



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

THE ETHNIC FACTOR AND MOVING DECISIONS IN A RACIALLY CHANGING COMMUNITY*

David P. Varady**

Introduction

Recently, an advisory panel to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development indicated that relatively little was known about the importance of different race related attitudes (including but not limited to racial prejudice) in affecting the willingness to move into racially mixed communities [30]. This statement is equally valid concerning the state of existing knowledge about the influence of these factors on the willingness to remain in racially changing communities. Three race related attitudes have been mentioned in the literature as affecting the willingness to remain: (1) racial prejudice;¹ (2) perceptions of the neighborhood's current racial composition; and (3) expectations of future racial changes. Few, if any, studies however have examined the relative importance of these characteristics in explaining variations in mobility in particular racially changing communities. This will be one of the major aims of this article.

The second purpose of this article is to examine the impact of the "ethnic factor" in affecting mobility decisions in racially changing Jewish communities. In a widely quoted article, Simmons [42, p. 633] notes: "The ethnic factor acts as a constraint only on the number of possible alternatives, explaining 'where' people move rather than 'why' they move. In fact, there have been few empirical tests of Simmons' assertion. This article examines the importance of two Jewish cultural characteristics--(1) the attitude toward intermarriage, and (2) the attitude toward driving to the synagogue on the Sabbath--in explaining variations in mobility behavior in one racially changing Jewish community.² Previous researchers have speculated that these two factors are crucial in affecting the choices of Jews as to where to move. We will test

*The author wishes to acknowledge the helpful comments of Kenneth E. Corey, Graduate Department of Community Planning, University of Cincinnati and William W. Philliber, Department of Sociology, University of Cincinnati.

The data for this paper were originally gathered by the staff of the Center for the Research on the Acts of Man, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania as part of research sponsored by a synagogue located in the Wynnefield section of Philadelphia and also by the Institute for Jewish Policy Planning and Research, Washington, D. C.

**Assistant Professor, Graduate Department of Community Planning, University of Cincinnati.

¹Prejudice has been defined as an attitude of disfavor and an over generalized belief about members of another group [3, pp. 2-3].

whether they also influence the decision of when to move from a racially changing community. The results dealing with these two Jewish cultural characteristics should be suggestive as to whether background cultural characteristics influence the move-stay decision in other (non-Jewish) white ethnic communities undergoing racial change.

This article also has a methodological purpose. Most previous mobility studies have relied on the relationships between background characteristics and moving plans (or moving desires). There is increasing consensus among researchers that these two variables (i.e., moving plans and moving behavior) are distinctive, and that research relying on plans as a proxy for behavior may provide a limited understanding of the mobility process [44]. Our approach is to view moving desires, plans and behavior as a set of interrelated decisions [12]. Utilizing this conceptual framework, this article seeks to determine which background characteristics affect mobility indirectly (through their impact on moving plans which are then implemented) and which affect mobility directly (i.e., affect the decision to move without having any effect on moving plans) (Figure 1). In a previous article, we utilized this approach to examine the determinants of mobility in an inner city community [45]. This article utilizes this same approach to examine the underlying causes of mobility in a racially changing community.

Methodology

This article is based on the results of a two stage survey of 269 Jewish families in the Wynnefield section of Philadelphia and adjoining Lower Merion Township (Figure 2).³ Wynnefield is a middle and upper middle income community located on the western edge of Philadelphia. It is adjacent to West Philadelphia, one of Philadelphia's three ghetto areas. Between the 1920s and 1960s, this community was a largely Jewish enclave, centered around many religious and cultural organizations. Black immigration began in 1963, and the community underwent a moderate rate of racial change during the mid and late 1960s. As of 1969, blacks comprised about one-third (31 percent, 647 of the total population surveyed).⁴ Jews still comprised the largest ethnic group, with about one-half (55 percent) of the total.⁵ There were smaller

² This case study of one racially changing Jewish community should be of broad interest because so many of the racially changing communities have been Jewish ones. Since the 1920s, researchers have noted the tendency for black ghetto areas to expand through Jewish communities rather than through other white ethnic areas [13, 17, 23, 27]. Based on the results of a recent nationwide survey of integrated neighborhoods, Bradburn, et al. [10] notes that a disproportionately large number of Jews live in substantially integrated neighborhoods (i.e., more than 10 percent black). Many of these neighborhoods adjoin predominantly black areas and have thus, likely undergone racial succession since Bradburn's study was completed.

³, ⁴, ⁵Footnotes on following page.

FIGURE 1: Mobility Model





FIGURE 2: Boundaries of Study Area



W — Wynnefield
LM — Lower Merion
— study area
— county lines

numbers of white Catholics (10 percent) and white Protestants (4 percent). There were sharp differences in the rates of racial transition within Wynnefield. Whereas Lower Wynnefield (closest to predominantly black West Philadelphia) had become a predominantly black area by 1970 (70 percent black), Upper Wynnefield remained predominantly white.

Lower Merion Township is adjacent to Wynnefield and lies at the eastern end of suburban Philadelphia's "Main Line". In contrast to the racial changes taking place in Wynnefield, blacks have continued to constitute an extremely small segment of Lower Merion's population. Since this article focuses on the determinants of mobility in racially changing communities--and because only Wynnefield has experienced such change--the analysis utilizes the results from Wynnefield residents only.

In the spring and summer of 1969, the 269 families were telephone inter-

³The 1969 sample actually consisted of two separate subsamples. The first group consisted of 141 Jewish families who were originally part of a randomly selected sample of Jewish and non-Jewish families in the Wynnefield-Lower Merion area. This sample was selected from the inverse telephone directory for Philadelphia and its suburbs--that is, a telephone book listing households by order of their address rather than by alphabetical order. A five percent random sample was selected for Wynnefield and the adjacent southeastern section of Lower Merion Township, and a 10 percent sample was drawn for the remainder of Lower Merion Township. These differing sampling rates were established by the needs of the original study--that is, the desire to interview a sufficient number of Jewish families in all parts of the study area to facilitate multivariate analysis. The second sample consisted of 128 families (an approximately 12 percent sample) who belonged to a large Conservative congregation in Wynnefield. These families completed a mailed questionnaire which included a printed version of the telephone interview schedule and the same questions included in the questionnaire sent to the first subsample. For a more detailed discussion of the methodology used in the 1969 survey, see [47].

⁴The 1969 results are based on the telephone survey of families in the Wynnefield Lower Merion area. The results dealing with families were translated into individuals by multiplying the numbers in the four ethnic groups by the mean family size for each group.

⁵Of the families who identified themselves as Jewish, two-fifths (40 percent) identified themselves as Conservative Jews. Considerably smaller numbers identified themselves as Orthodox (13 percent) and Reform (11 percent). About one-third (36 percent) considered themselves as Jewish but with no particular denominational preference. The limited information available, suggests that the denominational make up of Wynnefield's Jewish population is typical of that of other racially changing middle class Jewish communities. Therefore, the results presented in this article should be generalized to most other racially changing Jewish communities.

viewed for background characteristics and mobility information. Subsequently, they were sent and completed, mailed questionnaires which dealt with: (1) Jewish cultural characteristics; (2) race related attitudes; and (3) the level of satisfaction with different aspects of the residential environment. The 1969 surveys were part of a larger study of Jewish cultural patterns in the Wynnefield-Lower Merion area [24].

In the summer of 1974, these families were sent follow up questionnaires which included many of the items from the 1969 questionnaires as well as a series of questions on mobility behavior between 1969 and 1974 (including a question on whether the family had moved from its 1969 location). One hundred fifty-four (or 58 percent) were returned. Even where no questionnaire was returned, it was often possible to ascertain the family's mobility behavior between 1969 and 1974 using telephone directories, forwarding information provided by the post office and synagogue membership lists. Altogether, using these different methods, it was possible to obtain mobility information on 81 percent (or 217) of the original 269 families who participated in the 1969 survey.

DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES AND HYPOTHESIZED RELATIONSHIPS

Dependent Variables

1. Mobility Behavior. Based on the 1974 follow-up effort, respondents were classified into two groups: (1) moved and (2) did not move.

2. Moving Plans. Household moving plans were measured by the question from the telephone interview schedule: "How many years do you expect to remain at your current address?" The responses, given in number of years, were coded into nine categories ranging from less than three years to 80 years or more. A tenth category was for those who did not know how long they would remain. In the analysis, these categories were combined into two groupings: (1) those who planned to move within less than three years and (2) those who either planned to remain three years or more or who were uncertain about their moving plans. On the basis of previous research, we anticipated that there would be a fairly close correspondence between moving plans and behavior [39, 44, 46] and that plans to stay would be more accurate as predictors than plans to move.

Independent Variables

A. Factors Affecting the Susceptibility to Racial Change

1. Racial Prejudice. It has frequently been assumed, both by laymen and social scientists, that prejudiced individuals are the first to move from racially changing communities [16, 39]. When the association between prejudice and outmigration decisions has been tested, insignificant results have usually been obtained [10, 43, p. 173]. Based on Bogardus' social distance scales [7, 8, 9], this study developed two Guttman scales to measure racial prejudice.⁶ The first scale measures the attitudes of

⁶See Appendix I.

householders toward living in a racially mixed area under differing assumptions about the income levels of black families. The second measures the attitudes of householders toward sending their children to racially mixed schools under differing assumptions about the test scores of the black children. On the basis of previous research (cited above), we anticipated that these two measures of racial prejudice would not be accurate predictors of behavior. In other words, we did not expect those with "liberal" attitudes toward racial residential integration (i.e., who were interested in the idea when black families had incomes at least equal to theirs) to be less likely to move than those who held negative views on the subject.

2. Current Neighborhood Racial Composition. The concept of the tipping point has been widely utilized by laymen, practitioners and social scientists to describe the racial transition process [31]. Typically, the concept has been used to refer to a leaving point, the maximum proportion that a neighborhood can tolerate before white residents begin to panic move [52]. This concept implies that differences in mobility behavior among residents of a changing community might be due to variations in perceptions of the proportions of blacks. That is, those who perceive that the proportion of blacks has already exceeded the "tipping point" would be expected to have a greater probability of moving than those who perceive that the proportion of blacks is somewhat lower.

In recent years, social scientists have questioned the validity of the concept of the tipping point. Molotch [23] suggests that in many cases, racial change occurs without any panic moving on the part of white residents. Change occurs because most, or all of the homes that are put up for sale in the course of normal turnover are purchased by blacks. Furthermore, even where white panic moving has occurred, there has been no common tipping point [31].

While evidence in support of the tipping point concept is limited, previous research does indicate that as the proportion of blacks in a community increases, there is a sharp, but steady drop in the demand for housing in the area by prospective white residents. A recent nationwide survey of integrated neighborhoods [10, p. 61] concluded:

Of whites in any kind of integrated neighborhood, slightly less than one percent live in neighborhoods that are more than 50 percent Negro. . . At present then it would appear that the percentage of Negroes in the neighborhood is an important variable influencing the housing choice of whites.

This would strongly imply that the perception of the proportion of blacks would also be an important variable influencing the move-stay decision of white householders.

Downs [14, pp. 1338-1339] has provided a useful explanation for the reluctance of whites to move into or remain in substantially integrated communities in terms of the "Law of Dominance".

. . whites. . want to be sure that the social, cultural, and economic milieu and values of their own group dominate their own residential environment and the educational environment of their children. . . The best way to insure that this will happen is to isolate somewhat oneself and one's children in an everyday environment dominated by-but not necessarily exclusively comprised of-other families and children whose social, economic, cultural and even religious views and attitudes are approximately the same as one's own. . . a majority of middle class white Americans still perceive race and color as relevant factors in their assessment of the kind of homogeneity they seek to attain . . . Therefore, in deciding whether a given neighborhood or a given school exhibits the kind of environment in which "their own" traits are and will remain dominant, they consider Negroes as members of "another" group.

As part of the mailed questionnaire, respondents were asked to estimate the approximate racial composition of their immediate neighborhood. The five precoded response categories ranged from "none but our family" to "almost all of the families". We anticipated that the proportion of whites in the immediate vicinity would be correlated with residential stability.

3. Future Racial Changes. Recent studies have emphasized the importance of expectations of future racial change (rather than perceptions of the neighborhood's current racial composition) in influencing white mobility decisions [51, 52]. Whites may decide to move early in the transition process (when the proportion of blacks is relatively small), if they anticipate that their neighborhood will eventually become predominantly black. It is often believed that these expectations are irrational; but, in fact, researchers have found that residents formulate these expectations on the basis of realistic assessments of the market forces impinging on their communities [10, 27, p. 83, 51]. That is, they are most likely to fear complete transition when their community is immediately adjacent to a predominantly black area.

Mailed questionnaire respondents were asked whether they thought the proportion of blacks in the immediate vicinity of their home would increase, remain the same or decrease in the next five years or so. We assumed that the expectation of an increase in the proportion of blacks would be correlated with residential mobility.

The questionnaire included several other items dealing with race related changes. The following beliefs were assumed likely to contribute to residential mobility; that the:

- proportion of Jews would decrease
- typical income would be lower in five years, and
- property values would decline

4. Income Contextual Position. Reference group theory may be utilized to explain migration decisions in neighborhoods experiencing social and economic changes. This would include, but not be limited to, racially changing communities. Reference groups are "those groups to which the individual refers himself as part or to which he aspires to relate himself psychologically [41, p. 161]." It is assumed that one's neighbors may provide the basis for self-evaluation. The individual is assumed to implicitly estimate his deviance from others with respect to some characteristic of the group. Where the neighborhood is the significant reference group, and where there is a perception of too large a discrepancy in some salient characteristic between residents in the surrounding area and the household (possibly because of the characteristics of the new immigrant families), the household would be expected to be more inclined to move than if no such discrepancy existed.

Up to this point, research on the impact of the income contextual position of families on moving decisions has been inconclusive [32]. We assumed, nonetheless, that the income contextual position of Wynnefield whites might influence their mobility propensity. The income contextual position of the family was computed by subtracting family income from the perceived typical neighborhood income level. (Both questions, family income and perceived neighborhood income had the same five precoded categories, ranging from under \$5,000 to \$25,000 or more). We anticipated that to the extent that family income deviated from the typical family income level (either upward or downward) this would contribute to residential mobility.

5. Satisfaction with Shopping Facilities. In Wynnefield, as in other racially changing communities, transition has been accompanied by a deterioration in the quality of shopping in the local commercial district [1, 2, 4, 17, 28]. Kosher butcher shops, and other stores serving a Jewish clientele have closed symbolizing the disappearance of the Jewish community.

The mailed questionnaire respondents were asked about their level of satisfaction (ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied) with three aspects of neighborhood shopping: (1) the time required to get to the stores; (2) the types of goods and services; and (3) the comfort of shopping. A scale was developed to measure the overall level of satisfaction with neighborhood shopping by summing the number of items marked "very satisfied." We assumed that the level of satisfaction with neighborhood shopping facilities would contribute to residential stability.

6. Neighborhood Participation. Families who emphasize social participation in the immediate area, are likely to view racial change as more of a threat than those emphasizing a cosmopolitan life style [39]. Those oriented toward the surrounding community are likely to have many friends (and possibly relatives) in this area. The out-migration of these friends (as a result of racial change) would disrupt their social life and contribute to the decision to move. On the other

hand, the cosmopolite is likely to have few friends in the immediate vicinity and may not even know neighbors on his block [48]. Racial change would clearly pose far less of a threat to this type of family. The surveys included three measures of a locality oriented life style: (1) the presence of a relatively large number of friends in the immediate vicinity; (2) the presence of a relatively large number of relatives in the immediate vicinity; and (3) the membership of the family in one or more community based organizations. We anticipated that all three measures would be correlated with residential mobility.

7. Presence of School Age Children. Concern about declines in the quality of local public schools has been seen to be one of the most important factors affecting the moving decisions of current and prospective white residents in middle class areas subject to racial change [15, 17, 28, 54]. Parents with children already in the public schools would be expected to view such changes as more of a threat than would those without children or with children in other age groups or in private schools [34, pp. 36-37]. Consequently, we assumed that the presence of at least one school age child would be negatively associated with the willingness to remain in Wynnefield.

8. Housing Type. Studies of racially mixed areas have suggested that housing price and quality play a particularly important role in attracting and retaining white residents. White demand has been found to be particularly high where the housing offered better than average values for the money--and in particular, where comparable values were not available in suburban areas [17, 19, 30, 34]. This suggests that the types of housing available in Wynnefield would affect the willingness of whites to remain.

Wynnefield is divided into two sections. The "Lower Hill" section consists largely of attached homes but has some apartments. In the "Upper Hill" section, large and attractive single-family homes predominate. At the time the original survey was conducted in 1969, the cost and value of the homes in the Upper Hill section seemed to make them particularly attractive to middle and upper-income whites.⁷ Based on both the assumption that these detached homes were perceived as values by resident whites and on previous findings, it was anticipated that the presence of a family in a detached home would be positively associated with the willingness to remain.

9. Attitudes Toward Inter-marriage. The preference for marrying within one's own religious group (endogamy) has been viewed as one of the most important underlying reasons for residential clustering among Jews [18]. That is, Jewish parents choose to live in neighborhoods where there are a significant number of other Jewish families to maximize the potential

⁷This assertion is substantiated by a New York Times article on the Wynnefield community [20].

for contact between their children and other Jewish children [6]. This would imply that a decline in the number of Jewish families would most likely lead to decisions to move among those who emphasize endogamy.

A Guttman scale measuring this attitude was computed from the results to five separate items on the survey. Respondents were asked whether they would approve of a male friend of theirs marrying a Gentile in five situations, ranging from where the prospective wife was going to convert to Judaism to where the male friend was going to convert to Christianity. We expected that a strict attitude toward intermarriage (i.e., a low score on this scale) would contribute to residential mobility.

10. Attitudes Toward Driving to the Synagogue on the Sabbath. Under traditional Jewish law, it is forbidden to drive on the Sabbath. Orthodox interpretation forbids driving on the Sabbath; whereas it is permitted in Conservative and Reform Judaism. The need to be within walking distance of a congregation is, therefore, an important basis for residential clustering among the Orthodox. We would expect that a strict attitude toward driving on the Sabbath would contribute to residential stability in racially changing communities. These families would not have the option of moving from the community and then driving back for religious services.

The mailed questionnaire included a set of three items (forming a Guttman scale) dealing with the attitude toward driving to the synagogue on the Sabbath. Respondents were asked whether they would approve or disapprove of someone driving to the synagogue where (1) the individual lived within a short walk of the synagogue; (2) where he would find it inconvenient (but not impossible) to walk; and (3) where he lived beyond walking distance from a synagogue. We assumed that a positive score on this scale (i.e., a tolerant attitude toward driving) would contribute to residential mobility.

B. Factors Affecting Residential Mobility Generally Regardless of the Racial Context

1. Age. Researchers have generally found that for the metropolitan area as a whole, the most important determinant of voluntary moves is housing needs generated by life cycle changes [42]. "For typical families, mobility propensity is highest during the family formation, child bearing and child launching phases (of the life cycle) and is least marked during the child rearing period--especially when the child is in school" [39, p. 92]. In the past, researchers have frequently used age as an indicator for family life cycle position and found it to be negatively associated with mobility propensity (see for example [35, 36]). We also expected age to be negatively associated with mobility among Wynnefield residents.

2. Tenant Status. We anticipated that homeownership would constitute a barrier to moving among Wynnefield residents. Previous

research has documented the higher mobility propensity of renters than owners [33]. Moore [29] suggests that the higher mobility rate of renters is due to the greater economic, physical and psychological obstacles to moving facing owners.

3. Duration of Residence. Previous researchers have frequently found a negative association between duration of residence and mobility propensity [29, 39]. This finding probably reflects the fact that over time, the habits of individuals become established at one location and they become increasingly reluctant to initiate a new pattern of life elsewhere.

4. Family Income. Adequate financial resources are an important prerequisite for moving [39]. Financial resources include, but are certainly not limited to, current family income. We anticipated that family income would be positively correlated with residential mobility.

5. Likelihood of Job Transfers. Most intermetropolitan moves are related to the employment of the family breadwinner (e.g., job transfers). As part of the 1969 telephone interview, respondents were asked: "Will you/your husband still work at the same place after your next move?" A "no" response was interpreted to mean that the head of the household expected to be transferred or to obtain a new job elsewhere. We hypothesized that the expectation of a job transfer in the near future would contribute to residential mobility.

6. Accessibility to Work. Planners and economists usually have assumed that accessibility to work influences residential choices. This would imply that the desire to be closer to the job would influence moving decisions within the same commuting area [11, 36]. As part of the mailed questionnaire, respondents were asked about the extent to which they were satisfied with three different aspects of commuting--the time, expense, and comfort involved. A scale was developed to measure the overall satisfaction with commuting by summing the number of items marked very satisfied. A second measure of satisfaction with accessibility was computed by subtracting the amount of time the respondent said he spent commuting from the maximum time that he said he would be willing to spend commuting. (Both questions had the same eight precoded response categories ranging from one to nine minutes to 70 minutes or more). We assumed that to the extent that the time spent commuting exceeded the maximum specified, this would contribute to residential mobility.

ANALYSIS

In order to explain variations in mobility behavior among Wynnefield residents, regressions were run using moving plans, then moving behavior as the dependent variables and the background characteristics discussed in the previous section as the independent variables. We first ran the regressions with all the background characteristics discussed in the previous section as the independent variables. These results are presented in Table 1. We then

TABLE 1: Simple Associations and Relative Importance of Background Characteristics in Predicting Moving Plans (Likelihood of Remaining 3 years or more) and Mobility (Likelihood of Remaining Between 1969 and 1974) for Jews in Wynnefield

	<u>Moving Plans</u>		<u>Mobility Behavior</u>		
	<u>Correlation</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Correlation</u>	<u>Beta Excluding Moving Plans</u>	<u>Beta Including Moving Plans</u>
Age	.05	.38 ^b	.12	.22	.13
Children Under 6 (whether have none)	.00	-.09	.12	.07	.09
Children 6 to 17 (whether have none)	-.08	c	.03	.05	-.05
Housetype (whether live in detached home)	.26 ^a	.17	.23 ^b	.20	.16
Tenant Status (whether own)	.07	.09	-.05	-.07	-.09
Family Income	.18 ^a	-.02	.07	c	c
Education	.03	c	-.01	.11	.10
Length of Residence	.00	-.14	-.02	-.07	.10
Organizational Participation (whether none)	-.07	c	-.08	c	c
Number of Relatives in Vicinity	-.22 ^a	-.10	.09	.21	.23 ^b
Number of Friends in Vicinity	.15	-.07	.13	.15	.16
Likelihood of Job Transfer (whether do not expect transfer)	.03	.13	.01	-.10	-.14
Degree of Interest in Housing Inte- gration	-.02	.02	.05	.22	.21
Degree of Interest in Educational Integration	-.13	.06	-.06	-.22	-.23
Proportion of Whites in Vicinity	.12	.32	.23 ^a	.12	.04

TABLE 1: (Continued)

	<u>Moving Plans</u>		<u>Mobility Behavior</u>		
	<u>Correlation</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Correlation</u>	<u>Beta Excluding Moving Plans</u>	<u>Beta Including Moving Plans</u>
Likelihood that the Proportion of Blacks will Decrease	.00	.07	.12	-.02	-.03
Likelihood that the Proportion of Jews in Vicinity will Increase	.00	-.29	.17 ^a	.17	.24
Likelihood that Property Values will Increase	.03	.22	.11	.03	c
Likelihood that Typical Income will Increase	.10	-.08	.02	-.12	-.10
Income Contextual Position (Likeli- hood that Family Income is Lower than Neighborhood)	.06	c	.09	.17	.16
Degree of Tolerance of Intermarriage	-.17 ^a	-.30 ^b	.06	.14	.21
Degree of Tolerance of Driving to the Synagogue on the Sabbath	-.09	-.09	.13 ^a	.09	.11
Time to Work vs. Preferences (Like- lihood that the Trip to Work is Less than the Time Specified)	.07	.21	-.18 ^a	-.27 ^a	-.32
Degree of Satis- faction with Com- muting	.11	.10	.04	-.03	-.06
Degree of Satis- faction with Neigh- borhood Shopping	.06	-.07	.15	.03	.04
Moving Plans (to Remain Three Years or More)	---	---	.19 ^a	---	.24 ^b

TABLE 1: (Continued)

	<u>Moving Plans</u>		<u>Mobility Behavior</u>	
	<u>Correlation</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Correlation</u>	Beta Excluding <u>Moving Plans</u> Beta Including <u>Moving Plans</u>
Constant		.38		-.07
DF		56		56
R ²		.24		.35
F Ratio		.55		.89

^aKendall's correlation coefficient statistically significant at the .05 level.

^bF values statistically significant at the .05 level.

^cVariables not included in the regression equation because the F level or the tolerance level was insufficient for further computation.

reran the regressions, excluding those variables that did not meaningfully contribute to explaining variations in behavior. In general, we excluded those variables whose F values were statistically insignificant at the .05 level. There were two exceptions to this generalization. Firstly, we included householder's perceptions of their neighborhood's racial composition in later runs even though the F values were not statistically significant. We did this because of the theoretical importance of this variable combined with the fact that the beta value between this variable and moving plans was quite large.

Secondly, we excluded the number of relatives in the immediate vicinity even though the F value was statistically significant for the relationship with mobility behavior. We did this because the results dealing with moving plans were in the opposite direction. With such contradictory results, it was felt proper to exclude this variable from later regression runs.


We were conscious of the fact that we might encounter multicollinearity by including so many background characteristics in the regression analysis. In reality, this was not a serious issue in our analysis. Firstly, extreme multicollinearity did not exist (i.e., intercorrelations between .8 and 1.0). Secondly, where there was moderate multicollinearity (i.e., intercorrelations between .5 and .6) we used one variable as a proxy for others. Specifically, the initial regression run (see Table 1) indicated that there was moderate multicollinearity between perceptions of the neighborhood's current racial composition and expectations of racial, religious and income changes, as well as possible changes in property values. It also showed that perceptions of the neighborhood's current racial composition was far more powerful in explaining variations in mobility plans and mobility behavior than the other four variables. Consequently, in the next regression run--the one used to prepare the path diagram (Figure 3)--perceptions of the neighborhood's racial composition served as a proxy for the other four.

We were also aware of a second methodological issue. That is, that regression analysis assumes that all relationships are linear and additive whereas some of these relationships may conceivably be nonlinear and multiplicative. On the basis of the mobility model used in this article it seemed reasonable to assume that the relationships would not depart from the linearity assumption. Therefore, we did not modify any of the variables, using for example, log transformations.

The regression results reflecting these modifications are represented by a path diagram (Figure 3).⁸ The hypothesized causal relationships are represented by unidirectional arrows extending from each determining variable to each variable depending on it. Residual variables are represented by vertical unidirectional arrows leading from the residual variable to the dependent variable. Standardized regression coefficients are placed alongside

⁸This discussion of path diagrams is drawn from [25].

FIGURE 3: Path Analysis of the Effects of Background Characteristics and Moving Plans on Residential Mobility (Likelihood of Remaining) Wynnefield Jewish Residents



the unidirectional arrows (with an indication of whether the coefficients are statistically significant). Since the coefficients are standardized, the two paths leading to the same variable can be compared by order of magnitude to indicate which variable has the most powerful direct effect. The non-causal factors in the system are represented by two headed curvilinear arrows.

FINDINGS

Factors Affecting the Susceptibility to Racial Change

As expected, the two indicators of racial prejudice were not accurate predictors of behavior. Table 1 shows that there were negligible correlations between both moving plans and mobility behavior on the one hand and attitudes toward housing and educational integration on the other. Respondents who were interested in living in a racially integrated neighborhood or in sending their children to a racially integrated school were just as likely to move as those who held negative views on these subjects. These results clearly support previous research showing that racial prejudice is a relatively unimportant factor in influencing mobility choices.

These findings can be better understood if one recalls how racial prejudice was measured in our study. Respondents were asked about their level of interest in living in a hypothetical stable integrated community with a white majority. This type of hypothetical situation did not correspond to that actually experienced by many of the Wynnefield respondents (particularly those in the Lower Hill section, where rapid racial change had occurred during the 1960s). These residents perceived their neighborhoods as changing and many lived in neighborhoods that were predominantly black. Thus, the insignificant results partly reflect the sharp disparity between the type of community preferred by those with pro-integration sentiments, and the type of community in which they were situated.

These results also may be interpreted in terms of previous research showing no necessary relationship between prejudice and discriminatory behavior [5, p. 505]. Withdrawal from a racially mixed area can be considered a form of discrimination. Prejudiced individuals may have decided to remain in Wynnefield and ignore black neighbors or discriminate against them by, for example, excluding them from participation in the local residents association or by both.

The findings support the hypothesized importance of perceptions of the neighborhood's current racial composition in influencing the move-stay decision. Figure 3 shows that this variable (X_3) had both a strong indirect and direct impact on mobility. That is, respondents who perceived that they lived in neighborhoods that were at least one-half black, were far more likely to develop and implement plans to move than those living in neighborhoods that still had white majorities. In addition, some of the respondents who lived in substantially integrated neighborhoods made rapid decisions to move even though they had planned to remain. The respondents in substantially integrated neighborhoods who moved, probably did so

because they were unwilling to be part of a racial minority. They may have also feared that if they remained, they would be part of a tiny racial minority in the future.

Contrary to what had been anticipated, expectations of racial and race related changes did not significantly contribute to explaining variations in mobility behavior in the analysis (Table 1). There were insignificant beta coefficients between both moving plans and moving behavior on the one hand and expectations of (1) future racial changes; (2) future changes in neighborhood income levels; (3) future changes in the neighborhood's religious composition; and (4) future changes in property values.

The fact that this set of factors did not play a significant explanatory role may have been due to the fact that the study took place six years after the racial transition process had begun in Wynnefield. Thus, by 1969, the prospect of complete neighborhood racial turnover was a reality to residents rather than a distant possibility. Had these questions (dealing with expectations) been asked earlier in the transition process, they may have been more important in explaining variations in mobility.

The income contextual position of the family did not have a significant impact on the likelihood of moving (Table 1). That is, those whose incomes deviated downward or upward from the typical neighborhood income level were not more likely to move than those whose income corresponded to the norm.

There is also no evidence that dissatisfaction with neighborhood shopping, resulting from the deterioration of Wynnefield's commercial district, contributed to many mobility decisions. There were insignificant beta coefficients between both moving plans and moving behavior and the overall level of satisfaction with neighborhood shopping facilities.

The results dealing with neighborhood participation variables are contradictory and inconclusive. Table 1 shows that, contrary to what had been expected, families with a large number of relatives in the immediate area were significantly less likely to make rapid decisions to move. This implies that the presence of these relatives nearby held families to the area. However, Table 1 also shows that families with relatives nearby were more likely to have planned to move. There is no obvious explanation for these contradictory results. The two other measures of neighborhood participation--the number of friends in the vicinity and the number of organizations to which members of the family belonged--played insignificant roles in explaining variations in mobility plans and mobility behavior.

As anticipated, the house type of the family (X_2) had a significant direct impact on mobility (Figure 3). Families living in the detached single family homes were far less likely to make rapid decisions to move. As we mentioned previously, the detached homes are highly attractive, on shaded streets and with large plots of land. Comparable homes cost up to twice as much in nearby suburban areas. On the other hand, the row homes in Lower Wynnefield appear shabby and probably were viewed as obsolete by most white residents. The results, therefore, suggest that a key factor

holding whites to the area was the desire to maximize the quality of housing within available financial means.

In addition, the lower mobility rate of detached home residents may have been due to the fact that they were more optimistic about their section of the community (the Upper Hill area) remaining racially mixed, rather than becoming predominantly black. Although the market for detached single family homes was depressed as a result of racial change, the cost of the homes was still beyond the purchasing power of most home seeking black families from West Philadelphia. Thus, it would have been realistic for whites to anticipate that the detached home area would continue to attract middle class whites and relatively few blacks.

There is no evidence to support the hypothesized importance of another background characteristic--the presence of school age children--in influencing residential mobility. There were negligible beta coefficients between this variable and the two mobility measures and it, therefore, was not included in the regression analysis.

Earlier, we had hypothesized that individuals with a strict attitude toward intermarriage would be the ones most likely to move from a racially changing community. Table 1 and Figure 3 show, however, that a strict attitude toward this subject, indirectly contributed to decisions to remain. That is, individuals with a strict attitude toward intermarriage were significantly more likely to develop and implement plans to remain. This somewhat surprising finding can be explained in terms of previous research showing religious families to be the last to move from racially changing communities. The lower mobility rate of religious families reflects the fact that they usually have a greater sense of allegiance to their synagogue and stronger social ties to their Jewish neighbors.⁹ The low mobility rate of religious families in Wynnefield probably reflects another factor; that even if they

⁹This pattern is illustrated by the activities of the Lubavitch Hasidic sect (an ultra-orthodox Jewish group) in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn [22, 26]. During the 1960s the community underwent racial change and most of the middle class Jewish population moved away. The Lubavitch rebbe (the leader of the sect) decreed that it would be wrong for members of the sect to move away. Low interest loans have been utilized to assist Hasidic families in purchasing homes in the area. As a result of the decree and activities such as the housing loans, the area has stabilized with a black majority. It should be noted, however, that the activities of the Lubavitch Jews are somewhat atypical even among Orthodox (non-Hasidic) Jews. This is due to the particularly strong feeling of allegiance among Hassidim toward the rebbe.

¹⁰Religious families in a racially changing Jewish community in Detroit faced an analogous situation [50]. There was the last remaining identifiably Jewish community in the city.

wanted to move, there were (and are) only a few communities in the Philadelphia area that they could relocate to and remain within walking distance of a congregation.¹⁰

There was no evidence that the attitude toward driving to the synagogue on the Sabbath had any bearing on the likelihood of moving. Those who had a strict attitude (i.e., who were unwilling to approve of it under any conditions) were as likely to move as those who had a lenient attitude toward the subject.

Factors Affecting Residential Mobility Generally

As anticipated, the age of the household head (X_1) had significant, indirect and direct impacts on mobility (Figure 3). Older household heads were far less likely to develop and implement moving plans than younger ones. They were also less likely to make rapid decisions to move. The residential stability of older families probably reflects the fact that they were more reluctant to disrupt the patterns of life that they had established at their current locations.

None of the other general mobility characteristics measured on the telephone interview schedule (i.e., tenant status, length of residence at the current location, family income, and likelihood of a job transfer) significantly contributed to explaining variations in mobility behavior (Table 1). Similarly, the two measures of accessibility to the job (measured on the mailed questionnaire) were of no explanatory importance. The results for the variable "time to work versus preferences" were just the opposite of what had been anticipated. Household heads who spent less time commuting than their stated maximum were more likely to move rather than less likely as had been assumed. These latter results imply that few of the respondents moved to be closer to their jobs. Although these findings do contradict our hypothesis (as well as the results of two recent studies [11, 36], these results are actually in conformance with most research on the subject [29].

Moving Plans

The relatively large beta coefficient between moving plans and moving behavior (Table 1) indicates that plans independently contributed to explaining variations in behavior when all other background characteristics are taken into account.¹¹ Furthermore, moving plans account for explaining an additional five percent of the variance in mobility beyond that explained by background characteristics alone. The fact that moving plans independently contributed to explaining variations in behavior, probably reflects the fact that moving plans were affected by a variety of personality characteristics not measured on the survey (e.g., chronic restlessness). Had more of these characteristics been measured and included in the regression analysis, the independent impact of plans on behavior would have been considerably reduced.

¹¹Footnote on following page.

SUMMARY

This article has sought to add to the existing limited knowledge on the relative importance of different racial and ethnic attitudes and other background characteristics in explaining mobility behavior in racially changing communities. It has also attempted to determine the way in which these characteristics influence behavior. That is, which factors affect mobility indirectly through their impact on plans (which are then implemented) and which factors affect mobility directly. Multiple regression analysis was utilized to determine the relative importance of different race related attitudes, Jewish cultural characteristics and other background characteristics in explaining variations in mobility behavior among Jewish residents of the Wynnefield section of Philadelphia.

Four major conclusions emerge from the analysis:

1. One of the most important determinants of mobility behavior was the householder's perceptions of the neighborhood's current racial composition. Whites that lived in neighborhoods that were 50 percent or more black were far more likely to move than those in neighborhoods with fewer blacks. This finding parallels previous research showing few whites willing to move into or remain in substantially integrated communities.
2. The level of racial prejudice was not an accurate predictor of mobility behavior. Those interested in residential and educational integration were just as likely to move as those who held negative views on these subjects. These results, therefore,

¹¹The F ratio for moving plans is not statistically significant in Figure 3 even though it is in Table 1. This seeming discrepancy is due to the fact that in Table 1 the impact of moving plans includes the joint influence with other variables. When the list of background characteristics is reduced (as is the case between Table 1 and Figure 3) it is not surprising that the impact of moving plans decreases.

The bivariate crosstabular results dealing with the relationship between moving plans and moving behavior are of interest. Seventy-one percent of those who planned to move in less than three years (N=14) had moved by 1974, whereas only 40 percent of those who planned to remain three years or more (or who were uncertain about their moving plans N=73) had moved. The rate of correspondence between moving plans and behavior in this study, 58 percent, is lower than for previous research on the subject (i.e., where it has been found to be between 70 and 80 percent). Contrary to what had been expected, plans to move were more reliable predictors than plans to stay. Some of the respondents who planned to remain for the foreseeable future may have decided to move when it became apparent that racial change was occurring more rapidly than they had anticipated.

provide additional evidence (to that in earlier research) that there is a sharp difference between one's attitude toward integration in general, and one's attitude toward living in a particular racially changing community. The reason for this discrepancy has to do with what the respondents (and most white Americans) consider a desirable integrated community--that is, one that has a stable white majority. Many of the Wynnefield respondents would have been willing--if not eager--to remain if their community remained integrated with a white majority. Since many of the neighborhoods in Wynnefield (particularly in the Lower Hill section) were at least one-half black by 1969, the prointegration sentiments of white residents were largely irrelevant.

3. The family's house type had a great bearing on the likelihood of remaining. Households living in the large attractive detached homes in Upper Wynnefield were far less likely to move than those living in the attached homes or apartments. Detached home residents probably remained because comparable housing in nearby suburban areas would have cost considerably more. Previous research has shown that the desire to obtain the best apartment or house within one's means, is a key factor in the choice of where to move [10]. It appears that this factor is also important in deciding whether to move from a mixed community.
4. Finally, a strict attitude toward intermarriage contributed to decisions to remain. This finding supports previous research documenting the residential stability of religious Jewish families in racially mixed neighborhoods. The greater residential stability of religious families in Wynnefield probably reflects (a) the strong sense of allegiance to their synagogue and their strong social bonds to other religious families in the vicinity, and (b) the limited number of communities to which they might move (i.e., the fact that they could only consider areas where they would be within distance of a synagogue).

This latter finding appears to refute Simmons' assertion that ethnic variables affect only the decision of where to move and not the decision of when to move. It implies that cultural and religious characteristics may affect the mobility decisions of other types of white ethnic Americans besides Jews. Clearly, future research needs to be directed at explaining variations in the determinants of mobility in different types of racially changing white ethnic communities--as well as the underlying similarities involved.

APPENDIX I:

The specific questions used to measure attitudes toward housing and educational integration were as follows:

How would you feel about living in a community where about 20 percent of the families were black (and the percentage was not increasing)? Would you be very interested, somewhat interested, somewhat against or very much against the idea?

CIRCLE ONE OF THE NUMBERS AFTER EACH STATEMENT

	<u>Very Interested</u>	<u>Somewhat Interested</u>	<u>Somewhat Against</u>	<u>Very Against</u>
If most of the black families had incomes below that of your family	4	3	2	1
If most of the black families had incomes about the same as your family	4	3	2	1
If most of the black families had incomes greater than that of your family	4	3	2	1

How would you feel about sending your child (assuming that you had one) to a school where 20 percent of the school children were black (and the percentage was not increasing)? Would you be very interested, somewhat interested, somewhat against, or very against the idea?

CIRCLE ONE OF THE NUMBERS AFTER EACH STATEMENT

	<u>Very Interested</u>	<u>Somewhat Interested</u>	<u>Somewhat Against</u>	<u>Very Against</u>
If most of the black children had test scores below that of your child	4	3	2	1
If most of the black children had test scores about equal to that of your child	4	3	2	1
If most of the black children had test scores above that of your child	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX I: (Continued)

These two scales represent an attempt to respond to two criticisms of scales used to measure racial prejudice in previous studies. Firstly, most of the scales that have been used have contained statements dealing with a number of different attitudes (racial stereotypes, attitudes toward discrimination, sympathy with the plight of blacks, see [40, pp. 170-175]. Westie [49] has noted that racial prejudice is a composite of several components. This implies that the validity and sensitivity of the scales will be increased if the scales measure subcomponents of prejudice (rather than attempt to use only one scale to measure prejudice). He identified four separate social distance scales to measure racial prejudice: Residential Distance, Interpersonal-Physical Distance, and Interpersonal Social Distance. Furthermore, he suggested that an individual's social distance from blacks may vary depending on the socio-economic characteristics of blacks. Thus, it is important for the researcher to look at different occupational and racial combinations (e.g., a black doctor, a black laborer) in determining the relative importance of each component in assigning social distance. The two separate scales that have been used in this study to measure racial prejudice, incorporate features of Westie's social distance scales. The first--the attitude toward residential integration--measures the Residential Distance component of prejudice. The second--the attitude toward educational integration provides one possible indicator of the Interpersonal-Social Distance component of prejudice. Parents have relatively little control over whom their children will choose as friends at school. The willingness to send children to an integrated school may, therefore, be used as a measure of the willingness of a parent to permit social interaction between their children and black children. In addition, following Westie's suggestion, our scales include different income, social class and racial combinations. That is, respondents were asked about their attitudes toward residential integration under differing assumptions about the income levels of the black families, and their attitudes toward educational integration, under differing assumptions about the test scores of the black children. (We assumed that differences in the test scores of the black children reflect differences in the black childrens' social class background).

Secondly, most questions which have been used to measure the willingness to live in a hypothetical racially mixed community have not specified the racial composition of the area. We assumed that the willingness of a respondent to live in a racially mixed community is dependent upon the racial composition of that community and the rate of turnover from white to black. Similarly, we expected that the interest of whites in school integration would be dependent on the racial composition and rate of turnover of the student body. In order to insure that the respondents interpreted the questions similarly, the questions specified the community racial characteristics. Respondents were asked to assume that the community/school was 20 percent black and the proportion was not increasing. The stable 20 percent figure was used in both cases because we felt it to be beyond the level of token integration, but below the point where whites might move away simply because of the proportions per se.

The results for the tests of Guttman scalability for these and other Guttman scales in this article are to be found in Appendix II.

APPENDIX II: Tests for Reproducibility and Scalability of Sets of Items
Included in the Regression Analysis^a

<u>Tests</u>	<u>Intermarriage</u>	<u>Driving on the Sabbath</u>	<u>Housing^b Integration</u>	<u>Educational^c Integration</u>
Coefficient of Reproducibility	.9524	.9814	.9751	.9749
Coefficient of Scalability	.8300	.9048	.9115	.8529

^aThese tests were conducted using Guttman Scale subprogram in the SPSS package

^bInitially, there were four possible response categories for the items that made up this scale: very against, somewhat against, somewhat interested and very interested. The tests for scalability and reproducibility required that these four categories be combined into two broader groupings: against or interested.

REFERENCES

1. Aldrich, Howard. "Ecological Succession in Racially Changing Neighborhoods: A Review of the Literature," Urban Affairs Quarterly, 10 (3), March 1975, 327-348.
2. Aldrich, Howard and Albert J. Reiss, Jr. "Continuities in the Study of Ecological Succession: Changes in the Race Composition of Neighborhoods and their Businesses," American Journal of Sociology, 81 (4), January 1976, 846-866.
3. Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice, Boston: Beacon, 1958.
4. Arthur D. Little, Inc. East Cleveland: Response to Urban Change, Boston: Arthur D. Little, Inc., 1969.
5. Berelson, Bernard and Gary Steiner. Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.
6. Beshers, James M. Urban Social Structure, New York: Free Press, 1962.
7. Bogardus, Emory S. Immigration and Race Attitudes, Boston: Heath, 1928.
8. Bogardus, Emory S. "Measuring Social Distance," Journal of Applied Sociology, Vol. 9 (1925), 299-308.
9. Bogardus, Emory S. "A Social Distance Scale," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 17 (1933), 265-271.
10. Bradburn, Norman, Seymour Sudman, and Galen Gockel. Side by Side: Integrated Neighborhoods in America, Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971.
11. Brown, H. James. "Changes in Workplace and Residential Locations," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 41, January 1975, 32-39.
12. Butler, Edgar W., Georges Sabagh, and Maurice D. Van Arsdol, Jr. "Demographic and Social Psychological Factors in Residential Mobility," Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 48, January 1964, 138-154.
13. Caplan, Eleanor K. and Eleanor P. Wolf. "Factors Affecting Racial Change in Two Middle Income Areas," Phylon, 11 (1), 1960, 225-233.
14. Downs, Anthony. "Alternative Futures for the American Ghetto," Daedalus, 97 (4), Fall 1968, 1331-1379.
15. Fauman, S. Joseph. "Housing Discrimination, Changing Neighborhoods and Public Schools," Journal of Social Issues, 13 (4), 1957, 21-30.

16. Freeman, Linton C. and Morris H. Sunshine. Patterns of Residential Segregation, Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing, 1970.
17. Ginsberg, Yona. Jews in a Changing Neighborhood: The Study of Mattapan, New York: The Free Press, 1975.
18. Greer, Scott. The Emerging City, New York: The Free Press, 1962.
19. Guttentag, Jack M. "Racial Integration and Home Prices," Wharton Quarterly, Vol. 4, Spring 1970.
20. Janson, Donald. "Racial Change Slashes Values and Produces Bargains," New York Times, January 21, 1973.
21. Johnson, George E. "Synagogue Survival Strategies in a Rootless Society: A Case Study," Analysis, No. 45, April 1974.
22. Kandell, Jonathan. "Jewish Group Buying Homes in Crown Heights to Stabilize the Community," New York Times, January 9, 1972.
23. Kain, John F. Theories of Residential Location and Realities of Race, Harvard University Program in Regional and Urban Economics, Discussion Paper 47, Cambridge: Harvard University, 1970.
24. Klausner, Samuel Z. and David P. Varady. Synagogues Without Ghettos, Center for Research on the Acts of Man, University of Pennsylvania, 1970.
25. Land, Kenneth C. "Principles of Path Analysis," Sociological Methodology - 1969, San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc. (1969), 3-37.
26. Lichtenstein, Grace. "Transitional Crown Heights Now in Midst of Comeback," New York Times, August 1, 1974.
27. McEntire, Davis. Residence and Race, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.
28. Molotch, Harvey L. Managed Integration: Dilemmas of Doing Good in the City, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
29. Moore, Eric G. Residential Mobility in the City, A. A. G. Resource Paper No. 13, Commission on College Geography, 1972.
30. National Academy of Sciences--National Academy of Engineering. Freedom of Choice in Housing: Opportunities and Constraints, 1972.
31. Northwood, Lawrence K. and Louise H. Klein. "The 'Tipping Point' - A Questionable Quality of Neighborhoods," Journal of Intergroup Relations, 4 (4), Autumn 1965, 226-239.
32. Øyen, Ørjar. Ecological Context and Residential Differentiation, Oslo: Universitetstørlaget, 1964.

33. Pickvance, C. G. "Life Cycle, Housing Tenure, and Intra-Urban Residential Mobility: A Causal Model," Sociological Review, 21 (2), May 1973, 279-297.
34. Rapkin, Chester, and William Grigsby. The Demand for Housing in Racially Mixed Areas, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.
35. Roistacher, Elizabeth. "Residential Mobility," Five Thousand American Families -- Patterns of Economic Progress, Vol. II, Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, (1974), 41-78.
36. Roistacher, Elizabeth. "Residential Mobility: Planners, Movers and Multiple Movers," Five Thousand American Families -- Patterns of Economic Progress, Vol. III, Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center (1975), 79-106.
37. Rose, Harold M. Social Processes in the City: Race and Urban Residential Choice, Resource Paper No. 6, Commission on College Geography, Association of American Geographers, 1969.
38. Rossi, Peter H. Why Families Move, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.
39. Sabagh, Georges, Maurice Van Arsdol, Jr., and Edgar Butler. "Some Determinants of Intrametropolitan Mobility: Conceptual Considerations," Social Forces, Vol. 48, September 1969, 89-98.
40. Selznick, Gertrude J. and Stephen Steinberg. The Tenacity of Prejudice, New York: Harper and Row, 1969.
41. Sherif, Muzafer and Carolyn Sherif. Groups in Harmony and Tension, New York: Harper and Row, 1953.
42. Simmons, James W. "Changing Residences in the City: A Review of Intraurban Mobility," Geographical Review, Vol. 58, October 1968, 622-651.
43. Taeuber, Karl and Alma Taeuber. Negroes in Cities: Residential Segregation and Neighborhood Change, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965.
44. Van Arsdol, Maurice D. Jr., Georges Sabagh and Edgar W. Butler. "Retrospective and Subsequent Metropolitan Residential Mobility," Demography, 5 (1), 1968, 249-267.
45. Varady, David P. "Determinants of Mobility in an Inner City Community," Regional Science Perspectives, Vol. 5 (1975), 154-178.
46. Varady, David P. "Moving Intentions and Behavior in the Cincinnati Model Neighborhood," Bulletin of the Association of the American Collegiate Schools of Planning, 12 (1) Spring 1974, 1-3.
47. Varady, David P. The Household Migration Decision in Racially Changing Neighborhoods, University of Pennsylvania, Doctoral Dissertation, 1971.

48. Webber, Melvin M. and Carolyn Webber. "Culture, Territoriality and the Elastic Mile," Taming Megalopolis, Vol. 1, Garden City, N. Y.: Anchor Books (1967), 35-53.
49. Westie, Frank R. "Negro White Status Differentials and Social Distance," American Sociological Review, 17 (5), October 1952, 550-558.
50. Wolf, Eleanor P. "The Baxter Area, 1960-1962: A New Trend in Neighborhood Change," Phylon, Vol. 26, Winter 1965, 344-353.
51. Wolf, Eleanor P. "The Invasion Succession Sequence as a Self-Fulfilling Prophecy," Journal of Social Issues, 12 (4), 1957, 7-20.
52. Wolf, Eleanor P. "The 'Tipping Point' in Racially Changing Neighborhoods," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 25, August 1963, 417-422.
53. Wolf, Eleanor P. and Charles N. Lebeaux. Change and Renewal in an Urban Community: Five Case Studies of Detroit, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969.
54. Wolf, Eleanor P. and Charles N. Lebeaux. "Class and Race in the Changing City," Urban Research and Policy Planning, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, (1967), 99-129.