DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 202 RC 015 706

AUTHOR Hwang, Sean-Shong; Albrecht, Don E.
TITLE Factors Associated with the Fulfillment of Residential Preferences.
INSTITUTION Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.; Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Texas Real Estate Research Center.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 41p.; Additional support was provided by the Stewart Title Guaranty Company.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Demography; *Homeowners; Housing; Metropolitan Areas; *Place of Residence; Psychological Characteristics; Racial Factors; *Residential Patterns; Rural Areas; Social Characteristics; Socioeconomic Influences; Suburbs; Urban Environment
IDENTIFIERS Life Cycles; *Priorities; Satisfaction; *Texas

ABSTRACT

A 1983 survey of Texas homebuyers reveals a high degree of mismatch between the preferred and actual residence of homebuyers. Such mismatch is examined using social/psychological, life-cycle, racial, socioeconomic, and occupational factors as possible explanations. Questionnaires mailed to a stratified random sample of 960 homebuyers across 12 geographical areas of the state yielded 432 usable responses. Their analysis indicates that the logic of fulfilling residential preference is largely determined by the types of areas in which one prefers to live, neighborhood satisfaction, and the age of homebuyers. Preferred and actual residence mismatch is most common among homebuyers who prefer a suburban location, less so for people who prefer nonmetropolitan residences, and is lowest among people who prefer to live in central cities. The psychological argument that people tend to modify their preference in congruence with their neighborhood living experience is also supported; the proportion of fulfilled persons is highest among those who are highly satisfied with their current neighborhood. Finally, younger persons suffer a higher degree of residence mismatch than older persons. Such findings corroborate theoretical arguments advanced by students of population mobility. Some possible reasons are suggested to explain the failure to find evidence to support racial and socioeconomic arguments. (Author/NEC)

Factors Associated with the Fulfillment of Residential Preferences

Sean-Shong Hwang

Department of Rural Sociology
Texas Agricultural Experiment Station
The Texas A&M University System

and

Don E. Albrecht

Department of Rural Sociology
Texas Agricultural Experiment Station
The Texas A&M University System
and
Texas Real Estate Research Center
Texas A&M University

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting
of the Rural Sociological Society
(48th, August 21-24, 1985, Blacksburg, VA).

Support for this study was provided by the Texas Real Estate Research Center, the Department of Rural Sociology in the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, and Stewart Title Guaranty Company. The authors appreciate the helpful comments of James H. Copp, Wm. Alex McIntosh, and Steve H. Murdock.

Factors Associated with the Fulfillment of Residential Preferences

Abstract

A 1983 survey of Texas homebuyers reveals a high degree of mismatch between the preferred and actual residences of homebuyers. Such mismatch is examined using social psychological factors, life-cycle factors, and racial and socioeconomic factors as possible explanations.

The analysis indicates that the logit of fulfilling residential preference is largely determined by the types of areas one preferred to live, neighborhood satisfaction, and the age of homebuyers. Preferred and actual residence mismatch is most common among homebuyers who preferred a suburban location, less so for people who preferred nonmetropolitan residences, and is lowest among people who preferred to live in central cities. The psychological argument that people tend to modify their preference in congruence with their neighborhood living experience is also supported; the proportion of fulfilled persons is highest among those who are highly satisfied with their current neighborhood. Finally, younger persons suffer a higher degree of residence mismatch than older persons.

Such findings corroborated theoretical arguments advanced by students of population mobility. Some possible reasons are suggested to explain the failure to find evidence to support racial and socioeconomic arguments.

Factors Associated with the Fulfillment of Residential Preference

Although residential preferences have been posited by theorists of population mobility (e.g., Speare et al., 1974) to be an important component affecting migration decisions, empirical research examining residential preferences did not become popular until the early 1970s (Zuiches, 1981). The growth of research dealing with residential preference at this juncture can be seen as the result of a concerted effort among researchers of population mobility to resolve some anomalies which were evolving in the field (DeJong and Sell, 1977; Zuiches, 1981).

One such anomaly was the persistent discrepancy between residential preferences and actual mobility behavior. Although public opinion polls consistently showed that most Americans preferred to live in small towns and rural areas, the actual mobility of Americans had, for decades, shown the opposite. The areas where most people preferred to live were continually losing population to areas where few people expressed a desire to live (Fuguitt and Zuiches, 1975). To account for this discrepancy, Fuguitt and Zuiches (1975) suggested that public opinion polls failed to elicit the true residential preferences of the public. They maintained that when respondents indicate a preference to live in small towns or rural areas, they might actually have in mind suburban areas which are in close proximity to an urban center rather than the more remote open country. By allowing respondents to express their residential preferences not only in terms of size of place, but also in terms of proximity to an

urban center, Fuguitt and Zuiches (1975) were able to show that a majority of those respondents who preferred small towns and rural areas also indicated that they would like to live within 30 miles of an urban center. Such a finding is congruent with the continuing trend of population suburbanization in the U.S.

The reversal of historical patterns of population concentration in large urban centers in the U.S. that occurred in the 1970s (Beale, 1975) was another factor influencing the growth of residential preference research. The movement of people from rural areas to concentrated urban centers has been viewed as a process intrinsic to industrialization (e.g., Hawley, 1978). The industrialization of agriculture created a surplus of workers who were absorbed by other industrial sectors developing rapidly in urban centers. As such, rural depopulation and the accompanying urban concentration were phenomena which were explainable b economic push and pull factors. However, the nonmetropolitan population turnaround, which was more or less unanticipated by the classical explanation of population mobility, caused many researchers to turn to residential preferences as a complementary explanation (Wardwell, 1977; Zelinsky, 1974).

To students of population mobility, the study of residential preferences is relevant only if such preferences affect actual mobility behavior. Ironically, a research interest which was intended to assist in understanding population mobility has been swayed away from its proposed course of development. Very "limited attention has been given to the role of residential preferences in the mobility decision-making process" (Heaton et

al., 1979: 565; see also DeJong and Sell, 1977). Instead, a large proportion of the research in the area seemed content with juxtaposing characteristics of groups of people with different types of residential preferences and thus, tended to be descriptive (Zuiches, 1980; 1981). Further, when hypothesis testing is involved, researchers tend to focus on residential preferences as something to be explained. Few studies have treated residential preference as an independent variable that can be used to explain mobility potential (e.g., Blackwood and Carpenter, 1978; Heaton et al., 1979). Even fewer studies have looked at the possible effects of residential preference on actual mobility (e.g., DeJong and Sell, 1977; Zuiches and Rieger, 1978). Given the small number of studies linking residential preference to actual mobility activity, a number of theoretically important questions have been left unaddressed.

One such question is why do so few persons move to places consistent with their preferences. As noted above, this question has long been a concern of population mobility researchers and, in fact, has resulted in several pioneering studies (Fuguitt and Zuiches, 1975; Zuiches and Fuguitt, 1972). However, attempts to explain the discrepancy between preferred residential location and the places actually moved to have not been totally successful. Although part of the discrepancy has been accounted for by the way residential preference questions were asked (Fuguitt and Zuiches, 1975), the remaining discrepancy has not been adequately addressed. Blaming the way the preference question was asked for the preference-mobility discrepancy is

equivalent to assuming that if the questions were asked differently, there would be no more discrepancy. Although there is no data to empirically verify this assumption, the underlying notion that people can act on their preferences without constraints is undoubtedly far-fetched. Consequently, Fuguitt and Zuiches (1975) found that only 42 percent of the respondents interviewed in a national survey actually resided in the type of area in which they most preferred to live.

Longitudinal studies dealing with actual mobility (DeJong and Sell, 1977; Zuiches and Rieger, 1978) further discredit the assumption that people can act on their preferences without constraint. For example, a longitudinal study conducted by DeJong and Sell (1975) in Pennsylvania revealed that there was "incongruity between the size of place where people say they want to live and the actual size of place of destination of their move one year later" (DeJong and Sell, 1975: 137-138). This incongruity remains, even when proximity to a metropolitan center is controlled. Studies using longer time intervals have shown similar results. In another longitudinal survey in which the actual residences of respondents were determined seven years after the preference questions were asked, Zuiches and Rieger (1978) found that of a group of high school students who graduated in 1957-58, 42 percent of those who expressed a preference to live in rural areas at the time when they graduated actually resided in urban areas seven years later. In addition, among those who expressed a preference for living in urban areas in 1957-58, 40 percent of them actually ended up in a rural

location in 1964-65. A similar pattern of mismatch between previous preferences and later residences was also evident for another cohort of high school students who graduated in 1968 (Zuiches and Rieger, 1978).

The lack of congruence between preferences and actual mobility can be seen in yet other findings. Using the 1974 NORC General Social Survey, Zuiches (1981) showed that for a group of inmigrants who recently moved to cities with more than 50,000 population, 66 percent of them preferred a place other than their current residence. Although inmigrants to smaller cities and rural areas seemed to be more content with their move, there was, nevertheless, a large proportion who preferred to live in some other place besides their new residence and expressed a desire to move somewhere else within three years.

Clearly then, incongruity between preferences and actual mobility is not a unique event and seems to be a phenomenon experienced by a large proportion of Americans. As such, we believe that this incongruity deserves additional attention. Although the work by Fuguitt and Zuiches (1975) has made a groundbreaking contribution to our understanding of the phenomenon, we maintain that theoretical explanations, rather than simple methodological explanations, have to be explored.

Theoretical Considerations

Congruency between preferred and actual residence can be conceptualized as the fulfillment of residential preference. Given this conceptualization, the variation in rates of

fulfilling residential preference can be formulated as a function of factors which have effects on fulfillment. Three sets of theoretical factors which have been known to affect population mobility will be considered in this study.

Social Psychology of Residential Preferences

Berry et al. (1976) have argued that different residential areas can be seen as a hierarchical system ranked by "exclusiveness" and "desirability". Such a ranking system has been known to have resulted from, and is maintained by, ecological forces (Hawley, 1950; Park and Burgess, 1967), as well as the conscious regulations of man (Logan, 1976; Molotch, 1976; Shlay and Rossi, 1981). Viewing residential areas from this perspective, one would expect a variation in rates of fulfilling residential preferences to be associated with the types of residential areas preferred. People who prefer residential areas which are highly exclusive and desirable, are doomed to be less likely to have their residential preferences fulfilled than those who prefer a type of residence which is less exclusive and less desirable. An analogy to this phenomena can be drawn from the classical analysis of anomic suicide by Durkheim, who argued that a high rate of failure tends to be associated with people whose untamed ambitions far exceed their ability to obtain their desired ends (see Lukes, 1973).

In the U.S., the fact that a high proportion of people fail to actually live in areas they prefer can be at least partially explained by the unrealistic nature of their preferences. If we

use the median values of owner-occupied housing units and monthly owner costs for mortgaged housing units in a residential area as indicators of exclusiveness, it becomes clear that it is the areas that are most exclusive that are also most preferred. For example, American suburbs, as compared to central cities and nonmetropolitan areas, can be ranked as the most exclusive residential areas both in terms of housing values and mortgage rates (see Table 1) However, it is exactly this type of residential area that is most preferred by Americans. As a result, a large proportion of people who prefer to live in suburbs are kept away by socioeconomic barriers.

The fulfillment of residential preferences can be examined from yet another social psychological factor--residential satisfaction. The importance of satisfaction in affecting moving decisions has long been recognized by theorists of population mobility (Brown and Moore, 1970; Rossi, 1955; Speare, 1974; Wolpert, 1966). Empirical studies have substantiated the theoretical anticipation that migration will sometimes be resorted to as a means of adjusting to community dissatisfaction or environmental stress (Dillman and Dobash, 1972; Heaton et al., 1979; Zuiches and Fuguitt, 1972).

The same argument can be applied to relate satisfaction and fulfillment of residential preferences. Persons who are highly satisfied with their current residential areas are more likely to consider this residence as a preferable place to live. On the other hand, people who are not satisfied with their current residence are less likely to consider it as preferable, and are

more likely to consider migration as an alternative. So seen, residential preferences can be viewed as a cybernetic state of mind (Shibutani, 1968) which is constantly modified by people's current residential experiences in order to alleviate the tension induced by cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957). Regardless of one's previous preferences, those who find their current residences very satisfactory are likely to express a preference consistent with their current residences and, as a result, a higher proportion of residential preference fulfillment. Such a psychological mechanism has been long known by sociologists as the self-fulfilling prophecy (Merton, 1968).

Fulfillment of Residential Preference as a Function of Life-Cycle Stages

The fact that life-cycle stages will affect where a person moves, regardless of preferences, is well documented in the migration literature (Abu-Lughod and Foley, 1960; Frey, 1984; Frey and Kobrin, 1982; Long and Glick, 1976). People in their prime working ages often place special importance on career considerations, job and financial security, and the establishment of a family. Consequently, these persons are likely to give more weight to a location which promises more opportunities to meet such needs. Therefore, despite the fact that such locations may not provide the quality of life that is preferred, quality of life factors may be postponed given the more eminent nature of economic and career considerations.

The degree to which the pursuit of a career may temporarily suspend residential preferences is shown in a study by Brown and

Zuiches (1978). They show that despite the reversal of nonmetropolitan depopulation in the 1970s, nonmetropolitan areas are still losing a substantial number of young adults to metropolitan counties, while many people of older ages are moving to nonmetropolitan counties. Such a delay in achieving residential preference by young adults is also shown in studies by Long and Glick (1976) and Frey (1984), in which there is a marked difference between central cities and suburban areas in terms of the age patterns of net migration. According to Long and Glick (1976: 40), central cities "serve as 'staging areas' where people meet and marry before moving to suburbs to raise children." The growth of the elderly population in nonmetropolitan areas was interpreted as the realization of a long-delayed preference among American elderly (Wardell, 1977). So seen, the realization of residential preferences can be expected to vary with the age of the person, with older persons most likely to fulfill their residential preferences.

There is ample evidence that suggests that marital status and presence of children in a family affect not only residential preferences (Abu-Lughod and Foley, 1960), but also actual mobility (Frey and Kobrin, 1982; Long and Glick, 1976). Marital status can be seen as a barrier to the fulfillment of one's residential preference. The freedom to move to a more preferred location is constrained by the presence of another individual to whom one is responsible. As such, one who prefers to live in a central city may decide to live elsewhere, if that is his/her spouse's desire. A married couple may prefer to remain in a

central city where they both have well-paying jobs, but instead move to a suburb where the needs of their children can be more easily satisfied. Although the net outcome of a moving decision may be determined by the power distribution within the family or by the negotiation or reconciliation of conflicting preferences, the point is that the fulfillment of one's preference can be achieved more easily when there are no other family members. Thus, it is expected that persons who have never married and those who are divorced, separated, or widowed are more likely to realize their residential preferences than those who are currently married. In like manner, married couples without children are more likely to achieve their residential preferences than their counterparts who have children.

Racial and Economic Status

A study of residential fulfillment without a consideration of racial and socioeconomic dimensions would be incomplete. Persuasive arguments have been developed that human actions are directed to achieve goals, but are nevertheless constrained by the structural positions of actors (Merton, 196). Since such constraints are seldom uniformly distributed, population groups which are subject to more or higher degrees of constraint are less likely to achieve their goals than others. Thus, the success or failure of a person to achieve congruency between preferences and actual residence could be examined more fruitfully by not only looking at his/her goals, but also by looking at his/her position in the social structure. Specifically, three factors will be considered.

Race: Race plays a major role in influencing the degree of preference fulfillment. For example, although a national survey (see Zuiches, 1981: 100) reported that about 47 percent of blacks expressed a preference to live in suburbs in 1972, the actual proportion of blacks residing in suburbs was only 16% percent in 1970 (Long and DeAre, 1981; Schnore et al., 1976). The percentage of blacks living in central cities, however, exceeded the percentage that preferred to live there. In contrast, the percentage of whites who preferred a suburban place to live (56%) was found to be much closer to the percentage actually living in suburbs (39.9%).

The ability of minorities to move to suburbs is constrained by the fact that suburbs are not only more segregated than central cities (Hwang and Murdock, 1983), but also because there are simply fewer houses in suburbs that minority families can afford. Long and Spain (1978) have documented that during the period of 1967-1971, for all suburban housing units that had changed hands, only 5 percent of them were sold to black households. The percentage of blacks who bought homes from whites was even smaller, only 2 percent. In comparison, almost 20 percent of the homes sold in central cities were purchased by blacks. Given the fact that the opportunities for blacks are more abundant in areas where they have shown a lower desire to live, it is logical to expect that a higher proportion of them will be unable to fulfill their residential preferences.

Income: As with race, income is another structural factor that should directly affect the mismatch between preference and

actual residence. Since the price of housing tends to vary from area to area according to the socioeconomic status of the residents, the differential possession of wealth among homebuyers would affect their moving decisions. Studies (Berry et al., 1976; Hwang, 1983) have shown that suburban areas with higher costs of housing tended to hinder the entrance of population groups which are economically less qualified, and as a consequence, resulted in a lower degree of growth. This is true even when race is controlled. Residential segregation due to socioeconomic differences--a factor for which urban scholars are well aware (Duncan and Duncan, 1955; Farley, 1977; Massey, 1979)--further supports the hypothesis that achievement of one's residential preference depends heavily on the ability to afford the desired location.

Occupation: Human ecologists have long been aware that job opportunities are seldom distributed proportionally to the number of workers living in different areas (Hawley, 1950; Kasarda, 1972, 1976). As a result, workers must either travel or move to areas where such opportunities are located. Geographic concentration of job opportunities is especially prominent for the types of occupations that are so specialized that their existence relies on a large population base. Professional occupations are typical of this generalization. Thus, despite the recent deconcentration of manufacturing and sales activities from urban centers, professional occupations remain disproportionately concentrated in central cities (Kasarda, 1972, 1976). Given this fact, the only way professionals can use their

skills is to locate in areas where their skills are in demand. Most likely, this often necessitates a tradeoff between preferences and employment, and results in a lower rate of residential fulfillment for professionals than for their nonprofessional counterparts.

Data and Methods

The expected relationships implied by the preceding theoretical discussion are tested using data from a survey of a random sample of 1983 Texas homebuyers. A study of homebuyers provides an opportunity to examine a population as they move to a new residence and allows us to compare the preferred with the actual residential locations. While homebuyers are not representative of the general population as a whole,[1] they do represent an important segment of the mobile population--those purchasing homes.

A stratified random sampling procedure was used to obtain the list of potential survey respondents. The state of Texas was initially divided into 12 geographic areas to assure that the different parts of this very diverse state were represented. Next the total and metropolitan population in each region was calculated. From each region, a metropolitan and a nonmetropolitan county were randomly selected (24 total counties). In each county the number of names needed for the survey was determined by the proportion of the total State population that was either metropolitan or nonmetropolitan in that region. For example, 5.9 percent of the Texas population

lived in Region I (West Texas) in 1980, 80 percent of whom lived in metropolitan counties. Thus, 5.9 percent of the names for the sample came from Region I, with 80 percent of these names coming from the selected metropolitan county (Midland) and 20 percent coming from the selected nonmetropolitan county (Pecos).

After the 24 counties had been selected and the number of names needed in each had been determined, survey lists were compiled by randomly selecting names from the files of 1983 homebuyers in each county. A total of 960 questionnaires were mailed during 1984. Of these, 81 were returned because the respondent had moved again, had died, should not have been included in the sample, or because the address was incorrect. Of those remaining, 475 (54 percent) returned usable questionnaires. Up to two follow-up mailings were used with nonrespondents. Further, 5 cases were deleted because their newly purchased homes were second homes, and 38 cases were deleted because a preference answer was not provided.

Homebuyers were asked about their preferred places to live using a question similar to that of Fuguitt and Zuiches (1975). These preferences are then compared to the actual destination of their move (the current residence) to form a matrix of preference and actual destination. Since our interest is in the factors which affect the rate of preference fulfillment, the total sample is divided into two groups--one which has fulfilled their preference and the other which has not. During the survey, information was also obtained about the life-cycle characteristics (e.g., age, marital status and number of

children) and racial and socioeconomic characteristics (e.g., race, occupation and family income) of the homebuyers. The homebuyers were also asked the degree to which they were satisfied with the neighborhood of their newly purchased home.

Given the dichotomous nature of the criterion variables, logit analysis is used to analyze the data (Hanushek and Jackson, 1977; Swafford, 1980). The logit (the natural log of the odds ratios) is used as the dependent variable. Independent variables are categorized in the following manner in order to make theoretically meaningful contrasts:

(1) Preference Types: Residential preferences are trichotomized into (a) prefer central cities (includes places larger than 50,000); (b) prefer suburban cities (includes places larger than 2,500 and less than 50,000 as well as open country located within 30 miles of a central city); (c) prefer nonmetropolitan areas (includes all places located farther than 30 miles away from a central city);

(2) Satisfaction with current neighborhood: This variable is dichotomized into (a) highly satified and (b) not highly satisfied;

(3) Age: According to the previous studies of the age patterns of migration (Brown and Zuiches, 1978; Frey, 1984; Long and Glick, 1976), migrants younger than 30 years of age differed significantly from migrants of other ages in selecting destinations. Thus, we dichotomized age into (a) young (under 30 years of age) and (b) old (above 30);

(4) Marital status: Dichotomized into (a) currently married and (b) not currently married;

(5) Presence of Children: Dichotomized into (a) with children and (b) without children;

(6) Race: Dichotomized into (a) white and (b) other;

(7) Income: A cutting point that comes closest to the median income of the sample was used to divide the respondents into two groups, (a) high income (includes persons who reported a family income of more than $40,000) and (b) low income (specified family income below $40,000);

(8) Occupation: This was categorized into (a) professional and (b) other.

Because of the number of variables in the analysis, an immediate problem, given the sample size, is that a contingency table crosstabulating these variables cannot be constructed without creating a large number of structurally empty cells. Although methods to avoid empty cells have been suggested (Fienberg and Holland, 1973; Goodman, 1970), parameter estimates and chi-square tests relying on such methods are not guaranteed to be reliable (Reynolds, 1977).

To overcome this problem, an alternative strategy was utilized. This involved dividing the analysis into two steps. The first step analyzed three "partial" models by crosstabulating the criterion variable (fulfillment of residential preference) with each of the three sets of explanatory factors (e.g., social psychological factors, life-cycle factors, and racial and socioeconomic factors). This stage of analysis was mainly used to select significant factors from each set of factors to be included in the final model. A variable which was not significant in this step was excluded from further analysis. In the second step, a final model crosstabulating the criterion variable and explanatory variables selected in the first step was analyzed.

The use of this strategy is based on the following methodological premises. Since the program we used (FUNCAT, SAS, 1982) assumes hierarchical model building, it implies that if one is interested in the interaction effect between two factors (A and B), the main effects of both factors will be included in the model, regardless of whether or not their main effects are significant. Given that the chance of getting a significant interaction effect while the main effects are not significant is both statistically unlikely, but also substantively meaningless, the deletion of the factors altogether seemed to be a wise choice. Furthermore, it was theoretically anticipated that if there was any significant interaction among explanatory factors, these would be more likely to occur between variables within the sets, rather than between them. Thus, the deletion of an insignificant variable in the first step should not result in any major explanatory loss.

Analysis

Table 2 presents data obtained by crosstabulating preferred residences by actual residences for the sample of 1983 Texas homebuyers. Besides frequency counts, percentage distributions of actual residences for each type of preferred residence are also reported. By examining such percentage distributions, it is possible to show the proportion of homebuyers within each preference type who either fulfill (in the main diagonal) or do not fulfill (not in the diagonal) their residential preference. The data in Table 2 indicate that the rates of fulfillment vary

from one type of preference to another. Those persons who preferred to live within 30 miles of, but not in a large city are the least likely to fulfill their preference. In comparison, persons who preferred to live in cities larger than 50,000 and those who preferred to live more than 30 miles from those cities had a much higher chance of realizing their preferences. With the exception of those persons who preferred to live in areas located more than 30 miles away from a large city, a larger proportion of the homebuyers, regardless of their preferences, actually ended up settling in areas with populations larger than 50,000.

To analyze whether or not the fulfillment of residential preference is affected by the factors we considered important, three full logit models were formulated, each of which examines one of the three sets of explanatory factors (Tables 3-5).

In Table 3, the hypothesis that the fulfillment of residential preference would be affected by the types of preference as well as by neighborhood satisfaction is examined. An examination of the upper portion of the table indicates that fulfillment of residential preference is affected significantly by both of the factors considered, although there is no significant interaction effect. The lower portion of Table 3 displays how and to what degree such factors affected residential fulfillment. Table 3 shows how preference type (λ_p), neighborhood satisfaction (λ_s) and their interaction (λ_{ps}) contributed to the logit of fulfilled versus not fulfilled in an additive manner.

Given that the dependent variable is arrived at by taking the natural log of the odds ratio of the proportion fulfilled versus the proportion not fulfilled, the values for the dependent variable can range from $-\infty$ to ∞. A negative value indicates a smaller proportion of fulfilled than not fulfilled persons, while a positive value indicates a larger proportion of fulfilled than not fulfilled persons. When the number of persons is equally divided, a value of zero is obtained. An examination of the column providing logit values indicates that the rate of residential fulfillment ranges from a low of -3.1023 (for persons who preferred to live in the suburbs and showed a low satisfication with their current neighborhood) to a high of .4125 (for persons who preferred to live in central cities and were highly satisfied with their current neighborhood).

While the average person tended to have a low chance of being fulfilled (λ = -.9438) (λ is equivalent to the intercept in OLS regression), persons who preferred to live in central cities were much more likely to fulfill their residential preferences (λ_p = 1.2447). The chance of fulfilling one's residential preference is further improved if the person is highly satisfied with his/her current neighborhood (λ_s = .3028). In contrast, the general tendency toward not fulfilling one's residential preference is further aggrevated for persons who preferred to live in suburbs (λ_p = -1.7751) and who are not satisfied with their current neighborhood (λ_s = -.3028). For those persons who preferred to live in nonmetropolitan areas and are very satisfied with their current neighborhood, there is an equal

division between those who are fulfilled and those who are not fulfilled. Although there are some interaction effects between preference types and neighborhood satisfaction, such effects are not consequential to the results. In sum, Table 3 suggests that whether or not one fulfills his/her residential preference depends on the types of neighborhood preferred, and their satisfaction with the neighborhood.

Table 4 provides an analyis of the potential effects of life-cycle factors on residential fulfillment. Among the three factors we considered, only age had a significant main effect. The rate of residential fulfillment does not vary significantly for persons with different marital statuses and for persons with or without children. One two-way interaction effect (Age x Child) and the three-way interaction are also significant.

An examination of the bottom portion of Table 4 indicates that, as expected, young people have a smaller chance (λ_y = -.4535) of fulfilling their residential preference than older persons (λ_y = .4535). Although marital status and children contribute no significant main effects, being young and having children further decreases the chance of fulfillment by a λ_{yc} value of -.3575. Surprisingly, a combination of being young, married and having children contributes a significant positive effect. A study of the logit values indicates that among the eight possible combinations, the group that was least likely to fulfill their preference was persons who are young and have children, but are not currently married (probably divorced or separated). The highest value of fulfillment occurred in the

group composed of persons that are older, not married (probably widowed) and have children.

Overall, Table 4 suggests that fulfillment of residential preference is significantly affected by age. Marital status affects fulfillment only when it is considered together with age. The finding of a significant and positive three-way interaction effect was not anticipated theoretically.

The anticipation that fulfillment of residential preferences would be affected by racial and socioeconomic statuses of persons is evaluated in Table 5. Of the three variables we considered (i.e., race, occupation and income), none has a significant effect on residential fulfillment. The only effect that approaches significance is the interaction between race and income. Given the insignificant result, the logistic function showing the parameter estimates is not presented.

The preceding analysis of the fulfillment of residential preference has shown that residential fulfillment is affected by preference type, neighborhood satisfaction, and age. In the next phase of the analysis, those variables that displayed a significant main effect in the three preliminary models are pooled together into a single model. By pooling preference types, neighborhood satisfaction and age of respondents together, Table 6 presents some alternative models for looking at residential fulfillment. To simplify presentation, different models are shown in notations commonly used in the literature of log-linear analysis (Swafford, 1980). Equivalent to backward selection procedures, models are ranked in Table 6 from the most

complex (saturated model) to the simplest (main effect only model). Since the previous analyses indicated that all three variables are important in affecting residential fulfillment, no further model simplification is attempted beyond the three variables main effect model.

Using the saturated model (1) as the baseline model, Table 6 indicates that although each attempt to simplify the saturated model results in some increase in error (Likelihood Ratio χ^2 of error), such increases tend to be generally inconsequential. Thus, deletion of the three-way interaction (Model 2) raises the error from 0 to 5.52, but the concomitant increase in degrees of freedom renders the error insignificant. Models 3 through 5 further simplify the saturated model by deleting one of the three two-way interactions. Only Model 4, within the set, creates an error large enough to be significant at the .05 level. Models 6 through 8 delete yet another two-way interaction and end up explaining the dependent variables by three main effects and one two-way interaction effect. Despite such simplification, these models still do not perform significantly worse than the full model. This is so because the losses in accuracy of prediction are compensated for by the gains in model simplification. Model 9 specifies that the variation in logit of residential fulfillment can be explained by three main effects alone, without interaction between explanatory factors. Again, the error incurred by such further simplification is not statistically significant.

Since Model 9 is the simplest three-variable model and yet, provides a good fit to the data, its parameter estimates and fitted logits are presented in Table 7. An examination of these parameters and logits clearly shows that fulfillment of residential preference is predominantly affected by one's preference types and, to a lesser degree, by whether one is satisfied with his/her current neighborhood and whether one is young. Thus, the logits of residential fulfillment will be increased by 1.2311 if one preferred to live in central cities, by .5199 if one preferred to live in nonmetropolitan areas, but will be decreased by 1.7510 if one preferred to live in suburbs. Satisfaction with one's current neighborhood increases the logit of fulfillment by .1807 and dissatisfaction decreases it by .1807. Finally, being young decreases the logit of fulfillment by .1811 and being older increases it by the same amount.

Given the effects of these parameters, only three of the twelve subpopulations have a larger proportion of fulfilled than non-fulfilled persons. As was expected, the group composed of persons who preferred to live in central cities, are satisfied with their current neighborhood, and are older than 30 years of age is the one that has the largest proportion of persons being fulfilled. Persons who preferred to live somewhere other than central cities, regardless of their age and satisfaction status, generally have a smaller proportion of fulfilled than non-fulfilled persons. Among them, those who preferred to live in suburbs, are not satisfied with their neighborhood, and are

younger are the ones who are least likely to fulfill their residential preference.

Conclusions

The mismatch between preferred and actual residences has been given limited attention by students of population mobility (e.g., Fuguitt and Zuiches, 1975). This study expands the area of study by exploring some theoretical, rather than methodological, explanations for the mismatch. The argument that the fulfillment of residential preference is affected by social psychological factors, life-cycle factors, and social and socioeconomic factors is subjected to empirical tests using logit analysis. The results from this study lend support to the argument that fulfillment of residential preference depends on social psychological variables (i.e., preference types, neighborhood satisfaction) as well as one life-cycle factor (i.e., age), but show no significant effect from racial and socioeconomic factors.

By categorizing residential preferences into three types (i.e., central cities, suburbs and nonmetropolitan areas), it is found that the mismatch between preferred and actual residences is most apparent among people who preferred a suburban residence, less so for people who preferred nonmetropolitan residences, and is lowest among people who preferred to live in central cities. Such findings corroborate the argument that the chance of fulfilling one's residential preference is much higher in areas which are less exclusive compared to areas which are more

exclusive. The psychological argument that people tend to modify their preference according to their neighborhood living experience is also supported. A higher proportion of fulfilled persons is found among those who said they are highly satisfied with their current neighborhood. Finally, younger persons have a higher degree of residential mismatch than older persons, a finding consistent with the life-cycle argument that because of career considerations, younger persons tend to delay fulfillment of their preference to an older age.

The failure to find evidence to support the racial and socioeconomic arguments is theoretically perplexing. However, this finding, based on a single analysis, is not sufficient to challenge a well established theory. Many factors (e.g., sampling bias, the way such factors are categorized) may be operating to create such a result. Analyses based upon simple random sampling and upon factors coded differently may produce results which are different from those reported here.

Notes

1 Compared to the general population, homebuyers tend to be young, white, married, have high incomes, and employed in professional occupations.

References

Abu-Lughod, Janet, and Mary Mix Foley. 1960. Consumer differences. Pp 95-133 in Nelson N. Foote, Janet Abu-Lughod, Mary Mix Foley, and Louis Winnick (eds.), **Housing Choices and Housing Constraints.** New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Beale, Calvin. 1975. **The Revival of Population Growth in Nonmetropolitan America.** ERS-605. Washington, DC: Economic Research Service, Department of Agriculture.

Berry, Brian J.L., Carole A. Goodwin, Robert W. Lake, and Katherine B. Smith. 1976. Attitudes toward integration: the role of status in community response to racial change. Pp. 221-264 in Barry Schwartz (ed.), **The Changing Face of the Suburbs.** Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Blackwood, Larry G., and Edwin H. Carpenter. 1978. The importance of anti-urbanism in determining residential preferences and migration patterns. **Rural Sociology** 43: 31-47.

Brown, Lawrence, and E.G. Moore. 1970. The intra-urban migration process: a perspective. **Geografiska Annales,** series B, 52: 1-13.

DeJong, Gordon F., and Ralph R. Sell. 1977. Population redistribution, migration, and residential preferences. **The Annals of the American Academy** of Political and Social Science 429: 130-144.

Dillman, Don A., and Russell P. Dobash. 1972. **Preferences for Community Living and Their Implications for Population Redistribution.** Washington Agricultural Experiment Station. Bulletin 764. Pullman, WA: Washington State University.

Duncan, Otis D., and Beverly Duncan. 1955. Residential distribution and occupational stratification. **American Journal of Sociology** 60: 493-503.

Farley, Reynolds. 1977. Residential segregation in urbanized areas of the United States in 1970: an analysis of social class and racial differences. **Demography** 14: 497-518.

Festinger, Leon. 1957. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fienberg, Stephen E., and Paul W. Holland. 1973. Simultaneous estimation of multinomial cell probabilities. **Journal of the American Statistical Association** 68: 683-691.

Frey, William H. 1984. Life course migration and demographic change. **American Sociological Review** 49: 803-827.

_____, and Frances E. Kobrin. 1982. Changing families and changing mobility: their impact on the central city. **Demography** 19: 261-277.

Fuguitt, Glenn V., and James J. Zuiches. 1975. Residential preferences and population distribution. **Demography** 12: 491-504.

Goodman, Leo A. 1970. The multivariate analysis of qualitative data. **Journal of the American Statistical Association** 65: 226-256.

Hanushek, Eric A., and John E. Jackson. 1977. **Statistical Methods for Social Scientists.** New York, NY: Academic Press.

Hawley, Amos H. 1950. **Human Ecology.** New York, NY: Ronald Press.

_____. 1978. Urbanization as Process. Pp. 3-26 in David Street and Associates (eds.), **Handbook of Contemporary Urban Life.** San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Heaton, Tim, Carl Fredrickson, Glenn V. Fuguitt, and James J. Zuiches. 1979. Residential preferences, community satisfaction, and the intention to move. **Demography** 16: 565-573.

Hwang, Sean Shong. 1983. Suburbanization as a Sociocultural and Ecological Process: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Investigation. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University.

_____, and Steve H. Murdock. 1983. Segregation in nonmetropolitan and metropolitan Texas in 1980. **Rural Sociology** 48: 607-623.

Kasarda, John D. 1972. The theory of ecological expansion: an empirical test. **Social Forces** 51: 165-175.

_____. 1976. The changing occupational structure of the American metropolis: apropos the urban problem. Pp. 113-136 in Barry Schwartz (ed.), **The Changing Face of the Suburbs.** Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Long, Larry, and Diana DeAre. 1981. The suburbanization of blacks. **American Demographics** 3: 16-44.

_____, and Paul C. Glick. 1976. Family patterns in suburban areas: recent trends. Pp. 39-68 in Barry Schwartz (ed.), The **Changing Face of the Suburbs.** Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

_____, and Daphne Spain. 1978. **Racial Succession in Individual Housing Units.** Series P-23, No. 70. Current Population Reports. U.S. Bureau of the Census. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Logan, John R. 1976. Industrialization and the stratification of cities in suburban regions. **American Journal of Sociology** 82: 333-348.

Lukes, Steven. 1973. **Emile Durkheim, His Life and Work: A Historical and Critical Study.** New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Massey, Douglas D. 1979. Effects of socioeconomic factors on the residential segregation of blacks and Spanish Americans in United States urbanized areas. **American Sociological Review** 44: 1015-1022.

Merton, Robert K. 1968. **Social Theory and Social Structure.** New York, NY: The Free Press.

Molotch, Harvey. 1976. The city as a growth machine: toward a political economy of place. **American Journal of Sociology** 82: 309-332.

Park, Robert E., and Ernest W. Burgess. 1967. **The City.** Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rossi, Peter H. 1955. **Why Families Move.** New York, NY: The Free Press.

SAS. 1982. **SAS User's Guide: Statistics.** 1982 edition. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.

Schnore, Leo F., Carolyn D. Andre, and Harry Sharp. 1976. Black suburbanization, 1930-1970. Pp. 69-94 in Barry Schwartz (ed.), **The Changing Face of the Suburbs.** Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Shibutani, Tamotsu. 1968. A cybernetic approach to motivation. Pp. 330-336 in Walter Buckley (ed.), **Modern Systems Research for Behavior Scientist.** Chicago: Alding.

Shlay, Anne B., and Peter H. Rossi. 1981. Keeping up the neighborhood. **American Sociological Review** 46: 703-719.

Speare, Alden, Jr. 1974. Residential satisfaction as an intervening variable in residential mobility. **Demography** 11: 173-188.

_____, Sidney Goldstein, and William H. Frey. 1974. **Residential Mobility, Migration, and Metropolitan Change.** Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Co.

Swafford, Michael. 1980. Parametric techniques for contingency table analysis. **American Sociological Review** 45: 664-690.

Wardwell, John M. 1977. Equilibrium and change in nonmetropolitan growth. **Rural Sociology** 42: 156-179.

Wolpert, Julian. 1966. Migration as an adjustment to environmental stress. **Journal of Social Issues** 22: 92-102.

Zelinsky, Wilbur. 1974. Selfward bound? personal preferences and the changing map of American society. **Economic Geography** 50: 144-179.

Zuiches, James H. 1981. Residential preferences in the United States. Pp. 72-115 in Amos H. Hawley and Sara Mills Mazie (eds.), **Nonmetropolitan American in Transition.** Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

_____, and David L. Brown. 1978. The changing character of the nonmetropolitan population, 1950-75. Pp. 55-72 in Thomas R. Ford (ed.), **Rural U.S.A.: Persistence and Change.** Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.

_____, and Glenn Fuguitt. 1972. Residential preferences: Implications for population redistribution in nonmetropolitan areas. In Sara Mills Mazie (ed.), **Population Distribution and Policy: U.S. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.** Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____, and Jon R. Rieger. 1978. Size of place preferences and life cycle migration: a cohort comparison. **Rural Sociology** 43: 618-633.

Table 1: Ranking of Residential Types by Exclusiveness and Preferences

Residential Types	Exclusiveness: Housing Value[1]	Exclusiveness: Mortgage[2]	Exclusiveness: Rank	Preference[3]	Preference: Rank
Suburbs	$56,038	$402	1	52%	1
Central cities	$43,300	$340	2	21%	3
Nonmetropolitan Areas	$35,298	$311	3	27%	2

Sources:

[1/2] 1980 Census of Housing. Metropolitan Housing Characteristics. United States Summary. Tables A-5, B-5, C-5, A-9, B-9, C-9.

[3] 1974 NORC General Social Survey reported in Zuiches (1981). Table 2.2, p. 84.

Table 2: Preferred Residence by Actual Residences, Texas Homebuyers, 1983

Actual Residence	City over 500,000	City 50,000-500,000	Within 30 Miles of City over 50,000: City 10,000-50,000	Within 30 Miles of City over 50,000: Place under 10,000	Within 30 Miles of City over 50,000: Rural Area	More than 30 Miles from City over 50,000: City 10,000-50,000	More than 30 Miles from City over 50,000: Place under 10,000	More than 30 Miles from City over 50,000: Rural Area	Total
City over 500,000	54 (79.41)	47 (30.13)	30 (30.0)	11 (31.43)	7 (26.92)	1 (5.26)	5 (25.0)	1 (12.5)	156
City of 50,000 - 500,000	10 (14.71)	75 (48.08)	27 (27.0)	4 (11.43)	11 (42.31)	1 (5.26)	5 (25.0)	1 (12.5)	134
Within 30 Miles of City over 50,000									
City 10,000 - 50,000	2 (2.94)	6 (5.13)	6 (6.0)	3 (8.57)	1 (3.85)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (12.5)	21
Places 2,500 - 10,000	0 (0.00)	1 (0.64)	8 (8.0)	3 (8.57)	2 (7.69)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	14
Rural Area	0 (0.000	2 (1.28)	1 (1.0)	2 (5.71)	1 (3.85)	2 (10.53)	1 (5.0)	1 (12.5)	10
More than 30 Miles from City over 50,000									
City 10,000 - 50,000	1 (1.47)	16 (10.26)	23 (23.0)	8 (22.86)	2 (7.69)	15 (75.95)	5 (25.0)	2 (25.0)	72
Places 2,500 - 10,000	1 (1.47)	7 (4.49)	4 (4.0)	3 (8.57)	1 (3.85)	0 (0.00)	4 (20.0)	2 (25.0)	22
Rural area	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.0)	1 (2.86)	1 (3.85)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	3
Total	68 (100)	156 (100)	100 (100)	35 (100)	26 (100)	19 (100)	20 (100)	8 (100)	432

Table 3: Fulfillment of Residential Preference (F) by Types of Preference (P) and Satisfaction with Current Neighborhood (S)

Source	Df	Chi-Square	Prob.
Intercept	1	36.05	.0001
P	2	71.24	.0001
S	1	3.71	.05
P * S	2	1.21	>.05

Estimate of Logistic Function

Sample		Effect				Logit**	Odds
Preference (P)	Satisfaction (S)	λ	λ_p	λ_s	λ_{ps}	ln(P/1-P)	P/1-P
Central	High	-.9438	1.2447	.3028	-.1912	0.4125	1.51
Central	Low	-.9438	1.2447	-.3028	.1912	0.1892	1.21
Suburb	High	-.9438	-1.7751	.3028	.0807	-2.3354	.10
Suburb	Low	-.9438	-1.7751	-.3028	-.0807	-3.1023	.04
Nonmetro	High	-.9438	.5304	.3028	.1105	0.0000	1.00
Nonmetro	Low	-.9438	.5304	-.3028	-.1105	-0.8267	.44

** $\ln (P / 1-P) = \lambda + \lambda_p + \lambda_s + \lambda_{ps}$

Table 4: Fulfillment of Residential Preference (F) by Age (Y), Marital Status (M) and Presence of Child (C)

Source	Df	Chi-Square	Prob.
Intercept	1	13.62	.0002
Y	1	7.00	.01
M	1	0.09	>.05
C	1	0.75	>.05
Y * M	1	1.33	>.05
Y * C	1	4.35	.05
M * C	1	0.19	>.05
Y * M * C	1	5.01	.05

Estimation of Logistic Function

Sample			Effect								Logit**	Odds
Age (Y)	Married (M)	Child (C)	λ	λ_y	λ_m	λ_c	λ_{ym}	λ_{yc}	λ_{mc}	λ_{ymc}	ln(P/1-P)	P/1-P
Young	Yes	With	-.6324	4535	-.0510	-.1488	.1978	-.3575	.0745	.3837	-.9874	.3725
Young	Yes	Without	-.6324	-.4535	-.0510	.1488	.1978	.3575	-.0745	-.3837	-.8910	.4103
Young	No	With	-.6324	-.4535	.0510	-.1488	-.1978	-.3575	-.0745	-.3837	-2.1972	.1111
Young	No	Without	-.6324	-.4535	.0510	.1488	-.1978	.3575	.0745	.3837	-.2682	.7647
Old	Yes	With	-.6324	.4535	-.0510	-.1488	-.1978	.3575	.0745	-.3837	-.5281	.5897
Old	Yes	Without	-.6324	.4535	-.0510	.1488	-.1978	-.3575	-.0745	.3837	-.3272	.7209
Old	No	With	-.6324	.4535	.0510	-.1488	.1978	.3575	-.0745	.3837	.5878	1.8000
Old	No	Without	-.6324	.4535	.0510	.1488	.1978	-.3575	.0745	-.3837	-.4480	.6389

** $\ln (P / 1-P) = \lambda + \lambda_y + \lambda_m + \lambda_c + \lambda_{ym} + \lambda_{yc} + \lambda_{mc} + \lambda_{ymc}$

Table 5: Fulfillment of Residential Preference (F) by Race (W), Occupation (O), and Income (I)

Source	Df	Chi-Square	Prob.
Intercept	1	10.44	.001
W	1	0.02	>.05
O	1	0.06	>.05
I	1	0.41	>.05
W * O	1	0.71	>.05
W * I	1	2.10	>.05
O * I	1	0.01	>.05
W * O * I	1	0.02	>.05

Table 6: Logit Models of Association between Fulfillment of Residential Preference (F) and Types of Preference (P), Satisfaction with Current Neighborhood (S) and Age (Y) of Respondents

Model	Df	LR χ^2 of Error	Prob.
1 (FPSY)	0	0	0
2 (FPS) (FPY) (FSY)	2	5.52	0.06
3 (FPS) (FPY)	3	6.05	0.11
4 (FPS) (FSY)	4	9.28	0.05
5 (FPY) (FSY)	4	6.55	0.16
6 (FPS) (FY)	5	9.69	0.08
7 (FPY) (FS)	5	6.93	0.23
8 (FSY) (FP)	6	10.51	0.10
9 (FP) (FS) (FY)	7	10.88	0.14

Table 7: Estimation of Logistic Function for Model 9

Sample			Effect				Logit*	Odds
Preference (P)	Satisfaction (S)	Age (Y)	λ	λ_p	λ_s	λ_{ps} λ_y	ln(P/1-P)	P/1-P
Central	High	Young	-.9693	1.2311	.1807	-.1181	.3244	1.3832
Central	High	Old	-.9693	1.2311	.1807	.1181	.5606	1.7517
Central	Low	Young	-.9693	1.2311	-.1807	-.1181	-.0370	.9637
Central	Low	Old	-.9693	1.2311	-.1807	.1181	.1992	1.2204
Suburb	High	Young	- 9693	-1.7510	.1807	-.1181	-2.6577	.0701
Suburb	High	Old	-.9693	-1.7510	.1807	.1181	-2.4215	.0889
Suburb	Low	Young	-.9693	-1.7510	-.1807	-.1181	-3.0191	.0488
Suburb	Low	Old	-.9693	-1.7510	-.1807	.1181	-2.7829	.0619
Nonmetro	High	Young	-.9693	.5199	.1807	-.1181	- .3867	.6793
Nonmetro	High	Old	-.9693	.5199	.1807	.1181	- .1505	.8603
Nonmetro	Low	Young	-.9693	.5199	-.1807	-.1181	- .7431	.4733
Nonmetro	Low	Old	-.9693	.5199	-.1807	.1181	- .5119	.5994

* $\ln (P / 1-P) = \lambda + \lambda_p + \lambda_s + \lambda_y$