residential mobility in urban life

a study of kansas city, kansas

forrest j. berghorn and geoffrey h. steere

The significance of population movement in American life has been sensed at least implicitly ever since Frederick Jackson Turner wrote his frontier thesis into American historiography. The importance of mobility hidden in Turner's thesis was made explicit by Everett Lee and George W. Pierson,[1] among others; and a host of scholars (historians, planners, and other social scientists) have pointed out that population movement has continued as an important dynamic in the United States long after the passing of the pioneers.[2] Movers—from country to city, city to city, and from area to area within cities—have helped both to carry the seeds of cultural diversity and also to weave the web of a single society. Within this panorama of movement, our focus will be on the city and on the significance of mobility to the life experiences of urban dwellers.

Despite the long-recognized importance of mobility and the extensive urbanization of the United States, only limited attention has been given to residential movement in the city. One important reason for this is that investigation of population movement has concentrated especially on the interstate and intercounty level, rather than on metropolitan areas. Kalbach and associates point out that "The absence of sufficiently detailed census data on residential mobility for areas smaller than counties is primarily responsible. . . . Clearly survey studies of mobility experience are required."[3]

Survey data from one American city in the late 1960s forms the basis of this study.[4] While the survey was not designed to study mobility directly, it does lend itself to analyzing the consequences of mobility. That is, we can derive information from the survey telling us about people's experiences consequent to varying frequencies of residential movement. However, the data do not permit direct examination of the

sample and procedures

The sample we are studying numbers 440 people. It is derived from a stratified random sample of approximately 700 respondents in Kansas City, Kansas. The strata were delineated on the bases of income and ethnic origin, and specific neighborhoods were identified where those strata were concentrated. From these neighborhoods, specific blocks on specific streets were randomly selected, and on these streets specific families were selected randomly.

We have excluded from the original 700 those people sixty-five years or older, as well as those failing to answer the questions about their mobility. Virtually all of the older people were retired. By virtue of their nearly universal retirement, fixed income and lack of mobility, they represent a distinct segment of the population that we believe should be studied separately.

There are differences between the characteristics of our sample and the city's population. These differences are "inherited" from the survey, which attempted to study problems of specific sub-populations in Kansas City, Kansas. In both the areas of the city selected for the survey and in the sample used here, the proportion of blacks and Mexican-Americans is greater than in the city as a whole. Median family income is lower in both the selected areas and in our sample than in the city overall. Our sample has a greater proportion of people living in single-family units than is the case for either the selected areas or the entire city. Less than 7% of the households in our sample consist of a single member. This means that de facto we are studying low and moderate income, urban families living in single-family units. This sample is suitable for a comparative analysis of relatively mobile and non-mobile groups within an identifiable portion of the city's population.

Most of the survey responses included in the analysis are dichotomous. (We have, that is, clear divisions into "a" or "b," and know, for instance, whether a person has been laid off from work or not.) However, our definition of mobile and non-mobile persons depends on responses (to the question, "How many times have you moved within the last ten years?") that range from no moves to nine or more moves. For purposes of our analysis, we wished to separate "mobile" from "non-mobile" persons at some point on this continuum. But how many moves in a ten year period constitute "mobility"? In a preliminary analysis of selected variables,[6] we found that the optimum point on the continuum for distinguishing "non-mobile" from "mobile" respondents was between two and three moves. Here, a greater number of differences appeared between the two groups than at lower points. When persons who had moved three times were included in the "non-mobile" group, differences were radically reduced. Differences were further reduced by also including those who had moved four times in the "non-mobile" group. Thus, by non-mobile we mean all members of the sample who had moved two or fewer times in a ten year period; and by mobile, all who had moved three or more times in the same period. Approximately 73% of the sample is in the non-mobile group, and 27% in the mobile. Because of the discrepancy in the size of the two groups, it is important to recognize that our comparisons focus on proportions, rather than on absolute numbers, in each category of analysis.

What type of spatial movement characterizes the people in the mobile group? Are they long-distance migrants or are they locally mobile? We can trace the movement of the mobile people in the sample through their last two moves,[7] and we find their movement is predominantly residential within the metropolitan area.

Because of the nature of the data, we limit our statistical analysis to the use of Chi-square for testing significant differences between the two groups. (Chi-square measures the probability that differences between the two groups are attributable merely to chance. The larger the Chi-square, the lower that probability.—Ed.) If the probability is .05 or less ($P \leqq .05$) that the two sample groups were drawn from the same population, we conclude that there is a significant difference between them. Through this approach we can reach our objective of indicating potentially useful directions for further inquiry into the effects of residential mobilty.

psychological and social motivations of moving, which have received considerable attention from others.[5]

Though we are isolating mobility for analytic purposes, we are not implying that it is an isolated cause of any given behavior. Rather,

through a comparative analysis of relatively mobile and non-mobile groups, we are testing the proposition that frequent residential movement is a significant factor in understanding the needs, attitudes, and behavior of urbanites.

analysis

The first step in our comparative analysis is to examine six variables that are important indicators of the socio-economic background of the sample. We find that there is no significant difference between the distributions of the non-mobile and mobile groups regarding: 1) Family Income ($.50>P>.30$); 2) Education of Head of Household ($.90>P>.80$); 3) Occupation of Head of Household ($.40>P>.30$); and 4) Type of Present Dwelling ($.20>P>.10$).[8] We do not mean to imply that these variables have no influence on mobility patterns; but in our analysis, what influence they might have is exerted equally on the non-mobile and mobile groups. Thus, we may assume a measure of control over these variables.

For two other of these "background" variables, there was a significant difference between the non-mobile and mobile groups. The first of these variables is Ethnicity ($.02>P>.01$): 54% of the non-mobile group is white and 67% of the mobile group is white. The second variable is Age of Head of Household ($P<.001$): 23% of the non-mobile group is under 35 years of age, while 58% of the mobile group is under 35. Because of the significant differences in these two distributions, our analysis will incorporate a control for Ethnicity and for Age of Head of Household.

We have divided the ethnic distribution of the sample into two categories: 1) "majority," which consists of whites having an Anglo or European heritage; and 2) "minority," which consists of black Americans and Mexican-Americans. The age distribution is divided into 1) under 35 years of age and 2) 35-64. The former is defined as "younger," and the latter as "older."

Our comparison of mobile and non-mobile people, controlling for their age and ethnicity, is separated into four major sections: economic circumstances, medical and legal services, leisure-time activities outside the home, and housing. Some of the variables used in each of these sections indicate actual behavior or conditions, while some indicate attitudes. We will first present our findings for all variables and then proceed to a summary discussion in each section.

economic circumstances

The variables used to examine differences in the economic circumstances of non-mobile and mobile people are: Work Record (laid off or not in past three years); Welfare Payments (ever received or not); Need for Financial Assistance Other than Welfare (ever needed or not); and

TABLE 1

Work Record (for the Past Three Years)

	Total		Controlling for: Age				Ethnicity			
			Younger		Older		Majority		Minority	
	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile
Laid Off	50 16.5%	33 29.2%	11 15.1%	22 34.9%	37 16.2%	10 21.3%	26 15.5%	24 31.6%	22 16.2%	8 23.5%
Not Laid Off	253 83.5%	80 70.8%	62 84.9%	41 65.1%	191 83.8%	37 76.7%	142 84.5%	52 68.4%	114 83.8%	26 76.5%
Chi-square	7.5381		7.2521		0.7009		8.3280		1.0119	
Level of Significance	.01>P>.001		.01>P>.001		.50>P>.30		.01>P>.001		.50>P>.30	

TABLE 2

Welfare Payments

	Total		Controlling for: Age				Ethnicity			
			Younger		Older		Majority		Minority	
	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile
Received Welfare	34 11.1%	30 26.3%	5 07.0%	13 20.0%	29 12.4%	17 37.0%	13 07.6%	19 25.0%	21 15.3%	11 31.4%
No Welfare	273 88.9%	84 73.7%	66 93.0%	52 80.0%	205 87.6%	29 63.0%	158 92.4%	57 75.0%	116 84.7%	24 68.6%
Chi-square	13.8205		4.9615		16.8940		14.1221		4.7720	
Level of Significance	P<.001		.05>P>.02		P<.001		P<.001		.05>P>.02	

TABLE 3

Need for Financial Assistance (Excluding Welfare)

	Total		Controlling for: Age				Ethnicity			
			Younger		Older		Majority		Minority	
	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile
Have Needed Assistance	126 43.6%	61 57.0%	29 44.6%	40 62.5%	97 43.1%	21 48.8%	62 36.9%	40 56.3%	66 52.8%	21 58.3%
Have Not Needed Assistance	163 56.4%	46 43.0%	36 55.4%	24 37.5%	128 56.9%	22 51.2%	106 63.1%	31 43.7%	59 47.2%	15 41.7%
Chi-square	5.1098		4.1461		0.4803		7.7044		0.3446	
Level of Significance	.05>P>.02		.05>P>.02		.50>P>.30		.01>P>.001		.70>P>.50	

TABLE 4
Work Status of Wife

	Total	
	Non-mobile	Mobile
Worked	94 40.3%	36 38.7%
Did Not Work	139 59.7%	57 61.3%
Chi-square	0.0215	
Level of Significance	.90>P>.80	

Work Status of Wife (worked or not in past year). Distributions are presented in Table 1-4. The tables indicate that, in general, mobile people in the sample (though comparable to non-mobile people in income and occupational distributions), appear to have a more difficult time economically.

Work Record: In the total sample, the proportion of mobile people laid off in the past three years is significantly greater than the proportion of non-mobile people. The proportion of mobile people laid off is greater than that of non-mobile people also in the four control categories, but the variation is statistically significant only within majority and younger categories.

In the case of Work Record, as for all the variables where we control for ethnicity, the proportional differences between mobile and non-mobile people in the minority group are in the same direction as are the differences in the majority group. It appears that the lack of statistically significant differences within the minority group is in part due to the small number of minority respondents falling in the mobile category in this sample. We want to emphasize that we are not trying to compare the conditions of minority and majority people but rather to compare mobile and non-mobile people within each group.

The United States Bureau of the Census has concluded that, among local (i.e., intra-county) movers in all areas of the United States, job-related reasons for movement accounted for only 12% of the total (as opposed to 65% for intercounty and interstate migrants).[9] We find that approximately 29% of the mobile people in our sample (virtually all local movers) have been laid off in the past three years; and the percentage is even higher in the younger and majority categories. This suggests that there may be a stronger relationship between local mobility and unemployment than the Bureau's figures imply.

Welfare Payments: In the total sample, the proportion of mobile people who have ever received welfare payments is more than twice that

of non-mobile people. In all four control categories, a significantly greater proportion of mobile people received welfare payments.

Need for Financial Assistance (other than welfare): A significantly greater proportion of mobile people in the total sample have needed financial assistance. In all four control categories a greater proportion of mobile people have needed assistance, with significant variations in the younger and majority categories. However, the pattern in this table is somewhat different from the previous two tables. For the non-mobile and mobile minority and for the mobile majority categories, the proportion of persons having needed assistance is between 53% and 58%, while for the non-mobile majority it is only 32%. For the non-mobile and mobile older and for the non-mobile younger categories, the percent needing assistance is between 43 and 49, while for the mobile younger group it is 62.5. This indicates clearly that in terms of needing financial assistance mobility is an important factor, particularly among the young "majoritarians."

Work Status of Wife: There is no significant difference between mobile and non-mobile people with regard to the wife's work status.

Summary Discussion: There is a greater need for economic assistance among mobile people in our sample. In addition, the younger mobile people have greater difficulty maintaining a consistent work record and have the greatest need for financial assistance other than welfare; whereas the greatest need for welfare is among the older mobile people. This suggests that, in urban areas with concentrations of moderately low-income citizens who are also residentially mobile, one could anticipate greater unemployment problems among young adults and a greater need for welfare assistance among the older people than in more stable areas.

These findings raise important questions for further research. Do the consequences of frequent residential movement at an early age condition some people to dependence on the public sector of the economy, so that, as these mobile people advance in age, they also advance in their dependency on an institutionalized welfare system? Or do experiences of socio-economic dependency predispose people toward residential mobility, especially in the early years?

medical and legal services

The variables used to examine differences in the use of professional medical services are incorporated in these questions: 1) Do people in the sample seek medical help when it is needed? 2) Do they use City-County Health Department services? 3) Do they use hospitals? Distribution of the variables related to these questions appear in Tables 5-7. Table 8 shows anticipated sources of legal assistance.

Medical Services: Virtually all people in the sample—mobile and non-mobile alike—seek medical help when needed. But a significantly greater

TABLE 5

Use of City-County Health Department Services

	Total		Controlling for: Age				Ethnicity			
			Younger		Older		Majority		Minority	
	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile
Used Services	111 37.8%	53 50.0%	26 38.2%	30 48.4%	85 37.9%	22 52.4%	50 30.1%	34 45.9%	62 48.1%	18 60.0%
Have Not Used Services	183 62.2%	53 50.0%	42 61.8%	32 51.6%	139 62.1%	20 47.6%	116 69.9%	40 54.1%	67 51.9%	12 40.0%
Chi-square	4.3362		1.3630		3.0648		5.6346		1.3876	
Level of Significance	.05>P>.02		.30>P>.20		.10>P>.05		.02>P>.01		.30>P>.20	

TABLE 6

Use of Hospital (in Past Three Years)

	Total		Controlling for: Age				Ethnicity			
			Younger		Older		Majority		Minority	
	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile
Used Hospital	170 55.4%	76 67.9%	41 56.2%	50 76.9%	127 54.7%	25 55.6%	94 55.3%	55 73.3%	76 55.1%	20 57.1%
Have Not Used Hospital	137 44.6%	36 32.1%	32 43.8%	15 23.1%	105 45.3%	20 44.4%	76 44.7%	20 26.7%	62 44.9%	15 42.9%
Chi-square	4.7723		6.5974		0.0101		7.1065		0.0485	
Level of Significance	.05>P>.02		.02>P>.01		.95>P>.90		.01>P>.001		.90>P>.80	

TABLE 7

Seek Medical Help

	Total	
	Non-mobile	Mobile
Seek Help	307 97.8%	112 96.5%
Do not Seek Help	7 02.2%	4 03.5%
Chi square		*
Level of Significance		

* Distribution does not meet expected no. per cell criterion

TABLE 8

Anticipated Sources of Legal Assistance

	Non-mobile	Mobile
Legal Aid	13.6%	23.7%
Private Lawyer	62.9%	47.4%
Don't Know	08.9%	12.3%
Police	09.2%	06.1%
Church or Welfare Agency	05.4%	10.5%
N	315	114

proportion of the mobile people in the total sample have used city-county health services. The proportion of mobile people using such services is greater (in excess of 10%) than that of non-mobile people in all four control categories also.

A significantly greater proportion of mobile than non-mobile families also have had a member in the hospital sometime in the three year period. This difference is primarily the result of the relationship between mobility and the use of a hospital (as contrasted to other medical services, such as private physicians) in the younger and majority categories.

Legal Services: The differences between mobile and non-mobile people in anticipated sources of legal assistance are in the use of 1) the private lawyer by a greater proportion of non-mobile people, and 2) the church or welfare agency and legal aid by a greater proportion of mobile people.

Summary Discussion: There is a tendency for mobile people to use public health services and hospitals to a greater extent than do non-mobile people, as well as to anticipate use of public sources of legal counselling. It is possible that the relative economic disadvantages of mobility are reflected in the use of public services, since the use of private doctors and lawyers (the logical alternatives to public health and legal facilities) is more expensive. Also it may be that non-mobile people, by virtue of their stability in a neighborhood, simply have continued accessibility to professional help.

leisure-time activities outside the home

Analysis of the two variables here (i.e., Outside Activities and Adult Education Programs) indicates that there is no significant difference between mobile and non-mobile people in their engagement in leisure-time activities outside the home. Most people in both groups engage in some sort of leisure-time activities, while a small minority in both groups participates in adult education programs.

TABLE 9
Outside Activities

	Total	
	Non-mobile	Mobile
Participate	156 57.4%	58 55.8%
Do Not Participate	116 42.6%	46 44.2%
Chi-square	0.0259	
Level of Significance	.90>P>.80	

TABLE 10
Adult Education Programs

	Total	
	Non-mobile	Mobile
Participate	35 11.2%	12 10.8%
Do Not Participate	276 88.8%	99 89.2%
Chi-square	0.0023	
Level of Significance	.98>P>.95	

Summary Discussion: The similarity between mobile and non-mobile people in their participation in outside activities suggests that participation is not affected by residential change because these activities invite community-wide rather than just block or neighborhood participation.

Such activities, for those who participate in them, may help provide a valuable sense of continuity with familiar behavior patterns and primary social relationships that can mitigate some of the stresses accompanying residential change.

housing

The variables analyzed to test differences related to housing are 1) the Condition of the Present Dwelling, 2) Stated Reasons for Living at the Present Address, 3) Attitudes Toward Improving Living Conditions, and 4) Preference for Owning or Renting. The attitudes toward improving living conditions were derived from a question offering five possible responses. Three of these entailed improving conditions at the present address, while two entailed moving to a new address in order to improve conditions. Our interest is in respondents' predilections to move or remain stable. Distributions of housing variables appear in Tables 11-14.

Condition of Present Dwelling: In the total sample, twice the proportion of mobile people lives in deteriorating or dilapidated housing. A greater proportion of mobile than non-mobile people lives in deteriorating or dilapidated housing in all four control categories. Significant relationships between condition of dwelling and mobility are found in the majority, younger and older categories.[10]

Reasons for Living at Present Address: In the reason(s) for living at their present address, major differences between the mobile and non-mobile groups appear in only two categories of response: a greater proportion of mobile people say they live where they do because it is the

TABLE 11

Condition of Present Dwelling
(Respondent's Estimate Confirmed or Modified by Interviewer's Observation)

	Total		Controlling for: Age				Ethnicity			
			Younger		Older		Majority		Minority	
	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile
Sound	250 78.4%	69 60.0%	58 77.3%	40 59.7%	193 78.5%	29 60.4%	137 78.7%	42 54.5%	117 78.0%	27 71.1%
Deteriorating or Dilapidated	69 21.6%	46 40.0%	17 22.7%	27 40.3%	53 21.5%	19 39.6%	37 21.3%	35 45.5%	33 22.0%	11 28.9%
Chi-square	13.7175		5.1445		7.0672		15.2688		0.8163	
Level of Significance	P<.001		.05>P>.02		.01>P>.001		P<.001		.50>P>.30	

TABLE 12

Reason for Living at Present Address

	Non-mobile	Mobile
Only Place Available	06.0%	08.7%
Only Place We Can Afford	19.4%	34.8%
We Own It	21.0%	05.2%
We Like the House	14.0%	13.9%
We Like the Neighborhood	19.7%	15.7%
It Is Convenient to Work and Shopping	09.8%	05.2%
Because of Racial Restrictions	00.6%	00.0%
Other	09.5%	16.5%
N	315	115

TABLE 13

To Improve Living Conditions

	Total		Controlling for: Age				Ethnicity			
			Younger		Older		Majority		Minority	
	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile
Stay Where You Are	207 65.5%	50 43.5%	36 48.0%	20 29.9%	175 71.1%	30 62.5%	121 69.5%	33 42.9%	92 61.3%	17 44.7%
Move	109 34.5%	65 56.5%	39 52.0%	47 70.1%	71 28.9%	18 37.5%	53 30.5%	44 57.1%	58 38.7%	21 55.3%
Chi-square	16.0927		4.8804		1.4198		16.0285		3.4278	
Level of Significance	P<.001		.05>P>.02		.30>P>.20		P>.001		.10>P>.05	

TABLE 14

Preference for Renting or Owning

	Total		Controlling for: Age				Ethnicity			
			Younger		Older		Majority		Minority	
	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile
Rent	29 09.1%	21 19.3%	5 06.7%	13 19.4%	24 09.8%	8 16.7%	21 12.2%	15 19.5%	8 05.3%	6 15.8%
Own	289 90.9%	94 81.7%	70 93.3%	54 80.6%	220 90.2%	40 83.3%	151 87.8%	62 80.5%	142 94.7%	32 84.2%
Chi-square	6.0439		5.1858		1.9178		2.2738		*	
Level of Significance	.02>P>.01		.05>P>.02		.20>P>.10		.20>P>.10			

* Distribution does not meet expected number-per-cell criterion

"only place we can afford" (even though the income distribution of the two groups is virtually the same); while a greater proportion of non-mobile people state it is because "we own it."

Attitude Toward Improving Living Conditions: A greater proportion of mobile than non-mobile people (in the total sample and all four control categories) say they would move to improve their living conditions if they had the money.

Preference for Owning or Renting: In analyzing preferences for renting or owning, we find that most people prefer to own. However, there is a significant difference between mobile and non-mobile people, with twice the proportion of the mobile preferring to rent.[11] This difference results primarily from the relationship between preference to rent or own and mobility in the younger category, though in all four categories a larger proportion of mobile people prefer to rent.

Summary Discussion: Twice the proportion of mobile families live in physically less desirable dwellings than do non-mobile people (despite the fact that the two groups have approximately the same income and occupation distributions). We find here, as elsewhere, that a greater proportion of mobile people experience disadvantageous circumstances and a greater need for assistance than do non-mobile people.

It would be useful in further research to attempt a longitudinal analysis of residentially mobile urban people to determine whether frequent residential movement engenders a life pattern that in some ways is self-defeating, given the political and social organization of the United States. This is suggested by what we have found about housing. We see a tendency among people who have moved frequently to anticipate moving again to improve their housing (if they had the money). If we assume for the moment that the hope to improve housing has been a motivation in prior moves,[12] and if we acknowledge the fact that mobile people are currently less well housed when contrasted to non-mobile people, we see at least a suggestion that mobility can be self-defeating. That is, we may be viewing a mobility pattern exemplifying negative canalization[13] whereby families lock into repeated behavior even though it does not satisy their needs in the long run.

Most people prefer to own their homes. Once again, mobility makes a difference; twice the proportion of mobile as compared to non-mobile people prefer to rent, but the proportion of those preferring to rent among both groups is small. An economic reason for this proportional difference is suggested by the fact that a greater proportion of mobile people (despite an income distribution similar to non-mobile people) say they live where they do because it is the "only place we can afford." It may be that residential mobility tends to be more costly than stability and, consequently, some mobile families by virtue of their mobility have less money to spend for housing. Also, for some of these mobile families, ownership may be perceived as an impediment to future residential

change, since mobile families seem more predisposed to repeated movement.

conclusion

We have presented and discussed implications of evidence from a comparative analysis of survey data demonstrating that residential mobility is directly related to variations in a number of experiences of a sample of urban dwellers. The sample consists predominantly of families from the low-to-moderate income working class who live in single-family dwellings. These people live in a relatively small city (Kansas City, Kansas); but this city is itself part of a large metropolitan area (by virtue of its contiguity to Kansas City, Missouri). Therefore our findings may have implications extending to comparable samples of people in similarly small cities, as well as to sub-areas of other metropolitan complexes.[14]

We have defined "mobility" as constituting three or more moves in a ten-year period, because we have found that at this point on a mobility continuum people are distinguished most notably from those who have moved less often.

For the people in our sample, frequent residential movement tends to be economically disadvantageous and also correlates with a disproportionate need for social services. This indicates that repeated residential change is potentially stressful.[15]

The stressful characteristics of mobility have implications for planning. That is, to the extent that planning can influence residential mobility, it should be directed toward 1) minimizing the incidence of forced mobility—whether resulting from policies of, say, urban renewal, highway building, or zoning[16]—and 2) softening the impact of movement, whether voluntary or forced.

The first objective suggests renewing urban communities where they exist, reconstructing marginal housing where structurally sound, planning forced movement only when other measures cannot work, and planning forced movement with intimate knowledge of the needs of the people to be moved.

The second objective suggests that social service agencies should attempt both to identify those areas of the city where higher rates of residential mobility occur and to plan services for them. For in such areas the population is likely to include a greater proportion of people who need social services than is the case in areas of greater stability. These mobile people are laid off from work more often, which implies their greater need for unemployment assistance. They have also a greater need for financial aid, irrespective of the consistency of work record. Furthermore, they appear to use city-county medical services and welfare assistance more, and they need improved housing more than do non-mobile people.

This study has been concerned with the question, "Do people who change their residences with relative frequency disclose a pattern of living which distinguishes them from people who are relatively more stable?" The proportional variations in the experiences of the people in our two sample groups indicate that residential mobility does make a difference in the needs, attitudes and behavior of urban dwellers.

University of Kansas

footnotes

1. Everett S. Lee, "The Turner Thesis Re-examined," *American Quarterly*, XIII, 1 (Spring 1961), 77-83; George W. Pierson, "The M-Factor in American History," *American Quarterly*, XIV 2 (pt. 2) (Summer 1962, Supplement), 275-289.

2. Presently about 20% of the population of the United States changes residence annually; and 50% of the entire population moves within a five-year period (James W. Simmons, "Changing Residence in the City: A Review of Intraurban Mobility," *Geographical Review*, LVIII [Oct. 1968], 622).

3. Warren E. Kalbach, George C. Meyers, and John R. Walker, "Metropolitan Area Mobility: A Comparative Analysis of Family Spatial Mobility in a Central City and Selected Suburbs," *Social Forces*, XLII, 3 (March 1964), 310-14. Simmons, 3, notes further that, while migration has been studied widely, the studies have limited application to movement within urban areas "because economic opportunity, the mainstay of migration theory at the interstate level, is largely irrelevant to movement within a commuting area . . ." (Simmons, "Changing Residence," 623).

4. The interview survey was commissioned by the Board of City Commissioners, Kansas City, Kansas, in 1968, as part of a Community Renewal Program study by the City Planning Department. The primary purpose of the survey was to determine the welfare and housing needs of the community. The interview schedule was carefully constructed and pre-tested. All interviewers were given extensive training, and were closely supervised throughout the project.

We would like to thank Robert J. Leanna, Director of the City Planning Department, for supplying the survey data. We are also grateful to David H. Klassen, Coordinator of the Mid-America Urban Observatory, and Ronald C. Naugle, for assisting in the development of computer programs to analyze the data.

5. The psychological and social factors which have been analyzed in the literature include: age (or, perhaps more importantly, stage of family formation); family characteristics of movers; changes in individual and family life styles (especially in relation to changes in neighborhood); change in social class, racial or ethnic identity; and other personal reasons (beyond those stemming directly from physical need, class, or ethnic membership) which reflect problems in adapting to the environment. For discussion of these factors see: James W. Simmons, "Changing Residence," 622-51; John B. Lansing and Leslie Kish, "Family Life Cycle as an Independent Variable," *American Sociological Review*, XXII, 5, 1957, 512-19; Sidney Goldstein, *Patterns of Mobility 1910-1950: The Norristown Study* (Philadelphia, 1958); Gerald R. Leslie and Arthur H. Richardson, "Life Cycle, Career Pattern, and the Decision to Move," *American Sociological Review*, XXVI, 6 (Dec. 1961), 894-902; Maurice D. Van Arsdol, *et al.*, "Retrospective and Subsequent Metropolitan Residential Mobility," *Demography*, V, 1 (1968); Peter H. Rossi, *Why Families Move* (Glencoe, Ill., 1955); Georges Sabagh, M. D. Van Arsdol, and E. W. Butler, "Some Determinants of Residential Mobility: Conceptual Considerations," *Social Forces*, XLVIII, 1 (Summer 1969), 88-98.

6. This article condenses a previous version of the study which contains detailed explanations of procedures and "preliminary" findings. This information is available upon request.

7.

ADDRESSES OF MOBILE GROUP PREVIOUS TO CURRENT ADDRESS
(N = 114)

Previous Address*	No.	Address Before That**	No.
Kansas City, Kan.	85	Kansas City, Kan.	64
		Kansas City, Mo.	2
		State of Kansas	1
		Other States	7
Kansas City, Mo.	11	Kansas City, Kan.	4
		Kansas City, Mo.	5
		State of Kansas	1
State of Kansas	8	Kansas City, Kan.	2
		State of Kansas	5
		Europe	1
Other States	10	Kansas City, Kan.	3
		Kansas City, Mo.	1
		Other States	6

* None from outside U.S.

** 12 did not answer

8. Distributions of four "background" variables:

FAMILY INCOME

	Non-mobile	Mobile
Under 4,000	25.8%	28.2%
4,000-7,000	35.4%	38.2%
7,000-10,000	26.2%	27.3%
Over 10,000	12.6%	6.3%

EDUCATION COMPLETED

	Non-mobile	Mobile
8 yrs. or less	33.8%	29.5%
9-12 yrs.	32.2%	35.7%
H.S. Grad.	17.8%	17.8%
Some Col.	10.8%	12.5%
Col. Grad.	5.4%	4.5%

OCCUPATION

	Non-mobile	Mobile
Blue Collar	50.3%	53.0%
White Collar	17.9%	12.2%
Other	31.8%	34.8%

TYPE OF DWELLING

	Non-mobile	Mobile
Single Family	93.1%	87.8%
Duplex, Row or Apartment	6.9%	12.2%

9. "Reasons for Moving: March 1962 to March 1963," *Current Population Reports* (Bureau of the Census: Series P-20, No. 154, Aug. 22, 1966), 1.

10. Again, the proportional difference in the minority group is in the same direction as in the majority group. The high proportion of sound dwellings in the minority group may be explained by the predominance in our sample of single-family dwellings; and in Kansas City, Kansas, the percentage of blacks owning their own homes is approximately the same as the percentage of whites. (Ownership is generally thought to be related to the condition of dwelling.)

11. This finding of a relation between home-ownership and relative stability is consistent with the findings of James W. Simmons (see footnote 2), 626; and T. Earl Sullenger, "The Social Significance of Mobility: An Omaha Study," *American Journal of Sociology*, LV, 6 (May 1950), 562.

12. For a discussion of this motivation, as part of a complex of residential needs and aspirations, see Georges Sabagh, *et al.*, "Some Determinants" (footnote 5), 92.

13. Gardner Murphy defines canalization (both positive and negative) as: "The process by which general motives (which are at first rather non-specifically related to a class of stimuli) tend, upon repeated experience, to become more easily satisfied through the action of the specific satisfier than of others of the same general class . . .": *Personality: A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure* (New York, 1947), 162. For a full discussion of canalization, see Chapter 8.

For a discussion of repeated mobility as *de facto* canalization, see: Maurice D. Van Arsdol, *et al.*, "Retrospective . . . Mobility" (footnote 5), 265-266; and Peter A. Morrison, "Chronic Movers and the Future Redistribution of Population: A Longitudinal Analysis," *Demography*, VIII, 2 (May 1971), 171-184.

14. The 1970 census shows a population of 175,740 for Kansas City, Kansas. For the Kansas City, Missouri-Kansas metropolitan area, the total population is 1,253,912.

15. We find support from other writers who have noted the difficulties associated with mobility from the bases of data and methods different from our comparative analysis. For examples, see: Michael Copperman, "Residential Mobility of a Group of Public Welfare Clients," *Social Casework*, XLV, 7 (July 1964), 411-412; Marc Fried, "Grieving for a Lost Home," in Leonard J. Duhl, *The Urban Condition* (New York, 1963), 151-171; Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (New York, 1961); Charles Abrams, *The City is the Frontier* (New York, 1965).

16. The failure of one of these policies, urban renewal, has been discussed in many places. For examples see: Marc Fried, "Grieving . . ." (footnote 14); Jane Jacobs, *Death and Life* (footnote 14), 270-272; Peter Marris, "A Report on Urban Renewal in the United States," in Leonard J. Duhl, *The Urban Condition* (footnote 14), 120, 122, 123; Robert C. Weaver, "Major Factors in Urban Planning," in Duhl, *ibid.*, 103-105; and William W. Nash, Jr. and Chester W. Hartman, "Laissez-Faire in the Slums," *The Reporter*, 32 (Feb. 25, 1965), 49-52.