DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS

AFFECTING MIGRATION IN EIGHT

UNITED STATES CITIES

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

North Texas State University in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Paul Dwight Landua, B. A., M.S.

Denton, Texas

December, 1982

Landua, Paul Dwight, <u>Demographic</u> <u>and</u> <u>Social</u> <u>Psychological</u>
<u>Factors</u> <u>Affecting</u> <u>Migration</u> <u>in</u> <u>Eight</u> <u>United</u> <u>States</u> <u>Cities</u>.
Doctor of Philosophy (Sociology), December, 1982, 115 pp.,
18 tables, bibliography, 28 titles.

In this investigation, selected demographic and social
psychological factors affecting migration within eight United
States cities are examined. More specifically, the study
examines migration in terms of previous neighborhood satis-
faction, perceived initial attraction of present neighborhood,
present neighborhood satisfaction, family life cycle, residence
tenure, race, sex, income, and education.

The data for this investigation are taken from the 1975
National Crime Survey Attitude Sub-Sample Files. Using length
of residence to define migration status, 2,047 migrants and
1,928 non-migrants comprise the sample for this investigation.
Zero-order and multiple correlation measures are utilized in
the analysis of migration in terms of the previously mentioned
variables.

The analysis of data indicate there is virtually no
difference in the present neighborhood satisfaction levels
of migrants and non-migrants. The amount of variation in
migration explained by present neighborhood satisfaction,
when compared with the demographic factors, is minimal.
Of all the variables analyzed, the age of the household

1

head explains the greatest amount of variation in migration. Migrants, as compared with non-migrants are more likely to be younger, better educated, poorer, non-home owners, and have larger families. The analysis of data also indicate that neighborhood considerations were the primary reasons for migrations from previous neighborhoods, while housing concerns were the primary reasons for the selection of present neighborhoods. These findings suggest that in the selection of their present neighborhood, the migrants failed to correct the problems that they encountered with their previous neighborhoods, since their present neighborhood dissatisfaction is also related to neighborhood considerations.

The findings generated by this study suggests that the primary motivation for migration has shifted from spatial needs to economic concerns. Migration is greatest among young household heads with relatively high educations and low incomes. The finding that age explains more variation in migration than family size might indicate that future migration research focus less on family spatial needs and more on socio-economic factors.

TABLE CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Preliminary Statement

More than one-fifth of America's population migrate
annually. The point has been reached where internal migration
has surpassed both natural increase and net international
migration in volume. Petersen noted that "in many parts of
the country, particularly the West, internal migration has
been the most important determinant of population size and
composition, but it is still the demographic factor we know
least about."[1]

The field of internal migration, because of its limited
documentation, previously has been described "as an unsup-
ported step-child of demography."[2] Most of the previous
migration studies have employed either aggregate objective
data or localized subjective survey data. Those studies
employing objective data have focused on the demographic
determinants of migration while those using survey data
have emphasized social psychological factors.

---

[1]William Petersen, Population (New York, 1975), pp. 44-45.

[2]Dudley Kirk, "Some Reflections on American Demography
in the Nineteen Sixties," Population Index, XXVI (October,
1960), p. 307.

Many of the studies which have examined internal migration in terms of demographic factors are based on census data or population surveys. These studies generally distinguish migrants from non-migrants in terms of stage of the family life cycle, level of education, sex, level of income, and home ownership. Such investigations have examined the relationships of these variables to past migration and to the probability of future migration. The focus of these studies has been directed toward answering the question of who are the migrants rather than the question of why people move.

Migration studies employing subjective survey data have generally attempted to determine why people migrate. These studies recognize that needs, values, and aspirations are important components of the migration process. Variables such as neighborhood satisfaction, residential satisfaction, and social mobility aspirations have been employed to distinguish migrants from non-migrants. Essentially these investigations have determined how migrants and non-migrants evaluate (1) their neighborhood in terms of location and environmental factors (neighborhood satisfaction), (2) their residence in terms of spacial and structural features (residential satisfaction), and (3) their perceived housing and neighborhood needs (social mobility aspirations). These investigations traditionally have been of a localized scope and thus have been subject to social and economic conditions which may be unique to the study area.

Studies exclusively using either demographic or social psychological variables are well documented in the literature. The lack of research incorporating both types of variables has impeded the development of an adequate theory of migration. It is suggested that the development of such a theory is dependent upon the incorporation of both the demographic and social psychological perspectives. Fortunately in more recent years, attempts have been made to incorporate the two types of variables in the study of internal migration. The most common of these studies are those which examine the relationship of demographic factors to neighborhood and residential satisfaction and their effects on future migrations. The implication is that there is a negative correlation between residential and neighborhood satisfaction and future migration. There is evidence that residential and neighborhood satisfaction is a better predictor of future migration than any single demographic variable. The research design developed in the following chapter is an attempt to examine the demographic and social psychological factors as they relate to the questions of who actually migrates and why they move.

Demographic and Social Psychological Characteristics of Migrants

Numerous contemporary studies have examined the relationship of duration of residence to migration patterns. The Cornell model, developed by McGinnis and his associates, treats the relationship between duration of residence and

migration as an axiom in a probability model. The basic

assumption is that one's propensity to move is a function of,

among other variables, his or her duration of residence.

Utilizing attendance records of high school students in

Seattle, Washington, to evaluate the Cornell model, Myers,

McGinnis, and Masnich found that as duration of residence

increased, the probability of migration declined.[3]

Morrison examined the relationship of duration of resi-

dence to the propensity to migrate in terms of the intervening

effect of age. Using a sample of residential histories from

the Dutch population registration system, he transformed the

data into age specific and duration specific probabilities.

Morrison found that probability of migrating decreases as the

duration status increases for all age categories. Also, the

probability of migrating declines with increasing age.[4]

Land demonstrated that the relationship between migration

probability and duration of residence could hold for popu-

lations with varied ecological and demographic characteristics.

Applying the Cornell model to a sample of residents in

Monterrey, Mexico, and comparing it with the findings of

Morrison's Amsterdam study, he found that both revealed a

---

[3]George Myers, Robert McGinnis, and George Masnich, "The Duration of Residence Approach to a Dynamic Stochastic Model of Internal Migration: A Test of the Axiom of Cumulative Inertia," Eugenics Quarterly, XIV (June, 1967), pp. 121-126.

[4]Peter Morrison, "Duration of Residence and Prospective Migration: The Evaluation of a Stochastic Model," Demography, (August, 1967), pp. 553-561.

negative nonlinear relation between the probability of migration and duration of residence. Similarly, the findings suggested that age interacts with duration status.[5]

In each of the previously mentioned investigations employing the Cornell model, duration status or duration status and age were examined exclusively in terms of migration pro-babilities. Other studies, most of them recent, have examined the relationship between duration status and other demographic factors and social psychological concerns.

One of the first studies to focus on the significance of duration status was Zimmer's study of social participation in urban areas. He noted that migrants, as compared with non-migrants, were less likely to belong to formal organizations, less likely to hold offices in formal organizations, and less likely to be registered to vote. However, as the migrants' duration of residence increased, their participation rates began to resemble those of the residents of the community. He suggested that the adjustment period for most migrants possessing low status characteristics might never achieve equality in participation rate with the non-migrants.[6]

---

[5]Kenneth Land, "Duration of Residence and Prospective Migration: Further Evidence," Demography, VI (May, 1969), pp. 133-140.

[6]Basil Zimmer, "Participation of Migrants in Urban Structures," American Sociological Review, XX (April, 1955), pp. 218-224.

In his investigation of a representative sample of the
adult population of Rhode Island, Speare examined the
relationships among duration status, residential satisfaction,
migration aspirations and actual migration rates. Duration
of residence was found to be only moderately correlated with
residential satisfaction, the wish to move, and actual migration
in the year following the interview. Of the background
variables investigated, home ownership had the strongest
relationship to residential satisfaction, to desired migration,
and to actual mobility. Speare noted, however, that duration
of residence independently affected the renter's, but not
the owner's, desire to move, as well as, eventual migration.
The longer the renters resided in a neighborhood, the greater
were their migration aspirations and subsequent moves.[7]

More recently, Berry and Kasarda's analysis of community
attitudes in England identified duration of residence as the
central and crucial factor influencing local community attach-
ment. When compared with social class, life cycle, population
density, and size of community, duration of residence had
more positive and statistically significant effects on local
social bonds and community sentiments. With reference to
social bonds, duration status revealed particularly strong
relationships to the relative number of acquaintances in the

---

[7]Alden Speare, Jr., "Residential Satisfaction as an
Intervening Variable in Residential Mobility," Demography,
XI (May, 1974), pp. 173-187.

community, the number of relatives living nearby, and the proportion of all friends and relatives residing in the local community. Duration status also had a positive and statistically significant effect on sense of community and interest in community.[8] They further noted that the longer individuals resided in the community, the greater were their feelings of sorrow if they would have to move.

In each of the previously described studies, duration of residence was identified as having either a direct or an indirect effect on migration. Recently, migration research has focused on the indirect effects of duration status on migration by examining it in terms of general neighborhood attachment.

Studies of the relationship of family life cycle to migration are well documented in the literature. In his classic study Why Families Move, Rossi concluded that one of the major functions of migration was to provide a mechanism for families to satisfy their housing needs. He noted that modifications in housing needs were created by shifts in family composition that accompany life cycle changes. Therefore, younger families tended to be more residentially mobile than older families. Migration rates were especially high for young families with larger numbers of children. In the

---

[8]Brian J. L. Berry and John D. Kasarda, Contemporary Urban Ecology (New York, 1977), pp. 53-71.

final stage of the life cycle the need for space was reduced. In such instances migration to adjust to spatial needs was rather uncommon. Rossi suggested that it was easier to adjust to a surplus of space than to a shortage of space.[9] It should be remembered Rossi's study was based on a rather unique period in the history of urbanization in the United States, when suburbanization was in its early stages and housing was controlled by a seller's market.[10]

In analyzing data on streams of internal migration in Indiana, Beshers and Nishiura concluded that migration rates were highest for young adults. However, in contrast to Rossi's findings they noted migration rates for persons 65 years of age and older were generally greater than for persons in the 55-65 age category. The notable exception to this trend was for those in the streams with rural areas of origin. Beshers and Nishiura noted that persons living in rural areas, especially farmers and small businessmen, were less likely to have clearcut retirement ages than those in urban occupations. They further maintained that capital investments by farmers and business owners contributed to their attachment to a

---

[9]Peter H. Rossi, Why Families Move: A Study in the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility (Glencoe, Illinois), pp. 177-184.

[10]Edgar W. Butler, George Sabaugh, and Maurice D. Van Arsdol, Jr., "Demographic and Social Psychological Factors in Residential Mobility," Sociology and Social Research, XLVIII (January, 1964), pp. 139-140.

specific location. The discrepancies between the two studies might also be explained in terms of the variations in the scope of the samples studied and the time span between the investigations. Beshers and Nishiura's study was based on a state-wide sample in a period prior to the growth of post-war suburbs while Rossi's study focused on samples from one urban area in a period of rapid suburbanization.[11]

Long, using a national sample of households, examined mobility patterns in terms of the age of the head of the household, the ages of the children within the household, and the number of children in the household. As with the previously described studies, he found that migration was greatest among young heads of households. Mobility rates, however, were restricted by the presence of school-age children. When controlling for age, couples with children of school age had migration rates which were about fifty to sixty percent as large as couples with children of preschool age only. This pattern was observed in both short- and long-distance moving. The same pattern could not be discerned when family size was taken into consideration. Family size was inversely related to distance of move.[12] As short-distance moves comprised a majority of migrations, the

---

[11]James M. Beshers and Eleanor N. Nishiura, "A Theory of Internal Migration Differential," Social Forces, XXXIX (March, 1961), pp. 214-218.

[12]Larry H. Long, "The Influence of Number and Ages of Children on Residential Mobility," Demography, IX (August, 1972), pp. 371-382.

overall migration rates are greater for larger families than for smaller families.

Studies of the relationship of educational attainment to migration rates have generally indicated a positive correlation. Leslie and Richardson's study of mobility expectations in Layfayette, Indiana, revealed that variables influencing the individual's career patterns were more effective predictors of migration than were variables related to family life cycle. Educational attainment had the greatest correlation with the intention to migrate of the individual items influencing career patterns.[13] The inconsistency between their findings and those of Rossi was due primarily to the diversity of the two samples. Leslie and Richardson analyzed a homogeneous, young, urban subdivision while Rossi studied a population that exhibited a variety of living conditions.

The relationship of education to rates of migration are especially pronounced in the extremes of educational attainment. Beshers and Nishiura noted that individuals with less than six years of education were the least migrant of any education group. At the other extreme, the amount of migration was greatest for the college educated populations. These two patterns were most readily identifiable in streams

---

[13]Gerald R. Leslie and Arthur H. Richardson, "Life Cycle, Career Pattern, and the Decision to Move," American Sociological Review, XXVI (December, 1961), pp. 894-902.

with rural areas of origin. However, the same general trends could be observed in most streams with urban or suburban areas of origin.[14]

On a larger scale, Long examined the migration patterns of a sample of 50,000 households throughout the United States in terms of age and occupational and educational factors. He concluded that educational attainment within major occupation groups, controlling for age, is linearly related to migration probabilities. Long suggested that the most highly educated were at least twice as migratory as the least educated of identical age and nonfarm occupation categories. When using the same controls, the most highly educated persons had disproportionately higher rates for intercounty and interstate migration than those with the least educational attainments. The same pattern was not observed for intracounty migration.[15] The role of education as a predictor in migration might be declining as college enrollments increase and college graduates become a less select group with less distinctive migration patterns. At present, Long considers education to be an important predictor of migration, often more important than the traditional census classification of occupations.[16]

---

[14]Beshers and Nishiura, op. cit., pp. 217-218.

[15]Larry H. Long, "Migration Differentials by Education and Occupation: Trends and Variations," Demography, X (May, 1973), pp. 243-257.

[16]Ibid., p. 257.

Housing tenure is another background variable which has been related to migration aspirations and to actual migration. In general, research has suggested that renters tend to be more mobile than owners. Rossi's investigation revealed that more than sixty percent of the renters surveyed wanted to move while less than one-third of the home owners held migration aspirations. He also examined the renters' migration potential in terms of their value orientation toward home ownership. Of the renters who preferred to own their own home, nearly three-fourths expressed a desire to move. Conversely, only forty-three percent of the renters who preferred to rent expressed a desire to move.[17] Even when housing complaints were taken into consideration, renters were more inclined to move than were home owners. Rossi suggested that home owners were better able to adjust their own homes to their housing needs and thus more reluctant to migrate. Renters, on the other hand, had few opportunities to modify their existing dwellings.[18]

Speare noted that migration aspirations and actual migration were affected more by home ownership than any other background variables. Renters had greater migration aspirations and rates of migration than did home owners. Residence tenure was also found to be highly correlated

[17]Rossi, op. cit., pp. 68-74.

[18]Ibid., pp. 87-89.

with residential satisfaction. Speare suggested that renters were less likely than home owners to be satisfied with their residences. Consequently they were more likely to express a desire to move which was reflected in subsequent migration.[19] Speare's findings were generally substantiated by Bach and Smith's study of Durham, North Carolina.[20] They found renters more likely than home owners to be planning and actually migrating.

Income is another factor which has been widely employed in migration research. McAllister, Kaiser, and Butler observed that the level of income was positively correlated with the distance of migration. Families with low incomes had high intracity migration rates.[21] Speare observed that family income was only moderately related to neighborhood satisfaction. The desire to move was greatest among families with low incomes. However, this relationship was not nearly as strong as the correlation between income and subsequent mobility.[22] This finding might suggest that the poor may

[19]Speare, op. cit., pp. 182-187.

[20]Robert L. Bach and Joel Smith, "Community Satisfaction, Expectations of Moving and Migration," Demography, XIV, (May, 1977), pp. 147-167.

[21]Ronald J. McAllister, Edward J. Kaiser, and Edgar W. Butler, "Residential Mobility of Blacks and Whites: A National Longitudinal Survey," American Journal of Sociology, LXXVII (November, 1972), pp. 445-456.

[22]Speare, op. cit., pp. 181-183.

have been forced to move against their wishes. The effects
of income on migration generally parallels the relationship
of education to migration.

Historically, demographers have examined the relationship
of sex to migration. Ravenstein's pioneering study of
migration patterns in Great Britain indicated that females
were more migratory than males.[23] Shryock's examination of
migration histories of a sample of the adult population
within the United States indicated that there was very little
difference in the migration rates of males and females.
When the distance of migration was taken into consideration,
males actually had higher rates of mobility in long-distance
moves. The general pattern observed was that the sex-ratio
of movers increased with the distance moved, indicating men
were more likely to be long-distant migrants. He also
suggested that the patterns of migration vary by age. The
peak age for migration came earlier for females than for
males. Girls, fourteen to nineteen years of age, had
considerably higher rates than boys of the same age category.
In all other age categories, the rates for females were
about the same or slightly lower than for males.[24]

---

[23]E. G. Ravenstein, "The Laws of Migration," Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, XLVIII (June, 1885), pp.198-199.

[24]Henry S. Shryock, Population Mobility Within the United States (Chicago, 1964), pp. 411-425.

Studies concerning the relationship of race to migration have usually focused on blacks. From 1920 to 1960 the interstate migration rates for blacks exceeded those for whites. The reversal of this trend was first evidenced in 1970 census data.[25] The migration differentials for shorter distances is less clear. Shryock submits that blacks are less likely than whites to participate in "middle-distance moves" such as intracounty migration. However, Shryock suggests that intracity migration is greater for blacks than whites, with particularly high rates in the ghetto areas of the city.[26] It could be argued that trend will persist and possibly increase as land use patterns in the central city change forcing its former residents to outlying areas.

In a more recent study of migration patterns in the United States, Long noted that female heads of households were generally more residentially mobile than male heads of households. In contrast to Shryock's findings, Long observed that migration rates for male heads of household exceeded those for female heads of households in only the fourteen to twenty-four age category. Rates for intercounty migration were roughly the same for male and female heads of households, while male heads of households generally had higher

---

[25]T. Lynn Smith and Paul E. Zopf, Jr., Demography: Principles and Methods, (Port Washington, New York, 1976), pp. 537-538.

[26]Rossi, op. cit., pp. 418-425.

interstate migration rates than female heads of households. With the exception of the youngest age category, female heads of households had considerably higher rates of intra-county migration than did male household heads. For both male and female household heads, under thirty-five years of age, the probability for intercounty migration was inversely related to the number of children present. The same pattern held for male, but not female household heads in intracounty moves. There was no consistent relationship between the number of children present and intracounty migration rates for female heads of households. Among household heads less than forty-five years of age, females generally had higher migration rates than their male counterparts for all family sizes. The major exception to this pattern was in childless families where the male household heads were the most mobile.[27] Long suggests that the higher rates of female migration may be the result of changes in the family's structure due to being widowed or being divorced. He suggests that women with children may not have a well-defined place within the community, consequently they may fail to develop a commitment to a community that a husband-wife couple might develop.[28]

_____

[27]Long, op. cit., pp. 373-379.

[28]Ibid., p. 379.

Reasons for Migration

As noted earlier, each of the previously discussed variables has been most often examined as related to migration. It was not until the 1950's that these variables were studied in reference to social psychological factors in migration. In order to study migration more completely, these investigations focused on the specific reasons for migration.

Rossi's classic study of migration revealed that mobility was a function of housing needs. Migration rates were highest for young families, especially those with young children. The migration of these families was highly correlated with the need for more space. Nearly one-half of the families indicated that their primary reason for moving was their dissatisfaction with the amount of room in their previous dwelling. Complaints about the features of the previous neighborhood and costs of the former dwelling were of lesser significance in their decision to move. Renters were more sensitive to space and cost factors while home owners exhibited greater sensitivity to neighborhood features.[29]

Rossi also examined the relationship of residential and neighborhood dissatisfaction to the desire to migrate. More specifically, mobility inclinations were examined in

---

[29]Rossi, op. cit., pp. 145-151.

terms of complaints about dwelling unit space, utilities,
social environment, physical environment, costs, and the
location of the neighborhood. The variable which had the
strongest relationship to mobility inclination was dwelling
unit space while the weakest relationship was with the
location of the neighborhood. With the exception of the
location of the neighborhood, a rather uniform pattern was
found within each of the factors. The more complaints a
family gave, the greater their mobility inclinations. Rossi
suggested that the inconsistent relationship of the location
factor to mobility might be the result of a well-developed
mass transportation system and extensively diffused car own-
ership.[30] It should be noted that Rossi's study area consisted
of only four neighborhoods in Philadelphia. It is conceivable
that in cities where well-developed transportation systems
are lacking, location might be a more significant factor in
migration.

The final phase of Rossi's study examined the factors
related to the migrants' selection of a new residence. He
noted that the families considered a variety of specifications
in their search for new dwellings. The most frequently cited
specification was the amount of space in the dwelling unit.
The dwelling unit design ranked second, followed by

---

[30]Ibid., pp. 80-121.

neighborhood location and cost factors. Also, there was a correlation between the complaints concerning the previous dwelling with the specifications for the new residence.[31] The same pattern was not observed in the relationship between the complaints concerning the previous dwelling with the attractions of the new residence. Attractions were considered to be the reasons why a specific residence was selected over all other choices. Cost was the most important of the attractions, followed by space, neighborhood location, and neighborhood social composition. Rossi suggests that attributes other than costs may be primary criteria in narrowing the choice of acceptable dwelling units; however, cost of the dwelling unit is the major determinig factor in the final decision to select a particular residence over its competitors. If two or more units are equal in space, design, and location, the cheaper one is selected.[32]

Rossi's approach to the study of migration employed the method of reason analysis. He found that most migrations were of a voluntary nature. Families who are dissatisfied with their previous dwelling make the decision to move. These families outline their specifications for new dwellings and then make individual choices according to their relative attributes. Leslie and Richardson argue that the method

---

[31]Ibid., pp. 153-162.

[32]Ibid., pp. 163-172.

of reason analysis tends to de-emphasize the role of life cycle variables as determinants of migration. They suggest that complaints or dissatisfactions with the current dwelling be treated as intervening variables in the development of the decision to move. In their model, life cycle variables and career patterns would be the independent variables, with residential mobility as the dependent variable.[33] This model has been modified and employed in more recent investigations. The modified model will be described in subsequent paragraphs.

Numerous other studies have examined the reasons for migration and have produced findings similar to those of Rossi's study. Gans' study of Levittown revealed that a vast majority of the new residents of the community left their previous residence because of house-related reasons. The need for more space and the desire for home ownership were the most frequently cited reasons for their migration. Less than ten percent mentioned community related factors as their principal reason for moving. Like Rossi, Gans found the cost factor to be the primary criterion in the ultimate selection of a new home. Only two percent of the new residents considered the amount of space to be the principal reason for selecting their new dwelling.[34]

---

[33]Leslie and Richardson, op. cit., pp. 899-902.

[34]Herbert J. Gans, The Levittowners (New York, 1967), pp. 48-86.

The parallels between the two previously described studies may be partially explained by the fact that both were concerned with migration patterns in the Philadelphia area in post-war periods.

Butler and associates were among the first to relate social psychological and demographic variables in the study of residential mobility. Three social psychological variables, housing satisfaction, neighborhood satisfaction, and vertical mobility attitudes, were identified. These variables and demographic variables were examined in terms of migration intentions. Of the demographic variables, age of the household head exhibited the strongest relationship to migration. Of the three social psychological variables, housing satisfaction was the best predictor of migration. The relationship of neighborhood satisfaction and vertical mobility attitudes to migration was relatively weak. The investigators suggested that such weak relationships were possibly due to measurement deficiencies or the inadequacies of the independent measures in their exploratory study.[35]

More recent investigations have employed models which examine the effects of a number of demographic variables and a single social psychological variable on migration. These studies are based on the notion that migration is an adjustment to stress. Speare maintained that stress could

---

[35]Butler, Sabaugh, and Van Arsdol, op. cit., pp. 147-151.

be measured in terms of residential satisfaction as an intervening variable between demographic variables and residential satisfaction. The model that he designed treated residential satisfaction as an intervening variable between demographic variables and residential mobility. Residential satisfaction was a summary measure which included reactions to housing, neighborhood, and locational or distance factors.[36] As with most of the previously described studies, residential satisfaction was related to migration aspirations and to subsequent migration. In fact, Speare concluded that residential satisfaction was the major determinant of migration. He noted that all of the demographic variables had some effect on mobility. However, he observed that these tended to be indirect effects acting through the residential satisfaction variable. The only exception to this pattern was housing tenure, which had a direct effect on both migration aspirations and subsequent migration.[37]

Bach and Smith, utilizing a modification of the model designed by Speare, concluded residential satisfaction was strongly related to migration expectations, however, the relationship of satisfaction to actual migration was much less obvious. They contended that in order to predict

[36]Speare, op. cit., pp. 175-177.

[37]Ibid., pp. 183-187.

migration, information concerning migration expectations was needed in addition to residential satisfaction measures. Employing an interaction model, they concluded that residential satisfaction had a much more significant effect on actual migration than did migration expectations, which supported Speare's general formulation.[38]

Migration Methodology Problems

Previous migration research has generally focused on either retrospective or subsequent moves. Seldom have research designs incorporated both types of migration. Rather, the tendency has been to examine past migration in terms of demographic factors and to study future migration in terms of social psychological factors. Retrospective or past migration studies have utilized data primarily from population censuses and the Current Population Survey. Data for subsequent or future migration studies are generally limited to survey data derived from limited localized studies. Van Arsdol, Sabaugh, and Butler have suggested that these fragmented research efforts have greatly impeded the integration of demographic and social psychological concepts in migration study.[39] They have also suggested

---

[38]Bach and Smith, op. cit., pp. 147-167.

[39]Maurice Van Arsdol, Jr., George Sabaugh, and Edgar W. Butler, "Retrospective and Subsequent Metropolitan Residential Mobility," Demography, XV (1968), pp. 249-252.

that the relationship of attitudes to subsequent migration can best be observed through longitudinal surveys.[40]

Longitudinal surveys, in contrast to other forms of data collection can be utilized to answer the questions of who moves and why they move. The answers to these basic questions have been considered crucial to the development of a theory of migration.[41] Migration researchers have failed to use the longitudinal survey technique on a widespread basis. Rather, they have modified the technique by limiting the time span of the research or by limiting the geographic boundaries to a small localized area. These limitations are generally necessitated because of the extensive cost and time factors involved in longitudinal surveys. Also, until very recently subjective migration data were not readily available in any of the ongoing national surveys. The research design for this study is based on such national survey data (see Chapter II).

In previous efforts to link demographic and social psychological factors to migration, researchers have identified residential and neighborhood satisfaction as the major intervening variables between the background variables and actual migration. The measurement of neighborhood and residential satisfaction has created some controversy in migration

---

[40]Ibid., p. 251.

[41]Speare, op. cit., p. 173.

research. Most studies have utilized some type of index to determine satisfaction. Rossi developed a "complaints index" in which respondents indicated their degree of satisfaction with a number of housing and neighborhood items. The inter-relationships between the individual items were then determined, clusters of items were identified, labeled, and treated as separate dimensions of dissatisfaction. Scores for each of the dimensions were then determined by totaling the number of complaints registered by respondents within each cluster of items.[42]

Butler and associates used a similar technique to measure housing satisfaction. However, for measurement of neighborhood satisfaction they devised a "neighborhood discrepancy index." This index was based on the differences between desired and obtained neighborhood characteristics at the time of migration to the present neighborhood. Index values were then determined to measure the degree of satisfaction.[43] A major limitation of this technique, as compared to the "complaints index," is that is requires two sets of comparable data.

The authors of several recent studies have employed a modification of Rossi's "complaint index." Speare's index of satisfaction was based on responses to a series of questions about specific housing, neighborhood, or location items.

[42]Rossi, op. cit., pp. 196-200.

[43]Butler, Sabaugh, and Van Arsdol, op. cit., pp. 142-143.

After experimenting with several different indices, both weighted and non-weighted, Speare concluded that very little difference existed among these measures.[44] Similarly, Bach and Smith observed that complex weighting patterns were unwarranted. Rather, their index of satisfaction was based on a simple sum of the positive responses to questions related to housing and neighborhood conditions.[45] Although these latter two indices yield a single summary measure of satisfaction, it is also possible to examine the relationships of the individual items comprising the indices to other migration variables. Such examinations provide insights into the specific factors affecting satisfaction and migration.

Summary

A review of the literature related to internal migration has revealed a rather fragmented line of empirical investigation. Past research has been concentrated in the following areas: (1) demographic characteristics of the migrants, (2) social psychological reasons for moving, and (3) examinations of the interrelationships between demographic and social psychological factors in migration.

Most early students of migration attempted to make demographic distinctions between migrants and non-migrants.

---

[44]Speare, op. cit., pp. 179-180.

[45]Bach and Smith, op. cit., p. 154.

Such studies have indicated that migration probabilities were inversely related to duration of residence status. Further investigations indicate that duration status greatly affected neighborhood satisfaction, social participation, social bonds, and other variables related to desired and actual migration. These studies also indicate that migration was affected by the family life cycle. Migration was particularly high among young families and large families. The relationship of gender to migration was somewhat vague. Families with male heads of households generally had higher migration rates over long distances while families with female heads of households had the higher rates for short-distance moves. An examination of race indicated that whites had higher rates for long-distance migration while blacks had higher rates for short-distance moves. The relationship of income, education, and housing tenure to migration has also received much attention in the literature. Long-distance migration was positively related to level of income, educational attainment, and home ownership. Short-distance movers were predominantly low in educational attainment, poor, and renters.

Although the previously described variables have been valuable in explaining who migrates, they have been less valuable in explaining why migration occurs. Several studies have suggested that migration was a function of housing needs, such as the need for more space, or the desire for a

freestanding home. Other housing and neighborhood factors were also linked to migration aspirations and actual migrations.

The recent trend in migration research has been to examine migration in terms of the relationship between demographic and social psychological factors. It is suggested that such data are now available and are amenable to migration research.

The following chapter provides a detailed description of the data and the methodological approach utilized in this study. The focal concern of this study is the interrelationship between demographic variables, social psychological variables, and migration. Further, this investigation is based on a sample of eight selected cities which represent a cross-section of the United States.

Past research efforts have attempted both to identify the migrant and to determine why the migration occurred. Most of these studies have been based on limited local survey data. The National Crime Survey, described in the following chapter, provides data from eight selected major cities in the United States. In addition to providing basic demographic information, the survey focuses on the migrants' opinions about their past and present neighborhood. The methodological approach for this investigation is described in the following chapter.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methodological procedures that were utilized in this study. To facilitate the discussion of the methodological procedures and techniques, the following categories are described: (1) hypothesis, (2) methodological design and operational definitions, (3) source of data, and (4) statistical measures.

Hypotheses

The review of previous migration studies suggested several testable hypotheses. These suggested hypotheses and those based upon the expectations of the investigator were tested. The following hypotheses concerning migration and neighborhood satisfaction were tested.

1. Non-migrants are more satisfied with their present neighborhood than are migrants.

The literature is well documented with studies which suggest that duration of residence is a primary factor in neighborhood satisfaction. For example, Zimmer found the

period of adjustment for most migrants to be at least five years.[1] It would seem likely that those whose residence tenure was at least as long as the suggested adjustment period would be better satisfied with their present neighborhood than would those with shorter tenure.

2. Present neighborhood satisfaction will explain more variation in migration than will the traditional demographic variables (family life cycle, residence tenure, race, sex, income, and education).

The recent trend in migration research has been to examine the effects of a number of demographic variables and a single social psychological variable on migration. The general consensus has been that neighborhood satisfaction is a primary indicator of migration aspirations and actual migration. The second hypothesis is the major determinant of migration.[2]

3. The family life cycle will explain more variation in migration than will the other demographic variables (residence tenure, race, sex, income, and education).

4. Those in the early stages of the family life cycle are more likely to be migrants than are those in the later stage of the life cycle.

---

[1]Basil Zimmer, "Participation of Migrants in Urban Structures," American Sociological Review, XX (April, 1955), pp. 218-224.

[2]Alden Speare, Jr., "Residential Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable in Residential Mobility," Demography, XI (May, 1974), pp. 183-187.

The third and fourth hypotheses are based on the premise that younger families, especially those with younger children, often experience a change in housing needs. In order to satisfy these changing needs, they may be required to obtain housing in another neighborhood. Previous research, like Rossi's study of why families move, suggested migration was greatest among younger families.[3] Similar results are mentioned in several other studies described in Chapter I. The relative importance of family life cycle as a migration variable has also been examined in terms of other demographic variables. Butler and associates found the family life cycle variable to be the best predictor of migration.[4]

5. More current renters than current home owners are migrants.

The fifth hypothesis is based on the contention that migration is an expression of housing needs. Rossi suggested that home owners are better able to adjust their own homes to their housing needs than are renters and are thus likely to migrate.[5]

6. More non-whites than whites are migrants.

---

[3]Peter H. Rossi, Why Families Move: A Study in the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility (Glencoe, Illinois), pp. 177-184.

[4]Edgar W. Butler, George Sabaugh, and Maurice D. Van Arsdol, Jr., "Demographic and Social Psychological Factors in Residential Mobility," Sociology and Social Research, XLVIII (January, 1964), pp. 139-140.

[5]Rossi, op. cit., pp. 177-184.

Shryock submits that black migration is slightly less than white migration in interstate moves. The same pattern exists for middle-distance moves such as intercounty migration. However, Shryock suggests that intercity migration is greater for blacks than whites.[6] Since local moves generally exceed longer distance moves, it follows that total migration is greater for non-whites than for whites.

7. More female heads of households than male heads of households are migrants.

The seventh hypothesis, like the preceding one is based on the premise that the number of short-distance moves is greater than the number of long-distance moves. The literature suggests that there is generally very little difference in the migration rates of males and females. Shryock noted that when distance is considered, females exceeded males in short-distance migration.[7]

8. More household heads with low income are migrants than are household heads with high income; more household heads with low educational attainments are migrants than are household heads with high educational attainments.

Previous research indicates that the desire to move and actual migration are greatest among low income families.[8]

---

[6]Henry S. Shryock, _Population Mobility Within the United States_ (Chicago, 1964), pp. 418-425.

[7]Shryock, _op. cit._, pp. 418-425.

[8]Speare, _op. cit._, pp. 181-183.

This pattern was especially apparent in short-distance migrations.[9] The same pattern was observed when migration and education were examined. Short-distance migration was greatest among the least educated.[10]

9. The family life cycle will explain more variation in present neighborhood satisfaction, dissatisfaction with previous neighborhood, and perceived initial attractiveness of present neighborhood than the other demographic variables.

The underlying assumption for the ninth hypothesis is that migration is a function of housing needs. Younger families would likely be dissatisfied with their previous neighborhood, they would be more selective in choosing a new neighborhood, and because they haven't had time to adjust to their new neighborhood, they would be less satisfied with their new neighborhood.

In addition to the nine formally stated hypotheses, two related propositions were examined. These propositions were based on the specific reasons for the migration from previous neighborhoods and the reasons for the selection of their present neighborhood. The propositions were designed solely for descriptive purposes. Since the number of individual items

---

[9]Ronald J. McAllister, Edward J. Kaiser, and Edgar W. Butler, "Residential Mobility of Blacks and Whites: A National Longitudinal Survey," American Journal of Sociology, LXXVII (November, 1972), pp. 445-456.

[10]Larry H. Long, "Migration Differentials by Education and Occupation: Trends and Variations," Demography, X (May, 1973), pp. 243-257.

included in the housing, neighborhood, and "other" categories varied greatly, meaningful tests of significance could not be computed. These propositions were

1. Housing factors, rather than neighborhood and other factors, are the primary reasons for the dissatisfaction with previous neighborhood;

2. Housing factors, rather than neighborhood and other factors, are the primary reasons for selecting present neighborhood.

Methodological Design and Operational Definitions

In order to obtain a comprehensive view of migration, a number of different types of analyses were necessitated. First, migration was examined in terms of present neighborhood satisfaction, family life cycle, residence tenure, race, sex, income and education. These analyses are designed to provide a composite picture of the migrants. The first eight hypotheses are designed to examine the various characteristics of migrants.

A second analysis was designed to determine which migrants were the least satisfied with their previous neighborhood, which ones were most selective in choosing their present neighborhood, and which ones were the least satisfied with their present neighborhood. (A) The ninth hypothesis was formulated to examine these questions. An examination of these questions provides insights for the total picture of

migration. For example, are the migrants who were dissatisfied with their previous neighborhoods now satisfied with their present neighborhoods? Were those who were dissatisfied with their previous neighborhood more selective in choosing their present neighborhood? The final analysis was included to provide a more detailed view of the migrants' most recent move. Specifically, the individual reasons for moving and the reasons for selecting their present neighborhood were examined. (B) The two propositions were analyzed in terms of the individual responses. This analysis provides a basis for the comparison of reasons for the dissatisfaction with previous neighborhood and the reasons for selecting present neighborhood.

The variables and indices employed in this study are described in subsequent paragraphs. A detailed frequency distribution for all variables included in this study is located in Appendix A.

Independent Variables

The nominal level individual and household variables utilized in this study were dichotomized to facilitate analysis and interpretation. The heads of household were identified by sex, race, and residence tenure (home owners and renters).

The available data did not permit direct measurement of the family life cycle stages. Indirect measures were devised through a classification of age and family size variables.

These measures represented a slight modification of those used by Van Arsdol, Sabaugh, and Butler.[11] Family life cycle stages were identified by classifying the age of head of household by age categories 15-29, 30-59, and 60 years and older. Family size was measured by the number of household members less than twelve years of age. They were categorized as: no children, 1-2 children (low parity), 3-4 children (medium parity), and 5 or more children (high parity). This particular family size classification was dictated by the structure of the questionnaire. One of the crucial cutting points in the family life cycle classification is the child's entry into school, usually near the age of six. It would seem appropriate to utilize a measure based on the presence or absence of children less than six years of age. Since the data were not amenable to such a measure, the family size classification was developed as a secondary indicator of family life cycle. The combined effects of both age and family size were also examined.

Education was measured in terms of the highest grade completed by the head of household. The following categories were utilized: 8th grade or less, grades 9-11, 12th grade, 1-2 years of college, and four years of college or more.

---

[11]Maurice Van Arsdol, Jr., George Sabaugh, and Edgar W. Butler, "Retrospective and Subsequent Metropolitan Residential Mobility," Demography, XIV (May, 1968), p. 254.

Income, based on family income, was categorized as:
$0-4,999, 5,000-9,999, 10,000-14,999, 15,000-19,999, 20,000-24,999, and 25,000 and above

In the analysis of individual factors related to dissatisfaction with previous neighborhood the following classification scheme was employed.

1. Housing factors--factors related to the desire for better and/or cheaper housing and general housing characteristics.

2. Neighborhood factors--neighborhood characteristics, invasions of bad elements, crime increases, and location near job, friends, and family.

3. Other factors--the remaining individual factors including changes in living arrangements.

The classification scheme for factors related to the attractiveness of present neighborhood included identical categories. Housing factors included those items related to cost and characteristics of the house. Neighborhood factors included general neighborhood characteristics, quality of schools, extent of crime, and location relative to job, family, and friends. As in the previously discussed categorization, "other factors" was the residual category. These classifications were utilized for descriptive purposes in the discussion of the two propositions related to migrations from previous neighborhood and the selection of present neighborhood.

Dependent Variables

The operational definition of migration described in subsequent paragraphs was limited by the scope and design of

the original survey. Central cities were the only formally
defined geographic areas in the study. For each of the eight
cities, the boundaries were their incorporated city limits.
The concept "neighborhood" was not formally defined but was
left to the subjective interpretations of the respondents.

Migration measurement was severely limited by the absence
of clearly defined geographic areas. The only distinction
that could be made was between internal and international
migration. Internal migrants were those moving from within
the United States while all moving from outside the United
States were international migrants. Such a delineation made
it impossible to determine whether the internal migration was
rural, suburban, or urban. Also, it was impossible to deter-
mine or even estimate the distance of migration. Both type
and distance of migration would have been beneficial as controls
or for more detailed measurement of the dependent variable in
this investigation.

In view of these limitations, migration was measured in
terms of length of residence. Four length of residence cate-
gories were identified in the initial data source: less than
one year, one to two years, three to five years, and more
than five years. For purposes of analysis, this variable was
dichotomized. Migrants were those who had resided in the
neighborhood for a period of less than five years, while
non-migrants had resided in the neighborhood for at least
five years. The use of the five-year period of residence to

define migrant status is consistent with many migration studies using census data and studies of neighborhood adjustment.[12] Using this definition, there were 2,047 migrants and 1,928 non-migrants included in the sample employed for this investigation.

Three social psychological variables--present neighborhood satisfaction, previous neighborhood dissatisfaction, and initial attractiveness of present neighborhood--were identified and examined in terms of their relationships to a number of independent variables. In order to analyze the three previously mentioned social psychological concepts, three indices were developed. Initially, values for each of the three indices were based on the total number of items checked on questions concerning each of the three neighborhood variables.

Neighborhood satisfaction scores had a potential range from 0 (total satisfaction) to 8 (total dissatisfaction). Those classified as being totally satisfied were those who responded negatively to the question, "Is there anything you don't like about this neighborhood?" Those who were classified as being dissatisfied with their neighborhood identified specific neighborhood dislikes from the following alternatives: (1) traffic, parking; (2) environmental problems, trash, noise, overcrowding, etc.; (3) crime or fear of crime; (4) public transportation; (5) inadequate schools, shopping

---

[12]Basil Zimmer, "Participation of Migrants in Urban Structures," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, XX (April,1955), pp. 218-224.

facilities, etc.; (6) changing neighborhood, bad elements moving in; (7) problems with neighbors; and (8) others.[13]

Dissatisfaction with previous neighborhood was measured in a similar fashion. The possible range of scores were from 1 (least dissatisfaction) to 10 (total dissatisfaction). Respondents were asked to indicate reasons for leaving their previous residence from the following alternatives: (1) location closer to job; (2) house, apartment, or property characteristics; (3) wanted better housing; (4) wanted cheaper housing; (5) evicted, building condemned, etc.; (6) change in living arrangements, change in marital status, wanted to live alone, etc; (7) old neighborhood run down, bad elements moving in; (8) crime in old neighborhood, afraid; (9) didn't like neighborhood characteristics, environment, problems with neighbors, etc.; and (10) other.[14] Unfortunately the structure of the questionnaire did not readily permit the measurement of total satisfaction with previous neighborhood. Respondents were required to identify at least one reason for leaving their previous neighborhood.

Initial attractiveness of the present neighborhood was measured in terms of reasons for choosing the neighborhood. The possible score could range from 1 (least attractiveness)

---

[13]U. S. Bureau of Census, National Crime Survey (Central Cities Sample) Attitude Questionnaire (Washington, 1972), p. 1.

[14]Ibid., p. 1.

to 9 (total attractiveness). Respondents indicated their reasons for selection from the following: (1) neighborhood characteristics; environment, streets, parks, type of neighbors; (2) good schools; (3) safe from crime; (4) only place housing could be found, lack of choice; (5) price was right; (6) location, close to job, family, friends, school, shopping, etc.; (7) characteristics of house, apartment or property-size, quality yard; (8) always lived in this neighborhood; and (9) other.[15] All respondents were required to give at least one reason for the selection of their present neighborhood.

The basic assumption underlying the development of these three indices was that all of the features were additive. That is, the greater the number of choices, the greater the intensity of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. In order to check for the effects of additivity on the neighborhood satisfaction index, two separate analyses were necessary. The initial analysis treated the neighborhood satisfaction as additive (e.g., the higher the score the greater the level of dissatisfaction). In the second analysis, the neighborhood satisfaction variable was treated as dichotomous. Those expressing one or more dislikes concerning their present neighborhoods were classified as dissatisfied. As

---

[15]"Cities Attitude Sub-Sample User Directory" mimeograph, Data Use and Access Laboratories, Arlington, Virginia, 1976, pp. 1-5.

mentioned earlier, the indices of dissatisfaction and initial attractiveness assumed the presence of at least one reason for each and could not be dichotomized in the previously described fashion.

Source of Data

The data examined in this research were derived from the National Crime Survey tape files. The National Crime Surveys were conducted by the United States Bureau of Census for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration at periodic intervals between 1972 and 1975. The primary purpose of the surveys was to determine the extent of crime victimization in selected cities throughout the United States. During the four-year interview period, data were collected for twenty-six major central cities. Of these, the five largest cities and eight designated Impact Cities were included in a detailed attitude study. The cities selected for examination in the study described here were the eight designated Impact Cities which had been given extensive federal funds for crime prevention programs. These cities were selected for this study because they were the most recently surveyed. The eight cities designated as Impact Cities are Atlanta, Georgia; Baltimore, Maryland; Cleveland, Ohio; Dallas, Texas; Denver, Colorado; Newark, New Jersey; Portland, Oregon; and St. Louis, Missouri.[16]

---

[16]"National Crime Survey Handbook and Guide to the Tape Files," Data Use and Access Laboratories, Arlington, Virginia, pp. 1-6.

The Impact Cities ranged in size from Portland's 380,620 to Baltimore's 905,759. The mean population of the eight cities was 559,525. The migration data for the Impact Cities presented in Table I are based on 1970 census data for all persons five years of age or older. Migration was measured in terms of changes of residence since 1965.[17] The percentage of migrants ranged from 44.30 in Baltimore to 58.75 in Dallas. Slightly more than one-half (50.87%) of the total population of the eight Impact Cities had moved at least once during the five years prior to the 1970 census enumeration. This is comparable to the percentage for total population (53.00) and the percentage for all metropolitan areas (51.72). A detailed view of the different types of migration are included in Table II. Local migration includes those who moved within the central city of the SMSA and those who moved from other parts of the SMSA. Non-local migration includes those moving from outside the SMSA and those moving from abroad. Those included in the "other" category are those who moved but failed to report their 1965 residence. More than three-fifths (61.75%) of all the migrations in the eight Impact Cities were local moves.

---

[17]U. S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population and Housing: 1970 Census Tracts, Final Reports PHC (1)-14 (Atlanta, Georgia), PHC (1)-19 (Baltimore, Maryland), PHC (1)-45 (Cleveland, Ohio), PHC (1)-52 (Dallas, Texas), PHC (1)-56 (Denver, Colorado), PHC (1)-146 (Newark, New Jersey), PHC (1)-165 (Portland, Oregon-Washington), PHC (1)-180 (St. Louis, Missouri), (Washington, 1972).

TABLE I

MIGRATION VOLUME FOR THE EIGHT DESIGNATED IMPACT CITIES

Impact Cities	Migrants		Non-migrants		Totals	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All Cities	2,276,912	50.87	2,199,292	49.13	4,476,204	100.00
Atlanta	250,395	55.19	203,445	44.81	453,840	100.00
Baltimore	367,697	44.30	462,324	55.70	830,021	100.00
Cleveland	318,753	46.63	364,889	53.37	683,642	100.00
Dallas	450,577	58.75	316,416	41.25	766,993	100.00
Denver	168,810	56.00	208,149	44.00	376,959	100.00
Newark	140,761	52.13	163,365	47.87	304,126	100.00
Portland	119,251	49.35	180,011	50.65	299,262	100.00
St. Louis	236,771	47.43	300,993	52.57	537,764	100.00

U. S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population and Housing: 1970, Census Tracts, Final Reports PHC (1)-14 (Atlanta, Georgia), PHC (1)-19 (Baltimore, Maryland), PHC (1)-45 (Cleveland, Ohio), PHC (1)-52 (Dallas, Texas), PHC (1)-56 (Denver, Colorado), PHC (1)-146 (Newark, New Jersey), PHC (1)-165 (Portland, Oregon-Washington), PHC (1)-180 (St. Louis, Missouri), (Washington, 1972).

TABLE II

TYPES OF MIGRATION IN THE EIGHT DESIGNATED IMPACT CITIES

Impact Cities	Local Migration		Non-local Migration		Other Migration*		Totals	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
All Cities	1,406,106	61.75	534,891	23.49	336,071	14.76	2,277,068	100.00
Atlanta	148,386	59.26	67,069	26.78	34,945	13.96	250,400	100.00
Baltimore	250,778	68.20	47,835	13.01	69,084	18.79	367,697	100.00
Cleveland	215,700	67.67	53,914	16.91	49,139	15.42	318,753	100.00
Dallas	249,910	55.47	142,176	31.55	58,491	12.98	450,577	100.00
Denver	140,260	52.95	96,060	36.27	28,550	10.78	264,870	100.00
Newark	118,297	66.51	37,099	20.86	22,464	12.63	177,860	100.00
Portland	96,722	55.15	55,993	31.92	22,680	12.93	175,395	100.00
St. Louis	186,053	68.52	34,745	12.80	50,718	18.68	271,516	100.00

*Type of migration not specified.

Local migrations exceeded non-local and other migrations in each of the eight cities.

In each of the eight cities, approximately 12,000 sample units were designated for the sample. The sampling frame, the actual list of sampling units, was based on the complete file of housing units and persons in group quarters in each city, as enumerated in the 1970 Census of Population and Housing. In each city, the housing units were distributed among 105 strata. Occupied housing units were classified into 100 strata based on a combination of the following characteristics: type of tenure, size of household, household income, and race of the head of household. Unoccupied housing units were assigned to four additional strata, based on rental or property value. The one remaining stratum included the various types of group quarters. In addition, a sample of construction permits issued since the 1970 enumeration was selected to insure representation of those occupying newer housing. From the 12,000 sample units per city, approximately 10,000 interviews were obtained. The 2,000 sample units that yielded no interviews included unoccupied units and units whose occupants refused to participate in the survey.[18]

---

[18]National Crime Survey, op. cit., pp. 1-6.

In addition, one-half of the interviewed households
were included in a more detailed study of neighborhood atti-
tudes. This segment of the survey provided the data for this
investigation. The attitude survey was designed to obtain
information about living patterns, attitudes toward crime,
and general neighborhood patterns. The attitude questions
were asked of one member of each household. The respondents
were required to be at least sixteen years of age. The data
employed in this study were based on surveys taken during
March, April, and May, 1975. All National Crime Survey data
have been formatted in tape files and made available for
distribution by Data Use and Access Laboratories. The nec-
essary household and attitude data for this study were extracted
from the original tape files in order to facilitate further
data analysis.[19]

The surveys in each city were restricted to the central
city, thus excluding all metropolitan areas within the urban
fringe. Geographic identifiers for areas smaller than the
city as a whole were not included in the original survey.
Because of the absence of any clearly defined subdivisions
within each city and because the cities were similar in
their total populations, the data for the eight cities were
analyzed collectively rather than individually. The total

---

[19] Ibid.

number of interviews for the eight cities was 39,750. A ten percent random sample of each city's sample was drawn for use in this investigation. The final sample (N = 3,975) exceeds the number required for a sample from a population of 40,000 with a ninety-nine percent level of confidence and on a precision level of plus or minus three percent.[20]

Statistical Measures

Statistical techniques were employed in this investigation to describe the relationships between the previously described predictor variables and the dependent variables. Zero-order correlation coefficients and multiple correlation coefficients were computed to facilitate the analysis of migration and neighborhood satisfaction.

Since many of the variables utilized in this investigation were of nominal level, Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) was employed. The MCA is designed for examining the inter-relationship between several independent variables and a dependent variable within the context of an additive model. It represents an alternative to conventional multiple regression analysis which requires the use of a considerable number of dummy variables when non-interval level data are included. Traditional multivariate methods generally require

---

[20] Taro Yamane, Elementary Sampling Theory, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1967), pp. 398-400.

interval scales, linearized relationships, and bivariate

normal distributions. The MCA is free from these restrictions

since the predictors are always treated as sets of classes

or categories; therefore, all data at all levels of measure-

ment can be employed.[21]

The MCA technique does, however, require that the

dependent variable be an interval scale (or a numerical

variable) without extreme skewness or a dichotomy. When

ordinal scales are employed, it is necessary to assume they

approximate an underlying scale. When using a nominal scale,

it is necessary to dichotomize (e. g., 0 = no, 1 = yes).

It should be noted that since the categories of a nominal

scale can be placed in any order, the direction or sign of

the relationship with the dependent variable cannot be

determined.[22]

In order to determine the relationship between each

predictor and the dependent variable, Eta and Beta statistics

were calculated. Eta square, a zero-order correlation, was

used to indicate the amount of variance in the dependent

variable (e. g., migration) explained by each predictor

prior to adjustment for any other variable. It is analogous

---

[21]Frank M. Andrews, James N. Morgan, and James A.
Sonquist, Multiple Classification Analysis (Ann Arbor, 1967),
pp. 8-17.

[22]Ibid.

to r^2 except that the independent variable is categoric rather than linear.[23] Beta statistics were included because of their ability to explain variation in the dependent variable after adjusting for the effects of all other predictors.[24]

In addition, multiple correlation coefficients were computed to determine the proportion of variance in the dependent variable explained by the combined predictors. F tests were employed to measure strength of the relationship of each of the predictors to the dependent variable, the classical one-way analysis of variance. Additional tests were used to determine if all of the predictors together explained a significant portion of the variance in the dependent variable.

The statistical computations and data organization were accomplished through the use of selected programs from the OSIRIS III-2 collection of computerized programs. The majority of the computations were derived from the Multiple Classification Analysis program.[25] All of the computerized

---

[23]Walter Groves and Michael Hughes, "Possible Causes of the Apparent Sex Differences in Physical Health: An Empirical Investigation," American Sociological Review, XL (February, 1979), pp. 135-136.

[24]Andrews, op. cit., p. 22.

[25]Institute for Social Research, OSIRIS III-2 An Integrated Collection of Computer Programs for the Management and Analysis of Social Science Data (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1973), pp. 575-586.

analyses were performed at the North Texas State University Computing Center.

Summary

Based on the review of literature, eleven hypotheses were formulated. Each was designed to fit into a general explanation of migration, using both demographic and social psychological factors. The major contention was that neighborhood satisfaction is a better predictor of migration than traditional demographic factors and that life cycle stage is the best of the demographic predictors. Each of these hypotheses will be analyzed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF HYPOTHESES AND PROPOSITIONS

Introduction

In this chapter, each of the nine hypotheses proposed in the previous chapter is quantitatively analyzed. This analysis employs the previously described statistical procedures for the summation, description of association between variables, and statistical inference.

In addition to the examination of the stated hypotheses, this chapter includes an analysis of two propositions about the individual components of the social psychological indices.

Tests of Hypotheses

The primary focus of this study is to examine the relationship of demographic and social psychological variables to migration, utilizing data from a national comprehensive crime survey. The first two hypotheses are primarily concerned with the social psychological variable, present neighborhood satisfaction. The first hypothesis states

1. Non-migrants are more satisfied with their present neighborhood than are migrants.

As previously stated, present neighborhood satisfaction is measured on a scale from 0 (total satisfaction) to 8 (total dissatisfaction). The frequency distributions presented in Table I do not reveal any distinctive differences in satisfaction levels between migrants and non-migrants.

TABLE III

DISTRIBUTION OF PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION
SCORES OR MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS

Scores	Migrants		Non-Migrants	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
0	1,266	61.85	1,224	63.49
1	530	25.89	415	21.52
2	197	9.62	221	11.46
3	46	2.25	52	2.70
4	7	0.34	11	0.57
5	1	0.05	3	0.16
6	0	0.00	2	0.10
Total	2,047	100.00	1,928	100.00

$Beta^2$ = .005   F = 3.36 $p < .01$

A clear majority of both migrants (61.85%) and non-migrants (63.49%) indicate they are satisfied with their present neighborhood. As expected, the percentage of non-migrants expressing satisfaction exceeds that of migrants. Despite the rather small percentage differential, the relationship is statistically significant at the .01 level. This significance is probably a reflection of a rather large smaple (N = 3,975) rather than the degree of association between the two variables (Beta^2 = .005).

Of those migrants and non-migrants expressing dissatis- faction with their neighborhood, 27.5 percent of the migrants and 41.1 percent of the non-migrants indicate multiple dislikes. This finding is contrary to the expectation that non-migrants would have fewer complaints about their present neighborhood. Possibly non-migrants are more knowledgeable about community problems because of their longevity within the neighborhood and are able to identify more problems.

In order to check for the effects of additivity, a separate analysis was employed treating neighborhood satis- faction as a dichotomous variable. Those expressing no problems are considered as satisfied and those expressing one or more problems were identified as dissatisfied. The resulting Beta of .074 (Beta^2 = .0054) varied little from that of the initial analysis. Since there were only minimal

variations in the two analyses, the initial measurement of neighborhood satisfaction was utilized for subsequent analyses.

The frequency distributions presented in Table IV reveal the specific problems incurred by both migrants and non-migrants. With only one exception, the percentages are

TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION OF SPECIFIC PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED
BY MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS

Specific Problems	Migrants		Non-migrants	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Traffic, Parking	91	11.65	61	8.66
Environmental problems	212	27.15	195	27.70
Crime or fear of crime	198	25.35	149	21.16
Public transportation	9	1.15	8	1.14
Inadequate schools, shopping, etc.	33	4.23	22	3.13
Changing neighborhood, bad element moving in	31	3.97	70	9.94
Problems with neighbors	126	16.13	128	18.18
Other	81	10.37	71	10.09
Total	781	100.00	704	100.00

nearly identical. The percentage of non-migrants (9.94) identifying the changing neighborhood as a problem is more than double that of migrants (3.97). This might suggest that the non-migrants have identified the migrants as bad elements responsible for the neighborhood change. Non-migrants also report more problems with neighbors than do their migrant counterparts. Migrants, when compared to non-migrants have slightly greater problems with traffic and parking, crime or fear of crime, and inadequate schools and shopping.

An empirical examination of the first hypothesis suggests that a statistically significant relationship existed between neighborhood satisfaction and migration. With a rather large sample (N = 3,975), statistical significance is achieved at the .01 level, while associational level ($Beta^2$ = .005) was minimal. Such results suggest that the satisfaction levels of migrants and non-migrants actually differ very little, or perhaps that the measurement of satisfaction is inadequate. Each of these possibilities will be dealt with in the examination of subsequent hypotheses.

The second and third hypotheses suggest that neighborhood satisfaction explains more variation in past migration than traditional demographic variables and that family life cycle is the best of the demographic predictors. Since both

hypotheses are closely related and require identical statistical procedures, their analyses are combined. The two hypotheses formally stated are

2. Present neighborhood satisfaction will explain more variation in past migration than will the traditional demographic variables (family life cycle, residence tenure, race, sex, income, and education).

3. The family life cycle will explain more variation in past migration than will the other demographic variables (residence tenure, race, sex, income, and education).

Seven demographic variables (age, family size, income, education, race, sex of household head, and residence tenure) and neighborhood satisfaction were analyzed in terms of migration. The frequency distribution for neighborhood satisfaction was presented in Table III. The frequency distributions for the demographic variables are included in the subsequent analysis of hypotheses four through eight.

The relationships between these eight variables and migration are indicated in Table V. Multiple classification equations were computed with the eight independent variables in order to predict variation in the dependent variable, migration.

The hypothesis that present neighborhood satisfaction explains more variation in migration than will the traditional demographic variables is not supported. Of the seven

TABLE V

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS WITH MIGRATION
AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE AND DEMOGRAPHIC
FACTORS AND NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION
AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Variable	Eta^2	F Scores
Age	.265	732.22^a
Residence tenure	.178	886.51^a
Education	.041	42.93^a
Number of children $<$ 12 years	.038	52.91^a
Income	.008	6.25^b
Race	.004	10.80^a
Neighborhood satisfaction	.003	3.36^b
Sex of head of household	.001	3.20^{ns}

Multiple R^2 = .36   F = 101.25^a

[a] $p < .001$
[b] $p < .01$
ns - not significant

demographic variables, the sex of the household head is the
only variable which has a lower correlation (Eta^2 = .001)
with migration than does neighborhood satisfaction (Eta^2 =
.003). Income (Eta^2 = .008) and race (Eta^2 = .004) exhibit
similarly low correlations with migration. The four remaining
variables, age, residence, education, and family size, have

higher correlations with migration than does neighborhood
satisfaction. The total set of independent variables explain
36 percent of the total variance in migration, which is
statistically significant at the .001 level.

The third hypothesis, that family life cycle is the
best demographic predictor of migration, has empirical
support. As noted in Chapter II, the primary measurement
of family life cycle stages was obtained by classifying the
age of the household head: 15-29, 30-59, and 60 years and
older. A secondary indicator of family life cycle was a
classification of the number of children less than twelve
years of age. The first measure of family life cycle, age
of the household head, has the greatest correlation (Eta^2 =
.265) with migration of any of the other variables. The
second measure of family life cycle, family size, shows a
much weaker relationship (Eta^2 = .038) to migration. Both
of the correlations are statistically significant at the .001
level.

The correlation between residence tenure and migration
(Eta^2 = .178) ranks second among the demographic variables,
suggesting a reasonably high relationship between home owner-
ship and migration. There is also a moderate relationship,
ranking third among all variables, between education (Eta^2 =
.041) and migration. Each of these two correlations are also
statistically significant at the .001 level. The remaining

three demographic variables, income, race, and sex appear
to have substantially less influence on migration.

The examination of the second and third hypotheses
suggested that traditional demographic measures were, in
general, better predictors of migration than the social
psychological variable, neighborhood satisfaction. This
finding was contrary to the initial expectation. As expected,
family life cycle was the best demographic predictor of
migration. The lack of support for the second hypothesis
may be a reflection of the measurement of neighborhood
satisfaction. As previously indicated, neighborhood satis-
faction was determined from responses to survey questions
asked in each household. The respondent could be any repre-
sentative of the household sixteen years of age or older.
Thus, while all the demographic variables pertained to the
household head, the neighborhood satisfaction scores could
be based on the opinions of the spouses, the older children,
other household members, or the household heads. There is
a distinct possibility then that the presence of and extent
of dissatisfaction does not reflect the feelings of the
household head.

Hypotheses four through eight are designed to examine
the relationships of the seven demographic variables to
migration, including the direction and strengths of these
relationships. The fourth hypothesis is based on the premise

that younger families are more likely to migrate than are their elder counterparts. The fourth hypothesis formally stated is

4. Those in the early stages of the family life cycle are more likely to be migrants than are those in the later stage of the life cycle.

The frequency distributions presented in Table VI clearly indicate that migration is disproportionately high in the younger families, those in the first stages of the family

TABLE VI

DISTRIBUTION OF THE AGES OF THE HOUSEHOLD
HEADS OF MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS

Migrant Status	Age Categories					
	15-29		30-59		60 and above	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
Migrants	871	93.16	927	48.74	249	21.88
Non-migrants	64	6.84	975	51.26	889	78.12
Total	935	100.00	1,902	100.00	1,138	100.00

$Beta^2 = .147$ F = 732.2 $p < .001$

life cycle. The percentage of migrants (93.16) in the 15-29 age category greatly exceeds the percentages of migrants in the other age categories. The opposite relationship is found among non-migrants. The percentage of non-migrants in the 60 years of age and over category (78.12) is more than ten times greater than those in the youngest age category (6.84). The degree of association between the two variables (Beta^2 = .147) is statistically significant at the .001 level.

The second family life cycle related variable, family size also lends support to the hypothesis that migration is greatest during the first stages of the family life cycle. The frequency distributions in Table VII indicate that there are higher percentages of migrants in the low, medium, and high parity categories than there are non-migrants. These differences suggest that migrants are more likely to be in the early stages of the family life cycle (the child-bearing and child-rearing phases) than are their non-migrant counterparts. The percentage of non-migrants is larger among families having no children less than twelve years of age (54.63) than the percentages in the other parity categories. Since the category of no children less than twelve years includes both pre-child families and those families having only older children, further computations were necessitated.

TABLE VII

DISTRIBUTION OF THE FAMILY SIZES
OF MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS

Migrant Status	Number of Children $<$ 12 Years							
	No Children		1-2 (Low Parity)		3-4 (Medium Parity)		5 and over (High Parity)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Migrants	1,294	45.37	601	67.15	132	65.67	20	74.07
Non-migrants	1,558	54.63	294	32.85	69	34.33	7	25.93
Total	2,852	100.00	895	100.00	201	100.00	27	100.00

Beta^2 = .010   F = 52.9   p $<$ .001

In order to determine which of the two types of families was characteristic of migrants, the presence of children less than twelve years was analyzed in terms of the age of the household head. The frequency distributions in Table VIII demonstrate that the percentage of those having no children less than twelve years who are migrants (99.15) is much greater than the percentage in the other age categories. More than three-fourths (80.77%) of those having no children less than twelve years and who have household heads who are

TABLE VII

A COMPARISON OF MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS ON THE BASIS OF AGE AND
THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF CHILDREN LESS THAN TWELVE YEARS OF AGE

Families with children < 12 years

Migrant Status	Age Categories					
	15-29		30-59		60 and over	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Migrants	405	87.10	309	50.50	39	87.78
Non-migrants	60	12.90	303	49.50	7	12.12
Total	465	100.00	612	100.00	46	100.00

Families with no children < 12 years

Migrant Status	Age Categories					
	15-29		30-59		60 and over	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Migrants	466	99.15	618	47.90	210	19.23
Non-migrants	4	0.85	672	52.10	882	80.77
Total	470	100.00	1,290	100.00	1,092	100.00

$Beta^2 = .018$ $F = 83.6$ $p < .001$

sixty years or older are non-migrants; only 19.23 percent are migrants. These percentages suggest that pre-child families are much more likely to be migrants than are families containing only older children. These findings offer supplemental support to the hypothesis that migration is greatest for those in the first stages of the family life cycle.

An examination of the distributions for families with children less than twelve years indicates a similar relationship to migration. More than four-fifths (87.10%) of the families with household heads in the 15-29 age category are migrants. Such findings suggest that migrants are more likely than non-migrants to be in the child-bearing phase of the family life cycle.

Both the age and family size components of the family life cycle variable supported the hypothesis that migration is greatest for families in the first stages of family life cycle. Of the two variables, age of the household head (Beta^2 = .147) clearly explained more of the variation in migration than family size (Beta^2 = .010). The relationship of each of these variables to migration was statistically significant at the .001 level.

The fifth hypothesis was based on the premise that younger families, those in the pre-child and child-rearing stages of the family life cycle, are less likely to own

their own homes than are older families. If such a relationship exists, then they would be more likely to seek a change in their residence status which would likely result in their moving into a new neighborhood. The fifty hypothesis formally stated is

5. More current renters than current home owners are migrants.

The frequency distributions presented in Table IX clearly demonstrate an inverse relationship between home ownership and migration. Slightly less than three-fourths

TABLE IX

A COMPARISON OF MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS
IN TERMS OF RESIDENCE TENURE

Migrant Status	Residence Tenure			
	Home Owners		Renters	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Migrants	511	28.33	1,536	70.75
Non-migrants	1,293	71.67	635	29.25
Total	1,804	100.00	2,171	100.00

$Beta^2 = 0.089$ $F = 886.51$ $p < .001$

(70.75%) of the renters were migrants compared to less than one-third (28.33%) of the home owners. As shown in Table V, residence tenure (Beta^2 = .089) ranks second among all variables in its ability to predict migration. The relationship between residence tenure and migration is statistically significant at the .001 level.

Hypotheses six, seven, and eight were devised in the expectation that socio-economic variables have an influence on migration. The contention is that migration is greatest among those in the lower socio-economic levels. These hypotheses include income, education, race, and sexual status variables. The sixth hypothesis examines the relationship of race to migration. The sixth hypothesis formally stated is

6. More non-whites than whites are migrants.

Frequency distributions depicting the relationship between race and migration are presented in Table X.

The expected association between race and migration is indicated, although the degree of association (Beta^2 = .001) is very weak. The percentage of non-whites who are migrants (55.22) is slightly higher than that of whites who are migrants (49.66). As noted in Table V, of the eight variables included in the total analysis, race ranked sixth. The relationship was statistically significant at the .001 level.

TABLE X

A COMPARISON OF MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS
IN TERMS OF RACE OF THE HOUSEHOLD HEAD

Migrant Status	Race			
	Whites		Non-whites	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Migrants	1,322	49.66	725	55.22
Non-migrants	1,340	50.34	588	44.78
Total	2,662	100.00	1,313	100.00

$Beta^2 = .001$ $F = 10.8$ $p < .001$

The seventh hypothesis is based on the assumption that female heads of households would be disproportionately represented in the lower income brackets and would be more likely to migrate than would male household heads. The seventh hypothesis formally stated is

7. More female heads of households than male heads of households are migrants.

The relationship between sex and migration is presented in Table XI. The percentage of females who are migrants (52.07) is slightly higher than the percentage of males who are migrants (51.16). Although the observed difference is

TABLE XI

A COMPARISON OF MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS IN
TERMS OF THE SEX OF THE HOUSEHOLD HEAD

Migrant Status	Sex			
	Male		Female	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Migrants	1,279	51.16	768	52.07
Non-migrants	1,221	48.84	707	47.93
Total	2,500	100.00	1,475	100.00

Beta^2 = .0003   N = 3.20   p $\nless$ .01

in the predicted direction, it is not statistically signif-
at the .01 level. As indicated in Table V, sex of the
household head ranked last in its ability to predict migration.
One possible explanation for this weak relationship lies in
the measurement of the dependent variable. Migration, as
defined in this study, included all forms of migration from
intracity to international. The structure of the question-
naire was not amenable to a classification by distance of
migration. Thus, it is impossible to determine if long-
distance or short-distance migration predominates.
Traditionally females have been more likely than have males

to be involved in short-distance migration. Unfortunately such relationships were impossible to determine in this investigation.

The eight hypothesis examines the relationship of two socio-economic variables, income and education, to migration. The eighth hypothesis formally stated is

8. More household heads with low income are migrants than are household heads with high income; more household heads with low educational attainments are migrants than are household heads with high educational attainments.

The frequency distributions for income and migration are presented in Table XII Only limited support for the first part of this hypothesis can be discerned from an examination of the income distribution. In general, there is a non-linear relationship between income and migration. The percentage of non-migrants slightly exceed that of migrants in the two highest income levels. The same pattern is found in the lowest income category, perhaps indicating that the very poor are financially unable to move. The percentage of migrants in the two other lower income levels ($5,000-$9,999 and $10,000-$14,000) slightly exceed that of non-migrants. The minimal differences between the two groups are reflected in the statistical computations (Beta^2 = .004). Even with a rather large total (N = 3,809), statistical significance is attainable only at the .01 level.

TABLE XII

A COMPARISON OF MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS
IN TERMS OF INCOME DIFFERENTIALS

Income Level in Dollars

Migrant Status	0-4,999		5,000-9,999		10,000-14,999		15,000-19,999		20,000-24,999		25,000 and over	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
Migrants	168	46.80	592	52.25	581	57.13	389	51.12	162	45.37	87	47.80
Non-migrants	191	53.20	541	47.75	436	42.87	372	48.88	195	54.63	95	52.20
Total	359	100.00	1,133	100.00	1,017	100.00	761	100.00	357	100.00	182	100.00

$Beta^2$ = .004   F = 6.25 $p < .01$

The frequency distributions depicting the relationship between education and migration are given in Table XIII. The relationship between education and migration is the opposite of what was initially expected. In the lowest-ranked educational category, those with eight years or less of education, 65.73 percent are non-migrants, while in the highest two categories (1-3 years of college and 4 or more years of college) over 62 percent are migrants. Although the relationship is relatively weak (Beta^2 = .004), it is statistically significant at the .001 level.

The observed relationships between migration and level of education is comparable to the relationship of migration to income levels, suggesting that the least educated may be economically unable to move. The lack of a parallel in the high levels of income and education with migration possibly indicates that more educated migrants have not yet achieved the job tenure needed to bring their income to levels commensurate with their education.

In general, the eight hypothesis was only partially substantiated. With the exception of the very poor, income was inversely related to migration. The second part of the hypothesis was not supported. Educational levels were directly related to migration.

The ninth hypothesis examines the relationship of the previously described variables to three social psychological

TABLE XIII

A COMPARISON OF MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS
IN TERMS OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Educational Attainment

Migrant Status	8th grade or less		Grades 9-11		12th Grade		1-3 years of college		4 years of college or more	
	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent	Number	Per-cent
Migrants	304	34.27	408	50.68	555	53.78	364	62.54	416	62.18
Non-migrants	583	65.73	397	49.32	477	46.22	218	37.46	253	37.82
Total	887	100.00	805	100.00	1,032	100.00	582	100.01	669	100.00

$Beta^2 = .004$ F = 42.93 $p < .001$

variables, previous neighborhood satisfaction, perceived

initial attractiveness of present neighborhood, perceived

initial attractiveness of present neighborhood, and present

neighborhood satisfaction. It was predicted that the demo-

graphic variables would exhibit similar relationships to

the social psychological variables as they had to migration.

Formally stated, the ninth hypothesis states

9. The family life cycle will explain more variation

in present neighborhood satisfaction, dissatisfaction with

previous neighborhood, and perceived initial attractiveness

of present neighborhood than the other demographic variables.

As previously noted, the structure of the questionnaire

did not permit measurement of previous neighborhood dissatis-

faction and perceived initial attractiveness of present

neighborhood for non-migrants. For comparability, all three

of the social psychological variables were analyzed in terms

of migrants only. The correlations between the seven demo-

graphic variables and present neighborhood satisfaction are

presented in Table XIV.

Both life cycle variables, age ($Eta^2 = .01$) and family

size ($Eta^2 = .007$), indicate stronger correlations with

present neighborhood satisfaction than all other predictors

except education. Education ($Eta^2 = .009$) ranked second

of all the predictors.

TABLE XIV

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS WITH PRESENT
NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION AS THE DEPENDENT
VARIABLE AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AS
THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Variable	Eta^2	F Scores
Age	.011	11.12^a
Education	.009	3.67^b
Number of children $<$ 12 years	.007	4.84^b
Income	.002	$.81^{ns}$
Residence tenure	.001	2.09^{ns}
Sex of head of household	.000	$.16^{ns}$
Race	.000	$.48^{ns}$

Multiple R^2 = .02   F = 3.09^{ns}

[a] .001
[b] .01

The predictive ability of family life cycle for dis-
satisfaction with previous neighborhood was less prominent.
The correlations between the seven demographic variables
and previous neighborhood dissatisfaction are presented in
Table XV.

The two life cycle variables, family size (Eta^2 = .004)
and age (Eta^2 = .001 ranked first and fourth respectively

TABLE XV

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS WITH PREVIOUS
NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION AS THE DEPENDENT
VARIABLE AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Variable	Eta^2	F Scores
Number of children $<$ 12 years	.004	2.50^{ns}
Residence tenure	.003	4.64^{a}
Income	.003	0.71^{ns}
Age	.001	0.38^{ns}
Education	.001	0.36^{ns}
Race	.000	0.24^{ns}
Sex	.000	0.17^{ns}

Multiple R^2 = .003   F = 1.32^{ns}

among the predictors of previous neighborhood dissatsifaction. Family size was one of the variables which was statistically significant at the .01 level.

The relationship of family life cycle to the third variable in this hypothesis, perceived initial attractiveness of present neighborhood, is completely the opposite of the initial expectations. Table XVI provides these correlations. The life cycle variables, age and family size were the only variables in the analysis which were not significantly

TABLE XVI

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS WITH PERCEIVED
INITIAL ATTRACTIVENESS OF PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD
AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE AND DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES AS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Variable	Eta^2	F Scores
Income	.031	10.46^a
Education	.029	10.40^a
Race	.026	53.96^a
Residence tenure	.011	23.08^a
Sex of the household head	.004	7.57^b
Age	.003	2.87^{ns}
Number of children $<$ 12	.002	1.32^{ns}

Multiple R^2 = .055   F = 7.65^b

$^a p$ .001
$^b p$ .01

related to the perceived attractiveness of the present
neighborhood. The socio-economic related variables, income,
education, and race are clearly the best of the predictors.
An examination of the frequency distribution for perceived
attractiveness (Appendix B) suggests that whites, those
with the higher educational levels, and those in the upper
income levels are the most likely to be selective in
choosing their new neighborhoods.

The ninth hypothesis was only partially supported. Knowledge of the family life cycle stage is, in general, the best predictor of previous neighborhood dissatisfaction and present neighborhood satisfaction. The frequency distributions for previous neighborhood dissatisfaction (Appendix C) and present neighborhood satisfaction (Appendix D) indicate patterns similar to those discovered in the examination of the relation of family life cycle to migration. Those in the first stages of the family life cycle indicate greater dissatisfactions with both past and present neighborhoods.

The third segment of the hypothesis was clearly without support. Stages of the family life cycle were not significantly related to the selection of a new neighborhood.

The analysis of the ninth hypothesis suggests that those families in the first stages of the family life cycle were dissatisfied with their previous neighborhood and subsequently decided to migrate. Perhaps as a result of their lack of selectivity in choosing a new neighborhood, the resulting migration produced a similar dissatisfaction with their present neighborhood.

The specific reasons for past neighborhood dissatisfaction and perceived initial attractiveness of present neighborhood are examined in the final two propositions. Specifically it was expected housing factors would be

prominent in the explanation of the two social psychological variables. Ideally, the analysis should also include an examination of present neighborhood satisfaction. However, housing factors were not included in the measurement of present neighborhood satisfaction, thus it was not comparable to the other two measures. The first proposition formally stated is

1. Housing factors, rather than neighborhood and other factors, are the primary reasons for the dissatisfaction with previous neighborhood.

The frequency distribution of primary reasons for leaving past neighborhoods are given in Table XVII. Contrary to expectations, housing factors were not the most prominent factors in the migrants' decision to move from their previous neighborhoods. Slightly more than one-fifth (20.6%) of the migrants moved primarily because the neighborhood location was inconvenient to either family, job, friends, or shopping. Approximately one-sixth (16.6%) of the migrants left their previous neighborhood because of changes in their living arrangements. Another one-sixth (16.1%) were primarily motivated by the desire for home ownership or for better housing.

Based upon the classification scheme described in Chapter II, all housing factors accounted for 45.39 percent

TABLE XVII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE PRIMARY REASONS
FOR LEAVING PREVIOUS NEIGHBORHOOD

Primary Reasons for Moving	Number	Percentage
Bad location of neighborhood$_b$	421	20.6
Change in living arrangements$_c$	339	16.6
Better housing, desire for home ownership$_a$	329	16.1
Undesirable housing characteristics$_a$	300	14.7
Housing no longer available$_a$	179	8.7
Other factors$_c$	145	7.1
Desire for cheaper housing$_a$	121	5.9
Undesirable neighborhood characteristics$_b$	119	5.8
Crime in the neighborhood$_b$	75	3.7
Bad elements moving in$_b$	19	0.9
Total	2,047	100.0

a = denotes housing factors
b = denotes neighborhood factors
c = denotes "other" factors

of the primary reasons for previous migration, followed by
neighborhood factors (30.97%) and "other" factors (23.64%).
In general, the first proposition was supported.

The final proposition was based on the expectation that the migrants' primary concerns in selecting a new residence were related to housing characteristics and costs. The second proposition formally stated is

2. Housing factors, rather than neighborhood and other factors, are the primary reasons for selecting present neighborhood.

The frequency distribution for the primary reasons for selecting present neighborhood are depicted in Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE PRIMARY REASONS
FOR CHOOSING PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD

Reason for Selecting	Number	Percentage
Location of neighborhood$_b$	611	29.8
Neighborhood characteristics$_b$	333	16.3
Price of housing$_a$	275	13.4
Housing characteristics$_a$	251	12.3
Lack of choice$_c$	242	11.8
Other factors$_c$	148	7.2
Non-migrant$_c$	106	5.2
Safe from crime$_b$	47	2.3
Good schools$_b$	34	1.7
Total	2,047	100.0

a = denotes housing factors
b = denotes neighborhood factors
c = denotes "other" factors

The predicted pattern did not emerge. The primary reason given by migrants for selecting their present neighborhood was its location near family, friends, job, or shopping. Neighborhood characteristics (16.3%) ranked second. The two housing factors, housing cost and housing characteristics, ranked third and fourth. Neighborhood factors accounted for more than one-half (50.07%) of all reasons for the migrants' selection of their present neighborhood. Housing factors (25.70%) and "other" factors (24.23%) were each noted by about one-fourth of the migrants as their primary concerns in selecting their present neighborhood.

Summary of Data Analysis

Seven of the nine hypotheses tested in this investigation were empirically supported. The analysis of these hypotheses provide a general picture of migration in terms of demographic and social psychological variables. The analysis of each hypothesis is summarized in subsequent paragraphs.

The first hypothesis that neighborhood satisfaction is greater for non-migrants than for migrants was supported. A clear majority of both groups expressed satisfaction with their present neighborhood. However, the percentage of dissatisfied migrants slightly exceeded that of non-migrants. This difference between the two groups was most pronounced among those expressing only one problem with their neighborhood. For those with multiple problems, non-migrants were

more common than migrants. However, the number expressing multiple problems was too small to greatly affect over-all dissatisfaction. An examination of specific problems among migrants and non-migrants indicated little variability. Environmental problems and crime or fear of crime were the most common problems for both groups. The problem with the greatest variability between the two groups was the perception of a changing neighborhood with bad elements moving in. This problem was much more pronounced among non-migrants than among migrants.

There was virtually no support for the second hypothesis which held that neighborhood satisfaction would be a better predictor of migration than traditional demographic measures. Of the eight variables analyzed, neighborhood satisfaction ranked seventh. The sex of the head of the household was the only variable which ranked below neighborhood satisfaction as a predictor of migration. Age, residence tenure, education, family size, income, and race all ranked above neighborhood satisfaction.

The third hypothesis that family life cycle is the best predictor of migration among the demographic variables was generally confirmed. The primary indicator of family life cycle, age of the household head, ranked first among all predictors. The analysis of a second life cycle

measure, family size, was less supportive, ranking fourth among the seven demographic variables.

The specific internal relationships of the seven demographic variables to migration were examined in the analysis of hypotheses four through eight. The fourth hypothesis that migration was greatest for those in the first stages of the family life cycle was supported. This support was found in the analysis of both age and family size, the indicators of family life cycle. There were a disproportionate number of migrants among household heads 15-29 years of age. Nonmigrants were disproportionately represented in the sixty years of age and older category. In terms of family size, there were higher percentages of migrants than non-migrants in the low, medium, and high parity categories, suggesting that migrants were more likely to be in child-bearing and child-rearing stages of the family life cycle. An examination of family size by age indicated that among families with no children less than twelve years, there were more migrants in the pre-child stage of the life cycle while there were more non-migrants in the post-child phase.

The analysis of residence tenure to migration indicated support for the fifth hypothesis that migration is greater for renters than for home owners. Almost 71 percent (70.78) of all renters were migrants compared to less than one-third (28.33%) of all home owners. The strength of the

relationship of residence tenure to migration ranked second among all the independent variables included in the analysis.

The sixth hypothesis that migration is greater for non-whites than for whites was supported although the strength of the relationship was relatively weak. Race ranked sixth among the predictors of migration.

The direction of the relationship of the sex of the household head to migration was as predicted in the seventh hypothesis which stated that migration is greater for female than male household heads. The relationship of sex to migration was too weak to be statistically significant and ranked last of all predictors.

The eighth hypothesis that migration is inversely related to income and education could not be confirmed. The direction of the relationship of income to migration was as predicted for all except the lowest income category. There were more non-migrants than migrants in the lowest income category, perhaps suggesting that the very poor were financially unable to move. The degree of the association between income and migration was relatively weak. The strength of the relationship between education and migration was comparatively greater, however the direction of the relationship was contrary to original expectations. Migrants, as compared with non-migrants, had disproportionately high representation among high school

graduates and those with college educations. The incon-
sistency between income and education might indicate that
the educated migrants did not have the job tenure necessary
to make the income commensurate with their education.

The ninth hypothesis, which stated that family life
cycle is the best predictor of present neighborhood satis-
faction, previous neighborhood dissatisfaction, and the
perceived initial attractiveness of present neighborhood,
was partially verified. Age had the highest correlation
with present neighborhood satisfaction, while family size
ranked third. Family size had the highest correlation with
previous neighborhood dissatisfaction, while age ranked
fourth. Age and family size were the least effective
predictors for the perceived initial attractiveness of
present neighborhood. These findings might suggest that
since those in the first stages of the family life cycle
expressed greatest dissatisfaction with both previous and
present neighborhoods, the latter may be the result of a lack
of selectivity in choosing their present neighborhood.

An examination of the individual reasons for dissatis-
faction with previous neighborhood generally indicated
that housing factors were most prominent. Neighborhood
problems were of lesser concern to most migrants with
one exception. Location of the neighborhood ranked the
highest of any single reason for migration. These findings

were generally supportive of the first proposition, which predicted that housing factors would have the greatest effect on previous neighborhood satisfaction.

The final proposition, which predicted that housing factors would have the greatest effect on the perceived initial attractiveness of present neighborhood, was not supported. The two housing factors, price of housing and housing characteristics, ranked third and fourth among the predictors. Location of the neighborhood and neighborhood characteristics ranked higher.

The analysis of the nine hypotheses and two propositions provided a comprehensive picture of migration in terms of demographic and social psychological variables. Migrants, as compared to non-migrants, were more likely to be in the first stages of the family life cycle, renters, non-white, and dissatisfied with their present neighborhood. Family life cycle was found to be the primary indicator of migration. Younger families were not only more likely to migrate, they also indicated greater dissatisfaction with previous and present neighborhoods. These findings might suggest that these families migrate because of their dissatisfaction with their previous neighborhood. The scope of this investigation did not permit a direct measure of this relationship. Migrants indicated that housing problems were the primary reasons for their previous neighborhood dissatisfaction,

however, in choosing a new neighborhood they were primarily concerned with neighborhood factors. This might indicate why migrants, particularly younger migrants, were also dissatisfied with their new neighborhood. They had failed to change the situation which caused their initial dissatisfaction.

Difficulties with measurement and inconsistencies within the original questionnaire design and implementation were responsible for many of the problems in the data analyses. However, there was enough support for the hypotheses to provide a general view of migration using demographic and social psychological variables.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

In this concluding chapter, the principal findings of
this study are summarized and major contributions of the
investigation are discussed. Implications of this research
for further investigation of urban migration are discussed.

Summary of the Study

The primary concern of this investigation was to
examine empirically the relationship of demographic and
social psychological factors to migration. The general
contention was that social psychological factors were better
predictors of migration than were traditional demographic
variables. The National Crime Survey, utilized in the
study, provided data which were amenable to the study of
both the demographic and social psychological aspects of
migration.

The migration patterns in eight major cities were
analyzed in terms of present neighborhood satisfaction and
demographic factors. Migrants were defined as those whose
residence tenure in the neighborhood was less than five
years. Neighborhood satisfaction was measured on a scale

from 0 (total satisfaction) to 8 (total dissatisfaction) on the basis of responses to questions concerning neighborhood, housing, and other factors.

The expected relationship between neighborhood satisfaction and migration was not observed. Clear majorities of both migrants and non-migrants indicated total satisfaction with their present neighborhoods. The percentage of non-migrants identifying neighborhood problems was actually slightly higher than that of migrants. The same pattern existed for those identifying multiple dissatisfactions. These patterns might indicate that either the migrants have had relatively little difficulty in adjusting to their new neighborhood or that the non-migrants might be unable or unwilling to move from a neighborhood even though they were dissatisfied. The first of these possibilities would be contrary to previous research which found the adjustment to a new neighborhood usually takes an extensive period of time. For example, Zimmer suggested that the adjustment period might take at least five years.[1] An examination of the second possibility, that non-migrants might be unable or unwilling to migrate, would require both objective and subjective data, the latter of which were not available in this investigation.

---

[1] Basil Zimmer, "Participation of Migrants in Urban Structures," American Sociological Review, XX (April, 1955), pp. 218-224.

An examination of the individual dissatisfactions among migrants and non-migrants revealed only minor variations. However, non-migrants as compared with migrants had more problems with their neighbors and were more concerned with neighborhood changes.

The relationship between neighborhood satisfaction and migration was minimal; neighborhood satisfaction ranked only seventh of the eight variables included in the total explanatory model. Seven demographic variables, age, residence tenure, education, family size, income and race ranked higher than neighborhood satisfaction while the sex of the household head ranked lower.

The best predictor of migration was the stage of the family life cycle. Using the family life cycle classification suggested by Van Arsdol, Sabaugh, and Butler, age of household head categories were established for stages in the family life cycle.[2] Migration was greatest for those in the first stages of the family life cycle (the 15-29 age category) while non-migrants were disproportionately represented in the sixty years of age and older category. This finding was consistent with Rossi's earlier study of family migration.[3]

---

[2]Maurice Van Arsdol, Jr., George Sabaugh, and Edgar W. Butler, "Retrospective and Subsequent Metropolitan Residential Mobility," Demography, XIV (1968), p. 254.

[3]Peter H. Rossi, Why Families Move: A Study in the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility (Glencoe, Illinois), pp. 177-184.

An examination of a second family life cycle variable, the presence of children less than twelve years of age, supported the previously mentioned findings. Migrants were more numerous among low, medium, and high parity families while non-migrant families were more numerous among those with no children less than twelve years of age. A further examination of those families with no children less than twelve years of age indicated that the migrant families in that category were most likely in the pre-child stage. The obvious conclusion from the analysis was that migrants were more likely than non-migrants to be in the first stages of the family life cycle (the pre-child, child-bearing, and child-rearing stages). This is consistent with Rossi's contention that migration rates were especially high for younger families with larger numbers of children. Rossi suggested that this relatively high migration of younger families was an expression of increased spatial needs in their housing situations.[4] Specific questions concerning spatial needs were not included in the original research instrument utilized in this research. However, general housing, neighborhood, and other factors were examined in terms of previous neighborhood dissatisfaction and the perceived initial attractiveness of present neighborhood.

---

[4]Ibid., pp. 180-184.

Housing factors ranked ahead of neighborhood and "other" factors among the migrants' dislikes with their previous neighborhood. Of the housing factors, the desire for better housing and home ownership ranked first. Housing characteristics, a category that included the dissatisfaction with the size of the house, ranked second. Thus, the need for more space was a push factor in the migrants' departure from their previous neighborhood, however, it was not as pronounced as in the previously mentioned study by Rossi.

Neighborhood considerations were more prominent than housing and "other" factors in the migrants' selection of their present neighborhood. As was the case of previous neighborhood dissatisfaction, the location of the neighborhood was the primary concern of the migrants. Housing factors ranked third and fourth among the reasons migrants chose their present neighborhood. Rossi's contention of migration being a function of housing needs was totally supported.

It should be noted that preceding analysis was limited by the composition of the original questionnaire. Only approximate parallels could be drawn between most of the items utilized to measure previous neighborhood dissatisfaction and the perceived initial attractiveness of present neighborhood. The number of alternatives and the wording

of these alternatives in each question were not identical. More consistency would be advantageous for future investigation.

As previously mentioned, the structure of the questionnaire rendered it impossible to link previous neighborhood satisfaction, perceived initial attractiveness of present neighborhood, and present neighborhood satisfaction to migration in a direct fashion. Such an analysis was possible by separate examinations of three social psychological variables in terms of the demographic variables employed in the total investigation. Among the migrants, previous dissatisfaction was greatest for those in the first stages of the family life cycle. This dissatisfaction was the most pronounced for those families with a large number of children less than twelve years of age. Dissatisfaction was also negatively correlated with home ownership and level of income. The general picture of the previous neighborhood discontents was one of young, large, poor, families who rented the previous dwelling.

Respondents who expressed dissatisfaction with their present neighborhood had distinctive characteristics. Those families in the first stages of the family life cycle, especially large families, were the least pleased with their new neighborhood. To a lesser degree, the poor and uneducated found problems with their new neighborhoods. Residence

tenure, sex of the household head, and race of the household
head were not significantly related to present neighborhood
satisfaction. This analysis generally indicates that those
who were least satisfied with their previous neighborhood
were unable to resolve their difficulties by moving into a
new neighborhood, since they were also dissatisfied there.
Apparently they were able to lessen their housing problems
in the move. Residence tenure ranked high as a predictor
of previous neighborhood dissatisfaction, but was insignif-
icant in present neighborhood satisfaction. One possible
explanation was previously mentioned in the discussion of
factors involved in the selection of their present neigh-
borhood. Migrants indicated that housing costs and housing
characteristics were major considerations for locating in
their present neighborhood. They were the pull factors
which brought them into the new neighborhood, whose general
conditions perhaps offered little improvement over their
previous dwelling.

An examination of the demographic factors related to
the perceived initial attractiveness of the neighborhood
disclosed that selection varied with socio-economic categories.
More specifically, the more selective respondents were dis-
proportionately represented by those with higher incomes
and education, by home owners, and by families with white
heads of households. Neither of the two family life cycle

variables exhibited a significant relationship to initial neighborhood attractiveness. The absence of such a relationship might indicate that push factors were primarily responsible for the young families' move to their new neighborhoods.

In order to provide a more complete picture of the migrants, separate analyses were obtained for selected demographic variables. Approximately three-fourths (75.04%) of the migrant families were renters as compared to less than one-third (32.94%) of the non-migrants. This finding was consistent with Speare's conclusion that renters generally expressed greater dissatisfaction with their residences and were more likely to migrate than were home owners.[5] As previously noted, renters expressed greater dissatisfaction with their previous neighborhood than did home owners.

The relationship of race to migration has not shows a consistent nor definitive pattern in past research; the results of this investigation have failed to provide any further clarification. Migration was greater for non-whites than for whites. However, the strength of the relationship was relatively weak. A more definitive correlation might

---

[5]Alden Speare, Jr., "Residential Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable in Residential Mobility," Demography, XI, 2 (May, 1974), pp. 173-187.

have been determined if the structure of the data had been amenable to controls for distance and type of migration. The absence of these controls was also crucial in the examination of migration in terms of the sex of the head of the household. The present study indicated virtually no correlation between sex of the household head and migration. The percentage of female migrants was only slightly greater than the percentage of male migrants. This finding might suggest that short-distance migrations were predominant, since males tend to have higher migration rates over longer distances. The minimal variation found here supports Shryock's contention that, in the absence of controls, there was little difference in the migration rates for males and females.[6]

An examination of the relationship of education and income to migration produced contradictory results. The correlation of income (with the exception of the lowest income category) to migration was inverse while the relationship of education to migration was positive. Migrants were disproportionately represented in all of the lower income categories except the less than $5,000 category. This is consistent with Speare's finding that the poor had greater

---

[6]Henry S. Shryock, Population Mobility Within the United States (Chicago, 1964), pp. 411-425.

mobility inclinations and more subsequent actual migrations.[7]
The fact that non-migrants exceeded migrants in the lowest
income category might indicate that they were financially
unable to move and were, at least temporarily, locked in
their present neighborhood.

The relationship of education to migration revealed a
pattern contrary to that found with income. The pattern,
similar to Long's findings, demonstrated a positive link
between education and migration.[8] Nearly two-fifths (38.10%)
of the migrants had some college education, with slightly
more than one-fifth (20.32%) having four years of college
or more. The respective percentages for non-migrants were
34.43 and 13.12. At the other end of the educational con-
tinuum, more than one-half (50.83%) of the non-migrants had
less than twelve years of education compared to slightly
more than one-third (34.78%) for migrants (See Appendix A).

The discrepancy between the migrants' high educational
attainment and low income relative to the non-migrants pos-
sibly indicates that the migrants may lack the tenure
necessary to establish themselves financially.

The major substantive contribution of this investigation
is the finding that family life cycle is clearly the best
indicator of migration. This finding had been noted in

---

[7]Speare, op. cit., pp. 174-177.

[8]Long, op. cit., pp. 373-379.

numerous earlier studies. However, in the earlier studies the higher migration rates among families in the early stages of the family life cycle were viewed as an expression of a desire for more space to meet the growing needs of the family. In the present investigation, housing concerns were not disproportionately represented among the reasons for the selection of a new residence. Thus, it appears that the underlying motivation for migration has changed since Rossi's study where the desire for more space was the utmost concern.[9]

An examination of the two variables used to measure family life cycle, age and family size offer some clarification. Both variables ranked high in their association with migration. The fact that age ranked above family size also supports the contention that migration is not primarily an expression of a family's desire for more space. Rather, it appears that migration is primarily an economic expression. Migration is the vehicle in which young, educated, low income families attempt to modify their existing way of life.

Another contribution of this investigation is the delineation of both the demographic and social psychological characteristics of migrants based on data from a sample of cities throughout the United States. Migrants, as compared

---

[9]Rossi, *Ibid.*

with non-migrants, are younger, better educated, poorer, non-home owners, and have larger families. Neighborhood considerations are the primary push factors while housing considerations are the predominant pull factors to their present neighborhood. Neighborhood satisfaction is generally the same for migrants and non-migrants. These observations suggest a number of potential migration research possibilities in the fields of demography and urban sociology. The implications of this study and possible avenues for future research are discussed in the following section of this chapter.

Implications for Migration Studies

Throughout the history of internal migration research, researchers have been limited by the absence of substantial and reliable quantitative data.[10] The literature is well documented with general studies based on census or survey data. These studies have been generally limited to analysis of demographic factors as they relate to migration. The examination of the social psychological factors affecting migration has been limited to a number of localized surveys. This study indicates that data are available in which both types of factors can be examined from data for major cities throughout the United States. The migration data utilized

---

[10]T. Lynn Smith and Paul E. Zopf, Jr., Demography: Principles and Methods, (Port Washington, New York, 1974), pp. 478-479.

in this study are certainly not without limitations. As previously mentioned, distance and type of migration were not delineated. Thus, the findings of this study refer to total migration patterns.

It was demonstrated in this study that neighborhood satisfaction did not differ significantly among migrants and non-migrants. It was impossible to discern, with the existing data, the reasons for the absence of any differentiation. There are, however, a number of possible explanations. It is indeed possible that the satisfaction levels for both groups were similar. This conclusion would be consistent with Speare's findings that duration of residence was only moderately correlated with residential satisfaction.[11] Future research might examine the relationship of the other demographic variables to neighborhood satisfaction. For example, Speare suggested that a stronger relationship could be found with home ownership.[12] A second explanation is that the dissatisfied non-migrants are simply unable to migrate. The scope of the original survey did not address the question of migration aspirations of the respondents. Finally, it is possible that the measurement of neighborhood satisfaction was deficient. The list of possible dislikes did not include items related to housing.

---

[11]Speare, op. cit., pp. 174-177.

[12]Ibid.

Since it has been previously demonstrated that housing is a major factor in migration, its exclusion may have depressed the number of dissatisfied responses. Each of these possibilities needs to be examined in detail in future researches.

The relationship of the demographic variables to migration in this study were generally consistent with those found in previous research. There was, however, a noteable inconsistency between level of income and education attainment. Migration was directly related to educational attainment and inversely related to income. Future research efforts need to examine the interaction between variables in greater detail. Such examinations might focus on the relationship of age and family size to income and education. The findings of the present investigation suggests migration is greatest among the more educated and younger families, even though their incomes are relatively low. Ideally it might be advantageous to include in the examination data related to employment status and occupational classification.

The social psychological variables utilized in this study can provide the basic data for numerous future investigations. This study was primarily concerned with summary measures of present neighborhood satisfaction, previous neighborhood dissatisfaction, and the perceived initial attractiveness of the present neighborhood. The data are available to examine the relationship of selected

demographic variables to the individual items included in each of the three previously mentioned variables.

The relationships between previous neighborhood dissatisfaction, perceived initial attractiveness of present neighborhood satisfaction, in this study was only approximate, since the categories in the three social psychological variables were not identical. Standardization of these categories in future research could contribute significantly to the existing migration literature.

This study, despite its limitations, has considered both demographic and satisfaction factors in the study of migration. Previous studies involving these factors have focused almost exclusively on present neighborhood satisfaction, failing to examine the migrants' attitudes toward their previous neighborhood and their initial perception of their present neighborhoods. The present study indicates that migrants left their previous residence because of undesirable neighborhood features, but were more concerned with housing than neighborhood features in the selection of present neighborhood might provide a partial explanation for the migrants' dissatisfaction with their present neighborhood. The delineation of the demographic factors related to migration used in this study suggests that the primary motivation for migration has shifted from spatial needs to

economic concerns. Migration is greatest among young household heads with relatively high educations and low incomes. The finding that age explains more variation in migration than family size might indicate that future migration research focus less on family spatial needs and more on socio-economic factors.

APPENDIX A

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE VARIABLES USED
TO DISTINGUISH MIGRANTS FROM NON-MIGRANTS

Variables	Migrants		Non-migrants	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Residence Tenure				
Home owners	511	24.96	1,293	67.06
Renters	1,536	75.04	635	32.94
Total	2,047	100.00	1,928	100.00
Income Level				
$ 0- 4,999	168	8.49	191	10.44
5,000- 9,999	592	29.91	541	29.56
10,000-14,999	581	29.36	436	23.82
15,000-19,999	389	19.65	372	20.33
20,000-24,999	162	8.19	195	10.66
25,000 and over	87	4.40	95	5.19
Total	1,979*	100.00	1,830**	100.00
Number of children less than 12 years				
No children	1,294	63.21	1,558	80.81
1-2 children	601	29.36	294	15.25
3-4 children	132	6.45	69	3.58
5 and over	20	0.98	7	0.36
Total	2,047	100.00	1,928	100.00

APPENDIX A---<u>Continued</u>

Variables	Migrants		Non-migrants	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Age				
15-29	871	42.55	64	3.32
30-59	927	45.29	975	50.57
60 and over	249	12.16	889	46.11
Total	2,047	100.00	1,928	100.00
Race				
Whites	1,322	64.58	1,340	69.50
Non-whites	725	35.42	588	30.50
Total	2,047	100.00	1,928	100.00
Sex				
Male	1,279	62.48	1,221	63.32
Female	768	37.52	707	36.68
Total	2,047	100.00	1,928	100.00
Educational Attainment				
8th grade or less	304	14.85	583	30.24
Grades 9-11	408	19.93	397	20.59
12th grade	555	27.12	477	24.74
1-3 years of college	364	17.78	218	11.31
4 years of college or more	416	20.32	253	13.12
Total	2,047	100.00	1,928	100.00

*68 migrants failed to report their income
**98 non-migrants failed to report their income

APPENDIX B

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF REASONS GIVEN BY RECENT
MIGRANTS FOR SELECTING THEIR PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD
IN TERMS OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Variables	Number of Reasons for Selecting Present Neighborhood					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Residence Tenure						
Home owners	273	175	43	16	0	507
Renters	991	421	95	16	1	1,524
Total	1,264	596	138	32	1	2,031*
Income						
$ 0- 4,999	118	37	7	2	0	164
5,000- 9,999	413	146	22	5	1	587
10,000-14,999	355	182	38	4	0	579
15,000-19,999	219	121	34	10	0	384
20,000-24,999	87	54	17	4	0	162
25,000 and over	42	28	14	3	0	87
Total	1,234	568	132	28	1	1,963**
Number of children less than 12 years						
No children	807	383	82	18	1	1,291
1-2 children	354	177	49	10	0	590
3-4 children	89	31	7	4	0	131
5 and over	14	5	0	0	0	19
Total	1,264	596	138	32	1	2,031*
Age						
15-29	523	266	65	11	1	866
30-59	573	267	62	17	0	919
60 and over	168	63	11	4	0	246
Total	1,264	596	138	32	1	2,031*

APPENDIX B---Continued

Variables	Number of Reasons for Selecting Present Neighborhood					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Race						
Whites	751	423	110	30	1	1,315
Non-whites	513	173	28	2	0	716
Total	1,264	596	138	32	1	2,031*
Sex						
Male	763	383	97	23	1	1,267
Female	501	213	41	9	0	764
Total	1,264	596	138	32	1	2,031*
Educational Attainment						
8th grade or less	214	75	11	1	0	301
Grades 9-11	281	92	23	6	0	402
12th grade	349	176	24	2	1	552
1-3 years of college	207	101	47	6	0	361
4 years of college or more	213	152	33	17	0	415
Total	1,264	596	138	32	1	2,031*

*16 no responses
**182 no responses

APPENDIX C

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF REASONS GIVEN BY RECENT
MIGRANTS FOR LEAVING THEIR PREVIOUS NEIGHBORHOODS
IN TERMS OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Variables	Reasons for Leaving Previous Neighborhood					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Residence Tenure						
Home owners	402	79	22	2	1	506
Renters	1,266	222	34	4	1	1,527
Total	1,668	301	56	6	2	2,033
Income						
$ 0- 4,999	140	27	1	0	0	168
5,000- 9,999	487	81	18	0	0	586
10,000-14,999	482	77	17	2	1	579
15,000-19,999	302	69	9	3	1	384
20,000-24,999	132	26	4	0	0	162
25,000 and over	72	10	3	1	0	86
Total	1,615	290	52	6	2	1,965*
Number of children less than 12 years						
No children	1,061	189	31	3	1	1,285
1-2 children	492	87	17	2	0	598
3-4 children	102	20	6	1	1	130
5 and over	13	5	2	0	0	20
Total	1,668	301	56	6	2	2,033
Age						
15-29	720	123	24	1	1	869
30-59	752	140	20	5	1	918
60 and over	196	38	12	0	0	246
Total	1,668	301	56	6	2	2,033

APPENDIX C---<u>Continued</u>

Variables	Reasons for Leaving Previous Neighborhood					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Race						
Whites	1,066	203	39	3	2	1,313
Non-whites	602	98	17	3	0	720
Total	1,668	301	56	6	2	2,033
Sex						
Male	1,044	188	30	5	2	1,269
Female	624	113	26	1	0	764
Total	1,668	301	56	6	2	2,033
Educational Attainment						
8th grade or less	254	40	8	1	0	303
Grades 9-11	323	63	15	1	0	402
12th grade	447	90	10	2	1	550
1-3 years of college	301	46	15	1	1	364
4 years of college or more	343	62	8	1	0	414
Total	1,668	301	56	6	2	2,033

*68 no responses

APPENDIX D

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE PRESENT NEIGHBORHOOD
PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY RECENT MIGRANTS IN TERMS
OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Variables	Number of Present Neighborhood Problems						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
Residence Tenure							
Home owners	322	134	48	4	2	0	510
Renters	945	395	149	42	5	1	1,537
Total	1,267	529	197	46	7	1	2,047
Income							
$ 0- 4,999	115	31	16	5	1	1	169
5,000- 9,999	378	136	55	21	2	0	592
10,000-14,999	354	148	62	13	4	0	581
15,000-19,999	224	117	44	4	0	0	389
20,000-24,999	105	44	10	2	0	0	161
25,000 & over	48	30	8	1	0	0	87
Total	1,224	506	195	46	7	1	1,979*
Number of children less than 12 years							
No children	822	331	116	23	2	1	1,295
1-2 children	367	155	59	17	3	0	601
3-4 children	69	34	21	5	2	0	131
5 and over	6	9	1	1	0	0	20
Total	1,267	529	197	46	7	1	2,047
Age							
15-29	491	253	104	20	3	0	871
30-59	586	237	80	20	3	1	927
60 and over	190	39	13	6	1	0	249
Total	1,267	529	197	46	7	1	2,047

APPENDIX D---<u>Continued</u>

Variables	Number of Present Neighborhood Problems						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
Race							
Whites	806	352	136	24	3	1	1,322
Non-whites	461	177	61	22	4	0	725
Total	1,267	529	197	46	7	1	2,047
Sex							
Male	788	342	123	22	3	1	1,279
Female	479	187	74	24	4	0	768
Total	1,267	529	197	46	7	1	2,047
Educational Attainment							
8th grade or less	222	54	22	5	1	0	304
Grades 9-11	272	88	34	12	2	0	408
12th grade	338	150	50	13	4	0	555
1-3 years of college	210	101	41	12	0	0	364
4 years of college or more	225	136	50	4	0	1	416
Total	1,267	529	197	46	7	1	2,047

*68 no responses

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Andrews, Frank M., James N. Morgan, and James A. Sonquist, *Multiple Classification Analysis*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1967.

Berry, Brian J. L., and John D. Kasarda, *Contemporary Urban Ecology*, New York, Macmillan, 1977.

Gans, Herbert J., *The Levittowners*, New York, Pantheon, 1967.

Peterson, William, *Population*, New York, Macmillan, 1975.

Rossi, Peter, *Why Families Move: A Study in the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility*, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1955.

Shryock, Henry S., *Population Mobility Within the United States*, Chicago, Family and Community Study Center, 1964.

Smith, T. Lynn, and Paul E. Zopf, Jr., *Demography: Principles and Methods*, Port Washington, New York, Alfred Publishing Company, 1976.

Yamane, Taro, *Elementary Sampling Theory*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Articles

Bach, Robert L., and Joel Smith, "Community Satisfaction, Expectations of Moving and Migration," *Demography*, XIV, 2 (May, 1977), pp. 147-167.

Beshers, James M. and Eleanor N. Nishiura, "A Theory of Internal Migration Differential," *Social Forces*, XXXIX (March, 1961), pp. 214-218.

Butler, Edgar W., George Sabaugh, and Maurice D. Van Arsdol, Jr., "Demographic and Social Psychological Factors in Residential Mobility," *Sociology and Social Research*, XLVIII (January, 1964), pp. 139-152.

Groves, Walter, and Michael Hughes, "Possible Causes of the Apparent Sex Differences in Physical Health: An Empirical Investigation," American Sociological Review, XLIV (February, 1979), pp. 128-143.

Kirk, Dudley, "Some Reflections on American Demography in the Nineteen Sixties," Population Index, XXVI (October, 1960), pp. 306-318.

Land, Kenneth, "Duration of Residence and Prospective Migration: Further Evidence," Demography, VI (May, 1969), pp. 133-140.

Leslie, Gerald R., and Arthur H. Richardson, "Life Cycle Pattern, and the Decision to Move, " American Sociological Review, XXVI (December, 1961), pp. 894-902.

Long, Larry, "Migration Differentials by Education and Occupation: Trends and Variations," Demography, X (May, 1973), pp. 243-257.

Long, Larry, "The Influence of Number and Ages of Children on Residential Mobility," Demography, IX (August, 1972), pp. 371-382.

McAllister, Ronald, Edward J. Kaiser, and Edgar W. Butler, "Residential Mobility of Blacks and Whites: A National Longitudinal Survey," American Journal of Sociology, LXXVII (November, 1972), pp. 445-456.

Morrison, Peter, "Duration of Residence and Prospective Migration: The Evaluation of a Stochastic Modle," Demography, IV (August, 1967), pp. 553-561.

Myers, George, Robert McGinnis, and George Masnich, "The Duration of Residence Approach to a Dynamic Stochastic Model of Internal Migration: A Test of the Axiom of Cumulative Inertia," Euguenics Quarterly, XIV (June, 1967), pp. 121-126.

Ravenstein, E. G., "The Laws of Migration," Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, XLVIII (June, 1885), pp. 167-235.

Speare, Alden, Jr., "residential Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable in Residential Mobility," Demography, XI (May, 1974), pp. 173-188.

Van Arsdol, Maurice, Jr., George Sabaugh, and Edgar W. Butler, "Retrospective and Subsequent Metropolitan Residential Mobility," Demography, V (May, 1968), pp. 249-266.

Zimmer, Basil, "Participation of Migrants in Urban Structures," American Sociological Review, XX (April, 1955), pp. 218-224.

Publications of Learned Organizations

Institute for Social Research, OSIRIS III-2, An Integrated Collection of Computer Programs for the Management and Analysis of Social Science Data, Ann Arbor, The Unitersity of Michigan, 1973.

Public Documents

U. S. Bureau of the Census, National Crime Survey (Central Cities Sample) Attitude Questionnaire, Washington, D. C., Bureau of the Census, 1972.

Unpublished Materials

Data Use and Access Laboratories, "Cities Attitude Sub-Sample User Directory," mimeograph, Data Use and Access Laboratories, Arlington, Virginia, 1976.

Data Use and Access Laboratories, "National Crime Survey Handbook and Guide to the Tape Files," Data Use and Access Laboratories, Arlington, Virginia, 1972.