

February 28, 1968

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by T. Morris Jones entitled "Deciding to Move: The Process and Associated Characteristics for Rural Families in Tennessee Low-Income Areas." I recommend that it be accepted for nine quarter hours of credit in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Agricultural Economics.

Charles L. Cleland
Major Professor

We have read this thesis and
recommend its acceptance:

Joe A. Martin

James S. Hull

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith
Vice President for
Graduate Studies and Research

DECIDING TO MOVE: THE PROCESS AND ASSOCIATED
CHARACTERISTICS FOR RURAL FAMILIES
IN TENNESSEE LOW-INCOME AREAS

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Council of
The University of Tennessee

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
T. Morris Jones

March 1968

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his gratitude to the many persons who helped to make this study possible, especially for the cooperation of the rural families in the low-income areas of Hancock, Houston, Humphreys, and Union counties of Tennessee.

Especial appreciation is expressed to Dr. Charles L. Cleland, committee chairman, who rendered invaluable assistance by his guidance, understanding, and constructive criticism. To the other members of his committee, Dr. Joe A. Martin and Dr. James Snell, the writer also wishes to express his gratitude for their suggestions during the preparation of this manuscript.

Acknowledgment is made of the services performed by the secretarial employees of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology for their typing of the rough draft of this manuscript.

Sincere thanks is extended to my wife, Marie, for her helpfulness and for her willingness to endure those things which are necessary in the writing of a thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of the Problem.	1
Objective of the Study.	3
Definition of Terms	4
Procedures.	4
Significance of the Study	7
Review of Literature.	8
II. MOVERS AND NONMOVERS.	17
The Decision-Making Process Relative to Moving.	17
The Characteristics of Households that Move	21
Age of head	21
Occupation of head.	23
Tenure status	28
Level of living	31
Head and homemaker's social participation	34
Total family income	41
Education of head and homemaker	41
Size of household	44
Other household characteristics	48
III. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TIME SPAN AND SELECTED HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS	50

CHAPTER

PAGE

III. (CONTINUED)

Stage in family life-cycle.	51
Age of head	51
Occupation of head,	54
Tenure status	54
Level of living	57
Head and homemaker's social participation	64
Education of head and homemaker	64
Total family income	69
Size of household	69
Choices considered when thinking about moving	73
Head and homemaker's anomia	79
Number of rooms in the house	79
Other household characteristics	79

IV. THE INFLUENCE OF OUTSIDERS ON THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

RELATIVE TO MOVING.	84
Influence of persons outside the immediate family	85
Influence of seller of house.	85
Influence of relatives.	85

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 90

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. 95

APPENDIX 98

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Migration Status and the Age of Head in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	22
II. Migration Status and the Occupation of Head in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	24
III. Migration Status and the Nature of Head's Job Change from 1960 to 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	25
IV. Migration Status and the Number of Different Types of Jobs Held by Head from 1960 to 1966, Four Tennessee Counties .	27
V. Migration Status and Tenure Status in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	29
VI. Migration Status and the Change in Tenure Status from 1960 to 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	30
VII. Migration Status and the Material Possessions Scale Scores in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	33
VIII. Migration Status and the Change in Material Possessions Scale Scores from 1960 to 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	35
IX. Migration Status and the Communication Items Scale Scores in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	36
X. Migration Status and the Change in Communication Items Scale Scores from 1960 to 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	37

TABLE

PAGE

XI.	Migration Status and the Head and Homemaker's Social Participation Scores in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties. . .	39
XII.	Migration Status and the Change in the Head and Homemaker's Social Participation Scores from 1960 to 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	40
XIII.	Migration Status and Total Family Income in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	42
XIV.	Migration Status and the Change in Total Family Income from 1960 to 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	43
XV.	Migration Status and Education of Head in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	45
XVI.	Migration Status and Education of Homemaker in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	46
XVII.	Migration Status and Size of Household in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	47
XVIII.	Migration Status and the Change in Size of Household from 1960 to 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	49
XIX.	Time Span and Stage in Family Cycle in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	52
XX.	Time Span and the Age of Head in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	53
XXI.	Time Span and the Occupation of Head in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	55

TABLE	PAGE
XXII. Time Span and the Number of Different Types of Jobs Held by Head from 1960 to 1966, Four Tennessee Counties. . . .	56
XXIII. Time Span and Tenure Status in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	58
XXIV. Time Span and the Material Possessions Scale Scores in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	59
XXV. Relation of the Material Possessions Scale Scores to Time Span Among Families in Early, Middle, and Late Stages of Family Cycle, Four Tennessee Counties.	60
XXVI. Time Span and the Communication Items Scale Scores in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties ,	62
XXVII. Relation of the Communication Items Scale Scores to Time Span Among Families in Early, Middle, and Late Stages of Family Cycle, Four Tennessee Counties.	63
XXVIII. Time Span and the Head and Homemaker's Social Participation Scores in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	65
XXIX. Relation of the Head and Homemaker's Social Participation Scores to Time Span Among Families in Early, Middle, and Late Stages of Family Cycle, Four Tennessee Counties. . .	66
XXX. Time Span and Education of Head in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	67
XXXI. Time Span and Education of Homemaker in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	68

TABLE

PAGE

XXXII.	Relation of Education of Homemaker to Time Span Among Families in Early, Middle, and Late Stages of Family Cycle, Four Tennessee Counties.	70
XXXIII.	Time Span and Total Family Income in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	71
XXXIV.	Time Span and Size of Household in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	72
XXXV.	Time Span and Moving to a Distant Community, Four Tennessee Counties.	74
XXXVI.	Time Span and Moving to a Nearby Community, Four Tennessee Counties.	75
XXXVII.	Time Span and Moving but Staying in Same Community, Four Tennessee Counties.	76
XXXVIII.	Time Span and Building a New House, Four Tennessee Counties.	77
XXXIX.	Time Span and Changing the Status of Old House, Four Tennessee Counties.	78
XL.	Time Span and the Homemakers' Anomia Scale Scores in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	80
XLI.	Time Span and the Heads' Anomia Scale Scores in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	81
XLII.	Time Span and the Number of Rooms in the House in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	82
XLIII.	Time Span and the Influence of Persons Outside Immediate Family, Four Tennessee Counties	86

TABLE

PAGE

XLIV. Time Span and the Influence of Seller of House, Four Tennessee Counties.	87
XLV. Time Span and the Influence of Relatives, Four Tennessee Counties.	88
XLVI. Migration Status and the Number of Children Migrated from 1960 to 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	100
XLVII. Migration Status and the Marital Status of Head in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	101
XLVIII. Migration Status and the Household Dependency Index Scores in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	102
XLIX. Migration Status and the Heads' Anomia Scale Scores in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	104
L. Migration Status and the Heads' Change in Anomia from 1960 to 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	105
LI. Migration Status and the Homemakers' Anomia Scale Scores in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	106
LII. Migration Status and the Homemakers' Change in Anomia from 1960 to 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	107
LIII. Time Span and the Number of Children Migrated from 1960 to 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	108
LIV. Time Span and the Household Dependency Index Scores in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties	109
LV. Time Span and the Marital Status of Head in 1966, Four Tennessee Counties.	111

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The people in the United States are a people on the move. During the short period of time from March 1964 to March 1965, nearly 38 million of a total of 188 million people moved from one house to another.¹ The migration of individuals and families is essential to the proper functioning of the economy and moving is a necessary part of any migration. However, moving does not always involve migration in the usual sense of the term, although all migration does involve moving. Since migration is important to the economic progress of the economy and moving is a necessary part of migration, a study of the decision-making process relative to moving should be of value in the understanding of migration. The further understanding of migration should be of value in increasing the economic progress of the society.

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There is evidence that many of the people who live in rural areas in the United States have very low incomes. Although rural America has 29 per cent of the population of the United States, it

¹United States Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1966 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 32.

has over 43 per cent of the poverty.² Rural poverty is especially prevalent in the South. For example, the rural areas of the South have more than half of the rural poverty in the United States.³ However, very little research has been concerned with their plight.

Heady has suggested that most of the research carried on by public institutions in this country has emphasized living things such as plants and animals rather than people and families.⁴ He went on to say that the "truly complex problems of change and adjustment certainly surround the family."⁵ The present study was designed to increase our understanding of some of these complex problems. More specifically, it is concerned with the decision-making process relative to the moving of families in four low-income counties of Tennessee.

There is a great deal of information available about the quantitative aspects of moving, but little is known of the process through which families in low-income areas go in arriving at the decision to move. There are still questions about who moves and under what conditions. Also, there is little known as to how long it takes to complete the decision-making process relative to moving

²Howard Hallman, "Dimensions of Rural Poverty," Rural Poverty Conference Proceedings (Washington: National Association for Community Development, 1967), p. 1.

³Ibid.

⁴Earl O. Heady, "Comments and Overview," Family Mobility in Our Dynamic Society (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1965), p. 1.

⁵Ibid.

and under what circumstances. This study should provide partial answers to these questions.

II. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The overall objective of this study was to examine the nature of the decision-making process relative to the moving of families which were resident in rural low-income areas in Tennessee in 1960. The general objective was to answer the question, "What factors or combination of factors are associated with a family's decision to move and what process does the family go through in order to arrive at this decision to move?" This study will include the following specific objectives: (1) to compare movers and nonmovers with respect to certain socioeconomic and sociopsychological variables such as social participation, attitudes, and the level of living to obtain leads concerning the nature of factors that might cause a family to begin the decision-making process relative to moving, (2) to determine the relationship of time span (between first perceiving of the need to move and moving) with other household characteristics, (3) to determine whether the stage in the family life-cycle has any significant affect on the mover's decision to move and if the stage in the family life-cycle is related to time span, and (4) to determine the relative influences of family, relatives, friends, and others on the mover's decision to move and to see if this source of influence is related to time span.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Migration in the context of this paper means a change of residence which is usually accompanied by a severance of some ties with the community of origin.

Time span refers to the time period between the family's first perceiving of the need to move and actually moving.

Community of origin refers to the area which loses families. Those families which leave the community of origin are considered to be movers; those who do not leave are considered to be nonmovers.

Community of destination refers to the area which gains families.

The decision-making process relative to moving is an overall concept referring to the process a family goes through in order to arrive at the action or moving stage. (This process will often be referred to as the moving decision process.)

IV. PROCEDURES

The moving decision process begins in the community of origin and is consummated with the act of moving. Data collected in the summer of 1960 focussed attention in the community of origin on the conditions and circumstances of families in rural low-income counties of Tennessee. This survey was carried on in connection with the Southern Regional Project (S-44) entitled, "Factors in the Adjustment of Families and Individuals to Changing Conditions in Low-Income

Rural Areas."⁶ A follow-up survey of the same families was made in the summer of 1966 in connection with the Southern Regional Project (S-61) entitled, "Human Resource Development and Mobility in the Rural South." Data collected in the latter survey made possible an analysis of the changes that had taken place in the attitudes and circumstances of the rural families under investigation.

The data collected will be examined in the present study to describe in some detail the moving decision process. In order to accomplish the first objective, information contained in the 1960 and 1966 interview schedules such as the age of the head, marital status, education, occupation, size of household, tenure status, level of living, social participation, attitudes, and income will be analyzed. The variables will be categorized into high, medium, and low or similar breakdowns so that a comparison may be made between movers and nonmovers. All of the information came directly from the interview schedules, but for such quantitative variables as the level of living and attitudes, scaling techniques will be used to derive scores for individual families.⁷ A further analysis of changes in variables such as attitudes will be made to determine the direction of these

⁶The Southern Regional Project included 1908 households selected by a stratified random sampling procedure. There were 269 households selected in Tennessee from Hancock, Houston, Humphreys, and Union counties. Other states involved were Alabama, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Texas.

⁷Charles L. Cleland, Scaling Social Data: A Comparison of Scales Developed Using Various Techniques, Southern Cooperative Series Bulletin 108 (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Agricultural Experiment Station, December, 1965), pp. 17-64.

changes for both movers and nonmovers. Tests of significance will be made using the Chi-square test to determine whether there is a dependent relationship between moving and each of the above variables, that is whether or not they are independent. The .05 level of significance is considered to be appropriate for the present study.

To achieve the second and third objectives, time span will be set up as the dependent variable. Time span is to be broken down into short, medium, and long time periods and then cross-tabulated with other variables. These variables included the age of head, marital status, education, occupation, number of children, tenure status, level of living, choices considered when thinking about moving, participation in organizations, attitudes, and income. Households will be grouped into three categories according to the stage in the family life-cycle; those in the early stage, middle stage, and late stage; and selected cross-tabulations of variables found to be related to time span will then be made within each stage grouping to determine whether or not the relation remained constant. Changes in the strength of the relationship under these conditions will be interpreted as indications that the stage in the family life-cycle specifies the relationship of time span to other household characteristics.

Since there was no attempt in the 1966 survey to obtain an indication of the amount of influence of certain persons on the family's decision to move, an analysis of the fourth objective will require the use of the frequency of mention as an indicator of the relative strength

of influence of certain persons. The respondents were asked, "Did you talk about this move with anyone outside your immediate family?" If the response was "Yes," they were then asked with whom they had talked about the move. The frequency of mention of the various persons will then be cross-tabulated with time span.

V. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Better understanding and knowledge of the processes involved in moving may help local, state, and federal policymakers formulate policies to alleviate some of the problems connected with moving and so impede migration. This is especially so with respect to people with low incomes who tend to be concentrated in rural areas of the South. The locus of the present study is such that the results from it should be particularly helpful.

In connection with the moving process of families, some time passes between the moment the family first perceives the need to move and the time when the move is actually made. For some families the time that passes is very short while for others it is quite long. Policies that will shorten this time period without undue disruption in family life and activities are important to the society and to the families involved.

The present study should also be useful to planners since the ease with which people can move will affect the demand for and the use of land for residential, industrial, recreational, and public purposes. A study of the decision-making process relative to moving

may help planners forecast more accurately future population changes for their areas. If they know the way families learn about various moving alternatives, the things families consider in deciding on these alternatives, and what alternatives families with specified characteristics tend to select, planners may then be in a better position to advise officials as to the adjustments in services and facilities that will be needed in a given locality.

In addition, this study is precisely in an area in which there are pressing problems according to Heady:

Yet, the discussions on research suggest that we have invested very little in trying to gain a real understanding of the basic interrelationships among important variables and to solve some of the pressing problems of family mobility and family decision-making.⁸

VI. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Although much research and writing has been devoted to migration, a review of the literature reveals very little in the area of the decision-making process of families relative to moving. A parallel to the moving decision process can be seen by an examination of the research carried on by rural sociologists and others in the diffusion of new ideas and practices and their acceptance by farmers. Research in this area has been particularly important since the acceptance of these ideas and practices has brought about significant changes in

⁸Earl O. Heady, op. cit., p. 4.

the farming enterprise. Productivity per man, per farm, per acre, and per animal has increased.

Rogers defined the adoption process of new ideas and practices as "a mental process through which an individual passes from first hearing about a new idea to final adoption."⁹ He then listed and described five stages of the adoption process: (1) awareness--individual is exposed to an idea but has no detailed information about it; (2) interest or information--individual is motivated to seek more information about the new idea; (3) evaluation or application--individual evaluates the new idea mentally to see how it will fit into his present or future situation; (4) trial--if the idea or practice is favorable to the individual's situation, then he tries it out, usually on a small scale; and (5) adoption--if the trial stage is favorable, then the idea or practice is adopted on a full scale.¹⁰ Bertrand listed four stages of the adoption process.¹¹ Rogers pointed out the considerable time lag existing in the adoption process and went on to say that a better understanding of the sources of information about a new idea may suggest ways to speed up the diffusion of new technology.¹² Rogers also classified the farmers into five categories according to the relative time at which they

⁹Everett M. Rogers, Social Change in Rural Society (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960), pp. 401-402.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 402-403.

¹¹Alvin L. Bertrand, Rural Sociology (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1958), p. 388.

¹²Rogers, op. cit., p. 405.

adopt a new practice--innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards. Innovators tend to have higher education, larger farms, higher incomes, higher social status, and travel more widely than the other adopter categories.¹³ Thus, the moving decision process parallels the adoption process of new ideas and practices in that both processes can be divided into stages, have a time dimension, are subject to influence by various people, and different alternatives can be considered.

Several articles have been written pertaining to specific aspects of the moving decision process, but none have treated the process in its entirety. A study was made by Guither of two hundred Illinois farm operators who left farming between October 1960 and March 1961 and had capital investment in machinery and equipment. He found that 75 per cent of the farm operators made a voluntary decision to leave farming. The other 25 per cent were forced to quit because of the following reasons, in order of frequency: (1) health failure, (2) lack of income to meet family needs, (3) termination of the lease, (4) sale of the farm, and (5) restriction of credit and heavy debt. He found that the reasons for leaving farming generally fell into five groups: (1) financial, (2) tenure, (3) physical health and retirement at 65 years of age and older, (4) physical health, but under retirement age, and (5) family and other sociological reasons. The study showed that 54 per cent had been thinking about making a change for a year or more. The other 46

¹³Ibid., p. 409.

per cent made their decision in the year prior to leaving.¹⁴ Although Guither used the persons who left farming in his study, this does not mean that these persons made a change of residence. However, studies such as these can aid in understanding the overall moving decision process.

In a different study, Brinkley found eleven of thirty-one variables tested to be significantly related to family mobility. Relatively speaking, fewer movers owned homes, the movers possessed fewer of the level of living items (such as refrigerators, radios, etc.), and they tended to have either lower or higher incomes than the nonmovers. He pointed out that age, stage in the family cycle, and number of children migrated made it clear that younger families were the ones who tended to move. Educational differences between movers and nonmovers were found to be very slight. Other variables such as attitudes toward job and source of greatest satisfaction were also analyzed.¹⁵

Another study by Schulze, Artis, and Beegle revealed that community satisfaction was inversely related with the desire to migrate in a sample of 150 rural high school seniors in central

¹⁴Harold D. Guither, "Factors Influencing Farm Operators' Decisions to Leave Farming," Journal of Farm Economics, XLV (August, 1963), 567-576.

¹⁵Lew E. Brinkley, "Family Mobility in Rural Low-Income Counties of Tennessee" (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1966), pp. 24-70.

Michigan. However, community satisfaction was found not to be inversely related with educational and occupational aspirations.¹⁶

Rossi took four samples of households in Philadelphia (two stable areas but considerably different in socioeconomic status and two mobile areas, also of contrasting socioeconomic status) to study distinguishing features of stable and mobile areas. He found that variables closely related to the family life-cycle were the major social characteristics which differentiated stable and mobile households: large families were more mobile than small families; young families were more mobile than older ones; renters were more mobile than owners; renters who preferred to own were the most mobile of all; and families with complaints about the neighborhood, space within the dwelling, and the costs of rent and maintenance were more likely to have a desire to move. Rossi constructed two indexes--a Mobility Potential Index and a Complaints Index. When these two indexes were combined, they showed a very high relationship to mobility status. He indicated that a family's position in the family life-cycle and their attitude towards home and neighborhood were very good predictors of a family's current desires for moving. Dissatisfaction with the amount of space in their old dwellings was found to be

¹⁶Rolt Schulze, Jay Artis, and J. Allan Beegle, "Measurement of Community Satisfaction and the Decision to Move," Rural Sociology, XXVIII (September, 1963), 279-283.

the most important factor causing voluntary moves, followed by complaints about the former neighborhood and the cost of rent and maintenance of old houses.¹⁷

An attempt was made by Rossi to measure the gap between attitudes toward moving and actual moving behavior. Rossi found that 96 per cent actually stayed, of those who planned on staying, and 80 per cent moved, of those who planned to move. It was pointed out by Rossi that the respondents had the following things in mind in choosing their present homes, in rank order: space in the dwelling, particular dwelling design features, dwelling location, and cost. However, when they made the actual choice they considered costs, followed by space, location, and neighborhood, in that order.¹⁸

In a study of a relatively new urban subdivision in Lafayette, Indiana, Leslie and Richardson analyzed the process by which families and individuals change their place of residence. They sought to explain the decision to move by the life-cycle and career pattern approaches. The authors classified 201 household heads into potentially mobile and non-mobile groups. They found that when these two groups were related to residential mobility intentions, a very striking pattern emerged. Forty-four of the 47 households with upward social mobility potential had residential mobility intentions; whereas, only 20 out of the 154 households with no upward social mobility potential

¹⁷Peter H. Rossi, Why Families Move (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955), pp. 4-7.

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 7-9.

had residential mobility intentions. Forty-two of the 44 households who actually moved within one year were judged to have done so as part of the process of upward social mobility. Thus, the authors concluded, in the sample taken by them, that "upward social mobility far outweighed all other considerations in producing residential mobility."¹⁹

Leslie and Richardson used both family life-cycle and upward social mobility (career pattern), which were considered as the major determinants of residential mobility, to set up a model to explain voluntary residential mobility. They also attempted to explain the process by which these variables were translated into individual decisions to move. Stage of the family life-cycle and career pattern were set up as independent variables with residential mobility set up as the dependent variable. Complaints about the present dwelling were treated as intervening variables which might be considered as the vehicle that translates mobility potential into mobility intentions.²⁰

In a sample of 731 Detroit families, Blood and Wolfe found that 58 per cent of the decisions regarding housing were made jointly by the husband and wife. These authors stressed the importance of the one who makes the final decision.²¹ Another author suggested,

¹⁹Gerald R. Leslie and Arthur H. Richardson, "Life-Cycle, Career Pattern and the Decision to Move," American Sociological Review, XXVI (December, 1961), 894-899.

²⁰Ibid., pp. 901-902.

²¹Robert O. Blood, Jr., and Donald M. Wolfe, Husbands and Wives (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960), pp. 20-21.

however, that one could better predict when and where a couple would move if one knew more about how the instrumental role was played throughout the entire process rather than just knowing who made the final decision to move.²² Kenkel went on to state:

From sociological research we know something about who moves, in terms of such characteristics as age, marital status, education and the like. We know something about where they move in the sense that the migration stream runs from rural areas to urban, from east to west, and from south to north.²³

In addition to knowing who moves and where they move, Kenkel stressed the importance of finding out more about the entire moving decision process which he characterized as being a multistage process.²⁴

Kenkel focussed attention on the initial stages of this process which he called the "moving discussion" or "talking about" moving stage. By doing this, Kenkel went behind the actual decision to move and other decisions as to where, when, and how to move. He posited four assumptions regarding a hypothetical sample of families and discussed each: (1) There would be variation within the sample regarding the number of moving discussions that took place. Changes in the family life-cycle, in occupation, in social status, and the existence of family values and goals were deemed to be the forces

²²William F. Kenkel, "The Family Moving Decision Process," Family Mobility in Our Dynamic Society (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1965), pp. 189-190.

²³Ibid., p. 180.

²⁴Ibid.

that influence the family to begin a discussion about moving. (2) There would be variation within the sample regarding the content of the discussion, that is, what exactly was discussed. (3) There would be variation within the sample regarding the roles played by husbands and wives in the course of discussing a possible move. (4) There would be variation within the samples concerning the outcome of the discussion or, in simpler terms, concerning "how they left" matters.²⁵

Thus, very little research has been directed toward the moving decision process. On the other hand, much research has been devoted to the adoption process of new ideas and practices by farmers. As has been shown, most of the writers have pointed out reasons why individuals or families move and have found certain variables such as those related to the family life-cycle, social status, and attitudes of the family toward home and neighborhood to be the major determinants of moving. The analyses of these writers has been helpful in understanding the decision process with respect to moving, but at most has been fragmented in form. Kenkel departed from this traditional line of analysis and emphasized the overall moving decision process. He dealt primarily with the initial stages of the moving decision process which had to do with discussions about moving, but he also emphasized the importance of decisions made throughout the process.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 180-186,

CHAPTER II

MOVERS AND NONMOVERS

I. THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS RELATIVE TO MOVING

Every family makes decisions. Decisions are made with respect to the education of the family, the occupations of the members of the family, the religious life of the family, where the family wants to live, where and when the family should take part in recreation or other social affairs, and how a family should coordinate the daily tasks of life. Decisions can be made in any number of these or other areas at one time. These decisions do not necessarily have mutually exclusive results. A major decision made in one area will more than likely affect other decision areas. For example, the head of a household might make a decision to change jobs, and this decision might be accompanied by a relocation of the family.

Decisions made concerning where a family is going to live are locational decisions. The decision-making process relative to moving refers to an accumulation of decisions made regarding the residence of the family and what change, if any, should be made in its location. This process can be separated into several stages, and these stages can be visualized by looking at the sample of families that moved in the S-61 project.

The homemakers of the families that moved were asked, "What was the most important consideration that made you feel that you

should move?" The homemakers were asked to look back over the entire process that eventually led to the act of moving and to give their own reasons for moving. For instance, out of seventy-three movers, fifty (68 per cent) moved because of pull factors (to get a place of their own, to get in a better economic situation, to get a better house, etc.); sixteen (22 per cent) moved because of push factors (to get away from the family, to get away from the present job, to get away from an undesirable economic situation, etc.); and only seven (10 per cent) moved because they had to move (road construction, house burned down, owner wanted the house, etc.). Many of the homemakers gave a single reason for moving. If one were to examine the underlying situations of families before they moved, he might find a plurality of reasons for moving; and these reasons would more than likely be complex in nature. Before a family enters into the first stage (when they first become aware of the need to move) of the moving decision process, they already have preconceived ideas and attitudes about the world in which they live. They are also surrounded by a particular set of situations or circumstances, some of which they have some control over and some of which they do not. For example, it would be very difficult for some of the sample families who have low incomes to increase their incomes and, consequently, to improve their level of living without moving away from their communities of origin.

In a study previously mentioned, Brinkley postulated that there was a significant relationship between family mobility and

other selected variables of rural low-income families in Tennessee. He found eleven variables out of the thirty-one tested to be significantly related to family mobility.¹ Since many of these variables focussed attention on the situation of families as it existed in the community of origin, the present chapter will continue this line of analysis and extend it, where possible, to the community of destination.

The moving decision process, besides being affected by existing situations, can be influenced by the stage in the family cycle and by persons outside the immediate family. These two factors will be considered in subsequent chapters.

Many factors, such as the above, set the stage for the moving decision process to begin. The first stage commences when the family becomes aware of the need to move. After the family becomes aware of the need to move, they are faced with various alternatives which is the second stage. The movers were asked, "While thinking about the moving, did you consider any of these choices?" Then, they were given a list of nine choices. Some of the families considered more than one choice, but most of the families (74 per cent) indicated that they had considered only one choice. Choices other than those included in the list were considered but these were few. Out of a total of sixty-nine movers who responded, twenty considered moving to a distant community; sixteen considered moving to a nearby

¹Lew E. Brinkley, "Family Mobility in Rural Low-Income Counties of Tennessee" (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1966), pp. 24-61.

community; and seventeen considered staying in the same community. Also, nineteen considered building a new house while only nine considered remodeling or buying the house being rented. The third stage of the moving decision process involves the evaluation of the various alternatives. Kenkel has suggested that differences in the outcome of decisions can be explained by the nature and content of the decision-making process relative to moving,² which is relevant to the third stage.

The last two stages of this process are the selection of the alternatives and action upon the alternatives selected. A few families (6 per cent) lined the various alternatives up and considered the good and bad points of each. Another 16 per cent of the families disposed of each alternative one at a time until the best one came along. Four per cent of the families seriously considered only one choice from a number of choices. Most of the families (74 per cent), however, indicated that they had only considered one of the alternatives presented. When the selected alternatives were acted upon, we find that 18 per cent moved to a different residence in the same community, 38 per cent moved within the county, 18 per cent moved to an adjacent county, 11 per cent moved to a non-adjacent county within one hundred miles, and only 10 per cent moved more than one hundred miles.³

²William F. Kenkel, "The Family Moving Decision Process," Family Mobility in Our Dynamic Society (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1965), p. 192.

³Brinkley, op. cit., p. 17.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF HOUSEHOLDS THAT MOVE

Kenkel has suggested that changes in the family life-cycle, occupation, social status, and the existence of certain family values are factors that influence families to begin a discussion about moving.⁴ He also found that renters who have the goal of home ownership are more predisposed to move than renters who do not hold this goal.⁵ Variables such as education, income, occupation, and level of living are frequently used singly or in combination as an indicator of a family's social status. It is thought by the writer that many of the above mentioned household characteristics and other related variables have an impact on the moving decision process. The relation of these variables to moving is considered in the following paragraphs.

Age of head. The age of the head of the household is significantly associated with family mobility at the .005 level. (See Table I.) Forty-one per cent of the movers were under forty-five compared with only 19 per cent of the nonmovers. The older heads tended to be relatively non-mobile. For example, the nonmovers had nearly 48 per cent of the heads over sixty compared to 32 per cent of the movers. These findings suggest a direct relationship between family mobility and the age of the head. However, this relationship can possibly be explained in terms of those factors

⁴Kenkel, op. cit., p. 186.

⁵Ibid., p. 184.

TABLE I
MIGRATION STATUS AND THE AGE OF HEAD
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Age of Head	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Young (under 45)	41.1 30	19.4	26.3
Middle-aged (45 to 59)	27.4 20	32.9	31.2
Older (60 or more)	<u>31.5</u> 23	<u>47.7</u>	<u>42.5</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 73 73	N = 155	N = 228

$$\chi^2 = 12.47, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P < .005, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

which are associated with the age of the head. For instance, younger heads usually have expanding families, a low investment in housing and items used in family living, and the ability and the desire to improve their socioeconomic status. The middle-age heads have relatively stable jobs and their families are usually complete. Older heads sometimes have to move due to circumstances beyond their control, but, generally, they don't move unless they have to.

Occupation of head. From Table II the importance of nonfarm work for the movers may be seen. In 1966, over 68 per cent of the movers were employed in occupations other than farming, compared to 28 per cent of the nonmovers. The nonmovers had more than twice the percentage of heads who were farmers as compared to the movers, and a similar relation was found for those heads who were unemployed. The relationship of the migration status of the household and the occupation of the head was significant at the .005 level.

A further analysis of the occupation of the head suggests that movers are much more apt to be among those who make job changes. (See Table III.) For example, the results show that nearly 33 per cent of the movers changed jobs between 1960 and 1966 compared with about 9 per cent of the nonmovers. A partial explanation of this lies in the fact that about 46 per cent of the nonmovers were unemployed. The relationship between changes in occupation and moving was significant at the .005 level.

Moving is frequently accompanied by a change in jobs but it is uncertain which creates the need for which. For one family the

TABLE II
MIGRATION STATUS AND THE OCCUPATION OF HEAD
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Occupation	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Farmer	12.3	26.3	21.7
Other	68.4	28.0	41.2
Not employed	<u>19.3</u>	<u>45.7</u>	<u>37.1</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 57	N = 118	N = 175

$$\chi^2 = 26, \text{ d.f. } = 2, P < .005, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

CRANES & CREST

TABLE III

MIGRATION STATUS AND THE NATURE OF HEAD'S JOB CHANGE FROM
1960 TO 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Nature of Job Change	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
No change	67.2	90.7	83.0
Farmer to other	17.3	5.9	9.6
Other changes	<u>15.5</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>7.4</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 58	N = 118	N = 176

$$\chi^2 = 15.47, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P < .005, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

change of residence may create a need to change jobs. For another family a distant job opportunity may create a need to move. Whichever the direction in specific instances, an analysis of Table IV brings out that movers are prone to change the number of different types of jobs more frequently than are nonmovers. Nearly 46 per cent of the movers, for instance, made two or more changes in types of jobs compared to only 10 per cent of the nonmovers. The nonmovers were more likely to hold only one job during the five year period. This relationship was also significant at the .005 level.

Tables II, III, and IV indicate the importance of the occupation of the head as a stimulus for the moving decision process to begin. Since nonmovers did not tend to change jobs or did not tend to change the number of different types of jobs more than once, this suggests a relatively greater security for the nonmovers. With no great necessity to move in order to effect a change which would improve security, there was, consequently, no need to start a discussion about moving. On the other hand, there seems to be a greater need on the part of some families to move after job changes had been made. Once the change had been brought about, many families began the moving decision process to achieve a level of living or other goals commensurate with the nature of the job change. Indeed, it has already been pointed out that 68 per cent of the movers moved because of pull factors such as the need for a new or better house, the need to get a place of their own, or the need to get closer to work.

TABLE IV
MIGRATION STATUS AND THE NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF JOBS
HELD BY HEAD FROM 1960 TO 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Number of Different Types of Jobs	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
None	14.0	18.5	17.0
One	40.4	71.4	61.4
Two or more	<u>45.6</u>	<u>10.1</u>	<u>21.6</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 57	N = 119	N = 176

$$\chi^2 = 29.05, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P < .005, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

Tenure status. Brinkley in his thesis revealed that renters tended to move more than home owners. In 1960, he found that 86 per cent of the nonmovers were home owners as compared to 53 per cent of the movers.⁶ Those who were renting in 1966 also tended to be the families that moved. (See Table V.) There was also an inclination on the part of movers to move in the direction of home ownership. In 1966, for example, 89 per cent of the nonmovers were home owners compared to 65 per cent of the movers. These results suggest that a value was placed on home ownership by the families involved. To achieve the goal of home ownership, these families had to start the moving decision process. The relation was significant at the .005 level.

It can be seen from Table VI that movers are more likely to make changes in tenure status than are the nonmovers. Nearly 38 per cent of the movers made changes; whereas, only 7 per cent of the nonmovers made changes. Movers had a more pronounced tendency to change from renters to owners than the nonmovers. This emphasizes the fact that those families who desire home ownership are likely to go through the moving decision process. From Table VI it can also be seen that there was no difference between movers and non-movers as to whether the shift was from owner to renter or vice versa. The reason for this can possibly be explained by the fact that a few families were forced out of their homes and others moved

⁶Brinkley, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

TABLE V
MIGRATION STATUS AND TENURE STATUS
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Tenure Status	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Own home	65.3	89.0	81.4
Pay cash rent	22.2	6.5	11.5
Pay other kind of rent or live rent free	<u>12.5</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>7.1</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 72	N = 154	N = 226

$$\chi^2 = 18.32, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P < .005, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE VI
MIGRATION STATUS AND THE CHANGE IN TENURE STATUS FROM
1960 TO 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Change in Tenure Status	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
From renter or free residence to owner	25.0	4.6	11.1
From owner to renter or free residence	12.5	2.0	5.3
No change	<u>62.5</u>	<u>93.4</u>	<u>83.6</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 72	N = 153	N = 225

$$\chi^2 = 34.2, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P < .005, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

because of health failure and retirement. This is consistent with the findings of Guither.⁷

Level of living. It was thought by the writer that the level of living scales developed using Guttman scaling procedures would provide better insight into the reasons for starting the moving decision process than would any single indicator of the level of living. The items included in the Material Possessions Scale together with the percentage of each item possessed by the entire regional sample were as follows (in order of decreasing frequency):⁸

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Mechanical refrigerator | 87 per cent |
| 2. Gas or electric range | 67 per cent |
| 3. Kitchen sink | 53 per cent |
| 4. Water piped into the house | 48 per cent |
| 5. Bath or shower | 32 per cent |
| 6. Vacuum cleaner | 24 per cent |

The Communication Items Scale for the Regional sample included the following items in order of decreasing frequency:⁹

- | | |
|----------|-------------|
| 1. Radio | 82 per cent |
|----------|-------------|

⁷Harold D. Guither, "Factors Influencing Farm Operators' Decisions to Leave Farming," Journal of Farm Economics, XLV (August, 1963), 567-576.

⁸Charles L. Cleland, Scaling Social Data: A Comparison of Scales Developed Using Various Techniques, Southern Cooperative Series Bulletin 108 (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin, December, 1965), p. 20.

⁹Ibid., p. 21.

2. Television	63 per cent
3. Automobile	58 per cent
4. Daily newspaper	31 per cent
5. Telephone	28 per cent
6. Weekly or monthly magazine other than magazine for women or farm or trade journal	20 per cent

Brinkley found that movers tended to have fewer rooms in their houses in 1960, tended to have fewer houses with piped water, and had about the same percentage of houses with inside flush toilets as the nonmovers.¹⁰ He concluded, however, that a level of living scale "provides a better overall indication of circumstances with respect to household items."¹¹ Using the Material Possessions Scale scores as an indicator of the level of living, he found that only 49 per cent of the movers had a score of three or higher compared to 64 per cent of the nonmovers.¹² The patterns of relationship found to exist in 1966 differ quite markedly from those found in 1960. (See Table VII.) While the nonmovers tended to dominate the medium range of the scale scores, the movers were substantially over-represented in the high range. The movers not only had acquired more material possessions; enough mover families had acquired more material

¹⁰Brinkley, op. cit., pp. 26-33.

¹¹Ibid., p. 30.

¹²Ibid., p. 33.

TABLE VII
MIGRATION STATUS AND THE MATERIAL POSSESSIONS SCALE
SCORES IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Scale Scores	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Low (0-1)	11.0	12.9	12.3
Medium (2-4)	24.6	41.3	36.0
High (5-6)	<u>64.4</u>	<u>45.8</u>	<u>51.7</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 73	N = 155	N = 228

$$X^2 = 7.28, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P < .005, X^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

✓

possessions so as to surpass the nonmovers, in percentage terms, in the highest category. This is remarkable since the nonmovers also increased their material possessions. Evidence of general improvement is found in Table VIII. Here it may be seen that nearly half of the households increased their level of living while it remained the same for most of the others. Very few experienced a decrease. Movers more frequently improved their score on the Material Possessions Scale than the nonmovers. For example, 63 per cent of the movers increased their scale scores, while only 41 per cent of the nonmovers increased theirs. Both Tables VII and VIII were statistically significant. These findings suggest that dissatisfaction with level of living (as measured by the Material Possessions Scale) may contribute to a family's beginning to consider the moving decision process and carrying it through to completion.

The Communication Items Scale did not discriminate between the movers and nonmovers as did the Material Possessions Scale. (See Tables IX and X.) The number in each cell was close to the number theoretically expected. Brinkley's findings indicated that movers tended to rate lower on this scale.¹³ However, after the move was made, the mover families had acquired enough of the communication items so that there was essentially no difference

¹³Ibid., p. 47.

TABLE VIII

MIGRATION STATUS AND THE CHANGE IN MATERIAL POSSESSIONS SCALE
SCORES FROM 1960 TO 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Change in Scale Scores	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Increased	63.0	41.3	48.3
Same	27.4	52.9	44.7
Decreased	<u>9.6</u>	<u>5.8</u>	<u>7.0</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 73	N = 155	N = 228

$$\chi^2 = 13.08, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P < .005, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE IX
MIGRATION STATUS AND THE COMMUNICATION ITEMS SCALE
SCORES IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Scale Scores	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Low (0-1)	11.0	11.6	11.4
Medium (2-4)	52.0	47.7	49.1
High (5-6)	<u>37.0</u>	<u>40.7</u>	<u>39.5</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 73	N = 155	N = 228

$$\chi^2 = .37, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE X

MIGRATION STATUS AND THE CHANGE IN COMMUNICATION ITEMS SCALE
SCORES FROM 1960 TO 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Change in Scale Scores	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	Per cent-----		
Increased	45.2	42.6	43.4
Same	38.4	42.6	41.2
Decreased	<u>16.4</u>	<u>14.8</u>	<u>15.4</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 73	N = 155	N = 228

$$\chi^2 = .38, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

between the possession of these items among the movers and nonmovers.

Head and homemaker's social participation. A social participation score for 1966 was computed for both head and homemaker and an average of these two scores was then found. Each head and homemaker was given one point for every organization he or she belonged to, two points for active attendance in these organizations, and three points for serving in a leadership capacity. Brinkley found in 1960 that nonmovers tended to concentrate in the lower and higher ranges and the movers tended to concentrate in the middle range.¹⁴ The pattern of social participation in 1966 was somewhat different with no difference found between movers and nonmovers. (See Table XI.)

Table XII shows the direction of change for both movers and nonmovers with respect to social participation. The movers were more likely to have decreased their participation. These findings suggest that a high degree of social participation in organizations is not likely to be one of the factors associated with a family's beginning the decision process relative to moving; rather, it is a factor which is associated with a family's stability in a community. Families who get involved in the religious, civic, and fraternal organizations are much less prone to consider moving than are those families who are half-heartedly involved. It would be much easier, however, for the families who have fewer social ties to sever them

¹⁴Ibid.

TABLE XI
MIGRATION STATUS AND THE HEAD AND HOMEMAKER'S SOCIAL
PARTICIPATION SCORES IN 1966, FOUR
TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Average of Social Participation	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Low (0-2)	25.4	26.5	26.1
Medium (3-6)	22.5	22.5	22.5
High (7+)	<u>52.1</u>	<u>51.0</u>	<u>51.4</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 71	N = 151	N = 222

$$\chi^2 = .04, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE XII

MIGRATION STATUS AND THE CHANGE IN THE HEAD AND HOMEMAKER'S
SOCIAL PARTICIPATION SCORES FROM 1960 TO 1966,
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Change in Average of Social Participation	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	Per cent		
Increased	24.3	41.6	36.1
Same	30.0	20.1	23.3
Decreased	<u>45.7</u>	<u>38.3</u>	<u>40.6</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 70	N = 149	N = 219

$$\chi^2 = 6.61, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P < .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

and then establish new ties in the community of destination. In one sense, then, families with few social ties are in a freer position to consider moving and actually move if they so desire. Families with stronger ties might consider moving, but the social costs involved in moving may be so high as to deter them from moving.

Total family income. Brinkley found that total family income in 1960 was related to the migration status of the household. Movers tended to have a relatively greater percentage of families in the low (less than \$750) and high (over \$4,000) categories.¹⁵ The pattern was found to be different in 1966. (See Table XIII.) Movers still had relatively greater percentages in the higher income categories, but not in the lower income categories. For example, 24 per cent of the movers were in the "less than \$1,000" category compared to 29 per cent of the nonmovers. As can be seen from Table XIV, 49 per cent of the movers increased their income from a lower to a higher category (say from less than \$1,000 to over \$1,000); whereas, only 37 per cent of the nonmovers changed to a higher income category. Tables XIII and XIV were not significant statistically, but the trend in each was evident.

Education of head and homemaker. When the education of the head and homemaker was cross-tabulated with family mobility, an

¹⁵Ibid., p. 35.

TABLE XIII
MIGRATION STATUS AND TOTAL FAMILY INCOME IN 1966,
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Total Family Income	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	Per cent		
0-\$999	23.5	28.7	27.1
\$1,000-\$2,999	23.5	35.3	31.6
\$3,000-\$5,999	38.3	26.7	30.3
\$6,000 or more	<u>14.7</u>	<u>9.3</u>	<u>11.0</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 68	N = 150	N = 218

$$X^2 = 5.81, \text{ d.f.} = 3, P > .05, X^2_{.05} = 7.81$$

TABLE XIV
MIGRATION STATUS AND THE CHANGE IN TOTAL FAMILY INCOME
FROM 1960 TO 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Change in Total Family Income	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Increased	48.5	36.7	40.4
Same	41.2	42.7	42.2
Decreased	<u>10.3</u>	<u>20.6</u>	<u>17.4</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 68	N = 150	N = 218

$$\chi^2 = 4.54, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

inconsistent trend was revealed. (See Tables XV and XVI.) The movers tended to have a relatively greater percentage of heads with seven years of education or under and a relatively greater percentage of heads with nine years of education or more. For some reason the nonmovers tended to be over-represented among those completing only the eighth grade.

Roughly the same results were obtained with respect to the homemaker, except that the homemakers tended to concentrate in the higher grade categories; and, therefore, as a group has more education than the heads. Although not statistically significant, the education of the homemaker seems to be one of the factors which leads to a moving discussion. The homemaker can have just as much influence in causing a family not to move as she can in causing a family to move. The data for grades eight or above bear this out for both movers and nonmovers. It should be noted that over two-thirds of the heads and homemakers have less than a ninth grade education. Since many jobs in industry today require more education, it is evident that many of these low-income people do not have the education and skills to move into the industrial labor market and compete for employment.

Size of household. As can be seen from Table XVII, there is apparently no relation between size of household and migration status when households are divided into those with one or two and those with three or more persons. There was some tendency for changes in the

TABLE XV
MIGRATION STATUS AND EDUCATION OF HEAD IN 1966,
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Formal Education of Head	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	Per cent		
Four years or less	28.6	23.8	25.3
Five-seven years	27.1	23.2	24.4
Eight years	18.6	31.1	27.2
Nine years or more	<u>25.7</u>	<u>21.9</u>	<u>23.1</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 70	N = 151	N = 221

$$\chi^2 = 3.81, \text{ d.f.} = 3, P < .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 7.81$$

TABLE XVI
MIGRATION STATUS AND EDUCATION OF HOMEMAKER IN 1966,
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Formal Education of Homemaker	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Four years or less	10.0	9.0	9.4
Five-seven years	31.4	21.5	24.8
Eight years	22.9	36.8	32.2
Nine years or more	<u>35.7</u>	<u>32.7</u>	<u>33.6</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 70	N = 144	N = 214

$$\chi^2 = 4.89, \text{ d.f.} = 3, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 7.81$$

TABLE XVII
MIGRATION STATUS AND SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD IN 1966,
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Size of Household	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Two or less	46.6	49.0	48.2
Three or more	<u>53.4</u>	<u>51.0</u>	<u>51.8</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 73	N = 155	N = 228

$$\chi^2 = .12, \text{ d.f.} = 1, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 3.84$$

size of the household to be related to migration status but this was not significant statistically. (See Table XVIII.) Movers tended to increase the size of their households to a somewhat greater extent than did the nonmovers while the nonmovers tended to decrease the size of their households to a greater extent than the movers.

Other household characteristics. When the number of children migrated, the marital status of the head, the household dependency index scores, and the heads and homemakers' anomia scores were cross-tabulated with the migration status of the household, no statistical relationships were found, (See the Appendix.)

TABLE XVIII

MIGRATION STATUS AND THE CHANGE IN SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD
FROM 1960 TO 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Change in Size of Household	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Increased	21.9	14.8	17.1
No change	37.0	37.4	37.3
Decreased	<u>41.1</u>	<u>47.8</u>	<u>45.6</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 73	N = 155	N = 228

$$\chi^2 = 1.94, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

CHAPTER III

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TIME SPAN AND SELECTED HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

It was thought that many of the variables found to be related to the migration status of the household would also be related to time span. The purpose of this chapter is to examine this relationship and test the general hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between the time span involved in the decision to move and certain household characteristics of low-income families in Tennessee. Also, the relationship between time span and characteristics found to be significantly related to it will be examined to determine if the relationship still holds when the stage in the family life-cycle is held constant. Rossi indicated that a family's position in the family life-cycle and their attitudes toward home and the neighborhood were very good predictors of a family's current desires for moving.¹ Other writers used the family life-cycle and upward social mobility to explain voluntary residential mobility.²

Time span was defined as the time period between the family's first perceiving of the need to move and actually moving. The time involved for each family was determined. Three categories were set

¹Peter H. Rossi, Why Families Move (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955), pp. 4-9.

²Gerald R. Leslie and Arthur H. Richardson, "Life-Cycle, Career Pattern and the Decision to Move," American Sociological Review, XXVI (December, 1961), 894-899.

up with twenty-one families in the short time period, twenty-five families in the medium time period, and twenty-six families in the long time period. The short, medium, and long periods of time were one month or less, two to five months, and six to sixty-seven months in length, respectively. The "short" movers will be referred to as immediate movers, the "medium" as intermediate movers, and the "long" as delayed movers.

Stage in family life-cycle. Looking first at the relation between time span and stage in the family cycle, the results of the analysis show that they are significantly related statistically.³ (See Table XIX.) As anticipated, the families in the early stage tended to have an immediate time span or to make decisions about moving rather quickly. The immediate movers had 32 per cent in the relatively young couple category; whereas, only 8 per cent of the delayed movers were in this category. In general, the families in the later stage of the life-cycle tended to be concentrated in the delayed time period. Fifty-eight per cent of the families with a delayed time span were in the later stage compared to only 16 per cent of the families with an immediate time span.

Age of head. Although the age of the head was not statistically related to time span, there is a discernible trend. (See Table XX.)

³In this chapter, the various stages of the family life-cycle will be referred to as early, middle, and late stages.

TABLE XIX
TIME SPAN AND STAGE IN FAMILY CYCLE
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Stage in Family Cycle	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Couple only, relatively young	32	28	8	21
Oldest child under 17	52	32	34	39
Oldest child over 17 or older couple	<u>16</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>40</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 19	N = 25	N = 26	N = 70

$$X^2 = 9.88, \text{ d.f.} = 4, P < .05, X^2_{.05} = 9.49$$

TABLE XX
TIME SPAN AND THE AGE OF HEAD IN 1966,
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Age of Head	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Young (under 45)	52	32	39	40
Middle-aged (46 to 59)	29	23	23	28
Older (60 or more)	<u>19</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>32</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 21	N = 25	N = 26	N = 72

$$\chi^2 = 3.15, \text{ d.f.} = 4, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 9.49$$

The younger heads tended to be clustered in the immediate time span group, and the older heads tended to fall in the delayed time span group. When one considers the physical health of the younger heads and their tendency to change jobs, one would expect them to make quick decisions. Apparently, older heads tend to weigh more carefully all the factors involved in moving and come to a more considered decision.

Occupation of head, There is no statistical relationship between the occupation of the head and time span. (See Table XXI.) A partial explanation of this fact may lie in the categories used which involved dichotomization into nonfarm and farm work, including not employed. When the number of different types of jobs held by the last five years were cross-tabulated with time span, an irregular pattern appeared. (See Table XXII.) While the immediate and delayed movers tended to hold one job or none, the intermediate movers tended to be the ones who made two or more changes in types of jobs. It was expected that movers who held two or more types of jobs would have an immediate time span, and those who held one or no jobs would have a delayed time span. However, the relation was not statistically significant.

Tenure status. There was a tendency on the part of the home owners to be among those who carefully weighed or considered their moving decisions. However, tenure status was not statistically

TABLE XXI
TIME SPAN AND THE OCCUPATION OF HEAD
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Occupation	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Farmer or not employed	29	30	32	30
Other	<u>71</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>70</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 17	N = 20	N = 19	N = 56

$$X^2 = .02, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, X^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE XXII

TIME SPAN AND THE NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF JOBS HELD
BY HEAD FROM 1960 TO 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Number of Different Types of Jobs	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
None or one	65	35	63	54
Two or more	<u>35</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>46</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 17	N = 20	N = 19	N = 56

$$\chi^2 = 4.3, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

related to time span. (See Table XXIII.) Renters tended to be the immediate movers. This is logical since renters would not have to consider the risks of home ownership. Whereas, those who wanted to own homes and those who already owned homes would study the risks involved; and for those interested in building, there would be the delay until the home was built.

Level of living. Just as the Material Possessions Scale scores were found to be statistically related to the migration status of the household, these scores were also found to be statistically related to time span. (See Table XXIV.) A positive relationship was found to exist between the two variables. Those families with lower scores on the Material Possessions Scale tended to be among the immediate movers; those families with higher scores on the Material Possessions Scale tended to take the longest time in the moving decision process.

The problem now at hand is to specify one of the conditions under which the relationship between time span and the Material Possessions Scale scores becomes more or less pronounced. When the stage in the family cycle was held constant, there was no relationship among the families in the early and late stages of the family cycle.⁴ (See Table XXV.) However, in the middle stage, the strength of the relationship originally found between time span and the Material Possessions Scale scores appeared to be increased. The

⁴The values of the n's were so small that a computation of Chi-square and the Coefficient of Contingency was not warranted.

TABLE XXIII
 TIME SPAN AND TENURE STATUS IN 1966,
 FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Tenure Status	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Own home	50	68	73	65
Pay cash rent or other kind of rent or live rent free	<u>50</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>35</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 20	N = 25	N = 26	N = 71

$$X^2 = 2.81, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, X^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE XXIV

TIME SPAN AND THE MATERIAL POSSESSIONS SCALE SCORES
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Scale Scores	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Low and medium (0-4)	57	32	23	36
High (5-6)	<u>43</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>64</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 21	N = 25	N = 26	N = 72

$$\chi^2 = 6.12, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P < .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE XXV

RELATION OF THE MATERIAL POSSESSIONS SCALE SCORES TO TIME SPAN AMONG FAMILIES
IN EARLY, MIDDLE, AND LATE STAGES OF FAMILY CYCLE,
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Scale Scores	Stage of Family Cycle									
	Early Time Span			Middle Time Span			Late Time Span			Per cent
	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long	
Low or medium (0-4)	33	29	50	70	38	11	33	30	27	
High (5-6)	67	71	50	30	62	89	67	70	73	
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Number	N = 6	N = 7	N = 2	N = 10	N = 8	N = 9	N = 3	N = 10	N = 15	

middle stage is, therefore, the period of the family cycle in which the relationship holds and "explains" the existence of the significant relationship found when all of the families were considered at the same time. Other characteristics of either the households or their situations were more influential on the amount of time families without children of a dependent age required to make a move once the need for the move had been recognized.

The Communication Items Scale scores were also significantly related statistically to time span, but not to migration status. (See Table XXVI.) Eighty-six per cent of the immediate movers scored low on the Communication Items Scale compared to 58 per cent of the delayed movers. Those families who scored high tended to take more time in the moving decision process. Apparently, knowledge of the number of the level of living items in the home would be of value when one tries to predict how long it will take for some families in rural low-income areas in Tennessee to move.

When the stage in the family life-cycle was held constant, the relationship was the same in the early and middle stages, but the relationship was diminished and modified in the later stage. (See Table XXVII.) Since there was a relatively strong relationship in the early and middle stages, the relationship between time span and the Communication Items Scale scores presumably becomes more pronounced when only these two stages are used in the analysis.

TABLE XXVI
TIME SPAN AND THE COMMUNICATION ITEMS SCALE SCORES
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Scale Scores	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Low and medium (0-4)	86	52	58	64
High (5-6)	<u>14</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>36</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 21	N = 25	N = 26	N = 72

$$\chi^2 = 6.3, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P < .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE XXVII

RELATION OF THE COMMUNICATION ITEMS SCALE SCORES TO TIME SPAN AMONG
FAMILIES IN EARLY, MIDDLE, AND LATE STAGES OF
FAMILY CYCLE, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Scale Scores	Stage of Family Cycle								
	Early			Middle			Late		
	Time Span			Time Span			Time Span		
	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long
-----Per cent-----									
Low or medium (0-4)	83	29	50	90	38	44	67	80	67
High (5-6)	17	71	50	10	62	56	33	20	33
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 6	N = 7	N = 2	N = 10	N = 8	N = 9	N = 3	N = 10	N = 15

Head and homemaker's social participation. This variable was related quite significantly to time span statistically. (See Table XVIII.) A positive relationship was found to exist between the two variables. Those movers with low social participation scores tended to be immediate movers; and those with high scores exhibited a tendency to extend their time span. The association between the migration status of the household and social participation was almost zero. Although social participation was not associated with moving, it apparently is related to the length of time required to complete the moving decision process. Generally, movers with fewer ties in the community of origin will make the moving decision process shorter, and those with stronger ties will make the moving decision process longer.

When the stage in the family life-cycle was held constant, for only one group, the middle stage, was social participation positively related to time span. (See Table XXIX.) In the other groups, the relationship vanished. Thus, it is concluded that the relationship between time span and the family's social participation holds only for families in the middle stage of the family life-cycle.

Education of head and homemaker. The education of the head was not statistically related to time span, but there was a slight tendency toward a positive relationship. (See Table XXX.) However, the education of the homemaker was significantly related to time span at the .005 level. (See Table XXXI.) Homemakers with four years of education or less tended to be immediate movers; the homemakers with five to eight years of education tended to be delayed movers; and

TABLE XXVIII

TIME SPAN AND THE HEAD AND HOMEMAKER'S SOCIAL PARTICIPATION
SCORES IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Average of Social Participation	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Low (0-2)	33	29	16	26
Medium (3-6)	43	50	20	37
High (7+)	<u>24</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>37</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 21	N = 24	N = 25	N = 70

$$\chi^2 = 12.31, \text{ d.f.} = 4, P < .025, \chi^2_{.05} = 9.49$$

TABLE XXIX

RELATION OF THE HEAD AND HOMEMAKER'S SOCIAL PARTICIPATION SCORES
TO TIME SPAN AMONG FAMILIES IN EARLY, MIDDLE, AND LATE STAGES
OF FAMILY CYCLE, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Social Participation Scores	Stage of Family Cycle								
	Early			Middle			Late		
	Time Span			Time Span			Time Span		
	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long
	-----Per cent-----								
Low (0-2)	17	0	0	40	13	0	34	50	29
Medium (3-6)	50	100	100	40	50	44	33	20	57
High (7+)	<u>33</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>14</u>
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 6	N = 6	N = 2	N = 10	N = 8	N = 9	N = 3	N = 10	N = 14

TABLE XXX
TIME SPAN AND EDUCATION OF HEAD IN 1966,
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Formal Education of Head	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	Per cent			
Four years or less	32	34	23	29
Five-eight years	52	33	50	45
Nine years or more	<u>16</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>26</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 19	N = 24	N = 26	N = 69

$$\chi^2 = 2.89, \text{ d.f.} = 4, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 9.49$$

TABLE XXXI
TIME SPAN AND EDUCATION OF HOMEMAKER IN 1966,
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Formal Education of Homemaker	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Four years or less	47	21	0	20
Five-eight years	42	37	65	49
Nine years or more	<u>11</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>31</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 19	N = 24	N = 26	N = 69

$$\chi^2 = 18.01, \text{ d.f.} = 4, P < .005, \chi^2_{.05} = 9.49$$

those homemakers with nine years of education or more tended to be intermediate in the time taken to make a move. The education of the homemaker was not statistically related to migration status. It appears the homemaker has more influence on the length of the moving process than on moving as such.

When the stage in the family life-cycle was held constant, only one stage showed the same pattern of relationship which was found between the education of the homemaker and time span. (See Table XXXII.) Again, this period was the middle stage. The condition, then, under which the relationship between time span and the education of the homemaker holds is that the family be in the middle stage of the family life-cycle.

Total family income. The results of the analysis revealed no statistical relationship between the income of the household and time span. (See Table XXXIII.) Movers who earned less than \$1,000 tended to be immediate; and those under \$3,000 but over \$1,000 tended to be more careful. Those families with incomes of \$3,000 or over tended to take a shorter time span in making their decision to move. However, since the results were not significant, one cannot generalize and say that this will hold true for the total population.

Size of household. It was expected that the size of the household would be related to time span. (See Table XXXIV.) Although the findings were not statistically significant, there does seem to be a discernible relationship. Movers with smaller families tended to be intermediate while those with larger families tended to be delayed.

TABLE XXXII

RELATION OF EDUCATION OF HOMEMAKER TO TIME SPAN AMONG FAMILIES
IN EARLY, MIDDLE, AND LATE STAGES OF FAMILY
CYCLE, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Formal Education of Homemaker	Stage of Family Cycle									
	Early			Middle			Late			Per cent
	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long	Short	Medium	Long	
Four or less	0	14	0	20	13	0	0	33	0	
Five-eight	67	43	100	50	25	33	100	45	80	
Nine or more	<u>33</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>20</u>	
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Number	N = 6	N = 7	N = 2	N = 10	N = 8	N = 9	N = 3	N = 9	N = 15	

TABLE XXXIII

TIME SPAN AND TOTAL FAMILY INCOME IN 1966,
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Total Family Income	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
0-\$999	29	21	23	24
\$1,000-\$2,999	14	21	36	24
\$3,000 or more	<u>57</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>52</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 21	N = 24	N = 22	N = 67

$$\chi^2 = 3.44, \text{ d.f.} = 4, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 9.49$$

TABLE XXXIV
TIME SPAN AND SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD IN 1966,
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Size of Household	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	Per cent			
Two or less	43	56	39	46
Three or more	<u>57</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>54</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 21	N = 25	N = 26	N = 72

$$\chi^2 = 1.68, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

Choices considered when thinking about moving. In Table XXXV it may be seen that movers who thought about moving to a distant community tended to have a time span of two to five months (medium). Those movers who thought about moving to a nearby community tended to have a time span of six months or more (long). (See Table XXXVI.) Movers who thought about moving but staying in the same community tended to be little different from others. (See Table XXXVII.) When building a new house was considered, there was a statistically significant tendency for the movers to be included in the long time span category. (See Table XXXVIII.) The commitment to move was actually made when the contract to have the house built was entered into. The delay between that item and the completion of the residence caused these families to be included in the long time span group. For this reason, building a new house was not used in the family life-cycle analysis. Table XXXIX shows the same pattern except the numbers involved are too small to permit meaningful interpretation. When thinking about changing the status of the old house such as remodeling or buying the house being rented, the time period tended to be long. The findings of the last five tables, although only one showed a statistically significant relation, point to the fact that when the mover families thought about moving, the moving decision process was apt to be somewhat longer for those families who considered building a new house or changing the status of the old house.

TABLE XXXV
 TIME SPAN AND MOVING TO A DISTANT COMMUNITY
 FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Choices	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Moving to a distant community	22	40	23	29
Other choices	<u>78</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>71</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 18	N = 25	N = 26	N = 69

$$X^2 = 2.31, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, X^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE XXXVI
 TIME SPAN AND MOVING TO A NEARBY COMMUNITY
 FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Choices	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Moving to a nearby community	22	16	31	23
Other choices	<u>78</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>77</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 18	N = 25	N = 26	N = 69

$$\chi^2 = 1.57, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE XXXVII
 TIME SPAN AND MOVING BUT STAYING IN SAME COMMUNITY
 FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Choices	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Moving but staying in same community	22	28	23	25
Other choices	<u>78</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>75</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 18	N = 25	N = 26	N = 69

$$\chi^2 = .24, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE XXXVIII
TIME SPAN AND BUILDING A NEW HOUSE
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Choices	Time Span			Total
	Short ^a	Medium	Long	
	Per cent			
Building a new house	17	20	42	27
Other choices	<u>83</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>73</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 18	N = 25	N = 26	N = 69

$$\chi^2 = 4.56, \text{ d.f.} = 1, P < .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 3.84$$

^aThe short and medium time periods were combined to compute the Chi-square value.

TABLE XXXIX

TIME SPAN AND CHANGING THE STATUS OF OLD HOUSE
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Choices	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Changing status of old house	6 ^a	12	19	13
Other choices	<u>94</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>87</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 18	N = 25	N = 26	N = 69

^aSince the expected values were small in several cells, a Chi-square value was not computed.

Head and homemaker's anomia. The homemakers with high anomia scores tended to be somewhat over-represented in the medium time period. The relationship is not statistically significant, however. (See Table XL.) The relation between the heads' anomia and time span was somewhat different from that of the homemakers' anomia and time span. (See Table XLI.) Although the Chi-square value is not statistically significant, there is a clear trend. Heads with low or medium scores tended to have a longer time span, and heads with high anomia scores tended to have a shorter time span.

Number of rooms in the house. There is a direct relationship between the number of rooms in the house and time span, and the relationship is statistically significant. (See Table XLII.) Those who planned on moving into a house with four rooms or less tended to make the time span shorter, and the mover families that planned on moving to a house with five rooms or more were prone to make the time span longer. This probably can be explained by the fact that owning or renting a larger house entails more responsibility and risk. Also, it usually takes a longer period of time when a family builds a new house, and such houses are usually larger. Since the number of rooms in the house is probably related to the need for additional space in the house, it was not included in the family life-cycle analysis.

Other household characteristics. When the number of children migrated, the household dependency index scores, and the marital

TABLE XL
TIME SPAN AND THE HOMEMAKERS' ANOMIA SCALE SCORES
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Anomia Scores	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Low (0-1)	32	29	24	28
Medium (2-4)	36	17	40	31
High (5-6)	<u>32</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>41</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 19	N = 24	N = 25	N = 68

$$X^2 = 4.27, \text{ d.f.} = 4, P > .05, X^2_{.05} = 9.49$$

TABLE XLI
 TIME SPAN AND THE HEADS' ANOMIA SCALE SCORES
 IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Anomia Scores	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Low and medium (0-4)	50	68	76	66
High (5-6)	<u>50</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>34</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 16	N = 19	N = 21	N = 56

$$X^2 = 2.85, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, X^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE XLII
TIME SPAN AND THE NUMBER OF ROOMS IN THE HOUSE
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Number of Rooms	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Four or less	70	39	36	47
Five ^a	15	35	24	25
Six or more	<u>15</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>28</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 20	N = 23	N = 25	N = 68

$$\chi^2 = 6.03, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P < .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

^aThe second and third rows were combined to compute the Chi-square value.

status of the head were cross tabulated with time span, no statistical relationships were found. (See the Appendix.)

CHAPTER IV

THE INFLUENCE OF OUTSIDERS ON THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS RELATIVE TO MOVING

Since the adoption process of new farm ideas and practices was influenced by various persons and sources of information, it was thought that the moving decision process would be influenced by persons or other sources of information outside the immediate family.

When just the sources of information about house availability are considered, one finds that sixteen families (out of the sixty-eight families who gave information about the source of house availability) got the information from relatives; fifteen families got the information from friends; seventeen families had the house built; and twenty families found out from other sources. Although the information about the availability of houses for rent or sale did come mostly from friends and relatives, there is no indication of the relative influence of these persons on the moving decision process. The families who moved were asked with whom they had talked outside the immediate family about the move. The frequency of mention was used as an indicator of the relative influence of various persons on the moving decision process. Relatives and the owners of the houses were mentioned most frequently by the families who moved. The frequency of mention for real estate salesmen, builders, and friends was so small that a Chi-square test of significance was

inappropriate. Consequently, no cross-tabulations were made on these latter groups with time span.

Influence of persons outside the immediate family. The results of the analysis showed that 72 per cent of the movers did discuss the intended move with someone outside the immediate family although the extensiveness of such discussion is not known. (See Table XLIII.) A pattern is evident in the table but it is not significant, statistically. In general, those movers who did not discuss the move with someone outside the family tended to be immediate in their decision-making relative to moving, and those movers who did discuss the move with someone outside the family tended to prolong the moving decision process. Therefore, relatives, friends, and other persons do seem to exert a little influence on the moving decision process though the influence may be limited to the time required to reach a decision.

Influence of seller of house. The trend here is different from that found for persons outside the immediate family. (See Table XLIV.) When movers did talk to the seller of the house, they tended to have a short time span; and, if they did not discuss the move with the seller of the house, they tended to have a longer time span. Apparently, the seller of the house had some influence in getting families to move more quickly but the two variables are not statistically related.

Influence of relatives. The association between the influence of relatives and time span was almost zero. (See Table XLV.) The

TABLE XLIII

TIME SPAN AND THE INFLUENCE OF PERSONS OUTSIDE IMMEDIATE
FAMILY, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Move Discussed Outside Family	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	----- Per cent -----			
No	33	33	19	28
Yes	<u>67</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>72</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 18	N = 24	N = 26	N = 68

$$X^2 = 1.59, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, X^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE XLIV
TIME SPAN AND THE INFLUENCE OF SELLER OF HOUSE,
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Influence of Seller of House	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
No	44	67	61	59
Yes	<u>56</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>41</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 18	N = 24	N = 26	N = 68

$$\chi^2 = 2.22, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE XLV
TIME SPAN AND THE INFLUENCE OF RELATIVES,
FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Influence of Relatives	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
No	78	71	71	71
Yes	<u>22</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>29</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 18	N = 24	N = 26	N = 68

$$\chi^2 = .79, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

trend, however, was in the expected direction. If the mover families did talk to relatives about the proposed move, the length of the time span tended to be delayed.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The decision-making process relative to moving was described as an accumulation of decisions made regarding the residence of the family and what change, if any, should be made in its location. This process was conceptualized in five stages: (1) awareness of the need to move, (2) knowledge of alternatives, (3) evaluation of alternatives, (4) selection of alternatives, and (5) action on alternatives selected.

An earlier study made by Brinkley of the situations of families in 1960 was used in several instances in this study to compare the change in the situations of the same families from 1960-1966.

In the present study, nine out of twenty-five variables tested were found to be significantly related, statistically, to the migration status of the household. These nine variables are considered to be the main factors which predispose families in rural low-income areas in Tennessee to begin the moving decision process. In general, families with young heads tended to be among the movers. Those families whose heads had (1) nonfarm jobs, (2) made job changes, or (3) held two jobs or more tended to be among the movers rather than nonmovers. Also, those families who changed tenure status had a tendency to be among the movers. As compared with the nonmovers, the movers in 1960 had relatively fewer material possessions. By 1966 these movers had increased their material possessions enough to surpass the nonmovers, in percentage terms, in the highest category.

Families who decreased their social participation were over-represented among the movers.

Nonmovers, compared to the movers, tended to be somewhat over-represented among older heads, unemployed heads, or heads who made no job change between 1960-1966. Nonmovers in 1966 tended to be homeowners more so than the movers and also made practically no change in tenure status. While the movers tended to have high scores on the Material Possessions Scale, the nonmovers tended to have medium scores. As compared to the movers, the nonmovers tended to contain the greater number of families who increased their social participation.

Several variables were not statistically related to the migration status of the household. However, families with incomes of \$3,000 or more tended to be movers rather than nonmovers. Also, heads and homemakers with nine or more years of education tended to be somewhat over-represented among the movers.

When time span was cross-tabulated with certain household characteristics, seven out of twenty-nine independent variables were found to be statistically related to time span. Immediate movers tended to have the following characteristics: low Material Possessions Scale scores, low Communication Items Scale scores, low social participation scores, homemakers with four years of education or less, and interest in homes with four rooms or less. Although the relationships were not significant, the immediate movers also tended to be younger, to be renters, and to have incomes either less than \$1,000 or \$3,000 or more. The delayed movers tended to have high Material Possessions

Scale scores, high Communication Items Scale scores, high social participation scores, homemakers with five to eight years of education, and interest in homes with five or more rooms. Families who considered building a new house tended to be among the delayed movers.

When the stage in the family life-cycle was cross-tabulated with time span, it was found to be significantly related to time span. In general, those families in the early stages tended to be immediate movers while those in the later stage tended to be delayed movers. The stages in the family life-cycle were then examined to see if they exerted a controlling influence on the relationship between time span and four household characteristics found significantly related to it.

The findings suggest that the stage in the family life-cycle does specify one of the conditions under which the relationship between time span and other related variables holds. It is in the middle stage of the family life-cycle that selected family characteristics are related to length of the time span in the moving decision process. Only for those households with dependent children did the time span grow longer with increased level of living, greater education of the homemaker, and more intensive participation in formal social organizations.

For families in the early stage, the pattern of relationship remained the same only between time span and the Communication Items Scale scores. The relationship between time span and the three other variables (social participation scores, Material Possessions Scale scores, and education of the homemaker) did not hold.

When the later stage was considered, the pattern of relationship remained the same only when time span was related to the Material Possessions Scale scores; however, this relationship was diminished.

It was thought that persons outside the immediate family would have a significant impact on the moving decision process. The results of the analysis did not confirm the relationships as being statistically significant. However, patterns of relationship could be seen. If the movers talked with persons outside the immediate family, the time span tended to be longer; if they talked to the seller of the house, the time span tended to be short; and if they talked to relatives, the time span tended to be long. Additional research would be required to determine the nature of the influence of outsiders on the moving decision process.

A few concluding statements can be made about the analysis and results:

In general, moving has been necessary for some families in rural low-income areas in Tennessee to adjust to the changing situations and changing opportunities. Although some of the moves were only a short distance, adjustments still had to be made in terms of housing, things needed for the house, and family life activities.

Although statistical tests of significance did confirm the relation of certain factors to the migration status of the household, this does not mean that any one of these factors caused the moving decision process to begin. However, moving does seem to be related

to a perceived need for action; and some of the factors above may stimulate a family to begin the moving decision process and carry it through to completion. Even though some of these factors may cause a family to begin the moving decision process, further investigation is needed to point out the intervening variables.

Those agencies concerned with assisting families in low-income rural areas whose programs involve moving the families will achieve success more easily among those families with the characteristics found to be associated with a short moving-decision time span. These include low level of living, low education of homemaker, interest in a small house, and little formal social involvement for those families with dependent children at home. For families without dependent children these characteristics of the family and the home make little difference in speed of decision making in this area.

There may be circumstances other than stage in family cycle which govern when and where these relations hold but further research would be required to determine what they are.



SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bertrand, Alvin L. Rural Sociology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1958.
- Blood, Robert O., Jr., and Donald M. Wolfe. Husbands and Wives. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960.
- Brinkley, Lew E. "Family Mobility in Rural Low-Income Counties of Tennessee." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1966.
- Cleland, Charles L. Scaling Social Data: A Comparison of Scales Developed Using Various Techniques. Southern Cooperative Series Bulletin 108. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Agricultural Experiment Station, December, 1965.
- Guither, Harold D. "Factors Influencing Farm Operators' Decisions to Leave Farming," Journal of Farm Economics, XLV (August, 1963), 567-756.
- Haddox, Benjamin E. Joint Decision-Making Patterns and Related Factors Among Low-Income Rural Families. Southern Cooperative Series Bulletin 109. State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University Agricultural Experiment Station, December, 1965.
- Hallman, Howard. "Dimensions of Rural Poverty," Rural Poverty Conference Proceedings. Washington: National Association for Community Development, 1967.
- Hammonds, André D. "Socio-Economic Status and Anomia: An Interpretation and Specification of the Relationship." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1966.
- Heady, Earl O. "Comments and Overview," Family Mobility in Our Dynamic Society. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1965.
- Kenkel, William F. "The Family Moving Decision Process," Family Mobility in Our Dynamic Society. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1965.
- Leslie, Gerald R., and Arthur H. Richardson. "Life-Cycle, Career Pattern and the Decision to Move," American Sociological Review, XXVI (December, 1961), 894-899.
- Rogers, Everett M. Social Change in Rural Society. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960.

Rossi, Peter H. Why Families Move. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955.

Schulze, Rolt, and others. "Measurement of Community Satisfaction and the Decision to Move," Rural Sociology, XXVIII (September, 1963), 279-283.

Taylor, Lee, and Charles W. Glasgow. Occupations and Low-Income Rural People. Southern Cooperative Series Bulletin 90. Baton Rouge: Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station, December, 1963.

United States Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1966. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.



APPENDIX

An examination of Table XLVI reveals that there is essentially no difference between migration status and the number of children migrated. Nonmovers did, however, show a slight tendency to have no migrants from the home; whereas, movers tended to have more than one migrant who had left home.

When tested statistically, migration status and the marital status of the head were found to be independent. (See Table XLVII.) However, there was a slight tendency for the movers to have more household heads who were married than did the nonmovers. The nonmovers tended to have a few more of the single, separated, divorced, and widowed household heads.

The cross-tabulation of a composite dependency index with family mobility is seen in Table XLVIII. The scores for individual households were figured by use of the following formula:

$$D^1 = \frac{1 + X}{1 + Y + Z}$$

Where X = Number 14 through 64 years of age

Y = Number under 14 years of age

Z = Number 65 years of age and over

The results indicate no tendency for families with greater dependency to be either movers or nonmovers.

¹Larger scores (4.0 or more) represent lesser dependency, and smaller scores (0.1-0.9) represent greater dependency.

TABLE XLVI

MIGRATION STATUS AND THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN MIGRATED
FROM 1960 TO 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Number of Children Migrated	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
None	60.3	66.4	64.4
One	23.3	22.4	22.7
Two or more	<u>16.4</u>	<u>11.2</u>	<u>12.9</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 73	N = 152	N = 225

$$\chi^2 = 1.37, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE XLVII
MIGRATION STATUS AND THE MARITAL STATUS OF HEAD
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Marital Status of Head	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Married	75.4	69.0	71.1
Other	<u>24.6</u>	<u>31.0</u>	<u>28.9</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 73	N = 155	N = 228

$$\chi^2 = .96, \text{ d.f.} = 1, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 3.84$$

TABLE XLVIII

MIGRATION STATUS AND THE HOUSEHOLD DEPENDENCY INDEX SCORES
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Index Scores	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	Per cent		
1.9 or less	50.0	53.5	52.4
2.0 or more	<u>50.0</u>	<u>46.5</u>	<u>47.6</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 72	N = 155	N = 227

$$\chi^2 = .25, \text{ d.f.} = 1, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 3.84$$

When the heads' anomia² scores were cross-tabulated with family mobility, no relation was found between the two variables. (See Table XLIX.) Mover heads tended to be slightly over-represented in the medium category, and the nonmovers tended to be over-represented in the high category. The fact that the movers were not over-represented in the high anomia category is evidence of the fact that movers had not become quite as discouraged as had the nonmovers. Both mover and nonmover heads tended to increase in anomia, with a slightly greater proportion of the movers showing some increase. (See Table L.) Since both movers and nonmovers increased in anomia to approximately the same extent, anomia, as such, apparently was not related to moving.

When the homemakers' anomia scores were cross-tabulated with family mobility, virtually no relationship was found. (See Table LI.) In Table LII may be seen the same increased pattern of anomia for the homemakers as was found in Table L for the heads, except that somewhat more of the heads had an increase. Again, the change in anomia appears to have no relation to moving.

No relation was found between time span and the number of children migrated. (See Table LIII.)

As can be seen from Table LIV, no statistical relationship

²Anomia reflects a feeling of "self-to-others alienation" and is often described in terms of feelings of powerlessness, helplessness, meaninglessness, anxiety, or despair on the part of the individual. See André D. Hammonds, "Socio-Economic Status and Anomia: An Interpretation and Specification of the Relationship" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1966), pp. 4-5.

TABLE XLIX
MIGRATION STATUS AND THE HEADS' ANOMIA SCALE SCORES
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Anomia Scores	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Low (0-1)	22.8	21.9	22.2
Medium (2-4)	43.9	33.6	36.9
High (5-6)	<u>33.3</u>	<u>44.5</u>	<u>40.9</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 57	N = 119	N = 176

$$\chi^2 = 2.29, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE 1

MIGRATION STATUS AND THE HEADS' CHANGE IN ANOMIA FROM 1960
TO 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Change in Anomia	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	-----Per cent-----		
Increased	65.3	58.9	60.9
Same	14.3	25.0	21.7
Decreased	<u>20.4</u>	<u>16.1</u>	<u>17.4</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 49	N = 112	N = 161

$$\chi^2 = 2.3, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE LI

MIGRATION STATUS AND THE HOMEMAKERS' ANOMIA SCALE SCORES
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Anomia Scores	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	Per cent		
Low (0-1)	27.5	31.9	30.5
Medium (2-4)	31.9	28.4	29.5
High (5-6)	<u>40.6</u>	<u>39.7</u>	<u>40.0</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 69	N = 141	N = 210

$$\chi^2 = .49, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

TABLE LII

MIGRATION STATUS AND THE HOMEMAKERS' CHANGE IN ANOMIA FROM
1960 TO 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Change in Anomia	Migration Status		Total
	Movers	Nonmovers	
	Per cent		
Increased	55.1	48.9	51.0
Same	31.9	34.1	33.3
Decreased	<u>13.0</u>	<u>17.0</u>	<u>15.7</u>
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	N = 69	N = 135	N = 204

$$\chi^2 = .87, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

CRANES & CREST

TABLE LIII

TIME SPAN AND THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN MIGRATED FROM 1960
TO 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Number of Children Migrated	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
None	57	60	61	60
One or more	<u>43</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>40</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 21	N = 25	N = 26	N = 72

$$\chi^2 = .09, \text{ d.f. } = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$



TABLE LIV
TIME SPAN AND THE HOUSEHOLD DEPENDENCY INDEX SCORES
IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Index Scores ^a	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
1.9 or less	55	40	58	51
2.0 or more	<u>45</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>49</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 20	N = 25	N = 26	N = 71

$$\chi^2 = 1.8, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$

^aLow scores indicate high dependency.

was found between time span and the household dependency index. There was some tendency for families with higher index scores, i.e., with minimum dependency, to have a medium time span.

In Table LV it can be seen that married couples tended to take a slightly longer time in the moving decision process. However, the variables were found to be independent.



TABLE LV
 TIME SPAN AND THE MARITAL STATUS OF HEAD
 IN 1966, FOUR TENNESSEE COUNTIES

Marital Status of Head	Time Span			Total
	Short	Medium	Long	
	-----Per cent-----			
Married	71	72	81	75
Other	<u>29</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>25</u>
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	N = 21	N = 25	N = 26	N = 72

$$\chi^2 = .72, \text{ d.f.} = 2, P > .05, \chi^2_{.05} = 5.99$$