT NOT ON PHONE:**

Q: splead

It is very important to the representatives of this study that we speak with the person selected. May I at least speak with him/her, that way he/she can decide whether to help us with this survey?

1. Yes, person goes to get respondent → SKIP TO sintro3
2. Yes, but unavailable right now → SKIP TO scallbac
3. No, person still refuses for respondent → SKIP TO scallbac
6. Language barrier, too ill, hearing impaired, respondent out of town for duration of poll. → DISPOSE

Q: qemp

Were you employed or were you unemployed but looking for work during last week?

1. EMPLOYED
2. NOT EMPLOYED BUT LOOKING FOR WORK → SKIP TO qwrkstat
8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED) → SKIP TO qwrkstat
9. NO ANSWER → SKIP TO qwrkstat

Q: qemp4

Did you work at more than one job last week?

1. YES
2. NO
9. NO ANSWER

Q: qjobact

The next questions will be about your main job, that is, the job where you worked the most hours for pay or profit last week.

(PRESS ANY KEY TO CONTINUE)

Q: qemp2

Did you work full-time or part-time at this job?

1. FULL-TIME
2. PART-TIME

9 NO ANSWER

Q: qemp3

At this same job did you work for yourself or for someone else?

1. SELF
2. SOMEONE ELSE

9. NO ANSWER

Q: qjobact2

Specifically what kind of work did you do at this job?

INTERVIEWER: PROBE FOR RESPONDENT'S JOB TITLE AND A DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES. FOR EXAMPLE, DO NOT ACCEPT ENGINEER OR MANAGER, BUT MECHANICAL ENGINEER, PERSONNEL MANAGER, REGISTERED NURSE, ETC.

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
9. NO ANSWER

Q: qjobact3

What kind of business or industry is that?

(FOR EXAMPLE: HOSPITAL, BANK, MAIL ORDER FIRM, AUTO REPAIR SHOP, STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT. IF UNCLEAR, PROBE BY ASKING WHAT THE BUSINESS OR INDUSTRY IS CALLED, AND WHAT IT MAKES OR DOES.)

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
9. NO ANSWER

Q: qwrkitm

Do you use any of the following in your work?

- a computer
- a cellular telephone
- a pager
- e-mail, Internet or other method of electronic information transfer

1. YES
2. NO

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
9. NO ANSWER

Q: qpdhrs

Where did you spend the most paid work hours last week? Would you say...

1. at home → SKIP TO qyears
2. at a single workplace away from home → SKIP TO qwrkplc
3. traveling for work or moving among several workplaces → SKIP TO qyears
7. OTHER → SKIP TO qwrkplc

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED) → SKIP TO qwrkplc
9. NO ANSWER → SKIP TO qwrkplc

Q: qwrkplc

Is this work place in Georgia?

1. YES → SKIP TO qinga
2. NO → SKIP TO qnotga
8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED) → SKIP TO qtray
9. NO ANSWER → SKIP TO qtray

Q: qnotga

In what state is this workplace? (INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT SAYS IN ANOTHER COUNTRY LEAVE BLANK AND PRESS ENTER)

If answer there is an answer→SKIP TO qinga

Q: qcentry

In what country is this workplace?

SKIP TO qtray

Q: qinga

In what city is this workplace?

- 8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
- 9. NO ANSWER

Q: qcnty

In what county is this workplace?

- 8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
- 9. NO ANSWER

Q: qzip

What is the zipcode?

XXXXX

- 99998. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
- 99999. NO ANSWER

q: qtrav

How many hours or minutes did it take you to travel from where you live to this workplace, on average, last week?

(READ CATEGORIES)

- 1. 0-14 MINUTES
- 2. 15-29 MINUTES
- 3. 30-44 MINUTES
- 4. 45-59 MINUTES
- 5. 60-90 MINUTES
- 6. 90-120 MINUTES
- 7. OVER 2 HOURS
- 8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
- 9. NO ANSWER

**Residential Mobility, Migration and
Georgia's Labor Force**

Q: qyears

How many years have you worked at the same job? (INTERVIEWER: IF YEARS ARE LESS THAN 1 ENTER 0.)

XX

- 98. DON'T KNOW
- 99. NO ANSWER

Q: qmonths

(INTERVIEWER: ENTER MONTHS IF RESPONDENT SAID SOMETHING LIKE ONE YEAR AND FOUR MONTHS OR ONLY SAID MONTHS, OTHERWISE ENTER 0.)

XX

- 98. DON'T KNOW
- 99. NO ANSWER

Q: qearn

How much do you earn on this job before taxes including tips and bonuses?

XXXXXXX

- 9999998. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED) → SKIP TO qstjob
- 9999999. REFUSED, NO ANSWER → SKIP TO qstjob

Q: qearn2

(ASK ONLY IF UNCLEAR IN LAST QUESTION)

Is this hourly, weekly, biweekly, monthly, or annually?

- 1. HOURLY
- 2. WEEKLY
- 3. BIWEEKLY
- 4. MONTHLY
- 5. ANNUALLY

- 8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
- 9. NO ANSWER

Q: qstjob

When you started your current main job was it a new position or had someone else held it previously?

1. NEW POSITION
2. HELD PREVIOUSLY

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
9. NO ANSWER

Q: qwrkstat

Now thinking about your work status one year ago, that is on this date in 1999, were you...

1. employed
2. unemployed, not looking for work
3. unemployed, looking for work → SKIP TO qstat

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED) → SKIP TO qstat
9. NO ANSWER → SKIP TO qstat

Q: qwkstat2

Were you...

1. working at a different job than last week, but in the same location
→ SKIP TO qstat
2. working in a different location than last week

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED) → SKIP TO qstat
9. NO ANSWER → SKIP TO qstat

Q: qwrkplc2

Was this workplace in Georgia?

1. YES → SKIP TO qinga
2. NO → SKIP TO qnotga2

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED) → SKIP TO qtrav2
9. NO ANSWER → SKIP TO qtrav2

Q: qnotga2

In what state was this workplace? (INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT SAYS IN ANOTHER COUNTRY LEAVE BLANK AND PRESS ENTER)

If there is an answer → SKIP TO qinga2

Q: qcentry2

In what country was this workplace?

SKIP TO qtrav2

Q: qinga2

In what city was this workplace?

- 8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
- 9. NO ANSWER

Q: qcnty2

In what county was this workplace?

- 8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
- 9. NO ANSWER

Q: qzip2

What was the zipcode?

- 99998. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
- 99999. NO ANSWER

Q: qtrav2

How many hours or minutes did it take you to travel from where you lived to this workplace, on average, one year ago?

(READ CATEGORIES)

1. 0-14 MINUTES
2. 15-29MINUTES
3. 30-44 MINUTES
4. 45-59 MINUTES
5. 60-90 MINUTES
6. 90-120 MINUTES
7. OVER 2 HOURS

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
9. NO ANSWER

Q: qstat

Now thinking about your work status five years ago, that is on, this date in 1995, were you...

1. employed
2. unemployed, not looking for work → SKIP TO qcity
3. unemployed, looking for work → SKIP TO qcity

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)→ SKIP TO qcity
9. NO ANSWER→ SKIP TO qcity

Q: qstat2

Were you...

1. working at a different job than last week, but in the same location
→SKIP TO qcity
2. working in a different location than last week

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED) → SKIP TO qcity
9. NO ANSWER → SKIP TO qcity

Q: qstatloc

Was this workplace in Georgia?

1. YES → SKIP TO qinga3
2. NO → SKIP TO qnotga3

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED) → SKP TO qsttrav
9. NO ANSWER → SKIP TO qsttrav

Q: qnotga3

In what state was this workplace?

(INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT SAYS IN ANOTHER
COUNTRY LEAVE BLANK AND PRESS ENTER)

If there is an answer → SKIP TO qinga3

Q: qcentry3

In what country was this workplace?

SKIP TO qsttrav

Q: qinga3

In what city was this workplace?

SKIP TO qcnty3

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
9. NO ANSWER

Q: qcnty3

In what county was this workplace?

- 8 DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
- 9 NO ANSWER

Q: qstatzip

What was the zipcode?

XXXXX

99998. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)

99999. NO ANSWER

Q: qstrav

How many hours or minutes did it take you to travel from where you lived to this workplace, on average, five years ago?

(READ CATEGORIES)

1. 0-14 MINUTES

2. 15-29 MINUTES

3. 30-44 MINUTES

4. 45-59 MINUTES

5. 60-90 MINUTES

6. 90-120 MINUTES

7. OVER 2 HOURS

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)

9. NO ANSWER

Q: qcity

What city do you live in now?

9. NO ANSWER

Q: qcounty

What county do you live in now?

9 NO ANSWER

Q: qyrsliv

How many years have you lived in the same place? (INTERVIEWER: IF LESS THAN 1 YEAR, ENTER 0 AND PRESS ENTER.)

XX

IF ANSWER = 0 → SKIP TO qyrsliv2
IF ANSWER < 5 → SKIP TO q95live
IF ANSWER = 98 or 99 → SKIP TO qlive
OTHERWISE SKIP TO dedu

98. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
99. NO ANSWER

Q: qyrsliv2

(INTERVIEWER: ENTER MONTHS IF RESPONDENT SAID SOMETHING LIKE ONE YEAR AND FOUR MONTHS OR ONLY SAID MONTHS, OTHERWISE ENTER 0.)

XX

98. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
99. NO ANSWER

Q: qlive

Did you live in the United States one year ago, that is, on this date in 1999?

1. YES
2. NO → SKIP TO qlventry

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED) → SKIP TO q95live
9. NO ANSWER → SKIP TO q95live

Q: qlivcity

In what city did you live in one year ago?

9. NO ANSWER

Q: qlivstat

In what state was that?

9. NO ANSWER

Q: qzip99

What was the zipcode?

XXXXXX → SKIP TO q95live

99998. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)

99999. NO ANSWER

SKP q95live

Q: qlventry

In what country did you live one year ago?

9. NO ANSWER

Q: q95live

Did you live in the United State five years ago, that is, on this date in 1995?

1. YES

2. NO → SKIP TO qlvcntr

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED) → SKIP TO dedu

9. NO ANSWER → SKIP TO dedu

Q: qlvcity

In what city did you live in five years ago?

9. NO ANSWER

Q: qlvstat

In what state was that?

9. NO ANSWER

Q: qzip95

What was the zipcode?

XXXXXX → SKIP TO dedu

99998. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)

99999. NO ANSWER

Q: qlvctr

In what country did you live five years ago?

9. NO ANSWER

Q: dedu

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

(READ CATEGORIES.)

1. less than a high school graduate
2. high school graduate or equivalent (GED)
3. technical school, some college, or an associate's degree
4. college graduate, bachelor's degree
5. some graduate school
6. masters, professional or doctorate degree

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
9. NO ANSWER

Q: dschga

Did you ever attend school in Georgia?

1. YES → SKIP TO dedu
2. NO

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
9. NO ANSWER

IF (YES and LESS THAN A HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE) → SKIP TO dschna5

IF (YES and HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE OR GED) → SKIP TO dschna4

IF (YES and SOME COLLEGE) → SKIP TO dschna3

IF (YES and COLLEGE GRAD) → SKIP TO dschna3

IF (YES and SOME GRADUATE SCHOOL) → SKIP TO dschna

IF (NO) → SKIP TO dborn

IF (DON'T KNOW) → SKIP TO dborn

IF (NO ANSWER) → SKIP TO dborn

Q: dschnga

Did you attend graduate school in Georgia?

1. YES
2. NO

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
9. NO ANSWER

Q: dschnga3

Did you attend college in Georgia?

1. YES
2. NO

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
9. NO ANSWER

Q: dschnga4

Did you attend high school in Georgia?

1. YES
2. NO

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
9. NO ANSWER

Q: dschnga5

Did you attend elementary school or junior high in Georgia?

1. YES
2. NO

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
9. NO ANSWER

Q: dborn

In what year were you born?

XXXX (1900 TO 1984)

9998 DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)

9999 NO ANSWER

Q: dhispc

Do you consider yourself of Hispanic origin?

1. YES

2. NO

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)

9. NO ANSWER

Q: drace

I have just a few more questions. With which racial/ethnic group do you most strongly identify?

(READ CATEGORIES)

1. White

2. Black or African American

3. Asian, Oriental

4. Native Indian, Eskimo, Aleut

5. Multiracial

9. REFUSED/NO ANSWER

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

Q: dincme

Which of the following ranges best describes your household's total 1999 income before taxes? Remember to include your income from all sources, and the income of all family members living with you. Please stop me at the range that best describes your household's income. Would you say...

(READ CATEGORIES)

1. less than \$20,000
2. \$20,000 - 39,999
3. \$40,000 - 59,999
4. \$60,000 - 79,999
5. \$80,000 - 99,999
6. \$100,000 or more

8. DON'T KNOW (VOLUNTEERED)
9. NO ANSWER

Q: dsex

(INTERVIEWER: ENTER THE GENDER OF THE RESPONDENT. ASK ONLY IF YOU ARE NOT SURE.)

1. MALE
2. FEMALE

Those are all of the questions I have at this time. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

About The Author

Dr. Amy Helling is an Associate Professor in the Department of Public Administration and Urban Studies of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. She holds a Ph.D. in economics from Emory University and a master's degree in urban and regional planning from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

Nevbahar Ertas is a student in the joint Georgia State/Georgia Institute of Technology Ph.D. program in public policy. She holds a master's degree in urban policy planning from Middle East Technical University in Ankara, Turkey.

About The Fiscal Research Program

The Fiscal Research Program provides nonpartisan research, technical assistance, and education in the evaluation and design of state and local fiscal and economic policy, including both tax and expenditure issues. The Program's mission is to promote development of sound public policy and public understanding of issues of concern to state and local governments.

The Fiscal Research Program (FRP) was established in 1995 in order to provide a stronger research foundation for setting fiscal policy for state and local governments and for better-informed decision making. The FRP, one of several prominent policy research centers and academic departments housed in the School of Policy Studies, has a full-time staff and affiliated faculty from throughout Georgia State University and elsewhere who lead the research efforts in many organized projects.

The FRP maintains a position of neutrality on public policy issues in order to safeguard the academic freedom of authors. Thus, interpretations or conclusions in FRP publications should be understood to be solely those of the author.

FISCAL RESEARCH PROGRAM STAFF

David L. Sjoquist, Director and Professor of Economics
Margo Doers, Administrative Support
Alan Essig, Senior Research Associate
Catherine Freeman, Senior Research Associate
Lakshmi Pandey, Research Associate
William J. Smith, Research Associate
Dorie Taylor, Associate to the Director
Jeanie J. Thomas, Senior Research Associate
Arthur D. Turner, Microcomputer Software Technical Specialist
Sally Wallace, Associate Director and Associate Professor of Economics

ASSOCIATED GSU FACULTY

James Alm, Chair and Professor of Economics
Roy W. Bahl, Dean and Professor of Economics
Kelly D. Edmiston, Assistant Professor of Economics
Martin F. Grace, Associate Professor of Risk Management and Insurance
Shiferaw Gurmu, Associate Professor of Economics
Amy Helling, Associate Professor of Public Administration and Urban Studies
Julie Hotchkiss, Associate Professor of Economics
Ernest R. Larkin, Professor of Accountancy
Gregory B. Lewis, Professor of Public Administration and Urban Studies
Jorge L. Martinez-Vazquez, Professor of Economics
Julia E. Melkers, Associate Professor of Public Administration
Theodore H. Poister, Professor of Public Administration
Ross H. Rubenstein, Assistant Professor of Public Admin. and Educational Policy Studies
Benjamin P. Scafidi, Assistant Professor of Economics
Bruce A. Seaman, Associate Professor of Economics
Geoffrey K. Turnbull, Professor of Economics
Mary Beth Walker, Associate Professor of Economics
Katherine G. Willoughby, Associate Professor of Public Administration

PRINCIPAL ASSOCIATES

Mary K. Bumgarner, Kennesaw State University
Richard W. Campbell, University of Georgia
Gary Cornia, Brigham Young University
Dagney G. Faulk, Indiana University Southeast
Richard R. Hawkins, University of West Florida
L. Kenneth Hubbell, University of Missouri
Jack Morton, Morton Consulting Group
Francis W. Rushing, Independent Consultant
Saloua Sehilli, Centers for Disease Control
Stanley J. Smits, Workplace Interventions, Inc.
Kathleen Thomas, University of Texas
Thomas L. Weyandt, Atlanta Regional Commission
Laura Wheeler, Independent Consultant

GRADUATE RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

Hsin-hui Chui
John Matthews
Nevbahar Ertas

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

(All publications listed are available at <http://frp.aysps.gsu.edu> or call the Fiscal Research Program at 404/651-2782, or fax us at 404/651-2737.)

***Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force.* (Amy Helling and Nevbahar Ertas)**

This report examines the characteristics of workers who recently moved into and within Georgia and focuses particularly on who is employed in newly created jobs. FRP Report/Brief 69 (February 2002)

***Revenue Implications for Georgia of Tax Changes Since 1987.* (Kelly Edmiston, Alan Essig, Catherine Freeman, et al.)**

This report provides estimates of the state revenue impacts of all tax changes since 1987. FRP Report 68 (January 2002)

***Georgia's Taxes: A Summary of Major State and Local Government Taxes, 8th Edition.* (Jack Morton and Richard Hawkins)**

A handbook on taxation that provides a quick overview of all state and local taxes in Georgia. FRP Annual Publication A(8) (January 2002)

***Does Growth Pay For Itself? Property Tax Trends for School Systems in Georgia.* (Richard R. Hawkins)**

This report examines the relationship between economic growth and Georgia school property tax bases. FRP Report/Brief 67 (January 2002)

***Are Small Urban Centers Magnets for Economic Growth?* (Benjamin Scafidi, William J. Smith, and Mary Beth Walker)**

This report estimates a model of county-level job growth and finds an effect of small urban centers on their regional economies. FRP Report/Brief 66 (December 2001)

***Changes in the Geographic Distribution of County-Level Sales Tax Bases in Georgia.* (William J. Smith)**

This report presents the geographic changes in county-level sales tax base for Georgia and discusses the fiscal implications of these changes. FRP Report/Brief 65 (December 2001)

***Employment Trends in Georgia Border Counties.* (Saloua Sehili)**

This report explores the issue of whether Georgia's border counties have lost employment to surrounding states. FRP Report/Brief 64 (October 2001)

Residential Mobility, Migration and Georgia's Labor Force

***The Application of Local Economic Development Incentives in Georgia: Final Report.* (Julia Melkers, Francis W. Rushing, and Jeanie Thomas)**

This report uses results of a mail survey and a series of case studies. The report addresses the type and level of economic development incentives offered at the local level in Georgia. FRP Report/Brief 63 (August 2001)

***Where Has the Money Gone? Part II. The Supplemental Budget.* (Alan Essig)**

This report examines the sources of additional general fund revenues within the supplemental budget and how those general fund revenues have been appropriated for fiscal years 1196 through 2001. FRP Report/Brief 62 (August 2001)

***Racial Disparities in School Finance Adequacy: Evidence From Georgia and the Nation.* (Ross Rubenstein)**

This report explores the relationship between the level of education expenditures and the racial composition of school districts in Georgia and the nation and estimates the cost of achieving benchmarks for school finance adequacy. FRP Report/Brief 61 (July 2001)

***An Analysis of Plant Closings in Georgia's Apparel and Textile Industries.* (Julia E. Melkers, Francis W. Rushing, and David L. Sjoquist)**

This report explores various issues and programs associated with re-employment of workers from apparel and textile plants that close. FRP Report/Brief 60 (July 2001)

***Public Opinion on Issues of Tax Fairness.* (David L. Sjoquist)**

This report contains the results of a public opinion survey of Georgia residents regarding issues associated with tax fairness. FRP Report 59 (June 2001)

***Interstate Banking and Georgia-Based Banks.* (Dileep R. Mehta)**

This report explores whether the easing of the restrictions on interstate banking has generated positive, risk-adjusted benefits. FRP Report 58 (May 2001)

***Urban Welfare-to-Work Transitions in the 1990s: Patterns in Six Urban Areas.* (John Baj, Julie L. Hotchkiss, et. al.)**

This report focuses on patterns of welfare use and employment for welfare leavers for central counties in each of six metropolitan areas. FRP Report 57 (April 2001)

***The Georgia Sales Tax Revenue Impact From Electronic Commerce.* (Richard R. Hawkins)**

This report presents estimates of sales tax revenue loss by Georgia counties due to e-commerce. FRP Report 56 (March 2001)

(All publications listed are available at <http://frp.aysps.gsu.edu> or call the Fiscal Research Program at 404/651-2782, or fax us at 404/651-2737)

