Gender Role And Culture In Pre-Employment Relocation Decisions

Olga Chapa, University of Houston-Victoria, USA
Yong J. Wang, Ohio University, USA

ABSTRACT

Conventional understanding of pre-employment relocation is incomplete due to the disconnection between human resources managers and pre-employment individuals. This study attempts to empirically examine pre-employment relocation preferences of upcoming young professionals. Guided the literature, it states any individual with the same gender or gender role orientations and cultural influences may behave in a similar manner in non-professional occupations. The findings highlight certain timing and situation factors that are salient in determining pre-employment relocation preferences. The findings offer insights into pre-employment relocation for researchers and human resources managers.

Keywords: Employment; Relocation; Gender Role; Culture; Masculinity; Femininity

INTRODUCTION

Relocation is a growing topic of interest in organizations. Tens of thousands new employees are relocated annually, costing organizations billions of dollars (Worldwide Employee Relocation Council, 2009). In an organizational perspective, the literature is not prepared to contribute to an understanding of new employee relocation (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Eby & Russell, 2000; Gould & Penley, 1985). Staffing requirements often impose relocation as part of the organization's human resource management process and challenges have yet to be studied in depth (Eby & Russell, 2000). Overall, three primary reasons to investigate the willingness to relocate remain significant today: staffing organization strategies, personal career enhancement, and for work purposes (Gould & Penly, 1985; Magnus & Dodd, 1981). A literature review reveals that individuals increasingly decline to relocate (Eby & Russel, 2000).

The most common relocation research is under the scope and emphasis of time and situational variables: time-related (i.e., age, length of employment at the time of considering relocation) or situation-based (parenthood, marital status, job satisfaction) (Eby & Russell, 2000). Results vary among the studies with the exception of time variable *age*, which tends to negatively correlate with the willingness to relocate (Eby & Russell, 2000; Turban et al., 1992). When investigating situation variables, Veiga (1983) found that parenthood influenced relocation behavior, especially if the children were teenagers. For the most part, however; results based on children as predictors of the willingness to relocate are mixed (Eby & Russell, 2000; Turban et al., 1992). Shamir et al. (1990) introduced the care of elderly parents. Their findings showed a negative association between the willingness to relocate and gender, which suggested that the females were more reluctant to relocate given that they were probably the primary care givers of the elderly (i.e., gender role expectation). Studies based on the relationship between marital status and spouses' attitudes (Brett et al., 1993; Eby & Russell, 2000) yielded results that differed from research based on dual-career couples (Gould & Penley, 1985). Magnus and Dodd (1981) found that the perception of financial risks associated with relocation were higher among lower paid employees, reducing the probability of a willingness to relocate among the latter. Relocation opportunities among higher paid professionals were stronger than for non-professionals (Gould & Penly, 1985; Hall, 1976). Psychological research includes that of behavioral British scholars investigating relocation; findings show differences between Type A and Type B characteristics affecting employees' reaction to relocation; Type B individuals experienced less psychological distress when they relocated. Thus, Type B individuals would be more likely to have the psychological tools to deal with the stress of relocation and by extension would therefore be more willing to consider relocation in the first place (Frank, 2000).

Relocation studies offer a view of what relocation behaviors individuals, already employed within the organization requiring relocation for staffing or expansion reasons may follow. Scholars argue that understanding the challenges presented by targeted applicants prior to the development of staffing strategies increases their effectiveness (Breaugh & Starke, 2000). This study contributes to the literature by focusing on the willingness to relocate prior to seeking employment.

The literature exposes a gap in relocation studies investigating gender and gender related factors, influenced by culture. Mixed findings for the majority of the relocation studies emerge from differing samples, such as a one gender study (Eby & Russell, 2000). Both genders are studied to address the differing samples, and explore the participants' affiliation by measuring self-reported gender characteristics (Bem Sex Role Inventory List), an unexplored approach.

This study is guided by the literature that states any individual with the same gender or gender role orientations and cultural influences may behave in a similar manner in non-professional occupations. Triandis (1989) argued that individualism/collectivism self-constructs are present in people of all cultures and individualist, and collectivist dimensions of the self are accessed differently in a cultural context by the genders (Kashima et al., 1995). Within a cultural context, for instance, collectivist cultures have been shown to assign strict female gender roles as wives, mothers, caregivers, and other prescribed relationship-oriented roles, more so than individualist cultures (Karatepe et al., 2006; Triandis, 1989). The present research moves beyond the usual barriers obstructing applicants' choices to specifically investigate the influence that cultural beliefs and expectations have on the individuals' behavior in relation to vocation (Breaugh & Starke, 2000; Rynes & Barber, 1990). This approach has not been considered in the literature and is a contribution.

Furthermore, studies about geographic preferences are also rare and limited. Gould and Penley (1985) explored the willingness to relocate in other cities or states (US) and found negative associations between length of time in geographical area/length of time at job and the willingness to relocate. As an added contribution, the use of location variables to include relocating hours from home, within the home state, nationally (U.S.) and internationally are included to compare differences within the groups of study.

In summary, this study explores relocation through psychological and sociological lenses. The thought that the underpinning development of identities can influence pre-employment relocation behavior is explored. More specifically, the focus is on gender and ethnicity, the two most salient factors in an individual's identity (Burke & Tully, 1977), in addition to variables most frequently researched. The goal is to contribute to the gap in relocation discussions and literature and to help managers and individuals alike to better understand the complexities of relocation. Prior empirical studies in the relocation research arena focus on time and situational variables and little attention has been given to how culture, gender, and gender role perceptions might interact with the willingness to relocate. This study is an attempt to build onto the limited research findings and gaps, plus introduce new variables for organizations and researchers to consider when discussing and investigating relocation and its challenges in the 21st century.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Numerous variables were analyzed. Time and age variables: age, marital status, and parenthood are included, to expand on the limited research findings within the relocation literature to try and fill the gaps and continue building on the research foundation regarding these variables as predictors of the willingness to relocate. Identity, social identity, and role theories together with relocation literature form the basis for this study's hypotheses. In particular, these theories define and explicate the process of gender role expectations. Table 1 provides a summary of theories and perspectives guiding the gender and associated factors portion of this study.

Table 1: Summary of Terms in Psychological and Sociological Literature

Term	Authors	Characteristics
Culture	Triandis, 1972, 1989	Group norms, traditions, values, and roles
Cultural Dimensions	Hofstede, 1980	Nations are assigned to cultural dimensions: Individualist and collectivist
Gender	Fritsche & Jonas, 2005	Social categories between both sexes that help define the individual's social identity
Gender Role	Fritsche & Jonas, 2005	Prescribed culturally derived behaviors for masculine and feminine behaviors
Gender Role Attitude	Fischer & Arnold, 1994	Refers to the individual's beliefs regarding the roles and responsibilities assigned to the gender
Gender/Self Identity	Kashima et al., 1995	Gender reflects self-identity
Group	Tajfel & Turner, 1986	Three or more people sharing the same social identity
Group Identification	Hogg et al., 2007	A feeling of belonging by sharing in-group attributes
Identity Theory	Burke & Tully, 1977	A developmental process in which the individual, through a process of self-categorization, identifies with certain roles
In group	Stets & Burke, 2000	Strong commitments to the groups' expectations leads to inclusion
Out group	Stets & Burke, 2000	A lack of commitment to the groups' expectations leads to exclusion
Role Stress	Kahn et al., 1964	Stress caused by the inability to fulfill simultaneous role requirements and expectations
Self	Erchak, 1992	The identity of the individual and as part of a social group
Self-Categorization	Turner, 1985	A cognitive process of categorizing the material world, information and people
Sex Role Inventory	Bem, 1981	An inventory of male and female characteristics based on American values
Social Theory	Hogg et al., 2007	The use of theoretical social frameworks to explain social behavior and organizations

Gender Role Perceptions

Identity theorists postulate that the individual will first self-categorize as either male or female assuming a set of characteristics associated with the sex since childhood, and by affiliation with a particular ethnic group (Burke & Tully, 1977; Erchak, 1992; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Since behavioral scientists have found that gender role identities affect individual behavior, sub-categorizations of gender (i.e., husband, father, wife, mother) may be significant predictors of the willingness to relocate, (Hogg et al., 2007). Moreover, the individual will incorporate the attitudes and values associated with the membership of the social category as prescribed by the gender groups' values, beliefs and norms (Fritsche & Jonas, 2005).

Cultural Dimensions

The literature on individualism and collectivism offers further insights into the role behavior expected of males and females based on cultural expectations (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1989). The complexity of the self depends on the values set by the collective culture, and cultures differ considerably in their attitudes toward the individual and the collective (Triandis, 1989). Individualist cultures are those that privilege the interests of the individual over the group, whereas collectivist cultures privilege the interests of the group over those of the individual (Hofstede, 1980). According to ethnic theory, group affiliation should increase the participants' desire to protect and live up to the culture's reference group gender-role expectations, which further strengthens the culture's ability to uphold its basic cultural values (Fritsche & Jonas, 2005).

Age, Parenthood, and Marital Status

Researchers have found age to be negatively correlated with the willingness to relocate (Eby & Russell, 2000; Turban et al, 1992). This study follows the same assumption as other relocation research when forming the hypotheses that as age increases, so too does an unwillingness to relocate for work purposes. For parenthood hypotheses, this study follows Eby's and Russell's (2000) practice of relying on relocation stress literature to guide the creation of the hypotheses of a negative relationship between participants with children and the willingness to relocate. The theories stipulated in Table 1 guide the formation of hypotheses regarding the predictability of marital

status. Armed with previous findings, theories, perspectives, and new variables to consider, the following are hypothesized:

- H1a:** Males will identify with masculine characteristics more than feminine characteristics.
- H1b:** Females will identify with feminine characteristics more than male characteristics.
- H2:** Females are less likely to relocate than males.
- H3a:** Collectivist females are less likely to relocate than individualist females.
- H3b:** Collectivist males are less likely to relocate than individualist males.
- H4:** There is a negative relationship between the willingness to relocate and age.
- H5a:** There is a negative relationship between the willingness to relocate and being a parent.
- H5b:** Single females are more likely to relocate than married females.
- H5c:** Single males are more likely to relocate than married males.
- H5d:** Females without children are more likely to relocate than females with children.
- H5e:** Males without children are more likely to relocate than males with children.

METHODS

Sampling Procedure

To test hypotheses in this study, a population of students in the process of graduating with a business degree from three major universities in the U.S was sampled. The data collection for the surveys was an online method of data collection called SurveyMonkey, a method of data collection used in previous organizational studies (Agarwal & Hoetker, 2007). Using the honor code, students received a small credit for their participation when they sent the instructor an e-mail that they had participated in the study on *x* date. Data collection produced 208 usable surveys from 98 males and 110 females. A non-response rate is unavailable, given that only those who were willing to participate would access the survey online link. Table 2 provides descriptive of statistics for the respondents.

Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Demographic Variable	Percentage of Participants
<i>Gender</i>	
Male	47
Female	53
<i>Age</i>	
18-19	36
20-24	23
25-29	16
30-34	13
35-39	12
<i>Marital Status</i>	
Single	52
Married	41
Divorced	04
Living Arrangement	03
<i>Children</i>	
None	65
1	12
2 and above	23
<i>Income</i>	
< 18,000	36
< 30,000	15
< 48,000	10
< 60,000	08
< 90,000	25
> 90,000	06

Table 2 cont.

<i>Ethnicity</i>	
African American	16
Asian American	12
Caucasian	23
Hispanic	40
Other*	09

* Other represents a variety of ethnic groups are comprised into one group labeled "other" comprised of: Columbian, Indian, Italian, Norwegian, Pakistani, Pacific Islander, and Polish.

Measures

Relocation

This study follows the example of previous relocation studies and uses five author created items to measure relocation options. Participants were asked to respond on a five-point Likert type scale anchored to the left by strongly agree (1) and anchored to the right by strongly disagree (5). The option "I am not willing to relocate" was reverse coded for data analysis purposes.

Gender Role Perceptions

To measure the affiliation to genders (male or female), a valid and reliable instrument utilized for 35 years in gender schema and cultural studies called the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) instrument (Bem, 1974) was used. The results of BSRI aggregate and sub-scales have shown adequate to moderate test-retest reliability for college students over four years and show high internal consistency (Cohen & Hoberman, 1983; Maznah & Choo, 1986; Yanico, 1985). Shorter versions of the BSRI scales have been used in previous cultural studies (Özkan & Lajunen, 2005).

Cultural and Demographic Variables

Individualist and collectivist membership are derived from participants' demographic data (ethnic group) provided in the data collection process and are guided by the literatures of Hofstede, Triandis, and others to categorize individualist and collectivist cultures. Demographic data was utilized in this study to examine age, marital status, and parenthood.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Gender and Relocation

When analyzed by gender, basic descriptive interpretations of the data indicate that 58% of the males and 50% of the females in this study would at least slightly agree to relocate. Females (29%) slightly outnumbered the males (26%) in reported unwillingness to relocate, supporting H2, which hypothesized that females were less likely to relocate than males. Then, cultural dimensions were analyzed. Results show that collectivist females (49%) are more likely to relocate than individualist females (44%) not supporting H3a, which hypothesized that cultural dimensions influence females' relocation decisions. Collectivist males (64%) slightly outnumbered individualist males (59%) in their willingness to relocate, which does not lend support to H3b, which stated that cultural dimensions would be influential in the collectivist male sample.

BSRI Gender Roles Perceptions

A difference/median-split procedure described by Bem (1974) and Orlosfsky, Aslin, and Ginsburg (1977) was used to classify participants into sex role categories according to their masculine and feminine subscale scores. As recommended by Bem (1974), only the BSRI feminine and masculine scores are used for the analysis and 20 neutral items provide a measure of social desirability to be used as fillers. Based on the method, individual scores are compared to the masculine and feminine aggregate medians.

BSRI Descriptive Statistics

Means and standard deviations for the masculine and feminine scales are 4.60 ($SD = 0.75$) and 4.34 ($SD = 0.63$), respectively. The mean results are comparable to other studies using the BSRI scales, such as Maznah and Choo's (1986) study ($M = 4.32$; $F = 4.51$). When the data is split by gender, males: ($M = 4.83$; $F = 4.59$), females: ($M = 4.59$; $F = 4.51$), the results are similar to Whetton and Swindell's (1977) gender study of college students: males: ($M = 4.61$; $F = 4.66$) and females: ($M = 4.11$; $F = 4.74$).

Masculine and Feminine Scales

Table 3 shows the results of the BSRI 40 item analysis. The Masculine items (characteristics) correlated more highly with the masculine sub-scale than with the feminine sub-scale (mean correlation = 0.45). Likewise, the feminine items correlated more highly with the feminine scale than with the masculine scale (mean correlation = 0.52). Furthermore, the masculine scale ($\alpha = 0.85$) and the feminine scale ($\alpha = 0.78$) appear to have high internal consistency.

Table 3: Factor Loadings of Individual Items on Masculine and Feminine Scales

Variables	Masculine	Feminine
Self-reliant	0.05	
Yielding		0.32
Defends own beliefs	0.51	
Cheerful		0.39
Independent	0.52	
Shy		0.20
Athletic	0.28	
Affectionate		0.62
Assertive	0.57	
Flatterable		0.27
Strong personality	0.65	
Loyal		0.33
Forceful	0.37	
Feminine		0.34
Analytical	0.37	
Sympathetic		0.54
Leadership ability	0.73	
Sensitive to others		0.58
Willing to take risks	0.52	
Understanding		0.59
Makes decisions easily	0.44	
Compassionate		0.68
Self-sufficient	0.47	
Eager		0.52
Dominant	0.54	
Soft spoken		0.35
Masculine	0.30	
Warm		0.63
Tender		0.65
Aggressive	0.45	
Gullible		0.35
Acts as a leader	0.74	
Childlike		0.16
Individualistic	0.56	
Does not use harsh language		0.26
Competitive	0.60	
Loves children		0.51
Ambitious	0.59	
Gentle		0.62
Willing to take a stand	0.69	

All masculine items correlated with the masculine aggregate scale with loadings ranging from *masculine* ($r = 0.30$, $p < 0.01$) through *acts as a leader* ($r = 0.74$, $p < 0.01$). Ten of the twenty feminine items significantly loaded with the Masculine aggregate scale, such as *yielding* ($p < 0.05$) and *sensitive to other's needs* ($p < 0.01$). Feminine item *shy* was significant in the negative direction ($p < 0.01$). As with the masculine scale, all the feminine items significantly correlated with the groups' feminine scale, generating loadings ranging from *childlike* ($r = 0.16$, $p < 0.05$) to *gentle* ($r = 0.62$, $p < 0.01$). Ten out of the twenty masculine items in the analysis significantly correlated with the feminine aggregate scale with the weakest relationship being *self-reliant* ($r = 0.15$, $p < 0.05$) and the strongest loading being *ambitious* ($r = 0.39$, $p < 0.01$).

Table 4: Ethnicity and Gender Roles: Masculine and Feminine Scales

Ethnicity	Gender	Masculine	Feminine	Classification
African-American	Males	4.17	4.89	Feminine
	Females	4.30	4.21	Undifferentiated
Asian	Males	5.75	4.52	Androgynous
	Females	4.46	4.94	Feminine
Asian-American	Males	5.06	4.29	Masculine
	Females	4.32	4.73	Feminine
Caucasian	Males	4.58	4.17	Undifferentiated
	Females	4.75	4.34	Undifferentiated
Hispanic	Males	4.55	4.12	Undifferentiated
	Females	4.47	4.43	Undifferentiated
Mixed Race	Males	4.35	4.92	Feminine
	Females	3.20	4.47	Undifferentiated
Aggregate		4.80	4.50	
Aggregate	Males	4.49	4.46	Undifferentiated
Aggregate	Females	4.80	4.18	Masculine

Table 4 summarizes the results of the analysis based on the findings categorized by gender, ethnic group (cultural dimensions), aggregated BSRI median scores and categorizations (i.e., Androgynous, Undifferentiated). As an aggregate, data from 208 participants produced a masculine median score of 4.80 (total score divided by the 20 items) and a feminine median score of 4.50. Males in this study scored lower in self-reported masculine characteristics (4.49) than the females (4.80), whose median aggregate score was exactly at the masculine median. The results show the same reversal of affiliations when the feminine scores. Males scored higher (4.46) than the females (4.18).

The interpretation of the analysis is that males in this study are aggregately categorized as undifferentiated (below median on both subscales), which does not lend support to H1a; males would score higher on the masculine scale. The undifferentiated category implies an overlapping of masculine and feminine affiliations such that neither is the dominant one for either gender in those groups. Bem (1977) states that it is unclear whether undifferentiated individuals differ fundamentally in their assumptions about gender, they may still be like androgynous participants in that they are alike in the fact that they are not sex typed. Females were categorized as masculine (high masculine, low feminine). H1b hypothesized that females would self-categorize in feminine roles rather than male roles. The results do not support this hypothesis. This was a significant finding since masculine gender role characteristics imply independence, aggressiveness, and a willingness to take risks. Sex role research indicates that masculine-type individuals tend to outperform feminine-typed and undifferentiated individuals on various contrived tasks (Bem, 1974). Stevens et al. (1984) argue that masculine characteristics are desirable, but dysfunctional classes of masculine behavior associated with Type A behavior patterns imply long-term medical consequences.

Correlations between Gender and Relocation

Pearson correlation analysis between the Masculine and Feminine aggregate score and relocation options was conducted and presented in Table 5. As expected, “not willing to relocate” was negatively and significantly related to all four relocation (proximity) options. Non-significant correlations evolved from the analysis between the feminine aggregate scores and relocation options. Any significant finding with regard to the correlates and the unwillingness to relocate was found only in the masculine aggregate score ($r = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$). Moreover, significant negative correlations between the masculine subscale and relocation in the U.S. or internationally are reported. Therefore, although it is promising that males and females self identified with characteristics, such as *independence, assertiveness, and self-reliance* may be more prone to relocate, this is not necessarily the case.

The analysis also showed moderate to strong correlations between relocating a few hours from home, home state, and the U.S. The findings suggest that organizations located a few hours from the participants home and in the home state will more than likely not have any relocation challenges with participants willing to relocate from this sample group ($r = 0.53$, $p < 0.01$). Furthermore, strong correlations between an international assignment and the U.S. ($r = 0.76$, $p < 0.01$) indicates that participants, possibly internationally connected, given the sample demographics (see Table 2), are willing to relocate both in the U.S. and internationally.

Table 5: Correlations between Masculine and Feminine Scores and Relocation Options

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Masculine Aggregate						
2. Feminine Aggregate	0.24**					
3. A few hours from home	0.02	- 0.06				
4. In my home state	0.01	-0.01	0.53**			
5. In the United States	-0.25**	-0.04	0.02	0.19**		
6. Internationally	-0.19*	0.03	0.03	0.08	0.76**	
7. Not willing to relocate	0.21**	0.07	-0.17*	-0.30**	-0.49**	-0.36**

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

Impact of Time and Situation Variables on Relocation*Descriptive Statistics and Pearson Correlations*

Table 6 includes the means, standard deviations, and correlations between the masculine and feminine subscales, gender, time (age) situational variables (marital status, parenthood), and willingness to relocate options. The correlation between the masculine and feminine subscales was low ($r = 0.24$, $p < 0.01$), but significant. The correlation was higher than those Bem (1981) reported ($r = 0.00 - 0.11$). The feminine subscale showed a positive relationship with age ($r = 0.16$, $p < 0.05$). The masculine subscale showed significant relationships with age, but in the other direction ($r = -0.16$, $p < 0.05$) and parenthood ($r = 0.22$, $p < 0.01$). The relationship between age and the willingness to relocate was positive ($r = 0.19$, $p < 0.01$) which did not support H4, hypothesizing a negative relationship. Also non-significant was the relationship between parenthood and the willingness to relocate, which did not support H5a. Positive and significant relationships between age and children ($r = 0.58$, $p < 0.05$), age and marital status ($r = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$) and marital status and children ($r = 0.44$, $p < 0.01$) evolved from the study. The older the respondents were, the more likely they were married and parenthood was more likely reported by married respondents.

Table 6: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for All Variables

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Willingness to Relocate	3.63	0.77						
2. Gender	1.53	0.50	0.12					
3. Age	2.41	1.40	0.19**	-0.06				
4. Marital Status	1.58	0.73	0.07	0.14	0.38**			
5. Children	1.67	1.03	0.11	0.02	0.58**	0.44**		
6. Masculine	4.60	0.75	-0.03	-0.16*	0.14	0.11	0.22**	
7. Feminine	4.34	0.63	0.01	0.16*	-0.06	0.09	0.02	0.24**

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

Multiple Regression Analysis

To further explore and measure the contribution of each variable to the prediction of the willingness to relocate, a series of regressions were conducted, analyzing each predictor variable: (age, marital status, and parenthood) for the full sample and as separate genders to compare differences or similarities (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). Then, the masculine and feminine aggregate scales were entered into the equation and each step was repeated. Finally, the data was stratified by cultural dimensions and analyzed as in the previous steps. Several models showing predictability power evolved from the regressions.

Table 7: Regression Results on the Willingness to Relocate

Predictors	Sample	Model Fit	Parameters (Age)
Age			
	Full Sample	$R^2 = 0.04, F = 7.25, p < 0.01$	$\beta = 0.19, t = 2.70, p < 0.01$
	Male		$R^2 = 0.02, F = 1.81, p < 0.18$
	Female	$R^2 = 0.06, F = 6.84, p < 0.05$	$\beta = 0.25, t = 2.62, p < 0.05$
Age & Marital Status			
	Full Sample	$R^2 = 0.04, F = 3.60, p < 0.05$	$\beta = 0.20, t = 2.64, p < 0.01$
	Male	$R^2 = 0.04, F = 1.41, p < 0.25$	
	Female	$R^2 = 0.06, F = 3.38, p < 0.05$	$\beta = 0.25, t = 2.38, p < 0.05$
Age, Marital Status, & Parenthood			
	Full Sample	$R^2 = 0.04, F = 1.46, p < 0.10$	$\beta = 0.18, t = 1.99, p < 0.05$
	Male	$R^2 = 0.04, F = 2.40, p < 0.10$	
	Female	$R^2 = 0.07, F = 2.30, p < 0.10$	$\beta = 0.22, t = 1.84, p < 0.10$
Age, Marital Status, Parenthood, Gender, & Gender Role Orientations			
	Full Sample	$R^2 = 0.05, F = 1.44, p < 0.02$	$\beta = 0.19, t = 2.08, p < 0.05$
	Male		$R^2 = 0.05, F = 0.10, p < 0.54$
	Female	$R^2 = 0.06, F = 1.11, p < 0.36$	
Collectivist/Individualist			
Age			
	Female Collectivist	$R^2 = 0.12, F = 10.47, p < 0.05$	$\beta = 0.37, t = 2.43, p < 0.01$
Age, Marital Status, & Parenthood			
	Female Collectivist	$R^2 = 0.10, F = 3.46, p < 0.05$	$\beta = 0.44, t = 3.00, p < 0.05$
Age, Marital Status, Parenthood, & Masculine Scores			
	Male Individualist	$R^2 = 0.57, F = 2.62, p < 0.10$	$\beta = 0.63, t = 2.84, p < 0.05$
Due to limited space, only the significant models for cultural dimensions are illustrated.			

Age

As in previous studies (Eby & Russell, 2000; Gould & Penly, 1985; Turban et al., 1992), the relationship between age and the willingness to relocate was evident. In this study, age was the most foreseeable predictor when data was analyzed as a whole group ($R^2 = 0.04, F = 7.25, p < 0.01, \beta = 0.19, t = 2.70, p < 0.01$). ANOVA analysis results on age and the willingness to relocate show a significant difference between the groups ($F = 2.78, p < 0.03$). A Bonferroni (unequal cases) post hoc analysis shows that two of the five age groups (20-24 and 35-39) were significantly different from the other age groups. The 20-24 age group report more willingness to relocate. As the participants aged so did their unwillingness to relocate peaking with the 35-39 age groups. ANOVA results between relocation options and age show significant results for the group when considering location preferences: hours from home ($p < 0.01$) and home state ($p < 0.10$). This implies that as participants' age increased, the preference to relocate closer to their home increased.

For the genders, age was a significant predictor of some of the variance in the willingness to relocate among the females only ($R^2 = 0.06, F = 6.84, p = 0.05, \beta = 0.25, t = 2.62, p < 0.05$). Age was the strongest predictor

of a willingness to relocate for the collectivist female ($R^2 = 0.13$, $F = 10.47$, $p < 0.05$, $\beta = 0.37$, $t = 2.43$; $p < 0.01$) compared to the whole sample or as part of the female group. The only significant predictor for the individualist females (Caucasian) was age, and only when they were included in the female group ($\beta = 0.25$).

Marital Status

Single participants ($n = 115$) outnumbered participants who were married or living with someone ($n = 93$). Single (59%) females were more likely to relocate than married females (43%), supporting H5b, which hypothesized that marital status as a predictor of relocation. Married males (73%) slightly outnumbered single males (69%) in willingness to relocate, not supporting H5c, which hypothesized that marital status would influence relocation among males.

Regression analysis between marital statuses as a stand-alone predictor variable of the willingness to relocate was non-significant. Further analysis in the form of ANOVA tests confirm the non-significant results between marital status and the willingness to relocate. However, an interesting finding showed differences in relocating behavior between divorced or cohabitating males and females. Males were more likely to accept relocation whereas females in the same situation were less likely to relocate. Details of divorced/co-habitation relocation behavior are not reported in the literature. The accounted variance improved the model fit for the full sample when marital status was included in the analysis with age was ($R^2 = 0.04$, $F = 3.60$, $p < 0.05$, $\beta = 0.20$, $t = 2.64$, $p < 0.01$). When analyzed for gender differences, however, the analysis showed no predictability improvements in the model for the females ($R^2 = 0.06$, $F = 3.38$, $p < 0.05$, $\beta = 0.25$, $t = 2.38$, $p < 0.05$) and non-significant results for the males.

Parenthood

Reported number of participants with children show that the majority of the sample does not have children, males (80%) and females (74%). For further analyses, the use of three dummy variables was employed to group participants according to their willingness to relocate: Yes (1), No (2), and Uncertain (3). The findings show the majority of the participants willing to relocate do not have children, 81% and 84%, males and females, respectively. An ANOVA analysis produced a means plot, which illustrated behavior of participants without children. Participants who reported “1” or “4 or more” children were less likely to accept relocation. Gender differences showed that females without children (61%) report more of a willingness to relocate more than those with children, which lends support to H5d, which hypothesized that parenthood would influence relocation behaviors. Males without children (63%) were also more likely to relocate than males reporting at least one child (52%), supporting H5e hypothesizing the same outcomes as the females.

Collectivist and Individualist Cultural Dimensions

The final analysis consisted of analyzing the data by cultural dimensions, genders, and gender role perceptions. The same procedures were followed as with the previous analysis. Age, marital status, and parenthood were analyzed separately and in blocks. Each analysis was repeated with the most favorable model found among the collectivist females and individualist males. As seen in Table 7, for the collectivist female, age as a sole variable produced a better fit than previous models ($R^2 = 0.12$, $F = 10.47$, $p < 0.05$, $\beta = 0.37$, $t = 2.43$, $p < 0.01$). When marital status and parenthood were included in the equation, the predictability power improved for the collectivist females ($R^2 = 0.10$, $F = 3.46$, $p < 0.05$, $\beta = 0.44$, $t = 3.00$, $p < 0.05$). Thus, this analysis supports the theoretical underpinnings that the collectivist females will be strongly affiliated with culturally embedded gender role expectations as wives and mothers. By extension, these factors will influence the collectivist females more than the collectivist females when within the context of relocation. This can also account for the results for this group from previous analyses, which showed one of the female location preferences as close to home. As stated previously, the only significant predictor for the individualist females (Caucasian) was age.

The variables age, marital status, and parenthood were not significant for the individualist groups except when the analysis included gender role perceptions. After the insertion of the BSRI subscales, the model fit improved substantially for the male individualist ($R^2 = 0.57$, $F = 2.62$, $p < 0.10$, $\beta = 0.63$, $t = 2.84$, $p < 0.05$). The

results suggest that for Caucasian males with a strong affiliation to masculine characteristics, all three variables are significant predictors of a willingness to relocate. Table 8 is presented with a list of the hypotheses for this study and the findings.

Table 8: Hypotheses and Findings

H1a: Males will identify with masculine characteristics more than feminine characteristics.	NS
H1b: Females will identify with feminine characteristics more than male characteristics.	NS
H2: Females are less likely to relocate than males.	S
H3a: Collectivist females are less likely to relocate than individualist females.	NS
H3b: Collectivist males are less likely to relocate than individualist males.	NS
H4: There is a negative relationship between the willingness to relocate and age.	NS
H5a: There is a negative relationship between the willingness to relocate and being a parent.	NS
H5b: Single females are more likely to relocate than married females.	S
H5c: Single males are more likely to relocate than married males.	NS
H5d: Females without children are more likely to relocate than females with children.	S
H5e: Males without children are more likely to relocate than males with children.	S

S = Supported; NS = Not Supported

DISCUSSION

This study is an investigation on the relationship between relocation and gender, gender role perceptions, time and situation variables and cultural dimensions. Studies show that the willingness to relocate has decreased with time and the costs associated with relocation are high. Overall, males were more likely to be willing to relocate than females, but the difference is not large. Females prefer relocating close to home, U.S., and internationally. Males prefer relocating hours from home or in their home state. As promising as the results were in the exploration of a willingness to relocate, at least 50% of the females and 42% of the males are reluctant to relocate. Motives may or not be explained by variables not included in this study, and call for further research to research new variables of study when investigating relocation willingness.

The BSRI results call for further research into the area of gender schema. The majority of the ethnic groups fall into categories outside their gender, undifferentiated gender perceptions. As an aggregate, the females self-identify with masculine characteristics more so than males. The literature both praises and cautions against a high masculine characteristics. For the most part, however; masculine perceptions do not necessarily entail a willingness to relocate as was evident in the analysis showing a low but significant correlation between the subscale and an unwillingness to relocate ($r = 0.21$), in particular within the U.S. and internationally.

Time variable *age* was the strongest predictor for all groups, as a whole and stratified by gender explaining from 18% to 25% of the variance in the willingness to relocate. The most significant results were produced when the genders were stratified by cultural dimensions. Age ($\beta = 0.32$) was significant for the collectivist females and the only variable that showed betas greater than zero for the individualist females ($\beta = 0.25$). The results are equal to and exceed the results of other studies, such as Gould and Penly's (1985) study ($\beta = 0.25$) and Eby and Russell's (2000) findings ($\beta = -0.25$) in the other direction. Situation variables, marital status, and parenthood contributed to the predictability power of the models, but only when included in the blocks of analysis with age. When analyzed as a group, parenthood actually decreased the model fit ($\beta = 0.18$).

However, the most significant results were produced for this sample when stratified by gender and cultural dimensions, explaining between 37% and 63% of the variance in the willingness to relocate. This implies that in addition to age, marital status, and parenthood are predictors of a willingness to relocate, primarily in individualist males and collectivist females, contrary to individualist females and collectivist males in this study. In Eby and Russell's study investigating spousal attitudes, marriage was significant (2000). The parenthood results in previous studies tend to be mixed. Thus, the need to explore parenthood and the willingness to relocate is included. In line with gender, role identity, and cultural studies, when marital status and parenthood were included in the equation with age, the variance in the willingness to relocate increased and improved the model's fit for collectivist females ($\beta = 0.44$) and for the individualist males with the strongest masculine orientations ($\beta = 0.63$). Yet, collectivist females were more likely to relocate than individualist females 49% and 44%, respectively. This was an unusual

finding suggesting that some of the collectivist females have been able to overcome some of the gender role expected behaviors.

The results of this research suggest that genders, gender role characteristics, age, marital status/parenthood, and cultural dimensions are important predictors of the willingness to relocate and answer previous calls for further research in this area. The study of gender role perceptions and cultural dimensions within the context of relocation are new units of analysis, which based on the results of this research call for further investigation regarding these new variables of study when investigating relocation. As with previous studies investigating time and situational variables, the findings imply that relocation research is more complex than previously considered, especially when considering marital status and parenthood. This study has contributed to the gaps in the literature and opened the door for further discussions regarding relocation and its complexities.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

As with any study, this one has limitations. This is an exploratory study performed in the U.S. and results are not generalizable without further research. Moreover, only time and situational variables were researched. The BSRI results are based on American male/female characteristics. Although the BSRI instrument has been used in previous cultural studies, the exploratory nature of the study calls for caution when generalizing the results to similar of different cultures.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We express our gratitude to anyone who has contributed to previous versions of this study presented at conferences. Particularly, we extend our gratitude to the participants whom without; this study would not be possible.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Olga Chapa, College of Business Administration, University of Houston-Victoria, 14000 University Boulevard, Sugar Land, Texas 77479. Tel: 956-451-6018; Fax: 281-275-3056. E-mail: chapao@uhv.edu

Yong J. Wang, College of Business, Ohio University, Copeland Hall 638, Athens, Ohio 45701, USA. Tel: 740-597-1987; Fax: 740-597-2150. E-mail: wangy@ohio.edu (Corresponding author)

REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, R., & Hoetker, G. (2007). A Faustian bargain? The growth of management and its relationship with related disciplines. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1304-1322.
2. Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162.
3. Bem, S. L. (1977). On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 54, 196-205.
4. Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing source. *Psychological Review*, 88, 354-364.
5. Breugh, J. A., & Starke, M. (2000). Research on employee recruitment: So many studies, so many remaining questions. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 405-434.
6. Brett, J. M., Stroh, L. K., & Reilly, A. H. (1993). Pulling up roots in the 1990s. Who's willing to relocate? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 49-60.
7. Bretz, R. D. Jr., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Person-organization fit and the theory of work and adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44, 32-54.
8. Burke, P. J., & Tully, J. (1977). The measurement of role/identity. *Social Forces*, 55, 881-897.
9. Cohen, J., & Hoberman, H. (1983). Positive events and social supports as buffers of life change stress. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 13, 99-125.
10. Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
11. Eby, L. T., & Russell, J. E. (2000). Predictors of employee willingness to relocate for the firm. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57(1), 42-61.

12. Employee Relocation Council (2009). *U.S. domestic mobility trends: Results from recent worldwide ERC surveys*. Available from Employee Relocation Council, 1720 N.W., Washington, DC 20036.
13. Erchak, G. M. (1992). *The anthropology of self and behavior*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
14. Frank, M. (2000). What's so stressful about job relocation? British researchers give some answers. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(2), 122-123.
15. Fritsche, I., & Jonas, E. (2005). Gender conflict and worldview defense. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 571-581.
16. Gould, S., & Penley, L. E. (1985). A study of correlates of the willingness to relocate. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28(2), 472-478.
17. Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in cross-cultural values*. Sage Publications, CA.
18. Hogg, M. A., Sherman, D. K., Dierselhuis, J., Maitner, A. T., & Moffitt, G. (2007). Uncertainty, entitativity, and group identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 135-142.
19. Karatepe, O. M., Yavas, U., Babakus, E., & Avci, T. (2006). Does gender moderate the effects of role stress in frontline service jobs? *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 1087-1093.
20. Kashima, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Kim, U., Choi, S.-C., Gelfand, M. J., & Yuki, M. (1995). Culture, gender, and self: A perspective from individualism-collectivism research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(5), 925-937.
21. Magnus, M., & Dodd, J. (1981). Relocation: Changing attitudes and company policies. *Personnel Journal*, 26, 538-548.
22. Maznah, I., & Choo, P. F. (1986). The factor structure of the Bem Sex-role Inventory (BSRI). *International Journal of Psychology*, 21, 31-41.
23. Orlofsky, J., Aslin, A., & Ginsburg, S. (1977). Differential effectiveness of two classification procedures on the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Journal of Personal Assessment*, 41, 414-416.
24. Özkan, T., & Lajunen, T. (2005). Why are there six differences in risky driving? The relationship between sex and gender-role on aggressive driving, traffic offences, and accident involvement among young Turkish drivers. *Aggressive Behavior*, 31, 547-558.
25. Rynes, S. L., & Barber, A. E. (1990). Applicant attraction strategies: An organizational perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(2), 286-310.
26. Shamir, B., Landau, J., & Arthur, H. B. (1990). Factors related to managers' and professionals' willingness to relocate. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, pp. 48-52.
27. Stevens, M. J., Pfost, K. S., & Ackerman, M. D. (1984). The relationship between sex-role orientation and the Type A behavior pattern: A test of the main effect hypotheses. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 40(6), 1338-1341.
28. Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
29. Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96(3), 506-520.
30. Triandis, H. C., Kurowski, L. L., & Gelfand, M. J. (1994). Workplace diversity. In H. C. Triandis, M. D. Dunnette, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: 4* (2nd Ed., pp. 767-827). Consulting Psychologists Press, CA.
31. Turban, D. B., Campion, J. E., & Eyring, A. R. (1992). Factors relating to relocation decisions of research and development employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 41, 559-580.
32. Turner, J. C. (1985). *Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of work behavior*. In E. J. Lawler (ed.), *Advances in group processes: Theory and research*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
33. Veiga, J. F. (1983). Mobility influences during managerial career stages. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 64-85.
34. Whetton, C., & Swindells, T. (1977). A factor analysis of the BEM sex role inventory. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 33, 150-153.
35. Yanico, B. J. (1985). BSRI scores: Stability over four years for college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 9, 277-283.
36. Zurcher, L. A., Meadow, A., & Zurcher, S. L. (1965). Value orientation, role conflict and alienation from work: A cross- cultural study. *American Sociological Review*, 30(4), 539-548.

NOTES