



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Some Determinants of Intrametropolitan Residential Mobility: Conceptual Considerations

Author(s): Georges Sabagh, Maurice D. Van Arsdol, Jr. and Edgar W. Butler

Source: *Social Forces*, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Sep., 1969), pp. 88-98

Published by: Oxford University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2575472>

Accessed: 19-12-2019 11:57 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Oxford University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Social Forces*

SOME DETERMINANTS OF INTRAMETROPOLITAN RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY: CONCEPTUAL CONSIDERATIONS*

GEORGES SABAGH

University of California at Los Angeles

MAURICE D. VAN ARSDOL, JR.

University of Southern California

EDGAR W. BUTLER

University of California at Riverside

ABSTRACT

A conceptual framework is described to guide research on voluntary intrametropolitan residential mobility. Mobility determinants are discussed in terms of the following push-pull dimensions, which have both structural and social-psychological components: (1) the *family life-cycle and familism*; (2) *social mobility and social mobility aspirations*; (3) *the residential environment*, including changing characteristics of residence and neighborhood and residential needs and aspirations; and (4) *social and locality participation*. Influence of these factors on mobility is impeded or facilitated by frictional factors including the availability of desired residences, information about residential opportunities, and adequate financial resources.

INTRODUCTION

Background

Speaking to a group of architects, Wirth (1956) identified the following determinants of urban residential mobility:

The great mobility of city people . . . is connected with the relatively low rate of home-ownership, the changing place of work, the fluctuations in income, the insecurity of that income, the changing associations, and the changing preferences as to residence in accordance with changing family composition and family needs and aspirations. A house which may fit a family when its children are young may be unsuitable to them as long as there are no children or when children have grown up. A con-

veniently located residence in relationship to place of work at one stage of a person's career may be grossly mal-located when the job changes.

Elaborations of Wirth's mobility determinants—as found in the writings of Rossi (1955), Bogue (1959), and others (Kenkel, 1965; Foote *et al.*, 1960)—have tended to emphasize either structural or social-psychological themes. We believe that residential mobility explanations need to incorporate both structural and social-psychological views, including the substantive contributions of demography and urban ecology, as well as attitudinal and interpersonal factors leading to residence shifts. While these perspectives have been described as antithetical (Duncan and Schnore, 1959; Rossi, 1955; Duncan, 1959), their differences are likely more apparent than real.

Demographers have described streams and varieties of movers for different population categories. Ecological investigations of population redistribution suggest that mobility stems from organizational, technological, and environmental changes. Other structural approaches to mobility have thus focused on the family life-cycle, the place of the family in occupational and status hierarchies, "objective" descriptions of changes in housing and residential environments, and linkages of individuals with such environments.

*This paper is part of a larger study of residential mobility within Los Angeles and Orange Counties of California conducted by the University of Southern California Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Population Research Laboratory. It was implemented under the direction of Georges Sabagh and Maurice D. Van Arsdol, Jr., with the cooperation of Edgar W. Butler. Support was provided by the John Randolph and Dora Haynes Foundation of Los Angeles and the Research and Publication Fund of the University of Southern California. Jeanne Biggar, Malcolm W. Klein, Amos Hawley, Sanford Labovitz, Herman Turk, and William Yee, provided critical readings of earlier versions of this manuscript.

Social-psychological views of residential mobility reflect an understanding that needs, values, aspirations, and decisions are a crucial element in the moving process. As Lively and Taeuber (1939) expressed it in a study of rural migration in the 1930's, "The controlling element in whether or not to move may not be the objective reality; rather it may be the individual's subjective evaluation of the various alternatives which he is considering." Mobility-related attitudes and motivations may well be organized around counterparts to such structural elements as the family life-cycle, social mobility, the residential environment, and patterns of social and locality participation.

Approach

A set of interrelated propositions concerning dimensions likely to account for metropolitan residential mobility are examined and integrated into a conceptual scheme. Use is made of previous theoretical insights and research findings; including Rossi's (1955) mobility accounting scheme, and "push-pull" concepts taken from migration studies (see also Thomas, 1938; Bogue, 1959; Lee, 1966). The propositions emphasize *voluntary residential mobility within metropolitan areas*. Mobility is defined as "voluntary" when family members have some possibility of actualizing residential aspirations. "Involuntary" mobility may "be forced" (occur for reasons beyond individual or family control), or result from decisions that subsequently necessitate residence changes. Coercive and voluntaristic elements can both be present in a specific move. Nevertheless, a conceptual framework examining voluntary residence changes will differ from one for involuntary moves.¹

Although some of the propositions may apply to urban segments of other highly developed and capitalistically-oriented nations, the conceptual scheme focuses on metropolitan moves in the United States. Concepts predictive of

migration and interstate or intermetropolitan moves are not explicitly included. For example, there is no consideration of the flows of movers related to economic opportunity, which are important in long-distance migration. Large metropolitan areas are of such extent, however, that some intrametropolitan moves now have the aura of migration. Applications of the conceptual scheme must be tempered by the size of metropolitan areas to which they are applied.

Determinants of voluntary mobility are evaluated for "push-pull" dimensions related to moving origins and destinations, and for intervening "frictional" factors impeding or facilitating moves (Lee, 1966). Push-pull components are here considered as complementary, one being the converse of the other. For each mobility dimension identified, push-pull aspects of residence decisions are considered. Intervening frictional factors are then considered in a separate analysis.

PUSH-PULL FACTORS IN METROPOLITAN RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY

Families undergo structural or compositional changes associated with a life-cycle; pursue goals related to life style, including prestige, consumership, and intrafamily interaction; maintain spatial relationships to their housing and work environments; and partake of interaction within the immediate neighborhood and wider community. Such activities require an articulation of family norms and behavior. These considerations suggest that four dimensions are central to metropolitan residence changes. They are identified by their following structural characteristics: (1) *the family life-cycle*; (2) *social* (intergenerational and career) *mobility*; (3) *the residential environment*, including changing characteristics of residence and neighborhood; and (4) *social and locality participation*. Social-psychological characteristics of these dimensions are defined less explicitly in previous investigations. *Familism* is relevant to the family life-cycle, *social mobility expectations and aspirations* reflect the residential environment, and social and locality participation includes *neighborliness* and *satisfaction* with the nature and extent of participation.

¹ It should be noted here that it cannot always be determined if a particular move is "voluntary" or if it is incidental to other changes, i.e., a company transfer (which in itself may involve choice). However, in every move, we assume that a choice of a new neighborhood and housing unit must be made. (For an elaboration on this theme, see Butler *et al.*, 1969.)

Propositions pertaining to each of the four dimensions are summarized in the Appendix. In addition to those discussed in the text, others in the Appendix emphasize interrelations between the dimensions and their components. They are not intended to be exhaustive, and do not distinguish between ways in which residential mobility can be measured. In order to account for social-psychological as well as structural components of residence changes, emphasis is on subsequent (future) moves rather than retrospective (past) mobility (Van Arsdol *et al.*, 1968). For most propositions, effects of the family life-cycle are specified; if not, they are assumed to affect the postulated relationships. A dichotomy in the Appendix, between "general" and "specific" propositions, can be compared to Zetterberg's (1963) distinction between "theoretical" and "ordinary" propositions, but it is somewhat less formal. General propositions indicate the overall nature of the relationships of metropolitan residential mobility to particular dimensions. Specific propositions spell out the relationships implied by general propositions.

FAMILY LIFE-CYCLE AND FAMILISM

Family Life-Cycle

Family formation, growth, and dissolution account for a substantial share of residential mobility in the United States (Glick, 1957). When the family life-cycle from formation to dissolution is examined, critical stages or turning points can be identified which have an impact on the propensity to move. These stages normally include: (1) marriage (family formation), (2) pre-child (constant size), (3) child-bearing (increasing size), (4) child-rearing (constant size), (5) child-launching (decreasing size), (6) post-child (constant size), and (7) widowhood (family dissolution) (Foote *et al.*, 1960; Rodgers, 1964). Some stages do not apply to childless couples, most are irrelevant to never-married persons, and the course of the cycle may be altered at any time by death, desertion, divorce, or separation. Nevertheless, for "typical" families, mobility propensity is greatest during the family formation, child-bearing, and child-launching stages, and least marked during the child-rear-

ing period—especially when children are enrolled in school.

The actuation of mobility by family life-cycle changes depends on several factors. These include: (1) size and adaptability of the housing unit, (2) tenure status, (3) the way in which changes in family structure are evaluated and related to housing needs, and (4) availability of housing within the range of household financial resources. Furthermore, the size and composition of childless and broken families and single-person households is modified by in and out movement of parents and relatives, with effects comparable to shifts to child-bearing and launching phases. Marriage, divorce, and desertion almost always involve residence changes for some family members. These themes are expressed by specific propositions in the Appendix (Section I.1). Moreover, crises pertaining to family integration, illness, and financial difficulties may precipitate moves. The importance of life-cycle changes in activating mobility is likely influenced by family norms.

Familism

By arguing that the move to the suburbs "expresses an attempt to find a location in which to conduct family life which is more suitable than that offered by central cities," Bell (1958) has advanced "familism" as one factor influencing metropolitan mobility (see also, Jaco and Belknap, 1953; Fava, 1956; Burchinal and Bauder, 1965). Bell's definition of familism as "high valuation on family living; marriage at young ages; a short childless time-span after marriage, and child centeredness," implies that the child-bearing occurs earlier and lasts longest for couples with a familistic orientation. Family life-cycle changes, rather than familism per se, would here appear to account for moving propensities of households. Other familism components suggested by Bell are relatively independent of family life-cycle stages. In either case, familistically-oriented households would be more likely to move from residential locations perceived as inimical to family living and child welfare than those households that are not. It is possible, however, that persons lacking in familistic orientation are desensitized to this

environmental feature. On the other hand, mobility may sometimes be seen as a means of facilitating adjustment if relationships within the family are deteriorating.

The Appendix (Section I.2) indicates a remaining "extended-family" component of familism that may affect residential mobility. Due to preferences to live near relatives, nuclear families with close kinship ties within a metropolis may be less likely than other families to move away from their neighborhoods. Conversely, extended-family oriented persons are more likely to be "pulled" to neighborhoods where kin are present than are those lacking such orientation.²

SOCIAL MOBILITY AND SOCIAL MOBILITY ASPIRATIONS

A new direction for mobility research was outlined by Rossi (1955) in the mid-1950's which takes into account prestige goals of families:

Residential mobility is often the spatial expression of vertical social mobility. As families rise in social class position, they often change their residence to accord with their class destination. Inferential data on this aspect of mobility were shown in this study; more direct research is necessary to show the extent of this type of movement and its significance for the American social structure.

Subsequent attempts to explore linkages between horizontal and vertical mobility in metropolitan areas, however, have yielded contradictory findings. For example, Bell has argued that familism rather than upward mobility aspirations accounts for moves to the suburbs.³ Similarly, in a study of two North Carolina towns, Gulick, Bowerman, and Back (1962) report no relationship between "felt" social

²Litwak (1960) has argued that the extended-family relationship "does not demand geographical propinquity," thus implying that, under certain conditions, "extended-familism" may actually foster a move *away* from kin. Litwak, however, was more concerned with migration than urban residential mobility.

³Bell (1958:238) asserts that "only 10 percent of the respondents could be classified as having upward mobility aspirations involved in their moves to the suburbs, and even here most of these persons also had other reasons for moving."

mobility, and "desires for residential mobility." Whitney and Grigg (1958), however, refer to 90 percent of their respondents' local residence changes as being "status moves." Leslie and Richardson's (1961) findings of a striking association between social mobility expectations and residential mobility intentions, led them to a paradigm which "assumes that both the need for more living space as the family increases in size and the need to adjust housing to changes in social status are potent forces inducing families to move."

The limited scope of the aforementioned studies and differences in defining mobility may help explain their contradictory findings. Furthermore, this literature does not consider relations of situs changes to residential mobility. More important, however, is lack of identification of social-psychological factors intervening between social and residential mobility. These likely include the extent to which residential locations are perceived as indicative of social status or instrumental to social mobility, and to which current homes or neighborhoods are seen as consistent with a new or aspired-to status. These two assumptions facilitate a summary of relationships of social mobility aspirations and/or social mobility with the propensity to move.⁴ Propositions in the Appendix (Section II) exclude effects of moves due to work-place changes and also pertain to persons or households at the same family life-cycle stages.

THE RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENT

Changing Characteristics of Residence and Neighborhood

Urban subarea structural changes leading to population redistribution have been well documented in ecological studies of residential succession and the urban housing cycle (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1965). While these studies have

⁴For a similar argument analyzing the joint effect of social mobility and the family life-cycle see Leslie and Richardson (1961). A similar process may occur with *downward* social mobility, although it is more likely that a family will hang on to its one concrete symbol of its former higher status. Under similar conditions, upward social mobility is more likely to lead to residential mobility than downward mobility.

focused on areas, they suggest that changes in the residential environment of the family increase the propensity to move. Propositions in the Appendix (Section III) relate moving tendencies to housing unit condition, increasing neighborhood urbanization, and shifts in neighborhood status level and ethnic composition.

Housing unit deterioration and needs for frequent repairs may lead to desires to move. Whether or not families move will depend on other push factors. It should be noted, however, that moves may be to other dwellings in the same local area or neighborhood. Changes in neighborhood character are related to the urban housing cycle and shifts from single family land use to multiple family, commercial, or other more intensive urban uses. Whether or not these physical changes are perceived as sufficient grounds for moving depends on the stage of the family life-cycle as well as on other reactions of family members, including their perceptions of how neighborhood changes affect them.

Changes in the demographic and social composition of neighborhoods may also generate residence changes. Through residential replacement associated with the urban housing cycle, social status levels of neighborhoods may be downgraded or neighborhood ethnic composition altered.⁵ Reactions of current residents of transitional neighborhoods to these changes will depend both on their views of their new neighbors and their own self-perceptions. Prejudice and threats to self-image may impel some families to move from neighborhoods undergoing such changes. On the other hand, changing neighborhoods may be attractive enough to retain families who do not have these attitudes.

Some changes pushing families from neighborhoods pertain to the social relationships between a family and its neighbors.⁶ If members are strongly oriented toward neighbor interaction, and if existing relationships de-

teriorate, then there may be an increase in the desire to move. Families who have been interacting extensively and intimately with friends and relatives in their neighborhood may decide to move when these friends and relatives leave. These considerations apply to "locality-oriented" families and not those with "cosmopolitan" values.

Residential Needs and Aspirations

Residential needs and aspirations comprise one of the best-documented determinants of metropolitan residence changes. Previous findings are integrated with the propositions in the Appendix (Section III). Family members often have definite ideas as to what is an "ideal" home or neighborhood (apart from aspirations to "get ahead in life"). Housing unit expectations may pertain to privacy, type of tenure, style, and other features. Neighborhood aspirations may include locational as well as physical and social amenities.

On the other hand, the current dwelling and residential location may not have met original expectations, and the pull of the current place proved to be a disappointment. This in itself should generate dissatisfactions and the desire to move again. Constraints on family interaction imposed by an unfavorably perceived housing environment may be a further impetus to moving. Nevertheless, if family members become adjusted to the difference between expectations and reality, lower their expectations, or adjust their behaviors, the inclination to move may decline. However, if dwelling and neighborhood were initially considered to be nearly "ideal," a pattern of rising expectations can lower the degree of satisfaction and lead to a desire to move.

Symbolic Value of Residence and Neighborhood

Firey (1947) maintains that families may be attracted to or retained in metropolitan neighborhoods by symbolic attachments. He argues that "spatially referred values" are to be found not only at the upper end of the status scale but also at the lower end, although they may take different forms. Incidentally, subsequent studies have revealed few cultural islands with "symbolic value" in American cities. Components of symbolic value may nevertheless

⁵ According to Rossi (1955:148), "neighborhoods can change as new types of land use establish themselves, as new social groups enter as residents, and as old services and physical structure change.

⁶ According to Foote *et al.* (1960:184), "the two most compelling motives for moving are the dwelling itself and the social qualities of the neighbors."

be found among *individuals* living within certain areas. Symbolic residential mobility determinants appear to be of relatively minor consequence; emphasis is therefore directed toward other mobility determinants.⁷ On the other hand, it can be argued that components of symbolic value are here included if symbolic values are a product of locally anchored informal and formal associations (see Section IV.1 of the Appendix). Furthermore, long residence in any neighborhood may strengthen the pull of sentimental attachments to the present dwelling and neighborhood.

SOCIAL AND LOCALITY PARTICIPATION

Early urban sociologists assumed that high residential turnover is associated with an "anatomization of social relationship."⁸ This relationship has been documented both at the real and individual levels, and social-economic status and neighborhood participation have been found to be positively related (Rossi, 1955; 37-39; and Smith, Form, and Stone, 1954). It is not clear, however, whether length of time of neighborhood residence is a determinant or consequence of a high level of local participation. Rossi dismissed this lead as unfruitful after concluding that "proximity to friends and relatives has little effect on the desire to move or remain," and that "the closer location of personal relationships is a *consequence* of stability rather than a cause."⁹ This

⁷ In two exploratory studies the authors attempted to determine if there were cultural islands with "symbolic value" in a large metropolis. Symbolic determinants of residential mobility appeared of minor consequence and emphasis was directed toward other factors in residential moves.

⁸ Zorbaugh (1929) and almost 20 years later, Firey (1947:321) argues that excessive spatial mobility may be "inherently disruptive to certain associational processes that are functionally necessary to a community." Both Zorbaugh and Firey used the rooming house district as a prototype for this argument. Goldstein (1958) discusses the possible impact of repeated migration upon social and personal disorganization.

⁹ Rossi's (1955:90-92) conclusion was based on comparisons of proportions of respondents wanting to move among those whose friends and relatives reside locally and among those that Rossi calls "social environment complaints" ("complaints

view ignores possible effects of the extent and degree of intimacy of interaction with relatives, and with nonrelatives. When these factors are taken into account a number of propositions can be formulated, as indicated in the Appendix (Section IV.3). The propositions specify how patterns of formal and informal associations may influence propensities to move. Since this aspect of residential location may not be salient or crucial for many families, subsequent moves may depend on the effect of such other factors as the family life-cycle, social mobility, and physical environment.

Propositions concerning social and locality participation assume that persons least likely to move within the metropolis are those who are "socially integrated" in their neighborhoods. For example, Firey attributed the residential stability of foreign-born Italians in Boston's North End to the "localization of Italian associations and interaction patterns in a particular spatial area" (Firey, 1947). His argument assumed a strong feeling of attachment to "one's own kind" which is expressed in residential stability even in an unfavorable physical environment. While it may apply to other immigrant "islands" in American cities as well as to religious and cultural minorities with a strong sense of solidarity, high residential stability is likely to be observed in urban neighborhoods where there is little or no "social integration."

INTERVENING FACTORS FACILITATING OR IMPEDING METROPOLITAN RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY

The discussion of push-pull factors in residential mobility assumes that wishes and plans to move may remain unfulfilled and that wishes and plans to stay may be unrealized. Among factors impeding or facilitating moves are information and resources necessary to take advantage of whatever residences may be available.

Availability of Information about Residential Opportunities

Families normally obtain some indirect information concerning the housing market before moving decisions are implemented. How about the nearness to friends and relatives and kinds of people around here").

this information is gathered and used likely facilitates or impedes intended moves. While reliance on a variety of sources would appear to assist in finding the "ideal" dwelling in the "right" neighborhood, Rossi's findings suggest that personal contact is the most effective source of information about potential dwellings. Rossi (1955:159-162) also maintains that the type and effectiveness of information sources varies with the level of income and the nature of housing sought. It may be that relatives and friends not only help in locating a new housing unit but also provide the most convincing arguments for the final choice.

Availability of Resources

The effective housing market depends on the availability of financial resources. Higher-income families have a wider latitude in buying or renting than families with a lower income, and can more easily translate moving choices or plans into behavior. On the other hand, post-World War II upgrading of occupation and liberalization of credit may have minimized the impediment to mobility that results from insufficient financial resources. Furthermore, some families with limited funds have access to kinship aid, which extends their effective housing market beyond what would be anticipated from financial resources alone. Evidence is here limited and inconclusive.

Availability of Residences of the Type Sought by the Family

Despite sufficient resources and access to a variety of information sources, planned moves may be forestalled by a "tight" housing market.¹⁰ An expanding housing market, in contrast, provides more mobility temptations, particularly when accompanied by increases in "housing unit amenities" and changes in dwelling-place styles. Holding constant resources

¹⁰ Some of the most pertinent evidence is presented by Rossi (1955:120), who found that "unexpected stayers tended on the whole to be households of relatively high income. There is some indication that families with high income did not carry out their intention to move because they did not find suitable housing in the tight market of the late 1940's. Rossi's finding is limited in that he did not control for family size or life-cycle stages.

and sources of information, positive correlations would be expected in tight rather than in expanding markets between push-pull factors and mobility desires or expectations. Discriminatory practices, apart from lack of resources or adequate information, restrict the range of choice of some minority populations no matter what the character of the housing market.

CONCLUSIONS

Our objective has been to describe a conceptual framework to guide research on voluntary metropolitan residential mobility of families in the United States. The following assumptions were used to develop this framework:

1. Mobility determinants can be analyzed in terms of push-pull factors pertaining to origin and destination and frictional factors impeding or facilitating moves.
2. Both structural and social-psychological components influence mobility.
3. Basic dimensions likely to account for mobility are the family life-cycle and familism; social mobility and social mobility aspirations; the residential environment, including changing characteristics of residence and neighborhood, and residential needs and aspirations; and social and locality participation.

Push-pull factors in mobility were described and the interrelationships between them summarized as follows (see Appendix):

I. *Family Life-Cycle and Familism*

Family Life-Cycle. This is a structural component of a family dimension which is highly predictive of intrametropolitan residential moves. It pertains essentially to the effects of changing demographic composition of the family.

Familism. This is, in part, a social-psychological counterpart of the family life-cycle. It expresses the value placed on nuclear and extended family activities.

II. *Social Mobility and Social Mobility Aspirations*

This dimension includes vertical mobility as well as social mobility goals of family members. Its effects on residential mobility are somewhat problematic.

III. *The Residential Environment*

Changing Characteristics of Residence and Neighborhood. A changing ecological en-

vironment has impact on residential needs and aspirations of family members.

Residential Needs and Aspirations. Needs and aspirations pertaining to the dwelling and the neighborhood likely are one of the most important determinants of residential mobility.

Symbolic Value of Residence and Neighborhood. This aspect of the residential environment includes sentimental attachment to a residential location because of its history or traditions.

IV. *Social and Locality Participation*

This behavioral and attitudinal dimension pertains to the level of formal and informal participation of individuals and families in neighborhood and local areas.

Influence of the aforementioned dimensions is impeded or facilitated by frictional factors intervening between the areas of origin and destination. These include information about residential opportunities, the availability of residences of the type sought by the family, and the requisite financial resources. Push-pull dimensions here discussed do not exhaust the concepts useful in predicting propensity to move within a metropolitan area. Determinants of individual moves can be viewed as operating at ecological or structural as well as at individual levels. Considerations of these operating levels are essential to complete explanations of metropolitan residential mobility. Previous research would suggest that the concepts here explicated are pertinent to the study of residence change.

APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITIONS PERTAINING TO THE EFFECTS OF PUSH-PULL FACTORS ON RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY

I. *Family Life-Cycle and Familism.*

I.1. *Family Life-Cycle.*

A. *General Propositions.*

1. A change in the demographic structure of a family accompanied by perceived inadequacy of current housing and neighborhood is a strong incentive to residential mobility.
2. The most marked changes in the demographic structure of a family occur during the family life-cycle stages of family formation, child-bearing, child-launching, and family dissolution. The

least marked changes occur during the pre-child, child-rearing, and post-child stages.

B. *Specific Propositions.*

1. At a given point in time, young age of head, large family size, and the presence of young children are all indicators of the child-bearing stage and hence conducive to a high rate of mobility.
2. During a given period of time, expanding or contracting families are more likely to be mobile than families with a constant number of children.
 - a. Families with an increasing or decreasing number of children are more likely to be mobile than families with a constant number of children.
 - b. Families that are broken by separation, divorce, or death are more likely to be mobile than intact families.

I.2. *Familism.*

A. *General Proposition.* In some situations, a "familistic" orientation is involved in the decision to move or to stay. There is likely to be a close association between familism and the family life-cycle.

B. *Specific Propositions.*

1. Child-centered families, even during the relatively stable stage of child-rearing, are likely to consider moving if housing, neighborhood, or local facilities are considered as inimical to the welfare of children.
2. Families that emphasize doing things together in the home or the local area tend to move if the home or local area does not facilitate these family-oriented activities.
3. Families that place high value on frequent and intimate interaction with relatives are likely to seek a location close to these relatives. This tendency is more marked during some stages of the family life-cycle than others.

II. *Social Mobility and Social Mobility Aspirations*

A. *General Propositions.*

1. Social mobility aspirations will lead to residential mobility under the following conditions:
 - a. Social mobility aspiration is marked.
 - b. Residential location is considered as indicative of or conducive to higher social status.

- c. The present residential location is seen as inconsistent with the aspired status.
2. Actual social mobility (apart from job changes that necessitate a residential move) can lead to residential mobility when the current residential location is perceived as inconsistent with the new social status.
- B. *Specific Propositions.*
1. Under the conditions that (a) residential location is perceived as related to social mobility (or status), (b) the social-economic status of a family is markedly different than that of the subarea of current residence, the following relationships will obtain:
 - a. At each stage of the family life-cycle, there is a positive association between social mobility commitment and the propensity to move.
 - b. At each stage of the family life-cycle, there is a positive association between propensity to move and a recent rise in occupational status and/or income of family heads.
 - c. At each stage of the family life-cycle, families with a declining or stable social status have a lower propensity to move than those with an increasing social status.
 - d. If there is a move related to social mobility aspirations the subarea of destination will have a higher social rank than the subarea of origin.
 2. If it can be assumed that conditions (a) and (b) above are usually present when there is *marked* social mobility, the following behavior can be observed: at a given stage of the family life-cycle and for families living in urban subareas about equal in social rank, a marked rise in social status is more likely to be accompanied by residential mobility than a declining or stable social status.
 3. A strong familistic orientation will operate so as to counteract the effects of social mobility and social mobility aspirations on residential mobility.
- III. *The Residential Environment.*
- III.1. *Changing Characteristics of Residence and Neighborhood.*
- A. *General Proposition.* Apart from any variations in family structure and changes in residential needs and aspirations of family members, residence and neighbor-

hood may become altered in such a way as to intensify dissatisfaction with current residential location and increase the propensity to move.

B. *Specific Propositions.*

1. A deterioration of the housing unit with no possibility for repairs will increase the tendency to move, particularly if this is accompanied by upward social mobility and a change in the family life-cycle.
2. For families in their early stages and with a marked suburban orientation, an increasing "urbanization" of the local area is an incentive for mobility.
3. A social-economic downgrading or physical deterioration of neighborhood is an incentive to move among persons who consider residential location an important aspect of social status and who are strongly committed to upward social mobility. The stage of the family life-cycle of these persons must also be considered.
4. A change in the ethnic composition of a neighborhood with no physical deterioration or socioeconomic downgrading will increase the desire to move among persons with ethnic prejudices, whose families are still in the early stages of their life-cycles, or whose children are attending schools with increasing proportions of ethnic children.
5. A change in the relationship between a family and its neighbors or the move of close friends and relatives will increase the propensity to move.

III.2. *Residential Needs and Aspirations.*

A. *General Proposition.* Residential needs and aspirations, aside from aspirations to higher social status, increase the propensity to move if family members perceive their current residential location as not fulfilling these needs and aspirations.

B. *Specific Propositions.*

Assuming no changes in the family life-cycle, residential needs and aspirations can lead to moves in the following ways:

1. The more and stronger the complaints there are about the housing unit of current residence and the current neighborhood the greater is the likelihood of mobility out of this neighborhood.
2. Families that have complaints about the

- dwelling unit of current residence but are satisfied with the current neighborhood are more likely to move within this neighborhood than families that have complaints about both dwelling unit and neighborhood.
3. A marked discrepancy between originally expected characteristics of the present neighborhood and currently perceived neighborhood characteristics will increase neighborhood dissatisfaction and the propensity to move out of this neighborhood.
 4. Persons with a suburban orientation who live in an urban subarea are more likely to move to a suburban subarea than persons with an urban orientation who reside in the same subarea.
 5. Persons with an urban orientation who live in a suburban subarea are more likely to move to an urban subarea than persons with a suburban orientation who reside in the same subarea.
- IV. *Social and Locality Participation*
- A. *General Proposition.* In some situations, active social participation and informal interaction in one's neighborhood or local area is involved in the decision to move or to stay.
 - B. *Specific Propositions.* If it is assumed that there is (a) no change in the family life-cycle, and (b) little or no orientation toward a bureaucratic career or social mobility, the following behavior can be obtained:
 1. If there is a high level of frequent or intimate association with friends and relatives, persons who reside near them are more likely to want to stay in their neighborhoods than those who do not.
 2. Persons that value neighborliness and who interact frequently with neighbors have a lower propensity to move than those who do not.
 3. Given a high level of involvement in voluntary associations, persons whose associations are located in or close to their neighborhoods are less likely to want to move than those whose associations are more distantly located.
- REFERENCES
- Bell, Wendell
1958 "Social Choice, Life Styles, and Suburban Residence." In William F. Dobriner (ed.), *The Suburban Community*. New York: Putnam's.
- Bogue, Donald J.
1959 "Internal Migration." In Philip M. Hauser and Otis Dudley Duncan (eds.), *The Study of Population*. Chicago: University Press of Chicago Press.
- Burchinal, Lee G., and Ward W. Bauder
1965 "Adjustments to the New Institutional Environment." In Iowa State University Center for Agricultural and Economic Development, *Family Mobility in Our Dynamic Society*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Butler, Edgar W., Georges Sabagh, and Maurice D. Van Arsdol, Jr.
1964 "Demographic and Social Psychological Factors in Residential Mobility." *Sociology and Social Research* 48(January): 139-154.
- Butler, Edgar W., et al.
1969 *Moving Behavior and Residential Choice: A National Survey*. Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Sciences (NCHRP Division), forthcoming.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley
1959 "Rejoinder." *American Journal of Sociology* 65(September):149-153.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley, and Leo F. Schnore
1959 "Cultural Behavioral, and Ecological Perspectives in the Study of Social Organization." *American Journal of Sociology* 65(July):132-145.
- Fava, Sylvia F.
1956 "Suburbanism as a Way of Life." *American Sociological Review* 21(February): 34-37.
- Firey, Walter
1947 *Land Use in Central Boston*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Foote, Nelson N., et al.
1960 *Housing Choices and Housing Constraints*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Glick, Paul C.
1957 *American Families*. New York: Wiley.
- Goldstein, Sidney
1958 *The Norristown Study*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gulick, John, Charles E. Bowerman, and Kurt W. Back
1962 "Newcomer Enculturation in the City: Attitudes and Participation." In F. Stuart Chapin, Jr. and Shirley F. Weiss (eds.), *Urban Growth Dynamics*. New York: Wiley.
- Jaco, E. Gartley, and Ivan Belknap
1953 "Is a New Family Form Emerging in the

- Urban Fringe?" *American Sociological Review* 28(October):550-557.
- Kenkel, William F.
1965 "The Family Moving Decision Process." In Iowa State University Center for Agricultural and Economic Development, *Family Mobility in Our Dynamic Society*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Lee, Everett S.
1966 "A Theory of Migration." *Demography* 3:47-57.
- Leslie, Gerald R., and Arthur H. Richardson
1961 "Life-Cycle, Career Pattern, and the Decision to Move." *American Sociological Review* 25(December):894-902.
- Litwak, Eugene
1960 "Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion." *American Sociological Review* 25(June):385-394.
- Lively, C. E., and C. Taeuber
1939 *Rural Migration in the United States*. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.
- Rodgers, Roy H.
1964 "Some Factors Associated with Homogeneous Role Patterns in Family Life Cycle Careers." *Pacific Sociological Review* 7(Spring):38-48.
- Rossi, Peter H.
1955 *Why Families Move*. New York: Free Press.
- Smith, Joel, William H. Form, and Gregory P. Stone
1954 "Local Intimacy in a Middle-Sized City." *American Journal of Sociology* 60(November):276-284.
- Taeuber, Karl E., and Alma F. Taeuber
1965 *Negroes in Cities*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Thomas, Dorothy Swaine
1938 *Research Memorandum on Migration Differentials*. Bulletin 43. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Van Arsdol, Maurice D., Georges S. Sabagh, and Edgar W. Butler
1968 "Retrospective and Subsequent Metropolitan Residential Mobility." *Demography* 5:249-267.
- Wirth, Louis
1956 "Sociological Factors in Urban Design." In Elizabeth Wirth Marvick and Albert J. Reiss (eds.), *Community Life and Social Policy: Selected Papers of Louis Wirth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Whitney, Vincent M., and Charles M. Grigg
1958 "Patterns of Mobility Among a Group of Families of College Students." *American Sociological Review* 23(December):643-652.
- Zetterberg, Hans L.
1963 *On Theory and Verification in Sociology*. Totowa, New Jersey: Bedminster Press.
- Zorbaugh, Harvey W.
1929 *The Gold Coast and the Slum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND IMPROPRIETY IN A GUATEMALAN TOWN*

NORMAN B. SCHWARTZ
University of Delaware

ABSTRACT

Certain actors, because of the culturally defined impropriety of their behavior, are able to act as go-betweens for other actors whose statuses inhibit the composition of their differences. In a small Guatemalan town disputes between religious groups cannot be directly negotiated. A social type called the "backslider," by virtue of the impropriety of his role, is able to compose the differences between religious antagonists. Cultural and historical correlates of the situation are briefly discussed. The functional analogue of the backslider may occur elsewhere.

In this paper I shall describe how certain actors by virtue of the impropriety of their behavior are able to act as go-betweens, thereby integrating other actors whose respective statuses are such that they cannot

ordinarily compose their differences. Thus, this paper has reference to a type of social process

* This paper is a product of field work carried out in Guatemala during 1960-61. The field trip was made possible by a grant from the Anthropol-