

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE FAMILY
LIFE CYCLE TO INTRACOUNTY
MOBILITY OF FAMILIES

By

KATIE LENORA WILLIAMS

Bachelor of Arts

Texas Woman's University

Denton, Texas

1949

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1967

JAN 18 1968

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE FAMILY
LIFE CYCLE TO INTRACOUNTY
MOBILITY OF FAMILIES

Thesis Approved:

Sara Smith Suther

Thesis Adviser

Gerald R. Lister

D. D. Durbin

Dean of the Graduate College

660135

PREFACE

It is the purpose of this thesis to investigate the relationship of the family life cycle to intracounty mobility of families by using the 1960 United States Census One-In-A-Thousand population sample. In addition, the study will examine the adequacy of age of family head as an index to the concept of family life cycle as it relates to intracounty residential mobility. The relationship between age of family head and intracounty movement will first be tested for spuriousness by two variables not involved in the family cycle concept. Then the relationship will be specified by considering the effects of three family life cycle variables.

The writer wishes to express sincere gratitude to her adviser, Dr. Sara Smith Sutker, for helpful suggestions, competent guidance, and continuous encouragement throughout the study. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Gerald R. Leslie and Dr. Solomon Sutker for their contribution as members of the advisory committee. The writer is indebted to Dr. Richard Larson and Dr. James Tarver who made helpful suggestions at the beginning of this study. Appreciation is also expressed to the staff of the computing center of Oklahoma State University for processing the data, especially to Dr. Dale Grosvenor and Mr. Timothy Jurgen-son.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM.	1
Introduction.	1
Statement of the Problem.	2
Purpose and Contribution of the Study	2
Definition of Terms and Concepts.	3
Selection of Variables.	4
Hypotheses to be Tested	7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
III. METHOD AND PROCEDURE	17
Source of the Data.	17
Selection of the Sample	17
Analysis of the Data.	18
IV. FINDINGS	21
Effect of Education on Mobility	23
Effect of Tenure on Mobility.	24
Effect of Family Life Variables on Mobility	28
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	33
Summary	33
Implications for Further Study.	35
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	36
APPENDIX.	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Intracounty Mobility in Eight States of Family Life Cycle Defined by Age of Family Head	22
II. Intracounty Mobility by Age and Educational Attainment of Family Head	23
III. Intracounty Mobility by Age and Tenure Status of Family Head	25
IV. Intracounty Mobility by Age of Family Head and Educational Level Among Owners and Renters.	27
V. Intracounty Mobility in Four Stages of Family Life Cycle Defined by Age of Family Head.	29
VI. Intracounty Mobility by Age of Family Head in Larger and Smaller Families	30
VII. Intracounty Mobility by Age of Family Head in Expanding and Non-Expanding Families.	31
VIII. Intracounty Mobility by Age of Family Head in Relation to Number of Children.	39
IX. Intracounty Mobility by Age of Family Head in Larger Families	39
X. Intracounty Mobility by Age of Family Head in Smaller Families.	40
XI. Intracounty Mobility by Age of Family Head in Expanding Families.	40
XII. Intracounty Mobility by Age of Family Head in Non-Expanding Families.	41

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The residents of the United States are a mobile people. The Census Bureau provides some documentation in the decennial census of residential moves within counties, between counties and between states. This mobility is affected by many factors, some of which are the forming of new families at marriage, dissolving of households by either divorce or death, and the changing of jobs. All of these may precipitate moving the residence. According to Rossi and others, however, neither divorce, mortality, nor new households can account for more than a small per cent of American mobility. In 1950 there were approximately one and one-half million marriages involving the moves of three million persons and hence a mobility of about two per cent.¹ Job shifts more often involve a move across county lines and do not account for the bulk of the overall "milling around" within community areas. The census evidence indicates that two-thirds or more of these shifts in residence do not cross county boundaries; and many of them take place within smaller community areas.² To what factors then can this

¹Peter H. Rossi, Why Families Move: A Study in the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility (Glencoe, Illinois, 1955), p. 2.

²United States Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics, Series P-20 (March 25, 1965).

frequent changing of residence within the county be attributed?

Statement of the Problem

It is the purpose of this thesis to study a part of this mobility, the intracounty movement of husband-wife families, as evidenced in the data provided by the 1960 Census of Population. Various aspects of the relationship between the family life cycle and intracounty or residential mobility are examined. The problem does not include an investigation of mobility rates among various kinds of households, e.g., single people, divorced or one-parent families. In other words, there is no attempt to establish which groups are most mobile, but rather to test the relationship between the changing cycle of family life and intracounty mobility. In addition, by investigating other aspects of family life related to residential mobility, the study examines the adequacy of age of family head as an index to the concept of family life cycle in this context.

In order to represent the dominant family type of the United States, white male heads of husband-wife families with or without children under 18 were selected as units for analysis. The portion of the sample defined as mobile for this study are those families who changed residence during 1959-60, having resided within the same county in 1955.

Purpose and Contribution of the Study

Further research into local mobility is important because this type of movement is an underlying force in the changing urban areas of our country. From this study, more precise information should be

gained concerning the relative effects of several family characteristics to residential mobility. Because of the opportunity on control variables in the 1960 Census One-in-a-Thousand sample, more exact information is obtainable.

The testing of age of family head as an index of family life cycle with relation to residential mobility should increase knowledge about the concept of family life cycle. The study will perhaps have some additional methodological interest because it examines other possible indices of family life cycle.

Definition of Terms and Concepts

Definitions of terms and concepts used in this thesis are explained as follows:

1. Family--a group of two or more persons who live together and are related by blood, marriage or adoption. All such persons living together are regarded as members of the family.
2. Family life cycle--application of the biological life cycle to the family, beginning with the formation of the family at marriage, to the dissolution of the family at the death of both spouses.
3. Family head--the person so reported by the household respondent in the 1960 Census.
4. Household--the entire group of persons who occupy a house, apartment or other type of living quarters classified as a dwelling unit.
5. Intracounty movers or mobility--persons who move within

counties as defined by the United States Census.³

6. Primary family--a family which contains the head of a household among its members.
7. Sub-family--a married man and his wife with or without children under 18, sharing the dwelling unit of a relative.
8. Secondary family--no household head among its members, generally persons living as lodgers, guests or resident employees.
9. Residential mobility--changes of residence within the same community, not necessarily accompanied by a change of employment. This concept covers moves from one apartment to another, from one section of a city to another, including the much-heralded "flight to the suburbs." United States census data equates residential mobility with any residential change within the county. In this study the term will be used with the same meaning.
10. Migration--moves between communities of residence often equated with the United States census designation of inter-county movement.

Selection of Variables

The study divides itself into two parts. The first objective is

³ Ibid., p. 4. Published data of the United States Census Bureau and studies using census data distinguish between the terms "intra-county" and "intercounty" in referring to mobility. "Intracounty movement thus defined applies to 'local' changes of residence within the same community or labor market area, which can be made without change of job, while intercounty refers to change of residence required by a change of employment. The last category of movers are often termed intercounty migrants."

to test for spurious factors, i.e., those outside the family life cycle, which might be accounting for the relation of family life cycle to intracounty mobility. The second objective is to specify conditions within the family life cycle other than the age of family head which may be of importance in relation to intracounty mobility of families.

Several variables extrinsic to family life cycle were considered before the definite selections were made. Statistics from the published data of the United States Census were investigated concerning mobility differences in urban and rural areas. Intracounty mobility in urban areas in 1960 was 31.2 per cent while the corresponding rural non-farm mobility was 29 per cent.⁴ This was not deemed as sufficient difference to be important. After having read a number of studies related to residential mobility which were conducted in various parts of the United States, the author considered a variable concerning different regions of the country. Published census data, however, reveals that residential mobility does not vary greatly by region.⁵

Various studies in the literature point out the significance of owner-renter status in relation to intracounty residential mobility. According to Coons and Glaze, a rapid rise in home ownership as the age of the family head increases is apparent, the major increases occurring as family heads pass from 18 to 34 years.⁶ Rossi states that families

⁴United States Census of Population, Mobility for States and State Economic Areas, PC (2)-2B, Table 1.

⁵United States Census of Population, Characteristics of the Population, Summary, Vol. I (1960), p. XLVIII.

⁶Alvin E. Coons and Bert T. Glaze, Housing Market Analysis and the Growth of Non Farm-Ownership (Ohio State University, 1963), p. 75.

who own their own homes, regardless of their life cycle position, contribute least to residential mobility.⁷ Foote agrees that home ownership is a deterrent to intracounty mobility, but finds a very low percentage of ownership prior to age 35.⁸ Because of the apparent importance of owning or renting to residential mobility of families, tenure is included among the variables to be tested.

Style of life or socio-economic position is another variable which could contribute to intracounty mobility patterns. Feldman and Tilly point out that education, used as a measure of style of life, accounts for a substantially larger part of the variation in the association of occupations than does income.⁹ Because of this and other similar statements in the literature reviewed, educational level of the family head has been chosen to represent socio-economic position as another variable which might be a hidden factor in the intracounty mobility under investigation.

In regard to the second objective concerning aspects of family life cycle itself, Rossi's study emphasizes that large families are more prone to move than small ones and that the younger the family head the more likely the family is to move. Those families with younger children also tend to be more mobile. He maintains that the amount of space available in the old house is apparently not as

⁷Rossi, p. 180.

⁸Nelson Foote, et al., Housing Choices and Housing Constraints (New York, 1960), p. 102.

⁹A. S. Feldman and Charles Tilly, "The Interaction of Social and Physical Space," American Sociological Review, 25 (December, 1960), pp. 877-884.

important as the experience of shifts in relationship between this space and the size of the family. When the family expands with the birth of a child, the space is then experienced as inadequate.¹⁰ Abu-Lughod, co-author with Foote, agrees that residential mobility is usually motivated by discontent with previous accommodations because of an increase in the family size.¹¹

In the second part of the investigation, the relationship between age of the family head and intracounty mobility are specified by considering the effects of three relevant family life variables. These factors are size of family, age composition of children, and expansion stage of the family, determined by presence of a child under three.

Hypotheses to be Tested

The following six hypotheses have emerged from inadequacies, inconsistencies and seeming gaps in the literature. These hypotheses are focused on investigating the adequacy of age of family head as an index to family life cycle in relation to intracounty mobility of families.

Objective I: Testing for Spurious Factors

H₁: The proportion of husband-wife families who change residence within counties and SMSA'S¹² decreases throughout the family life cycle defined by age of family head.

¹⁰Rossi, p. 6.

¹¹Foote, et al., p. xxiii.

¹²Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas will be treated as single local communities. United States Census of Population, Mobility for States and State Economic Areas, PC (2) 2B (1960), p. xv.

Age is classified as follows: age 24 and under; age 25 through 29; age 30 through 34; age 35 through 44; age 45 through 49; age 50 through 54; age 55 through 64; age 65 and over.

H₂: The relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility stated in H₁ continues when educational attainment of family head is introduced.

Levels of education are classified as follows: no high school; some high school; high school graduation; some college and above.

H₃: The relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility stated in H₁ continues when tenure status is introduced.

Tenure is classified as owner and renter.

Objective II: Testing for Specifying Factors

H₄: The relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility as stated in H₁ is influenced by size of family.

Size of family is classified into larger (measured as three children or more) and smaller (measured as no children, one child, two children).

H₅: The relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility as stated in H₁ is influenced by the age composition of the children.

Age composition is classified as younger (measured as no child being above 13 years of age) and other.¹³

H₆: The relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility as stated in H₁ is influenced by expansion of the family size.

Family expansion is classified as expanding (measured by presence of a child under three years of age) and non-expanding (no child under three years of age).

¹³ Age 13 was chosen as the division between older and younger children because of age groupings contained on the tape.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A survey of the literature indicates that Paul Glick's analysis of American family living is the most quoted of the studies based on census data. The family life cycle concept is central to this study. This concept seems to date back at least to a work of Loomis¹ in 1936. Since then Glick has attempted to validate the stages of the cycle with census data, using age of the husband.² The concept of family life cycle has become an accepted part of sociological terminology because of its usefulness in describing changes in family living and the effects of these changes on other patterns of behavior. This concept is an application of the biological life cycle to the family. Between formation and dissolution, families go through a series of stages including initial establishment of a household, bearing and rearing children, marriage of the children and the later years before the family is dissolved by death of the remaining spouse. Successive readjustment of behavior patterns is required as the adult and child members shift their roles.³

¹Charles P. Loomis, "Study of the Life Cycle of Families," Rural Sociology, 1 (June, 1936), pp. 180-199.

²Paul C. Glick, "The Family Cycle," American Sociological Review, XII (April, 1947), pp. 164-174.

³Paul C. Glick, American Families (New York, 1957), p. 65.

Based on 1950 census data, Glick said that about four-fifths of the persons who marry change residence at the time of marriage, or within the year. The mobility rate, thereafter, decreases sharply as the number of years of marriage increases. By the time couples have been married 10 to 15 years, only about 20 per cent move to another home in the course of a year's time. By this time most of the changes in residence required to provide room and a measure of privacy for the various family members have been made. Also the difficulty of moving all the belongings of the family when it is at its maximum size may serve as a deterrent to residential changes during this stage of family life.⁴

The continued decline, rather than an increase, in mobility during the later years of life perhaps suggests that families do not ordinarily move into smaller quarters after their children have left home. Data from the 1950 Census of Housing also suggest that the shifts to smaller homes are relatively few in number during this period of life and that most of them take place after the husband reaches 65 years of age.⁵

Another major work in local residential mobility was Rossi's Why Families Move, a field survey which attempts to explain individual household mobility in terms of the family life cycle. He samples four Philadelphia census tracts selected to represent areas of high and low mobility rates and high and low socioeconomic status. Rossi states that most studies in residential mobility could be classified according

⁴Paul C. Glick, "The Life Cycle of the Family," Marriage and Family Living, 17 (February, 1955), p. 8.

⁵Ibid.

to area studies, household studies, or motivational studies. Area studies are the most frequently encountered; in these urban subareas or census tracts are classified by mobility rates. A large number of generalizations concerning the close association between mobility rates and rates of divorce, delinquency, dependency, and housing conditions emerge from these studies. Most of the knowledge concerning residential mobility derives from them. Household studies, which are encountered less frequently, involve comparisons of mobile households and more stable households. Motivational studies are concerned with social psychological aspects of moving. Rossi attempts to combine these three previously used ideas into one study.

He finds that the social characteristics which differentiated mobile from stable households are variables closely related to the family life cycle. Family size first rapidly increases as children are born in the early years of marriage. It is this period in a family's life cycle that its housing, because of the rapid change in its needs, is most likely to be out of adjustment with its requirements. During this early stage, the family typically moves from smaller to larger dwellings, from mobile, non-family areas to areas where family living is the typical pattern of household existence.⁶

Once through the life cycle stage in which family size manifests the most dramatic increase, housing needs stabilize and residential stability is also attained. Rossi's study points out that large families are more prone to move than small ones. The younger the household head the more likely the family is to move, and families who rent

⁶Rossi, p. 6.

their home are more prone to move than owners. He concludes that the major function of residential mobility is to enable families to adjust their housing to needs that are generated by the shifts in family composition accompanying life cycle changes. The amount of space available in the old house is apparently not as important as the experience of shifts in the relationship between this space and the size of the family. If there is, the birth of a child, the space is then experienced as inadequate. Such family size changes are most likely to occur to families which are under 10 years old; hence, the strong tendency for most of a household's moves to be accomplished during the early years of its existence.⁷

Smith, Kivlin and Sinden's study is to discover factors impelling families to move from one owned house to another. Most young families cite an increase in the number of children as a cause for moving.⁸

Foote agrees with studies previously mentioned that the child-bearing years in the family life cycle are the most mobile, with median family moves of three to four times within this period. Space takes precedence over locational convenience to occupation at this period.⁹

Abu-Lughod, co-author with Foote, states that the maldistribution of housing is only in part a function of the unequal distribution of income. Perhaps even more important is the unequal distribution of

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ruth H. Smith, Laura Kivlin, Cecile Sinden, Housing Choices and Selection as Evidenced by Residential Mobility, Pennsylvania State University College of Home Economics Research, Pub. 204 (May, 1963) p. 49.

⁹ Foote, et al., p. xxiii.

housing among people who occupy the various stages of the family life cycle. Older families whose children have left home have more space than they need and young and growing families have too little. The fact that income rises over the life cycle has helped to obscure the importance of this life cycle factor. After reviewing a number of studies of residential mobility, Abu-Lughod concludes that most residential moves are intracommunity and motivated by discontent with previous accommodations, usually because of increase in family number and the increased age of children. Family need for space reaches a maximum when children are in their late teens; it declines thereafter. Foote refers to this period as the child-launching stage, when space is needed for a parents' sphere and a children's sphere. This author agrees with Glick that older families tend to retain the maximum quarters they have achieved for a long period after family size has shrunk. Very often until one partner dies, Abu-Lughod suggests that older families should move to apartments or smaller quarters and free more large housing for bigger families.

Foote says that there is a growing desire on the part of consumers to develop a style of life which distinguishes them. The consumer's housing is conceived of as a means of expressing the dwellers' style of life. The middle-aged suburb-to-suburb mover then is not seeking space so much as housing which expresses his style of life.¹⁰

As previously stated, Glick's family life cycle stages are based primarily on the age of the father. He attempts to establish the adequacy of age of family head as an index to the stages of the family

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 175.

life cycle when he uses age of head to explain the relation of family life cycle to mobility. It is suggested by Lansing and Kish, however, that the critical dates in the life of an individual may not be his birthdays as much as the days when a change occurs in his family status; such as when he marries or when his first child is born. To understand an individual's social behavior, it may be more relevant to consider which stage of the family life cycle he has reached than how old he is. A man's actions may be more affected by the fact that he has a teen-age child than by the fact that he is 38 years old.¹¹

Glick does not control other age-related variables, such as career patterns and education. From a study conducted in an urban subdivision, Leslie and Richardson report that social mobility concerned with career patterns outweighs family cycle variables in producing residential mobility. They agree with other studies that age of family head, size, and tenure alone do not compose an adequate index of family life cycle and suggests that future studies could get at family life cycle more directly through changes in the family composition. The population in this study is a fairly homogeneous one, especially in relation to age of household heads and tenure status. The authors suggest that it might be of interest in regard to residential mobility to duplicate this study in a variety of urban circumstances, with samples drawn from small and large cities and from metropolitan areas, including

¹¹ John Lansing and Leslie Kish, "The Family Life Cycle as an Independent Variable," American Sociological Review, 22 (April, 1957), pp. 512-519.

deteriorated areas as well as middle and upper class suburbs.¹²

Wattenberg, in his analysis of the 1960 census, points out that the prime movers of today are young people under 30. He also emphasizes the relation between lack of education and mobility. Individuals with little education are more mobile within the county than those with a higher level of education.¹³

A study by Feldman and Tilly referred to in Chapter I points out that explanations of occupational residence patterns have stressed either occupational differences in resources or in style of life. This study tests the relative importance of these two factors in the residential association of occupations in one city. Its authors conclude that residential association is a function of similarity in rank and reflects education more directly than income.¹⁴

Both education and tenure status are often mentioned as having an effect on residential mobility and have been selected for investigation here. This study is also concerned with family life cycle variables which may relate to intracounty mobility. Several writers on the subject state that number, age composition, and the addition of children affect local movement. In short, the review of the literature points to the relevance of the variables chosen for further inquiry here.

¹²Gerald R. Leslie and Arthur H. Richardson, "Life-Cycle, Career Pattern, and the Decision to Move," American Sociological Review, 26 (December, 1961), pp. 894-902.

¹³Ben J. Wattenberg, This U.S.A. (New York, 1965), p. 113.

¹⁴Feldman and Tilly, p. 884.

These test variables, suggested by earlier studies, are educational attainment and tenure status of the family head, size of family, age composition of children, and family expansion.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Source of Data

The sample for this study is taken from the 1960 United States Census one-in-a-thousand sample recorded on magnetic tape. The information contained in this record comprised substantially all of the characteristics of those 180,000 persons (approximately) enumerated in the twenty-five per cent sample portion of the 1960 population census. Although the sampling procedures do not automatically insure an exact twenty-five per cent sample of persons, the sample design was originally unbiased if carried through according to instructions. Biases could have arisen only if the census enumerator failed to follow his listing and sampling instructions exactly.

The particular value of the sample tape for this research problem is that it permits cross-tabulation of a large number of variables as well as holding factors constant in a way not possible from the published data of the census alone.

Selection of Sample

The study sample is selected to test various aspects of the relationship between family life cycle and intracounty mobility and not to investigate the total amounts of residential mobility among various kinds of households. The relationship of family patterns and mobility

among various kinds of households. The relationship of family patterns and mobility can best be studied by using the dominant family type.

Representing the dominant family type of the United States, white, male heads of husband-wife families with or without children under 18 are the units for analysis. To increase the homogeneity, racial minority groups, one-parent families, and other minor family types are omitted. Heads of husband-wife families married during the period of 1959-60 are also excluded because this change of residence is in reality establishing a new family unit and should be treated as a separate problem.¹ The mobile portion of the sample is defined as those families who changed residence during 1959-60, having resided within the same county in 1955. The total sample includes 21,276 family heads. Of this total 2,402 have moved within the county and are thus considered as the mobile portion of the sample.

Analysis of the Data

The necessary information on characteristics of these 21,276 cases have been removed from the tape by computer and recorded on a smaller tape. Cross-tabulation with chi-square analysis has been used to test whether the results obtained could have occurred by chance alone.

Cross-tabulation, which is a numerical tabular presentation of data in which variables are juxtaposed in order to study the relation between them, may be used to classify the cases by the categories of

¹United States Census of Population, Characteristics of the Population, Summary, Vol. I (1960), p. XLVIII. Since year of marriage is recorded only for first marriages, the study sample will not include second marriages.

the variables under study.² Another important reason for using cross-tabulation is that it facilitates the study and analysis of relationships; in addition, a chi-square test can easily be applied to such tables either by computer or manually. An added advantage is that it allows for testing a relationship between two variables while controlling other variables.

The tests to determine spuriousness and to specify conditions follow a procedure recommended by Lazarsfeld and Kendall, which can be described as the clarification of relationships between two or more variables. With this methodology a researcher can find if the original relationship is more pronounced in one sub-group than in another when the total sample is divided by the test factor. One technique used is referred to by the authors as the f coefficient. It is a crude measure of the effect on an established relationship between two variables when a third variable is introduced. The procedure is merely one of simple arithmetic where one percentage is subtracted from the adjoining one in a four fold table. This f coefficient is a device for observation rather than a means of testing significance of differences.³

The chi-square test is used because it is suitable for nominal data of a nonparametric nature in which the frequencies are in discrete categories. It is also a suitable technique for samples with a large

²Matilda White Riley, Sociological Research (New York, 1963), p. 408.

³Paul Lazarsfeld and Patricia Kendall, "Problems of Survey Analysis," in Merton and Lazarsfeld, eds., Continuities in Social Research (Glencoe, Illinois, 1950), pp. 133-196.

number of cases such as this one.⁴ The level of significance is set at the .05 level for the two tail test.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses stated in Chapter I are formulated as null hypotheses for statistical testing as follows:

Objective I: Testing for Spurious Factors

- H₁: There is no difference in the proportion of husband-wife families who change residence within counties and SMSA'S throughout the eight stages of the family life cycle defined by age of the family head.
- H₂: The relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility does not continue when educational attainment of the family head is introduced.
- H₃: The relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility does not continue when tenure status of the family head is introduced.

Objective II: Testing for Specifying Factors

- H₄: There is no influence on the relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility by size of family.
- H₅: There is no influence on the relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility by age composition of children.
- H₆: There is no influence on the relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility by expansion of family size.

⁴Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York, 1956), pp. 36-42.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

There is sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis one, which states there is no difference in residential mobility as age of family head increases. (See Table I). As anticipated the mobility is highest for those family heads who are age 24 and under. The decrease in mobility, however, is much more rapid than expected after age 25. It seemed probable that the mobility would not decrease rapidly until after age 35, as is the case in Glick's analysis of the 1950 Census data.¹ Whether patterns of residential mobility actually changed to this degree between 1950 and 1960 is impossible to say. Wattenberg does point out that the prime movers of today are young people under 30.² Some difference may also come from the fact that the composition of this study sample is different from that used by Glick. Eliminating remarried couples probably decreases the numbers of mobile people in age categories over 24 years. Since the average age of first marriage was 22.8 for men in 1960, a great number of remarriages could not occur before age 24.

¹Glick, American Families, p. 65.

²Wattenberg, p. 114.

TABLE I

INTRACOUNTY MOBILITY IN EIGHT STAGES OF FAMILY LIFE CYCLE
DEFINED BY AGE OF FAMILY HEAD

Mobility Status		Stages of Family Life Cycle								Total
		24 and under	25-29	30-34	35-44	45-49	50-54	55-64	65 and over	
Intracounty movers	Per Cent	33.3	18.4	13.6	9.6	8.7	6.6	5.9	4.9	(2402)
	Number	(413)	(460)	(396)	(546)	(201)	(130)	(158)	(98)	
Other	Per Cent	66.7	81.6	86.4	90.4	91.3	93.4	94.1	95.1	(18874)
	Number	(827)	(2036)	(2530)	(5137)	(2107)	(1858)	(2509)	(1870)	
Total		100.0 (1240)	100.0 (2496)	100.0 (2926)	100.0 (5683)	100.0 (2308)	100.0 (1988)	100.0 (2667)	100.0 (1968)	(21276)

X^2 - 973.02 (7d.f.) significant at .01 and .05 level.

Effect of Education on Mobility

The overall pattern of declining mobility by age as stated in research hypothesis one holds when educational attainment is introduced as a test variable. Null hypothesis two, therefore, is rejected. It states that the inverse relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility does not continue when education is introduced as an intervening variable. High mobility for these age 24 and under continues when educational attainment is introduced. In each of the four categories of education, the per cent of mobility continues to be greater among those 24 and under, declining as age increases. (See Table II).

TABLE II
INTRACOUNTY MOBILITY BY AGE AND EDUCATIONAL
ATTAINMENT OF FAMILY HEAD

Intracounty Movers by Education	Age							
	24 and under	25-29	30-34	35-44	45-49	50-54	55-64	65 and over
Per Cent								
No high school N = 773	39.6	25.2	25.6	13.3	10.6	8.3	6.4	5.1
Some high school N = 531	35.4	24.6	14.7	11.0	8.7	4.1	6.5	5.3
High school graduate N = 616	32.9	16.1	10.5	7.8	8.2	5.6	6.1	3.4
Some college and above N = 371	25.9	13.8	8.2	7.1	5.2	5.1	3.9	4.9

For X^2 values see Table IV, X^2 by education and tenure.

It is interesting to note, although it does not pertain directly to these problems, that those individuals with the least amount of education have a higher rate of intracounty mobility in all but the two oldest age groups.³ The mobility patterns for individuals with the lowest and the highest educational levels differs considerably from those of the middle categories.⁴

Effect of Tenure on Mobility

It appears that mobility continues to be high among younger family heads with a gradual decrease as age increases when tenure status is introduced. Considerable difference, however, can be seen between owners and renters. It is, therefore, assumed that tenure status does have an effect on local residential mobility. There is sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis three in regard to owners; null hypothesis three, however, must be accepted for renters. In the age category, 45-49, renters have an increase in mobility rather than the hypothesized decrease. (See Table III).

Owners have a consistent pattern of gradual decline in intracounty mobility as the age of the family head increases. When stratified by educational level, however, other patterns are found. Among

³Ibid., p. 115.

⁴It is reported by the Census Bureau that college attendance expands both the aspiration level and opportunities of the individual, and thus migration tends to occur with greater frequency in the careers of the better educated. The higher income group (which indirectly reflects educational attainment) have a lower local mobility rate. Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics, Series P-20, No. 141, September, 1965.

TABLE III
INTRACOUNTY MOBILITY BY AGE AND TENURE
STATUS OF FAMILY HEAD

Intracounty Movers by Tenure Status	Age							
	24 and under	25-29	30-34	35-44	45-49	50-54	55-64	65 and over
	Per Cent							
Owners	29.5	16.6	10.8	7.4	5.9	4.4	3.5	3.5
N = 15,024								
Renters	35.5	20.8	20.2	18.0	20.9	14.8	13.9	12.1
N = 5,344								

See Table IV for X^2 values.

those who own their house, the percentage of mobility is considerably less in the upper levels of education than in the two lower levels of education. (See Table IV).

Renters are not as consistent as owners in the established trend of high mobility in the younger age categories with a decline as the age of family head increases. In fact, among renters there is a slight increase in residential mobility in the 45-49 age category. The overall mobility, moreover, declines more slowly among renters than among owners.

This sustained mobility among renters in the middle years may have several explanations. It is quite possible that this is the same part of the cycle which Foote refers to as the "launching cycle." At this point, children are leaving home and families are shrinking in size. This change could easily precipitate a move to a smaller house or leave sufficient funds for renting more impressive housing. It is also possible that the household head has reached the peak of his income, thus

making it possible to move to a more desirable location. It seems plausible that this pattern would be more predominant among renters than owners because ownership indicates a closer tie to the property, discouraging mobility.

More variation of patterns appears among renters and owners at age 55 and above when educational level is considered. (See Table IV). Those in the highest educational level show an increased mobility in the age categories corresponding roughly to the age of retirement. Renters with the lowest educational attainment show a decline rather than increase in mobility after age 55.

This analysis also uncovers considerable difference between the patterns of owners and renters in relation to local mobility in the later years and reinforces Nelson Foote's statement that there is no consistent pattern of mobility for those over 65, rather several variations in patterns.⁵ It is interesting to note that mobility increases considerably above age 65 for those renters in the college educational level, while those in other educational levels who are 65 and over show a decline.

Since the general pattern of mobility found is one of decline in the older age categories, this study agrees with Abu-Lughod's comment that older families tend to retain the maximum quarters they have achieved. Even when the extrinsic influences of tenure status and educational attainment are analyzed separately as in Table IV, the pattern of declining intracounty mobility with increasing age persists.

⁵Nelson Foote, preface.

TABLE IV
 INTRACOUNTY MOBILITY BY AGE OF FAMILY HEAD AND
 EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AMONG OWNERS AND RENTERS
 (N=21,276)

Intracounty Movers Among Owners and Renters by Education	Age								X ²
	24 and under	25-29	30-34	35-44	45-49	50-54	55-64	65 and over	
Per Cent									
<u>Owners</u>									
No high school	34.10	25.30	16.50	8.80	6.47	5.32	4.47	3.75	203.44*
Some high school	35.06	20.72	11.39	9.15	5.35	2.66	4.59	3.75	144.38*
High school graduate	26.08	14.03	10.18	6.44	6.57	4.66	5.15	2.42	122.99*
Some college above	22.80	13.43	8.15	6.31	4.38	4.72	3.67	2.92	64.46*
<u>Renters</u>									
No high school	41.25	25.11	38.18	24.2	24.15	19.76	15.96	11.91	71.79*
Some high schools	35.51	28.09	21.67	17.9	23.75	12.72	16.00	15.15	31.14*
High schools	37.28	19.31	11.65	14.68	17.85	10.34	11.32	7.69	78.90*
Some college above	27.04	14.10	8.20	11.32	11.11	6.89	5.26	15.00	36.58*

*Significant at .05 level (Chi-square readings above 14.06 are significant at .05 level with 7 d.f.)

Effect of Family Life Variables on Mobility

Three relevant variables are analyzed to specify the conditions within the cycle of family living which may affect the pattern of local mobility. These variables are size of family measured by number of children; age composition of the children; and expansion of the family size.

Chi-square analysis demonstrates that the original inverse relationship between age of family head and intracounty mobility continues when these variables are introduced. The way in which the test variables affect or specify the general pattern is indicated in the f coefficients, which are simple remainders when a percentage is subtracted from the percentage adjoining it. This is merely a device for observation rather than a means of testing significance.⁶

For the purpose of observing the differences in partial relationships revealed by the f coefficients, a summary table of the basic relationship between age of family head and intracounty mobility is presented. This table is a basis for analyzing the influence of the family life variables. (See Table V).

⁶See footnote 3, p. 18.

TABLE V

INTRACOUNTY MOBILITY IN FOUR STAGES OF FAMILY
LIFE CYCLE DEFINED BY AGE OF FAMILY HEAD*

Mobility Status	Stages of Family Life Cycle by Age of Family Head				
	24 and under	25-34	35-49	50 and over	Total
Intracounty movers	Per Cent 45.8 Number (567)	31.9 (1730)	21.2 (1702)	12.4 (825)	22.7 (4824)
Other	Per Cent 54.2 Number (673)	69.1 (3692)	79.8 (6289)	87.6 (5798)	77.3 (16,452)

* Because of changes in computer center personnel and problems of getting the data off the One-in-a-thousand tape, the number of intracounty movers in Tables V, VI and VII is different from Table I although the basic pattern is maintained. Because of a machine error instead of the one year, (1959-60) intracounty mobility, these figures include intracounty movers for the period of 1955-60. The total number and percentage of intracounty movers fortunately are not critical to either the first or second parts of the analysis so that the discrepancy in the counts is not a serious error.

The hypothesis that the relationship between intracounty and age would be influenced by size of family is not found to be true. Null hypothesis four is, therefore, accepted. (See Table VI). The established pattern is maintained i.e., high mobility among younger family heads with decreased movement as age of family head increases. The f coefficients, moreover, show a very similar pattern between larger and smaller families. The decline in local mobility between larger and smaller families in the two younger age categories varies only one per cent. Movement continues in the two older age categories at a slightly higher level for larger families than smaller families; the percentage of decline, however, between the larger and smaller families is very close.

TABLE VI
 INTRACOUNTY MOBILITY BY AGE OF FAMILY HEAD
 IN LARGER AND SMALLER FAMILIES

Intracounty Movers	Stage of Family Life Cycle by Age of Family Head				Total
	24 and under	25-34	35-49	50 and over	
Larger families	45.54	31.20	22.33	14.03	24.89
	f = .14	f = .09	f = .08		
N = 6,236					
Smaller families	45.75	32.33	20.55	12.28	21.75
	f = .13	f = .12	f = .08		
N = 15,040					

This table is constructed from computer tables with the following chi-square values significant at .05: Larger (three or more children, $X^2 = 131.21$); Smaller (two children, $X^2 = 248.91$; one child, $X^2 = 319.03$; no child, $X^2 = 235.61$).

Evidence for accepting or rejecting null hypothesis five, which states that there is no influence on the relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility by age composition of children, is inconclusive. Methodological complications in removing information from the One-in-a-Thousand sample tape made it impossible to separate the information for the age of children in some instances according to the original plan. Ages are grouped in such a manner that the desired age breaks are not obtainable. This limitation in age categories was not detected when the thesis problem was outlined. For this reason little reliance can be placed on the results concerning age of children. No analysis for this hypothesis is reported in the study.

The hypothesized relationship that intracounty mobility would be influenced by expansion of family size is found to be true in only one age category. Null hypothesis six is accepted for age categories 24 and under, 25 thru 34, and 35 thru 49, but it is rejected for family heads age 50 and over. The expected decline in local mobility is not found among those family heads age 50 and over who have a child under age three. (See Table VII).

TABLE VII
INTRACOUNTY MOBILITY BY AGE OF FAMILY HEAD IN
EXPANDING AND NON-EXPANDING FAMILIES

Intracounty Movers	Stage of Family Life Cycle by Age of Family Head				Total
	24 and under	25-34	35-49	50 and over	
Expanding families	47.44	32.73	26.19	26.56	33.54
		f = .15	f = .07	f = .00	
N = 5,420					
Non-expanding families	40.46	30.85	20.29	12.32	18.96
		f = .10	f = .11	f = .08	
N = 15,856					

This table was constructed from computer tables with the following chi-square values significant at .05: Expanding (larger family, child under three) $X^2 = 31.96$; (smaller family, child under three) $X^2 = 54.50$; Non-expanding (larger family, no child under three) $X^2 = 51.24$; (smaller family, no child under three) $X^2 = 451.06$.

The finding may be affected by the small number of family heads in this age category; the f coefficients, however, show no decline in mobility for this age group. The effect of family expansion is more pronounced when the presence of a child under three is viewed

separately for smaller and larger families. (See Appendix Table VIII). Smaller families with family heads age 50 and over having a child under three show an increase in mobility of 2.07 per cent. In larger families, with family head age 50 and over, those having a child under age three maintain the same percentage of mobility as the previous age category.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This thesis is concerned with intracounty mobility of families as it is analyzed in relation to the family life cycle defined by age of family head. Educational level and tenure status, two factors outside the family life cycle concept which could confound this relationship between mobility and family life cycle stages, are explored. Three specifying conditions of the family life cycle--the number, age composition, and addition of children--are analyzed to test the adequacy of age of family head as an index to family life cycle in the study of residential mobility. Following is a summary of the important findings.

The proportion of husband-wife families who are residentially mobile decreases throughout the family life cycle as age of family head increases. The higher rate of mobility expected among younger families is found for those 24 and under. This mobility declines sharply, however, during the period between 25 and 30 and gradually thereafter. The pattern differs somewhat from Glick's analysis of the 1950 census when mobility did not drop sharply until after age 35.

This relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility, or residential mobility, continues when educational attainment of family head is introduced. Educational level does affect local mobility among some age groups, though the original relation of declining

mobility with increasing age still holds. It is found that those family heads having no high school education maintain a higher level of mobility for a longer number of years. Those with the highest educational level decrease more rapidly in relation to residential mobility than the individuals in other levels.

This relationship of mobility with age of family head continues when the tenure status is that of owners, but there is some deviation among renters. Rather than the consistent decline in mobility as the age of the family head increases, which is found for owners, the renters show a slight increase in residential mobility between age 45 and 49.¹ In general, renters are more mobile than owners.

Among the family life cycle variables, larger families are not found to have more influence than smaller families on the stated relationship of age of family head with intracounty mobility. An additional finding which is not part of the original hypotheses concerns those families with no children. These childless couples are less mobile than couples who have children, regardless of the number of children. In other words, having no children affects the relationship of age of family head with local mobility, especially among those age 24 and under. (See Appendix A, Table VIII).

Local mobility for expanding families (or families with a child under age three) does not decrease as age of family head increases according to the anticipated pattern. These findings agree with Rossi

¹When owners and renters are not viewed separately, the dominant pattern is that of owners, because owners outnumber renters three to one in this sample. (15,024 owners, 5,344, renters, 908 no cash rent.) In the 1960 population the ratio is 64% owners to 36 % renters or approximately 3 to 2.

who says when the family expands with the birth of a child, the space available then becomes inadequate and precipitates a residential move. This, of course, is not a startling discovery.

From findings in this study, it would seem that the age of the household head is a useful index to the study of family life cycle as it relates to residential mobility. The specifying effect of expansion of family size indicates that age of children may be another relevant index to family life cycle stages in the study of local mobility.

Implications for Further Study

It would seem worthwhile that further investigation into the mobility patterns of renters be conducted because it is possible that this could contribute to the general knowledge concerning urban residential mobility. In addition to this, other studies might more successfully test age composition of children as a family cycle variable related to residential mobility of the family.

It would be interesting to investigate further the mobility patterns of family heads over age 65. Renters in this age bracket with the highest educational level (college) maintain a high level of mobility. This is in reverse of the mobility pattern for other age groups in the same educational level. More knowledge concerning this relationship might be of possible interest in a country where a higher percentage of the population continues to reach the age of 65 and over.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Coons, Alvin E., and Bert T. Glaze. Housing Market Analysis and the Growth of Non Farm Ownership. Columbus: Ohio State University Press (1963).
- Feldman, A.S., and Charles Tilly. "The Interaction of Social and Physical Space." American Sociological Review, 25 (December, 1960), pp. 877-884.
- Foote, Nelson, et al. Housing Choices and Housing Constraints. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. (1960).
- Glick, Paul C. American Families. New York: John Wiley and Sons (1957). (A volume in the Census Monograph Series.)
- Glick, Paul C. "The Family Cycle." American Sociological Review, 12 (April, 1947), pp. 164-174.
- Glick, Paul C. "The Life Cycle of the Family." Marriage and Family Living, 17 (February, 1955), pp. 3-10.
- Lansing, John and Leslie Kish. "The Family Life Cycle As An Independent Variable." American Sociological Review, 22 (April, 1957), pp. 512-519.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul, and Patricia Kendall. "Problems in Survey Analysis." Continuities in Social Research. Eds. Robert K. Merton and Paul Lazarsfeld. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press (1950), pp. 133-196.
- Leslie, Gerald R., and Arthur H. Richardson. "Life-Cycle, Career Pattern, and the Decision to Move." American Sociological Review, 26 (December, 1961), 894-902.
- Loomis, Charles P. "Study of the Life Cycle of Families." Rural Sociology, 1 (June, 1936), pp. 180-199.
- Riley, Matilda White. Sociological Research. New York: Harcourt Brace, and World, Inc. (1963).
- Rossi, Peter H. Why Families Move: A Study in the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press (1955).

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. (1956).

Smith, Ruth H., Laura Kivlin, and Cecile Sinden. Housing Choices and Selection as Evidenced by Residential Mobility. Pennsylvania State University College of Home Economics Research. Publication 204 (May, 1963).

United States Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports. "Population Characteristics." Series P-20 (March 25, 1965).

United States Census of Population. Characteristics of the Population. Summary, Volume I (1960).

United States Census of Population. Mobility for States and State Economic Areas. PC (2) 2B, Table I (1960).

Wattenberg, Ben J. This U.S.A. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc. (1965).

APPENDIX A

TABLE VIII

INTRACOUNTY MOBILITY BY AGE OF FAMILY HEAD
IN RELATION TO NUMBER OF CHILDREN

Number of Children	Stages of Family Life Cycle by Age of Family Head				Number	X ²
	24 and under	25-34	35-49	50 and over		
None	38.21	30.11	24.30	11.88	5455	235.61
One	46.21	34.52	20.00	13.55	4584	319.03
Two	50.00	31.60	19.21	12.18	5001	248.91
Three or more	45.52	31.21	22.34	14.04	6236	131.21

Chi-square values significant at .05.

TABLE IX

INTRACOUNTY MOBILITY BY AGE OF FAMILY HEAD
IN LARGER FAMILIES

Intracounty Mobility		Stages of Family Life Cycle by Age of Family Head				Total
		24 and under	25-34	35-49	50 and over	
Intracounty movers	Per Cent	45.54	31.20	22.33	14.03	24.89
	Number	(66)	(640)	(751)	(95)	(1552)
Other	Per Cent	54.46	68.80	77.67	85.97	75.11
	Number	(79)	(1411)	(2612)	(582)	(4684)
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
		(145)	(2051)	(3363)	(677)	(6236)

X² = 131.21, significant at .05.

TABLE X
INTRACOUNTY MOBILITY BY AGE OF FAMILY
HEAD IN SMALLER FAMILIES

Intracounty Mobility		Stages of Family Life Cycle by Age of Family Head				
		24 and under	25-34	35-49	50 and over	Total
Intracounty movers	Per Cent	45.75	32.33	20.55	12.28	21.75
	Number	(501)	(1090)	(951)	(730)	(3272)
Other	Per Cent	54.25	67.67	79.45	87.72	78.25
	Number	(594)	(2281)	(3677)	(5216)	(11768)
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
		(1095)	(3371)	(4628)	(5946)	(15040)

This table was constructed from computer tables with the following chi-square values significant at .05: two children, $X^2 = 248.91$; one child, $X^2 = 319.03$; no child, $X^2 = 235.61$

TABLE XI
INTRACOUNTY MOBILITY BY AGE OF FAMILY
HEAD IN EXPANDING FAMILIES

Intracounty Mobility		Stages of Family Life Cycle by Age of Family Head				
		24 and under	25-34	35-49	50 and over	Total
Intracounty movers	Per Cent	47.44	32.73	26.19	26.56	33.54
	Number	(444)	(998)	(359)	(17)	(1818)
Other	Per Cent	52.56	67.27	73.81	73.44	66.46
	Number	(492)	(2051)	(1012)	(47)	(3602)
Total		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
		(936)	(3049)	(1371)	(64)	(5420)

This table was constructed from computer tables with the following chi-square values significant at .05; larger family, child under three, $X^2 = 31.96$; smaller family, child under three, $X^2 = 54.50$.

TABLE XII
 INTRACOUNTY MOBILITY BY AGE OF FAMILY
 HEAD IN NON-EXPANDING FAMILIES

Intracounty Mobility	Stages of Family Life Cycle by Age of Family Head					
		24 and under	25-34	35-49	50 and over	Total
Intracounty movers	Per Cent Number	40.46 (123)	30.85 (732)	2029 (1343)	12.32 (808)	18.96 (3006)
Other	Per Cent Number	59.54 (181)	69.15 (1641)	79.71 (5277)	87.68 (5751)	81.04 (12835)
Total		100.00 (304)	100.00 (2373)	100.00 (6620)	100.00 (6559)	100.00 (15856)

This table was constructed from computer tables with the following chi-square values significant at .05: larger family, no child under three, $X^2 = 51.24$; smaller family, no child under three, $X^2 = 451.06$.

VITA

Katie Lenora Williams

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE FAMILY LIFE CYCLE
TO INTRACOUNTY MOBILITY OF FAMILIES

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Whitewright, Texas, January 1, 1928,
daughter of William L. and Henrietta Kincaid.

Education: Attended Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas;
received the Bachelor of Arts Degree from the Texas
Woman's University, with a major in social work, in June,
1949; completed requirements for the Master of Science
degree from the Oklahoma State University, with a major
in Sociology, in July, 1967.

Professional Experience: Served as Executive Director for
Bryan-College Station Council Girl Scouts, June, 1949
to June 1951; Instructor in Department of Sociology,
East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma, September,
1965 to June 1966; member, Southwestern Sociological
Association.