Job and residential mobility in the Netherlands: the influence of human capital, household composition, and distance

Kristin Kronenberg[1]
Maastricht University, Maastricht, The Netherlands
Statistics Netherlands (CBS), Heerlen, The Netherlands

Abstract

The aim of this study is to identify and evaluate the determinants of employees' job and residential mobility. Register data provided by Statistics Netherlands allow for the construction of virtually complete samples of the employees working fulltime in selected Dutch sectors in 2003/2004. The datasets consist of information regarding the workers' individual characteristics, household composition, and employers, as well as the distances between their places of residence and workplaces. In the empirical analysis, a multinomial model of job and residential change is estimated, and the results are discussed in the framework of utility maximization.

[1] Kristin Kronenberg, Department of Organization and Strategy, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht, The Netherlands. Phone: +31-43-3884793, Fax: +31-43-3884893, e-mail: K.Kronenberg@maastrichtuniversity.nl

1 Introduction

Economic theory generally assumes mobility to be motivated by an expected gain in utility (e.g. Blaschke, 1982; Böheim and Taylor, 2007; Lansing and Morgan, 1967; Ritsilä and Ovaskainen, 2001; Schneider, 2007). Individuals are therefore expected to change employers in order to receive higher wages, or to benefit from superior career opportunities. Along the lines of human capital theory, search theory, and matching theory, it can thus be explained why e.g. older workers with longer firm tenure are more inclined to stay with their current employers, while younger and highly educated individuals have a higher propensity to change jobs. Within the framework of utility maximization, residential relocation can also be explained, as individuals may be induced to move in order to enjoy amenities such as more sunshine, a lower crime rate, or a generally more pleasant environment (e.g. Knapp et al., 2001; Nivalainen, 2004). In addition, job and residential mobility are also closely related, since relocation might require individuals to also switch jobs, or changing employers may bring about the need for migration (e.g. Bartel, 1979; Blaschke, 1982; Clark and Withers, 1999; Kan, 2003; Sjaastad, 1962). Furthermore, a long commuting distance between one's place of residence and workplace can also be assumed to affect job and residential mobility, since it might trigger an employee to either switch employers, or to move geographically (Clark et al., 2003; Zax, 1991; Zax and Kain, 1991).

Until today, most studies on job mobility presume that individuals merely take personal characteristics such as their age, firm tenure, or level of education

into consideration when deciding upon changing jobs or staying with their current employer. Nevertheless, as many employees belong to households consisting of more than one person, 'the presence of other members of the household should not be ignored' (Van Ommeren, 2000), especially since the composition and the dynamics of the household have been found to affect the decision of whether or not a residential relocation will take place (Feijten and Van Ham, 2007; Linneman and Graves, 1983). In line with this, it can be reasoned that a job change not involving migration is intrinsically different from interfirm mobility requiring the employee and possible further family members to move.

We employ a multinomial logit model in order to investigate the determinants of job and residential mobility. In the analysis, data provided by Statistics Netherlands (CBS) are utilized. The dataset consists of information regarding the individual characteristics, household composition, and employers of the employees who had been working fulltime in selected Dutch sectors in 2003, as well as the distances between their places of residence and workplaces in 2003.

The empirical results of the analysis with respect to job mobility generally confirm human capital, search and matching theory, showing that age, firm tenure, and firm size decrease an individual's propensity to change employers, while interfirm mobility is higher among employees with a higher level of education and a higher salary. Furthermore, female employees within a relationship are found to be less likely to switch jobs, while workers who faced

longer commuting distances between their place of residence and the location of their previous job have a higher propensity to change employers.

Regarding residential mobility, the findings show that especially changes regarding employees' household composition – gaining/losing a partner/child – bring about a change of residence. Age, firm tenure, and the number of children inhibit residential mobility, while a higher level of education, a higher salary, and a longer commuting distance facilitate migration. Interestingly, a long commuting distance rather encourages employees to change employers than to relocate. Furthermore, there is a tendency of single female employees to be more geographically mobile, while those within a relationship are less inclined to migrate.

The propensity to change both job and place of living within the same year decreases with age, firm tenure, and the number of children, while it increases with the level of education. Contradicting both search and matching theory, a high salary encourages joint job and residential mobility, suggesting that individuals already in superior positions decide to switch employers in order to further advance their careers. Furthermore, changes concerning employees' household composition, as well as long commuting distances have a positive impact on joint job and housing mobility.

The findings of the empirical analysis illustrate the need to differentiate between interfirm mobility not involving migration, and job changes requiring the residential relocation of the employee and possible additional family members. While job mobility not including geographical relocation is to a great extent

determined by a worker's personal characteristics (e.g. the accumulated human capital), joint interfirm and residential mobility is also influenced by the structure and the dynamics of the household the employee is part of. Accordingly, since migration affects all members of the household, a prospective job changer is presumed to take the welfare of these into consideration when assessing the benefits and shortcomings of a possible job change including residential relocation.

Job and residential mobility might, however, also substitute for each other, since utility is also affected by the commuting distance between one's place of residence and place of work (van Ommeren et al., 1997; Zax, 1991). Thus, by either changing employers, or moving geographically, employees will benefit from the reduced distance between their place of residence and their workplace. We therefore conclude that job and residential mobility need to be analyzed within a common framework which acknowledges the various interactions between interfirm mobility and migration.

The study is organized as follows: Firstly, we provide the theoretical background of the research which is carried out. More specifically, we introduce human capital, search, and matching theory as well as the concept of utility maximization in the context of job and residential mobility, give an overview regarding the existing literature on these issues, and illustrate the line of reasoning followed in this investigation. Next, we outline the characteristics of the data used in this study, and identify their sources. Subsequently, we introduce the model employed in the empirical analysis, and outline the variables used in

the study. In the next section, we present the results of the multinomial regressions which were performed in order to identify the determinants of job and residential mobility. Finally, we discuss our findings, and indicate the limitations of the study as well as further research opportunities. In the Appendix, all tables are provided.

2. Theoretical framework and hypotheses

2.1 Job mobility in the context of human capital theory

In recent years, human capital theory has been increasingly utilized in order to explain workers' motivations to change employers. According to the human capital approach, the knowledge and skills embodied in individuals represent a production factor which can be invested in, and which may contribute to production and growth (e.g. Bodenhöfer, 1967).

Typically, one distinguishes between two different forms of human capital, namely firm- or job-specific, and general human capital. Firm- or job-specific human capital represents a person's expertise which can only be used within the organization or with respect to the job in which it has been obtained. General human capital, on the other hand, is equal to a person's level of broad knowledge which can be transferred to and used with any employer (e.g. Becker, 1962; Borghans and Heijke, 2005; Henneberger and Sousa-Poza, 2002).

It can be expected that both the type and level of human capital acquired and held by an individual should have an effect on this person's propensity to change jobs. Regarding specific human capital, it is generally assumed that the

more an employee previously invested in this type of expertise, the less likely this employee will be to change employers. As a consequence, it follows that the longer a person has been employed with a specific firm, the more likely this person is to stay with the same firm in the future (e.g. Bellmann and Bender, 1997; Bergin, 2008; Henneberger and Sousa-Poza, 2002). Likewise, older employees are expected to have accumulated higher amounts of job-specific knowledge, and are therefore more inclined to stay with their current employer (Bergin, 2008; Mertens, 1997), especially since they have less time to recoup the costs associated with moving (Henneberger and Sousa-Poza, 2002; Mertens, 1997; Schneider, 2007).

Concerning general human capital, however, both theory and empirical findings are less straightforward. On the one hand, highly educated individuals are supposed to be more proficient with respect to the utilization of their knowledge in different environments, hence job mobility may increase due to a higher quantity of alternative opportunities (e.g. Bergin, 2008; Mertens, 1997; Weiss, 1984). On the other hand, it has been argued that better educated individuals have more to lose by changing jobs, as they previously invested more in human capital, therefore turnover among employees with higher levels of education should be lower (e.g. Bergin, 2008; Börsch-Supan, 1990).

Furthermore, the human capital approach predicts that the size of a company influences employee's tendency to change jobs, as bigger companies usually provide better career and training opportunities within the firm. Hence, within large organizations, employees can put their firm- and task-specific skills to

use and have the chance to advance their careers without having to change employers (Rebitzer, 1986).

2.2 Job mobility in the context of search theory

Search theory regards the process of searching as an investment in information (Stigler, 1962). In the context of job search, it is therefore assumed that employees continue looking for a new position as long as the discounted expected additional future gains from changing jobs exceed the additional costs of searching which have to be invested at this point in time. Hence, the higher an employee's present salary is, the less likely the employee is to find another job which is even better paid, hence job mobility will be lower for employees with higher wages (e.g. Bergin, 2008; Boockmann and Steffes, 2007; Burdett, 1978; Henneberger and Sousa-Poza, 2002). Furthermore, employees with higher levels of formal education may be more prone to change jobs, as they more efficiently collect and process relevant information, and therefore benefit from comparatively lower search costs (Bergin, 2008; Börsch-Supan, 1990; Greenwood, 1975; Mertens, 1997).

2.3 Job mobility in the context of matching theory

According to matching theory, the labor market is characterized by imperfect information, since the quality of an employee-employer-match is not known in advance, but employees determine it through experience (e.g. Bergin, 2008; Blien and Rudolph, 1998; Boockmann and Steffes, 2007; Jovanovic, 1979;

Schneider, 2007). Hence, in line with human capital theory, matching models assume the propensity to change jobs to decline with firm tenure (Bergin, 2008; Blien and Rudolph, 1998; Jovanovic, 1979; Schneider, 2007). Furthermore, lower wages – together with short firm tenure – indicate a bad employee-employer-match, while a good match is signified by longer tenure and higher wages, since employers may reward workers they wish to retain (Jovanovic, 1979). Hence, salary is expected to have a negative effect on job mobility. Moreover, Boockmann and Steffes (2007) propose a negative impact of firm size on job mobility, as larger organizations exhibit a lower degree of job-mismatch due to the fact that their personnel policies are often known to job applicants.

In line with these arguments, we hypothesize that interfirm mobility is higher for employees with higher levels of general human capital, and lower for employees with higher levels of firm-specific human capital.

2.4 The interplay of job and residential mobility

Human capital, search, and matching theory assume that individuals strive to maximize their utility. Consequently, an employees' decision to change jobs constitutes an investment which will only take place if the expected benefits derived from the new position (e.g. a friendlier working atmosphere, a higher salary, or better career opportunities) exceed the benefits derived from the present job.

This assumption, however, only holds if one assumes that individuals define the utility of a scenario without taking into consideration the implications of

their actions for the welfare of others, e.g. one's partner or children. However, as illustrated by Blaschke and Nagel (1984), rational decision-making in order to improve one's personal conditions is limited as soon as additional individuals are affected by the outcome of the decision. An employee with a family can therefore reasonably be assumed to care about the interests of other household members, as those might, for instance, object to the residential move which accompanies a job change, or even suffer from it. Hence, it can be reasoned that when analyzing the mobility of workers between firms within a framework of utility maximization, one is required to take the characteristics of the job change - e.g. whether it also requires the residential relocation of the worker (and possibly other family members) or not – into account.

Residential mobility which is unrelated to a job change has been found to be conditional upon individuals' personal characteristics as well as the composition and dynamics of the household they are part of. As demonstrated by Linneman and Graves (1983), age and firm tenure have a negative impact on the propensity to relocate; these findings suggest a mobility-inhibiting effect of age on mobility in general which does not necessarily have to be explained within the framework of human capital accumulation. Interestingly, Linneman and Graves (1983) find individuals with higher levels of education to be less likely to migrate, while Bartel (1979) detects a positive relationship between educational attainment and residential relocation.

With respect to household composition, Mincer (1978) argues that 'family ties deter migration'; this assumption was empirically verified by Linneman and

Graves (1983) and Molho (1987), who identified a lower propensity to migrate among employees who are married and have children. Moreover, changes regarding the structure of the household were also found to have a positive impact on residential mobility (Feijten and Van Ham, 2007; Linneman and Graves, 1983). Additionally, since utility also depends on the commuting distance between one's place of residence and place of work (van Ommeren et al., 1997; Zax, 1991), job and residential mobility may also serve as substitutes.

As these findings illustrate, while job mobility not requiring migration is primarily determined by employees' personal characteristics (e.g. the human capital previously accumulated), residential mobility is encouraged by individuals' personal attributes and, predominantly, by the composition of their families. Hence, we hypothesize that residential mobility is lower for employees with stronger family ties (e.g. married, with children), while it is higher for employees who experienced recent changes regarding the structure of the household they are part of. Furthermore, we assume that employees who face longer commuting distances will be more likely to change either their workplace, or their place of residence.

In line with this, it follows that a joint change of one's job and place of residence will be conditional not only upon employees' individual characteristics, but also upon the structure, dynamics and preferences of the household they are part of. While empirical studies have not been able to establish the relationship between education and job mobility in general, a high level of education has unequivocally been found to have a positive impact on an employee's probability

to jointly change employer and place of residence (e.g. Bartel, 1979; Blaschke, 1982; Börsch-Supan, 1990; Eliasson et al., 2003; Linneman and Graves, 1983). These findings might either suggest that individuals with higher levels of education are more willing to relocate when accepting a new position, or indicate that those with a degree in higher education are more successful in finding a new position when undertaking a long-distance move. With respect to the effect of salary, Bartel (1979), Henneberger and Sousa-Poza (2002) and Linneman and Graves (1983) find individuals with higher wages to have a lower joint probability of quitting jobs and migrating; these findings are in line with both search and matching theory.

Being married and having children is, as predicted by Mincer (1978), generally found to impede joint job and residential mobility (e.g. Cohen 1999; Eliasson et al., 2003; Kan, 2003; Kirschenbaum and Weisberg, 1991; Kirschenbaum and Weisberg, 2001; Linneman and Graves, 1983), while changes regarding the structure of the household increase the probability to change both employer and place of residence (Linneman and Graves, 1983).

We therefore hypothesize as follows: Joint interfirm and residential mobility is lower for employees with higher levels of firm-specific human capital and stronger family ties, while it is higher for employees with higher levels of general human capital, and for those who experienced recent changes regarding the structure of the household they are part of. Furthermore, since job changes and migration serve as substitutes, we assume that joint interfirm and residential mobility is not affected by the length of the commuting distance.

As previously illustrated, job mobility may be explained by human capital, search, and matching models, allowing for its analysis within the framework of utility maximization. Changing employers, however, may also require migration, which is assumed to affect not only the employee, but also other members of the household who would be required to relocate as well. Furthermore, as individuals also derive utility from the length of their commuting distance, interfirm mobility and residential migration are interrelated insofar as they can be regarded as substitutes. Hence, we aim to investigate the determinants of job and residential mobility within a common framework which acknowledges the various interactions between job changes and migration, and differentiates between the various types of job and housing mobility.

3 Data

3.1 Data sources

The data employed in this study were provided by Statistics Netherlands (CBS). Information on employees and households originates from the Social Statistical Database (SSB) which is compiled on the basis of register and survey data from various sources. Personal information (e.g. date of birth, gender, address) within the SSB stems from the municipal registration system (GBA) which also holds information regarding personal relations and household composition. Information regarding employees' jobs (e.g. employer, duration of employment, salary) is provided by the Fibase, a database delivered by the Dutch Tax Administration. Furthermore, data concerning individuals' level of education originate from the

Dutch central student register (CRIHO) which is based on information originating from the Informatie Beheer Groep, a Dutch governmental institution.

Information regarding firms – on the level of the business unit (BE), defined on the basis of its economic activity – stems from the population of economically active business units. This dataset is based on the business register (ABR), the dataset BASELINE which provides information regarding value-added tax, corporate tax, and labor tax, the SSB, the Survey on Employment and Wages (EWL), and the Survey Production Statistics (SBS and STS).

In addition, since the location of both workplace and place of residence is known for each employee on the level of the municipality, the respective distances between the cores of the municipalities could be determined as well.

3.2 Data description

In order to analyze job and residential mobility between the years 2003 and 2004, we constructed discrete samples of employees working in the following industrial sectors in 2003: NACE[2]/ISIC[3] 15 (Manufacture of food and beverages), NACE/ISIC 22 (Publishing, printing and reproduction of recorded media), NACE/ISIC 24 (Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products), NACE/ISIC 28 (Manufacture of fabricated metal products, except machinery and equipment), NACE/ISIC 29 (Manufacture of machinery and equipment n.e.c.), NACE/ISIC 521 (Retail sale in non-specialized stores), NACE/ISIC 55 (Hotels and restaurants),

[2] Nomenclature statistique des activités économiques dans la Communauté européenne
[3] International Standard Industrial Classification of all Economic Activities

NACE/ISIC 66 (Insurance and pension funding, except compulsory social security), NACE/ISIC 70 (Real estate activities), and NACE/ISIC 8511 (Hospital activities). These industries were selected in order to allow for generalizability of the results, since they represent six important industrial sectors (Manufacturing, Wholesale and retail trade, Hotels and restaurants, Financial intermediation, Real estate, renting and business activities, and Health and social work), are roughly equal in size, and have a share of females ranging from 7 percent (NACE/ISIC 28) to 67 percent (NACE/ISIC 8511), allowing us to examine and compare the determinants of mobility in both male- and female-dominated sectors.

The samples consist of information regarding personal characteristics, household composition and employment in the years 2003 and 2004. Information regarding employees' duration of employment is available with exact start and end dates, while individuals' characteristics, personal relations, and household composition are determined once a year (last Friday in September). Hence, we limited the samples to employees holding jobs in the Netherlands in both September 2003 and September 2004, since only at those points in time, reliable information regarding all variables of interest is available.

Furthermore, we selected only fulltime workers (at least 0.8 FTE), as it is difficult to investigate job mobility if employees hold more than one job at the same time. In order to compare 'stayers' to 'movers', employees who quit their job between the reference dates in 2003 and 2004 without starting a new job were removed from the samples, as well as all records for which information on any of the relevant variables (e.g. age, number of children, address) was missing.

Moreover, it became apparent that the information on salary for the year 2003 might be unreliable for those employees who changed jobs within that year, since bonus payments (e.g. compensation of unused hours of leave, 'golden handshake') might falsefully suggest that job changers received higher salaries in their previous positions. Hence, we selected only employees who held their job at the reference date in 2003 already in 2002, and the information on salary for the year 2002 was used. Since the data on salary were found to be unreliable for jobs which had lasted only a few days in 2002, only employees who had held their job for at least 16 days in 2002 were selected. Furthermore, the samples were restricted to employees age 15 and older, as it is impossible to hold a fulltime job in the Netherlands at a younger age, thus we assumed these records to be incorrect. Moreover, only employees working in firms with an average number of at least 2 employees in 2003 were selected in order to only include individuals which had been employed with a firm without possibly being its owner at the same time. This selection was made since we assumed firm owners to be highly unlikely to change employers. With all these restrictions imposed, the samples range from 36,710 (NACE/ISIC 70) to 116,850 (NACE/ISIC 8511) records. These samples are referred to as 'full samples'[4] Additionally, information regarding higher education (university/college degree) is only reliable for

[4] Originally, the datasets consisted of 67,408 to 488,637 records (employees in the respective sector in 2003). Selecting only fulltime employees (at least 0.8 FTE) reduced the number of cases to 53,258 to 176,112. Next, as only employees working at the reference date in 2003 were selected, the datasets were further limited to 47,569 to 159,386 records. For 46,356 to 153,588 employees, information regarding relevant personal and household characteristics in 2003 and 2004 was available. Employees not having a job at the reference date in 2004 were removed from the samples, since it is the aim of this study to compare 'stayers' to 'movers'; the datasets were thus reduced to 43,384 to 136,827 records. Out of these employees, 36,710 to 116,850 already held their job in 2002; these records constitute the 'full samples' utilized in this study.

employees who were older than 21 and younger than 41 in 2003. Hence, we also constructed subsamples of 16,667 (NACE/ISIC 70) to 54,359 (NACE/ISIC 8511) employees age 22-40 in order to allow for the inclusion of educational level as an explanatory variable. These subsamples are referred to as 'restricted samples'.

4 Model and variables

We developed and estimated multinomial models in order to analyze the determinants of job and residential mobility. A multinomial logit is a model with unordered outcomes which incorporates only individual-specific characteristics (e.g. age, gender), not choice-specific attributes. In the framework of utility maximization, one assumes that given a choice between M alternatives (indexed, $j = 1, \ldots, M$), the utility that the ith person ($i = 1, \ldots, N$) derives from the jth alternative can be represented as U_{ij} (Borooah, 2002). Logically, it is assumed that an individual opts for the alternative which yields the highest level of utility (Cooper and Nakanishi, 1988). Hence, if Y_i is a random variable whose value ($j = 1, \ldots, M$) indicates the choice made by person i (Borooah, 2002), the probability that this person chooses alternative m is

$$\mathbf{Pr}\ (Y_i = m) = \mathbf{Pr}\ (U_{im} > U_{ij}) \text{ for all } j = 1, \ldots, M, j \neq m$$

The dependent variable is *MOBILITY*, Table 1 displays the four alternatives as specified in the multinomial logit model, and their respective frequencies for the full samples; Table 2 provides the same information for the restricted samples. The first category is 'stay/stay', consisting of individuals who changed neither

their job, nor their place of residence between September 2003 and 2004. The next category, ‘change job/keep residence’, comprises job changers who did not migrate between the reference dates in 2003 and 2004. Category 3 - ‘keep job/change residence’ - encompasses those who moved houses without changing employers, while the last category - ‘change job and residence’ - consists of those who changed employers and relocated within the period of reference.

Table 3 presents the explanatory variables used in the analysis. The variable PARTNER_GAIN refers to registering a partnership (including marriage) between the reference dates in 2003 and 2004, while PARTNER_LOSE indicates the ‘loss’ of the partner (e.g. separation, passing away) during this time. Likewise, CHILDREN_GAIN signifies the birth of one or more children, while CHILDREN_LOSE generally denotes the moveout of older children who leave their parents’ homes.

Tables 4-23 present the descriptive statistics for the explanatory variables used in the study. (Note: for all dummy variables, the value ‘1’ signifies ‘yes’ or ‘change’, while the value ‘0’ denotes ‘no’ or ‘no change’.)

5 Results

5.1 Job mobility

Tables 24-29 present the results of the multinomial logit regressions using the full and the restricted samples. As predicted by human capital theory, Tables 24 (full samples) and 25 (restricted samples) show that across all sectors, job mobility

decreases with age and firm tenure, suggesting that the previous accumulation of firm-specific human capital indeed inhibits interfirm mobility. Moreover, also in line with human capital theory, interfirm mobility generally decreases with firm size, indicating that larger firms offer better career opportunities within the firm.

As Table 25 illustrates, employees with a degree in higher education are generally more likely to change jobs. The effect of salary on job mobility is, however, less prominent than in Table 24. This finding might either indicate that job changes among younger employees are not as strongly influenced by the salary earned in the recent position as those among employees in general, or, more likely, it illustrates that the effect of salary as a proxy for skills or education is now to a large extent captured by the variable indicating a degree in higher education.

Across all industries, job mobility was found to be more likely among employees who faced longer commuting distances between their place of residence and their previous place of work[5], whereas the propensity to change employers is in general less likely for female employees, especially if they are within a relationship.

5.2 Residential mobility

With respect to residential mobility, the results (Tables 26 and 27) illustrate that across all industries, changes regarding employees' household structure - gaining/losing a partner/child – strongly foster relocation. Age and firm tenure

[5] We also investigated the impact of distance² in order to check for non-linear effects of commuting distance on mobility, but generally did not find any significant results.

inhibit residential mobility, proposing a general mobility-inhibiting effect of age. As expected, the propensity to relocate also decreases with the number of children, since the costs of moving increase with the number of household members involved. Furthermore, employees with higher salaries are generally more likely to move, however, for the restricted samples (Table 27), the effect of salary is again to a great extent captured by the variable indicating a university/college degree: Employees with a higher level of education are generally more likely to move, while the effect of salary on residential mobility is less prominent than in the full samples (Table 26).

Interestingly, female employees in general are more likely to change their place of residence, while those within a relationship have a reduced propensity to relocate. Moreover, longer commuting distances also tend to have a positive effect on migration, however, the results suggest that employees facing long journeys to and back from work are more strongly encouraged to change employers than to relocate.

Two differences between the full and the restricted samples merit attention: While having a partner significantly fosters migration among employees age 22-40 (Table 27), it does not have a sizeable effect for the full samples (Table 26). Moreover, although for the full samples, housing mobility is conditional upon whether the partner also holds a fulltime job, this effect can not be observed for the restricted samples.

5.3 Joint job and residential mobility

As expected, the inclination to change both job and place of residence (Tables 28 and 29) decreases across all industries with age, firm tenure, the number of children, and – to a lesser extent – firm size, illustrating the inhibiting effects of both individual and household characteristics on mobility. Furthermore, changes concerning employees' household structure (gaining or losing a partner or children) have a positive impact on joint job and housing mobility.

For the full samples (Table 28), salary was found to profoundly increase joint job and residential mobility. However, as Table 29 illustrates, having a university or college degree increases the probability of a joint job and residence change. Thus, as the variable for higher education once more appears to capture the positive effect of salary, the latter effect consequently becomes less prominent for the restricted samples.

Again, there is a difference between single women and those having a partner: while female employees in general are more likely to jointly change their job and place of residence, those within a relationship have a reduced propensity to simultaneously change employers and relocate. Furthermore, long commuting distances also encourage joint job and residential mobility.

6 Discussion

6.1 The determinants of job mobility

The aim of this study has been the analysis of the determinants of employees' job and residential mobility. Supporting human capital theory, and confirming our hypotheses, indicators of specific human capital (e.g. age, firm tenure) were found to have the expected negative effects on interfirm mobility, while the positive effect of general human capital (e.g. education) on job mobility could also be verified.

Salary was generally found to have a positive effect on the propensity to change jobs, suggesting that individuals already in high-ranking positions decide upon changing employers in order to further advance their careers. This finding supports human capital theory, according to which a person's salary reflects his or her work-related skills and expertise, while it contradicts both search and matching theory. As soon as, however, education is entered as an explanatory variable (see restricted samples) as well, the influence of salary on job mobility decreases. This possibly demonstrates that the effect of salary - as a proxy for general knowledge - is now captured by the variable indicating a university/college degree, although it might also indicate that job changes among employees age 22-40 are not stimulated by the salary earned in the current position.

Furthermore, also in line with our proposition, the distance between an employee's place of residence and workplace was found to be a significant

determinant of a consequent job change, suggesting that employees derive a high utility from a reduced commuting time and the lower costs associated with it.

6.2 The determinants of residential mobility

As presumed, changes regarding employees' household composition were found to strongly foster residential mobility. However, while the propensity to migrate evidently decreases with the number of children in the household, the findings with respect to having a registered partner are mixed: while there is a positive influence on residential mobility for the restricted sample, hardly any effect can be found for the full sample. These findings might suggest that when analyzing the determinants of residential mobility, one needs to differentiate between short-distance moves (e.g. within a city after finding a more suitable house or apartment) and long-distance moves, which might e.g. require the partner to give up his or her job.

In line with Bartel (1979) as well as Linneman and Graves (1983), employees' individual characteristics were also found to have an effect on their propensity to migrate, as older workers with longer firm tenure are less likely to move. As suggested by Linneman and Graves (1983), this might 'reflect the shorter time period over which to realize any adjustment benefits (…) associated with residence site choice'.

Furthermore, employees with a partner who also works fulltime are in general more likely to change houses, suggesting that a certain level of financial security on the level of the household facilitates residential relocation. Likewise,

migration is also more likely for employees with higher salaries, indicating the necessity of having certain financial means in order to realize a residential move.

Also as hypothesized, longer commuting distances tend to have a positive effect on migration. In line with Siegel (1975), commuting distance was found to have a greater impact on job than residential mobility, indicating that employees who face long journeys to and from work are more likely to change employers than to relocate.

6.3 The determinants of joint job and residential mobility

In line with our hypotheses, joint job and residential mobility was generally found to be influenced by both employees' personal characteristics such as the accumulated general and specific human capital, and the structure and dynamics of the household they are part of. Since gaining/losing a partner/child has a positive impact on joint job and housing mobility, it may be assumed that employees not only modify their residential situation according to the altered household composition, but are also likely to adjust their careers. Having a partner, however, does not have the expected negative effect on the propensity to jointly change jobs and migrate, once more suggesting that the analysis might benefit from differentiation between short- and long-distance moves. Salary was also found to increase joint job and residential mobility, suggesting that individuals who aim to advance their careers are also willing to simultaneously relocate.

Furthermore, and not in line with our expectations, we found that larger distances between one's place of residence and place of work not only encourage job changes or migration, but also joint job and residential mobility. This is surprising, as - since both quits and moves are costly - commuting distances should most likely be adjusted by either a workplace, or a residence relocation (e.g. Zax, 1991). Thus, it may ultimately be questioned to what extent job and residential mobility indeed serve as substitutes.

6.4 Limitations

This study is, however, not without limitations. First of all, an analysis of the determinants of job mobility would benefit from a differentiation between voluntary and involuntary job changes. Unfortunately, the data available do not provide information regarding the reasons underlying the interfirm mobility of employees[6].

Next, since changes between the reference dates in two consecutive years are used in the analysis, any information referring to the timespan in between those two points in time (e.g. additional jobs) gets lost. Moreover, since the samples had to be restricted to fulltime employees for technical reasons, job changes to parttime jobs or the reduction of an existing job from fulltime to

[6] A possible solution for this problem could be to only regard those employees as voluntary job changers whose period of unemployment between jobs did not exceed a specific timespan (Schneider, 2007). A preliminary analysis for the chemical sector (NACE/ISIC 24) revealed that about 20% of the 'movers' had been unemployed more than 90 days between jobs, thus, in line with this reasoning, 1/5 of the moves could be considered involuntary. However, as the majority of the moves would still be regarded as voluntary, none of the cases were excluded at this point in time. The issue of how to determine voluntary/involuntary job mobility will be subject to further investigations.

parttime were recorded as ‘moveouts’, and the records were deleted from the samples.

Given that the information on salary in 2002 had to be used, only employees with jobs already existing in 2002 could be selected. As, however, previous mobility induces further mobility (e.g. Linneman and Graves, 1983; Nivalainen, 2004), this selection may be assumed to be not completely unbiased, since predominantly the records of frequent job changers were thus removed from the samples. Furthermore, the measures indicating the distances between employees’ place of residence and place of work constitute rather problematic proxies for two reasons. Firstly, since actual distances (e.g. address to address) are not available, only the distances between the cores of the Dutch municipalities could be measured. Thus, distances which are actually quite short (e.g. moving just across the border of two municipalities) appear to be much larger, while distances covered within a municipality are recorded as zero. Secondly, a firm (BE) can have more than one location; in these cases, the location closest to the employee’s place of residence was selected as the most probable workplace.

Next, simultaneity is also an issue, as the variables indicating household dynamics refer to changes which took place sometime within one year (from reference date to reference date), while they are used in order to predict mobility which also takes place at some point during that year.

7 Conclusion and future outlook

The results of the empirical analysis illustrate the necessity to differentiate between interfirm job mobility not involving migration, and job changes requiring the residential relocation of the employee and possible further members of the household. While the former is to a great extent determined by a worker's personal characteristics, the latter is also influenced by the structure and the dynamics of the household the employee is part of. Since migration affects all family members, an employee who considers changing employers is supposed to take the welfare of these into account when assessing the benefits and shortcomings of a possible job change including residential relocation. Furthermore, utility also depends on the commuting distance between the employee's place of residence and place of work, since job and residential mobility may substitute for each other. Hence, it can be concluded that job and residential mobility need to be analyzed within a common framework which acknowledges the interactions between interfirm mobility and migration, and differentiates between the various types of job and housing mobility.

In the future, we are going to investigate local, regional and interregional job changes by developing a refined model of interfirm mobility. Furthermore, we plan to analyze job and residential mobility in double income households, especially with respect to the choice of whether to commute or to migrate after changing jobs. In addition, we are going to study specific Dutch regions (e.g. the Randstad, the A2 corridor) regarding the in- and outflow of workers. Lastly, not

only the determinants, but also the consequences of mobility (e.g. higher wages, increased employment stability) will be subject to further investigations.

References

Bartel A., 1979, The Migration Decision: What Role Does Job Mobility Play?, The American Economic Review, December 1979, 775-786.

Becker G.S., 1962, Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis, The Journal of Political Economy, 70 (5), 9-49.

Bellmann L. & S. Bender, 1997, Die Analyse der Stabilität von Beschäftigungsverhältnissen bei Berufsanfängern, MittAB, 3/97, 681-687.

Bergin A., 2008, Job Mobility in Ireland, Economics, Finance and Accounting Department Working Paper Series, Department of Economics, Finance and Accounting, National University of Ireland – Maynooth, 1-24.

Blaschke D., 1982, Berufliche Qualifikation and arbeitsbedingte regionale Mobilität, MittAB, 2/82, 111-119.

Blaschke D. & E. Nagel, 1984, Regionale Mobilität von Erwerbspersonen, MittAB, 2/84, 201-215.

Bodenhöfer H.-J, 1967, The mobility of labor and the theory of human capital, The Journal of Human Resources, 2 (4), 431-448.

Boockmann B. & S. Steffes, 2007, Seniority and Job Stability: A Quantile Regression Approach Using Matched Employer-Employee Data, ZEW Discussion Paper 07-014.

Borghans L. & H. Heijke, 2005, The Production and Use of Human Capital: Introduction, Education Economics, 13 (2), 133-142.

Borooah V.K., 2002, Logit and Probit. Ordered and Multinomial Models (Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications).

Böheim R. & M.P. Taylor, 2007, From the dark end of the street to the bright side of the road? The wage wage returns migration in Britain, Labour Economics, 14 (2007), 99-117.

Börsch-Supan A., 1989, Mobilitätshemmende und mobiliätsfördernde Qualifizierung, Schriften des Vereins für Socialpolitik, 178, 451-470.

Börsch-Supan A., 1990, Education and ist Double-Edged Impact on Mobility, Economics of Education Review, 9 (1), 39-53.

Burdett K., 1978, A Theory of Employee Job Search and Quit Rates, The American Economic Review, 68 (1), 212-220.

Clark W.A.V. & S.D. Withers, 1999, Changing jobs and changing houses: mobility outcomes of employment transitions, Journal of Regional Science, 39 (4), 653-673.

Clark W.A.V., Y. Huang & S. Withers, 2003, Does commuting distance matter? Commuting tolerance and residential change, Regional Science and Urban Economics, 33 (2003), 199-221.

Cohen A., 1999, Turnover among professionals: a longitudinal study of American lawyers, Human Resource Management, 38 (1), 61-75.

Cooper, L.G. & M. Nakanishi, 1988, Market-Share Analysis (Boston, Dordrecht, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers).

Eliasson K., U. Lindgren & O. Westerlund, 2003, Geographical Labour Mobility: Migration or Commuting?, Regional Studies, 37 (8), 827-837.

Feijten P. & M. Van Ham, 2007, Residential mobility and migration of the divorced and separated, Demographic Research, Vol 17, Article 21, 623-654.

Greenwood M.J., 1975, Research on internal migration in the United States: a survey, Journal of Economic Literature, 13 (2), 397-433.

Henneberger F. & A. Sousa-Poza, 2002, Beweggründe und Determinanten zwischenbetrieblicher Mobilität: Die Schweiz in einer internationalen Perspektive, MittAB, 2/2002, 205-231.

Hicks, J.R., 1932, The Theory of Wages (London: Macmillan).

Jovanovic B., 1979, Job Matching and the Theory of Turnover, Journal of Political Economy, 87 (5), 972-990.

Kan K., 2003, Residential mobility and job changes under uncertainty, Journal of Urban Economics, 54 (2003), 566-586.

Kirschenbaum, A. & J. Weisberg, 1991, Employee turnover intentions: implications from a national sample, The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 2 (3), 359-375.

Kirschenbaum, A. & J. Weisberg, 2001, Employee's turnover intentions and job destination choices, Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23 (2002), 109-125.

Knapp, T., N.E. White & D.E. Clark (2001), A Nested Logit Approach To Household Mobility, Journal of Regional Science, 41 (1), 1-22.

Lansing J.B. & J.N. Morgan, 1967, The Effect of Geographical Mobility on Income, The Journal of Human Resources, 2 (4), 449-460.

Linneman P. & P.E. Graves, 1983, Migration and Job Change: A Multinomial Logit Approach, Journal of Urban Economics, 14 (1983), 263-279.

Mertens A. , 1997, Industrielle und berufliche Mobilität, MittAB, 3/97, 663-670.

Mincer J., 1978, Family migration decisions, Journal of Political Economy, 86, 749-773.

Nivalainen S., 2004, Determinants of family migration: short moves vs. long moves, Journal of Population Economics, 17 (2004), 157-175.

Rebitzer J.B., 1986, Establishment Size and Job Tenure, Industrial Relations, 25 (3), 292-302.

Ritsilä J. & M. Ovaskainen, 2001, Migration and regional centralization of human capital, Applied Economics, 33 (2001), 317-325.

Schneider L., 2007, Zu alt für einen Wechsel? Zum Zusammenhang von Alter, Lohndifferentialen und betrieblicher Mobilität, IWH-Diskussionspapiere, 1/2007, 2-25.

Siegel J., 1975, Intrametropolitan migration: a simultaneous model of employment and residential relocation of white and black households, Journal of Urban Economics, 2 (1975), 29-47.

Sjaastad L., 1962, The Costs and Returns of Human Migration, The Journal of Political Economy, 70 (5), part 2, 80-93.

Stigler G.J., 1962, Information in the Labor Market, Journal of Political Economy, 70, 94-105.

Van Ommeren J., P. Rietveld & P. Nijkamp, 1997, Commuting: In Search of Jobs and Residences, Journal of Urban Economics, 42 (1997), 402-421.

Van Ommeren J., 2000, Job and residential search behaviour of two-earner households, Papers in Regional Science, 79 (2000), 375-391.

Weiss A., 1984, Determinants of Quit Behavior, Journal of Labor Economics, 2 (3), 371-387.

Zax J.S., 1991, The Substitution between Moves and Quits, The Economic Journal, 101 (November 1991), 1510-1521.

Zax J.S. & J.F. Kain, 1991, Commutes, Quits, and Moves, Journal of Urban Economics, 29 (1991), 153-165.

Appendix

Table 1: MOBILITY (full samples)

NACE/ISIC	stay/stay	change/stay	stay/change	change/change	total
15	72668	3335	5943	470	82416
22	42819	2456	3903	371	49549
24	47792	1594	3642	212	53240
28	60227	3499	4407	378	68511
29	58136	2922	4380	328	65766
521	33084	1989	4006	400	39479
55	41437	4643	5732	1126	52938
66	34524	1342	3552	217	39635
70	31611	1689	3119	291	36710
8511	101223	3399	11092	1136	116850

Table 2: MOBILITY (restricted samples)

NACE/ISIC	stay/stay	change/stay	stay/change	change/change	total
15	32663	2096	4198	382	39339
22	19107	1668	2855	310	23940
24	20466	966	2551	176	24159
28	28153	2081	3205	294	33733
29	27817	1812	3299	262	33190
521	19229	1346	3145	328	24048
55	23767	3337	4452	927	32483
66	17387	972	2743	192	21294
70	13019	1173	2224	251	16667
8511	42958	2365	8080	956	54359

Table 3: Definitions of variables used in the analysis

Variable	Definition
AGE	Age (in years) of employee in 2003
FIRM_TENURE	Firm tenure (in years) in 2003
HIGH_EDUCATION	1 = university/college degree and 0 = otherwise [only used in restricted sample]
FEMALE	1 = female and 0 = male
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	Natural logarithm of daily salary (in €) in 2002
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	Natural logarithm of firm size (average number of employees) in 2003
PARTNER	1 = registered partnership and 0 = otherwise (in 2003)
PARTNER_GAIN	1 = partner gained between 2003 and 2004 and 0 = otherwise
PARTNER_LOSE	1 = partner lost between 2003 and 2004 and 0 = otherwise
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	Number of children in the household in 2003
CHILDREN_GAIN	1 = household gained at least 1 child between 2003 and 2004 and 0 = otherwise
CHILDREN_LOSE	1 = household lost at least 1 child between 2003 and 2004 and 0 = otherwise
PARTNER_JOB	1 = partner held fulltime job (at least 0.8 FTE) in 2003 and 0 = otherwise
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	Distance between place of residence and place of work (in 2003, in 10 km)
FEMALE*PARTNER	1 = female with partner and 0 = otherwise

Table 4: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 15, full sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	16	87	40.69	10.122
FIRM_TENURE	1	54	10.09	8.778
FEMALE	0	1	0.18	0.385
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	2.28	7.93	4.46	0.392
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	8.15	5.47	1.647
PARTNER	0	1	0.76	0.430
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.03	0.167
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.02	0.138
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	13	1.16	1.201
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.06	0.231
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.06	0.244
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.22	0.411
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	25.66	1.27	2.106

Number of observations: 82,416

Table 5: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 15, restricted sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	22	40	32.80	5.037
FIRM_TENURE	1	25	6.26	4.843
HIGH_EDUCATION	0	1	0.12	0.328
FEMALE	0	1	0.23	0.418
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	3.12	6.91	4.40	0.326
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	8.15	5.26	1.625
PARTNER	0	1	0.71	0.455
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.04	0.206
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.02	0.155
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	11	1.06	1.146
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.09	0.291
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.04	0.202
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.27	0.445
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	25.66	1.33	2.178

Number of observations: 39,339

Table 6: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 22, full sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	15	84	41.11	10.122
FIRM_TENURE	1	46	9.40	8.369
FEMALE	0	1	0.24	0.426
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	2.14	7.09	4.50	0.386
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	7.91	4.75	1.870
PARTNER	0	1	0.73	0.442
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.03	0.179
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.02	0.145
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	12	0.91	1.074
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.05	0.223
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.05	0.223
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.26	0.441
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	22.00	1.28	1.933

Number of observations: 49,549

Table 7: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 22, restricted sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	22	40	32.71	4.848
FIRM_TENURE	1	24	5.68	4.466
HIGH_EDUCATION	0	1	0.19	0.395
FEMALE	0	1	0.30	0.456
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	3.03	6.52	4.40	0.326
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	7.91	4.60	1.844
PARTNER	0	1	0.67	0.471
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.05	0.222
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.03	0.166
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	12	0.79	1.018
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.09	0.280
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.03	0.179
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.31	0.464
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	21.26	1.29	1.911

Number of observations: 23,940

Table 8: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 24, full sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	15	86	41.94	9.450
FIRM_TENURE	1	49	11.81	9.824
FEMALE	0	1	0.15	0.356
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	2.28	7.37	4.69	0.386
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0	8.15	6.03	1.329
PARTNER	0.69	1	0.80	0.399
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.02	0.156
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.02	0.135
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	14	1.05	1.089
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.05	0.224
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.06	0.230
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.22	0.412
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	26.55	1.30	1.949

Number of observations: 53,240

Table 9: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 24, restricted sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	22	40	33.55	4.759
FIRM_TENURE	1	24	6.47	5.225
HIGH_EDUCATION	0	1	0.22	0.417
FEMALE	0	1	0.21	0.408
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	3.03	6.62	4.57	0.328
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	8.15	5.96	1.390
PARTNER	0	1	0.74	0.439
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.04	0.199
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.02	0.152
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	8	0.96	1.055
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.09	0.289
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.03	0.177
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.29	0.452
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	26.55	1.41	1.997

Number of observations: 24,159

Table 10: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 28, full sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	16	89	40.33	10.244
FIRM_TENURE	1	50	8..86	7.109
FEMALE	0	1	0.07	0.247
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	2.14	6.91	4.36	0.342
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	7.23	4.04	1.330
PARTNER	0	1	0.75	0.434
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.03	0.160
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.02	0.131
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	15	1.17	1.151
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.06	0.230
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.06	0.243
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.19	0.390
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	28.22	1.07	1.807

Number of observations: 68,511

Table 11: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 28, restricted sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	22	40	32.81	4.988
FIRM_TENURE	1	26	6.50	5.592
HIGH_EDUCATION	0	1	0.06	0.244
FEMALE	0	1	0.07	0.260
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	3.03	6.32	4.31	0.265
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	7.23	3.95	1.304
PARTNER	0	1	0.70	0.458
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.04	0.195
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.02	0.148
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	11	1.11	1.102
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.09	0.289
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.05	0.212
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.23	0.419
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	24.35	1.08	1.780

Number of observations: 33,733

Table 12: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 29, full sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	15	92	40.42	10.066
FIRM_TENURE	1	52	9.18	7.835
FEMALE	0	1	0.07	0.252
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	2.41	7.86	4.45	0.360
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	7.94	4.58	1.437
PARTNER	0	1	0.76	0.428
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.03	0.163
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.02	0.124
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	16	1.13	1.141
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.06	0.237
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.06	0.238
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.19	0.394
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	27.02	1.46	2.317

Number of observations: 65,766

Table 13: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 29, restricted sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	22	40	32.84	4.853
FIRM_TENURE	1	24	6.10	4.480
HIGH_EDUCATION	0	1	0.16	0.370
FEMALE	0	1	0.08	0.269
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	3.03	7.86	4.39	0.288
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	7.94	4.57	1.497
PARTNER	0	1	0.70	0.459
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.04	0.203
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.02	0.140
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	16	1.02	1.091
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.10	0.298
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.04	0.201
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.24	0.425
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	26.52	1.52	2.332

Number of observations: 33,190

Table 14: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 521, full sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	17	71	35.63	10.464
FIRM_TENURE	1	49	9.13	8.073
FEMALE	0	1	0.39	0.489
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	2.28	7.21	4.22	0.408
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	10.82	8.18	2.477
PARTNER	0	1	0.61	0.488
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.05	0.214
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.02	0.146
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	12	0.92	1.107
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.06	0.228
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.07	0.257
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.28	0.447
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	22.96	0.33	1.016

Number of observations: 39,479

Table 15: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 521, restricted sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	22	40	30.62	5.333
FIRM_TENURE	1	25	6.84	5.105
HIGH_EDUCATION	0	1	0.06	0.240
FEMALE	0	1	0.42	0.494
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	3.03	7.13	4.21	0.301
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	10.82	8.07	2.528
PARTNER	0	1	0.59	0.492
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.06	0.243
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.03	0.160
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	10	0.78	1.028
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.08	0.265
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.06	0.240
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.32	0.466
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	22.96	0.32	1.009

Number of observations: 24,048

Table 16: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 55, full sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	15	85	36.31	10.666
FIRM_TENURE	1	40	5.17	4.726
FEMALE	0	1	0.37	0.482
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	2.28	7.80	4.14	0.369
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	8.70	4.16	2.218
PARTNER	0	1	0.60	0.490
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.06	0.233
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.03	0.180
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	11	0.86	1.062
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.06	0.235
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.06	0.254
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.30	0.457
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	29.09	0.95	1.962

Number of observations: 52,938

Table 17: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 55, restricted sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	22	40	30.65	5.349
FIRM_TENURE	1	24	4.15	3.438
HIGH_EDUCATION	0	1	0.06	0.236
FEMALE	0	1	0.36	0.480
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	3.03	6.22	4.14	0.295
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	8.70	4.12	2.132
PARTNER	0	1	0.57	0.495
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.07	0.260
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.04	0.197
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	9	0.73	0.978
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.08	0.265
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.06	0.237
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.31	0.464
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	29.09	1.01	2.011

Number of observations: 32,483

Table 18: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 66, full sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	18	71	39.89	9.539
FIRM_TENURE	1	44	10.86	9.972
FEMALE	0	1	0.29	0.453
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	2.96	8.33	4.73	0.418
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0	9.32	7.55	1.669
PARTNER	0.69	1	0.74	0.440
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.03	0.176
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.02	0.146
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	11	0.88	1.066
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.06	0.236
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.05	0.208
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.29	0.452
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	21.96	1.38	2.114

Number of observations: 39,635

Table 19: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 66, restricted sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	22	40	32.60	4.744
FIRM_TENURE	1	24	5.50	4.618
HIGH_EDUCATION	0	1	0.33	0.471
FEMALE	0	1	0.37	0.482
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	3.03	6.88	4.60	0.360
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	9.32	7.51	1.656
PARTNER	0	1	0.68	0.465
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.05	0.215
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.03	0.164
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	11	0.71	0.980
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.09	0.292
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.03	0.170
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.36	0.481
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	21.96	1.34	2.098

Number of observations: 21,294

Table 20: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 70, full sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	17	90	41.63	10.633
FIRM_TENURE	1	46	7.31	7.098
FEMALE	0	1	0.32	0.467
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	2.59	8.32	4.55	0.431
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	7.65	4.00	1.686
PARTNER	0	1	0.76	0.424
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.03	0.178
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.02	0.145
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	15	0.91	1.086
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.05	0.221
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.06	0.235
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.30	0.458
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	21.82	1.17	1.986

Number of observations: 36,710

Table 21: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 70, restricted sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	22	40	32.08	5.017
FIRM_TENURE	1	24	4.18	3.602
HIGH_EDUCATION	0	1	0.24	0.425
FEMALE	0	1	0.43	0.494
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	3.03	7.69	4.43	0.364
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	7.65	3.85	1.669
PARTNER	0	1	0.68	0.465
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.06	0.229
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.03	0.166
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	8	0.74	1.009
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.09	0.284
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.03	0.178
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.37	0.484
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	21.82	1.21	1.997

Number of observations: 16,667

Table 22: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 8511, full sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	17	70	40.25	10.646
FIRM_TENURE	1	45	9.77	8.862
FEMALE	0	1	0.57	0.495
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	2.42	7.34	4.49	0.398
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.69	9.13	7.84	0.870
PARTNER	0	1	0.65	0.477
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.04	0.200
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.02	0.149
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	14	0.78	1.085
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.04	0.199
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.06	0.235
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.31	0.464
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	26.39	0.91	1.400

Number of observations: 116,850

Table 23: Descriptive statistics (NACE/ISIC 8511, restricted sample)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
AGE	22	40	31.23	5.345
FIRM_TENURE	1	24	5.11	4.426
HIGH_EDUCATION	0	1	0.39	0.487
FEMALE	0	1	0.67	0.471
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	3.03	7.34	4.37	0.298
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	3.91	9.13	7.88	0.867
PARTNER	0	1	0.61	0.489
PARTNER_GAIN	0	1	0.07	0.249
PARTNER_LOSE	0	1	0.03	0.168
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	0	14	0.58	0.978
CHILDREN_GAIN	0	1	0.07	0.252
CHILDREN_LOSE	0	1	0.04	0.199
PARTNER_JOB	0	1	0.38	0.486
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0	23.07	1.01	1.483

Number of observations: 54,359

Table 24: Multinomial logit regression model: change job/keep residence (full samples)

	15	22	24	28	29
AGE	- 0.042**	- 0.044**	- 0.028**	- 0.028**	- 0.030**
FIRM_TENURE	- 0.056**	- 0.059**	- 0.047**	- 0.066**	- 0.078**
FEMALE	0.012	- 0.055	- 0.063	- 0.437**	0.267*
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	0.122*	0.065	0.208**	- 0.288**	- 0.049
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	- 0.081**	- 0.001	- 0.182**	- 0.072**	- 0.162**
PARTNER	- 0.014	- 0.024	- 0.083	0.125*	0.107
PARTNER_GAIN	- 0.028	0.003	0.043	0.224	0.138
PARTNER_LOSE	0.089	0.153	0.583**	0.086	0.007
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	- 0.026	- 0.046*	0.039	- 0.026	- 0.027
CHILDREN_GAIN	- 0.191*	- 0.112	- 0.119	- 0.178*	- 0.032
CHILDREN_LOSE	0.001	- 0.024	- 0.150	- 0.214*	- 0.023
PARTNER_JOB	0.068	0.105	0.202**	- 0.019	- 0.053
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0.088**	0.061**	0.075**	0.054**	0.043**
FEMALE*PARTNER	- 0.335**	- 0.239*	- 0.131	- 0.220	- 0.462**

Table 24 (continued)

	521	55	66	70	8511
AGE	- 0.044**	- 0.045**	- 0.038**	- 0.052**	- 0.054**
FIRM_TENURE	- 0.066**	- 0.131**	- 0.069**	- 0.095**	- 0.078**
FEMALE	- 0.196**	- 0.246**	0.099	0.164	- 0.157*
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	0.055	0.010	0.530**	0.054	0.731**
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	- 0.019	- 0.077**	- 0.132**	- 0.104**	- 0.012
PARTNER	0.080	0.069	- 0.061	0.123	0.017
PARTNER_GAIN	- 0.225	0.124	- 0.280	0.097	0.352**
PARTNER_LOSE	0.117	0.249**	0.333	0.049	0.350**
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	- 0.010	- 0.054**	- 0.044	- 0.070**	- 0.038*
CHILDREN_GAIN	- 0.242*	- 0.279**	- 0.350**	- 0.193	- 0.044
CHILDREN_LOSE	- 0.059	- 0.039	- 0.164	- 0.288	- 0.205
PARTNER_JOB	- 0.057	- 0.041	- 0.057	- 0.135	0.216**
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0.160**	0.048**	0.061**	0.099**	0.180**
FEMALE*PARTNER	- 0.379**	- 0.186**	- 0.346*	- 0.371**	- 0.320**

The reference category is stay/stay. ** indicates significance at the 1%-level, * indicates significance at the 5%-level.

Table 25: Multinomial logit regression model: change job/keep residence (restricted samples)

	15	22	24	28	29
AGE	- 0.030**	- 0.019**	0.008	- 0.017**	- 0.009
FIRM_TENURE	- 0.082**	- 0.095**	- 0.074**	- 0.107**	- 0.121**
HIGH_EDUCATION	0.320**	- 0.018	0.427**	0.121	0.178**
FEMALE	0.019	- 0.009	- 0.089	- 0.356*	0.333*
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	0.156	0.042	- 0.074	- 0.038	0.010
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	- 0.087**	- 0.005	- 0.199**	- 0.098**	- 0.184**
PARTNER	0.077	0.012	0.014	0.056	0.104
PARTNER_GAIN	0.127	- 0.186	- 0.132	0.195	0.094
PARTNER_LOSE	0.116	- 0.208	0.384	- 0.022	- 0.048
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	- 0.068**	- 0.086**	- 0.008	- 0.036	- 0.075**
CHILDREN_GAIN	- 0.272**	- 0.169	- 0.258*	- 0.206*	- 0.066
CHILDREN_LOSE	0.095	0.002	0.175	- 0.324	0.319*
PARTNER_JOB	0.032	0.059	0.132	0.045	- 0.074
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0.077**	0.059**	0.071**	0.041**	0.043**
FEMALE*PARTNER	- 0.340**	- 0.302*	- 0.038	- 0.144	- 0.403*

Table 25 (continued)

	521	55	66	70	8511
AGE	- 0.038**	- 0.052**	- 0.024**	- 0.037**	- 0.032**
FIRM_TENURE	- 0.091**	- 0.167**	- 0.112**	- 0.139**	- 0.134**
HIGH_EDUCATION	0.681**	0.168*	0.000	0.063	0.503**
FEMALE	- 0.319**	- 0.279**	0.187	0.204	- 0.117
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	0.019	0.219**	0.543**	- 0.020	0.881**
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	- 0.025*	- 0.089**	- 0.138**	- 0.139**	0.048*
PARTNER	0.096	0.036	0.080	0.154	0.124
PARTNER_GAIN	- 0.134	0.152	- 0.457	0.136	0.308**
PARTNER_LOSE	0.099	0.255**	0.362	- 0.058	0.335*
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	- 0.057	- 0.073**	- 0.025	- 0.076*	- 0.076**
CHILDREN_GAIN	- 0.352**	- 0.277**	- 0.443**	- 0.307*	- 0.181*
CHILDREN_LOSE	- 0.222	0.077	- 0.072	- 0.066	0.008
PARTNER_JOB	- 0.086	0.022	- 0.185	- 0.082	0.046
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0.149**	0.047**	0.061**	0.084**	0.169**
FEMALE*PARTNER	- 0.277*	- 0.139	- 0.400**	- 0.382**	- 0.309**

The reference category is stay/stay. ** indicates significance at the 1%-level, * indicates significance at the 5%-level.

Table 26: Multinomial logit regression model: keep job/change residence (full samples)

	15	22	24	28	29
AGE	- 0.054**	- 0.055**	- 0.054**	- 0.055**	- 0.059**
FIRM_TENURE	- 0.020**	- 0.022**	- 0.017**	- 0.028**	- 0.025**
FEMALE	0.154**	0.061	0.119	0.259**	0.300**
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	0.154**	0.097	0.075	0.340**	0.454**
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.017	0.029**	- 0.022	0.015	0.043**
PARTNER	0.010	- 0.027	- 0.078	- 0.009	0.108*
PARTNER_GAIN	2.171**	2.186**	2.095**	2.267**	2.416**
PARTNER_LOSE	1.351**	1.381**	1.450**	1.375**	1.177**
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	- 0.222**	- 0.245**	- 0.205**	- 0.242**	- 0.255**
CHILDREN_GAIN	0.380**	0.442**	0.196**	0.396**	0.302**
CHILDREN_LOSE	1.516**	1.583**	1.331**	1.609**	1.670**
PARTNER_JOB	0.101*	0.111*	0.142**	0.029	- 0.007
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0.032**	0.021*	0.035**	0.026**	0.003
FEMALE*PARTNER	- 0.248**	- 0.146	- 0.270**	- 0.190	- 0.201

Table 26 (continued)

	521	55	66	70	8511
AGE	- 0.061**	- 0.048**	- 0.054**	- 0.053**	- 0.057**
FIRM_TENURE	- 0.021**	- 0.038**	- 0.022**	- 0.026**	- 0.023**
FEMALE	0.115*	- 0.009	0.223**	- 0.031	0.009
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	0.449**	0.130*	0.103	0.090	0.033
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.010	0.012	0.000	- 0.005	0.003
PARTNER	0.278**	0.070	0.095	- 0.192**	0.003
PARTNER_GAIN	2.362**	1.849**	2.198**	2.048**	2.284**
PARTNER_LOSE	1.205**	1.151**	1.266**	1.418**	1.515**
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	- 0.344**	- 0.334**	- 0.181**	- 0.223**	- 0.245**
CHILDREN_GAIN	0.562**	0.444**	0.276**	0.475**	0.363**
CHILDREN_LOSE	2.243**	2.062**	1.610**	1.393**	1.677**
PARTNER_JOB	- 0.020	0.046	0.151**	0.105	0.068*
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0.012	0.038**	0.007	0.017	0.028**
FEMALE*PARTNER	- 0.160*	- 0.111	- 0.338**	- 0.060	- 0.172**

The reference category is stay/stay. ** indicates significance at the 1%-level, * indicates significance at the 5%-level.

Table 27: Multinomial logit regression model: keep job/change residence (restricted samples)

	15	22	24	28	29
AGE	- 0.035**	- 0.042**	- 0.047**	- 0.040**	- 0.047**
FIRM_TENURE	- 0.040**	- 0.032**	- 0.038**	- 0.036**	- 0.035**
HIGH_EDUCATION	0.013	0.153**	0.105	- 0.009	0.174**
FEMALE	0.238**	0.116	0.136	0.322**	0.371**
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	0.072	0.024	0.088	0.204*	0.227*
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.022	0.025	- 0.018	- 0.002	0.045**
PARTNER	0.213**	0.216**	0.188*	0.207**	0.459**
PARTNER_GAIN	2.123**	2.091**	2.089**	2.189**	2.383**
PARTNER_LOSE	1.028**	1.183**	1.122**	0.987**	0.720**
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	- 0.243**	- 0.247**	- 0.223**	- 0.279**	- 0.267**
CHILDREN_GAIN	0.293**	0.325**	0.050	0.269**	0.149*
CHILDREN_LOSE	2.208**	2.378**	2.158**	2.244**	2.473**
PARTNER_JOB	0.046	0.036	0.034	- 0.034	- 0.140*
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0.033**	0.010	0.027*	0.028*	0.002
FEMALE*PARTNER	- 0.354**	- 0.213*	- 0.291**	- 0.334*	- 0.282

Table 27 (continued)

	521	55	66	70	8511
AGE	- 0.047**	- 0.033**	- 0.045**	- 0.037**	- 0.046**
FIRM_TENURE	- 0.023**	- 0.041**	- 0.037**	- 0.054**	- 0.033**
HIGH_EDUCATION	0.230*	0.041	- 0.011	0.147*	0.091**
FEMALE	0.108	0.036	0.276**	0.063	0.131**
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	0.234*	- 0.115	0.110	0.053	0.001
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	0.007	0.012	0.005	- 0.022	0.018
PARTNER	0.447**	0.188**	0.342**	0.127	0.250**
PARTNER_GAIN	2.262**	1.831**	2.149**	1.973**	2.188**
PARTNER_LOSE	1.079**	1.006**	1.019**	1.238**	1.367**
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	- 0.357**	- 0.347**	- 0.239**	- 0.250**	- 0.264**
CHILDREN_GAIN	0.471**	0.338**	0.228**	0.294**	0.234**
CHILDREN_LOSE	2.808**	2.553**	2.361**	2.448**	2.453**
PARTNER_JOB	- 0.031	0.074	0.071	0.050	- 0.024
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0.028	0.028**	0.002	- 0.004	0.012
FEMALE*PARTNER	- 0.233*	- 0.157*	- 0.376**	- 0.158	- 0.281**

The reference category is stay/stay. ** indicates significance at the 1%-level, * indicates significance at the 5%-level.

Table 28: Multinomial logit regression model: change job and residence (full samples)

	15	22	24	28	29
AGE	- 0.080**	- 0.089**	- 0.097**	- 0.073**	- 0.077**
FIRM_TENURE	- 0.124**	- 0.112**	- 0.110**	- 0.147**	- 0.103**
FEMALE	0.193	0.118	0.142	0.549*	0.681**
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	0.411**	0.592**	0.947**	0.227	0.414*
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	- 0.062*	0.023	- 0.153**	0.011	- 0.099*
PARTNER	- 0.111	- 0.101	0.125	- 0.035	0.376*
PARTNER_GAIN	1.954**	2.108**	2.040**	2.248**	2.470**
PARTNER_LOSE	1.416**	1.327**	1.577**	1.493**	1.210**
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	- 0.371**	- 0.265**	- 0.210*	- 0.356**	- 0.349**
CHILDREN_GAIN	0.214	0.269	0.209	0.674**	0.448*
CHILDREN_LOSE	1.916**	1.697**	1.095**	1.996**	1.621**
PARTNER_JOB	- 0.088	0.403*	- 0.181	- 0.006	- 0.323
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0.078**	0.050*	0.088**	0.062**	0.052**
FEMALE*PARTNER	- 0.095	- 0.468*	0.167	- 0.690	- 0.894*

Table 28 (continued)

	521	55	66	70	8511
AGE	- 0.076**	- 0.073**	- 0.103**	- 0.112**	- 0.098**
FIRM_TENURE	- 0.147**	- 0.230**	- 0.128**	- 0.167**	- 0.103**
FEMALE	- 0.268	0.018	0.290	0.376*	0.099
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	0.387*	0.139	0.666**	0.535**	1.277**
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	- 0.009	- 0.061**	- 0.130**	- 0.045	0.050
PARTNER	0.190	- 0.011	0.194	- 0.005	0.094
PARTNER_GAIN	2.463**	1.752**	2.650**	2.050**	2.409**
PARTNER_LOSE	1.418**	1.313**	1.383**	1.209**	1.549**
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	- 0.436**	- 0.538**	- 0.056	- 0.159*	- 0.284**
CHILDREN_GAIN	0.703**	0.556**	- 0.066	0.354	0.565**
CHILDREN_LOSE	2.169**	2.232**	1.091**	1.203**	1.208**
PARTNER_JOB	0.029	- 0.061	0.071	- 0.173	- 0.118
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0.131**	0.052**	0.060*	0.077**	0.121**
FEMALE*PARTNER	- 0.235	- 0.431**	- 0.630*	- 0.214	- 0.515**

The reference category is stay/stay. ** indicates significance at the 1%-level, * indicates significance at the 5%-level.

Table 29: Multinomial logit regression model: change job and residence (restricted samples)

	15	22	24	28	29
AGE	- 0.052**	- 0.085**	- 0.080**	- 0.065**	- 0.059**
FIRM_TENURE	- 0.165**	- 0.166**	- 0.150**	- 0.171**	- 0.144**
HIGH_EDUCATION	0.407**	0.068	0.423*	- 0.047	0.232
FEMALE	0.327*	0.095	0.259	0.631*	0.435
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	0.215	0.780**	0.731*	0.210	0.122
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	- 0.084*	0.017	- 0.160**	- 0.018	- 0.106*
PARTNER	0.185	0.010	0.358	0.116	0.476*
PARTNER_GAIN	1.914**	2.050**	1.985**	2.304**	2.398**
PARTNER_LOSE	1.154**	1.189**	1.399**	1.288**	1.109**
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	- 0.362**	- 0.350**	- 0.244*	- 0.362**	- 0.392**
CHILDREN_GAIN	0.115	0.228	0.098	0.555**	0.389*
CHILDREN_LOSE	2.560**	2.327**	1.767**	2.295**	2.237**
PARTNER_JOB	- 0.133	0.316	- 0.443	- 0.164	- 0.332
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0.070**	0.039	0.088**	0.066*	0.041
FEMALE*PARTNER	- 0.315	- 0.465	0.134	- 0.661	- 0.546

Table 29 (continued)

	521	55	66	70	8511
AGE	- 0.046**	- 0.058**	- 0.092**	- 0.088**	- 0.078**
FIRM_TENURE	- 0.154**	- 0.228**	- 0.126**	- 0.191**	- 0.121**
HIGH_EDUCATION	0.609**	0.362**	0.085	0.322*	0.305**
FEMALE	- 0.220	0.095	0.358	0.399*	0.194
DAILY_SALARY_LOG	0.162	- 0.130	0.345	0.176	1.403**
FIRM_SIZE_LOG	- 0.025	- 0.058**	- 0.118**	- 0.058	0.093*
PARTNER	0.401	0.031	0.586*	0.198	0.178
PARTNER_GAIN	2.511**	1.755**	2.657**	1.959**	2.321**
PARTNER_LOSE	1.274**	1.203**	1.235**	1.173**	1.518**
NUMBER_OF_CHILDREN	- 0.396**	- 0.572**	- 0.094	- 0.294**	- 0.247**
CHILDREN_GAIN	0.479*	0.458**	- 0.205	0.229	0.433**
CHILDREN_LOSE	2.483**	2.557**	1.558**	2.259**	1.724**
PARTNER_JOB	- 0.130	- 0.056	- 0.018	- 0.135	- 0.170
DISTANCE_HOME_WORK	0.116**	0.040**	0.065*	0.056*	0.116**
FEMALE*PARTNER	- 0.187	- 0.462**	- 0.856**	- 0.349	- 0.644**

The reference category is stay/stay. ** indicates significance at the 1%-level, * indicates significance at the 5%-level.