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Motivation

The effect of natural resource abundance in an area is complex. On one hand exploration of natural resources played a large role in early development of some of world’s richest economies: United States, Canada, and Australia. On the other hand resource abundant areas are associated with higher levels of poverty, unemployment, and underemployment. Growth and Natural Resource Abundance 1970-1990 (Sachs and Warner, 2001).

Research Question

• Why do resource rich areas underperform economically?
• Are there barriers to migration?
• Does homeownership constrain migration?

Effect of Homeownership

The interest in the effect of homeownership on migration comes from a positive association between higher rates of homeownership and higher rates of unemployment. Oswald (1996) finds that in the US periods of high unemployment correspond to periods of high homeownership rates. In Europe, countries with the highest proportion of homeowners also find that indeed, homeowners are least likely group to migrate (Gardner et al., 2001; Böheim and Taylor, 2002; Lux and Sunega, 2012).

Conceptual Framework

• Based on the three-state, optimal search model
• Three states: employment, unemployment with national search, and staying local

Empirical Framework

The empirical framework is based on the migration model where an individual will move away from the local area if the utility he can achieve in another region is higher than the utility he is currently achieving.

\[ M_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{UN}_{it-1} + \beta_2 \text{IND}_{it-1} + \beta_3 \text{HOME}_{it-1} + \beta_4 \text{UN}_{it} + \beta_5 \text{IND}_{it} + \beta_6 \text{HOME}_{it} + \text{IND}_{it-1} + \varepsilon_{it} + \gamma \text{ECON} + \delta \text{DEMO} + \zeta_t \]

where \( \text{UN} \) is an unemployment dummy (1-unemployed, 0-otherwise) in time period \( t \), \( \text{HOME} \) is home ownership dummy (1-owns home, 0-otherwise), and \( \text{IND} \) is a vector of other economic factors that may affect migration decisions such as wage difference, unemployment rate difference, unemployment benefits, etc. and \( \text{DEMO} \) is a vector of demographic characteristics such as age, education, family composition, etc.

The migration model is estimated as a random parameters model

\[ \Pr(\text{Move}_{it}|x_i) = \Phi(\alpha + \beta x_i + \varepsilon_{it}) \]

where \( \text{Move}_{it} \) is a migration indicator (1-person moved in reference year, 0-otherwise) in time period \( t \). \( x_i \) is the vector of explanatory variables as specified above, \( \Phi \) is the vector of corresponding parameters, and \( \Pr(\cdot) \) is the probability of event.

Results and Discussion

It appears that there is a significant difference in annual variation in both homeownership and migration rates between the entire nation and areas reliant on natural resources and agriculture. The higher variability may be explained by greater exposure of natural resources to global commodity markets. For example, in 1998 rural homeownership rate decreased significantly from 88 to 71 per cent. This decline corresponds to the 1998 Asian financial crisis.
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Data

The data used in the analysis of the migration decision is based on the five panels of the Survey of Labor and Income Dynamics (SLID) conducted by Statistics Canada. Each panel is a nationally representative sample of approximately 17,000 households, containing about 34,000 adults that are interviewed each successive year for six years. Information is collected regarding respondent’s labor market experiences during the previous year, income, educational activity, family relationships, and other economic and demographic characteristics.
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