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ABSTRACT

This study identifies a need for an overall conceptual framework for viewing residential mobility and proposes that a stress-response model supplies that need. A proposed model tries to incorporate all the various existing notions of stress in one basic model. It provides for a wide variety of human experiences and responses, attempts to explain the stress condition, and provides a basis for future research in a variety of problem areas. The model is tested, and found to be satisfactory with a sample of high-rise apartment dwellers who moved within London, Ontario.
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INTRODUCTION

North American society has become increasingly mobile, especially with regard to changing residential locations. In many cities, the turnover rate for housing units is extremely high. Boyce (1971) points out that in certain parts of Seattle there is a change in occupancy rate of 38% per year. In other words, in these cases, more than 1/3 of all households move in any given year.

Much of the more recent interest in residential mobility stems from Rossi's work in 1955. He suggested that people will move as their housing requirements change due to their changing family structure and life style. Other ideas have been put forward by researchers such as Kain (1962) who thought that people would move in order to be closer to a new job. Both of these ideas attempt to explain why people move, but have little success in accounting for high mobility rates cited in Seattle and other urban areas. These ideas of residential mobility have been far too simplistic to deal with the wide variety of reasons that could be given for moving.

In any residential environment there are many circumstances with which residents must deal. Some of these circumstances are likely to cause the household to be
uncomfortable or anxious. This discomfort or dislike may lead to a desire on the part of the household to move out of the situation. Moving can be seen as a way of leaving the problems behind. This idea can be incorporated into a concept of human stress.

Human stress research has been undertaken in a number of areas of study, although psychology has been the field of study most utilizing this notion. However, geographers have begun to seriously examine human stress as a useful concept in dealing with the movement of people. (Brown and Moore, 1971; Wolpert, 1966; Clark and Cadwallader, 1973; etc.) The major problem developing out of stress research has been the lack of an overall or fundamental model on which to base the variety of research interests. Often the models and concepts used have little similarity with models used in other contexts.

This research paper attempts to overcome this lack of a comprehensive model of human stress. A model is developed in chapter two which tries to incorporate all existing notions of stress into one basic model. This model provides for a wide variety of human experiences and responses, and attempts to explain the stress condition. It views man as a decision-maker, capable of reacting to potentially harmful
situations and responding in a positive problem-oriented manner. This model provides a basis for future stress research in a variety of problem areas.

This study also evaluates the model using residential mobility as a framework. Residential mobility is viewed as a coping mechanism, the result of stressful conditions in the residential environment. In particular, the model is operationalized using a sample of high-rise apartment dwellers who moved within the city limits of London, Ontario, between July 1977 and August 1978. This research is intended to be a preliminary investigation in which the proposed model is evaluated using actual research findings. To this end, the research and analysis are general in nature and do not focus on specific aspects. The research is intended to identify trends or relationships which support or deny the ability of the model to explain residential mobility in terms of human stress.
CHAPTER TWO
A MODEL FOR RESIDENTIAL STRESS ANALYSIS

While notions of human stress have received a great deal of attention in recent years, it is immediately obvious that the various research areas lack conceptual ties to a central stress theme (Appley and Trumbull, 1967; Carson and Driver, 1967; McGrath, 1970). Studies dealing with physiological, psychological or social stress conditions are often conceptually remote, sharing few obviously common elements. This situation has promoted severe problems among the different interests, including incompatibility of research designs, failure to achieve comparability of research measurements, incongruent definitions and concepts, and the like. Indeed, the differences between the various research areas appears so great that one review suggested that stress be considered a field of study with particular sub-areas, rather than a single concept (Carson and Driver, 1967: 51-52). In spite of the difficulties, many researchers continue to express a desire to work towards a comprehensive concept of human stress, citing a number of common elements in research as justification (Kahn, 1970; Glass and Singer, 1972; Turan, 1973; Cohen, 1976). This chapter will examine existing models of human stress, and identify their weaknesses. It will also seek to provide a comprehensive model of human stress.
Existing Models of Human Stress

From the multitude of ideas and theories using the stress term, we can identify a number of basic models which would seem to incorporate most of the existing research paradigms.

Psychology has been in the forefront of the development of concepts of stress. This subject area has used several models to date. For example, in a study of adaption, Mechanic (1962) considered stress to be the "discomforting responses of persons to particular situations" (1962: 7). A person avoided these discomforting responses by altering his behavior in such a way as to reduce or eliminate any effect of the situation. In other words, a person adapted his behavior to a situation in order to avoid stress. This is a response-based definition of stress.

Basawitz (1955) ignores any response by the person in his model of stress used to investigate anxiety of men in combat. To this researcher, we need only consider the stimuli in order to determine if stress will result. Stress will be produced if the integrity of the organism is threatened or jeopardized in some way. He suggests that stress stimuli may be organized along a continuum, ranging from those
sources which are likely to affect only one or several organisms, to those that are likely to affect most or all organisms.

In dealing with large-scale traumatic events, Janis (1954) considered only response aspects in his model. His studies of man-made and natural disasters indicate that three stages are apparent. The first stage consists of the appraisal of impending danger or disaster; the second stage requires action on the part of the person to avoid death or injury; the third stage is when the victim assesses the damage to himself and others. This model is concerned only with psychological responses to stress.

A model of stress by Dohrenwend (1961) viewed stress as "a state intervening between antecedent constraints and consequent efforts to reduce constraint" (1961: 296). Stress is the product of behaviors aimed at reducing pressures exerted by the environment. Dohrenwend used this model to investigate mental disorders occurring as a result of disruption in the social environment. In this model, no distinction is made between behaviors which are adaptive or beneficial, and those which are maladaptive.

Stress is not just considered to appear at the psychological level of functioning, but may also occur at the
physical level. A series of psychosomatic models of stress have been developed that are based on the premise that tension in one system of the body may have pathological consequences for other systems in the body. For example, Aakster (1974) investigated the idea that dissatisfaction in the social environment leads to physiological disruption and medical illnesses. He concludes by stating "our results seem to support the point of view that unresolved social stresses lead to health disturbances" (1974: 89).

Hans Selye (1956) examined the physiological and biochemical responses to stress. He viewed stress as a general body reaction to a specific disruptive stimulus. A single stress-producing stimulus triggers a whole range of reactions throughout the body based on biochemical functions. He termed this response the General Adaption Syndrome.

A series of models have been developed which deal with very specific physiological changes in humans as a result of disruptive stimuli. These models, which examine such physiological processes as cardiovascular disorders and mucous membrane secretions, tend to be very limited in their outlook and difficult to apply to other situations. These models also tend to be very mechanical in that stress is viewed "as the internal response of the organism to an
external load placed on it by some pathogenic agent..." (Scott and Howard, 1970: 262).

In analyzing these existing models of human stress, Scott and Howard (1970: 264-269) identify a number of weaknesses which limit the models' effectiveness, and promote incompatibility. The major factor indicated is the number of different stress concepts and models employed under the stress rubric. Variations restrict, and even disallow, meaningful generalization between research efforts. These differences become more apparent as each field of study develops models and theories according to its own goals and interests. The models used have failed to realize that stress is a phenomenon that transcends the traditional, arbitrary boundaries of human study. The resulting research efforts are usually incomplete to the extent that not all aspects of the stress condition are examined.

Scott and Howard (1970: 268) further suggest that many models of human stress make unjustified and unwarranted assumptions. These assumptions are made both about the nature of the stimuli, and the likely responses to them. These assumptions hinder the search for a realistic explanation of stress by providing boundaries and limitations on the search.
It should be noted that most models of stress have only considered reactions to extreme and traumatic events. This focus has diverted attention away from the study of stimuli that wear down the organism without dramatic occurrences. The weakness in this is the one-sided view of stress and stress research that develops. Stress needs to be considered on both the traumatic and less noxious scales.

Thus, these weaknesses in existing models need be eliminated or reduced in models aimed at providing a comprehensive framework for stress research. Models must be capable of dealing with stress at all levels of analysis and accounting for all relevant variables and factors. Comprehensive models must also justify basic assumptions, using them to lead to explanation, rather than as a hindrance to research. In addition, it is necessary that comprehensive models be able to incorporate normal, every-day stressful events into the analysis of stress. Models based on improving these weaknesses must be developed before research can be tied to a central, all-encompassing notion of stress.

One model aimed at improving stress models, and providing a comprehensive framework for stress, is the model developed by Howard and Scott (1965). Their model attempts to overcome
the shortcomings already identified while providing a unifying concept for future stress research.

The Howard and Scott theoretical model maintains that stress results from a person's inability to achieve a harmonious relationship with his environment. In other words, the individual is placed in a position where the environment does not adequately meet his needs. The resulting discrepancy produces stress due to the additional or supplementary resources required to be generated by the individual in order to function in an appropriate manner. Howard and Scott have termed this additional effort "maintenance tension" and suggest "to the extent that excess maintenance tension exists, the organism can be said to be experiencing stress" (Howard and Scott, 1965: 150).

Prior to the development of maintenance tension, the individual is placed in a position where he may react to the poor environmental relationship. In this way the model views people as capable of reacting in a problem-solving capacity to less than ideal situations. People have available resources which they may use in order to change or lessen the severity of the relationship. The individual has the capacity to eliminate any harmful effects, and thus avoid stress. However, if the action taken by the person does not totally
eliminate environmental discrepancies, then the maintenance tension develops.

The Howard and Scott model visualizes discrepancies between the actual and ideal environments as originating from one, or several, separate categories. They are concerned with sources both internal and external to the individual, as well as symbolic and non-symbolic sources. This four-part classification allows their model to incorporate all sources of potentially stress-inducing stimuli, something not accomplished by other models.

Once a person has been placed in a stressful position, as a result of not being able to rectify the discrepancy between the ideal and actual environments, stress will continue for as long as conditions remain unchanged. The person may be able to institute some behaviors which attempt to cope with the situation, but do nothing to solve it. These coping behaviors attempt to release the maintenance tension at least temporarily. Often the result of stress and coping is the production of deviant behaviors which indicate a reduced overall general health standard for the individual (Howard and Scott, 1965: 152).

This model is based on the assumption that people will respond to situations that are not ideal in such a manner
as to more fully approach the ideal condition. It views humans as capable of solving problems posed by the environment.

The Howard and Scott model is useful for a number of aspects. Foremost is its ability to provide a comprehensive base for the study of stress. It is broad enough to accommodate the many and varied notions of stress, but specific enough to be realistically tested. By dealing with the many sources of stimuli and the many outcomes of stress, it allows incorporation of different test results. However, because it maintains ties to a central concept of stress, it allows comparability of results. In addition, it can successfully handle everyday less-than-traumatic events within its framework.

Furthermore, the Howard and Scott model is based on the realistic assumption that man is capable of making decisions about his environment and acting on those decisions. It eliminates the trap of viewing people as simply mechanistic respondents to difficult environmental conditions. It recognizes that man is capable of actions directed at reducing environmental difficulties.

A second model which embodies many ideas similar to the Howard and Scott model is that proposed by Lazarus (1966). This author indicates that people, when confronted with
difficult situations, may perceive a threat to their way of life, or condition. He suggests that "the appraisal of threat is not a simple perception of the elements of the situation, but a judgement, an inference in which the data are assimilated to a constellation of ideas and expectations" (Lazarus, 1966: 44). Furthermore, the perception of threat leads to a coping response by which the individual seeks to overcome the posed difficulties. The coping response may, or may not, eliminate the threat. In the case where the threat is not removed, the individual experiences anxiety or continued threat. In many ways, the Howard and Scott and the Lazarus models are comparable, employing different terms to explain similar concepts. Realistically, however, they share similar limitations.

The two above models have attempted to overcome the obvious lack of a comprehensive model of human stress. However, they have limitations which need be identified.

1. They do not fully explain the importance of individual factors in the consideration of stress and its development in people.

2. The models do not adequately show how actions on the part of individuals in attempting to deal with difficult situations may alter or influence subsequent actions or behaviors.

3. The models have not adequately developed a concept of
coping, or dealing with failure to eliminate stressful conditions.

4. The models lack structure or definite form which is important for the operationalization of these models. Rectification of these weaknesses follows through the development of a proposed model of human stress.

A Proposed Comprehensive Model of Human Stress

Through recognition of the limitations of existing models of stress, and the contributions of the Howard and Scott model, the following model is proposed. In this model, graphically represented in Figure 1, human behavior is conceived as a problem-solving phenomenon.

This model of stress is built on two underlying assumptions: 1. Humans are most comfortable when environmental and self-imposed threats and disturbances are at a minimum.

2. A threat or disturbance motivates the individual to reduce the threat or disturbance. The individual may be considered as actively seeking to maintain an equilibrium or steady-state condition, with respect to his environmental fields. Lack of equilibrium indicates a problem situation, to which the individual can
Figure 1: A Comprehensive Model of Human Stress
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- tension
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- psychosomatic disease

Outcome
- conditioning
- psychological bolstering
be expected to respond in such a manner so as to reduce the threat. It is difficult to conceive of conditions where individuals have complete mastery over equilibrium since environmental demands are continually being made or changed. A steady-state condition is the theoretical goal, although realistically never achieved.

**Demand Stage** - Stress-inducing stimuli, or stressors, are forces which cause stress in the individual by their excess or absence, or their special combination. Conceptually, these forces can be considered as originating external or internal to the individual, and having either symbolic (internalized abstract meaning) or nonsymbolic natures. Howard and Scott (1965: 146), using these categories, suggest four areas from which problems could originate (Figure 2). Demands from the internal psychological realm may include such things as integrating fantasy or imagery with reality, or dealing with hopelessness. Biochemical

**FIGURE 2: DEMAND STAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Stimuli</th>
<th>External Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Stimuli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsymbolic Stimuli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Realm</td>
<td>Sociocultural Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical Realm</td>
<td>Physical Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
disruption or deterioration disturbs the biochemical realm sufficiently to cause stressful conditions. Sociocultural problems originate in group living, and will occur as conformity demands, job pressures and the like. The physical environment, including such things as temperature, chemical irritants or relief, will also provoke problems in the individual.

While these categories may represent large areas of stress sources, it is important to note that they are not mutually exclusive and may complement or confound each other. A single situation may make demands on the individual from several different environments or realms, making precise classification or identification difficult. Therefore, it is important that a comprehensive model of stress, such as this, be able to adequately deal with these sources, both as single categories and in combinations as they appear in realistic situations.

Detection/Appraisal Stage - This stage represents the processes through which the individual comes to realize that stimuli are disturbing or disruptive. The actual appraisal of disruption will be influenced by the individual's characteristics, which will include demographic factors, physiological, perceptual and cognitive abilities, social and cultural background, and life experiences. These factors determine
which stimuli are perceived and which of these are considered potentially harmful to the maintenance of equilibrium. In effect, these characteristics filter the objective stimuli, evaluating some and ignoring the irrelevant or inconsequential information.

The above statement may seem to indicate that the appraisal of disruption implies perception or sensation of stimuli, which obviously is the case in many instances. However, there may be instances of potentially stressful stimuli occurring below the level of mental functioning. For example, biochemical disruption may well occur without the individual becoming cognitively aware of it until such time as deterioration of the system signals it. In order for this model to function at all levels of analysis, this stage should incorporate both autonomic and cognitive appraisal of stimuli.

**Response Stage** - The appraisal of stimuli as threatening to disrupt equilibrium means the individual is presented with a problem. He must either respond in such a manner as to preserve a comfortable state, or suffer the consequences. As in the case of appraisal, we need not consider the effort of problem-solving as cognitive functioning. In the context of this model, a problem may be regarded as any condition or
circumstance which is posed to the individual for solution, whether it incorporates mental abilities or not.

In order to deal with problems, people may make use of a number of things which contribute to the resolution of the problem situation. These innate or acquired resources will be a function of individual characteristics of the person at the time of the problem. These characteristics will also determine the effectiveness of the individual's attempts at mastery.

In addition to resources, humans have available energy with which to deal with problems. "Energy is viewed as a potential of the organism which is activated by demands for maintenance and problem-solving." (Howard and Scott, 1965: 145) Each person will have available an amount of energy for solving a particular problem, and this specific energy level will be a subset of the total or general energy level of the person. Energy potential will vary according to the individual's characteristics, such as personality and age.

However, the application of energy and resources to the problem situation need not result in the solution. The problem itself must first be solvable, and the person's response must be appropriate for solution. If the energy and resources are
insufficient, the problem insoluble, or the response ineffective, then mastery will not occur.

**Decision Stage** - At the beginning of problem-solving, the individual has a finite amount of energy to be combined with resources. The energy available for problem-solving is an amount that the organism can afford over and above what is needed for the operation of the remainder of the system. If this energy level becomes depleted before the problem is adequately mastered, then the system remains in a state of disruption. Extra energy for problem-solving can only be obtained by stealing from other parts of the system, resulting in disruption in those parts, and greater disruption to the entire system. Continued disruption results in the inefficient operation of the system since it now requires greater inputs of energy to the total system in order to reach the same level of operation as during equilibrium. This excess energy and resources needed for maintenance of the operating level can be considered a "tension" that exists because of disruption of the system. "To the extent that an organism must utilize its energy and resources for maintenance beyond minimum requirements, thereby limiting its problem-solving capacity, it may be considered as experiencing stress." (Howard and Scott, 1965: 152)
However, if the person is able to effectively eliminate the problem, then no maintenance tension develops and demobilization of resources occurs. Mastery of problems will leave the individual in a superior state than had the problems not arisen (after resources have been replenished). This idea is based on concepts of conditioning or muscular development. Strong demands successfully met enhance a person's efficiency in problem-solving.

Coping Stage - The tension resulting from a disequilibrium represents a drain on the individual's energy and resources. If the effects of this drain are to be reduced then mechanisms must be found to relieve the tension, or stress. Behaviors which are aimed at reducing or dissipating the acquired tension can be termed "coping behaviors". In one manner or another, the individual attempts to reduce the tension brought about by his failure to match the actual environment with the ideal environment. However, the maintenance tension cannot be entirely eliminated since the disruption of the system still exists. At best, tension-releasing activities are temporary and may in themselves be stressful to the person. Tension relief may occur at the biochemical, physiological, psychological and behavioral levels in people, or in some combination of them.
Characteristics of the individual will influence what coping mechanisms are used to deal with stress. Particularly important in determining mechanisms may be previous relief mechanisms used, and personality. Means of coping will modify the individual factors through changes in the energy and resource levels available to solve future problems. Coping may also alter the stimuli sources by affecting things in the environment.

Outcome Stage - Stress, and the attempts to cope with it, have inherent costs for the individual. The tension will continue to exist, and may become additive if the coping mechanisms themselves become stress sources. The energy and resources required for maintenance and coping are lost for problem-solving, and so the effectiveness of future problem-solving is undermined. The health of the individual is jeopardized since disequilibrium is a deviation from the optimum condition of comfort. On the other hand, successful mastery of potentially stressful situations leaves the person in a position to more effectively deal with future problems of that kind. Learning or conditioning has occurred, and resources and energy may be mobilized more efficiently than in the past. It is also apparent that the outcome of problem-solving will have implications for individual factors and stimuli sources. For example, failure may prompt the
person to avoid conflict in future situations, while successful mastery may encourage aggression on subsequent problems.

This model, then, is an attempt to allow the analysis of human stress at all levels of functioning. Stress is viewed as an excess energy requirement over and above minimum operating requirements, and as a result of the inability of the person to master equilibrium problems. As such, the person's problem-solving effectiveness and personal characteristics mediate the potentially stressful stimuli. Coping is the action of the individual aimed at reducing the impact of his failure to master environmental problems.

While this proposed model is based on comprehensive models of human stress developed by Howard and Scott (1965) and others (Lazarus, 1966), it does contain a number of improvements. On a superficial level, the proposed model has utilized a series of stages to structure the overall process of stress. This staging allows a more concrete image or structure to develop. The chief benefit of this structure would seem to be the ease in which other models may be plugged into this model, or at least compared with this model. This is an important quality given that this proposed model claims to be a new development in the study of stress.
The other models lack development of the importance played by individual factors in developing or influencing stress. They allow that the personality and background of the individual will be important in problem-solving since this will determine the energy and resources available. However, it seems apparent that other factors of the individual's make-up will influence the development of stress, or the outcome of environmental threats. For instance, individual factors will influence the detection and appraisal of incoming stimuli, selecting some and ignoring others. Or, individual factors will determine coping mechanisms used, and so on. The abilities, background and experiences of people will have an influence on the development, or lack of development, of stress far in excess of that indicated in the existing models.

In addition, the existing models of stress lack feedback mechanisms whereby actions on the part of the individual may influence future conditions. For example, successful problem-solving may involve alteration of the environment in such a way as to change its influence in the future. Furthermore, the outcome and coping stages may involve behaviors which alter or influence the incoming stimuli. It is important that these feedback devices be included in a comprehensive model of stress.
The proposed model has incorporated the concept of "coping" which was not developed by Howard and Scott. These researchers suggest that individuals will seek relief in one form or another as a result of their failure to solve environmental problems. The proposed model has indicated that these relief mechanisms are part of a coping process whereby people seek to dissipate the mounting maintenance tensions. At the coping stage, the individual is faced with a second problem, other than the one originally posed by the environment. Now he must also deal with the mounting maintenance tension as a result of his failure in the original problem. This second-order problem requires the use of the coping concept in order to be fully developed, especially with regards to the forthcoming discussion of residential mobility.

The refinements incorporated in the proposed model improve its effectiveness in dealing with stress in humans by overcoming some weaknesses in existing models.

A Residential Stress Model

Using the general model of stress outlined above, a model may be developed dealing with a specific stress situation. In this case, the stress associated with the residential
environment will be dealt with. This model of residential stress is graphically represented in Figure Three.

In order to establish a concept of residential stress, we must delineate the potential sources of stimuli under study. Since we are dealing with the residential environment, we must first be concerned with those stressors that have their origin outside of the person, and second, only those stressors that are a function of the person's residence in a particular place or location. In other words, we are dealing primarily with stressors in the physical and the sociocultural environments of a place. Certain internal psychological stimuli may also be considered if they relate to the external environment. For example, an image of a place may have ramifications for a person living there. Other internal stimuli, since they are not a function of the location, will not be considered.

Attributes of the physical environment inducing stress might include such things as house size and form, neighborhood density, conditions or configuration, location with respect to other places, visual, auditory or odor characteristics, chemical pollutants, and so on. Sociocultural stressors are likely to be such things as ethnic, religious or color factors, variations in services and supplies, economic
FIGURE 3: A MODEL OF RESIDENTIAL STRESS
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and social differentiation, authorities' policies and programs, and others. Psychological stimuli may include the image of the place, or the image of the self in relation to the place. Many potential stressors could be included in two or more categories since man typically provides physical features or forms with specific sociocultural and psychological meanings.

As indicated earlier, a person appraises stimuli through a filter of personal factors. Therefore, incoming information about the residential environment must be considered in light of these factors, and the value the individual attaches to each. The disruptive abilities of the stimuli are assessed by the individual against limits of tolerance. The more competent the individual, the less disruptive environmental forces will be.

If the person or household considers the forces as moving them into a more uncomfortable residential situation, they will need to attempt some sort of rectification. In this case, they make use of the most appropriate resources, such as wealth, abilities, or tools to work towards a solution. This assertive response to a problem requires the person to oppose the offending stimulus and to channel energy and resources into the most appropriate solution attempts. While mastery
of the problem may be achieved by this opposition, limitations on resources or energy may lead to ultimate failure. Assertive responses to physical elements in the environment may include such things as manipulation of the landscape, or alterations in the built environment. Social or cultural responses are likely to fall into the category of aggressive reactions to neighbors, or others, in the residential environment. By changing an image of the environment a person is making a psychological response to stress. Failure at solution will be realized where the person diverts his resources and energy away from confrontation, or where the person is incapable of making a response.

Coping with the stress of not being able to match the actual residential environment with the ideal environment may take place on all levels of the individual's make-up. For example, continual tension may bring a wide range of psychosomatic diseases or disruption of the body's biochemical composition. Also, deviant behaviors and altered self-images are other coping behaviors. Most coping mechanisms may be classified as divergent responses since they are not aimed at reducing the problem in the residential environment, but at reducing the tension.

Examples of coping mechanisms in the residential
environment are alteration of the environment, deviant or culturally sanctioned tension-releasing behaviors, psychosomatic diseases, and mobility. The type of mechanism chosen will depend on individual factors. For example, those with greater wealth are in a better position to alter their physical environment, or move. This model, because it focuses on residential mobility, will deal specifically with moving as a coping mechanism. This should not be interpreted as indicating that other coping mechanisms are ignored or considered less important. Other coping mechanisms may well be of greater significance for the majority of households. However, study limitations force the exclusion of these mechanisms from this study, with the result that the focus is on moving and residential mobility.

In the case of the residential environment, stress may result in continuing and escalating tension, lack of communication with neighbors, psychosomatic disorders, abnormal behaviors, high mobility rates and the like. On the other hand, continual low stress levels, through problem mastery, will enhance problem-solving abilities, and the environment as a whole.

This model of residential stress, while dealing with only a narrow range of stimuli and events, tries to maintain
ties to a broader notion of stress. It allows the examination of the interpretation and response to stress at many different levels of functioning. The model does not preclude the examination of different functions, but rather allows this type of investigation to occur. This model's usefulness will need to be determined through empirical testing and development.
The model of residential stress developed in the previous chapter will provide a framework for testing the proposition that stress is, or can be, a useful analytical base for studying residential mobility.

**Review of the Literature**

Rossi (1955) suggested that people decide to move based on their dissatisfaction with housing characteristics. Important in his analysis is the idea of needs of the household, or householder characteristics as they relate to housing. Mobility was considered a process by which housing was adjusted to the housing needs, which are being modified by life-cycle changes. In this respect, Rossi was considering the 'push' factors of housing, those forces that encourage the household to change locations.

Dissatisfaction with the residential environment was further discussed by Speare (1974). He concluded that residential satisfaction was a key determinant in whether a person moves or stays in a particular location. This satis-
faction was dependent on household characteristics, the location of the unit, and social bonds of the household. Changes that occurred in any of these areas could lead to dissatisfaction with the residential environment, and hence a desire to move.

A model of residential mobility incorporating a stress concept was introduced by Wolpert (1966). Wolpert considered stress to mean noxious or potentially noxious environmental forces which impinge on the individual. The individual's reactions to these forces, termed strain, are mediated by his background and personality factors. Individuals differ in their ability to alter or control stress forces in order to achieve some harmony with their environment. Moving was considered by Wolpert as a mechanism by which individuals or households under stress avoided the consequences of remaining in that location.

Brown and Moore (1971) further developed this stress-strain notion. They suggest that the disparity between collective needs of the household and characteristics or attributes of the environment give rise to stressful conditions. Under stress conditions a household or individual has several alternatives in order to reduce disparities. These are: a) adjust needs of the household; b) alter the environment so that household needs are better met; or c) relocate in
another place which better satisfies needs of the household. Under the Brown and Moore analysis of residential mobility, moving to a new location is only one of a number of decisions that could be made in order to reduce the stressful situation for a household.

Building on the Brown and Moore model, Clark and Cadwallader (1973) and Clark (1975) developed a model of locational stress. Locational stress was conceived as the difference or disparity between the satisfaction a household receives at one location, and that which it perceives it could receive at another location. The stress producing factors considered important by these researchers were: a) aspects of the dwelling; b) characteristics and relative location of the neighborhood; and c) quality of the physical environment.

The notion of stress or imbalance between the household and environment has been used for a number of years in dealing with residential mobility. However, there has been only limited agreement as to the nature of stress or the factors which mediate its occurrence. These issues will be explored in this research.
Objectives for Research

The purpose of this research is to provide a situation to judge the adequacy of the proposed comprehensive model of human stress. The model, developed in detail in chapter two, proposes that humans will respond in a problem-solving capacity when confronted with an uncomfortable situation. However, if the model is to prove useful in furthering understanding on this topic, it must be capable of being used for investigative research. A model that is not capable of being operationalized, no matter how closely it approximates reality, will do little to advance our knowledge of human response to stress. The model needs to be used and judged in situations drawn from actual living conditions.

A number of hypotheses have been derived from this model. These hypotheses are suggested by the nature of the model, or are based on what appears to be logical consequences of the model. If the model is capable of explaining residential stress in this circumstance, then perhaps it is capable of explaining stress in other cases. The hypotheses examine the effectiveness of the model in handling actual situations, to determine if the model has merit in conceptualizing stress. The hypotheses are not intended to assess the intrinsic logical development of the model, but rather, are intended
to provide an evaluative tool for judging the adequacy of the model in explaining stress. The objectives of this research are pragmatic in nature.

The four hypotheses used are aimed at different parts of the model. They are only samples of the type of focuses that could have been used. Figure 4 illustrates the aspects of the model investigated by the individual hypotheses.

The following hypotheses were generated and used.

Hypothesis #1. Stress inducing stimuli are not of equal importance. Some types of stressors are more important in inducing a change in residence than others.

While it is recognized that a large number of factors will be important in promoting a change in location, not all will likely be of outstanding importance. For example, characteristics of the neighbourhood have been suggested as an important source of disturbing stimuli. Stegman (1969) maintains that these factors are much more important than accessibility factors in creating dissatisfaction. Clark and Cadwallader (1973) also gave considerable importance to this factor. However, the study by 'icholson (1977), in Toronto, found that the neighbourhood conditions were only one aspect of a number of factors and were not of singular importance.
FIGURE FOUR: FOCUS OF HYPOTHESES
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One area in which most researchers agree is the importance of the characteristics of the dwelling unit in yielding dissatisfaction and promoting residential mobility. In their examination of residential mobility, Clark and Cadwallader (1973: 30) state that "stress due to the size and facilities of the dwelling unit appears to be the most important factor". This finding was confirmed by Clark in 1975. M. H. Turan (1973), in dealing with the housing environment, identified a number of situations which will contribute to stress within the family unit because of characteristics of the dwelling itself. Michelson (1977) identified dwelling unit characteristics as prominent push factors in encouraging residential mobility.

The relation of home to workplace has long been considered important in mobility studies (Kain, 1962). It has been suggested that people will change their residence in order to minimize the distance they will have to travel in order to get to work. A change in work location will result in a change in residence. However, not all research supports this contention. For example, R.P. Boyce (1971: 339) maintains:

Most studies of residential mobility have dealt with the relation of home to workplace and the results indicate that residence change within cities has little to do with a change in workplace. Instead, residential change appears to be highly voluntary (i.e., strictly speaking, unnecessary) and to be triggered by discontent with the present neighbourhood or house. The basic force seems to be "push" rather than a "pull" feature...
Recent work by Michelson (1977) indicates that distance to work may be of some importance but certainly there is little agreement on the importance of this factor.

This research will attempt to determine the relative importance of the above sources of stress in the consideration of residential mobility.

Hypothesis #2. Changes in the life-cycle of a household are relatively unimportant in promoting residential change.

Rossi (1955) suggested that moving was a way of adjusting the housing to the changes that are taking place to the family unit. Changes in family structure occur as a result of recent additions to the family, family members leaving, and so on. However, this explanation does not take into account much higher rates of mobility shown by renters (Boyce, 1971). It seems probable that many renters move without the impetus of changing family structure or size. Under the stress notion employed in this model, there are many other factors which could be considered of equal or greater importance in causing renters to change their residence. For example, the inability to deal with the neighbours, lack of privacy in the dwelling, concern for the safety of children, or even the high rental cost. These other concerns cannot be ignored
by the household, and may be contributing sources of stress. Particularly with renters, who have relatively weak ties to a residential unit, these other sources of stimuli may well be more influential in generating move than the changes that occur in the family unit. Because of the multitude of other possible stress sources, this second hypothesis suggests that life-cycle changes will not be as important as indicated by earlier researchers.

Hypothesis #3. Problem-solving attempts will take place, except in those circumstances where the problem is viewed as being insolvable, or too costly for the household.

Under the model proposed in chapter two, the individual (or household) may detect and appraise a situation as threatening or uncomfortable. In this case, a response to the problem is called for which will reduce the effects of the situation. However, what if the person (or household) cannot conceive of a solution to the problem? Or if they can conceive of a solution, perceives it as being too costly to implement? In these cases, no active response may take place. The individual (or household) could then be considered in a condition of stress since the threatening situation has not been countered and the system remains in an unbalanced condition.
Within the context of a residential mobility stress model, this non-reaction to a problem is easy to see. There are some conditions which are simply beyond the means of the household's ability to handle. For example, the family cannot enlarge the actual size of the dwelling, or cannot single-handedly change the ethnic or social make-up of the neighbourhood. In these situations, the family cannot make an effective problem-solving attempt. It may, however, under the conditions of the model, make an attempt to cope with stressful conditions, and so partially avoid the situation.

Hypothesis #4. Moving is a coping mechanism, the result of a stressful residential situation.

The notion of stress, as considered in this research paper, maintains that stress occurs as a result of the non-mastery of disturbing conditions. If the individual or household is unable to achieve a comfortable or harmonious relationship with its environment, then it is forced to exert extra energy and resources in order to maintain a reasonable level of functioning. The extra energy and resources required is termed "stress". Since the individual or household cannot master the situation, it cannot reduce the stress. It is left to find ways of coping with the stress.

Coping does not solve problems. It may, temporarily,
reduce the effects of the stressful condition, but it does not eliminate the source of the stress. For example, if your neighbour is an ardent tuba player, and insists on practicing at two a.m., successful mastery of the situation would occur when the neighbour ceases playing. The source of the aggravation has been eliminated. However, if the neighbour refused to stop, and you decided your best alternative was to wear ear plugs, then you would be coping with a stressful situation. The tuba player becomes a source of aggravation, and the ear plugs a coping mechanism.

People in high-rise apartments conceivably have a number of coping mechanisms at their disposal. Ear plugs has been suggested as one. Also available would be actions such as excessive use of alcohol and drugs, withdrawal from neighbours, psychosomatic illnesses, aggressive behavior and so on. These are devices aimed not at alleviating the problem situation, but at reducing effects of the situation. Moving to a new residence may also be included in the list of coping behaviors. It is aimed at reducing the impact of the stress situation rather than solving it. Moving away would eliminate the need for ear plugs; however, the tuba player would play on!

These four hypotheses will be tested in order to determine the utility of the stress concept in residential mobility studies.
Data Collection

The sample for this research was drawn from Vernon's Directory of London, a publication which lists names and addresses of residents. By comparing the 1977 and 1978 directories, it is possible to identify people who had moved within the past year but still resided in the city of London. By identifying "recent" movers it was possible to question them about the reasons for their move while those reasons were reasonably fresh in their minds, avoiding some of the problems of memory decay.

The sample consisted of people who had recently moved from a high-rise apartment, which they rented, to new rental accommodations within the city. The sample was restricted to renters in order to reduce the variation within the sample. Speare (1974) indicates that there are considerable differences in the desire to change residences between renters and owners of housing units. Households who own a housing unit are much more likely to have a stronger commitment to the housing unit than those who rent. For this reason, the sample was restricted to renters.

High-rise apartment buildings (over seven stories) were used for the initial residential unit because they are easily
identified in field research. Traverses of London yielded a list of high-rise buildings as candidates. These buildings were further investigated using the city directory to determine that they were over seven stories in height. In the final analysis, 25 apartment buildings were involved, primarily, but not exclusively, located on Wonderland Road, Cherryhill Boulevard, Kipp's Lane and Adelaide Street (see Appendix A). Restricting the sample to high-rise dwellers also assured that the sample had experienced similar physical environmental conditions prior to the move under investigation.

In addition, the sample was restricted to those households where the head could reasonably be termed a "blue collar" worker. Management and professional people were not used in order to roughly categorize the sample by income. Hopefully this restriction reduced the variations in income for the sample, giving a more uniform level of resources available for coping and problem-solving.

A two-stage approach was used to select the sample following the initial identification of households who had recently moved from a high-rise into other rental accommodations. In all, about 400 potential households were identified. The "recent movers" were contacted by telephone and the purpose of the call was explained. The people were then
asked a series of questions concerning occupation, length of time in the present residence, form of tenure, and so on. If the respondents matched the previously established criteria they were asked to complete a questionnaire which would be mailed to them (stamped, self-addressed return envelope included). About three hundred and twenty-five people were contocted following this scheme. Of this number, 117 households met the criteria. A total of 52 usable questionnaires were returned from a single mailing to 76 households. Forty-one people refused to participate in the questionnaire portion of the data collection. A final sample size of 52 was used because of the time constraints involved in selecting other possible candidates.

A copy of the questionnaire and covering letter used in the survey is included as Appendix P. A small pre-test was used in the development of this final version.

The questionnaire was designed to be used to evaluate the model, and the questions probe various aspects of household's behavior in order to relate it to the stress model. Questions one through fourteen gather background and residential information about the respondents. The answers include demographic information, past and present forms of tenure, and household sizes. Questions fifteen and sixteen provide opportunities for the respondent to identify what they
had not liked about the previous home, and why they moved. The detection stage of the model was probed by question seventeen, which attempts to determine the extent to which conditions of the dwelling are appraised prior to renting.

Question eighteen indicates the strength of the response to problems, and tries to demonstrate that moving is a coping mechanism to deal with ineffective problem-solving behavior. Number nineteen shows what the respondent would have expected if the problem-solving attempt had been successful. Questions twenty and twenty-one deal with the present dwelling of the respondent. These questions try to determine if problem-solving is necessary in the new location, and if moving is still considered an alternative to remaining in the current dwelling.

The data collection for this research was undertaken during June, July and August of 1978.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH ANALYSIS

This research was conducted in order to examine the usefulness of using a model of residential mobility based on the concept of stress and problem-solving. The sample consisted of 52 respondents, of which 55.7% were female. Sixty-three percent of the sample were married, 25% were single, and 11.5% considered themselves as "other". Figure 5 illustrates the distribution of ages for the sample. Over 63% of the sample were between 20 and 39 years of age. The stated occupations are shown in Figure 6. While the selection process excluded managerial and professional people, the returned questionnaires indicated that four respondents felt they most appropriately belonged in those categories. These returns were included in the analysis since, in the opinion of the researcher, the occupations given during the telephone interview were more appropriately placed in other acceptable categories. The average length of residence, since the move from the high-rise apartment, was 8.92 months. The breakdown according to number of months in residence is shown in Figure 7.

The following analysis is intended to be as comprehensive
Figure 5: Age distribution of the sample

Figure 6: Occupations of the sample
Figure 7: Length of Time in New Residence

N = 52
as possible. However, due to the small sample size, and the exploratory nature of the research, the statistical analysis was unsophisticated. The analysis will attempt to identify possible relationships and show the potential of the stress concept. This is not intended as a definitive statement on the subject, but rather as an explorative preliminary investigation.

Hypothesis Number One

Stress inducing stimuli are not of equal importance. Some types of stressors are more important in inducing a change in residence than others.

Hypothesis number one maintains that not all threatening stimuli will have the same weight or importance for the household. Some stimuli or classes of stimuli will be more instrumental in promoting a move than will others, although many stimuli may be identified as being threatening, or requiring some problem-solving action. The discussion in the previous chapter identified several areas that have received attention by other researchers. In general terms, three categories can be formed. These are: a) location or accessibility factors; b) characteristics of the dwelling unit; and c) characteristics of the building and neighborhood. This hypothesis was developed in order to investigate the
"demand" and "detection/appraisal" stages of the comprehensive model of human stress developed in chapter two.

Respondents were asked to list in order of importance those things which they did not like about their previous home (question #15). This question was open-ended and allowed the respondent to reply as openly as possible, and in terms of relative importance. This question identified those areas of concerns which promoted the greatest dissatisfaction for the household. The results of the question fell into 12 categories, with these categories grouped according to the three broad areas identified above. Table 1 shows the results obtained using this grouping method and the ranking by level of importance.

From the table it is immediately obvious that "location or accessibility factors" are not of significant importance in determining if people like their home. The "characteristics of the dwelling unit" were of more importance, particularly for the number one rank in importance. The broad grouping of "characteristics of the building and neighborhood" received the highest weighting in all three levels of importance. Superficially, this would indicate that stimuli originating from outside the dwelling unit itself are of greater importance in stimulating dissatisfaction with the residence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of Building and Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Importance Rank 1</th>
<th>Importance Rank 2</th>
<th>Importance Rank 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike of Neighbours</td>
<td>9/12</td>
<td>8/23</td>
<td>26/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Style</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>1/23</td>
<td>1/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>1/23</td>
<td>28/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>5/12</td>
<td>0/23</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints about Building Maintenance</td>
<td>3/12</td>
<td>0/23</td>
<td>2/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints about Management</td>
<td>4/12</td>
<td>0/23</td>
<td>5/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>4/23</td>
<td>1/23</td>
<td>4/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>4/23</td>
<td>12/23</td>
<td>4/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate Size of Dwelling</td>
<td>1/23</td>
<td>2/23</td>
<td>7/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot/Cold Light/Dark</td>
<td>5/12</td>
<td>2/12</td>
<td>1/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>5/12</td>
<td>2/12</td>
<td>1/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                                        | TOTAL             | TOTAL             | TOTAL             |
| Privacy                                      | 4/23              | 1/23              | 4/23              |
| Rent                                         | 4/23              | 12/23             | 4/23              |
| Inappropriate Size of Dwelling                | 1/23              | 2/23              | 7/23              |
| Hot/Cold Light/Dark                          | 5/12              | 2/12              | 1/12              |
| Accessibility                                 | 5/12              | 2/12              | 1/12              |
However, if we examine individual categories, we find some interesting features. The category "inappropriate size of dwelling" accounted for almost 33% of all first rank responses, or 16 out of 52 questionnaires returned. This is almost twice as high as the next most identified category. The table also shows that this importance is not continued throughout remaining levels of importance, dropping down to 2 out of 41 responses in the second rank, and 1 of 25 in the third. From this information we could speculate that the size of dwelling, particularly if the dwelling is too small, is of considerable importance or intensity. If the dwelling is not of an adequate size for the household, this inadequacy assumes a great importance, ranking foremost in the minds of the family. It rarely assumes a secondary position.

The category "dislike of neighbors" shows up as an important area. This category was second in terms of responses for rank #1 and first for the remaining two ranks. It accounted for 19.8% of all responses, more than any other category. Since it has a high level of importance throughout all three ranks, it appears to be an important factor in causing dissatisfaction. However, it does not appear to match the importance ascribed to the "inappropriate size of dwelling" category. It is often a factor in a household's dissatisfaction, but need not be the most important factor.
Dissatisfaction was expressed by respondents about the management and maintenance of high-rise apartments. These two categories were third and fourth in terms of overall responses and indicate the influence of landlords and superintendents in establishing dissatisfaction with a housing unit. These two categories accounted for a total of 23.3\% of the total responses, and were generally strong at all three ranks. They appear to be important, but without a strong intensity or overwhelming significance. They are often cited as factors, but are not always considered the most important factor.

The respondents were asked to complete a check list of reasons why they moved. This question (number 16) was a closed type of question meant to confirm responses given in question 15. Respondents checked as many "reasons" as they felt appropriate. Table 2 shows the distribution of responses, grouped according to the system established in Table 1. From this table we see that "location" factors are again relatively unimportant while the other two groups are more significant. In this case, the groups "characteristics of dwelling" and "characteristics of building and neighborhood" are about equal. Unfortunately, the large "other" component could not be categorized and so weakens the conclusions that can be drawn from this data. Nevertheless, this information
Table 2: Reasons Given for Moving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location or Accessibility</th>
<th>Location or Accessibility</th>
<th>Location or Accessibility</th>
<th>Location or Accessibility</th>
<th>Location or Accessibility</th>
<th>Location or Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance from work</td>
<td>Distance from social group</td>
<td>Distance from relatives</td>
<td>Distance from friends</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/136</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>4/136</td>
<td>13/136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics of Dwelling Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Too Small</th>
<th>Too Large</th>
<th>Rent Too High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/136</td>
<td>19/136</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>13/136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics of Building and Neighbourhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unlikely Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Poor Maintenance</th>
<th>Landlord Problems</th>
<th>Location to City</th>
<th>Wanted Rural Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
does tend to confirm that size of dwelling, neighborhood, and management are important stimuli for a change in residence.

It appears that the information supports the hypothesis as stated. There is evidence to suggest that not all threatening stimuli or conditions have the same strength or importance in causing dissatisfaction. Characteristics of the building and/or neighbourhood seem to be, in general, the most important. Particularly significant components of this category are the dislike or intolerance of the neighbors, the dislike or intolerance of the management personnel, and a dissatisfaction with the building maintenance. Other conditions mentioned, but of lesser importance, are the degree of satisfaction with parking and recreation facilities, concerns for the safety of the household in the dwelling, and the like or dislike of the high-rise form of accommodation.

Characteristics of the dwelling unit appear to be of lesser importance in causing dissatisfaction. However, the importance of the size of the dwelling in relation to the needs of the household appears to be a significant aspect. Dissatisfaction with the size of the dwelling must be viewed as a major factor in causing dissatisfaction with the dwelling unit as a whole. Certainly in this study, concerns
over the size of the unit far outweigh concerns over the monetary cost of the unit, or the degree of privacy felt. Factors dealing with location or accessibility were found to have little importance in causing dissatisfaction.

Hypothesis Number Two

Changes in the life-cycle of a household are relatively unimportant in promoting residential change.

From the above, it would seem that concern for the amount of space available in a dwelling is a significant generator of dissatisfaction with the dwelling. We could speculate that one important cause of changing space demands is the changing life-cycles of the occupants. For example, the birth of children, death of a householder, moving away of offspring, and so on. In this study, the relatively young sample, well into the child-bearing years, would seem to be candidates for pressure for additional space due to increasing family sizes. However, a household comes under the influence of a great number of other conditions in daily life. By comparison, we might suggest changes as a result of changing family structure are overshadowed by these other conditions.

The background information obtained from the sample
indicated that 11 households had changed size about the time of the move from the high-rise apartment. Seventy-eight percent of the sample showed no change in the size of the household, at least at the time of the move. It is interesting to note that of the households who indicated size of dwelling was a factor in the move, there were more households which the family size did not change, than where the family size actually did change. However, of the respondents who underwent a change in the size of the family unit, most indicated that space was an important consideration in the move (9 households out of 11). Table three illustrates this relationship. A Chi-square test on the relationship of changing family size and the importance of size of dwelling showed a level of significance of .001 (Chi-square = 12.34). From this test, it seems that changing family size is likely to lead to a relocation because of the pressures of accommodating the size of the dwelling to the needs of the family. In other words, the level of significance of the Chi-square test supports the observation that changing family size is associated with residential mobility. Therefore, we must suggest that this finding tends to negate the hypothesis since it had indicated that other factors would likely be more important in residential mobility.

It is possible that the sample selection mediated against the production of a conclusion favourable to the hypothesis.
### TABLE 3: CHANGE IN FAMILY SIZE AND SPACE REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dwelling Size a Factor in Move</th>
<th>Dwelling Size Not a Factor in Move</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change in</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N=52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The small numbers involved make statistical analysis difficult in this study. Also, it may well be that many people who move as a result of changing family cycle, especially younger families, buy a home rather than move to another rental unit. In this case, they would have been eliminated from the sample.

However, in spite of the negative results in this instance, the model does not appear to be at fault. Changing family size and life cycle characteristics could be easily incorporated into the model and used to explain the occurrence of stress in households. These changes fall within the realm of "individual factors" represented in the model. These factors influence the formation of stress, and the ability to cope, within the individual or household.

Hypothesis Number Three

Problem-solving attempts will take place, except in those circumstances where the problem is viewed as being unsoluble, or too costly for the household to attempt to solve.

The comprehensive model of stress employed in this research maintains that failure at problem-solving will result in stressful conditions. According to the model, we also consider the inability or refusal to attempt problem-
solving as a failure. People in uncomfortable residential situations may or may not attempt to solve an obvious problem based on their perception of the problem. If a problem is perceived as being too costly for the household to respond to, or simply perceived as insoluble, no actual problem-solving attempt may take place. The household, since it has not mastered the problem, is placed in a stress position.

Question #18 asked the respondents if they had attempted to improve the conditions they found uncomfortable in their home, and what their solution attempts had been. This question aims at the "response" stage of the model of human stress. Twenty-two respondents indicated that they had attempted some problem-solving actions. Table 4 shows the problems for which respondents indicated they had tried to find solutions. It is interesting to note that only 5 of the 22 indicated the problem was related to the dwelling unit. The poor condition of the unit was cited by 4 of the 5 people. Most of the problems were identified as being external to the dwelling. Frequently attacked were the condition of the buildings (8/22) and neighbors of the respondents (6/22).

Actions taken by respondents are listed in Table 4. Most of these actions could be classified as complaints or petitions made to management personnel. There were no cases in which the respondents indicated they actively became
TABELE 4: PROBLEM SOLVING ATTEMPTS

PROBLEMS ATTEMPTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Attempts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor building maintenance</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints about neighborhood</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor condition of unit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor parking facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTIONS TAKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Attempts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complaints to management re: maintenance</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints to management re: neighbors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints to management re: unit improvements</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints to management re: parking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees, petitions, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHY MOVE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Attempts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No action by management</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective action by management</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(N=22\)
involved in building maintenance or unit improvement. Of the reasons given for moving even after the problem-solving attempt, the failure by management to take action was most common (16 of the 22 respondents). Ineffective action by management was cited by the remainder.

Table 5 is a listing by rank of the problems that respondents did not try to solve. It is significant that 50% of the respondents who did not try to solve the problems reported they disliked the inappropriate size of the dwelling.

The above information shows that people attempted to solve some of their problems. We can assume the respondents identified these as problems which they felt they could change. They thought that they had the resources and energy to alleviate the threatening situations. However, their attempts were thwarted by actions, or inactions, of the people who manage high-rise apartments. In this way, the problem-solving attempts were failures and the respondents were faced with stress situations.

Some of the problems did not warrant attempts at solution. The most important problem here seems to be the inappropriate size of the dwelling, or more specifically, the cramped and crowded conditions in the dwellings. The respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Rank</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Importance of Characteristics of Building and Neighbourhood

N = 30
indicated that this was a situation that could only be overcome by moving. Frequent comments about this lack of space were "What could we do?", "There was nothing that could be done!", and so on. Respondents considered this a major problem that had no solution, at least within the bounds of their resources.

This analysis tends to confirm the third hypothesis as stated.

Hypothesis Number Four

Moving is a coping mechanism, the result of a stressful residential situation.

All of the recent movers included in the sample for this study identified reasons for moving from their high-rise dwelling. All respondents indicated characteristics of their home, neighborhood, or location that had caused them concern. No one in the sample who had moved could find no fault with their past dwelling. It would seem that households had moved in order to get away from the problems they had encountered in their high-rise dwelling. It would seem these people were moving because of stressful or uncomfortable situations, and therefore, their moving could be interpreted as a coping mechanism.
The fact that households are able to identify problems indicates that stress conditions are likely present. The analysis of hypothesis number three showed that many people made no attempt to deal with these problems, and were placed in a stress position. Those who attempted to deal with the problems had all been unsuccessful in alleviating them, and were also placed in a stress position.

The sample generally recognized moving as a way of dealing with dissatisfaction. Of the 52 respondents, 45 indicated in question #20 that they would move out of their present dwelling if they were not satisfied. Only 4 of the 52 said they would be unwilling to move. This indicates that moving is a method of dealing with dissatisfaction recognized by the sample. Moving is a method of coping with dissatisfaction and stress, according to the residents.

However, we must face the fact that the sample was selected from recent movers. How did the households who did not move cope with problems? Are their coping mechanisms different? Why was moving not selected by these people? These questions should be asked, and should be studied. However, these avenues of study are beyond the scope of this research effort.
General Discussion

From the foregoing analysis of the questionnaire results, we can draw a number of broad conclusions.

The influence of conditions and events external to the actual dwelling unit seem to have an important impact on renters. These external events were an important source of dissatisfaction. Residents seem particularly upset by neighbours around them and the condition of the neighbourhood in general. Of considerably less importance was the concern for facilities or amenities of the building. Apart from neighbourhood conditions, the size of the dwelling in relation to the needs of the household was a significant determinant of stress. People seem intensely aware of the fact that their home was too large or too small. People who thought their place was too small decided there was little they could do except move. These people made few attempts at dealing with the problem in situ. People who did try to make changes in the problems confronting them seemed to be frustrated by the management personnel of high-rise buildings. The management holds the power to make a dwelling a "nice" or comfortable place to live for tenants. If the management is not cooperative the tenants may be placed in a stressful position.

People say that they move because they are not satisfied
with their circumstances. Moving is a way of eliminating problems or uncomfortable circumstances. Many of the people moved because the places were too small. Many moved because other conditions became too oppressive, and there was no sign of their rectification. People move seeking a better balance between themselves and their environment.

The intent of this research was to examine the usefulness of employing a stress notion in studying residential mobility. Does it work? Four hypotheses examined aspects of the demand, detection/appraisal, response, and coping stages of the model. Admittedly, any number of hypotheses could have been generated and operationalized from any perspective using the model. However, these four have shown the adaptability of the stress concept.

The model was able to incorporate a number of behaviours and decisions by movers. It was not restricted to the idea that all threatening conditions need be considered stressful. It allowed scope for reaction to uncomfortable conditions and problem-solving behaviors by the residents. It views residents as thinking, reacting people rather than simple recipients of external stimuli.

This model offers explanations for the moving behavior
of households. It does not rely on simple ideas such as the change in life-cycle of the residents, or change in work place. While the model will incorporate these ideas as well, it goes beyond them to look at a multitude of alternative conditions which could be responsible for residential mobility. In this way, it is a more comprehensive, inclusive model of residential mobility.

In addition to explaining why people change residences, this model also offers explanations as to why people do not move. The model accepts the differences between people and households and their ability to deal with conditions in their environment. Not moving, as with moving, is simply a reaction to the conditions under which the residents find themselves. It is the result of their abilities, and resources, applied to the circumstances of their environment.

This model appears to be of considerable use in dealing with residential mobility. The important attraction, of course, is its comprehensive nature. Residential stress may be viewed within a framework of a much broader notion of human stress. In addition, other conditions and aspects of human stress may be considered within the bound of the same comprehensive model. This will allow meaningful
comparison of results of research to take place, and lead to generalizations about stress and coping behaviors in people.
From the foregoing discussion, it appears as if there is merit to the model of residential stress. The findings of this study showed the usefulness of the comprehensive model of stress detailed in chapter two. However, there are some important considerations which should be made clear.

Limitations of the Study

This research dealt with people who rented their dwelling unit. They were selected because they tend to move more frequently and, therefore, there was a larger potential population from which to sample. In addition, it was assumed that renters would be better subjects for a residential mobility study since they tend to have less commitment to a dwelling unit than owners. However, the conclusions drawn from this study may not be appropriately generalized to the population as a whole. Differences between renters and owners may be too great.

Owners will likely respond to stress in different ways than renters. For instance, if a renter decides to move, the
financial considerations are small, perhaps the rental of a vehicle for a few hours. However, when an owner decides to move, the financial considerations become much more involved. There are real estate fees, lawyer fees, public utility payments, and so on, that must be paid. The financial considerations could easily make moving too costly for the household, and make in situ adjustments necessary.

Owners have a greater opportunity to adjust the physical characteristics of the dwelling unit. It is possible for them to build additions, change partitions, adjust the interior or exterior characteristics of the home, while renters are not able to do so. In this respect, "characteristics of the dwelling" may be even of less importance in promoting a move among those who own a dwelling. However, moving because of life-cycle changes may be more closely tied to owners than to renters. Owners tend to remain in a residence longer, and indeed may change only when the home becomes too big or too small for the family. The adjustment in situ by the owners is a method of coping with stress, or solving the dissatisfaction altogether. A gross imbalance between the size of the dwelling and the needs of the household will eventually have to be solved by moving.

Other coping mechanisms were not dealt with in this
study. This research dealt specifically with households who had moved as a result of stress in the housing environment. We must accept, however, that many households did not move and yet may be experiencing stress in the housing environment to one degree or another. These households have found other coping mechanisms, and this study is unable to make comments on the type of mechanism used, or their effectiveness in relieving tension. Indeed, it is impossible to indicate even the proportion of people who are experiencing stress and opt for a change in location. Information of this kind was beyond the scope of this study.

Care must be taken with the conclusions drawn from this study. The sample was selected using a number of criteria, and is therefore not representative of all residents, or even all renters. The purpose of the study was not to make sweeping statements about all aspects of residential mobility, but rather to apply the model of stress to residential mobility studies.

We must consider the lengthy lag between the actual move, and the questionnaire responses to the move. While every attempt was made to reduce the time between the actual move and the administration of the survey, the time lag still remained large. This lag reduces the reliability of the
responses by the residents. Their memories become distorted and the situation may be perceived in a somewhat altered manner. However, given this potential limitation, the responses are believed to be reasonably accurate accounts of the situations at the time of the moves.

Where Do We Go From Here?

This research used a stress notion within the limited perspective of a residential mobility study. It attempted to move away from the very restrictive stress ideas that appear in residential mobility research, and towards a more comprehensive stress model capable of accommodating many areas of stress and stress research. This study was successful from the point of view of accommodating the analysis into the theoretical framework. However, this study was only intended to provide a preliminary framework for the further development of the stress model.

In order for this model to be further developed, it needs to be examined and applied in a number of other situations. This research dealt only with a very limited number of factors, and, because of scale limitations, ignored the others. Research is necessary to examine the effect of individual factors and characteristics on the appraisal and response
to uncomfortable situations in a more detailed fashion. Another area of potentially valuable research is the further exploration of coping and coping mechanisms. This study dealt only with moving as a coping mechanism, but coping has many other facets which could yield valuable insight into the stress/coping relationship.

This research study was reasonably successful in applying the conceptual model to a study of residential mobility. However, its limited perspective leads to far more questions, and opens more avenues of potential research, than it solves. The research was intended to be exploratory, and to this end it is considered a success. This is an area of research that has only begun to be explored. Many answers lie in the future.
APPENDIX A

LIST OF APARTMENTS BUILDINGS USED IN THIS STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Location</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th># of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1132 Adelaide St., N.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>112 Arbour Glen Cres.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>112 Baseline Rd., W.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>301 Baseline Rd., W.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10 Beechwood Place,</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>105 Cherryhill Blvd.,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>120 Cherryhill Blvd.,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>140 Cherryhill Blvd.,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>180 Cherryhill Blvd.,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>130 Connaught Ave.,</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>754 Kipp's Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>848 Kipp's Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>368 Oxford St.,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>396 Queen St.,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1265 Richmond St.,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>380 Southdale Rd., E.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>390 Southdale Rd., E.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>291 Windermere Rd.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>740 Wonderland Rd.,</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>760 Wonderland Rd.,</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>780 Wonderland Rd.,</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>924 Wonderland Rd.,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>951 Wonderland Rd.,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>955 Wonderland Rd.,</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>961 Wonderland Rd.,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Households = 52
Dear

I have included a copy of my questionnaire investigating why people move to new homes within the city. Thank you very much for agreeing to participate. Please be assured that a very high level of confidentiality with respect to your answers will be maintained. You may use the enclosed, stamped envelope to mail the completed questionnaire to me. Again, thank you for your help.

Yours truly,

Graham A. Draper
This questionnaire is being used to investigate why people move to new homes. Your cooperation would be appreciated. Please answer the questions as accurately and completely as possible.

1. Sex: ( ) Male ( ) Female

2. Marital Status: ( ) Single ( ) Married ( ) Other

3. Age: ( ) 19 or less ( ) 40-49
   ( ) 20-29 ( ) 50-59
   ( ) 30-39 ( ) 60+

4. Occupation: ( ) Industrial
   ( ) Sales
   ( ) Managerial
   ( ) Professional
   ( ) Construction
   ( ) Domestic
   ( ) Other (Specify: ____________)

5. Your present residence is: ( ) Detached
   ( ) Semi-detached
   ( ) Town house
   ( ) Apartment
   ( ) Other (Specify: ____________)

6. Number of adults living in your present home: ______

7. Number of children living in your present home: ______

8. Length of time at your present address: ______ months

9. Do you own: ( ) Own
   ( ) Rent
   ( ) Other (Specify: ____________)

10. Your previous residence was: ( ) Detached
    ( ) Semi-detached
    ( ) Town house
    ( ) Apartment
    ( ) Other (Specify: ____________)

11. Number of adults who lived in your previous home: ______

12. Number of children who lived in your previous home: ______

13. Length of time at your previous address: ______ months

14. Did you: ( ) Own
    ( ) Rent
    ( ) Other (Specify: ____________)

...
15. What things did you not like about your previous home?  
(List in order of importance.)

1. ____________________________

2. ____________________________

3. ____________________________

4. ____________________________

16. Here is a list of reasons others have given for moving out of their former residences. Which apply to you?

( ) Disliked neighbourhood
( ) Disliked school for my children
( ) Disliked some particular characteristic of the home
( ) Housing too small
( ) Housing too large
( ) Long distance from work
( ) Long distance from church or social group
( ) Long distance from relatives
( ) Long distance from friends
( ) Rent too high
( ) Poor maintenance
( ) Landlord problems
( ) Forced to move
( ) Wanted country or rural setting
( ) Other

17. Were you aware of some of the things that bothered you about your last home before you moved in?  ( ) Yes  ( ) No

If yes, what were these things?

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

18. Before you decided to move out of your last home, did you try to change the things that were bothering you?  ( ) Yes  ( ) No

If yes, what did you try to do?

________________________________________

Why did you still decide to move?

________________________________________

If no, why did you not try to change things?

________________________________________
19. What changes would have had to have been made before you would have stayed in your former residence?


20. If you find you are not satisfied with your present home, will you move?
   ( ) Yes   ( ) No

21. What are some things you might do to increase your satisfaction with your present home?


Thank you for your cooperation.


Turan, M.H. (1973) "Environmental Stress and Flexibility in the Housing Process", in Preiser, W.F.E. Environmental Design Research, 4th EDRA Conference, 47-58