

# Kent Academic Repository

## Full text document (pdf)

### Citation for published version

Marrow, Helen B. and Klekowski von Koppenfels, Amanda (2018) Modeling American Migration Aspirations: How Capital, Race, and National Identity Shape Americans' Ideas about Living Abroad. *International Migration Review*. ISSN 0197-9183. (In press)

### DOI

### Link to record in KAR

<http://kar.kent.ac.uk/69217/>

### Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

#### Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

#### Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

#### Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

[researchsupport@kent.ac.uk](mailto:researchsupport@kent.ac.uk)

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

**Modeling American Migration Aspirations:  
How Capital, Race, and National Identity Shape Americans' Ideas about Living Abroad<sup>1</sup>**

by

Helen B. Marrow  
Associate Professor  
Department of Sociology  
Tufts University  
[helen.marrow@tufts.edu](mailto:helen.marrow@tufts.edu)

and

Amanda Klekowski von Koppenfels  
Senior Lecturer in Migration and Politics  
University of Kent at Brussels  
[ak248@kent.ac.uk](mailto:ak248@kent.ac.uk)

*paper accepted at International Migration Review*

*on 09/22/2018, forthcoming*

---

<sup>1</sup> Acknowledgements: We gratefully acknowledge several funding sources for our survey: the Faculty Research Fund from the Faculty of Social Sciences at University of Kent, the Research Support Fund of the School of Politics and International Relations at the University of Kent, and the Summer Faculty Fellowship from the Faculty Research Awards Committee at Tufts University. We thank Bart Bonikowski, Katharine Donato, Dan Hopkins, Saara Koikkalainen, Natasha Kumar Warikoo, Kerilyn Schewel, Debbie Schildkraut, Cinzia Solari, the Migration and Immigrant Integration Workshop at Harvard University, the IMISCOE network, and the editor and three anonymous reviewers at *IMR* for helpful feedback.

**ABSTRACT**

Recent scholarship proposes a “two-step” approach for better understanding mechanisms underlying the migration process, suggesting we study migration aspirations separately from migration behavior and that the one does not always translate directly into the other. Research on aspirations, however, concentrates on the Global South, despite growing migration flows originating in the Global North. Here, we fill this gap, drawing on a nationally representative online survey we commissioned in 2014 in the United States. Bivariate analysis shows that fully one third of Americans surveyed reveal some aspiration to live abroad, a plurality of those primarily for the purpose of exploration. Multivariate analysis suggests that certain elements of cultural and social capital, including the networks Americans have with prior and current U.S. citizen migrants, structure these aspirations, in tandem with strength of national attachment. Further, both cultural and economic aspects of class, alongside race and national attachment, shape where American aspirants envision going and why. While existing literature addresses the motivations and profile of American migrants already living abroad, ours is the first study to examine Americans’ aspirations prospectively from the point of origin, thereby connecting the literature on Global North migration flows to that on migration aspirations.

**Keywords:** migration aspiration, overseas Americans, Global North

## INTRODUCTION

Recent scholarship proposes a “two-step” approach to understanding the migration process, calling for separate analysis of, on one hand, individuals’ evaluations of migration as a potential course of action and, on the other, translation of such evaluations into either mobility or immobility (Carling and Schewel 2018). Renewed interest in migration aspirations revives a strand of research from the 1980s and 1990s that once looked deeply into the microdynamics of migrants’ pre-migration decision-making (De Jong 2000; De Jong *et al.* 1985; Sandu and De Jong 1996). It also takes inspiration from recent developments, among them the continued tightening of borders in Europe and North America, as well as the renewed social scientific interest in emotions, temporalities, and ongoing migration “projects” (Carling and Collins 2018).

We contribute to reemerging research on migration aspirations with a case study of U.S.-born U.S. citizens. We commissioned a unique, nationally representative online survey conducted in the United States in 2014 and, using that data, provide a quantitative picture of 877 Americans’ aspirations to live abroad, including their preferences for where they would like to go, for how long, and why. In line with the two-step aspirations approach, we measure their aspirations *prior to potential migration* and *from the point of origin*. Acknowledging that migration aspirations are “socially embedded and culturally informed” (Bal and Willems 2014; Benson and Osbaldiston 2016; Koikkalainen and Kyle 2016; Salazar 2011), we also model the influence of key cultural, financial, and social capital variables on each dimension.

Why study Americans’ migration aspirations? Because the number of Americans living abroad is growing, yet this group remains understudied, even as the utility of studying migration aspirations has been demonstrated in other Global North contexts (Scheibelhofer 2018; Van Dalen and Henkens 2013; Williams *et al.* 2018). In 2016, the U.S. State Department estimated that approximately nine million U.S. citizens lived abroad, equivalent to three percent of the total

U.S. citizen population and a substantial increase over its prior estimates of 7.6 million in 2013 and 6.3 million in 2012 (Klekowski von Koppenfels 2014, 32). Mexico and Canada are currently the top two destinations of U.S. citizens living abroad, followed by the United Kingdom, Germany, Australia, and Israel (OECD 2015: 256; Pew Research Center 2016; Smith 2014). In Mexico alone, U.S. citizens are now the largest immigrant population, at an estimated 850,000 and growing (Schafran and Monkkonen 2011).

Still, estimates of how many U.S. citizens live abroad vary (see also Fors Marsh 2016; Smith 2010) not only because different countries employ different methods of counting Americans with varying visa and citizenship statuses (Klekowski von Koppenfels and Costanzo 2013) but also because not all Americans self-identify, or are seen as, *migrants* in the first place (Croucher 2009a; 2015; Klekowski von Koppenfels 2014). This makes generating a representative sample from an unknown population base tricky at best, impossible at worst. It also means that our knowledge of Americans' motivations for migration is typically measured retrospectively, after migration (e.g., Croucher 2012; Klekowski von Koppenfels 2014; Trundle 2009), and typically focuses on migrants who are most visible or living in areas of high concentration. In contrast, emerging scholarship on migration aspirations collected at the point of origin centers primarily on flows originating in the Global South (Scheibelhofer 2018), offering little insight on how migration aspirations arise among Americans or other residents of economically advanced countries in the Global North.

The 2007-13 World Gallup Polls are one exception (OECD 2015). Using their microdata, Docquier, Peri, and Ruysen (2014) find few differences in how a host of economic, social, cultural, and policy factors shape migration aspirations among *all* potential migrants in 138 countries worldwide. However, their study was conducted at the aggregate level, leaving space

for finer-grained analysis. How many individuals in societies of the Global North aspire to move and live abroad? If so, where, for how long, and why? What does such potential movement mean to them? To begin addressing these questions, we start by situating our U.S. case study within the literature on migration aspirations. After introducing our primary data and methods, we present results from bivariate models showing how many Americans reveal aspirations to migrate, and if so, to where, for how long, and why. Next, we construct a range of multivariate models to compare the relative influences of cultural, financial, and social capital on each dimension. We conclude by discussing our main findings and their implications, the limitations of our study, and ideas for future research.

## **MIGRATION ASPIRATIONS IN SOCIAL CONTEXT**

According to Scheibelhofer (2018), aspirations are “hopes, plans, ambitions or goals that can be clearly formulated or kept rather vague” (2) and that simultaneously address both the present and the future. Scheibelhofer, studying Austrians, argues that aspirations are not purely situational but instead “rather enduring” in their influence over an individual’s life course. Indeed, *prospection* – the representation of possible futures – can function psychologically as “mental simulation” to shape human action, as individuals engage, in different ways, in “episodic future-thinking” (Seligman *et al.* 2013, cited in Koikkalainen and Kyle 2016). Set within a broader capabilities framework, Appadurai (2004) argues that aspiration is a future-oriented cultural capacity that is strongly classed – more open to and commonly enjoyed by more affluent individuals. Other scholars argue even more strongly that imagination, as well as the ability to act upon it, is shaped by not only historical context but also wider cultural repertoires and power dynamics (Benson 2012; Smith 2006).

Migration aspiration, specifically, refers to the basic conviction that leaving a particular place would be better than staying (Carling and Collins 2018, 7). “Inherently elusive” (Carling and Schewel 2018, 4), migration aspiration can exist along several continua – including one moving from strong aspiration to leave to strong aspiration to stay, the (in)voluntariness of potential migration, and the degree to which plans have (not) been solidified (Bivand Erdal and Oeppen 2018; Carling 2002; Carling and Collins 2018; Carling and Schewel 2018). As with other types of aspirations, migration aspiration varies across time and space (Van Mol *et al.* 2017) and likely reflects class and other stratification in people’s capabilities to imagine migration as one facet of their broader goals and outcomes (de Haas 2014).

By contrast, migration *behavior*, Carling and Schewel (2018) contend, is a separate stage and object of analysis, although it may sometimes be correlated with migration aspiration. Certainly, individuals’ migration intentions have been shown to be moderate to strong predictors of actual migration patterns in a variety of national contexts, including the Netherlands and Mexico (see Creighton 2013; Czaika and Vothknecht 2014; De Jong 2000; De Jong *et al.* 1986; Docquier, Peri, and Ruysen 2014; Theiss-Morse and Wals 2014; van Dalen and Henkens 2013; Wals and Moreno n.d.). Still, aspirations, intentions, and even self-reported likelihoods of migrating do not always translate seamlessly into actual migration behavior (de Groot *et al.* 2011; Gardner *et al.* 1985). An individual may have ideas or preference to migrate but lack the ability or resources (whether information, social networks, or money) to do so, resulting in what Carling (2002) calls “involuntary immobility.” Vice versa, other people can migrate without ever having developed an aspiration to do so – whether enticed by an unanticipated job offer or coerced by natural or political disaster (Kokkalainen and Kyle 2016). Finally, individuals may adjust their migration aspirations over time.

For all these reasons, Koikkalainen and Kyle (2016) argue that aspirations should ideally be measured *prior* to mobility taking place and should include people who do not necessarily wish to migrate as well as aspirants who never come to move. In practice, however, most studies “sample on the dependent variable” twice – first, by analyzing only individuals who have already migrated and, second, by measuring their aspirations retrospectively. In response, a wave of studies on migration aspirations have now emerged at various points of origin, including the aforementioned Gallup World Polls and EUIMAGINE, a survey of migration aspirations among people living in four different community contexts of Morocco, Senegal, Turkey, and Ukraine. Together, these surveys provide a useful global overview of migration aspiration patterns; they reveal that migration aspirations vary widely within (and not just between) sending country contexts, even after controlling for individuals’ socioeconomic status, and that migration aspirations exceed actual migration rates. Still, as Carling and Schewel (2018) point out, point-of-origin studies often fail to conceptualize and operationalize migration aspirations uniformly, which contributes to ongoing conceptual vagueness. At the same time, scholars largely agree that migration aspirations, like migration behavior, emerge from interactions between individual characteristics and the wider macro-level emigration environment (i.e., the broader social, economic, political, and legal context) (Carling and Collins 2018; Carling and Schewel 2018). Docquier, Peri, and Ruysen’s (2014) cross-country analysis, for example, evaluates how various economic, policy, linguistic, cultural, and social network factors work to shape aggregate migration aspirations, as well as the transition of those aspirations into subsequent mobility.

Finally, research shows that migration aspirations can be reflections of individuals’ other “life” aspirations and identity projects, including *who* they want to be at a future point (Carling and Schewel 2018), which they often connect to images and ideas about other places, or *where*



they want to be, too (Benson 2011; 2012; Benson and O'Reilly 2016; Timmerman, Hemmerchts, and De Clerck 2014). Prior migrants can be a key source of such imagery, complementing those that can also circulate through domestic institutions, material goods, and media (Collins 2018; Glick Schiller and Salazar 2013). Indeed, migrants remit not just money but also non-economic ideas about culture, gender, race, and politics to nonmigrants within “transnational social fields” (Levitt 2001; Joseph 2015; Roth 2012). These ideas have been shown to exert normative influence over nonmigrants’ imaginings of themselves in different places, which in turn shape new aspirations to move (Gardner 1993; Van Mol *et al.* 2017).

## **MIGRATION ASPIRATIONS IN THE GLOBAL NORTH**

While scholarship on migration aspirations is expanding quickly, it focuses primarily on people in or from economically deprived world regions where migration is often envisioned as a pathway to build a better and more economically secure future and for whom the experience of migration and adaptation often involves various adversities (Scheibelhofer 2018: 2). The Gallup World Polls are a notable exception (Docquier, Peri, and Ruysen 2014), as is Scheibelhofer’s study of migration aspirations among Austrians in New York City. Members of the latter group, Scheibelhofer found, did not make one single “decision” to migrate but rather went through different stages in a larger “process” of arriving at a decision to leave and then settling on their destination. Further, aspirations for self-determination and self-realization were prominent among them: they saw New York City as a place of innovation in comparison to Austria and preferred the U.S. for that reason.

Although Scheibelhofer’s (2018) study is limited by the “mobility bias” Koikkalainen and Kyle (2016) identify, as it measures migration aspirations retrospectively, her findings still

resonate with those in a separate literature on migration from the Global North, which focuses on flows of what are often dubbed “lifestyle migrants” moving from Northern to Southern Europe or from North to Central and South America (Benson 2011; Benson and O’Reilly 2009; 2016; Benson and Osbaldiston 2016; Croucher 2009a; 2015; 2018; King, Warnes, and Williams 2000; Oliver and O’Reilly 2010; O’Reilly 2000). Benson and O’Reilly (2009) define “lifestyle migrants” as “relatively affluent individuals, moving either part-time or full-time, permanently or temporarily, to places which, for various reasons, signify for the migrants something loosely defined as quality of life” (621). Various studies in this tradition find that among lifestyle migrants, motivations for self-actualization (e.g., leaving something behind, starting anew, and achieving a new self or set of goals) are salient compared to the fulfilment of economic need. They also find that movement is often made possible by such migrants’ economic and noneconomic privilege, including high levels of cultural, financial, or social capital (Benson 2012; Croucher 2012; 2015; 2018), and that “lifestyle” migrants often construct and attach noneconomic criteria, like “paradise” or the “rural idyll”, to images they hold of specific geographic destinations (Benson 2011; 2012; Hayes 2015a; Kordel and Pohle 2016; Osbaldiston 2011; Viteri 2015).

Nevertheless, Benson and Osbaldiston (2016) caution that as a label, lifestyle migration is often “adopted uncritically” and “without much thought to the theoretical implications it implies” (409). Similarly, as far back as 2002, King cautioned against “false characterisations” of migrants as only “poor, uprooted, marginal and desperate” individuals coming from the Global South (89) and noted that space in theorization of migration should be left to include those migrants who were not marginal or desperate, as well as those from the Global North.<sup>2</sup> In other

---

<sup>2</sup> In other bodies of literature, migrants from the Global North are conceptualized largely as highly skilled and seen as “expats” (Dewolf 2014; Koutonin 2015), “corporate transferees,” or “global talent”

words, migrants from the Global North are not necessarily categorically distinct in motivation (i.e., noneconomic, consumptive) or material condition (i.e., affluent) than those from the Global South; whether migrants originate in the Global South or the Global North, their motivations are often complex and multi-causal (Castles 2010). This has led Benson and O'Reilly (2016) to argue more recently that lifestyle migration is best viewed not as a single migrant type but as an inductive “lens” for understanding how consumption-based and noneconomic motivations for migration intersect with economic ones among all migrants in the present era of globalization (see also Croucher 2015). Even so, investigations of how migrants from the Global North develop their initial aspirations to live abroad remain limited, especially by retrospective measurement and a lack of comparisons to nonmigrant populations still at home. If we are to better model the first “aspiration” step of Carling and Schewel’s (2018) two-step model, we must move back to Global North migrants’ points of origin to correct this mobility bias.

## **DATA AND EXPECTATIONS**

In this article, we measure migration aspirations from the point of origin in one Global North sending country – the United States – prior to migration behavior potentially taking place. Our data come from an original internet survey we commissioned of 1,015 adults ages 18 and older living in the United States that was conducted by GfK Custom Research North America using its web-enabled KnowledgePanel® on July 11-13, 2014.<sup>3</sup> Subtracting all panelists who

---

(Beaverstock 2005; 2017), with migration motivations centered on economic as opposed to noneconomic aspirations (although see Ryan 2008 and Tabor, Milfont, and Ward 2015).

<sup>3</sup> GfK’s surveys are designed to be representative of the total U.S. adult population, including those without internet access, and are further constructed to be comparable both across panels and across time. We selected GfK’s online probability platform for several reasons. While larger face-to-face population-based surveys are ideal, we know of none with questions relating to past or potential emigration experiences. Research also shows that a carefully executed internet panel, especially one drawn from a

were first-generation immigrants, non-U.S. citizens, or both, we arrived at a final sample of 877 U.S.-born citizens for the present analysis.

## Dependent Measures

We use four survey questions to calculate dependent variables for our multivariate analysis.

*Aspiration.* First, in line with the literature on migration aspirations, we developed *aspiration* as a compound variable that measures various aspects of aspiration but does not restrict aspiration to permanent moves,<sup>4</sup> as the 2007-13 Gallup World Polls did<sup>5</sup> (see Table 1). We found that one third of survey panelists (N=288, 33.1%) revealed some aspiration to live abroad, including those who did not “realistically think it will happen” (N=130, 14.9%), those who would consider it (N=111, 12.8%), and those with stronger desires or plans (N=47, 5.4%). On the other hand, a clear majority of survey panelists (N=509, 58.4%) reported no aspiration to live abroad. In between, just under one tenth (N=74, 8.4%) reported no aspiration but indicated they would consider it if a special opportunity were to arise.

---

large pool of respondents, produces results as accurate as an random-digit-dialed (RDD) telephone survey, with little negative effect on the patterning of internal causal relations between variables (Ansolabere and Schaffner 2011; Stephenson and Crête 2011). Given GfK’s panel selection methodology, we are able to assuage potential concerns about its opt-in nature (Chang and Krosnick 2009) by adjusting our results using statistical weights that incorporate probabilities of panelists’ selection and population benchmarks from U.S. Census Current Population Survey reports.

<sup>4</sup> These aspects include whether a survey panelist has ever thought about living outside the United States (*aspiration*), whether a survey panelist reports being open to thinking about living abroad in the future (*potential aspiration*), to what degree he/she thinks an aspiration is likely to come to fruition (*likelihood*), and finally, to what degrees he/she either wants to make aspiration a reality (*desire*) or has already begun making it happen (*plans*).

<sup>5</sup> With that more restrictive wording, the 2007-13 World Gallup Polls found that 10 percent of Americans expressed an aspiration to move abroad (OECD 2015, 256-57).

[Table 1 about here]

***Geographic Preference of Aspiration:*** Second, our survey asked panelists who revealed some aspiration to live abroad to note the country or world region in which they would be most interested in living (*geographic preference*).<sup>6</sup> As Table 2 shows, over half of panelists (52.1%) who answered this question revealed an aspiration to live abroad in Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand. Behind them, a fifth of aspirants (19.5%) indicated Latin America or the Caribbean; together with those who indicated Mexico (3.8%), they comprise nearly one quarter. Just under one tenth of aspirants preferred Canada and Asia each. Given small sample size, we constructed dummy variables to see what factors predict these aspirants' interest in living abroad in each of the following three geographic categories: *Canada* (vs. elsewhere), *Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand* (vs. elsewhere), and *Latin America or the Caribbean (including Mexico)* (vs. elsewhere).<sup>7</sup>

[Table 2 about here]

***Timing Preference of Aspiration:*** Third, our survey asked panelists who revealed some aspiration to live abroad how long, ideally, they would like to do so (*timing preference*).<sup>8</sup> Table 2

---

<sup>6</sup> We offered eight response categories based on current rankings of destinations for Americans already abroad. Two were single-country options: Canada and Mexico. The rest were regional options: Western Europe combined with Australia and New Zealand (as Anglophone countries); Eastern Europe or the (former) Soviet Union; Central and South America (except Mexico) or the Caribbean; Asia, the Middle East (including Israel); and Africa.

<sup>7</sup> We considered adding Canada to the Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand category, as it has also developed in large part from British colonization. However, due to Canada's geographic and cultural proximity to the United States and to the fact that some Americans do not necessarily see it as "foreign," we decided not to. Indeed, the "political border [between the United States and Canada has] not generally represent[ed] a sociologically significant boundary" for Americans (Dashefsky *et al.* 1992, 29). In contrast, we did add Mexico to the Latin America or Caribbean category, since many Americans perceive that large cultural, socioeconomic, and political differences divide the United States from Mexico.

<sup>8</sup> The extant literature on American migrants already abroad documents a range of shorter- to longer-term aspirations, with some short-term aspirants ultimately becoming "accidental [permanent] migrants" (Klekowski von Koppenfels 2014).

shows that while approximately half of aspirants (49.8%) indicated that they would ideally like to live abroad for less than one year, almost one-third of aspirants (30.2%) envisioned somewhat longer-term moves between one and five years, and another fifth (19.8%) envisioned moving for longer than five years. Therefore, we constructed a dummy variable to see what factors predict these aspirants' interest in living abroad for *one year or longer* (vs. less than one year).

***Motivations for Aspiration:*** Finally, our survey offered panelists who revealed some aspiration to live abroad six choices of possible motivating factors (*motivations*) – (a) *to work*, (b) *to study*; (c) *to join a partner*; (d) *to retire*; (e) *to explore*; or (f) *to leave a bad situation in the U.S* – and asked them to select up to three of the most likely, in order of strength. Based on the extant literature on American migration, we expected to uncover a range of motivating rationales (Klekowski von Koppenfels 2014; Schafran and Monkkonen 2011), including both “pull” factors such as exploration or job and study opportunities and “push” factors such as economic risk minimization or dissatisfaction with their personal or general situation at home (although see Klekowski von Koppenfels 2014; Morgan *et al.* 2016; Vance and McNulty 2014).<sup>9</sup>

As Table 3 shows, *to explore* is by far the most frequently and highly ranked motivation among aspirants; well over three quarters (N=87.4%) ranked it as one of their top three motivations, and almost half (44.0%) ranked it as their leading motivation. *To retire*, *to leave*,

---

<sup>9</sup> The first three motivations (*to work*, *to study*, and *to join a partner*) can be viewed as most instrumental, the fourth (*to explore*) more expressive. The sixth motivation (*to leave*) most explicitly attempts to account for push factors that might be related to Americans' dissatisfaction with personal, economic, social, or political conditions at home, including personal financial concerns (Hayes 2014; Miles 2015) or what Van Dalen and Henkens (2013) call dissatisfaction with the quality of the public domain (see also Hayes 2015a). The fifth (*to retire*) can be considered both expressive, in that retirement or lifestyle migration may offer Americans new opportunities for exploration, self-actualization, and fulfillment (Benson and O'Reilly 2016), and instrumental, in that considerations about retirement can be related to financial push factors (Hayes 2014).

and *to work* were the next most frequently ranked motivations, by approximately half of aspirants each (50.8%, 49.0%, and 48.3% respectively), though we note that *to retire* was listed most commonly as a second motivation and *to leave* as a third motivation. *To study* (33.1%) and *to join a partner* (19.4%) were ranked least often, but still by roughly one fourth to one third of all aspirants. For ease, we condensed these responses into dummy variables for each motivation, coded “1” if a panelist selected a given motivation with a top 1-3 ranking and “0” otherwise.<sup>10</sup>

[Table 3 about here]

## Independent Measures

**Controls:** We control for age, gender, and U.S. region of residence, all of which have been indicated in the literature as potentially shaping the development of aspirations to migrate (e.g., Coulter 2013; De Jong, 2000; Kley 2011; Viteri 2015). We also control for race, political ideology, and strength of national identification as American. Not only is race the key “dispersive prism” through which Americans consider their identities and opportunities and senses of belonging within the nation (Masuoka and Junn 2013); there is also some indication that American voters who feel a weakened sense of belonging to their nation (Hardwick 2010), especially during moments immediately following a lost Presidential election (Alter 2012; 2016; Motyl 2014), may vocalize greater aspiration to leave. Indeed, stronger national identity has been found to reduce migrants’ emigration intentions in other sending-country contexts like Mexico and Iceland (Theiss-Morse and Wals 2014). Because fully 86.0% of our sample reported a “very strong” American identity and another 12.0% a “somewhat strong” American identity –

---

<sup>10</sup> Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs) indicate that multicollinearity among the six motivations in the full sample (N=1,015 panelists) is not a problem.

compared to just 2.0% who identified “not very strongly” as American or “not at all” – for parsimony we constructed a dummy variable for *very strong American identification* (vs. anything less).

***Cultural Capital Predictors:*** Social class, in both its economic and noneconomic dimensions, figures heavily in international migration flows from the Global North (Benson and O’Reilly 2009; 2011; 2016; Croucher 2015; Miles 2015; Scott 2006; Vitieri 2015). Benson (2012) most explicitly calls for scholars to pay greater attention to the “cultural drivers” of migration aspiration and behavior, for which research on migration aspirations has found some support (Canache et al. 2013; Docquier, Peri, and Russyen 2014; van Dalen and Henkens 2013). Here, our cultural capital predictors include a recoded ordinal measure capturing survey panelists’ *highest level of education*, three dummy variables capturing *internet access in the household* (internet access vs. not), *passport ownership* (holding a U.S. passport vs. not), and *foreign language* (ability to speak at least one foreign language vs. only English), and two ordinal variables for extent of panelists’ *prior travel/tourism experience* and *prior living abroad experience* (ranging from “I have never traveled/lived outside the United States” to “I have toured/lived abroad in more than 20 countries”).<sup>11</sup> Our reasoning is that in the U.S., higher education, having access to the internet, having a U.S. passport, the ability to speak at least one foreign language, and prior tourism and/or living abroad experience<sup>12</sup> are all arguably measures of Americans’ embodied cultural capital and class location (Bourdieu 1986), or even

---

<sup>11</sup> We distinguished these two variables in our survey instrumentation as being *short-term* (e.g., as a tourist or short-term volunteer) versus *longer-term* (excluding any shorter visits for tourism purposes). To facilitate presentation of results, we sometimes employ these ordinal versions but at other times employ dummy variables indicating whether panelists have had *any prior tourism experience* (vs. none) or *any living abroad experience* (vs. none).

<sup>12</sup> A large literature on the “tourism-migration nexus” suggests that the former can incite imagination about the latter (Legkekk 2001; Williams and Hall 2000).



cosmopolitanism (Haubert and Fussell 2006), not just their human capital or “hard” professional skills. Furthermore, internet access may reflect stratified access to mass-mediated imagery that circulates to Americans through this medium, which scholarship has shown can encourage both cognitive imagining of migration (Koikkalainen and Kyle 2016; Salazar 2012) and actual migration (Hayes 2014).

***Financial Capital Predictors:*** We also follow other scholars’ lead in hypothesizing that financial resources – such as income, employment status, or even dissatisfaction or anxiety with one’s personal finances or the broader “quality of life” in the public domain – can shape the “first stage” of migration aspirations (Canache *et al.* 2013; Docquier, Peri, and Russyen 2014; Hayes 2014; Theiss-Morse and Wals 2014; Wals and Moreno n.d.; van Dalen and Henkens 2013). Here, our financial capital predictors include a continuous measure of *annual pre-tax median household income*; two dummy variables for currently *employed status* and *homeownership*; and two ordinal variables to measure panelists’ subjective ratings of the *health of their own personal finances* and the *health of the U.S. economy*, our ways of gauging their personal and sociotropic assessments of economic well-being. We think it equally plausible that Americans’ aspirations could be classed by differential access to financial resources (Appadurai 2004) or, alternately, that they could be more “open” and less dependent on financial capital compared to later stages of decision and action.

***Social Capital Predictors:*** A central form of capital (Bourdieu 1986), social capital can be loosely defined as resources that derive from individuals’ relationships with others and that can be converted into value. Docquier, Peri, and Russyen (2014)’s study shows that social networks with prior migrants are the “key” factor encouraging the development of migration

aspirations worldwide,<sup>13</sup> while the larger literatures on migration and transnationalism show that prior migrants are a key source of imagery about different destinations (Collins 2018). Here, our social capital predictors include a dummy variable measuring survey panelists' *immigrant heritage*; two dummy variables measuring panelists' social networks beyond the household: *military service* and panelists' self-reports of direct *social networks* with other U.S. citizens who have lived or are living abroad; and two dummy variables for household structure: *living with partner* and the presence of *children under 18 in the household*. Our reasoning is that Americans' social ties to U.S. citizens abroad can emerge from a number of sources, including their families, their broader circles of friends, coworkers, and acquaintances,<sup>14</sup> and even formal institutions such as the military, which commonly deploys Americans overseas. We also follow extant research showing that household structure shapes peoples' norms and obligations, especially by age, gender, and class.

## **BIVARIATE CORRELATES OF AMERICANS' MIGRATION ASPIRATIONS**

Tables 4 and 5 present bivariate associations between our independent and dependent variables. We focus on the main patterns to save space for our multivariate results, but cross-

---

<sup>13</sup> While some studies of migration aspirations measure these networks at an aggregate level (e.g., size of migrant stock abroad, community-level migration prevalence, or presence or size of remittance flows), others measure it more directly as social ties to particular individuals, in rare cases even differentiating between ties to family members versus friends (Van Mol *et al.* 2018) or ties that derive from patrilineal versus matrilineal lines (Creighton and Riosmena 2012).

<sup>14</sup> While our questions about these networks initially probed not only their degree of "closeness" but also whether the persons were still living abroad or had since returned to the U.S., for the sake of parsimony we collapse responses into a single dummy capturing whether panelists did (vs. did not) know any U.S. citizens who had gone to live in another country, regardless of whether or not they had returned.

tabulations for all significant results are located in an online Supplemental Online Appendix for interested readers.

[Tables 4 and 5 about here]

***Aspiration:*** A number of variables are significantly associated with survey panelists' *aspiration* to live abroad (see Table 4, Column 1). Among the controls, higher proportions of panelists who are younger, reside in the U.S. Northeast, are politically liberal, and report less than a very strong American identity also indicate stronger aspiration to live abroad. Beyond the controls, all six cultural capital variables, three of the five financial capital variables, and three of the five social capital variables are also significantly associated with panelists' aspiration to live abroad (see Table 4, Column 1). Cultural capital appears to be especially strongly correlated with Americans' aspirations to live abroad; higher proportions of panelists who are college-educated, have internet access at home, speak at least one language in addition to English, hold a U.S. passport, and have prior tourism experience report higher levels of aspiration. In terms of financial capital, higher mean household income and being employed full or part-time are positively associated, yet home ownership negatively associated, with migration aspirations. Having social networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad and having recent immigrant heritage (defined as having second- to fourth-generation immigrant heritage) are the two key social capital variables associated with stronger aspiration.

Most of these bivariate associations and significance levels remain unchanged when we run a robustness check dropping *aspiration's* response categories 2 and 3 (see Table 4, Column 2). We do this because we recognize that these two response categories may capture competing yes/no aspects of aspiration within our compound variable, so the results give us greater confidence in our findings.

***Geographic and Temporal Dimensions of Aspiration:*** Honing in on the survey panelists who revealed some aspiration to live abroad, Table 4 (see Columns 3, 4, and 5) shows two main patterns: first, fewer variables are significantly associated with Americans' ideal destinations and length of residence abroad than was the case with *aspiration* itself; and second, no cultural, economic, or social capital variables are consistently significantly associated across all the models. For instance, aspirations to live abroad in Canada (see Table 4, Column 3) are significantly associated only with having a weaker national identification. By contrast, aspirations to live abroad in Western Europe, Australia, and New Zealand (see Table 4, Column 4) are significantly associated only with whiteness and having networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad. Still differently, aspirations to live abroad in Mexico, Latin America, or the Caribbean (see Table 4, Column 5) are significantly associated with a wider range of variables: being older and less educated, having internet access in the household, homeownership, currently living with a partner, and *not* having networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad. Finally, aspirations to live abroad for more than one year (see Table 4, Column 6) are significantly associated with yet a different constellation of variables: being in mid-life, rating the U.S. economy's health as better, currently living with a partner, and service in the U.S military.<sup>15</sup>

***Motivations for Aspiration:*** Turning to the different motivations for aspirations to live abroad – working, studying, joining a partner, retiring, exploring, or leaving a bad situation in the U.S. – once again bivariate analysis (see Table 5) shows that fewer variables are significantly associated with any of these underlying motivations than was the case with *aspiration* itself. For

---

<sup>15</sup> Aspirations to live abroad for more than one year are also associated with having more prior experience living abroad, but the relationship is only significant when the latter is measured as a dummy, and only marginally so ( $X^2=3.747, p < .05$ ).

example, the motivation *to work* is significantly associated (see Table 5, Column 1) with being younger, male, and a resident of the U.S. Midwest and, among the types of capital, having internet access in the household, not being a homeowner, and not having served in the military. Aspiration to live abroad *to study* is significantly associated (see Table 5, Column 2) with being either younger (ages 18-25) or older (over age 55) and having a very strong national identification and also with not being employed, giving a positive rating to the U.S. economy's health, and not currently living with a partner. Still differently, the motivation *to join a partner* (see Table 5, Column 3) is significantly associated with being female, nonwhite, and a resident of the U.S. West, plus not being a homeowner.

In comparison, social capital appears more relevant to the motivation *to retire* (see Table 5, Column 4), whereas cultural capital appears more relevant to the motivation *to leave* (see Table 5, Column 5). *To retire*, for instance, is significantly associated with being older and having a very strong national identification but also with having prior international tourism experience, being a homeowner, currently living with a partner, not having children under the age of 18 living at home, and military service. *To leave* is significantly associated with weaker American national identification and also with having only a high school degree, not holding a U.S. passport, not having prior tourism experience, and giving a lower rating to the U.S. economy's health. Finally, the motivation *to explore* (see Table 5, Column 6) is significantly associated only with whiteness, stronger national identification, and having less prior experience living abroad. Fully 92.4 percent of white aspirants – especially those who identify as “somewhat” (94.4%) and “very” strongly (86.6%) American – rank *to explore* as a motivation, compared to just 76.6 percent of nonwhite aspirants in our sample.

## PREDICTORS OF AMERICANS' MIGRATION ASPIRATIONS

Having established the bivariate relevance of many of our independent variables, we now build several multivariate models to examine whether – and if so, how – they effectively predict Americans' aspirations to migrate.

*Aspiration:* First, we conducted multinomial logistic regression to predict the presence of *aspiration*. This method is used to model nominal outcome variables and thus offers an opportunity to examine which independent variables predict each of *aspiration*'s three clean “yes” response categories (numbers 4-6) relative to its clean “no” response category (number 1), without sacrificing sample size. Since none of the independent variables significantly predict response category 6, perhaps because of its small sample size, we focus our discussion here only on the variables that predict response categories 4 (“Yes, I have [considered living abroad] and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it”) and 5 (“Yes, I have [considered living abroad] and I want to find a way to make it happen someday”). In the text, we transform the coefficients that appear in Table 6 into odds ratios for ease of discussion.

[Table 6 about here]

Compared to the bivariate results presented earlier, far fewer independent variables predict *aspiration* in the multivariate models. Political ideology, of particular note, is *not* a significant predictor of *aspiration*, though having less than a very strong American identification does raise *aspiration* in both response categories 4 and 5, as does residing outside the U.S. West in response category 5. Among the other significant results, cultural capital appears to be strongest, followed by social capital.<sup>16</sup> Surprisingly, however, it is not education level,

---

<sup>16</sup> Mean household income is largely nonsignificant, except for moving from the lowest mean household income category (under \$25,000 per year) to the top one (over \$175,000), which reduces *aspiration* in category 5.

knowledge of foreign languages, or household structure that shapes Americans' *aspiration*.

Rather, aspiration to migrate is greater among panelists who hold a U.S. passport; have internet access in the household, prior living abroad experience, and recent immigrant heritage; have served in the military; and have networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad.<sup>17</sup>

***Geographic and Temporal Dimensions of Aspiration:*** Second, we conducted binary logistical regression to predict whether aspirants rank (a) Canada, (b) Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand; or (c) Latin America or the Caribbean (including Mexico) as their preferred destination and whether they aspire to live abroad for longer than one year (see Table 7).

[Table 7 about here]

Overall, cultural capital appears to be the strongest predictor of aspirants' geographic preferences, followed by financial capital. Perhaps surprisingly, knowledge of foreign languages and internet access in the household do not determine where panelists aspire to go. Still, aspirants are 2.6 times more likely to aspire to live in Latin America as their education level decreases, 3.0 times more likely to prefer Canada (though 2.4 times less likely to prefer Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand) if they hold U.S. passports, and .7 times less likely to prefer Canada if they have greater prior international tourism experience. In terms of financial capital, aspirants are 1.8 times less likely to prefer Canada as their evaluation of the health of their own

---

<sup>17</sup>Results in Table 6 show that if a panelist were to move from being a U.S. passport holder to not holding a U.S. passport, their relative log odds of indicating both categories of *aspiration* would be reduced by -1.593 (category 4,  $p < .01$ ) and -1.391 (category 5,  $p < .01$ ) relative to category 1 (no aspiration). Similarly, if a panelist were to move from knowing other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad to not having such social networks, their relative log odds of indicating both categories of aspiration would be reduced by -1.389 (category 4,  $p < .001$ ) and -1.495 (category 5,  $p < .001$ ) relative to category 1 (no aspiration). The remaining variables predict only one of the *aspiration* response categories (category 4), but not both. If a panelist were to move from having internet access at home, from having prior living abroad experience, from reporting 2nd- to 4<sup>th</sup>-generation immigrant ancestry, or from having prior or present military service to not, their relative log odds of indicating category 4 aspiration to live abroad would be reduced by -1.139 ( $p < .05$ ), -.743 ( $p < .05$ ), -.745 ( $p < .05$ ), and -.801 ( $p < .05$ ), respectively, relative to category 1 (no aspiration).

personal finances improves, 2.6 times more likely to prefer Latin America if they are homeowners, and 1.6 times more likely to want to live abroad for longer than one year if they are employed. Only one social capital variable is significant: aspirants are 2.1 times more likely to aspire to live in Latin America, and 1.7 times more likely to aspire to live abroad for longer than one year, if they are currently living with a partner.

Interestingly, three controls – gender, race, and strength of national identification – also shape panelists’ geographic “imagining” of where they wish to go. Aspirants are 2.8 times more likely to prefer Canada if they are male. If they are non-Hispanic white, they are 1.8 times more likely to prefer Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand but 2.39 times less likely to prefer Latin America. Finally, as national identification intensifies, aspirants are 1.5 times more likely to prefer Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand but 2.9 times less likely to prefer Canada. In sum, whereas we saw earlier that certain elements of cultural and social capital, including networks with prior migrants, best predicted the presence versus absence of *aspiration* among Americans in our sample, in tandem with weaker American national identification and non-West U.S. region residence, here we see that the geographic dimensions of such aspirations are best predicted by a combination of *both* the cultural and economic aspects of social class, alongside race and national attachment.

***Motivations for Aspiration:*** Third, we conducted binary logistical regression to predict whether aspirants rank (a) *to work*, (b) *to study*; (c) *to join a partner*; (d) *to retire*; (e) *to explore*; or (f) *to leave* among their top three motivations (see Table 8).

[Table 8 about here]

We find that the controls – specifically, age, race, U.S. region of residence, and strength of national identification – help predict several motivations, but in different constellations. For



example, as age increases, aspirants are 1.4 times less likely to rank *to work* but 1.4 times more likely to rank *to retire* as a motivation. Aspirants are 2.0 times more likely to rank *to join a partner* if they are female. If they are nonwhite, aspirants are 2.7 times more likely to rank *to join a partner* and 2.1 times more likely to rank *to retire*, but 3.1 times less likely to rank *to explore*. If they live in the U.S. Northeast or West, aspirants are 2.9 times less likely to rank *to work* as a top motivation; those in the Northeast are also 2.2 times more likely to rank *to leave*. Finally, as national identification strengthens, aspirants are 3.0 times more likely to rank *to study*, but 4.0 times less likely to rank *to leave*.

Beyond these controls, three cultural capital and three financial capital variables predict just one motivation each, while one social capital variable (*currently living with partner*) predicts two. None of the forms of capital help predict whether aspirants rank *to work* or *to explore*. Aspirants are 2.4 and 1.8 times more likely to list *to study* as a top motivation if they are unemployed or not currently living with a partner. As their education declines, if they lack access to internet at home or are not homeowners, aspirants are 2.2, 3.0, and 2.4 times more likely, respectively, to list *to join a partner*. Aspirants are 2.6 times more likely to list *to retire* if they are currently living with a partner. Finally, aspirants are 1.9 and 1.7 times more likely to rank *to leave* as a top motivation if they do not hold U.S. passports and if they give a *better* (as opposed to worse) rating to the U.S. economy's health, respectively.

## DISCUSSION

This article has measured Americans' migration aspirations from the point of origin and prior to potential migration behavior, using a nationally representative online sample we commissioned and fielded in Summer 2014. We asked, at that point in time, how many

Americans had some aspiration to live abroad, and if so, where did they imagine going, for how long, and why? In our analysis, we investigate what forms of cultural, financial, and social capital “embed and inform” (Bal and Willems 2014) these considerations.

Overall, we found that one-third (33.1%) of panelists in our sample expressed some aspiration to live abroad (see Table 1). Likely because our measure does not restrict aspiration to long-term or permanent moves, this proportion is higher than the 10 percent of Americans who indicated a wish to move abroad “permanently, if they had the opportunity to do so,” in the 2007-13 Gallup World Surveys (OECD 2015). We also found that over half of aspirants (52.1%) looked primarily toward Western Europe, Australia or New Zealand, while another quarter (23.3%) were eyeing Latin America, the Caribbean, or Mexico (Table 2). Aspirants were evenly divided between those who envisioned going abroad for less than one year and those who envisioned going abroad for longer; in fact, nearly 15 percent envisioned going abroad for more than 10 years or indefinitely (see Table 2).

Finally, we found that exploration was the leading motivation behind aspirants’ desires to live abroad; fully 87% of all aspirants ranked it as one of their top three motivations, and almost half (44%) ranked it as their first. Nevertheless, aspirants’ overall motivations for living abroad were varied; approximately half ranked *to retire*, *to leave*, or *to work* among their top three motivations, and even though they were less prominent, roughly one fourth to one third of aspirants also ranked *to study* (33.1%) or *to join a partner* (see Table 3). On one hand, we interpret these results as fitting nicely with the extant literature on so-called “lifestyle migration,” which often shows that Global North migrants see migration as a way to pursue new opportunities for exploration, self-actualization, and fulfillment (e.g., Benson and O’Reilly 2016; Scheibelhofer 2018). On the other hand, we think these results support the effort already

underway in that literature to problematize what can sometimes come across as an overly facile depiction of Global North migrants as some singular, homogenous migrant type composed of uniformly “advantaged” and “privileged” people (Benson 2014; Croucher 2012). To be sure, many of our American aspirants, if they were to eventually move abroad, would be “relatively advantaged” (by class, race, and national origin) compared to their host populations, particularly in Latin America, Asia, and Africa (see Benson 2013; Croucher 2007; 2009b; 2018; Hayes 2015b; Kordel and Pohle 2018; Spalding 2013). Still, research shows that American migrants abroad are heterogenous in terms of class status and motivation (Hayes 2014; Klekowski von Koppenfels 2014; Schafran and Monkkonen 2011); our research shows this is also the case among Americans who are considering migration prospectively.

In other words, while exploration is certainly prominent among our aspirants, especially those who are non-Hispanic whites and those who are strong national identifiers, and while some of the other motivations we offered to panelists may also capture elements of an expressive search for self-fulfillment or improved “way of life,” aspirants also exhibit a range of economic and noneconomic motivations for wanting to migrate that belie singular categorization. Indeed, we think our results suggest utility in future research working to better conceptualize exploration as a migration motivation, not only in the literature on flows from the Global North but even more broadly. We know, for instance, that small proportions of U.S.-bound Mexican migrants report wanting to migrate in search of “adventure” (*a la aventura*) (Hagan *et al.* 2014, 83; Hernández-León 1999; Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994; Smith 2005) or for greater sexual freedom and autonomy (Carrillo 2018). Such motivations, however, remain understudied and undertheorized among a group and stream typically typologized as economic “labor” migrants, despite the fact

that economic desires for higher wages or risk minimization are often intertwined with a noneconomic desire for an improved “quality of life.”

Setting our panelists’ aspirations and their characteristics within a structure-agency framework, our multivariate results indicate that the presence of migration aspiration among Americans is best predicted by a combination of cultural and social capital, in tandem with weaker American national identification and non-West U.S. regional residence. Our panelists’ aspirations increase when they live outside the U.S. West and express less than a “very strong” national identity, but also when they hold U.S. passports; have internet access in the household, prior living abroad experience, and recent immigrant heritage; have served in the military; and have social networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad. We interpret these findings as lending support to research conducted in other sending contexts that shows a negative impact of national attachment (Theiss-Morse and Wals 2014) but a positive impact of social networks and institutions (such as the military or mass media) (Massey 1999) on the development of migration aspirations. In our data, some Americans do appear to develop “imagery” about a life abroad from prior migrants, having internet access, and serving in the U.S. military.

Further, we interpret these findings as supporting the argument that cultural, not merely economic, elements of social class shape how individuals in the Global North envision their potential lives abroad (Benson 2012; Smith 2006). Among panelists in our sample, migration aspirations are certainly “classed” (Appadurai 2004) but by the forms of cultural capital listed above, not by access to financial resources, at least not directly. Of course, financial capital may still come into play more strongly in later stages of decision and action, helping determine which panelists’ migration aspirations will get translated into actual behavior in the future, or not (Benson and O’Reilly 2016; Docquier, Peri, and Russyen 2014; Oliver and O’Reilly 2010).

Finally, our analysis of the factors predicting the geographic and temporal dimensions of, and motivations underlying, Americans' migration aspirations tell a less consistent story overall. However, among them we see two noteworthy patterns. First, national attachment and cultural capital continue to be salient; here they shape the "culturally significant imaginings" (Benson 2012) of where Americans wish to go and are joined by a few other economic aspects of class and race. Whites, stronger national identifiers, and aspirants who do not hold U.S. passports are more likely to look toward Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand. Perhaps this reflects dominant views held by many white Americans that Western Europe, Australia, and New Zealand are "civilized" and safe "white" spaces socioeconomically closest in position to the United State, versus dominant views of Latin America, Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and even Eastern Europe and the (former) Soviet Union as socioeconomically, racially, and religiously inferior or distant.<sup>18</sup> In contrast, aspirants who hold passports and rate the health of their own personal finances as better but are weaker national identifiers and have less international tourism experience are more likely to look toward Canada. Perhaps this echoes long-standing myths and realities about American migrants in Canada, some of whom, despite internally complex "circumstances and motivation" (Dashefsky *et al.* 1992: 32), went there during the 1960s and 1970s as "draft dodgers, deserters, or political activists who opposed the [Vietnam] war" (Hardwick 2010: 90). Finally, nonwhites, less educated aspirants, and homeowners are more likely to look toward Latin America. This could fit well with the extant literature on American retirees and second homeowners throughout Latin America (e.g., Janoschka 2009; Lizzáraga Morales 2010; Miles 2015; MPI 2006; Ortero 1997). However, the fact the large majority of American migrants in Latin America today are *white* (Benson 2013; 2015; Croucher 2018;

---

<sup>18</sup> U.S. President Trump illustrated these views when he pitted "desirable" immigrants from Norway against "undesirable" ones from alleged "shitholes" like Haiti, Africa, and Central America (Hulse 2018).

Hayes 2015b) suggests a critical disjuncture in how race shapes Americans' predecisional "mental time travel" (Kyle and Koikkalainen 2016) versus how it may shape their actual migration behavior, which future research could explore further.

Second, we think it noteworthy that race and national attachment also shape Americans' motivations for living abroad. In our multivariate results, non-Hispanic whites are more likely to rank *to explore* – the top motivation listed by all aspirants – but less likely to rank *to retire* or *to join a partner*, while weaker national identifiers are more likely to rank *to leave* but less likely to rank *to study*. While no forms of capital we tested predict motivations *to work* or *to explore*, we do find that American aspirants who are motivated *to join a partner* appear somewhat less advantaged overall (they are less educated, have no access to internet, and are not homeowners), while those who are motivated *to leave a bad situation in the U.S.* seem less so (they do not hold U.S. passports but give a better rating to the U.S. economy's health). Combined with the finding that aspirants who rank the U.S. economy's health as better are more likely to want to live abroad for longer, perhaps these results suggest it is the more economically secure (as opposed to insecure) Americans who express the greatest "push" to leave. This would not necessarily invalidate current research documenting narratives of financial insecurity and risk among Americans already abroad (Hayes 2014; 2015b; Hayes and Pérez-Gañán 2017), but it could help put such narratives into broader context, by distinguishing between the ways economic outlook shapes Americans' predecisional considerations versus their subsequent decisions to move.

While our study offers these contributions in an effort to enrich the literature on migration aspirations in a Global North context, we do acknowledge its limitations. Most importantly, our measure of *aspiration* is imperfect, since it does not allow us to examine the full continuum of aspiration or the full range of survey panelists' desires, intentions, likelihoods,

strategies, or plans (Carling and Collins 2018; Carling and Schewel 2018). Carling and colleagues call for surveys that employ multiple questions to better operationalize and capture these dimensions. Further, like Benson and O'Reilly (2016), they suggest that qualitative methods may be even better suited to studying migration aspirations, as they focus centrally on micro-level process-tracing and uncovering meaning, whereas survey methods are more appropriate for identifying broad patterns and establishing causal relationships. Identifying broad patterns and variation among potential migrants within a representative sample was our main focus here, but qualitative methods would certainly help flesh out why panelists did or did not reveal migration aspirations, why they were interested in some places over others, and how they made sense of their underlying motivations.

Further, while we include some measures of Americans' cultural, financial, and social resources and agree with Oliver and Reilly (2010) that these wield the power to shape what humans consider achievable and worth aspiring to in different settings, our list of predictors is by no means exhaustive. While Docquier, Peri, and Ruyssen (2014) find little evidence for a range of cultural, institutional, and policy controls on the development of migration aspirations worldwide in the late 2000s, we agree with existing studies on both migration aspirations and Global North migration that there is utility in future quantitative studies operationalizing not only wider cultural norms and repertoires about migration, perhaps as cultural or social capital (Benson 2012; Carling and Collins 2018; Timmerman, Hemmereichs, and De Clerck 2014) in their models, but also the various kinds of "migration industry" organizations and institutions that grease the wheels of Global North migration, perhaps as social or institutional capital variables (Hayes 2014; Hayes and Pérez-Gañán 2017; Mescoli 2014; Prado 2012). In addition, while political ideology was not significantly associated with migration aspiration or its

characteristics in our multivariate analysis – at least not during the mid-term election year of 2014 – how political variables may shape Americans’ aspirations likely varies over time and could plausibly shift under the contested nature of the current Trump presidency (Kaysen 2018).<sup>19</sup> Nor does our survey include a number of other variables that could shape aspiration, such as personality, environmental disparities, or even incentive structure at the place of destination, which could include the range of economic and political incentives that many foreign countries currently offer to recruit Global North migrants (e.g., Canache *et al.* 2013; MPI 2006; van Dalen and Henkens 2013).

More broadly, future research could investigate the geographic and temporal dimensions of Americans’ migration aspirations at a finer-grained level; query for a wider variety of motivating factors behind why some individuals wish to leave versus stay; begin tracking aspirations and the aspiration-migration nexus over time (using repeated cross-sectional or longitudinal research designs that allow for better specification of causality than we are able to provide); and engage in cross-national comparisons with other flows originating in both the Global North and Global South. How economic and noneconomic motivations intersect among various groups’ migration aspiration could be one fruitful area of comparative research (Hayes 2014; Hayes and Pérez-Gañán 2017); how different groups perceive their aspirations on a continuum of (in)voluntariness could be another (Bivand Erdal and Oeppen 2018). As Benson and Osbaldiston (2016) and Hayes (2014) argue, such efforts will help uncover how both material structure and historical time work to shape Americans’ prospective imaginations of themselves, either at home or abroad.

---

<sup>19</sup> However, Alter (2012; 2016) lays out several psychological reasons for why many ideologically disaffected aspirants do not follow through in behavior.



## REFERENCES

- Alter, A. 2012. "You're Not Moving to Canada: The Psychology of Post-Election Melodrama." *The Atlantic* (November 7).
- . 2016. "Here's Why You Won't Really Move to Canada if Trump Wins in November." *Washington Post* (March 2).
- Ansolabelere, S. and B. F. Schaffner. 2011. "Re-Examining the Validity of Different Survey Modes for Measuring Public Opinion in the U.S.: Findings from a 2010 Multi-Mode Comparison." Paper presented at the *Cultural Contact and Immigration Working Group Meeting*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York (July 28-29).
- Appadurai, A. 2004. "The Capacity to Aspire: Culture and the Terms of Recognition." In *Culture and Public Action*, edited by V. Rao and M. Walton, 59-84. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bal, E. and R. Willems. 2014. "Introduction: Aspiring Migrants, Local Crises and the Imagination of Futures 'Away from Home'." *Identities* 21(3): 249-58.
- Beaverstock, J. V. 2005. "Transnational Elites in the City: British Highly-Skilled Inter-Company Transferees in New York City's Financial District." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31(2): 245-268.
- . 2017. "The Spatial Mobility of Corporate Knowledge: Expatriation, Global Talent, and the World City." In *Mobilities of Knowledge*, edited by H. Jöns, P. Meusbürger, and M. Heffernan, 227-246. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer Verlag.
- Benson, M. 2011. *The British in Rural France: Lifestyle Migration and the Ongoing Quest for a Better Way of Life*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- . 2012. "How Culturally Significant Imaginings are Translated into Lifestyle Migration." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38(1): 1681-1696.
- . 2013. "Postcoloniality and Privilege in New Lifestyle Flows: The Case of North Americans in Panama." *Mobilities* 8(3): 313-330.
- . 2014. "Negotiating Privilege in and through Lifestyle Migration." In *Understanding Lifestyle Migration*, edited by M. C. Benson and N. Osbaldiston, 47-69. Basingstoke, UK: MacMillan.
- Benson, M. and K. O'Reilly (Eds.). 2009. *Lifestyle Migration: Expectations, Aspirations and Experiences*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- . 2016. "From Lifestyle Migration to Lifestyle in Migration: Categories, Concepts, and Ways of Thinking." *Migration Studies* 4(1): 20-37.
- Benson, M. and N. Osbaldiston. 2016. "Toward a Critical Sociology of Lifestyle Migration: Reconceptualizing Migration and the Search for a Better Way of Life." *The Sociological Review* 64(3): 407-423.
- Bivand Erdal, M. and C. Oeppen. 2018. "Forced to Leave? The Discursive and Analytical Significance of Describing Migration as Forced and Voluntary." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44(6): 981-998.
- Bourdieu, P. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by J. G. Richardson, 241-58. New York: Greenwood.
- Canache, D., M. Hayes, J. J. Mondak and S. C. Wals. 2013. "Openness, Extraversion and the Intention to Emigrate." *Journal of Research in Personality* 47(4): 351-355.
- Carling, J. 2002. "Migration in the Age of Involuntary Immobility: Theoretical Reflections and Cape Verdean Experiences." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 28(1): 5-42.

- Carling, J. and F. Collins. 2018. "Aspiration, Desire, and Drivers of Migration." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44(6): 909-926.
- Carling, J. and K. Schewel. 2018. "Revisiting Aspiration and Ability in International Migration." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44(6): 945-963.
- Carrillo, H. 2018. *Pathways of Desire: The Sexual Migration of Mexican Gay Men*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Castles, S. 2010. "Understanding Global Migration: A Social Transformation Perspective." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(10): 1565-1586.
- Chang, L. and J. A. Krosnick. 2009. "National Surveys Via RDD Telephone Interviewing Versus the Internet: Comparing Sample Representativeness and Response Quality." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73(4): 641-678.
- Collins, F. 2018. "Desire as a Theory for Migration Studies: Temporality, Assemblage and Becoming in the Narratives of Migrants." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44(6): 964-980.
- Coulter, R. 2013. "Wishful Thinking and the Abandonment of Moving Desires over the Life Course." *Environment and Planning A* 45(8): 1944-1962.
- Creighton, M J. 2013. "The Role of Aspirations in Domestic and International Migration." *The Social Science Journal* 50(1): 79-88.
- Creighton, M J. and F Riosmena. 2012. "Migration and the Gendered Origin of Migrant Networks among Couples in Mexico." *Social Science Quarterly* 94(1): 79-99.
- Croucher, S. 2007. "'They Love Us Here': American Migrants in Mexico." *Dissent* 54(1): 69-74.
- . 2009a. *The Other Side of the Fence: American Migrants in Mexico*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 2009b. "Migrants of Privilege: The Political Transnationalism of Americans in Mexico." *Identities* 16(4): 463-91.
- . 2012. "Privileged Mobility in an Age of Globality." *Societies* 2(1): 1-13.
- . 2015. "The Future of Lifestyle Migration: Challenges and Opportunities." *Journal of Latin American Geography* 14(1): 161-172.
- . 2018. "Rooted in Relative Privilege: US 'Expats' in Granada, Nicaragua." *Identities* 25(4): 436-455.
- Czaika, M. and M. Vothknecht. 2014. "Migration and Aspirations – Are Migrants Trapped on a Hedonic Treadmill?" *IZA Journal of Migration* 3(1): 1-21.
- Dashefsky, A., J. DeAmicis, B. Lazerwitz, and E. Tabory. 1992. *Americans Abroad: A Comparative Study of Emigrants from the United States*. New York: Plenum Press.
- de Groot, C., C. H. Mulder, M. Das, and D. Manting. 2011. "Life Events and the Gap between Intention to Move and Actual Mobility." *Environment and Planning A* 43(1): 48-66.
- de Haas, H. 2014. "Migration Theory: Quo Vadis?." Working Paper, 100: Oxford, UK: International Migration Institute, University of Oxford.  
<https://www.imi.ox.ac.uk/publications/wp-100-14>.
- De Jong, G. F. 2000. "Expectations, Gender, and Norms in Migration Decision-Making." *Population Studies* 54(3): 307-319.
- De Jong, G. F., B. D. Root, R. W. Gardner, J. T. Fawcett, and R. G. Abad. 1985. "Migration Intentions and Behavior: Decision Making in a Rural Philippine Province." *Population & Environment* 8(1-2): 41-62.
- Dewolf, C. 2014. "In Hong Kong, Just Who Is an Expat, Anyway?" *Wall Street Journal* (December 29).

- Docquier, F., G. Peri, and I Ruysen. 2014. "The Cross-Country Determinants of Potential and Actual Migration." *International Migration Review* 48(S1): S37-S99.
- Fors Marsh. 2016. *Federal Voting Assistance Program Overseas Citizen Population Analysis Volume 1: Participation and Voting Rates Estimation Prototype*. Arlington, VA: FVAP.
- Gardner, K. 1993. "Desh-Bidesh: Sylheti Images of Home and Away." *Management Science* 28(1): 1-16.
- Gardner, R. W., G. F. De Jong, F. Arnold, and B. Cariño. 1985. "The Best-Laid Schemes: An Analysis of Discrepancies between Migration Intentions and Behavior." *Population and Environment* 8(1-2): 63-77.
- Glick Schiller, N. and N. B. Salazar. 2013. "Regimes of Mobility across the Globe." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39(2): 183-200.
- Hagan, J., J. L. Demonsant, and S. Chávez. 2014. "Identifying and Measuring the Lifelong Human Capital of 'Unskilled' Migrants in the Mexico-U.S. Migratory Circuit." *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 2(2): 76-100.
- Hardwick, S. W. 2010. "Fuzzy Transnationals? American Settlement, Identity, and Belonging in Canada." *American Review of Canadian Studies* 40(1): 86-103.
- Haubert, J. and E. Fussell. 2006. "Explaining Pro-Immigrant Sentiment in the U.S.: Social Class, Cosmopolitanism, and Perceptions of Immigrants." *International Migration Review* 40(3): 489-507.
- Hayes, M. 2014. "'We Gained a Lot Over What We Would Have Had': The Geographic Arbitrage of North American Lifestyle Migrants to Cuenca, Ecuador." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40(12): 1953-1971.
- . 2015a. "Into the Universe of the Hacienda: Lifestyle Migration, Individualism and Social Dislocation in Vilcabamba, Ecuador." *Journal of Latin American Geography* 14(1): 79-100.
- . 2015b. "'It is Hard being the Different One All the Time': Gringos and Racialized Identity in Lifestyle Migration to Ecuador." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38(6): 943-958.
- Hayes, M. and R. Pérez-Gañán. 2017. "North-South Migrations and the Asymmetric Expulsions of Late Capitalism: Global Inequality, Arbitrage, and New Dynamics of North-South Transnationalism." *Migration Studies* 5(1): 116-135.
- Hernández-León, R. 1999. "¡A la Aventura!: Jóvenes, Pandillas y Migración en la Conexión Monterrey-Houston." In *Fronteras Fragmentadas*, edited by G. Mummert, 115-143. Zamora, Mexico: El Colegio de Michoacán.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. 1994. *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hulse, C. 2018. "Inside the Oval Office Immigration Meeting That Left a Senator Stunned." *New York Times* (January 19).
- Janoschka, M. 2009. "The Contested Spaces of Lifestyle Mobilities: Regime Analysis as a Tool to Study Political Claims in Latin American Retirement Destinations." *Die Erde* 140(3): 1-20.
- Joseph, T. 2015. *Race on the Move: Brazilian Migrants and the Global Reconstruction of Race*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kaysen, R. 2018. "Some Said They'd Flee Trump's America. These People Actually Did." *New York Times* (April 14).
- King, R. 2002. "Towards a New Map of European Migration." *International Journal of Population Geography* 8(2): 89-106.

- King, R., A. M. Warnes, and A. M. Williams. 2000. *Sunset Lives: British Retirement to Southern Europe*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Klekowski von Koppenfels, A. 2014. *Migrants or Expatriates? Americans in Europe*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Klekowski von Koppenfels, A. and J. Costanzo. 2013. "Counting the Uncountable: Overseas Americans." *Migration Information Source* (May).
- Kley, S. 2011. "Explaining Stages of Migration within a Life-Course Framework." *European Sociological Review* 27(4): 469-486.
- Koikkalainen, S. and D. Kyle. 2016. "Imagining Mobility: The Prospective Cognition Question in Migration Research." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42(5): 759-776.
- Kordel, S. and P. Pohle. 2018. "International Lifestyle Migration in the Andes of Ecuador: How Migrants from the USA Perform Privilege, Import Rurality, and Evaluate Their Impact on Local Community." *Sociologica Ruralis* 58(1): 126-146.
- Koutonin, M. R. 2015. "Why are White People Expats While the Rest of Us are Immigrants?" *The Guardian* (March 13).
- Legkekk, J. 2001. "Leisure Experience and Imagination: Rethinking Cohen's Modes of Tourist Experience." *International Sociology* 16(2): 173-184.
- Levitt, P. 2001. *The Transnational Villagers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lizzáraga Morales, O. 2010. "The U.S. Citizens' Retirement Migration to Los Cabos, Mexico." *Recreation and Society in Africa, Asia, and Latin America (RASAALA)* 1(1): 75-92.
- Massey, D. S. 1999. "Why Does Immigration Occur? A Theoretical Synthesis." In *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, edited by C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz, and J. DeWind, 34-54. New York: Russell Sage.
- Masuoka, N. and J. Junn. 2013. *The Politics of Belonging: Race, Public Opinion, and Immigration*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mescoli, Elsa. 2014. "Towards the Elsewhere: Discourses on Migration and Mobility Practices between Morocco and Italy." *Identities* 21(3): 290-304.
- Miles, A. 2015. "Health Care Imaginaries and Retirement Migration to Cuenca, Ecuador." *Journal of Latin American Geography* 14(1): 39-55.
- Migration Policy Institute (MPI). 2006. "America's Emigrants: US Retirement Migration to Mexico and Panama." Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Morgan, C. V., M. M. Trieu, A. Stevens, and R. Nemoto. 2016. "A Grounded Typology of Foreign-born Spouses in Japan: The Motivations behind Migration to Japan." *Ethnicities* 16(4): 589-609.
- Motyl, M. 2014. "'If He Wins, I'm Moving to Canada': Ideological Migration Threats Following the 2012 U.S. Presidential Election." *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy* 14(1): 123-136.
- Oliver, C. and K. O'Reilly. 2010. "A Bourdieusian Analysis of Class and Migration: Habitus and the Individualizing Process." *Sociology* 44(1): 49-66.
- O'Reilly, K. 2000. *The British on the Costa Del Sol: Transnational Identities and Local Communities*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2015. *Connecting with Emigrants: A Global Profile of Diasporas 2015*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Ortero, Lorena Melton Young. 1997. "U.S. Retired Persons in Mexico." *American Behavioral Scientist* 40(7): 914-22.

- Osbaldiston, Nick 2011. "The Authentic Place in the Amenity Migration Discourse." *Space and Culture* 14 (2): 214-26.
- Pew Research Center. 2016. "Origins and Destinations of the World's Migrants, from 1990-2015." Washington, DC: Pew Research Center (May 17).
- Prado, Anayasi. 2012. *Paraiso for Sale*. Impacto Films.
- Roth, W. D. 2012. *Race Migrations: Latinos and the Cultural Transformation of Race*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Ryan, L. 2008. "'I had a Sister in England': Family-Led Migration, Social Networks and Irish Nurses." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34(3): 453-470.
- Salazar, N. B. 2011. "The Power of Imagination in Transnational Mobilities." *Identities* 18(6): 576-598.
- Sandu, D. and G. F. de Jong. 1996. "Migration in market and democracy transition: Migration intentions and behavior in Romania." *Population Research and Policy Review* 15: 437-457.
- Schafran, A. and P. Monkkonen. 2011. "Beyond Chapala and Cancún: Grappling with the Impact of American Migration to Mexico." *Migraciones Internacionales* 6(2): 223-258.
- Scheibelhofer, E. 2018. "Shifting Migration Aspirations in Second Modernity." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44(6): 999-1014.
- Scott, S. 2006. "The Social Morphology of Skilled Migration: The Case of the British Middle Class in Paris." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 32(7): 1105-1129.
- Seligman, M. E. P., P. Railton, R. F. Baumesiter, and C. Sripada. 2013. "Navigating into the Future or Driven by the Past." *Perspectives on Psychological Sciences* 8(2): 119-141.
- Smith, A. 2006. "'If I Have No Money for Travel, I Have No Need': Migration and Imagination." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 9(1): 47-62.
- Smith, R. C. 2005. *Mexican New York: Transnational Lives of New Immigrants*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Smith, C. M. 2010. "These are Our Numbers: Civilian Americans Overseas and Voter Turnout." *OVF Research Newsletter* 2(4)  
[https://www.overseasvotefoundation.org/files/OVF\\_NL\\_July-Aug2010.pdf](https://www.overseasvotefoundation.org/files/OVF_NL_July-Aug2010.pdf).
- . 2014. *Convenience Voting and Technology: The Case of Military and Overseas Voters*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Spalding, A. 2013. "Lifestyle Migration to Bocas del Toro, Panama: Exploring Migration Strategies and Introducing Local Implications of the Search for Paradise." *International Review of Social Research* 3(1): 67-86.
- Stephenson, L. and J. Crête. 2011. "Studying Political Behavior: A Comparison of Telephone and Internet Surveys." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 23(1): 24-55.
- Tabor, A. S., T. L. Milfont, and C. Ward. 2015. "International Migration Decision-Making and Destination Selection Among Skilled Migrants." *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology* 9(1): 28-41.
- Theiss-Morse, E. and S. Wals. 2014. "Con La Cara que Midas... National Identity and Attitudes toward Immigration and Emigration in Mexico." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the *American Political Science Association*, Washington, DC (August 28-31).
- Timmermann, C., K. Hemmereichs, and H. Marie-Lou de Clerck. 2014. "The Relevance of a 'Culture of Migration' in Understanding Migration Aspirations in Contemporary Turkey." *Turkish Studies* 15(3): 496-518.

- Trundle, C. 2009. "Romance Tourists, Foreign Wives, or Retirement Migrants? Cross-Cultural Marriage in Florence, Italy." In *Lifestyle Migration: Expectations, Aspirations and Experiences*, edited by M. Benson and K. O'Reilly, 51-68. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- van Dalen, H. P. and K. Henkens. 2013. "Explaining Emigration Intentions and Behaviour in the Netherlands, 2005–10." *Population Studies* 67(2): 225-241.
- Van Mol, C., E. Snel, K. Hemmerechts, and C. Timmerman. 2018. "Migration Aspirations and Migration Cultures: A Case Study of Ukrainian Migration Towards the European Union." *Population, Place, and Space* 24(5): 1-11.
- Vance, C. M. and Y. McNulty. 2014. "Why and How Women and Men Acquire Global Career Experience: A Study of American Expatriates in Europe." *International Studies of Management and Organization* 44(2): 34-54.
- Viteri, M. A. 2015. "Cultural Imaginaries in the Residential Migration to Cotacachi." *Journal of Latin American Geography* 14(1): 119-138.
- Wals, S. and A. Moreno. n.d. "Assessing the Validity and Reliability of Self-Reported Items on Likelihood of Migration." Unpublished paper, University of Lincoln-Nebraska, Lincoln, NB.
- Williams, A. M. and M. Hall. 2000. "Tourism and Migration: New Relationships between Production and Consumption." *Tourism Geographies* 2(1): 5-27.
- Williams, A. M., C. Jephcote, H. Janta, and G. Li. 2018. "The Migration Intentions of Young Adults in Europe: A Comparative, Multilevel Analysis." *Population, Space and Place* 24(1): 1-16.

**Table 1:**  
**Americans' Aspirations to Live Abroad**

<b>Aspiration</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N (for multinomial ordered logit models)</b>
1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	509 (58.4%)	509 (58.4%)
2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	74 (8.4%)	204 (23.3%)
3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	130 (14.9%)	
4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	111 (12.8%)	164 (18.9%)
5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	41 (4.7%)	
6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	6 (0.7%)	
	<b>N=871</b>	

\*Six respondents were dropped because of missing data on *aspiration*.

**Table 2:**  
**Geographic and Temporal Dimensions of Americans' Aspirations to Move Abroad**  
**(only among panelists who reveal aspirations)**

<b>Geographic Preference of Aspiration</b>		
“What country or region of the world are you most interested in living in, at least right now?”	Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand	184 (52.1%)
	Central and South America (except Mexico) or the Caribbean	69 (19.5%)
	Canada	32 (9.2%)
	Asia	30 (8.5%)
	Eastern Europe or the (former) USSR	12 (3.5%)
	Mexico	13 (3.8%)
	Africa	8 (2.3%)
	The Middle East (including Israel)	4 (1.2%)
		<b>N=353</b>
<b>Timing Preference of Aspiration</b>		
“Ideally how long would you like to live in that country or region, at least right now? (Select only one response.)”	Up to 3 months	49 (13.6%)
	Between 3 and 6 months	53 (14.8%)
	Between 6 months and 1 year	77 (21.4%)
	Between 1 and 5 years	109 (30.4%)
	Between 5 and 10 years	18 (5.1%)
	More than 10 years or indefinitely	53 (14.7%)
		<b>N=360</b>



**Table 3:**  
**Motivations behind Americans' Aspirations to Move Abroad**  
**(only among panelists who reveal aspirations)**

Motivations for Aspiration	No, Not Ranked as Top 1-3	Ranked #1	Ranked #2	Ranked #3	Yes, Ranked as Top 1-3
To have the opportunity to work abroad (including in the military) or advance in my career (dummy)	187 (51.7%)	59 (16.3%)	56 (15.5%)	60 (16.5%)	175 (48.3%)
To have the opportunity to study abroad (dummy)	242 (66.9%)	16 (4.5%)	41 (11.4%)	62 (17.2%)	120 (33.1%)
To join a spouse or partner that is already located, or will move, abroad (dummy)	292 (80.6%)	22 (6.0%)	23 (6.4%)	25 (7.0%)	70 (19.4%)
To retire (dummy)	178 (49.2%)	51 (14.0%)	73 (20.1%)	60 (16.6%)	184 (50.8%)
To explore or have an adventure (dummy)	46 (12.6%)	159 (44.0%)	97 (26.8%)	60 (16.6%)	317 (87.4%)
To leave what I consider a bad or disappointing (economic, political, personal, healthcare, etc.) situation in the United States (dummy)	185 (51.0%)	49 (13.7%)	57 (15.6%)	71 (19.7%)	177 (49.0%)
N=362					

**Table 4:**  
**Bivariate Relations between Independent and Dependent Variables**

	Aspiration <sup>a</sup>		Geographic Preference <sup>b</sup>			Timing Preference <sup>b</sup>
	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6
	Full 6 Response Categories	Robustness Check (Dropping Response Categories 2-3)	Canada	Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand	Latin America or the Caribbean (including Mexico)	More than 1 year
<b>Independent Variables</b>						
<b>I. Controls</b>						
Age, recoded	108.002***	86.393***	6.358	2.660	14.341*	13.700*
Male (dummy)	5.359	4.037	2.472	.375	.060	3.432
White, non-Hispanic (dummy)	4.304	3.600	1.509	11.145***	1.574	.380
Northeast (dummy)	10.858*	9.123*	1.035	.041	.892	1.390
West (dummy)	3.445	3.077	.627	2.135	1.013	.004
South (dummy)	6.087	5.168	.060	3.554	.073	.332
Midwest (dummy)	3.447	3.011	.115	.977	.000	3.503
Political ideology, recoded	36.718***	31.571***	2.082	1.903	1.433	8.508
Strength of American identity	110.718***	94.846***	9.519*	1.052	3.177	6.093
<i>Very strong American identity (dummy)</i>	<i>66.395***</i>	<i>64.541***</i>	<i>8.175**</i>	<i>.144</i>	<i>2.314</i>	<i>2.945</i>
<b>II. Human/Cultural Capital</b>						
Education level, recoded	71.138***	55.576***	.453	4.173	9.490**	.346
Internet access in household (dummy)	30.749***	25.251***	.527	.992	4.866*	.206
Speaks at least one foreign language(s) (dummy)	35.067***	34.273***	2.015	1.735	.033	1.927
Passport owner (dummy)	81.075***	71.734***	.080	.594	1.762	.006
Number of foreign countries toured	107.187***	86.707***	11.628*	4.826	6.592	6.850
<i>Ever toured abroad (dummy)</i>	<i>39.703***</i>	<i>28.306***</i>	<i>.193</i>	<i>.072</i>	<i>.281</i>	<i>2.503</i>
Number of foreign countries lived in	53.780***	47.403***	6.532	2.712	1.578	7.366
<i>Ever lived abroad (dummy)</i>	<i>36.651***</i>	<i>33.407***</i>	<i>1.315</i>	<i>.472</i>	<i>.179</i>	<i>3.747*</i>
<b>III. Economic/Financial Capital</b>						
Mean Household Income, recoded	40.294**	28.696**	2.835	7.560	6.536	2.421
Employed (dummy)	40.232***	29.445***	.855	.475	.001	2.535
Homeowner (dummy)	12.529*	11.063**	.001	.206	7.613**	.591
Rating of health of personal finances	18.323	7.961	.985	1.261	2.067	3.863
Rating of health of U.S. economy	19.226	14.699	1.258	3.392	.393	14.422**
<b>IV. Social Capital</b>						
Currently living with partner (dummy)	3.821	3.469	1.606	.070	6.767**	7.270**
At least one child under age 18 living in household (dummy)	11.250*	5.373	.445	.037	.356	.007
Immigrant heritage (dummy)	30.935***	27.849***	.027	.596	.257	.102
Social networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad (dummy)	81.376***	65.991***	.003	7.981**	5.698*	.591
Military service (dummy)	2.297	.994	.453	1.227	.858	5.437*

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) values,  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

<sup>a</sup> Full sample.

<sup>b</sup> Only among panelists who reveal aspirations.

**Table 5:**  
**Bivariate Relations between Independent and Dependent Variables, cont'd.**  
**(only among panelists who reveal aspirations)**

	Motivation for Aspiration					
	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6
	To work	To study	To join a partner	To retire	To explore	To leave
<b>Independent Variables</b>						
<b>I. Controls</b>						
Age by Decade	31.718***	15.182*	10.731	69.578***	11.807	3.658
Male (dummy)	3.890*	.945	3.743*	1.630	.211	.008
White, non-Hispanic (dummy)	.117	.002	9.247**	.162	17.639***	.441
Northeast (dummy)	.572	.345	.243	1.384	6.454	.098
West (dummy)	.998	.048	4.996*	2.343	.458	2.528
South (dummy)	.628	.003	1.696	1.664	2.172	.845
Midwest (dummy)	7.881**	.608	1.710	.897	.010	.937
Political ideology, recoded	.558	.948	1.311	4.846	.806	.288
Strength of American identity	2.563	6.031	5.058	11.728	13.996**	27.664***
<i>Very strong American identity (dummy)</i>	.323	5.566*	.291	6.790**	.868	18.046***
<b>II. Human/Cultural Capital</b>						
Education level, recoded	1.954	.889	3.005	3.053	3.628	7.624*
Internet access in household (dummy)	4.047*	.002	3.459	.865	1.327	2.342
Speaks at least one foreign language(s) (dummy)	.725	.149	.058	.404	.043	.986
Passport owner (dummy)	.022	.769	.069	3.538	.738	13.087***
Number of foreign countries toured	.3856	2.820	4.018	15.667**	4.843	11.842*
<i>Ever toured abroad (dummy)</i>	.097	.291	.510	.113*	.129	6.086
Number of foreign countries lived in	3.462	.825	1.157	5.251	10.423*	5.830
<i>Ever lived abroad (dummy)</i>	.394	.153	.033	.866	.167	1.346
<b>III. Economic/Financial Capital</b>						
Mean Household Income, recoded	1.432	6.147	3.113	4.701	4.877	8.681
Employed (dummy)	1.916	4.044*	.369	.202	.889	.038
Homeowner (dummy)	4.071*	.200	6.380**	8.711**	.649	.002
Rating of health of personal finances	2.623	.365	1.570	.965	5.020	3.433
Rating of health of U.S. economy	5.211	12.852**	2.296	2.208	4.681	26.029***
<b>IV. Social Capital</b>						
Currently living with partner (dummy)	.373	13.041***	.600	35.174***	.120	.679
At least one child under age 18 living in household (dummy)	3.045	.721	.536	3.734*	1.517	.025
Immigrant heritage (dummy)	.199	.061	.194	.075	.364	1.496
Social networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad (dummy)	.500	.295	.240	1.031	1.636	.014
<i>--Only those who are still abroad (dummy)</i>	.669	.278	.927	5.315*	.196	2.183
<i>--Only those who have returned home (dummy)</i>	.295	4.533*	.856	.331	5.025*	4.344*
Military service (dummy)	3.644*	.688	2.676	11.802***	.282	.001

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) values,  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

**Table 6:**  
**Predictors of Americans' Aspirations to Live Abroad**

Dependent Variables	Aspiration <sup>a</sup>	
	Response Category 4: “Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it”	Response Category 5: “Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday”
N	858	
Chi-Square	527.303***	
Cox & Snell R Square	.478	
<b>Independent Variables</b>		
<b>I. Controls</b>		
18-25 years old	18.991	18.780
26-35 years old	17.220	16.158
36-45 years old	18.104	18.286
46-55 years old	18.303	17.239
56-65 years old	16.707	16.339
66-75 years old	15.143	14.543
Male	-.023	-.754
White, non-Hispanic	-.126	.011
Northeast	-.726	-.123
West	-.253	1.391*
South	-.211	-.225
Liberal	.387	.401
Moderate	-.091	-1.023
Less than very strong American identity	1.234**	2.460***
<b>II. Human/Cultural Capital</b>		
Less than high school graduate	-1.463	.757
High school graduate but no BA	-.406	.232
No internet access in household	-1.139*	-.664
Speaks only English	-.628	-.625
Not passport owner	-1.593**	-1.391**
Never toured abroad	-.260	-.399
Never lived abroad	-.743*	-.431
<b>III. Economic/Financial Capital</b>		
below \$25K, annual household income	.548	3.503*
\$25,000-74,999	.516	2.199
\$75,000-124,999	.700	2.340
\$125,000-174,999	1.050	2.757
Not employed	.113	.230
Not homeowner	.470	.677
Excellent, rating of health of personal finances	-.424	-1.681
Good, rating of health of personal finances	-.955	-1.175
Fair, rating of health of personal finances	-.926	-1.443
Excellent, rating of health of U.S. economy	-.614	.158
Good, rating of health of U.S. economy	-.869	-1.068
Fair, rating of health of U.S. economy	-.468	-1.520
<b>IV. Social Capital</b>		
Not currently living with partner	.575	-.164
No children under age 18 living in household	.071	-.061
No immigrant heritage	-.745**	-.579
No social networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad	-1.389***	-1.495***
No military service	-.801*	-.719

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

<sup>a</sup> B Values from multinomial logistical regression models, \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ . The reference category is 1. “No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so.”

**Table 7:**  
**Predictors of Geographic and Temporal Dimensions of**  
**Americans' Aspirations to Live Abroad**  
**(only among panelists who reveal aspirations)**

Dependent Variables	Region of Aspiration <sup>a</sup>			Timing of Aspiration <sup>b</sup>
	Canada	Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand	Latin America or the Caribbean (including Mexico)	More than 1 year
N	367	367	367	373
Chi-Square	44.115**	36.714*	55.652***	8.263
Cox & Snell R Square	.124	.105	.154	.108
<b>Independent Variables</b>				
<b>I. Controls</b>				
Age	.002	-.020*	0.20	.000
Male (dummy)	1.034*	-.455	.059	.304
White, non-Hispanic (dummy)	1.228	.644*	-.880*	.055
Northeast (dummy)	.124	.050	.050	.626
West (dummy)	.987	.016	-.342	.426
South (dummy)	.324	-.392	-.036	.526
Political ideology	.289	-.050	-.072	-.028
Strength of American identity	-1.054**	.538*	.275	-.480
<b>II. Human/Cultural Capital</b>				
Education level, recoded	.837	.433	-.949**	-.413
Internet access in household (dummy)	.506	.109	-.671	-.068
Speaks at least one foreign language(s) (dummy)	.002	.084	-.125	.001
Passport owner (dummy)	1.090*	-.894**	.614	-.046
Number of foreign countries toured	-.249*	.021	.054	.048
Number of foreign countries lived in	-.362	.127	-.092	.114
<b>III. Economic/Financial Capital</b>				
Median Household Income	-.001	.005	-.005	.004
Employed (dummy)	.222	-.247	.258	.580*
Homeowner (dummy)	.557	-.384	.958*	-.158
Rating of health of personal finances	-.666*	-.017	-.050	-.260
Rating of health of U.S. economy	.009	-.127	-.116	-.250
<b>IV. Social Capital</b>				
Currently living with partner (dummy)	-.300	.136	.782*	.614*
At least one child under age 18 living in household (dummy)	.337	-.130	-.378	-.041
Immigrant heritage (dummy)	.650	-.178	-.040	-.032
Social networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad (dummy)	-.013	.305	-.460	-.275
Military service (dummy)	-.377	-.031	-.117	.481

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

<sup>a</sup> B Values from binary logistical regression models, \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

<sup>b</sup> Parameter Estimates from ordered logit regression models, \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

**Table 8:**  
**Predictors of Motivations behind Americans' Aspirations to Live Abroad**  
**(only among panelists who reveal aspirations)**

	Motivation for Aspiration					
	To work	To study	To join a partner	To retire	To explore	To leave
N	376	376	376	376	376	376
Chi-Square	70.300***	39.506*	48.458**	106.672***	35.322	73.881***
Cox & Snell R Square	.186	.109	.133	.269	.098	.195
<b>Independent Variables</b>						
<b>I. Controls</b>						
Age	-.050***	-.013	-.012	.053***	-.006	.012
Male (dummy)	.811**	.030	-.744*	.009	-.111	.019
White, non-Hispanic (dummy)	.553	.275	-.986**	-.775**	1.415**	.147
Northeast (dummy)	-1.077**	-.118	.349	.275	-.727	.817*
West (dummy)	-1.107**	-.451	.851	.048	.298	.858
South (dummy)	-.579	.083	.270	.312	.384	.064
Political ideology	-.056	-.105	.043	.178	-.192	-.010
Strength of American identity	.378	1.094***	.231	-.046	-.167	-1.467***
<b>II. Human/Cultural Capital</b>						
Education level, recoded	.453	.167	-.796*	-.171	-.655	-.069
Internet access in household (dummy)	.055	-.059	1.277*	-.150	.060	-.404
Speaks at least one foreign language(s) (dummy)	-.017	.297	-.660	-.316	.303	-.114
Passport owner (dummy)	.070	.342	.095	.385	-.024	-.688*
Number of foreign countries toured	.038	-.036	-.005	.039	.056	-.041
Number of foreign countries lived in	.099	-.024	-.157	-.199	-.046	.074
<b>III. Economic/Financial Capital</b>						
Median Household Income	-.002	.004	.005	-.001	.009	-.002
Employed (dummy)	-.078	-.865**	.395	.447	-.764	.434
Homeowner (dummy)	-.323	-.462	-.862*	.299	-.477	.581
Rating of health of personal finances	-.146	-.021	.278	-.192	.156	-.014
Rating of health of U.S. economy	.109	.135	-.058	.151	.208	-.631***
<b>IV. Social Capital</b>						
Currently living with partner (dummy)	-.203	-.674*	-.149	.966***	-.361	.332
At least one child under age 18 living in household (dummy)	.312	-.220	.132	-.398	.717	-.068
Immigrant heritage (dummy)	.352	-.078	.033	-.465	-.059	-.006
Social networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad (dummy)	.206	.245	.257	-.431	.297	.090
Military service (dummy)	-.355	.065	-.495	.416	-.357	-.097

\*B Values from binary logistical regression models, \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**ISUPPLEMENTAL ONLINE APPENDIX:  
BIVARIATE CROSS-TABULATIONS FOR ALL SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATIONS  
BETWEEN THE INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

**A. Aspiration**

**Table A-1:  
Age (by Decade) and Aspiration**

		<b>18-25</b>	<b>26-35</b>	<b>36-45</b>	<b>46-55</b>	<b>56-65</b>	<b>66-75</b>	<b>76+</b>
<b>--No prior/present aspiration</b> --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	36.4%	53.7%	48.1%	56.5%	70.5%	78.1%	85.3%
<b>--No, prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	11.9%	7.5%	10.7%	5.6%	10.5%	4.4%	2.9%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	20.3%	20.9%	12.2%	14.5%	10.0%	13.2%	11.8%
<b>--Yes, prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	21.0%	12.7%	18.3%	18.5%	6.8%	3.5%	0.0%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	9.1%	4.5%	9.9%	3.2%	2.1%	0.9%	0.0%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	1.4%	0.7%	0.8%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>N=870</b>		N=143 (16.4%)	N=134 (15.4%)	N=131 (15.1%)	N=124 (14.3%)	N=190 (21.8%)	N=114 (13.1%)	N=34 (3.9%)

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 108.002,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-2:  
Northeast U.S. Region of Residence (Dummy) and Aspiration**

		<b>Not Northeast</b>	<b>Northeast</b>
<b>--No prior/present aspiration</b> --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	59.4%	53.6%
<b>--No, prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	8.9%	6.0%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	15.0%	14.6%
<b>--Yes, prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	11.4%	19.9%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	4.4%	6.0%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.8%	0.0%
<b>N=871</b>		N=720 (82.7%)	N=151 (17.3%)

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 10.858,  $p < .05$ .



**Table A-3:  
Political Ideology (Recoded) and Aspiration**

		<b>Liberal</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Conservative</b>
<b>--No prior/present aspiration</b> --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	43.8%	64.8%	63.0%
<b>--No, prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	9.4%	8.9%	7.0%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	19.3%	13.3%	13.3%
<b>--Yes, prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	18.9%	9.5%	11.7%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	6.9%	2.9%	5.0%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	1.7%	0.6%	0.0%
<b>N=848</b>		N=233 (27.5%)	N=315 (37.1%)	N=300 (35.4%)

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 36.718,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-4a:**  
**Very Strong American National Identity (Dummy) and Aspiration**

		Not Very Strong American ID	Very Strong American ID
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	30.6%	63.0%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	14.0%	7.4%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	19.0%	14.3%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	19.0%	11.8%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	15.7%	3.1%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	1.7%	0.5%
<b>N=869</b>		N=121 (13.9%)	N=748 (86.1%)

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 66.395,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-4b:**  
**Strength of American National Identity and Aspiration**

		Not at all	Not very strongly	Somewhat strongly	Very strongly
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	25.0%	33.3%	31.1%	63.0%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	0.0%	13.3%	14.6%	7.4%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	0.0%	13.3%	19.4%	14.3%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	0.0%	20.0%	20.4%	11.8%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	50.0%	13.3%	13.6%	3.1%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	25.0%	6.7%	1.0%	0.5%
<b>N=869</b>		N=4 (100.0%)	N=15 (100.0%)	N=103 (100.0%)	N=748 (86.0%)

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 110.718,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-5:  
Level of Education and Aspiration**

		Less than a High School Degree	HS Degree	Bachelor's Degree or Higher
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	79.8%	63.4%	40.6%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	3.4%	7.4%	12.2%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	9.0%	13.6%	19.3%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	2.2%	10.4%	21.7%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	5.6%	4.9%	4.3%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.0%	0.2%	2.0%
<b>N=871</b>		N=89 (10.2%)	N=528 (60.6%)	N=254 (29.2%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 71.138,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-6:  
Internet Access in the Household (Dummy) and Aspiration**

		No, no Internet Access in the Household	Yes, Internet Access in the Household
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	72.9%	54.5%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	5.3%	9.2%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	12.8%	15.5%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	3.7%	15.2%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	1.6%	0.4%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	1.6%	0.4%
<b>N=871</b>		N=188 (21.6%)	N=683 (78.4%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 30.749,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-7:  
Knowledge of Foreign Languages (Dummy) and Aspiration**

		No, speaks only English	Yes, speaks at least 1 foreign language other than English
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	62.3%	40.6%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	8.4%	9.0%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	14.1%	18.7%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	10.5%	23.2%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	3.9%	8.4%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.8%	0.0%
<b>N=871</b>		<b>N=716 (82.2%)</b>	<b>N=155 (17.8%)</b>

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 35.067,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-8:  
Passport Ownership (Dummy) and Aspiration**

		No, not passport owner	Yes, passport owner
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	71.0%	44.7%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	6.7%	10.5%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	12.4%	17.6%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	5.3%	20.9%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	4.7%	5.0%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.0%	0.7%
<b>N=872</b>		<b>N=451 (51.7%)</b>	<b>N=421 (48.3%)</b>

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 66.395,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-9a:**  
**Prior Tourism Experience (Dummy) and Aspiration**

		Have Not Toured Abroad	Have Toured Abroad
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	73.2%	51.8%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	5.9%	9.7%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	10.7%	16.7%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	5.5%	16.2%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	4.4%	4.8%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.4%	0.8%
<b>N=871</b>		<b>N=272 (31.2%)</b>	<b>N=599 (68.8%)</b>

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 39.703,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-9b:**  
**Prior Tourism Experience and Aspiration**

		Never traveled abroad	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+ Foreign countries
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	73.2%	49.3%	49.3%	42.3%	33.3%	25.0%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	5.9%	8.9%	10.4%	13.4%	0.0%	10.7%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	10.7%	15.6%	19.4%	15.5%	15.4%	25.0%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	5.5%	9.9%	17.2%	21.6%	35.9%	35.7%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	4.4%	5.0%	3.0%	6.2%	10.3%	3.6%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%	1.0%	5.1%	0.0%
<b>N=871</b>		<b>N=272 (31.2%)</b>	<b>N=302 (34.6%)</b>	<b>N=134 (15.4%)</b>	<b>N=97 (11.1%)</b>	<b>N=39 (4.5%)</b>	<b>N=28 (3.2%)</b>

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 107.187,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-10a:**  
**Prior Living Abroad Experience (Dummy) and Aspiration**

		Have Not Lived Abroad	Have Lived Abroad
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	62.3%	36.3%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	8.3%	9.6%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	13.7%	21.5%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	11.2%	22.2%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	4.1%	8.9%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.4%	1.5%
<b>N=871</b>		<b>N=735 (84.5%)</b>	<b>N=135 (15.5%)</b>

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 36.651,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-10b:**  
**Prior Living Abroad Experience and Aspiration**

		Never lived abroad	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+ Foreign countries
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	62.3%	37.3%	28.6%	50.0%	--	0.0%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	8.3%	9.3%	7.1%	0.0%	--	8.4%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	13.7%	22.0%	14.3%	50.0%	--	50.0%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	11.2%	21.2%	28.6%	0.0%	--	50.0%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	4.1%	8.5%	14.3%	0.0%	--	0.0%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.4%	1.7%	7.1%	0.0%	--	0.0%
<b>N=871</b>		<b>N=735 (84.4%)</b>	<b>N=118 (13.5%)</b>	<b>N=14 (1.6%)</b>	<b>N=2 (0.2%)</b>	<b>N=0 (0.0%)</b>	<b>N=2 (0.2%)</b>

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 39.703,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-11:  
Mean Household Income and Aspiration**

		<b>Below \$25K</b>	<b>\$25,000- \$74,999</b>	<b>\$75,000- \$124,000</b>	<b>\$125,000- \$174,999</b>	<b>\$175K and above</b>
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	70.2%	61.2%	50.4%	46.1%	54.2%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	6.2%	7.3%	11.3%	10.5%	6.3%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	10.6%	15.9%	17.4%	15.8%	10.4%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	7.5%	10.6%	14.8%	21.1%	27.1%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	5.6%	4.5%	5.2%	5.3%	0.0%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.0%	0.6%	0.9%	1.3%	2.1%
<b>N=873</b>		N=161 (18.4%)	N=358 (41.0%)	N=230 (26.3%)	N=76 (8.7%)	N=48 (5.5%)

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 40.294,  $p < .01$ .

**Table A-12:  
Employment Status (Dummy) and Aspiration**

		<b>Not Employed</b>	<b>Employed (full or part-time)</b>
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	68.5%	49.8%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	2.5%	6.0%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	6.2%	8.7%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	3.4%	9.4%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	2.2%	2.5%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.3%	1.1%
<b>N=874</b>		N=400 (45.9%)	N=472 (54.1%)

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 40.232,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-13:  
Homeownership Status (Dummy) and Aspiration**

		<b>Not a Homeowner</b>	<b>Homeowner</b>
<b>--No prior/present aspiration</b> --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	54.2%	60.1%
<b>--No, prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	7.5%	8.9%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	13.3%	15.5%
<b>--Yes, prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	16.3%	11.4%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	7.9%	3.5%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.8%	0.6%
<b>N=871</b>		N=240 (27.6%)	N=631 (72.4%)

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 12.259,  $p < .05$ .

**Table A-14:  
Household Structure (Dummy) and Aspiration**

		<b>No Children under 18 living in the Household</b>	<b>1+ Children under 18 living in the Household</b>
<b>--No prior/present aspiration</b> --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	61.0%	50.5%
<b>--No, prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	7.5%	11.2%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	13.9%	18.2%
<b>--Yes, prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	12.5%	14.0%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	4.3%	6.1%
<b>--Yes prior/present aspiration</b> --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.9%	0.0%
<b>N=871</b>		N=657 (75.4%)	N=214 (24.6%)

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 11.250,  $p < .05$ .



**Table A-15:  
Immigrant Heritage (Dummy) and Aspiration**

		No Such Ancestry Reported	2 <sup>nd</sup> -4 <sup>th</sup> Generation Immigrant Ancestry
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	64.0%	48.3%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	7.2%	10.9%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	15.0%	14.6%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	9.2%	19.5%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	3.9%	6.3%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.7%	0.3%
<b>N=869</b>		N=567 (65.2%)	N=302 (34.8%)

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 30.935,  $p < .001$ .

**Table A-16:  
Social Networks (Dummy) and Aspiration**

		No such social networks reported	Yes, has social networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad
--No prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	1. "No, I have not and realistically do not expect to do so"	70.4%	41.9%
--No, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	2. "No, I have not but if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	5.5%	12.3%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --No present likelihood	3. "Yes, I have but I do not realistically think it will happen"	13.2%	17.3%
--Yes, prior/present aspiration --Yes potential aspiration	4. "Yes, I have and if a special opportunity arose to do so I would consider it"	6.9%	21.1%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present desire	5. "Yes, I have and I want to find a way to make it happen someday"	3.6%	6.3%
--Yes prior/present aspiration --Yes present likelihood --Yes present plan	6. "Yes, I have and have already begun making plans to do so"	0.4%	1.1%
<b>N=871</b>		N=506 (58.1%)	N=365 (41.9%)

\* Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) = 81.376,  $p < .001$ .

## B. Geographic and Temporal Dimensions of Aspiration

**Table B-1a:**  
**Very Strong American National Identity (Dummy) and**  
**Canada as Geographic Preference of Aspiration**

	Not Very Strong American ID	Very Strong American ID
Not Canada	82.9%	93.3%
Canada	17.1%	6.7%
N=351	N=82 (23.4%)	N=269 (76.6%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 8.175,  $p < .01$ .

**Table B-1b:**  
**Strength of American National Identity and**  
**Canada as Geographic Preference of Aspiration**

	Not at all	Not very strongly	Somewhat strongly	Very strongly
Not Canada	100.0%	77.8%	82.9%	93.3%
Canada	0.0%	22.2%	17.1%	6.7%
	N=3 (0.9%)	N=9 (2.6%)	N=70 (19.9%)	N=269 (76.6%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 9.519,  $p < .05$ .

**Table B-2a:**  
**Prior Tourism Experience and**  
**Canada as Geographic Preference of Aspiration**

	Never traveled abroad	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+ Foreign countries
Not Canada	92.5%	85.3%	90.0%	96.4%	100.0%	100.0%
Canada	7.5%	14.7%	9.1%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 11.628,  $p < .05$ .

**Table B-2b:**  
**Prior Tourism Experience (Dummy) and**  
**Canada as Geographic Preference of Aspiration**

	Have Not Toured Abroad	Have Toured Abroad
Not Canada	92.5%	90.8%
Canada	7.5%	9.2%
N=351	N=67 (19.1%)	N=284 (80.9%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = .193,  $p < NS$ .

**Table B-3:**  
**Race/Ethnicity and**  
**Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand as Geographic Preference of Aspiration**

	Nonwhite	White, non-Hispanic
Other	51.9%	33.1%
Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand	48.1%	66.9%
N=353	N=108 (30.6%)	N=245 (69.4%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 11.145,  $p < .001$ .

**Table B-4:**  
**Social Networks (Dummy) and**  
**Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand as Geographic Preference of Aspiration**

		No such social networks reported	Yes, has social networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad
Other	Other	47.6%	32.7%
Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand	Western Europe, Australia, or New Zealand	52.4%	67.3%
N=353		N=145 (41.1%)	N=208 (58.9%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 7.981,  $p < .01$ .

**Table B-5:**  
**Age (by Decade) and**  
**Latin America as Geographic Preference of Aspiration**

	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65	66-75	76+
Other	84.9%	86.9%	73.1%	69.8%	64.3%	79.2%	60.0%
Latin America or the Caribbean (including Mexico)	15.1%	13.1%	26.9%	30.2%	35.7%	20.8%	40.0%
N=352	N=86 (24.4%)	N=61 (17.3%)	N=67 (19.0%)	N=53 (15.1%)	N=56 (15.9%)	N=24 (6.8%)	N=5 (1.4%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 13.700,  $p < .05$ .

**Table B-6:  
Level of Education and  
Latin America as Geographic Preference of Aspiration**

	Less than a High School Degree	HS Degree	Bachelor's Degree or Higher
Other	52.6%	74.6%	82.6%
Latin America or the Caribbean (including Mexico)	47.4%	25.4%	17.4%
N=353	N=19 (5.4%)	N=185 (52.4%)	N=149 (42.2%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 9.490,  $p < .01$ .

**Table B-7:  
Internet Access in the Household (Dummy) and  
Latin America as Geographic Preference of Aspiration**

	No, no Internet Access in the Household	Yes, Internet Access in the Household
Other	51.9%	33.1%
Latin America or the Caribbean (including Mexico)	48.1%	66.9%
N=353	N=51 (14.4%)	N=302 (85.6%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 4.866,  $p < .05$ .

**Table B-8:  
Homeownership (Dummy) and  
Latin America as Geographic Preference of Aspiration**

	Not a homeowner	Homeowner
Other	86.1%	72.7%
Latin America or the Caribbean (including Mexico)	13.9%	27.3%
N=353	N=108 (30.6%)	N=245 (69.4%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 7.613,  $p < .01$ .

**Table B-9:  
Household Structure (Dummy) and  
Latin America as Geographic Preference of Aspiration**

	Not Living with a Partner	Living with a Partner (Married or Cohabiting)
Other	83.1%	71.4%
Latin America or the Caribbean (including Mexico)	16.9%	28.6%
N=352	N=160 (45.5%)	N=192 (54.5%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 6.767,  $p < .01$ .

**Table B-10:  
Social Networks (Dummy) and  
Latin America as Geographic Preference of Aspiration**

	No such social networks reported	Yes, has social networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad
<b>Other</b>	70.3%	81.3%
<b>Latin America or the Caribbean (including Mexico)</b>	29.7%	18.8%
<b>N=353</b>	N=145 (41.1%)	N=208 (58.9%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 5.698,  $p < .05$ .

**Table B-11:  
Age (by Decade) and Timing Preference of Aspiration**

	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65	66-75	76+
<b>1 Year or less</b>	60.0%	46.8%	32.8%	46.3%	57.9%	52.0%	60.0%
<b>More than 1 year</b>	40.0%	53.2%	67.2%	53.7%	42.1%	48.0%	40.0%
<b>N=360</b>	N=90 (25.0%)	N=62 (17.2%)	N=67 (18.6%)	N=54 (15.0%)	N=57 (15.8%)	N=25 (6.9%)	N=5 (1.45)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 13.700,  $p < .05$ .

**Table B-12a:  
Past Living Abroad Experience (Dummy) and  
Timing Preference of Aspiration**

	Have not Lived Abroad	Have Lived Abroad
<b>1 Year or less</b>	52.5%	40.5%
<b>More than 1 year</b>	47.5%	59.5%
<b>N=360</b>	N=276 (76.7%)	N=84 (23.3%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 3.747,  $p < .05$ .

**Table B-12b:  
Prior Living Abroad Experience and  
Timing Preference of Aspiration**

	Never lived abroad	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+ Foreign countries
<b>1 Year or less</b>	52.5%	44.4%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	49.7%
<b>More than 1 year</b>	40.3%	8.9%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	50.3%
<b>N=360</b>	N=276 (76.7%)	N=72 (20.0%)	N=9 (2.5%)	N=1 (0.3%)	N=2 (0.6%)	

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 7.366,  $p < .NS$ .

**Table B-13:**  
**Rating of the Health of the U.S. Economy and**  
**Timing Preference of Aspiration**

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
1 Year or less	40.2%	60.7%	45.9%	20.0%
More than 1 year	59.8%	39.3%	54.1%	80.0%
N=351	N=122 (34.8%)	N=163 (46.4%)	N=61 (17.4%)	N=5 (1.4%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 14.422,  $p < .001$ .

**Table B-14:**  
**Household Structure (Dummy) and Timing Preference of Aspiration**

	Not Living with a Partner	Living with a Partner (Married or Cohabiting)
1 Year or less	57.6%	43.3%
More than 1 year	42.4%	56.7%
N=359	N=165 (46.0%)	N=194 (54.0%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 7.270,  $p < .01$ .

**Table B-15:**  
**Military Service (Dummy) and**  
**Timing Preference of Aspiration**

	No such social networks reported	Yes, has social networks with other U.S. citizens who have lived abroad
1 Year or less	51.9%	33.3%
More than 1 year	48.1%	66.7%
N=357	N=312 (87.4%)	N=45 (12.6%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 5.437,  $p < .01$ .

**C. Motivations for Aspiration:**

**Table C-1:  
Age (by Decade) and To Work Motivation**

	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65	66-75	76+
To work not ranked	34.4%	41.3%	49.3%	59.3%	71.9%	76.0%	80.0%
To work ranked Top 1-3	65.6%	58.7%	50.7%	40.7%	28.1%	24.0%	20.0%
N=352	N=90 (24.9%)	N=63 (17.5%)	N=67 (15.0%)	N=54 (15.8%)	N=57 (15.8%)	N=25 (6.9%)	N=5 (1.4%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 31.718,  $p < .001$ .

**Table C-2:  
Gender and To Work Motivation**

	Female	Male
To work not ranked	56.6%	46.2%
To work ranked Top 1-3	43.4%	53.8%
N=362	N=189 (52.2%)	N=173 (47.8%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 3.890,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-3:  
Midwest U.S. Region of Residence (Dummy) and To Work Motivation**

	Not Midwest	Midwest
To work not ranked	55.4%	37.0%
To work ranked Top 1-3	44.6%	63.0%
N=362	N=289 (100.0%)	N=73 (20.2%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 10.858,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-4:  
Internet Access in Household (Dummy) and To Work Motivation**

	No Internet Access in Household	Internet Access in Household
To work not ranked	64.7%	49.5%
To work ranked Top 1-3	35.3%	50.5%
N=362	N=51 (14.1%)	N=311 (85.9%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 4.047,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-5:  
Homeownership (Dummy) and To Work Motivation**

	Not a Homeowner	Homeowner
To work not ranked	43.6%	55.2%
To work ranked Top 1-3	56.4%	44.8%
N=362	N=110 (30.4%)	N=252 (69.6%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 4.071,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-6:  
Military Service (Dummy) and To Work Motivation**

	No Military Service	Prior or Current Military Service
To work not ranked	50.2%	65.2%
To work ranked Top 1-3	49.8%	34.8%
N=359	N=313 (87.2%)	N=45 (12.8%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 3.644,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-7:  
Age (by Decade) and To Study Motivation**

	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	56-65	66-75	76+
To study not ranked	53.8%	69.8%	76.1%	76.4%	66.7%	65.4%	25.0%
To study ranked Top 1-3	46.2%	30.2%	23.9%	23.6%	33.5%	34.4%	75.0%
N=363	N=91 (25.1%)	N=63 (17.4%)	N=67 (18.5%)	N=55 (15.2%)	N=57 (15.7%)	N=26 (7.2%)	N=4 (1.1%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 15.182,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-8a:  
Very Strong American National Identity (Dummy) and  
To Study Motivation**

	Not Very Strong American ID	Very Strong American ID
To study not ranked	77.4%	63.5%
To study ranked Top 1-3	22.6%	36.5%
N=361	N=84 (23.3%)	N=277 (76.7%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 5.566,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-8b:  
Strength of American National Identity and  
To Study Motivation**

	Not at all	Not very strongly	Somewhat strongly	Very strongly
To study not ranked	66.7%	80.0%	77.8%	63.5%
To study ranked Top 1-3	33.3%	20.0%	22.2%	36.5%
N=362	N=3 (0.8%)	N=10 (2.8%)	N=72 (19.9%)	N=277 (76.5%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 6.031,  $p < NS$ .

**Table C-9:  
Employment (Dummy) and To Study Motivation**

	Not Employed	Employed Full or Part-time
To study not ranked	60.0%	70.5%
To study ranked Top 1-3	40.0%	29.5%
N=362	N=125 (34.5%)	N=237 (65.5%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 4.044,  $p < .05$ .



**Table C-10:  
Rating of the Health of the U.S. Economy and  
To Study Motivation**

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
To study not ranked	74.4%	58.5%	77.0%	40.0%
To study ranked Top 1-3	25.6%	41.5%	23.0%	60.0%
N=355	N=125 (35.2%)	N=164 (46.2%)	N=61 (17.2%)	N=5 (1.4%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 12.852,  $p < .01$ .

**Table C-11:  
Household Structure (Dummy) and  
To Study Motivation**

	Not Living with a Partner	Living with a Partner (Married or Cohabiting)
To study not ranked	57.2%	75.1%
To study ranked Top 1-3	42.8%	24.9%
N=363	N=166 (45.7%)	N=197 (54.3%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 13.041,  $p < .001$ .

**Table C-12:  
Gender (Dummy) and  
To Join a Partner Motivation**

	Female	Male
To join a partner not ranked	76.8%	84.9%
To join a partner ranked Top 1-3	23.2%	15.1%
N=362	N=190 (52.5%)	N=172 (47.5%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 3.743,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-13:  
Race/Ethnicity (Dummy) and  
To Join a Partner Motivation**

	Nonwhite	White, Non-Hispanic
To join a partner not ranked	71.2%	84.9%
To join a partner ranked Top 1-3	28.8%	15.1%
N=362	N=111 (30.7%)	N=251 (69.3%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 9.247,  $p < .01$ .

**Table C-14:**  
**West U.S. Region of Residence (Dummy) and**  
**To Join a Partner Motivation**

	<b>Not West</b>	<b>West</b>
<b>To join a partner not ranked</b>	83.3%	72.4%
<b>To join a partner ranked Top 1-3</b>	16.7%	27.6%
<b>N=362</b>	N=275 (76.0%)	N=87 (24.0%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 4.996,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-15:**  
**Homeownership (Dummy) and To Join a Partner Motivation**

	<b>Not a Homeowner</b>	<b>Homeowner</b>
<b>To join a partner not ranked</b>	72.7%	84.1%
<b>To join a partner ranked Top 1-3</b>	27.3%	15.9%
<b>N=362</b>	N=110 (30.4%)	N=252 (69.6%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 6.380,  $p < .01$ .

**Table C-16:**  
**Age (by Decade) and To Retire Motivation**

	<b>18-25</b>	<b>26-35</b>	<b>36-45</b>	<b>46-55</b>	<b>56-65</b>	<b>66-75</b>	<b>76+</b>
<b>To retire not ranked</b>	82.2%	57.8%	43.3%	25.5%	26.3%	32.0%	40.0%
<b>To retire ranked Top 1-3</b>	17.8%	42.2%	56.7%	74.5%	73.7%	68.0%	60.0%
<b>N=363</b>	N=90 (24.8%)	N=64 (17.6%)	N=67 (18.5%)	N=55 (15.2%)	N=57 (15.7%)	N=25 (6.9%)	N=5 (1.4%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 69.578,  $p < .001$ .

**Table C-17a:**  
**Very Strong American National Identity (Dummy) and**  
**To Retire Motivation**

	<b>Not Very Strong American ID</b>	<b>Very Strong American ID</b>
<b>To retire not ranked</b>	61.9%	45.7%
<b>To retire ranked Top 1-3</b>	38.1%	54.3%
<b>N=362</b>	N=84 (23.2%)	N=278 (76.8%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 11.728,  $p < NS$ .

**Table C-17b:**  
**Strength of American National Identity and**  
**To Retire Motivation**

	Not at all	Not very strongly	Somewhat strongly	Very strongly
To retire not ranked	0.0%	50.0%	65.3%	45.7%
To retire ranked Top 1-3	100.0%	50.0%	34.7%	54.3%
N=363	N=3 (0.8%)	N=10 (2.8%)	N=72 (19.8%)	N=278 (76.6%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 6.790,  $p < .01$ .

**Table C-18a:**  
**Prior Tourism Experience (Dummy) and To Retire Motivation**

	Have Not Toured Abroad	Have Toured Abroad
To retire not ranked	60.3%	46.2%
To retire ranked Top 1-3	39.7%	53.8%
N=361	N=73 (20.2%)	N=288 (79.8%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = .113,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-18b:**  
**Prior Tourism Experience and To Retire Motivation**

	Never traveled abroad	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+ Foreign countries
To retire not ranked	60.3%	55.9%	41.2%	47.3%	26.9%	30.0%
To retire ranked Top 1-3	39.7%	44.1%	58.8%	52.7%	73.1%	70.0%
N=360	N=73 (20.3%)	N=118 (32.8%)	N=68 (18.9%)	N=55 (15.3%)	N=26 (7.2%)	N=20 (5.6%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 15.667,  $p < .01$ .

**Table C-19:**  
**Homeownership (Dummy) and To Retire Motivation**

	Not a Homeowner	Homeowner
To retire not ranked	60.9%	44.0%
To retire ranked Top 1-3	39.1%	56.0%
N=362	N=110 (30.4%)	N=252 (69.6%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 8.711,  $p < .01$ .

**Table C-20:  
Household Structure (Dummy) and  
To Retire Motivation**

	<b>Not Living with a Partner</b>	<b>Living with a Partner (Married or Cohabiting)</b>
<b>To retire not ranked</b>	66.3%	35.0%
<b>To retire ranked Top 1-3</b>	33.7%	65.0%
<b>N=363</b>	N=166 (45.7%)	N=197 (54.35)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 35.174,  $p < .001$ .

**Table C-21:  
Household Structure (Dummy) and  
To Retire Motivation**

	<b>No Children under 18 living in the Household</b>	<b>1+ Children under 18 living in the Household</b>
<b>To retire not ranked</b>	45.9%	57.0%
<b>To retire ranked Top 1-3</b>	54.1%	43.0%
<b>N=362</b>	N=255 (100.0%)	N=107 (29.6%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 3.734,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-22:  
Military Service (Dummy) and To Retire Motivation**

	<b>No Military Service</b>	<b>Prior or Current Military Service</b>
<b>To retire not ranked</b>	52.4%	25.5%
<b>To retire ranked Top 1-3</b>	41.4%	74.5%
<b>N=360</b>	N=313 (86.9%)	N=47 (13.1%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 11.802,  $p < .001$ .

**Table C-23:  
Race/Ethnicity (Dummy) and  
To Explore Motivation**

	<b>Nonwhite</b>	<b>White, Non-Hispanic</b>
<b>To explore not ranked</b>	23.4%	7.6%
<b>To explore ranked Top 1-3</b>	76.6%	92.4%
<b>N=361</b>	N=111 (30.7%)	N=250 (69.3%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 17.639,  $p < .001$ .

**Table C-24a:  
Very Strong American National Identity (Dummy) and  
To Explore Motivation**

	Not Very Strong American ID	Very Strong American ID
To explore not ranked	9.5%	13.4%
To explore ranked Top 1-3	90.5%	86.6%
N=361	N=84 (23.3%)	N=277 (76.7%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = .868,  $p < NS$ .

**Table C-24b:  
Strength of American National Identity and  
To Explore Motivation**

	Not at all	Not very strongly	Somewhat strongly	Very strongly
To explore not ranked	66.7%	30.0%	5.6%	13.4%
To explore ranked Top 1-3	33.3%	70.0%	94.4%	86.6%
N=362	N=3 (0.8%)	N=10 (2.8%)	N=72 (19.9%)	N=277 (76.5%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 13.996,  $p < .01$ .

**Table C-25a:  
Prior Living Abroad Experience (Dummy) and To Explore Motivation**

	Have Not Lived Abroad	Have Lived Abroad
To explore not ranked	12.3%	14.0%
To explore ranked Top 1-3	87.7%	86.0%
N=361	N=277 (76.3%)	N=86 (23.7%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = .167,  $p < NS$ .

**Table C-25b:  
Prior Living Abroad Experience and To Explore Motivation**

	Never lived abroad	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+ Foreign countries
To explore not ranked	12.3%	10.8%	22.2%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%
To explore ranked Top 1-3	87.7%	89.2%	77.8%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
N=361	N=277 (76.3%)	N=74 (20.4%)	N=9 (2.5%)	N=1 (0.3%)	N=0 (0.0%)	N=2 (0.6%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 10.423,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-26a:**  
**Very Strong American National Identity (Dummy) and**  
**To Leave a Bad Situation in the U.S. Motivation**

	<b>Not Very Strong American ID</b>	<b>Very Strong American ID</b>
<b>To leave not ranked</b>	31.0%	57.4%
<b>To leave ranked Top 1-3</b>	69.0%	42.6%
<b>N=361</b>	N=84 (23.3%)	N=277 (76.7%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 18.046,  $p < .001$ .

**Table C-26b:**  
**Strength of American National Identity and**  
**To Leave a Bad Situation in the U.S. Motivation**

	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Not very strongly</b>	<b>Somewhat strongly</b>	<b>Very strongly</b>
<b>To leave not ranked</b>	100.0%	0.0%	32.4%	57.4%
<b>To leave ranked Top 1-3</b>	0.0%	100.0%	67.6%	42.6%
<b>N=361</b>	N=3 (0.8%)	N=10 (2.8%)	N=71 (19.7%)	N=277 (76.7%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 27.664,  $p < .001$ .

**Table C-27:**  
**Level of Education and**  
**To Leave a Bad Situation in the U.S. Motivation**

	<b>Less than a High School Degree</b>	<b>HS Degree</b>	<b>Bachelor's Degree or Higher</b>
<b>To leave not ranked</b>	57.9%	44.0%	58.7%
<b>To leave ranked Top 1-3</b>	42.1%	56.0%	41.3%
<b>N=362</b>	N=19 (5.2%)	N=193 (53.3%)	N=150 (41.4%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 7.624,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-28:**  
**Passport Ownership (Dummy) and**  
**To Leave a Bad Situation in the U.S. Motivation**

	<b>No, not passport owner</b>	<b>Yes, passport owner</b>
<b>To leave not ranked</b>	38.0%	58.4%
<b>To leave ranked Top 1-3</b>	62.0%	41.6%
<b>N=362</b>	N=129 (35.6%)	N=233 (64.4%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 13.087,  $p < .001$ .

**Table C-29a:**  
**Prior Tourism Experience (Dummy) and**  
**To Leave a Bad Situation in the U.S. Motivation**

	Have Not Traveled Abroad	Have Traveled Abroad
To leave not ranked	38.4%	54.5%
To leave ranked Top 1-3	61.6%	45.5%
N=361	N=73 (20.2%)	N=288 (79.8%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 6.086,  $p < NS$ .

**Table C-29b:**  
**Prior Tourism Experience and**  
**To Leave a Bad Situation in the U.S. Motivation**

	Never traveled abroad	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+ Foreign countries
To leave not ranked	38.4%	47.1%	57.4%	58.2%	65.4%	66.7%
To leave ranked Top 1-3	61.6%	52.9%	42.6%	41.8%	34.6%	33.3%
N=362	N=73 (20.2%)	N=119 (32.9%)	N=68 (18.8%)	N=55 (15.2%)	N=26 (7.2%)	N=21 (5.8%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 11.842,  $p < .05$ .

**Table C-30:**  
**Rating of the Health of the U.S. Economy and**  
**To Leave a Bad Situation in the U.S. Motivation**

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
To leave not ranked	32.8%	60.4%	62.3%	66.7%
To leave ranked Top 1-3	67.2%	39.6%	37.7%	33.3%
N=356	N=125 (35.1%)	N=164 (46.1%)	N=61 (17.1%)	N=6 (1.7%)

\* Chi-square ( $X^2$ ) = 26.029,  $p < .001$ .