

Is family well-being still the most important motive in the decision to move?

A comparison between the US in the 1950s and the Czech Republic in the 2010s

Hynek Jerabek & Sarka Tesarova

72nd Annual WAPOR Conference (19-21 May 2019) in Toronto, Canada

Abstract

This presentation offers a cross-national and cross-century comparison of the classic study by Peter Rossi 'Why Families Move' and a current study about the motives and reasons that families who changed their place of residence had for moving from Prague, the capital of the Czech Republic, to the countryside or to a non-metropolitan area where they buy or build their own house. Both studies explain how residential change, particularly moving out of an urban area, can improve family well-being. Rossi's study from the 1950s found that important motives in the decision were the relative size of a dwelling to the changing needs of the family, being able to own rather than just rent a house, and the social composition of the new neighbourhood. These factors have a strong impact on the subjective well-being of the whole family. Our aim is to reveal how much the composition of reasons for moving may have changed in the Czech Republic in the present. There are many difficulties in this comparison. The different time and place, the distance of the move, the changes in lifestyle, occupational structure, etc. However, generally speaking, if there are any similar patterns in the reasons people in America moved in the 1950s and why people in the Czech Republic did in the 2010s, this would be some validation of Rossi's model and also of the strength of the reason analysis method that was developed by Paul Lazarsfeld and his colleagues. If we find an identical pattern of reasons in two situations that differ so much in place and time as in our case, there would be very strong empirical evidence for some general model of explanation.

Contents:

1. Why people move – in the Czech Republic today and in the USA in the 1950s?
2. Differences between the two projects – primarily in terms of the methods of research
 - 2.1. The methodology of Peter Rossi's Philadelphia project in 1955
 - 2.2. The methodology of the project by Tesarová and Jerabek in Prague in 2019/20
3. The task in the Czech Republic
4. The shared methodology – Reason Analysis
5. Preliminary results from the first stage of research

1. INTRODUCTION: WHY PEOPLE MOVE – IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC TODAY AND IN THE USA IN THE 1950S?

Leaving the city for the countryside is something we know people have been doing ever since far in the past. Socrates reportedly owned a small estate in the village called 'Gúdi', where he used to travel in order to get a rest from all the commotion in what was then the capital city Athens. Nowadays this phenomenon is occurring on a large scale. In the literature the standard version of this practice is referred to as the 'counter-urbanisation story' and is driven by motives that relate to several basic family needs (Mitchell 2004). The main reasons for moving are usually that people need more space and want to own their own home, where they will be better able to decide how to use that space. (Rossi 1980 [1955]).

However, in its standard version the 'counter-urbanisation story' also encompasses motives that involve finding solutions to several other needs, such as the wish to move to a quieter and safer environment, which the countryside offers. When these migrants move to a certain location that meets their demands, this step is also accompanied by an increase in social status if they are moving to a location that is one of the more sought-after places to live (Benson, O'Reilly 2009). The process of making the decision to move is by no means uniform across individual cases and there exists a wide range of factors that influence individuals and families and to select a certain location for his or her or more often their new home.

Our research question is as follows: 'Is family well-being still the most important motive in the decision to move?' This question brings us back to the old but now classic study that Peter Rossi carried out in the middle of the 1950s, more than sixty years ago, in the USA (Rossi 1980 [1955]). In our study we note some of the similarities in the decision-making processes of migrating families (today and then) and seek explanations for them both in contemporary theories and in the mechanisms that were already described by Peter Rossi in his famous book *Why Families Move?* Our methodological guideline here is the method of 'reason analysis'. Peter Rossi applied this method in his study of residential change in Philadelphia in the 1950s and we also apply the same method to the reasons why families move from a similarly large city, Prague, in the present day.

If we ask what people are looking for when they move to the countryside, the question that suggests itself is to ask why they leave and above all what is it that they do not like about the place where they are living in at present. Peter Rossi's study (Rossi 1980 [1955]) indicates that over sixty years ago people were more motivated to for very concrete reasons and usually because they did not like the neighbourhood they were living in and they did not have enough space. Today we can describe these as factors that have a very significant influence on the decision to move, i.e. 'push effects': when looking for the right place to move to, people's decisions are primarily guided by the problems they see in the place where they are currently living. The initial objective then is to solve these unpleasant problems by moving to a better place.

In the 1950s Rossi drew attention also to a second group of reasons that people have for moving, namely 'pull effects'. The results of the most recent studies have shown that today it is these 'pull effects' that ranks among the main reasons people take into consider when deciding to move. Migrants today thus give more attention to the characteristics of the

location that is their destination than they do to any shortcomings in the place where they are currently living. (Halliday, Coombes 1995 p.445). Since the 1950s the methods used to closely analyse the decision-making process of migrant families and households have differed, but qualitative studies nonetheless have shown that the decision-making process in this case has not changed in any notable ways.

The standard 'counter-urbanisation mainstream' expects that residential change will be accompanied by an ensuing elevation in status, i.e. to the level of status associated with the new address. (Halfacree 2001 p.398-399) In this kind of situation, the image of a space (Lefébvre 1991), that is, how that space is perceived, is a more significant factor in the decision-making process than are the actual and real characteristics of the space (Baylina, Berg 2010). Another level of perspectives that shape the decision-making process involves considerations that are not just based on the physical characteristics of the target location. The first of these considerations relates to the social attributes of the location, which become the subject of careful inquiry and are assessed according to additional criteria. Such criteria may include the quality of the 'living space', the 'physical space', or the 'represented space' (Lefébvre 1991).

Nowadays we can no longer work just with the simple model presented by the 'counter-urbanisation story'. It is necessary to expect that there is a much wider range of reasons and combinations of reasons that influence people's decision to move (Halfacree 2012). In the case of what is called 'lifestyle migration' (Benson 2015), people who move to the country are looking for places that have not yet been discovered, and it is not an increase in social status that they are seeking. On the contrary, they some of them are looking for a community that suits them and that feels close to them, which is how Mari Korpela described the situation in northern India in the city of Varanasi (Mari Korpela in: Benson 2016-2009 p.17-18). Or they are searching for a place with a feeling of authenticity, an authenticity that is lost through mass settlement; they are thus looking for 'undiscovered' places with specific characteristics (Osbaldiston 2012). Their choice of location is based on the lifestyle they want to live, which they themselves refer to as 'the good life'. Another group of motives, according to Moss, is espoused by 'amenities migrants'. These people are searching for something very specific and they often look for remote places, idyllic, pristine landscapes in the mountains, where they can live according to their own notion of the spiritual dimension of a place (Moss 2006). According to Moss's observations, they are motivated by higher aspirations and a desire for transcendence. (Moss 2006; Osbaldiston 2011)

2. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO PROJECTS – PRIMARILY IN TERMS OF THE METHODS OF RESEARCH

2.1. The methodology of Peter Rossi's Philadelphia project in 1955

Peter Rossi considered whether to study residential change in a past perspective, that is, a change in residence that had already taken place, or residential change that is planned to take place in the near future. He decided in favour of the second of these options. He asked

inhabitants of Philadelphia – individual households – questions about their plans: whether they plan to move or not, and why they plan to move. Eight months later Peter Rossi returned to the same addresses to find out whether any planned moves had in fact occurred. That means, his research involved sufficiently checking up on the fulfilment of this plan. Rossi was among other things studying the conditions under which the motivation to move is transformed into action. He discovered that it was more often those who had only been renting their housing who moved and less often those who owned the housing they were in. (Rossi 1980: 120 [1955]) It would be natural to expect that the households most likely to move were households that were renting and wanted to buy their own home. Also, the younger the family and the larger the family, the more likely they were to move. (ibid., p. 124) Large families living in small flats especially were interested in moving. A particularly significant factor was that of an increase in the number of members in the family and the entailing need for more space, the need for one's own home. This referred to the situation where the parents had had or were expecting the birth of a (another) child. Both such circumstances led to an increased likelihood of moving.

Peter Rossi deemed it important to select representatives from four different social and urban environments in Philadelphia. He interviewed four groups of inhabitants of the City of Philadelphia who resided in four different areas of the city: 'Four areas – census tracts – were to be chosen, one of high mobility and high socio-economic status, one of high mobility and low socio-economic status, one of low mobility and high socio-economic status, and one of low mobility and low socio-economic status.' (Rossi 1980: 65) 'The median monthly rental was thus used as an index of the socioeconomic status of the census tracts, and the proportion of owner-occupied dwelling units formed an index of mobility'. (Rossi 1980: 66 [1955]) Drawing on census data from 1940 he selected four relatively compact areas in the city and picked one census tract from each one. He then selected households – families – to interview from each of these areas. Moving is a far more frequent phenomenon in the United States than it is, for example, in the Czech Republic, so it was logical that Peter Rossi focused on 'current data' and decided, first, to compare socio-economic status in the environments that people were moving out of and, second, to compare the mobility plans of families in areas with above-average mobility to the plans of families in areas with below-average mobility. (Rossi 1980: 65-68 [1955])

2.2. The methodology of the project by Tesarova and Jerabek in Prague in 2019/20

By contrast, our project is based on the situation in the Czech Republic, where the average rate of residential mobility is much lower. Moving residence is not as common as it is in the United States. Prague, the capital of the Czech Republic, which currently has a population of 1.2 million inhabitants, was selected for the comparison with Philadelphia. In our research we were not interested in just any kind of relocation from one place to another. For the Czech study we tried to select the kinds of families people for which residential change would represent a situation comparable to that of the situation in the USA in the 1950s, when many households there lived in family homes, which they either owned or rented. This is not the situation of the majority of the population in Prague. The difference is that in Prague hinterland are not many family houses for rent, they are only for sale, which can be one of the reasons why these people leave the city.

In the Czech sample of families, we focused on what is called 'privileged migration'. (Lów 2016) Given the lower rate of residential change, selecting areas and asking families about

their current plans to move would have produced very few affirmative responses. We therefore decided to collect our data in the reverse way and ask about migration that had already taken place. We questioned families that in the past five years had moved from the urban area of Prague to a surrounding area outside the metropolitan area.

The project is now in its first stage: we are conducting semi-structured preliminary interviews and looking for all the important factors that may have an influence on residential change – the direction, the distance, and intensity with which it occurs. The aim of this first stage is to prepare an ‘accounting scheme’, which means to uncover a set of reasons that influence a family’s decision to undertake the particular change of residence that they do: why did they move to the particular place they moved to? In the ensuing and more extensive stage, we will interview a larger number of families that in the past five years have moved from Prague to the countryside. In this stage a flexibly structured questioning schema will be used. It will be based on the principle of the ‘reason analysis’ method. The sample of families who have moved from Prague will be selected from several areas (localities) identified in advance, and these areas should as much as possible be representative of the main types of reasons or even the limitations that determine preferences relating to the choice of a new place to live. In conclusion we will try to create a typology of migrating families based on combinations of specific reasons for moving to particular areas around Prague. In this stage it will be possible to make a better and more detailed comparison of our study with Peter Rossi’s study ‘*Why Families Move?*’ conducted sixty years ago. We hope that, despite the great distance in time between the two studies, the different cultural and historical contexts, and the substantial differences between Czech and American families, we will be able to find some identical and some similar reasons and also some easy to explain differences in the migration behaviours of Czech families today and American families in the past.

3. THE TASK IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC

The Czech Republic is generally seen as a place where a lower rate of population mobility than is commonly observed in other countries. Nevertheless, or perhaps for this very reason, it makes sense to ask what motives the Czechs who do migrate have for moving. Our objective is to find an answer to the basic question underlying our research: ‘Is family well-being still the most important motive in the decision to move?’ Given the differences in time and place, we follow a modified methodological approach. Reason analysis – the shared methodological foundation of both projects – is a method that allows us to also ask today, what are people’s motives for migrating out of the big city – in this case the city of Prague in the centre of Europe. And we can then compare the motives identified in the research with the results of Peter Rossi’s project. Our specific objective is to compare how much of a difference there is between the motives that drive the privileged migration of a portion of the Czech population in Prague and the motives that drove the migration of Americans who moved out of the similarly large city of Philadelphia sixty-five-years ago. And we will also try to determine whether there exists any basic pattern of motives that recur irrespective of time and place. We are searching to discover the basic objectives behind why certain part of the population wants to move out of the city. The title of our paper contains our basic hypothesis. That main objective or motive would then be ‘family well-being’.

In studying the concepts of privileged migration more closely, the possibility suggests itself of linking interpretations of these concepts to Maslow's pyramid of hierarchical needs (Maslow 1987). In the case of migrants who are trying to attain a 'good life', which can also be understood to mean 'family well-being', there is a clear connection to the top level of the pyramid, where individuals are striving for self-actualisation. Migrants of this type diametrically transform their lifestyle in order to move closer to discovering their own sense of life, meaning in life. (Benson 2016).

Conversely, the standard version of the 'counter-urbanisation story' relates mainly to families in the productive period of their lives and who are planning to have children or already have children. Their attempt to acquire more living space simultaneously entails an increase in status, if they choose the right locality (Halfacree 2012). Here it is possible to see a strong connection to the second level of the pyramid from the bottom, which relates to feelings of satisfaction, success in society, and recognition (Maslow 1987). In this case again it is possible to see a link between this and the objective of seeking 'family well-being', though in a slightly different sense. Nevertheless, this connection cannot explain the migration trend to rural areas that do not qualify as what can be called 'a good address'. (Bijker, Haartsen 2012). And it is still a question to what extent certain addresses or localities are in Czech society regarded as an element that meaningfully contributes to status. Lefébre's idea that what matters more is how a location is perceived, is illustrated in Czech society through the example of what localities are 'more popular' and 'less popular' to move to, even though visually they look much alike (Štefánková, Drbohlav 2014). The key to understanding their popularity lies in regarding them from a multidimensional perspective (Bijker Haartsen 2012)

As well as a simple explanation of motives based on the need pyramid, there are other factors that may enter the story and that co-shape the reality of the counter-urbanisation process, which may to some extent be characterised as a search for the rural idyll of the nineteenth century. This idealisation of the past can represent a certain way of escaping from present-day reality, known as the risk society (Beck 1992). A feeling of insecurity and a view of society as incomprehensible or even hostile is a likely explanation for the need some migrating families have to physically isolate themselves from others. In some cases, this can manifest itself as (the decision to live behind) an impenetrable two-metre wall and voluntary isolation from the local community. Nor is it clear even for the category of 'amenity migrants' (Moss 2006) whether their actions genuinely relate to the top level of the period, the need for self-actualization (Maslow 1987) or whether part of the reason they have for moving is a hidden need for safety, which they are provided with by removing themselves from the disorienting urban environment. Their motive may be much like that of the preceding cases. Except instead of a two-metre wall, in the case of this group people choose to live in a place that is remote from civilisation. In practice this spatial separation works better than a two-metre wall.

In the frame of privileged migration in a rural direction, choosing where to move to is a question that encompasses a great variety of motives. Although the story make look similar from the outside, as it has resulted in the choice of the same locality, it may in its course and its key milestones be a very different story. It is not very surprising that in one locality it is possible to find very different types of migrants with wholly distinct decision-making

schemas, which nevertheless led them to the same place.

4. REASON ANALYSIS - A METHOD FOR ANALYSING DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

Paul Lazarsfeld first described the principles of 'reason analysis' in his article 'The Art of Asking Why' in 1935. (Lazarsfeld 1972 [1935]) This paper was the first publication in which the principles of reason analysis were revealed. And reason analysis was historically the first original contribution from Paul Lazarsfeld to the equipment at the disposal of empirical sociologists for research procedures aimed at the study of relationships between causes and their consequences.

Reason analysis employs an individualised strategy based on discerning the reasons and motivations that lead a particular person to specific actions, decisions, or deeds. It is an individualised case analysis of causes and reasons. The 'reason analysis' method employs detailed specifications of answers to the question 'Why?'. People usually have more than one reason for their behaviour, decisions, and actions. Even so, if they are asked, they usually explain their actions or behaviour with one reason. The method of reason analysis, which also encompasses a model of thought processes, a questioning procedure, and a concluding strategy for reducing information, is aimed at creating typologies and it seeks to overcome the inadequacy of a single simple response to the question 'Why?'.

Reason analysis is a complex approach that involves a theoretical model of assumed connections between reasons and consequences. The method does not work with samples that represent an entire population regardless of whether the members of that population had made a decision or not. For example, instead of working with a population of all potential voters, only those who decided to vote for a specific party are questioned, and they are asked about how they reached their decisions. Unlike research on all shoppers, only people who bought a certain type of good are interviewed, and the reasons for their specific decisions are determined. Generally speaking, reason analysis studies a set of persons who really made decisions, and it reconstructs the models of their decision-making processes.

Before applying the reason analysis approach, it is necessary to decide which specific actions the decision-making process relates to. Usually this means analytically breaking up the decision-making process into its individual sub-elements, which are observed separately.

The procedure applied in this analysis can be described in a several-step sequence:

1. Formulation of the problem. What are the dimensions of the decision-making process? What action are they deciding about?
2. Conducting exploratory interviews
3. Revealing the 'accounting scheme' – (a structured set of reasons)
4. Using the accounting scheme in interviews
5. A reduction of the model of decision-making and the formation of typology

1. In the first phase we usually conduct a detailed conceptualisation of a specific solved task. On the basis of an analysis of the problem and with the use of theory we divide up the mechanism through which decisions are reached into several sequential decision-making steps.
2. The method uses pilot interviews that determine what reasons led individuals to reach their specific decisions. In these exploratory interviews we focus on revealing the real decision-making mechanisms in individual cases.
3. The outcome of the orientational, exploratory interviews is a structured set of reasons, which Lazarsfeld refers to as an 'accounting scheme'. Revealing the 'structure of motives' or creating the 'accounting scheme' on the basis of many individual analyses of actual mechanisms of individual decision-making represents the most difficult part of the reason analysis method. The task of the phase of creating the 'accounting scheme' is to inductively summarise a number of subjective statements into a general model. The model takes into account the sequence of the decision-making steps, about which we will question the respondents in the interviews in the following, fourth phase of the reason analysis method.
4. In the next phase, the accounting scheme – the structural model of decision-making – is converted into a large number of questions. The data collection is arranged as a set of questions or as hundreds of standardised, partially structured interviews, i.e. 'face to face' interviewing, conducted by specially trained interviewers. In it the interviewers fill in the answers, step by step with the respondents, to dozens of detailed questions, and do so in the order that is set up at the start of the interview according to how the respondent understands the first questions. The interviewer fills in the gaps in the respondent's statements with complementary questions. Only detailed, fully completed questionnaires can create an idea of the chains of reasons that were in effect in the case of the individual actors. The difficulty in the method lies in the fact that data collection that is conducted using semi-structured interviews based on a 'motivational scheme' can produce quite a mixed variety of decision-making models. This makes the concluding phase of the approach even more demanding.
5. In the final phase of the method's application the relative significance of the individual reasons revealed in the preceding steps is calculated. In this phase the task is to reduce the numerous minor ways in which people reach decisions in individual cases to form typical decision-making models that are valid for groups of decision-making people. These models then represent the concrete outcome of the reason analysis method.

When Peter H. Rossi began to conceptualise his research on the motives American families have for moving, he employed the principles of the reason analysis method. The motives for a family move can be divided into four main groups: 1) complaints – concerning the

characteristics of the former dwelling – how satisfied the family is with the house or flat they live in; 2) specifications – the attributes of the new home that the family would like to own or rent in the near future; 3) attractions – features of a particular new home that made it more attractive than other possible dwellings; 4) information sources – the media or subjects from which the family received incentives to be interested in such a home. (Rossi 1980: 177-178 [1955])

In Peter Rossi's model it is possible to distinguish some levels on which we can evaluate and assess the motives that influence a family in the decision-making process. If we start with the characteristics of the old dwelling, we have a) complaints – how often the families mention various complaints about the home the family lives in; b) impact – this means how important individual complaints are for the family; and c) effectiveness – e.g. the extent to which a complaint, when mentioned, is regarded as important and having an impact. (Rossi 1980: 180 [1955])

There is also the other side of the decision-making process, and that is how the attributes of the new home and its attractions are evaluated. In this case there are also three important aspects: a) a specification of what kind of new home the family needs; b) information sources that the family draws on in the process of searching for a new home, and c) the final decision concerning the most important attractions of the desired home.

Some characteristics of the new dwelling are spontaneously mentioned. Some other are the cold tacit assumptions. There are some expectations that families consider to be self-evident. If people own a house they expect that if they move to a new house it will be as the owners of that house, and if people rent a house, then they expect they will also rent the next house they move to. If they want to buy a house, they will mention this specifically. (Rossi 1980: 204-5 [1955]) People's specification of the characteristics they need the new home to have relates closely to the complaints they mention about their former dwelling. If the cost of the housing was a complaint about the old home, the family will very likely mention the cost of the new home as an important characteristic, and specifically that it should be not too costly. Peter Rossi explicitly says: 'If a family has complained about some aspect of its former home, it is to be expected that this same aspect should loom large as a specification for the new place.' (Rossi 1980: 205 [1955]). Such specifications concern mainly the size of the home, its cost and its neighbourhood. (Rossi 1980: 206 [1955])

In our project we use the reason analysis model in his original version. We start with the sample of families that actually moved out of the Czech capital Prague and now live in a house outside or away from any big city or town. Our main question is: Why did families move to this specific location, to this house, to this natural area, to this village, or other non-urban place to live in?

In the first step of our project we conducted semi-structured interviews to search for specific combinations of reasons for this unique decision. We are looking for an accounting scheme with which we can prepare our structured questioning. These interviews allow us to identify some basic reasons for leaving the former home that we can set out from. To define the constraints of the old dwelling, its criticisms of it. Then the next section of the interviewing

asks about the process of looking for a new dwelling – where to live, the address, the size of the new house, its surroundings, and the nature of the social environment. Of course, we will evaluate the importance of individual characteristics of the old and the new living location. The next important issue is the sequence/ordering of the reasons, of the decision-making steps, and not only the exact importance of each of them.

We hope at the end of this research process to find a typology of families and their new dwellings, including the characteristics of their natural and social environment. We can then compare these final typologies with the findings that Peter Rossi arrived at in his classic study.

5. PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS FROM THE FIRST STAGE OF THE RESEARCH

We expect that there are many motives and impulses for moving that have existed unchanged for many years, perhaps for generations, and appear to apply across states and perhaps even continents. One of the constants that greatly influence our thinking about housing is ‘the ownership relationship to a home’. This is a need that enhances the feeling that the place we live in is our home. Compared to the situation in earlier years, access to ownership is more reserved in the sense that people are aware that a house that is burdened with a mortgage actually still belongs to the bank and is not theirs. A very important factor is that when we own our home we are able to customise it according to our own wishes. Also significant is that we have a greater sense of security when we own our home than when we rent it. This is true both for the situation in the United States when Peter Rossi published his research, and for current Czech citizens who are looking for a home and leaving the cities to live in a non-metropolitan area.

Another universal motive that strongly influences the decision to move is the size of the original dwelling, and the same equation applies across different time periods and regardless of location. If the family feels that the dwelling is too small for them, then that is a much stronger reason for moving than if the dwelling is too big. The spatial demands of families and individuals have generally been increasing over time, and what was very comfortable for a certain number of people fifty years ago is nowadays for the same number of people felt to be altogether unsuitable. Our preliminary conclusions confirm that for Czech families the number of rooms in a dwelling and their layout also plays a bigger role in determining housing satisfaction than any net measure of space by square metre.

We can see a substantial difference between the Czech environment and the American environment in how socio-economic status can be created through a so-called ‘good address’. This factor probably has very little influence on the structure of the population in different localities in the Czech Republic. Also, decisions about where to live are only slightly influenced by such considerations or preferences. Peter Rossi writes about neighbourhoods and areas that ‘blue collars’ or ‘white collars’ would tend to move to in the 1950s, while Michael Benson has mentioned similar effects in his current studies (Benson 2014).

In the current situation in the Czech Republic a big role is played by financial considerations, as almost all respondents mention that it would actually be cheaper for them to build or to buy and renovate a house outside of Prague than it would be to buy a finished apartment or

house in Prague. Thus, many of these people are actually economic migrants because it was not their original intention to leave the urban environment at all. However, a very surprising finding is that even those who left the city reluctantly and purely for economic reasons consider their current housing to be much more enjoyable than their previous residence, wherever it was or whatever it was like.

We can see now in the Czech environment for the first time a prevalence of prejudices generally created by the media and a long-standing notion of the 'ugly north' and the 'attractive south'. Some respondents had an image of an ugly landscape with no hills or forests on the northern outskirts of Prague: '... it is ugly in the north, boring and flat with no forests ...'. And they were not even interested in visiting these areas or had visited a few of them but that had done nothing to change their dislike.

Our preliminary findings indicate that the respondents who decided to leave Prague to move to the countryside are all looking for peace and quiet and less population density and consider Prague to be overcrowded, especially its public green areas such as parks. All the respondents without exception mentioned the need for peace and quiet. When asked to specify what exactly that means, they say 'to get rid of the noise that is everywhere, especially from cars and the hustle and bustle'. However, they cannot exactly define what the hustle and bustle means; to them it signifies a kind of mood that is created by streets full of people rushing somewhere and not actually noticing the other people they pass on the street. It signifies more certain feelings that the respondents describe rather than something that could be described in real and concrete terms. They also feel that urban residential development is overcrowded and they find it unpleasant living so close together with other people from whom they are separated by only a thin wall and dislike how there is no way to block out the various smells and noises that permeate the space in prefabricated apartment buildings in large Prague housing estates, many of which were built under the previous regime.

Czech data reveal not only the motive of wanting 'not to be disturbed' but also the thoughtful wish 'not to disturb one's neighbours'. Respondents not rarely but repeatedly said things like: '... look, I'm glad I can play music here, the closest neighbours are so far away from here, and I'm not disturbing anyone, and there's peace ...'. Thus, the motive not to be disturbed and at the same time not to be a disturbance is concisely expressed in a sentence that several respondents independently of each other said is various but very similar formulations. 'We really like it best here in the winter when there's no one here'. This sentence alludes to a specific situation in the Czech Republic, where many rural properties are used only as holiday homes even though they are actually residential houses. The owners of these properties work in in Prague, so they often do not visit or heat these homes in the winter months and use them only in the summer. Many migrants who have moved permanently to areas where there are a number of such homes like and appreciate this aspect of where they live very much.

Respondents also appreciate the landscape and surrounding area of the home they have chosen to live in and rate hilly and forested landscapes to be the type of landscape they prefer most. Another important element of what they see in the kind of the area they want

to live in is the presence of birds and animals that live in rural areas such as deer, hedgehogs, and squirrels.

A problem in the Czech context is that there is a public administration system that makes it difficult to define who has actually moved. There exists something that is defined as a person's 'permanent residence', a permanent address registered with the local municipal authorities that is processed for the purposes of quantitative statistical data. Some of our respondents who indeed felt that they had permanently moved had nevertheless not registered a change of address with the local authorities and for various reasons had kept their Prague address as their official permanent address. One such reason is that a Prague address allows people to park for a small residential fee in the district where they work or do business, another is that they are eligible to enrol their children in a particular Prague school or kindergarten, and there are other administrative reasons as well. This, of course, distorts any quantitatively conducted research with which we might otherwise compare

We can see that many of people's attitudes and behavioural patterns relating to residential change remained unaltered over time, but just as many have changed, especially given developments made possible by new technologies. It is not so surprising that the range of attractive places to move to and live in has been growing thanks to the possibility that many people have now to work remotely or to occasionally work from home. This attribute impact mainly people without children because the families must think about how their children will go to school in person so the influence of the modern technologies and the opportunities of working remotely is not that useful for these people.

References:

- Baylina, M., & Gunnerud Berg, N. (2010). Selling the countryside: Representations of rurality in Norway and Spain. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 17(3), 277-292.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. Sage.
- Benson, M., & O'reilly, K. (2009). Migration and the search for a better way of life: a critical exploration of lifestyle migration. *The sociological review*, 57(4), 608-625.
- Benson, M. (2016, 2009). *Lifestyle migration: Expectations, aspirations and experiences*. Routledge.
- Bijker, R. A., & Haartsen, T. (2012). More than counter-urbanisation: Migration to popular and less-popular rural areas in the Netherlands. *Population, Space and Place*, 18(5), 643-657.
- Halfacree, K. (2001). Constructing the object: taxonomic practices, 'counterurbanisation' and positioning marginal rural settlement. *International Journal of Population Geography*, 7(6), 395-411.
- Halfacree, K. (2012). Heterolocal identities? Counter-urbanisation, second homes, and rural consumption in the era of mobilities. *Population, space and place*, 18(2), 209-224.
- Halliday, J., & Coombes, M. (1995). In search of counterurbanisation: some evidence from Devon on the relationship between patterns of migration and motivation. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 11(4), 433-446.
- Champion, T. (2001). The continuing urban-rural population movement in Britain: trends, patterns, significance. *Espace Populations Societes*, 19(1), 37-51.
- Kaduschin, Ch. (1968): Reason Analysis. In: International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences. (ed. D. Sills) Vol. 13, pp. 338-343
- Katz, E. and Lazarsfeld, P.F. (1955): *Personal Influence. The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communications*. Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press 1955.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F. (1935) "The Art of Asking Why. Three Principles Underlying the Formulation of Questionnaires." *National Marketing Review*, 1, 1, pp. 32-45 (reprinted in Lazarsfeld, P.F. (1972): *Qualitative Analysis. Historical and Critical Essays*. Boston, Allyn and Bacon Inc., pp. 183-202)
- Löw, M. (2016). *The sociology of space: Materiality, social structures, and action*. Springer.
- Maslow, A. H., Frager, R., Fadiman, J., McReynolds, C., & Cox, R. (1987). *Motivation and personality*, 3rd. New York.
- Mitchell, C. J. (2004). Making sense of counterurbanization. *Journal of rural studies*, 20(1), 15-34.
- Moss, L. A. (Ed.). (2006). *The amenity migrants: Seeking and sustaining mountains and their cultures*. Cabi.
- Osbaldiston, N. (2012). *Seeking authenticity in place, culture, and the self: The great urban escape*. Springer.
- Osbaldiston, N. (2011). The authentic place in the amenity migration discourse. *Space and Culture*, 14(2), 214-226.
- Rossi, P. H. (1980 [1955]). *Why families move: A study in the social psychology of urban residential mobility*. Free Press.

ŠTEFÁNKOVÁ, M., & DRBOHLAV, D. „ZLATÁ PRAHA “ „ZASLÍBENÝ JIH “ A TO OSTATNÍ...?
REGIONÁLNÍ A SÍDELNÍ PREFERENCE OBYVATELSTVA ČESKA.

Zeisel, H. (1958): *Say it with Figures*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd 1958 (1st eds. 1947).