

YOU OR ME?  
GENDER AND GRADUATE STUDENTS' ORIENTATIONS  
TOWARD SACRIFICE AND MIGRATION

Sarah Elizabeth Patterson

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree  
Master of Arts  
in the Department of Sociology  
Indiana University

May 2009

Accepted by the Faculty of Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

---

Linda L. Haas, PhD, Chair

Master's Thesis  
Committee

---

Peter Seybold, PhD

---

David C. Bell, PhD

To my parents, who have always believed in me and supported me no matter what

harebrained idea I've gotten into my head.

Mom, without you I wouldn't know what strength is.

And Dad, you've taught me more about perseverance than you know.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the gracious help of the professors who allowed me into their classrooms this project would not have been possible. Thank you to all the graduate students who participated and gave me time to pick their brains. Thank you also to the Sociology Department and IUPUI for my continued academic support.

Thank you to all of my professors that I've been lucky enough to learn from over the years. Thank you to Professor Linda Haas for being my advisor and giving me invaluable input, time, and patience into my project and academic work. I am a better academic and a better person overall because of you. To Professor Peter Seybold, the best friend in a professor a young academic could have. Thanks for making me think critically. To Professor David Bell, your invaluable input on my survey and methods helped this project be what it is today. To Dr. Carrie Foote, who has been my confidant and supporter since I entered the program. To Professor Brian Powell, I wouldn't have found my niche in Sociology without your guidance and friendship.

Thank you to my family and friends. Where would I be without all of you? To my family who have been my cheerleaders all the way. To my sister, Julie, you have been my support system through life. To my friend Erin, who I could never have JFDI if you hadn't been my thesis buddy. And to all of my friends who have been there for me during the course of my Master's work. Your support has been the light that has guided me through. I cannot say enough Thank Yous to enough people to satisfy the appreciation that I feel.

## ABSTRACT

Sarah Elizabeth Patterson

### YOU OR ME? GENDER AND GRADUATE STUDENTS' ORIENTATIONS TOWARD SACRIFICE AND MIGRATION

In an exploratory study of graduate students moving expectations, a self-administered survey was utilized to examine the compromises and sacrifices they expect themselves or their potential partners to be making in moving decisions, as well as their willingness to sacrifice or ask their partner to sacrifice in a move. This study focuses on this work-life decision due to its being understudied in previous literature; it aims to start to establish migration decisions as an important work-family balance topic as well as explore what role gender plays in expectations and willingness to move, especially regarding who sacrifices in a moving decision.

The study focused on the potential impact of gender on migration orientations, comparing men's and women's attitudes. It also looked at the influence of gender ideology, program's gender composition, perceived transportability, salary, partner's relative salary and Money as Power attitudes as well as some demographic data. Previous literature has suggested that women are more likely to be willing to sacrifice in a moving decision while men are more willing to ask their partners to do so. Findings from this study generally confirm this. Some individual factors related to being willing to ask the partner to sacrifice more were: holding a traditional gender ideology, being in a male-dominated program, having a higher expected salary, belief in money as power, and belief in moving as important to a career. Results also suggest that this is a fruitful area for further study.

Linda L. Haas, PhD, Committee Chair

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	vii
Introduction	1
Literature Review	5
Research Questions	17
Methods	22
Results	38
Discussion	70
Conclusion	81
Appendices	
Appendix A	84
Appendix B	85
Appendix C	88
Appendix D	93
References	101
Curriculum Vitae	

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. T-tests for Gender Differences in Salience of Migration Issues	40
Table 2. T-tests for Gender Differences in Expectations and Willingness	48
Table 3. Correlations between Expectations and Willingness Scales	50
Table 4. T-tests for Gender Differences in Gender Related Items	56
Table 5. T-tests for Gender Differences in Expected Salary Range	62
Table 6. T-tests for Gender Difference in Moving Attitudes	63
Table 7. T-tests for Gender Differences in Demographic Questions	69
Table 8. Pearson’s Correlations for Expectation Items, Willingness Scales, and Independent Variables	80
Table A-1. Headcount of Each Program	84
Table D-1. Percentage Distribution for Students’ Orientations toward Migration	93
Table D-2. Percentage Distribution for Students’ Attitudes toward Moving Out of Central Indiana After Graduation	93
Table D-3. Percentage Distribution for Having Moved with a Partner Before	94
Table D-4. Percentage Distribution for Gender and Expectations	94
Table D-5. Percentage Distribution for Gender and Self-Sacrifice Willingness	95
Table D-6. Percentage Distribution for Gender and Partner Sacrifice Willingness	96
Table D-7. Percentage Distribution for Self-Sacrifice and Partner Sacrifice Scales	97
Table D-8. Percentage Distribution for Gender Ideology	97
Table D-9. Percentage Distribution for Program’s Gender Composition	98
Table D-10. Percentage Distribution for Transportability	98
Table D-11. Percentage Distribution for Expected Salary Range	98

Table D-12. Percentage Distribution for Partner's Relative Salary	99
Table D-13. Percentage Distribution for Money as Power Scale	99
Table D-14. Percentage Distribution for Moving Attitudes	100
Table D-15. Percentage Distribution for Partnership Status	100



## INTRODUCTION

Young adults today want to “have it all,” by being able to balance work and family. Most hope to obtain a rewarding and satisfying job that will provide them financial stability for their families in the future (Gerson 2004). Both young men and young women report strong commitments to both work and family (Peake and Harrison 2002) and careers are now just as important to women as to men (Castleman, Coulthard, and Reed 2005). Dual-career couples are becoming more commonplace (Raley, Mattingly and Bianchi 2006), as women obtain increasingly higher levels of education and elect to work at the same time as they raise children (U.S. Department of Education 2005).

However, one major work-life decision in the lives of young professionals, migration, has not received as much attention as other common work-life issues (such as dependent care, family leave, and flexible scheduling). In addition, the influence of gender on such decisions has also been minimized. Migration decisions involve a choice between work and family in that a worker may be asked to move to another state while his/her partner wants to stay in their current residence for his/her own career. Which partner sacrifices in the decision, or whether or not to move at all, are huge issues in this area. Migration decisions are especially important to younger workers, who have the highest relocation rates (Swain and Garasky 2007).

Moving because of one’s job can be a more complex and difficult decision when a partner is involved. Being married often means that the mover has to take into account their spouse and even their children and extended family (Jacobsen and Levin 2000) (although previous literature has also shown that they do not always do this, see Challiol

and Mignonac 2005). Decisions are also very variable and may depend on many factors, including one's gender. For instance, one couple may decide a certain move may not be the one they want to make because of the sacrifices one partner would have to make, but another couple with the same decision may have a completely different outcome (Swain and Garasky 2007).

Migration decisions are more complicated today because of the demands of a changing workforce. One major change can be seen along gender lines is that women can no longer be assumed to be "transportable spouses" (Hendershott 1995), nor can women's careers be assumed to be secondary (Pixley and Moen 2003). Gender is an important aspect in moving decisions because "gender influences what is perceived as normative, appropriate, and feasible" (Lewis and Haas 2005: 353) as well as who may be more likely to sacrifice or be asked to sacrifice.

This issue of migration is particularly salient to young workers in professional degree programs since, "as the number of professionals in dual-career marriages continues to grow, organizations will increasingly need to attract dual-career couples in order to recruit the best candidates" (Cooper 2004: 100). Migration decisions may arise as soon as a student completes a professional degree. While previous studies show that students find relocation an important issue for their futures (Orrange 2002), orientations toward migration decisions and sacrifice have not been explored thoroughly with students. One study of students' future work-family expectations reported that the "most commonly cited decision problem was which job to favour in decisions about where to live" (Castleman et al. 2005:17). The life transition from professional degree program to the working world oftentimes involves this pivotal decision of migration and thus

deserves more research. This study focuses on this work-life decision due to its being understudied in previous literature; it aims to help establish migration decisions as an important work-family balance topic as well as explore what role gender plays in expectations and willingness to move, especially regarding who sacrifices in a moving decision.

One good way to look at migration decisions is to study young people's orientation to relocation while they are still in graduate school. **This study explores graduate students' expectations for moving; it examines the sacrifices they expect themselves or their potential partners to make in moving decisions, as well as their willingness to sacrifice or ask their partner to sacrifice in moving decisions.** Building on the literature about young people's work-life balance expectations and gender attitudes, the main focus of the study is to explore and compare women and men students' orientations toward migration and outlooks on sacrifice. The study also explores the role played by gender ideology and the gender composition of post-graduate degree program students are studying. Building on the literature about adult job holders' migration decisions, the study explores some of the implications of cost-benefit and family power theories that money and breadwinning status can become tools of power during moving decisions in deciding who will sacrifice. Both of these theories look at how men and women's earning status may play into migration decisions, with women earning less and therefore potentially sacrificing more. The influence of opinions regarding the male model of work and moving, i.e., that moving is pivotal to a career, will also be explored. Perceived career mobility, or transportability, will also be explored; women have often been seen as easily moved due to their jobs being more

mobile. This might affect expectations and willingness to sacrifice. Within both types of literature, on young adults and adult job holders, demographic data, such as partnership or even marital status, age, and race have been found to be influential, and thus will be explored here.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on young people's future ideas about migration is limited. Since this field is sparse, this research study builds upon two sets of related research literature: (1) young adults' work-life balance expectations and gender attitudes and (2) determinants of adult job-holders' migration decisions.

### *Young Adults' Work-Life Balance Expectations and Gender Attitudes*

While young adults' expectations for future migration decisions per se have not been thoroughly explored, other work-life issues for them have been widely researched. Young adults' desire to balance work and family is no secret. Konrad (2003) found that women in professional programs plan to blend work and family roles rather than sacrifice their careers for family, implying that they have significant career aspirations. On the other hand, both men and women's future ideas of family tend to be tentative and often revolve around the central theme of career (Castleman et al. 2005). Both male and female students show an understanding of the rigidity of professional careers and how this may make balancing work and family difficult (Orrange 2002).

There are gender differences in this ambivalence, even among the same age cohort (Orrange 2002). While male students tend to see themselves as being the main provider for the family, female students associated themselves more with the idea of balancing work and family, through such compromises as working part-time. Some women, though not men, even saw themselves remaining single as a real possibility for balancing work and family in the way they wanted (Orrange 2002). Such work-family issues as having children also show a gender difference. "For the women, the decision to

have a child is considerably more fraught than for men and usually articulated in terms of career-family incompatibilities” (Castleman et al. 2005). So, while men, even those who consider themselves egalitarian, still hope to find a partner who takes primary responsibility for home life, women generally tend to want a partner who will allow both of them to share in family and breadwinning responsibilities (Orrange 2002). This difference in perception of future work-life issues may translate easily to a migration decision that involves sacrifice, where men may be more likely to ask their partner to sacrifice and see themselves as not sacrificing, while women may be more likely to sacrifice their career prospects, as a product of compromise. In this study, gender will be kept at the forefront in order to better understand patterns that emerge regarding orientations and willingness to sacrifice in moving decisions.

Future expectations for balancing work and family can vary even among each gender. According to Hallett and Gilbert (1997: 320), “not all women want to integrate work and family in the same way.” In an interview study with young women, Aronson (1999) found that in her sample there seemed to be a few factors that pulled women toward domesticity, rather than employment, including marriage and a strong family focus as their ideal conception of their future (Aronson 1999). These factors that drive women toward domesticity might also lead to young women being willing to migrate with their partner when job opportunities present themselves. Findings for men show that while men overall still tend to see themselves as family providers, some do consider themselves more egalitarian than other men and wish to balance work and family with a partner, depending on the circumstances (Orrange 2002).

Men and women may have had differing expectations for their futures in the past, but society's gender ideology is continuing to change from those of previous generations (Spade and Reese 1991). It has been argued that "gender role attitudes and expectations of many men are changing in reaction to or in accordance with the changing role attitudes and expectations of women" (Thorn and Gilbert 1998: 259). In a study of male college juniors and seniors, Thorn and Gilbert (1998) found witnessing nontraditional roles by their parents made respondents more likely to accept those roles themselves, showing the generational change that can take place. However, recent cohorts of both men and women continue to expect family to be more prominent in women's lives, while paid employment is still considered to be more important for men (Orrange 2002).

Traditional gender ideology may therefore impact who, along gender lines, is willing to ask their partner to sacrifice. Perhaps men, in assuming their partners' careers will be secondary, will be willing to ask their partner to sacrifice their career in a move, while women may be willing to sacrifice because they assume the primacy of their male partner's career. A recent study of first-year university students showed that young people today still tend to expect a gender difference in partner sacrifice when it comes to balancing work and family, with young women seeing themselves as balancing by doing things such as working part-time while men still envision themselves working full-time (Preston 2006). Although women are more likely than men to start off with egalitarian views in general, ideology concerning women's roles has been found to become less traditional over time during college for both men and women (Bryant 2003). "Many college-educated women today are thinking quite differently about their futures in comparison to women of earlier generations" (Hallett and Gilbert 1997: 320), again

highlighting the salience of continuous change in gender ideology and future expectations.

Gender ideology becomes an important area for research when looking at balancing work and family, as previous research has shown, since decisions about moving require this same type of effort at balance. In a study of career-oriented university women who anticipated a dual-career family in their future, Hallett and Gilbert (1997) compared women who are considered to hold the conventional gender ideology (where women are seen as responsible for maintenance and upkeep of the house and parenting, with the worker role as secondary) with women considered to hold role-sharing ideology (where both spouses pursue careers as well as share household work and parenting). They found that women with role-sharing attitudes are more likely to be committed to a lifelong career than the conventional group (Hallett and Gilbert 1997). This research leads to the expectation in this study that young adults with more egalitarian views will be less likely to be willing to sacrifice themselves or their partners since either partners' career may be impaired by the move.

Particular fields of anticipated work and their gender composition could be another important factor in determining young adults' orientations toward family migration decisions. Women in traditional fields, such as education, have been found to be more likely to plan to balance work and family in a more traditional manner, by focusing on domesticity (Aronson 1999) or by working the "double shift," compared to those in gender neutral or nontraditional majors, such as engineering (Savage and Fouad 1994). Women who aspire to nontraditional fields have been found to have higher levels



of commitment to planning for multiple roles, focusing on both career and family, compared to other women who have only marriage plans (Peake and Harris 2002).

While some studies have shown that women who choose female-dominated careers hold more traditional gender attitudes (e.g., Murrell, Frieze and Frost 1991), some studies have not found this link (e.g., O'Connell, Betz and Kurth 1989). A study by Preston (2006) found that women in the nontraditional programs of technology and science are similar to women in other educational programs in terms of the importance placed on the ability to combine work and family, but are less concerned about how flexible their future jobs will be or whether they have the ability to take time out of the workforce, which could affect migration orientations and their expectations for sacrifice. In this study, the effect of programs' gender composition will be explored to examine if women in nontraditional fields are less willing than women in traditional fields to sacrifice themselves in a migration decision.

#### **Adult Job Holders' Willingness to Move**

Although young adults' willingness to move for careers has not been explored, numerous studies have looked at adult job holders' willingness to move, as well as patterns in their actual migration decisions and sacrifice. In a study utilizing employees from large corporations who had moved at least once for their company, Brett, Stroh, and Reilly (1993) found that those most willing to move were younger, with lower incomes, and high career aspirations. Since the respondents here in the present study are in professional programs, in light of the Brett et al. (1993) research, this issue might be particularly salient for them at this point in their professional lives.

In the migration literature, three theories have been used to explain adult job holders willingness to be geographically mobile for occupational advancement – cost-benefit theory, family power theory, and gender role theory. Markham and Pleck (1986) argue that it is hard to separate these theories since they each seem to explain a part of the decision. Moreover, when taking gender into account many of the other explanations for moving disappear (Markham and Pleck 1986). This point highlights the importance of keeping gender at the forefront of this study.

From a theoretical standpoint, most previous research on migration decisions has focused on cost-benefit theory, also known as human capital theory. This model assumes interest maximization; the interests can be individual or joint (e.g., couple-based). This model predicts that individuals agree to migrate together when the overall economic benefits exceed the costs (Bielby and Bielby 1992; Hendershott 1995; Lichter 1982), or that whoever has the most economic potential should be favored in moving decisions (Pixley and Moen 2003). When looking at families versus individuals, the model favors family economic well-being above individuals' well-being and the model treats women and men identically. What this theory does not account for is that in the labor market men and women are not equal (Cooke 2003; Preston 2006), which has been a criticism of the theory since it assumes equality (Bielby and Bielby 1992). When looking at migration decisions, we must pay attention to labor market factors such as the fact that women tend to earn less than men in comparable work (Jacobsen and Levin 2003), and how this plays into family decisions. To examine this aspect of cost-benefit theory, this study explores how students' views on money as power in moving will be explored. It is

expected that those endorsing money as power will be more likely to be willing to ask their partners to sacrifice in moving decisions.

A similar theory used to explain moving decisions is family power theory, which proposes that the partner who contributes the most financially wields the most power in the relationship and thus has more say in the moving decision (Bielby and Bielby 1992; Hardill et al. 1997; Pixley and Moen 2003). This theory has been used to explain why the man's career takes priority over the woman's, since traditionally men tend to earn more than women (Sultana 2005). Research has supported this theory by showing that the less a partner makes, the less say s/he has in a decision to move (Eby 2001). While men's careers still tend to get priority due to this financial power, research suggests that this is less true than before (Pixley and Moen 2003).

Family power theory also suggests that responsibility for breadwinning can also be a source of power; that is, whoever is considered responsible for being the primary earner for the family may have more power in making family decisions. Cooke (2003) used a two-wave study of the National Survey of Families and Households and found that whether the wife was technically a primary or secondary earner did have some effect on the migration decision in that the wife's relative earning capacity was taken into account in moving decisions. Raley, Mattingly, and Bianchi (2006)'s study highlights the continuing importance of looking at breadwinning and the translation of money into power. In 2001, 70% of the couples in the study were dual providers; however, wives shared equally in providing income only in 24% of the couples (up from 9% in 1970). They also found that younger women are more likely than older women to be in dual-earner couples and more likely to be equal providers, highlighting the importance of

shared breadwinning for young adults. In this study, since we cannot gauge actual breadwinning behavior, perceived primary, secondary, or equal breadwinning status with future partner will be utilized instead to start to understand how this aspect of family power may affect migration orientations. Those seeing themselves as primary earner may be more likely to ask their partner to sacrifice.

Since money has been shown in previous literature to be a pivotal factor in moving decisions, the power of money specifically in terms of moving is important to take into account when studying young adults' expectations about career migration. Both cost-benefit and family power theories attribute some power to money as reasoning for patterns, so this study looks at how respondents' opinions about "money as power" may play into their expectations and willingness to sacrifice or ask a partner to sacrifice. Those endorsing money as power statements may be more likely to favor partner sacrifice, especially if the respondent expects to earn more than their spouse.

The third theory utilized in the dual-career migration literature is gender role theory. Gender socialization is generally assumed to affect career decision making. Previous literature suggests that women may be less likely than men to have a say in moving decisions or are more likely to move for their husband's job than men are, due to traditional gender socialization (Eby 2001) and because couples enact cultural patterns of behavior (Pixley and Moen 2003). This may transfer easily to willingness to sacrifice and expectations of sacrifice in moving decisions, with women being more willing and expecting to move to be with their partner as compared to men. A reason why a wife may move with a husband rather than live apart to pursue her professional career is because living apart "violates cultural norms and laws about married couples living

together” (Hendershott 1995: 76). Husbands still tend to have the most influence over migration decisions because of gendered expectations in marriage, but research suggests that the more egalitarian both spouses’ beliefs about gender are, the more influence the wife’s career plays into the moving decision (Bird and Bird 1985). The extent to which gender role ideology affects young adults’ orientations toward migration decisions has yet to be thoroughly explored. In light of findings from the young adult literature, in addition to these findings about adult job holders, gender ideology will be an important factor to take into consideration regarding sacrifice in moving decisions.

Not only gender ideology, but gender itself has been proven to become important in regards to moving decisions, especially in terms of sacrifice. In a landmark study by Bielby and Bielby (1992), using the 1977 Quality of Employment Survey, they found that over half of males (57%) and the vast majority of females (89%) showed reluctance to relocate if they were offered a “much better” job over 100 miles away. This sample consisted of married respondents who were currently in dual-earner families. Over half of women (56%) cited family considerations as the reasoning behind their reluctance, while only 16% of men did so. While women were not usually willing to ask their families to sacrifice in moves, men were not as reluctant.

This gender difference, of women giving more consideration to family in migration decisions, has been reflected in other studies. In an earlier study about willingness to relocate, Markham and Pleck (1986) found women to be somewhat less willing than men to move for advancement in their own careers, with about half of the sample of women and about one-third of men being completely unwilling to move. Women were more likely than men to cite family ties or a family member’s job as a

reason why they would not want to move, similar to the Bielby and Bielby (1992) study. Other studies also indicate that women are more likely than men to concede in moving (Cooper 2004), as well as give thought to the effects on the family when choosing whether or not to move (Gilbert 1993). When moving, women in dual-career couples are more likely than their partners to make compromises, as illustrated by evidence of their shorter job tenure and more frequent job changes (Smith 1997). It will be important to see if women are more likely to sacrifice themselves, and less likely to ask their partners to sacrifice in moving decisions, as the previous literature of adult job holders suggests.

Another reason for gender differences in migration decisions could be the perceived transportability of career which could drastically alter expectations and willingness, especially regarding sacrifice. Transportability, however, might be affected by gender. In a study of Canadian migrants, Hiller and McCaig (2007) found that “many women felt they had skills that were easily transferable” (2007: 466), which made them more open to moving with their partner. In the Bielby study (1992), husbands tended to have higher job and firm investments, while women tended to have higher levels of “general” skills. Such difference in skill is often used as a reason why women might find it easier to get another job in a new area, which could contribute to their migration orientations.

Still in line with gender role theory, it has been argued that employment is based on a male model of work, whereby it is assumed that employed men should prioritize their jobs over families and that they have wives at home to take care of things (Gilbert 1993). Research has shown that most professional men see work and family relationships as separate or segmented, although those men who hold strong egalitarian beliefs hold

less segmented views. On the other hand, professional women see work and family as interconnected and integrated and thus more “synergistic” (Andrews and Bailyn 1993). Within companies, there is still an expectation that men will move regardless of their family situation, and if a man decides not to relocate for reasons having to do with the job of his spouse, this may be looked down on. Meanwhile, women are overall assumed to be unlikely to move to take a better job because of family ties (Cooper 2004). In this study, it is possible to explore whether graduate students have a sense of whether companies are still organized in the traditional ways that fitted men, where people need to move in order to advance in their careers. Those who accept this aspect of emphasizing career would seem more likely than those who do not to expect partners to sacrifice their career aspirations by moving.

### **Other Potential Determinants of Migration Orientations**

While the role gender plays in migration orientations is the main focus here, the study also examines within-group differences by examining three demographic factors: age, partnership status, and race. Age is an important demographic to include since previous studies have found younger people to be less traditional in terms of gender ideology as well as work-family balance choices (Aronson 1999). Those who are younger may be less willing to sacrifice and place more importance on career.

Partnership status may also be important in young adults’ expectations and willingness to sacrifice in migration decisions. In Orrange’s (2002) study, single students approached work-family decisions differently than those who were partnered, with those planning to be partnered thinking about work-family decisions in terms of their effects on them and their partner versus those who remain single planning only for themselves.

Since they are not partnered at the time of the survey, single people may be less willing to sacrifice themselves in moving decisions, while those with partners may be more willing.

Race may also have an influence on migration orientations, considering that previous research has found significant differences between white and black students' expectations for family; for instance, African Americans are more likely to support employment of mothers with very young children (Bridges and Etaugh 1996). However, other studies have found no racial differences in work-family expectations (Murrell et al. 1991). Here race is explored for explanatory power in willingness and expectations for sacrifice in moving.



## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Migration decisions will continue to be an important work-life decision for all workers in the future, and especially for professional workers. Lichter (1983:501) states: “How couples decide the timing and location of their moves will be an issue of continuing importance for those interested in labor utilization and labor mobility in this country.” Therefore, this research aims to better understand how young people think about partnered migration decisions in terms of what they expect for themselves and their partners, especially in terms of sacrificing careers.

This research examines two important but different aspects of moving orientations, namely expectations for moving and willingness to move. Do graduate students even expect partnered moving decisions or moving at all for their career to be a salient issue for them? Do they themselves expect to sacrifice, in order to move with a partner, and are they willing to do so? Do they expect their partner to sacrifice more?

Expectations will be important to explore to see how graduate students think about these issues, but willingness will be an important comparison to make as well. Both dimensions of sacrifice in moving orientations will be explored since participants may *expect* certain situations (such as having to move to be with partner) but may have different opinions on what they are *willing* to do in a moving decision or ask of a partner to do. People may agree that they are willing to do one thing, but when faced with the situation, they may do something different. Part of this may be due to what respondents expect to be situations that they really will be faced with.

While previous literature has not focused specifically on young adults’ future migration decisions, the literature on young adults’ work-family expectations and gender

ideology, in combination with literature on moving decisions of adult jobholders, suggests some potentially fruitful areas for investigation. Overall, research on young people and adult jobholders suggests that it is extremely important to evaluate the impact of gender in migration decisions. With careers being salient nowadays for young adult workers of both sexes, what sacrifices are young women and young men willing to make in moving decisions and are women still more willing than men to sacrifice their career interests? Do young women and men expect to be confronted by the same sort of career decisions that may call for them to consider a geographic move, and do they expect to be the one sacrificing in the move, or asking their partner to sacrifice?

In order to better understand young adults' orientation toward migration decisions, this study's research questions below explore both expectations about sacrifice and willingness to sacrifice.

### **Salience of the Issue of Moving**

1. How salient is the issue of moving to graduate students in this sample? Do they expect to have to move frequently because of their career? Do they expect to move out of the area after graduation? And what percent of them have already made partnered moving decisions? Do women and men differ on how salient they see these issues to be?

### **Expectations and Willingness Concerning Moving and Gender**

2. To what extent do graduate students *expect* to move for self or for partner? To what extent are graduate students *willing* to sacrifice themselves in moving decisions or have their partner sacrifice? How do their expectations relate to their willingness to sacrifice self or their partner? Are women more likely than men to expect and be willing

to sacrifice in a move? Are women less willing to have their partner sacrifice in a move, as traditional gender expectations would suggest?

3. Is there a gender divide in gender ideology? In turn, does gender ideology, whether traditional or egalitarian, have an influence on expectations and willingness for partner or self-sacrifice? To what extent does gender ideology influence migration orientations differently, in the sub-samples of women and men?

4. Does the program's gender composition affect expectations and willingness as far as sacrifice is concerned for future moves? Are students in programs traditionally populated by women (i.e., social work) more likely to expect to sacrifice in migration decisions than students in other programs, either gender-equal (i.e., public and environmental affairs – SPEA and law) or traditionally populated by men (i.e., business)? Do women in male-dominated programs have differing orientations than those in female-dominated programs? What about men?

5. Are individuals who see their careers as more transportable more likely to say they expect to and/or will sacrifice in a moving decision? Are women more likely than men to agree with the fact that their career will allow them to move anywhere?

### **Cost-Benefit and Family Power as Explanations**

6. Does expected salary have any effect on young adults' migration orientation? Does expecting a low salary mean they also expect to sacrifice self more in a move? Does expecting a high salary reduce young adults' willingness to sacrifice themselves in a move and increase their likelihood of being willing to their partner to sacrifice? What are the gender differences in expected salary and how does that relate to their willingness to sacrifice self or partner?

7. When comparing their own perceived salary to their future partner's expected salary, do those who expect to earn more than their partners expect the partner to sacrifice more? Are those who expect to earn the same or less than their partner more likely to be willing to sacrifice self in a move, and not willing to ask a partner to sacrifice? Are women more or less likely than men to expect their partners to sacrifice, regardless of expected future salary?

8. To what extent do students endorse the concept of Money as Power in migration decisions? Are women students less likely to endorse statements about moving based on money, with men more likely to endorse these statements?

9. What are respondents' opinions about moving providing workers with more opportunities, which goes along with the traditional "male model of work"? Do those who say that moving provides good opportunities to advance a career also expect to ask their partners to sacrifice in a move more than those who do not agree with this career prioritizing? Do those who say that moving provides good opportunities to advance a career also expect to ask their partners to sacrifice in a move more than those who do not agree with this type of model? Do men and women have different opinions on the model of moving for work with men being more likely to endorse these statements?

#### **Other Potential Explanations for Career Migration Decisions**

10. Does partnership status have an effect on expectations and willingness about sacrifice? Are those who have partners more likely to consider self-sacrifice than those who are single? Is there a gender difference in these expectations?

11. Are younger students, particularly women, expecting to sacrifice more or are they less willing to sacrifice themselves in moving decisions, as we would expect because of changing roles of women in society?

12. Does race have any effect on expectations and willingness concerning career migration?

## METHODS

### **Sample**

Previous research has successfully studied students in professional programs to understand future work-family decisions (Konrad 2003; Orrange 2002). By being in their 20s or older and on the verge of starting their careers, this type of sample “reflect[s] an anticipatory stage in the life course” (Orrange 2002: 287). Much like Orrange’s study, my research will “address the question of how men and women who are soon to enter the ranks of the professional middle class define their life plans for work and family life” (Orrange 2002: 291), focusing specifically on migration decisions.

This research study involved a self-administered survey of students currently completing graduate level coursework in professional programs at a large Midwestern urban university. Students were enrolled in classes at the 500 level or above, which are most often used to complete graduate level degrees.

For this particular study a purposive sampling method, using multi-stage clustering of graduate level classes, was conducted. Using Fall 2008 Graduate Student headcounts provided by the university’s official website, 20 schools were identified as offering graduate programs on campus. Then, due to time constraints, four programs were picked based on the gender composition of those programs. Business was picked because it had a majority male student body (72%), while still having a significant representation of women (28%). Social Work was chosen because it had a majority female student body (86%), while still having some men in the program (14%). Two programs with a more equal split were picked; these included: Law (47% women/53% men) and Public and Environmental Affairs (57% women/43% men). Orange (2002)

also studied law and business. The specific number of students seeking a degree in each program is available in Appendix A.

At the next sampling stage, classes in these programs with the largest size and highest enrollment at the 500 and above level were targeted. The instructor was contacted about participating; if the instructor chose not to have his or her class participate, the next largest class with the highest enrollment number was chosen. A total of sixteen instructors were contacted via email; of these, 11 agreed to allow me to survey their classes (a 69% response rate at this stage). The poorest response came from Law (33% response) while the best response came from Business (100% response). The e-mail requested permission to use 10 minutes at the start or end of one class period in order to distribute and collect the surveys from participants. (See Appendix B-1 for the email sent to professors regarding the survey.)

A short explanation was given to the class about the survey and how it was for a master's thesis project (see Appendix B-2 for the class introduction used). Since some students in each class sampled may be from a different program, part of the explanation of the study requested those who had taken the survey in another class to write this on the top of this survey and hand it in with everyone else. (This occurred in eight instances; these duplicate surveys were eliminated from the study.) Surveys were distributed to the class along with a separate piece of paper to enter the participant in a raffle (see Appendix B-3). Ten raffle prizes (\$25 gift certificates from Barnes and Nobles bookstores) were used to encourage participation. Information to enter the raffle was kept completely separate from the survey tool and participants could enter regardless of participation in the survey.

The target sample size for this study was 400 students, with approximately 100 students from each of the four types of degree programs. In the end, a total of 424 surveys were actually collected. Business students constituted 32% of the sample (N=130); Social Work students were 29% (N=116); Law students were 21% (N=88); Public Affairs students were 19% (77). While participation in the survey was emphasized as voluntary, it appears that all those who were distributed surveys completed them, except perhaps for four blank surveys left behind that could have been extras due to the administration of the survey, but could also have been refusals. A total of seven participants were discarded for having less than  $\frac{3}{4}$  of their survey completed (missing one page or more), and one participant was discarded for lack of answers (had circled “no opinion” for over half of the entire survey). So with a total of eight surveys being discarded, the total sample size for this study was 416. For analyses looking specifically at gender, the sample size is reduced to 411, as there were five participants who did not circle an answer for their gender.

The classes sampled in two of the four schools had gender compositions similar to that of the schools in general, according to university statistics. For the male-dominated School of Business, the university indicated that 72% of its students were men, and in the sample for this study, 75% of those surveyed in business classes were men. The female-dominated School of Social Work also reflected the population parameter with the university reporting 86% women, and in this sample there were 90% women. The samples from the two schools presumed to have a more equal gender balance turned out to have a wider gender gap than anticipated, however. The sample from Law had fewer women than anticipated, with 39% women, while the university indicated that 47% of all



law students were women. The sample from Public Affairs had fewer men than anticipated, with the sample being 36% men, while the university reported that 43% of graduate students in the school were men.

As for the sample as a whole, there was a good gender split, with 46% of the sample being men, and 53% being women, with 1% (5 respondents) of the sample missing information on gender. The median age for this sample was 26, with a mode age of 23. As for partnership status, this sample had 34% identifying as single (which includes those who were divorced/separated/widowed but not presently with a partner), 20% in a relationship but not married, and 45% currently married or living as married. Racial categories were condensed into minority and white, with this sample containing 19% minority respondents, and 81% white.

Since these students were expected to be working in careers in professional fields after graduation, they were assumed to be more likely than undergraduates to be ready to consider and explain their future expectations for work-family life and migration. Using professional level graduate students is relevant because “in this population, occupational and family roles, and whether and how to integrate them in adulthood, may have greater salience” (Gilbert et al. 1991: 113). In a similar study design, the researchers used students who graduated from programs in engineering, business, social work and library studies, to “gain a cross-section of professional careers ranging from traditionally male-dominated discipline of engineering to the female-dominated professions of librarianship and social work” (Castleman et al. 2005).

## **Measurement**

A self-administered survey was used to collect data (see Appendix C for the complete survey). The survey instrument contained some questions utilized in other research, but contained mostly new questions formulated specifically for this study. Quantitative methods were utilized in this study in order to evaluate the relative importance of different factors in young adults' migration orientations. Quantitative methods allowed this study to be done quickly and efficiently, but there are limitations to this type of method. Surveys limit the in-depth exploration of the subject matter at hand, but instead give a broad overview and suggestions for further research in this area. In addition, since the questions were mostly formulated by the author, the reliability of items may be weaker than if previous tools with well-established reliability had been used. Quantitative methods were also used in order to look at a population that has limited study in previous research. This methodology also allowed for a larger sample size, increasing the potential for patterns to emerge, in this exploratory study.

## ***Saliency***

The main question that gauges whether students feel this issue is relevant to them, states: "I expect that my career field will require me to move frequently." Another question gauges participants' specific plans for after graduate school as far as moving is concerned. This question was scored with a 5-point Likert scale of likeliness, ranging from (1) very unlikely to (5) very likely. The statement reads: "I expect to move out of the area (central Indiana) for work after I graduate with my degree."

Previous partnered moving experiences were gauged with a simple “yes” or “no” question at the end of the survey which asked: “Have you ever moved with a partner/spouse before?”

### ***Expectations and Willingness Concerning Moving and Gender***

There are two main categories of migration orientation variables for this study. The first category gauges graduate students’ *expectations* for moving decisions, whether they feel they will have to move around and whom if anyone they expect to be making sacrifices (themselves or partners). This category of expectations was created specifically for this study. The second category examines students’ *willingness* to move. This concept of being willing to move was borrowed from Brett, Stroh, and Reilly’s (1993) study of adult job holders. Here, it was modified and given more specific scenarios specifically for this study’s purposes.

#### ***Expectations***

Expectations for moving decisions were measured with four questions, using a 5-point Likert scale, with answers ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). These questions aim to explore what students feel will be the true issues they will have to deal with when moving decisions arise in the future, that is, what they expect to happen versus what they are willing to do.

One of these four items measured expectations for self-sacrifice in a move and included: (1) “I expect that I will be the one in my partnership making more compromises in moving decisions.” Two items designed to measure expectations for the partner to sacrifice in moving included: (2) “I expect that I will put my own career first when making a moving decision with a partner/spouse;” (3) “I expect that my partner will make

more compromises in moving decisions.” An additional question that was created for this study also examined this same concept in terms of their own expectations by asking for agreement to the statement: (4) “When choosing where to live, my partner’s career or job will be as important as mine.” This question was used to gauge their expectations for balancing both careers evenly, theirs and their partner’s.

Factor analysis revealed that these items did not form reliable scales, so they were analyzed individually. Further research is needed to increase the reliability of measures designed to examine student expectations about migration. Individual items measuring expectations were used in this study.

### *Willingness Scales*

Two categories were created to consider “willingness” to move, specifically for this study. The first category is “willing to move and sacrifice self” (i.e., “it’s going to be me sacrificing”) and the second is “willing to move and have partner sacrifice” (i.e., “it’s going to be you sacrificing”). Answers are measured on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

Willingness to move and sacrifice self was measured by five statements. These include: (1) “I’d be willing to move without a job offer for myself if moving for my spouse/partner’s career meant an overall increase in joint income;” (2) “I’d be willing to move to further my spouse/partner’s career if s/he earns more than me;” (3) “I’d be willing to move without a job offer for myself in order to be with my partner/spouse;” (4) “I’d be willing to move in order to further my spouse/partner’s career, regardless of the consequences to my own career;” (5) “I’d be willing to take a job not in my career field in order to move to be with my partner/spouse.”

All questions using the terms “I’d be willing” were coded from 1 to 5 with the latter being a high score since we are gauging willingness to move. Any question using the term “I would not be willing to move” was reverse coded (indicated with an “R”) so that disagreeing with these statements would also earn a high score when scaled, since we are looking at willingness to move even when the partner has to sacrifice.

Factor analysis was used to develop a reliable scale, with all five items regarding sacrificing self together scaling satisfactorily. All items were analyzed using factor analysis with a rotated matrix, which showed that all items loaded well above .3, which suggests that they reflect the same underlying phenomenon. Cronbach’s *alpha* reaffirmed the items had good reliability as a scale, with an *alpha* coefficient of .71. These questions all tend to revolve around willingness to sacrifice self, or “it’s going to be me sacrificing” in a moving decision. Replies to all five questions were added together and the resulting total divided by the number of items to form the Self-Sacrifice Scale.

The second category of willingness is associated with an individual’s willingness to move and ask a partner to sacrifice in that moving decision. These items are designed to explore what the respondent would be willing to ask of their partner. Previous research showed that women were less likely to ask their partner to sacrifice, which will be explored through the use of this scale here.

This Partner Sacrifice Scale (i.e., “it’s going to be you sacrificing”) contains four items: (1) “I would not be willing to move to further my career if my partner/spouse had to sacrifice because of the move (R);” (2) “I’d be willing to move to further my career, even if there is nothing for my partner;” (3) “I’d be willing to move if I could make good

money, even if my partner has to sacrifice;” (4) “I would not be willing to move to take a job unless there was a comparable job for my partner/spouse(R).” Factor analysis was used to develop a reliable scale, with all of these items together scaling satisfactorily, with loadings above .3, which suggests they all measure the same phenomenon.

Cronbach’s *alpha* reaffirmed their good reliability as a scale, with an *alpha* coefficient of .73. Replies to all four questions were added together and the resulting total divided by the number of items to form the Partner Sacrifice Scale.

### ***Gender and Gender Ideology***

Gender was the main comparative factor (men versus women) in this study and was used to run t-tests on all individual items. Gender is an important aspect in moving decisions because it “influences what is perceived as normative, appropriate, and feasible” (Lewis and Haas 2005: 353), as previous research on couples how have moved has shown. In addition, some analyses using subsamples of men and women were run separately to tease out all of gender’s effects on other relationships. Gender was gauged by asking the participant to indicate whether they are male or female. Items or tests utilizing gender have a smaller sample size (N=411) since five participants did not indicate their gender.

Four items from Potuchek (1997) were used to gauge gender ideology, with an additional question constructed for this study, all measured on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Gender ideology gauges whether participants endorse more gender traditional views (where men are responsible for working and women for taking care of children and housework) or more egalitarian views (where both men and women work and share housework and childcare

responsibilities). Statements include: (1) “It is much better for everyone if the man earns the main living and the woman takes care of the home and family(R);” (2) “Preschool children are likely to suffer if their mother is employed (R);” (3) “A woman who works full time can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work;” (4) “A married woman should not work outside the home if her husband can comfortably support her (R).” An additional item, created specifically for this study looked at working for income: (5) “Both men and women should share the burden of working for income.” The questions were aimed at gauging an egalitarian gender ideology and thus those that are more in line with traditional gender ideology are reverse coded, so that a higher score means more egalitarian. When these five items were scaled, their *alpha* coefficient was .79, indicating good reliability. Replies to all five questions were added together and the resulting total divided by the number of items to form the Gender Ideology Scale.

Previous literature has given mixed indications about what results will be seen with the current sample. While literature on adult job jobholders has shown women who espoused traditional gender ideology to be more willing to sacrifice, while men who are traditional are more willing to ask their partner to sacrifice, research on younger people has found mixed results with gender ideology. Therefore, a two tailed test will be run here to further explore the relationship between gender ideology and moving orientations.

### ***Program’s Gender Composition***

Degree program was measured by giving participants a choice of degree programs to check which one they are in. Previous research has shown that the programs students are enrolled in can have an effect on their plans for work-family balance, which might

translate here to particular migration decisions and attitudes about sacrifice. Those in female-dominated fields (e.g., Social Work) may be more likely to expect and be willing to sacrifice, with those in more male-dominated fields more likely to see their partner as sacrificing (e.g., Business). If a participant circled two programs, belonged to a program outside the study (such as Liberal Arts) or did not answer this question at all, their survey was moved into the program associated with the class they were participating in when taking the survey. This happened with a total of 49 cases, or 12% of surveys in the total sample.

Programs were then recoded into an ordinal scale. Social Work was coded as 1 which was female dominated. Both gender neutral program (SPEA and Law) were the middle category, and Business was coded as 3 for a male dominated program. So those having a “high” score on this idea were more likely to be in a program that was male dominated.

### ***Perceived Transportability of Career***

Perceived career transportability gauges how easily movable their occupation is perceived to be by the respondent. Previous literature showed that women’s careers have been seen as more transportable and their fields of work as providing them with more general, or moveable, skills. This question, created for this study, was measured on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5): “My career field will allow me to move just about anywhere and get a job.” An example would be a nurse’s job that is often seen as being very transportable since there are many opportunities in many locations to work in that career, versus an oceanographer, who may only be able to work in certain locations. Those who perceive their work as being



more transportable may be more likely to expect to move for a partner and to be willing to sacrifice self in a move, since their career is more mobile.

### ***Money as Power***

An open-ended question within the demographics section asked: “How much do you think your starting salary will be?” Those who expect a high income were predicted to be more likely to expect their partner to sacrifice and be more willing to ask them to. For this item, the sample size is somewhat smaller (N=350) as anyone who said they did not know or did not answer the question about salary was excluded. Since participants provided raw numbers for their answers, these were used to run correlations. However, to better understand the frequency patterns for the part of the sample that answered, categories were created but only for descriptive purposes. Salary questions will help understand the influence of money on expectations and willingness regarding migration decisions, which ties into the following section on relative partner salary and a scale with measures Money as Power attitudes.

Another item that examines the idea of money as power looked more closely at relative income, which might also measure who is expected to be the family’s major breadwinner. The statement, created specifically for this study, reads: “My partner/spouse’s salary will more than likely be: less than mine, more than mine, about the same as mine.” If the person thinks that they will earn more, this identification as the primary earner may affect their expectations and willingness to sacrifice, as well as the extent to which they expect their partner to sacrifice.

Three questions constructed for this study gauge whether students endorse “Money as Power” based decision to migration decisions. The first two items were

modeled after questions regarding gender and moving from Brett et al. (1993), and modified for this study. The questions state: (1) “The spouse who earns less should be willing to move for their spouse” and (2) “The spouse who earns more should have the final say in the moving decision.” Both are measured on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). One additional item, created specifically for this study, looks at the importance of money in the respondent’s own decision. The item states: (3) “I expect that money will be the deciding factor in my future moving decisions with a partner/spouse.” Endorsing an economic rationale for moving puts human capital at the forefront of the moving decision, with the same Likert scale. These three “Money as Power” items loaded above .3 in factor analysis, which suggests they gauge the same phenomenon; the Cronbach’s *alpha* coefficient indicated modest reliability for these three items at .67. Replies to all three questions were added together and the resulting total divided by the number of items to form the Money as Power Scale. Those endorsing a more money-based rationale for moving (i.e., those with a higher score on this scale) are expected to be more willing to ask their partner to sacrifice, while those who put less emphasis on Money as Power are not expected to be willing to ask their partner to sacrifice.

### ***Moving for Work Attitudes***

Previous migration research by Brett et al. (1993) focuses on opinions about moving and careers in general. In this study, these beliefs are also explored to better understand graduate students’ opinions about moving and its potential effect on their careers. These questions are taken directly from Brett et al. (1993), a study of transferred employees and their spouses in the late 1980s. Statements include: (1) “If you turn down

a promotion that requires a move it hurts your career” and (2) “Moving provides workers opportunities to develop their careers.” Both items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. It is expected that those who endorse these two items will be more likely to expect and more willing to ask their partner to sacrifice or even self in moves since they emphasize career. Since answering these questions positively means they see moving as important to a career, they are more likely to endorse expectations and willingness items that favor careers in moving. Previous research has suggested that there is still an expectation that men should move but that women will not. Since no research has been done directly with students, this relationship will be explored.

#### ***Other Potential Explanations for Migration Decisions***

Current partnership status was analyzed as a possible determinant of migration decisions. Partnership status was gauged by asking respondents to circle their answer given the choices: Single, never married; In a relationship, not married; Currently married (or living as married); Formerly married (Separated/Divorced). This information was collected to see whether those currently in a relationship tended to have different orientations about migration compared to those who are not. Those who are partnered may be more willing to sacrifice self or even partner in order to keep the partnership together. In addition, the influence of the institution of marriage itself can be explored by looking at those who are married against those who are not to look for differences. Individuals might be willing to sacrifice self and partner regarding moving decisions if their relationship is more formal (as is marriage) than if their relationship is not; in particular, respondents might conform more to traditional expectations concerning the

husband's career as primary while the wife's as secondary. For example, married women might be more willing to self-sacrifice, while married men might be more willing to ask for partner sacrifice.

Respondents were put into one of three categories: married (or living as married), partnered (but not married), and single. Partnership status was created as an ordinal variable, with single, partnered, and married categories. If a participant circled two answers (such as divorced but in a relationship), the "in a relationship" category trumped the divorced category and that participant was given that status. Those who only circled divorced, or the one write-in of widowed, were grouped into the single category.

Age is another important demographic in that it may influence expectations and willingness. Those who are younger may be more willing to sacrifice for partner than those who are older. Age is gauged by a simple fill in the answer blank. The ages ranged from 21 to 58, with a majority (74%) being age 30 or under. Raw age proved to be too skewed for bivariate analysis; so only those 21 to 35 were analyzed here.

Race was studied as a determinant of migration orientation in this study. However, previous studies have had different findings, with some showing minorities emphasizing both career and family and some not. Therefore no specific direction of influence was hypothesized. Race was measured by having participants pick as many categories as they wanted from the following choices, including: African American/Black, Asian, Caucasian/White, Hispanic/Latino/a, Other. Since the proportion of respondents who were from different minorities was small, these answers were recoded into two categories of white and minority. The minority category comprised 19%.

## **Analysis Techniques**

Descriptive statistics such as frequency distributions and means were used to analyze respondents' answers to most of the above questions. Independent samples t-tests were computed to examine whether men's and women's answers significantly differed on most questions. One-tailed t-tests were used when a specific finding was hypothesized, e.g., expecting women to predict more self-sacrifice than men. Two-tailed tests were used when a direction was not hypothesized, e.g., when investigating if women or men were more likely to have a partnered status. Pearson's zero-order correlation coefficients were calculated when a relationship was explored between variables measured at the ordinal level or above; for example, when examining the relationship between scores on the Gender Ideology Scale and the Partner Sacrifice Scale. One-tailed Pearson's correlation coefficients were calculated for most relationships, where a specific directional relationship was hypothesized. Two-tailed tests were run if no relationship was hypothesized or previous literature was mixed or unsure (e.g., when analyzing the effects of race). Subsamples of men and women were investigated separately, to see if the relationship between particular possible correlates of migration attitudes was true for one or both sexes (or neither). Analysis of variance was used to examine the relationships between some variables, e.g., program's gender composition and orientations to migration. The standard significance level of .05 was used throughout these analyses.

## RESULTS

### **Salience of the issue of moving**

RQ1. How salient is the issue of moving to graduate students in this sample? Do they expect to have to move frequently because of their career? Do they expect to move out of the area after graduation? And what percentage have already made partnered moving decisions? Do women and men differ on how salient they see these issues to be?

To establish salience of the moving issue, three questions were analyzed.

Findings showed that only 10% of the sample agreed that their career field would **require** them to move frequently, with another 26% being unsure. Almost two-thirds of the sample (64%) did not feel that their career field would require them to move frequently (item E7 in questionnaire in Appendix C). According to this first measure, then, the sample felt that the issue of careers requiring moving will probably not be very salient for them.

The second measure of salience showed that moving was still a possibility for many respondents. Interestingly, the sample was split as far as their expectations to move out of central Indiana for work after graduating (item G1 in questionnaire). While only 10% of the sample agreed that their career would **require** them to move frequently, a higher percentage, 39% of the sample, agreed that they **expected** to leave Indiana after graduation (see Table D-1 in Appendix D). Perhaps students feel that they initially might need to move after graduating, but not that their career will require them to move around a lot. So while students do not feel required to move, they still expect to move after graduation for work. This could potentially be due to a perceived dearth of local opportunities or rather just an exploration of other opportunities.

When looking at whether this sample had already tackled this issue of moving, they were asked if they had moved with a partner or spouse previously. A third of the sample (36%) had moved with a partner or spouse before, while the remaining 64% had not (item J1) (see Table D-2).

How salient is this issue of moving overall? That is, how many participants answered yes to at least one salience question of the three posed to respondents? A cross tabulation of answers to all three questions reveals that this issue could be considered salient to well over half (61%) of the sample (254 participants out of 416) (see Table D-3). That is, a majority of the sample either agreed that their career would require them to move, or that they were likely to leave central Indiana after graduation, or that they had already moved with a partner before. So while the majority does not feel that they will be required to move, per se, it has the potential to be relevant to well over half of the sample.

When looking at the overarching influence of gender, it is important to look at whether women or men find these issues more salient to begin with, which may in turn affect their migration and sacrifice orientations. Two-tailed t-test results indicate that men are significantly more likely to agree with the statement that their career field will **require** them to move frequently (14% vs. 6% for women) (for t-test results for this section see Table 1 on next page). In this sample, men were also significantly more likely to **expect** that they will move out of the area after graduation (42% of men saying this compared to 37% of women). Overall, men are more likely to expect as well as feel required to move.

Men were not significantly more likely than women to indicate that they have moved with a partner or spouse before. Since the reason for moving before with a

partner/spouse was not specifically asked, it is not clear who moved for whom. This finding could mean that men moved with a partner and asked them to sacrifice, rather than moved and had to sacrifice anything for their partner, though this cannot be concluded here.

So, with men being more likely to expect to move post-graduation as well as expecting their career field to require them to move frequently, will they be more willing than women to ask their partner to sacrifice? This will be explored below in looking at gender differences for the expectation items and willingness scales that were established in this study.

Table 1. T-tests for Gender Differences in Salience of Migration Issues

	All (N= 416 )	Women (N= 221 )	Men (N= 190)	t-value (two-tailed)
E7: Expect that career field will require me to move frequently <sup>a</sup>	2.36	2.20	2.55	4.14*
G1: Expect to move out of the area (central Indiana) for work after I graduate <sup>b</sup>	3.12	3.01	3.25	2.00*
J1: Moved with partner/spouse before <sup>c</sup>	.36	.33	.40	1.56

\*Significant gender difference at the .05 level

*a: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Unsure/Neither, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree*

*b: 1 = Very Unlikely, 2 = Unlikely, 3 = Unsure, 4 = Likely, 5 = Very Likely*

*c: 0 = No, 1 = Yes*

### **Expectations Questions and Willingness Scales and Gender**

RQ2. To what extent do graduate students expect to move for self or for partner?

To what extent are graduate students willing to sacrifice themselves in moving decisions or have their partner sacrifice? Are women more likely than men to expect and be



willing to sacrifice in a move? Are women less willing to have their partner sacrifice in a move, as traditional gender expectations would suggest?

### ***Expectations***

Overall, respondents did not expect themselves to have to sacrifice in moving decisions for their partners, but opinions were more varied when asking if the respondents expected their partner to sacrifice. When looking at expectations about self-sacrifice in moving, only a small portion (17%) of the sample agreed that they expect themselves to be the one in their partnership to be making compromises in moving decisions (item E4) (for frequencies for expectation items see Table D-4).

As for the sample's expectations about their partner sacrificing, opinion was spread among all answer categories. A quarter (24%) of the sample agreed that they expect to put their career first (item E1). A similar percentage (27%) agreed they expect their partner to make more compromises in moving decisions, with about one-third (35%) disagreeing and the rest (38%) falling in between (item E6).

The last expectation question asked about when choosing where to live, whether a partner's career or job would be just as important as their own (item E8). This last question seems the one most likely to be answered in a socially desirable fashion, and perhaps not surprisingly over three-fourths (79%) of the sample agreed with it. So, this sample shows that only about one-fourth feel their expectations falling along traditional lines in migration (putting self first and asking partner to sacrifice) but a large majority also wish to balance the two careers when making moving decisions.

The one-tailed t-test results for these items reflect previous research. Women were significantly more likely than men to agree with the statement that they expect they

will be making more compromises in future moving decisions (24% of women agreed, compared to 11% of men). Women were more likely than men to acknowledge that they expect that they would be the one making more sacrifices.

Regarding expectations for partner sacrifice, the one-tailed t-tests for both items show significant gender differences (for t-test results for expectation items see Table 2 on page 54). Men are significantly more likely than women to agree with the expectation that they will put their career first in a moving decision (33% of men vs. 17% of women), hinting that they are expecting the partner to sacrifice. This is shown in that men were also significantly more likely than women to say they expected their partner to be the one to sacrifice in moving decisions (40% of men expect their partner to sacrifice versus only 15% of women). This falls into line with the significant gender difference seen with women earlier, where they expected to have to compromise more. So, while this was not measured directly here, these results suggest that women are aware of traditional expectations that they will be the ones to move more, while men are aware of expectations that they will put their career first and ask their partner to sacrifice in moving decisions.

Though a majority of both men and women said that a partner's career would be as important as their own when choosing where to live, women were significantly more likely than men to agree with this statement (85% of women vs. 65% of men). All of these results highlight, again, that gender differences still exist, and that men are more likely than women to see their careers as a priority and expect their partners to make more compromises in moving decisions.

### ***Willingness***

Willingness to move items were measured by two scales, examining two dimensions, one for self-sacrifice and the other for partner sacrifice.

### ***Self-Sacrifice***

According to the individual items in the scale, a majority of the sample would be willing to sacrifice self in a move, for various reasons. Findings show that a large majority (81%) of this sample agreed that they would be willing to move without a job for their partner if there was an overall increase in joint income, highlighting the importance of money in sacrifice (item D4). When asked if they would be willing to move to further their partner's career if the partner earned more (item D12), over half (58%) agreed that they would be willing to do so.

According to one item, the sample felt that they would be willing to move without a job offer for themselves in order to be with their partner, with 72% agreeing (item D8). However, another item indicated more ambivalence: only about one-fourth (27%) said they would be willing to move to further their partner's career regardless of the consequences to their own, with one-third (34%) not being sure (D11). While the sample was not willing to just move regardless of consequences, their opinions softened when asked if they would take a job not in their career field. Here half (54%) of the sample did agree with the statement that they would be willing to take a job not in their career field in order to move to be with their partner/spouse (item D14) (see Table D-5 for individual self-sacrifice item frequencies). These findings imply that the sample was willing to move to be with their partner in the right circumstances, but that they still are concerned about their own careers.

T-tests revealed that women were not significantly more likely to say they would engage in self-sacrifice on four of the five Self-Sacrifice Scale items. No significant gender differences were found for whether an overall joint income increase would matter in willingness to move, nor for the item that asks whether they'd be willing to move regardless of the consequences to their career or for the item about willingness to take a job outside their career field. Interestingly, men were more likely (with 62% of men agreeing compared to 54% of women) to be willing to move if their partner earns more – a strong relationship in the opposite direction from what was predicted (that women would be more likely to sacrifice). This phenomenon may make more sense later when looking at how money affects moving orientations. There was a significant gender difference in one Self-Sacrifice Scale item. Regarding willingness to move without a job offer to be with partner, women were more likely than men (78% women vs. 67% men) to be willing to sacrifice self (see Table 2 on page 54 for all t-test results regarding sacrifice questions and scales).

The five self-sacrifice items formed the Self-Sacrifice Scale (see Table D-7 for Scale frequencies). Three categories of self-sacrifice were established in order to keep all scales neatly divided into thirds for ease of analysis: over one-third (38%) of the sample had answers that implied high personal sacrifice (with scores in the 3.68 – 5.00 range), over half (58%) of the sample had answers that implied some personal sacrifice (with scores in the 2.34 - 3.67 range), and only 4% of the sample had a score that implied low self-sacrifice (with scores in the 1.00 – 2.33 range). A high score on this scale means that the respondent was willing to move despite personal consequences.

No significant gender difference in willingness to sacrifice personally in a move was found for the Self-Sacrifice Scale. This is not surprising since there was only one variable with a significant gender difference for the five self-sacrifice individual questions. Scores for both men and women are similar; for example, over half (57%) of women and over half (59%) of men fell into the middle personal sacrifice category (neither agree nor disagree), indicating that in certain circumstances personal sacrifice in moving is possible for both sexes. Since all those involved in the study are in professional programs, it was expected that a greater number of respondents would fall into the low self-sacrifice category since they have given such investment to their education and thus careers. This was not, however, the case. Perhaps this shows that most people are generally willing to move in certain circumstances for their partner, even those with accelerated schooling.

#### *Partner Sacrifice*

The next set of willingness items are those revolving around asking the partner to sacrifice in a moving decision (see Table D-6 for individual partner sacrifice question frequencies). In a general statement asking about partner sacrifice, 37% of the sample said that they would be willing to move even if their partner sacrifices because of that move (item D9). When asked if they would be willing to move even if there was nothing for their partner, about one-third (30%) agreed with this statement (item D3). When looking specifically at money, we see an almost even split, with 33% agreeing and disagreeing respectively and the other 31% being in the middle, as for whether they would be willing to move if they made good money even if the partner has to sacrifice (item D7). A similar pattern emerged when asked whether they would not be willing to

move unless a comparable job was available for their partner. For this item, they were willing to move regardless of whether there was a comparable job for their partner to which 33% of the sample agreed, 33% said neither agree nor disagree, and 34% disagreed (item D13).

The t-tests for gender differences for the individual items measuring partner sacrifice showed significant gender differences for three out of four questions. In two of the cases, it was clear that women were less likely than men to be willing to let their partner sacrifice. Moving even if there was nothing for the partner saw more men in agreement with this item than women (38% men v. 24% women) (item D3). Money came up as a significant gender difference in terms of partner sacrifice, whereas men are more likely to agree (40% of men compared to 30% of women) that they would have their partner sacrifice if they themselves could make good money (item D7). Men were also more likely to be willing to sacrifice the partner finding a comparable job in a moving decision. Here 40% of men would move even without a comparable job for their partner, while women (29%) were less willing to make their partner sacrifice in that way (item D13). There was no significant gender difference for the item dealing with general partner sacrifice from a move (item D9); even though it pinpointed career advancement, the use of the specific word “sacrifice” for the partner may have made respondents shy away from strong answers.

The Partner Sacrifice Scale, made up of these four individual items, was divided up into thirds for consistency and had a range of 3.68 - 5.00 for high partner sacrifice (19% of the sample), 2.34 - 3.67 for middle partner sacrifice (59% of the sample), and 1.00 - 2.33 for low partner sacrifice (22% of the sample). The number of high scores on

this scale is almost half of those seen for self-sacrifice (partner sacrifice high: 19%, compared to 38% high self-sacrifice). This result suggests that, at least in this survey, graduate students are more willing to say they are willing to sacrifice personally in a move than they are to say they are willing to ask that of a partner.

Since most of the individual items for partner sacrifice showed significant gender differences, it is no surprise that the one-tailed t-test for the Partner Sacrifice Scale also illustrates a significant gender difference. Men were significantly more likely than women to have a high score on the Partner Sacrifice Scale (26% men vs. 14% women). These findings illustrate that traditional gender expectations for roles in relationships persist, i.e., women are less likely than men to request their partner to sacrifice.

Table 2. T-tests for Gender Differences in Expectations and Willingness

	All (N= 416 )	Women (N= 221 )	Men (N= 190)	t-value
<b>Expectations</b>				
<b>E4:</b> I will be the one making more compromises in moving decisions	2.59	2.67	2.52	-1.73*
<b>E1:</b> I will put my own career first when making a moving decision	2.76	2.57	2.98	4.27***
<b>E6:</b> my partner will make more compromises in moving decisions.	2.88	2.58	3.22	7.29***
<b>E8:</b> my partner's career or job will be as important as mine.	3.97	4.19	3.72	- 5.19***
<b>Willingness to Self-Sacrifice</b>				
<b>I'd be willing to...</b>				
<b>D4:</b> move without a job offer for myself if moving for my spouse/partner's career meant an overall increase in joint income.	3.90	3.90	3.91	.06
<b>D12:</b> move to further my spouse/partner's career if s/he earns more than me.	3.51	3.42	3.63	2.51**
<b>D8:</b> move without a job offer for myself in order to be with my partner/spouse.	3.78	3.87	3.70	-1.89*
<b>D11:</b> move in order to further my spouse/partner's career, regardless of the consequences to my own career.	2.88	2.85	2.92	.79
<b>D14:</b> take a job not in my career field in order to move to be with my partner/spouse.	3.33	3.29	3.37	.79
<b>Self-Sacrifice Scale</b>	3.48	3.46	3.50	.66
<b>Willingness for Partner to Sacrifice</b>				
<b>I'd be willing to...</b>				
<b>D9:</b> move to further my career if my partner/spouse had to sacrifice because of the move.	3.11	3.04	3.18	1.59
<b>D3:</b> move to further my career, even if there is nothing for my partner.	2.76	2.59	3.02	4.43***
<b>D7:</b> move if I could make good money, even if my partner has to sacrifice.	2.99	2.86	3.15	3.26***
<b>D13:</b> I would not be willing to move to take a job unless there was a comparable job for my partner/spouse.	3.02	2.88	3.17	3.16***
<b>Partner Sacrifice Scale</b>	2.97	2.84	3.13	4.25***

\*Significant gender difference at the .05 level (one-tailed)

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Unsure/Neither, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree



How do expectations and willingness scales relate to one another? Pearson's correlation analysis between the Self-Sacrifice Scale and all the expectations questions showed only two expectations that were significantly correlated with the Self-Sacrifice Scale. There was a negative relationship between the Self-Sacrifice Scale and expecting to put own career first ( $r = -.18$ ), so that the more someone expects to put their career first, the less likely they are to be willing to sacrifice self in a move. A significant, positive relationship also exists between expecting a partner's career to be as important as the respondents ( $r = .20$ ). This means that the more likely they expect to balance careers, the more willing they are to sacrifice. However, separate analysis between men and women shows that these trends hold true for women, but not men. For women, there was a significant association between Self-Sacrifice and expecting to balance careers, while this didn't occur in the men's subsample nor in the total sample.

Pearson's correlations showed a significant relationship between the Partner Sacrifice Scale and almost all of the expectation questions. There was a positive, significant relationship ( $r = .37$ ) between expecting to put own career first and willingness to have a partner sacrifice in a move. This relationship is what previous literature would expect to find. There was also a positive relationship between expecting the partner to compromise more in moving decisions and the Partner Sacrifice Scale ( $r = .31$ ). A negative relationship exists ( $r = -.33$ ) between expecting a partner's career to be as important as the respondent's and the Partner Sacrifice Scale. This means that the more likely they expect to balance careers with their partner, the less likely they are to be willing to ask partners to sacrifice in a moving decision. No gender differences were

found when analyzing men and women separately for the correlating expectations and Partner Sacrifice Scale.

Table 3. Correlations between Expectations and Willingness Scales

	Self-Sacrifice Scale	Partner Sacrifice Scale
E4. Expect that I will compromise more in moving decisions	.06	-.09
E1. I expect to put my career first	-.18**	.37**
E6. Expect my partner to compromise more	-.05	.31**
E8. Partners career is as important as mine in moving decisions	.20**	-.33**

\*\*Significant at the .01 level (two-tailed)

### Gender Ideology

RQ3. Does gender ideology, whether traditional or egalitarian, have an influence on expectations and willingness for partner or self-sacrifice? To what extent does gender ideology influence migration orientations differently, in the sub samples of women and men?

The higher the score on the Gender Ideology Scale, the more egalitarian the respondents' gender ideology was considered. Over half of the sample (59%) scored high on egalitarian gender ideology (scores: 3.68 - 5.00), with another large portion (37%) scoring into a neutral or middle ground category (scores: 2.34 - 3.67). This sample only had 4% of the respondents scoring into the traditional ideology category (scores: 1.00 - 2.33) (see Table D-8 for Gender Ideology frequencies).

A one-tailed t-test was used since literature has shown that women tend to be more egalitarian than men in their ideology. The t-test here reveals that, as previous research has shown, women in this sample were significantly more likely to score in the egalitarian ideology category while men were more likely to be in the middle category. Over three-fourths (76%) of women's scores fell in the egalitarian category compared to only 40% of men's (see Table 4 for t-test results on page 62).

Correlation analysis revealed a significant correlation between the Gender Ideology scale and two of the four expectation questions. A two-tailed test was used since the exact effect on expectations is not clear without taking into account the variable of gender of respondent. Respondents who scored more egalitarian were significantly less likely to expect their partner to compromise more in moves ( $r = -.20$ ). Gender ideology also had a significant positive relationship ( $r = .25$ ) with the expectation item that states the partner's career would be rated as important as the respondent's. It is interesting that gender ideology only tied to those expectation questions that deal directly with the partner, but no significant correlations were present for the question regarding self.

Separating men and women in the analysis revealed that gender ideology affected men's expectations about their partner but not women's. Having a more traditional gender ideology was significantly correlated with men's expecting their partner to sacrifice more, but not for women. Furthermore, the more egalitarian men's ideology was, the more likely they reported that they expect to balance careers with a partner in a moving decision.

Another interesting finding for gender ideology came up when the subsamples of men and women were analyzed separately. Men who are more egalitarian in gender ideology are significantly *more* willing to compromise self about moving, while women who are more egalitarian were significantly *less* willing to compromise.

There was a significant correlation between the Gender Ideology Scale and the Partner Sacrifice Scale. Individuals who score as more egalitarian on the Gender Ideology Scale were significantly less likely to indicate that they were willing to ask their partner to sacrifice ( $r = -.15$ ). These results did not hold when analyzing men and women separate – the relationship between gender ideology and the Partner Sacrifice Scale disappears.

Although gender ideology and willingness to engage in self-sacrifice was not significantly associated in the total sample, when running separate correlations for men and women, women's gender ideology was found to have a significant relationship with the Self-Sacrifice Scale, with more egalitarian women being less willing to self-sacrifice. No significant relationship was found for men or for the total sample.

### **Program's Gender Composition**

RQ4. Does gender composition of career program affect expectations and willingness as far as sacrifice is concerned for future moves? Are students in programs traditionally populated by women (social work) more likely to expect to sacrifice in migration decisions than students in other programs, either gender-equal (public and environmental affairs - SPEA, law) or traditionally populated by men (business)? Do women in male-dominated programs have differing orientations than those in female-dominated programs? What about men?

Almost half of the women in this sample were in a traditionally female field (Social Work) (48%), while half of men (51%) were in a traditionally male field (Business), a statistically significant difference, according to a one-tailed t-test. Similar percentages of men and women (43% vs. 38% respectively) were in the gender-neutral programs (Law and SPEA); however, more women were in a traditionally male program (15%) compared to men in a traditionally female program (6%) (see Table D-9 for frequencies).

Correlations indicated that the more the respondent expected to put themselves first and partner second, the more likely they are to be enrolled in a more male-dominated graduate program. One-tailed tests were run for the expectation items as those in more male programs were predicted to expect the partner to sacrifice while those in female programs would expect self-sacrifice. There was a significant relationship between program's gender composition and moving expectations all four items. A positive ( $r = .18$ ) relationship exists between gender composition of the program and expecting to put self first in a move; that is the more male-dominated the program the more likely they were to say they put self first in a move. There was also a significant relationship ( $r = .36$ ) between program's gender composition and expecting the partner to compromise more in a move. Here the more likely they are to expect their partner to compromise, the more likely they are to be enrolled in a more male-dominated program or vice versa. There was also a negative, significant relationship between program and expecting to make sacrifices themselves ( $r = -.16$ ), with expecting self to sacrifice meaning more likely to be in a more female-dominated program. Expecting a partner's career to be as important as theirs in a move ( $r = -.18$ ) was also significantly negatively

related to program's gender composition, those students who were expecting to balance careers were more likely to be in a female-dominated program.

When examining men separately, all expectation items and program's gender composition were significantly correlated. For women, however, only one of the expectation items is correlated to their program's gender composition, with a positive relationship, showing that women in a more male-dominated field are more likely to see their partner as compromising more in moving decisions. In general, however, women in more male-dominated fields were not more likely to expect to put self first, as were men.

For the two sacrifice scales, Pearson's coefficients yielded a significant result for only the Partner Sacrifice Scale ( $r = .21$ ). The more male-dominated their degree program, the more willing the person is to ask their partner to sacrifice. There was no significant correlation between program and the Self-Sacrifice Scale, however. When analyzing results for men and women separately, the relationship between program and partner-sacrifice was found to only hold for men. Again, we find evidence that being in a male-dominated program affects men's attitudes toward migration, in this case, their willingness to have their partner sacrifice, while being in such a program is not related for women.

### **Transportability**

RQ5. Are individuals who see their careers as more transportable more likely to say they expect or will sacrifice in a moving decision? Are women more likely to agree with the fact that their career will allow them to move anywhere?

A majority (72%) of the sample felt that their career field would allow them to move just about anywhere and get a job (item F7). Women were significantly more

likely to agree that their career field would allow them to be transportable (88% women compared to 67% men) (see Table D-10 for frequencies). Tests were run to see if type of degree program had any effect on perception of transportability. An ANOVA showed ( $p < .001$ ) that those in the social work program were more likely than any other program to agree with this statement.

Perceptions of transportability and expectations for moving were significantly correlated, according to two of four items. Two-tailed tests were used here as a direction was not hypothesized. There was a significant negative ( $r = -.13$ ) relationship between perceived transportability and expectation that the partner will compromise more. So, the more transportable the respondent saw themselves, the less likely they were to see their partner sacrificing in moves. Also, there was a significant positive ( $r = .13$ ) relationship between perception of transportability and respondents' agreement with the importance of a comparable career for partner in a move. The more transportable they perceived their own career to be, the more likely they were to see a partners' career as more important in a move. Since they perceive themselves as easily moved they want to make sure their partner's career is weighed in. When analyzing men and women separately, these relationships were no longer significant, perhaps because the association was weak to start with.

When looking at the two sacrifice scales, only the Self-Sacrifice Scale has any significant correlation ( $r = .10$ ) to transportability. The more transportable the respondent perceived their career to be the more likely they are to be willing to sacrifice self in a move. This, again, makes sense in that they see their transportability as making them

more mobile and able to sacrifice in a move. On the other hand, expectations for partner sacrifice were not related to perceptions of own transportability.

When men and women are analyzed separately, results show that this relationship holds true only for women: women who see themselves as more transportable are more likely to score higher on the Self-Sacrifice Scale, but not men. Here again, the findings illustrate how factors thought to be related to migration orientations show gender differences.

Table 4. T-tests for Gender Differences in Gender Related Items

	Sample (N=416)	Men (N=190)	Women (N= 221)	t-value
Gender Ideology Scale <sup>a</sup>	3.82	3.48	4.11	-8.85***
Program's Gender Composition <sup>b</sup>	2.03	1.67	2.45	11.90***
F7: My career field will allow me to move just about anywhere and get a job. <sup>c</sup>	4.00	4.21	3.72	-5.53***

\*\*\*Significant gender difference at the .00 level

*a: High Score = More egalitarian, Lower Score = More traditional (two tailed t-test)*

*b: 1 = Female Dominated, 2 = Gender Neutral Program, 3 = Male Dominated (one tailed t-test)*

*c: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Unsure/Neither, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree (two tailed t-test)*

## Salary

RQ6. Does expected salary have any effect on expectations and willingness?

Does expecting a low salary mean they also expect to sacrifice self more in a move?

Does expecting a high salary reduce young adults' willingness to sacrifice themselves in a move and increase their likelihood of being willing to ask sacrifice from a partner?

What are the gender differences in expected salary and how does that relate to their willingness to sacrifice self or partner?



Almost half (46%) of the respondents to this question (with a smaller N = 350) felt that they would earn \$60,000 or more per year after graduating with their professional degree. Another third (30%) felt that their salary would fall into the range of \$30,000 - \$49,999 (see Table D-11 for frequencies). Men were significantly more likely to expect to earn higher salaries upon graduation, with 80% of men expecting to earn \$60K or more, while only 35% of women did (see Table 5 on page 62 for t-test results).

Correlations between expected salary and migration expectations showed some relationships with all of the expectation variables. One-tailed t-tests were run since those who expect to earn more are hypothesized to be more likely to expect partner to sacrifice and put self first. There was a significant association of expected salary with all four items measuring expectations. As expected, there are positive significant relationships between expected salary and expecting to put own career first ( $r = .20$ ) as well as between expected salary and expectation that the partner will compromise more in moves ( $r = .23$ ). These findings suggest that the more the respondent thinks they will earn, the more likely they are to put themselves first in a move and expect the partner will compromise. There were also significant, negative relationships between salary and expecting self to make compromises more in a move ( $r = -.18$ ) as well as with expectations of balancing both careers when moving ( $r = -.17$ ). So here, the less someone expects to earn, the more they expect to compromise self in a move or want to balance both careers.

When men and women are looked at separately, differences emerge. For men, three of the four relationships retain significance, but one – expecting a lower salary and expecting to balance both careers -was not correlated for men. For women, two of the

four relationships lose significance. For women, expecting to put self first and expecting partner to compromise more were not correlated to salary.

There was a significant positive ( $r = .17$ ) relationship between expected salary and the Partner Sacrifice Scale scores, in that the more the person perceived themselves earning, the more likely they were to be willing to ask their partner to sacrifice in a move. There was no significant relationship between expected salary and the Self-Sacrifice Scale. Interestingly, when analyzing men and women separately, the significant relationship only held for men, showing that men who expect to earn larger salaries are more willing to ask their partner to sacrifice in a moving decision. Women's expected salary had no such effect.

### **Partner's Relative Salary**

RQ7. When comparing their own perceived salary to their future partner's expected salary, do those who expect to earn more than their partners expect the partner to sacrifice more? Are those who expect to earn the same or less than their partner more likely to be willing to sacrifice self in a move, and not willing to ask a partner to sacrifice? Are women more or less likely than men to expect their partners to sacrifice, regardless of expected future salary?

A pretty even split was found for partner's expected relative salary. The largest portion of the sample (39%) felt that their partners' relative salary would be *less* than theirs (see self as primary earner). A third (31%) felt their partners' relative salary would be *about the same* as theirs and another third (31%) felt their partners' salary would be *more* than theirs (see self as secondary earner) (see Table D-12 for frequencies). As for expectations for partner's relative earning status, there were significant gender

differences. Women were more likely to see their partners' salaries as *more* than theirs (women 45% vs. men 13%) while men were significantly more likely to see their partner's salary as *less* than theirs (60% of men compared to 21% of women) (see Table 5 on page 68 for t-test results).

One-tailed tests were run since it is expected that seeing self as the primary earner (or rather seeing partner as earning less) would be associated with expectations for the partner to sacrifice. Partner's relative salary showed significant relationships with all of the expectation questions. There were positive relationships between partner's relative salary and expecting self to compromise more in moving decisions ( $r = .30$ ), and when choosing where to live expecting that the partner's career will be as important as own ( $r = .30$ ). So, here, the more someone expects to be the secondary earner (meaning they said their partner's relative salary would be more than theirs), the more they expect to compromise in moving decisions, as well as to balance both careers when moving. There were negative relationships between partner's relative salary and expecting to put self first in a move ( $r = -.32$ ), and expecting the partner to compromise more in a move ( $r = -.38$ ). These relationships show that the more the respondent expects to be the primary earner (meaning they said their partner's salary would be less than theirs), the more they expect to put themselves first in a move as well as expect their partner to compromise more in a move.

When analyzing men and women separately these relationships held their significance and direction (positive or negative) with each gender, the same as seen for the whole sample. This suggests that the relative earning status of the partner is

important for moving expectations for both men and women. This will be important to remember when looking at the power as money section below.

Pearson's correlation coefficients showed a significant negative correlation ( $r = -.22$ ) between partner's relative earnings and the Partner Sacrifice Scale. The more the respondent expects their partner to earn relative to themselves (meaning they would have secondary earning status), the less likely the respondent is willing to ask their partner to sacrifice in moves. There was no significant relationship between partner's perceived relative earnings and the Self-Sacrifice Scale. This is surprising given the finding that men said they were more likely to agree to move if their partner earned more than they do.

When looking at men and women separately, this same relationship holds true for both genders. There continued to be no significant relationship between partner's relative earning and the Self-Sacrifice Scale even when taking gender into account.

### **Money as Power**

RQ8. To what extent do students endorse the concept of Money as Power? Are women students less likely to endorse statements about moving based on money, with men more likely to endorse these statements?

Almost half (46%) of the sample's scores fell into the middle range on the Money as Power Scale and another 44%'s scores fell into the low Money as Power category. Only 10% scored high for Money as Power beliefs (see Table D-13 for frequencies). T-tests showed a significant gender difference in Money as Power Scale scores, with men being more likely to score higher on this scale than women (16% of men compared to

only 5% of women scoring in the “high” category) (see Table 5 on page 62 for t-test results).

Correlations between the Money as Power Scale scores and migration orientations yielded results similar to the hypothesized relationships. One-tailed tests were used since it was thought that those endorsing this attitude might be more likely to endorse partner sacrifice. Results showed that the more respondents endorsed the idea of money as power, the more likely they were to expect to put self first in a move ( $r = .35$ ) and expect the partner to compromise more in a move ( $r = .34$ ). There was a significant negative ( $r = -.24$ ) relationship between Money as Power scores and the partner’s career being as important in deciding to move, hinting that they expect their partner sacrifice. However, there was a significant relationship, though very weak, with endorsing money as power and expecting self to compromise more ( $r = .08$ ).

When men and women are analyzed separately, this expectation to compromise more only holds for women, possibly meaning they endorse money as power and therefore will concede to their partner in moving decisions and compromise more. For women, the significant relationship between Money as Power and balancing careers when moving disappears. Expecting to put self first, and partner compromise more relationships held for both genders; the more respondents of both sexes endorse money as power, the more they see themselves first in moving decisions and partner’s compromising.

Pearson’s correlation analysis showed a significant positive ( $r = .22$ ) relationship between the Partner Sacrifice Scale and the Money as Power Scale. The more respondents believe in money as power, the more likely they are to ask a partner to

sacrifice in a move. No significant relationship exists between the Self-Sacrifice Scale and the Money as Power Scale.

When looking at men and women separately, an interesting pattern emerges. The relationships between Money as Power Scale and partner sacrifice is only significant for men. Interestingly, a positive relationship between Money as Power and self-sacrifice emerges for women ( $r = .20$ ), when it wasn't significant for the total sample as hypothesized. This finding suggests that for women, when money is seen as holding power in relationships, they are more willing to sacrifice self in moving decisions, while men are not. The relationships between Money as Power and expectations hint that men are more likely to connect Money as Power to putting self first and partner second, but that women are more likely to expect themselves to compromise more in moving decisions if they score high on Money as Power attitudes. This might reflect the fact that women in this sample expected to earn less, so when money is seen as important, they are likely to be willing to sacrifice more for their higher-earning partner.

Table 5. T-tests for Gender Differences in Expected Salary Range

	All (N= 350 )	Women (N= 188 )	Men (N= 157)	t-value
Expected Salary <sup>a</sup>	3.93	3.35	4.67	11.45***
Partner's Relative Salary <sup>b</sup>	2.00	2.24	1.53	-9.78***
Money as Power Scale <sup>c</sup>	1.66	1.52	1.82	4.57***

\*\*\*Significant gender difference at the .001 level (one tailed)

*a: 1 = Under \$30,000; 2 = \$30,000 – 39,999; 3 = \$40,000 – 49,999; 4 = \$50,000 – 59,999; 5 = \$60K +*

*b: 1 = less than mine; 2 = same as mine; 3 = more than mine*

*c: Higher Score = value money in moving decisions*

## Moving for Work Attitudes

RQ9. What are respondents' opinions about moving providing workers with more opportunities? Do those who say that moving provides good opportunities to advance a career also expect to ask their partners to sacrifice in a move more than those who do not agree with this career prioritizing? Do those who say that moving provides good opportunities to advance a career also expect to ask their partners to sacrifice in a move more than those who do not agree with this type of model? Do men and women have different opinions on the model of moving for work?

A majority (82%) of the sample agreed that moving provides workers with opportunities to develop their careers. However, only 38% felt that if you turn down a promotion that requires a move, it hurts your career. This indicates that they believe moving helps a career but does not necessarily hurt a career if refused. There was a significant gender difference in opinions about moving and the relationship to careers. Men were more likely to strongly agree (32%) that moving provides workers with opportunities to develop their careers compared to women (19%). Men were also more likely to strongly agree that if you turn down a promotion that requires a move, it will hurt your career (11% men compared to 2% women) (see Table D-14 for frequencies).

Table 6. T-tests for Gender Differences in Moving Attitudes

	All (N= 416 )	Women (N= 221 )	Men (N= 190)	t-value
B4: Moving provides workers with opportunities to develop their careers.	4.05	3.92	4.21	4.34***
B8: If you turn down a promotion which requires a move, it hurts career.	3.12	2.89	3.40	5.56***

\*\*\*Significant gender difference at the .001 level (one tailed)

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Unsure/Neither, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

One-tailed correlations were used since those who place importance on moving for work may be more likely to expect and be willing to sacrifice self as well as partner in moves since they feel that it is important to a career. Three out of four correlations with expectations variables were significant. Believing that moving helps develop one's career was positively and significantly related to expecting to put self first in a move ( $r = .20$ ), and expecting partner to compromise more in a move ( $r = .20$ ). Belief that moving develops a career was negatively and significantly related to expecting self to compromise more in moving decisions ( $r = -.10$ ). Belief that moving helps to develop a career was not related to expecting balance careers with partner when moving.

Separately analyzing men and women shows that two of these four correlations remained significant for both sexes. However, the relationship between self compromising does not hold true for either sex, when examined separately. Interestingly, expecting to balance both careers when choosing where to live does become significant for women ( $r = .16$ ), with seeing moving as providing opportunities for workers.

Correlations between belief that turning down a move may hurt your career was positively significantly related to three expectation items, namely expecting to put self first in moves ( $r = .20$ ) and expecting their partner to compromise more in moving decisions ( $r = .33$ ). Belief that turning down a promotion because it requires moving and its ability to hurt ones career was negatively related to expecting to balance careers when choosing where to live ( $r = -.25$ ). Analyzing men and women separately does not yield any new findings.

Correlations showed a significant positive relationship between moving opinions and the sacrifice scales. The more someone agreed with the idea that moving helps with



a career, the more likely ( $r = .13$ ) they were to be willing to score high on the Self-Sacrifice Scale; they were also more likely to be willing to have a high score on the Partner Sacrifice Scale ( $r = .28$ ) which is what was hypothesized since agreement with these statements endorses emphasizing career. These results show that endorsing moving as positive for a career means the respondent is more willing to sacrifice self and partner, thus emphasizing careers over sacrifice. Belief that turning down a promotion could hurt your career also had a significant positive ( $r = .18$ ) relationship with Partner Sacrifice Scale scores, but not to Self-Sacrifice Scale scores. Again, those who emphasized moving importance for career (by not turning down a move based promotion) were more willing to ask their partner to sacrifice.

When looking at men and women separately, the relationships change. For men, moving to develop a career is no longer related to their Self-Sacrifice Scale scores. The relationship remains for women, though, so that the more they see moving as developing a career, the more likely they are to sacrifice self. This agrees with what was hypothesized; women who see career moves as important are still willing to sacrifice themselves in a move, perhaps thinking of the importance of moving for their partner's career here. Perhaps women, in reading these questions regarding moving, defaulted to thinking about men's careers, thus explaining these findings.

For the women's subsample there is no significant relationship between the belief that turning down a promotion would hurt one's career and the Partner Sacrifice Scale, though this stays true for men. Interestingly, when looking at the genders separately, a new pattern emerges for women, in that that the more emphasis they place on taking a promotion that requires a move the less likely they are to sacrifice self ( $r = -.15$ ). This

finding is opposite of what would be expected here and therefore not significant. There were no relationships between moving attitudes and the Self-Sacrifice Scale for men.

### **Other Potential Explanations**

#### ***Partnership Status***

RQ10. Does partnership status have an effect on expectations and willingness about sacrifice? Are those who have partners more likely to consider self-sacrifice than those who are single? Is there a gender difference in these expectations?

Almost half of the sample considered themselves married or living as married (45%), while another third (34%) considered themselves single, never married. The rest of the sample (20%) considered themselves in a relationship but not married (see Table D-15 for frequencies). T-tests showed a significant gender difference in marital status, with men being more likely than women to be married (51% of men in the sample versus 40% of women) (see Table 7 on page 69 for t-test results).

A one-tailed Pearson's was run since it is expected that those who are partnered or married will expect to sacrifice self and partner more. However, partnership status was not related to any expectation items.

When looking at men and women separately, interesting patterns do emerge. For men, the expectation items that are found to be significantly related to their partnership status are: less expecting self to compromise more in moves ( $r = -.15$ ), and expecting the partner to compromise more ( $r = .16$ ). So, for men, those who are more likely to be partnered see their partners compromising more but not themselves. For women, partnership status was significantly related to expecting to put self first in moving decisions ( $r = -.22$ ), and expecting to balance both careers when choosing where to live

( $r = .17$ ). Women who are more likely to be partnered are less likely to expect to put themselves first in a move, but do expect to balance careers when moving.

Pearson's correlation coefficients showed a significant relationship between partnership status and the willingness scales. Respondents who were more likely to be partnered or married were significantly more likely to say they would engage in self-sacrifice ( $r = .18$ ). However, there was a negative correlation ( $r = -.13$ ) between partnership status and partner sacrifice. That is, those who were more likely to be partnered or married were less likely to expect their partner to sacrifice.

When analyzing men and women separately, the relationship between partnership status and the Partner Sacrifice Scale disappears for men, but holds constant for women. This suggests the women who were more likely to be partnered were less likely to be willing to ask their partner to sacrifice in moving decisions, while men's willingness to sacrifice partner was not affected by relationship status. Both genders' relationship between partnership status and the Self-Sacrifice Scale hold constant, that is, if partnered willing to sacrifice self.

### *Age*

RQ11. Are younger students, particularly women, not expecting and less willing to sacrifice themselves in moving decisions, as we would expect because of changing roles of women in society?

When looking at a narrower range in this sample, those 21 to 35, age is found to have little effect on expectations and willingness. A one-tailed correlation was run since it was expected that younger respondents may be less willing to sacrifice self or a partner in a move. Pearson's correlations only yielded one significant relationship between age

and expectations; that is, those who are older in this range are more likely to expect their partner to compromise more in a move ( $r = .13$ ). Analyzing men and women separately shows that this relationship only holds true for men. This may be tied to whether older men are more traditional in their gender ideology. For women, there were no significant correlations between age and expectation items.

Pearson's did yield a positive, significant relationship between age and the Self-Sacrifice Scale ( $r = .11$ ), though this only held true for women. So here, the older women are more likely to be willing to sacrifice themselves in a moving decision. There was no relationship between age and the Partner Sacrifice Scale even when analyzing genders separately.

### ***Race***

RQ12. Does race have an effect on expectations and willingness concerning career migration?

Since previous literature has done little to look at racial differences in moving orientations, a two-tailed test was run here. Race was negatively and significantly related to one moving expectations: expecting the partner to compromise more in moving decisions ( $r = -.12$ ). Minorities were more likely to expect the partner to compromise more in moving decisions. When analyzing men and women separately, the relationship between race and partner compromising disappears for men, but stays true for women ( $r = -.15$ ). That is, minority women were more likely than white women to see their partner compromising more in a move.

Race did not show any significant relationship with the two sacrifice scales. When analyzing men and women separately, a significant relationship shows itself for

men between race and willingness to have self-sacrifice more in a move ( $r = .20$ ). That is, white men were more likely than minority men to be willing to sacrifice self in a move.

Table 7. T-tests for Gender Differences in Demographic Questions

	All (N= 416 )	Women (N= 221 )	Men (N= 190)	t-value
Partnership Status <sup>a</sup>	2.11	2.01	2.21	2.31*
Age <sup>b</sup>	29.0	29.1	28.6	-.72
Race <sup>c</sup>	0.81	0.82	0.81	.15

\*Significant gender difference at the .05 level

*a: 1 = single, never married; 2 = in a relationship, but not married; 3 = married or living as married (one tailed)*

*b: self-reported age (one tailed)*

*c: 0 = Minority, 1 = White (two tailed)*

## DISCUSSION

The issue of moving appeared to be salient for over half of the sample, reflecting previous research with young adults that shows post-graduation as the greatest time of migration (Swain and Garasky 2007). Men were more likely to feel that their career would require them to move more as well as expecting to move out of central Indiana after graduation. Research has shown that men tend to ask their partner to move with them (Bielby and Bielby; Brett et al. 1993).

This research examined two important but different aspects of moving orientations, namely *expectations* for moving and *willingness* to move. In examining expectations for moving, this study found that women were more likely than men to expect that they would compromise more than their partners in moving decisions. This reflects patterns shown in previous research where women have shorter job tenure and are more likely to move for a partner (Hiller and McCaig 2007; Smith 1997). Women were also more likely than men to expect to balance both theirs and their partners' careers when moving. This finding could reflect the fact that women take family into consideration more than men when making moving decisions (Bielby and Bielby 1992; Markham and Pleck 1986). Findings in this study also revealed that men were more likely to expect to put themselves first in a moving decisions as well as to expect their partner to compromise more in moving decisions similar to their greater expectations for the issue being salient. These trends reflect what previous literature has shown and what this study set out to investigate: women are (still) more likely to expect to sacrifice self while men are more likely to put self first and partner second. These findings also highlight the importance of this current study in that research has done little to look at a

younger cohort of professionals and their migration orientations, and to find similar patterns to those seen in previous research highlights that these trends still persist in a cohort that is different than those seen in previous literature. These findings help to establish balancing careers and relationships in moving as a relevant topic along gender lines, even to today's young professionals.

While some interesting patterns emerged for the four items measuring expectations about migration, there was difficulty in establishing a multi-item indicator of this important concept. This highlights the difficulty of asking students what they expect for their future, which may be more important to learn about than originally thought. This will be an important area to explore further in order to better understand what exactly students expect for their future moving decisions.

Willingness, however, emerged as a stronger set of items for developing scales. Two categories were created to consider "willingness" to move, specifically for this study. The first category is "willing to move and sacrifice self" (i.e., Self-Sacrifice Scale), which looked at the extent to which students would be willing to sacrifice themselves in order to move with a partner, measured by a five-item reliable scale. The Self-Sacrifice Scale saw over a third of the sample scoring high, meaning they are willing to sacrifice themselves and potentially their careers for their partnerships in moving decisions. No gender difference emerged for the overall scale, though two individual items on the scale had interesting findings. Men were more likely to be willing to sacrifice self if their partner earned more than them, while women were more willing to sacrifice by moving without a job just to be with their partner. The finding for men was in the opposite direction of what was predicted (that women would score higher on self-

sacrifice items), but this may hint that money is important for men when considering migration orientations. The finding for women reflects similar patterns seen in previous literature where women who have moved for a partner have shorter job tenures and more frequent job changes (Smith 1997). Again, these findings highlight that by finding similar patterns to previous research, these issues are still relevant to study in a younger cohort.

The second category is “willing to move and have my partner sacrifice” (i.e., Partner Sacrifice Scale), the extent to which they would be willing to sacrifice various advantages for their partner in a moving decision. Overall, men were more likely to have a higher score on the Partner Sacrifice Scale than women, showing their stronger alliance with this viewpoint. This also aligns with previous literature, in that women expect to make more compromises, and that their male partners expect them to (Orange 2002). Men also had the strongest relationships for almost all of the individual items that made up the scale.

When looking at how expectations relate to willingness, expected patterns emerge. Regarding the Self-Sacrifice Scale, expecting to put self first meant that the respondent was less willing to sacrifice self, while the more they expected their partner’s career to be as important as their own in a move, the more likely they were willing to sacrifice self. However, these relationships only hold true for women. Perhaps women, as they gain more alliance with male thinking in moving decisions, are beginning to put themselves first (i.e., being less willing to sacrifice self). For the Partner Sacrifice Scale, expectations related highly. The more a respondent is willing to ask their partner to



sacrifice, the more likely they are to expect to put their career first, as well as expect the partner to compromise more.

Those who did expect to balance careers were less willing to ask their partner to sacrifice. These relationships held true for both genders. Since these items are new to the literature, these patterns would reflect what would be expected – that expecting to put self first, means putting partner second and being more willing to sacrifice them.

Several factors were explored for their relationship with students' attitudes toward migration. Many factors related to gender issues that previous literature suggested were important to take into account when looking at migration (Markham and Pleck 1986), and most of the separate gender analysis here teased these relationships out. Closely tied to gender itself is gender ideology. Over half of the sample scored high on the egalitarian scale, but here, as in previous literature (Bryant 2003), women were found to be more egalitarian than men. As expected, men with more traditional ideology expected the partner to compromise more, while traditional women did not (Eby 2001). More egalitarian men were more likely to expect to balance careers. In addition, while egalitarian men were more likely than traditional men to expect themselves to compromise in moving decisions, egalitarian women actually were actually less likely to expect themselves to compromise more in moving decisions. A similar pattern emerged when willingness to sacrifice self and partner was examined; egalitarian women were found to be less likely than traditional women to be willing to sacrifice themselves in moving decisions. This might reflect previous literature that showed women with role-sharing attitudes are more likely to be committed to a life-long career (Hallett and Gilbert 1997), so here, those women who had egalitarian ideology were more committed to not

compromising their career. The finding for men, however, is contradictory to what Orrange (2002) found, since egalitarian men in his sample still wanted to put their career first. This difference in study findings could be tied to the program they are in or their expected salary and should be explored in future research.

Program's gender composition was explored for relationships to migration orientations. About half of women in this sample were in a female-dominated field, while about half of men were in a male-dominated field. Women who aspire to nontraditional fields have been found to have higher levels of commitment to planning for multiple roles, focusing on both career and family, compared to other women who have only marriage plans (Peake and Harris 2002). Students in male-dominated programs tended to expect their partner to sacrifice more, although men seemed to expect this more than women. Men in more male-dominated programs were more likely to expect to put themselves first in a move as well as expect partner to compromise more, while those in more female-dominated fields were more likely to expect themselves to compromise more as well as balance careers when moving. These findings parallel previous literature that also found women in traditional fields plan to balance work and family in more traditional ways (Aronson 1999), seen here as compromising more in moving decisions. Here, men who are in female-dominated fields taking on the attitudes and orientations that previous literature showed women having, thus again hinting that perhaps the gendered composition of the academic program has an effect on how young adults think about migration orientations, as gender ideology did for egalitarian men.

When looking at willingness and program's gender composition, men in more male-dominated programs were more willing to have their partner sacrifice, while being

in a male-dominated program did not affect women's willingness to have their partner sacrifice, despite their earlier expectations that their partner will compromise more. This again reflects the general trend of previous findings: women are not willing to ask their partner to sacrifice, but men are (Bielby and Bielby 1992).

Women are often seen as more transportable (Hiller and McCaig 2007) in a move. This study examined the importance of perceiving one's own career as transportable for women and men alike. While a majority of the sample felt that their career was transportable, women were more likely than men to see their careers as transportable and those in the social work field were more likely to feel this way about their field than others that were studied, a finding which previous literature has also shown (Hiller and McCaig 2007). The less transportable the respondents felt, the more they expected their partner to compromise and the less likely they were to expect to balance their partner's career in a move. Unexpectedly, no major gender differences emerged when looking at the relation of transportability to expectations to migrate.

When looking at willingness, however, the more women felt their career was transportable the more willing they were to sacrifice self in a move. These results may suggest that women's greater likelihood of having a transportable career still might facilitate couple decision-making that sacrifices her career over her partner's.

Much of the previous literature has focused on and shown the importance of money in migration decisions, whether it be through family power theory or human capital theory (Hardill et al. 1997; Pixley and Moen 2003). Findings for expectations and salary were aligned with previous literature. Men expected to earn more than women in this sample; research has found that men do earn more than women even when doing

comparable work (Jacobsen and Levin 2003). Men expecting to earn higher salaries were more likely to expect to put self first and ask their partner to compromise, which reflects previous literature showing that when men earn more than women (as they felt they would in this sample) their career takes priority (Sultana 2005). For women, the lower the salary a woman expected to earn, the more she expected to balance careers in a moving decision. Findings reflect previous literature which has found that whoever has the most economic potential in a relationship may be favored in a moving decision (Pixley and Moen 2003). Regarding willingness, men were also more likely to ask their partner to sacrifice the more they earned, though women were not. This repeats earlier findings that women continue to be unwilling to sacrifice their partner, but men continue to show this pattern.

Partner's relative earning status also affected migration attitudes. Men were more likely to see themselves as the primary earner (with their partner earning less) and women were more likely to see themselves as the secondary earner (seeing their partner earning more). Those students who saw themselves as primary earners (regardless of sex) were more likely to put themselves first and expect their partner to compromise more; they were also more willing to ask their partner to sacrifice in moving decisions. This aligns with previous research that shows primary or secondary earning status has an effect on making these decisions (Cooke 2003), so the more someone's partner earns the less likely they are willing to ask them to sacrifice in a move, perhaps because of the power their partner's salary holds. While these findings held for women as well as men, women's lesser likelihood of being primary earners suggests that relative earning status still keeps women at a disadvantage in migration decisions.

The essence of family power theory is that money yields power in relationships, here explored in relation to migration orientations. Family power theory says the partner who wields the most power in the relationship and thus has the most say in the moving decisions is the one who earns more (Bielby and Bielby 1992; Hardill et al. 1997; Pixley and Moen 2003). When looking at Money as Power attitudes, only a small percentage of the sample scored high on this scale, but men were more likely to do so than women. The higher men score on this scale, the less likely they are to expect to balance careers when moving. Both genders who score higher on this scale expect their partner to compromise more in moving decisions. Interestingly, women who scored higher on the Money as Power Scale were also more likely to expect to put self first in a move. This reflects some of the other patterns that have emerged where the more women parallel men (here by giving power to money), the more their expectations reflect those seen for men.

When looking at willingness to sacrifice and money as power attitudes, the study found patterns that reflected those seen in previous literature. Men who scored higher on the Money as Power Scale were willing to sacrifice their partner more than men who scored lower, while there was no such relationship for women. Interestingly, women who scored higher on this scale were more willing to sacrifice themselves in moving potentially because they were giving the “power” to their partner’s career versus their own and thus concede in moving.

Moving for work has previously been an issue for men, but with more and more women entering the workforce, the attitudes of workers should be reassessed for their opinions regarding moving, which this study aimed to explore. A large portion of the

sample agreed that moving for work meant more career opportunities, but less than half felt that turning down a move based promotion would necessarily hurt a career. Men were more likely than women to agree with these ideas than women, reflecting previous literature which found that men are still expected to relocate for their jobs and may be looked down upon if they don't, while women are overall assumed to be unlikely to move for a job because of family ties (Cooper 2004). For both measures, respondents who endorsed moving as important for a career were more likely to say they expected to put themselves first and the partner would compromise more. For women, the more they agreed that moving is important for a career they more likely they were to be willing to sacrifice self in a move, perhaps because they are giving the "importance" to their partner's career, similar to the Money as Power finding.

Findings suggest some additional background characteristics may influence orientations. About three-fourths of the sample was partnered at the time of the survey (either by being in a relationship or married) with men more likely to be married than women. Men who were partnered were less likely to see themselves as compromising in moving decisions, and expected their partner to be compromising more. Women with partners, on the other hand, were less likely to put themselves first in a moving decision, although they did expect to balance careers. Regardless of sex, the more students were to be partnered, the more they were willing to say they would sacrifice self in a move. When it came to asking for partner sacrifice the effect of having a partner was only significant for women. Partnered women were less likely than single women to say they were willing to ask their partner to sacrifice in a move. Orrange's study (2002) found

that those planning on being partnered gave more thought to the effect of decisions on their partners.

Age and race had some, but relatively few, effects on migration attitudes. Older men expect their partner to compromise more in moving decisions, while older women are more likely to be willing to sacrifice self in a moving decision. It was interesting here that age did not affect more here as it was thought that a younger cohort would yield different results. The fact that older women were more likely to be willing to sacrifice themselves in a move may hint at how gender ideas are changing among younger women who may be less willing to sacrifice self as they put more emphasis on their career. Both of these findings may tie to gender ideology, and should be explored further in future research. For race, minority women were more likely to expect their partner to compromise more, while minority men were more willing to sacrifice themselves in moving decisions. Since willingness to sacrifice scores were not affected by age or race, these variables are probably less important determinants of migration attitudes than other variables examined in the study.

Table 8. Pearson's Correlations for Expectation Items, Willingness Scales, and Independent Variables

	I will compromise more in moving decisions	I expect to put my career first in moving	My partner will compromise more in moving decisions	...my partners career is as important as mine	Self-Sacrifice Scale	Partner Sacrifice Scale
1. Gender	.08*	-.21**	-.34**	.25**	-.03	-.21**
2. Gender Ideology Scale	.03	-.09	-.20**	.25**	-.06	-.15**
3. Program's Gender Composition	-.16**	.18**	.36**	-.18**	.07	.21**
4. Perceived transportability	-.03	-.07	-.13**	.13**	.10*	-.07
5. Salary	-.18**	.20**	.23**	-.17**	.02	.17**
6. Partner's Relative Salary	.31**	-.32**	-.38**	.30**	.05	-.22**
7. Money as Power Scale	.08*	.35**	.34**	-.24**	.06	.22**
8. Moving Develops Career	-.09*	.20**	.20**	-.04	.13**	.28**
9. Turning down a promo b/c of a move hurts career	-.08	.20**	.33**	-.25**	-.08	.18**
10. Partnership Status	-.07	-.08	.08	.04	.18**	-.13**
11. Age	-.07	.02	.13**	-.03	.11	-.01
12. Race	-.05	.04	-.12*	-.06	.03	-.02

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .01



## CONCLUSION

Both young men and young women report strong commitments to both work and family (Peake and Harrison 2002) and careers are now just as important to women as to men (Castleman, Coulthard, and Reed 2005). So, who sacrifices when a moving decisions arises? What will young professionals answer, “Me or you?”

This study aimed to explore graduate students’ expectations for moving; it examined the sacrifices they *expect* themselves or their potential partners to make in moving decisions, as well as their *willingness* to sacrifice or ask their partner to sacrifice in moving decisions. While previous literature has not focused specifically on young adults’ future migration decisions, the literature on young adults’ work-family expectations and gender ideology, in combination with literature on moving decisions of adult jobholders, gave this study some potentially fruitful areas for investigation.

Results suggested that the majority of the sample of graduate students surveyed indicated that they would be willing to sacrifice themselves in a move, but answers varied considerably in terms of being willing to ask their partner to sacrifice. While there wasn’t any significant gender difference in students’ answers on the Self-Sacrifice Scale, men did score higher than women on the Partner Sacrifice Scale. Overall, many of the same trends seen in previous literature emerged, with women giving more thought to their partners in moving decisions, while men were more likely to expect their partners to sacrifice and they were more likely to be willing to have their partner sacrifice more in moving decisions (Bielby and Bielby 1992).

Several factors related to gender turned out to be important correlates of migration attitudes. For men, being in a male-dominated program, have a higher expected salary,

holding an attitude that money has power in decision-making, and seeing moving as important to career advancement were all correlated with men's willingness to have their partner sacrifice. For women, already having a partner, perceiving one's career as transportable, and being older were correlated with women's willingness to sacrifice themselves in a move. These findings reflect much of previous literature. In this study, men are influenced by certain aspects of moving decisions (such as money as power), while women tend to give favor to family and relationships, reflecting previous literatures, such as the landmark study by Bielby and Bielby (1992) which found similar patterns among their adult respondents along gender lines.

Though this study was exploratory, the findings confirm previous patterns seen in research but also suggest new areas for exploration. One of the aims of this research was to establish moving as an important work-life decision for young adults. The importance of the issue was established in this study through responses to questions about the likelihood of this coming up; the issue of moving with a partner turned out to be a salient issue for over half of the respondents.

Another aim of this research was to develop some good measures of migration attitudes, to fill a void in the work-family literature. It proved easier to establish reliable multi-item indicators of students' willingness to sacrifice and willingness to have partner sacrifice, than it was to design items that reliably measured what students expected would happen in regarding to migration and sacrifice. "Willingness" indicators measured attitudes, while "expectation" items asked students to look into their future to predict what behavior would occur. Clearly, the latter task is more difficult than the former,

which might explain why it was difficult to measure expectations. Young adults are unsure of their future decisions regarding migration and this warrants further study.

While the study was successful in testing whether gender and gender-related factors were important for migration attitudes, work still needs to be done to explore further how the various gender-related factors interact with each other to influence how graduate students form their expectations for moving decisions as well as what exactly influences their willingness to move and sacrifice self or their partner.

APPENDIX A: Breakdown of student body in each degree program

<b>School</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Pct. Female</b>
Business	899	344	1243	28%
Dentistry	77	41	118	35%
Library & Inf. Sci.	55	283	338	84%
Social Work	84	511	595	86%
Law (check #s)	27	24	51	47%
Public & Env. Aff.	174	226	400	57%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1316</b>	<b>1429</b>	<b>2745</b>	<b>56%</b>

Table 1. Headcount of Each Program. Numbers provided by University's Office of the Registrar

## APPENDIX B: Items used to advertise the study

### B-1: “Dear Professor” letter

Dear Professor XX,

My name is Sarah Patterson and I’m a graduate student in Sociology. I am involved in doing a master’s thesis under the supervision of Dr. Linda Haas. I am writing to request the opportunity to come to your class (**INFO HERE**) to conduct a short survey with your graduate students about their future professional moving or migration decisions. This survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete. This could take place at your convenience (professors usually prefer the beginning of class or end of class). This study has received IRB approval (Study # ).

I have attached a copy to this email so you can see it. Please let me know when it would be possible to come to your class **within the next two weeks** to administer my survey?

Thank you in advance for your time!

Sarah Patterson  
sapatter@iupui.edu  
Soc. Dept. #

## B-2: Class introduction at survey distribution

Hello –

My name is Sarah and I am a graduate student in Sociology. I am interested in how graduate students think about their future, especially decisions regarding moving or migration. I am interested in how students plan to balance work and family needs when moving. This study will be used for my thesis, but I will not be collecting any identifying information on the questionnaire, so your responses will be anonymous.

This is a brief survey that should take less than 10 minutes to complete. This study is completely voluntary, and if you choose not to participate, please just leave the form blank and I will collect them all at the end. There is a separate sheet of paper where you can write down your name and information to be entered in a raffle to win one of five \$20 gift certificates to Barnes and Nobles. Your raffle entry will be collected separately and will not be attached to your survey in any way. Raffle winners will receive an email by the end of the semester.

Thank you in advance for your time and participation! I look forward to seeing the results. If you would like to see results as well, my information is listed on the raffle sheet and you may tear that bottom part off to send me an email to register your interest in getting results. Also on the bottom of the raffle entry is information regarding CAPS and the Career Center. Both places are available if you feel like the issues raised in this study are ones you want to talk over with someone.

Thanks again!

Sarah Patterson

B-3: Raffle Entry

**RAFFLE ENTRY**

Please fill out this short form if you would like to be entered into the raffle for one of five \$25 gift certificates for participating! Winners will be chosen at the end of the semester and notified via email.

**PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY.**

**NAME:** \_\_\_\_\_

**EMAIL:** \_\_\_\_\_

**THANKS AGAIN FOR PARTICIPATING!**

— — — — — (tear here) — — — — —

Winners for the raffle will be chosen at the end of the semester and notified via email. You may also email me at [sapatter@iupui.edu](mailto:sapatter@iupui.edu), after May 1<sup>st</sup> to inquire about the winners. You are also free to email me to learn about results. Thanks again for your participation!

\*\*\*\*\*

Graduate school and graduation are a stressful time in one's life. There are many resources on campus, here are just a few:

**IUPUI Career Center:**

The IUPUI Career Center provides services to all students, alumni, faculty and staff of the Indianapolis and Columbus Campuses. They provide career counseling, help with job searches and gaining experience, as well as numerous other services. For more information, see their website at <http://www.career.iupui.edu/> or call them at 274-2554. You can also contact them by email at [career1@iupui.edu](mailto:career1@iupui.edu).

**CAPS:**

If you find that life stressors are interfering with your academic or personal success, consider contacting Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS). All IUPUI students are eligible for counseling services at minimal fees. CAPS also performs evaluations for learning disorders and ADHD; fees are charged for testing. CAPS is located in UN418. For more information, see the CAPS web-site at: <http://www.life.iupui.edu/caps/> or call them at 274-2548.

APPENDIX C: Survey

**GRADUATE STUDENT SURVEY**

Please think about the following questions in regards to your life after graduating.

For each question below, circle your answer or fill in the blank.

**A. 1. What graduate program are you currently in? (please circle your answer)**

Business	Law	Library and Information Sciences	Public and Environmental Affairs	Social Work	Other: _____ *includes: undergraduate, non-degree, and other*
----------	-----	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------	---

**Please fill in the blank below**

2. What month and year do you expect to graduate:	____/20____
3. What specific graduate degree are you completing (ex: MBA, MA, PhD, etc):	
4. What is your age?	

<b>B. Opinions about Moving</b>	<b>Scale of Agreement</b>					
	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>
1. A career which requires frequent transfers is hard on a relationship.	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. The spouse who earns more should have the final say in a moving decision.	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. A wife should be willing to move in order to further her husband's career.	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. Moving provides workers with opportunities to develop their careers.	1	2	3	4	5	0
5. The spouse who earns less should be willing to move for the other spouse's career.	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. Lots of good employees leave an organization rather than move.	1	2	3	4	5	0
7. A husband should be willing to move in order to further his wife's career.	1	2	3	4	5	0
8. If you turn down a promotion which requires a move, it hurts your career.	1	2	3	4	5	0

**C. 1. What is your current marital status? (please circle your answer)**

Single, never married	In a relationship, not married	Currently married (or living as married)	Formerly married (separated or divorced)
-----------------------	--------------------------------	--	--



**Relationship status: please mark your answer and follow the corresponding directions.**

2. I have no current life partner/spouse.	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>YES</b> For the following questions, imagine that you will have a partner when you graduate. Please go to next set of questions.
3. I have a partner who may become my life partner/spouse. <b>OR</b> I have a definite life partner/spouse.	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>NO</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>YES</b> Answer the following questions assuming that your current partner will be your partner when you graduate.

<b>D. Willingness to Move Questions</b>	<i>Scale of Agreement</i>					
	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Unsure</b>
1. I would <u>not</u> be willing to move to further my partner/spouse's career unless the money was enough to offset my losses.	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. I'd be willing to commute more than an hour in order for my partner and me to both have the careers we want and still be able to live together.	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. I'd be willing to move to further my career, even if there is nothing for my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. I'd be willing to move without a job offer for myself if moving for my spouse/partner's career meant an overall increase in joint income.	1	2	3	4	5	0
5. I would <u>not</u> be willing to move unless it furthered my own career.	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. I'd be willing to live in separate states in order for my partner and me to both have the careers we want and still be together.	1	2	3	4	5	0
7. I'd be willing to move if I could make good money, even if my partner has to sacrifice.	1	2	3	4	5	0
8. I'd be willing to move without a job offer for myself in order to be with my partner/spouse.	1	2	3	4	5	0
9. I would <u>not</u> be willing to move to further my career if my partner/spouse had to sacrifice because of the move.	1	2	3	4	5	0
10. I'd be willing to split up with my partner/spouse rather than sacrifice my career if we couldn't both work in the same location.	1	2	3	4	5	0
11. I'd be willing to move in order to further my spouse/partner's career, regardless of the consequences to my own career.	1	2	3	4	5	0
12. I'd be willing to move to further my spouse/partner's career if s/he earns more than me.	1	2	3	4	5	0

13. I would <u>not</u> be willing to move to take a job unless there was a comparable job for my partner/spouse.	1	2	3	4	5	0
14. I'd be willing to take a job not in my career field in order to move to be with my partner/spouse.	1	2	3	4	5	0

<b>E. Expectations for Moving Questions</b>	<b>Scale of Agreement</b>					
	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Unsure</b>
1. I expect that I will put my own career first when making a moving decision with a partner/spouse.	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. I expect that money will be <u>the</u> deciding factor in my future moving decisions with a partner/spouse.	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. I expect to have to move frequently to be with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. I expect that I will be the one in my partnership making more compromises in moving decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
5. I expect that my partnership will end if a moving decision comes between me and my career.	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. I expect that my partner will make more compromises in moving decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
7. I expect that my career field will require me to move frequently.	1	2	3	4	5	0
8. When choosing where to live, my partner's career or job will be as important as mine.	1	2	3	4	5	0

<b>F. General Questions</b>	<b>Scale of Agreement</b>					
	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Disagree nor Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>
1. A married woman should not work outside the home if her husband can comfortably support her.	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. Preschool children are likely to suffer if their mother is employed.	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. Both men and women should share the burden of working for income.	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. A woman who works full-time can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work.	1	2	3	4	5	0

5. It is okay for a woman to earn significantly more than her husband.	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. Men and women should share equally the responsibility for household upkeep and childcare.	1	2	3	4	5	0
7. My career field will allow me to move just about anywhere and get a job.	1	2	3	4	5	0
9. It is much better for everyone if the man earns the main living and the woman takes care of the home and family.	1	2	3	4	5	0

<b>G. After Graduate School Questions</b>	<b>Scale of Likeliness</b>				
	<b>Very Unlikely</b>	<b>Unlikely</b>	<b>Unsure</b>	<b>Likely</b>	<b>Very Likely</b>
1. I expect to move out of the area (central Indiana) for work after I graduate with my degree.	1	2	3	4	5
<u>If you answered likely or very likely to #1</u> 2. I expect to move with a current partner or plan to be partnered at the time of the move.	1	2	3	4	5

<b>H. Future Career Specifics</b>	<b>Please fill in the blank</b>
1. <i>Planned Occupation after graduating w/current degree:</i>	
2. <i>How much do you think your starting salary will be:</i>	

3. <i>My partner/spouse's salary will probably be:</i>	Less than mine	More than mine	About the same as mine
4. <i>I will most likely work in the:</i>	Public Sector	Private Sector	Other: _____

**I. Background Questions:**

1. <i>Please indicate your gender:</i>	Female		Male		
2. <i>Please indicate your race: (circle all that apply)</i>	African American/ Black	Asian	Caucasian/White	Hispanic/ Latino/a	Other: _____
3. <i>Please indicate the gender of your partner, or of a typical partner for you.</i>	Female		Male		Prefer Not to Answer

**J. Previous Moving Experience:**

<i>1. Have you ever moved with a partner/spouse before?</i>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
---	-----------	------------

**If you answered “YES,” please briefly explain (i.e.: Why, specifically, did you move? Did someone receive a job? Go back to school? How did you work it out with your partner/spouse?)**

Thank you for taking the time to fill out my survey!

APPENDIX D: Frequency Tables

Table 1. Percentage Distribution for Students' Orientations toward Migration

	1=Strongly Disagree			Disagree			Unsure			Agree			5=Strongly Agree		
	All	Women	Men	All	W	M	All	W	M	All	W	M	All	W	M
E7: I expect that my career field will require me to move frequently	12%	15%	8%	52%	58%	44%	26%	20%	34%	8%	5%	12%	2%	1%	2%

Table 2. Percentage Distribution for Students' Attitudes toward Moving Out of Central Indiana after Graduation

	1=Very Unlikely			Unlikely			Unsure			Likely			5=Very Likely		
	All	Women	Men	All	W	M	All	W	M	All	W	M	All	W	M
G1: I expect to move out of central Indiana for work after I graduate	12%	15%	7%	21%	23%	19%	29%	25%	32%	22%	19%	25%	17%	18%	17%

Table 3. Percentage Distribution for Having Moved with a Partner Before

	0 = No		1 = Yes	
	All	Men	All	M
J1: Moved with a partner/spouse before	64%	60%	36%	40%

Table 4. Percentage Distribution for Gender and Expectations

	1=Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Unsure		Agree		5=Strongly Agree	
	All	Women	All	W	All	W	All	W	All	M
I expect...										
<b>E4:</b> I will be the one making more compromises	9%	10%	42%	38%	31%	28%	16%	22%	10%	1%
<b>E1:</b> I will put my own career first	7%	8%	39%	45%	30%	30%	20%	15%	27%	6%
<b>E6:</b> my partner will make more compromises	6%	9%	29%	39%	38%	37%	25%	14%	36%	4%
<b>E8:</b> my partner's career or job will be as important as mine.	1%	1%	8%	3%	15%	11%	46%	46%	46%	21%

Table 5. Percentage Distribution for Gender and Self-Sacrifice Willingness

	1=Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Unsure		Agree		5=Strongly Agree		
	All	Women	All	W	All	W	All	W	All	M	
I would be willing to ...											
<b>D4:</b> move without a job offer for myself if ... overall increase in joint income.	1%	1%	7%	7%	12%	10%	63%	65%	18%	62%	18%
<b>D12:</b> move to further my spouse/partner's career if s/he earns > than me.	2%	3%	11%	15%	30%	29%	50%	46%	8%	54%	8%
<b>D8:</b> move without a job offer for myself in order to be with my partner/spouse.	2%	2%	8%	7%	18%	14%	54%	58%	18%	50%	17%
<b>D11:</b> move in order to further partner's career, regardless of consequences to my own career.	5%	5%	35%	37%	34%	32%	22%	21%	5%	25%	4%
<b>D14:</b> take a job not in my career field in order to move to be with my partner/spouse.	4%	4%	21%	24%	21%	20%	46%	45%	8%	47%	8%

Table 6. Percentage Distribution for Gender and Partner Sacrifice Willingness

	1=Strongly Disagree			Disagree			Unsure			Agree			5=Strongly Agree		
	All	Women	Men	All	W	M	All	W	M	All	W	M	All	W	M
I would be willing to...															
<b>D9:</b> move to further my career if my partner/spouse had to sacrifice because of the move.	3%	3%	3%	23%	26%	19%	38%	36%	40%	35%	33%	36%	2%	2%	3%
<b>D3:</b> move to further my career, even if there is nothing for my partner.	6%	8%	4%	42%	51%	33%	22%	17%	26%	27%	23%	33%	3%	1%	5%
<b>D7:</b> move if I could make good money, even if my partner has to sacrifice.	3%	4%	2%	32%	39%	24%	31%	28%	35%	32%	28%	36%	3%	2%	4%
<b>D13:</b> I would not be willing to move to take a job unless there was a comparable job for my partner/spouse.	3%	4%	2%	30%	36%	24%	33%	32%	35%	30%	26%	35%	4%	3%	5%



Table 7. Percentage Distribution for Self-Sacrifice Scale and Partner Sacrifice Scales

	Low (1.00 – 2.33)			Mid (2.34 – 3.67)			High (3.68 – 5.00)		
	All	Women	Men	All	W	M	All	W	M
<b>Self-Sacrifice Scale</b>	4%	5%	3%	58%	57%	59%	38%	38%	38%
<b>Partner-Sacrifice in Move</b>	22%	29%	14%	59%	57%	60%	19%	14%	26%

Table 8. Percentage Distribution for Gender Ideology

	Traditional (1.00 – 2.33)			Neutral (2.34 – 3.67)			Egalitarian (3.68 – 5.00)		
	All	Women	Men	All	W	M	All	W	M
<b>Gender Ideology</b>	4%	1%	7%	37%	24%	53%	59%	76%	40%

Table 9. Percentage Distribution for Program's Gender Composition

	1=Female Dominated Program		2 = Gender Neutral Program		3= Male Dominated Program	
	All	Women	Men	All	W	M
Program's Gender Composition	29%	48%	6%	40%	38%	43%
					32%	15%
						51%

Table 10. Percentage Distribution for Transportability

	1=Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Unsure		Agree		5=Strongly Agree	
	All	Women	All	Men	All	W	All	M	All	M
F7: : My career field will allow me to move just about anywhere and get a job.	1%	1%	8%	1%	13%	8%	42%	50%	30%	21%

Table 11. Percentage Distribution for Expected Salary Range

N = 345	1) Under \$30K		2) \$30K-		3) \$40K -		4) \$50K		5) \$60K +	
	All	Women	All	Men	All	W	All	M	All	M
Expected Salary	2%	4%	19%	0%	15%	21%	7%	10%	55%	80%

Table 12. Percentage Distribution for Partner's Relative Salary

	1) Less Than Mine			2) About the same as mine			3) More Than Mine		
	All	Women	Men	All	W	M	All	W	M
<b>Partner's relative salary</b>	39%	21%	60%	31%	34%	27%	31%	45%	13%

Table 13. Percentage Distribution for Money as Power Scale

	1) Low Money as Power			2) Middle Money as P			3) High Score		
	All	Women	Men	All	W	M	All	W	M
<b>Money as Power Scale</b>	44%	53%	34%	46%	43%	50%	10%	5%	16%

Table 14. Percentage Distribution for Moving Attitudes

	1=Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Unsure		Agree		5=Strongly Agree		
	All	Women	All	W	All	W	All	W	All	W	
B4: Moving provides workers with opportunities to develop their careers.	0%	0%	1%	2%	17%	22%	57%	57%	25%	19%	32%
B8: If you turn down a promotion which requires a move, it hurts your career.	2%	3%	27%	33%	33%	39%	32%	24%	6%	2%	11%

Table 15. Percentage Distribution for Partnership Status

Partnership Status	Single (includes divorced)			In a relationship, but not married			Currently married or living as married		
	All	Women	Men	All	W	M	All	W	M
	34%	39%	30%	20%	21%	19%	45%	40%	51%

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, Amy and Lotte Bailyn. 1993. "Segmentation and Synergy: Two Models of Linking Work and Family." Pp. 262-275 in *Men, Work, and Family*, edited by J. C. Hood. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications.
- Aronson, Pamela. 1999. "The Balancing Act: Young Women's Expectations and Experiences of Work and Family." *Research in the Sociology of Work* 7:55-83.
- Bielby, William T and Denise D Bielby. 1992. "I Will Follow Him: Family Ties, Gender-Role Beliefs, and Reluctance to Relocate for a Better Job." *The American Journal of Sociology* 97:1241-1267.
- Bird, Gerald A. and Gloria W. Bird. 1985. "Determinants of Mobility in Two-earner Families: Does the Wife's Income Count?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family*:753-758.
- Brett, Jeanne M., Linda K. Stroh, and Anne H. Reilly. 1993. "Pulling up roots in the 1990s: Who's Willing to Relocate?" *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 14:49-60.
- Bridges, Judith S. and Claire Etaugh. 1996. "Black and White College Women's Maternal Employment Outcome Expectations and Their Desired Timing of Maternal Employment." *Sex Roles* 35:543-562.
- Bryant, Alyssa N. 2003. "Changes in Attitudes Toward Women's Roles: Predicting Gender-Role Traditionalism Among College Students." *Sex Roles* 48:131-142.
- Castleman, Tanya, Darryl Coulthard, and Rosslyn Reed. 2005. "Complexities in the Career-Family Perspectives of Young Professionals." *Labour & Industry* 16:61-80.
- Challioli, H. and K. Mignonac. 2005. "Relocation decision-making and couple relationships: a quantitative and qualitative study of dual-earner couples." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 26:247-274.
- Chao, Georia T. and Philip D. Gardner. 2007. "How Central is Work to Young Adults?" Michigan State University and MonsterTRAK.
- Cooke, Thomas J. 2003. "Family Migration and the Relative Earnings of Husbands and Wives." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 93:338-349.
- Cooper, Cary L. 2004. "Corporate Relocation Policies." in *The Work-Family Challenge*, edited by S. a. J. L. Lewis. London, UK: Sage Publications.

- Covin, Teresa Joyce and Christina Christenson Brush. 1991. "An Examination of Male and Female Attitudes Toward Career and Family Issues." *Sex Roles* 25:393-415.
- Eby, L. T. 2001. "The boundaryless career experiences of mobile spouses in dual-earner marriages." *Group & Organization Management* 26:343-368.
- Gerson, Kathleen. 2004. "Understanding Work and Family Through a Gender Lens." *Community, Work & Family* 7:163-178.
- Gilbert, Lucia A., Suzzane Dancer, Karen M. Rossman, and Brian L. Thorn. 1991. "Assessing Perceptions of Occupational-Family Integration." *Sex Roles* 24:107-119.
- Gilbert, Lucia Albino. 1993. *Two Careers/One Family*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Hallett, Mary Beth and Lucia Albert Gilbert. 1997. "Variables Differentiating University Women Considering Role-Sharing and Conventional Dual-Career Marriages." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 50:308-322.
- Hardill, I., A.E. Green, A.C. Dudleston, and D.W. Owen. 1997. "Who Decides What? Decision Making in Dual-Career Households." *Work, Employment, and Society* 11:313-326.
- Hendershott, Anne B. 1995. *Moving for Work: The Sociology of Relocating in the 1990s*. Landham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.
- Hiller, Harry H. and Kendall S. McCaig. 2007. "Reassessing the role of partnered women in migration decision-making and migration outcomes." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 24:457-472.
- Jacobsen, Joyce P. and Laurence M. Levin. 2000. "The effects of internal migration on the relative economics status of women and men." *Journal of Socio-Economics* 29:291-304.
- Konrad, Alison M. 2003. "Family Demands and Job Attribute Preferences: A 4-Year Longitudinal Study of Women and Men." *Sex Roles* 49:35-46.
- Lewis, Suzan and Linda Haas. 2005. "Work-Life Integration and Social Policy: A Social Justice Theory and Gender Equity Approach to Work and Family." Pp. 349-374 in *Work and Life Integration: Organizational, Cultural, and Individual Perspectives*, edited by E. E. a. S. J. L. Kossek. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lichter, Daniel T. 1982. "The Migration of Dual-Worker Families: Does the Wife's Job Matter?" *Social Science Quarterly* 63:48-57.

- Lichter, Daniel T. 1983. "Socioeconomic Returns to Migration among Married Women." *Social Forces* 62:487-503.
- Markham, William T. and Joseph H. Pleck. 1986. "Sex and Willingness to Move for Occupational Advancement: Some National Sample Results." *The Sociological Quarterly* 27:121-143.
- Murrell, Audrey J., Irene Hanson Frieze, and Jacquelyn L. Frost. 1991. "Aspiring To Carrers In Male- and Female-Dominated Professions." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 15:103-126.
- Novack, Lesley Lazin and David R. Novack. 1996. "Being Female in the Eighties and Nineties: Conflicts Between New Opportunities and Traditional Expectations Among White, Middle Class, Heterosexual College Women." *Sex Roles* 35:57-77.
- O'Connell, Lenahan, Michael Betz and Suzanne Kurth. 1989. "Plans for Balancing Work and Family Life: Do Women Pursuing Nontraditional and Traditional Occupations Differ?" *Sex Roles* 20:35-45.
- Orrange, Robert M. 2002. "Aspiring Law and Business Professionals' Orientations to Work and Family Life." *Journal of Family Issues* 23:287-317.
- Parker, Lauren and Tammy D. Allen. 2001. "Work/Family Benefits: Variables Related to Employees' Fairness Perceptions." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 58:453-468.
- Peake, Amy and Karen L. Harris. 2002. "Young Adults' Attitudes toward Multiple Role Planning: The Influence of Gender, Career Traditionality, and Marriage Plans." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 60:405-421.
- Pixley, Joy E. and Phyllis Moen. 2003. "Prioritizing Careers." Pp. 183-200 in *It's About Time: Couples and Careers*, edited by P. Moen. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Potuchek, Jean L. 1997. *Who Supports the Family? Gender and Breadwinning in Dual-Earner Marriages*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Preston, Alison. 2006. "An Empirical Analysis of the Career Expectations of Women in Science and Technology Courses." *Labour & Industry* 16:21-38.
- Raley, Sara B., Marybeth J. Mattingly, and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 2006. "How Dual Are Dual-Income Couples? Documenting Change From 1970-2001." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 68:11-28.
- Savage, Claire T. and Nadya A. Fouad. 1994. "Traditionality of College Major and Attitudes Towards Work-Family Balance: Vocational Correlates." *Journal of Career Assessment* 2:163-178.

- Spade, Joan Z. and Carole A. Reese. 1991. "We've Come a Long Way, Maybe: College Students' Plans for Work and Family." *Sex Roles* 24:309-321.
- Smith, Catherine R. 1997. "Career transitions of dual-career couples: an empirical study." *Career Development International* 2:229.
- Sultana, S. 2005. "Effects of married-couple dual-earner households on metropolitan commuting: Evidence from the Atlanta metropolitan area." *Urban Geography* 26:328-352.
- Swain, Li Li and Steven Garasky. 2007. "Migration Decisions of Dual-earner Families: An Application of Multilevel Modeling." *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 28:151-170.
- Thorn, Brian L. and Lucia A. Gilbert. 1998. "Antecedents of Work and Family Role Expectations of College Men." *Journal of Family Psychology* 12:259-267.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). "Postsecondary Institutions in the United States: Fall 2003 and Degrees and Other Awards Conferred: 2002-03 (NCES 2005-154)." Retrieved April 1, 2007 from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=72>



## CURRICULUM VITAE

**Sarah Elizabeth Patterson**

### EDUCATION

- **Master of Arts in Sociology at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis**
  - August, 2007 through May, 2009
  - Preparing Future Faculty Program Participant
- Bachelor of Arts in Sociology, and a Bachelor of Arts in Psychology at Indiana University
  - August, 2001 through May, 2005
  - Summa Cum Laude

### RESEARCH EMPLOYMENT

- 8/08-present **Project Manager-Data, Indiana Youth Institute**
- Manage a statewide database of child-well being indicators
  - Produce quarterly research briefs and an annual data book
- 5/08-8/08 **Data Analyst, Indiana Center for Intercultural Communication**
- Statistical analysis project using Indexes of Discrimination
- 2/06-8/07 **Research Specialist, Health Services Research and Development Service, Richard Roudebush Indianapolis Veterans Medical Center**
- Served as a research assistant for multiple studies
- 6/06-8/06 **Research Assistant, Kinsey Institute, Indiana University**
- Chart audits for eligibility
- 6/04-8/04 **Psychology Laboratory Research Assistant, Indiana University**
- Responsible for running experiments, contacting participants, entering, analyzing, and tracking data

### TEACHING EMPLOYMENT

- 10/07-8/08 **GED Instructor, Craine House**
- Help female criminal offenders obtain their GEDs; class twice per week
  - Aid women in employment skills, such as choosing a job and applying
- 8/07-8/08 **Teaching Assistant, Indiana University-Indianapolis Soc. Dept.**
- Hold weekly office hours and review sessions; help grade tests
  - Responsible for tracking attendance (3 classes, ~200 students total)
- 8/01-5/05 **Tutor, Indiana Reading and Math Team, Monroe County Public Library**
- One-on-one reading tutor for students K-6; prepare and execute productive sessions

- 8/04-12/04 **Teaching Assistant**, *Indiana University-Bloomington Soc. Dept.*
  - Hold review sessions; help grade tests
- 6/03-8/03 **Arts and Crafts Leader, Camp Counselor**, *Camp Allyn*
  - Held daily activities, adapted according to each person's disability
- 8/02-12/02 **Community Class Teacher**, *Collins Living Learning Center*
  - Served as a mentor for each student to ease them into the college life

RESEARCH WORK (Employment and Non-Employment)

- 8/08-present **Children's Well-Being Indicators**, *Sarah Patterson, Indiana Youth Institute/Kids Count/Annie E. Casey Foundation*
  - Track and analyze indicators of children's well-being in the state of Indiana; part of national Kids Count Network Projects
- 5/07-5/09 **Sociology of Work, Family, and Migration**, *Sarah Patterson, IUPUI*
  - Thesis project focuses on how people in professional programs think about future work-based migration decisions in terms of balancing work/family
  - Responsible for literature review, construction of the survey, IRB paperwork, collecting data, and analysis; results will used in an article for publishing
- 2/06-8/07 **Health Services Research**, *Brad Doebbeling, MD, Indianapolis VAMC*
  - Focus on health related issues
  - Responsible for organizing and managing small studies as well as completing IRB paperwork and editing reports
- 1/05-5/05 **Sociology of Education**, *Professor Pamela Barnhouse Walters, IU*
  - Focus on Title IX, vouchers, funding equalization, the politics of equity talk
  - Responsible for library and internet research; compiling and organizing data
- 8/04-5/05 **Sociology of Family**, *Professor Brian Powell, IU*
  - Focus on previous research, public polls on the redefinition of family
  - Responsible for library and internet research; cleaning data
- 8/03-8/04 **Developmental Psychopathology**, *Professor John E. Bates, IU*
  - Focus on longitudinal study of adolescent behaviors and familial influences
  - Responsible for contacting participants, administering in-person or telephone surveys, running experiments, experiment revisions, coding, data entry

## HONORS, AWARDS, FELLOWSHIPS

2009 **Chancellor's Scholar Award**, IUPUI  
2007-2008 **Sociology Department Funding**, IUPUI  
2006-2007 **University Fellowship**, IUPUI  
2006 **Superior Performance Award**, VA Medical Center  
2001 **Phi Beta Kappa; National Society of Collegiate Scholars**, IU-B  
2001-2005 **Dean's List**, IU-B  
2004 **Outstanding Sociology Major Achievement Award**, IU-B  
2003 **Jim Beeson Award/Extraordinary Involvement**, Collins Living Learning Center, IU-B  
2002 **Psi Chi member**, Psychology Honor Society, IU-B  
2002 **Outstanding Freshman Award**, Collins Living Learning Center, IU-B

## UNIVERSITY INVOLVEMENT

6/07-5/08 **President of Sociology Graduate Student Organization**, IUPUI  
7/07-5/08 **IRB Board Member**, IUPUI Behavioral Research IRB  
9/07-5/08 **Graduate Representative**, Sociology Grad Committee, IUPUI  
8/01-5/03 **Community Newsletter Writer, Co-Director, and LLC Student Government Board Member**, Collins Living Learning Center, IU-B

## COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

8/06-8/07 **Community Life Team Member**, HSR&D VA Medical Center  
2/06-7/06 **Personal Hospice Helper**, Rae L. and her family  
5/04-8/04 **Animal Care Volunteer**, Bloomington Animal Shelter  
2/03-5/03 **After School Program Volunteer**, Bloomington Boys and Girls Club  
1/03-5/03 **Fundraiser Coordinator**, Locks of Love Fundraiser at Collins

## PROFESSIONAL PAPERS PRESENTED AT MEETINGS

2007 **Muterko, S.P.** (2007, August). *Higher Education Faculty/Administration Dual Career-Couples and their Career Based Migration Decisions*. Paper presented at Society for the Study of Social Problems Conference, New York, NY  
2007 **Flanagan M, Doebbeling BN, Muterko S.** (2007, February). *Evaluation of an Electronic Decision Support Tool to Improve Patient Handoffs*. Poster presented at VA HSR&D National meeting, Washington, DC

## PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP

2006-present American Sociological Association  
2006-present Society for the Study of Social Problems