



November 1975

The Impact of Urban Removal from a Child's Point of View

L. K. Northwood
University of Michigan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>

 Part of the [Place and Environment Commons](#), [Social Work Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Northwood, L. K. (1975) "The Impact of Urban Removal from a Child's Point of View," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 3 : Iss. 2 , Article 13.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol3/iss2/13>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Social Work at ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.



THE IMPACT OF URBAN REMOVAL FROM A CHILD'S POINT OF VIEW

L. K. Northwood
School of Social Work, University of Michigan

Although several million families and their children have been displaced by urban renewal projects and other civic improvements during the past decades, there are few careful empirical studies of the subject. In particular, there is a paucity of research about the effects of forced moving on children and their social networks.¹ The purpose of this paper is to report one such study.² For reasons of economy of space, the report will be limited to the forced move phase of the resettlement.

Before presenting the findings of the study, some comments are in order about the nature of forced moving and its hypothesized effects on children.

Urban settlement is accomplished as the result of both voluntary and forced moves. The Federal Government estimates that about 20 percent of our population moves each year, a third of these across county lines.³ What proportion of these are forced moves is unknown. In the mid-sixties, a quarter of a million households were displaced annually to make way for urban renewal, highway construction, school construction and other civic improvements. Writing in 1965, William Slayton, the Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration, predicted that by 1972 there would be one million families displaced by urban renewal, about one in every fifty families in the United States.⁴ Whether this prediction was verified or not, the scope of forced moving is large, and the problems associated with dislocation remain with us.

It is the premise of this paper that forced urban resettlement has more devastating consequences for children and their families than the usual voluntary moving process. The moving process, whether forced or voluntary, involves the following phases: a decision to change the place of residence, an exploration of housing opportunities in various areas, the final selection of one of these, activities associated with making the move, and activities associated with getting settled in the new house and neighborhood.⁵

For most families, the moving process entails both threats and opportunities. Aside from the financial outlays and the inconveniences incurred by the move and the transition from one neighborhood to another, many families have a strong attachment to the old home and neighborhood and to its social networks which they regret losing or which they fear cannot be replaced in the new setting.⁶ These may be offset by anticipated benefits as a result of the move: better and more attractive living quarters, more convenient or desirable location, superior institutional services, more friendly neighbors and so forth. In addition, most families usually change their place of residence for their own personal reasons, if not always at their own choice

and timing. The moving process often coincides with changes in family composition or the age of its members, with changes in the affluence of the family, with changes in the patterns of employment or unemployment of its major breadwinners.⁷ These changes often seem natural and gradual, and they can be anticipated and planned for.

Forced resettlement, on the other hand, interrupts or interferes with this natural transition process. It imposes a relatively fixed time schedule on events. It substitutes a formal, collectively sanctioned plan in the place of a set of culturally conditioned personal preferences. Furthermore, the urban redevelopment program which requires population resettlement usually has more far-reaching consequences for the community than the gradual transitional process. Houses may be razed, institutional facilities torn down or altered, land uses changed. Above all, the fabric of social relationships that existed in the old neighborhood may be lost forever.⁸ For these reasons, recent projects which require urban resettlement have been accompanied by auxiliary programs of education and community organization to win public support for them. Environmental impact statements are required before implementation in an attempt to assess the adverse effects of the redevelopment on the community and the proposed services to mitigate these effects. The families to be moved are given financial and other assistance to relieve hardship during the transition period. But the amount of financial assistance never seems to cover the financial costs to the family for its resettlement, and the neighborhood mutual aid networks usually are not organized effectively enough to take up the slack.⁹ While the economic problems and the logistics of moving are likely to be uppermost for impoverished families facing resettlement, it is hypothesized that grade school children, aged 6-14, will be more concerned with what is happening to the neighborhood and its social networks.¹⁰ Children are often the most intensive users of the space, objects, facilities and people in and around their homes. Children are active rather than passive agents in their socialization. The neighborhood provides them with new experiences, activities and associations from which they acquire values, frames of reference, role models. They learn about danger and strangeness as well as familiar things such as nature, peer relationships, and their rights and responsibilities as children.

It is all of these things that make up a child's world that are threatened by a residential move. The threat is greater when the move is perceived to be compulsory and when homes, schools, all the familiar places and relationships, are to be destroyed during the moving process.

Methods

The occasion for the research came in 1959 when an urban renewal and highway construction project were undertaken in Topeka, Kansas. During the next six years, The Menninger Foundation mounted research to answer two broad questions: (1) What are the social, psychological, and economic consequences of forced relocation? (2) Can a program of planned counseling affect the

outcome of forced relocation?¹¹ -

One phase of this research was the study of the child population of Lincoln Elementary School, which was scheduled to be torn down in 1962. Thus, there was the unusual opportunity to learn how the children were affected by a forced move - a move accompanied by the destruction of their former homes and familiar places, and which could reasonably be expected to alter the meaningful social networks and institutional relationships of the children.

The children's study covered a four-year period, 1961-1964. The plan called for four interviews with each child at yearly intervals. These were held in the school the child was attending. The first two interviews were open-ended; the latter were structured.

Because of the longitudinal nature of this study, it was possible to interview most of the children before as well as after they moved. Since most of the children were interviewed twice after they moved, we are able to get a picture of the final disintegration of a neighborhood and the effect of this on the children's attitudes.

All four interviews deal with their feelings about school, family, friends, house, neighborhood, moving experience and the project causing their move, leisure activities, work, family activities, relatives, and aspirations for the future.

In addition, there are also interviews with 31 heads of families containing 39 children, obtained from the larger survey of which the children's study was a part. By utilizing these parents' interviews, consensus and dissensus within the same family on the issues related to the move can be obtained.

In the analysis of data, the information was organized to represent three time periods: one year before the move from the project area, one year after the move, and one year later. In a few cases, the first interview was taken just after the move, and children were asked to recapture their pre-move experiences. The sample size varies with the maximum number being 72, 75, and 62 children respectively in the time periods.

The characteristics of the household and respondents are presented in Table I, based on the total sample of 75. Findings are based on usable answers; thus, the number of cases varies. The pre-move data are most sketchy because they were gathered through an open-ended technique, which resulted in salient rather than systematic information. In contrast, standard questions were asked in the post-move periods.

TABLE I. HOUSEHOLD AND RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS
OF THE SAMPLE OF 75 CHILDREN

Racial Composition of Household		Family Composition of Household	
White	19%	Intact Nuclear	64%
Mexican-American and Indian	51%	Extended	13%
Black	30%	Child with Relatives	7%
No information	-	One Parent Only	14%
		No reply	3%
Monthly Income of Household		Sex of Child	
\$250 and Less	34%	Percent Male	47%
\$251 to \$450	49%		
\$451 and up	16%	School Grade of Child After Move	
Educational Status of Father		2-3	11%
Low	26%	4-5	34%
Medium	40%	6-7	54%
High	17%	8-9	3%
No information	17%	Other	1%

Findings

The findings answer four basic questions: (1) To what extent are the children aware and concerned about the forced move - is the issue salient to them? (2) What were the children's feelings, and how did they change over time? (3) What factors are associated with satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the removal? (4) Are children more distressed by a forced move than their parents?

To avoid needless repetition, the level of statistical significance is indicated by placing an asterisk after the sentence reporting the finding. One asterisk denotes the .05 level of significance, according to chi square analysis, two asterisks the .10 level, and three asterisks the .20 level. Unless there is an asterisk, the finding is not statistically significant or a statistical test was not performed on the data.

How salient was the forced move to the children?

It is evident that the children were sure that they would have to move, and that their homes and school would be torn down as a part of urban renewal. During the first interview all but two of the children agreed with the interviewer that they would have to move from their present homes. Forty families were reported to have begun the search for new housing. Only five of the 46 children were unsure about the razing of the school; one denied this fact. Moreover, 27 children told the interviewer the name of the school to which they expected to be transferred.

The impending move had been the subject for discussion with their peers of 15 children. Twenty-five children made assessments of their parents' feel-

ings about moving. The parents were reported as having mixed feelings: 13 favored the move; 8 were negative; 4 ambivalent. When asked "for whom - parents or children - does the move give the hardest time?" 12 children said that their parents had "more work or responsibility in the move," or "they had lived longer in the neighborhood and would hate to give it up." Mine children, who believed children "would suffer the most", gave reasons such as: "they would lose their friends," or "they have to change schools."

Many of the children knew the family plans for moving, and some children were asked their opinion about the new house or otherwise participated in moving process. Children in household with higher incomes apparently were more likely to be involved in decisions about housing than those households with lower incomes, as indicated in Table II.

This relationship is not statistically significant. However, income of household seems to be related to the information process. For example, children in lower income households have less knowledge of a new housing site

TABLE II. WAYS IN WHICH PARENTS INVOLVED THEIR CHILDREN IN SEARCH FOR HOUSING FOLLOWING A FORCED RELOCATION

Monthly Household Income	\$250 & under	\$251 to \$350	Over \$350
Number of Cases	17	17	14
Child Saw House & Asked His Opinion	41%	53%	43%
Child Saw House & Not Asked His opinion	18%	29%	38%
Child Did Not See, /asked His Opinion	18%	6%	7%
Child Did Not See House, Not Asked His Opinion	24%	12%	14%

13
 than the other children. The relationship of income to availability of housing is also marked. Two-thirds of the children in upper income households reported their families had found a home or were building one by the time of the first interview, as compared with 32% of the mid-income and 6% of the low income households.

Twent-six children stated how they were involved in the moving process. The usual answer was that they helped in packing and loading. Two children volunteered that they were helpful by "staying out of the way."

The Meaning of Urban Renewal

Moving to make way for urban renewal meant many things to the children. These meanings changed with time.

At the beginning, children differed with their evaluations. About 40% of the children identified urban renewal with building highways and the general improvement of Topeka. A similar proportion saw the program as a form of destruction that would result in the inconveniences of a forced move, the loss of

cherished friends, or the tearing down of home and school. A few children identified urban renewal with agency social services or payments to help in moving.

Over time, the most frequently mentioned negative aspect of urban renewal came to be not the loss of friends, not the physical destruction of buildings, but the continuing inconveniences suffered during the move itself. This is seen in Table III.

TABLE III. REASONS FOR DISLIKING URBAN RENEWAL

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Year Before Move (N 20)</u>	<u>Year After Move (N 32)</u>	<u>One Year Later (N 49)</u>
Inconveniences suffered during move	35%	47%	53%
Physical deterioration of buildings, neighborhood	25%	22%	10%
Disruption of social network, loss of friends	25%	3%	4%
Personal attachment fo building, things, housing, people	5%	16%	8%
Nothing, or general negativeness	10%	13%	24%

The negative comments about urban renewal outweigh the positive by about five to one.¹⁴ However, they declined over time. The reasons given sharply divided the sample of children: Negro and Mexican-American vs. other White; lower vs. upper poverty households based on income and educational status. Children of both deprived minorities and in lower status households were more concerned with the loss of their friends and familiar aspects of the old neighborhood than they were with the inconveniences of moving, although, to be sure, they also resented these inconveniences. This finding was often repeated in the subsequent analysis.

Children's Feelings About Moving

Children were asked to tell about their experiences since departure from the project site. This required the rating of "moving in general" as either very positive, positive with reservations, neutral or ambivalent, negative with reservations or very negative. Table IV indicates a sharp decline over time in positive feelings toward moving. In the latest period fewer than a quarter of the children felt "positive" about moving, and the great bulk were either negative, neutral, or ambivalent.

TABLE IV. CHILDREN'S RATINGS OF MOVING IN GENERAL

<u>Rating of "Moving in General"</u>	<u>Year Before Move (N=45)</u>	<u>Year After Move (N=56)</u>	<u>One Year Later (N=62)</u>
Positive	51%	30%	23%
Neutral or ambivalent	11%	18%	29%
Negative	38%	52%	48%

The following factors are associated with attitudes about moving:¹⁵

1. Sex of child. While there was little difference in the statements of girls and boys prior to the move, boys were likely to look back on the move with less favor than girls.* The discussion with boys about their daily round of activities pointed clearly to an outdoor orientation missing in the girls. Girls saw the dying Lincoln School Area with its taverns and unsavory night life as a threat to them, whereas the boys found adventure in the empty houses and excitement in the big machinery working on the new projects. Perhaps these are environmental factors that the boys missed after the move that led to its negative evaluation by them.
2. Race of child. Of the three ethnic groups, Black children most favored the move before it occurred (78%) and least favored the move in the year after (23%). They had the sharpest disapproval by the time of the third interview (64%).
3. Age of child. The children in early school grades were most positive to moving at all times that they were interviewed, or this is what they said. Dissatisfaction with moving was positively related to school grade.** Over half of the children in grades 7-9 were negative to moving in general.
4. Home ownership vs. renting. Two-thirds of the children of home owners opposed moving, whereas only a quarter of the children of renters felt the same way.** However, there were no differences in attitudes toward moving among the children who moved out of sub-standard housing, than those who left standard units.
5. Number of moves in lifetime. Only 19% of the children who claimed to have moved five or more times in their lifetime felt positively about the relocation from the Lincoln School District, whereas 33% of those having only one move did so.*
6. Time of move. Some families move from the area as soon as they heard it was to be a project site. Others lingered until the last minute. The children of families which moved at the latest possible time were much more positive to having moved than those who did so earlier.**

- This finding reinforces the comment made under (1) above.

7. Number of shifts in school. Some children had completed grade school and were ready to shift to junior high school at the time of the relocation. Speaking in retrospect, two years later, these children with a normal pattern of shifting schools were much more positive about moving than the other children.*
8. Frequency of Contact with relatives. Children who saw their relatives less frequently in the period immediately following the move than they did before, were much more likely to disfavor moving than their counterparts.* This is illustrated in Table V. Sixty-seven percent of the children with fewer contacts with their relatives following the removal were negative to moving, whereas only 17% of those with more contacts with their relatives after the move felt that way.

TABLE V. CHANGE IN FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH RELATIVES BEFORE AND AFTER URBAN RENEWAL MOVE

Child's Attitudes Toward Moving	Change in Number of Contacts Before and After Urban Renewal Move		
	More (N 12)	Same (N 15)	Less (N 31)
Positive	42%	33%	10%
Neutral	42%	40%	23%
Negative	17%	27%	67%

9. Loss of playmates. Children, in general, were not as distressed by the loss of playmates as they were by separation from relatives.*** Being close to friends is desirable but not necessary. A detailed analysis indicated that the daily round of activities remained relatively the same, but there were drastic shifts in the participants. Whereas activities with "some friend" was maintained during the period of the move, activities with siblings declined markedly. Most children, however, were able to find new playmates shortly after moving. The presence of friends was always associated significantly with the positive ratings given new schools in the new neighborhoods.* It was much more difficult to reproduce the "social life" of the old school district than to replace lost friends. The comments of early teen-age girls of Mexican-American origin suggest that they missed the social life of the Mexican-American community lost to them during the course of the moves.

10. Participation in the Moving Process. Some parents involved their children in the work of the move, and in the decision of selecting a new house. But there were no significant differences in the attitudes of children whether or not they were involved in such participation.
11. Parents' Attitudes Towards Moving. In general, the children alleged that they reflected their parents' attitudes: Where parents were positive toward moving, so were the children.*** In passing, it should be noted that in the year immediately after the removal from the urban renewal and highway areas, children turned from their peers to their parents for help with homework.* Shortly after this, the help was discontinued, according to the children's reports.

The Durability of Negative Attitudes Towards Moving

In the last section it was demonstrated that, viewed retrospectively, children are negative about "moving in general." Although 51 percent assigned positive ratings to moving prior to the event, the positive ratings declined to 30 percent in the year after the move and to 23 percent one year later. Thus, by the time of the last interview, 77 percent of the children were either negative, neutral or ambivalent to the process of "moving in general."

However, a distinction is made by the children between "moving in general" and "having moved," as indicated below:¹⁶

TABLE VI. PERCENT AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH POSITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS MOVING

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Percent and Number Children with Positive Attitudes</u>	
	<u>One Year After Move</u>	<u>One Year Later</u>
Moving in general	30% (17)	23% (14)
Having moved	48% (29)	51% (30)

By the last interview, about half of the children expressed positive attitudes about "having moved" while less than a quarter are favorably disposed toward the inconveniences and consequences of "moving in general."

Having distinguished between the moving process and the existing situation of having moved, we can ask the question of whether having moved has an effect on the ratings of children of their current schools, homes, and neighborhoods. The data are presented in Table 7. It is shown that if children

hold positive attitudes about having moved, they are likely to have favorable attitudes about these facilities. Of the children with positive attitudes towards having moved, 93 percent like their new school, 79 percent like their new home, and 67 percent like their new neighborhood. In contrast, those negative to having moved are less likely to have less positive feelings about these facilities.

TABLE 7. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEELINGS OF HAVING MOVED WITH ATTITUDES TOWARD NEW SCHOOL, HOME & NEIGHBORHOOD

<u>Feelings About Having Moved</u>	<u>Positive to New School</u>	<u>Positive to New Home</u>	<u>Positive to New Neighborhood</u>
Positive	93% (14)	79% (11)	67% (10)
Neutral	69% (11)	94% (17)	77% (13)
Negative	68% (11)	73% (24)	47% (15)

Whether the dissatisfaction of children can be attributed to a shift in neighborhood or the moving process is moot. Comments of the children would tend to support the conclusion that they are related. All of them loved the old Lincoln School; only 74 percent had good things to say about the 28 different schools into which they were transferred. Sixty-nine percent praised the old neighborhood whereas slightly over half liked the new locality. Of one thing we can be certain: children look with disfavor on a forced move, and their antipathy increases with time.

Do children look with disfavor on moving more than their parents?

An opportunity to answer this question was presented where interviews were taken with the parents of about 30 children. A direct comparison was made of the four items reported in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII. EXTENT OF FAMILY CONSENSUS ON FEELINGS ABOUT ISSUES IN THE MOVING PROCESS BY PARENT-CHILD PAIRS

<u>Extent of Agreement Between Parent & Child</u>	<u>About the Necessity of Moving (N 32)</u>	<u>About Having Moved (N 27)</u>	<u>About the New Neighborhood (N 24)</u>	<u>About the New House (N 29)</u>
Full Consensus	37%	45%	66%	72%
Partial Consensus	31%	17%	29%	15%
Dissensus	31%	38%	4%	14%

The rating of "full consensus" means both members of the pair exactly agreed in their feelings of "positive," "negative" or "neutral." Partial consensus means one member of the pair rated the event as "positive" or "negative" and the other member was "neutral." The rating of "dissensus" signifies that the members had opposed views. This comparison indicated that children are likely to disagree with their parents more frequently about "the necessity of moving" and about "having moved" than they do in their evaluations of the new neighborhood or the new house. About one-third of the small sample of children disagreed with their parents on these items. Where this is the situation, it is because the child was more strongly opposed to the move. In fact, only six percent of the parent-child pairs felt completely positive about the necessity of moving. The proportion rises to 28 percent of the parent-child pairs that felt completely positive about having moved. Again the children who differ from their parents are those who rate having moved negatively.*

DISCUSSION

Three conclusions derive from the study: (1) Most children have more negative than positive feelings toward the moving process in forced resettlement. These negative feelings occur more frequently after the move than beforehand. (2) Children are less likely than their parents to welcome a forced move. (3) Children who evaluate the moving process negatively, are more likely to negatively evaluate their housing, school, and neighborhood after the move than children with positive evaluations of the need for moving.

Significantly associated with the negative feelings toward the moving process were: (a) male sex, (b) number of residential moves in a lifetime, (c) number of shifts in school in lifetime, (d) less frequent contact with relatives after the move. Although several other factors failed to achieve the .05 level of statistical significance, the following six appeared highly relevant to the negative evaluation of the move; (1) Negro race, (b) parental ownership of housing in the project areas, (c) preference of the Lincoln School District over the new neighborhood, (d) delay in moving from project area until latest possible time, (e) anticipated loss of paymates, (f) membership in junior high school after the move.¹⁷ No association was found between attitudes toward the move and (a) living in substandard housing in the project area, (b) ascription of great public value to the urban renewal project, (c) participation in the moving process, (d) participation in the selection of the house in the new area.

Notwithstanding the negative attitudes expressed by the children about moving, the forced relocation did not result in significant damages to the children in either their progress or behavior at school as measured by indicators as grade point average, absence rates, grade failures, withdrawals, drop-outs, and other test scores.¹⁸

There are many limitations to this study. Where the sample size is adequate for detailed analysis, the data are sketchy. Where the data are rich

and detailed, there is a limited number of cases.

Reservations must also be exercised with respect to information gathered in an open-ended interview. We cannot be sure how much interviewer "loading" occurred in this process. On the other hand, the greatest methodological strength of the study, perhaps, came from the use of diverse sources of information: personal interviews, school and social agency records, rating forms filled out by teachers, and urban renewal workers. These sources supplement and buttress one another.

In toto, we are able to derive an insightful account of how children, living in poverty, largely are shifted from one set of ghettos, Negro and Mexican-American, to another. For most families the conditions of life at no time permit the optimal selection of house, school or neighborhood. The forced removal from the project areas is one more large-scale disruption in their lives. Most of our children are on the "losing end" of this transaction, not because of the forced removal, per se, but because they are part of the culture of poverty. The position of the children is quite clearly shown by the juxtaposition of two questions asked them during the interviews. They were asked about future career aspirations and how far they expected to go in school. Table IX presents the results. The children would seem to have had completely unrealistic aspirations for managerial or professional careers, and these

TABLE IX. CAREER AND EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS OF CHILDREN

<u>Career Aspiration</u>	<u>Year Before Move</u>	<u>Year After Move</u>	<u>One Year Later</u>
Managerial or Professional	55% (18)	55% (30)	63% (30)
Unskilled Labor or Service	15% (5)	7% (4)	4% (2)
Other	30% (10)	38% (21)	33% (16)
<u>Educational Aspiration</u>			
To Go to College	75% (9)	64% (28)	52% (30)
To Complete High School	8% (1)	27% (12)	36% (21)
Other	17% (2)	9% (4)	12% (7)

aspirations continued to trend upward as they grew older. A majority of the children at the time of the latest interview expected to attend college, although more children realistically estimated they would be limited to a high

school education than at the beginning of the survey. The data highlighted a second contradiction: as career aspirations increased, educational aspirations declined! It would seem that most of the children lived in a fantasy world.

It is such a world of fantasy that is evoked by "grand public events" like urban renewal.¹⁹ The hopes of children may be raised by promises inherent in the events even if they are not spoken. The personal outcome for the child and his family is seldom as great as the promise. Frequently, the move brings no distinct advantage in living conditions, and for some the conditions are worsened. The growth in negative attitudes toward the process of moving may be a reflection of this disillusionment. The lessened involvement of children in school and neighborhood may well be a part of their gradual phase-out from society. The findings have implications for ameliorative intervention.

For many children the impending move was a very real worry. The programs under the auspices of Lincoln School gave the children information about the nature of the highway and urban renewal projects. Urban renewal workers came to their homes to help with the tasks of the move and to provide financial aid to their parents. But there was very little personal counseling with the children themselves except during the annual interviews with the friendly members of the survey team. Levin and Sprague carefully document the help given children through an examination of the tape-recorded accounts of the open-end interviews with them in the early phases of the moving process.²⁰ Questions were asked to help the child relate to the reality of relocation such as: "When you move, what will you do to help?" "What will you take with you?", "What will you have to leave behind?" "Will you miss your friends?" "Will you have difficulty in making new friends?" "Will you be attending a different school next year?" The children were encouraged through the structure of the interview to visualize the nature of the change and to anticipate in advance some of the problems they were likely to encounter through the use of pictures and "pointed" questions and comments.

In short, it would seem that the research interviewers provided informal counseling services to children in need of them. They were helpful in winning the children's initial consent and support for urban renewal. From a research standpoint, however, it is quite likely that the activities of the researchers mitigated the deleterious impact of the move on the children; that is, they biased the outcome of the study. The experience, however, would seem to demonstrate utility of personal counseling services for youngsters in neighborhoods undergoing change. From a broad perspective, the incident of urban renewal can be viewed as a scheduled crisis that facilitates the early detection of children with serious personal problems that require treatment. Thus, during the process of the physical rehabilitation of an area, steps could also be taken toward improving its social health as well, if provisions were made for this.

Our data suggest that there was very little involvement of children in housing decisions by their families before the move. In fact, it has become

apparent that most poor people do not have much housing choice. To be sure, the families were helped by information about available housing, by financial subsidies and other aids. This sort of assistance was especially helpful for the discriminated-against Negro and Spanish minorities, according to our interviews. However, these are benefits that filter down to the child, slowly, if at all: they are not the sort of program in which he can be actively involved.

Once having left the project areas, however, social services seem to have terminated. This was the time when our children complained of lost friends and severed relational ties. It was from this point in time that the evaluations of the moving process became more and more negative. It would seem that more attention should be given to resettlement aids in the receiving neighborhood. How can the old familiar social patterns be reproduced in the new area? One line of helpful intervention might be in providing more family-based services and programs with the theme being "family resettlement by locality based organizations". All forms of locality based organization should be mobilized in this effort - from churches and neighborhood houses to citizen groups and social recreational clubs.²¹

Our interviews with parents and children on parallel items suggest that they live in quite different social worlds, even if these worlds are located in the same house or the same neighborhood. The findings confirm our assertion at the beginning of the paper that the most intensive use of the neighborhood is by its children, especially the boys. Frequently, what these boys seek is not activity organized for them, but the unsupervised opportunity to create and organize activity of their own choice. The planning and design problems in creating a "children's environment" in neighborhoods is a difficult one, but long range urban development will require adequate plans for this kind of socialization, if it is to be successful.

FOOTNOTES

1. Among the best of the careful empirical studies of the social effects of geographical mobility and migration are: Mildred Kantor (ed.), Mobility and Mental Health (Springfield, Ill.: Charles Thomas, 1965). K. Tooley, "The Role of Geographic Mobility in Some Adjustment Problems of Children and Families," Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry 9 (1970), 2:366-78. However, these studies do not deal with social effects of a forced move in residence. For this see: Charles Barrisi and John Lundquist, "The Urban Community Attitudes toward Neighborhood and Urban Renewal," Urban Affairs Quarterly 5 (March, 1970) 278-90. Marc Fried, "Transitional Functions of Working Class Communities: Implications for Forced Relocation", in Kantor, op. cit., pp. 123-165. T.T. Jitodai, "Migration and Kinship Contacts," Pacific Sociological Review 6 (1963) 49-55. Eugene Litwak, "Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion," American Sociological Review, 25 (1960) 385-94. G.J. Hunt and E.W. Butler, "Migration, Participation, and Alienation," Sociology and Social Research 56 (1972) 4:440-52. J. Mogeay and R.N. Morris, "Causes of Change in

Family Role Patterns," Community Study Bulletin 1 (1960) 3. L. Weller and E. Luchterhand, "Effects of Improved Housing on Family Functioning of Large, Low-Income Black Families," Social Problems 20 (1973) 3:382-89. E.W. Wolf and C. LeBeaux, "On the Destruction of Poor Neighborhoods by Urban Renewal," Social Problems 15 (1967) 3:3-8. L.T. Cagle and I. Deutscher, "Housing Aspirations and Housing Achievement: the Relocation of Poor Families," Social Problems 18 (1970) 2: 243-56. None of the research concerned with forced moves deal systematically with the effects on children.

2. L.K. Northwood, "The Impact of Relocation on Children," in William H. Key, When People are Forced to Move (Topeka, Kansas: The Menninger Foundation, 1967) pp. 241-275.

The author is indebted to Helen Levin and Harvey Sprague, A Study of the Social Impact of a Forced Move on School Age Children within an Urban Area (University of Washington School of Social Work; Seattle: MSW Thesis, 1965); and to John Dart, "Changes in Activities of Children Undergoing a Forced Move," (paper for research seminar, University of Washington School of Social Wor, 1966).

3. Statistics are taken from Geographical Mobility of Labor, U.S. Department of Commerce Area Development Administration, 1969, p. 7.

4. Quoted in Martin Anderson, "Fiasco of Urban Renewal," Harvard Business Review 43 (1965) 1:6-21.

5. See David L. Birch, "Toward a Stage Theory of Urban Growth," Journal of the American Institute of Planners 37 (1971) 78-87. A two-stage model is advocated by E. Butler and E. Kalser, "Prediction of Residential Movement and Spatial Allocation", Urban Affairs Quarterly 6 (1971) 477-94.

6. A comprehensive theory of the functions of the neighborhood is outlined in Donald I. Warren, "Neighborhoods in Urban Areas," in R. Morris, The Encyclopedia of Social Work (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1972), pp. 872-82. For additional references see G. Bell, E. Randall, J. Roeder, Urban Environments and Human Behavior: an Annotated Bibliography (Stroudsburg, Pa.: Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross, 1973), pp. 152-191.

7. J. Lansing, New Homes and Poor People: a Study of Chains of Moves (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, 1969). P. Rossi, Why Families Move (New York: Free Press, 1952). H.C. White, "Multipliers, Vacancy Chains, and Filtering in Housing," Journal of the American Institute of Planners 37 (1971) 88-94.

8. Fried, Wolf and LeBeaux, Cagle and Deutscher, op. cit.

9. C. Hartman, "Relocation: Illusory Promises and No Relief," Virginia Law Review 57 (1971) 745-817. J. Seeman and P. Williams, "Applied Research and Public Policy: A Study in Urban Relocation," Community Mental Health 7 (1971) 2:99-106. A Downs, Urban Problems and Prospects (Chicago: Markham, 1970), pp. 192-227.

10. R. Brown, Social Psychology (New York: Free Press, 1965). The place and the function of the neighborhood in the life of the child is often alluded to but seldom studied systematically. For documentation of this point, see the chapters on "Socialization" by E. Zigler and I. Child and "Laughter, Humor and Play" by D. Berlyne and G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.) The Handbook of Social Psychology (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969), Vol. 3, pp. 450-589, 795-852. Some relevant articles include: H. McKay, "The Neighborhood and Child Conduct," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 261 (1949) 32-41. M. Mead, "Neighborhoods and Human Needs," Ekistics 21 (1966) 124-6. S. Keller, "The Social World of the Urban Slum Child: Some Early Findings," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 33 (1963) 5:823-31. E. Cobb, "The Ecology of Imagination in Childhood," Daedalus 88 (1959) 3:537-48. L. Della Fave, "The Culture of Poverty Revisited: a Strategy for Social Research Problems" 21 (1974) 5:609-621. M. Spivack, "The Political Collapse of a Playground," Landscape Architecture Quarterly 59 (1971) 4: 288-91. J. Piaget, The Child's Construction of Reality (London: Routledge, 1955). U. Bronfenbrenner, J. Daba, "Families and Children in Urban Redevelopment: A View from a Settlement House," Children, 6 (1959) 6:203-208. Gould, F. and Kerchhoff, "A Study of Children's Sense of Community," 1961 and "A Study of Children's Sense of Community - Part II," 1962, mimeographed, Detroit: Merrill-Palmer Institute. Granger, L., "The Child's Community," Child Study 31 (1954) 3:28-33. Kriesberg, Louis and Seymour S. Bellin, "The World of Informal Social Relations, Neighbors, Friends and Kinsmen," mimeographed, Syracuse: Syracuse University Youth Development Center, 1965.

11. W. Key, op. cit.

12. In addition to interviews, information was obtained from the following sources. They are reported in L.K. Northwood, op. cit., pp. 243-56. The sources are school records and attendance records from 1954-5 through 1962-3; teacher evaluations for 1963-4 following the children's move to a new location; comments on some of the children by the principal, the interviewer, and leaders of such organizations as the Boy's Club to which the children belonged, urban renewal records about the families.

13. Barrisi and Lundquist, op. cit. find a relationship between knowledge of urban renewal and positive evaluation of urban renewal. They studied 654 white and 811 black households involved in an urban renewal project in Akron, Ohio.

14. Barrisi and Lundquist, ibid., have the same finding.

15. Similar findings to those reported in this study appear in existing research. For example, Barrisi and Lundquist, ibid., found that positive attitudes towards the home neighborhood were associated with the location of friends and relatives living nearby, as do Litwak op. cit., and Jitodai, op. cit. Hunt and Butler, op. cit., note that separation from informal and neighborhood structures of the old neighborhood increases the sense of alienation for those low income men and families who move. Fried, op. cit., comes to the same con-

clusion, although Wolf and Lebeaux, op. cit., report that there is no such strong attachment of low income blacks to the residential area they studied in Detroit. The comparisons made between this study and others are of a child population with an adult population. No comparable data exist for child populations on the relevant variables.

16. No attempt was made to control for the number of moves in this phase of the analysis. Consequently, this may be considered as another way of presenting the data already reported in points 3 and 5 on page 230

17. There is an apparent, but not real, contradiction between negative evaluation of the move and two other factors: number of shifts in school in lifetime, and membership in junior high school after the move. Where the shift was an expected "natural" one from grade school to junior high, and this occurred during the period of the move, children tended to be positive in their evaluation of the move. Where there was a recurrent pattern of shifts in schools other than this "natural" one, children tended to be "negative."

18. L.L. Northwood, op. cit., pp. 243-56.

19. M. Weissman and E. Paykel, "Moving and Depression in Women," Society 9 (1972) 9:24-28. The authors find that the stressful effects of geographic mobility are experienced most severely by women who are already depressed. These women sometimes view a residential move as a way to patch up marital problems. They project a fantasy world, free of troubles, that will be realized through the move.

20. Levin, Helen and Harvey Sprague, op. cit. If it is true that the research interviewers "helped" the children to deal with their problems accompanying the forced move, and thus offset some of the deleterious consequences for them, it is remarkable how many such consequences remained, and were reported by the children. Despite the softening effect of the interview on these hardships, they were still very evident.

21. Levin and Sprague, ibid., J. Weinandy, Families Under Stress (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, 1962). S. Simons, "Migration and Resettlement Services," in Robert Morris (ed.), Encyclopedia of Social Work (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971), pp. 836-844. W. Smart, "Housing Relocation, Social Work In," in Robert Morris, ibid., pp. 633-636. L.K. Northwood, "Deterioration in the Inner City" in Nathan Cohen (ed.), Social Work and Social Change (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1964), pp. 201-269. S. Culbert and J. Renshaw, "Coping with the Stresses of Travel as an Opportunity for Improving the Quality of Work and Family Life," Family Process 11 (1972) 3:321-37. J. Mao, "Relocation and Housing Welfare: a Case Study," Land Economics 41 (1965) Nov., 365-370.

22. D. Appleyard and M. Lintell, "The Residents' Viewpoint Environmental Design: Research and Practice," Journal of the American Institute of Planners 38 (1972) March, 84-101. A. Booth and D. Johnson, "The Effect of Crowding on Child Health Development," American Behavioral Scientist 18 (1975) 6:736-49. J. Moge, Family and Neighborhood (London: Oxford University, 1956). A. Downs, op. cit.

References

- Abbott, Carrell W., Charles R. Brown and Paul V. Crosbie
1973 "Exchange as symbolic interaction: For what?" American Sociological Review 38 (August): 504-506.
- Akers, Ronald L.
1973 Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Banduar, Albert
1969 Principles of Behavior Modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Becker, Howard S.
1963 Outsiders. New York: The Free Press
1971 "Labelling theory reconsidered." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the British Sociological Association (April).
- Blumer, Herbert
1969 Symbolic Interactionism. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bruyn, Severyn T.
1966 The Human Perspective in Sociology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Cohen, Albert K.
1966 Deviance and Control. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Denzin, Norman K.
1969 "Symbolic interactionism and ethnomethodology: A proposed synthesis." American Sociological Review 34 (December); 922-934.
1970 The Research Act. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Day, Willard F.
1969 "Radical behaviorism in reconciliation with phenomenology." Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior 12 (March): 315-328.
- Fletcher, C. Richard, Peter Manning, Larry Reynolds and James Smith
1969 "The labelling theory of mental illness: a critical evaluation of the views of Goffman, Lemert and Scheff." Unpublished manuscript.
- Garfinkel, Harold
1956 "Conditions of successful degradation ceremonies." The American Journal of Sociology 61 (March): 420-424.
- Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss
1967 The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Goffman, Erving
1961 Asylums. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc.
1963 Behavior in Public Places. New York: The Free Press
1969 "The insanity of place." Psychiatry 32 (November): 357-388.