

UC Berkeley
IURD Working Paper Series

Title

The Structure and Determinants of Attachment to Place

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0q753327>

Authors

Stueve, Ann

Gerson, Kathleen

Fischer, Claude S.

Publication Date

1975-08-01

THE STRUCTURE AND DETERMINANTS OF
ATTACHMENT TO PLACE*

Ann Stueve
Kathleen Gerson
Claude S. Fischer**

August 1975

Working Paper No. 255

*Paper presented to the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, August 1975. A revised version of this paper will appear in Fischer et al., Networks and Places (Free Press, 1976).

**The work reported here was supported by a small grant to the third author from the National Institute of Mental Health (MH-25406-01), and by the Institute of Urban and Regional Development, Berkeley. We thank Robert Max Jackson, Lynne Jones, and Mark Baldassare for assistance and helpful comments.

INTRODUCTION

The issue of community is of more than abstract importance to sociologists and policy makers alike. Each year about one-fifth of all Americans move from one house to another; about one-tenth change neighborhoods. By the end of a decade, perhaps 40% have changed places (see Abu-Lughod and Foley, 1960; Simmons, 1968; Zimmer, 1973). The interest in voluntary moves is great (e.g., Packard, 1972); the turmoil of forced moves is significant (e.g., Fried, 1967). This concern about place is also demonstrated in vigorous defenses of neighborhoods by groups threatened with invasion, and also by people's frequent search for exclusive class or ethnic enclaves. Numerous speculations have been offered about the consequences of not being attached to a place. Residential turnover is often thought to bring disorganization to local communities (e.g., Angell, 1947; Whyte, 1943) and estrangement to individuals (Nisbet, 1967; Packard, 1972; our analysis of this proposition appears in Fischer and Stueve, 1975).

It is rare to find amidst all of these speculations any explicit examination of the underlying question: what is the nature and what are the determinants of the relationship between individuals and their places? Why is it that people are attached to their places? How are they attached? By what processes? And, what do places mean to people? We are specifically concerned with place of residence, identified as neighborhood or local community. These are the considerations which we shall touch upon in this paper.

A definition of "attachment" should precede this discussion; however, we shall not offer such a definition now because the specific interpretation of "attachment" varies with the conceptual approach to the problem. Let us simply proceed with this general understanding: attachment to place refers to an individual's voluntary commitment to his or her residential location and its populace.

The basic task of this paper is to answer three empirical questions:

1. Is attachment to place largely a unitary dimension? If not, what are its distinguishable components?
2. Proceeding inductively, what attributes of families, their homes, and their places determine their attachments?
3. Can we develop a deductive model of attachments which is based on a priori assumptions about the nature of the relationship between people and places? Is this deductive model as powerful as an inductive approach in predicting attachment?

Our conclusions, in brief, are:

1. Attachment is multi-dimensional. Its key elements seem to be: institutional involvement (e.g., having children in the local schools); local interaction, such as casual socializing; having intimate relations, kin or friends, in the neighborhood; and, affect for the place.
2. Given this multi-dimensionality, the predictors of attachment vary. Only years in residence are consistently correlated with all forms of attachment. Several individual and contextual variables predict some dimensions, but not others; few have opposite effects on different dimensions of attachment.

3. Our efforts to develop and test a deductive model -- one focused on the "fit" between people and their places -- achieves mixed results, but is suggestive for future research.

Before describing our empirical analyses, it is important to present the conceptual framework of this research.

PERSPECTIVES ON ATTACHMENT TO PLACE

This section reviews three alternative conceptual approaches concerning the nature of the relationship between individuals and places: psychological, sociological, and economic. These perspectives are not necessarily contradictory; rather, they each stress different aspects of the relationship and propose essentially distinct understandings of it.

Psychological approaches locate the source of attachment to place in mental (or even, biological) processes. Specific versions of this perspective include:

1. Ethological analyses which argue that attachment is located in the "territorial instinct" (e.g., Ardrey, 1967; Van den Berghe, 1974; for critiques, see Martin, 1972; Montagu, 1973).

2. Cognitive theories which posit that "sense of place" develops because it provides a source of psychological stability. Place is a reference point from which to view the world, and a basic source of identity.

3. Learning, or associational, models which focus on the acquired association between a place and the activities which occur there. Familiar, and presumably pleasurable, features of a person's life become linked to the places in which they occur, so that these places become valued (e.g., Tuan, 1974).

Sociological perspectives concentrate on the social relationships found in a particular locale. An old and influential view is that interpersonal relationships which individuals have with their neighbors are ultimately fuller, deeper, and more "primary" in character than are relationships with persons in other places (Nisbet, 1967; Alexander, 1973; Packard, 1972). More recently, Gerald Suttles (1972) and others (Heberle, 1960; Leeds, 1973) have argued that geographical areas provide convenient units of organization for society -- for classifying people, dispensing resources, pursuing collective goals, etc. This view suggests that attachment to place fundamentally involves an instrumental membership in a corporate unit. Presumably, as non-spatial dimensions (e.g., profession, or political persuasion) become efficient organizing principles, place decreases in importance relative to "non-place communities" (Webber, 1970).

Economic perspectives view attachment to place as the product of an implicit calculation of costs and benefits, in which people compare features of their residence to other alternatives (e.g., Wolpert, 1965). Of course, the elements which enter into the calculation can include the social and psychic rewards associated with a place (for instance, the glow of fond memories). Unlike psychological and sociological theories, this approach involves both a calculus and a comparison. Furthermore, economic models explicitly recognize the extent to which attachment can reflect constraint -- for example, when a family's low income inhibits their ability to choose alternative places.

A consideration of the logical structure implicit in these approaches suggests that they also fall into another, cross-cutting classification. A few theories are essentially functional explanations:

attachment to place meets certain social or psychic needs, so that without it people suffer. To demonstrate that attachment serves such functions, one must show that people engage in strenuous efforts to achieve it, and/or that its absence results in injurious consequences. Second, there are linear causal models. A relatively simple example is the "familiarity breeds content" argument: time leads to familiarity; familiarity is conducive to affective attachment. More complex models take into account both individual and contextual variables. Third, rational decision-making models interpret attachment as an outcome of choice. People select places and select (in most cases) whether and how to be attached to them. Implicit in this approach is the notion of a "fit" between the individual and his residential environment. Both the economic analysis and the social instrumental interpretation of neighborhoods are examples of this perspective. Each focuses on the regards and costs of being attached.

For the bulk of this paper, we shall set aside these theoretical considerations and engage in a more inductive analysis. We shall, however, return to them to interpret our findings.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA

We have re-analyzed a national survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center in 1967. This survey, described fully in Bradburn, et al. (1970), was largely concerned with racial integration in American neighborhoods. For that purpose NORC selected a sample of neighborhoods which were open to Blacks, and then matched these neighborhoods with controls which were white -- or Black-segregated. Within neighborhoods, households were sampled so that the sex ratio of the respondents is 3:1 female. For this analysis, we used only white, urban respondents (N=2,747).

We merged three distinct sets of data concerning the respondents and their places: (1) data from personal interviews collected in the 1967 household survey; (2) census data for the respondents' neighborhoods (N=230), dated 1960; (3) data from knowledgeable informants for each neighborhood interviewed by NORC. These local leaders provided general qualitative assessments of the various locales. We were able, therefore, to create a file which included not only respondent data, but also a wide range of independent information about respondents' places.¹ The dependent variables which concern us were formed from various questions in the household survey dealing with the families' and the respondents' connections to, behaviors in, and attitudes about their neighborhoods. (The texts of these items are presented in Appendix A.)

I: THE STRUCTURE OF ATTACHMENT TO PLACE

While numerous studies have explored the determinants of local ties (see review in the next section), few have directly questioned whether attachment to place is unitary or multidimensional - or the nature of these dimensions. Most adopt a single measure; some combine various indicators into a single scale; only a few use multiple indicators or distinguish local social ties from affect about the locality (see, especially, Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974). A direct analysis of the structure of attachment is still needed.

After constructing different measures of community attachments (listed and described in Appendix A), we cross tabulated each against the other. An examination of these tabulations (presented in Table 1) suggests, first, that attachment to place is not unitary, but multidimensional; and, second, that there are four key dimensions: (1) Institutional (or formal) ties, such as attendance at local schools and churches; (2) Local activity, including informal socializing with neighbors and participation in neighborhood organizations; (3) Intimate ties -- having relatives and/or friends in the neighborhood; and (4) Affective attachment -- feelings about the locality and about leaving it. The last is a different form of attachment which we consider largely a consequence of the other dimensions, although the relationship is probably mutually reinforcing.

Table 1 reveals the generally low associations among the attachment measures; one tie does not presume another. There is, however, a

Table 1. Relationships Among Attachment Measures^a (gammas).

	Local Activity		Intimate		Affect	
	Neigh- boring	Organi- zations	Kin	Friends	Happy	Stay
Institutional Ties	.17	.33	.09	.12	.09	.04
Sociable Neighboring		.50	.01	.39	.22	.12
Organizational Involvement			.07	.39	.24	.15
Kin in Neighborhood				.23	.05	.07
Friends in Neighborhood					.30	.29
Happy with Neighborhood						.67
Prefer to Stay or Leave						

^aMeasures explained in Appendix A.

substantial "cluster" of ties which consists of local friends, sociable neighboring, and organizational participation. This cluster suggests that families which maintain voluntary and informal involvements of one type are likely to maintain other such commitments. Furthermore, the weak associations between kinship ties and all the others (except local friendships) contrast with the strong associations between local friendships and other variables. Having kin nearby seems to do little to "root" people in other ways, but friends are an extremely important link to general neighborhood attachment.

SUBSAMPLE ANALYSIS

The results in Table 1 refer to our sample as a whole. There are reasons to suspect, however, that the structure of local attachment may vary depending on critical characteristics of a family. In particular, how do the needs and opportunities of different families, reflected in life-cycle stage, economic level, and location, influence the pattern and strength of the relationships among community ties? (See the literature review in Section II.) Children, for example, connect their parents to the neighborhood in a variety of ways: they demand local supervision,

promote informal contact with other residents, generate parental interest in the neighborhood, and belong to community organizations, keeping their mothers close to home. The effect of income is more problematic; however, the life style of high status groups seems to foster voluntary local attachments such as wining and dining with neighbors and participating in local organizations. The isolation and life style characteristic of the suburbs, it has been agreed, encourage multiple ties, especially among family members who remain home during the day. Consequently, we replicated Table 1 within five levels of family stage, four of family income, and four of location (city apartment, city house, suburban apartment, suburban house). However, the importance of ties to everyone and the common motivation to establish them may operate to minimize differences in the structure of attachment among the selected groups.

Our major finding (results not shown here) is the consistency of the associations among neighborhood socializing, organizational involvement, and local friendships -- the major "cluster" we described earlier -- across all levels of family stage, class, and location. Beyond this, there are some variations worth noting.

Families in the later stages of the life-cycle have less strongly "clustered" attachments; for them each dimension is more autonomous than it is for younger families. Higher income families show somewhat stronger associations among neighboring, organizational participation, local friendships, and institutional ties. Both these findings suggest that less constrained families (younger, affluent) can select more consistent patterns of attachment than can others.

Kin in the neighborhood are important for low-income families, being highly associated with local friends ($\gamma=.39$); they are essentially

unrelated for high-income families ($\gamma=.10$). This relative importance of kin-centeredness among lower-income families is consistent with many ethnographic studies (Bott, 1971; Young and Willmott, 1957; Gans, 1962). Finally, among families living in suburban homes, institutional ties and local kin are relatively unrelated to other attachment dimensions, suggesting that suburban living promotes informal participation even in the absence of local kin and formal ties (cf. Fischer and Jackson, 1975).

To examine the subsample relationships between the affect dimensions (happiness with neighborhood, preference to stay) and the dimensions of local ties (institutions, neighboring, etc.), we undertook a more complex analysis. We regressed each affect variable on the five measures of local ties, running these regressions within very specific subgroups. These subgroups were chosen to exemplify, on the one hand, families that are very dependent on the locality (low income families, low income families with working mothers, families with female heads, and the low income elderly), and, on the other hand, families that are less dependent (moderate income, childless, either young or middle-aged). These groups vary in the degree to which their daily lives are circumscribed, due to either choice or necessity, by the boundaries of their local area. The question, then, is whether affective attachment assumes greater importance in determining satisfaction among locally dependent subgroups.² (The results are presented in Appendix B.)

Our findings indicate that the differences among these subpopulations are less compelling than their similarities. Several patterns are again worth noting: (1) Institutional ties generally do not predict affect -- except for low income families with working mothers and the elderly, which suggests that nearby institutions may be important for

constrained groups.³ (2) Sociable neighboring is a predictor of affect -- except for families with working mothers. These are families with little opportunity for and probably little interest in casual socializing. (3) Organizational involvement is not a predictor of affective attachment for any subgroup; informal relationships seem much more important than formal ones. (4) Local kin do not contribute to satisfaction with the neighborhood, while local friends contribute quite significantly regardless of level of local dependence. A possible exception is low income families with working mothers, who show a reverse tendency. Perhaps they are too pressed to cultivate neighborhood friendships. It seems that while families can be tied into the community in a number of ways, voluntary forms of attachment emerge as the most important element in promoting satisfaction with the locality.

CONCLUSIONS

The basic result of this analysis is to affirm that attachment to place is multidimensional. There is some overlap in the many ways in which residents are related to their places; in particular, voluntary dimensions of local social involvement cohere relatively well. Nevertheless, it is not sufficient to conclude that one local attachment implies another. There are multiple ways in which families use neighborhoods ranging from purely utilitarian concerns to cushions of emotional support, and these forms are relatively independent. The multiplicity of ties and lack of overwhelming "clustering" offer evidence for Janowitz's notion of the modern neighborhood as a "community of limited liability."

II: THE DETERMINANTS OF ATTACHMENT --

AN INDUCTIVE ANALYSIS

In this section, we shall present the results of an inductive analysis concerning the determinants of attachment to place. This analysis goes beyond those previously reported, first, by incorporating a multi-dimensional approach to attachment and, second, by adding new variables, particularly contextual ones. Before presenting the data, we briefly review the extant literature.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Earlier survey research on attachment to place can be divided into two general categories: (1) social ties, including casual neighboring; and (2) affect, including the desire to stay in the neighborhood.

(a) Ties. A number of studies have demonstrated an association between local involvement and a variety of individual characteristics. Length of residence (particularly Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; also Gates, et al., 1973; Smith, et al., 1954), though a powerful correlate of attachment, is theoretically problematic. Since length of residence can just as easily be considered a consequence as a cause of local ties, its explanatory value is called into question. Stage in the life-cycle is important, largely because children tie their parents into the locality (Janowitz, 1967; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Gates, et al., 1973). The employment status of the women in the household is another predictor: housewives are more attached to the neighborhood, and so are their

families (Michelson, 1973a; Gates et al., 1973; Fellin and Litwak, 1963). These three variables all have in common the effect of increasing opportunities for contact between a household and its neighbors (see Gates, et al., 1973).

The effect of social class is somewhat unclear. Keller (1968) suggests that higher status may increase sociable neighborliness, but at the same time decrease the likelihood of intense relations with neighbors. The latter sort of tie, she suggests, results largely from local dependency, which is more characteristic of lower status groups. Finally, house residence, compared to apartment residence, may promote neighboring due to both self-selection and greater financial and emotional investment in the community (Michelson, 1973b; Bradburn, et al., 1970; Tomeh, 1964). As for other individual traits, there are only scattered findings. Caution in interpreting these findings is especially necessary since local attachment may result from either positive choice or lack of access to the wider community.

A few studies have examined neighborhood context as a determinant of attachment, but hardly any have done so systematically. It would seem that the higher the class level of a neighborhood, the more neighboring there is (Smith, et al., 1954; Gates, et al., 1973; Fischer and Jackson, 1975), though the evidence is not unanimous (Bell and Boat, 1957). Other attributes of places which tend to be positively associated with local ties are: a local population in the child-rearing stage (Bell and Boat, 1957; Greer, 1956; Fischer and Jackson, 1975), suburbanism and ruralism (Fara, 1958; Tomeh, 1964; Bradburn, et al., 1970; Fischer and Jackson, 1975), and probably homogeneity (Keller, 1968).

Several conclusions about earlier work emerge from our consideration of this literature: (1) few individual-level variables have been employed as predictors, especially in multivariate analyses; (2) rarely have more than one or two attributes of a place, if any at all, been employed as predictors; (3) the simultaneous analysis of both individual and place variables is extremely unusual (Gates, et al., 1973, being an exception); (4) it is rare for more than one dimension of attachment to appear as a dependent variable (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974, being a notable exception here); and, (5) usually, studies have been restricted to single neighborhoods or cities. Our analysis, described below, avoids all these shortcomings.

(b) Affect. Rather sophisticated analyses have been used to explain satisfaction with place as well as intentions to stay in one's place. Length of residence is again a prime correlate, though still a problematic one (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Nathanson, 1974; and others). Stage in the life-cycle is crucial, for expanding families express a need to move to more spacious quarters (Rossi, 1956; Simmons, 1968; Butler, et al., 1968). Higher social class, in most studies, promotes contentment (Lansing and Ladd, 1964; Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Wilkinson and Sigsworth, 1974; versus Marans and Rodgers, 1974). Owning a house, especially of high quality, increases the likelihood of staying in one's residence (Nathanson, 1974; Wilkinson and Sigsworth, 1972). Finally, local ties promote affective attachment (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974; Lansing, 1966).

A major problem in these studies is that attributes of the place have been treated almost exclusively in terms of perceptions. It is no surprise that dissatisfaction with features of one's house and neighborhood are associated with a desire to leave (e.g., Speare, 1974; Marans

and Rodgers, 1974; Zehner and Chapin, 1974; Kasl, 1972). Other factors which weaken affective attachment seem to be urbanism (Marans and Rodgers, 1974; but not Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974), poor access (Butler, et al., 1968), and racial change (Varady, 1974; Bradburn, et al., 1970).

These studies share some of the drawbacks already discussed, but the defect we most specifically redress in our research involves the analysis of place attributes. We employ, therefore, a number of contextual variables measured independently of the respondents' perceptions.

PROCEDURE

We pursued two lines of analysis. First, we attempted to predict the various forms of attachment developed in the preceding section. (See Appendix A for changes in the measurement of selected dependent variables.) Next, employing the dimensions of social ties as intermediate variables, we tried to predict affective ties. Our selection of predictor variables was eclectic, following both research reported in the literature and "common sense," yielding as comprehensive a list of determinants as possible. In developing measures of place attributes, we selected a wide variety of indices from both the census and neighborhood informant files, factor-analyzed them within previously specified domains (e.g., class composition, physical attributes), and then reduced the data by creating scales and eliminating colinear items. Using this long list of independent variables, we ran preliminary regression runs which enabled us to prune variables which were largely insignificant and/or redundant. We re-ran the regressions, the results of which are summarized in Table 2. (The specific variables and their definitions are listed in the notes to the table.)

TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF REGRESSIONS OF ATTACHMENT VARIABLES
(Only $p < .05$ betas Shown)

Independent Variables ^a	Ties to Neighborhood					Affect	
	Inst. Ties	Neigh- boring	Orgz. Invlv.	Nbhd. Kin	Nbhd. Frnds	Happy Here	Prefer Stay
<u>Individual Traits</u>							
Pre-Children	.05	.08		.13	.08		-.06
With Children	.35	.13	.10	.18	.10	-.13	-.16
Sex of R - Male					.05	-.06	-.08
SES of Household		.17	.16	-.06	-.10		
Woman Works	.24	-.04	-.07		-.08		
Religion (s) ^b	.32	.06	.08	.14	.08	.11	.09
Years in Nbhd	.11	.07	.13	.12	.19		.07
Dwelling Unit Char's (s)		.06	.10			.13	.20
<u>Neighborhood Characteristics</u>							
Minorities (s)	.07	-.09			-.06	-.08	
Nbhd. Quality				-.08	-.06	.10	
Growth (s)				-.16	-.06		.08
Crime	-.05	-.06	.06	.07		-.06	
Activism			.07		.07		
Suburb		.06	.08				
<u>Ties to Neighborhood</u>							
Institutional Ties	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		
Neighboring	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	.08	.06
Orgz. Involvement	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	.05	
Neighborhood Kin	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	.05	
Neighborhood Frnds	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	.11	.14
R ²	.323	.121	.121	.114	.062	.127	.130

Abbreviations:

Char's - Characteristics Frnds - Friends Nbhd - Neighborhood
Inst - Institutional Invlv - Involvement Orgz - Organizational

NOTES TO TABLE

^aDefinition of Independent Variables:

Pre-children: Dummy -- under 36, without children.

Children: Dummy -- have one or more children at home.

SES of Household: Scale combining family income and head's education.

Woman Works: Dummy -- woman of household works at least part-time.

Religion: 3 dummies: Catholic; Jewish; other or Athiest.

Years in Neighborhood: Scale of years (approximate log).

House Characteristics: (1) dummy -- rent vs. own; N.B.: this correlates .82 with apartment versus house.

(2) monthly cost (estimated for homeowners).

Minorities: (1) percent Catholic.

(2) presence of Blacks: scale combining percent Black and distance to nearest Black neighborhood (log and inverse).

Neighborhood Quality: Scale combining (a) median house value; (b) percent of sound housing; (c) rated physical appearance. N.B.: This correlates .82 with a scale

composed of the income and educational levels of residents.

Growth: (1) years since last new housing built.

(2) percent of population which lived elsewhere five years before.

Crime: scale combining rated safety and percent of informants who cite crime as major problem.

Activism: scale combining rated social activity level of residents and number of local organizations.

Suburb: dummy -- suburb vs. city (political definition).

^b(s) Signifies sheaf coefficients summarizing individual betas (Heise, 1972).

We should underline the advances which this analysis yields over previous work: (1) we have employed various dimensions of attachment (as did Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974), thus permitting a comparison of the differential effects of the same independent variables on these dimensions. (2) We have simultaneously considered an uncommon number of independent variables including attributes of the individual, of the house, and especially of the neighborhood, measured independently of the respondent.

RESULTS

We draw the following general conclusions from our examination of the data:⁴ (1) the argument of the preceding section, that attachment is multi-dimensional, is reaffirmed. While some variables predict all dimensions of attachment in the same manner (especially length of residence), others operate differently. Social class is positively related to neighboring but negatively related to local kin and friends as well as to desire to stay. Having children promotes both neighboring and local ties, but reduces affective attachment.

(2) The relative importance of individual and place variables differs by type of attachment. Individual variation is the predominant

factor in predicting localities, accounting for about 75% of the explained variance (data not shown). However, house and neighborhood variables are slightly more important than individual traits in predicting affective attachment. Local ties, while significant predictors of affect, are not substantial ones (adding about one-third of the explained variance). One interpretation of these findings is that individual attributes and local involvement are less intrinsic to affective attachment than attributes of the house and place. Perhaps people within a neighborhood socially involve themselves to varying degrees in accord with their personal traits, but their satisfaction with the neighborhood and their preferences for staying or leaving are determined more by the place itself than by their social relations within it.

(3) What, then, are specific determinants of attachment? The results indicate: (a) Length of Residence is a consistently significant factor, though still a conceptually problematic one. The effect of length of residence on feelings about a locale is largely explained by the mediation of local ties.⁵ This finding weakens those arguments which assume that attachment develops as an unmediated consequence of residence (the arguments that "familiarity breeds content," or that "sense of place" serves cognitive functions). Instead, time in a place is important insofar as it produces local involvement. (b) Children connect people to places, but simultaneously increase their desire to leave. This is probably due to space strains. (c) Higher social class encourages local activities, perhaps because of the life style associated with higher status, but decreases the likelihood of intimate local ties. This directly supports Keller's (1968) thesis that middle class people can enjoy their neighbors, but do not need them, while the

reverse is true for working class families. (d) Families with employed women are less tied into their neighborhoods (except for formal ties if the woman works nearby), but they are not any less content with them.⁶ This too, suggests a pragmatic orientation to place. (e) With respect to religion, non-protestants maintain stronger local ties but are less satisfied with the neighborhood and more willing to leave it. (f) It is noteworthy that attributes of the dwelling unit have only modest effects on local involvement but notable effects on the desire to stay or leave. (g) Briefly, the neighborhood variables have the following effects: the presence of Black or Catholic neighbors tends to reduce attachment for the average -- i.e., non-Black, non-Catholic -- family; new and affluent neighborhoods are conducive to fewer local ties but, nevertheless, to more happiness; finally, local crime shows mixed results in predicting local ties but has a negative effect upon happiness with the neighborhood.

It is somewhat hazardous to draw theoretical conclusions from inductive, empiricist analyses such as those reported here. Nevertheless, certain features of the results suggest a tentative conclusion. The differential effects of selected attributes, especially social class and children, on various dimensions of attachment; the influence of contextual variables, particularly on overall assessments; the slight importance of social ties on affective attachment; the relatively small independent effect of time on attitudes; the consequences of female employment (fewer ties but no less commitment); and, the general structure of associations -- all of these findings imply that approaches to attachment which emphasize universal needs and preferences overlook the instrumental purposes of attachment for different types of families.

People are responsive to particular needs, to particular aspects of their places, and they choose particular forms of attachment.

III: THE DETERMINANTS OF ATTACHMENT --

A DEDUCTIVE ANALYSIS

In this section we endeavor to develop and test a deductive model of attachment to place. Since the NORC data were not collected with such a model in mind, the empirical test is only rough and suggestive, more experimental than definitive.

THE MODEL

The model developed is an example of the decision making approach described earlier. Our argument is that people choose whether and how much to be attached to a place on the basis of how well the place "fits" their needs and wants. It is the congruence between a family's needs and preferences and the attributes of the neighborhood which determines attachment (cf. Michelson, 1973b). The "fit" between the social characteristics of one's neighbors and oneself determines the likelihood of social interaction; the total "fit" of a house, a place, and its people with a family determines neighborhood satisfaction and the probability of staying or leaving. This "fit" between a place and its residents varies according to the preferred life styles, resources, and constraints of families (e.g., income, knowledge, age, number of children, race, etc.). In other words, a good "fit" for one family may not be a good "fit" for another. Note that simple attributes of households are not accorded the causal force that would be salient in an additive model; it is their interaction with contextual variables that we are describing.

PROCEDURE FOR TESTING

To empirically test this theory, we would ideally want independent assessments of a household's needs/preferences and of the attributes of its place. (Some researchers have measured both components in terms of respondents' subjective judgements [e.g., Speare, 1974] -- A confounded procedure in our view.) Unfortunately, our data lack many of these necessary measures, particularly of household needs/preferences. Consequently, for this largely exploratory treatment, we constructed a list of needs/preferences which we then imputed to the separate households. This list, derived from a search of the literature on residential satisfaction and mobility, consists of the features of a place which people (particularly Americans) tend to care about most:

A. Attributes of Dwelling Unit

1. Space
2. Cost
3. Ownership (versus renting)
4. Detached House (versus apartment)
5. Condition of Unit

B. Attributes of Locale

1. Physical Condition and Quality
2. Social Composition
 - a. Race
 - b. Ethnic/Religious Make up
 - c. Life-cycle Stage
 - d. Class
3. Access
 - a. to Work

- b. to Services and Facilities
- c. to Friends and Relatives
- 4. Population Density
- 5. Quality of Schools

We can assume that some of these features are equally desirable and important to virtually everyone -- neighborhood quality, for instance. For most other features, there tends to be consensus on the desired state, but the importance of the feature varies according to characteristics of the household -- e.g., space is more important to large families, access it more important to families with working mothers.⁷

In an ideal analysis we would combine the observed attributes of a place with a household's needs and preferences to yield a measure of "fit". In our analysis, instead, we (a) imputed a respondent's desires (e.g., everyone prefers more rather than less space); (b) used approximate indicators of place characteristics available in the data (e.g., space was measured by number of rooms); and (c) estimated the importance of selected residential features to a household on the basis of the family's attributes (e.g., number of household members). The reader can see that while these "imputations" are reasonable, they are nevertheless quite rough.⁸

In the context of the framework outlined above, we used the following procedure to create a long list of "fit" measures. Taking an attribute of the place, and in most cases weighting it by an attribute of the household, we produced variables such as rooms per person, percent of neighbors of own ethnicity, suburban versus city residence by availability of car, and so on.

As in our inductive analysis, we examined preliminary regressions on the attachment variables, purged "fit" measures on the basis on non-significance and colinearity, and then analyzed reduced models. The results are presented in Table 3 (notes to the table explain how each "fit" measure was constructed).

TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF REGRESSIONS OF ATTACHMENT VARIABLES ON "FIT" VARIABLES
(Only p<.05 betas shown.)

"Fit" Variables ^a	Inst. Ties	Neigh- boring	Orgz. Ties	Nbhd. Kin	Nbhd. Frnds.	Happy Nbhd.	Prefer Stay
Rooms/Persons	-.22	-.06		-.08		.08	.13
Cost/Income	-.06				.05		.07
Own-Rent X Child	.13	.11	.16		.05	.11	.16
Neighborhood Quality	.06	.07	.13	-.05		.09	
% Own Race (white)		.12		.06		.10	
% Own Religion		.07		.08	.08	.11	.08
% Own Ethnicity	.05			.11			
Class Similarity			-.07	.05			
City/Woman Works		-.06					
Nbhd Services/Cars			.06			.09	.07
	R ²	.168	.071	.071	.041	.016	.077
							.075

Abbreviations:

Inst. - Institutional Nbhd. - Neighborhood
Orgz. - Organizational Frnds. - Friends

^aDefinition of "Fit" measures

- Rooms/Persons = Number of rooms in dwelling unit ÷ total persons in household.
- Cost/Income = Estimated monthly cost ÷ family income.
- Own-Rent X Child = Ordinal scale: (High) owns-has children; owns-doesn't have; rents-doesn't have; rents-has (Low).
- Neighborhood Quality = See notes to Table 2. Considered equally important to all.
- % Own Race = Inverse of presence of Blacks; see notes to Table 2.
- % Own Religion = Percent of neighborhood which is Protestant, Catholic, Jewish or other, appropriately assigned to household.
- % Own Ethnicity = Percent which is Northern European, Southern European, Eastern European, or Far East and other, appropriately assigned to household.
- Class Similarity = Absolute Z-scores of household income relative to neighborhood mean income and head's education relative to neighborhood mean education, averaged and sign reversed.
- City/Woman Works = Ordinal scale: (High) lives in city, woman works; lives in city, doesn't work; lives in suburb, doesn't work; lives in suburb, works (Low).

Nbhd Services/Cars = Scale combining number of recreational services in neighborhood and informant's ratings of local services, divided by estimated number of cars in household (plus 1).

RESULTS

Due to space limitations, we shall not discuss the individual regression equations or coefficients, but focus instead on a comparison of this deductive analysis with the inductive one described in the previous section.

In some respects, our experiment with formulating a "fit" model has produced disappointing results. The explained variances (R^2) are noticeably less in this table than they are in Table 2. The partial correlations for variables excluded from this model -- variables such as length of residence, number of children, and social class -- remain significant and high. (An equation incorporating both the "fit" measures and ones from the inductive analysis is difficult to interpret because of severe multicollinearity.) The present "fit" model is clearly incomplete. There is, however, some reason for optimism. In terms of parsimony -- explained variance relative to the number of variables used -- the "fit" model more frequently works better than our inductive model, especially in predicting neighborhood satisfaction. The former uses 10 predictors, the latter 18 (including dummies), so that a comparison of F-tests in Table 4 yields the following:

TABLE 4: COMPARISON OF F-TESTS FOR INDUCTIVE AND "FIT" MODEL

	<u>Inductive Model</u>	<u>"Fit" Model</u>
Predicting		
Institutional Ties	53.62	42.74
Sociable Neighboring	15.48	16.20
Organizational Involvement	15.54	16.13
Kin in Neighborhood	14.42	9.04
Friends in Neighborhood ₉	7.43	3.46
Happy with Neighborhood ₉	11.86	17.49
Prefer to Stay or Leave ₉	12.67	17.15

Considering these results, together with the measurement limitations on our "fit" model, we can draw two general conclusions: first, certain family attributes, such as rearing children, social class, and length of residence, are determinants of attachment irrespective of the degree of congruence between families and their immediate environments. In contrast to the "fit" variables, these individual family characteristics have a greater effect upon local ties than upon affective attachment. Second, a theory of fit might make significant contributions to further research, particularly if the key features of people and their places can be defined prior to data collection and measured carefully.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has rapidly covered a great deal of lengthy and complex theoretical approaches and data analysis, which frequently produced uncertain or ambiguous results. Nevertheless, the general outcomes are clear. First, attachment to place is multidimensional. People can be "rooted" in some ways and not others, and the connections among those ways can be quite weak. Second, the inductive analysis yielded a more complete and sophisticated multivariate model of attachment than previously available. That model demonstrates both the differential consequences of certain personal attributes (e.g. they promote one form of attachment and depress another) and the significance of contextual factors. Third, our experiment in developing a model of attachment based on "fit" between families and places suggests that there is promise in that direction, but that there are certain attributes of families which tend to attach them regardless of the location. Finally, various results sprinkled throughout the analysis point toward (though do not by any means confirm) a general conclusion concerning theoretical approaches

to the topic: holistic conceptions of attachment to place, be they mystical, biological, psychological, or cultural, do not tell the complete story. Of greater importance are orientations which emphasize the specificity of attachments, their voluntariness, their congruence with particular needs, and their instrumentality.

APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF SCALES

1. Sociable Neighboring

This is an additive scale consisting of the following items:

Which of these things has anyone in your family done in the past few months with members of families who live in this neighborhood?

CODE "YES" OR "NO" FOR EACH ITEM ASKED.

- a) Stopped and talked when we met
- b) Had an informal chat together in their home or our home
- c) Had dinner or a party together at their home or our home
- d) Went out together for dinner or a movie
- e) We got together on other occasions
(EXPLAIN)

Respondents score one point each for answering "yes" to items a, b, c. or d, e. Items c and d are collapsed because they are virtually interchangeable. This is a quasi-Guttman scale; for example, families that dine with neighbors are almost certain to socialize in more informal ways. This scale is collapsed into 4 categories for the cross-tabular analysis in Section I.

2. Organizational Involvement

This scale consists of the following two items:

- a) ...Has anyone in your family [attended the meeting of a neighborhood organization or group together] in the past few months with members of families who live in this neighborhood?

CODE "YES" OR "NO" FOR EACH ITEM ASKED.

- b) What neighborhood organizations do you or your family belong to? (OMIT CHURCH AND SCHOOL GROUPS.) IF NOT MENTIONED: Do you belong to any organized groups of renters or homeowners?

Respondents score one point if they attend local meetings or report memberships in at least one organization. For cross-tabular analysis the scale is collapsed into a dummy variable.

3. Institutional (or Formal) Ties

Our measure of local institutional ties is an additive scale consisting of the following items:

- | <u>ITEM</u> | <u>R Scores 1 Point if:</u> |
|--|---|
| a) Could you tell me the name of the church or temple which members of your family attend?

Is (name) within walking distance?

(1) <u>IF NO</u> : How long does it take to get there? | Family attends a church within walking distance or within 10 minute drive of home. |
| b) What are the names of the schools which your children attend?

Is that in this neighborhood? . . | Respondent/s children attend a local public elementary and/or high school. |
| c) How long does it take (head of household) to get to work? What kind of transportation (does head of household) normally take? | Workplace of household head is within walking distance or within a 10 minute drive of home. |
| d) How long does it take (name of wife) to get to work? What kind of transportation (does she) normally take? | Workplace of wife is within walking distance or within a 10 minute drive of home. |

The following item is included in the institutional scale used in Section I but is not included in the scale used in Sections II and III:

- | | |
|--|--|
| e) Do you or your (husband/wife) belong to the PTA (of your child's) school? | Either husband or wife belongs to the PTA. |
|--|--|

This scale favors certain types of families: those which belong to churches, have children, or have employed wives. It is collapsed into 4 categories for the cross-tabular analysis (Section I).

4. Kin in the Neighborhood

Based on the item below, this measure counts the number of neighborhood kin classified as parents, parents-in-law, siblings, siblings-in-law, and other kin:

Do your parents live in this neighborhood, in another neighborhood in this metropolitan area/county, or do they live somewhere else? How about your husband's/wife's parents? How about your brothers and sisters? Your husband's/wife's brothers and sisters?

Do you have any (other) relatives living in this neighborhood?

This scale is collapsed into a dummy variable for the cross-tabular analysis.

5. Friends in the Neighborhood

Neighborhood friendships are measured by the following item:

Do most of your friends live in the neighborhood, or do most of them live farther away?

Most in neighborhood . . .
Some do, some don't . . .
Most live farther away.

Respondents with at least some neighborhood friends score "1"; others score "0".

6. Neighborhood Satisfaction

The following two items are analyzed separately as measures of neighborhood satisfaction:

a) Happy with neighborhood

On the whole, how happy are you with living here in (name of neighborhood)? Would you say you're very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy with this neighborhood?

Very happy . . .
Pretty happy . . .
Not too happy.

b) Prefer to stay or leave

If, for any reason, you had to move from here to some other neighborhood, would you be very unhappy, a little unhappy, or would you be happy to move - - or wouldn't it make any difference?

- Very unhappy
- A little unhappy
- Wouldn't make any difference.
- Happy to move.

APPENDIX B. SUMMARY OF REGRESSIONS OF AFFECT VARIABLES ON
OTHER ATTACHMENT VARIABLES, WITHIN SPECIAL POPULATIONS
(only Betas $\geq .10$ shown)

Independent Variables	Groups ^a					
	LOW LOCAL DEPENDENCE		HIGH LOCAL DEPENDENCE -			
	Moderate Income Childless	Young Mid-Age	Low Income Families	Wife Works	Female Head of Household	Low Income Elderly
	Dependent Variable = Happy with Neighborhood					
Institutional Ties	-.21*			.22*		.16*
Sociable Neighboring Organizational Involvement	.14	.17*				.18*
Neighborhood Kin			-.13	-.11		
Neighborhood Friends	.28*	.14*	.16*	.16		.16*
R ²	.17	.07	.04	.07	.03	.11
Dependent Variable = Prefer to Stay						
Institutional Ties				.20	.11	
Sociable Neighboring Organizational Involvement		.19*	.15*			.11*
Neighborhood Kin				.10		
Neighborhood Friends	.17*	.16*			.28*	.15*
R ²	.08	.10	.03	.04	.11	.05
N =	(142)	(253)	(171)	(74)	(115)	(311)

* $p < .10$

^aGroup Definitions

- (1) Young, moderate income, childless -- respondents under 36, a family income of \$7,000 +, and no children.
- (2) Middle age, moderate income, childless -- between 36 and 55, an income \geq \$7,000, no children.
- (3) Low income families -- married couples, with children, earning under \$6,000.
- (4) Low income, wife works -- same as above, plus mother works part or full-time.
- (5) Female head -- families of single women and children.
- (6) Low income, elderly -- 60 years or older, earning under \$6,000.

FOOTNOTES

¹We are grateful to Pat Bova and the staff at NORC for supplying us with the data tapes and advice on their use. And, we also thank Elihu and Sue Gerson for helping us with this data.

²In order to more thoroughly analyze the theoretical issues raised here, it is necessary to develop a clearer notion of the components of local dependence and create an exhaustive typology of families based upon them.

³We also find that young singles and couples without children are less happy with their neighborhood when they are tied into local institutions such as workplaces and churches. This is the only significant negative relationship found -- and one for which we have no immediate explanation.

⁴Our equations tend to have relatively low explained variances ($R^2 \approx .13$). We attribute this largely to the categorical and skewed nature of some of the dependent variables, and in a couple of cases, to low reliability. We do not think, however, that these defects distort the general pattern of the results, but only mute their numerical size.

⁵The introduction of our "ties to the neighborhood" variables reduces the partial coefficient of length of residence from $-.083$ ($p < .01$) to $-.04$ (N.S.) for happiness, and from $-.107$ ($p < .01$) to $-.069$ ($p < .05$) for preference to stay.

⁶The total indirect effect of women's employment on affect, operating through ties, is only about $-.01$.

⁷These judgements were also based on our reading of the literature.

⁸An "ideal" measure of fit, for example, might look like this:

$$\text{"Space Fit"} = [(\text{amount of space}) + (\text{desired space})] \\ \times (\text{importance of space})$$

In our analysis, however, it was necessary to employ a cruder measure:

$$\text{"Space Fit"} = (\# \text{ of rooms}) + (\# \text{ of household members})$$

⁹The F-tests reported here are for equations which do not use local ties as predictors of affective attachment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abu-Lughod, J. and Foley, M.M. "The Consumer Votes by Moving." In Housing Choices and Housing Constraints, edited by N.N. Foote, J. Abu-Lughod, M.M. Foley, and L. Winnick, pp. 134-178. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.
- Alexander, C. "The city as a mechanism for sustaining human contact." In Urban-Man, edited by T. Helmer and N.A. Eddington. New York: Free Press, 1973.
- Angell, R. "The social integration of American cities of more than 100,000 population." In American Sociological Review, pp. 335-342. June 1947.
- Ardrey, R. The Territorial Imperative. London: Atheneum, 1967.
- Bell, W. and Boat, M.D. "Urban neighborhoods and informal social relations." American Journal of Sociology, pp. 391-398. January 1957.
- Bott, E. Family and Social Network, second edition. New York: The Free Press, 1971.
- Bradburn, M., Sudman, and Gockel, L. Racial Integration in American Neighborhoods: A Comparative Survey. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1970.
- Butler, E.W., Chapin, F.S. Jr., Hammens, G.C., Kaiser, E.J., Stegman, M.A., and Weiss, S.F. Moving Behavior and Residential Choice. Chapel Hill, N.C.: Center for Urban and Regional Studies, 1968.
- Fava, S.F. "Contrasts in neighboring: New York City and a suburban county." In The Suburban Community, edited by W. Dobriner, pp. 122-130. New York: Putnam, 1958.

- Fellin, P. and Litwak, E. "Neighborhood cohesion under conditions of mobility." In American Sociological Review 28, June, 1963. pp. 364-376.
- Fischer, C.S. and Jackson, R.M. "Suburbs, networks, and attitudes." In The Changing Face of the Suburbs, edited by B. Schwartz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Fischer, C.S. and Stueve, A. "The 'Authentic Community': on the role of place in modern social life." To appear in Fischer et al, Networks and Places, 1975.
- Fried, M. "Functions of the working-class community in modern urban society: implications for forced relocation." In Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 33 March, 1967. pp. 90-103.
- Gans, H. The Urban Villagers. New York: The Free Press, 1962.
- Gates, A.S., Stevens, H., and Wellman, B. "What makes a good neighbor?" Paper presented to American Sociological Association, New York City, August, 1973.
- Greer, S. "Urbanism reconsidered: A comparative study of local areas in a metropolis." In American Sociological Review 21, pp. 19-25. February 1956.
- Heberle, R. "The normative element in neighborhood relations." In Pacific Sociological Review 3, pp. 3-11. Spring, 1960.
- Heise, D.R. "Employing nominal variables, induced variables, and block variables in path analyses." In Sociological Methods and Research 1, pp. 147-174. November 1972.
- Janowitz, M. The Community Press, second edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Kasarda, J. and Janowitz, M. "Community Attachment in Mass Society." In American Sociological Review, 39, pp. 328-339. June 1974.

- Kasl, S.V. and Harburg, E. "Perceptions of the neighborhood and the desire to move out." In Journal of American Institute of Planners, 38, pp 318-372. September 1972.
- Keller, S. The Urban Neighborhood. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Lassing, J.B. Residential Relocation and Urban Mobility: The Second Wave of Interviews. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, 1966.
- Lansing, J.B. and Hendricks, G. Living Patterns and Attitudes in the Detroit Region. Detroit: Southeast Michigan Council of Governments, 1967.
- Lansing, J.B. and Ladd, W. The Propensity to Move. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.
- Leeds, A. "Locality power in relation to supralocal power institutions." In Urban Anthropology, edited by A. Southall, pp. 15-42. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Lynch, K. The Image of the City. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1960.
- Marans, R.W. and Rodgers, W. "Toward an understanding of community satisfaction." In Metropolitan America: Papers on State of Knowledge, edited by A. Hawley and V. Rock. Washington: National Academy of Sciences, 1974.
- Martin, R.D. "Concepts of human territoriality." In Man, Settlement, and Urbanism, edited by P.J. Vicko, R. Tringham, and G.W. Dimbelby, pp. 427-445. Cambridge: Schankman, 1972.
- Michelson, W. "Reconciliation of 'subjective' and 'objective' data on physical environment in the community." In Sociological Inquiry, 43, pp. 147-173, 1973a.
- Michelson, W. "Environmental Change." Research Paper No. 60, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, 1973b.

- Montagu, A. (Editor). Man and Aggression, second edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Nathanson, C.A. "Moving preferences and plans among urban black families." In Journal of American Institute of Planners 40, pp. 353-359, 1974.
- Nisbet, R. Community and Power. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Packard, V. A Nation of Strangers. New York: McKay, 1972.
- Rossi, P. Why Families Move. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955.
- Simmons, J.W. "Changing residence in the city." The Geographical Review 58, pp. 622-651. October 1968.
- Smith, J., Form, W.H., and Stone, G.P. "Local intimacy in a middle-sized city." American Journal of Sociology 60, pp. 276-284, November 1954.
- Speare, A., Jr. "Residential satisfaction as an intervening variable in residential mobility." In Demography 11, pp. 173-189. May 1974.
- Suttles, G.D. The Social Construction of Communities. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- Tomeh, A.K. "Informal group participation and residential patterns." American Journal of Sociology 70, pp. 28-35. July 1964.
- Tomeh, A.K. "Informal participation in a metropolitan community." In Sociological Quarterly 8, pp. 85-102. Winter, 1967.
- Tuan, Y. Topophilia. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hale, 1974.
- Van den Berghe, P. "Bringing beasts back in." In American Sociological Review 39, pp. 777-788. December 1974.
- Varady, D.P. "White moving plans in a racially changing middle-class community." In Journal of American Institute of Planners 40, pp. 360-370. 1974.

- Webber, M.M. "Order in diversity, Community without propinquity."
In Neighborhood, City, and Metropolis, edited by R. Gutman and D.
Popenoe, pp. 792-811. New York; Random House, 1970.
- Whyte, W.H. Street Corner Society. Chicago: University of Chicago
Press, 1943.
- Wilkinson, R.K. and Sigsworth, E.M. "Attitudes to the Housing Environ-
ment." Urban Studies 9, pp. 193-214. June 1972.
- Wolpert, J. "Behavioral aspects of the decision to migrate." In
Papers of the Regional Science Association 15, pp. 159-169, 1965.
- Young, M. and Willmott, P. Family and Kinship in East London.
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957.
- Zehner, R.B. and Chapin, S.F. Jr. Across the City Line. Lexington,
Mass: Lexington Books, 1974.
- Zimmer, B. "Residential mobility and housing." Land Economics 69,
pp. 344-350, August 1973.