



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 MOBILITY PROCESS IN A RACIALLY CHANGING COMMUNITY*

David P. Varady**

Introduction

This article represents an extension of the author's research into the causes and characteristics of the racial transition process in middle class Jewish communities.¹ In previous articles [14, 15] we have examined the determinants of mobility among white residents in this type of community; that is, the relative importance of different demographic, housing and attitudinal characteristics (e.g., racial prejudice) in explaining variations in moving plans and actual mobility behavior. This article examines residential mobility from another perspective: the reasons for moving provided by the residents themselves.² We focus on three stages of the mobility process: (1) the decision to move from the former residence; (2) the search for a new home; and (3) the actual choice of where to move.

This approach to the study of mobility--i.e., where the focus is on reasons provided by the subjects--has been termed "reason analysis." This is a set of

*The data for this paper were originally gathered by the staff of the Center for 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.

¹An underlying assumption of this paper is that the determinants of mobility may vary between different types of white ethnic communities. It is therefore, important to conduct empirical studies of residential mobility in these different types of communities. Studies of racially changing Jewish communities are particularly appropriate since so many racially changing communities have been Jewish ones.

²Some readers might note the similarity between the title of this article and the title of the previous one that appeared in this journal. There are three major differences between the two articles. Firstly, the articles use different approaches to explain the mobility decision. This article uses reason analysis while the earlier one examines the determinants of mobility. Secondly, this article deals with all three stages of the mobility process (i.e., the decision to move, the search for a new home and the actual choice of where to move) whereas the earlier paper focuses exclusively on the first stage. Thirdly, only this article deals with crime as a factor affecting residential mobility decisions. Ideally, this article should be read in conjunction with the earlier one.

procedures used by survey researchers to study the causal relationships involved in an action based on perceived motives supplied by respondents [6]. In this type of analysis, the action or decision is broken into phases, based on an underlying theory or model. Respondents are queried about the factors affecting each phase. In his classic mobility study published in 1955, Rossi [11] utilized reason analysis to study household moves, but his study did not include any racially changing neighborhoods. Since that time, there have been few applications of this technique to transitional communities (for an exception to this generalization see [13]). This article is directed at this gap in existing research.

This article has two more specific objectives. The first is to determine the extent to which the mobility process in a changing neighborhood is distinctive from that in an adjoining stable predominantly white community.³ Do residents of racially changing communities move because of the existence of racial change (or race related changes) or do they move for normal reasons (e.g., the need for more or less space, job transfers)? Are the criteria used in the housing search influenced by the reasons given for moving from the original location? More specifically, is there a tendency for those who move because of the existence of racial change to be particularly concerned about the racial composition of prospective locations? How does the existence of racial change influence the scope and nature of the housing search? Assuming that there is a tendency for residents in the racially changing community to panic move, does this make them more likely to limit the housing search in terms of the locations considered and in terms of the length of time spent in the search? Are residents of racially changing communities less likely to relocate within the same community than residents of stable predominantly white areas?


The second objective is to examine how Jewish ethnic characteristics influence mobility decisions in racially changing Jewish communities. Do the more religious families have different reasons for moving? Are the more religious families more likely to limit their search to communities with significant numbers of other Jewish families?

Methodology

This article is based on an analysis of 42 Jewish families in the Wynnefield-Lower Merion section of Philadelphia who moved between 1969 and 1974. Wynnefield is a middle class community located along the western edge of Philadelphia (see Figure 1). Between the 1920s and mid 1960s, the community was a predominantly

³There are problems in using a stable adjoining area as a control community. Residents and potential buyers may formulate expectations of change in their area based on trends in the racially changing community. Ideally, we should have chosen for a control community a stable predominantly white one distant from any black ghetto. Unfortunately, this was not feasible to do at the time the study area boundaries were defined.

FIGURE 1: Boundaries of Study Area



Jewish enclave centered around many synagogues and other religious and cultural institutions. Black immigration began in the mid 1960s and by 1970, the community was approximately one-half black. Lower Merion is a stable, predominantly white upper middle income area immediately to the west of Wynnefield, along suburban Philadelphia's Main Line.

In the summer of 1969, 269 Jewish families in this area were first telephone interviewed and then completed mailed questionnaires covering: (1) background demographic and housing characteristics; (2) Jewish religious and cultural characteristics; (3) race related attitudes; and (4) attitudes toward the residential environment. In the summer of 1974, follow-up questionnaires were sent to all of the families who were surveyed in 1969. This follow-up questionnaire repeated many of the attitudinal items from the 1969 survey and in addition, contained a set of questions on the three stages of the mobility process mentioned above.

Respondents were first asked whether they had, in fact, moved from their 1969 locations. Those who had moved were asked about their complaints with their 1969 location that had led to the move. They were provided with a list of 22 housing and neighborhood related characteristics which (on the basis of previous research) would be expected to affect the migration decision. They were asked to indicate whether these characteristics were very important, somewhat important or not important at all in this migration decision. Respondents were presented with a similar list to identify criteria used in the housing search. Subsequent questions dealt with (1) information sources used in the housing search; (2) types and numbers of areas considered; (3) time spent in the housing search; and (4) the location of the family home chosen.

One hundred fifty-four of the follow-up questionnaires were returned. Twenty-seven percent (or 42 families) had moved between 1969 and 1974 and thus, completed the mobility section of the survey. The analysis in this paper is limited to these 42 families. Due to the small sample size, the results should be considered as tentative in nature.

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. The analysis of actual mobility patterns (Table 5) is based on this larger sample of families for whom mobility information was available.

Hypotheses

A. Distinctive Aspects of the Mobility Process in a Racially Changing Community

1. White Panic Moving. It has been widely assumed by both social scientists and laymen that the racial transition process involves white panic moving [5]. That is, once the proportion of blacks

exceeds a certain point--the "tipping point"--the white outmigration rate accelerates.⁴ We, therefore, anticipated that Wynnefield and Lower Merion movers would differ in terms of their complaints about their previous locations. Lower Merion residents would be more likely to mention "normal" types of complaints related to the home itself (e.g., not enough space). On the other hand, Wynnefield residents would be more likely to mention the existence of racial change or problems related to it (e.g., declines in the quality of local schools).

2. Importance of Different Race Related Reasons for Moving. A number of researchers have studied the types of beliefs and concerns that whites develop about the surrounding residential area when the proportion of blacks increases. The beliefs and concerns mentioned in the literature include the expectation: (1) that property values will decline [1, 7]; (2) that the area will eventually become all or nearly all black [8, p. 84]; (3) that income levels and the status level of the area will decline; (4) that the quality of education at the local public schools will decline [3, 16]; and (5) that the area will experience physical deterioration. Recent case studies suggest that the most serious concern is about violent street crime. In her study of the racially changing Mattapan section of Boston, Ginsberg [4] found that street crime had made life unbearable for the remaining white residents; and that the fear of street crime was based on reality. We, therefore, assumed that physical safety would be the most frequently mentioned complaint among Wynnefield movers.
3. Criteria Utilized in the Housing Search. Previous studies have indicated that "the criteria specified by the household (for the housing search) reflect the motivations of the decision to seek a new residence" [10, p. 3]. This would imply that there would be strong relationships between the stated reasons for moving from the 1969 location and the criteria used in the housing search. More specifically, this would mean that Wynnefield residents who moved because of the existence of racial change in the surrounding area would be particularly concerned about the racial composition of prospective locations. On the other hand, Lower Merion residents who moved because of

⁴A recent study by Molotch [9] has questioned this assumption. He found the mobility rate in the racially changing South Shore Community (Chicago) was no higher than in comparable stable white communities. Racial change was occurring because nearly all the homes that were being put up for sale in the course of normal turnover were being purchased by blacks.

complaints about the home would be particularly concerned about housing characteristics at new locations.

4. The Evaluation of Alternatives. Time is an important element in the search process. Among forced movers, "the sheer necessity of providing a roof over their heads imposes a substantial time constraint" [10, p. 18]. It would seem reasonable to assume that the situation of families moving from a racially changing community would be somewhat analogous to forced movers. That is, if the quality of life deteriorates rapidly (for example, if a member of the family is assaulted or the house robbed), they may feel the pressure to purchase or rent the first dwelling they see that meets their standards. This implies that Wynnefield movers would have spent less time in their housing search and would have seriously considered fewer locations than Lower Merion movers.
5. Geographical Scope of the Housing Search. Previous research indicates that families usually concentrate their housing search in nearby areas, and secondarily, in the same sector of the city [10]. We expected the same pattern in the study area although we anticipated that relatively few respondents would look for homes in Wynnefield because of the existence of racial change in that area.

B. Jewish Ethnic Characteristics and the Mobility Process

Simmons [12, p. 633] in a widely quoted article asserts that "the ethnic factor (which would include Jewish cultural characteristics) acts as a constraint only on the number of possible alternatives, explaining 'where' people move rather than 'why' they move." This would suggest that Jewish cultural characteristics would affect the types of areas considered in the housing search as well as the area finally chosen, but would not affect the decision to move. That is, the more religious families would probably confine their housing search to areas of relatively high Jewish density in the northern section of Wynnefield (near the city boundary) or to immediately adjoining areas in Lower Merion Township. They would do this to insure that there would be a sufficient number of Jewish families in the immediate vicinity to insure that their social life could be largely confined to other Jewish families.

In a recent article based on the same data set [14] we found that one Jewish cultural characteristic, the attitude toward intermarriage, was important in explaining variations in mobility among Wynnefield residents. This suggests that this variable (or some other Jewish religious/cultural characteristic) would be associated with the types of reasons provided for moving from a Wynnefield location. More speci-

fically, we would assume that the more religious or identifiably Jewish families would be more likely to cite as reasons for moving, such factors as declines in the number of Jewish families in the area and the closing of synagogues in the area.

Findings

The Decision to Move. Table 1 provides support for the hypothesis that Wynnefield whites would move in response to racial change, rather than simply for normal mobility reasons. This table compares Wynnefield and Lower Merion Township movers in terms of the proportions considering each of the housing and neighborhood factors as very important. This table also indicates the ranking of each of these factors, broken down by location, based on the proportions mentioning the factors as very important. As shown, a far higher proportion of Wynnefield than Lower Merion residents mentioned the following neighborhood related characteristics as very important in their decisions to move: that the community was undergoing racial change; that the quality of public schools and neighborhood shopping facilities were declining and that the community was experiencing declines in the proportion of Jewish families. These findings generally parallel the results from earlier analyses we have completed about this community where we found: (1) that Wynnefield respondents had more rapid moving plans than comparable families in Lower Merion Township [15]; (2) that an important factor affecting the moving decision was the perception of the neighborhood's current racial composition [14]; and (3) that racial change was accompanied by declines in the quality of local public schools and by a deterioration in the quality of the local business district. Whereas Wynnefield residents were more likely to move as a result of racial and race related changes, Lower Merion Township residents were more likely to move as a result of dissatisfaction with the quality of their home. This is shown by the fact that a far higher proportion of Lower Merion Township than Wynnefield residents mentioned the following three aspects of housing quality as very important to their mobility decision: the layout of the dwelling, the quality of the construction and the exterior appearance of the home.

The fear of crime was the most important reason for moving among both Wynnefield and Lower Merion Township respondents. Ninety percent of the Wynnefield respondents and 80 percent of the Lower Merion Township respondents considered this factor to be very important in their migration decision. The fact that safety was mentioned so frequently among Wynnefield respondents is as anticipated. There was, in fact, a sharp increase in the incidence of violent crime in Wynnefield in the late 1960s and early 1970s.⁵ The results

⁵During the late 1960s and early 1970s, Wynnefield experienced a series of muggings and stabbings of middle age and elderly women. Youth gang violence claimed a number of lives. Serious crime (murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault) rose by 57 percent between 1967 and 1973 for the police district encompassing Wynnefield and other sections of West Philadelphia.

TABLE 1: Home and Neighborhood Related Reasons for Moving from the 1969 Location

	<u>Wynnefield</u>		<u>Lower Merion Township</u>	
	Prop. mentioning as <u>very imp.</u> (N=14)	<u>Rank</u>	Prop. mentioning as <u>very imp.</u> (N=9)	<u>Rank</u>
Crime	88%	1	78%	1
Racial Change	62	2	25	13
Neighborhood Reputation	60	3	67	5
Accessibility-Ease of Commuting	58	4	33	11
Shopping Facilities	56	5	22	14
Quality of Public Schools	54	6	0 ^a	17
Amount of Space (too much or too little)	53	7	56	7
Cost of Maintenance	46	8	56	8
Religious Change (decline in the proportion of Jews)	46	9	0 ^a	19
Cost of Buying (and financing)	43	10	76	4
Neighborhood Appearance	40	11	67	6
Layout of the Dwelling	36	12	78	2
Exterior Appearance of Home	33	12	56	9
Quality of Construction	29	13	67	3
Relatives--declines in the immediate area	29	14	0	21
Class composition--most of the residents of a different income or educational level	23	15	11	15
Property Values--expected to decline	23	16	38	10
Friends--declines in the immediate area	23	17	0	20
Quality of Private Schools	15	18	0	18

TABLE 1: Continued

	<u>Wynnefield</u>		<u>Lower Merion Township</u>	
	Prop. mentioning as <u>very impt.</u> (N=14)	<u>Rank</u>	Prop. mentioning as <u>very impt.</u> (N=9)	<u>Rank</u>
Synagogues--declines in membership, closing of facilities	15	15	11	16
Age composition--most of the residents of a different age	8	20	0	19
Neighbors not friendly	0	21	25	12

Notes:

a. Chi square statistically significant at the 95 percent confidence level

for Lower Merion Township are surprising in that the actual incidence of violent street crime in this area was quite low in the 1960s and 1970s. This surprising finding might reflect the increasing concern of suburbanites throughout the nation about the crime problem [2]. On the other hand, it might reflect the fact that Wynnefield's crime problem actually spilled over into adjoining areas of Lower Merion Township, or that the residents believed that it would spill over into this area. If this latter explanation were valid, one would expect that most of the Lower Merion Township respondents who mentioned crime as a reason for moving would have lived in one of the Lower Merion Township communities adjoining Wynnefield. This is, in fact, what occurred. Of the eight Lower Merion Township residents who mentioned crime, seven lived in communities immediately adjoining Wynnefield. With the data at hand, it is impossible to determine whether these householders mentioned crime because they believed the incidence had increased in their area, or because they believed that it would increase in the near future.

It is important to stress that Wynnefield families did not move solely because of racial change (and related impacts on the community). They frequently moved for this reason combined with the need for less space. Space problems were a relatively important reason for moving among both Wynnefield and Lower Merion Township residents. Slightly over one-half of the movers in both areas mentioned this factor (Table 1). It is not uncommon for older families to move to smaller quarters when their children leave home. Given the aging character of the Jewish population in the Wynnefield area, one would suspect that families who moved for space usually moved because they had too much space. This expectation is supported by the results to a set of four questions on the survey. Householders were asked whether any of the following family related reasons were responsible for their move: (1) widowhood; (2) more children at home; (3) fewer children at home; and (4) the retirement of the breadwinner. Table 2 shows that a far higher proportion of both Wynnefield and Lower Merion Township respondents mentioned the fact that there were fewer, rather than more, children at home. This same table indicates that more Lower Merion Township than Wynnefield moves resulted from the retirement of the breadwinner. Thus, it appears that many of the older Jewish families in Wynnefield would have moved away even if racial changes had not occurred. The fact that the community was undergoing ethnic change and (most importantly), that the security problem was worsening, probably hastened these decisions.

Earlier, we hypothesized that Jewish cultural characteristics influence the reasons for moving from a racially changing community like Wynnefield (e.g., that a decline in the number of Jewish families would be particularly important to religious families). This expectation was supported; the attitude toward intermarriage, between Jews and gentiles, was the most important explanatory variable. Respondents with a strict attitude toward intermarriage more frequently mentioned religious changes as a reason for moving than those with a lenient attitude (43 percent, 14 versus 12 percent, 17).⁶ Parents with

⁶The numbers within the parentheses represent the bivariate cross-tabular results in abbreviated form. Presented in a more expanded form, the results would read as follows: 43 percent of the 14 respondents with a strict attitude toward intermarriage mentioned religious reasons for moving; 57 percent did not. In comparison, 12 percent of the 17 respondents with a lenient attitude mentioned religious changes; 88 percent did not.

TABLE 2: Family Related Reasons for Moving from
the 1969 Location

<u>Reason:</u>	<u>Proportion Mentioning Reason as Important</u>	
	<u>Wynnefield (N=16)</u>	<u>Lower Merion Township (N=9)</u>
Widowhood	8%	0%
More Children at home	8	0
Fewer Children at home	67	56
Breadwinner retired	17	44

strict attitudes probably were concerned about religious changes because they would increase the possibility that their children would meet and date gentiles. Secondly, these householders were probably the ones emphasizing a social life confined to other Jewish families. These families may have been concerned that as a result of declines in the number of Jewish families in the area, it would become more difficult to maintain an adequate social life.⁷

The Search for a New Home

1. The Criteria for Evaluation. We assumed that the criteria used in the housing search would be a function of the reasons for moving from the original location. If this hypothesis were valid, a far higher proportion of Wynnefield movers would have been concerned about the characteristics of the home itself in choosing new locations. Table 3 supports these expectations by comparing the proportions of Wynnefield and Lower Merion residents mentioning the different neighborhood and housing factors as very important. A far higher proportion of Wynnefield residents mentioned the racial and religious composition of the neighborhood and the quality of the local public schools as very important in choosing their new location. A higher proportion of Lower Merion Township residents mentioned the amount of space in the dwelling, the layout of the dwelling, the costs of owning or renting the dwelling and the quality of construction as very important criteria in the housing search. Both Wynnefield and Lower Merion Township respondents were highly concerned about safety from street crime in their search for a new location. Nine out of the 10 Wynnefield respondents and eight of the 10 Lower Merion Township respondents considered this factor to be very important.

This hypothesis is also supported by the fact that there were strong relationships between the stated reasons for moving from the 1969 location and the criteria used in the housing search. Families that moved because of space problems were more likely to consider this factor as important in the housing search than those who did not move because of space problems (94 percent, 18 versus 20 percent, 15). Similarly, those who moved because of racial changes were far more likely to seriously consider this factor in exploring new locations than were those who did not move for this reason (79 percent, 15 versus 6 percent, 16).

⁷In a previous article based on the same data set [14] we showed that a strict attitude toward intermarriage contributed to decisions to remain. It might appear at first glance that the finding conflicts with the one presented here (e.g., that those with a strict attitude were more likely to mention religious changes). In fact, no real discrepancy exists since the analysis in this article is limited to families who moved. It appears that, in general, this attitude promoted residential stability; but that among the relatively few householders with a strict attitude who moved, religious changes in the area were a serious matter of concern.

TABLE 3: Housing and Neighborhood Related Reasons
for Choosing the New Location

	<u>Wynnefield</u>		<u>Lower Merion Township</u>	
	Prop. mentioning as <u>very impt.</u> (N=20)	<u>Rank</u>	Prop. mentioning as <u>very impt.</u> (N=10)	<u>Rank</u>
Safety from crime	91%	1	80%	1
Religious composition	71	2	22	17
Convenience to work/ease of commuting	68	3	40	12
Neighborhood appearance	65	4	40	11
Shopping Facilities	62	5	50	9
Neighborhood Reputation	60	6	50	8
Layout of Dwelling	58	7	73	3
Racial composition	57	8	22	16
Amount of Space in Dwelling	50	9	73	2
Cost of maintenance	50	10	50	7
Quality of Public Schools	50	11	20	19
Cost of buying (and financing and/or renting the dwelling)	47	12	64	5
Exterior Appearance	45	13	40	10
Quality of Construction	42	14	60	6
Property Values	42	15	60	4
Class composition	33	16	10	21
Relatives (relatively large number in immediate area)	29	17	10	22
Synagogues (convenience of the location to a congrega- tion)	26	18	30	15

TABLE 3: Continued

<u>Reason:</u>	<u>Wynnefield</u>		<u>Lower Merion Township</u>	
	Prop. mentioning as <u>very impt.</u> (N=20)	<u>Rank</u>	Prop. mentioning as <u>very impt.</u> (N=10)	<u>Rank</u>
Quality of Private and Parochial Schools	17	19	10	20
Age Composition	20	20	20	19
Neighbors friendly	15	21	30	13
Friends (relatively large number in immediate area)	11	22	30	14

A comparison of Tables 1 and 3 indicates that religious variables were more important in selecting a new location than in deciding to move from the original location. Less than one-half (46 percent) of the Wynnefield residents mentioned religious changes as very important in their decision to move. In contrast, seven-tenths (71 percent) mentioned the religious composition of the area as a very important factor in choosing their new location. These findings probably reflect the fact that in deciding whether to move, families were primarily concerned about racial change per se rather than other changes in the social composition of the population that were accompanying racial change (e.g., changes in the religious composition of the population). In choosing new locations, householders were concerned with finding stable white areas, but this left many areas as possibilities. The search was narrowed by insisting that the area have a sufficient number of Jewish families (this number varied) so that the family (including the children) could have Jewish friends in the area.

Table 3 shows, however, that few of the respondents were concerned about the accessibility to synagogues at new locations. Only about one-fourth of the Wynnefield respondents and one-third of the Lower Merion Township respondents considered this factor to be very important in their housing search. This finding reflects two factors. Firstly, there were few Orthodox families in the sample of movers and thus, most of the families had no reservations about driving outside the community to a synagogue for Sabbath or holiday services. (In Orthodox Judaism it is forbidden to drive on the Sabbath as this is considered a type of work). Secondly, (as we shall see in a later section) most of the respondents limited their housing search to the Wynnefield-Lower Merion Township area; and most locations in this area are highly accessible by car to one or more congregations. Thus, there was little variation within this area in the degree to which locations provided accessibility to synagogues. Since there was so little variation, it would be unlikely that respondents could use this factor as a basis for choosing among different locations.

As anticipated, the concern for the religious composition of the area (as part of the housing search) was a function of the family's Jewish cultural and religious characteristics. More specifically, those with a strict attitude toward intermarriage were far more likely to consider the religious composition of the area as a very important criteria in the housing search than those with lenient attitudes. Parents with a strict attitude were probably concerned that if they moved to a predominantly gentile area there would be an increased possibility that their children would meet and date gentiles. In addition, householders with strict attitudes toward intermarriage probably wanted to restrict their social life to other Jewish families and it would only be possible to do this in an area containing a sizeable number of Jewish families.

2. Types of Areas Considered. Table 4 documents the tendency for study area families to focus their housing search on nearby areas and secondarily to limit their housing search to the western section of the city. Lower Merion Township was the area most frequently mentioned by both Wynnefield and Lower Merion Township movers, although it was mentioned somewhat more frequently by members of the latter group.⁸ Furthermore, a surprisingly large proportion (one-fifth) of the Wynnefield respondents considered relocating within that community. Undoubtedly, most of these families were thinking about moving to the high rise and garden apartments in the northern section of the community. Such a move would insulate them, to a certain degree, from racial change. Firstly, racial change was occurring relatively slowly in the northern section of the community. Secondly, residents of high rise apartments often have little physical or social contact with residents of the surrounding area. Thirdly, by renting they would not have to face the problem of experiencing a loss in equity as a result of declining property values. The cross-tabular results provide additional evidence in support of this latter point. The fact that the family moved from the previous location because of racial change (or because of problems with the public schools) was relatively unimportant in predicting whether the family would consider one or more suburban locations. Fifty-eight percent (12) of those who felt that racial changes were very important in their moving decision, as compared to 65 percent (17) who felt that they were not very important, considered one or more suburban areas.

There was some support for the hypothesis that the more religiously and culturally identifiable Jewish families would limit their housing search to areas of high Jewish density. One Jewish cultural characteristic--the attitude toward intermarriage--did influence the housing search within Lower Merion Township. Householders with a strict attitude confined their search to southeastern Lower Merion Township, where Jews constituted a large minority of the population (see Figure 2).⁹


⁸We are using the terms Lower Merion Township and the western suburbs interchangeably. The survey results indicated that few of the respondents considered locations in the western suburbs outside Lower Merion Township.

⁹The 1969 telephone interview survey indicated that Jews constituted 40 percent of the population in southeastern Lower Merion Township and 21 percent of the total in northwestern Lower Merion Township. Most of the Jewish population in northwestern Lower Merion Township was concentrated in one community (Penn Valley), immediately adjoining southeastern Lower Merion Township. Thus, in most sections of northwestern Lower Merion Township, Jews constituted less than one-fifth of the total.

TABLE 4: Communities Considered in Selection
of New Location

<u>Area:</u>	<u>Proportion of Respondents Who Considered the Area</u>	
	<u>Wynnefield (N=20)</u>	<u>Lower Merion Township (N=11)</u>
<u>Within City:</u>		
Center City	15%	30%
North Philadelphia	5	0
Northeastern Philadelphia	26	0
Northwestern Philadelphia	11	0
South Philadelphia	0	0
West Philadelphia	10	10
Logan	5	0
Overbrook	11	0
Wynnefield	21	10
<u>Within Suburbs:</u>		
New Jersey Suburbs	10	18
Northeast Suburbs	10	0
Northwest Suburbs	5	0
Southwest Suburbs	5	18
Western Suburbs	40	55

FIGURE 2: Distribution of Religious Groups



City Boundary - - - - -

ONE ●, △, ○ = 84 FAMILIES

- = JEWISH
- △ = CATHOLIC
- = PROTESTANT

In contrast, those with more lenient attitudes, were more likely to extend their search to the northwestern section of the community (where Jews generally constituted a tiny minority). Whereas about two-fifths (44 percent, 16) of those who had a lenient attitude toward intermarriage considered one or more of those predominantly non-Jewish communities, only about one-fifth (19 percent, 16) who had a strict attitude considered these areas.¹⁰

The more religiously oriented Jewish families were not more likely to extend their housing search to Northeast Philadelphia, which contains the major Jewish concentration in the Philadelphia area. There were insignificant associations between the likelihood of considering Northeast Philadelphia on the one hand and Jewish religious and cultural characteristics on the other. Perhaps the insignificant results reflect the fact that Northeast Philadelphia is fairly distant from the Wynnefield-Lower Merion area, combined with the fact that families, regardless of their degree of religiosity, were reluctant to move across sectoral boundaries. Furthermore, Northeast Philadelphia is far less accessible to Center City Philadelphia than is the Wynnefield-Lower Merion area.

Why was the attitude toward intermarriage an accurate predictor of where families looked for homes in Lower Merion Township? The explanation here is basically the same as the one presented earlier, regarding the reasons why those with strict attitudes toward intermarriage were more likely to consider the religious composition of areas as a very important criteria in the housing search than those with lenient attitudes. Parents with strict attitudes probably were concerned that if their families moved to predominantly gentile areas in Lower Merion Township, there would be an increased likelihood that their children would meet and date gentiles. In addition, regardless of whether they had children, householders with strict attitudes, probably preferred to socialize with other Jewish families. Being in a predominantly gentile area would decrease the possibility for making close Jewish friends in the area.

3. The Evaluation of Alternatives. Contrary to what was anticipated, the existence of racial change did not cause families to restrict their housing search, either in terms of time spent in the search or in terms of the number of communities considered. There

¹⁰Communities were categorized into two types: (1) those containing large Jewish minorities; (2) those containing tiny Jewish minorities, on the basis of the results of the 1969 telephone survey.

were relatively small differences between Wynnefield and Lower Merion movers in terms of the amount of time spent on the search. Sixty percent of the Wynnefield movers (20) as compared to 40 percent of the Lower Merion movers (10) spent less than three months in the housing search. Furthermore, there were weak associations between the amount of time spent on the search and both: (1) whether the respondent mentioned racial change as a reason for moving; and (2) the racial composition of the original neighborhood.

There was also no evidence that the existence of racial change caused families to limit the geographical scope of their housing search (that is, the number of communities considered).¹¹ The mean number of communities considered by Wynnefield families was actually slightly larger than for Lower Merion Township families (3.3 versus 2.3), rather than smaller as was anticipated. Thus, the results provide no support for the stereotype of white families panic moving and taking the first decent home available.

4. The Actual Selection of a New Location. The results dealing with the actual migration patterns of residents parallel those presented earlier relating to their search patterns. Residents of both Wynnefield and Lower Merion tended to move to nearby areas and secondarily within the western sector of the city.

Table 5 describes the actual locations chosen by families when they moved from their 1969 locations. Figure 3 describes the intercensus tract migration patterns; that is, the movement patterns within the Wynnefield-Lower Merion Township area. Both the table and the figure are based on the sample of Jewish families who completed the 1969 mailed questionnaire and for whom the new address was known. This includes, but is not limited to, those who had completed the 1974 follow-up questionnaire.¹²

As shown, Lower Merion Township was the most common destination of residents of both areas. Figure 3 shows that Wynnefield residents who moved to Lower Merion Township relocated to nearby communities just across the city boundary. Similarly, most of

¹¹In order to measure the number of communities considered, a new variable was computed from the results of three items in the survey: (1) the number of Philadelphia communities considered; (2) the number of suburban areas considered (e.g., the western suburbs); and (3) the number of communities considered in the western suburbs.


¹²The remainder of this article is based on the sample of families who completed both the 1969 and 1974 surveys.

TABLE 5: Location of New Home (by Community Area)
by 1969 Location

(Proportions Moving to Particular Areas)

	<u>Wynnefield</u>	<u>Lower Merion Township</u>
<u>Within City</u>		
Center City	3%	14%
Northeast	10	0
Northwest	5	4
Wynnefield	20	7
(Subtotal)	(38)	(25)
<u>Within Suburbs</u>		
Northeast	5	0
Southwest	3	3
West-Lower Merion Township	27	45
Other West Suburbs	7	3
(Subtotal)	(42)	(51)
<u>Outside Philadelphia</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>Metropolitan Area</u>	N=40	N=29

FIGURE 3: Inter-Census Tract Mobility



the moves of Lower Merion Township residents were within the communities immediately to the west of Wynnefield. A surprisingly large proportion (20 percent) of Wynnefield movers relocated within that community; given the existence of racial change in that area. As shown in Figure 3, most of these were families who relocated to the apartment area in the Upper Hill section of the community.

Even when Wynnefield families moved because of racial change, this did not increase their likelihood of moving out of the community. This is shown by the fact that respondents who mentioned racial change, or decline in the quality of public schools, as reasons for moving were not more likely to move to suburban areas than respondents who did not consider these reasons to be very important. It appears that many older families who owned their homes adapted to racial changes by moving to apartments a short distance away. In this way, they insulated themselves to a certain degree from racial changes but at the same time were able to maintain familiar patterns and contacts. As we mentioned earlier, these were probably families who would have moved anyway but those moves were hastened by the existence of racial change.

Conclusions

This paper has employed reason analysis to study three aspects of the mobility process in a racially changing community: (1) the decision to move; (2) the search for a new residence; and (3) the actual selection of a new home. We have attempted to determine the extent to which these three stages of the process differ between a racially changing and a stable predominantly white community. We have also sought to determine how Jewish religious and cultural characteristics influence these three stages in a racially changing community. We have investigated these issues by analyzing survey results from 40 movers in the Wynnefield-Lower Merion section of Philadelphia.

Wynnefield and Lower Merion residents did differ in terms of reasons for moving. Wynnefield residents tended to move because of the existence of racial change and the impacts of racial change on community standards (e.g., declines in the quality of local public schools and local shopping facilities). On the other hand, Lower Merion Township movers emphasized their dissatisfaction with the quality of their own housing conditions (e.g., the layout of the home). The fear of crime was the most frequently mentioned reason for moving among both Wynnefield and Lower Merion Township residents.

The existence of racial change did influence the housing search pattern of Wynnefield residents in one important way. Residents who moved for this reason were particularly concerned about the social composition of prospective new locations. In two other respects, the search for and selection of new homes were remarkably similar among residents of the two communities. Firstly, residents of the two communities spent about the same amount of time in the search and considered about the same number of communities. There was no

evidence that the existence of racial change caused Wynnefield residents to restrict their housing search in either of these two ways. Secondly, residents of both communities searched for and selected homes in nearby areas. A surprisingly large number of Wynnefield families relocated within that community.

One Jewish cultural characteristic--the attitude toward intermarriage--played an important role in the decision to move from Wynnefield locations as well as in the search for and selection of a new home. Those with a strict attitude toward intermarriage were more likely to explain their moves as resulting from the decline in the number of Jewish families in the area. In searching for a new house, they were concerned about the religious composition of new locations. As a result, they were more likely to search for and select homes in nearby sections of Lower Merion Township where the density of the Jewish populations was relatively high. These results provide yet additional evidence to that already available [14] that ethnic variables influence the decision when to move as well as the decision where to move in racially changing Jewish communities.

REFERENCES

1. Abrams, Charles. "The Housing Problem and the Negro," Daedalus, (Winter 1966), 64-76.
2. Delaney, Paul. "Suburbs Fighting Back as Crime Rises," New York Times, August 30, 1976.
3. Fauman, S. Joseph. "Housing Discrimination, Changing Neighborhoods and Public Schools." Journal of Social Issues, 13 (4) 1957, 21-30.
4. Ginsberg, Yona. Jews in a Changing Neighborhood: The Study of Mattapan, New York: The Free Press, 1975.
5. Grodzins, Morton. "Metropolitan Segregation," Scientific American, 197 (October 1957), 33-41.
6. Kadushin, Charles. "Reason Analysis," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 13 (1968), 338-343.
7. Laurenti, Luigi. Property Values and Race: Studies in Seven Cities, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.
8. McEntire, Davis. Residence and Race, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.
9. Molotch, Harvey L. Managed Integration: Dilemmas of Doing Good in the City, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
10. Moore, Eric G. Residential Mobility in the City, A.A.G. Resource Paper No. 13, Washington, D.C.: Commission on College Geography, 1972.
11. Rossi, Peter H. Why Families Move, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955.
12. Simmons, James W. "Changing Residences in the City: A Review of Intra-Urban Mobility," Geographical Review, 58 (1969), 622-651.
13. Thomas, Wesley and William Simon. Migration and Racial Change in Bond Hill and Kennedy Heights, Cincinnati, Ohio: Department of Urban Development, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1976.
14. Varady, David P. "The Ethnic Factor and Moving Decisions in a Racially Changing Community," Regional Science Perspectives, 7 (2), 1977, 135-164.
15. Varady, David P. "White Moving Plans in a Racially Changing Middle Class Community," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 40 (5), September 1974, 360-370.

16. Wolf, Eleanor P. "The Baxter Area, 1960-1962: A New Trend in Neighborhood Change," Phylon, 26 (Winter 1965), 244-353.