

**MOBILITY AND MIGRATION: A COMPARISON OF THE DECISION-
MAKING TYPOLOGY AND THE HOUSING-ADJUSTMENT MODEL**

Sue R. Crull

ABSTRACT

Using panel data collected in the late 1970s in a small rural city, two approaches to the study of the mover/non-mover dichotomy are compared. The mobility decision-making typology developed by Sell and DeJong (1983) and the model of housing adjustment developed by Morris and Winter (1978) and tested by Crull (1979) are found to show similar results. Both find that satisfaction, housing factors, age and education are significant variables in mobility-migration decisions. Both approaches illustrate that not all movers nor all non-movers are alike and that there is considerable variation within the dichotomous categories.

INTRODUCTION

Sell and DeJong (1983) present a decision-making typology which delineates types of movers and stayers in a panel study. This paper is in response to their call for an improvement in the causal modeling of change-of-residence behavior. According to Sell and DeJong (1983), "Previous research has not extensively examined the variety of paths inherent in a dynamic conceptualization of the mobility decision" (p.148). Unbeknown to Sell and DeJong, those very concerns were conceptualized by Morris and Winter (1975, 1978) during the 1970s. Crull (1979) tested them empirically with a causal model of residential mobility based on panel data. That conceptualization is referred to as the *housing-adjustment model*.

This paper does not debate the importance of the study of mobility nor does it present a theoretical analysis. Instead, it tests the "match" of the mobility decision-making typology presented by Sell and DeJong (1983) with the housing-adjustment model. Replication and comparison are needed in the study of housing so that future research can build upon the past.

Sue R. Crull is Assistant Professor, Department of Family Environment and Sociology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. This study was funded by the Fort Dodge City Planning Department, YOUR Inc., and the Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station, Iowa State University. The Experiment Station funding was provided in part through Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972. This is Journal Paper No. J-12284 of the Iowa Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station, Ames, Iowa, Project 2530. A version of this paper was presented at the 1985 Annual Conference of the American Association of Housing Educators, Ames, Iowa.

Sell and DeJong (1983) identify a typology of mobility decision-making that operationalizes various paths within the process based on observed desires, expectations and behaviors. In a panel study in the state of Pennsylvania, they name seven major process types, two mover types and five non-mover types that cover 87 percent of the sampled households. The following definitions of the seven types reflect the three-stage interview schedule (1974, 1975 and 1977) of the panel.

- Type 1. Consistent Decision-Maker Movers: 1) households who consistently wanted and expected to move and did move during the three-year period, and 2) those who wanted to move, did not expect to move, but moved in the three-year period.
- Type 2. Unwilling Mobility: households that did not state a desire to move, but changed their residence in the three-year period.
- Type 3. Wishful Thinker Non-Movers: households that stated either a desire to move or both a desire and an expectation of moving, but did not move.
- Type 4. Adjuster Non-Movers: households that expressed a desire and/or expectation to move in the first contact, but changed to a desire and/or expectation to stay for the second contact and did not move.
- Type 5. Entrenched Non-Movers: households who did not desire or expect to move and did not move.
- Type 6. New Decision-Maker Non-Movers: households who did not desire or expect to move in the first contact, desired to move in the second contact, but did not change residence by the end of the three-year period.
- Type 7. Potential Forced Movers: households who did not desire to move, expected to move at some time in the future and had not moved within the three-year period.

Sell and DeJong (1983) find that the typology dimensions do not vary by distance moved (migration vs. residential mobility), although some household characteristics of the movers and of the migrants differ. On the basis of an across-the-typology comparison of means and F-ratios, they find that there are differences between the process types based on household attitudes (satisfaction and community integration) and characteristics (home ownership, age and education of head, family income and race). They conclude that there is considerable within-group variation when all movers are compared with all non-movers. Unwilling movers have a level of pre-move satisfaction comparable to most non-movers and the wishful thinker non-movers are most comparable in satisfaction to consistent decision-maker movers. Age and education of head, race and family income also show some within-group variation that a comparison

between all movers and all non-movers obscures. Home ownership and community integration shows little within-group variation and reflects the dichotomous classification of movers and non-movers. All non-mover types have relatively high levels of home ownership and community integration.

Crull (1979) utilized the model of housing-adjustment developed by Morris and Winter (1978) to study a normative approach to residential mobility. The critical issue of the causal model was the interpretation of residential mobility as a housing-adjustment process in which households adjust their housing to meet changing needs. The model is based on previous work in housing theory and research (Brown and Moore, 1970; Speare, 1974; Michelson, 1977; Morris and Winter, 1975; Morris, Crull and Winter, 1976). The framework incorporated the belief that housing deficits (deviations from normatively defined housing conditions) produce housing dissatisfaction, which in turn creates a propensity to move and subsequent mobility.

Morris and Winter (1978) view families as evaluating their housing in terms of cultural norms and family norms. Cultural norms are defined as societal standards or rules for behavior of life conditions. Family norms are the family's standards used with respect to itself and its specific situation. Although families are influenced by cultural norms, a family may or may not conform to the norms of the culture. In addition to the existence of unique family norms, deviation from cultural norms is often permitted in response to constraining factors in the situation. A housing deficit in Crull's (1979) model was defined as a gap between actual conditions and the conditions prescribed by the family.

Morris and Winter (1978) describe three types of deficits: Type I, a deviation from the norms in either direction, positive (surplus) or negative (deficit), both of which are undesirable; Type II, a deviation from the norm in which only a surplus is undesirable; and Type III, a deviation from the norm in which only a shortage is undesirable. Investigated in Crull's (1979) causal model are tenure, structure-type, space and expenditure deficits. Tenure and structure-type are defined as Type I deficits with deviation from the norms in either direction being undesirable. Renters wanting to be owners and owners wanting to be renters have tenure deficits. Households in single-family dwellings wanting multi-family dwellings and households in multi-family dwellings wanting single-family dwellings have structure-type deficits. If tenure or structure-type norms and actual conditions match, the households are said to have no tenure or structure-type deficits. Space is based on the number of bedrooms and is considered a Type III deficit only where a shortage of bedrooms is undesirable. The expenditure deficit is based on annual expenditures for housing including rent or mortgage payments and the cost of utilities, insurance and taxes. The expenditure deficit is a Type II deficit because it is undesirable to pay more than the household feels it should for housing.

According to Morris and Winter (1978), when a family's housing does not meet the norms and the deficit perceived by the family involves a salient housing condition, housing satisfaction is low. When satisfaction is low, the family considers some form of housing-

adjustment behavior. Housing-adjustment behavior involves either residential mobility or residential alterations and additions. Either the family moves to another dwelling or changes the present dwelling to meet its needs. Constraints may impinge upon the family's ability to engage in successful adjustment behavior. If a family is unable to overcome constraints that block adjustment responses, it may select adaptive responses to handle the housing dissatisfaction. Adaptive responses involve changing family norms or family structure rather than housing.

Crull (1979) examined empirically a causal model of residential mobility that focused on housing deficits, neighborhood quality, housing and neighborhood satisfaction and propensity to move as intervening variables between characteristics of the household and subsequent residential mobility. Residential mobility, the dependent variable, was operationalized as a change of residence within the local area. Migrants were not included in her model. Residential mobility measured subsequent mobility in 1978, three years after the initial interview. The other concepts were measured in the 1975 interview. Propensity to move was operationalized as the level of motivation the household had in 1975 in terms of thinking, desiring or expecting to move in the next year. Satisfaction was operationalized as two Likert-type scale variables -- housing satisfaction and neighborhood satisfaction. The housing deficits were operationalized as deviations the household had from its expressed family housing norms (tenure, structure-type, space and expenditure). Neighborhood deficits were operationalized as a measure of the housing quality of the neighborhood. Household characteristics were operationalized as age, sex, education of the household head and household size and income. Ordinary least squares regression and path analysis procedures were utilized in testing the theoretical model using the data collected from a stratified random sample in a small city.

The findings from Crull's (1979) empirical analysis were supportive of 10 of the 16 hypothesized paths in the theoretical model. Crull concluded that the theoretical model was moderately well-supported, especially the hypothesized relationships among the intervening variables. Briefly summarizing, Crull found propensity to move, housing deficits, age of head and household size with significant paths in the fully recursive regression of residential mobility. Propensity to move, satisfaction and housing deficits were strong, significant intervening variables in the model.

The goal of this paper is to replicate as many of the types in Sell and DeJong's (1983) typology as is possible with the available data. Residential mobility and migration are treated as separate types at all times. The causal model variables used by Crull (1979) are incorporated into the analysis to reflect the "match" of the typology with the housing-adjustment model. It is hypothesized that the typology and the housing-adjustment model will show similar results.

PROCEDURES

The sample from which data were obtained for this paper was drawn in 1975 as a stratified random sample of about six percent of the households in a small rural city (31,000) in the Midwest. Stratification was by enumeration districts to guarantee geographic

distribution of the sample throughout the city. Personal interviews were completed in 455 households. In 1978, a follow-up study was undertaken to study residential energy conservation and housing values by means of a mail questionnaire. The respondents were asked to give the current address and the date the household moved into the current dwelling. If households did not return the questionnaire after three contacts, other sources, such as directories, neighbors, relatives and employers, were used to obtain the 1978 addresses of the households interviewed in 1975.

Sixteen of the households were dropped from the sample due to deaths and 13 households were dropped because the current residence could not be verified. Of the 426 households remaining in the panel, 42 were dropped because of missing data, leaving a sample size of 384. Residential mobility was operationalized by verification of the 1978 residence of the household and comparing it to the household location in 1975. Households living in the same dwelling in 1978 as in 1975 were classified as non-movers. Households in different dwellings within the local area were classified as residentially mobile movers. The local area was defined as the city and the six surrounding rural communities that shared a common labor and housing market. Households in different dwellings outside of the six-county area were classified as migrants.

Multiple moves within the three-year period were not measured. Thirty-eight (10 percent) of the households were migrants, 107 (28 percent) households were residentially mobile and 239 (62 percent) households did not move. Housing-adjustment variables were operationalized identically to Crull's (1979) measures.

The data were divided into four of the seven typology types developed by Sell and DeJong (1983). Households desiring to move in 1975 and moving by 1983 were classified as consistent decision-maker movers. Those who did not desire to move in 1975 and who did move by 1978 were classified as unwilling movers. The two groups of movers were then further divided into the residentially mobile and migrant movers. Households desiring to move in 1975, but who did not move by 1978, were classified as wishful thinker non-movers. Those who did not desire to move in 1975 and who did not move by 1978 were classified as entrenched non-movers. Only 2 households were classified as potential forced movers having no desire to move, but having an expectation to move. Because there were only 2 households in this category, the two were dropped from the analysis. Adjuster non-movers and new decision-makers could not be identified in the two-stage panel study.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

For the two samples, a proportional comparison of the replicated typology types is presented in Table 1. The Pennsylvania sample (Sell and DeJong, 1983) and the Midwestern rural city sample are not very similar in distribution across the typology types. Twenty-three percent of the households in Pennsylvania and 38 percent of the households in the Midwestern city moved over the 3-year period. The most similar typology types between the two samples appear to be the consistent decision-makers (15.2 percent Pennsylvania and

Table 1. Comparison of Typology Types in the Two Samples.

Typology types	Pennsylvania Weighted Sample N (%)	Pennsylvania Adjusted N (%)	Midwestern Rural City N (%)
Type I	1576 (100)*	1576 (100)*	384 (100)
Consistent Decision-Maker Mover	239 (15.2)	239 (15.2)	57 (14.8)
Residentially mobile Migrants	161 60		45 12
Type II			
Unwilling Movers	129 (8.2)	129 (8.2)	88 (22.9)
Residentially mobile Migrants	92 23		62 26
Type III			
Wishful Think Non-Movers	154 (9.8)	332 (21.2)	21 (5.4)
Type IV			
Adjuster Non-Movers	178 (11.3)		
Type V			
Entrenched Non-Movers	743 (47.1)	824 (52.2)	216 (56.2)
Type VI			
New Decision-Maker Non-Movers	81 (5.1)		
Type VII			
Potential Forced Movers	52 (3.3)	52 (3.3)	2 (0.5)

* Pennsylvania percentages were recalculated with the residual-missing data cases omitted. Inaccuracies in totals of raw data are due to inconsistencies in Sell and DeJong Tables.

14.8 percent Midwestern city) and the entrenched non-movers (52.2 percent Pennsylvania and 56.2 percent Midwestern city). The most dissimilar proportions between the samples appear to be the unwilling movers and the wishful thinker non-movers.

Within the two mover types, residentially mobile and migrants, the decision-making elements occurred with comparable frequency regardless of type of move within each sample. In Pennsylvania, 64 percent of the residentially mobile are consistent decision-makers and 36 percent are undesired movers. Similarly, 72 percent of the Pennsylvania migrants are consistent decision-makers and 28 percent are unwilling migrants. In the Midwestern city sample, 42 percent of the residentially mobile are consistent decision-makers and 58 percent are unwilling movers. Thirty-two percent of the Midwestern migrants are consistent decision-makers and 68 percent are unwilling migrants.

The lack of replication of the proportions for all typology types in the Midwestern city sample may be a result of the difference in

the sampling procedures. The Pennsylvania sample is part of a larger research project studying regional population redistribution with 780 households randomly selected and 316 households selected because they indicated fairly high probabilities of moving. The sample was then weighted to represent the non-institutionalized population of Pennsylvania. The mover households are classified as residentially mobile if they moved less than 15 miles and migrant if they moved 15 miles or more. Therefore, the Pennsylvania sample may be biased with higher proportions of Type I, Type III and Type IV in the typology than would randomly occur. Also, the residentially mobile/migrant 15 mile cut-off may not reflect the actual patterns in the householder's area. The Midwestern sample is a stratified random sample of a small city and is biased only to the idiosyncrasies of the city studied. The sample studied reflects one labor market and the distinction between residentially mobile and migrant movers is operationalized specifically to the actual patterns of the householder's area.

Although it is not critical to the replication that the two samples show similar proportions in the typology types, it is important that the two samples show similar trends of characteristics associated with the process typology. In Table 2, across-the-typology comparisons are presented for the Midwestern city sample.

When considering the housing-adjustment model variables with the typology, movers are differentiated into residentially mobile and migrant types rather than combining them as Sell and DeJong (1983) did in their first table. Propensity to move is included in the table, although one component of the scale is used to construct the typology groups. This was done to evaluate the dynamics of the scale in relation to the structure of the typology. The dynamics are represented well. The consistent decision-makers average the highest level of propensity to move. The wishful thinkers average relatively high in propensity to move and unwilling movers and entrenched non-movers average very low propensities.

Sell and DeJong (1983) find that pre-move satisfaction shows the greatest amount of variation across the typology, but did not show much variation between mobiles and migrants. Housing satisfaction in this study replicates the findings of Sell and DeJong. The consistent decision-maker movers, whether mobile or migrant, have the lowest mean housing satisfaction scores. The wishful thinker non-movers average low housing satisfaction scores comparable to the consistent decision-maker mover. Higher levels of housing satisfaction are found for the entrenched non-movers and the unwilling movers whether mobile or migrant. Therefore, this replication supports the findings of Sell and DeJong that comparing satisfaction of all movers and all non-movers would obscure important within-group differences. There is also little difference between residentially mobile and migrant movers' satisfaction within each decision-making type.

In terms of the variable, age of the household head, the present study shows some similarity to the results of Sell and DeJong. Both studies find the consistent decision-maker movers to be relatively young and the entrenched non-movers to be relatively old. Both

Table 2. Housing-Adjustment Variables Associated with the Mover Decision-Making Typology

Variables	MOVERS			
	Consistent Decision-Makers		Unwilling	
	Mobility	Migration	Mobility	Migration
N=382	45	12	62	26
Propensity to move(1)	2.9	3.0	0.3	0.5
Housing satisfaction(2)	8.4	8.3	19.7	22.3
Neighborhood satisfaction(3)	11.2	12.2	11.7	11.7
Number of housing deficits(4)	1.4	1.5	1.0	0.7
% Tenure deficit	53	50	29	19
% Structure deficit	38	33	26	4
% Bedroom deficit	38	58	16	12
% Expd. deficit	11	8	26	35
Neighborhood Quality Index(5)	68	72	65	71
Age of Head	34	30	45	31
Education of Head	12.6	13.4	11.8	13.0
Household Size	2.8	3.6	2.4	3.3
Sex of Head (% male)	82	67	69	81
Total Household Income	15702	12925	10382	12957

studies find that the unwilling movers are a little older than the consistent decision-maker movers and that the mobiles are a little older than the migrants. The major difference between the studies is the mean age of the wishful thinker non-movers. Sell and DeJong (1983) find this type to be similar in age to consistent decision-maker movers. In this study, they are similar to the entrenched non-movers. The mean in this study may be higher because the adjuster non-movers are included with the wishful thinker non-movers. In Sell and DeJong's study, the adjuster non-movers are separate and show a higher mean than the wishful thinker non-mover.

The number of housing deficits also varies significantly across the typology. According to the housing-adjustment model, households with more deficits should be less satisfied and more willing to consider moving. The model and typology match well with the largest mean number of housing deficits recorded for the consistent decision-maker movers. The wishful thinker non-movers average half as many deficits as the consistent decision-maker movers. Although their

Table 2. (Conti.)

NON-MOVERS				
Variables N=382 (conti.)	Wishful Thinking 21	Entrenched 216	Across Typology (Univariate, 5&376 d.f.)	
			F-ratio	Significance
Propensity to move(1)	2.2	0.3	243.8	.00
Housing satisfaction(2)	10.9	23.6	16.08	.00
Neighborhood satisfaction(3)	11.4	12.1	2.29	.00
Number of housing deficits(4)	0.7	0.5	10.18	.00
% Tenure deficit	29	13	9.84	.00
% Structure deficit	19	7	8.63	.00
% Bedroom deficit	5	14	6.70	.00
% Expd. deficit	14	17	1.94	.09
Neighborhood quality index(5)	61	69	1.61	.16
Age of Head	51	55	23.08	.00
Education of Head	11.0	11.7	2.44	.03
Household size	3.1	3.0	1.90	.09
Sex of Head (% male)	67	73	0.76	.57
Total Household Income	12395	12929	1.04	.39

(1) Guttman-scale coded 1) thinking about moving, 2) desiring to move, and 3) expecting to move.

(2) Likert-type scale of 6 items weighted for importance, range -44 to .48. Items were satisfaction with tenure, structure-type, number of bedrooms, dwelling's physical condition, style-design of dwelling and image of dwelling.

(3) Likert-type scale of 3 items, range 3 to 15. Items were satisfaction with neighborhood people, children and condition of housing.

(4) Total number of deficits, range 0 to 4.

(5) Average condition of neighborhood dwellings, range 31 to 98.

housing satisfaction is relatively low, it is seemingly not because of normative deficits. If one considers meeting the family norms as strong motivators for mobility, then the low number of housing deficits may explain why the wishful thinker non-movers stay. For example, if you own a single-family home with enough bedrooms and the payments are not high, your dissatisfaction may be channeled to some other form of adjustment for adaptation rather than moving.

In looking more closely at each of the housing deficits, some similarity is found with Sell and DeJong's (1983) variable. They find that the level of home ownership is more congruent with the dichotomous mover/stayer analysis and does not vary greatly within the two types. Fewer movers own their homes than do the stayers. In this study, the percentage with a tenure deficit does not reflect as extreme a comparison as does the percentage of home owners in Sell and DeJong. However, the two studies are similar in that the consistent decision-maker movers have the lowest percentage of home owners for Sell and DeJong and the highest percentage of tenure deficits for this study. Tenure, structure and bedroom deficits all vary significantly across the typology.

Like Sell and DeJong, this study also finds that education is a significant, but slight, variant across the typology. Income is not significant in this study.

The only other variable that differs significantly across the typology is neighborhood satisfaction. The magnitude of the variance is quite small, however. The two groups with the lowest levels of neighborhood satisfaction are the consistent decision-maker residentially mobile movers and the wishful thinker non-movers. The latter group also averages the lowest neighborhood quality index score.

SUMMARY

The results of this study indicate that there are many similarities between the typology of mobility decision-making developed by Sell and DeJong (1983) and Morris and Winter's (1978) model of housing-adjustment tested as a causal model by Crull (1979). Satisfaction, housing deficits/ownership, age and education of the head are significant variables in both the typology and the model. Both the typology and the model provide general support for the study of residential mobility and migration as decision-making processes. Both approaches illustrate that not all movers or all non-movers are alike. There is considerable variation within the dichotomous categories.

As to future research, the comparison between the mobility decision-making typology and the housing-adjustment model provides direction. It seems that migrants and residentially mobile movers may differ more substantially on household characteristics than on housing conditions. The propensity-to-move scale used by Crull (1979) seems to adequately reflect the process dimensions incorporated into the decision-making typology. Sell and DeJong's (1983) typology verifies the inclusion of the propensity variable as a "must" in a causal model. Both approaches suggest a need for a multivariate analysis of residentially mobile movers, migrant movers and non-movers. Both approaches also suggest a need for more research on motivations, constraints and alternatives in the decision-making process to move. Overall, the findings generated by the mobility decision-making typology and the housing-adjustment model indicate that both household characteristics and housing factors are essential in understanding the decision-making process to move.

REFERENCES

- Brown, L.A., and Moore, E.G. The intra-urban migration process: A perspective. *General Systems*, 1970, 15, 109-122.
- Crull, S.R. *Residential satisfaction, propensity to move and residential mobility: A causal model*. Ph.D Dissertation. Iowa State University, 1979. (No. 80-00123, University Microfilm, Ann Arbor, Michigan.)
- Michelson, W. *Environmental Choice, Human Behavior, and Residential Satisfaction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Morris, E.W., Crull, S.R., and Winter, M. Housing norms, housing satisfaction and the propensity to move. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1976, 38, 309-320.
- Morris, E.W., and Winter, M. A theory of family housing-adjustment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1975, 37, 79-88.
- Morris, E.W., and Winter, M. *Housing, Family, and Society*. New York: Wiley, 1978.
- Sell, R.R., and DeJong, G.F. Deciding whether to move: Mobility, wishful thinking and adjustment. *Sociology and Social Research*, 1983, 67, 147-165.
- Speare, Alden, Jr. Residential satisfaction as an intervening variable in residential mobility. *Demography*, 1974, 11, 173-188.