FACTORS IN THE INFORMAL AND FORMAL SOCIAL PARTICIPATION OF
INNER CITY WORKING CLASS HOUSEWIVES: A STUDY OF THREE
LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSING ESTATES IN CENTRAL LONDON

By

MAXINE MOSHER HENRYSON, B. S.

ProQuest Number: 10097308

ProQuest.

ABSTRACT

The primary aim of this study was to determine the variations
in the degree of informal and formal social participation of work-
ing class housewives living on council housing estates in the
inner city. The investigator hoped to discover whether the house-
wives lead lives dominated by segmental relationships or whether
they tended to share quasi-primary relations with one another and
be active in kinship groups.

A random sample was taken of housewives living on three coun-
cil housing estates of an Inner London Borough. There was a re-
sponse rate of 82% giving a total of 149 respondents. The data
were collected by means of an eleven page interview schedule with
six undergraduates and the investigator doing the interviewing.
Most of the tabulations were done using the Cope Chat card; gamma
associations and percentages were calculated.

It was found that the housewives' social relations with her
neighbours were not totally segmental: most shared quasi-primary
relations and almost half shared a primary relation. Relatives
played an important role in the housewives social participation.
Social relations with friends and attendance at formal activities
was of relatively minor importance. A respondent was more likely
to have a high social participation rate if she were young, mar-
ried with children, had gone to school as a child in the district

she now lived, and had a long length of residence on the estate. Respondents in the maisonettes tended to have a higher rate of social participation than those living in the three to six storey flats or the tower block. A high rate of social participation was shown to increase the likelihood of a positive self-report of happiness with life on the estate, a high level of satisfaction with the estate, and low rate of anomie.

To Herbert and Dylan

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

9

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEM

This study is concerned with the informal and formal social relations of housewives living on council housing estates in the inner city. The variables studied were the degree of intimacy and the frequency of social relations with relatives and friends, and the extent of attendance at clubs, social events and places of unplanned interaction. The effects of the architectural structure of buildings on the social participation of the residents, and the effects which certain demographic characteristics and mental attitudes may have on the degree of social participations were also considered.

"Distinctive features of the urban mode of life have often been described sociologically as consisting of the substitution of secondary for primary contacts, the weakening of bonds of kinship, and the declining social significance of the family, the disappearance of the neighbourhood, and the undermining of the traditional basis of social solidarity."[1] Recent studies[2] have both

_____

[1] Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life" (103), pp. 20-1.

[2] See, e.g., Axelrod (2), Bell and Boat (3), Dotson (18), Young and Willmott (105).

questioned the extent to which the city in general contains impersonal, anonymous, and secondary social relations and suggested that the differences between sections and settlement types of the city should be considered in making generalizations about urban social relationships. Are impersonal relations equally present in every section of the city? In particular, more information is needed on the social relations of residents living in that section of the city referred to as the inner city.

As one of the settlement types becoming prevalent in the inner city is the council housing estate, it was felt that it would be valuable to discover whether living on a council housing estate was an urban condition under which impersonal social relations were more or less likely to arise.

Post-war British literature contains a number of community studies made on local authority housing estates that are located on the edge of the British cities, and in the New Towns.[3] In compar-

_____

[3]See, e.g., Durant (19), Hodges and Smith (47),
Young and Willmott (105).

ison little attention has been given in the literature to the increasing number of tenants living on council housing estates[4] that are being built to rehabilitate substandard housing areas at the centres of cities. With some notable exceptions most of the tenants in the inner city housing estates live at a high density level in blocks of flats. This is in contrast to the tenants in the New Towns and the housing estates at the edge of the city who generally live in detached or semi-detached houses.

There have been community studies done on inner city working class populations, but, in general, these studies have not been concerned with council tenants. There are two exceptions: Westergaard and Glass' "A Profile of Lansbury" (100) and the Centre for Urban Studies' "Tall Flats in Pimlico".(10) Lansbury is an estate in the East End of London. According to Westergaard and Glass, when they were rehoused the respondents brought a 'community' with them and Lansbury soon became a "true neighbourhood". In the study "Tall Flats in Pimlico" the housing estate

---

[4]For a general discussion of how one becomes a tenant of a council housing estate see Morris and Mogey (65), pp. 12-6. In the 1964 Annual Review of Housing for the Metropolitan Borough of St. Pancras (16) (the borough as such is now defunct as it was combined with the Hampstead and Bloomsbury local authorities to form the Greater London Borough of Camden), there is a description of the points system they used to allocate housing.

was located in the centre of London. It was composed of working
and middle class tenants who did not share the same homogeneity
of background as those at Lansbury. The researchers felt that
most people in the Pimlico flats did not suffer from urban
anonymity or 'anomie'.

Young and Willmott (105) showed that a village type community
existed in the Bethnal Green area of London. Madeline Kerr (49)
showed, similarly, that in the Ship Street area of Liverpool there
was a village type community. Broady (8) showed that in working
class streets in Sheffield people organized for Coronation Day
celebrations. The respondents in these last three studies lived
in housing in the inner city which had not been redeveloped and in
which the inhabitants had, for the most part, a long history of
residence.

Three of the most often referred to American studies con-
cerned with the informal social participation of inner city popu-
lations are Bell and Boat's (3) study in San Francisco,
Dotson's (18) in New Haven, the study by Axelrod (2) in Detroit,
and Gans' The Urban Villagers (30). None of these took place in
public housing complexes, which would be roughly equivalent to the
council housing estate.

II. THEORIES OF SOCIAL RELATIONS

In addition to the specific questions posed by this study, it is of interest to consider the broader sociological questions and propositions, especially those of a more inclusive or general character, to which the particular concerns of this study relate. There are two aspects of sociological theory to which the interests of this study are most closely related: social relations and community. Two assumptions generally appear in the traditional sociological discussions of social relations. The first sees social relations as falling into two ideal types; primary, face-to-face social relations, and secondary, segmental ones. The second assumption sees primary relations as being associated with rural life styles and secondary relations with urban life styles. Frequently, those groups which are felt to have mainly primary relations are considered a community, whereas those with mainly secondary ones are not. Thus, community is thought to be common to rural areas but not to urban ones.

Such assumptions can be found in the theories of LePlay, Tonnies, Durkheim, Simmel, and Wirth. It is postulated that as society moves from a rural to an urban style of life, there is a move from community characterized by primary groups, face-to-face social relations, and feelings of group identity, toward a lack of

community characterized by the absence of primary groups and
thus, secondary, segmental social relations rather than face-to-
face relations and individualist identity rather than a group one.

Sorokin (84) divides social relations into three categories:
familistic, compulsory and mixed or contractual. Briefly, fam-
ilistic social relations are toward each other, mixed social
relations are partly toward and partly away from one another, and
compulsory social relations are away from each other. Sorokin's
typology will be used in the following discussion of the theories
of social relations in order to simplify comparisons.

LePlay published Les ouvriers europeens in 1855. In it he
set forth his study of social phenomena in which he viewed the
family as the basic social unit. He classified the fundamental
types of family by explaining their origin, by describing the
social processes of the family, and by showing the importance of
the family for the whole social organization and historical des-
tiny of a group. He gave classifications of the social processes
of three fundamental types of family and society: the patri-
archal, the particularist and the unstable.. The patriarchal and
unstable type best represent the familistic and contractural forms
of social relations. The particularist type falls in between.

LePlay was primarily an environmentalist and argued that the geography of the land determined the form of labour a group of people practised, and the form of labour corresponded to the type of family. The family education determined the type of social organization. By looking at the education it gives its young, Pinot (71) has distinguished LePlay's three main family types. The patriarchal family,

> "...moulds the young generation so that the children remain together in peace under the authority of the head of the family, causes them to sacrifice all their individual efforts for the Family-community and to depend entirely on this family organization. Within it the individual is annihilated and completely absorbed by the community."[5]

LePlay gave as an example the nomadic shepherds of the steppes of Central Asia and Oriental Europe. They were dependent on the grass of the steppes to feed their horses and sheep. When the animals had eaten all the grass, the entire family moved. The steppes remained common property among the shepherds because ownership of a limited portion of land would be useless to a shepherd once all the grass was consumed. The self-sufficiency of the family meant that there was no need for any permanent social organization larger than the family. Each family had a patriarch

---

[5]Pinot (71), p. 63 as quoted by Sorokin (71), p. 86.

or father at its head with all children except married daughters around him. He exerted supreme power over all members of the family. There was a strong group identity and feeling of "we" or belonging. The social relations were towards one another. The patriarchal family represents the familistic form of social interaction.

The particularist family

> "...enables its young people to manage
> their own business or affairs independently
> and to establish themselves in a definite
> field of activity. It develops a great
> deal of individual initiative... The parents
> do not consider their children as property,
> nor that the children are a mere continuation
> of themselves... They have no greater anxiety
> than to hasten the emancipation of their children."[6]

The Scandinavian and English speaking countries are given as examples of societies where the particularist family predominates. The nomads in wandering into Scandinavia were gradually transformed from patriarchal to particularist type because of the gradual change in the geography from steppes to fiords. In the fiords the main transportation was small boats and this made it impossible for the children to remain with their families. Rather, they were encouraged to leave their parents and live independently as soon as they were able. The breakdown of the extended family

---

[6]Pinot (71), p. 64 as quoted by Sorokin (71), p. 87.

caused free social organizations to be substituted for the en-

forced association of the patriarchal family. The associations

were voluntary, based on covenant and agreement. In this way

the particularist type of family created self-governing social

and political bodies. There was less group identity as independ-

ence and individualism were encouraged. However, there was not a

complete loss of group identity; the particularist family type of

organization created associations of government and cooperated

towards a common goal.

The unstable family

> "...brings up its children without imparting
> respect for authority and traditions as does
> the patriarchal family and at the same time,
> it does not fit them for originality, or for
> the independent production of new ideas, as
> does the particularist type of family."[7]

According to LePlay the unstable family originated in the forests

of South America and Africa. They were hunters and were charac-

terized by qualities essential to the hunter, "agility, address

and strength". As these were attributes of the young in which the

old were to a large extent deficient, the young soon became inde-

pendent of the parents while the old became a burden. Paternal

authority was weakened and there was a decline in the respect for

---

[7]Pinot (71), p. 64 as quoted by Sorokin (71), p. 86-7.

the old. Under such conditions it was impossible to inculcate into the young generation either the community of property or the conservative traditionalism of the patriarchal family. The particularist family created associations of government and cooperated towards a common goal, but the unstable family of the forest did not have these either. The unstable family fostered individualism; there were few forces for group cooperation or identity. More emphasis was placed on feelings of "me" than the group identity of "we". The unstable family represents the contractural type of social interaction which is partly toward and partly away from one another.

It should be remembered that LePlay did not intend to put forward a systematic analysis of social relations but rather of social systems with the family as the elementary and basic social unit. In putting social interaction labels on family types, some imprecision is bound to result. Taking this into account, it would seem fair to argue that if one uses polar types for comparison, as the following writers generally do, then LePlay's typology of the unstable family and society affords a fairly typical portrait of the contractural form of social relationship and the patriarchal family and society of the familistic form of social relationship. The particularist family would be somewhere in between.

Tonnies published <u>Gemeinschaft</u> <u>und</u> <u>Gesellschaft</u> in 1887; in
it he discussed the fundamental forms of social relations. He
felt the two basic forms of social relations were Gemeinschaft and
Gesellschaft, the former being characterized by natural will and
the latter by rational will. Loomis said in his introduction to
the 1940 edition of <u>Gemeinschaft</u> <u>und</u> <u>Gesellschaft</u> (97),

> "Tonnies assumes that all social relationships
> are created by human will. As social facts
> they exist only through the will of the indi-
> viduals to associate. This will and the inner
> relationship of the associated individuals with
> one another may vary from one situation to
> another. For instance, a group or a relation-
> ship can be willed because those involved wish
> to attain through it a definite end and are
> willing to join hands for this purpose, even
> though indifference or even antipathy may exist
> on other levels. In this case rational will...
> prevails. On the other hand, people may
> associate themselves together as friends do,
> because they think the relation valuable as an
> end in and of itself. In this case it is
> natural or integral will which predominates."[8]

Tonnies gave the characteristics of the Gemeinschaft and

Gesellschaft social relationships,

> "...In such natural relationships it is self-
> evident that action will take place and be
> willed in accordance with the relationship,
> whether it be what is contained on the one hand
> in the simplest relationships resulting from
> desire and inclination, from love or habit, or
> on the other hand from reason or intellect
> contained in the feeling of duty. These latter

---

[8] Tonnies (97), p. xv.

types of natural will change into one another,
and each can be the basis of Gemeinschaft.

On the other hand, in the purest and most
abstract contract relationships the contracting
parties are thought of as separate, hitherto and
otherwise independent, as strangers to each other,
and perhaps even as hitherto and in other respects
inimical persons. Do, ut des (I give, so that you
will give) is the only principle of such a relation-
ship. What I do for you, I do only as a means to
effect your simultaneous, previous, or later service
for me. Actually and really I want and desire only
this. To get something from you is my end; my
service is the means thereto, which I naturally
contribute unwillingly. Only the aforesaid and
anticipated result is the cause which determines
my volition. This is the simplest form of rational
will.

Relationships of the first type are to be
classified under the concept Gemeinschaft, those
of the other type under the concept of Gesellschaft,
thus differentiating Gemeinschaft-like and
Gesellschaft-like relationships."[9]

There seems to be little doubt that Gemeinschaft social

relations are best characterized as familistic, similar to LePlay's

patriarchal family type, and Gesellschaft relations as contractual,

as was LePlay's unstable family type. Gemeinschaft is a relation

toward each other; Gesellschaft is a relation partly toward and

partly away from one another. Tonnies felt that Gesellschaft was

replacing Gemeinschaft. As society becomes urbanized the contrac-

tual relations of the city are breaking down the most basic form

---

[9]Tonnies (97), p. 20-1.

of Gemeinschaft, the family. In the city, "family life is

decaying".

> "Family life is the general basis of life in
> the Gemeinschaft. It subsists in village and
> town life. The village community and the town
> themselves can be considered as large families,
> the various clans and houses representing the
> elementary organisms of its body; guilds,
> corporations, and offices, the tissues and organs
> of the town. Here original kinship and inherited
> status remain an essential, or at least the most
> important, condition of participating fully in
> common property and other rights...In the city...
> the difference between natives and strangers
> becomes irrelevant. Everyone is what he is,
> through his personal freedom, through his wealth
> and his contracts. He is a servant only in so
> far as he has granted certain services to someone
> else, master insofar as he receives such services.
> Wealth is indeed, the only effective and original
> differentiating characteristic..."[10]

Durkheim published De la division de travail social (20) in 1893.

He took as a "variable" division of labour and tried to correlate

its variations with other social phenomena. We will be primarily

concerned with the effects of the division of labour on social

relations. Durkheim classified social entities into mechanical

and organic forms. In the mechanical form there is no, or slight,

division of labour. The division of labour grows through the

process of time; when it becomes great, the result is the organic

form of social relationship. Thus, there are two kinds of

---

[10]Tonnies (97), p. 267.

positive solidarity, mechanical and organic, which are distin-

guished by the following qualities:

> "The first binds the individual directly to
> society without any intermediary. In the
> second, he depends upon society, because he
> depends upon the parts of which it is composed...
> Society is not seen in the same aspect in the two
> cases. In the first, what we call society is a
> more or less organized totality of beliefs and
> sentiments common to all the members of the group:
> this is the collective type. On the other hand,
> the society in which we are solidary in the
> second instance is a system of different, special
> functions which definite relations unite."[11]

Durkheim described mechanical solidarity,

> "Solidarity which comes from likenesses is at
> its maximum when the collective conscience
> completely envelops our whole conscience and
> coincides in all points with it...If our ideal
> is to present a singular and personal appearance,
> we do not want to resemble everybody else.
> Moreover at the moment when this solidarity
> exercises its force, our personality vanishes,
> as our definition permits us to say, for we are
> no longer ourselves, but the collective life.
>
> The social molecules which can be coherent
> in this way can act together only in the measure
> that they have no actions of their own, as the
> molecules of inorganic bodies. That is why we
> propose to call this type of solidarity mechanical."[12]

---

[11] Durkheim (20), p. 129.

[12] Durkheim (20), p. 130.

Durkheim described organic solidarity,

> "It is quite otherwise with the solidarity
> which the division of labor produces.. Whereas
> the previous type implies that individuals re-
> semble each other, this type presumes their
> difference. The first is possible only insofar
> as the individual personality is absorbed in
> the collective personality; the second is
> possible only if each one has a sphere of
> action which is peculiar to him; that is a
> personality...In effect, on the other hand,
> each depends as much more strictly on society
> as labor is more divided; and, on the other,
> the activity of each is as much more personal
> as it is more specialized. Doubtless, as
> circumscribed as it is, it is never completely
> original. Even in the exercise of our occupation,
> we conform to usages, to practices which are
> common to our whole professional brotherhood.
> But, even in this instance, the yoke that we
> submit to is much less heavy than when society
> completely controls, and it leaves much more
> place open for the free play of our initiative...
> Each organ, in effect, has its special physiognomy,
> its autonomy. And, moreover, the unity of the
> organism is as great as the individuation of the
> parts is more marked. Because of this analogy,
> we propose to call the solidarity which is due to
> the division of labor, organic."[13]

In other words, a mechanical solidarity is characterized by

familistic social relations and organic solidarity by contractual

ones. It seems the only real difference in Durkheim's theory of

mechanical and organic solidarity, and Tonnies' Gemeinschaft and

Gesellschaft is Durkheim's opinion that the contractual way of

life of organic solidarity is the best one and Tonnies' view that

---

[13]Durkheim (20), p. 131.

the familistic way of life of Gemeinschaft is the best one.[14]

Thus, it appears that "mechanical solidarity" is very similar to Tonnies' Gemeinschaft and LePlay's patriarchal family type since the social relations are toward each other. Durkheim's "organic solidarity" appears to be similar to Tonnies' Gesellschaft and LePlay's unstable family type in that it is partly a relation toward and partly a relation away from one another.

Cooley published Social Organization (13) in 1929. In it he described the primary group which has many of the same characteristics as the patriarchal family, Gemeinschaft and Durkheim's mechanical society.

> "By primary groups I mean those characterized by intimate face-to-face association and cooperation. They are primary in several senses, but chiefly in that they are fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual. The result of intimate association, psychologically, is a certain fusion of individualities in a common whole, so that one's very self, for many purposes at least, is the common life and purpose of the group. Perhaps the simplest way of describing this wholeness is by saying that it is a "we"; it involves the sort of sympathy and mental identification for which "we"

---

[14]There is another difference in that Durkheim believes that even in societies with organic solidarity that some mechanical solidarity will persist. "...mechanical solidarity persists even in the most elevated societies." (20), p. 186.

is the natural expression. One lives in the
feeling of the whole and finds the chief aims
of his will in that feeling."[15]

Cooley felt that the primary group was often found in the family,

the play-group of children, and the neighbourhood or community

group of elders. Secondary social relations are usually contrasted

with those of a primary nature. They are usually defined as being

segmental and involving only a small part of the individuals, as,

for example, the performance of a service.

The Metropolis and Mental Life (81) was written by Simmel in

1902-1903. In it he postulated two types of social relations:

rational, intellectual relations and emotional ones. Rational

relations tend to be found in the city and emotional ones in the

country.

The city person has more freedom, because of the division of

labour in the city, but the small town person has a positive re-

lation to almost everyone he meets. If the city person reacted

the same way as the country person to everyone he met, he "would

be completely atomized internally and come to an unimaginable

psychic state".[16] The money economy of the city with the producer

and consumer not being acquainted, and the minute precision of

---

[15]Cooley (13), p. 23.

[16]Simmel (81), p. 415.

city life have, according to Simmel, coalesced into a structure of the highest impersonality. The city person has to adopt rational social relations which are characterized by reserve, sophistication and blase; because his nerves refuse to react to the overwhelming number of stimuli.

Although he believed that the individual had more freedom in the city, Simmel argued that as the division of labour increased, the individual became more specialized and man was reckoned with as a number.

> "The individual has become a mere cog in an enormous organization of things and powers which tear from his hands all progress, spirituality, and value in order to transform them from their subjective form into the form of a purely objective life. It needs merely to be pointed out that the metropolis is the genuine arena of this culture which outgrows all personal life. Here in buildings and educational institutions, in the wonders and conforts of space-conquering technology, in the formations of community life, and in the visible institutions of the state, is offered such an overwhelming fullness of crystallized and impersonalized spirit that the personality, so to speak, cannot maintain itself under its impact."[17]

_____

[17]Simmel (81), p. 422.

Simmel felt that in the country people shared emotional, subjective relations or, in other words, familistic relations toward one another. The city, because of the overwhelming numbers of people and stimuli, forced people to have rational relations or contractual relations which are partly toward and partly away from one another.

Wirth published Urbanism as a Way of Life (104) in 1938. In it he contrasted the rural folk society settlements as characterized by the farm, the manor, and the village to the urban-industrial settlements as characterized by the city. Wirth defined the city as a large, dense, and permanent settlement of socially heterogeneous individuals. Various combinations of the four factors make up cities. He described the effect of each one of the characteristics. The increased number of people forces individuals to share only segmental relations. They are less dependent upon particular persons and their dependence upon others is confined to a highly fractionalized aspect of the other's round of activity.

> "The multiplication of persons in a state of
> interaction under conditions which make their
> contact as full personalities impossible produces
> that segmentalization of human relationships
> which has been seized upon by students of the
> mental life of the cities as an explanation for
> the schizoid character of urban personality."[18]

---

[18] Wirth (103), p. 119-121.

The city, according to Wirth, is characterized by secondary rather than primary contacts. He felt that the contacts of the city may indeed be face-to-face, but they were, nevertheless, impersonal, superficial, transitory and segmental.

The density of the city, according to Wirth, reinforced the effect of numbers in diversifying men and their activities and in increasing the complexity of the social structure. People in the city have close physical contact but great social distance. Wirth felt that this accentuated the reserve of unattached individuals toward one another and, unless compensated by other opportunities for response, gave rise to loneliness. The heterogeneity of the city increased the likelihood of contractual social relations. Wirth felt that wherever large numbers of differently constituted individuals congregate, the process of depersonalization also entered. These feelings are summed up in the statement:

> "The distinctive features of the urban mode of
> life have often been described sociologically
> as consisting of the substitution of secondary
> for primary contacts, the weakening of bonds
> of kinship, and the declining social significance
> of the family, the disappearance of the neighbour-
> hood and the undermining of the traditional basis
> of social solidarity.[19]

---

[19]Wirth (103), p. 128.

The people of the country share primary social relations and the people of the city segmental, secondary ones. Primary relations are similar to familistic and secondary to contractual ones.

There seems to be little doubt that LePlay, Tonnies, Durkheim, Simmel and Wirth have in common their belief that there are generally two types of social relations: familistic and contractual. LePlay's patriarchal family type, Tonnies' Gemeinschaft, Durkheim's mechanical relations, Cooley's primary relations, Simmel's emotional relations and Wirth's primary social. relationships are all essentially familistic or relations toward one another. A second common theme is that rural settlements are characterized by familistic social relations and the city by contractual ones. People generally belong to a community in the country and can have a group feeling of "we". In the city there is a great deal of emphasis placed on individualism. Because there are so many people in the city, there is little chance of having whole social relationships; rather, they tend to be of a fragmentary, segmental nature. LePlay's unstable family, Tonnies' Gesellschaft, Durkheim's organic relations, Simmel's rational relations and Wirth's secondary social relationships are all basically contractual ones; that is, relations partly toward and partly away from one another.

Gans differs from these authors in that he does not contrast rural and urban life styles. To understand contemporary urban life, he argues that it is important to analyse different types of urban settlements, such as the modern city and the modern suburbs. From Gans point of view a blanket statement about the social relations of the city is much too general. He breaks the city into sections, the inner city, outer city, and suburbs, and feels that each of the sections has characteristic social relations.

> "By the inner city, I mean the transient
> residential areas, the Gold Coasts and the
> slums that generally surround the central
> business district, although in some communities
> they may continue for miles beyond that district.
> The outer city includes the stable residential
> areas that house the working- and middle-class
> tenant and owner. The suburbs I conceive as
> the latest and most modern ring of the outer
> city, distinguished from it only by yet lower
> densities, and by the often irrelevant fact of
> the ring's location outside the city limits."[20]

Before describing which social relations Gans feels are characteristic of each of the sections, it is necessary to define these social relations. Here Gans also differs from the previous authors in that he names three types of social relations as opposed to two: Primary, Quasi-Primary, and Secondary. His primary and secondary relations are essentially the same as the

---

[20]Gans (31), p. 628.

familistic and contractual ones. "Quasi-primary relations, what-
ever the intensity or frequency of these relationships, the inter-
action is more intimate then a secondary contact, but more guarded
then a primary one."[21]

Gans feels that the inner city is generally characterized by
secondary relations, the outer city and the suburbs by quasi-
primary ones. The inner city is composed of the "cosmopolities",
the unmarried or childless, the "ethnic villagers", the "deprived",
and the "trapped" and downward mobile. Even in the inner city,
however, Gans feels that only the last two groups lead lives
dominated by segmental, impersonal, social relationships. The
first two types are generally detached from neighbourhood life, but
belong to distinct subcultures that shield them from the generally
assumed contractual social relations of the city resident. The
ethnic villagers isolate themselves from significant contact with
most city facilities, except for the workplace. Emphasis is placed
on kinship and the primary group and there is suspicion of anything
and anyone outside their neighbourhood. The deprived, as a conse-
quence of low income and racial discrimination, live in generally
overcrowded conditions, and, because they have no residential
choice, live among heterogeneous type people. The conditions of

---

[21]
  Gans (31), p. 634.

heterogeneity and transients tend to make their social relations mainly segmental, secondary ones. The trapped are those who are left behind, usually for monetary reasons, when a neighbourhood changes. Thus, the trapped and the downward mobile find themselves in a heterogeneous and transient situation and their lives tend to be characterized by secondary relations as well.

The outer city is the stable residential area which houses working- and middle-class families. Neighbour relations are generally quasi-primary and Gans feels that a good description of these areas is the actual small American town, as opposed to the romantic construct of that same entity by anti-urban critics. Gans feels that the major difference between the outer city and suburbs is that the latter are low-density, single family homes. The suburbs are also typified by quasi-primary social relations.

Thus, we see that Gans has a very different picture of the social relations of the city than do any of the earlier authors. He feels that only a small segment of the urban population are leading lives dominated by contractual secondary social relationships, as opposed to other writers who felt contractual relations dominated almost every aspect of city life.

III. THE SOCIOLOGY OF COMMUNITY

Before discussing the hypotheses of this study it is neces-
sary to look at another area that is of a more general socio-
logical interest, the sociology of community. The term community
is used to describe a large variety of situations. In this study
it is defined as a social group or groups that hold a geographic
area in common. The term group is used to mean a mere plurality
of persons who fall under a category such as 'residents of an
estate'. The size and number of groups can vary, as can the social
interaction among the members of the group or groups, and the size
of the geographic area. The combination of these variables deter-
mines the kind of community, i.e., very integrated or very dis-
organized.

In reviewing community studies carried out in the U.K., three
community types seem to have been distinguished:

(i) The Village Community - The social group(s) and
geographic area were such that practically every resident of the
geographic area shared social relationships of a primary nature
with every other resident of the geographic area.

(ii) The Town Community - There was more than one social
group in the geographic area. Both the size and number of groups,
as well as the size of the geographic area, would probably be

larger than in the case of the village. The majority of social

relationships would be mainly of a face-to-face nature, but there

could also be a considerable number of residents who rarely, if

ever, came in contact with one another.

(iii) The Non-Community - The residents of a common geo-

graphic area, because of its size or their heterogeneity or any

other reason, have very little contact with one another. The

majority of residents share secondary relations if they have any.

However, it is still quite likely that in these circumstances there

are groupings of people within the geographic area who maintain

social relationships of a primary sort with one another.

The village community is usually common to rural areas, but

examples have been found in cities. Young and Willmott's (105)

study of Bethnal Green, The People of Ship Street (49) by Madeline

Kerr, and Broady's (8) study in Sheffield all provide examples of

the village community within cities. The town type is best

presented by Stacey's study of Banbury (87) as well as in several

studies done on the New Towns and estates on the outskirts of the

city where there is generally low-density semi-detached and

detached houses. Some of the New Town studies where the area has

remained relatively unintegrated provide the best examples of the

non-community. Willmott and Young's (105) study of the Greenleigh

housing estate is an example.

It seems, obvious that more research is required to discover
whether the urban resident is isolated and leading a contractual,
segmental life with little family or neighbourhood structure in
which to enjoy primary relations. This would be the contention
of all the theorists reviewed except Gans, although recent
studies have indicated that this may not necessarily be the case.[22]

IV. THE PROBLEM

It was the hope of the investigator to discover whether
living on council estates in the inner city was an urban condition
under which housewives were isolated and leading lives dominated
by impersonal, segmental relationships or whether it was a condi-
tion under which housewives tended to share quasi-primary relations
with one another and be active in a kinship group.

The areas surrounding the three estates selected for study
had characteristics of both Gans' inner and outer city definitions.
The location and many of the characteristics of the areas sur-
rounding the three estates fit his definition of the inner city.
The southern border of the local authority in which the three
estates are located is the central business district of London or
in the Register Generals words the Greater London Conurbation

Centre.[23]   All three of the estates have at least one of Gans'
five inner city types living in the immediate area surrounding the
estate: 'cosmopolities'; 'unmarried or childless'; 'ethnic
villagers'; 'deprived'; and the trapped and downward mobile.
However, the estates themselves are more characteristic of Gans
definition of the outer city, "the stable residential areas that
house the working- and middle-class tenant and owner"; in this
case the working-class tenant. Having pointed out this exception
to Gans definition, the term inner city will be used to describe
the areas in which the estates are situated and the respondents
will be referred to as residents of the inner city, as the latter
seems a more accurate definition of the area than the outer city.

---

[23]"In each of the conurbations, apart from the West Yorkshire
conurbation, a central area has been identified. .This central
area has been defined as that containing the principal concentra-
tion of administrative and commercial offices, major shopping
streets, theatres, cinemas and dance halls, public buildings,
hotels, special areas and precincts (e.g., university, cathedral
and legal) and main railway and coach terminal. It is character-
ized by relatively low residential population, by a large concentra-
tion of employment, involving journey to work and often by traffic
congestion and car parking problems. The areas corresponding to
this definition have been specified in consultation with the
Ministry of Housing and local government, the local planning
authorities and interested university departments."
General Register Office; Census 1961; England and Wales; Age,
Marital Condition and General Tables; London: HMSO 1964, pp.
xiv-xv.

Westergaard described the area of London where the estates
are located in "The Structure of Greater London", (99)

> "The western districts of the Centre and the
> boroughs of the West End and Hampstead Zone
> are the only parts of inner London in whose
> population one finds a large upper and middle
> class element. In fact, however, no single
> index of status is by itself sufficient to
> describe their unusual social composition:
> for these boroughs also have considerable
> proportions of semi-skilled and unskilled
> workers. They are districts in which there
> are marked social contrasts of a long-
> established kind. Fashionable houses are
> quite often found near working class houses;
> districts of high prestige are adjacent to
> localities that would be shaded blue or black
> on any contemporary 'poverty map' of London.
> Social frontiers are fluid. Nowadays, working
> class quarters are often being invaded by new
> luxury flats and also by the conversion of old
> houses and mews for middle class occupation."[24]

Thus, the population studied does not live near the outskirts of
the urban area and has the characteristics of the modern re-
developing inner city as opposed to the suburbs. There is, for
example, a marked difference in density level between the two. The
residents of the estates and of the areas surrounding the estates
nearly all live in a high density level mainly in blocks of flats
or multi-occupied dwellings, whereas low-density detached and semi-
detached houses are more characteristic of the suburbs.

---

[24]
Westergaard (99), p. 104.

This study was an attempt to learn more about the social relations within what was felt to be a typical section of the inner city population. Gans points out that most studies of this sort deal primarily with the exotic sections of the inner city while very little is known about the more typical residential neighbourhoods of the inner city.

Given the limitations of time and the availability of research resources, the study was only able to explore certain of the problems rather than test hypotheses. The following questions were investigated:

(i) What is the rate of formal and informal social participation of housewives living on council estates at the centre of the city?

(ii) Does a sense of community exist on the estates?

(a) What kind and degree of social relations do the housewives have with their neighbours?

(b) What degree of social participation do they have with relatives and friends and how often do they attend clubs, social events and places of unplanned activity?

(c) What are the characteristics of those with different degrees of social participation? Are age, family type, length of residence associated with the degree of social participation?

(d) Are the self-reporting of happiness, satisfaction and anomie related to the degree of social participation?

> (e) Is the architecture of the estates and
>   buildings related to the degree of
>   social participation?

It was felt that if it could be shown that certain demographic

characteristics were related to increased social participation,

and if certain architectural designs, layouts and building types

could be shown to be better suited to social participation than

others, and if a high degree of social participation were shown

to increase the likelihood of positive attitudes, then social

planners should be able to plan an inner city estate where the

chances of social participation would be increased and, conse-

quently, also the positive attitudes of the housewives. This

would help to decrease some of the reputed alienating affects of

centre city living for those housewives living on council housing

estates.

What expectations there were, were based primarily on other

studies. For example, if the classic theorists were right, then

the answer to the question, "Are the housewives isolated?" would

be that they share secondary relations with their neighbours. If

the estates studied proved to be similar to the Bethnal Green

Study, then the housewives would have predominantly primary re-

lations with neighbours. If Gans' hypothesis were right, the

relations with neighbours would be of a quasi-primary sort. Few

studies of neighbour relations in Britain or America have shown

neighbours to have no relations. On the other hand, as stated earlier, those dominated by primary relations are neighbourhoods in which people usually have long histories of residence or ethnic bonds which distinguish them from the surrounding areas. Thus, at this stage it was felt that the situation was too unknown for specific hypotheses to be suggested.

In planning the present study the investigator was well aware of numerous factors that were not included although they were undoubtedly well worth investigating. The factors finally chosen were selected in terms of a combination of their assumed significance and the accessibility of the data required. In this study the number of variables was decreased because the population studied was relatively homogeneous; husbands' occupation, amount of education, and religious affiliation.

The main dependent variables were the housewives' social participation with neighbours, relatives, friends and within clubs and social events. These dependent variables were compared with eight principal independent variables: age, family type, length of residence, the respondent's work status, self-report of happiness, satisfaction, anomie, and the architecture of the buildings.

The plan of this work is as follows: Chapter II is devoted
to a discussion of the research procedures; i.e., the study
design, the nature of the sample, the data collection techniques,
the method of statistical analysis. In Chapter III the results
are presented and in Chapter IV the principal findings and
conclusions are summarized.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

I. THE INTERVIEWING

The data for the study were secured by using an eleven page interview schedule (Appendix A) to interview 149 housewives living on three council housing estates located within Greater London.

The investigator was assisted in the interviewing by seven undergraduates, five female and two male. The students were just completing their first year and helped with the study as part of the practical training in their course work.

They were given a handbook on the first day which outlined why the survey was being done, the main questions being asked, some background on similar studies which had been done in Britain, and instructions on interviewing methods. During the first training session the investigator outlined the theoretical aspects of the study and the handbook served as a basis for discussion about the survey. The investigator was aided in leading the discussions by her supervisor. The importance of the interviewer's role was explained to the students and it was stressed that the value of the survey depended upon the accuracy and completeness of the information they collected.

44

During the subsequent sessions: (i) the students went through
the interview schedule question by question with the investigator
in order to make clear the meaning of each of the questions;
(ii) mock interviews were conducted with one another using the
schedule while the investigator listened; (iii) there was dis-
cussion of the pre-trial interviews which each student had con-
ducted with a respondent on any council housing estate in London
with the exception of those included in the final study.

After the students had begun the interviewing, the investi-
gator supervised them in the field. As the investigator was also
conducting interviews during this time, she was not able to ac-
company each of the students on an interview.[1] However, the in-
vestigator was available in her office at agreed hours each day and
the students frequently phoned the investigator during the evenings
at her home. In this way the investigator and interviewers were in
fairly constant communication. The students were encouraged to feel
free to contact the investigator if at any point they should begin
to feel uncomfortable about some aspect of the interviewing. After
the third day of interviewing, the students and the investigator

---

[1]Three of the students were accompanied; the investigator went
with a fourth but, unfortunately, none of her respondents were
home that morning. Times did not coincide for the last three.

met so that the students could discuss some of the problems which they were running into and the best way to handle them.

The investigator, with guidance from her supervisor, attempted to give the students the opportunity to make the training session and the interviewing a learning experience. The students were asked to write a short report of their observations on the estate outside the interviews and at the conclusion of the interviewing. they were asked to do a report comparing this study with others similar to it, evaluating the questionnaire and the research techniques. A reading list was provided in the interview handbook. It was also hoped that by doing such field work the students would have the opportunity to learn some of the techniques of sociological research from first hand experience.

In the initial stage of the interviewing introduction letters were not sent to the prospective respondents. It was felt that the response rate would be better if the housewives did not know ahead of time that they were going to be asked to be interviewed. By the time the students had finished their interviewing, however, the response rate was rather low. It was, therefore, decided to send letters to all but the most adamant refusals in the hope of improving the response rate. Those housewives who had not shown, in the interviewer's opinion, even a slight willingness to be interviewed, were classified as adamant refusals. If the student

felt there was any possibility of obtaining an interview, the

respondent was sent a letter. It should be pointed

out that in most cases the students, upon being refused an inter-

view during the first visit, were encouraged to try a second time

prepared with their most persuasive arguments for cooperation.

Some of those sent letters had never actually refused to be inter-

viewed, but had played the game "avoid the interviewer:"

> "Continuous evading...every time I called,
> the man said he did not know where his wife
> was or what time she would return. He would
> say, 'She must be out shopping or chatting...
> she's a roamer that one.'"

It was recognized that the letters might antagonize those house-

wives who had already refused, but it was felt that this danger

was worth risking in the hope of convincing most of them to be

interviewed. Of the 18 letters sent out, the investigator was able

to secure interviews with ten of the housewives concerned. The

results of the interviewing were such that it would, perhaps, have

been better to have sent out letters in the initial stages of the

interviewing.

The average number of interviews done by each student was

seventeen and the investigator did the remainder (28). The inter-

views averaged 45 minutes in length.

II. OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS AND ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

In this section we will be concerned with the methods which were used in translating the questions from the interview schedule into measures of the variables with which the study was concerned. The kind of social relations a respondent had with her neighbours could be of an intimate-primary, primary, quasi-primary or secondary nature. Neighbours were defined as someone living in the same building or on the same estate as the respondent. However, it was the impression of the investigator that the subjects, for the most part, utilized a more restricted definition of neighbour conceiving of neighbours as persons who either lived in their section of the building or on their immediate balcony or landing. The responses to five questions were used to classify the respondents social relations in one of these four categories. The questions included:

1. Is there anyone on the estate you would consider a best friend; in other words, someone with whom you could discuss personal problems such as difficulties with your children, husband, money and so on?

2. Do you have any of your neighbours into your home for a casual cup of tea?

3. With how many of your neighbours would you exchange or borrow things - magazines, tools, dishes, recipes, food?

4. How many of the names of the families in your
    building do you know?

5. How many of the people in your building do you
    say "hello" or "good morning" to when you meet
    on the street? And, how many others who live
    in this neighbourhood, but not in this building?

An intimate-primary relation was defined operationally as one in
which the person was "considered a best friend". It was one which
involved a willingness to discuss personal problems, such as
difficulties with their children, husband or money. A primary
relation was defined as one which did not involve discussion of
intimate problems but included inviting someone in for tea. A
quasi-primary relation was defined in Gans' terms as being less
than a preimary relation but more than a secondary one. Two
questions on the schedule were used to measure quasi-primary re-
lations: with how many do you lend and borrow and how many names
in your building are known? It was felt that two questions were
needed to cover the transitional nature of a quasi-primary rela-
tion. The first of the two questions was to refer to that aspect
of a quasi-primary relation that was less than a primary relation
and the second question was to refer to that aspect that was less
than a secondary relation. A secondary relation was defined as a
segmental one in which the respondent simply said "hello" or "good
morning" to her neighbour.

A scalogram was constructed from these five questions and each respondent was given a score by means of the scale. (Table I) This is referred to as the respondent's neighbourhood social participation score. The Guttman method was used.

> "He (Guttman) considered an area scalable if responses to a set of items in that area arranged themselves in certain specified ways. In particular, it must be possible to order the items such that, ideally, persons who answer a given question favourably all have higher ranks than persons who answer the same question un-favorably. From a respondent's rank or scale score we know exactly which items he indorsed. Thus, we can say that the response to any item provides a definition of the respondent's attitude."[2]

For example, if a respondent had a best friend who lived on the estate, she probably also said hello, knew the names of, borrowed and lent, and had tea with some of her neighbours. For each of the five scale items, the respondents were given a positive or negative score. This was done by using Guttman's method for establishing "cutting points".[3] That is, in order to get a positive score the respondent had to have at least one best friend, at least

---

[2]S. A. Stouffer, et al., The American Soldier, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1951, p. 5.

[3]The method for establishing cutting points is paraphrased by Goode and Hatt (39), pp. 289-295. From Louis H. Guttman, "The Cornell Technique for Scale and Intensity Analysis," Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. Vii, 1947, pp. 248-279.

TABLE I

NEIGHBOURHOOD SOCIAL PARTICIPATION SCALE

	Scale Pattern					Respondent Positive on Question					Respondent Negative on Question					Total
	1	2	3	4	5*	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
High(3)	+	+	+	+	+	3	3	3	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	3
	-	+	+	+	+	-	5	5	5	5	5	-	-	-	-	5
	+	-	+	+	+	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
	+	+	+	+	-	4	4	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	4	4
	+	+	-	+	+	6	6	-	6	6	-	-	6	-	-	6
	-	+	-	+	+	-	3	-	3	3	3	-	3	-	-	3
	+	+	-	+	-	4	4	-	4	-	-	-	4	-	4	4
	+	+	+	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
	+	+	-	-	+	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	1
	-	+	-	+	+	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	1
	+	-	+	+	-	2	-	2	2	-	-	2	-	-	2	2
	+	-	-	+	+	3	-	-	3	3	-	3	3	-	-	3
Medium(2)	+	-	-	-	+	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	1
	+	-	-	+	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	2	2
	+	+	-	-	-	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	4	4
	+	-	-	-	+	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	1
	+	-	+	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	1
	-	+	-	-	+	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	2	2	-	2
	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	1	1
	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	11	11	11	11	11	-	-	11
	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	6	-	6	6	6	-	6	6
	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	20	20	20	20	20	-	20
	+	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	5	5	5
	-	+	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	5	-	5	5	5	5
	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	2	-	2	2	2
Low(1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	47	47	47	47	47	47
Frequency						39	39	20	52	58	103	105	122	90	84	142
Errors						5	11	7	0	0	9	1	0	11	25	

$$\text{Coefficient of Reproducibility} = 1 - \frac{69}{5 \times 142} = 0.91$$

*

The number (1-5) refer to the five questions discussed on page 25 of the text.

TABLE II

CUTTING POINTS FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD SOCIAL PARTICIPATION SCALE

Question	1	0
1	1 or more	nil
2	2 or more	1 or nil
3	3 or more	2 or nil
4	11 or more families	10 or less families
5	26 or more people	25 or less people

TABLE III

IDEAL NEIGHBOURHOOD SOCIAL PARTICIPATION SCALE

Ideal Neighbourhood Social Participation Scale Types	Pattern of Responses				
	Question 1	2	3	4	5
I	+	+	+	+	+
II	−	+	+	+	+
III	−	−	+	+	+
IV	−	−	−	+	+
V	−	−	−	−	+

two neighbours with whom she exchanged or borrowed, know the names of at least eleven families, and say hello to at least twenty-six people. (Table II)

In the first stage of the scaling the answers to each question were put into five almost equal groups. By using Guttman's technique of combining categories, a means of increasing the scale's reproducibility, the five categories for each question were dichotomized. This procedure resulted in the "cutting points" discussed above. The coefficient of reproducibility of the scalogram is 0.91.[4]

The scalogram was used to give each of the respondents a high, medium, or low neighbouring score. This resolution resulted from dividing the respondents into three groups of as equal numbers as possible according to their neighbouring scores. Thus, those with a neighbouring score of three to five were categorized as having a high neighbour participation; those with scores one to two as medium participation, and those with a zero score as low participation.

---

[4]For the formula used to calculate the coefficient of reproducibility see Table I. "Guttman uses the coefficient of reproducibility as one of the major criteria of fit to the model... A reproducibility of 100 per cent would mean that each individual's scale score describes the exact pattern of his answers for all the questions." Riley (75), p. 476.

Guttman scales have been used by others to evaluate social interactions with neighbours. Wallin (98) devised a Guttman scale consisting of twelve questions for measuring the neighbourliness of women under sixty. The scale was tested on two samples, one from a residential area of a large American city, and the other from a small suburban community. Although the scale questions in Wallin's study and this one are similar, Wallin's cutting points are based mainly on frequency, e.g., do you exchange or borrow with neighbours often, sometimes, or rarely, whereas in this study respondents were asked how many neighbours they exchanged or borrowed with at least occassionally. The only question on the two scales which was directly comparable was that regarding best friends in which Wallin's scale requires two or more for a positive score while the present study requires one or more. This differ- ence may be explained by the difference in the respondents' social economic status between the two studies. Wallin used two middle class single-dwelling residential areas. The Lynds in Middle- town (58) showed that business class housewives had more intimate friends than working class housewives. The difference might also be explained as a cultural one between American and British neighbouring habits.

A second Guttmann scale to test neighbourhood social intimacy was devised by Smith, et al. (82) His scale consisted of four

questions but they were not comparable with those used in this

study.

The respondent's participation with relatives, friends, and

in clubs and social events was measured in a more direct manner.

In these areas social participation refers to the number of

contacts in a certain time period, e.g., to the act of "doing".

> "...'Doing' is part of both 'activity' and
> 'decision making'. That participation should
> go beyond 'doing' is a contention of various
> social scientists. Alport, for example, states
> that if participation, which he does not
> confine to voluntary associations, is to be
> more than peripheral 'motor activity' it must
> 'tap central values' i.e., participation must
> be 'ego-involved'."[5]

In the neighbourhood social participation scale, an attempt was

made to access the quality of the relationship as described above.

Relatives were defined in this study as related persons other

than those who may be living in the same household as the respon-

dent. The respondents were asked the number and relation of her

own and her husband's immediate living relatives, other than

members of the household unit. They were asked when they last

saw these relatives and the average frequency of their contacts.

Lastly, they were asked if they had any other relatives whom they

had not mentioned. In deciding whether a respondent had high,

_____

[5]Evans (21), p. 149.

medium, or low social participation with relatives, the number of relatives seen in the last four weeks was recorded for each respondent. They were then divided into three almost equal groups. Those who had a high score had seen from five to sixteen relatives, those with a medium score three to four, and those with a low score from zero to two.

A friend was defined as someone who was considered to be such by the respondent and had been seen in the last four weeks but was neither a neighbour nor a relative. It was the hope of the investigator that the time limitation would help to eliminate any one who was simply an acquaintance.[6] As the investigator failed to ask for a differentiation between workmates and friends, there is an inherent difficulty in this question. The method used in determining social participation with relatives was used to define high, medium and low friend participation scores. The results showed that those with a high friend participation score had seen from two to twelve friends, with a medium score one, and with a low score zero.

In obtaining the data concerned with formal organizations or voluntary associations, the full name of the organization was recorded and the coding was done after the interviewing was

---

[6]The interviewers were instructed to probe if they suspected the individual was only an acquaintance.

completed. If there had been a high participation in clubs and
formal organizations, this data compilation method could have
proved quite unwieldy. However, other studies have shown that
working class populations tend to show a low participation in
formal organization, and, consequently, no coding problems were
anticipated. This proved to be the case.

An index was developed to measure the respondent's activity
in formal organizations, social events and places of unplanned
interaction. The last two categories were included in this
investigation since it has been shown that a working class popu-
lation tends toward informal as opposed to formal social participa-
tion. Social events were defined as formally organized meetings
which were not for the purpose of club-like activity. Evening
classes and bingo parties were the two most important kinds of
social events in this study. Participation in formal organizations
was measured by at least one attendance a year, and for social
events, involvement at least on special occassions. The respon-
dents were asked if there was any place they visited regularly
where they met people they knew. These have been referred to as
places of unplanned interaction. The places most frequently stated
were the open market, the shops, the laundramat, the hairdressers,
public house, and the park. The time limit for interaction on
such places was at least once a month. The respondents were given

a score of one for each of the three activity areas if they had had any participation. The highest score was thus three and the lowest zero.

Thus, for each of the four measures of social participation: i.e., with neighbours, relatives, friends, and in places of un-planned interaction, clubs and social events, the respondents were given a score of high, medium or low. The scores from each category were then added to give each respondent a total social participation score. A high score for each measure of social participation was given a value three, medium two, and a low score one. The highest possible total social participation score was, therefore, twelve and the lowest four. The final distribu-tion of summary scores was then divided into three categories at a cutting point where the number of cases in each of the three categories was approximately equal. High total social participa-tion was found to equal a score of nine to twelve, medium seven to eight, and low four to six.

The independent variables, age, family type, length of resi-dence, self report of happiness and satisfaction, anomie, and the architecture of the estate, were generally measured by use of a single question for each variable. On questions for which the coding was not obvious, an explanation is given below.

As there were very few housewives who were nineteen to twenty-nine, the youngest age category was chosen to cover twenty years rather than ten as the other categories. The age categories were 19-39, 40-49, 50-59, and 60 years old and over.

Housewives were placed in one of four categories of family type; married with children, married without children, alone with children, and alone without children. Each category, however, included a small number of families with extended kin in the household. Extended kin are persons who are related to but not members of the elementary family. There were five married women with children, two married women without children, two women alone with children, and four women alone without children who had extended kin in the households. Since the number is small it was felt best to leave them in the categories rather than extending the number of categories. A further difficulty appears when the number of women alone with or without children is examined. Since there are so few women in this category it might appear that they should be placed in a single category, "someone alone". However, the two groups, though small, have very different associations with the dependent variables. Whether or not there are children appears to be as important, or perhaps more important, than the fact that no male is reported to be living in the household unit.

Length of residence was measured in two ways: actual length of residence on the estate and the location of the respondent's schooling as a child. It was felt that the latter measure would serve as a good indication of the respondent's length of familiarity with the district. In the strict sense it is not a measure of residence, but, rather, differentiates those who have probably had contact with the district from childhood from those whose contact was probably more recent. When asked where schooled, the respondent was requested to give the postal district number if it was known. Alternatively, she was asked to give the commonly known name of the area and it was later assigned a postal number by means of the A to Z Atlas of London. (68)

Self-report of happiness was measured by asking, "Do you feel very happy, fairly happy, rather unhappy, or very unhappy living here?" As so few of the respondents reported being very unhappy, the last two categories were combined. Satisfaction was measured in a similar manner. "Do you feel this is an excellent, good, fair or poor place to live?" It was recognized that attitudes are very difficult to measure and that there were more complex and probably more accurate ways to assess happiness and satisfaction, but it was felt that the method used was sufficient for a study of mainly an exploratory nature.

Srole's (85) scale for testing anomie was used. The scale contains five items which attempt to test various aspects of anomie: (i) the individual's sense that community leaders are detached from and indifferent to his needs; (ii) the individual's perception of the social order as essentially fickle and unpredictable; (iii) the individual's view that he and people like him are retrogressing from the goals they have already reached; (iv) the deflation or loss of internalized social norms and values, reflected in extreme form in the individual's sense of the meaninglessness of life itself; (v) the individual's perception that his framework of immediate personal relationships, the very rock of his social existence, was no longer predictive or supportive.[7]

The questions representing these five elements of anomie were respectively:

1. "There's little use writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man."

2. "Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself."

3. "In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better."

4. "Its hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future."

5. These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on."

---

[7] This is paraphrased from Srole (85), pp. 712-13.

The respondent was asked if she agreed or disagreed with each of these five statements. They were separated by other questions in order to avoid an "acquiescense set".[8]

III.   SAMPLE SELECTION

Sample Selection

For a number of reasons only housewives were interviewed during this study. First, women are more likely to be home during the day which would be expected to increase the successful interview rate per call made. Furthermore, it was felt that since women generally spend more time at home, they are likely to play a more active part in the local neighbourhood and would have a better knowledge of the practicality of architectural designs on the estate than the men. Thirdly, by considering adults of only one sex and with a common role, the variability of informants is reduced. If men and children had been included, without increasing the number of interviews, the results, which might be expected to vary with sex, would have been less reliable for both sexes.

Limitations on both time and funds made it impossible to take a national sample. As the investigator's supervisor was doing a large study for one of the Inner London Boroughs assessing their social services, it was decided that the investigator would select

---

[8] See Mizruchi (63).

three housing estates from the same borough. In this way use
could be made of existing contacts with borough administrators
and bureaucratic difficulties could be considerably alleviated.
The respondents were chosen by drawing from a random sample with
a sampling fraction of approximately forty per cent of the house-
holds on the three housing estates in the borough.[9] This gave an
initial number of 193.

The three estates were selected from those in the borough
according to the following criteria: (i) size, (ii) year of
original occupation, (iii) design and (v) location.

Only those housing estates with one hundred dwelling units
(approximately 360 people) or more were considered.

In order to estimate whether social participation was effected
by length of residence, three estates were chosen: one that was
three to four years old, one five to six years old, and one eleven
to twelve years old. The estates in the Borough had generally been
built in sections, one section usually being completed in a given
year and the next the following. For example, one estate was
completed in 1961/62, but the first buildings on the estate were
completed in 1954/55. To take into consideration the year of
original occupation and to keep the survey to a manageable size,

_____
[9] For discussion of the sampling frame see p. 36.

it was necessary to select areas of estates rather than whole estates.

Two of the selected estates were, relatively speaking, similar in type of design. Both of them contained mainly blocks of flats from three to five stories high, though one of the estates included a tower block as well. The third estate investigated was composed of blocks or terraces of maisonettes. As already stated, all three estates were located within the same Inner London Borough. One was very close to the West End, the main shopping and entertainment area of London, and the other two were two and one-half miles, respectively, to the north of this area.

The three housing estates selected for study were the Bletchley Park Estate, Cocklyn Estate and Sturbridge Estate.[10] Area B of each of the three estates was chosen. The years of original occupation for the buildings in Area B of Bletchley Park Estate were eleven to twelve years, for Cocklyn Estate, five to six years, and for the Sturbridge Estate, three to four years. The investigator attempted to make the selection of the three estates as random as possible, but, inevitably there was some bias involved.

_____

[10] The respondents were told that their statements would be kept confidential, for this reason fictitious names have been given to the three estates.

For example, it was not possible to find two estates that had exactly the same design and, yet, were originally occupied approximately four years apart. The investigator attempted to include the three major design types in the study: blocks of 3-4 storey flats, a tower block of flats and a maisonette complex. On the oldest and newest areas selected, the majority of the housing was 3-4 storey blocks of flats, though the newest estate also had a tower block. Thus, where the comparison of effects of length of residence were greatest, the type of design was as similar as possible in view of the fact that the one is eight years older than the other. In other words, an attempt was made to obtain the best of two possibilities: that is, to include the three major types of building designs in the sample and to have similar types of designs for the oldest and newest in order to limit the variables. One could argue that the study should have concentrated solely on the latter. The investigator felt that research of a more controlled nature would be the logical next step after more knowledge of a general nature had been obtained.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF ESTATES

Although the three estates selected for study are relatively
close to one another, the immediate area which surrounds each has
its own particular character. The Bletchley Park Estate is the
largest in the borough with over 1600 dwelling units housing about
6000 people. Bletchley Park Estate is about one mile and a ten
minute bus ride from the centre of London's West End. It covers
a rectangular area of about 300 yards broad by ½ mile long, the
U.S. equivalent perhaps of four city blocks wide and ten city
blocks long; it forms something of an island in the middle of two
heavily used arterial roads leading from the West End to the North.
It is close to a substantial area of park land to the West and to
a main railway terminal on its East.

The Cocklyn Estate is about two miles from the West End and
about a fifteen minute bus ride northward from the Bletchley Park
Estate. It is located in the heart of what is usually considered
a working class area. The estate with 381 dwelling units is
considerably smaller than the Bletchley Park Estate. It is about
a quarter mile from heavily used roads but is surrounded by
secondary ones which bear some through traffic. The estate is

close to a railway in the east-southeast and to the northwest
there is a street market. The area surrounding the estate is
characterized by old semi-detached houses which will be torn down
shortly. Cocklyn Estate is of trapezoidal shape and sits in the
middle of an area that, for the most part, is awaiting redevelopment.

The Sturbridge Estate is about 2½ miles from the West End.
It is within five minutes walking distance of the Cocklyn Estate
and is bordered on its Northern side by a large area of open heath-
land. A main road, a small group of houses, and a railway track
separate the tenants from direct access to the heath. When many
of the tenants on the Sturbridge Estate look out of their windows
on the southern side of their flats, they look out on very close
rows of chimneys and old slate roofs, through air which is often
smoky. The northern windows of the same flat, however, look out
on a huge expanse of green fields, hills and trees. The air looks
smokeless and healthy. The difference is startling. Just to the
west side of the estate is an area in which many freeholds have
been bought up by middle class people with the intention of
improving the run-down housing.

Thus, although the three estates are relatively close to one
another, they are each located within their own distinctive
surroundings.

V. SELECTION OF SAMPLE

On each of the three estates a random sample was drawn. The flat numbers for each building in the selected area of the three housing estates were used as the sampling frame. These numbers were listed and by use of a table of random numbers, sixty-four flats were chosen from the Bletchley Park and Sturbridge Estates and sixty-five from the Cocklyn Estate. These totals represent a sampling fraction of approximately 40% of the total households. The sample was stratified for housewives for the reasons stated earlier. When an interviewer discovered that a man was living on his own, i.e., there was no adult woman living with him, the flat number was crossed off the list. It could be argued that the population should have been stratified for housewives before the sample was chosen. This was not done for a number of reasons. To obtain the necessary information, it would have been necessary for the investigator to spend many hours in the Housing Manager's office going through their records. As the investigator wished as far as possible to avoid being associated with the council, it was felt that this would be unwise. Furthermore, it seemed likely that the estate manager's records would have, for example, the widowers on record, but not those men whose wives had recently left them for

whatever reason. It was also felt that there would be a very small number of men living on their own on the three estates. The number turned out to be larger than had been anticipated.

VI. THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The interview schedule (Appendix A) was eleven pages long and contained fifty-five questions. Many of the questions relating to activities with neighbours had been used previously in other studies. A modified version of Chapin's scale (11) of social participation in formal organizations was used, and Srole's (73) scale was employed for testing anomie.

Both open-ended and precoded questions were used in the interview schedule. Approximately one-third of the questions were open-ended. They were used in areas where there was little preliminary information or where it seemed desirable to obtain the respondent's own formulation of the issue and the motivations underlying her opinions.

A number of factual questions were open-ended in the sense that the categories for coding were established during the tabulating stage. This was necessary because of the lack of sufficient prior information to establish discrete categories. A closed question would have had the advantage of focusing the respondent's attention, but it was felt that this advantage was

outweighed by the danger of forcing answers into preset categories.
Except where the range of answers to the factual questions was
well established beforehand, the setting up of categories was done
at the tabulation stage.

There were precoded factual and opinion questions on the
schedule.

> "Closed questions are more efficient where
> the possible alternative replies are known,
> limited in number and clear cut. Thus, they
> are appropriate for securing factual informa-
> tion (age, education, home ownership, amount
> of rent, etc.) and for eliciting expressions
> of opinion about issues on which people hold
> clear opinions."[11]

Opinions are normally complex constructs and there is some doubt
as to how many can be said to hold "clear opinions". Nevertheless,
in those areas where the investigator felt reasonably confident of
covering the range of answers to the question, precoded questions
were used.

VII. THE PRETEST

The pretest was carried out to discover whether there were
any problems in the adminstration of the questionnaire or whether
there was need to either add or delete questions from the pretest
schedule. The pretest also gave the investigator an opportunity
to test the sequence and wording of the questions, become confident

---

[11]Selltiz (79), p. 262.

of interviewing methods, and assess the amount of time required for each interview. Furthermore, it gave the researcher an opportunity to become accustomed to the respondents' accent and to see whether there would be any difficulty in the respondents following the investigator's American accent. The pretest was carried out at Dorchester Court, a tower block located at the far end of the Sturbridge Estate. It is separated by some houses and a road from that section of the estate where the investigator conducted the main study. Thus, the housewives interviewed in the pretest were similar in characteristics to those who were interviewed in the final study. A random sample was drawn using each flat as the sampling unit, and a total of fifteen housewives were interviewed by the investigator using the schedule proposed for the final study. After the respondent had answered all the questions on the interview schedule, she was asked how she felt about answering the questions and whether there were any questions she did not understand, etc. The pretest indicated the need for some changes in wording, in the question sequence, and in the introductory remarks, and the need for more space on the schedule to record the respondents' answers. Some questions were added that had been overlooked.

Several questions that were asked on the interview schedule were not used in the final analysis, primarily because there was limited time available to do the analysis. Almost all of those questions which were not used would have shed more light on the data reported, but a decision had to be made between what was considered to be of primary importance and that which was felt to be of a complimentary nature. It is quite possible that questions have not been analyzed which should have been, and vice versa.

VIII. RESPONSE RATE

The non-response rate was about 18%. (Table IV). From the total random sample of 193, eleven of the original sampling units were males living on their own. As only women were being interviewed, the eleven men were crossed off the list and no substitutes were made. A total of 142 interviews were obtained. The 18% of the 182 in the final sample who did not respond were made up of twenty-four who refused to be interviewed, three who could not be contacted, four who were in hospitals, one who had died, and one who was too ill to be interviewed. Again no substitutes were made. However, in three instances, after repeated attempts to contact the wife without success, three husbands were interviewed. They were asked to answer only the factual questions such as the number and age of those in the household.

TABLE IV

RESPONSE RATE

	Bletchley Estate	Sturbridge Estate	Cocklyn Estate
Number Interviewed	52	49	48
Number of Males Living Alone	4	1	6
Number who Refused to be Interviewed	5	12	7
Number not Contacted	1	0	2
Number in Hospital	2	1	1
Number too Ill to be Interviewed	0	0	1
Number Deaths	0	1	0
TOTAL	64	64	65 = 193

IX. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

As this study was of an exploratory nature and limited in number, it was felt that it would be inappropriate to do a complex statistical analysis of the data. Rather, it was felt that the data should be presented in as straightforward a manner as possible with the corresponding percentages and a measure of association. Most of the analysis is done in the form of cross-tabulations with gamma measuring the association.[12] Some multivariate analysis is done, but, because of the small sample size, this technique was used only in those situations in which it was deemed essential to try to clarify the relationships between two variables. The data from the three estates were combined for the purposes of analysis. If the data had been analyzed for each estate, the frequencies in the cross-tabulation tables would have been so small as to make interpretation both difficult and unreliable.

X. TABULATION

Given that there were less than 200 cases, it was felt that hand tabulation using Cope Chat cards would be less time consuming than machine tabulation. Hand tabulation also provided the investigator with greater flexibility in that she was not dependent on the availability of a counter-sorter or computer. However, in

---

[12]See Goodman and Kruskal (40).

the last stage of analysis, the gamma associations and percentages
were programmed and run on a digital computer to serve as a check
on the accuracy of the hand calculations.

XI. DATA PROCESSING

As over one-third of the questions were not pre-coded, the
coding procedure was rather long and arduous. On the open-ended
questions, the investigator made a list of all the answers that
had been given to a question, and from this, drew up the appropriate
categories. Appropriate categories were defined as ones that had
a single classificatory principle, were mutually exclusive and
were exhaustive of the range of answers.

CHAPTER III

CONSIDERATION OF THE DATA

I. DESCRIPTION OF RESPONDENTS

The women interviewed ranged in age from 19 to over 60 years. When they were grouped into four age groups, the proportion in each was relatively similar as follows: 25% were from 19 to 39 years old, 35% from 40 to 49, 20% from 50 to 59 and 20% aged 60 and over. There were considerably more women in the 40-49 year category in the sample than in the Greater London population[1] (Table VIII).

The majority of the women interviewed were members of elementary families, i.e., they were married and had unmarried children living in the household. About a quarter of the sample were married women who had no children living at home. The third category was made up of women who were widowed, divorced, separated, or single who had children living at home, and the fourth category of women who were widowed, divorced, separated or single with no children living at home. About 10% of those interviewed were in each of the "women alone" categories (Table V).

---

[1]Census 1961, England and Wales Greater London Tables (33), p. 7, Table 6, "Age and Marital Condition".

TABLE V

FAMILY TYPES

	Number of Respondents	Percent
Married Couple with Unmarried Children	81	54.4
Married Couple with no Children	41	27.5
Women alone with Children	12	8.00
Women alone without Children	15	10.1
TOTAL	149	100.0

Eighty percent of the respondents were married, 18% widowed, separated, single or divorced. Within the Greater London population, about 50% of the women were married, 12% widowed or divorced, and 40% single.

The housewives were relatively similar with respect to their educational attainments, their religious affiliations, and the social classification of their husband's occupations. The legal school-leaving age is now 15 years, but about 10% of the respondents who were either at school before the 1944 act when the age was 14, or at school in Eire where it is still 14, left before they were fourteen, while 80% of those interviewed left school between the

ages of 14 and 15. In other words, approximately 90% of the
sample had only the minimum legal amount of education. The per-
centage of those who left school after the age of fifteen is less
for those in the sample than for the Greater London female popula-
tion.[2] (Table X)

When asked their religion, two-thirds of those interviewed
replied that they were Church of England. The next largest group
were Roman Catholics who made up about 22% of the sample, while
10% belonged to other religions. (Table VI).

TABLE VI

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATIONS

	Number of Respondents	Percent
Church of England	99	67.3
Roman Catholic	33	22.4
Other	15	10.2
Didn't Answer	2	
TOTAL	149	99.9

The question regarding husband's occupation was not applicable to
about 23% of those interviewed as they had no husband, or he had
retired, or, as in two cases, the answer was insufficient to allow

----

[2] Census 1961, England and Wales Occupation Tables (34), p. 11,
Table 2 "Population Aged 15 and over in 9 Age sections
classified by 7 Terminal Education Age groups."

a classification to be made. In making up the classification code of five social classes, this study employed those used by the Register General in the Classification of Occupations 1966 (35). Approximately 7% of the husbands were in Social Class V consisting of unskilled, namely manual labours, about 20% in Social Class IV, i.e., the semi-skilled manual, about 67% in Social Class III who were skilled manual, or routine nonmanual who had obtained a supervisory position, and 4% in Social Class II who were in less prestigious professional work. Thus, almost all the husbands were manual workers with a particularly high proportion of skilled men among them. A very much smaller proportion of the respondent's husbands were professional or lower professional than the Greater London population.[3] (Table XI)

The respondent's length of residence on the estate was, in most cases, related to the age of the section of the estates selected for study. Thus, a resident of Bletchley Park could have lived there for a maximum of twelve years whereas the maximum for a resident on the Cocklyn Estate would have been four years.

---

[3]Census 1961, England and Wales Occupation Tables, (34), p. 193, Table 27, Socio-economic Group and Social Class.

TABLE VII

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

	Number of Respondents	Percent
7-12 Years	41	27.7
5-6 Years	34	23.0
3-4 Years	52	35.0
2 or Less Years	21	14.2
Didn't Answer	1	
TOTAL	149	99.9

As discussed above an attempt was made to assess the
respondent's familiarity with her district of residence by inquiring
into the location of her schooling. It was found that over half
the respondents were living in the same district as that in which
they had gone to school as children. (Table XIV)

TABLE VIII

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS AND OF MARRIED
WOMEN IN GREATER LONDON

Age at Last Birthday	Number	Percent	Age at Last Birthday	Greater London Married Women Census 1961 percent
19-39 years	36	24.2	20-39 years	35
40-49 years	51	34.2	40-49 years	19
50-59 years	28	18.8	50-59 years	19
60 and over	34	22.8	60 and over	27
TOTAL	149	100.0		100

TABLE IX

MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS AND OF WOMEN
IN GREATER LONDON

Respondents' Marital Status	Number	Percent	Greater London Census 1961	Marital Status Percent
Married	122	81.9	Married	49
Widowed, Separated, Single, Divorced	27	18.1	Widowed, Divorced	12
			Single	39
TOTAL	149	100.0		100

TABLE X

EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS AND WOMEN IN GREATER LONDON

Age Respondents Finished Full Time Schooling	Number	Percent	Age Women of Greater London Finished Full Time Schooling Census 1961	Percent
Under 14 Years	11	7	Under 15 Years	54
14 to 15 Years	116	78	15 Years	18
16 to 18 Years	14	14	16 to 20 Years	28
No Information	7	5		
TOTAL	149	100		100

TABLE XI

SOCIAL CLASS OF RESPONDENTS' HUSBANDS WHO ARE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE AND ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE AND RETIRED MALES IN GREATER LONDON CONURBATION

Respondents' Husbands who are Economically Active	Number	Percent	Greater London Conurbation Economically Active Males Census 1961 percent
Professional	0	0.0	5
Lower Professional	5	4.4	116
Skilled Manual	74	67.2	53
Semi-skilled Manual	23	21.2	18
Unskilled Manual	8	7.1	9
TOTAL	110	99.9	101
No Information	4		
Retired	11		
No Husband	23		
Note Employed	1		

TABLE XII

WORKING STATUS OF RESPONDENTS AND OF WOMEN 15 YEARS

AND OVER IN ENGLAND AND WALES

Respondents	Number	Percent	England and Wales Females 15 Years and Over Census 1961 Percent
Economically Active	107	71.8	38.
Economically Inactive	42	28.2	62.
TOTAL	149	100.0	100

TABLE XIII

WORK STATUS OF MARRIED RESPONDENTS

Married Respondents	Number	Percent
Economically Active	72	61.5
Economically Inactive	45	38.4
TOTAL	117	99.9

TABLE XIV

LOCATION OF SCHOOLING

	Number of Respondents	Percent
Same District as Estate	80	56.7
District other than Estate	61	43.3
Didn't Answer	8	
TOTAL	149	100.0

Only 28% of the respondents were not employed. About 36%
worked full time and about 36% worked part time.

TABLE XV

RESPONDENTS WORKING STATUS

	Number of Respondents	Percent
Full Time	53	35.6
Part Time	54	36.2
Not Employed	42	28.2
TOTAL	149	100.0

The percentage of respondents employed is considerably higher than for women in England and Wales; about 70% of the respondents were employed compared to 38% in England and Wales.[4] (Table XII) Westergaard points out in "The Structure of Greater London" (99) that in 1951 35 to 40 percent of married women living in the "inner zones" of London were employed. He found that employment was most common among the housewives of the East End and other inner working class zones.[5] Among the married respondents about 60 percent were employed and about 40 percent not employed.[6]

Summary

Many of the women interviewed had similar demographic characteristics. More than 90% of the husbands were manual workers, almost 70% of the respondents replied that their religion was Church of England, and about 90% had no schooling beyond the age of fifteen.

---

[4]Census 1961, England and Wales Occupation Tables, (34), p. 193, Table 27, Socio-economic Group and Social Class.

[5]Westergaard (99), p. 113

[6]Census 1961, England and Wales Occupation Tables, (34), p. 136, Table 26 "Occupation and Status".

The principal differences within the sample population were
in age, family type, length of residence on the estate, the loca-
tion of schooling, and their working status. The majority of
those interviewed were from 19-49 years of age, belonged to an
elementary family, were schooled in the same district as the
estate on which they were living, and were working either part or
full time. The majority had lived on the estate since the first
year of occupation.

It has been stated several times that homogeneity is thought
to play a positive role in bringing about social interaction.[7]
If this hypothesis were true, the respondents in this study could
be expected to display high neighbour interaction by dint of their
relative similarities.

II. INFORMAL AND FORMAL SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

As already indicated, one of the principal interests of this
study was the variation to be found in formal and informal social
participation of housewives living in council housing estates in
the inner city. Information relevant to this interest may be
obtained by studying the distributions of the respondents' partici-
pation with neighbours, relatives, friends, and in clubs and
social events.

[7] See Gans (29), Morris and Mogey (65).

Social Participation with Neighbours

The distribution of the respondent's participation with their neighbours will be considered first. More then 90% of the respondents had a secondary and a quasi-primary (by knowing a neighbour's name) social relation with at least one neighbour. There is then a sharp decline in neighbour participation as just less then half the respondents had a quasi-primary relation as measured by exchanging with or borrowing from a neighbour(s). About 40% shared a primary relation with a neighbour(s) (i.e., by inviting one in for a cup of tea occasionally or more often) and 28% shared an intimate primary relation with a neighbour(s) by discussing personal difficulties. The frequency for all five questions was "on special occasions" or more often. (Table XVI)

These percentages do not support the theories of the traditional writers reviewed in Chapter I who indicated that the city dweller was isolated from his neighbours. The results do tend to support Gans hypothesis that housewives who live in relatively stable residential areas within the city would share quasi-primary relations with their neighbours. The data seem to go beyond Gans hypothesis, however, and suggest that not only does almost every respondent share the minimum quasi-primary relation with her neighbour(s), but also close to half of the sample population also share a primary relationship, with nearly 3/10 sharing an intimate

TABLE XVI

NEIGHBOUR PARTICIPATION

Type	Positive Response	Negative Response	Didn't Answer
1. Secondary relationship with at least one neighbour; i.e., said hello or good morning to someone in her building or on the estate when she sees them on the street.	141 (98.6%)	2 (1.4%)	6
2. Quasi-primary relationship with at least one of her neighbours; i.e., she knew the names of someone in her building or on the estate.	134 (93%)	10 (6.9%)	5
3. Quasi-primary relationship with at least one of her neighbours; i.e., borrowed or lent with a neighbour(s) on special occasions or more often.	70 (48.6%)	74 (51.4%)	5
4. Primary relationship with at least one of her neighbours; i.e., invited one of her neighbours in for a cup of tea occasionally or more often.	60 (41.7%)	84 (58.3%)	5
5. Intimate-primary relationship with at least one of her neighbours; i.e., she considers one of her neighbours a best friend, someone with whom she can discuss personnel things.	41 (28.5%)	103 (71.5%)	5

primary relationship with at least one neighbour. Thus, it seems, from a theoretical point of view, that the inner city housewife is neither totally isolated from her neighbours nor limited to sharing only quasi-primary relations. On the other hand, she does not seem to share the intimacy of a folk society type culture. Rather the situation seems to be one which lies between these extremes in which most share quasi-primary relations and about half share a primary relation with their neighbour(s).

Both Young and Willmott's (105) study and that of Kerr (49) indicate that there is very little visiting between neighbours among the British working class. However, when Young and Willmott asked the couples in the marriage sample whether they visited, or were visited by, friends in one or another's home at least once a month, about 40% reported exchanging visits with friends. This is comparable to the 40% of the respondents in this study who invited neighbours in for tea. The two studies also emphasize that the working class woman does not usually have intimate relationships with people who are not relatives. As 28% of the respondents in this study had at least one neighbour for a best friend, it suggests that a substantial proportion of working class women shared intimate relations outside their kin group, in this case with neighbours. However, both Young and Willmott's and Kerr's studies were done in areas where the respondents had a long history of residence.

Rehoused populations are less likely to have kin for neighbours
and thus may be more prepared to substitute neighbours for kin in
intimate primary relationships.

As there is a shortage of information about relationships
with neighbours among British inner city working class housewives,
it is of interest to consider a study of a council housing estate
on the edge of the city. Hodges and Smith (47) found that there
appeared to be two kinds of neighbour relations, neighbourly and
friendly. The former was based on a willingness to give or
readiness to ask for and accept help from others, while the latter
implied a close reciprocal relationship based on trust, affection
and respect. The authors introduce a third kind of neighbour with
whom intimate social relations are developed, but they reported
that very few such relationships existed. They found that a
respondent considered herself fortunate if she shared a friendly,
as opposed to a neighbourly relation with her neighbour. No
figures were given by the authors as to the number of housewives
who shared the various degrees of intimacy with their neighbours.

In an American study, Foley (26) inquired into the informal
neighbouring of residents in a middle-class area within the city
of Rochester. The homes were mainly of a single family type. He
found that 75% of the respondents chatted with one another, short
of entering one another's home, 59% exchanged favours, such as

receiving parcels, about 40% visited informally in each others homes, and about 26% asked advice on problems. The frequency required by Foley for all the quoted percentages was "often or sometimes". These data are very close to those of the present study for similar levels of intimacy with neighbours, especially in the last two categories.

In both Foley's study and the present one, the more prevalent types of relations among neighbours appear to be essentially casual and the more intimate relations relatively infrequent. It is difficult to draw any specific comparisons between the data of the present study and those of the studies by Young and Willmott, (105) Kerr, (49) and Hodges and Smith (47) as these studies give very little quantitative information.

TABLE XVII

SOCIAL PARTICIPATION WITH RELATIVES

Number of Relatives Seen in the Last Four Weeks

6-16	4-5	3	2	1	0	DA
37(26%)	31(22%)	28(19%)	22(15%).	22(15%)	4(3%)	1

Social Participation With Relatives

The number of relatives that the respondent had seen in the last four weeks ranged from zero to sixteen. (Table XVII) Almost half had seen four or more different relatives in that time period, and 97% of the study group saw relatives at least once in the month preceding the interview. The traditional theorists seem to have underestimated the part kinship ties could play in the total social participation of the urban housewife.[8] The findings of this study are similar to other studies which have pointed out the importance of kinship to the working class city dweller.

British studies of urban working-class families have shown that extended kin play an important role in the family's social activities. Firth (25) reported that English working-class families in London have extensive and important relationships with their relatives. In Young and Willmott's (106) study of the relationships of working-class families with their relatives, they indicate that certain working-class families have a great deal of contact with their relatives. The elementary family does not stand alone in as much as its members keep up frequent and intimate relationships with parents and with at least some of the siblings, uncles and aunts, and cousins of the husband and wife. Bott (6)

---

[8] However, it should be remembered that Durkheim felt that consanguinity was a more effective social tie then cohabitation.

found, in attempting to explain variations in contacts with kin, that there was some correlation with class status. She found that families who had the most contact with kin were, or had been, working-class. She emphasizes that there are several other factors that may play as important or more important roles in frequency of contact with kin than class status.

Similar findings have been obtained in American studies. Dotson reports that of 50 working-class families in New Haven, about 40% had no intimate friends outside of their own families and relatives. In the majority of these cases, Dotson points out, this does not mean social isolation, but, simply, that activities are restricted to the members of the kin group. About 85% of his informants had a regular visiting pattern with relatives.

In his study of formal and informal group participation in Detroit, Axelrod (2) reported that about 60% of those with low social status got together at least a few times a month with their relatives. Bell and Boat (3) found in the Outer Mission area of San Francisco, a neighbourhood of low-rent detached houses with low economic status and high family status, that 72% of the males interviewed saw their relatives at least once a month. In interviews of relatives residing in the households of former mental patients in Boston, Teele (94) found that about 75% of the female respondents had seen at least one family of relatives in the month

prior to the interview.

To the extent that these works are comparable to the present study, it would seem that the particular urban condition of the women interviewed is not one that inhibits participation with relatives. The apparent importance of the kin group as a source of informal relations for the respondents corroborates Axelrod's comment:

> "The extended family may have lost its
> function as an economic producing unit
> in the city, but relatives continue to
> be an important source of companionship
> and mutual support."[9]

TABLE XVIII

SOCIAL PARTICIPATION WITH FRIENDS

Number of Friends Seen in the Last Four Weeks

2-12	1	0	Didn't Answer
37(25%)	46(32%)	63(43%)	3

---

[9] Axelrod (2), p. 17.

Social Participation With Friends

The number of friends seen by the respondents in the last four weeks ranged from zero to twelve. (Table XVIII) About 40% had not seen any friends, about 30% had seen one friend, and one-quarter of the respondents had seen from two to twelve. Thus, a total of about 60% of the sample had seen a friend(s) in the month prior to the interview. As mentioned earlier, there was a difficulty in the wording of this question since workmates were not differentiated from friends.

As stated above Young and Willmott (105) found that 40% of the people in their marriage sample exchanged visits with friends. They defined "friend" as anyone other then a relative. They felt that friends did not play a major role in the social participation of their respondents. Friends were seen in the street, at the market, at the pub or at work, but for the most part, not in the home.

Kerr's (49) findings in a working class neighbourhood in Liverpool were similar. "Occasionally individuals have personal friends but this is not very common in adult life."

In an American study, Williams (101) found a high positive association between status and the number of close friends. He found that about 30% of the lowest status group had six or more close friends compared to about 68% of the women in the two highest status groups. Dotson (18) found that 60% of the working-class

couples interviewed had intimate friends outside their own families and relatives. Axelrod (2) found that 34% of the people in the lowest social status group saw friends, other than friends among their neighbours or work associates, a few times a month whereas the percentage was 62% for those in the highest social status group. The women in Teele's (94) study were relatives of ex-mental patients and, thus, not of a particular social status group. It was found that about 82% saw friends (anyone not a relative) at least once a month. In Bell and Boat's (3) study of males living in the high family, low economic status area of Outer Mission, about 80% saw friends, as differentiated from neighbours and co-workers, about once a month or more often.

Comparison with the results of these studies is difficult since the definition of friend, the sex, and social class of the subjects can differ. There seem, however, to be two general conclusions which may be drawn. The fact that 40% of the respondents in this study had not seen any friends in the month prior to the interviewing is not as striking a figure as it might first appear, in light of these other studies. This is a consequence of the apparent relation between the importance of friends in a persons total social participation and his social class.

Social Participation in Clubs, Social Events, and at Places of Unplanned Interaction

The number of respondents who regularly went to places of unplanned interaction was approximately 60%, and about 30% of those interviewed went to social events regularly. (Table XIX) Only about 15% attended formal organizations. This is in line with several studies which have shown that the working class generally does not belong to many formal organizations and that working class women join even less frequently then the males.[10]

In attempting to discover some of the characteristics that might be associated with the respondents varying levels of informal and formal social participation, three areas were investigated: demographic characteristics, attitudes, and the architectural design of the estates.

The respondents were essentially homogeneous in some of the demographic characteristics often selected as means for differentiating groups in a population. Those demographic characteristics which did not show a high degree of homogeneity were used in assessing associations with the respondents different levels of social participation. The demographic characteristics used were age, family type, length of residence on the estate, location of schooling, and the respondents work status.

---

[10] See, e.g., Komarovsky (50), Morris and Mogey (65).

TABLE XIX

SOCIAL PARTICIPATION IN CLUBS, SOCIAL EVENTS,
AND AT PLACES OF UNPLANNED INTERACTION

Participation in:	Participated Number	Percent	Did Not Participate	Percent	No Inf.	Total No. %	
Places of unplanned interaction, on special occasions or more often	83	58.4	59	41.6	7	149	100
Social events, on special occasions or more often	45	30.2	104	69.8		149	100
Formal organizations, once a year or more often	22	14.8	127	85.2		149	100

III. DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND MEASURES OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Age and Measure of Social Participation

There was an inverse relation between age and social participation with neighbours. (Table XX) The youngest respondents were more likely to have a high or medium neighbour social participation score than any of the other three age groups. Only 15% of the respondents who were in the youngest age group, 19-39 year old, had a low neighbour social participation, whereas 33% of the 40 to 49 year olds were in this category. The 50 to 59 year olds and the 60 and over group both had over 40% in the low neighbour participation category. A relatively high gamma correlation of .33 was calculated as a measure of this association.

There was an inverse relation between age and social participation with relatives. The association was very similar to that between age and social participation with neighbours in that the younger respondents were more likely to have high or medium social participation with relatives. Only about 19% of the youngest group, 19-39 years old, had low participation with relatives, whereas 35% of the 40-49 year olds, and more than 40% of the two oldest groups had low participation with relatives.

TABLE XX

RELATION OF RESPONDENT'S AGE TO SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Social Participation Measure	19-39	40-49	50-59	60 & over	
Neighbour					
High	14(41%)	13(27%)	3(11%)	5(16%)	.33
Medium	15(44%)	20(41%)	12(43%)	13(42%)	
Low	5(15%)	16(33%)	13(46%)	13(42%)	
Relative					
High	17(47%)	19(37%)	9(32%)	5(15%)	.26
Medium	12(33%)	14(27%)	6(21%)	15(45%)	
Low	7(19%)	18(35%)	13(46%)	13(39%)	
Friend					
High	12(34%)	12(24%)	7(25%)	8(26%)	.09
Medium	11(31%)	15(31%)	9(32%)	9(29%)	
Low	12(34%)	22(45%)	12(43%)	14(45%)	
Clubs and Social Events					
High	3(9%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	4(13%)	.08
Medium	13(38%)	22(45%)	12(43%)	7(23%)	
Low	18(53%)	27(55%)	16(57%)	19(63%)	
Total Social Participation					
High	14(41%)	10(20%)	4(14%)	6(20%)	.30
Medium	14(41%)	22(45%)	11(39%)	9(30%)	
Low	6(18%)	17(35%)	13(46%)	15(50%)	

The gamma correlation was .27.

There was some association between age and social participation with friends. Those women in the youngest age group were found to be more likely to have a high or medium social participation with friends than any of the other age groups. There is, however, little difference between the other three groups. About 35% of the 19-39 year old respondents had a low social participation with friends, whereas about 45% of the respondents in the other three age groups were in this category. The gamma correlation was .09.

There was also some association between age and activity in places of unplanned interaction, clubs and social events. Again, those who were younger were more likely to be active, but the difference among the other age groups was small. The gamma correlation was .08.

The index of total social participation, which is, as described previously, essentially a compendium of the above measures shows a strong correlation with age. Only about 18% of those in the 19-39 age group have a low total social participation score. This is in contrast to 35% in the 40-49 age group, 46% in the 50-59 age group, and 50% in the 60 and over category who have low total social participation. The gamma correlation was calculated to be .32.

Although age is a standard item in almost any questionnaire, researchers have not often compared a respondents age with his social participation.

M. Jefferys found in "Londoners in Hertfordshire" (48) that:

"...Age was one of the most significant factors in sociability. Only 12 percent of the women under 30 had not found a friend on the estate; but in each successive ten year age group the proportion without a friend increased. Almost 60 percent of the 50 to 59 year age group had no friend at Oxhey. However, it seemed that the tendency to make friends improved again in the next age group - that of women in or beyond their sixties." Footnote p. 242[11]

Jefferys felt that the special attention given to the retired on the estate by the welfare agencies and the lack of attention shown for the problems of those in their 50's - women in this age group had often been allocated homes for nervous debilities - might explain the over 60's increased ability to make friends on the estate.

Jefferys pointed out that it was the older woman who had already brought up her family who had the greatest difficulty in adjusting to her new environment of the out-county estate at South Oxhey. The same appears to be true on these three inner London estates: the two youngest age groups, the 19-39 and the 40-49 year olds were more likely to have a high or medium neighbour social

---

[11]Jefferys (44), p. 242.

participation score then the two oldest age groups, the 50 to 69 and those 60 years and over.

Similar to Jefferys' findings, the 60 and over age group in this study did not show a decreased ability from the 50 to 59 year olds to make friends with neighbours. The researcher did not have data indicating why the respondents in this study were allo-cated flats; therefore it is impossible to know whether the 50 to 59 year old age group had any particular problems such as nervous conditions. However, some special attention was given to the problems of the retired and elderly. Activities were organized for this age group by the local authority on each of the three estates studied. Similar to Jefferys' study, this may help to explain why the 60 and over age group had approximately the same degree of social participation with neighbours as the 50 to 59 year olds, rather than a lower one as the previous age trend would have indicated. Bernard (4) interviewed married women in St. Louis. She used ten questions which were relatively similar to those in this study, to measure the extent of neighbourliness. She did not find any consistent relationship between age and neighbourliness though she states that a minute analysis of each item according to its relative frequency by age groupings shows that the very young and the very old might be spuriously discriminated against by the instrument for measuring neighbourliness.

To the investigator's knowledge, there are no other studies which compare age and social participation with relatives. It is difficult to explain the rather high correlation between age and social participation with relatives. It is possible that as the respondent gets older her relatives, such as parents, may become elderly, more dispersed geographically and less able to interact frequently. This, of course, does not explain participation with siblings, except in the case of the elderly respondents where death may reduce the potential amount of interaction.

William (101) found a relationship between age and the number of close friends to be curvilinear and independent of status. In general, the younger and older groups have many close friends while the intermediate group has relatively few. The data in this study do not support Williams' findings in that there is a positive linear relationship between participation with friends and age.

Both Tomeh (95) and Phillips (70) compare age with measures of total social participation. For Tomeh, social participation is an index of contacts with neighbours, relatives, co-workers, and friends, whereas for Phillips total social participation is an index of contact with friends, neighbours and organizational activity. Both differ from the present study, but Phillip's omission of relatives would seem to have greater importance in a working-class population than Tomeh's omission of organizational

activity. Tomeh's sample consisted of a cross-section of all adults in the Detroit area living in private households and Phillips' study was concerned with 600 adults living in the state of New Hampshire. The present study, in view of the total social participation index and the urban sample, is closer in structure to Tomeh's study than to that of Phillips. Tomeh found that younger persons participate more than older persons whereas Phillips found no correlation with age.

Family Type and Measures of Social Participation

In attempting to understand why the younger respondents tend to have a higher degree of social participation than the older ones, it is necessary to examine family type. It seemed likely that the younger respondents would differ from the older respondents in the kind of family unit of which they were members. As antici-pated the married women with children were more active with neighbours than any other group. (Table XXI) Only 25% of the married women with children had a low neighbour participation score where-as 50% of the married women without children had low neighbour participation. It would seem to follow that women alone with children would have a higher participation with neighbours than women alone who do not have children. The data, however, do not support this contention. As the number of respondents in these two groups is quite small, such an anomalous result may be due to

TABLE XXI

RELATION OF FAMILY TYPE TO MEASURES
OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Social Participation	Family Type				
	Married Couple With Children	Married Couple Without Children	Widowed, Divorced, or Separated Women With Children	Widowed, Divorced, or Separated Women Without Children	
Neighbour					
High	27(34%)	4(11%)	1(8%)	3(23%)	
Medium	32(41%)	15(39%)	7(58%)	6(46%)	.29
Low	20(25%)	19(50%)	4(33%)	4(31%)	
Relative					
High	33(41%)	13(32%)	0(0%)	3(23%)	
Medium	24(30%)	14(34%)	6(46%)	3(23%)	.29
Low	24(30%)	14(34%)	7(54%)	7(54%)	
Friend					
High	24(30%)	6(16%)	4(33%)	6(46%)	
Medium	26(32%)	11(29%)	3(25%)	3(23%)	.05
Low	30(38%)	21(55%)	5(42%)	4(31%)	
Clubs and Social Events					
High	2(3%)	1(3%)	2(18%)	2(15%)	
Medium	37(47%)	9(24%)	4(36%)	5(38%)	.05
Low	40(51%)	28(74%)	5(45%)	6(46%)	
Total Social Participation					
High	23(29%)	5(13%)	2(18%)	4(31%)	
Medium	37(47%)	12(32%)	3(27%)	4(31%)	.30
Low	19(24%)	21(55%)	6(55%)	5(38%)	

chance and, not indicative of real differences. Alternatively, there might be a hidden social factor involved which would explain this result. The gamma correlation between family type and neighbour participation was .29.

Being married with children was found not to be as important in social participation with relatives as it had been with neighbour interaction. About 30% of the married women with children had a low relative social participation and 34% of the married women without children were in this category. Women alone with children appeared to have no greater participation with their relatives than those alone without children. Both groups appeared to be particularly distant from relatives with 54% in both cases having low participation with relatives. The gamma was calculated as .29.

The women alone without children, as a group were found to have more activity with friends than any of the other three family types. Thirty-one percent of the women alone without children had low social participation with friends and 38% of the married women with children were in this category. The percentages then go up to 55% and 50% for the married women without children and the women alone with children, respectively. The gamma reflects this low association in its value .05.

The same pattern persists in the instance of participation in clubs, social events, and places of unplanned interaction. Again the women alone without children were found to be more active than any other group. The married women with children, the women alone with children, and the married women without children follow in that order. The gamma was again .05.

As with neighbour participation, the married women with children were found to have the highest scores on the total social participation index. The women alone without children were next. The married women without children and the women alone with children both had more than half of the sample population with scores of low total social participation. The high total social participation of women alone without children is somewhat surprising. It seems that as they have neither a husband nor children to make mobility difficult, as is perhaps the case of women alone without children, they are more likely to seek companionship outside the home. It must, however, be noted that the numbers are very small for the women in this category and consequently, any conclusions drawn must be highly speculative.

Several studies have indicated that children serve as a catalyst for bringing neighbours together. It is, therefore, surprising that the women alone with children should have less contact with neighbours than women alone without children. It is

quite possible that in the former category, the woman's marginal
role in not having a man living in the household is more pronounced
when there are children and perhaps this gives rise to a hidden
social factor within the data.

Few studies have been made relating family type to social
participation. Schmidt and Rohrer (78) did do such a study but
they did not include any males or females living alone. Two of
their family types are similar to those in this study: pair
family, no child or outside adult in the family; and the simple
family, married couple with child or children. They found that
among the urban families studied, the wife in the pair family
tended to be more active in formal organizations than the simple
family. There were similar findings in this study.

Length of Residence and Measures of Social Participation

It was anticipated that length of residence on the estate
would be associated with the degree of social participation. One
of the criteria used in selecting the three estates was the year
of original occupation. It was hoped that as the Bletchley Park
Estate was occupied twelve years ago, the majority of the respon-
dents would have lived there for that amount of time. It was
found, for the most part, that the majority of the tenants on the
three estates had been there since the year of original occupation.

There appears to be a positive association between length of residence on the estate and social participation with neighbours. (Table XXII) However, there was no association between length of residence on the estate and any other measures of social participation with the exception of contacts with friends, in which case there was a negative correlation. Often friends were from previous neighbourhoods. It seems likely that the longer the respondent lived on the estate, the less frequently she would have contacts with friends from her old neighbourhood. It was found that the longer the respondent had lived on the estate, the more likely it was that she would have a high or medium social participation with neighbours. The one group which did not fit this pattern were those with a five to six years length of residence. The majority of those with a five to six year length of residence lived on the Sturbridge Estate which tends to have a younger population, more nuclear families, and a maisonette architecture as opposed to the other two estates which are generally three to five story blocks of flats. If age, family type, and architecture were controlled for, it seems likely that length of residence would show a higher association with neighbour social participation. As the study sample is small, the multivariate analysis required would leave such small numbers in the categories as to make the data almost impossible to interpret.

TABLE XXII

RELATION OF LENGTH OF RESIDENCE ON THE ESTATE
TO MEASURES OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Social Participation Measure	9-12 yrs.	5-6 yrs.	3-4 yrs.	2 or less	DA	
Neighbour						
High	9(24%)	14(42%)	9(18%)	3(16%)	0	
Medium	17(45%)	12(36%)	22(43%)	9(47%)	0	.14
Low	12(32%)	7(21%)	20(39%)	7(37%)	1	
Relative						
High	15(37%)	10(29%)	15(29%)	10(48%)	0	
Medium	12(29%)	12(35%)	18(35%)	4(19%)	1	-.02
Low	14(34%)	12(35%)	18(35%)	7(33%)	0	
Friend						
High	7(18%)	8(24%)	14(27%)	9(45%)	1	
Medium	11(29%)	11(33%)	17(33%)	5(25%)	0	-.22
Low	20(53%)	14(42%)	20(39%)	6(30%)	0	
Clubs and Social Events						
High	2(5%)	1(3%)	3(6%)	1(5%)	0	
Medium	15(39%)	12(36%)	16(32%)	10(53%)	1	-.05
Low	21(55%)	20(61%)	31(62%)	8(42%)	0	
Total Social Participation						
High	10(26%)	9(27%)	10(20%)	5(26%)	0	
Medium	14(37%)	14(42%)	17(34%)	10(53%)	1	.01
Low	14(37%)	10(30%)	23(46%)	4(21%)	0	

Those respondents who as children had gone to school in the same district as the estate on which they were now living were more likely to have a high or medium score in every kind of social participation than those who went to school in a district other then the one where they were now living. (Table XXIII) The differences were most marked in the case of social participation with neighbours and relatives. Of those schooled in the same district as the estate, only 26% had low social participation with neighbours whereas 43% of those who had gone to school in another district had a low score. The percentages were approximately the same in the instance of social participation with relatives. Only 27% of the former group had low participation with relatives and 43% of the latter were in this category. The differences between the two groups was quite marginal in the measures of participation with friends and in clubs, social events and places of unplanned interaction. A difference of only about 5% in both cases indicated a weak association which tends to indicate that the location of the respondents schooling was not related to her participation with friends or in clubs and social events.

Length of residence on the estate was positively associated with neighbour participation, but had no relation to any other

113

TABLE XXIII

RELATION OF LOCATION OF SCHOOLING TO
MEASURES OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

| Social Participation Measure | Location of Schooling | | |
	Same District as Estate	Different District from Estate	DA
Neighbour			
High	22(29%)	12(21%)	1
Medium	35(45%)	21(36%)	4 .27
Low	20(26%)	25(43%)	2
Relative			
High	30(38%)	19(32%)	1
Medium	28(35%)	15(25%)	4 .20
Low	22(27%)	26(43%)	3
Friend			
High	21(27%)	17(29%)	1
Medium	22(29%)	20(34%)	2 .08
Low	34(44%)	22(37%)	4
Clubs and Social Events			
High	3(4%)	4(7%)	0
Medium	33(43%)	20(35%)	1 .05
Low	41(53%)	33(58%)	6
Total Social Participation			
High	21(27%)	12(21%)	1
Medium	35(45%)	18(32%)	3 .27
Low	22(28%)	27(47%)	3

measure of social participation with the exception of contacts with friends where there was a negative correlation. Those who, as children, had gone to school in the same district as the one they were now living in were more likely to have a high or medium social participation then those who had gone to school in another district.

Several studies have stated that beyond a certain point the length of residence does not markedly influence neighbour relationships. Bernard (4) set the point at about the fifth or sixth year. Young and Willmott (105), however, placed a great deal of emphasis on length of residence and stressed the fact that 53% of the people in their general sample were born in Bethnal Green. Foley (26) found in his Rochester study that the "old timers" were generally more neighbourly then were the newcomers.

Although going to school in the district is not a measure of length of residence, it does indicate a life-long familiarity with the district. Length of residence on the estate and length of familiarity with the district are both positively related to social participation with neighbours. Going to school in the district appears to be an extension of the positive effects of a longer length of residence on the estate.

Length of familiarity with the district is also positively related to social participation with relatives. Living in the district where one grew up as a child may increase the likelihood of relatives living nearby. In summary, it seems possible that the longer the familiarity with a district, the more likely the respondent is to develop a general feeling for and identity with it and this gives her more confidence in neighbouring.

Working Status and Measure of Social Participation

The respondent's working status was found to have less association with measures of participation than might have been anticipated. (Table XXIV) There was no association between the respondents working status and degree of participation with neighbours or relatives. There was a positive relation between work and participation with friends. Those who were employed were more likely to participate with friends than those who worked part time and full time. There was a positive association between work and participation in clubs, social events and places of unplanned interaction. Those who worked were more likely to participate than those who did not. There was, similarly, a weak positive association between work status and total social participation. These data do not support the image sometimes

TABLE XXIV

RELATION OF WORK STATUS AND

MEASURES OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Social Participation Measure	Work Status			
	Full Time	Part Time	Not Employed	
Neighbour	8(3%)	17(32%)	1(20%)	-.03
High	6(18%)	17(32%)	11(20%)	
Medium	17(50%)	16(30%)	27(50%)	-.03
Low	11(32%)	20(38%)	16(30%)	
Relative				
High	11(32%)	22(42%)	17(31%)	
Medium	9(26%)	16(30%)	18(33%)	.00
Low	14(41%)	15(28%)	19(35%)	
Friend				
High	14(41%)	14(26%)	9(17%)	
Medium	9(26%)	16(30%)	19(35%)	.24
Low	11(32%)	23(44%)	26(48%)	
Clubs and Social Events				
High	2(6%)	2(4%)	3(6%)	
Medium	16(47%)	25(47%)	13(24%)	.29
Low	16(47%)	26(49%)	38(70%)	
Total Social Participation				
High	8(23%)	16(30%)	10(19%)	
Medium	15(44%)	20(38%)	21(39%)	.13
Low	11(32%)	17(32%)	23(43%)	

portrayed of the woman who stays home to care for the children and keep house spending a lot of her time socializing with neighbours and relatives.

In a study of neighbour cohesion under conditions of mobility, Fellin and Litwak (23) found that the working wives of white collar and manual workers knew fewer neighbours well enough to call on than those who did not work. Only 16% of the women in Fellin and Litwak's study worked whereas three quarters of those in the present study worked.

The fact that 75% of the women in this study were working either part-time or full-time may be a partial explanation for the lack of association between work status and neighbour and relative social participation. However, the degree of participation of the few women who did not work was not great enough to indicate an association.

A respondent's work status was compared with her family type and total social participation. (Table XXV) Among the married women and the women alone with children, the respondent's work status had little effect on her social participation rate. However, among the married and the women alone without children, the rate of social participation was affected by the work status. Those who worked were more likely to have a high social participation than those who did not. When the respondent had children,

TABLE XXV

FAMILY TYPE AND TOTAL SOCIAL PARTICIPATION –
BY WORK STATUS[*]

Family Type Total Social Participation	Full Time	Part Time	Not Employed	
Married with Child(ren)				
High	11(73%)	25(76%)	24(77%)	.06
Low	4(27%)	8(24%)	7(23%)	
Married Without Child(ren)				
High	4(44%)	8(53%)	5(36%)	.15
Low	5(56%)	7(47%)	9(64%)	
Women Alone With Child(ren)				
High	3(75%)	2(50%)	0(0%)	.08
Low	1(25%)	2(50%)	3(100%)	
Women Alone Without Child(ren)				
High	5(83%)	1(100%)	2(33%)	.77
Low	1(17%)	0(0%)	4(67%)	

[*]High and medium neighbour social participation were combined

to increase the size of the categories and thus hopefully to

make the data more readable.

working did not appreciably increase her rate of total social participation as it did when she did not have children.

IV. ATTITUDES AND MEASURES OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

An association between the respondents' level of contentment with her living conditions and her degree of social participation was anticipated by the investigator. Self-report of happiness with where she was living and stated satisfaction with the estate as a place to live were the two measures used to study this effect. A third measure was used to test the respondents' general attitude. Srole's anomie scale was employed in this measure (85).

Self-Report of Happiness

It was found that there was some association between self-report of happiness and degree of social participation. (Table XXVI) A consistent difference in the measures of social participation was found between those who reported being "very happy living here" and those who reported being "rather or very unhappy living here". The middle group who reported being fairly happy wavered between the two groups in rate of social participation. Twenty-seven percent of those who reported being very happy had a low neighbour participation score, whereas 36% of those who reported being unhappy were in this category. The participation with relatives scores followed a similar trend as 36% of those reporting

TABLE XXVI

RELATION OF SELF-REPORT OF HAPPINESS
TO MEASURES OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Social Participation Measure	Self-Report of Happiness			
	Very Happy	Rather Happy	Unhappy	
Neighbour				
High	14(25%)	19(25%)	2(18%)	
Medium	26(47%)	29(38%)	5(45%)	.11
Low	15(27%)	28(37%)	4(36%)	
Relative				
High	24(41%)	21(27%)	5(45%)	
Medium	13(22%)	31(40%)	1(9%)	.07
Low	21(36%)	25(32%)	5(45%)	
Friend				
High	18(32%)	19(25%)	2(18%)	
Medium	16(29%)	22(29%)	6(55%)	.07
Low	22(39%)	35(46%)	3(27%)	
Clubs and Social Events				
High	5(9%)	2(3%)	0(0%)	
Medium	25(45%)	28(37%)	1(9%)	.41
Low	25(45%)	45(60%)	10(91%)	
Total Social Participation				
High	18(33%)	15(20%)	1(9%)	
Medium	21(38%)	30(40%)	5(45%)	.25
Low	16(29%)	30(40%)	5(45%)	

being very happy had a low participation with relatives compared
with 45% of those who were unhappy. On the other hand, there was
very little association between participation with friends and
self-report of happiness. About 40% of the respondents who
reported being very happy had a low social participation with
friends and only 27% of those who reported being unhappy had a
low social participation with friends. The greatest association
between a category of social participation and self-report of ·
happiness was found in the case of clubs, social events and places
of unplanned interaction. In this case it was quite clear that
the more active respondents were the ones who reported being happy.

When Phillips (70) compared self-report of happiness with social
participation, he made use of an index of total social participa-
tion, and the results are, therefore, comparable with the present
study. Using the index of total social participation in the present
study, an association rather similar to that of Phillips is found.
Those who reported being happy were found to have higher social
participation than either those who reported being fairly happy or
unhappy. The trend is particularly strong when those who report
being very happy are considered. Although more reliable research
is essential in methods of testing happiness, there does seem to be
some association between a respondent's report of happiness with
her living conditions and her social participation. The relation

is positive in the sense that the higher the extent of social participation, the greater her report of happiness. Such a conclusion supports the results of other studies which have shown that the isolated individual is more likely to be discontented than the non-isolated individual.

Satisfaction with the Estate

In testing the respondent's satisfaction with the estate, she was asked, "How would this area of the estate be rated as a place to live in? excellent, good, fair or poor" It was felt that if the respondent were dissatisfied with the quality of her life on the estate (i.e., lack of compansionship among her neighbours) she would probably answer "fair or poor". However, an alternative way the respondent could have interpreted the question was to give an evaluation of the facilities. The flat, the grass area, and so on were probably considerably better than similar amenities the tenant had prior to moving onto the estate.

These explanations may help to indicate why there was little association between either neighbour participation or participation with friends and the level of satisfaction with the estate. (Table XXVII) There was, however, an association with both participation in clubs, social events and places of unplanned inter- action. In these cases, as well as with the index of total social

TABLE XXVII

RELATION OF SATISFACTION WITH THE ESTATE
AND MEASURES OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Social Participation Measure	Satisfaction with Estate				
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
Neighbour					
High	1(8%)	21(28%)	12(27%)	0(0%)	
Medium	7(54%)	31(41%)	18(41%)	4(44%)	.04
Low	5(38%)	23(31%)	14(32%)	5(56%)	
Relative					
High	3(23%)	32(43%)	14(32%)	1(11%)	
Medium	5(38%)	21(28%)	16(36%)	1(11%)	.15
Low	5(38%)	22(29%)	14(32%)	7(78%)	
Friend					
High	5(38%)	17(23%)	12(27%)	3(33%)	
Medium	5(38%)	24(32%)	10(23%)	5(56%)	.02
Low	3(23%)	34(45%)	22(50%)	1(11%)	
Clubs and Social Events					
High	2(15%)	3(4%)	2(5%)	0(0%)	
Medium	6(46%)	33(44%)	13(30%)	2(22%)	.33
Low	5(38%)	39(52%)	29(66%)	7(78%)	
Total Social Participation					
High	4(31%)	20(27%)	10(23%)	0(0%)	
Medium	6(46%)	29(39%)	17(39%)	4(44%)	.20
Low	3(23%)	26(35%)	17(39%)	5(56%)	

participation, those who had a high or medium score were more likely to report that they were satisfied with the estate than those who had a low social participation.

Anomie

Srole's scale (85) was used to test anomie. It was antici- pated that those who did not participate were more likely to be anomic than those who did. It was indeed found that there was a negative association between a respondent's level of participation and her degree of anomie in the sense that the more active a respondent, the less likely she was to be anomic. (Table XXVIII) This association held for all measures of social participation except participation with friends in which case there was essen- tially no association. Unfortunately, 37 of the respondents were unable or refused to answer all five of the questions in Srole's scale. Of the 37, 25 answered the following two questions in the scale: "Some people say, 'It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future'"; "Some people say, 'These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on'". They were asked if they agreed or disagreed. The same association was found with this smaller sample using only the two questions as had been found for the larger sample. (Table XXIV)

TABLE XXVIII

RELATION OF ANOMIE[*] TO MEASURES OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Social Participation Measure	0	1	2	3	4	5	DA	
Neighbour								
High	5(50%)	11(38%)	6(21%)	4(20%)	3(25%)	2(40%)	3	
Medium	3(30%)	13(45%)	13(46%)	9(45%)	4(33%)	1(20%)	17	.24
Low	2(20%)	5(17%)	9(32%)	7(35%)	5(42%)	2(40%)	17	
Relative								
High	6(60%)	13(45%)	7(25%)	8(40%)	4(33%)	1(20%)	11	
Medium	3(30%)	10(34%)	5(18%)	3(15%)	4(33%)	3(60%)	15	.20
Low	1(10%)	6(21%)	16(57%)	9(45%)	4(33%)	1(20%)	11	
Friend								
High	3(30%)	7(24%)	7(25%)	2(10%)	5(42%)	2(40%)	11	
Medium	1(10%)	7(24%)	13(46%)	8(40%)	1(8%)	0(0%)	14	-.03
Low	6(60%)	15(52%)	8(29%)	10(50%)	6(50%)	3(60%)	12	
Clubs and Social Events								
High	2(20%)	2(7%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	3	
Medium	3(30%)	12(41%)	13(46%)	8(40%)	4(33%)	2(40%)	12	.18
Low	5(50%)	15(52%)	15(54%)	12(60%)	8(67%)	3(60%)	22	
Total Social Participation								
High	5(50%)	10(34%)	7(25%)	5(25%)	0(0%)	1(20%)	6	
Medium	4(40%)	10(34%)	9(32%)	5(25%)	8(67%)	2(40%)	18	.26
Low	1(10%)	9(31%)	12(43%)	10(50%)	4(33%)	2(40%)	13	

[*] Anomie score is based on the five questions of Srole's scale

TABLE XXIX

RELATION OF ANOMIE* TO MEASURES OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Social Participation Measure	0	1	2	DA	
Neighbour					
High	19(37%)	11(20%)	4(17%)	0	.28
Medium	21(41%)	23(43%)	11(46%)	5	
Low	11(21%)	20(37%)	9(37%)	7	
Relative					
High	24(47%)	16(30%)	7(29%)	3	
Medium	14(27%)	18(33%)	6(25%)	5	.26
Low	13(26%)	20(37%)	11(46%)	4	
Friend					
High	14(27%)	12(22%)	6(25%)	5	
Medium	13(26%)	20(37%)	7(29%)	4	.00
Low	24(47%)	22(41%)	11(46%)	3	
Clubs and Social Events					
High	5(10%)	1(2%)	0(0%)	1	
Medium	21(41%)	18(33%)	10(42%)	5	.21
Low	25(49%)	35(65%)	14(58%)	6	
Total Social Participation					
High	21(41%)	10(19%)	2(8%)	1	
Medium	15(29%)	22(41%)	11(46%)	8	.33
Low	15(29%)	22(41%)	11(46%)	3	

*Anomie score is based on two of the five questions of Srole's scale.

Rose (77) asked recent migrants to Minneapolis how many friends they had and how many clubs or organizations they had belonged to at their former residence. These were his measures of social participation. He used Srole's anomie scale and found that it discriminated groups of respondents who reported many friends and many or some organizational affiliations as being less anomic than groups reporting fewer friends and organizational affiliations. He found that the anomie attitudes in question related more closely with reports made concerning organizational affiliations than with the reports of number of friends. Clearly, the same result was found in the present study. Rose, of course, does not differentiate neighbours from friends and consequently the comparison is not really direct.

ARCHITECTURE AND MEASURES OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

An attempt was made to assess whether or not the architectural environment had an influence on the respondent's degree of social participation with neighbours. This proved quite difficult to test.

A section of each of the three estates was chosen for study. Both the architecture of the buildings and the year of original occupation differ among the estates. On all three estates the majority of the respondents had been living there since the year of original occupation. The oldest estate is, in overall appearance,

a very dense settlement of buildings. Tenants were interviewed in three buildings which made up section 'B' of the estate. One of the buildings was four storeys and each of the other two six storeys high. All three buildings had two entrances and there were two flats on each landing. The two six storey buildings also had a third section. There were two east entrances and a north entrance for each of these two buildings. In the north entrance there were three flats sharing a common balcony on each level.

The second oldest estate had a more open layout than the Bletchley Park Estate and was considerably smaller. The section of this estate chosen for study was made up of maisonettes, essentially double maisonettes in that the building was two maisonettes high. The maisonettes on the lower level opened onto a long common sidewalk and on the second level onto a long common balcony.

The newest estate had an open layout. Three buildings in the section selected were three storeys high and there was one tower block which was 12 storeys high. In the three story buildings there was an outdoor central stairwell with a balcony to the left and the right at each level. There were generally three flats opening onto each balcony.

Despite the difficulties involved and the inevitable possibility of hidden factors, the residents on the three estates were compared for neighbour social participation. In order to give more stability to the relationships, age was controlled. In three of the four age groups, Sturbridge, the five to six year old estate made up of maisonettes, had as many or more respondents in the high and medium categories as either of the other two estates. In the sixty and over age group there were fewer respondents in the low neighbour social participation category on the oldest estate, Bletchley Park, than on Sturbridge, (Table XXX)

The Bletchley Park Estate had a larger percentage of respondents in the high or medium category of neighbour social participation than the newest estate, Cocklyn, for all age categories except the 40-49 year olds. As the type of buildings on these two estates was essentially the same, the explanation in this case seems to be due to the age of the estate. On the Bletchley Park Estate the majority of the respondents had been living there since it was first occupied, 12 years earlier. On the Cocklyn Estate, most of the respondents had also been living there since it was first occupied three years ago.

TABLE XXX

ESTATE AND NEIGHBOUR SOCIAL PARTICIPATION - BY AGE[*]

Age Neighbour Social Participation	Bletchley	Sturbridge	Cocklyn
19-39			
High	4(80%)	15(94%)	10(77%)
Low	1(20%)	1(6%)	3(23%)
40-49			
High	11(65%)	11(69%)	11(69%)
Low	6(35%)	5(31%)	5(31%)
50-59			
High	6(55%)	5(63%)	4(44%)
Low	5(45%)	3(38%)	5(56%)
60 & Over			
High	10(71%)	5(63%)	2(25%)
Low	4(29%)	3(38%)	6(75%)

[*] High and medium neighbour social participation were combined to increase the size of the categories and thus hopefully to make the data more readable.

The age of the estate seems to be associated with neighbour social participation except when the architecture is such that it particularly stimulates interaction through forced physical and eye contact. In this case, the architectural factor may be more important than the age of the estate. There is far more forced physical and eye contact on the Sturbridge Estate, because of the very long balconies with about ten flats opening on the balcony, than on either of the other two estates.

When the three building types are compared, the 19-39 year olds living in the maisonettes are found to have a higher percentage with high or medium neighbour social participation than the same age group in any other type of building. (Table XXXI) Those 40-49 year olds living in the tower block are least heavily represented in the low neighbour social participation range when compared with their age group types of buildings. There are about the same percentage of 50-59 year olds with low neighbour participation in the maisonettes and tower block whereas those in the three to six storey building show a considerably higher percentage with low neighbour participation. Those respondents aged 60 and over living in the maisonettes or three to six storey buildings had a far better chance of having high or medium participation with neighbours than those in the tower block.

TABLE XXXI

TYPE OF BUILDING AND NEIGHBOUR SOCIAL PARTICIPATION – BY AGE*

Age Neighbour Social Participation	Type of Building		
	Maisonette	3-6 Story Building	Tower Block
19-39			
High	15(94%)	11(79%)	3(75%)
Low	1(6%)	3(21%)	1(25%)
40-49			
High	11(69%)	17(63%)	5(83%)
Low	5(31%)	10(37%)	1(17%)
50-59			
High	5(63%)	8(47%)	2(67%)
Low	3(38%)	9(53%)	1(33%)
60 & Over			
High	5(63%)	11(65%)	1(20%)
Low	3(38%)	6(35%)	4(80%)

*See footnote of Table XXX

Thus, the youngest age group had a higher neighbour participation when they lived in the maisonettes whereas the oldest age group had a higher participation with neighbours when they lived in the three to six storey buildings or maisonettes. The 40-49 and 50-59 year olds tended to have a higher social participation if they lived in the tower block. It should be noted that the numbers for the tower block are small, and, thus, the investigator is reluctant to place much emphasis on the above comparisons.

In view of the fact that most respondents lived in either maisonettes or 3-6 storey buildings, the figures for these two groups should bear comparison. It was found that those living in the maisonettes had a better chance of having high or medium social participation than those in the 3-6 storey buildings for every age group except the 60 and overs. With the latter group the frequencies were about the same for each type of building.[12]

----

[12] Westergaard and Glass (100) found in their study of Lansbury that apparently one reason for leaving Lansbury was the disadvantages of living in a flat. "...When we looked at the record of the first tenants in the exhibition area, that of households who arrived in 1951 and 1952, we found that over a third of the 'flat dwellers' in that group had left Lansbury by the end of 1958, as compared with just over a quarter of those in maisonettes - whether on ground level or above - and only about a fifth of those in houses." P. 185.

In conclusion, there seems to be little doubt that Sturbridge is the estate and maisonettes the architectural type which exert the greatest influence upon social participation with neighbours. It appears that the long balconies encourage eye and physical contact. Also, the fact that most of the respondents from Sturbridge had lived there for five to six years may have played a role as this time period would have permitted them to adjust to living on the estate, meet neighbours and establish relationships. Of course, it should be remembered that the ideal situation for testing the effects of the architectural environment on social participation would be to control for the architecture of the buildings, year of original occupation, and the respondent's length of residence.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. DEGREE OF INFORMAL AND FORMAL SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

The primary aim of this study was to determine the variations
in the degree of informal and formal social participation of working
class housewives living on council housing estates in the inner
city. The data were collected by means of an interview schedule
with six undergraduates and the investigator doing the interviewing.
The findings of this study are now summarized.

The school of sociologists, such as Tonnies, Durkheim, Simmel
and Wirth, who took the more conventional view of the city,
emphasized the impersonality of relationships in the city. The
data of this study indicated that the housewives living on council
housing estates in the inner city were not isolated from one another,
on the other hand they did not share regularly the intimate relations
that are associated with folk societies and rural villages. The
housewives were generally friendly with each other, at least on the
rather surface level of saying "hello" and knowing one anothers'
names. Exchanging and borrowing was practiced by just less than
half of the respondents. Deeper relationships such as inviting

135

at least one neighbour in for a cup of tea were shared by 40% of
the respondents. About a quarter of the respondents had a neighbour
who was a best friend. Although the estates are not village type
communities the housewives do have contact with their neighbours.

Thus, the housewives social relations with her neighbours are
not totally segmental or secondary as, for example, Tonnies,
Durkheim, Simmel and Wirth would have predicted; but neither are
they only quasi-primary as Gans would have hypothesized. Almost
all the housewives reported sharing quasi-primary relations with
neighbours, but close to half also reported sharing primary
relations with neighbours. It seems from these findings that
these urban housewives are neither totally isolated; but nor do
they share the intimacy of a folk society type culture with their
neighbours nor have only quasi-primary relations with their
neighbours. The situation seems to be one in which most share
quasi-primary and almost half share primary relations with their
neighbours.

Relatives appear to play an important role in the social
participation of these housewives. Contrary to what might have
been predicted by Tonnies, for example, relations with kin outside
the immediate nuclear family seem to remain strong. Almost all
the respondents had seen at least one relative in the four weeks
preceding the interview. As Axelrod (2) has argued, although many

of the functional prerequisites which previously bound members of
the extended kinship group into a unity may no longer exist, the
family apparently continues as a most important form of informal
association. Urban man, or rather woman, apparently does get
together with his relatives more frequently than on ceremonial
occasions such as christenings, marriages, and funerals.

Social relations with friends seem to be of relatively small
importance for the inner city working class housewife. About 40%
had not seen any friends at all in the past four weeks. This is
in contrast to studies of higher status populations which have
shown that housewives place social participation with friends at
a high priority.

Going places or using facilities regularly seemed to be a
means of social participation for these women. Most of them
reported meeting people they knew regularly at the market, the
local shops, the laundramat, the park, etc. As has been shown in
other studies, the working class housewife seems to place little
importance on attending social events and formal organizations as a
means for social interaction.

II. SOCIAL PARTICIPATION AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Demographic Characteristics

The following demographic characteristics were related to the respondents' level of social participation: age, family type, length of residence on the estate, the location of the respondent's schooling as a child, and the housewives working status.

The youngest respondents, aged 19-39 years old, were more active in all areas of social participation than any other age group. With each subsequent age group social participation decreased. This association was particularly cogent to social participation with neighbours and relatives. In the case of friends and participation at clubs, social events and places of unplanned activity the youngest respondents were the most active, but there was little difference in the degree of participation of the other three age groups.

The marriage bond, rather than the presence of children in the household, seemed to be the important determinant in the respondents participation with extended kin. Married women without children were just about as active with relatives as married women with children. The women alone, whether they had children or not, were particularly distant from relatives when compared to the married women.

A women alone without any children seems to have the need
and possibly the freedom of mobility to be more active with friends
than any of the other family types. The married women with
children were the next most active, while married women without
children and women alone with children had a low level of participa-
tion with friends. The same pattern held in the instance of un-
planned interaction, and in participation in clubs and social
events. The women alone without children were more active than
any other groups, followed by the married women with children,
women alone with children, and finally married women without
children.

Length of residence on the estate and participation with
neighbours was positively related. The longer the respondent had
lived on the estate the more likely she was to have high or medium
social participation. If age or family type or architecture had
been controlled for, it was felt that the association would have
been greater. There was no association between length of residence
on the estate and any other measure of social participation.

Long familiarity with the district in which the respondent was
currently living proved an important factor in the respondent's
degree of social participation with neighbours and relatives. Those
who as children had gone to school in the same district as the
estate where they were now living had a higher social participation

with neighbours and relatives than those who as children had gone
to school elsewhere. It seems that familiarity with a district
since childhood is of greater importance to neighbour and relative
social participation than, for example, living on the same estate
for ten years. There was not enough association to indicate that
the respondent's location of schooling was related to her participa-
tion with friends and places of unplanned interaction, clubs and
social events.

The respondent's working status had less association with
measures of participation than might have been anticipated. There
was no association between the respondent's working status and
degree of participation with neighbours or with relatives. Those
who were not employed were more likely to participate with friends
than those who worked, and more likely to participate at places of
unplanned interaction, clubs and social events.

Attitudes

A respondent's degree of social participation is generally
positively related to her attitude towards living on the estate and
towards life in general. There was some association between the
individual measure of social participation and self-report of
happiness with living on the estate. The association was most
pronounced with the index of total social participation.

Those who were satisfied with the estate as a place to live had more participation with relatives and at places of unplanned interaction, clubs and social events than those who were dissatisfied. There was little association between neighbour participation and level of satisfaction with the estate; nor was there an association with participation with friends. It was the investigator's impression that the respondents had not interpreted the question concerning satisfaction with the estate as the investigator had intended.

The more active a respondent the less likely she was to be anomic. This association held for all measures of social participation except participation with friends, where there was essentially no association.

Architecture

The age of the estate seems to be associated with neighbour social participation except when the architecture is such that it particularly stimulates interaction through forced physical and eye contact. In the latter case the architectural factor may have a greater influence on the degree of neighbour participation than the age of the estate.

Three types of buildings were compared: maisonettes, three
to six storey flats, and a tower block. The bulk of the respondents
lived in the first two types. When the respondents living in the
maisonettes and three to six storey buildings were compared,
controlling for age, it was found that those living in the
maisonettes had a higher social participation with neighbours than
those in the three to six storey buildings. This is felt to be a
consequence of the far greater physical and eye contact in the
maisonettes. The respondents in the tower block tend to have
either less than or about the same degree of social participation
with neighbours for each category of age as those in the maisonettes.
However, the numbers for those in the tower block were so small
as to make the data inconclusive.

III. "SENSE OF COMMUNITY"

It was stated in Chapter I that there seem to be three types
of community: village, town and non-community. There seems to be
very little doubt that a non-community existed on all three of the
estates studied. There was no indication that the respondents
knew the majority of the tenants in their building, let alone on
the entire estate. That is not to say that the respondents knew
none of their neighbours. There was no sense of the group feeling
of "we" which Tonnies describes as being characteristic of the

rural community. In this sense the traditional theorists seem to

be correct in'their assumptions that the group feelings and

identity of the village do not exist in the city. One could hardly

call the housewives interviewed on the three estates "urban

villagers".

Each housewife does, however, seem to have her own social

network. The social network included neighbours at varying levels

of intimacy depending on the respondent. This seems to be, at

least in part, a consequence of the very small number of respondents

who had kin living on the same estate. In studies of the working

class where a community approaches a village type, there are

generally extensive kinship patterns within the community, which

help to bind the community together in an interconnected network

of primary relationships.

It is often suggested that tenants in estates in the inner

city are happier keeping themselves to themselves, and not being a

part of a community such as that which exists in the town or village.

The fact that self-report of happiness with one's living condition

is related to total social participation seems to rule out that

possibility. To make this point clearer, the respondents were

asked whether, if they had a free choice, they would want a neighbour

with whom they could share secondary, quasi-primary, primary, or

intimate primary social relations. The results, shown below, seem to be an added indication that these respondents would prefer belonging to a town or village community than a non-community because the majority want some form of primary relationships with their neighbours rather than secondary ones which are more likely to be found in the non-community.

TABLE XXXII

IDEAL NEIGHBOUR TYPE

Secondary 37 (27%)

Quasi-Primary .... 16 (12%)   3 respondents
                                              didn't know or
Primary .... 17 (12%)   didn't answer

Intimate 68 (49%)

The theories of Tonnies, Durkheim, Simmel and Wirth do not seem to apply to the case of the working class housewives living on a council housing estate in the inner city. She is not totally isolated, she does have contacts with her neighbours, even beyond the quasi-primary relation that Gans predicted, and she does interact with extended kin and to some extent with friends and in clubs, social events and places. However, the conditions on the estates do fit into these theorists' beliefs that the rural and town type

community will break down in the city in the sense that there would be little group identity and an emphasis on individualism.

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The following conditions of this study limit the extent to which possible generalizations can be drawn from it.

1. The conclusions apply directly only to a section of each of three working class council estates located on the north side of central London. How representative they are for central London or large cities in general cannot be assessed.

2. The entire study was built around verbal responses obtained and recorded by student inverviewers and the investigator.

3. The fact that friends, other than neighbours, were not differentiated from co-workers may have influenced the relation between participation with friends and other variables.

4. The small size of the sample prevented a sophisticated statistical analysis of the data.

5. The fact that the interviewing was done during June and July may have biased the responses. People may tend to be more active in all categories of social participation during the summer when the weather is generally more pleasant than any other season of the year.

V. IMPLICATIONS

In introducing this study it was suggested that

> "If it can be shown that certain demographic
> characteristics are related to increased social
> participation, and if certain architectural
> designs, layouts, and building types can be
> shown to be better suited to social participa-
> tion than others, and if a high degree of
> social participation is shown to increase the
> likelihood of positive attitudes, then social
> planners should be able to plan an inner city
> estate where the chances of social participa-
> tion would be increased and, thus, also the
> positive attitudes of the housewives."

It has been shown that age, family type, length of residence, and familiarity with the district through schooling as a child were related to social participation. An architectural design that forces eye and physical contact also seems to be better suited to high or medium social participation than others. A higher degree of social participation was shown to increase the likelihood of positive attitudes.

It would seem that social planners should be able to use this information to plan an inner city estate where the chances of social participation would be increased and thus, the positive attitudes of the housewives. This does not mean that urban planners should expect to be able to create the village community in the city. A town-type community, however, would seem to be realistic. In this

case, there would be more then one social group in the geographic area and the majority of social relations would be mainly of a face-to-face nature. However, there would also be a considerable number of residents who rarely, if ever, came into contact with one another.

In conclusion, social planning should place more emphasis on creating conditions which increase the possibilities for social participation.

VI. FURTHER QUESTIONS

The investigator feels that the questions which prompted this study have been shown to be an important one requiring further investigation. Many of todays urban problems involve devising new plans to solve the ills of the centre city population. Further investigation is required in this area, but new and more accurate means of measuring must be found. This is especially true in measuring the intimacy of social relations, the attitudes of happiness, satisfaction and anomie, and in trying to determine the influence of a particular type of architecture on the social relations of the residents. Further investigation is needed to understand the effects of environmental structures in dense urban settings on social participation patterns and mental attitudes.

APPENDIX A

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The possible responses are given wherever the question asked
the respondent to choose one of several pre-selected responses.

Study number:

Estate:

Name of building:

Flat number:

Floor:

Date:

Time started:

STANDARD INTRODUCTION

We are from the University of London and want to know what
people feel about living in this neighbourhood. All the information
will be kept confidential.

If necessary the following was also stated.

We believe that by collecting information about how you feel
towards your housing, better houses can be built in the future.

We plan to use the material to write a report abour your
experiences and those of other families for the University of
London. All the information you give will appear anonymously.

Many of the questions are statements of opinion and have no
right or wrong answers.

1.   First, would you tell me what you like and what you

dislike about this part of the city?

2. a. Is there anything you particularly like about the interior design of your home?

    b. IF YES, could you name the three things you like the most?

    c. Is there anything you particularly dislike about the interior design of your home?

    d. IF YES, could you name the three things you dislike the most?

    e. And what about the building itself?

3. Do you think the childrens' play areas on the estate are adequate or inadequate?

4. What do you think about the grass areas, the open spaces of the estate that is?

5. a. Would you describe this estate as very beautiful, beautiful, attractive, fairly attractive or ugly?

    b. Why?

6. a. Now could you tell me a little about yourself? Are you from this area originally, that is, were you born here?

    b. Where did you do most of your schooling?

7. And where did your mother live before she was married? IF IN LONDON which section? IF NOT IN LONDON which Town, County, Country?

8. Can you tell me where you lived before moving to this estate? IF LONDON which section? IF NOT LONDON which Town, County, Country?

9. a. What kind of place was it? private house, communal flat, self-contained flat, maisonette, other.

    b. And who did you pay your rent to? council, landlord, private.

10. a. How long have you lived on this estate?

    b. Have you always lived in this (flat), (maisonette)?

    c. IF NO, where else on this estate have you lived?

d. Could you tell me briefly why you moved? (social, health, physical layout of accomodation).

11.   Did you know anyone on the estate before you moved in?

12.   Do you see more or less of your neighbours now then before you moved to this estate? More, Less, Same.

13.   Do you find this a friendly place to live?

14. a. Now could you tell me a little about your relationships with other people in this area? How many of the people in your neighbourhood do you say 'hello' or 'good morning' to when you meet on the street?

b. And how many others who live in this neighbourhood, but not in this building?

15. a. With how many of your neighbours would you exchange or borrow things -- magazines, tools, dishes, recipes, food?

b. How often?

16.   Have you ever had help from any of your neighbours in time of sickness or a crisis? IF YES, from one, or more than one neighbour? IF NO, what about in an emergency; would you be able to call on any of your neighbours? From one or more than one?

17. a. How many of your neighbours would you call on to help you if you were sick for even as long as a month?

b. How many relatives?

c. Which relatives?

d. How many friends who don't live on the estate?

18. a. How many of the names of the families in your building do you know?

b. And how many on other parts of the estate?

19. a. Do you and any of your neighbours go to films, outings, or anything like that together?

b. IF YES, how often?

20. a. Do you have any of your neighbours into your home for

a casual cup of tea?

   b. About how many?

   c. How often?

  21. What three people in this building do you see the most of socially; that is, someone with whom you would at least pass the time of day?

  22. a. Is there anyone on the estate you would consider a best friend; in other words, someone with whom you could discuss personal problems such as difficulties with your children, husband, money, and so on?

   b. IF YES, do you have more than one best friend on this estate?

   c. How long have you known your best friend(s)?

   d. Where did you meet?

   e. How often do you see your best friend(s)?

  23. Whom do you consider to be the closest person to you; in other words the first person you would want to contact in a crisis? IF SHE SAYS HUSBAND, SPECIFY other than your husband.

  24. Do you ever get together with a group of your neighbours? For example to organize bazaars or activities for the children.

  25. a. Is there any place you go to regularly where you meet people you know, such as a public house, corner shop, fish and chip shop, park, market, other?

   b. How often?

  26. a. Do you go to any social events where you meet people you know such as bingo parties, evening classes, other?

  27. a. Did you go out any evening in the last seven days?

   b. IF YES, who went with you?

  28. a. Do you have any friends who do not live in this building, but who do live on this estate? IF YES, let's start with the friend you see most frequently.

   b. Where does he or she live?

      c. When did you last see him/her?

      d. IF SEEN IN LAST FIVE YEARS, how often do you see him/
her?

      e. Where did you meet?

      f. How long have you known one another?

The questions b through f were asked for other friends that the
respondent mentioned.

   29. a. Do you have any friends who do not live on this
estate? IF YES, let's start with the friend you see most frequently.

      b. Where does he or she live?

      c. When did you last see him/her?

      d. IF SEEN IN LAST FIVE YEARS, how often do you see him/
her?

      e. Where did you meet?

      f. How long have you known one another?

The questions b through f were asked for other friends that the
respondent mentioned.

   30. a. Now I would like to ask some questions about your
close relatives. First, are your parents living?

      b. Are your husband's parents living?

      c. How many brothers and sisters do you have who are living?

      d. How many brothers and sisters does your husband have who
are living?

      e. Do you have any children over 15 who are living at home?

For all living relatives mentioned in a through e, the following
questions were asked.

      f. Where does he or she live?

      g. When did you last see him/her?

      h. Where did you last see him/her?

      i. IF SEEN IN LAST FIVE YEARS, how often do you see him/her?

      j. Lastly, are there any immediate relatives you see
regularly whom you haven't mentioned? IF YES, c through i were asked.

30. a. Do you belong to any clubs, organizations or societies?

b. IF YES, could you tell me the name(s) of the club(s) you belong to?

c. Have you ever been on any committee(s)?

d. How often do you attend?

e. Do you belong to the tenant's organization? IF YES, how often do you attend meetings?

31. What do you think of the tenant's organization?

32. a. What do you think of the Community Centre on this estate?

b. Do you ever attend any meetings there?

c. IF YES, about how often do you attend meetings there?

33. Now I would like to ask some questions about yourself, your circumstances and your household. By that I mean the people who live with you (i.e. eat together and sleep in the same house). Do you mind telling me who they are one by one? First of all, let's start with you. Age, sex, marital status, working status, working hours, occupation, and where employed. The respondents were then asked about each member of the household to whom it was applicable.

34. Can you give me an idea what your total weekly income is? 5 pound, three pound, 10 pound, 15 pound, 20 pound.

35. IF MARRIED, you told me earlier where you were born; now could you tell me where your husband was born?

36. What is your religion?

37. AT what age did your full-time schooling finish?

38. Have you thought about what jobs your children are likely to follow?

39. IF CHILDREN STILL AT SCHOOL, do you think they will stay on at school after they reach 15?

40. To what extent have you become friendly with the parents of your children's friends?

41.   Some people say, "It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future." Do you agree or disagree?

42.   Some people say, "These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on." Do you agree or disagree?

43.   On the whole would you say that you are very happy, fairly happy, rather unhappy, or very unhappy here?

44.   Have you ever thought of moving? IF YES, have you ever taken any steps whatsoever in considering a move, including speaking to someone about a transfer or merely looking at advertisements? IF YES, where would you like to move?

45.   a. Has living here brought you any special happiness or pleasure?

        b. IF YES, would you mind telling me a little about this?

46.   a. Has living here brought you any special worries, problems, or anxieties?

        b. IF YES, would you tell me a little about them?

47.   Lastly, I would like to ask some questions about this area of the estate. How would this area of the estate be rated as a place to live in? Excellent, good, fair or poor.

48.   Do you feel this is a good place to raise children?

49.   a. Are the people in this area of the estate of the same kind or do they differ?

        b. Do you think that many different types of people can all live together happily in the same building?

50.   Do you think this neighbourhood is getting better or getting worse?

51.   If you had a free choice, which one of the following kinds of neighbour would you choose?

        i. Someone to whom you simply say 'hello' or 'good morning' to when you meet on the street;

        ii. Someone with whom you could borrow and lend, in an emergency, but whom you would not invite into your home;

iii. Someone with whom you could go out with in the evenings and visit in one-anothers homes'

iv. Someone who could be a best friend and with whom you could discuss your personal problems.

52.   "In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average person is getting worse, not better." Do you agree or disagree?

53.   Some people say, "There's little use writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average person." Do you agree of disagree?

54.   Some people say, "Now-a-days a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself." Do you agree or disagree?

55.   If you had the opportunity, what sort of changes would you make on this estate?

MAIN REFERENCES USED

1.   Arensberg, C. M. and Kimball, S. T., "Community Study: Retrospect and Prospect," Amer. J. Sociol. 73, 1968, pp. 691-705.

2.   Axelrod, M., "Urban Structure and Social Participation," Amer. Sociol. Rev. 21, 1956, pp. 13-19.

3.   Bell, W. and Boat, M. D., "Urban Neighborhoods and Informal Social Relations," Amer. J. Sociol. 62, 195, pp. 391-398.

4.   Bernard, J., "An Instrument for the Measurement of Neighborhood with Experimental Applications," The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, XVIII, No. 2, 1937, pp. 145-159.

5.   Bernard, J., "Social-Psychological Aspects of Community Study: Some Areas Comparatively Neglected by American Sociologists," Brit. J. Sociol. 2, 1951, pp. 12-30.

6.   Bott, E., Family and Social Networks, Tavistock Publications London: 1957.

7.   Bracey, H. E., Neighbours, On New Estates and Subdivisions in England and U.S.A., Routledge and Kegan Paul, London: 1964.

8.   Broady, M., "The Organization of Coronation Street Parties," Sociol. Rev. N.S. 4, 1956, pp. 65-75.

9. Caplow, T. and Forman, R., "Neighborhood Interaction in a Homogeneous Community," Amer. Sociol. Rev. 15, 1950, pp. 357-366.

10. Centre for Urban Studies, "Tall Flats in Pimlico," London Aspects of Change, MacGibbon and Kee London: 1964.

11. Chapin, F. S., Experimental Designs in Sociological Research, Harper & Brothers Publishers, London, 1947.

12. Chapin, F. S., "The Effects of Slum Clearance and Rehousing on Family and Community Relationships in Minneapolis," Amer. J. Sociol. 43, 1938, pp. 744-763.

13. Cooley, C. H., Social Organization, Charles Scribner's Sons New York: 1929.

14. Costner, H. L., "Criteria for Measures of Association," Amer. Sociol. Rev. 30, 1965, pp. 341-353.

15. Curtis, R. F., Timbers, D. M. and Jackson, E. F., "Prejudice and Urban Social Participation," Amer. J. Sociol. 73, 1967, pp. 235-244.

16. Davey, A. W., Ed., Housing, Annual Review, Metropolitan Borough of St. Pancras, London, 1964.

17. Dewey, R., "The Rural-Urban Continuum: Real but Relatively Unimportant," Amer. J. Sociol. 66, 1960, pp. 60-66.

18. Dotson, F.,"Patterns of Voluntary Associations Among Urban Working-Class Families," Amer. Soc. Rev. 16, 1951, pp. 687-693.

19. Durant, R., Watling, King London: 1939.

20. Durkheim, E., The Division of Labor in Society, The Free Press: New York, 1964.

21. Evan, W. M.,"Dimensions of Participation in Voluntary Associations," Social Forces, 36, 1957, pp. 148-153.

22. Fanning, D. M., "Families in Flats," Brit. Med. J. 4, 1967, pp. 382-386.

23. Fellin, P. and Litwak, E., "Neighborhood Cohesion Under Conditions of Mobility," Amer. Sociol. Rev. 28, 1963, pp. 364-376.

24. Festinger, L., Schacter, S. and Back, K., Social Pressures in Informal Groups, Harper New York: 1950.

25. Firth, R., Two Studies of Kinship in London, The Athlone Press London: 1956.

26. Foley, D. L., "Neighbors or Urbanities?," ("University of Rochester's Studies of Metropolitan Rochester," No. 2, Rochester: Department of Sociology, University of Rochester, 1952) (Mimeographed).

27. Frankenberg, R., Communities in Britain, Penguin Books Ltd., 1966.

28. Fried, M. and Gleicher, P., "Some Sources of Residential Satisfaction in an Urban Slum," J. Amer. Institute Planners, 27, 1961, pp. 305-315.

29. Gans, H. J., The Balanced Community," J. Amer. Institute Planners, 27, No. 3, 1961, pp. 176-184.

30. Gans, H. J., The Urban Villagers, The Free Press, New York: 1962.

31. Gans, H. J., "Urbanism and Suburbanism as ways of Life," Human Behavior and Social Processes, Rose, Arnold (Eds.) London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

32. General Register Office, Census 1961, England and Wales, Education Tables, London: H.M.S.O., 1966.

33. General Register Office, Census 1961, England and Wales, Greater London Tables, London: H.M.S.O., 1966.

34. General Register Office, Census 1961, England and Wales, Occupation Tables, London: H.M.S.O., 1966.

35. General Register Office, Classification of Occupations 1966, London: H.M.S.O., 1967.

36. Glass, R., "Housing Rents Survey, Report of the Centre for Urban Studies," Housing-Rents Study Report on the Preliminary Enquiry, Centre for Urban Studies, University College, London, 20 June 1966.

37. Glass, R., "Urban Sociology in Great Britain: A Trend Report," Current Sociol. 4, 1955, pp. 5-19.

38. Goldhamer, H., "Some Factors Affecting Participation in Voluntary Associations," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1943.

39. Goode, W. J. and Hatt, P. K., Methods in Social Research, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., 1952.

40. Goodman, L. A. and Kruskal, W. H., "Measures of Association for Cross Classifications," Journal of the American Statistical Association, 49, 1954, pp. 732-764.

41. Gough, H. G., "Predicting Social Participation," The Journal of Social Psychology, 35, 1952, pp. 227-233.

42. Greer, S., "Urbanism Reconsidered: A Comparative Study of Local Areas in a Metropolis," Amer. Sociol. Rev. 21, 1956, pp. 19-25.

43. Guterman, S., "In Defense of Wirth's 'Urbanism as a Way of Life'", Amer. J. Sociol. 1969, 74, pp. 493-499.

44. Harrington, M., "Co-operation and Collusion in a Group of Young Housewives," Sociological Review, 12, 1964, pp. 255-281.

45. Herbertson, D., "LePlay and Social Science," The Sociological Review, 12, 1920, pp. 36-42 and pp. 108-110; 13, 1921, pp. 46-48.

46. Hodge, R. W. and Treiman, D. J., "Social Participation and Social Status," _Amer. Sociol. Rev._ 33, 1968, pp. 722-740.

47. Hodges, M. W. and Smith, C. S., "The Sheffield Estate," _Neighbourhood and Community_, Liverpool: University Press, 1954.

48. Jefferys, M., "Londoners in Hertfordshire," _London Aspects of Change_, Centre for Urban Studies, London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1964.

49. Kerr, M., _The People of Ship Street_, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958.

50. Komarovsky, M., "The Voluntary Associations of Urban Dwellers," _Amer. Sociol. Rev._ 11, 1946, pp. 686-698.

51. Kuper, L. (Ed.), _Living in Towns_, London: The Cresset Press, 1953.

52. Lipman, A., "Some Problems of Direct Observation in Architectural Social Research," _The Architects Journal Information Library_, 12 June 1968, pp. 1349-1356.

53. Litwak, E. and Szelenyi, I., "Primary Group Structures and Their Functions: Kin, Neighbours, and Friends," _Amer. Sociol. Rev._ 1969, pp. 465-481.

54. Litwak, E., "Voluntary Associations and Neighborhood Cohesion," _Amer. Sociol. Rev._ 26, 1961, pp. 258-271.

55. Lockwood, D., "Sources of Variation in Working Class Images
    of Society," Sociol. Rev., N.S. 14, 1966, pp. 249-267.

56. Lowenthal, M. F. and Haven, C., "Interaction and Adaptation:
    Intimacy as a Critical Variable," Amer. Sociol. Rev.
    33, 1968, pp. 20-30.

57. Lowenthal, M. F., "Social Isolation and Mental Illness in Old
    Age," Amer. Sociol. Rev. 29, 1964, pp. 54-70.

58. Lynd, R. and Lynd, H., Middletown, New York: Harcourt, Brale
    and Company, 1929.

59. Mann, P. H., An Approach to Urban Sociology, London: Routledge
    and Kegan Paul, 1965.

60. Mann, P. H., "The Concept of Neighbourliness," Amer. J. Sociol.
    60, 1954, pp. 163-168.

61. Minar, D. W. and Greer, S., The Concept of Community,
    Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.

62. Mitchell, G. D. and Lupton, T., "The Liverpool Estate,"
    Neighbourhood and Community, Liverpool: University Press, 1954.

63. Mizruchi, H. E., "Social Structure and Anomie in a Small City,"
    Amer. Sociol. Rev. 25, 1960, pp. 645-654.

64. Mogey, J. M., Family and Neighbourhood: Two Studies in Oxford,
    Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956.

65. Morris, R. N. and Mogey, J., The Sociology of Housing, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.

66. Moser, A., Survey Methods in Social Investigation, Heinemann Educational Books, Ltd., 1958.

67. Neuwirth, G., "A Weberian Outline of a Theory of Community: Its Application to the 'Dark Ghetto'," British Journal of Sociology, 20, 1969, pp. 148-163.

68. Pearsall, P. (Ed.), Geographers' A to Z, Atlas of London, London: Geographers' Map Company, Ltd.

69. Phillips, D. L., "Social Participation and Happiness," Amer. J. Sociol. 1967, pp. 479-488.

70. Phillips, D. L., "Social Participation and Happiness: A Consideration of Interaction Opportunities and Investment," Sociol. Quarterly, 10, 1969, pp. 3-21.

71. Pinot, R., "La classification des especes de la famille etablie par Le Play, est-elle exacte?" Societe Intern. de Science Sociale, Brochure de Propagande, pp. 44-64 as quoted in Sorokin, P. A., Contemporary Sociological Theories (83).

72. Queen, S. A., "Social Participation in Relation to Social Disorganization," Amer. Sociol. Rev. 14, 1949, pp. 251-257.

73. Riemer, S., "Villagers in Metropolis," British J. of Sociology, 2, 1951, pp. 31-43.

74. Riley, M. W., _Sociological Research_, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

75. Riley, M. W., Toby, J., Cohn, R. and Riley, J. W. Jr., "Scale Analysis of Collective Data," _Sociological Research_, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

76. Roper, M. W., "The City and The Primary Group," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1935.

77. Rose, A. M., "Attitudinal Correlates of Social Participation," _Social Forces_, 37, 1959, pp. 202-206.

78. Schmidt, J. F. and Rohrer, W. C., "The Relationship of Family Type to Social Participation," _Marriage and Family Living_, August, 1956, pp. 224-230.

79. Selltiz, C., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M. and Stuart, C. W., _Research Methods in Social Relations_, London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1966.

80. Shuval, J. T., "Class and Ethnic Correlates of Casual Neighbouring," _Amer. Sociol. Rev._ 21, 1956, pp. 453-458.

81. Simmel, G., "The Metropolis and Mental Life," _The Sociology of George Simmel_, Translated by K. H. Wolff, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1950.

82. Smith, J., Form, W. H. and Stone, G. P., "Local Intimacy in a Middle-Sized City," Amer. J. Sociol. 60, 1954, pp. 276-284.

83. Sorokin, P. A., Contemporary Sociological Theories, New York: Harper and Row, 1956.

84. Sorokin, P. A., Society, Culture and Personality, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.

85. Srole, L., "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study," Amer. Sociol Rev. 21, 1956, pp. 709-716.

86. Stacey, M., "The Myth of Community Studies," British Journal of Sociology, 20, 1969, pp. 134-147.

87. Stacey, M., Tradition and Change: A Study of Banbury, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960.

88. Stone, G. P., "City Shoppers and Urban Identification: Observations on the Social Psychology of City Life," Amer. J. Sociol. 60, 1954-55, pp. 35-45.

89. Sussman, M. B., "The Isolated Nuclear Family: Fact or Fiction," Sociol. Problems, 6, 1959, pp. 333-340.

90. Sutcliffe, J. P. and Crabbe, B. D., "Incidence and Degree of Friendship in Urban and Rural Areas," Social Forces, 42, 1963, pp. 60-67.

91. Sweetser, F. L., "A New Emphasis for Neighbourhood Research," *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 1942, pp. 525-533.

92. Taylor, L. and Chave, S., *Mental Health and Environment*, London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1964.

93. Teele, J. E., "An Appraisal of Research on Social Participation," *Sociological Quarterly*, 6, 1965, pp. 257-267.

94. Teele, J. E., "Measures of Social Participation," *Social Problems*, Summer, 1962, pp. 31-38.

95. Tomah, A. K., "Informal Group Participation and Residential Patterns," *Amer. J. Sociol.* 70, 1964, pp. 28-35.

96. Tomah, A. K., "Informal Participation in a Metropolitan Community," *Sociological Quarterly*, 8, 1967, pp. 85-102.

97. Tonnies, F., *Fundamental Concepts of Sociology*, New York: American Book Co., 1940.

98. Wallin, P., "A Guttman Scale for Measuring Women's Neighborliness," *Amer. J. Sociol.* 59, 1953-54, pp. 243-246.

99. Westergaard, J. H., "The Structure of Greater London," *London Aspects of Change*, Centre for Urban Studies, London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1964, pp. 91-144.

100. Westergaard, J. H. and Glass, R., "A Profile of Lansbury," London Aspects of Change, Centre for Urban Studies, London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1964.

101. Williams, J. H., "Close Friendship Relations of Housewives Residing in an Urban Community," Social Forces, May, 1958, pp. 358-362.

102. Willmott, P., The Evolution of a Community, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.

103. Wirth, L., Community Life and Social Policy, "The Scope and Problems of Community," p. 31, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," p. 33, "Localism, Regionalism, Centralization," p. 36, "Urban Communities," p. 38, "Housing as a Field of Sociological Research," p. 38, Marvick, E. W. and Reiss, A. J. Jr. (Eds.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

104. Wright, C. R. and Hyman, H. H., "Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Evidence from National Sample Surveys," Amer. Sociol. Rev. 23, 1958, pp. 284-294.

105. Young, M. and Willmott, P., Family and Kinship in East London, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1957.