Population Churn: The Migration Flow Of Florida

2004

Marguerite Cashen
University of Central Florida

POPULATION CHURN: THE MIGRATION FLOW OF FLORIDA

By

MARGUERITE F. CASHEN
B.A. University of Central Florida 2002

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology
in the College of Arts and Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term

2004

ABSTRACT

Recent research has focused attention on the concerns of migration in and out of Florida and within the counties themselves. In 1949, Cape Canaveral was established and the boom was on. The character of the state dramatically transformed after 1965, when plans were announced to convert twenty-seven thousand acres of swampland into Walt Disney World. Since then, Orlando's evolution is divided into two eras: before and after Walt Disney World. Orlando has changed from a quiet town whose function was to service the surrounding citrus growing regions in a sparsely populated Orange County to a booming metropolis. Has the growth been for the best? While geographical mobility is frequently analyzed in terms of in-migration, out-migration, and net migration, this thesis will examine the population churn, the sum of in- and out-migration divided by population size. The simple descriptive questions in this thesis are, first, how do Orange County and the Orlando metro area “stack up” against other Florida cities, counties, and metro areas such as: Tampa, Jacksonville, and Miami. Secondly, across 67 Florida counties, what county level characteristics predict the rate of churn? The sample will consist of intra-migration and intermigration movers from a dataset drawn from the 2000 U. S. Census, IRS data, and local data by county, such as, F Cat, Index Crime Rate, and Domestic Violence Rate. The U.S. Census data are compiled from the Census of 2000; most estimates come from data collected by the CPS (Current Population Survey), which the U.S. Census conducts. The Internal Revenue Service migration flow data shows migration patterns by county based on changes in the addresses entered on individual tax returns. Correlation analysis is used to show the strength of association between population churn and the other variables.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is among the first efforts in sociology to examine the concept of population "churn," defined here as in-migration to a county plus out-migration from a county divided by county population. As is evident from the definition, churn is a measure of population turnover (not growth, migration, mobility, or decline). My interest in "churn" as a sociological concept resulted initially from a report entitled *Legacy 2002: Greater Orlando Indicators Report,* the 2002 version of an annual "social indicators" report written and distributed by the Healthy Community Initiatives (HCI) of Greater Orlando. With some fanfare, this report announces a "New measure" to indicate the relative degree of "community stability" – *population churn* (HCI 2002:55).

As depicted in the report, churn is a key dynamic of the Central Florida community and as a key dynamic, it affects the community's ability to face challenges, educate children, and promote a high quality of life. Through the use of the indicator, HCI has set a framework of sustainability to maintain focus on the future well-being of the community. The basic premise is that stable interaction with society, economy, nature and well-being enables people to build communities, to commit themselves to each other, and to knit the social fabric. In Legacy 2000, churn is equated to unstable communities, which were considered a challenge for community development. HCI believes instability robs the sense of belonging and the concrete experience of social networks such as relationships of trust and tolerance and a sense of well-being.

In Legacy 2002, HCI reported that we experienced more churn in the Orlando area than ever before and implied this has a negative affect on creating a sense of community. In addition,

the report assumes or implies that churn is higher in Orlando than in most other Florida cities, and that high levels of churn are a bad thing. Churn links directly with sprawl, which is characterized by unnecessary land consumption.

That the HCI social indicators now include population churn as a factor to be monitored implies that (1) churn is inordinately high in the Orlando MSA, and (2) churn is a good indicator of something, such as lack of social capital, social isolation, or alienation. My thesis asks very basic descriptive questions, namely, whether churn is in fact "inordinately high" in Orlando as compared to the rest of the state. I also present data showing the characteristics of counties that predict churn. My data and methods of analysis tell us how Orange County stacks up against the other sixty-six counties in Florida and how the Orlando Metropolitan Statistical Area compares to the eighteen other MSAs in the state.

Although churn itself has not received much sociological attention, closely related concepts such as migration, geographical mobility, and population growth certainly have. Population migration, for example, has been an ongoing public issue for several decades. The U. S. Census report (Schacter, 2001) states that between March 1999 and March 2000 43.4 million Americans moved. Over half, 56 percent, of these moves were local (within the same county), 20 percent were between counties in the same state and 19 percent were moves to a different state. Only 4 percent of movers came from abroad. In comparison to stayers, movers are younger, single or divorced, renters, and lower-income. For example, one-third of 20-29 year-olds moved in the previous year, a little more than twice the moving rate of all people (Meyers et al, 1997).

Sociologists have been interested in the why and where of residential and geographical mobility for some time, at least since Rossi (1955). Different groups in the population migrate

for different reasons; for the working age population, much of the motivation for moving is economic as people seek jobs and employment opportunities that best match their skills (Schacter, 2001a). Local amenities, which could include factors as diverse as cultural attractions and the weather, also influence migration decisions (Schacter, 2001a). A factor that has stood out in studies is the importance of weather. The Glaeser & Shapiro (2000) study showed that since 1940 the south has grown significantly due to weather and the technological advances that have made it easier to live in hotter climates. Between 1995 and 2000, 308,000 people moved from New York to Florida, creating the largest state-to-state flow in the United States (Perry, 2003). Although, this flow has been sizeable for decades it also reflects a substantial retiree migration. As in Florida, the elderly population migration is common in the United States with specific regions in the south and west, attracting significant flows of retired migrants (Zimmerman, 1994) who as a group tends to have relatively high incomes (McHugh et al, 1995).

The literature references concentrate on migration and geographic mobility both important components of population churn. This paper examines population churn in Florida. Population churn is defined as the total number of people moving in and out of an area, divided by the size of the population in that same area. More to the point, it is the population turnover rate for a specific community. The difference of churn from migration is that churn is a property of communities, not people or families, whereas migration, the movement of people into and out of a specified territory, usually results from several factors such as dissatisfaction with life or the opportunity for a better life.

LITERATURE REVIEW

As indicated in the previous discussion, there is little in the sociological literature on churn per se, but there are large and helpful literatures on cognate topics, most of which I review here. Geographical mobility has long been an important aspect of American life. Jasper (2000) notes that Americans move more than any other culture except nomadic tribes. Unlike these tribes, which move the entire village, Americans move as individuals on average every five years. In a typical five-year period, only half the population (fifty-three percent) is living in the same place at the end as at the beginning. Jasper (2000) theorizes that Americans are defined by their desire and compulsion to be on the move. Although, it appears that mobility has been dropping since the mid-nineteenth century the average American will move fourteen times in a lifetime (Marx, 1994).

Why do people move? Most social scientists agree that there is a combination of economic and non-economic reasons for moving that vary depending on the time and the age of the movers (Schacter, 2000). Until recently, there has been little national data on individual reasons for moving. More important to our understanding of this issue is the trend line. The trends in geographic mobility are important for the following reason: higher rates of mobility could contribute to increased rates of sustainable economic growth through higher levels of employment and productivity. Some trends in intermigration may contribute to environmental and social problems in both areas of population decline and growth; and geographic mobility is associated with social mobility which, may also, disrupt social networks (Donovan et al, 2002).

Peter Rossi, who has synthesized much of the research on mobility, stated that residential

mobility is normal (1982). As pointed out by Rossi (1955) people move to adapt their housing to life cycle evolution of their household needs. The major impact of life cycle on residential mobility has been recognized, and numerous studies are based on the life cycle model. For sociologists, the important question is no longer why people move but rather why people move where they do. (Tobey et al, 1995) As pointed out by Rossi (1955), who stressed the difficulty of disentangling the reasons underlying the move decision, "a general 'why' question usually produces a congeries of answers" since respondents often confuse the events or motivation leading to the move and the reasons associated with the property and location choice. In other words various factors of residential choice have to be addressed in order to sort out the various dimensions of residential behavior.

Residential mobility out of a poor neighborhood and into better ones is believed to enhance employment and educational prospects, to reduce crime, and to increase access to a variety of valued services and facilities (South & Crowder, 1997). The Gautreaux program in Chicago was a court-ordered remedy for segregation and the results were the inspiration for Mark Shoder's (2001) study. Shoder's MTO (Moving to Opportunity), authorized by HUD, was designed to measure one of three solutions to poverty concentration in urban areas. MTO was successfully implemented in five metro areas: Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York where forty percent of the people living in public and assisted housing projects were living in poverty in 1989. The MTO program has shown that it was possible to relocate low-income families from poverty areas to low poverty areas by using Section 8 vouchers.

Many studies have focused on relocations that are motivated primarily by changes in employment opportunities and housing demands. Still other research claims that relocations need

not be limited to changes in employment, which change supplies and demands for residential site characteristics (Knapp et al, 2001). Mobility may then be as simple as location choices. Kane (2001) argues that in recent years, not only has the desire for greater comforts and material successes come to dominate the goals and values of Americans, but also a desire for more speed, for frequent new jobs and moves to new homes.

Researchers have investigated numerous consequences of mobility for individuals, families, and whole communities. Geographic mobility has frequently been analyzed in terms of in-migration (number of people entering an area), out-migration (number of people leaving an area) and net migration (the difference between the in-migration and the out-migration) and looked mostly for the overall effect on population growth. However, some analysts have recently begun talking about population churn, the sum of in- and out- migration divided by population size. Churn is a property of communities or geographic aggregates, not individuals, families, or households. As a community property or characteristic, it is linked to social networks and social capital.

So in short, what challenges has “churn” posed to communities? If people move every five years, what is the likelihood that they will want to build relationships and ties to the community? If high paying jobs are the primary factors for attracting residents, how long will those residents stay before another high paying job presents itself? Could mobility be an indicator of how satisfied residents are with the quality of life in their state, county or MSA (Metropolitan Statistical Area)? The consequences of migration may be linked to who migrates. Migration is taking place among younger, better educated, and more highly productive workers (Schacter, 2001a).

It can be argued that better educated workers tend to have higher salary and pay higher taxes, but they do not consume a large amount of public services. Therefore, in-migration of better-educated workers may reduce the tax burden of the less educated. Likewise, the willingness to invest in a community may depend on the possible rewards of the migrants' investments.

Let us be clear on the differences between churn, mobility and population growth. Mobility is the movement of people into and out of a specific area. Population growth rate is computed by subtracting the crude death rate from the crude birth rate. Population churn is defined as the ratio of the sum of people moving in and out of an area, divided by the size of the population in that same area; more to the point it is the population turnover rate for a specific community. A city can have a high churn and no growth, i.e., lots of people move out but just as many move in. Likewise, you can have low churn and no growth, i.e., no one moves in or out. So just knowing that a population is stable does not tell you anything about churn. To look further, you can have high churn and low, medium, or high growth. What you cannot have is low churn and high growth. So population churn is related to population growth but not isomorphically.

Regardless of the household's specific reason for moving, a change in residence can be considered an attempt by a household to improve its situation (Bullamore, 1981). One of the purposes of Bullamore's (1981) research was to determine the circumstances that a job change had on mobility. Bullamore's (1981) research showed that a job change might substantially alter the place utility that a household derives from its current dwelling. In other words if a change in job location or compensation leads to a decline in place utility, it is likely that a household will consider seeking new residence. One way a job change can reduce place utility is through

shifting the worker to another employment location. If other housing attributes are held constant, it is reasonable to assume that people prefer living near their workplace. A change in workplace that lengthens the journey to work in terms of time, cost, or frustration with the commute may then cause a residential relocation. (Bullamore, 1981) If the overall fertility slackens, geographic mobility will play an increasing role in determining the growth and decline of individual locales, markets, and regions of the country. (Dahmann, 1986) The assumption of a single, fixed place of residence is untenable for a substantial number of Americans, which is surprising because throughout human history people were born and died in the same community. In fact, banishment from a community was worse than death.

There is a life course perspective on migration, which implies a predetermined set of stages, through which most individuals pass: leaving the parental home, marriage or career, child rearing, retirement, and loss of spouse (McHugh et al, 1995). The life course concept is potent in migration research because residential decisions are often linked with life events and transitions. Although Florida was known as a retirement destination, it has become a location where young people come to start their adult lives. Researchers therefore argue that recurrent mobility between multiple residences is more prevalent today than in the past due to the diversification of life course choices (McHugh et al, 1995). Age related patterns of geographic mobility are now well established in the demographic literature: mobility is concentrated in young adulthood, and then plateaus at a lower point in middle age, followed by two bumps, one in early retirement years and the other late in life. This pattern is found in all industrial and postindustrial societies (Treas& Longino, 1997). This life course affects our population churn since as mention before a

great deal of migration is that of older migrants coming to Florida for retirement and the time spent in the community is limited.

Racial differences in mobility are small, but adjusting for differences in homeownership and other socio-demographic characteristics reveal that, net of these factors, Blacks are significantly less likely than non-Blacks to change residence in a given year (South& Deane, 1993). Life cycle factors, housing characteristics, and features of the metropolitan area influence Black and non-Black mobility, but there are clear racial differences in the determinants of mobility (McHugh et al, 1995). High levels of residential segregation in the metropolitan area also create barriers to the mobility of Blacks, while large suburban population and high vacancy enhance the mobility prospects of non-Blacks (Massey & Denton cited in South & Deane, 1993). Black residential mobility, especially into higher status neighborhoods, is believed to be hampered by a deficit of financial resources (Massey& Denton cited in South& Deane, 1993) as well as by discriminatory practices of real estate agents, bankers, residential associations, and local government agencies (Fairchild& Tucker cited in South& Deane, 1993).

There are also social costs of geographic mobility. Individuals now have the opportunity to seek greater personal fulfillment, but in doing so may be threatening the foundations on which community was built. This has resulted in the creation of a highly individualistic society and this may threaten our social networks. The importance of social networks and personal ties cannot be overemphasized since it is through these networks and personal ties that society makes its mark on us. Without these ties, there may be a link with the disruption of stable families, hence a possible link with crime and other social dysfunctions. For more than a century, sociologists and policy makers have been concerned with the effects of urbanization and geographic mobility on

the social fabric of communities. The local community is viewed as an ongoing system of social networks into which new generations and new residents are assimilated, while the community itself passes through its own life cycle. Since assimilation of newcomers into the social fabric of local communities is necessarily a temporal process, residential mobility and population churn may operate as a barrier to the development of local association ties (Kasarda & Janowitz, 1975).

Most research has also restricted itself to factors concerning married couples which neglects the fact that mobility differs for married and unmarried movers (South& Crowder, 1998). The impact of social class and marital status on mobility is of particular interest because of differences in psychological well-being in different social classes and marital statuses. Beginning with Rossi's (1955) pioneering analysis, conventional models of residential mobility emphasize life cycle and demographic factors as key determinants of the decision to move. Age, marital status, and the presence of children have been shown to play important roles in mobility (Long, 1988; Long, 1992; McHugh et al, 1994). For single mothers, marriage is likely to be a particularly salient event. Not only does marriage usually entail a change of residence, but also for poor single mothers, marriage is sometimes a route out of poverty (South & Crowder, 1998). The number of children in the household also plays a role in a single mothers' residential mobility. In general, children deter mobility due to ties to schools, families, and friends. Another possible barrier to the residential mobility of single mother families is the social networks and the survival strategies they entail (South & Crowder, 1998).

Although it is known that Americans have high rates of residential mobility, American children are especially mobile compared to children in other countries. As mention before, children have an anchoring effect in that families with children are less likely to move. (Long,

1992) For children who do move the effects have been intensely debated. Rossi's classic *Why Families Move* (1955) correlates mobility with increased family well-being. Other research notices less positive effects of moving. These studies suggest that frequent mobility at childhood ages is associated with falling behind in school and subsequent failure to complete high school (Long, 1992).

Long's study (1992) gives us some explanations for the mobility of American children: families with children encounter fewer impediments to relocating; neighborhoods and communities may be so highly differentiated and segregated that mobility among them is a structured component of life cycle stages. The high rate of moving for American children is derived from less stable family structures and relatively greater poverty. Children from mobile families are more likely than their counterparts to experience behavioral problems (DeWitt et al, 1998). Simpson & Fowler (1994) study evaluated the relationship of geographic mobility to reported emotional/behavioral adjustment and school functioning among children. They concluded that children who moved three or more times were at an increased risk for emotional/behavioral and school problems. Other research argues that unstable family relationships and generally dysfunctional nature of the families associated with maltreatment may predispose these families to move frequently. (Eckenrode cited in DeWitt et al, 1998)

Sociologists often use the term "population change" as a measurement or indicator of this key explanatory concept of the "quality of social ties." Areas with high population churn contain many individuals who have left friends, family behind, and many others whose friends and family have left These individuals may suffer from loss of social support. High population churn areas may make it difficult for individuals to establish and sustain strong ties, for both movers

and stayers. Even if you never move, it is hard to maintain a relationship with your neighbor if you have a new neighbor every six months (Carter, 2003).

Criminologists have long been interested in regional variation in crime rates. One demographic trend, which has not received criminological research attention, is geographic mobility. One of the links that may connect geographic mobility to crime is informal social controls that exists in established communities but may be lacking in transient ones. Another possible explanation is that mobility may produce de-fact segregation by income level and race that may negatively affect social control of behaviors. Hartnagel (1997) showed that differences in crime rates are at least partly a function of differences in mobility. The areas that have more migration also have higher rates of both violent and property crime. In line with previous interpretations of the effect of geographic mobility (Crutchfield et al cited in Hartnagel, 1997) this suggests that higher rates of geographic mobility produce a weakening of the structure of social relations, with a consequent decline in the power of informal social controls, resulting in higher crime rates.

Mobility, migration and population growth, which are processes associated with population churn but not the same as churn. A separate measurement of population churn is needed to differentiate population growth from the churn within a community. Therefore, we look to our measure of population churn, described previously, to answer the descriptive questions in this thesis, first, how do Orange County and the Orlando metro area "stack up" against other Florida cities, counties, and metro areas such as: Tampa, Jacksonville, and Miami. Secondly, across 67 Florida counties, what county level characteristics predict the rate of population churn?

DATA AND METHODS

A data set was created for this thesis from the following sources: the 2000 U.S. Census, the IRS County to County Migration Statistics, 2000 U.S. Census Quick Facts that includes statistics such as race, age, income etc., the 2000 Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) files on total crime index by county and the total domestic violence offenses by county, third-graders who failed FCAT scores for 2002 from the Orlando Sentinel (2/24/2003 pA13), and The Florida Defense Industry Economic Analysis Report of 2003 (Refer to Table 1 for the complete list identifying each variables and its origin).

Prior research has stated that high population mobility can result in instability at community level and militate against community renewal and the sustainability of communities. Population churn has been said to have significant impact on the provisions of local services.

This thesis focuses on how much churn there is and how Orange County compares with the other sixty-six Florida counties. This thesis will also examine if and what are county characteristics that predict population churn, and finally, does churn predict crime or domestic violence? A correlation analysis is performed to see if there is any significant correlation between pop churn and factors that may influence Florida. This thesis aims to identify the factors contributing to the balance and sustainable development of our community while looking to improve the quality of life.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Challenging the Legacy 2002 report (Health Community Initiative of Orlando, 2002) that Orange county continues to experience “amazingly” high churn, with their claim that 100,000 people either move away or move into Orange county, this research found that for the year 2000, ninety thousand seven hundred and fifty-five (90,755) people moved into Orange County and seventy six thousand two hundred and twelve (76,212) moved out, a total turnover of one hundred sixty-six thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven (166,967). The data shows that the estimated 2000 churn rate for Orange County, which is calculated as migration in plus migration out divided by total population, was nineteen percent (19%) (Table 2-the alphabetical listing of Florida counties and the population churn for each). Although, Orange County churn is on the high side of the state average,(Table 3-average churn for Florida counties) in comparison to the sixty-six other counties, twelve counties had higher churn than Orange County while Martin, Lake and Charlotte counties had the same rate of churn (Table 4- population churn ranking of Florida counties). The Orange County data does not jump out as extraordinary high as say Santa Rosa County, with a forty percent churn rate (40%) (Table 4). It appears somewhat of an exaggeration for the HCI to characterize Orange County as having “amazingly” high churn when there is as much or more churn in fifteen (15) other counties.

When looking at MSA (Metropolitan Statistical Area) data for Jacksonville, Miami, Orlando and Tampa, Orlando leads over the other three MSAs with over eighteen percent (18.7%) churn. The population churn for the MSAs is calculated by the total migration in plus the total migration out divided by population of all the counties making up the individual MSA

(Table 5- population churn ranking for Metropolitan Statistical Areas of Florida). Surprisingly, Osceola, the most rural county of the Orlando MSA has the highest pop-churn of the four counties making up the Orlando MSA. (Table 4) When we look at all the MSAs of Florida, Orlando is fifth behind Pensacola with over twenty-six percent(26.9%), Fort Walton Beach over twenty-six percent (26.1%), Melbourne-Titusville-Palm Bay over twenty-five percent (25.4%), and Panama City with over twenty percent(20.2%). Again, the Orlando area shows a high churn in comparison to other Florida MSAs, but not astoundingly so. When comparing the population change (the difference between the population of an area at the beginning and end of a period) from 1990 to 2000, Florida ranks seventh (tied with Texas) with over twenty-three percent (23.5%) rate of growth. Although high compared to average population change rate for the United States, which is over thirteen percent (13.2%) (Table 6-states ranked by population change), it is still not exceptionally high compared with, for example, Nevada ranked as number one with a population change of over sixty-six percent (66.3%) (Table 6).

There are speculations on what would make a county high churn versus low churn. Are there characteristics, such as the weather as discussed earlier, to predict this churn? Glaeser & Shapiro (2000) showed that cities built for pedestrians and mass transit shrank while auto-dependent areas grew. Beyond regional location and climate, the most important factor is its human capital: skilled labor as opposed to unskilled and annual household incomes in which both are included in still another factor of growth, a robust labor market (Glaeser & Shapiro, 2000).

In order to see if there were any characteristics associated with population churn in our area and throughout the different counties of Florida, all raw data was converted to rates and

percentages and a correlation analysis was performed. The results were that pop churn had significant positive correlations with the following variables; percent Bachelor's degree or higher , percent High school graduates, counties with military bases, percent Asian persons, percent Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islanders, percent White persons not of Hispanic/Latino origin, and median household income (Table 7- positive correlations)). Variables such as percent African-Americans, percent third graders who failed FCAT, percent persons living below poverty level, percent living in the same house in 1995 and 2000 showed a significant negative correlation with pop churn (Table 8-negative correlations). Contrary to expectations, there was no significant correlation between pop churn and crime or domestic violence (Table 9-no correlations).

In analyzing the results, we see the higher churn areas have more White-Americans and fewer African-Americans. Although little research has focused directly on racial differences, South & Deane (1993) attribute the mobility of Whites to opportunities for suburbanization and higher vacancy rates. Their results imply that, for African-Americans, housing constraints are produced primarily by high levels of residential segregation and high rents. Among African-Americans, the most important contextual predictor of mobility is the level of residential segregation and that with limited housing options many blacks who would otherwise change residences simply choose not to move. (South& Deane, 1993) Further research would need to be done to see if these factors apply to our results but they do offer a legitimate explanation for these findings.

On the positive side, the results tell us that areas with high churn translate into more persons with Bachelor degrees and above and more high school graduates than areas with lower

churn. The results also show the more churn the more third graders passed the FCAT. Another variable that shows a significant positive correlation with pop churn is the median household income. Florida's median household is $35, 411. Glaser & Shapiro (2000) characterize annual household incomes below $20,000 with minimal growth rate and incomes over $30,000 as fast growing areas and this certainly seems to be true for Florida. The results also show the more churn, the fewer persons living below the poverty level. This coincides with HCIs Legacy 2002, which states, "our community is becoming healthier in real-dollar terms." The negative association with persons living in the same house 1995 and 2000 stands to reason, the more population churn the fewer persons living in the same house more than five years.

A factor not mentioned in prior literature is the possible effect military installations on population churn. The top five counties in the ranking of pop churn all have large military installation in those counties (Table 4). This also affects the top MSAs, which are made up of those same counties (Table 5). In this study, the results show a significant positive correlation between pop churn and military bases. Serow (2003) studied the patterns of residential mobility among individuals around age of retirement and found that the communities lost their military retirees along with their bases, forcing these retirees to move to another area with military bases. Although the size of the military force nationally has declined by thirty-six percent (36%), some Florida counties have seen an increase in military employment while others whose military employment has decreased cite the drop of the military force and an increase in other employment sectors as a reason. (Hass Center, 2003) There are fifteen (15) counties where military installations are located. For many of these counties, the economic impact of defense spending represents a significant portion of their economic output particularly in northwest

Florida. The importance of including military installations is that military people come and go, they are transferred, they complete their training, and this is a perfect example of churn. Since the closures, Florida is still home to twenty-one (21) military installations, where over eighty-two thousand (82,000) Department of Defense personnel (both active duty and civilian) serve (Hass Center, 2003). Also the impact of defense-related spending on Florida's economy has been substantial, lending to forty -four billion dollar economic impact and employing over seven hundred thousand (714,000) Floridians(Hass Center, 2003). In fact, there is a movement to bring new military installations into this state. (Poppert & Herzog, 2003) This reaffirms that the counties with the highest churn are perceived, by the present state administration, to be a catalyst for the economy.

These results answer our descriptive question of how Orange County and the Orlando metro area "stack up" against other Florida cities, counties, and metro areas such as Tampa, Jacksonville, and Miami. Orange county ranks twelfth in the population churn ranking nineteen percent (19%) and although it has a higher churn rate than the average the differences are relatively small. The results also show a significant positive correlation with the following variables; Bachelor's degree or higher, High School graduates, counties with military bases, Asian person, Native Hawaiian & other Pacific Islanders, White persons not of Hispanic/Latino origin, and median household income. The results also show a significant negative correlation with third graders who failed FCAT, persons living below poverty level, living in the same house 1995 and 2000, and African-Americans.

In contrast to other studies, (Levin, 2001; Hartnagel, 1997) these results showed no correlation with either crime or domestic violence (Table 8). Levin (2001) argued that the more

geographically mobile a community, the lower the social cohesiveness. This implies that people who live in communities for a short time have fewer connections with their neighbors; fewer connections imply higher risk for victimization and for social control. However, these patterns were not what I found.

Therefore, we can conclude that there is little evidence to suggest population churn has a negative influence on a community. I agree with HCI that Orlando's rate of population churn indicates a relatively unstable population base although the differences compared to the other counties are not large. However, most of the things correlated with churn seem to represent assets to a community, not deficits.

CONCLUSION

Although prior research of migration and geographic mobility shows more negative than positive associations, my findings reveal that population churn can be a positive influence on growth and the economy. Population churn cannot be mistaken for population growth, which is calculated by the Census Bureau based on the increase of residents in a specific urbanized area over a period, or sprawl, which is the spreading out of a city and its suburbs and involves the conversion of rural land, which is now a key issue to environmentalists. (Dowling, 2000) Population churn is the population turnover for a specific community. This data shows a positive association with most good things, negatively associated with most bad things, and no association either way with crime or domestic violence contrary to prior research (Carter, 2003; Hartnagel, 1997).

As noted earlier, it may be expected that people's willingness to invest in their community would be proportional to the likelihood that they will leave the community or proportional to the length of time they are likely to remain. HCI believes that population churn makes it hard to create a sense of community, where the citizens share a vision for the future of their community. It is true that this sense of community has considerable economic payoff but pursuing one's own self-interest may further the interest of the collectivity as well. It would depend upon the likelihood that the migrants might reap the rewards of their investments.

What can be concluded is that with the migration to Florida, we may gain political influence at the national level (e.g., more members in the U.S. House of Representatives). Floridians must recognize they cannot celebrate the growth and population churn and not expect

the same social issues facing many high growth areas. Researchers need to examine how these concerns can best meet the specific needs of a highly mobile community. It may be that our definition of community must change; our perception of Small-town USA is nostalgic. We can accommodate this migratory phenomenon without the complete dissolution of community, as we have known it. In the 1950s, the migratory trend emerged within the United States to the suburbs. In a seemingly contradictory way, they fostered a new sense of community. They represented a new direction of reclaiming the nostalgia of small town America. As the suburbs developed, they transformed into networks of families and individuals and a growing sense of community emerged.

Although we are experiencing dissolution from the traditional community, we may be growing into a new sense of community. The disappearance of traditional communities may be a potential for a new freedom to create new communities that best fit our needs. Does the fact that many Americans are on the move geographically (whether within or between communities) suggest rootlessness, isolation and the lack of community (Marx, 1994)? Although Durkheim thought growth of industrial cities undermined tradition, he also optimistically pointed to a new solidarity, where communities once built on likeness can have social life based on differences (Marx, 1994). For Durkheim, this new sense of community offered more choice, moral tolerance, and personal privacy (Marx, 1994). According to Durkheim, population growth then became an aid to social progress (Marx, 1994). This population churn should be seen as conducive to economic development and integration, as people have a greater breadth of experience come to understand and appreciate diversity and are able to some degree choose where and how they live.

Therefore, overall counties interested in socio-economic growth should embrace population churn. This churn involves stimulation, which is essential to growth.

Population churn may also have a downside for areas not blessed with the same socio-economic opportunities. There may be a significant impact on the provisions of local services such as education. As we see in our local headlines, schools struggle to cope with high turnover of pupils between key stages and as previous literature has pointed out, children who change schools frequently tend to achieve less than those who are less mobile. Therefore, local authorities may have to meet higher costs to shape services to meet the needs of these areas. In Downtown Orlando, we can see buildings torn down and high-rise condominiums being developed which is pushing the residents further and further towards Orange Blossom Trail. In turn there is a move to renovate the Orange Blossom Trail area, pushing those who cannot afford to move into a more concentrated area of low-income and below poverty level residence. As this developing of the more depressed areas continues, where will the low-income families go? As mentioned previously, people of low-income and below poverty level cannot move because their options are limited. In a sense, we are further ghettoizing the area, endangering the residential area and creating pockets of poverty.

Many early residents see that Florida has reached the downside of growth. What was once seen as a sunny paradise is now looked at as a mass of subdivisions, and congested highways. The more people that want to get away from areas of concentrated growth and move to the “suburbs” the more sprawl is created. We see the re-zoning of schools due to overcrowding because schools cannot be built fast enough to service the growing population.

As with all things too much of a good thing may not be good. While population churn is healthy for socio-economic growth Floridians must recognize that a state with our growth and population churn must include the deprived sectors concerns, those with environmental concerns, and those concerned over fragmentation in our communities.

APPENDIX: POPULATION CHURN CORRELATIONS AND COMPARISONS

Table 1

Complete List of Variables and Data Origins

Variable	Label	Source
county	Florida counties numbered 1-67 alphabetically	
pop2000	Population by county 2000	U.S. Census
moutst00	Migration out to other states, 2000	IRS
minst00	Migration in from other states, 2000	"
moutco00	Migration out to other counties, 2000	"
minco00	Migration in from other counties, 2000	"
under 18	Persons under 18 years of age, percent, 2000	U.S. Census
over 65	Persons over 65, percent, 2000	"
afriamer	Black or African American, percent, 2000	"
nativeam	American Indian & Alaska Native, percent, 2000	"
asian	Asian & Asian American, percent, 2000	"
pacifisl	Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islanders, percent, 2000	"
othrace	Persons reporting some other race, percent, 2000	"
Hispanic	Persons of Hispanic or Latin origin, percent, 2000	"
White	White not of Hispanic/Latino origin, percent, 2000	"
Samehom	Living same home in 1995 & 2000, percent age 5+, 2000	"
Othlang	Language other than English spoken at home, percent age 5+, 2000	"
Educhs	High School graduates, percent of persons age 25+, 2000	"
Educba	Bachelor degree or higher, percent of persons age 25+, 2000	"
Homeown	Homeownership rate, 2000	"
Medhinc	Median household income, 1999	"
Pcincome	Per capita income, 1999	"
Perbelow	Persons below poverty level, percent, 1999	"
Failfcat	Third graders who failed Fcat, percent, 2002	OrlandoSentinel
mio2000	Migration out-other US data suppressed, 2000	IRS
min2000	Migration in- other US data suppressed, 2000	"
dv2000	Total domestic violence, 2000	FDLE
crime00	Total index crime, 2000	"
popchurn	Total migration in + total migration out/population, 2000	"
military	counties with/without military bases	Fl.Defense Industry

Table 2

Alphabetical Listing of Florida Counties and the Population Churn Rate

1	Alachua	0.16
2	Baker	0.12
3	Bay	0.20
4	Bradford	0.10
5	Brevard	0.25
6	Broward	0.13
7	Calhoun	0.09
8	Charlotte	0.19
9	Citrus	0.16
10	Clay	0.25
11	Collier	0.17
12	Columbia	0.14
13	Dade	0.07
14	De Sota	0.12
15	Dixie	0.14
16	Duval	0.16
17	Escambia	0.22
18	Flagler	0.23
19	Franklin	0.11
20	Gadsden	0.12
21	Gilchrist	0.14
22	Glades	0.20
23	Gulf	0.16
24	Hamilton	0.13
25	Hardee	0.13
26	Hendry	0.16
27	Hernando	0.16
28	Highlands	0.14
29	Hillsborough	0.15
30	Holmes	0.15
31	Indian River	0.15
32	Jackson	0.11
33	Jefferson	0.14
34	Lafayette	0.09
35	*Lake*	*0.19*
36	Lee	0.15
37	Leon	0.16
38	Levy	0.16
39	Liberty	0.10
40	Madison	0.09
41	Manatee	0.17
42	Marion	0.15
43	Martin	0.19
44	Monroe	0.25
45	Nassau	0.18
46	Okaloosa	0.26
47	Okeechobee	0.14
48	*Orange*	*0.19*

49	*Osceola*	*0.23*
50	Palm Beach	0.13
51	Pasco	0.17
52	Pinellas	0.14
53	Polk	0.13
54	Putnam	0.12
55	St. Johns	0.21
56	St. Lucie	0.18
57	Santa Rosa	0.40
58	Sarasota	0.14
59	*Seminole*	*0.17*
60	Sumter	0.16
61	Suwannee	0.14
62	Taylor	0.10
63	Union	0.10
64	Volusia	0.15
65	Wakulla	0.14
66	Walton	0.15
67	Washington	0.15

Table 3

Average Population Churn for Florida Counties

N	VALID	67
MEAN	.1586	
RANGE	.32	
MINIMUM	.07	
MAXIMUM	.40	

Table 4

Population Churn Ranking of Florida Counties

1	Santa Rosa	0.40
2	Okaloosa	0.26
3	Monroe	0.25
4	Clay	0.25
5	Brevard	0.25
6	*Osceola*	*0.23*
7	Flagler	0.23
8	Escambia	0.22
9	St Johns	0.21
10	Glades	0.20
11	Bay	0.20
12	*Orange*	*0.19*
13	Martin	0.19
14	*Lake*	*0.19*
15	Charlotte	0.19
16	St. Lucie	0.18
17	Nassau	0.18
18	*Seminole*	*0.17*
19	Pasco	0.17
20	Manatee	0.17
21	Collier	0.17
22	Sumter	0.16
23	Levy	0.16
24	Leon	0.16
25	Hernando	0.16
26	Hendry	0.16
27	Gulf	0.16
28	Duval	0.16
29	Citrus	0.16
30	Alachua	0.16
31	Washington	0.15
32	Walton	0.15
33	Volusia	0.15
34	Marion	0.15
35	Lee	0.15
36	Indian River	0.15
37	Holmes	0.15
38	Hillsborough	0.15
39	Wakulla	0.14
40	Suwannee	0.14
41	Sarasota	0.14
42	Pinellas	0.14
43	Okeechobee	0.14
44	Jefferson	0.14
45	Highlands	0.14
46	Gilchrist	0.14
47	Dixie	0.14
48	Columbia	0.14

49	Polk	0.13
50	Palm Beach	0.13
51	Hardee	0.13
52	Hamilton	0.13
53	Broward	0.13
54	Putnam	0.12
55	Gadsden	0.12
56	De Sota	0.12
57	Baker	0.12
58	Jackson	0.11
59	Franklin	0.11
60	Union	0.10
61	Taylor	0.10
62	Liberty	0.10
63	Bradford	0.10
64	Madison	0.09
65	Lafayette	0.09
66	Calhoun	0.09
67	Dade	0.09

Table 5

Population Churn Ranking for Metropolitan Statistical Areas of Florida

MSA	CHURN RATE
Daytona Beach	.145
Fort Myers-Cape Coral	.154
Fort Pierce-Port St. Lucie	.185
Fort Walton Beach	.261
Gainesville	.158
Jacksonville	*.171*
Lakeland-Winter Haven	.126
Melbourne-Titusville-Palm Bay	.254
Miami	*.097*
Naples	.171
Ocala	.146
Orlando	*.187*
Panama City	.202
Pensacola	.269
Punta Gorda	.186
Sarasota-Bradenton	.138
Tallahassee	.149
Tampa	*.149*
West Palm Beach-Boca Raton	.13

Table 6

Top Ten States Ranked by Population Change: 1990-2000

Rank	State	Change, 1990 to 2000
1	Nevada	66.3
2	Arizona	40.0
3	Colorado	30.6
4	Utah	29.6
5	Idaho	28.5
6	Georgia	26.4
7	*Florida*	*23.5*
8	Texas	23.5
9	North Carolina	21.4
10	Washington	21.1
(*NA)*	*United States*	*13.2*

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Internet Release Date: April 2, 2001

Table 7

Positive Correlations

		White persons not of Hispanic/ Latino origin, 2000	Asian persons percent, 2000	Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander, percent, 2000
POP CHURN	Pearson Correlation	.331**	.385**	.277**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.001	.023
	N	67	67	67

		Median household income, 1999	Bachelor degree or higher, pct of persons age 25+, 2000	High school grads, pct of persons age 25+, 2000
POP CHURN	Pearson Correlation	.372**	.326**	.343**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.007	.005
	N	67	67	67

		Counties with military bases
POP CHURN	Pearson Correlation	.378**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002
	N	67

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 8

Negative Correlations

		Persons below poverty, pct, 1999	Living in the same house in 1995 and 2000, pct age 5+, 2000	Third-graders who failed FCAT,2002
POP CHURN	Pearson Correlation	-.522**	-.490**	-.388**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.001
	N	67	67	67

		African-Americans Persons, percent, 2000
POP CHURN	Pearson Correlation	-.402**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001
	N	67

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 9

Population Churn, Crime, and Domestic Violence Correlations

		Rate of Crime per 1000, 2000	Rate of Domestic Violence per 1000, 2000
POP CHURN	Pearson Correlation	-.152	-.082
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.219	.511
	N	67	67

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

REFERENCES

Bullamore, H. (1981). Job change as a motivation for intraurban residential mobility. *Growth and Change, 12*(1), 42-49

Carter, G. (2003) Migration and social order: The examples of suicide and crime. *Sociology by the Numbers*.July,retrieved08/08/2003from http://web.bryant.edu/~gcarter/home/issue_of_the_month/july.htm

Dahmann, D. (1989). The survey of income and program participation as a source of migration data. *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement, 15*, 57-70.

Dahmann, D. (1986). Geographical mobility research with panel data. *Growth and Change, 17*(3), 35-48.

DeWitt, D.; Offord, D.; Braun, K. (1998). What does moving do to your children? *Workshop Paper for Investing in children: A National Research Conference*

Donavan, N.; Pilch, T; Rubenstein, T. (2002). Geographic Mobility. *Performance and Innovation Unit, July*

Dowling, T. (2000). Reflections on urban sprawl, smart growth, and the Fifth Amendment. *University of Pa Law Review, 148*(3), 873-888.

Fulkerson, J. (1995). Deep roots vs. rolling stones. *American Demographics, 17*(5), 13.

Gabrielson, S. (Eds.). (2002). Legacy 2002: Greater Orlando indicators report. *The Healthy Community Initiative of Greater Orlando.*

Glaeser, E., Shapiro, J. (2000). City Growth: Which places grew and why. *Redefining Urban and Suburban America. Katz, B. Lang, R. (Eds),* 13-32, Brookings Institution Press, Washington D. C.

Hartnagel, T. (1997). Crime among the provinces: The effect of geographic mobility. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, October,* 387-402.

Haas Center, (2003). Florida Defense Industry Economic Impact Analysis: Volume Two County Analysis. University of West Florida

Jasper, J. (2000). Restless Nation: Starting over in America. Retrieved on 11/10/2003 from http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/394786.html

Kane, H. (2001). Triumph of the Mundane. Retrieved on 11/10/2003 from http://www.halkane.com/triumph.htm

Kasarda, J.; Janowitz, M. (1974). Community attachment in mass society. *American Sociological Review*, 39(3), 328-339.

Knapp, T.; White, N.; Clark, D. (2001). A nested logit approach to household mobility. *Journal of Regional Science, 41*(1), 1-22.

Levin, B. (2001). Policing for a changing world: Demographics and Economics, Retrieved from http://www.br.cc.va.us/Levin/papers/2001.IACP.PFI.doc on 08/08/2003.

Long, L. (1988). Migration and residential mobility in the United States. New York: Russell Sage.

Long, L. (1992). International perspectives on the residential mobility of America's children. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 54*(4), 861-870.

Marx, G. (1994). Fragmentation and cohesion in American society. In Dynes, r. & Tierney, K. *Disasters, Collective Behavior, and Social Organization*, University of Delaware Press.

Matthews, C. (2003). Population and Sustainable Development. *Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry of New Zealand*. Retrieved from www.beehive.govt.NZ/documents/files/population%20and%20sustainable%20development%202003 ON 09/10/2003.

McHugh, K.; Hogan, T.; Happel, S. (1995). (1995). Multiple residence and cyclical migration: A life course perspective. *Professional Geographer. 47*(3), 251-268.

Muellbauer, J. (2003). Geographic mobility. Retrieved from http://www.number- 10.gov.uk/su/gmseminar/gm_muellbauer. on 08/08/2003.

Myers, D.; Woolee, S.; Choi, S. (1997). Constraints of housing, age, and migration on residential mobility. *Professional Geographer, 49*(1), 14-28.

Perry, M. (2003). State-to-State migration flows: 1995 to 2000. *U.S. Census Bureau* CENSR-8.

Poppert, P.& Herzog Jr., H (2003) Force reduction, base closures, and the indirect effects of military installations on local employment growth, *Journal of Regional Science. 43*(3), 459-482.

Putnam, R. (2000). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American Community. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Rossi, P. & Shlay, A. (1982). Residential mobility and public policy issues: Why families move revisited. *Journal of Social Issues,* 38, 21-34.

Rossi, P. (1955). Why families move. Glencoe, Ill.: Sage

Sartre, J. (1974). Between Existentialism and Marxism. New York: William Morrow and Company.

Schacter, J. (2001). Geographical mobility: Population characteristics. *U.S. Census Bureau* P20-538.

Schacter, J. (2001a). Why people move: Exploring the March 2000 Current Population Survey. *U.S. Census Bureau* P23-204.

Serow, W. (2003). Economic consequences of retiree concentrations: A review of North American Studies. *The Gerontological Society of America, 43,* 897-903.

Shroder, M. (2001). Moving to opportunity: An experiment in social and geographically mobility.Retrievedfrom http://www.hud.user.org/publications/pdf/brd/17Schroeder.pdf

Simpson, G. & Fowler, M. (1994) Geograhic mobility and children's emotional/behavioral adjustment and school functioning. *National Center for Health Statistics, 93*(2) 303-309.

South, S. & Crowder, K. (1998). Avenues and barriers to residential mobility among single mothers. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 60*(4), 866-878.

South, S. & Crowder, K. (1997). Escaping distressed neighborhoods: Individual, community and metropolitan influences. *American Journal of Sociology, 102*(4) 1040-1084.

South, S. & Deanne, G. (1993). Race and residential mobility: Individual determinants and structural constraints. *Social Forces, 72*(1), 147-167.

Strassman, P. (2001). Residential mobility: Contrasting approaches in Europe and the United States.

Tobey, R., Wetherell, C., Brigham, J. (1995).Moving out and settling in: Residential mobility, home owning, and the public enframing of citizenship, 1921-1950. *American Historical Review 95*(5) 1395-1422.

Treas, J. & Longino, C. (1997) Demography of aging in the United States in Ferraro, ed., *Gerontology: Perspectives and Issues.* New York: Springer

Ward, J. (1995). Demographics and economic changes facing schools in the North Central Region.NCREL'sPolicyBriefsRetreviedfrom http://www.ncrel.org/ncrel/sdrs/areas/issues/envrmnt/go/95-1ward.htm

Zimmerman, J. (1994). Young adults, renters most mobile: South remains a magnet for interregional migrants. *National Civic Review*, 83(4), 487-489.