

Some Determinants of Labour Mobility in Northern Ireland

D. J. D. ROCHE

W. D. BIRRELL

A. S. MURIE

P. A. R. HILLYARD

REGIONAL planning throughout Europe has increasingly emphasised the importance of growth centres in development strategies. New and expanded towns are proposed not solely as solutions to problems of overspill, congestion and re-development but as aids to regional economic growth. In the United Kingdom this approach has been most fully developed in Northern Ireland. Following the Belfast Regional Survey and Plan in 1964 (the Matthew Report)¹ a new Ministry of Development was established to bring together what was described as the key functions of infrastructure, planning, development and local government. The main recommendation of the Matthew report was for the creation of a new city in County Armagh, some thirty miles west of Belfast. The new city, named Craigavon, was to be one of a number of centres of growth. Although its proximity to Belfast, and the introduction of a stop-line on the growth of Belfast, indicated that it was to cater for Belfast's overspill and facilitate re-development, Craigavon (along with other growth centres) was an essential part of a regional strategy to increase employment and production, and to improve the economic structure of the province.

Although Northern Ireland has succeeded in recent years in achieving faster rates of economic development than Britain, in improving its economic structure, and in attracting a considerable volume of new industry into the province, high rates of unemployment have remained.² The benefits of job creation have been

1. *Belfast Regional Survey & Plan*, 1962. Belfast: HMSO, 1964.

2. For a brief exposition of these points see *Development Programme, 1970-75*. Belfast: HMSO, 1970.

offset by job losses in other areas, and by population growth. Despite this, some concern has been expressed over problems of economic development arising out of labour supply shortages.

G. Davies has shown very clearly that high percentage unemployment figures do not indicate the relative availability of labour between regions.³ Employers seeking new sources of labour are not irrational in preferring areas with comparatively low unemployment rates. As Davies writes, "it is not the percentage of unemployment that matters, but the numbers available within a reasonable travel-to-work radius of the plant."⁴ In Northern Ireland in March, 1971, ten local office areas had over 1,000 registered unemployed; but only three had more than 2,000. Belfast alone had more than 10,000.⁵

However, although percentage unemployment rates may be high, labour supply may be limited. Without entering into a discussion of whether the available supply of labour is under-represented by the process of unemployment registration,⁶ whether female labour reserves are lesser or greater in Northern Ireland than elsewhere,⁷ or whether the available labour is more or less likely to prove unsuited for industrial employment or suitable for training,⁸ it is immediately evident that Northern Ireland is not necessarily an attractive prospective area for development because of the availability of labour. Much concern has been expressed over this issue. The Northern Ireland Economic Council's report on the manpower position between 1964 and 1970 stated that "our conclusion that there is no danger of an overall shortage of labour in Northern Ireland by 1970 does not mean that local scarcities may not exist".⁹ The origin of this problem lies in the dominance of Belfast in both population and industry. High land and factory costs will not offer opportunities for the expansion of manufacturing unless the green belt limit on urban development is abandoned. As long as planning and conservation considerations prevent this, the growth of employment can only be fostered if industry can be attracted to centres outside Belfast. However, these are few outside Belfast which, even with high unemployment rates, have a pool of labour of sufficient size. The NIEC report stated "seventy per cent of the employment in the 'new industry' sector comes from manufacturing projects with employment targets of 300 or more: projects with targets of 500 or more

3. G. Davies, "Regional development, labour availability and redeployment", *Oxford Economic Papers*, 1967, 19, pp. 59-74.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 61.

5. Ministry of Health and Social Services Statistics.

6. D. Metcalf & R. Richardson, "The nature and measurement of unemployment in the UK" *The Three Banks Review*, 1972, 93, pp. 30-45.

7. See figures in Cmnd. 2764. *The National Plan* 1965, pp. 86-95, and Govt. of NI, *Ministry of Health & Social Services*; The MAFE Houghton report on the employment and training of women in Northern Ireland.

8. "Characteristics of the Unemployed" Survey Results, *Ministry of Labour Gazette*, 1966, 74, pp. 156-157.

9. *Northern Ireland Economic Council*. "Manpower; An appraisal of the position 1964-1970," Belfast: HMSO 1967, p. 20.

account for over half of the 'new industry' employment. Projects of this order need a sizeable population upon which to draw."¹⁰ This may simply be an initial problem which will disappear as policies mature.

The concentration of labour resources in growth centres has become an important feature of policy. It is assumed that such concentration would reduce costs of investment in infrastructure, would generate external economics and the benefits of inter-industry linkage. In the long-run this would be effective in reducing unemployment. It is not the object of this paper to examine the soundness of the assumptions implicit in this. Where it is not clear that there are grounds for rejecting such growth strategies out of hand it is important to assess aspects of their operation.

The Development Programme 1970-75 has expressed the view that employment and housing objectives might be jeopardised unless proposals to increase labour mobility were effective.¹¹ In view of this it is valuable to offer evidence relevant to the nature and problems of labour supply associated with growth centre development. The rest of this paper presents evidence resulting from a survey, centred on Craigavon, designed to elucidate aspects of labour mobility. This aimed to assess not only how far British evidence of movement to new towns was confirmed in Northern Ireland, but, of more immediate interest, to assess reasons for "non-take-up" of movement opportunities. For example, it was felt important to assess whether growth centre strategies which required considerable change of residence were likely to prove unsuccessful because of the strength of social and economic deterrents to movement.

There is an important distinction in studies of mobility between potential mobility and actual mobility. Research studies have shown that potential mobility varies with age, education, training, property ownership as well as with "immobility preferences" such as family ties and friendships.¹² There have been two surveys which covered potential mobility in Northern Ireland. A study¹³ carried out by Building Design Partnership in areas of Belfast designated for redevelopment found that older families and those on lower incomes were less inclined to move. Younger families and those who were dissatisfied with their present accommodation expressed a willingness to move to the growth centres. In 1963, a survey of migration and labour mobility within the province included questions on potential mobility.¹⁴ This survey found that a larger proportion of those between the ages of 20 and 34 were prepared to consider a move, the main reasons offered being better prospects in housing and employment. However, findings on potential mobility have little significance for identifying factors which have influenced people who have actually moved, except to provide hypotheses for empirical research.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 20

11. *Development Programme*, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

12. *A Sample Survey of Labour Mobility in NI Belfast*, HMSO, 1965.

13. *Belfast Urban Area Plan*, Vol. 1. Building Design Partnership, 1969.

14. *Op. cit.*

A Survey of Labour Mobility

In an attempt to identify such factors in 1971, a questionnaire was administered to a range of subjects who could be classified as actually mobile or non-mobile. In all, four samples were selected, three of these were classified on the basis of mobility criteria, the other could be called a control group. The samples were:

- Sample A:* This was the "mobile" group. It consisted of 151 families who had moved to, and were living in, rented accommodation provided by the Development Commission in the new town of Craigavon.
- Sample B:* This consisted of individuals who at one time had moved to Craigavon but did not remain there. These could be called "extra-mobile". We were able to contact 68 families in this group.
- Sample C:* These were individuals who were offered job opportunities in Craigavon by the Ministry of Health and Social Services. They refused to move and can be considered a non-mobile group. The sample was obtained from Ministry lists, the Ministry having first contacted the individuals requesting their co-operation. In all 69 families were interviewed.
- Sample D:* This consisted of 149 families who were to act as a comparison group. The sample was chosen from a development area in Belfast, the town of Newry, and from a rural area. To control for unemployment factors, 50 per cent of this sample was unemployed.

Samples A, B, and C were drawn by the Ministry of Health and Social Services.

The research tools consisted of two questionnaires, one each for the husband and wife, and various attitude and opinion scales. These were designed to elicit background data, occupational data, housing conditions, educational attitudes as well as attitudes towards work-related change, and the respondent's present job.

In the analysis of the Survey results the major objective was to assess if differences in movement behaviour could be explained by differences in demographic and other characteristics.

Demographic Factors

(a) Age

Several studies have reported a strong relationship between mobility and age. An analysis of the age structure of migrants to new and expanding towns in Britain by Cooke¹⁵ shows an excess of young children, a very high proportion of young adults in their twenties and a shortage of old people. In his study of

15. R. L. Cooke. "An analysis of the age structures of immigrants to new and expanding towns." *Journal of the Town Planning Institute*, Vol. 54, 1968, No. 9, pp. 430-436.

British new towns, Kellaway¹⁶ found that over 60 per cent of the migrants were between the ages of 15 and 30. The Craigavon study produced the following results:—

TABLE 1: *Age structure of households: mean ages (years) of husband, wife and children*

	<i>Mobile Group</i>	<i>Extra-mobile Group</i>	<i>Non-mobile Group</i>	<i>Comparison Group</i>
Husband	34.4	35.5	41.4	42.5
Wife	31.8	32.8	37.6	36.6
Children	7.5	7.2	10.4	9.3

The age difference is obvious. An interesting factor is the disparity between the ages of husband and wife among the samples. Families who could be deemed mobile manifest greater age similarity between husband and wife. If this is taken in conjunction with the fact that age may be a determinant of mobility, then this disparity of ages is proportionately greater when, demographically speaking, a family is more likely to move. This may affect the decision-making process in the family at the time.

Another significant factor which emerges is that, on average, the children of the mobile samples are younger than the non-mobile groups. This finding is in line with Rossi's¹⁷ explanation of why age and household structure affect mobility so strongly. He suggests that both of those variables are indications of family life cycle stage, which is in turn a strong determinant of the housing needs of a household.

(b) *Family Size*

It is reasonable to expect that family size would be a factor affecting mobility; the larger the family, the more difficult it is to move. This line of reasoning is upheld by the results.

TABLE 2: *Family size*

	<i>Mobile Group</i>	<i>Extra-Mobile Group</i>	<i>Non-mobile Group</i>	<i>Comparison Group</i>
1—4 persons	82	47	33	82
5—7 persons	59	16	23	55
over 8 persons	10	5	13	12

16. A. J. Kellaway, "Migration to eight new towns in 1966". *Journal of the Town Planning Institute*, Vol. 55, 1969, No. 5, pp. 196-201.

17. P. H. Rossi, *Why Families Move*, The Free Press, Glencoe 1955.

Distance

Distance and the location of economic opportunities have had an important place in some discussions of mobility. On the one hand, the theory has been developed that there is no relationship between distance and mobility as such. Further, the number of persons moving any given distance is directly proportional to the number of opportunities existing at that distance.¹⁸ On the other hand, it has been shown that most people in Britain who move residence, do so within a ten mile radius of their former homes. Looking at the relationship between distance and employment opportunity, Kellaway found that most migrants to new towns moved relatively short distances and came principally from nearby local authority areas. Other studies have clearly shown that higher occupational groups are more prepared to move long distances for job reasons than are members of lower occupational groups. Friedlander and Roshier¹⁹ found that only thirteen per cent of manual workers had ever moved residence more than 50 miles. In this investigation there was no clear evidence that distance was related to mobility. The following account of home areas exemplifies this statement.

TABLE 3: *Home area of respondents*

	CB <i>Belfast</i>	Co. <i>Antrim</i>	Co. <i>Armagh</i>	Co. <i>Down</i>	Co. <i>L'Derry</i>	CB <i>L'Derry</i>	Co. <i>Tyrone</i>	Co. <i>Fermanagh</i>
Mobile-group	30	9	20	16	8	5	22	3
Extra-mobile group	14	1	8	7	6	6	5	1
	<i>Irish Republic</i>		<i>England</i>		<i>Scotland</i>		<i>Wales</i>	
Mobile-group	8		14		7		0	
Extra-mobile group	2		11		4		1	

Kinship Ties

One possible factor that might deter people from moving is concern at losing easy contact with other members of their family. It has been asserted by Abrahamson²⁰ that mobility is directly related to the strength of dependance identification and the degree of dependance on relatives. The results of this survey

18. R. M. Jones, "A case study in labour mobility", *The Manchester School*, 2 June, 1969 pp. 169-174.

19. D. Friedlander and R. J. Roshier, "A study of internal migration in England and Wales Part II", *Population Studies*, 1966, 20, pp. 45-59.

20. M. Abrahamson "Cosmopolitanism, Dependence, Identification and Geographical Mobility" *Administrative Science Qty.*, 1965, 10, pp. 98-106.

have some bearing on this point. Apropos of the home area (original home of the mobile groups) it is evident that the non-mobile groups have a greater kinship network around them and this would presumably affect any mobility decisions.

TABLE 4: "Do any of your family live within a 10 minute walk of your home?"

	Mobile* sample	Extra-mobile* group	Non-mobile sample	Comparison group
Yes	82	26	40	106
No	67	42	27	43

*Refers to home areas prior to move to Craigavon.

There is an obvious significant difference here. In the case of the mobile groups there are less opportunities for family contact and this may affect their perception of an area and any consequent mobility decisions. Further questioning indicated that only 26 per cent of the mobile sample daily visited those of their relatives who lived within 10 minutes walk. This compares with 50 per cent daily visiting by the non-mobile sample and can be taken as an indicant of the degree of family commitment in a particular area.

Educational Qualifications

The survey on labour mobility in Great Britain²¹ showed that the higher the qualifications a person holds the more likely it is that the person has moved for a work purpose. Also research in the Diffusion of Innovation²² indicates that higher educational levels are correlated with innovativeness and mobility. The educational distribution of members of the samples in this survey was as follows:—

TABLE 5: *Educational attainment*

	Mobile		Extra-mobile		Non-mobile		Comparison Group	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Primary school only	61	68	24	23	40	39	103	94
Secondary/technical	57	59	23	27	21	20	36	47
Grammar	26	18	20	16	6	2	8	4

It would be safe to say from the above table that the relationship between education and mobility holds true for this sample.

21. D. J. B. Mitchell "Some aspects of labour mobility and recent policy in Britain". *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Nov. 1969, pp. 353-367.

22. E. M. Rogers, *Diffusion of Innovation*, Free Press, Glencoe, 1962.

Psychological factors

It is possible that mobile persons can be identified by common psychological characteristics. It has been asserted, for example, that there may be a positive relationship between achievement motivation and occupational mobility. The achievement motive is regarded as a stable and enduring aspect of personality and a source of individual differences. Some investigators have argued that achievement motivation is one of the important motivational sources of the process of mobility.²³

Beshers and Nishiura²⁴ have conducted research into the decision-making process of migration, and attempted to delineate the social and cultural constraints which must enter into a decision. They distinguish between a "purposive" rational mode of orientation which involves a future orientation towards the long-term occupational goals of the decision maker or educational prospects for their children, and "short-run hedonistic" mode of orientation based on short-term situational factors such as day-to-day employment, for example, dissatisfaction with the starting time. At the more general level it may be possible to show that mobile people hold certain attitudes which predispose them towards mobility and which are a common characteristic of mobile groups. Consequently, psychological attitudes may identify the mobile in any community.

In this survey it was decided to investigate the distribution of attitudes towards work-related change, certain economic and labour topics on a liberal-conservative dimension, and job attitudes.

TABLE 6: *Average work-related change scores*²⁵

	<i>Mobile sample</i>	<i>Extra-mobile sample</i>	<i>Non-mobile sample</i>	<i>Comparison sample</i>
Male	29.3	25.3	25.8	33.0
Female	31.4	28.7	25.9	30.1

No significant difference between the samples is apparent.

23. B. G. Stacey, "Achievement Motivation and Inter Generational Mobility", *Life Science*, 1965, 4, pp. 1327-1332.

24. J. M. Beshers & E. N. Nishiura, "A Theory of Internal Migration Differentials", *Social Forces*, 1961, 39, pp. 214-218.

25. D. A. Trumbo, "Individual & Group Correlates toward work related change", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1961, 45, pp. 338-344. Scores range from 9 to 45: the higher the score the less the change orientation.

TABLE 7: *Distribution of Economic Attitudes*

	Mobile sample		Extra-mobile sample		Non-mobile sample		Comparison sample	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Number holding interventionist economic attitude	76	83	35	32	31	45	89	96
Number holding non-interventionist economic attitude	46	42	25	37	31	15	41	36

No significant difference exists in the distribution among male respondents, although female respondents of the non-mobile group manifest what could be called a liberal economic attitude. However, no consistent picture emerges as to the relationship between mobility behaviour and the economic opinions expressed by the respondents.

TABLE 8: *Attitude towards job*

Degree of satisfaction	Mobile sample	Extra-mobile sample	Non-mobile sample	Comparison sample
Low	65	37	13	47
Moderate	55	19	22	54
High	9	2	3	4

The major differential here can be found in the high proportion of satisfied attitudes held by the transients, but again no firm data was found as to a relationship between job attitude and mobility.

Housing

Availability of housing is one of the most frequently quoted determinants of mobility. The prospect of new housing accommodation is referred to constantly in the reports discussed above as one of the main incentives to move. Yet J. B. Cullingworth²⁶ in a comprehensive study of the literature and research on housing and labour mobility comes to the conclusion that the significance of housing in relation to labour mobility is by no means clear. Cullingworth pointed out that insufficient distinction is made between housing as a factor inhibiting a move from an area and housing as a factor which makes difficult a move to a new area. In the former the issue is one of ties and of inertia, for example, an owner occupier having an outstanding mortgage and living in an area of decline where

26. J. B. Cullingworth, *Housing and Labour Mobility*. OECD Paris 1969.

there is no demand for the purchase of houses, will obviously be tied to his home. Policies aimed at giving him access to housing in a new area will not solve the problem he faces of selling his existing home.

Residential mobility tends to be from privately rented to publicly rented houses, from rented to owner occupied houses, and few move in the opposite direction.

In an examination of this variable in the present survey, some interesting findings emerge. Of the Craigavon sample 38 per cent mention the prospects of a better house or home ownership as a major incentive to move, and over 75 per cent consider that their housing conditions were improved as a function of their move.

TABLE 9: *Tenure type of previous home*

Owner occupied	32
Council rented	34
Privately rented	43
NI Housing Trust	16
Owned by relative	14
Lodging	4
Free	6
Non-response	2

At present the Craigavon sample occupied accommodation rented from the development commission and this factor clearly limits the conclusions which can be drawn. However, it is notable that a considerable number of respondents were involved in a change of tenure (Table 9). This includes a large proportion of movers from owner occupation to public authority dwellings. Although data is not available to indicate the nature of any movement in the opposite direction it would seem that a major factor considered by mobile individuals is the prospect of house improvement. However, the complexity of the operation of this variable is evidenced by the following data.

TABLE 10: *Tenure Type*

	<i>Mobile sample</i>	<i>Extra-mobile* sample</i>	<i>Non-mobile†</i>	<i>Comparison‡ group</i>
Owner occupied	32	27	26	57
Council rented	34	17	17	51
Privately rented	43	9	12	36
Housing trust	16	10	12	2
Owned by relatives	14	2	1	3
Lodgers	4	0	1	0
Free	6	3	0	0
Non-response	2	0	0	0

*For this group the figures are for the previous home but one.
 †Figures refer to present accommodation.

The major difference here is that the successful Craigavon settlers were more likely to have been in rented accommodation. Also the non-mobile groups manifest a greater degree of home ownership. However, a proportion of the mobile and extra mobile sample were owner occupiers and were prepared to move to rented accommodation in Craigavon. This evidence would appear to be consistent with Cullingworth's ²⁷view that "there is more than a suggestion that other things being equal a worker is more likely to be mobile if his existing housing conditions are bad than if they are good". Inertia arising from problems of house sale in areas of low demand and where dwellings may be deficient in certain respects, (dwellings in owner occupation especially in the west of the province are more likely to be old and lack amenities than public authority accommodation²⁸) create further problems for analysis.

Job Category

It is possible that tangible mobility opportunities are offered to certain categories of workers, if so, then the samples should differ significantly in their occupational classification. To attempt to control for the effects of mobility it was decided to consider the distribution of previous jobs among the mobile groups. In this section it was possible to get information only from approximately 50 per cent of each sample. The results were as follows:—

TABLE II: *Job Category*

<i>Job Category</i>	<i>Mobile group</i>	<i>Extra-mobile group</i>	<i>Non-mobile group</i>	<i>Comparison group</i>
Supervisory	12	7	7	12
Skilled	13	12	10	7
Semi-skilled	33	7	7	25
Unskilled	8	5	11	22

The major differences here indicated is that there was a greater proportion of supervisory and skilled workers amongst the mobile groups. From this it could be concluded that individuals in such categories are more likely to be mobile and successful in mobility. While as we noted, this may be a reflection of employment structure in new industries, other research indicates that higher occupational groups manifest greater mobility than lower occupational groups.²⁹

27. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

28. W. D. Birrell, P. A. R. Hillyard, A. S. Murie, D. J. D. Roche, *Housing in Northern Ireland*, Centre for Environmental Studies, 1971. p.12.

29. R. Thomas, *London's New Towns*, London, PEP 1969.

TABLE 12: *Job Tenure (previous job)*

	Mobile Group	Extra-mobile Group	Non-mobile Group	Comparison Group
1—3 years	76	47	38	62
4—7 „	20	10	9	25
7—10 „	7	1	8	12
over 10 years	19	0	7	16

R. M. Jones³⁰ in a study of labour mobility in a new industrial plant in Wales concluded that immobility was identified in workers who were in their job for five years or more. In general, this conclusion is borne out by the results of this survey.

TABLE 13: *Respondents experience of unemployment*

	Mobile Group	Extra-mobile Group	Non-mobile Group	Comparison Group
Yes	77	29	68	112
No	71	37	1	37
No answer	3	2	0	0

The most significant point which emerges is that nearly 100 per cent of the non-mobile group have experienced unemployment, and yet have refused to move to a job in Craigavon. We must also bear in mind that it is a policy of the Ministry to contact unemployed persons and offer them job opportunities at Craigavon. What does emerge is that the experience of unemployment need not necessarily motivate an individual towards mobility, and that the unemployed person may not be a suitable candidate for mobility. Indeed it would appear that the individual who has experienced unemployment and subsequently obtained employment is less likely to be prepared to experience the increased insecurity involved in movement.

Income Levels

There is some evidence that the prospect of higher wages is not itself of great significance in encouraging mobility. Mitchell³¹ has noted the relevance of an

30. R. M. Jones, *op. cit.* p.171

31. D. J. B. Mitchell, *op. cit.* p.361

OECD study³² on the importance of wages in stimulating mobility in arguing that labour mobility was stimulated primarily by the process of lay-offs and new employment rather than through wage increases. Also Cullingworth³³ has noted that badly housed workers have moved from a high wage area (London) to a lower wage area. In this survey income levels do not significantly discriminate among the samples.

TABLE 14: *Income Levels*

<i>wage/week</i>	<i>Mobile Group</i>	<i>Extra-mobile Group</i>	<i>Non-mobile Group</i>	<i>Comparison Group</i>
£0—9	25	35	1	14
£10—19	55	11	26	64
£19—29	35	16	28	40
£29 and upwards	23	2	10	18
Non response	13	4	4	13

Summary and Conclusions

1. Labour mobility is very closely tied in with the life cycle of individual families. In the present survey the mobile groups have younger heads of households and are more recently married. Many are thus new or recently formed households and may for this reason not be strictly movers but new family units.

2. Size and structure of the family unit will affect mobility. Larger families and families with older children will be less likely to move. This may reflect a desire for stability and security especially when children are of school age. Unless there are limited risks involved families at this stage in their history will think twice before moving. Consideration will be given, not only to income, housing, employment and schooling but to prospects of employment for children. The group which emerged as most mobile are those who moved to Craigavon but have since moved again. This group had the smallest and youngest families. It could be reasoned from this that if the age structure of predominantly migrant communities is to be balanced factors which will attract longer established households must be introduced.

3. This study would suggest that distance is not a clear influence on mobility. Where only short distance moves are involved families are not less likely to move. If distance is a significant factor in mobility it is clearly so complicated by occupation, housing and kin contacts that it can offer no clear indication of preference.

4. There are evident differences between patterns of kin contact between mobile and non-mobile groups. For established residents in the new town a network will

32. "Wages and Labour Mobility", OECD Paris, 1967.

33. J. B. Cullingworth, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

develop as the town matures. However, it would seem likely that original family ties will remain a considerable obstacle to mobility. This is likely to be more important where other factors associated with greater mobility are not present.

5. Movers to the new town are more likely to have greater experience of secondary education. It is to be expected that higher education levels offer greater opportunity for future mobility and secondary education may well inculcate a higher achievement motivation. Oeser and Emery³⁴ are convinced that experience of secondary education makes an individual more "cosmopolite" i.e. more oriented to extra-localite affairs and consequently more likely to be mobile.

6. Those who moved to Craigavon and remained there and those who refused to undertake such a move are clearly differentiated by their previous experience of unemployment. This suggests that the degree of security and certainty demanded before movement will be undertaken, will be determined not only by the costs involved or loss experienced, but also by the nature of economic experience. The individual who has experienced unemployment, and who since has obtained satisfactory employment may require additional guarantees and inducements to move.

7. Movers to new estates in Craigavon are more likely to be from private rented accommodation. However, a considerable number of previous owner occupiers are included. It would, in general, appear that the most important contribution to mobility made by housing is if improved quality of dwelling is available. Notwithstanding that, it is felt that opportunities for a choice of types of housing and tenure would be desirable. Also aid should be made available where difficulties exist over the sale of previous dwellings and where there are considerable change in rent costs.

8. Psychological and attitudinal factors do not appear in this study to discriminate between the groups. Although it was found that the extra-mobile group have a stronger commitment to self help, this is not reflected in other assessments of attitude. It would seem that commitment to self help may be a function of, for example, the experience of employment and need not necessarily be articulated in attitude scales.

9. The evidence of movement behaviour presented here is broadly consistent with theories of familism and careerism.³⁵ "Successful" movers appear to be those who have chosen the familism life style. Other formulations of values in terms of spiralists and other groups assist in explaining the nature of movement.³⁶ Coherent theoretical interpretations of this type are valuable in assessing policy alternatives.

10. This study has been based on the analysis of three groups clearly identified on the basis of actual mobility. The most mobile are those who have since moved away from Craigavon and the least mobile those who refused the opportunity

34. D. A. Oeser & F. E. Emery, *Information, Decision and Action*, Melbourne UP 1958.

35. R. J. Johnson, *Urban Residential Patterns*, London, Bell, 1971.

36. B. M. Simmie, "The Sociology of Internal Integration", CES University working paper 15. London, 1972.

to move. If the new town is to develop in size to attract industry, all the present indications are that the population will remain distinct for a considerable time period. It would clearly be of advantage if population structure was more balanced, but this is not desirable if it conflicts with the growth of labour supply and job creation.

It would also appear that the least mobile sector may respond to extended aid, information and publicity which could offset the various barriers to mobility. This would take into account the different age and family structure, employment opportunities for school leavers, maintenance of kin contact, housing choice, and community facilities. This involves then, not only making Craigavon attractive but also helping families to deal with problems, financial or otherwise, in their present place of residence.

It is hoped that this research will encourage more work in this area with the eventual practical aim of gathering enough hard data to identify key constraints on mobility. This may indicate that growth centre strategies must aim more directly at mobile sectors of the community. This would considerably influence the nature of economic development. Alternatively, it may suggest that such strategies will only succeed if non-mobile groups can be induced to move. If the latter is the case it is not evident how mobility can be induced. In either case consideration of the effects on communities experiencing decline and of the nature of non-mobile groups may suggest that a strategy to enable full use of labour resources must be based on smaller centres and improved transport facilities so as to enable non-mobile as well as mobile persons to participate. This does not cast doubt upon the principle of growth centres but it does suggest that successful implementation must be consistent with relevant social behaviour.

New University of Ulster.