Negative microfilm 63–4972
received from university

JITODAI, Ted Teruo, 1928–
MIGRATION, MOBILITY AND SOCIAL PARTICIPATION.

University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1963
Sociology, general

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

MIGRATION, MOBILITY AND SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

by
Ted Teruo Jitodai

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan
1962

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Ronald Freedman, Chairman
Associate Professor Charles F. Cannell
Assistant Professor David Goldberg
Professor Amos H. Hawley

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply grateful to Dr. Ronald Freedman, chairman of my committee, who originally suggested the topic and who gave valuable criticisms throughout the course of the study. I am also indebted to Dr. David Goldberg for his extremely helpful suggestions. The study benefited greatly from the help of Dr. Harry P. Sharp, former director of the Detroit Area Study, who helped compile and analyze the data. Dr. Amos H. Hawley contributed much with his critical reading and comments.

In the actual writing and typing of the dissertation, I wish to thank Mrs. Ernest Harburg and Mrs. Curt Tausky for some invaluable editing service. To Mrs. Richard O'Toole, who typed my dissertation, I give thanks for her kind consideration and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Types of Migration A Contrast of Urban and Rural Environments and Its Relationship to Migration Social Participation Relationships Between Migration and Types of Social Participation Hypotheses To Be Investigated	
II.	METHODOLOGY	30
	The Population Studied and the Sample A Typology of Migrants: Physical Movement and Mobility--Definitions and Measures Social Participation: Definitions and Measures The Importance of Controls Techniques of Analysis Summary	
III.	THE RELATIONSHIP OF MIGRANT STATUS TO FORMAL GROUP MEMBERSHIP	43
	Introduction Membership Rates With Controls For Sex, Socio-Economic Status, and Region The Effect of Length of Residence The Effects of Migrant Differentials on Socio-Economic Differences in Membership Rates Summary	
IV.	THE RELATIONSHIP OF MIGRANT STATUS TO VOTING.	70
	Introduction Migrant Differences in Voting Rates Socio-Economic Differences in Voting Rates Summary	

CHAPTER Page

V. THE RELATIONSHIP OF MIGRANT STATUS TO FREQUENCY OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE. 101

Introduction
The Findings
Interpretations of the Findings

VI. THE RELATIONSHIP OF MIGRANT STATUS TO INFORMAL GROUP PARTICIPATION. 122

Summary. 148

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 151

Relationship to Other Studies
Some Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Future Research
Some Broader Consequences of the Findings

APPENDIX 166

BIBLIOGRAPHY 177

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Percentage Who are in Each Socio-Economic Status, by Sex, by Migrant Type.	42
2.	Percentage Who are Formal Group Members Standardized for Age, By Sex, by Length of Residence	44
3.	Percentage Who are Formal Group Members, By Migrant Type, By Sex.	51
4.	Percentage Who are Formal Group Members, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status	52
5.	Percentage Who are Formal Group Members, Standardized for Socio-Economic Status, By Migrant Type, By Sex.	54
6.	Percentage of Rural Migrants Who are of Southern Origin, By Migrant Type	54
7.	Percentage Who are Formal Group Members, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Region of Origin .	56
8.	Percentage Who are Formal Group Members, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin.	57
9.	Percentage Who are Formal Group Members, Standardized for Socio-Economic Status, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Region of Origin. . .	58
10.	Percentage Who are Formal Group Members, Standardized for Age, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin, By Length of Residence.	61
11.	Socio-Economic Differences Among Northern Migrants in Formal Group Membership Rates, Standardized for Age, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Length of Residence.	70
12.	Socio-Economic Differences in Formal Group Membership Rates (Unstandardized) Between Upper White Collar and Blue Collar Northern Migrants By Migrant Type, By Sex	70

Table		Page
13.	Percentage Who Were Voters in Last National Elections, By Migrant Type, By Sex. .	78
14.	Percentage Who Were Voters in Last State Elections, By Migrant Type, By Sex	78
15.	Percentage Who Were Voters in Last National Elections, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Region of Origin.	79
16.	Percentage Who Were Voters in Last State Elections, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Region of Origin.	80
17.	Percentage Who Were Voters in Last National Elections, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin.	81
18.	Percentage Who Were Voters in Last State Elections, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin . .	82
19.	Percentage Who Were Voters in Last National Elections, Standardized for Socio-Economic Status, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Region of Origin.	83
20.	Percentage Who Were Voters in Last State Elections, Standardized for Socio-Economic Status, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Region of Origin	84
21.	Percentage Who Were Voters in Last National Elections, Standardized for Age, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin, By Length of Residence	85
22.	Percentage Who Were Voters in Last State Elections, Standardized for Age, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin, By Length of Residence . . .	87
23.	Percentage Who are Catholics, By Migrant Type	103
24.	Percentage Who Attend Church Frequently, By Migrant Type, By Sex.	103

Table		Page
25.	Percentage Who Attend Church Frequently, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Region of Origin .	104
26.	Percentage Who Attend Church Frequently, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin.	105
27.	Percentage Who Attend Church Frequently, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin, By Religion . . .	106
28.	Percentage Who Attend Church Frequently, Standardized for Religion, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Region of Origin.	107
29.	Percentage Who Attend Church Frequently, Standardized for Age, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Region of Origin, By Length of Residence.	108
30.	Percentage Who Attend Church Frequently, Standardized for Age, By Migrant Type, By Socio-Economic Status, By Religion, By Length of Residence.	110
31.	Percentage Differences in Church Attendance Rates Between Urban and Rural Migrants During the Initial Decade of Residence, By Socio-Economic Status, By Religion	111
32.	Percentage Who Have a High Number of Informal Contacts, Standardized for Age, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin, By Length of Residence.	126
33.	Percentage Who Have a High Number of Informal Group Contacts, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin, By Membership in Formal Groups	129
34.	Percentage Who Have Frequent Contacts With Friends, Standardized for Age, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin, By Length of Residence . . .	133

Table		Page
35.	Percentage Who Have Frequent Contacts With Neighbors, Standardized for Age, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin, By Length of Residence	135
36.	Percentage Who Have Frequent Contacts With Co-Workers, Standardized for Age, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin, By Length of Residence.	137
37.	Percentage Who Have Frequent Contacts with Relatives, Standardized for Age, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin, By Length of Residence . .	139
38.	Types of Informal Associations Ranked by Frequency of Participation, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Socio-Economic Status, By Region of Origin.	144
39.	Percentage Who Have Relatives in the Detroit Area, But Outside of Their Own Household, By Migrant Type, By Sex, By Length of Residence.	145
40.	Calculations of the Number of Unmarried Respondents Needed for Inclusion With the 1955 D.A.S. Sample	168
41.	Indirect Standardization For Age of Formal Group Membership Rates of Male, Blue Collar, Northern, Urban Migrants of Over 25 Years Residence.	176

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix		Page
A.	Weighting the Sample for Inclusion of the D.A.S. Sample.	167
B.	Interview Questions on Migration History and Social Participation. .	169
C.	Construction of an Index For Socio-Economic Status	173
D.	Indirect Standardization	174

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A distinctive feature of modern urban industrial societies is the great physical mobility of their populations. This mobility is associated with the high degree of specialization and the rapid rate of social change which create a demand for a mobile labor force to staff a complex and dynamic economic structure. Migration between communities or societies at any given time can be conceptualized as resulting from a lack of balance between the factors of population size, composition, and functional base. The interplay between these factors set the conditions of "push" for certain communities and "pull" for others. In simplest terms, streams of migrations flow in the direction of expanding opportunity from areas of contracting opportunity.

There have always been many different streams of migration to American cities. Throughout the nineteenth century there was considerable internal migration from rural areas to cities and from one city to another. However, internal migration flows were overshadowed in visibility, if not in amount, by the great waves of foreign migration which reached their peaks in the period 1875-1924. The foreign

migrants were so visible and created so many easily identifiable problems of integration and adjustment that relatively little attention was given to the internal migration occurring simultaneously.

Since the end of the great Atlantic migration, internal migration has become more visible and probably more frequent, both in relative and absolute terms. A rough indication of the volume of internal movement is that fourteen million persons lived in a different county in 1940 than their county of residence in 1935. This represents net inter-county movement of 13.5 per cent in a five year period. Of the urban population in 1940, 11.1 per cent or 8.3 million persons had been living in other counties, states, or countries in 1935. It has been estimated that not more than 10 to 15 per cent of the adult population live their entire lives within the same county. In every year from 1947 through 1958, 5 to 7 per cent of the population has made a residential change involving at least the crossing of a county boundary.[1]

Two streams of migration deserve special attention. First, there is the movement of people from rural to urban areas. This resulted from an interrelated pull and push. On the one hand, the natural growth in urban areas was not

---

[1]Donald J. Bogue, The Population of the United States (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1959), pp. 375-376; also, U.S., Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, Nos. 14, 61, 73, 82, 86.

large enough to fill the expanding number of functional roles in the cities--this created a pull. On the other hand, the rationalization of agriculture led to a decreasing need for manpower. Also, the rural areas had relatively high birth rates; and this factor, along with the decreasing need for manpower, contributed to a surplus population--this created the push. It has been estimated that between 1920 and 1945, forty-six and one-half million people departed from the farms for the cities.[1] Even during the decade between 1940 and 1950, approximately nine million persons migrated from the farms to urban and nonfarm areas.[2] The net cumulation of farm-reared migrants in urban places is indicated by the fact that in 1952 they constituted 33 per cent of the total adult urban population.[3]

Urban to urban movement has always been significant along with the rural-urban movement, but it is growing in relative importance because the greater functional interdependence between urban communities is calling for a greater mutual exchange of manpower, while the rural population has declined both relatively and absolutely as the source of

---

[1]T. Lynn Smith, "Rural-Urban Migration," in The Sociology of Urban Life, edited by T. Lynn Smith and C. A. McMahon (New York: Dryden Press, 1951), p. 297.

[2]Bogue, op. cit., p. 40.

[3]Ronald Freedman and Deborah Freedman, "Farm-Reared Elements in the Nonfarm Population," Rural Sociology, XXI (March, 1956), p. 50.

urban manpower. In 1950, only 12 per cent of the total population, or twenty-one millions, still lived on the farms. Estimates for the period 1935-1940 indicate that of all of the various streams of migration between rural farm, rural nonfarm, and urban areas, the urban to urban movement was the largest. It constituted one-third of all inter-county movement and was more than twice as large as the rural to urban movement.[1] It is believed that that trend has not been altered.[2]

Such massive movements of population may be expected to have important consequences for both the sending and the receiving areas. Most studies of internal migration have approached these consequences indirectly by studying the volume of migration or such stable characteristics of the migrants as age and education. Traditional demographic sources for migration analysis usually make available only occupational or labor force status as behavioral characteristics of migrants in the place of destination. While these are very important, they do not exhaust the socially significant correlates of migration.

Like several other recent studies, this one is concerned with behavior in the receiving area, as indicated

---

[1]Donald J. Bogue, Henry S. Shryock, Jr., and Siegfried A. Hoermann, Subregional Migration in the United States, 1935-1940, I (Oxford, Ohio: Scripps Foundation Studies in Population Distribution, 1953, Number 5), pp. 46-47.

[2]Donald J. Bogue, The Population of the United States, op. cit., pp. 409-411.

by reports on participation in important groups and associations in the receiving area. And like a number of the recent studies, it assumes that the effect of migration on such behavior in the receiving area depends not only on the fact of physical movement itself, but also on the type of movement specifically, whether the movement is from an area that is similar or dissimilar to the receiving area in its general social organization.[1]

Since the distinction between the fact of sheer physical movement and the type of movement is so basic to this approach, we turn to this distinction next.

Types of Migration

The movement in space from one community to another is likely to involve some social dislocation, even if the sending and receiving communities are very similar. Every migrant leaves behind him a complex of relationships which define his daily round of life, and he must establish new local ties and relationships. However, the more similar the communities of origin and destination, the less difficult these adjustments are likely to be.

Therefore, the consequences of migration can be further examined in relation to previous community experiences of the

---

[1]Basil G. Zimmer, "Adjustment of Migrants in the Urban Area," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, 1954); and Harry P. Sharp, "Migration and Social Participation in the Detroit Area," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, 1954).

migrant to see whether this previous experience has or has not prepared him for life in the community of destination. The assumption is that if the new community of residence resembles the community of origin in general physical and cultural features and, consequently, in general life patterns, then living in the new environment will involve minimal adjustments. The habits developed in the old environment will still be appropriate. On the other hand, if the migrant moves from an environment which differs radically from that of his destination, then he probably will be less well prepared for life in the new community.

We shall use the terms migration and mobility to differentiate between physical movement per se and movement involving a significant change in type of community. Any person who moves from one community to another is a migrant. He is also mobile to the extent that the community of destination and origin are different in their basic social organization. Migration itself always involves some dislocation, but our general assumption is that this dislocation is directly proportional to the mobility associated with the migration.

Relatively little work has been done in systematically analyzing the relative effects of migration alone and migration plus mobility on the behavior patterns in the receiving area. The existing evidence does indicate that mobility is probably a crucial additional dimension. This dissertation is an attempt to further test and elaborate the previous findings.

In this study we are using rural backgrounds as an indicator of mobility--the extent to which the migrant's cultural background differs from that of his place of destination (Metropolitan Detroit). Our assumptions are that: (1) rural areas, in general, differ in important ways from the metropolis; and (2) the longer a migrant has been exposed to the rural environment, the more likely it is that he will bring with him a set of distinctive expectations and behavior patterns.

This is not a study of the place of origin of migrants, so we do not intend to study or to analyze in detail the nature of urban-rural differences. We are assuming that these differences exist. In a sense we are testing the existence of differences in the sending communities by testing differences derived from them: differences in behavior in Detroit related to differences in urban-rural background of the migrant. We shall also be concerned with distinguishing the migrants from that region--the South--in which traditional urban-rural differences are believed to persist most strongly. In the following section we present a summary view of the major urban-rural differences which we assume persist to a significant degree, although we are not documenting these differences directly. We do not deny that these urban-rural differences are beginning to blur. We only assert that they still are sufficiently great to make it reasonable to assume that migrants to Detroit from rural areas will have a different cultural

background than have the migrants from other urban areas, and that this difference will influence behaviors in Detroit.

A Contrast of Urban and Rural Environments and Its Relationship to Migration

Functionally, the rural community is characterized as occupationally more homogeneous than the urban community--primarily centered around agriculture. It is further distinguished by the greater importance given to certain institutions when contrasted to the urban community. For example, the family as a basic economic unit is much more prominent in rural than in urban areas. Also, patterns of interaction are characterized as more face to face, intimate, with smaller and more informal groups. There tends to be a greater degree of isolation which results in a less rapid rate of change and a greater adherence to traditional values.[1]

The urban community, on the other hand, is characterized by a diverse occupational structure and a high degree of specialization. Therefore, urbanites meet one another in

---

[1]For discussions of contrasts between urban and rural places see: Charles P. Loomis and J. Allan Beegle, Rural Social Systems (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1950), pp. 3-36; T. Lynn Smith, op. cit., pp. 43-58; Charles N. Lebeaux, "Rural and Urban Backgrounds as Factors in the Behavior of Factory Workers," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, 1954), pp. 1-42.

highly specialized, segmental roles. This is best described by Wirth:[1]

> Characteristically, urbanites meet one another in highly segmental roles. They are to be sure, dependent upon more people for the satisfactions of their life-needs than are rural people and thus are associated with a greater number of organized groups, but they are less dependent upon particular persons, and their dependence upon others is confined to a highly fractionalized aspect of the other's round of activity. This is essentially what is meant by saying that the city is characterized by secondary rather than primary contacts. The contacts of the city may indeed be face to face, but they are nevertheless impersonal, superficial, transitory, and segmental. The reserve, the indifference, and the blase outlook which urbanites manifest in their relationships may thus be regarded as devices for immunizing themselves against the personal claims and expectations of others.

An additional important characteristic is that the great mobility of the population, the diverse functional base, and the extensive communicative system make urban life prone to a rapid rate of change. Urbanization is linked to secularization and a breakdown of the dominance of traditional patterns of doing things. Urbanism, then, as a way of life, differs from ruralism in ways of work, in habits of thought, and with respect to traditional controls.

Rural life has generally been depicted as being closer to the folk type of group life on the folk-urban continuum. People socialized in this type of environment have had different life experiences than those who have lived all their lives in an urban setting.

---

[1]Louis Wirth, "Urbanism As A Way of Life," American Journal of Sociology, XLIV (July, 1938), p. 12.

It is true that presently the increased urbanization of our society has changed the character of our rural areas, and the picture of rural life which we have presented was more typical several or more decades ago. But it should be remembered that many migrants to the cities from these rural areas were socialized at a time when these areas were less urbanized. In fact, some of the migrants were socialized in a rural setting many decades ago. It is true that for the very recent young migrants from these areas, our descriptions would not adequately describe the social environment of their socialization. Such descriptions would be more pertinent to the social environment in which the older migrants were socialized. We shall also see that it is important to note in what regions this rural experience took place, for some regions are generally more urbanized than others.

A fact of great significance for our approach is that the modern urban dweller is accustomed to handling change. The urbanite is socialized in an environment which is constantly changing, and part of the habit system which he develops is concerned with adjusting to change. On the other hand, individuals socialized in a rural environment are subject to different conditions, and the need to inculcate habits of handling change is not pressing.

Therefore, when people move from a rural to an urban environment, they are not only moving between rather dissimilar social environments, which requires the learning of

a new habit system, but they are also deficient in those skills which would make this adjustment smoother and less fraught with problems. On the other hand, the urbanite who moves to another urban environment is not only moving between similar social environments, but, because of his acquired habits, he can handle more rapidly and systematically whatever changes may occur as a result of physical movement.

As we have mentioned, it is undoubtedly true that the traditional urban-rural differences are beginning to blur in our country. The continued urbanization and industrialization of our society is more closely linking the urban and rural sectors in a single social system. However, this process has not affected all regions equally. There is evidence that the northern regions and especially the northeastern and north central regions of our country are more urbanized and industrialized than others. For these regions, with their extensive communication and highly industrialized base, the bounds of the urban community have extended far into the countryside. Hence, even the rural areas of the North are becoming more closely integrated with the urban communities, not only functionally, but normatively. Under these conditions, the traditional urban-rural differences may be at a minimum. Vestiges of past cultural differences may remain, but on the whole there is an emerging culture which everyone shares.

It is in the southern rural region of this country that we assume the traditional rural patterns may most strongly

persist. Although we cannot fully document the persistence of these patterns, there are certain demographic characteristics presently associated with the South[1] which are typical of rural areas of the past. For example, the rural farm area of the South has a lower educational level,[2] a higher fertility ratio,[3] and a lower median income level[4] than any other region of the country.

The South also has certain other rural characteristics to a greater degree than other regions. Of all regions, the South has the lowest percentage of workers employed in manufacturing, communication and transportation, and the highest percentage of people employed in agriculture.[5] In terms of urban-rural residence in 1950, it was one of the few regions in the United States in which the rural population constituted more than 20 per cent of the population.[6]

---

[1]Following the U. S. Census definition of the Southern Region, we generally refer to the South as that region comprised of the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia. Migrants from these states will be referred to as southern migrants. The "North" or "Northern Regions" will be used in this study to designate those regions outside of the South. Thus, northern migrants refer to those migrants who come from regions outside of the South. For the convenience of discussion this term seemed to be the most appropriate to refer to the non-southern migrants.

[2]Otis D. Duncan and Albert J. Reiss, Social Characteristics of Urban and Rural Communities, 1950 (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1956), p. 90.

[3]Ibid., p. 50. [4]Ibid., p. 105.

[5]Bogue, The Population of the United States, op. cit., p. 72.

[6]Ibid., p. 67.

These characteristics strongly suggest that migrants from the rural South will come from social environments least similar to those of a northern industrial metropolis; and, therefore, are less prepared than other migrants for the social life in this metropolis.

Obviously, the influence of the community of origin on the migrant will depend both on the length of time and the period of his life which he lived there. We assume that a long exposure to rural life in the early formative years would be especially important for the internalization of rural habits.

Urban habits and attitudes may be acquired even in a traditional rural setting. For instance, education is a means by which this may occur. Education not only develops the occupational skills necessary to function in an urban setting, it also may provide skills and perspectives necessary for handling change. There is some evidence that formal education which is higher than the average for a rural setting may hinder adjustment to rural life. Acquiring new skills and values in school may be incompatible with the traditional ways of rural life.[1] Conversely, they may prepare the way for urban life.

On the basis of the preceding discussion, we shall distinguish two general types of migrants: (a) those who

---

[1]T. Lynn Smith, op. cit., p. 311.

have had no rural background and who have moved between urban settings, and (b) those with varying amounts of rural experience.

We shall assume that behavioral differences between the urban migrants and the natives are associated with migration, since both groups come from similar social environments, but one group has experienced physical movement. On the other hand, we assume that the differences between the rural migrants and the natives involve both migration and mobility. Since the fact of movement into a new setting is common to both types of migrants, the differences in behavior patterns between urban and rural migrants are assumed to be associated with mobility when other relevant factors are controlled.

We have reason to believe that differences in participation patterns between these migrants exist because there are other differences among migrants, such as socio-economic status. For instance, there is evidence that rural migrants, and especially those of southern origin, are more heavily concentrated in the lower socio-economic positions. The inter-city migrant is likely to be in a higher occupational status than the rural migrant.[1]

---

[1]Donald J. Bogue, Henry S. Shryock, Jr., and Siefried A. Hoermann, op. cit., pp. 43-63; Ronald Freedman, Recent Migration to Chicago (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950), pp. 30-109; Howard Beers and Catherine Heflin, "The Urban Status of Rural Migrants," Social Forces, XXIII (October, 1944), pp. 32-37.

Social Participation

Among the variety of types of behavior by which migrants might be contrasted to non-migrants, we have chosen to concentrate on the extent of participation in certain kinds of strategic groups and associations. Membership and activity in such groups and associations have been classified under the general rubric of social participation. These groups and associations are both formal and informal in structure and serve important functions for the integration of the individual personality and of the community and larger social whole. It is not our purpose to make any original contribution to the understanding of the integrative functions of these groups, but only to discuss briefly some of these functions.

Individuals could not function as acceptable members of society without meaningful and intimate social relationships. A situation in which individuals belong to no stable groups leaves the personality without the continual reinforcement of patterned relationships that seem essential to meaningfully integrated conduct. Thus, the informal groups which are "special areas of density" of interaction, like families, neighborhoods, work and congeniality groups, are important because psychological security and behavioral consistency are anchored to them.[1]

---

[1]This discussion is adapted from Williams' on social cohesion. See Robin M. Williams, Jr., American Society (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1960), pp. 552-553.

Society and particularly the modern urban community are composed of more than informally structured groups. There is also a network of more formally structured groups which are interrelated and interlocked in terms of membership, not only among themselves, but with informal groups. Consequently, individuals who participate in any of these groups find themselves involved, in various ways, in the larger community and society, because these groups, from the smallest to the largest, are linked by communication, representation, and chain interaction into larger social units. In this respect, then, these groups implement the integration between the individuals and the larger social whole.

Moreover, a network of these groups, and especially of the formal secondary associations, is a temporizing force on the internal cleavages and conflicts which exist in modern societies. These cleavages and conflicts arise from opposing occupational, ethnic, or religious interests. A network of secondary groups whose memberships frequently cut across conflicting lines brings together members from conflicting segments and provides opportunities for more intimate contacts with others. In doing so, it prevents these segments from intensifying their conflicts into deep schisms which may disrupt the functioning of the entire social system.

Closely related to the above, a network of secondary organizations serves to check on the monopolization of

power by a single group in the community and larger society. A network of groups provides avenues for concerted action by members into an organized opposition, and through these means they may serve to check on the concentration of power in any one group.

These various integrative functions of formal secondary organizations are further developed by the theorists of mass society who are concerned with the conditions necessary for democracy in societies and private organizations.[1] For these theorists, a network of secondary groups independent of state control is essential if a democratic society is to remain viable. Not only do these secondary organizations counterbalance state power, but they also serve to integrate their membership into the larger communal life by anchoring values in a group structure and by constantly reinforcing group norms. Only through a wide, personally meaningful range of social participation can a person become firmly integrated in society and remain resistant to mobilization in mass movements.

We cannot spell out further here the particular role of each kind of group in social integration. But there is enough evidence that such a role exists to make it reasonable to assume that if migrant status and mobility affect the pattern of participation in such groups, this effect

---

[1]William Kornhauser, Politics of a Mass Society (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960).

will have wider repercussions. Our concern is with the particular relationship of migrant status to social participation.

For the purposes of this thesis, attention will be focused on participation in formal organizations, political activities, religious activities, and informal groups. We shall be concerned with the frequency with which migrants take memberships in formal groups, vote in elections, attend religious services, and have frequent contacts in various types of informal groups. We shall briefly describe each type of participation and some of its known socio-economic correlates. These important correlates will need to be considered as controls for our analysis of migrant status and social participation.

Formal Group Participation.--Much of the sociological literature dealing with social participation and its theoretical importance has focused attention on formal groups. These are non-governmental groups which have a specialized activity, a regular meeting time and place, formal rules of procedures, and in which membership is usually voluntary. These types of groups, commonly called voluntary associations, range from small neighborhood groups to very large national associations, and their activities cover all the diverse types of interests found in the urban setting: hobby clubs, P.T.A.'s, charitable clubs, recreational lodges, veterans' organizations, professional societies, etc.

There is ample evidence that everyone does not participate equally in such organizations. People in the upper socio-economic positions participate more often than those in the lower positions; males tend to participate more than females; and participation increases with age up to middle years after which it decreases.[1] This pattern of relationship to age may only apply to the lower socio-economic groups.[2]

Voting.--Closely related to participation in formal groups is participation in political affairs. This is an important way in which the individual may express his membership in a community, and is a basic mechanism for collective action, particularly in a democratic society. Furthermore, political action may bring men into association with one another and form the basis for other types of non-political associations.

Differentials in the extent of voting tend to follow the same patterns as noted for formal groups. Thus, people of higher socio-economic status are more likely to vote in

---

[1]For a good review of literature in this area up to 1953, see Basil G. Zimmer, op. cit., pp. 25-32. For further bibliography see Sharp, op. cit., p. 16. Also see Charles R. Wright and Herbert Hyman, "Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults; Evidence from National Surveys," American Sociological Review, XXIII (June, 1958), pp. 284-294.

[2]Wendell Bell and Maryanne Force, "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations," American Sociological Review, XXI (February, 1956), pp. 25-34; John M. Foskett, "Social Structure and Social Participation," American Sociological Review, XX (August, 1955), pp. 431-438.

any given election than those of lower socio-economic status. Males tend to vote more than females, and voting tends to increase with age until past middle age.[1] Those who are members of formal groups are more likely to vote than non-members.[2]

Religious Participation.--The conception of religion as an integrator of society can be traced to ancient times. It has been seen for a long time as an organ of social control. Religious groups help to solve the problems of order both in designating social goals and in prescribing appropriate means for the attainment of these goals. By ritual, symbol, systems of belief, and doctrines of rewards and punishments, religious groups help to produce the socialized individuals who accept the dominant values as to legitimate means and ends.[3]

Some estimates of participation differentials exist in terms of church attendance. Catholics attend church more frequently than Protestants, and the Jews attend the least

---

[1]For summaries and discussions on voting differentials, see: Seymour M. Lipset, Political Man (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1960), pp. 179-219; Robert E. Lane, Political Life (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1959), pp. 45-52, 135-272; also Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin, Warren E. Miller, The Voter Decides (Evanston: Row,Peterson and Company, 1954), pp. 71-73.

[2]See: Wright and Hyman, op. cit., pp. 292-293.

[3]J. Milton Yinger, Religion, Society, and the Individual (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1957), p. 71.

often.[1] Similar to their participation in formal groups, people in higher socio-economic positions attend more than those in lower positions, but the difference is not as large.[2] On the other hand, females tend to participate more than males.[3]

Informal Participation.--Many of the students of urban life have tended to stress the more impersonal, secondary types of group life characteristic of formal groups. But the community involves an intricate web of informal groups which are related to other forms of group life. These informal groups still function to reinforce the norms and common values of the society and provide for the affectional needs of individuals. Recent studies have called attention to the continuing existence and importance of these primary groups in the urban community.[4] The study of primary groups in an industrial setting,[5] the extent of kinship ties and other informal groups are points which call for

---

[1]Bernard Lazerwitz, "Some Factors Associated with Variations in Church Attendance," Social Forces, XXXIX (May, 1961), pp. 301-309.

[2]The Catholic Digest Survey, "Do Americans Go To Church?," Catholic Digest, XVII (December, 1952), p. 5.

[3]Morris Axelrod, "A Study of Formal and Informal Group Participation in a Large Urban Community" (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, 1953), p. 69; Zimmer, op. cit., pp. 77-78.

[4]Axelrod, op. cit., pp. 107-131; Floyd Dotson, "Patterns of Voluntary Association Among Urban Working Class Families," American Sociological Review, XVI (October, 1951), pp. 687-693; Sharp, op. cit., pp. 123-150.

further attention. The findings of these studies indicate that these informal bonds are more universal than expected.

Differentials by socio-economic status for participation in these types of groupings are not pronounced. Participation in these groups is more universal than in formal groups.[1]

Relationships Between Migration and Types of Social Participation

All of these forms of social participation represent different patterns of interaction existing in the urban community. But it must also be noted that they exist in varying degrees in rural communities. Therefore, it is important to know the extent to which participation in these groups is a radical or moderate change in the behavior pattern of anyone moving between these social environments.

If a particular type of participation is equally likely in the rural and urban areas, we would expect minimal differences related to type of migrant background. The association of migrant background with participation rates should be greatest for those types of associations which are quite different in rural and urban areas. Unfortunately, knowledge about the urban-rural differences in participation patterns is not extensive, but there are some data and some theories permitting us to indicate that we expect maximum differences in the areas of formal group

---

[1]For review of findings in this area, see: Sharp, op. cit., pp. 22-24.

participation and voting. Minimal differences should be found with respect to church attendance and informal group membership.

Formal group participation is the least familiar to a person reared in a rural setting because these groups are organized to carry out the specialized types of relationships found most often in an urban setting. These are in contrast with the more informal and intimate types of relationships characterizing a traditionally rural way of life. Thus, people in rural farm areas participate in voluntary associations less than city people.[1]

Therefore, we expect that differences among migrants to an urban community with varying amounts of urban and rural experiences will be the greatest for these types of social participation. There is some evidence to support this conclusion. Beers and Heflin, Freedman, Sharp and Zimmer have all found that participation in formal groups varies with the previous urban and rural experiences of the migrant.[2] Migrants with urban backgrounds participate the most and migrants with rural backgrounds the least. Moreover, Zimmer and Sharp both found that southern migrants have the lowest membership rates.[3]

---

[1]Wright and Hyman, op. cit., p. 290.

[2]Beers and Heflin, op. cit., pp. 33-37; Freedman and Freedman, op. cit., pp. 58-59; Myles W. Rodehaver, "Fringe Settlement as a Two-Directional Movement," Rural Sociology, XII (March, 1947), pp. 50-57; Sharp, op. cit., pp. 40-74; Zimmer, op. cit., pp. 137-283.

[3]Zimmer, op. cit., p. 153; Sharp, op. cit., pp. 50-51.

Political participation, such as voting, is another phenomenon which is not as frequent in rural areas as in urban areas. Previous studies on political activities have found that rural people vote less than urban people. One of the reasons for these urban-rural differences may be the relatively greater degree of isolation from political issues in rural areas. Other conditions which are conducive to more active political participation do not exist to any great degree in rural areas. For example, rural areas are less likely to have the special interest groups, the class differentiation and the ethnic diversity which make politics more salient for the urban sector. Also, certain rural areas like the South are dominated by a one-party system, and the prevalence of this type of system may lead to indifference on the part of the citizens. Migrants to cities from these areas will, therefore, find these activities somewhat foreign. Consequently, we find migrant differentials in voting related to the urban and rural background of the migrants. There is some evidence to support this conclusion although the findings on voting alone are not clear. Freedman, Freedman, and Rodehaver,[1] using various indices of political activities in which voting was one component, found that rural migrants were politically less active than urban migrants. Zimmer found that southern migrants had lower rates of voting registration

---

[1]Freedman and Freedman, op. cit., pp. 56-58; Rodehaver, op. cit., p. 56.

than other migrant groups.[1] Considering voting alone, Sharp found that rural migrants voted less frequently than urban migrants in Detroit, although these differences were small. The southern rural migrants had the lowest rates for voting.[2]

Differences in church attendance by migrant status should be very small. This type of activity exists to a great degree in rural areas[3] and, therefore, this type of participation is meaningful for the rural migrants. The findings of previous studies are not consistent on the extent of urban-rural differences in church attendance rates. Zimmer found urban-rural differences in church attendance,[4] but Sharp concluded that urban-rural backgrounds of migrants were unimportant for church attendance.[5]

Informal associations are also likely to be equally meaningful to the urban or rural migrants. These types of groups are pervasive and important because they are the fundamental social network in which everyone lives. Therefore, it is likely that migrant differentials will be less for these groups than for formal groups or voting. Unfortunately, adequate evidence on the relationship of migration

---

[1]Zimmer, op. cit., p. 187.

[2]Sharp, op. cit., pp. 83-84.

[3]Catholic Digest Survey, op. cit., p. 5.

[4]Zimmer, op. cit., p. 162.

[5]Sharp, op. cit., pp. 111-117.

to informal group participation is lacking. Perhaps the most systematic study is Sharp's. He found that there are few consistent differences in informal associations patterns between migrants and non-migrants. Those differences that did exist were soon eliminated with migrants' increasing length of residence in the community.[1]

Previous studies (especially Sharp's and Zimmer's) call attention to the fact that differences in participation rates between migrants and non-migrants are partly a function of the length of residence in the community. Generally, with increasing length of residence in the community, the migrants' patterns of participation will tend to approach those of the natives. Also, participation rates for different types of migrants tend to converge. The points at which participation rates converge depend both on the type of participation and the type of migrant.

Hypotheses To Be Investigated

1. Formal group membership and voting rates will vary inversely with the extent of rural experience. Migrants with urban experience will have the highest rates, and migrants with longest rural experience will have the lowest. This general hypothesis follows from our assumption that urban migrants have previous experience most similar and rural migrants have experiences least similar to the life experiences in the urban setting.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 123-141.

On the basis of our earlier discussions, the southern rural migrants are assumed to be the least prepared for distinctive urban institutions, and, therefore, the following hypothesis can be stated:

2. Formal group membership and voting rates will be lowest for southern rural migrants.

A second set of hypotheses analyzes social participation in relation to length of residences as well as type of community of origin. Here, the assumption is made that as the length of residence in the community of destination increases, social participation rates of various migrant groups increase and tend to converge with each other and with those of the native urbanites. Furthermore, it is assumed that the more dissimilar the previous environment, the longer the process of learning the habits of the new environment, unless special training, (e.g., education), changes the situation. The speed of the convergence is also a function of training to handle capably new experiences. Migrants with rural backgrounds but of high socio-economic status are better prepared to enter the formal group network and political life of the community than migrants from similar backgrounds but of low socio-economic status. Being better educated and occupying more strategic functional roles, these migrants of high status have or make available channels for participation more readily than migrants of low socio-economic status.

Hence, the following set of hypotheses can be stated:

3. The length of time for convergence with native rates will decrease with increasing socio-economic status. Migrants of higher socio-economic status will approximate the rates of the natives of comparable socio-economic status more quickly than those migrants of lower socio-economic status.

4. Formal group membership and voting rates of urban migrants will approach those of the native urbanites more quickly than those of the rural migrants.

In our previous discussion, it was indicated that participation in religious activities and informal groups was more pervasive than formal group membership and voting. Therefore, the following hypothesis can be stated:

5. Urban and rural migrants will differ less in rates of church attendance and informal group contacts than in rates of formal group memberships and voting.

For some of these hypotheses, there is already some evidence in the literature, as we have indicated. In the present study we hope to make a contribution by overcoming two limitations present in earlier work.

First, earlier studies have been unable to scale the degree of urbanization or rurality of background in sufficient detail. For example, no one has been able to distinguish migrants with extensive and early rural socialization in a rural setting from those with little rural background. Second, the range of controls used previously has been

limited both as to the variables used and the possibilities of simultaneous controls. The problem of controls is crucial since migrants tend to be distinctive in such matters as education and occupation. In the present dissertation, more detailed significant variables can be controlled and more simultaneous controls are possible because of a larger sample.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The Population Studied and the Sample

The data for this dissertation came from the Detroit Area Study (henceforth abbreviated as D.A.S.) of the University of Michigan, a continuing project involving an annual sample survey of residents of the Detroit area covering various sociological topics.[1] The samples are drawn on a probability basis, thus giving assurance that they represent the population under study within predictable limits of error.

The surveys cover the Standard Metropolitan Area of Detroit, comprising Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb counties. Two-thirds of the population covered reside in Detroit; the remaining one-third live in the suburban area. Strictly speaking, the results of the present investigation, like others based on the D.A.S., apply only to the Detroit Metropolitan Area. To test the generality of the results, replication in other areas will be necessary. Although this community perhaps may have certain unique characteristics

---

[1]For a description of Detroit Area Study see: Ronald Freedman, "The Detroit Area Study," American Journal of Sociology, LIX (July, 1953), pp. 30-33.

for historical reasons, it has other general features which are characteristic of a large, northern, urban metropolis. It is highly industrialized, has a large, heterogeneous population, and a history of rapid population growth. It has an unusually large number of rural migrants for a large metropolis, which increases the possibility of finding significant samples with various amounts of rural background.

In several of the D.A.S. surveys of a cross section of adults, comparable questions were asked about migration histories, and various aspects of social participation. The responses to these questions, cumulated into a single sample, are utilized in this study. In all the samples the basic sampling element is an adult, defined as a person who is at least twenty-one years of age.

The basic sample frame for the surveys involves area probability samples designed to yield a representative cross section of all adults in the greater Detroit community.[1] The samples were selected through a procedure which assured all dwellings in the community an equal chance of selection.

---

[1]For discussions of the sample design for each year, see bibliography in Detroit Area Study, "A Progress Report on the University of Michigan's Detroit Area Study, September 1, 1951--December 31, 1959," University of Michigan, 1960. (Mimeographed.)

For further descriptions of this project and bibliography of publications based on this project see: Detroit Area Study, "The Detroit Area Study: Progress Report to the Ford Foundation," University of Michigan, 1960. (Mimeographed.)

The surveys were restricted to private dwellings; all military establishments, hospitals, religious and educational institutions, hotels, and large rooming houses were, therefore, excluded from the sample. This eliminated roughly 5 per cent of the adult population from the sample.

Our study also excluded all foreign-born and non-white respondents. The primary concern of this study was the effect of urban and rural backgrounds of migrants to Detroit. It was felt that a systematic analysis of other related factors of migration, such as ethnicity, would be beyond the scope of this study.

Our justification for combining samples from different years is the belief that the kinds of relationships under study did not change substantially in the period under study. An analysis of the relationship of migrant status to social participation by single years found that no trend or basic changes occurred in the relationship. It is true that yearly fluctuations occurred, especially when the more detailed categories of migrant status were utilized. Part of these fluctuations may be attributable to the small number of cases in some of the categories. However, when the over-all category of urban migrants was compared to rural migrants, the pattern of differences appeared to be consistent from year to year. By combining data for the different years, it was possible to obtain samples large enough for the detailed classifications of migrants and controls which are the distinctive contributions of this

study. Even so, the cases available become too few for many of the desirable detailed analyses so that it becomes necessary to make combinations and to collapse categories.

Questions about migration histories were asked intermittently and not always in the same years as the participation questions. For this reason the sample size varies from one part of the analysis to another. The total sample available for analysis of each type of social participation and the study years from which the samples were accumulated are indicated below:

TYPE OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION	STUDY YEARS	TOTAL SAMPLE SIZE
Formal Group Membership	1952, 1954, 1955,* 1957, 1959	3,291
Voting	1952, 1953, 1957, 1958	2,058
Informal Group Contacts	1952, 1955*, 1957, 1959	2,334
Church Attendance	1952, 1954, 1955,* 1958, 1959	3,104

*The sample for the 1955 study was composed solely of husbands and wives and, therefore, a weighting procedure was utilized to give better representation of single persons. See Appendix A for the procedures involved.

A Typology of Migrants: Physical Movement and Mobility--Definitions and Measures

For research purposes, there are various definitions of a migrant and each definition may lead to different empirical results. A commonly used definition is the one developed by the U. S. Bureau of the Census, based on

change in residence in particular time periods.[1] By this definition, if a person lives at the survey date in a county or quasi-county different from the one in which he lived at a previous designated date, he is considered a migrant. For example, in the 1940 Census, a person was defined as a migrant if he was living in a different place than his reported residence on April 1, 1935. In the 1950 Census, a migrant was defined as a person who resided in a county or quasi-county different than his place of residence one year earlier.[2]

The disadvantage of this approach is that it includes with the non-migrants those persons who migrated prior to a designated recent period. Thus, any comparisons between migrants and non-migrants may be questioned unless we assume that any differential effects of migration disappear within the designated period. As we shall see later, some types of migrants retain distinctive behavior patterns for longer than five years. For this reason we shall consider as migrants any persons not living in the Detroit Area all their lives. We can then consider the question of when migrants to Detroit lose their distinctive characteristics

---

[1]U.S., Bureau of the Census, Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940. Population, Internal Migration 1935 to 1940, 1-4.

[2]U.S., Bureau of the Census, Population Census: 1950. Special Reports, IV, Part 4, Chapter D, 3-10.

as an empirical question rather than settling the matter by an arbitrary definition of the time period.[1]

Previous studies of the problem we are investigating have not been able to make a systematic distinction among migrants other than whether they migrated from the farms or from other urban places, either because information was lacking or because the sample size was too small for finer distinctions.

In this study, because the sample was larger, it was possible to use a more detailed history of movement for each person for many comparisons in order to develop a more refined classification of migrants. Information was available on whether each respondent had lived all his life in the Detroit area and, if not, where he was born--in a large city, small city, or on a farm. Migrants also could be classified by whether they ever had lived on a farm, at what periods in their lives, and in what region of the country.

A migrant is defined here as anyone who has not spent all of his life in Detroit; a native is one who was born in Detroit and has lived all his life there. Migrants were further classified on the basis of the character of their residential experience during major periods of their lives. The basic distinction between migrants and natives

---

[1]Arbitrary definitions of migrant status such as the one used by the U. S. Census are useful for such purposes as studying migrant flows in a recent period.

divides those who have had some experience of migration and those who have not. The subclassification of the migrants distinguishes various degrees of mobility, defined in terms of a scale running from highly urban to highly rural background. Our basic assumption is that the more rural the background, the greater the mobility involved in coming to Detroit.

The types of migrants are as follows:

Urban Migrants: all have had no rural experience

Type I--Persons who have had no rural experience and were born in communities with populations of more than 50,000.

Type II-Persons who have had no rural experience and who were born in communities with populations of less than 50,000.

Rural Migrants: all have had some rural experience.

Type III-Persons who have lived on a farm less than half of their lives before age eighteen and not at all afterwards.

Type IV-Persons who lived on a farm more than half of their lives before age eighteen and not at all afterwards.

Type V--Persons who have lived on a farm more than half of their lives before age eighteen and less than half of their lives afterwards.

Type VI-Persons who lived on a farm more than half of their lives before age eighteen and also more than half of their lives afterwards.

This classification makes a major distinction between migrants with rural experience and those with only urban experience. Within these broad categories, urban migrants are classified further by whether they came originally from large or small communities. The rural migrants are sub-classified with reference both to the amount of rural experience and the period of life at which they had the experience. Since it is the early years of life which are crucial for the kinds of habit systems developed, it is useful to distinguish pre-adult and adult experience roughly by the periods before and after age eighteen.

This classification scheme will be followed whenever possible throughout this study. However, this degree of refinement is not always possible when controlling for certain variables because the number of cases available in each class becomes too small. Therefore, the adjacent categories will be combined in some analyses. A distinction will always be made between urban and rural migrants.

The classification has certain limitations. It does not distinguish rural migrants who may have had extensive urban experience prior to coming to Detroit. For some rural migrants, only a small amount of time may have been spent on the farm, and most of their lives may have been spent in a large urban community before coming to Detroit. In most such cases, the rural migrant necessarily will be on the end of the rural scale closest to the urban scale.

The classification also only distinguishes the place of birth of the urban migrants. Migrants who were born in large urban communities could have spent most of their lives prior to migration to Detroit in a smaller community. On the other hand, urban migrants who were born in small communities may have spent most of their lives before coming to Detroit in a larger urban community.

These limitations, however, would tend to obscure rather than accentuate the differences in behavior patterns among migrants. Thus, any differences in behavior patterns which are noted by the use of this classification would tend to indicate minimal differences and for this reason, it seems justified to utilize it further.

Social Participation: Definitions and Measures

Measures for the dependent variable--social participation--were taken from responses to questions pertaining to the frequency with which the respondents participate in various types of groups. Formal group membership was determined by asking respondents whether they have memberships in various types of formal organizations, such as fraternal organizations, veterans' organizations and the P.T.A. The conceptual definition of formal groups stated in Chapter I[1] was not part of the specifications of the

---

[1]Formal groups were defined as any non-governmental groups which have a specialized activity, a regular meeting time and place, formal rules of procedures, and in which membership is usually voluntary.

question asked on formal group membership.[1] However, the data appear to fit the definition operationally, although no systematic checks have been made.

In our study, labor unions are not included as formal groups although they have been in other studies. Union membership does not have the voluntary characteristics of other groups and may, to a somewhat greater extent, be non-voluntary. Many places of employment in Detroit have been unionized to the extent that one may not work unless one becomes a member of a union. Consequently, since membership is more compulsory, it will not select people in the same manner as do organizations in which membership is voluntary.

Our index of participation in political activities is based on the respondent's report of his voting activity in the last previous state and national elections. This is a minimal definition. It indicates the lowest level of participation in most scales in other studies. Political participation can involve more than voting, for example, participation in political campaigns or holding an officership in a political party.

Religious participation was measured by the reported frequency of church attendance. Since both church attendance and migrant status is distinctive for Catholics and Protestants, religion is a necessary control in considering this index.

---

[1]For examples of how the questions on participation were asked, see Appendix B.

Informal participation refers to the frequency of contacts with four classes of people: friends, neighbors, co-workers, and relatives. Frequent contacts in any of these categories are assumed to indicate primary group relations in that category; infrequent contacts indicate the absence of a primary group relationship.

The Importance of Controls

We are interested in whether migrant status is related to participation differences either in whole or in part because of the distinctive associated social and demographic characteristics. If participation differentials exist, this is a significant fact; but the understanding of these differentials depends on knowing whether non-migrants or various types of migrants have similar or differing participation rates when they have similar social and demographic characteristics. Therefore, the problem of controls for our analysis is crucial. The principal controls used are sex, region of origin, socio-economic status, age, and length of residence.

It seems especially important to control for sex. Men and women occupy different roles in our society, and these role differences presumably should have some consequences on social participation. The importance of control for region of origin has already been noted. We will distinguish between those migrants from the South and those from other regions whom we shall refer to as northern migrants.

Our previous discussion has also indicated the importance of controlling for socio-economic status in our analysis. For the purposes of control, an index of socio-economic status was developed based on the respondent's occupation and education.[1] For the female respondents, it was based on the occupation and education of the head of the household. Three general categories of status were used: upper white collar, lower white collar, and blue collar. The differences in the distribution of the various migrant types in these socio-economic categories are striking (Table 1). Migrants from large cities are disproportionately concentrated in the upper white collar category. The native and urban migrants from smaller communities tend to be less concentrated in the upper white collar positions, and more in lower white collar and blue collar positions. Among the rural migrants there is an increase in the proportion who are blue collar, and a decrease in the proportion who are white collar as the extent of rural experience increases. The finding is important since there is substantial evidence that social participation is related to socio-economic status. Therefore, the effects of migration on participation would be confounded by the socio-economic differences between migrant types. In the analyses to follow, the upper white collar and lower white collar categories have frequently been combined due to small numbers in each class.

---

[1]See Appendix C for the construction of this index.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE WHO ARE IN EACH SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY SEX, BY MIGRANT TYPE

Migrant Type	Percentage in Each Socio-Economic Status: Upper White Collar	Lower White Collar	Blue Collar	Total	Numbers in Base Group
Males					
Natives	10	35	54	100	703
Type I	32	30	38	100	200
Type II	18	24	58	100	327
Type III	11	26	63	100	133
Type IV	14	19	67	100	192
Type V	12	7	81	100	85
Type VI	3	23	74	100	31
Urban Migrants	23	26	51	100	527
Rural Migrants	12	19	69	100	441
Total	18	22	60	100	968
Females					
Natives	6	35	59	100	616
Type I	14	38	48	100	234
Type II	15	29	56	100	290
Type III	9	31	59	100	118
Type IV	9	30	61	100	125
Type V	14	25	60	100	63
Type VI	3	7	90	100	40
Urban Migrants	14	33	53	100	524
Rural Migrants	9	27	64	100	346
Total	12	31	57	100	870

The factor of age should also be considered as an important control variable since the age roles which individuals may occupy could affect their participation. Age is especially important because it is confounded with length of residence in the community. Due to an insufficient number of cases, it was not possible to utilize the conventional method of controlling for age. However, control for age was realized by standardizing the participation rates of the various migrant subgroups to the age-participation rates of the natives.[1]

Previous studies have established the importance of length of residence of the migrants to social participation. This is further documented in our study by the relationship between length of residence and membership in formal groups when the age distribution of the migrants has been standardized to that of the natives (Table 2). In general, for either sex, there is an increase in formal group membership rates with increasing length of residence in Detroit. Among males, the membership rate of migrants who have resided in Detroit over twenty-five years is over one and one-half times higher than that of migrants who have resided in Detroit less than five years. The pattern is not consistent for the females since there is a decrease in membership rates after twenty-five years of residence. Nevertheless, membership rates do increase substantially after five years of residence.

---

[1]See Appendix D for a discussion of indirect standardization.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE WHO ARE FORMAL GROUP MEMBERS STANDARDIZED FOR AGE, BY SEX, BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Length of Residence In Detroit	Percentage Who Are Members	
	Males	Females
0 - 5 Years	36	33
6 -25 Years	57	51
Over 25 Years	65	49

It was not always possible to manipulate these controls in the same detail because the number of variables considered at one time increased or because the number of cases available for each type of participation was too small. For instance, it was not possible to use the same length of residence intervals for each type of participation. Details in the classification of the control variable were retained as much as possible within the limitations of the sample. Whenever possible, the detailed classification of migrant type was used, but this is often impossible with the multiplication of controls. Therefore, much of the discussion with multiple controls deals with just two broad migrant types: all urban migrants and all rural migrants.

Technique of Analysis

Our method of analysis will involve the comparisons of participation rates between the various migrant and

non-migrant groups. These rates are simple percentages of each group who have membership in formal groups, voted in the last state or national elections, attend church frequently, or have frequent contacts with friends, neighbors, co-workers, or relatives. Frequently, these percentages will be standardized in order to control for certain factors.

Our conclusions will be based on whether a pattern of consistent urban-rural or native-migrant differences in a given direction or a trend in differences exist in different subcategories within sets of the major control categories. Even small differences are important for our analysis if they are consistent. For example, we will examine whether urban migrants have higher formal group membership rates than rural migrants within all sex, socio-economic, regional, and length of residence categories. If such differences do not exist within all of the categories, we will next examine whether they exist for each sex, or for the southern migrants, or during the initial period of residence. This emphasis on the consistency of differences may overlook differences--even large differences--within a particular control category. These individual differences are frequently too dependent on small numbers to be reliable although some of them may be meaningful and significant for that subgroup. To analyze the significance of these individual differences would require an intensive analysis of each of the subgroups, which is beyond the scope of this study.

Summary

This study is based upon samples of white, native-born respondents from several consecutive yearly surveys combined into a single sample. Information was obtained from these respondents regarding migration background and their participation in various types of activities in the Detroit area.

The respondents are classified in seven migrant status categories reflecting the two dimensions of migration which constitute our independent variables. They are also classified by various indices of social participation: membership in formal groups, voting in recent elections, frequency of attendance at religious services, and frequency of contacts with friends, neighbors, co-workers, and relatives.

Migrant status and social participation are both related to certain socio-economic and demographic characteristics, and any further analyses of the relationships between migrant status and social participation must control for these associated social and demographic characteristics. Some of the major controls utilized will be sex, region of origin, socio-economic status, and length of residence. An age control will be utilized by standardizing the migrant's participation rates to the age participation rates of the natives. Other variables may be controlled when analyzing particular types of social participation. They will be discussed whenever utilized.

Our analyses will involve the comparisons of participation rates for the various migrant and non-migrant groups. We will investigate whether any consistent pattern of migrant differentials in participation rates exists across the major control categories.

CHAPTER III

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MIGRANT STATUS TO FORMAL GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Introduction

In this chapter the data on the relationship between migrant status and formal membership are analyzed. Our initial hypothesis was that membership rates would decrease with increasing rural background because we expected that the more rural the background of the migrants, the less likely that they had come from communities in which they had experienced such membership. In this chapter a test of this relationship is made initially with only sex controlled, and the hypothesis is supported.

Since we know that both the membership rates and migrant status vary with socio-economic status, the relationship is then examined with controls for this variable, and it is found to persist, with some qualifications.

Since we recognize that the traditional urban-rural differences are disappearing, especially outside the South, we examine next the question of whether the over-all urban-rural differential we have found is only the distinctive characteristic of the southern migrants, whose large numbers

in Detroit may produce the differences found. We do find, in fact, that this is largely true. The importance of this regional distinction did not occur to us until late in the analyses. It puts a new light on the question of urban-rural migration differentials, as we shall see.

An important qualification of our hypothesis is that migrant background will have its maximum effect--if any--during the first years in the new community. This period is a time of "adjustment" or "learning" during which migrants must establish new local ties and relationships to replace those inevitably disrupted by their movement. This period of adjustment may be brief, or prolonged throughout their lifetime, depending upon the degree of mobility involved. But, an initial period of relatively low activity should prevail for all migrant groups. All those factors believed to have a negative effect on participation should have their greatest effect during this period, so the initial disadvantages should be greatest for those with rural, southern backgrounds, and blue collar status.

We expect that all migrant types will have lower participation rates than comparable natives during the initial period, since all have problems of entering the particular local system. But the differences between migrants and non-migrants should disappear after this initial period--and apparently they do--for those migrants whose urban background and white collar status have either given them

previous experience in similar settings or require membership in formal organizations observed for comparable natives.

Finally, we will examine the extent to which migrant background can explain the differences in membership rates between major socio-economic strata. While the differences related to socio-economic status are much greater than those related to migrant status, we shall find that they are significantly affected by migrant status and length of residence distributions.

Membership Rates With Controls for Sex, Socio-Economic Status, and Region

In Table 3 the relationship of migrant background to formal group membership for each sex is considered for the whole sample without any controls. For both sexes, urban migrants have higher membership rates than rural migrants. Furthermore, there is a gradient pattern for each sex so that membership rates decrease as the amount of rural experience increases. The differences between urban migrants and migrants with the least rural experience are small, whereas the differences between urban migrants and migrants with the most rural experience are substantial.

These urban-rural differences still remain when controlled for socio-economic status (Table 4). For each sex, and within each socio-economic category, urban migrants consistently have higher membership rates than rural migrants.

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE WHO ARE FORMAL GROUP MEMBERS,
BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Are Members		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Natives	63	60	689	613
I	66	56	196	233
II	61	55	326	288
III	57	48	133	118
IV	46	47	191	124
V	45	58	85	64
VI	42	28	31	40
Urban Migrants	63	56	522	520
Rural Migrants	49	47	440	346
Total	57	52	962	866

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE WHO ARE FORMAL GROUP MEMBERS, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Are Members		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Upper White Collar				
Natives	87	94	71	34
Urban Migrants	91	86	135	76
Rural Migrants	84	78	64	32
Total	88	83	199	108
Lower White Collar				
Natives	67	66	249	216
Urban Migrants	67	55	158	172
Rural Migrants	64	54	84	94
Total	66	55	242	266
Blue Collar				
Natives	54	52	383	366
I	43	50	77	113
II	49	45	189	163
III	49	37	84	70
IV	39	45	129	76
V	39	47	69	38
VI	35	25	23	36
Urban Migrants	47	47	266	276
Rural Migrants	40	40	385	220
Total	43	44	651	496

Table 5 shows, in summary measures, the relationship between migrant background and formal group memberships across all socio-economic groups when the rates of membership are standardized to the socio-economic distribution of the natives. The over-all difference between the two broad urban and rural groups still persists for each sex, i.e., urban migrants have higher membership rates than the rural migrants. However, urban migrants from the smaller communities have rates as high as those from larger communities. There is still some evidence of the pattern of decreasing rates of memberships with increasing rural experience because there is only one reversal for each sex. Even with socio-economic status controlled, migrants with extensive rural experience still have substantially lower rates than either the urban migrants or the migrants with only little rural experience, but the differences between the two urban migrant groups disappear.

At this point, the question arises as to whether the urban-rural differences found are attributable solely to migrants from the South. We have previously discussed and presented some evidence about the greater rural character of the South as compared to other regions. We have also mentioned that the findings of other studies are consistent with this assumption of the rural character of this region--findings that show southern rural migrants have lower rates of formal group memberships than other migrant groups. Also, as Table 6 indicates, southern rural migrants constitute an

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE WHO ARE FORMAL GROUP MEMBERS, STANDARDIZED FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Are Members		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Natives	63	60	689	613
I	61	53	196	233
II	61	53	326	288
III	59	48	133	118
IV	47	47	191	124
V	48	56	85	64
VI	45	30	31	40
Urban Migrants	61	53	522	520
Rural Migrants	52	47	440	346
Total	57	51	962	866

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF RURAL MIGRANTS WHO ARE OF SOUTHERN ORIGIN, BY MIGRANT TYPE

Migrant Type	Per Cent of Southern Origin	Numbers in Base Group
III	25	251
IV	37	315
V	38	149
VI	66	71
All Rural Migrants	36	786

increasingly larger part of those migrant subclasses with more rural experience. Among the rural migrants only one-fourth of those with the least rural experience, but almost two-thirds of those with the most rural experience, are southerners. Therefore, the low membership rates of the most rural categories could be attributable to their southern component, which may also account for the over-all urban-rural differences.

The important influence of the southern rural migrants in producing the low membership rates for rural migrants can be seen in Tables 7 and 8. For northern migrants the urban-rural differentials found for the total sample in Tables 3 and 4 are reduced, reversed, or eliminated in almost every comparison. The consistently greater degree of activity of urban migrants as compared with the rural migrants in Tables 3 and 4 has become quite small. There are small reversals for both males and females in the lower white collar categories. Furthermore, the gradient pattern which we previously found in relation to rural background disappears. For the northern migrants, rural experience is not consistently related to lower rates of formal group memberships. With socio-economic status controlled by standardization (Table 9), there is neither a gross urban-rural difference nor a gradient pattern for northern migrants.

On the other hand, the expected urban-rural differences are consistently found and are very large among the southern migrants. In all possible comparisons, southern urban

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGE WHO ARE FORMAL GROUP MEMBERS, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY REGION OF ORIGIN

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Are Members		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
North				
I	64	57	171	211
II	64	57	277	241
III	62	52	101	87
IV	57	55	110	89
V	57	63	49	43
VI	67	67	15	9
Urban Migrants	64	57	448	452
Rural Migrants	60	56	275	228
Total	63	57	723	680
South				
I	77	59	26	22
II	49	47	49	47
III	44	39	32	31
IV	31	29	81	35
V	25	42	36	21
VI	44	16	16	31
Urban Migrants	59	51	75	69
Rural Migrants	33	31	165	118
Total	41	38	240	187
Natives	63	60	689	613

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE WHO ARE FORMAL GROUP MEMBERS, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX
BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN

Migrant Type	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Are Members		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Are Members		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Upper White Collar								
Natives	87	94	71	34				
Urban Migrants	91	86	102	71				
Rural Migrants	84	77	43	26				
Total	89	85	145	97				
Lower White Collar								
Natives	67	66	249	216				
Urban Migrants	67	55	127	155	70	65	10	22
Rural Migrants	69	58	68	73	45	45	16	20
Total	68	56	195	228	54	55	26	42
Blue Collar								
Natives	54	52	383	366				
I	43	50	69	100	48	67	52	12
II	54	48	150	126		35		35
III	55	44	60	45	33	24	24	25
IV	43	53	61	55	28	21	68	24
V	51	38	43	29	24	38	34	16
VI					49	40	15	29
Urban Migrants	51	49	219	226	48	43	52	47
Rural Migrants	49	46	164	129	29	23	141	94
Total	50	48	383	355	54	34	193	141

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGE WHO ARE FORMAL GROUP MEMBERS, STANDARDIZED FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY REGION OF ORIGIN

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Are Members		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
North				
I	60	54	171	211
II	63	54	277	241
III	64	50	101	87
IV	56	56	110	89
V	59	56	49	43
VI	71	60	15	9
Urban Migrants	62	54	448	452
Rural Migrants	61	54	275	228
Total	62	54	723	680
South				
I	71	68	26	22
II	52	51	49	47
III	47	43	32	31
IV	34	31	81	35
V	28	42	36	21
VI	50	19	16	31
Urban Migrants	59	53	75	69
Rural Migrants	37	34	165	118
Total	44	41	240	187
Natives	63	60	689	613

migrants have membership rates at least 50 per cent higher than those for the southern rural migrants. The urban-rural gradient for the detailed classification persists for both southern males and females in general and within the blue collar group, with only one reversal in each case. Standardizing for socio-economic status (Table 9), affects the southern differentials very little--they are still large.

It is also striking that the southern rural migrants are the least active of all the migrant groups. Among both males and females, and within each socio-economic category, southern rural migrants have lower membership rates than any group, migrant or non-migrant. The rates are particularly low for the southern blue collar rural migrants--40 to 50 per cent below those of the comparable northern groups or the southern urban blue collar migrants.

Even the southern rural group with the highest membership rates (lower white collar migrants) have rates lower than the lowest northern group (blue collar rural migrants). This may indicate that any advantages for participation which migrants may have because of their superior socio-economic positions are offset by the disadvantage of previous experience in the rural South.

In summary, we find that, controlling at once for sex, socio-economic status, and region of origin, differences in membership rates between urban and rural migrants are small or non-existent among the northern migrants, but they are very substantial among the southern migrants. Also,

with less consistency, varying degrees of rural experience are inversely related to rates of formal group membership for southern migrants. The over-all urban-rural differences with which we began are attributable to the effects of southern migration.

The Effect of Length of Residence

Since length of residence is an important factor affecting the social participation of migrants, we now ask what the migration differentials are for formal group membership when we add length of residence as a control to sex, socio-economic status, region, and age (Table 10). The results differ significantly for males and females, and, therefore, each sex will be discussed separately.

Males.--For males, urban rather than rural background results in higher membership rates during the period of entry into the community. But this initial urban-rural difference persists into longer residence periods only for the southern migrants; for northern migrants the difference is greatly diminished or reversed.

The urban rates exceed the rural rates in all three of the possible comparisons during the first five years of residence. For the southern migrants, the urban-rural differences are even larger during the two longer residence periods than initially. For the northern migrants these differences are diminished or reversed. The influence of southern rural background is apparently very long

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE WHO ARE FORMAL GROUP MEMBERS, STANDARDIZED FOR AGE, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN, BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Migrant Type	White Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Are Members		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Are Members		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	0-5 Years In Detroit							
Urban Migrants	66	76	45	39				
Rural Migrants	56	53	19	12				
Total	62	71	64	51				
	6-25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	74	57	94	103				
Rural Migrants	86	60	38	50				
Total	77	58	132	153				
	Over 25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	73	60	88	84				
Rural Migrants	68	61	54	37				
Total	71	60	142	121				
Natives	72	70	320	250				

TABLE 10--Continued

Migrant Type	Blue Collar							
	North --				South			
	Per Cent Who Are Members		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Are Members		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	0-5 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	28	22	19	24	18	0	14	12
Rural Migrants	21	48	9	15	13	3	48	34
Total	25	31	28	39	15	2	62	46
	6-25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	51	51	100	103	48	61	23	23
Rural Migrants	51	46	84	72	34	33	61	47
Total	51	49	184	175	38	43	84	70
	Over 25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	63	40	102	99	89	36	15	12
Rural Migrants	59	42	71	42	51	30	31	10
Total	61	40	173	141	63	32	46	22
Natives	54	52	383	366	54	52	383	366

lasting, but being from the rural North makes a significant difference only during the initial adjustment period.

Females.--For females, the urban-rural differences are erratic and do not follow the pattern found for males. The urban-rural differences vary by time period, socio-economic group, and region. Initially, in the white collar group, the urban migrants are much more active than the rural migrants, but there is a large difference in the opposite direction for the blue collar migrants. After the first five years, white collar rural migrants are slightly more active than the white collar urban migrants. But among the blue collar migrants, these urban-rural differences are reversed. For males, the membership rates increase between the first and second period for each of the six categories considered; for females, this only occurred in four of the six categories.

We conclude, therefore, that membership rates are inversely related to the extent of rural experience--a finding which is consistent with our hypothesis--but this relationship occurs only among the male migrants and during the initial period of residence. Thus, our original hypothesis is only relevant to this migrant subgroup and for this time period. After this initial period, the hypothesis is only relevant for the southern male migrants among whom urban-rural differentials persist throughout all intervals. The relatively lower membership rates hypothesized for the southern migrants are also partly confirmed by the findings

among the male migrants because the southern male rural migrants were found to have consistently lower membership rates throughout our analyses.

The findings for the females do not appear to substantiate our hypothesis in whole or in part when the relevant controls have been considered. Apparently, the effects of migrant status and socio-economic position on the acculturation process are dissimilar for males and females. We will discuss this later in more detail.

How Migrant Membership Rates Differ From Those For Natives

So far, we have dealt only with differences between migrant types. Now we will compare migrants with non-migrants to see whether migrants do initially have lower membership rates than natives and, if so, how rapidly the initial disadvantage is removed. This is done with consideration of the effects of socio-economic status, region, and sex (Table 10). The patterns again are different enough for males and females to warrant separate discussion.

Males.--Recent male migrants have lower participation rates than natives. This is true irrespective of socio-economic status, region of origin, and urban or rural background. The differences are quite small for white collar migrants, large for northern blue collar migrants, and very large for blue collar migrants from the South. In the initial period, membership rates for white collar migrants are 8 to 22 per cent below those of the white

collar natives; the rates for blue collar northern migrants are 48 to 61 per cent below those of the blue collar natives, and the rates for southern blue collar migrants are 67 to 76 per cent below the rates for blue collar natives.

After the initial five year period, it is only the rural southern migrants who consistently have lower rates than the natives--and these low rates persist even after twenty-five years in the community. They begin with much lower rates and are still substantially lower six to twenty five years after migration. In fact, they never equal the native rates.

The rates for white collar migrants, whether rural or urban, rise to be even higher than the native rates after five years. They are not far behind to begin with, and they catch up quickly.

For males, there is an increase in membership rates for each type of migrant and for each socio-economic and regional group between the first and second time periods. We interpret this as indicating a "learning" or "adjusting" process of some kind. For the blue collar groups this increase over time occurs both in the second and third time periods for each of the migrant types and for those from both regions. Regardless of background, migrants apparently make "progress" in participation as they become more accustomed to their new social environment. But the rapidity of the increase in these rates and the particular

level which they reach depend upon the migrant's urban-rural and regional background and his socio-economic position.

Females.--When length of residence and region are taken into account along with migration status and socio-economic status and age, the relationships for females are quite different from those for males. It is true that during the first five year period, the female migrants, like the males, have lower membership rates than the natives, so we can generalize that all migrant subgroups--both male and female--have lower initial rates than the natives. But here the resemblance to the male pattern ends.

In the first place, the consistent acculturation process over time which we found for males does not apply to females. In sixteen out of eighteen comparisons based on cross classifications of length of residence, urban-rural background, and socio-economic status, female migrants have lower rates of membership than the natives. Rural female migrants never have rates as high as those for comparable natives, and this is true irrespective of length of residence, socio-economic status, or regional background. In nine out of nine such comparisons, rural migrants have lower rates than the natives. With only one exception in six comparisons, blue collar female urban migrants have lower rates than the comparable natives. The white collar female urban rates are less than the native rates in two out of three comparisons.

Second, there is no consistent pattern of urban-rural differences within the control categories--even for the southern migrants.

The patterns of native-migrant differentials in membership rates, therefore, partially substantiate our second set of hypotheses relating migrant differentials to the speed of convergence with native rates; but again, these hypotheses are only relevant for the male migrants. For males, the white collar migrants initially have rates slightly below those of the natives and have higher rates during the next interval, while the process is slower for the blue collar migrants. This finding confirms our hypothesis that the rates for the migrants of higher socioeconomic status will converge with those of the natives more rapidly than those of the migrants of lower socioeconomic status.

The findings partially substantiate our hypothesis that the rates for the urban migrants will approach those of the natives in a shorter interval of time than those of the rural migrants--at least for the extreme groups in our urban-rural scale. We have found that migrants most prepared for urban living (white collar urban migrants) have rates not far below the natives even in the initial period, and the convergence of their rates with those of the natives was quite rapid. On the other hand, those rural migrants with the most extensive rural experience (migrants from the rural South) have rates which never do

approximate those of the natives. The evidence is not clear for the other migrant groups. If the length of residence categories could have been broken down into finer categories--particularly the six to twenty-five year interval--a more systematic test of this hypothesis could have been made.

These hypotheses are not relevant to the relationships found among the females. As we have seen, there is no systematic convergence of the female migrants' rates with those of the natives. The factors operating to determine membership rates for females are apparently different from those for males.

The Effects of Migrant Differentials on Socio-Economic Differences in Membership Rates

There are substantial and consistent socio-economic differences in membership rates. In twenty-two of the twenty-four possible comparisons in Table 10, the rates for the white collar group are higher than those for the blue collar group, within simultaneous controls on migrant status, length of residence, sex, and age. It is also true among males that in five of the six possible comparisons the socio-economic differentials are greater--and usually much greater--than the urban-rural difference.

However, it is also true that for males the socio-economic differentials are influenced to a considerable extent by the migration status distribution of the population--especially by the recency of migration. This is

illustrated in Table 11 (based on Table 10) which presents the socio-economic differences among northern migrants by length of residence. First, there is clearly a very sharp reduction in the socio-economic differential for both urban or rural migrants with increasing length of residence. Second, the difference between the migrants and non-migrants in the size of the socio-economic differential is large in the initial period and then is sharply reduced by time so that, after twenty-five years of residence, the socio-economic differentials for either urban or rural migrants are lower than those of the non-migrants. Not considering the effects of length of residence (Table 12 which is based on Table 8), we note that differences between upper white collar and blue collar northern male migrants are also consistently larger for the urban or rural migrants than the non-migrants. However, the socio-economic differentials among migrants who have resided in Detroit over twenty-five years are much lower than the over-all differences found in Table 12.

The significance of these results is that the size of the differences in membership rates depends on the percentage of the population that is migrant, and especially on the recency of the migration. The size of the socio-economic differences in membership rates will be greater if the population is composed of very recent migrants, than if the population is composed of migrants of long residence in the community of destination. Thus, the socio-economic

TABLE 11

DIFFERENCES IN STANDARDIZED FORMAL GROUP MEMBERSHIP RATES BETWEEN NORTHERN WHITE COLLAR AND NORTHERN BLUE COLLAR RESPONDENTS, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE*

Length of Residence	Socio-Economic Differences in Membership Rates					
	Males			Females		
	Natives	Urban Migrants	Rural Migrants	Natives	Urban Migrants	Rural Migrants
0-5 Years	18	38	35	18	54	5
6-25 Years	18	23	25	18	6	14
Over 25 Years	18	10	9	18	20	19

*The differences were computed from Table 10.

TABLE 12

DIFFERENCES IN FORMAL GROUP MEMBERSHIP RATES (UNSTANDARDIZED) BETWEEN NORTHERN UPPER WHITE COLLAR AND NORTHERN BLUE COLLAR RESPONDENTS BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX*

Migrant Type	Socio-Economic Differences in Membership Rates	
	Males	Females
Natives	33	42
Urban Migrants	40	37
Rural Migrants	35	31
Total	36	27

*The differences were computed from Table 8.

differences in formal group membership rates so frequently found in other studies may be partly attributable to migration. Although the effects of migration are not large enough to eliminate socio-economic differences in membership rates, the size of the socio-economic differential will depend on the proportion and type of migrants.

Such a pattern of socio-economic differences does not exist for the females. We find in Table 11 that socio-economic differences vary erratically by length of residence for the urban migrants. Moreover, the size of the differential increases for the rural migrants.

Summary

Males.--During the initial period of entry into the community, membership rates are higher for urban than for rural migrants in every comparison. This is true irrespective of socio-economic status or region of origin. Apparently, rural background means a lower initial membership even for white collar migrants who are from a highly urbanized region.

After this initial period, however, the existence of urban-rural differences depends upon the region of origin of the migrants. For northern migrants, the urban-rural differences are greatly reduced, eliminated, or reversed after this period. But among the southern migrants, the urban-rural differences are maintained in every comparison. Moreover, in every comparison and under every control, the rural southern migrants have substantially lower

membership rates than any other group. These differences persist even after twenty-five years of residence in Detroit. For membership in formal groups, this migrant type clearly emerges with the lowest membership rates. This is consistent with our interpretation that the rural South, as compared with other regions, still retains traditional rural characteristics which least prepare the migrant for normal group life in an urban community.

As compared with natives, every subclass of migrants, irrespective of socio-economic status or region, has lower rates than the natives during the initial period of residence. Apparently, for every category of migrants, there is an initial period of "learning" or "adjustment" which may be related to the newness of the environment. However, the difference from the natives is quite small for white collar migrants, indicating only minimal initial problems in entering the formal community network. The difference is quite large for the blue collar migrants from the North, very large for blue collar migrants from the South, and especially so for those from the rural South. This last group has all the postulated initial disadvantages--they are in a low socio-economic stratum and come from a region and from a rural environment least favorable to participation.

After the initial period, all migrant groups, except the southern rural group, have participation rates that differ little from those of comparable natives. But the

rural southern migrant group never equals the native participation rates--even after twenty-five years of residence. They begin with much lower rates than the natives, remain much lower than the natives after other migrant groups have converged with the natives, and they never equal the native rates.

If region of origin is initially ignored, the rates for all urban migrants are consistently higher than the rural migrants for each sex and each socio-economic group, and this difference increases with the amount of rural background. However, there are no differences between migrants from small or large cities. This general pattern is consistent with our initial hypothesis that the amount of rural background is negatively correlated with membership rates. What our more detailed analysis indicates is that the gross distinction between broad population types is mainly a function of the distinctive character of the migration from the South and of the initial residence periods for other migrants.

Females.--The relationship of migration to participation rates for females is quite different from that for the males in many ways. It is true that during the initial residence period, all the female migrant groups, like the male, have significantly lower membership rates than the natives. But here the resemblance ends. In general, unlike the males, the female migrants do not show any consistent effects of urban-rural differences in background

either during the initial or later period. Furthermore, longer residence in the community does not have the acculturating effect found for males. Even after five years of residence the female membership rates are less than for comparable natives in eleven out of twelve comparisons.

How can we explain these distinctive results for female migrants? We can only offer a speculative interpretation. Apparently, these differences arise out of the contrasting roles which men and women traditionally play in our society. Generally, the female's role has been centered in the home and family, whereas the man's role has involved him in activities and relationships outside of the home, principally in the occupational system of the community. Consequently, migration creates different types of problems for them. For the male, it is chiefly a problem of establishing himself in the occupational network of his new community--a new job, new co-workers, and all the expectations and obligations which these entail. For the females, migration creates problems of establishing a home in a new neighborhood or community--new social contacts, and relationships more in line with her role as a homemaker. To a certain degree, these problems exist for all migrants, regardless of urban-rural and regional backgrounds.

We know that formal group participation is an activity centered outside of the family and closely linked to the occupational system. Hence, we would expect that the consequence of migration on formal membership may be more

central to the males and more peripheral to the females. Therefore, we may expect that the relationships of migrant backgrounds to formal group membership would differ between males and females.

We found that the socio-economic differentials by migration status may partly account for the socio-economic differences in formal group membership rates frequently noted in other studies. Also, the size of the socio-economic differentials in membership rates is quite large among migrants of recent duration. However, these differences are sharply reduced with longer residence. Thus, part of the socio-economic differences in membership rates existing in a population are due to the proportion of migrants in the population, and especially recent migrants. This finding is only relevant for the male migrants because similar results were not found for the females.

CHAPTER IV

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MIGRANT STATUS TO VOTING

Introduction

Our introductory remarks concerning the relationship between migrant status and voting will be brief because the underlying considerations in our analyses are very similar to those of formal group memberships. Our initial hypothesis was that the frequency of voting would decrease with increasing rural experience. This hypothesis was based on an assumption similar to that which we stated for formal group membership. That is, we expect that the more rural the background of migrants, the less familiar they are with the kinds of politics found in a large urban center.

As in Chapter III, we first will analyze the migrant differentials in voting for each sex with no controls. Then controls for socio-economic status, region, and length of residence will be introduced. Then, we will see to what extent migrants differ in voting rates from the natives and to what extent socio-economic differences in voting occur among migrant types.

In voting rates, as in formal membership rates, we may expect that migration differentials will be greater during the initial years in the new community. The reasons for this assumption have been covered in Chapter III--the critical initial period is a time of "adjustment" and "learning" and all those factors believed to have a negative effect on participation should have their greatest effect during this period.

The data on migration differentials in voting rates are presented in Tables 13 to 22. As we shall see, significant differences are found between males and females, and they will be discussed separately.

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGE WHO WERE VOTERS IN LAST NATIONAL ELECTIONS BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Natives	77	71	497	404
I	77	71	130	160
II	79	72	183	176
III	69	43	97	67
IV	72	54	124	85
V	67	72	71	43
VI		33		21
Urban Migrants	78	71	313	336
Rural Migrants	71	52	292	216
Total	75	64	605	552

TABLE 14

PERCENTAGE WHO WERE VOTERS IN LAST STATE ELECTIONS BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Natives	77	67	497	402
I	76	69	130	160
II	74	68	183	176
III	66	34	97	67
IV	64	53	124	85
V	65	72	71	43
VI		29		21
Urban Migrants	75	68	313	336
Rural Migrants	65	49	292	216
Total	70	60	605	552

TABLE 15

PERCENTAGE WHO WERE VOTERS IN LAST NATIONAL ELECTIONS BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY REGION OF ORIGIN

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
			North	
I	81	70	108	145
II	83	76	149	147
III	74	42	77	45
IV	78	60	69	58
V, VI	74	75	42	28
Urban Migrants	82	73	257	292
Rural Migrants	76	57	188	131
Total	80	68	445	423
			South	
I	61	86	18	14
II	66	50	32	28
III	50	50	20	20
IV	65	44	54	25
V, VI	63	51	27	35
Urban Migrants	64	62	50	42
Rural Migrants	61	49	101	80
Total	62	53	151	122
Natives	77	71	497	404

TABLE 16

PERCENTAGE WHO WERE VOTERS IN LAST STATE ELECTIONS
BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY REGION OF ORIGIN

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
			North	
I	81	72	108	144
II	79	72	149	147
III	70	36	77	45
IV	77	60	69	58
V VI	} 67	} 68	} 42	} 28
Urban Migrants	79	72	257	291
Rural Migrants	72	53	188	131
Total	76	66	445	422
			South	
I	67	57	18	14
II	59	50	32	28
III	50	35	20	20
IV	50	40	54	25
V VI	} 63	} 51	} 27	} 35
Urban Migrants	62	52	50	42
Rural Migrants	53	43	101	80
Total	56	46	151	122
Natives	77	67	497	402

TABLE 17

PERCENTAGE WHO WERE VOTERS IN LAST NATIONAL ELECTIONS BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN

Migrant Type	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Upper White Collar								
Natives	91	92	45	25				
Urban Migrants	95	94	54	51				
Rural Migrants	97	83	30	12				
Total	95	92	84	63				
Lower White Collar								
Natives	81	71	172	133				
Urban Migrants	83	70	64	88	69	85	13	17
Rural Migrants	66	60	41	40	64	60	11	15
Total	76	67	105	128	67	72	24	32
Blue Collar								
Natives	76	70	267	241				
I	77	65	48	77	60	44	10	25
II	76	71	87	76	63		27	
III	77	38	47	26	53	64	17	14
IV	73	63	44	40	61	35	46	17
V	69	50	26	12	64	79	25	14
VI						28		18
Urban Migrants	76	68	135	153	62	44	37	25
Rural Migrants	74	53	117	78	60	49	88	63
Total	75	63	252	231	61	48	125	88

TABLE 18

PERCENTAGE WHO WERE VOTERS IN LAST STATE ELECTIONS BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN

Migrant Type	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Upper White Collar								
Natives	89	92	47	25				
Urban Migrants	95	90	58	51				
Rural Migrants	97	83	30	12				
Total	95	89	88	63				
Lower White Collar								
Natives	78	70	174	132				
Urban Migrants	78	73	64	88	62	69	13	17
Rural Migrants	66	58	41	40	45	40	11	15
Total	73	68	105	128	54	56	24	32
Blue Collar								
Natives	78	65	267	239				
I	75	62	48	77	70	} 36	10	} 25
II	72	67	87	76	59		27	
III	72	27	47	26	59	43	17	14
IV	71	63	44	40	48	29	46	17
V	} 58	} 42	} 26	} 12	} 64	79	} 25	14
VI						28		18
Urban Migrants	73	65	135	153	62	36	37	25
Rural Migrants	68	47	117	78	55	43	88	63
Total	71	59	252	231	57	41	125	88

TABLE 19

PERCENTAGE WHO WERE VOTERS IN LAST NATIONAL ELECTIONS, STANDARDIZED FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY MIGRANT TYPE BY SEX, BY REGION OF ORIGIN

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
North				
I	77	68	108	144
II	78	72	149	147
III	72	41	77	45
IV	77	59	69	58
V VI	} 72	} 71	} 42	} 28
Urban Migrants	78	70	257	291
Rural Migrants	73	55	188	131
Total	76	65	445	422
South				
I	56	85	18	14
II	66	50	32	28
III	52	48	20	20
IV	65	43	54	25
V VI	} 62	} 74	} 27	} 35
Urban Migrants	62	62	50	42
Rural Migrants	61	47	101	80
Total	62	52	151	122
Natives	77	71	497	404

TABLE 20

PERCENTAGE WHO WERE VOTERS IN LAST STATE ELECTIONS, STANDARDIZED FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY REGION OF ORIGIN

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
North				
I	77	69	108	144
II	73	67	149	147
III	66	34	77	45
IV	74	59	69	58
V, VI	64	64	42	28
Urban Migrants	75	68	257	291
Rural Migrants	69	64	188	131
Total	72	67	445	422
South				
I	62	54	18	14
II	59	50	32	28
III	52	34	20	20
IV	48	39	54	25
V, VI	62	51	27	35
Urban Migrants	60	50	50	42
Rural Migrants	52	42	101	80
Total	55	45	151	122
Natives	77	67	497	402

TABLE 21

PERCENTAGE WHO WERE VOTERS IN LAST NATIONAL ELECTIONS, STANDARDIZED FOR AGE BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN, BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Migrant Type	White Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
0-15 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	82	64	40	58				
Rural Migrants	51	59	23	19				
Total	71	62	63	77				
Over 15 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	93	81	82	81				
Rural Migrants	99	65	48	33				
Total	95	76	130	114				
Natives	83	74	217	158				

TABLE 21--Continued

Migrant Type	Blue Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
0-15 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	58	44	43	53	50	13	22	14
Rural Migrants	50	48	40	39	42	41	60	50
Total	54	46	83	92	44	34	82	64
Over 15 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	73	70	92	100	60	67	15	11
Rural Migrants	72	49	77	40	83	67	28	12
Total	73	64	169	140	74	67	43	23
Natives	71	67	267	241	71	67	267	241

TABLE 22

PERCENTAGE WHO WERE VOTERS IN LAST STATE ELECTIONS, STANDARDIZED FOR AGE, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN, BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Migrant Type	White Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	0-15 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	80	58	40	58				
Rural Migrants	50	53	23	19				
Total	70	57	63	77				
	Over 15 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	89	75	82	81				
Rural Migrants	99	62	48	33				
Total	93	71	130	114				
Natives	81	78	217	157				

TABLE 22--Continued

Migrant Type	Blue Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Were Voters		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	0-15 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	51	43	43	53	50	16	22	14
Rural Migrants	51	50	40	39	40	36	60	50
Total	51	46	83	92	43	31	82	64
	Over 15 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	77	67	92	100	67	56	15	11
Rural Migrants	69	40	77	40	85	72	28	12
Total	73	59	169	140	79	65	43	23
Natives	78	64	267	239	78	64	267	239

Migrant Differences in Voting Rates

Males.--A higher proportion of urban than rural migrants vote in both national and state elections (Tables 13 to 20). This generalization holds either when controls for region and socio-economic status are consecutively applied (Tables 17 and 18) or when socio-economic status is standardized (Tables 19 and 20). Urban migrants are more active as voters than rural migrants for every comparison within each of the control categories with but one exception--the northern upper white collar migrants. This exception involved a small difference in a category where almost everyone votes.

While over-all urban-rural differences are found consistently, the further differentiation of migrants by amount of urban or rural experience is not consistently relevant for voting. Voting rates for subcategories of rural experience display no consistent gradient pattern.

As in formal group memberships, southern migrants are less active as voters than northern migrants. Within each urban and rural group, and within each socio-economic category, northern migrants have consistently higher voting rates than southern migrants in both national and state elections.

The higher voting rate for urban, as opposed to rural, migrants is characteristic of those who have been in Detroit for less than fifteen years. When length of

residence is considered as an additional control (Tables 21 and 22), urban-rural differences are found consistently only in the first of two broad categories. Among residents of less than fifteen years duration, urban migrants have a higher voting rate than rural migrants within each regional and socio-economic category, in both national and state elections. There is one exception to this pattern for six comparisons, and this is a tie. However, after fifteen years this consistent pattern disappears. In fact, in four out of six comparisons, the rural migrants have a higher percentage of voters than the urban migrants, but no consistent principle seems to be involved here. In short, urban-rural differences seem to be significant for voting during the initial period, but unimportant afterwards.

We now go on to compare the voting rates for migrants and natives to see if there are any significant differences between them (Tables 21 and 22). During the initial period, migrants have lower voting rates than the natives. This occurs in each of the twelve comparisons made for socio-economic, urban-rural and regional categories. As in the case of formal group membership, migrants seem to have an initial "disadvantage" in voting. But again we find that the disadvantages are practically non-existent for those urban migrants of white collar status whose voting rate differs from those of the natives by only one percentage point in both elections. Moreover, the difference in

voting rates between natives and the migrants is largest for those migrants whom we have presumed to be the least prepared for urban life--the migrants from the rural South.

With longer length of residence, the native-migrant differences in voting rates either decrease substantially or are reversed, so the initial "disadvantage" is much less or disappears completely. After fifteen years, white collar migrants from the North, whether urban or rural, have higher rates than the natives. Northern blue collar migrants also have voting rates which are either higher or slightly below the native rates. Even the southern blue collar migrant group, whether urban or rural, converges on the native rates so that differences between these migrants and the natives become smaller. Thus, in the case of voting, the southern rural group does not have the persistent disadvantage found for formal group membership even after long residence.

In general, then, coming from the South does not have such a consistent effect on voting as was the case for formal group membership. However, this conclusion is based on the relatively high rates exhibited by the southern rural migrants who have been in Detroit more than fifteen years. This may result from sampling errors, for otherwise the southern voting rates are consistently lower than the blue collar northern migrants.

Females.--Among females, urban migrants also have consistently higher rates of voting in both national and state elections than rural migrants. This occurs with but one exception in all socio-economic and regional groups. It is only among the blue collar southern groups that there is a reversal of our expected differences.

Furthermore, like the males, varying degrees of urban or rural experience are not consistently related to voting rates. Tables 13 to 20 indicate that migrants with extensive amounts of rural experience including southern rural migrants, frequently have voting rates which are higher than those of migrants with the least amount of rural experience.

Northern female migrants appear to be more active as voters than southern migrants. This is true irrespective of socio-economic status or urban-rural background. The only exception is found in voting rates on national elections among white collar migrants.

When control for length of residence is added (Tables 21 and 22), no consistent pattern of urban-rural differences in voting rates are found across all major control categories, even in the initial period. Urban-rural differences vary by socio-economic status. For the white collar migrants, urban migrants have consistently higher voting rates than the rural migrants, and this difference persists with no decrease beyond the initial fifteen year period.

The results are unclear for the blue collar migrants, but the rural group always has the higher rate in the initial period. This occurs in four out of four possible comparisons. In all eight possible comparisons, the voting rates of rural migrants exceed those of the urban migrants in five cases, and there is a tie in one case.

During the initial period, the northern migrants of both urban and rural background have consistently higher voting rates than the southern migrants. But after this period, these regional differences in rates are sharply reduced for the urban migrants, and they are reversed for the rural migrants. Thus, as in the case of males, female southern migrants appear to overcome the relative inactivity in voting found in the initial period. However, we should be cautious in these interpretations since the number of female southern migrants in the sample who have resided in Detroit for more than fifteen years is quite small, and the rates may be unreliable.

In general, under controls for socio-economic status, region, and length of residence, our hypothesized urban-rural differences only exist among the white collar migrants. These differences in voting rates do not exist for the other migrant subclasses, even in the initial period of residence.

All female migrant groups have lower voting rates than the natives during the period. Hence, there is a uniform disadvantage in voting for these migrants during this

interval. But after fifteen years, no consistent pattern of native-migrant differences in voting rates is found. This results from the fact that only one migrant group out of six, classified by socio-economic status, region, and urban-rural background, failed to show any increase in voting after fifteen years. Moreover, in eleven out of twelve comparisons, the female migrants are closer to the natives after the first fifteen-year interval than they are during the first interval. Thus, voting rates generally increase with length of residence in the community, but whether female migrant rates eventually converge with those of the natives is not certain.

Socio-Economic Differences in Voting Rates

Significant socio-economic differences have been found in voting for both sexes. White collar migrants of both sexes are generally more active as voters than are blue collar migrants during the initial period. White collar migrants have higher voting rates than blue collar migrants in fifteen out of sixteen possible comparisons across all sex, urban-rural, and regional categories and for both elections. Moreover, these socio-economic differences persist after this initial period because after fifteen years, white collar migrants still have higher voting rates than blue collar migrants in fourteen out of sixteen possible comparisons (Tables 21 and 22). Furthermore, there is no indication that these socio-economic differences

have diminished, since some of these differences increased in size from the initial period.

In general, then, the existing urban-rural and regional differences in voting rates among male migrants diminish after the initial period. Furthermore, the migrant rate approaches the native rate with length of residence in the community. The only significant differences in voting rates that remain after fifteen years are socio-economic differences. Consequently, for the males, urban and rural experiences, whether they occurred in the North or South, are significant for voting during the initial period of adjustment to the new urban setting. As length of residence increases, these background factors play an increasingly insignificant role. For the females, urban-rural differences in voting rates do remain for the white collar group after the initial period, in addition to socio-economic differences. Apparently, white collar female migrants are generally more involved than blue collar migrants in voting; and when this occurs, previous urban-rural experiences are still important factors affecting those who vote. The importance of previous urban-rural environment is greatly diminished in categories such as that of female blue collar migrants, where lower general involvement in voting is normal.

We may now briefly assess these results and see whether they substantiate our original set of hypotheses. As in

the case of formal group memberships, there is an inverse relationship between voting rates and the extent of rural experience, but this relationship exists only among the males and in the initial period of residence. Thus, our initial hypothesis stating this inverse relationship is partially substantiated. Unlike the case for formal group memberships, the urban-rural differentials do not persist beyond the initial period for the southern migrants because of the substantial increases in voting rates for the southern rural migrants. Hence, this migrant group does not have voting rates consistently below the other migrant groups, and, therefore, does not remain a disadvantaged group as we had hypothesized.

The findings show that the process of acculturation to urban voting habits is more rapid for migrants of higher socio-economic status than that of lower socio-economic status as we had hypothesized. The white collar migrants begin with relatively high voting rates which are not too different from the comparable natives and eventually have rates substantially higher than the natives. These results can be compared to those for the blue collar migrants whose initial rates are substantially lower than those of the natives, and whose rates approximate those of the natives in the next interval.

Also, there is some evidence to indicate that migrants with extensive rural experience will take a longer period of time to become acculturated to the political activities

of Detroit than those most prepared for urban living. Our length of residence periods are too broad to give any detailed analyses of these trends, but we do find that white collar urban migrants--a very urban group--have initial voting rates which differ little from the natives, and so they are probably able to approximate the voting rates of natives in a short period of time. On the other hand, the southern rural migrants--a very rural group--initially have the lowest voting rates of all migrant groups, and they probably cannot learn about the political processes of Detroit as rapidly as the white collar urban migrants. Consequently, it would take a longer period of time for the southern rural migrants to have voting rates on the level of the natives. With only two broad length of residence periods, a more systematic test of the hypothesized urban-rural differences in the convergence of voting rates with those of the natives is not possible. A more refined set of time intervals is needed to test this hypothesis in detail.

Summary

Males.--Under controls for socio-economic status and region, urban migrants have consistently higher voting rates than do rural migrants. However, we find that these differences exist only among those migrants who have resided in Detroit less than fifteen years, and these differences disappear after fifteen years. This finding,

like our findings on formal group membership, suggests that urban experience, regardless of socio-economic status or region, does create a higher initial rate of voting activity.

Considering the effects of regional backgrounds on voting, the pattern of urban-rural differences in voting rates among southern migrants is similar to that found for the northern migrants. That is, urban-rural differences are found during the initial period, but do not subsequently persist. Moreover, the southern rural migrants do not consistently remain a "disadvantaged" group in voting. After fifteen years of residence, their voting rates are as high as, or higher than, other migrant groups.

During the initial period, male migrants have lower voting rates than the natives, and this is true irrespective of urban-rural background or region. After fifteen years, voting rates of the male migrants converge with those of the natives. These findings suggest that voting is an activity more readily accessible to everyone than formal group membership. Voting is more individually centered, requiring only that the individual make an effort to register and vote. On the other hand, formal membership requires more social involvement. Channels for formal group membership are not accessible to all: they are limited in terms of the occupation, interests, and the various contacts which the individual must have in order to be sought for membership. Such involvement requires

more social skill and effort of the individual. If his previous social experience has not equipped him for such types of activity, it may take some time to overcome the deficiency--longer than it would take to develop the practice of voting. Consequently, those migrants whose previous experience has least prepared them for urban living--migrants from the rural South--may never acquire the necessary skills or be in positions readily to seek and to accept memberships in formal groups. But voting is a practice which can more readily be adopted by these migrants; and after an initial period of relatively lower voting activity, they are able to participate as frequently as other migrant and non-migrant groups in this type of activity.

Females.--For voting, as for formal group membership, the effects of migration create different problems of adjustment for males and females because of the differences in their respective roles. It is true that, like the males, a consistent pattern of urban-rural differences in voting rates exists for females under simultaneous controls for socio-economic status and region. Southern female migrants are also less active as voters than the northern migrants. When controls for length of residence are added, females have other patterns of differences similar to those found for males. The southern migrants do not consistently remain a "disadvantaged" group in voting, nor do urban-rural differences persist within this southern group. Moreover,

female migrants initially have lower voting rates than the natives, but come substantially closer to the natives after fifteen years.

But in contrast to the males, no consistent patterns of urban-rural differences are found for the females when length of residence is considered, even among those females of recent migration. Instead, the urban-rural differences vary depending on the socio-economic and regional categories considered. For example, urban-rural differences remain among the white collar migrants, but vary with length of residence and region among the blue collar migrants. In this latter group, rural migrants are more active as voters than the urban migrants, irrespective of region, during the initial period. Afterwards, this difference is reversed for the northern blue collar migrants, and eliminated for the southern blue collar migrants.

Socio-Economic Differences. --White collar migrants have consistently higher voting rates than blue collar migrants. This is true irrespective of sex and length of residence in Detroit. Moreover, there is no indication that these differences diminish, even after fifteen years in Detroit. These socio-economic differences in voting rates appear to be the significant consistent pattern of differences in voting rates which persist for either sex after the initial period of residence.

CHAPTER V

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MIGRANT STATUS TO FREQUENCY OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE

Introduction

Our initial hypothesis about church attendance (Chapter I) was that it would not differ greatly for urban and rural migrants. The data prove this hypothesis to be incorrect, as will be seen in this chapter.

Using a variety of controls, we find a higher rate of church attendance for urban than for rural migrants. This difference is usually a large one. It is similar to those found for formal groups in Chapter III, except that the differences are consistent in a larger variety of subgroups. While these urban-rural differences are confined to the first decade of residence, they are remarkably consistent--urban migrants have higher rates of church attendance than do rural migrants irrespective of sex, socio-economic status, region, or religion.

The sequence of analysis in this chapter will be similar to that in Chapters III and IV (formal groups and voting). The detailed tables will be given in approximately the same order, but we will condense the discussion of the findings because of the consistency

of the results and the similarity of the basic procedures of those of earlier chapters.

For all of the following analyses "frequent church attendance" is defined as going to church at least twice a month. One new control--Catholic or non-Catholic--will be used in this chapter, since previous studies show that Catholics have substantially higher rates of church attendance than other major religious groups. Moreover, as Table 23 indicates, Catholics in our study are more heavily concentrated in the urban migrant and native categories: the proportion of Catholics decreases with increased rural experience.

TABLE 23

PERCENTAGE WHO ARE CATHOLICS BY MIGRANT TYPE

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Are Catholics	Numbers in Base Group
Natives	54	1323
I	36	414
II	34	581
III	26	228
IV	18	301
V	14	111
VI	16	44
Urban Migrants	35	995
Rural Migrants	20	684
Total	29	1679

TABLE 24

PERCENTAGE WHO ATTEND CHURCH FREQUENTLY BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Natives	60	73	703	619
I	49	64	197	231
II	46	60	307	284
III	43	51	136	100
IV	31	47	181	127
V	42	47	78	64
VI	27	50	22	34
Urban Migrants	47	62	504	515
Rural Migrants	37	49	417	325
Total	42	57	921	840

TABLE 25

PERCENTAGE WHO ATTEND CHURCH FREQUENTLY BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY REGION OF ORIGIN

Migrant Type	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Natives	60	73	703	619	60	73	703	619
I	47	65	171	209	58	59	26	22
II	48	62	258	236	37	44	49	48
III	42	51	105	73	45	52	31	27
IV	33	48	104	87	29	45	77	40
V and VI	45	58	58	45	31	40	42	43
Urban Migrants	48	63	429	445	44	49	75	70
Rural Migrants	39	51	267	205	33	44	150	120
Total	45	59	696	650	37	46	225	190

TABLE 26

PERCENTAGE WHO ATTEND CHURCH FREQUENTLY BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN

Migrant Type	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Upper White Collar								
Natives	57	71	76	42				
Urban Migrants	50	60	105	72				
Rural Migrants	40	60	47	20				
Total	47	60	152	92				
Lower White Collar								
Natives	63	71	252	209	63	71	253	209
Urban Migrants	47	68	117	151	40	58	10	19
Rural Migrants	34	54	62	69	21	52	14	23
Total	42	64	179	220	29	55	24	42
Blue Collar								
Natives	58	74	375	369	58	74	375	369
Urban Migrants	47	61	208	222	41	44	54	45
Rural Migrants	39	48	162	116	32	43	131	90
Total	43	57	370	338	34	43	185	135

TABLE 27

PERCENTAGE WHO ATTEND CHURCH FREQUENTLY BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN, BY RELIGION

Migrant Type	White Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Catholics							
Natives	82	92	165	123				
Urban Migrants	79	96	75	57				
Rural Migrants	63	65	27	23				
Total	74	87	102	80				
	Non-Catholics							
Natives	42	52	163	128	42	52	163	128
Urban Migrants	34	54	145	166	52	53	21	19
Rural Migrants	29	52	80	66	44	57	16	26
Total	32	53	225	232	49	56	37	45

Migrant Type	Blue Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Catholics							
Natives	75	91	221	209				
Urban Migrants	68	79	101	112				
Rural Migrants	63	77	48	40				
Total	67	78	149	152				
	Non-Catholics							
Natives	33	52	154	160	33	52	154	160
Urban Migrants	26	42	107	111	32	46	44	37
Rural Migrants	25	33	112	76	31	37	118	87
Total	26	38	219	187	31	40	162	124

TABLE 28

PERCENTAGE WHO ATTEND CHURCH FREQUENTLY STANDARDIZED FOR RELIGION, BY MIGRANT TYPE BY SEX, BY REGION OF ORIGIN

Migrant Type	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Natives	60	73	703	619	60	73	703	619
I	52	70	171	209	76	64	26	22
II	52	69	258	236	52	58	49	48
III	49	59	105	73	60	68	31	27
IV	42	53	104	87	44	57	77	40
V and VI	58	69	58	45	46	55	42	43
Urban Migrants	52	69	429	445	60	60	75	70
Rural Migrants	48	58	267	205	48	58	150	120
Total	52	65	696	650	53	59	225	190

TABLE 29

PERCENTAGE WHO ATTEND CHURCH FREQUENTLY STANDARDIZED FOR AGE, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY REGION OF ORIGIN, BY RELIGION, BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Migrant Type	Catholics							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
0-10 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	81	73	39	29				
Rural Migrants	68	52	10	16				
Total	78	64	49	45				
11-25 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	75	86	58	57				
Rural Migrants	83	87	21	26				
Total	77	86	79	83				
Over 25 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	100	86	79	83				
Rural Migrants	61	85	44	21				
Total	86	86	123	104				
Natives	78	91	386	332				

TABLE 29--Continued

Migrant Type	Non-Catholics							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
0-10 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	32	53	67	93	38	44	36	23
Rural Migrants	24	34	39	24	22	36	75	60
Total	29	49	106	117	27	39	111	83
11-25 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	34	47	77	84	44	44	18	21
Rural Migrants	33	31	67	65	38	35	37	33
Total	33	40	144	149	40	39	55	54
Over 25 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	32	41	109	99	41	52	9	12
Rural Migrants	32	51	86	53	53	61	30	20
Total	32	45	195	152	51	56	39	32
Natives	38	52	317	288	38	52	317	288

TABLE 30

PERCENTAGE WHO ATTEND CHURCH FREQUENTLY STANDARDIZED FOR AGE, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY RELIGION, BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Migrant Type	Catholics				Non-Catholics			
	Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Attend Frequently		Numbers in Base Group	
	White Collar	Blue Collar	White Collar	Blue Collar	White Collar	Blue Collar	White Collar	Blue Collar
0-10 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	86	61	34	38	47	34	122	97
Rural Migrants	52	50	11	21	29	31	48	150
Total	78	58	45	59	42	32	170	247
11-25 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	82	72	44	78	48	37	105	95
Rural Migrants	69	89	16	33	43	25	56	146
Total	78	77	60	111	46	30	161	241
Over 25 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	86	78	60	115	40	34	125	106
Rural Migrants	49	75	30	44	52	37	83	103
Total	73	77	90	159	45	35	208	209
Natives	86	83	288	430	46	43	291	314

TABLE 31

PERCENTAGE DIFFERENCES IN CHURCH ATTENDANCE RATES BETWEEN URBAN AND RURAL MIGRANTS DURING THE INITIAL DECADE OF RESIDENCE, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY RELIGION*

Socio-Economic Status	Catholics Percentage Difference	Non-Catholics Percentage Difference
White Collar	34	18
Blue Collar	9	3

*The differences were taken from Table 30.

The Findings

Table 24 shows that, for the sample as a whole, urban migrants have substantially higher church attendance rates than rural migrants. Although there is some trend in the more detailed subclasses for church attendance to decrease with less urban background, this trend becomes irregular when controls are introduced. Our analysis, therefore, is confined to the broad urban-rural dichotomy.

Table 27 shows the main results using all the pertinent controls except length of residence. In this table church attendance rates are higher for urban than for rural migrants in eleven out of twelve comparisons involving simultaneous controls for sex, socio-economic status, region, and religion. The only reversal occurs in a subgroup containing a small number of cases. Similarly, in Table 28 where the rates are standardized for religious distribution, urban migrants have higher rates than rural migrants for each sex and for each region.

The consistently higher urban church attendance is a phenomenon of the migrants' first decade in Detroit. Beyond this period there are no consistent differences within the control categories between urban and rural migrants. Presumably a period of "learning" and "adjustment" takes place which later eliminates the initial differences. Documentation of these generalizations appears in Table 29 and 30. In the six subcategories based on sex, region, and religion in Table 29, urban rates exceed the rural in

every case. In the two later time periods the urban rates are higher in only six out of twelve comparisons. Table 30 permits a similar comparison, but controls on socio-economic status, instead of sex and region. Again the results are completely consistent during the first decade: the urban rate is higher than the rural in four out of four comparisons. But in the next two intervals the urban rates exceed the rural in only five out of eight comparisons.

The higher urban than rural rates in the first decade are much larger for white collar than for blue collar migrants of either religious group (see Table 30). We can also show that the differential is more important for Catholics than for non-Catholics within the white collar group and within the first decade of residence (Table 30). Table 31 (based on Table 30) shows these differences by socio-economic and religious groups. One notes that the urban-rural differentials for the white collar Catholic groups are almost four times as great as those for the blue collar Catholic groups and almost two times as great as those of the white collar non-Catholic group.

We conclude that urban migrants consistently attend church more frequently than rural migrants only during their first years in the city. Their higher church attendance during that period cannot be explained by socio-economic status, religion, region of origin, sex, or age. However, this difference disappears after longer periods of residence and even during this first residence period it is primarily attributable to the white collar migrants.

Turning to a comparison of the migrants' rates with those of the natives,we find that the pattern of differences is not consistent--even during the first decade of residence. During this first decade of residence, it is only the rural and blue collar migrants who have consistently lower rates than those of the natives. The white collar urban migrants, on the other hand, have rates of church attendance as high as those of the natives. Beyond this period, the pattern of native-migrant differences is even more inconsistent. If we consider the process of acculturation beyond the initial period, no consistent principle related to the urban and rural background of the migrants seems to determine which migrant subgroups have rates which converge or fail to converge with those of the natives. The pattern varies by sex, socio-economic status, and religion. It is important to note further that the rates for the migrant subgroup which we have associated with having extensive rural experience--the southern rural migrants--also converge with those of the natives. We conclude, therefore, that the effects of migration and mobility on church attendance, even during the initial period, do not operate uniformly on all migrant subgroups to make all of them a "disadvantaged" group when compared to the natives. The fact that natives have higher church attendance rates than the migrants as a whole (see Table 26) is mainly a result of the heavy concentration of Catholics in the native group (see Table 23). With the

controls for religion and length of residence (Tables 27-30) the native-migrant differences become inconsistent, persisting only in the initial period of residence and then only for certain migrant subgroups.

We arrived at these findings by a sequence of progressive addition of controls (see Tables 24-31). While we shall not repeat verbally this step-by-step analysis, a few other important differences in attendance rates between and within the major control categories will be pointed out before we assess the meaning of our results.

1. While southern migrants initially have the lowest rates of church attendance, this is a result of having a preponderance of non-Catholics among the southern migrants as compared with the northern migrants. Adding a control for religion, the regional differences become unimportant (Table 27).

2. The urban-rural differences in church attendance are not great enough to cancel out the large and consistent religious differentials in church attendance as between Catholics and non-Catholics. For example, in Table 29 church attendance rates for Catholics are much higher than those for non-Catholics in all twelve of the possible subcategories based on sex, region, and length of residence. Moreover, in most cases, the religious differentials are much larger than the urban-rural differences in the same subcategories. Similar results are obtained in Table 30 with controls for socio-economic status. With one exception the Catholic rates are higher than those of non-Catholics,

not only for their own subcategory, but also for every other subcategory as well. For example, in Table 30 recent Catholic blue collar rural migrants (a low church attendance group) have a higher rate of church attendance than all but one subgroup of the white collar urban non-Catholic migrants--regardless of length of residence.

3. In contrast to the figures for formal organizations, the higher urban church attendance rates apply as consistently among women as among men. Apparently, religious activity is relevant to both men and women insofar as migration differentials are concerned. The data for church attendance fit our initial hypothesis about formal group participation better than do the data for the formal organizations.

4. Women attend church more frequently than men, irrespective of region, religion, or socio-economic status (Table 27). This finding is consistent with the results of numerous other studies of church attendance.

Interpretations of the Findings

The findings of this chapter were not anticipated. We had expected that urban-rural differences in church attendance would not show any consistent pattern. If one pattern appeared, we would have expected the rural migrants to have higher rates because church attendance rates appear to be higher in the rural areas of origin than in the urban areas of destination. But the higher attendance rates of urban migrants cannot be explained in

this way, as we saw in Chapter I. We also found that the migration differentials anticipated for formal groups applied in the case of church attendance to both men and women, although in our earlier findings for other formal groups, they were only relevant for men. Finally, we found that the urban-rural church attendance differentials were especially high for Catholics. How can these various unexpected findings be explained?

After the fact, the findings appear to make sense if we think of the urban church as a form of secondary association performing in a massive way the kind of integrating functions that are supposed to characterize all formal associations. In performing this function, the urban church has developed a unique structure which distinguishes it from the rural church and makes it a "strange" institution even to the rural migrant who was a regular churchgoer at home. It is a formal group which will have direct relevance to women because it has an appeal directed to the family rather than to individuals in a highly specialized capacity. As a distinct urban institution, it will have an especial appeal to Catholics who are highly concentrated in urban places. Moreover, the weakness of the Catholic church in rural areas will explain the great differences in rates between Catholic urban and rural migrants. The Catholic rural migrants will find their urban church especially new and foreign and different because, compared with the urban Catholic migrants, they have had relatively

little contact with this type of church organization. For them, the difference as compared with others of the same religion is greater than for Protestants whose church organizations are relatively stronger in rural than urban areas.

Let us develop these ideas more fully. First of all and most important, the church in the city is a different kind of institution than its rural counterpart. The modern urban church is characterized by its large size, professionalized staff, and its general structure of secondary and impersonal relationships. It is, moreover, very often an organizing center and meeting place for many kinds of both secondary and primary groupings--sport, social, professional, intellectual, as well as religious. Participating in this type of organization is quite different from participating in the small rural church organized around more communal and primary relationships. Therefore, rural migrants may need time to become acquainted with the religious network of the metropolis and to find a church which is compatible with their values and practices. The findings do show that rural migrants, even those from the rural South, eventually attend church as often as the other groups, but in the beginning their participation is relatively low.

Beyond the strangeness of this institution to the rural migrant, the higher rates of participation by the urban migrants make sense if we think of the church as a

mechanism for achieving wider social interaction--beyond the primary level--required in the urban setting. This is the kind of function which formal secondary groups are supposed to perform in the city. We are suggesting that the church performs such a function, and that it will be used most by urban migrants who have learned its value and the way to use it. It will be used most by the white collar groups among the migrants who have the greatest need for and skill in such wider social interaction as a result of the requirements of their economic positions.

The fact that church attendance is equally pertinent to men and women in the differentials studied may result from the fact that this is a formal organization of widest reference--it has pertinence for wider interrelations based on occupation, but it is also the one organization with a very wide range of activities with special emphasis on the family. Unlike other formal associations, whose bases for memberships are intimately linked to the occupational system, churches also play an instrumental role for the family as a unit. For instance, it is one of the primary agencies used to instil moral values in the young. The role of the female as mother and wife--therefore an integrator of the family and key socializing agent of the young--involves her in the religious network of the community to an even greater extent than the male who is more involved in the occupational system. Given this greater involvement of females, the effects of urban and rural backgrounds on

church attendance become salient. Consequently, unlike our findings on formal group memberships, we find that urban-rural differentials exist for both sexes.

While women are generally less active than men in formal organizations which are strongly oriented to the world of work, it is perhaps not strange that they should choose as their link to the wider community the organizations which perform this function most widely and with the most familial emphasis.

The large urban-rural differentials among Catholics is another unanticipated finding. We begin by noting that Catholicism is predominantly an urban religion in American society. Thus, we could expect that Catholic institutions in rural areas are weaker than they are in urban areas. Probably the church is not as well organized to perform many of its functions in the rural areas, and, therefore, rural Catholicism, in practice, may be quite different from the urban variety. There is some evidence that the religious practices of rural Catholics are less contained in the church and, therefore, more family centered than those of urban Catholics.[1] There is, for instance, a greater reliance on the rural family to uphold and teach the Catholic dogmas than upon churches and parochial schools, which may be few and ineffective. Consequently, these urban-rural

---

[1]John L. Thomas, "Religious Training in the Roman Catholic Family," American Journal of Sociology, LVII (September, 1951), pp. 178-183.

differences may create a definite problem of "adjustment" for rural Catholic migrants. Since Catholic church attendance rates are very high, the rural migrants' problems of adjustment to urban Catholic institutions may show larger urban-rural differences in church attendance rates than the non-Catholics since the latter have relatively lower rates of attendance to begin with. The large differences among the white collar Catholic migrants could result from the greater emphasis that the white collar urban migrant places on church participation as a means of establishing social and economic contacts. In general, our interpretations center around the idea that the church is important as an integrating mechanism in the community, so that the groups best equipped and most in need of such a mechanism will show the highest rates of church attendance.

CHAPTER VI

THE RELATIONSHIP OF MIGRANT STATUS TO INFORMAL GROUP PARTICIPATION

Our initial hypothesis was that migrant status affects participation in informal groups much less than it does in formal groups or voting behavior. As we stated in Chapter I, these informal groups perform key integrative functions in any social system because they are the fundamental social network in which everyone lives. Therefore, informal group relationships are more pervasive than either formal group memberships or voting and all migrants irrespective of urban or rural background have had intimate experience with these types of relationships.

We will examine migrant differentials in the frequency of contacts with friends, neighbors, co-workers, and relatives both through the use of a summary measure which combines the frequency of contacts in all informal associations and by comparing migrant differences in the percentage who have frequent contacts for each type of association.

By <u>frequency of contacts</u> we mean how often migrants and non-migrants get together with friends, neighbors, co-workers, and relatives. It is important to note here

that in the case of relatives we are referring to those outside of the respondent's household. Also, the category of friends is a residual category referring to informal associations which are neither neighbors, co-workers, nor kin.

As we shall see, the patterns of migrant differences under relevant controls become quite complex and vary in a number of ways. Within any specific control category for a given type of informal association some fairly large migrant differentials may be found. But it is beyond the scope of the study to give a detailed analysis of the significance of these individual subgroup differences. Our sample is too small for such a purpose. Much more intensive analysis of each of these specific groups would be needed to make such an attempt. We shall only deal with differences that are consistent in their pattern either across all kinds of controls for particular kinds of informal association, or across all kinds of informal associations for particular classes of controls or both. We shall not deal with differences found only within a specific subclass of one category. We begin to look for the most general patterns of migrant differentials--significant relationships which exist across the major control categories and for all types of informal contacts. More specifically, we ask the following types of questions:

1. Do urban migrants have consistently higher rates of contact in all informal groupings (friends, neighbors, co-workers, and relatives) than rural migrants irrespective of sex, socio-economic status, region, or length of residence in Detroit?

2. If such consistent differences are not found, do they exist for any significant subgroups of migrants: do they exist for the males or the females, or do they exist for the migrants of recent duration, or do southern rural migrants have consistently lower contact rates than other migrant groups?

3. Do natives have consistently higher contact rates than migrants or certain subgroups of migrants?

We first consider these questions when looking at informal group contacts in their totality, that is, using a summary measure which combines contacts in all the informal groupings into a single scale. Summary scores were constructed for each person on the basis of frequency of participation in any type of informal association. First of all, for each of the four types of informal association, those who got together at least once a week were given a score of 4; those who got together at least once a month were given a score of 3; those who got together a few times a year or less were given a score of 2; those who did not have any contacts were given a score of 1. The summary score for all informal associations was determined by adding the four scores for the specific types of informal

association. Summary scores ranging from 4 to 16 were obtained in this manner. A summary score then was chosen which divided the sample into two approximately equal halves--a "high" and a "low." Table 32 presents the proportions standardized for age of each migrant type who have a high number of informal contacts, with controls for sex, region, socio-economic status, and length of residence.

This table shows that no consistent pattern of urban-rural differences exists in the proportion who have a high number of informal contacts. For both sexes, the differences vary erratically in terms of socio-economic status and length of residence. Even in the initial period, for each sex, the urban-rural differences vary by socio-economic status.

Moreover, neither the southern migrants nor the southern rural migrants have the consistently low rates found to characterize their formal group memberships. Even during the initial decade, southern migrants have higher rates than northern migrants in two of the four comparisons, one comparison is a tie, and the southern rural migrants of either sex have initial rates which are equal to or higher than the northern rural migrants. Furthermore, migrants as a group do not have rates consistently below the natives. Even during the initial decade of residence, the native-migrant differences in informal participation are not consistent for either sex. Natives have higher rates

TABLE 32

PERCENTAGE WHO HAVE A HIGH NUMBER OF INFORMAL CONTACTS STANDARDIZED FOR AGE, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Migrant Type	White Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	0-10 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	34	46	35	69				
Rural Migrants	46	23	12	17				
Total	36	42	47	86				
	11-25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	31	46	42	62				
Rural Migrants	13	67	15	39				
Total	26	54	57	101				
	Over 25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	61	60	47	71				
Rural Migrants	61	43	34	28				
Total	61	56	81	99				
	Total: All Durations							
Urban Migrants	44	52	124	202				
Rural Migrants	46	50	61	84				
Total	45	51	185	286				
Natives	46	43	169	240				

TABLE 32--Continued

Migrant Type	Blue Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	0-10 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	41	29	19	53	57	6	14	18
Rural Migrants	34	35	20	23	34	42	40	50
Total	38	30	39	76	41	31	54	68
	11-25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	31	49	43	74	45	34	12	29
Rural Migrants	46	47	28	49	44	64	39	33
Total	37	48	71	123	45	50	51	62
	Over 25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	47	31	52	95				
Rural Migrants	30	55	32	42				
Total	40	39	84	137				
	Total: All Durations							
Urban Migrants	40	36	114	222	50	23	26	47
Rural Migrants	37	47	80	114	39	49	79	83
Total	39	40	194	336	42	39	105	130
Natives	41	43	215	341	46	43	215	341

than migrants in only eight out of twelve comparisons in this first residence interval.

We conclude, therefore, that if we examine informal group contacts as a single phenomenon, using a summary measure, migrant status has no consistent relationship to informal group participation. No consistent urban-rural or regional differentials are found for either sex, nor do migrants and non-migrants differ consistently.

If significant migrant differentials are not found with the summary measure of informal group contacts, we may ask whether these results may be attributable partly to those migrants who compensate for low participation in formal groups by higher participation in informal groups. It seems reasonable that, if the formal associations of the community are unattractive to the rural migrants, they may depend more on the informal associations to which they have easier access and in which they are more at home.

But the data in Table 33 show no such compensation of high informal group activity for low formal group membership. Migrants with formal group memberships are more likely to have informal group contacts than those who have no formal group membership. This is true irrespective of sex, region, socio-economic status, and urban-rural background. This pattern is strikingly consistent, occurring in sixteen out of a possible eighteen comparisons.

TABLE 33

PERCENTAGE WHO HAVE A HIGH NUMBER OF INFORMAL GROUP CONTACTS, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN, BY MEMBERSHIP IN FORMAL GROUPS

Membership in Formal Groups	White Collar							
	North				South			
	Percentage with High Degrees of Contacts		Numbers in Base Group		Percentage with High Degrees of Contacts		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Urban Migrants							
Have Membership	61	63	94	136				
No Membership	40	59	30	66				
Total	56	61	124	202				
	Rural Migrants							
Have Membership	54	64	46	50				
No Membership	40	55	13	33				
Total	51	60	59	83				
	Natives							
Have Membership	63	65	136	171				
No Membership	61	55	33	168				
Total	63	60	169	339				

TABLE 33--Continued

Membership in Formal Groups	Blue Collar							
	North				South			
	Percentage with High Degrees of Contacts		Numbers in Base Group		Percentage with High Degrees of Contacts		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Urban Migrants							
Have Membership	75	67	52	111	40	39	10	18
No Membership	42	30	64	113	64	28	14	29
Total	57	48	116	224	54	32	24	47
	Rural Migrants							
Have Membership	45	62	33	58	67	64	23	22
No Membership	47	46	47	56	41	34	58	61
Total	46	54	80	114	48	42	81	83
	Natives							
Have Membership	59	60	112	171	59	60	112	171
No Membership	57	54	103	168	57	54	103	113
Total	58	57	215	339	58	58	215	284

Such a finding has other important implications since it has been found in other recent studies.[1] In a general sense, it negates the assertions of the earlier urban sociologists who have contended that secondary groups in the large urban community have more or less taken over many of the functions performed by informal groups.[2] Such a view sees the decline of the primary groups as coincident with and directly the result of the spread of secondary groups. Consequently, an inverse relationship should exist between participation in informal and formal groups. Our findings, however, indicate no such relationship. On the contrary, we find that informal participation, rather than being inversely related to formal group memberships, tends to be positively related. Those who are members of formal groups are more active in informal groups. These two types of activities tend to be linked and to supplement each other. Participation in informal groups may serve as an important channel into the formal group network. Conversely, those who participate in formal groups apparently are better able to establish intimate associations.

Even though no significant migrant differentials in informal group contacts were found using a summary measure, we may find that such differentials exist if we analyze the

---

[1]Axelrod, op. cit., pp. 141-153; Sharp, op. cit., p. 147.

[2]Such implications are evident in the essay by Louis Wirth, op. cit.

data separately for each type of informal grouping. We may then ask the following questions:

1. Are there consistent differences by migrant status cutting across all kinds of informal groups but within the major control categories, e.g., do urban male migrants or urban female migrants have consistently higher contact rates with friends, neighbors, co-workers, and relatives than male rural migrants or female rural migrants during the initial period of residence?

2. Or, do such consistent migrant differences within major control categories appear to exist for certain kinds of informal associations, e.g., do urban migrants have consistently higher contact rates with co-workers than rural migrants?

Let us first consider the question of consistent migrant differences across all informal groupings. Tables 34 to 37 present the percentage of each migrant type (standardized for age) having frequent contacts with friends, neighbors, co-workers, and relatives, under separate classifications of sex, socio-economic status, region, and length of residence. Frequent contacts are defined as contacts which occur at least once a month.

TABLE 34

PERCENTAGE WHO HAVE FREQUENT CONTACTS WITH FRIENDS STANDARDIZED FOR AGE, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN, BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Migrant Type	White Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	0-10 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	63	80	35	69				
Rural Migrants	61	62	12	17				
Total	62	77	47	86				
	11-25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	58	82	42	63				
Rural Migrants	63	82	15	40				
Total	60	82	57	103				
	Over 25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	67	87	52	73				
Rural Migrants	88	93	34	36				
Total	76	85	86	109				
	Total: All Durations							
Urban Migrants	63	83	129	205				
Rural Migrants	77	73	61	93				
Total	67	82	190	298				
Natives	68	80	174	244				

TABLE 34--Continued

Migrant Type	Blue Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
0-10 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	73	63	19	53	54	42	14	18
Rural Migrants	57	67	20	25	48	61	40	53
Total	64	64	39	78	50	56	54	71
11-25 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	55	75	43	74	59	69	12	29
Rural Migrants	56	67	33	50	61	82	39	33
Total	55	72	76	124	61	76	51	62
Over 25 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	76	80	55	95				
Rural Migrants	74	77	33	42				
Total	75	79	88	137				
Total: All Durations								
Urban Migrants	68	74	117	222	58	60	26	47
Rural Migrants	62	71	86	117	54	69	79	86
Total	66	73	203	339	55	66	105	133
Natives	62	66	219	347	62	66	219	347

TABLE 35

PERCENTAGE WHO HAVE FREQUENT CONTACTS WITH NEIGHBORS STANDARDIZED FOR AGE, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN, BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Migrant Type	White Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	0-10 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	46	54	16	69				
Rural Migrants	42	32	12	17				
Total	43	50	28	86				
	11-25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	51	74	43	63				
Rural Migrants	22	78	15	40				
Total	43	76	58	103				
	Over 25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	70	63	52	74				
Rural Migrants	85	73	34	36				
Total	76	66	86	110				
	Total: All Durations							
Urban Migrants	59	63	111	206				
Rural Migrants	61	68	61	93				
Total	60	64	172	299				
Natives	51	48	174	244				

TABLE 35--Continued

Migrant Type	Blue Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group		Percent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	0-10 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	44	45	19	55	66	41	14	18
Rural Migrants	66	27	20	27	60	53	40	53
Total	56	39	39	82	61	49	54	71
	11-25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	36	57	43	74	56	50	12	29
Rural Migrants	44	66	33	81	55	40	39	33
Total	39	62	76	155	55	45	51	62
	Over 25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	55	48	55	95				
Rural Migrants	27	89	41	43				
Total	43	61	96	138				
	Total: All Durations							
Urban Migrants	46	50	117	224	62	46	26	47
Rural Migrants	41	66	94	151	57	48	79	86
Total	44	57	211	375	58	47	105	133
Natives	44	43	219	349	44	43	219	349

TABLE 36

PERCENTAGE WHO HAVE FREQUENT CONTACTS WITH CO-WORKERS STANDARDIZED FOR AGE, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN, BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Migrant Type	White Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
0-10 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	52	57	36	69				
Rural Migrants	51	14	12	17				
Total	52	49	48	86				
11-25 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	25	68	43	62				
Rural Migrants	43	51	15	39				
Total	40	61	58	101				
Over 25 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	43	55	47	77				
Rural Migrants	28	28	34	28				
Total	37	43	81	105				
Total: All Durations								
Urban Migrants	40	60	126	208				
Rural Migrants	36	36	61	84				
Total	39	53	187	292				
Natives	38	34	174	240				

TABLE 36--Continued

Migrant Type	Blue Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
0-10 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	52	36	19	55	41	11	14	18
Rural Migrants	66	18	20	25	68	28	42	53
Total	59	30	39	80	55	24	56	71
11-25 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	43	39	43	74	52	17	12	29
Rural Migrants	36	14	28	50	44	32	39	33
Total	41	29	71	124	45	24	51	62
Over 25 Years in Detroit								
Urban Migrants	43	32	54	95				
Rural Migrants	30	24	40	43				
Total	37	30	94	138				
Total: All Durations								
Urban Migrants	45	35	116	224	46	15	26	47
Rural Migrants	40	19	88	118	52	29	81	86
Total	43	30	204	342	50	24	107	133
Natives	48	29	229	344	48	29	219	344

TABLE 37

PERCENTAGE WHO HAVE FREQUENT CONTACTS WITH RELATIVES STANDARDIZED FOR AGE, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION OF ORIGIN, BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Migrant Type	White Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	0-10 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	46	51	35	69				
Rural Migrants	69	71	12	16				
Total	51	55	47	85				
	11-25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	62	71	42	63				
Rural Migrants	58	81	15	41				
Total	61	75	57	104				
	Over 25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	100	100	52	75				
Rural Migrants	69	69	34	36				
Total	87	90	86	111				
	Total: All Durations							
Urban Migrants	73	75	129	207				
Rural Migrants	66	74	61	93				
Total	71	75	190	300				
Natives	84	89	174	244				

TABLE 37--Continued

Migrant Type	Blue Collar							
	North				South			
	Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group		Per Cent Who Have Frequent Contacts		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	0-10 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	68	59	19	53	54	71	14	18
Rural Migrants	75	85	20	25	59	76	40	53
Total	72	68	39	78	57	75	54	71
	11-25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	86	84	43	74	66	94	12	29
Rural Migrants	83	86	33	50	67	86	39	33
Total	84	85	76	124	67	81	51	62
	Over 25 Years in Detroit							
Urban Migrants	91	93	55	95				
Rural Migrants	85	90	33	42				
Total	89	92	88	137				
	Total: All Durations							
Urban Migrants	85	82	117	222	58	85	26	47
Rural Migrants	80	87	86	117	63	79	79	86
Total	83	84	203	339	62	81	105	133
Natives	86	86	219	348	86	86	219	348

The data in these tables show that:

1. No consistent pattern of urban-rural differences in contact rates exist across the various types of informal groups within the major control categories. For example, male urban migrants have higher rates of contacts with friends than male rural migrants during the initial period of residence. But at the same time, they have lower rates of frequent contacts with relatives. Thus, the pattern of urban-rural differences varies by type of participation as well as by the control categories. This conclusion is valid also even if we consider each sex or regional group separately. Therefore, compared to urban migrants, rural migrants do not begin or continue with a uniform disadvantage for participation in the informal group network.

2. Neither southern migrants nor the southern rural migrants have uniformly lower rates of informal contacts than other groups, even during the first period of residence in Detroit. For either sex, in the initial period, or in the later time intervals, regional differentials in contact rates do not persist across all controls and all types of associations.

3. Natives do not have consistently higher contact rates than the migrants either in the initial period or throughout all the time intervals for all the informal groups considered. If we consider each sex and the initial period separately, no consistent pattern of differences is

present. In the initial period, natives have higher rates for certain types of contacts and lower rates for others.

We come to the conclusion, then, that there are no consistent differences among migrants for all informal associations even within the major control categories.

We now examine the second question of whether consistent migrant differences exist for any particular type of association. It is possible that such differences exist, e.g., urban male migrants consistently may have more frequent contacts with co-workers than rural male migrants. Only a few consistent patterns were found, and we list them below.

1. The most important and consistent pattern of differences found for both sexes during the initial period was for contacts with relatives (Table 37). A consistently higher proportion of rural migrants than of urban migrants of each sex have frequent contacts with relatives during the initial period. However, with each period of longer residence, the proportion of urban migrants having frequent contacts with relatives increases substantially while the contact rates for the rural migrants remain stable, decrease, or increase only slightly. Consequently, after twenty-five years, urban migrants have consistently higher rates of frequent contacts with relatives than do the rural migrants. Thus, rural migrants do rely on kinship contacts more frequently than urban migrants during the initial decade of residence. This is the type of grouping which is perhaps

the most familiar and the most meaningful to them during the initial period of residence. We assume that kinship is an important basis for informal association in rural areas. Therefore, it is reasonable that rural migrants should initially rely on relatives in seeking aid and information through informal association in adjusting to their new social environment.

This finding is important since the data in Table 38 show that association with relatives is the most frequent type of informal contact for natives as well as for almost all types of migrants. So as compared with urban migrants, rural migrants initially do have more frequent contacts in that type of informal association most universal in the general population.

The initially higher rate of association with relatives for rural migrants is partly accounted for by the availability of their relatives in the Detroit area--at least this is true for the male migrants. A substantially larger proportion of male rural migrants have relatives outside of their own household in the Detroit area during the initial period (Table 39). However, such a difference does not exist for the females. Perhaps male rural migrants consider these kin relationships as especially important; therefore, they migrate with their relatives to Detroit. Another possible explanation might be that the migration of the rural male is guided more by knowledge received from relatives than is the migration of the urban male.

TABLE 38

TYPES OF INFORMAL ASSOCIATION RANKED BY FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION, BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, BY REGION

Type of Contact	Natives		Urban Migrants		Rural Migrants	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
			Northern White Collar			
Relatives	1	1	1	2	2	1
Friends	2	2	2	1	1	2
Neighbors	3	3	3	3	3	3
Co-workers	4	4	4	4	4	4
			Northern Blue Collar			
Relatives	1	1	1	1	1	1
Friends	2	3	2	2	2	2
Neighbors	3	2	3	3	3	3
Co-workers	4	4	4	4	4	4
			Southern Blue Collar			
Relatives			1	1	1	1
Friends			2	2	3	2
Neighbors			3	3	2	1
Co-workers			4	4	4	3

TABLE 39

PER CENT WHO HAVE RELATIVES IN THE DETROIT AREA BUT OUTSIDE OF THEIR OWN HOUSEHOLD BY MIGRANT TYPE, BY SEX, BY LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Migrant Type	Per Cent Who Have Relatives		Numbers in Base Group	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
	0-10 Years in Detroit			
Urban Migrants	37	90	38	52
Rural Migrants	56	92	18	24
Total	43	91	56	76
	11-25 Years in Detroit			
Urban Migrants	65	92	37	59
Rural Migrants	63	89	34	39
Total	64	91	71	98
	Over 25 Years in Detroit			
Urban Migrants	84	94	31	63
Rural Migrants	85	95	20	37
Total	84	94	51	100
Natives	96	98	146	262

All migrant types have initially lower rates of contact with relatives than the natives. Part of this initial difference may be attributed to the fact that a greater proportion of natives have relatives in the Detroit area (Table 39). Not only do a greater proportion of natives have a relative in the Detroit area, but it is also likely that these natives have a greater number of relatives in Detroit due to their life-long residence in the community. This, then, gives them an opportunity for a wider range of kin contacts. After this initial period, the native-migrant differences become erratic.

2. Our finding for association with relatives was the only major migrant differential which existed for both sexes and within all regional and socio-economic groupings. For other types of informal associations, migrant differences only existed within specific minor categories. The following are the more important ones:

a. During the initial period of residence, male urban migrants tend to rely on friendship contacts more than rural migrants do (Table 34). Consistent urban-rural differences in contact rates are found for male migrants in the initial period. These differences, however, are substantially reduced, or reversed, in the later time intervals.

b. Female urban migrants have consistently higher rates of frequent contacts with neighbors than rural migrants (Table 35). This pattern exists only in the initial period and becomes inconsistent later.

c. Northern female urban migrants have consistently higher contact rates with co-workers than northern rural migrants (Table 36). These differences are substantial and persist throughout all time intervals. However, the pattern is opposite for the southern female migrants.

d. Northern male migrants have initially higher rates of frequent contacts with friends and relatives than do the male southern migrants (Tables 34 and 37).

e. As compared with natives, all male migrants initially have higher rates of frequent contacts with co-workers and lower rates of contact with friends. These differences disappear after the initial period.

Our finding about the higher rate of contact with relatives for rural migrants during the initial period fits our initial expectations quite well, but these scattered findings about the other types of informal contacts do not. On the assumption that informal contacts with persons other than kin or neighbor are more characteristic of urban than rural life, we had anticipated that urban migrants might see friends and co-workers more than rural migrants, and that both types of migrants would have these types of informal contacts less than natives. Neither of these expectations are realized in any consistent way. On the basis of the greater significance of neighboring in rural areas, we had expected that rural migrants might see their neighbors more than the urban migrants and natives. This, too, proved not to be the case. It would appear to be a fair

generalization that only the greater frequency of contacts with relatives during the initial period distinguishes the migrant groups from each other systematically. Even that distinction disappears with longer residence in the community. Basically, the fact appears to be that informal association is not systematically related to migrant status.

Summary

The most important single conclusion coming out of our analysis is that even in a metropolis like Detroit, extensive participation in some kinds of informal groupings is likely, irrespective of migrant background. Migrants apparently come to the new community sufficiently prepared to participate in some type of informal grouping. Such a result was anticipated, since participation in various forms of close, informal groupings is almost universal. Such informal participation comprises a fundamental social network in which everyone lives. Such groups give the individual member security and status, and define the norms by which he lives. Thus, participation in these types of groups will be a significant and meaningful part of everyone's life experience. To lack such experience would deprive the individual of the kind of social interaction which gives stability and meaning to his life.

We would speculate that not only are migrants better prepared to participate in these informal groups than in formal groups, but also that these informal groups do not

offer as much resistance for entry in the urban setting. Informal groupings do not have a set of objective external qualifications for entry which characterize most formal groups. Informal groups are more responsive to the personal qualities of the individuals concerned--their ability to get along with others. Moreover, these groupings are more spontaneous--they can be more readily formed to meet a variety of needs. No formal enactments are necessary for their formation. A person may become a member of such a group gradually and without any deliberate decision. We suggest, then, that no major segment of the population will be found which does not participate extensively in some kind of informal grouping.

It is true that migrants will vary in types of informal associations they rely upon, but in general no consistent principle seems to be involved here for the characteristics we have examined, and the differences found appear to be idiosyncratic. The one important consistent differential is the greater frequency of contacts with relatives as compared with urban migrants during the first period of residence.

Perhaps more important than the differentials for association with relatives is the fact that, like the general population, migrants of all types associate with relatives more frequently than with any other group. This finding, along with the findings of other studies, negates the assertions of the earlier urban sociologists who have

postulated the decline of the importance of kinship groupings. Contacts with kin are still the most important type of informal association.

Another important finding in this chapter is that informal group participation is not a substitute for formal group memberships. Indeed, the two types of activity seem to go together so that actively participating in informal groups may involve one in a much wider network of secondary associations. On the negative side, this finding suggests that those who are isolated from one aspect of the group life may also be isolating themselves from other significant spheres of participation.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Our study was concerned with the relationship between the migrants' backgrounds and certain patterns of behavior in the community of destination--Metropolitan Detroit. The types of behavior patterns analyzed were participation in formal groups, political activities, religious activities, and informal groups.

The white, native-born migrants studied were classified according to their urban and rural background and region of origin because we assumed that migrants would differ in certain behavior patterns depending upon whether their previous social environment prepared or failed to prepare them for such kinds of behavior. We further assumed that the social environment of rural areas differed from urban areas in certain important cultural characteristics, so that migrants from rural areas to Detroit would differ significantly in certain behavior patterns from migrants with no rural experience.

Our hypotheses on migrant differentials within each type of participation were based on the assumption that urban and rural migrants would differ most in those types of activities which were more characteristically "urban" and would differ least in those activities which were more

universal--meaningful to both types of migrants in their previous life experience. Consequently, we predicted that urban-rural differentials would exist for formal group membership and voting, and would be minimal for church attendance and informal group contacts.

The analyses were based on the comparison of participation rates of various migrant and non-migrant groups under a wide range of controls. We considered whether urban migrants had consistently higher participation rates than rural migrants within the major control categories. We also compared the participation rates of non-migrants to those of the migrants.

If consistent differences were not found among all types of migrants or for all types of controls, we then considered whether they existed for certain groups of migrants or in certain groups of control categories, e.g., among males or females, among southern migrants, or during the initial period of residence.

The findings are summarized in terms of their consistency with our original set of hypotheses. We must begin by saying that our summary of findings for formal group membership and voting are only pertinent for the males, since no consistent patterns of migrant differences were found for females. We attribute this to the contrasting role which men and women play in our society. Women's roles are centered around the home, and they are not as directly involved in the occupational system of the

community as the men. Thus, the problems of adjustment resulting from migration are different for women and men, and for women these problems are less directly related to membership in formal organizations and political activities. With this initial consideration, the findings are summarized as follows:

1. Urban-rural background is related to formal group membership and to voting rates, but these relationships are important only during the initial period of residence in Detroit and only among the male migrants. Urban migrants consistently participate at higher rates than the rural migrants for both kinds of activities during the initial period. After that period, urban-rural differences disappear except for the southern rural migrants who participate in formal groups less than any other group--even after a very long period of residence.

For formal group membership there is some evidence of a gradient pattern of decreasing rates of participation with increasing amounts of rural experience among the southern migrants. For the northern group the amount of rural experience has no consistent relationship to membership rates.

More generally, the groups who experience migration, but no mobility, participate in formal groups and voting more than those who experience both migration and mobility. Moreover, the greater the degree of mobility experienced by the migrants, the less they are able to participate in

the formal group and political life of the urban setting--at least during the initial period of residence. This conclusion is illustrated by the striking differences between the white collar urban migrants (a group characterized by migration but little mobility) and the southern blue collar rural migrants (a group characterized by migration and a large degree of mobility). The rates for the other migrant groups who experience varying degrees of mobility fall between these two extremes.

The importance of the migrants' initial period of residence in Detroit for formal group membership and voting is one of the significant findings of this study. The initial period is the most crucial one for analyzing these migrant participation differentials, for this is a period of adjustment, and the factors negatively affecting participation will have their greatest effect.

2. All migrant groups begin their residence in Detroit with lower rates of participation in formal groups and in voting than the natives. Apparently, an initial period of adjustment is required by all migrant groups, regardless of their background because this period calls for the establishment of new social relationships and behavior patterns appropriate to the new setting. But the initial disadvantage appears to be slight for white collar migrants (who experience little mobility), is larger for migrants of blue collar status (who experience more mobility), and

is extremely large for blue collar migrants from the rural South (who experience the most mobility).

With increasing length of residence, most migrants appear to become better acquainted with the formal group and political network of Detroit since their rates of participation in these activities increase substantially. In time, the average participation rates for migrants become quite similar to those for the natives of similar status. The exception already noted is the southern rural migrant group.

The white collar migrants, irrespective of urban or rural background, not only begin with the rates closest to the natives, but also their rates converge to the native rates in a shorter interval of time than those of the blue collar migrants. This is consistent with our initial hypothesis that migrants of higher socio-economic status are better equipped educationally and occupationally to deal with movement and should have a minimal initial disadvantage and a faster rate of assimilation into the social structure.

3. Of the migrant groups, the southern rural migrants appear to be the least prepared to participate in the formal group and political life of Detroit.

This finding substantiates our original hypothesis that relatively low degrees of participation characterize this group. These migrants have been socialized in a region postulated to have many of the traditional rural

characteristics and, therefore, are the least prepared to become integrated into the urban group life of Detroit. Moreover, they are concentrated in the lower socio-economic strata which generally have low rates of participation. They begin with lower rates than any other migrant group, and, in the case of formal group membership, they never do equal the membership rates of the natives, even after twenty-five years when other migrant groups appear to have done so. They come the closest to being "isolates." However, it is well to remember that, with the exception of formal group memberships, their disadvantages occur only during the initial period and that they are able to overcome most of these deficiencies with increasing length of stay. Moreover, in the specific case of informal group participation, they do not differ in any consistent manner from the other migrant groups. Thus, even for this group, the isolation is confined to certain types of participation and certain periods of time.

4. Our hypothesis that migrant backgrounds will have no relationship to church attendance was not supported. On the contrary, it was found that the urban-rural backgrounds of migrants do affect their patterns of church attendance during the initial decade of residence in Detroit. In fact, the patterns of urban-rural differences hypothesized for formal group membership and voting rates appear to be more relevant for church attendance. Urban migrants consistently have higher church attendance rates than rural migrants.

The patterns of differences were consistent across all sex, socio-economic, and regional groups during the initial period of residence in Detroit. Such a finding makes sense if we regard the urban church as a distinctly urban institution, performing in a massive way many of the integrative functions associated with formal groups. Thus, church attendance in Detroit is a very "urban" phenomenon and may appear to be quite strange to rural migrants who might have been frequent church attenders before migrating to Detroit.

5. No consistent pattern of migrant differentials was found for informal group contacts. As we hypothesized, the types of consistent migrant differences we found for the other types of social participation were not found for informal association. We attribute this to the relatively universal nature of informal association, so that the migrants, regardless of how extensive their rural background, have sufficient experience in these types of groups. Therefore, migrants are prepared to carry on these types of relationships in the community of destination.

The exception to this conclusion about informal groups was in our findings on contacts with relatives. Rural migrants have higher initial rates of frequent contacts with relatives than urban migrants. Such a finding, however, is consistent with our expectations since we assumed that rural migrants have had ample experience in kinship groupings.

Informal group participation is not a substitute for formal group memberships. On the contrary, informal group participation is positively related to formal group membership, both for natives and for all types of migrants. These two types of participation are linked, so that participation in one type of grouping serves as an important channel into other types of groups.

6. The effects of the urban-rural backgrounds of migrants on their participation patterns are confounded by the effects of other demographic and social characteristics of the migrants. Such characteristics of the migrants as sex, socio-economic status, and religion are crucial in influencing participation rates.

We have already mentioned the importance of sex in influencing the patterns of participation in formal groups and voting. Men and women migrants have different patterns of participation resulting from the different positions they occupy in our society.

Socio-economic status also plays an important role in formal group memberships, voting, and church attendance. Migrants of higher socio-economic status, irrespective of urban or rural backgrounds, have initially higher participation rates than those of lower socio-economic status and are not too different from the comparable non-migrants. This may indicate that they have fewer initial problems of adjustment to the new environment and that the initial disadvantages which do exist are quickly eliminated.

Apparently, such higher status migrants are better prepared for urban living irrespective of any rural background. They appear to be better prepared to handle changes from movement, and they appear to use the formal group, political, and religious network as a means of gaining entry into the group life of the community.

We have also found that the Catholic migrants, irrespective of urban or rural backgrounds, have substantially higher church attendance rates than other religious groups.

Therefore, we can say that it is not sufficient to know the urban and rural backgrounds of the migrants to understand their patterns of social participation. Frequently, the other associated factors are more significant.

It is these intricate relationships between migration and other social and demographic factors and social participation which make the use of controls so crucial. We have frequently found that gross migrant differentials in participation rates are partly, or entirely, the result of the associated social and demographic characteristics of the migrants. When controls for these factors are simultaneously applied, the initial differentials only persist within certain migrant subgroups. Such a finding has been one of the distinctive contributions of this study.

Relationship to Other Studies

Where our findings can be compared with others, they are generally consistent. However, they are contradictory in some ways and--more important--in some aspects our findings extend the area of knowledge.

Of particular importance for comparison are the studies of Zimmer[1] and Sharp[2] because this study has pursued some of the important suggestions and comparisons which they made. Our findings are consistent with theirs in that both found (1) urban-rural differences in formal group membership and voting rates;[3] (2) lower membership and voting rates of the southern rural migrants; (3) the increase in formal, political, and religious activity which is associated with an increased length of residence; (4) the lack of any consistent migrant differentials in informal group participation;[4] and (5) the existence of migrant differentials in church attendance rates (supported by Zimmer, but not by Sharp).[5]

---

[1]Zimmer, op. cit., pp. 202-283.

[2]Sharp, op. cit., pp. 151-162.

[3]However, Zimmer analyzed vote registration rather than voting.

[4]This does not apply to Zimmer's study since he did not analyze informal group participation.

[5]Sharp offers the explanation for the discrepancy between his findings and Zimmer's (in this area) that Zimmer did not control for religious preference. However, this control was used in this study, and our findings still agreed with Zimmer's. See: Sharp, op. cit., p. 157.

It is important to note that the findings of this study were based on replicated comparisons in a larger variety of subgroups than were Zimmer's and Sharp's. This might account for the contradiction that Sharp[1] found migrant differences existed among both sexes in formal group membership and voting rates. We also found this to be true when we used simultaneous controls for socio-economic status and region. However, when control for length of residence was added, the pattern of migrant differences among females becomes erratic. Therefore, the pattern only held true for males.

Because of the wider range of controls, we were also able to extend the area of knowledge by showing how migrant backgrounds and length of residence jointly affect participation. We concluded that migrant differences in participation rates exist only in the initial period of residence in the community. Sharp was not able to analyze simultaneously the effects of both migrant backgrounds and length of residence. Zimmer did analyze migrant backgrounds with length of residence, but he was not able to utilize any controls.

---

[1]Zimmer did not analyze females.

Some Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Future Research

The size of the sample--considerably larger than in previous studies--was not large enough for sufficiently detailed analysis of some of the questions we posed, e.g., questions dealing with migrant differentials in "rates of entry" into the group life of Detroit for specific migrant subgroups.

Since a large number of factors confound the relationship between migration and social participation, a large number of cases are needed in order to analyze migrant differences in participation rates under a number of simultaneous controls. Therefore, future studies on the relationship of migrant status to social participation should be based on a larger number of cases. An alternative is the use of multiple regression analysis with smaller numbers of cases, but this will not permit desirable descriptive analysis of subgroups.

Another limitation of the present investigation is that, strictly speaking, it applies only to the Detroit Metropolitan Area. To test the generality of the results, replication in other areas will be necessary.

A third limitation is that we analyzed social participation in a very broad manner. Each type of participation can be studied much more intensely. For example, do migrants differ in the kinds of organizations they join? Does the process by which they become active in such

organizations differ? Do they differ in political activities beyond voting--for example, in the nature of their participation in political campaigns?

A more detailed analysis may be especially important for informal group participation where we found no consistent patterns of migrant differences on the basis simply of an index of frequency of contacts. Analyses based on the content of these informal contacts--for example, the various purposes served by each type of informal contact--might reveal consistent patterns.

Finally, our analyses were based on data gathered by cross-section interview surveys at a given time. This limits the possibility of studying the developmental stages in the adjustment process for migrants. Such a study could require a panel design in which a group of migrants are studied over a period of time.

Some Broader Consequences of the Findings

If participation in the important formal associations and groups of Detroit is a means by which the residents are integrated into the community structure, then migrant status does affect the degree of integration. To the extent that a resident is a migrant--and, more importantly, a recent migrant--his previous urban or rural background will affect whether he becomes active in the formal group, political, and religious life. Extensive rural background is a barrier to his entry into these activities. Even

those migrants with little or no rural background will have some initial disadvantage for entry due to their movement into a new social environment.

However, migrants--whether urban or rural--initially participate as much as natives in certain informal groups for which their previous experience is relevant. Moreover, these informal groupings are probably linked by a chain of memberships to the more formal secondary groups. By initial participation in these informal groupings, migrants probably have access to the formal structure of relationships and also learn the behavior patterns appropriate for the whole urban setting. Thus, in time, many of the initial deficiencies in participation are overcome, and they are able to participate like other residents.

Our findings suggest that the greater the mobility of the population, the less the community integration.[1] High mobility means the population includes a substantial number of recent migrants who will be less active than other residents in the group life of the community. This consequence of migration is likely to become progressively less important, because with the continuing urbanization of our society, the rural sectors continue to absorb the expanding urban culture and to develop social characteristics similar

---

[1]This is consistent with the findings of Angell. See: Robert C. Angell, The Moral Integration of American Cities, monograph published as Part 2 of the American Journal of Sociology, LVII, No. 1 (July, 1951).

to the urban sector. Hence, the urban and rural sectors of our society are becoming integrated into a single urban culture. Movements between these sectors increasingly will be more associated with migration rather than mobility. Under such conditions urban-rural background will become less important as a factor affecting participation. Even then, however, some effects on participation should remain during the migrants' initial period of residence in the new community since migration, too, affects participation to some extent--even without mobility.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

WEIGHTING THE SAMPLE FOR INCLUSION OF THE D.A.S. SAMPLE

The 1955 D.A.S. sample was composed solely of husbands and wives, and the inclusion of the interviews from that year in our combined sample from different years meant that unmarried respondents would be under-represented. Consequently, a simple weighting scheme was devised to overcome this deficiency.

We did this by adding to the 1955 sample an appropriate number of unmarried cases randomly selected from the other years. The proportion of married males in the total sample was .875 and the proportion of married females was .774. There were 434 husbands and 485 wives from the 1955 sample to be added to our total sample. Therefore, a total of 553 males (484/.875) and 627 females (485/.774) were added to our sample of which 69 males (555-434) and 142 females (627-485) were unmarried and selected from the total sample.

The unmarried respondents were distributed in the unmarried categories (single, divorces, separated, widowed) in the same proportions as the total sample. The calculations of the required number of additional cases needed in each of these categories are illustrated in Table 4C. Column 1 of this table shows the proportion in each of the marital categories of the total sample. By multiplying

each of the proportions in these categories by 553 for the males and 627 for the females, we got the required number of unmarried respondents to be added along with the husbands and wives of the 1955 sample in order to give a proportionate representation to these categories.

Once the required number of cases for each unmarried category was calculated, these cases were randomly selected from each of the corresponding categories of the total sample and given a double weight. Since our data were punched on IBM cards, we simply duplicated the responses of these selected cases on IBM cards and, therefore, included them twice in the sample.

TABLE 40

CALCULATIONS OF THE NUMBER OF UNMARRIED RESPONDENTS NEEDED FOR INCLUSION WITH THE 1955 O.A.S. SAMPLE

Marital Status	Proportion of the Total Sample (1955 Sample Excluded)		Number of Cases To Be Included	
	Males	Females	Males [(1)x553]	Females [(2)x627]
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Single	.074	.065	41	41
Divorced	.014	.034	8	22
Separated	.008	.019	4	12
Widowed	.029	.107	16	67
Total	1.000	1.000	69	142

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ON MIGRATION HISTORY AND SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Those sections of the Detroit Area Study's interview schedules which obtained data on migrant status, formal, political, religious and informal group participation are reproduced below.

Migrant status was ascertained through the use of the following questions:

1. How long have you lived in the Detroit area? (IF NEEDED, ADD: The Detroit area is any place in Wayne, Macomb, or Oakland counties.)

(IF NOT ENTIRE LIFE)

a. Where were you born?_____(TOWN)____(STATE)

b. Have you ever lived on a farm? Yes No

(IF YES)

c. Where?_____(STATE)

d. Between what ages?_____to_____

This question obtained information on formal group membership:

1. One way in which some people in Detroit spend their time is in clubs and organizations. I would like you to look at this list of kinds of organizations and tell me if you belong to any organizations like labor unions, a church and so on--?

LABOR UNIONS: A local of some union
A CHURCH

CHURCH CONNECTED GROUPS: Like a club connected with a church--such as men's clubs, ladies' aid societies, Holy Name Societies, Missionary societies.
FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS OR LODGES: Like the Masons, Knights of Columbus, Elks, Eastern Star.
VETERANS ORGANIZATIONS: Like the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars.
BUSINESS OR CIVIC GROUPS: Like Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions
PARENT-TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
NEIGHBORHOOD CLUBS OR COMMUNITY CENTERS
ORGANIZATIONS OF PEOPLE OF THE SAME NATIONALITY BACKGROUND: Like the Polish National Alliance, the B'nai B'rith, the Steuben Society.
SPORT TEAMS: Like bowling or baseball teams.
PROFESSIONAL GROUPS: Like the American Medical Association, or a builders' association.
POLITICAL CLUBS OR ORGANIZATIONS
NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATIONS
WOMEN'S CLUBS
CHARITABLE AND WELFARE ORGANIZATIONS

The voting activity of the respondent was ascertained by the following questions:

1. We know that there are many reasons why people don't get to vote in elections. Could you tell me whether you voted in these elections--

1a. First, the last local election?

1b. Now, the presidential election--did you vote then?

The following questions on the religious participation of the respondent were asked:

1. What is your religious preference?

Catholic____ Protestant____ Jewish_____

Other_____ _____
(SPECIFY)

(IF PROTESTANT) 1a. What religious denomination is that?

_____
(SPECIFY)

2. About how often do you usually attend religious services?

Once a week_____

Twice a month_____

Once a month_____

A few times a year _____

Never_____

Those questions which dealt with informal group participation were the following:

1. Apart from the formal organizations and clubs like the ones we have been talking about, some people get together every once in a while. Sometimes they just talk or visit and sometimes they do things like playing cards or bowling or s mething else.

a. How often do you get together with any of your neighbors?

At Least Once a Week, A Few Times a Month, About Once a Month, A Few Times a Year, Never.

b. How often do you get together, outside of work, with any of the people you (your husband) work (s) with?

At Least Once a Week, A Few Times a Month, About Once a Month, A Few Times a Year, Never.

c. How often do you get together with any of your relatives other than those living at home with you?

At Least Once a Week, A Few Times a Month,
About Once a Month, A Few Times a Year, Never.

d. And how often do you get together with any other friends?

At Least Once a Week, A Few Times a Month,
About Once a Month, A Few Times a Year, Never.

APPENDIX C

CONSTRUCTION OF AN INDEX FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

An index of socio-economic status was constructed based on information about the respondent's occupation and education. For females, the socio-economic position was determined by the occupation and education of the head of the household.

The respondents were classified into two broad occupational categories--white collar and blue collar. All respondents who were in the professional, managerial, clerical, and sales categories were classified as white collar. All craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers, operatives and kindred workers, private household workers, service workers, and laborers except farm and mine were classified as blue collar.

The white collar group was further subdivided into two age categories, and in each of these age categories an educational dichotomy distinguished upper and lower white collar workers. For those above age forty-five, the respondents who at least graduated from high school were classified as upper white collar: those who had not finished high school were classified as lower white collar. Those white collar respondents under forty-five years of age who were college graduates were classified as upper white collar: all the others were considered to be lower white collar.

APPENDIX D

INDIRECT STANDARDIZATION*

Indirect standardization was used to control for the effect of certain variables. For the purposes of our discussion let us consider the problem of standardizing the formal group membership rates of various migrant groups to the age participation rates of the natives.

Assume that the natives and migrants of various durations of residence, backgrounds, and sex constitute different populations. Then let us further assume that the participation rates for each age group are known for one population (the natives), but not for the others. These other groups shall be referred to as the second population. Since we know the participation rates for each native subgroup, let us apply them to the corresponding age groups in the second population--that is, the one for which the specific proportion of participants is not available. The population from which the known rates were taken then becomes the standard population (natives). Multiplying the number in each subgroup of the second population by

---

*This was adapted from Jaffe's discussion on indirect standardization. See U. S., Bureau of the Census, Handbook of Statistical Methods for Demographers (preliminary edition--second printing), by A. J. Jaffe, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1951, pp. 44-45.

the corresponding rate for the first population and summing these calculations result in a figure showing how many participants there would be in the second population, with its particular age composition, if its participation rates for each subgroup were exactly the same as for the first population. If the actual number of participants were greater than the expected number, we would conclude that for some--at least--of the specific age groups the proportion of participants in the second population must have been higher than in the first population, and, therefore, the standardized proportion in the second population would be greater than that in the first. It would be greater by the ratio of the actual to the expected number of participants in the second population. To obtain this estimate of the standardized proportion of participants in the second population, we simply multiply the over-all rate of the first population by the ratio of the actual to expected number of participants in the second population.

The mechanics of this procedure are shown in Table 41, in which the formal group membership rates of the male, blue collar, northern, urban migrants of over twenty-five years residence are standardized. The proportion of formal group memberships in the various age groups of the natives are shown in column 1. In column 2 are the numbers of the migrants who are in each of the age groups. If the numbers in column 2 are multiplied by the corresponding rates in

column 1, we would get the expected number of memberships (column 3). The sum of the age specific calculations is 50 (total of column 3) giving an expected rate of .49 (50/102): the actual rate is .57. The actual rate divided by the expected rate is equal to 1.16. The proportion of male blue collar natives with formal group memberships is .54. Therefore, .54 is multiplied by 1.16 to produce the figure of .63, which is the standardized proportion of this migrant subgroup which has membership in formal groups.

TABLE 41

INDIRECT STANDARDIZATION FOR AGE OF FORMAL GROUP MEMBERSHIP RATES OF MALE, BLUE COLLAR, NORTHERN, URBAN MIGRANTS OF OVER 25 YEARS RESIDENCE

Age	Native Rates (1)	Migrant Numbers (2)	Expected Numbers [(1) x (2)] (3)
21 - 25	.47	0	0
26-29	.52	0	0
30-34	.60	4	2.4
35-39	.71	12	8.5
40-44	.44	17	7.5
45-54	.43	28	11.9
Over 55	.48	42	19.7
Total	.54	102	50.0

Expected Rate = 50.0/102 = .49

Actual Rate = .57

Actual Rate/Expected Rate = .57/.49 = 1.16

Standardized Rate = 1.16 x .54 = .63

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angell, Robert C. The Moral Integration of American Cities, monograph published as Part 2 of the American Journal of Sociology, LVII, No. 1 (July, 1951).

Axelrod, Morris. "A Study of Formal and Informal Group Participation in a Large Urban Community." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, 1953.

Beers, Howard, and Heflin, Catherine. "The Urban Status of Rural Migrants," Social Forces, XXIII (October, 1944), 32-37.

Bell, Wendell, and Force, Maryanne. "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations," American Sociological Review, XXI (February, 1956), 25-34.

Bogue, Donald J. The Population of the United States. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1959.

Bogue, Donald J., Shryock, Henry S. Jr., and Hoermann, Siegfried A. Subregional Migration in the United States, 1935-1940. 1, No. 5, Oxford, Ohio: Scripps Foundation Studies in Population Distribution, 1953.

Campbell, Angus, Gurin, Gerald, and Miller, Warren E. The Voter Decides. Evanston: Row, Peterson and Company, 1954.

Detroit Area Study. "The Detroit Area Study: Progress Report to the Ford Foundation." University of Michigan, 1960. (Mimeographed.)

Detroit Area Study. "A Progress Report on the University of Michigan's Detroit Area Study, September 1, 1951-December 31, 1959." University of Michigan, 1960. (Mimeographed.)

Dotson, Floyd. "Patterns of Voluntary Associations among Working Class Families," American Sociological Review, XVI (October, 1951), 687-693.

Duncan, Otis D., and Reiss, Albert J. Social Characteristics of Urban and Rural Communities, 1950. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956.

Freedman, Ronald. "The Detroit Area Study," American Journal of Sociology, LIX (July, 1953), 30-33.

Freedman, Ronald. Recent Migration to Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Freedman, Ronald, and Freedman, Deborah. "Farm-Reared Elements in the Nonfarm Population," Rural Sociology, XXI (March, 1956).

Foskett, John M. "Social Structure and Social Participation," American Sociological Review, XX(August, 1955), 431-438.

Kornhauser, William. Politics of a Mass Society. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960.

Lane, Robert E. Political Life. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1959.

Lazerwitz, Bernard. "Some Factors Associated with Variations in Church Attendance," Social Forces, XXXIX (May, 1961), 301-309.

Lebeaux, Charles N. "Rural and Urban Backgrounds as Factors in the Behavior of Factory Workers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, 1954.

Lipset, Seymour M. Political Man. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1960.

Loomis, Charles P., and Beegle, J. Allan. Rural Social Systems. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1950.

Mayo, Elton. The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization. Boston: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, 1945.

Rodehaver, Myles W. "Fringe Settlement as a Two-Directional Movement," Rural Sociology, XII (March, 1947), 50-57.

Sharp, Harry P. "Migration and Social Participation in the Detroit Area." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, 1954.

Smith, T. Lynn, and McMahon, C. A. (eds.) The Sociology of Urban Life. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.

The Catholic Digest Survey. "Do Americans Go To Church?," Catholic Digest, XVII (December, 1952), 1-7.

Thomas, John L. "Religious Training in the Roman Catholic Family," American Journal of Sociology, LVII (September, 1951), 178-183.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, Series P-20, Nos. 14, 61, 73, 82, 86.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Population Census: 1950. Special Reports, Vol. IV.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940. Population, Internal Migration: 1935 to 1940.

Williams, Robin M., Jr. American Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.

Wirth, Louis. "Urbanism as a Way of Life," American Journal of Sociology, XLIV (July, 1938), 1-24.

Wright, Charles R., and Hyman, Herbert. "Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Evidence from National Surveys," American Sociological Review, XXIII (June, 1958), 284-294.

Yinger, J. Milton. Religion, Society and the Individual. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957.

Zimmer, Basil G. "Adjustment of Migrants in the Urban Area." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, 1954.