Over the past several decades population movement in the United States has been from rural to urban areas, and from depressed labor-surplus areas to more prosperous ones. Since, in many cases the more urbanized areas also are the relatively more prosperous areas, it is difficult to measure the relative importance of these two factors in motivating the migratory population. To what extent do people move seeking better employment and income opportunities; and to what extent do they move (especially the young) simply because they want to live in a more urban environment?

Gallaway has pointed out that through the early 1950's it was generally held that workers were not responsive to spatial differences in economic advantages. However, in more recent years the differential economic advantage thesis has received increased support. Even more recent discussions have focused on the many amenities enjoyed by people who live in large urban areas and suggestions that these amenities are part of the reason urban areas continue to attract people and industry.

The motives for and preferences related to migration are particularly important when one views the overwhelming proportion of Appalachian migrants flowing into northern SMSA's where, in many cases, they contribute to local
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congestion and ghetto problems. Hansen and Yu Khin have presented some evidence that this is not necessary. Based on a questionnaire completed by 625 Eastern Kentucky graduating high school seniors, they concluded that the students would prefer to migrate to prosperous areas other than the large metropolitan areas of the North.\(^5\)

This paper attempts to empirically investigate, on an intra-Appalachian net migration basis, the extent to which recent Appalachian migrants actually have responded to the relative prosperity of areas as opposed to the extent to which areas are urbanized. Specifically, this paper investigates the extent to which migration, associated with Appalachian subregions, can be explained by spatial differences in economic activity, and the extent to which it is related to spatial differences in urbanization within Appalachia.

**Data and Method of Analysis**

The Appalachian region encompasses 397 counties in 13 states stretching from New York to Mississippi. Between 1950 and 1960 this region experienced a net population outmigration of almost 2,202,000, resulting in a 1950-1960 net migration rate of -12.7. Between 1960 and 1965, although the migration rate slowed, approximately 589,000 people left the region. This resulted in a net migration rate of -3.3.\(^6\) During the latter period, there were large spatial differences in population movements within the region, with a significant number of subregions actually gaining population.

For purposes of this paper, selected employment, population, and income data for 1960 for the 397 counties in Appalachia were aggregated into 63 subregions which correspond to the Appalachian Regional Commission’s Planning Districts. In principle, each subregion contains a group of counties which are more similar to one another than to surrounding counties in other subregions, i.e., each subregion supposedly contains a relatively economically homogeneous set of counties.

Initially, 25 variables were collected for each subregion. First, employment data for 21 industries were converted into location quotients. These are coefficients showing the percent employed in each industry in each subregion in Appalachia relative to the percent of employment in that industry in the nation as a whole. The location quotients were computed as follows:

\[
LQ_{ij} = \frac{E_{ij}}{E_i} / \frac{E_n}{E_{in}}
\]
