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The concern of this study is with residential location. It is contended that while consideration of economic and broad social variables will explain general patterns of segregation, finer differentiation exists which can only be revealed when detailed household characteristics are taken into account. The hypothesis under examination is that the social character of an individual or household has a significant effect on the choice of residential location, people with similar social characteristics grouping together in the same residential area. The hypothesis was tested in two upper income areas of Vancouver, British Columbia - Shaughnessy and British Properties - the expectation being that two distinct groups might emerge, representing an old elite group and a new upper class. Such a distinction was sought in terms of three main variables - mobility, family ties and social background. After interviewing thirty households in each area it was found that two distinct groups did emerge, the Shaughnessy group displaying characteristics attributable to the old upper class - stability, strong family ties and a prestige social background common to all the members - while the British Properties residents were highly mobile, had weak family ties and varied social backgrounds lacking the prestige elements present in the other group, such characteristics being typical of a new elite. These distinct
social groups are shown to be spatially segregated with households of similar characteristics occupying the same residential area.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In the urban area the amount of land devoted to residential use is greater than for any other activity, so that the residential area is an important, integral part of urban structure and further investigation of this one aspect will increase our overall understanding of the whole. Much work has been done in trying to explain the location of different residential areas within the urban area in terms of environmental factors and the relative location of other land uses and facilities in the city. The nature of the housing stock of a city and the different uses to which it has been put through time has also been of interest. The aim of such investigations has been an attempt to reach an understanding of the processes at work in the urban area which are instrumental in shaping residential areas. It is hoped that from greater awareness of these processes, theories will emerge which can usefully be employed in formulating policies to be aimed at alleviating urban problems. Recent emphasis has been on creating for the city's population healthy and attractive urban environments, and it seems necessary that if new residential areas are to be planned, as much information as possible should be obtained from the housing consumer about his needs and preferences.

For those interested in the residential area, the ultimate aim must be to understand the process by which a home is selected by a
household, the motives and factors which influence the final choice. To do this, it is essential to have more information than is provided by aggregate data as from census material. What is in fact needed is data which will incorporate the individual's behaviour. Only in this way can the household's wants and preferences be understood and knowledge of these is vital for effective planning of residential areas to be implemented. In addition to having an awareness of the type of housing which is needed, it is desirable to try to discover people's ideas about residential areas, and take these into account when planning. It might, for example, be a mistake to create communities for mixed social groups if the indications are that segregation of groups with different social characteristics is preferred.

While sociologists are concerned with such questions as socialisation patterns in the city and psychologists with the isolation of the individual in the urban context, and architects with the design of the urban environment, the urban geographer contributes to the research on city problems by investigating the internal structure of the urban area, which refers to "the location, arrangement and interrelationships between social and physical elements in the city". (Bourne, 1971, p. 4) Part of this urban structure is the residential area, and the geographer has been interested in two main aspects: first, the physical form of the area, taking account of the type of houses, their age, style, fabric and so on, and secondly, the location of the area with respect to the
whole city in terms of social composition, accessibility to facilities and services, etc. These can be seen to correspond with the two general areas of consideration which might be examined by a household selecting a home, for not only the features of the house itself, but the nature of the residential area is important. In this study the concern is with the wider implications of the residential area and not with the house types.

The three classic models describing land use patterns in the city and emphasising concentric, sectoral and multiple nuclei forms of spatial structure are well known and it is from these that most of the urban geographer's work has evolved. Burgess (1928) in his descriptive model of urban land use based his work on the idea of differential land values in a city and identified five zones which lay in concentric rings around a core. These five zones of segregation were the central business district, the transition zone, the zone of independent workingmen's homes, the zone of better residences and the commuter zone. The model emphasised the importance of accessibility in producing these patterns, suggesting that when a location in the city is being chosen, the buyer is paying for ease of access to the centre, the nearer to the centre the location, the less the costs of transportation and the higher the land value. The sector model, originally suggested by the land economist Hurd (1903) and later elaborated by Hoyt (1939), was again concerned with accessibility and attempted to explain urban structure in terms
of differential rents. Hoyt's model describes the pattern of land uses as a series of sectors extending out from the central core representing the central business district. The descriptive work of Harris and Ullman (1945), however, suggests, unlike the two previous models, that there is no one basic pattern of ecological structure common to many cities and that urban land uses, instead of concentrating around a single centre, develop around a series of centres or nuclei in a cell-like way.

In each of these models the stress has been on the roles of rent, land values and accessibility in explaining the patterns of land use in the urban area, including the residential use of land, but it can also be noted that in each case distinction is made between types of residential areas which can be identified according to their socio-economic composition. In each of these models, residential areas are described in terms of their socio-economic status. In his concentric zone model, Burgess is generally suggesting that socio-economic status varies directly with distance from the centre, better class residences being found toward the periphery, the zone of workingmen's homes close to the centre. Hoyt describes how residential areas of relative uniform social status originate in sectors near the city centre and then move out toward the periphery in the same sector as growth takes place. He notes that fashionable residential areas migrate along transportation routes and higher ground, the sectors between being filled by lower
class residences. Harris and Ullman too describe distinct high class, medium class and lower class residential cells in their model of urban structure. The importance of socio-economic composition of an area was emphasised with the development of the concept of filtering which evolved from Hoyt's sector theory. This concept was directly concerned with the change in the socio-economic status of an area over time, as fashionable residential areas moved out from the core to new areas and the homes which were left behind were occupied first by middle class and eventually by lower class groups.

Thus, even if only implicitly or at a very general level, these models are making note of the spatial distribution of socio-economic characteristics in the city and are indicating the existence of segregation along socio-economic lines and it is clear that socio-economic composition is a fundamental part of the understanding of residential areas. Further investigation into this aspect should increase understanding not only of the residential area itself but of the residential area as part of the urban structure.

Following on from these basic models, later studies have attempted to explain the location of residential areas in the city in economic terms, stressing again the importance of land values, rent and accessibility.

These were seen as being the most important factors in the location decision and in fact the final location was thought to be determined by the ability of the household, via its income, to cover the land costs.
and costs of transportation at any one location. This basic explanation of the differentiation of residential areas is still relevant, but it should be emphasised that the picture which it presents is a very general one and does not take account of many factors which could allow finer differentiation to be made. These factors certainly lay down the broad limits to the household's range of choice, but it is clear that the household could probably find several areas which are equally satisfying and suitable for its needs if viewed only in these terms. Intuitively it is evident that there are many other factors which affect the location decision and differentiate those areas which are uniformly appealing from a purely economic standpoint. One such factor is the social composition of the residential area.

The important role of the character of the residential area in selection of housing is increasingly being recognised. Gruen writes that the two categories of satisfying attributes of the product occupied by housing consumers are "physical quality and differentiation". Differentiation refers to "locationally determined attributes that separate the market into social areas" and Gruen indicates the importance of this by indicating that dwelling units of identical quality will have a uniform price within a social area, but this price may vary among different social areas, and also that the value of dwelling units can change as its social characteristics change. Since the nature of the social composition of the area affects the value of the house, it is clear that
this is a major factor taken into account when the consumer is buying a house. Thus while the physical form of an area is an important part of its study, its social composition might be even more important, this aspect perhaps overriding the importance of physical form when the residential location choice is being made. The eventual aim must be to determine just how important this factor is, i.e. how large a part it plays in the location decision.

It is not always possible, because of restraints of time and finance, to investigate directly what the major factors have been when a location decision is being made and what are the household's preferences for living space. It is instead often necessary to use data which is easily obtainable and to infer the household's behaviour from the residential patterns existing in the urban area, for the urban landscape reflects countless decisions made by the various decision making groups in the city - individuals, companies, local government, etc. Investigation of residential patterns should thus lead to some indication of the motives behind the decisions.

It has already been indicated that differentiation of residential areas can be outlined in economic terms - land values and transportation costs. Closer examination and consideration of other factors reveals that further differentiation is possible. From discussions of status, the concept of the residential area as a symbol of social position has emerged and it has been noted that the residential address has signifi-
cance and can give apparent prestige. As individuals move up the social scale, and particularly when they reach the upper strata, they feel it necessary that they should move into a residential area which befits their new status. This is usually an area where people of similar social status are to be found. Thus it is found that "like seeks like" and people display a preference for living near others as much like themselves as possible, resulting in the development of what Packard (1969) calls "one-layer communities", whose residents show uniform social characteristics. The social groupings of the urban area as they are expressed spatially have been the subject of much investigation. As has already been suggested, available data is often a problem, but identification of segregated groups along the lines of certain socio-economic characteristics of the population has been achieved. Differentiation is probably most immediately evident along ethnic lines, ethnic minorities in North American cities often having their own distinct residential areas, the most obvious example of this perhaps being the segregation of the black population into ghettos. People's desire to associate with others similar to themselves is reflected in the segregation of households by income or occupation status, people of similar status clustering together in the same neighbourhood. Along these lines, therefore, differentiation of residential areas is possible and the divisions which are achieved are finer than those reached by examining only economic factors,
although the patterns identified in this way would be expected to fit into the broad outlines set initially by the economic considerations. One way to test this would be to identify areas of similar economic value and see whether or not they can be socially differentiated.

The next question to be asked is whether social areas can only be defined in broad terms and along very general lines or is it possible to identify residentially segregated social groups on the basis of detailed analysis of the social characteristics of the residents? Has this not been done because the available data is too imprecise to allow such divisions to appear, or do people cluster with others who show broad similarities only and do not seek out those individuals who resemble them in many detailed ways? It might therefore be interesting to discover just how alike people are within residential areas and to see whether or not further dividing lines can be drawn between areas which possess gross economic similarities and which, using aggregate socio-economic data, would be considered uniform. It may, for example, appear that between areas of similar income or similar occupation status, differences can be observed in terms of other characteristics of the populations.

So far it has been suggested that economic factors such as land values, etc. may produce an initial division of residential areas, that further differentiation is possible when socio-economic characteristics are taken into account and that still further differentiation might become apparent if more detailed knowledge were available about the
social characteristics of the populations of residential areas. If in fact it can be shown that segregation is apparent when detailed examination is made of the social character of households, then more precise pointers as to what a particular household is seeking when choosing its residential location will have been found. It would then be easier to estimate the extent of the influence of the social character of neighbours on the final choice.

The hypothesis which is tested in this study is that people of similar social character group together in the same residential area, and it is investigated through the examination of the social characteristics of households in two residential areas. The study was carried out in Vancouver, British Columbia, where two areas of apparently uniform income and occupation status and similar value of housing were selected, with a view to demonstrating that despite their apparent economic and social uniformity, differences could in fact be identified. Since it has been shown that the clustering of social groups is more pronounced at the extreme upper and lower levels of the social scale, it seemed reasonable to select comparable areas which would fit into one of these two classes. The areas chosen were upper income residential ones, selected because they were easily identifiable. In addition, it was felt that the residents of the upper income areas might be considered to be aware of current urban problems and sympathetic to research aimed at solving them and so more willing to respond to interviews.
Chapter Two is devoted to a critical review of selected literature on residential location, showing the limitations of previous work and indicating how this study constitutes an improvement on it. Chapter Three is concerned with the collection of the data, giving the general character of the sample areas, showing how the characteristics on which differentiation was anticipated were determined and outlining the setting up of the interview schedule. The analysis of the data is presented in Chapter Four, while in the fifth chapter conclusions are drawn.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON RESIDENTIAL LOCATION

In this chapter a selective review of literature will be given to illustrate the factors which have been considered as having significance in the question of residential segregation. There have been two main approaches - an economic approach, taking account of such factors as income, transportation, rent, land values, and a social approach, examining the role of, for example, occupation, education, and family ties.

I Economic Approach

The proponents of the economic approach base their ideas on economic theory, stressing the importance of land values or density of land use and the roles of rent and accessibility in the residential location decision. Park and Burgess (1925) for example, considered that land values, the result of a bidding process by the potential users, were the chief determining factors in land use segregation and determined which areas would be used for residential purposes. Hawley (1950) writes that:

"Familial units are distributed with reference to land values, the location of other types of units and the time and cost of transportation to centers of activity.... The influences of these three factors are combined in a single measure, namely, rental value for residential use." (Hawley, 1950, p. 280.)

Haig too, a land economist writing in the 1920's, emphasises the
importance of accessibility in the residential location decision, suggesting that the individual buys accessibility rather as he would buy consumer goods, such as food or clothing, and continuing this line of reasoning to point out the consequently inevitable complementarity between rent and transportation costs. The land economists, while attempting to create a theory of urban land use, following the model suggested by Von Thunen, nevertheless paid little specific attention to residential location. Attempts to fill this gap have been made by later writers who continue to use the economic approach. Berry, Simmons and Tennant (1963) give a brief but clear outline of the ideas behind the economic approach to urban land use, stating that urban sites can be regarded as offering two goods - land and location - and utility from a site is derived by each urban activity.

"Utility may be translated into ability to pay for that site. The most desirable property of urban sites is centrality... The less central the location, the greater are the transport inputs incurred and the lower the net returns." (Berry, Simmons and Tennant, 1963, pp.391 - 392.)

Alonso (1960, 1964) develops a series of 'bid price curves' which represent a set of combinations of land prices and distance among which the individual is indifferent, this concept being similar to the economists' indifference curve mapping except that Alonso's curves represent not indifference between combinations of quantities of two goods, but the indifference paths between the price of one good (land) and quantities of another good (distance from the centre of a city).
In addition, indifference curves refer only to taste, while bid rent functions include both budget and preference considerations.

"The bid rent curve of the individual will be such that, for any given curve, the individual will be equally satisfied at every location at the price set by the curve. Along any bid rent curve the price the individual will bid for land will decrease with distance from the centre at a rate just sufficient to produce an income effect which will balance to his satisfaction the increased costs of commuting and the bother of a long trip". (Alonso, 1960, p. 154.)

Alonso shows that it is possible to construct bid price curves for business, agriculture and residential land uses, the criterion of satisfaction for the former two being profits, while the household's satisfaction comes in the form of optional location to minimise transport costs:

"A consumer, given his income and his pattern of tastes, will seek to balance the costs and bother of commuting against the advantages of cheaper land with increasing distance from the centre of the city..." (Alonso, 1960, p. 154.)

Having obtained the appropriate bid rent curves, it is then possible to see which areas of land will be used for which land use, for the steeper curves will occupy more central locations, where rents are higher. In preparation of this model, Alonso makes several assumptions, that he is dealing with a featureless plain on which all land is of the same quality; that the buyers and sellers have perfect knowledge and that there are no legal or social restraints, that businesses are seeking to maximise profits and households to maximise satisfaction from their family budget which is fixed and that the landlord will rent to the
highest bidder. All of these are unrealistic assumptions far removed from the workings of the market place, so that the Alonso model, while providing us perhaps with a very general outline of residential location theory, does not serve to give an accurate account of the location decision, with many exceptions to its laws and failing to explain many of the residential patterns which exist.

Still working from an economic point of view, but more directly concerned with residential location perhaps than Alonso, Thompson (1965) emphasises the importance of income along with accessibility in the location decision. He points out that the individual or family has a wide array of possible residential sites from which they can choose and they must consider the cost of various factors at each site in relation to their income:

"Conceptually, the household begins from the objective base of a set of price relatives which apply to each of the various goods and services at each of the many residential sites (e.g. the relative cost of travel to downtown and back, land values and rents, the relative accessibility of open space and outdoor recreation and other living cost differentials at the various residential sites) and from the objective base of his given money income. The householder then proceeds to select from those sites he can afford, that site at which he realises the greatest satisfaction..." (Thompson, 1965, p. 97.)

Taking this line of argument a little further, it can be seen that laying stress on the importance of income in the location decision leads to the position where households with similar incomes would be expected to occupy similar residential sites and perhaps be grouped
in the same residential area, as Thompson himself states:

"If a metropolitan area is divided into many small political entities, then the distribution of income within each of these usually small areas will tend to be quite equal."

and:

"People are inclined to group their residences by income."  
(Thompson, 1965, p. 116.)

Muth (1961, 1969) also stresses the role of income in the location decision, but he too adheres to the school of thought which places the main emphasis on distance and accessibility:

"For any pattern of residential location to be an equilibrium one for each consumer at his optimal location the saving in housing costs from a small change in distance must exactly equal the change in transport costs."  
(Muth, 1961, p. 208.)

The distance deterministic approach is followed too by some writers (Kain, 1962, 1969; Wingo, 1961; Woforth, 1965) through an examination of the journey to work in relation to the residential area chosen, Wingo stating that:

"The crucial locational determinant of household location is its employment linkage with the place of work of the head of the household."  
(Wingo, 1961, p. 197.)

As far as Kain is concerned, the costs of transport for the household travelling to points other than the place of work or travelling within the residential area, i.e. for shopping or recreational purposes, for example, are small and may be ignored, in contrast to the costs of the journey to work which form a significant part of the household's outlay. So important is this distance, that Wingo considers the worker to
receive a wage which is made up of two components, "a pure payment for labor services, the other a premium based on the cost to the marginal worker of overcoming the spatial separation of home and workplace." (Wingo, 1961, p. 200.) A change in residential location thus may have a considerable effect on the household budget, through the changing costs of the journey-to-work, so that "locations in the urban region become differentiated by the extent to which they can yield a saving in transport costs." (Wingo, 1961, p. 198.)

In considerations of distance as the important factor in residential location, the assumptions are made that rent decreases with distance from the centre, while transportation costs increase as we move toward the periphery of the city, so that the household's satisfaction is maximised where the combined outlay for rents and transportation costs are at a minimum. Knowing the sites which minimise rent and transport costs and, in addition, the household's required expenditure for each quantity of residential space, then we have "all the information we must have to enable us to obtain a unique locational solution for each household." (Kain, 1962, p. 143.) Kain's variables are locational rents at each site and transportation costs per mile, from which a third variable - price of residential space - is obtained, incomes, preferences for residential space and preferences for all other goods and services.

Journey-to-work costs are thus considered to be a very important
explanatory variable in many models of residential location. It is sometimes expressed in the form of "spacious living versus easy access" (Hoover and Vernon, 1959) lower residential density being regarded as a superior and desirable good, suggesting that higher income workers should live farther from their workplace than lower income workers.

It is apparent, therefore, that there has been a considerable amount of work done, following an economic approach and based on economic theory, using such concepts as indifference paths and satisfaction and utility theory. The consumer or householder is considered as trying to maximise his satisfaction from his income in the purchase of dwelling space, the costs to be taken into account being the rent of the dwelling space and the transportation costs to his place of work, and possibly also to other areas within the city. These in the opinion of the writers adopting this approach, are the important factors in the residential location decision. The main problem with this body of literature which concerns itself with residential location, as indeed is the problem with the economic theory on which it is based, is that its assumptions are so far removed from actuality, that it can do little more than point to general patterns in the landscape. It considers man as a perfectly rational human being, who, when making a purchase, or, as in this case, when choosing a dwelling space, consciously attempts to maximise the utility of the good or maximise his satisfaction. We know from our own experience that this is not in fact the case, and
that goods are not purchased with any such conscious satisfaction or utility maximising aim in mind. The theory thus does not allow for "peculiarities in human behaviour" (Johnston, 1966) which are important in explaining the choice of a good. A theory based solely on economic theory will not, therefore, be able to explain in detail the residential patterns which are found in the landscape, nor will it be able to draw any fine differentiation between different residential areas.

"It is apparent that the economic model of classical economists... must be discarded in favour of models which consider social realities." (Form, 1954, p. 317.)

II Social Approach

While models which concern themselves largely with economic factors can lay down the broad pattern of residential location within the urban area, nevertheless, these general patterns can be refined by reference to social considerations within the areas, which serve to distinguish one area from the next. The economic approach as we have called it, then, might usefully be considered as leading to the first stage of differentiation of residential areas, while the approach which takes account of social factors, results in a higher degree of differentiation. In this section, therefore, we shall be concerned with the socio-cultural approach, as it is termed by Johnston (1966) or a socio-economic approach as it appears in other works (e.g. Shevky and Bell, 1955; Duncan, 1955;
Robson, 1966; Wheeler, 1968.)

One of the first protagonists of the socio-cultural approach to land uses in the urban context was Firey (1945, 1968) who advocated the importance of sentiment and symbolism in the understanding of the patterns, illustrating his work from the situation in Boston. He believed that space could have a cost imposing character and a sentimental or symbolic value, and in the Beacon Hill residential area of the city it was the aesthetic, historical and familial sentiments which took precedence over the cost factors in explaining the spatial patterns. Jones (1958) too, working in Belfast, stressed the significance of cultural factors in explaining land use patterns.

Residential segregation studies, emphasising social factors, are to be found mainly in sociological works rather than geographical ones. Sociologists have attempted to explain this segregation from the point of view that individuals in a society can be grouped according to several characteristics, e.g. race, religion, socio-economic status, etc.

"Place and nature of work, income, racial and ethnic characteristics, social status, custom, habit, taste preference and prejudice are among the significant factors in accordance with which the urban population is selected and distributed into more or less distinct settlements." (Wirth, 1964, p.74.)

Social interaction within a group is seen to be greater than that among groups, so that:

"On the basis of this evidence it is reasonable to assume that individuals prefer to interact with others who are socially similar to themselves...The result is a partial, but relatively
stable, separation of the major subgroups that comprise the city." (Anderson, 1962, p. 168.)

It is apparent, therefore, that to understand the residential patterns in a city, we must pay attention to the social stratification of the society.

Lack of adequate data has been the major difficulty in the studies of residential location which take account of socio-economic characteristics.

"Analysis of residential segregation is bedevilled by lack of available data. One is forced to use indices which approximate to the variable under consideration - in this case social class." (Robson, 1966. p. 120.)

This being the case, sociologists have been forced to use whatever information was readily available to them, often in the form of census data, to indicate social differentials in the society with which they are dealing. In many English studies of residential segregation (e.g. Robson, 1966) rateable values were used, mainly because they were easily available to the sociologists. They purported to correlate social class, income and rateable value, indicating the high prestige areas and occupation groups, but difficulties arose in that the proportion of income spent on housing was not constant from one class to another; rateable values failed to show differences in life styles; in a rooming house area rateable values failed to give any indication of social class; in addition, households have different proportions of earners and non-earners, which serves to upset the correlation between rateable values
and income and therefore with class. Nevertheless, this measure was widely used, since it was an easily obtainable index.

Discussion of residential areas have also been made, which place emphasis on occupation, describing the residential areas in terms of occupational status. (Duncan and Duncan, 1955; Wheeler, 1968.) The Duncans' study is perhaps the most notable of these. In it they calculate an index of dissimilarity which is used to measure the areal distributions of occupation groups, by calculating for each group the percentage of all workers in that group living in each area unit. The dissimilarity between the groups is then taken to be equivalent to half the sum of the differences between the distributions taken area by area. The study, which is concerned not only with social stratification, but also with spatial stratification, finds a close relationship between spatial and social distances in Chicago and concludes that "residential segregation is greater for groups with clearly defined status than for those with ambiguous status."

Wheeler, in a study of the general occupational structure of residential areas in Pittsburgh, corroborates the findings of the Duncans' study. Kain (1962) too, was concerned with the occupational status of workers, his findings in Detroit showing that highest income workers live in the outer areas of the city, farthest from their workplace, while the lowest income workers live nearest to their place of work.

Further, in some studies of residential segregation, sociologists have used several variables to give some indication of the status of
people with which they are dealing. Lazerivitz (1960), for example, in a study of variations in residential belts* of Chicago, uses several characteristics of the family head - education, occupation, family income, family liquid assets, monthly rental or value of the dwelling unit, age of the family head and the family life cycle. Using more than one characteristic, it is possible to have a more precise differentiation of groups than when only one factor is used. This type of approach resembles the concept of social area analysis which has been widely used as a framework by sociologists to analyse the socio-economic structure of residential areas. First used by Shevky and Bell (1955), this method is designed to provide a systematic classification of residential areas in large cities using census data, which is readily available, and the census tract as the basic unit of study. Each district is given a score, which is derived from a combination of indices, intended to show degrees of social differentiation among the districts' populations. The districts which are found to have similar scores are grouped into what are called social areas. The variables used have been derived from census data, and are fitted into a conceptual framework which Shevky and Bell relate to changes in society through time, the main trend which they see being the change from a rural to an urban society, which they termed 'increasing scale'. The constructs which represent the trends are:-

social rank or economic status, which is derived from measures of
occupation, education and rent;
urbanisation or family status, derived from measures of fertility,
percentage of women in the labour force, single family
dwelling units;
segregation or ethnic status which is measured from place of
nativity or citizenship, indicating the proportions of ethnic
groups in a city.

The three constructs which are used are seen as representative of the
change taking place in society or of increasing scale, which is defined
as an ordering of groups according to occupation, an increasing proportion
of the population being involved in clerical and management occupations
rather than in manual ones; by a decline in family life, brought about
by urbanisation, which has itself been the result of the development
from primary to secondary and then to tertiary industry; and by a clustering
of ethnic groups, which is indicative of increasing complexity of
society and the resulting increasing spatial segregation.

Social area analysis has been criticised mainly on its rationale.
Is, in fact, its theoretical justification valid? Hawley and Duncan
(1957) have questioned the justification, but a later study showed that
the indices had general applicability and could be applied to several
cities (Van Ardsol, Camilleri and Schmid, 1958.) The study, however,
showed that, while the distinguishing feature of the Shevky-Bell method
was that it combined indices in a particular way, equally good results
were achieved without combining census tract measures into the several constructs. Further work, testing the "changing society" aspect of the Shevky-Bell theory, confirms the social rank and urbanisation constructs, but disputes that of segregation. (Udry, 1964.) Udry reaches these conclusions after an examination of trends in the United States between 1850 and 1960 and finds that the model is partially supported up to 1940. He asserts that the real question which Shevky and Bell are asking is "What will be the axes of functional differentiation of sub-areas of a society?" which is not logically based on a theory of the development of industrial society, i.e. a theory of increasing scale:

"I suggest that we consider these two separate but co-ordinated theories: one a theory of increasing scale; the other, using the same axes and variables, but not deducible from the first, a theory of sub-area differentiation." (Udry, 1964, p. 408.)

Again, there is the suggestion that a theoretical base is not necessary, but what is required is a factor analysis of census tract data, from which a typology can be derived, and in this way, criticisms such as those of Hawley and Duncan be met. Bell and Moskos (1964), however, were not satisfied that Udry had demonstrated conclusively that the two theories were not one, and emphasise that Shevky is considering long term trends and not short term fluctuations, which Udry had studied. It is generally agreed, however, that the theory is too vague and should be elaborated.
As the method has been applied (Bell, 1955; Anderson & Egeland, 1961; Herbert & Fielding, 1967) the construct of social rank has come to be associated with sectoral patterns of residential land use and urbanisation with concentric patterns, as for example in the Anderson and Egeland study, which reports a statistical comparison of the concentric zone and sector hypotheses of urban residential structure, where residential structure is measured by the prestige value (social rank) and urbanisation indices of Shevky and Bell. (Anderson & Egeland, 1961.) The conclusions of the report were that urbanisation varies concentrically by distance from the centre, while social rank varies sectorally, with very little distance variation.

It has already been suggested that it is possible to make use of census data through component analysis, without a theoretical basis. This process has been outlined by Herbert (1967, 1968) in an article concerning "diagnostic variables in the analysis of urban structure," where he suggests that component analysis attempts to achieve objectively and statistically what social area analysis does deductively. This method was applied by Nicholson and Yeates (1969) to socio-economic data of Winnipeg, isolating out a number of components or factors which could be thought of as producing most of the variation. The conclusions to this study report findings which generally support the existence of social area analysis dimensions as viable forms of socio-economic variation in Winnipeg, one component being similar to social rank,
another to urbanisation and several others taken together, resembling the segregation construct. Murdie (1969) applied a factor analytic model to census data for Metropolitan Toronto to determine the dimensions of socio-economic differentiation and attempted too to outline the changes which took place in the city between 1951 and 1961. The population was found to be differentiated by family status, economic status and zones of recent growth and a relatively stable ecological structure was found to have existed.

Some of the criticisms of social area analysis have been discussed, but as far as our interests are concerned, the disadvantage of the Shevky-Bell model, as with other studies which have used socio-economic data, often derived from census material, is the degree of precision which it gives and thus the degree of area differentiation which it makes possible.

The studies taking account of social factors can be thought of as an improvement on the economic approach, for they take account of more influences which are involved in the location decision, and they allow greater differentiation - they allow more precision than those using gross economic factors. Even in these studies, however, the data used is crude so that the results obtained are not as precise as they would be if detailed information were available. The "peculiarities of human behaviour" are still not being taken into account, although more than merely economic factors are being viewed. It is apparent that there is
more involved in explaining residential patterns than can be done through an examination of economic and broad social variables.

From this selective review of the literature, several points emerge. The first is that economic factors can be thought of as a basic influence determining the residential land use patterns in the urban area and can be seen as controlling and conditioning the general structure of residential patterns. Although these factors cannot be ignored, understanding of residential segregation based only on these must necessarily be of a broad and general nature. Only the broad differentials between residential areas emerge. In addition to these, however, are social factors which serve to explain to a greater degree these differentials. These factors are also manifested in the landscape and might be thought of as being superimposed on the basic grid of economic influences. Studies taking account of social factors should thus be able to achieve a greater degree of understanding of area differentiation than those using only economic factors. The social approach could be thought of as a second stage of depth in the analysis.

Analytical studies which attempt to take account of social or socio-economic factors have been hindered by lack of available data and have been forced to use indices approximating to social class or status. The results, once more, therefore, could only be of a broad or general nature. Some third stage of depth should therefore be found.
Sociologists have for many years been concerned with stratification of society and have attempted to find methods of distinguishing among social groups. Although most of these studies have been carried out in urban areas, there has been no interest in the spatial aspects of social groupings and residential segregation has not been the concern of the sociologist.

It is the suggestion of this study that greater precision in differentiating between residential areas will be achieved by examining the nature of the household itself. By considering the individuals that make up the society, greater understanding of residential segregation should result. The hypothesis which thus emerges and is tested in the study is that the social character of an individual or household has a significant effect in the choice of residential location, people with similar social characteristics grouping together in the same residential area. By taking investigations down to this smaller scale, it is hoped to present a more detailed picture than has hitherto been the case. Correspondence will be sought between social character and residential area.
CHAPTER THREE

DATA COLLECTION

I Sample Areas

It was decided to conduct the study in two upper income residential areas of Vancouver, British Columbia. In neither of these areas were economic factors such as rent, land values, incomes felt to be in a deterministic land selection position, so that the effect of the individual's social character could be seen.

Bell's (1965) study, using 1961 census data, showed that there were five census districts of the city in which 60 per cent or more of the population were employed in the professional and managerial occupations. These were the University Endowment Lands, west Shaughnessy, the district including east Shaughnessy, British Properties and Oakridge. Of these areas, all but the University Endowment Lands had an average income of over $9,000 and had the highest income averages for Vancouver. In addition, these areas, with the exception of that including east Shaughnessy, had the highest education levels, with 25 per cent or more of the population having attended university. It should be noted that the figures for east Shaughnessy are misleading since it lies within a census district which also includes an area of lower social status. Selection had therefore to be made from these areas. It was felt that the University Endowment Lands was unsuitable for study purposes since it is a special area of the city with a biased population, oriented
over 25 per cent with university education

Figure 1: Location of high status areas in Vancouver
towards the university. Oakridge is part of the Canadian Pacific Railway land grant which was largely developed only in the 1960's so that the area still lacks stability. It was therefore rejected, too. The two areas thus selected for study were Shaughnessy and British Properties. (Figure 1.)

Shaughnessy, the older of the two areas and lying on the main peninsula of the city, was opened up by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in 1910 as a residential area for upper income families at a time when the traditional upper class residential area of the city - the West End - was becoming overcrowded. From the early 1920's, Shaughnessy had been protected by an act of the Provincial Legislature as a single family residential area and has been shielded from the establishment of commercial enterprises and from the conversion of property to uses other than single family dwellings. An exception to this was the granting of permission for the conversion of several large houses to nursing homes during the last war and these have been allowed to continue operating. Despite the protection, however, some conversion has taken place and a number of revenue houses operate illegally, particularly in the older part of the area.

British Properties is a newer residential area. Begun in the 1930's by the Guinness Company, most of the development has been since 1945 and extensions to the area are still being opened up, the most recent of these - Chartwell - having been started in 1965. (The
The Chartwell area was ignored in this study because of its newness and therefore lack of established patterns. Lying on the north shore of the Burrard Inlet, between three hundred and twelve hundred feet, the area commands a magnificent view of the city.

In both areas a break has been made from the uniform grid pattern of streets which dominates Vancouver, this having been replaced by curved avenues, boulevards and crescents, many of which are tree-lined. In British Properties many of the houses are built around a golf course. The average size of lots in both areas is half an acre, and the general impression is one of spaciousness with homes set in surrounding gardens.

In both areas houses range in price from about $40,000 to $200,000, the upper and lower limits for British Properties being a little higher than those for Shaughnessy.

Of all the residential areas in the city (British Properties is part of the municipality of West Vancouver), Shaughnessy has been shown, using 1961 census data, (Mayhew, 1967) to have the highest percentage of owner occupied homes and the highest mean family income. In addition it has the highest percentage of persons in the labour force in the professions or in management, i.e. it had the highest occupation status. According to Peucker's (1971) findings, both the Shaughnessy and British Properties areas are high income ones.

Shaughnessy is in the unique position of lying close to the city centre and of being crossed by some of the city's main routes and yet
it has maintained its position as a good residential area and until very recently has enjoyed protection and privileges. British Properties, on the other hand, lies apart from the city and is distinct too from nearby residential areas, this being emphasised by a single entrance to the area, across which is a sign proclaiming the name 'British Properties'.

Both Shaughnessy and British Properties have been specifically created as residential areas which would attract the upper strata of Vancouver society and both have come to be recognised as prestige residential areas and to be occupied by the groups for whom they were established. Although each area contains the upper class groups of Vancouver, nevertheless it was anticipated that between the areas distinct differences in the social character of individuals might be found. Peucker's work, for example, indicates that the British Properties area has the highest mobility for the greater Vancouver area while Shaughnessy is found to be one of the most stable areas of the region. Since Shaughnessy is an earlier development than British Properties and has kept its status, it is reasonable to suppose that it might still be occupied by the old elite of the city while entrants to the upper class group look for homes in the newer area. Indications of such a distinction will be sought.

II Interview Schedule

A scale which would allow measurement of the social character of
selected families in each area had to be constructed. Information was to be collected by interviewing and an interview schedule was drawn up. Having decided to examine two upper income areas the aim of the schedule was to obtain such information as might make it possible to distinguish, first, households belonging to upper strata from those of lower strata, but more importantly, to distinguish distinct groups within the upper classes themselves. At this stage sociological literature was consulted for means of differentiating social groups.

The literature concerned with status crystallisation expresses dissatisfaction at the way in which sociologists, until the early 1950's, approached the problem of social stratification. The approach was thought to be inadequate for until then, the vertical structure of human groups had been seen in terms of a single hierarchy, in which each member occupied a single position. Since the 1950's, however, there has been a move toward the idea that the structure of human groups involves the coexistence of a number of parallel, vertical hierarchies, which are correlated in some way, one with another. From this standpoint, then, the status of an individual or of a family becomes a series of positions in a series of related vertical hierarchies and the question is then raised as to how these positions are interrelated. Theoretically it becomes possible to think of a non-vertical dimension to family or individual status - a consistency dimension. (Lenski, 1954.) This means that individuals are compared with respect to the degree of con-
sistency of their positions in the several vertical hierarchies, i.e. their status consistency or crystallisation is the degree to which an individual's rank positions are at a comparable level.

The potential for crystallisation would be expected to be strong at each extreme of the system and weaker in the intermediate stages, which can be explained by the fact that there is usually sufficient power at the top of each system to monopolise the equivalent strata in other ranks. (Landecker, 1960.) In the middle strata, however, the goal of upward mobility works against the desire to strengthen one's present position, while at the lower extreme, there is insufficient power to move up in any system. Empirical findings have given support to this in that correlations between income and education have been highest at the extremes of occupation and, similarly, between occupation and education at the extremes of income.

Much of the work which has been done using this concept has been concerned with the social consequences of crystallisation. Inquiries have been made into emotional stress and interpersonal strain resulting from weak crystallisation (Lenski, 1956; Jackson, 1962) while the effects of weak crystallisation on participation (Lenski, 1956; Hodge and Treiman, 1968) and preference for change in power distribution (Goffman, 1957) have also been examined. The rank systems or hierarchies normally employed in studies are occupation, income, education and racial/ethnic descent.
The idea of status crystallisation thus suggested that it is possible to measure an individual's position in society by taking into account several of his social characteristics, and since four variables can give a greater degree of accuracy than one, it could be assumed that the more variables under examination, the more accurate will be the resulting status position and thus the greater will be the degree of differentiation among the individuals. Thus to construct a scale to measure the social character or the social position of the individual, which might later be related to his choice of residential location, more variables in addition to the four already suggested had to be determined and included to achieve as accurate a measure as possible.

Sociologists have approached the problem of social differentiation from many viewpoints, a fact which has been indicated by Lasswell (1965), who points out that:

"at least five kinds of variables are found in the current literature as determinants of social class or social stratification. Micro-cultural traits, power relationships, social cohesion, symbolic representation and attribute categories are all in current use as both independent and dependent variables in sociological studies." (Lasswell, 1965, p. 277.)

Coleman (1965) outlines a paradigm for studying social strata giving six possible perspectives, along with the type of category studied and the research device used. The perspectives are: cultural, prestige, associational, influence/power, demography and social psychology.

Kahl and Davis (1955) write that while income is often used as an indication of socio-economic status, it is a poor measure of status,
for they contend that the core of status is culturally defined and involves a group shared style of life. Income is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition of status, as can be seen in the various ways in which different groups distribute their incomes, reflecting their different values. Oeser and Hammond (1954) in a study of social class in Australia suggest the variables: manners, family characteristics, social living, family living, patterns of social relationships, educational and other personal qualities, ambitions and beliefs, as possible indicators of social differentiation. In the United States, Warner, Meeker and Bells (1949) developed an objective 'Index of Status Characteristics' that was made up of ratings on six items: occupation, amount and source of income, house type, residential location, amount of education, which was later simplified to a three item index using occupation, income source and rental value of house, by Hatt (1950).

For the purpose of distinguishing between the different groups of the upper classes, it was from some of the descriptive sociological works that most help was derived.

Characteristics of elite groups. Sociologists have described the distinguishing features of the upper classes, pointing out the characteristics which distinguish them from the lower strata of society, and further differentiating between the 'old' and the 'new' upper classes, (Mills, 1956) although, in the studies of social stratification, differential characteristics used are usually limited to one or more of
the variables: occupation, education, income and ethnicity. High incomes, whether as a result of inherited wealth or derived from a successful career, are features of the upper classes (Mills, 1956; Porter, 1965) as is high occupational status, Porter reporting that in Canada the career patterns of the elite groups are in the technical and administrative system of production, the legal system and in high finance. The division of the elite into 'old' and 'new' upper class was made by Mills, who speaks of the former achieving status by family lineage, the latter by wealth. He refers to the culture and position of the old upper class, where prestige is inherent in their way of life, while the new elite is socially mobile and striving continuously for prestige and recognition by the established group.

The distinguishing features which are discussed in the studies of social class and elite groups can be summarised under three general headings. The first of these is social mobility, which represents the fact of the old upper class inheriting prestige while the new upper class strive to achieve status. The old upper class, relying on family lineage, inherit a recognised high status, and thus exhibit social stability, while the new upper class display upward mobility. (Mills, 1956; Porter, 1965.) Social mobility can be considered as being of two types - inter-generational mobility and intra-generational mobility, the former involving a comparison of the individual's occupation with that of his father, the latter concerning the individual's career
pattern. (Jackson & Crockett, 1964; Lipset & Zetterberg, 1956; Rogoff, 1953.) Occupation is usually taken as the index of social mobility, for it is relevant to all social stratification and there is close correspondence between occupation and other criteria of class, such as prestige, income, style of life, power. (Chinoy, 1955; Lipset & Bendix, 1952, 1959; Centers, 1948.) These are problems involved in the measurement of social mobility through these concepts, especially when the individual under consideration is young, for it is impossible to trace a career pattern, and his status is not properly established, so that comparison with his father's status is made difficult. (Yasuda, 1964.) Nevertheless, occupation serves as a convenient index, along with some idea of family background, for social mobility.

Another area discussed by sociologists in differentiating between the old and the new upper class, is that of kinship links. In the case of the former, kinship links are very strong, for having had a common social background and upbringing, involving attendance at similar schools and membership of the same clubs, strong ties are established. They have relatives and friends in common; ties with the family are very important and are reflected in residential proximity to relatives and in contacts with them socially, in business and through associations. (Mills, 1956; Porter, 1965.) Kinship ties, on the other hand, are unimportant to the new upper class, as would be expected in a group which is upwardly mobile, for the members are trying to leave behind their former
class and status and achieve the level of a higher stratum. (Crysdale, 1968; Parsons, 1943; Porter, 1965.) Hollingshead (1949) showed that in American society there is a close association between class and kinship structures and that in a stratified society such as the American one, we find the families of marital partners belonging to similar strata in the social structure. It is suggested by Brown (1965) that kinship ties should perhaps become less important in a competitive society which is greatly concerned with achievement for:

"The modern competitive production system makes it important to have the best qualified person in each job; it is bad business to prefer the less qualified man because he is your nephew or to pass over the superior applicant because he is a Negro." (Brown, 1965, p. 106.)

There is no indication, however, in studies of the elite groups that family connections in business are lessening.

A third group of distinguishing factors can be placed under the heading of 'social background'. This is considered to include such features as schools, club, ethnicity, religion, etc. (Porter, 1965.) The old upper class have schools and colleges in common, these institutions forming the background for initiating and strengthening friendships and loyalties. Its members belong to the same clubs, membership of which is through introduction by one or more existing members, so that the status of the club might be preserved. In addition, the individual must be recognised as a member of the group, before he is accepted to the club.
The old upper class are reported to be active patrons of the arts. (Boskoff, 1962; Mills, 1956; Porter, 1965.) They are described as taking no part in political life, but will direct their energies to charitable organisations and welfare activities, although it has been suggested by Hollingshead (1949) that their interest may be only a pecuniary one, leaving active participation to the lower social groups, whose interests tend to be in socio-economic associations such as Rotary. In addition, the old upper class are reported to share a common religion, the elite groups in Canada usually being members of the Anglican Church. (Porter, 1965.)

Throughout all the discussions the emphasis is seen to be on the fact that the old upper class have a distinct and uniform social background manifested in their prestige schools and clubs, while the social backgrounds of the new upper classes are very varied and they find it difficult to attain membership in the prestige associations.

CONCEPTUAL PARADIGM

- High occupation status
- Strong kinship links
- Stability
- Homogeneous social background
- Old upper class
- Residential area
- Urban Structure
- High income
- New upper class
- Residential area
- Weak kinship links
- Upward mobility
- Varied social background
- Urban Structure
The variables are indicated as follows:

proximity to relatives
contact with relatives socially
  in business
  through associations
family ties
social: father's occupation against
  individual's occupation
  career pattern
mobility
residential
social
background
ethnic affiliation
friends

With these characteristic features in mind, the interview schedule was constructed. (Appendix). Questions were derived to elicit information showing whether or not the household possessed each of the characteristics indicated. In some cases the information could be obtained from one or two simple questions. For example, a household's religion could be ascertained by asking 'Do you attend church?' and 'Which church do you attend?' With other characteristics, several questions had to be asked. For example, it was felt that in Vancouver the major cultural activities revolve around the Vancouver Symphony Orchestra and the Playhouse. In addition, three performances of opera and three of ballet are given each year in the Queen Elizabeth Theatre. Thus, to discover whether or not a household takes part in cultural activities, questions were asked about attendance at these functions. Furthermore, season tickets are available for regular attenders of the
Symphony and the Playhouse and so the household was asked if they had these. Information on how many of these activities the household has attended over a certain period was also obtained. Thus, the result is a series of questions of different orders for each activity, helping to determine the degree of the household's interest.

Again, to determine whether or not a household has contact with relatives, the question first had to be asked, 'Do you have relatives in Vancouver?' Subsequently it was asked how often visits were exchanged with relatives. It was felt also that regular telephone calls to relatives would indicate a wish to maintain social connections for those people who find themselves too busy for frequent visits. Contact in business or through associations was revealed by asking whether presently or in the past any relatives had been employed by the company with which the head of the household is employed or whether any relative is involved with associations of which individuals in the household are members.

As an indicator of the degree of interest and participation which the household has in associations or societies of which it is a member, questions were put as to whether or not any of the family had served on a committee for any association. Similar questions concerning relatives of the household were also included.

The stability or mobility of residential location led to questions about the number of houses in which the husband and wife had lived during their upbringing and in which the present household had lived.
The household was also asked whether it regarded its present home as a permanent one.

As far as occupations are concerned, the head of the household was asked to give his occupation and that of his father, so that the two occupations might be compared. In addition, the household head was asked for the nature of his first employment and the number of jobs he had had in the course of his career as indicators of how varied his career had been.

When an interview schedule had been constructed, eight interviews were conducted with households living in the sample areas who had agreed to be interviewed so that the questionnaire might be tested. The information collected at this stage was not used in the subsequent survey. Following on these initial interviews, some alterations were made in the schedule, eliminating ambiguities in questions which had not previously been detected and changing the order of questions to make for a smoother interview. With these final adjustments, the schedule was completed.¹

¹. For easier interviewing the order of questions was changed.
III Sampling Procedure

Prior to the actual selection of the samples, maps were obtained showing every lot in each area and those lots which were occupied by buildings which were not single family dwellings (i.e. schools, nursing homes, etc.) were eliminated. This was found to be only necessary in Shaughnessy where the older large homes lend themselves to conversion. It was known that in Shaughnessy some houses have been illegally divided into suites, but because of their illegal nature no listing of these houses is available. It proved impossible to identify these houses by observation and so it was decided to proceed with the sampling and reject any houses which turned out to be other than single family dwellings, although it was realised that this limited the validity of the sample. In the event, the sample which emerged consisted solely of single family dwellings.

The question of block sampling was considered, but while a useful technique in parts of the city where the grid pattern is dominant it was felt to be unsuitable in this instance because of the irregular shape and size of the blocks in both Shaughnessy and British Properties. In addition, the variety of lot sizes leads to differing densities of houses, especially in Shaughnessy where there is a marked difference in density between the north and the south of the area. The following method was thus thought to be more suitable for the areas under consideration.
Known non-residential property having been excluded, a number was assigned to each remaining lot and using random number tables, a sample of houses was selected from each area. Forty homes in each area were selected, only the first thirty of these being required for interview purposes, the remaining ten serving as a reserve list in the event of a refusal from one or more of the first thirty.

Using the Vancouver City Directory, the owners of the selected homes were determined and then contacted and asked to agree to an interview. In neither area were all of the thirty originally chosen finally interviewed. Eight householders, five in Shaughnessy and three in British Properties, refused to be interviewed, while another in British Properties was living in Europe during the interview period. Substitutes for these householders were taken from the first names on the reserve lists. In addition, in three cases in British Properties the occupants of the houses were no longer as specified in the Directory. In one of these cases it proved possible to find out who is living in the house now; in the other two cases these homes were discarded and the householders of the next two homes on the list contacted instead. At the end of the interviewing period responses had been obtained from sixty households.

In every case the household head's income was over $10,000 and in most cases over $20,000. Heads of households' occupations belonged in almost every case to the professions and to the upper echelons of management. In each case the household owned or was in the process of
buying the house in which it lived; there were no cases of households renting their homes. There were no instances of non-family households. In all but two cases there were children in the family, and in most cases at least some children still lived at home.

IV Interviewing

Interviews were conducted by the writer in most cases with the wife of the household. Exceptions to this occurred when the householder was a widower or when the wife refused to be interviewed, as was the case in three homes in British Properties and two in Shaughnessy. In fourteen cases the interview was conducted with both husband and wife present, either because the wife had requested that her husband be present or because the husband had expressed interest in the study. The interview was usually conducted in the household's home, except on three occasions when the husband was interviewed in his office.

Information was collected for both husband and wife, although it was felt to be adequate to have one answer for the other. Only on a few occasions did difficulty arise with this arrangement - when wives had difficulty answering questions about their husbands' incomes or the occupations of their fathers-in-law.

In almost every case the subjects responded readily to the questions. On the whole it was felt that the wives responded more readily to the interview, elaborating their responses and showing a willingness to talk,
while the husbands tended to more concise and confine themselves to more precise replies. In five instances no response was obtained for the question about incomes - two in Shaughnessy and three in British Properties - and in three cases - all in British Properties - no response was given to the question concerning the individual's father's occupation.
The information collected was coded by the writer. Although it was understood that this procedure is not entirely satisfactory and could result in introducing bias, financial constraints made it necessary. In addition, the interview schedule was so set up that much of the information could be coded as the responses were given, and only a few of the questions were open ones, thus limiting the possibility of introducing bias.

Univariate frequency tables and univariate total percentage tables were calculated for each group. Some of the responses were combined to form one variable, and similar tables were obtained. Chi-square values were computed to test the null hypotheses that the samples could have been drawn from the same population. All differences are significant at the 0.1 per cent level unless otherwise indicated.

Some initial comments can be made about the characteristics of the two samples of households. Of the Shaughnessy group 43 per cent, and of the British Properties group 37 per cent had incomes of between $20,000 and $30,000, while 84 per cent of the Shaughnessy group and 77 per cent of the British Properties group had incomes of under $20,000. Five households - three in Shaughnessy and two in British Properties - gave no response to this question and those households not already accounted for had incomes of between $10,000 and $20,000. These figures
give confirmation that the two groups under examination are upper income groups.

Neither group was found to be uniform in its life stage. In each group households with young children and households with the husband retired were found. The majority of households had children of high school age. In 63 per cent of the Shaughnessy households and 70 per cent of the British Properties households the age of the oldest child was over fifteen years and in Shaughnessy 33 per cent and British Properties 27 per cent of the households no longer had any children living at home. From these indicators there appeared to be no significant difference in the life stages of the two groups.

The two groups will now be examined on the basis of the characteristics previously outlined.

I  Mobility

Both the degree of residential mobility of the two groups and also the degree of social mobility are of interest.

1) Residential mobility

This has been considered in two parts:

a) the mobility of the husband and the wife during their upbringing;

b) the mobility of the present household.

a) In Shaughnessy all the husbands interviewed and 90 per cent of the wives had been brought up in two houses or less, (77 per cent of the
husbands and 67 per cent of the wives had been brought up in one house) while in British Properties 77 per cent of the husbands and 87 per cent of the wives had lived in four houses or more during their upbringing. One of the British Properties husbands had lived in eleven houses, and two in fourteen, while one of the wives had lived in seventeen houses.

In these figures alone, it is clear that there is a background of mobility which is not present in the other group.

b) Table 1 shows the relative stability of the Shaughnessy households compared with those of the British Properties. Again there appears to be greater mobility in British Properties.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>20+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Properties</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The life stage of the households could have some bearing on the length of time which a household has spent in its present home, but as already indicated, the two groups appear to be similar in terms of life stage. Difficulties in comparing the two sets of figures do arise, however, from the fact that much of the development in British Properties has taken place since the last war and there has hardly been time for many people to have lived there for much more than twenty years. Never-
theless, if this were a stable area, it might be reasonable to expect that a large proportion of households would have occupied their present homes for around fifteen years and the fact that 50 per cent of the households have been in their homes for five years or less suggests a fair degree of mobility in the group. This is supported to some extent by the households' attitude towards their homes. All the Shaughnessy residents regarded their present home as a permanent one (at least until their children have left home, although only four households felt that even then they might consider moving), while only 27 per cent of the British Properties households thought of their present house as a permanent home.

Of the Shaughnessy households, 73 per cent had lived in at least one other house (other than rented accommodation) and this was the case for 90 per cent of the British Properties households. The residential backgrounds of the two groups, however, differed. Of the Shaughnessy households whose present house was not their first residence, more than half had lived in another house in Shaughnessy and almost all the others in another part of Vancouver (excluding Shaughnessy and British Properties); two households had lived outside North America. Of the British Properties group 28 households had lived outside British Columbia, i.e. in other parts of Canada, in the United States, or outside North America. There also appeared to be a considerable amount of movement within British Properties, thirteen households having lived in other
homes in the area and, of these, seven households had lived in at least four homes in British Properties, one having lived in as many as nine. (The interview schedule did not set out to obtain this information and so it is available for only these seven households.)

2) Social mobility

a) Career pattern

Some idea of the household head's career pattern in terms of its variety or stability was obtained.

Of the Shaughnessy group, 10 per cent, and 37 per cent of the British Properties group were found to have changed the nature of their occupations during their careers. (The difference is significant at the 5 per cent level.) In Shaughnessy 67 per cent and in British Properties 17 per cent of the household heads began their careers with the company with which they are presently employed, while none of the Shaughnessy household heads and 67 per cent of those in British Properties had been employed with more than four companies or in more than four positions if professional.

Table 2

| Percentage of household heads and number of years of employment in present job |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|                            | 0-5      | 6-10     | 11-15    | 16-20    | 20+      |
| British Properties         | 43       | 23       | 3        | 7        | 23       |
| Shaughnessy                | 7        | 3        | 13       | 27       | 50       |
Table 2 shows the relative lengths of time for which the household heads in the two groups had been employed in their present jobs. The difference in stability is quite marked, with a greater degree of stability in Shaughnessy, 77 per cent of those interviewed having been employed in their present job for sixteen years or more compared with 30 per cent in British Properties.

The age of the household head could affect the length of time spent in a particular job and number of occupations or jobs which he has had - the older he is the more time he has had to try several occupations and change his jobs frequently. The interview schedule did not ask for the ages of the respondents, but from the observations of the interviewer and the information obtained about the life stage of the households, both indicated that neither group contains a large proportion of either old or young heads of households. There appeared to be no marked difference in ages between the groups which might help to account for the difference between them in stability of career pattern.

b) Occupation of father v. occupation of son

In this section any upward move in occupation status from the first to the second generation is investigated.

In Shaughnessy all the household heads and in British Properties all but two were in the two occupation groups of professional and management, the breakdown of this being about 50 per cent professional
and 50 per cent management in both areas. (The largest occupation group in Shaughnessy was lawyers and in British Properties engineers.) This being the case, the percentage of household heads for each group whose occupations were in the professions or management and whose fathers' occupations were of lower status was obtained. (Table 3.)

Of the British Properties group, three households failed to respond to the question about the father's occupation and in two other cases the occupation of the household head was of lower status than professional and management levels. In the remaining 40 per cent of the households the occupation of the household head and of the father were of similar status. Table 3 indicates that the differences in social mobility as indicated by occupation status is nevertheless striking, the Shaughnessy group showing greater stability than British Properties.

From the foregoing statements, it can be seen that there is stability in the Shaughnessy area which is lacking in British Properties, where the society appears to be a mobile one, both in terms of their residential location and social mobility as measured by changes in
occupation status. Stability would be associated with the old elite, while mobility is a characteristic of the new upper class.

II Family Ties

The first set of distinguishing characteristics were grouped under the heading of family ties and it was anticipated that the residents of Shaughnessy would display stronger family ties than the residents of British Properties.

Family ties are indicated by:

1) proximity to relatives
2) contact with relatives  a) socially  
   b) in business  
   c) through associations.

1) Proximity to relatives

The question of whether a household had relatives in Vancouver was first examined. In Shaughnessy it was found that 76 per cent of the husbands and 80 per cent of the wives have relatives living in Vancouver. In British Properties the corresponding figures were 30 per cent of husbands and 27 per cent of wives.

A household was defined as having proximity to relatives if either the husband or the wife, or both, had relatives living in their own residential area (i.e. Shaughnessy or British Properties.) Table 4 shows the results.
2) Contact with relatives

a) Social contact

The household was defined as having social contact with relatives if they exchanged visits with relatives at least once a week, or if they telephoned relatives at least twice a week. If contact was less frequent then they were regarded as having little social connection with their relatives.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of households having social contact with relatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Props</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Business contact

The household was considered to have contact through business with relatives if the firm with which the household head is employed is or has been a family company and at least one other member of his family, or of his wife's family, has been employed or is presently employed in that business. Table 6 shows the results.
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of households having business contact with relatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Properties</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Association contact

The household was regarded as having contact with relatives through associations if either the husband or the wife has one or more relatives who have been members or are presently members of clubs or associations of which either the husband or the wife are members. (Table 7.) Associations were considered to include business associations, cultural or welfare societies and social clubs. The interest was not at this stage in the kind of association, but in whether any family connections existed through membership in the same association.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of households having association contact with relatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Properties</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each case, possession of the required characteristic - i.e. relatives in their own residential area, relatives members of the same associations - by either the husband or the wife has been considered sufficient to allow possession of the characteristic by the household.
This was necessary to cover the cases of households where either the husband or the wife has come from outside Vancouver, the other partner belonging to Vancouver, and has adopted the characteristics of the family into which he or she has married - becoming members of clubs and associations of which in-laws are members and perhaps entering a family business.

From Tables 4 to 7 it is evident that proximity to relatives is greater in the Shaughnessy sample than in British Properties, while contact with relatives socially, in business and through associations, is also greater in Shaughnessy. With these as indicators, it can be concluded that family ties in Shaughnessy are stronger than in British Properties.

At this stage it might be useful to outline some other facts which emerge from the data collected and which can be seen to have some bearing on the above results.

**Table 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of residents born in Vancouver *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>husbands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Properties</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference is significant at the 1 per cent level.*
From Tables 8 and 9 it is clear that a large proportion of residents in Shaughnessy belong to Vancouver either by birth or by upbringing and, in fact, 67 per cent of the husbands interviewed (in Shaughnessy) and 63 per cent of the wives were actually brought up in Shaughnessy. By far the larger proportion of British Properties residents, however, have come from outside Vancouver, 30 per cent of both husbands and wives having been brought up in other parts of Canada (i.e. outside British Columbia) and 50 per cent of the husbands and 40 per cent of the wives outside Canada. We are therefore dealing with two groups, one of which has a predominantly Vancouver background, the other a more varied residential background, and it would be natural to expect that the former group would have more relatives in Vancouver and perhaps in their residential area than the latter. This being the case, however, it should also be pointed out that mere proximity to relatives does not necessarily imply contact with them and it is noteworthy that a large proportion of the Shaughnessy sample claim to have social, business and association contact with their family.

Table 9

| Percentage of residents brought up in Vancouver |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| husbands                   | wives |
| British Properties         | 7   | 20  |
| Shaughnessy                | 67  | 83  |
III Social Background

The aspects of social background which were of concern in this study were ethnic origins, religious affiliation, cultural activities, schools, membership in associations and friendships. It was anticipated that the Shaughnessy households would be of predominantly British origin, would attend the Anglican church, would take an active part in cultural activities, would receive their education at private schools and would have membership in associations ranging from prestige clubs to cultural societies and charity organisations. The British Properties group, on the other hand, was expected to lack these characteristics. It was expected that there might be some participation in cultural activities, the result of the new upper class imitating the old; membership in some associations was expected, but not in the prestige clubs nor to any extent in cultural or charity societies; some interest in political associations was considered as possible.

1) Ethnic origins

The British Properties households were found to be less strongly Canadian than those of Shaughnessy, where 60 per cent of the husbands and 70 per cent of the wives were at least the third generation of their family to live in Canada. The corresponding figures for British Properties were 3 per cent and 10 per cent.
Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of residents with British origins *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husbands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husbands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Difference is significant at the 1 per cent level.

From Table 10 it is evident that apart from being more strongly Canadian, the Shaughnessy sample has a much greater proportion of individuals with a British background.

2) Religious affiliation

Seventy-seven per cent of Shaughnessy households claimed to have some religious affiliation and 63 per cent said that they had attended church in the previous month, while in British Properties only 37 per cent claimed religious affiliation and 30 per cent had attended church in the previous month.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of households with religious affiliation *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Differences significant at the 5 per cent level.
The representation of the Anglican church in neither sample is very high, although it is higher in Shaughnessy than in British Properties (Table 11.) The majority of churchgoers in Shaughnessy attend the United church which is the main church of Canada. It appears from these results that religious affiliation is not serving as a useful differentiating characteristic.

3) Cultural activities

To determine the degree of participation which a household had in cultural activities, its responses to three questions were examined - whether it had season tickets for the Symphony, or for the Playhouse, and how often it attended the ballet or opera. For this last activity it was felt that attendance at three performances or more in the year, i.e. half the possible attendances, would constitute a reasonable interest. It was felt that a household with keen interest in the city's cultural life would participate in all three activities. Table 12 shows the percentage of households in the two groups with a strong cultural interest.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of households with strong cultural interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Properties</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Strong' cultural interest was defined as being possession of Symphony
season tickets and Playhouse season tickets plus attendance at at least half the operas and ballets given each year. Table 12 shows that no household in British Properties fulfilled these conditions while a reasonably large proportion of the Shaughnessy households did.

Further investigation showed that 87 per cent of the Shaughnessy households fulfilled two out of the three conditions while none of the British Properties households did. In British Properties, in fact, only one household had season tickets for the Symphony, while two had season tickets for the Playhouse and two attended half the ballet or opera performances. The three households with season tickets were the only ones to claim any interest in the Symphony and in the Playhouse, i.e. only these three households claimed to attend the Symphony and the Playhouse, with or without season tickets. This means that twenty-five out of thirty households interviewed stated that they had no interest in the cultural activities of the city; they did not claim an interest only to indicate later that it was a superficial one, but seemed content to admit to lack of participation. There is, of course, no way of determining whether or not accurate responses were obtained from each group - it was not possible to find out whether those households which had season tickets actually made use of them. The writer has no reason to believe that false information was being given, but even if this were the case, it is still interesting to note that one group was unconcerned at expressing an almost total lack of interest in cultural activities, while the other was eager to give the impression of being culturally involved.
4) **Schools**

The interest here was in determining whether or not private schools had been attended first by the parents and secondly by the children of the household. The results are in Table 13.

**Table 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of households with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents at private schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Properties</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If either of the parents had been educated in a private school, they were considered to have attended private schools. If any child in the family was attending or had attended a private school, then the household was considered to have had children educated at private schools. It was, however, unusual for only one child in a family to be at a private school, while the rest of the family was at state schools. In only two cases did this occur. It was not unusual, however, to find that one or more children in the family had attended both public and private schools, and perhaps also more than one type of private school during their education.

As far as the parents were concerned, the private schools attended were only in Vancouver if the individual had been brought up here. On the whole, the children's private schools were in Vancouver. Exceptions
to this were seven households in Shaughnessy and one in British Properties who had children at boarding schools on Vancouver Island and five families in Shaughnessy and one in British Properties who had had children at private schools in Europe.

Table 13 shows that private schools are considerably more popular with the Shaughnessy households than with those of British Properties.

5) Associations

First, membership in social and prestige clubs and second, membership in all other associations will be examined.

a) Membership in three prestige clubs in the city were considered (Table 14.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver Club</th>
<th>Terminal City Club *</th>
<th>Vancouver Tennis Club</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Properties</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Difference is significant at the 5 per cent level.

British Properties membership can be seen to be negligible while Shaughnessy representation is quite high.

The further observation can be made that British Properties membership in any social/sports clubs was found to be very low. Five families were members of the Capilano Golf Club and one a member of the West Vancouver Yacht Club. The highest membership was in the Hollyburn Country Club,
in which eleven households claimed membership. In Shaughnessy, on the other hand, in addition to the clubs already mentioned in Table 14, eighteen families were members of the Shaughnessy Golf Club and nine of the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club. In addition, ten families in each group claimed membership in clubs not already discussed. It should be noted too that no households in Shaughnessy had membership in clubs similar to the Hollyburn Country Club. Membership in the Arbutus Club was expected, but was not found.

b) Membership in four types of association were examined. As with social clubs, membership was found to be greater among the Shaughnessy group (Table 15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Charity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Properties</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No significant difference.

Households were included in Table 15 if they had membership in one or more of the types of associations described.

With both groups almost every household with membership in associations had also had representation on committees for one of these associations, so that their interest appeared to be fairly active.

The cultural associations which appeared most often were the Symphony Society and the Art Gallery; the business associations included the Board of Trade and professional societies; charity associations were
represented mainly by groups working in conjunction with hospitals, or organisations whose purpose is to raise funds for charities. Political associations included civic, provincial and federal politics.

It appears therefore that there is a notable difference between the two groups in terms of membership in clubs and associations, the Shaughnessy group showing considerable interest, the other a clear lack of interest. Several reasons were given during the interviews by a number of British Properties residents for lack of participation. Five households stated that presently they were unable to afford the subscriptions to some of the clubs; seven gave lack of time as an excuse. In addition, eleven households indicated that their social life revolved around parties which were frequent in the area, so that they had no need of clubs, etc., and eight stated that they had no membership in clubs or associations since they did not expect to be in Vancouver for more than a few years, further strengthening the impression of a mobile society.

6) Friendships

In both areas, most households had at least one close friend living in their own area (93 per cent in Shaughnessy and 87 per cent in British Properties), but the origin of friendships differed between the two groups (Table 16.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of households and friendship origins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Properties</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaughnessy</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To Table 16 it can be added that of the Shaughnessy households, 87 per cent stated that over 50 per cent of the people with whom they exchanged visits were school friends, while the corresponding figure for British Properties was 3 per cent.

It can be seen, therefore, that unlike British Properties, school friendships are maintained among Shaughnessy residents while parties, important in British Properties, were not mentioned as a source of friendship in Shaughnessy. Considering the previous findings that the Shaughnessy area contains a large number of Vancouver people and, in fact, a large number of people who were brought up in Shaughnessy, while British Properties appears to have few Vancouverites, these friendship patterns are perhaps not too surprising. It is nevertheless interesting to note that in Shaughnessy the school friendships have been maintained and this would be expected if, as has already been suggested, the households form a socially stable group. One must, however, be wary of concluding that lack of school friendships in the British Properties group is due to a socially mobile group of households when so many of the individuals interviewed are now living well outside their school areas. On the other hand, of the eleven people interviewed in British Properties who had been brought up in Vancouver, none indicated that school friendships had been maintained and lack of continuance of these would be characteristic of an upwardly mobile society, which, as already indicated, appears to be what is found in
British Properties.

To the maintenance of school friendships, it can be added that 56 per cent of the Shaughnessy households stated that over fifty per cent of the people with whom they exchanged visits are members of their clubs and associations. The corresponding figure for British Properties was 10 per cent. This is another characteristic of old elite groups which is possessed by the Shaughnessy group, clubs and associations often acting as vehicles through which friendships can be maintained.

The Shaughnessy group is thus seen to fit to a considerable extent the requirements of a prestige social background as indicated by the characteristics discussed. The Shaughnessy residents are of predominantly British origin; they are represented in private schools — both the parents and the children; they take an active part in cultural activities and have membership in prestige clubs and cultural and charity associations; school friendships have been maintained. The type of religious affiliation, while being represented as expected, was felt to be an unsatisfactory means of differentiating between the groups since a large number of households in each area had no religious affiliation of any kind. The British Properties households lack these characteristics. Their social backgrounds are more varied and if they share a common characteristic it must be that they possess this variety of background.
Conclusions.

It is clear from the foregoing discussion that the two groups can be clearly distinguished.

Mobility - both residential and social - was found to be greater in British Properties than in Shaughnessy. Since proximity to relatives and contact with them is greater in Shaughnessy than in British Properties, it can be concluded that family ties are stronger in the former group. In addition, Shaughnessy households possess the characteristics indicative of a prestige social background.

The concern of this study has been with two elite groups in the city, one of which it was anticipated would display old upper class characteristics and the other, characteristics typical of the new upper class. Shaughnessy households have been seen to possess old upper class characteristics. It was expected, however, that the new upper class, while not possessing the prestige of the other group, would be aspiring to achieve this prestige and so would to some extent imitate them by having membership in some clubs and associations, even if these did not have the same status, and by taking at least a superficial, if not an active interest in the city's cultural activities. As already suggested, however, this was not found to be the case. The British Properties group did not appear to be trying to emulate their Shaughnessy counterparts by participating in associations or cultural activities. The clear impression emerged that they have very little interest in these
activities.

The differences between the groups are, however, clear. The general picture which emerges is of an old elite group, with a predominantly Vancouver background, with close family ties, social and residential stability, representation in prestige institutions and participation in activities of the city. On the other hand, there exists an elite group with a high degree of residential and social mobility, with few Vancouver connections and little contact with family and virtually no interest in city activities or representation in prestige institutions.

It has been shown too that households of similar characteristics are grouped together in the same residential area and the impression is given that there is little contact between the two areas. Only two British Properties households have friends or relatives in Shaughnessy, while no Shaughnessy households talked of friends in British Properties, and of the eight Shaughnessy families with relatives in British Properties, six added that the relative - often a son or a daughter - only lived there because no suitable home had yet been found in Shaughnessy. If given a free choice of location in the Vancouver area, all the Shaughnessy households would elect to remain in Shaughnessy. Many reasons were given, but the most frequent one was that the area has a dignity not found in any other part of the Vancouver area. When asked why they would not choose to live in British Properties, fourteen families
replied that they did not like the style of life there. All but five of the British Properties families would remain in British Properties, the main reason given being the view and, found almost as frequently, that the area is a good one for children, since there are many professional people with homes there. It was interesting to note that the other five families would prefer to live in Shaughnessy and that in each case either the husband or the wife had been brought up in Vancouver. Each emphasised the dignity and elegance of the Shaughnessy area, and four indicated that it had always been a "good residential area".

These few remarks suggest that at least some households in the two areas are conscious of some distinction between the two groups or between the two areas. Whether or not they have articulated these differences or used them as a basis for location decisions, it is impossible to say. The study did not set out to examine this and the information obtained is scant, but it seems possible that to try to obtain information of this kind might prove valuable in determining what affects the choice of residential location.
CONCLUSION

This study has shown that to achieve finer differentiation of residential areas in cities than has hitherto been possible, consideration must be given to the detailed social characteristics of the individual households rather than to broad economic and social factors. The hypothesis that households of similar social characters would be found clustered together was shown to be valid when tested in two upper income residential areas of high occupation status.

It has been demonstrated that within these upper income areas, two distinct social groups can be identified on the basis of mobility, family ties and social background, using the indicators which were outlined in Chapter Three. One group was found to be of a predominantly Vancouver background with a marked interest in city activities and showing the characteristics attributable to an old elite group - stability, strong family ties and a prestige social background, through which their friendships, loyalties and common interests have been strengthened. The other group, while failing to show certain characteristics which had been expected, such as membership in clubs and associations even if these lacked prestige, could nevertheless be clearly distinguished. With very few Vancouver connections and apparently very little interest in city activities, they displayed the characteristics of a new elite group - high mobility and weak family ties, while their
backgrounds were very varied and lacked the prestige elements present in the other group.

The existence of distinct social groups has thus been demonstrated. In addition, however, it has been shown that the households of similar social character are found grouped together in the same residential area. The two groups have been shown to be residentially segregated and in the older established area are found the families whose social characteristics are those of an old elite group, while the newer area is peopled by households possessing characteristics which resemble those of the new upper class. It appears too from the available information that there is little contact between the two areas, very few households in either group having friends or relations in the other area.

In this study it has merely been demonstrated that segregation exists and that it exists along the lines of the social characteristics of households. No statements have been made as to whether people consciously segregate themselves in this way, but, if as originally suggested, the urban landscape can be viewed as being the product of decisions made by many individuals and further, the patterns of the landscape can be interpreted to give an indication of people's behaviour, then it might be considered that the social divisions observed are the results of decisions made by households who have taken account of the social makeup of the area into which it proposes to move. It would be the subject of further investigation to discover how important the social
composition of their residential area is to the household, perhaps by examining their attitudes both to their own and to other residential areas. Within the limits of the present study only some general impressions of the household's attitudes to the two areas emerged. Responses to the question of where the household would choose to live in the city if given a free choice, as well as reasons for this choice and other remarks made during some of the interviews, suggest that at least some households of the older established area are fully aware of the status of their area and all households would prefer to live there rather than in any other area of the city, while a few households of the newer area, all with Vancouver backgrounds and so presumably with some knowledge of the nature of the residential areas of the city, expressed a preference for the older area. The information which we have, while far from being conclusive, can nevertheless be regarded as a pointer suggesting that investigation into people's awareness of the prestige attached to residential areas and the importance which this holds for them might prove to be valuable.

The immediate result of this study has been to show that residential segregation exists along social lines among upper income groups in the city. The wider implications are to suggest that further investigation of segregation in the urban area be undertaken at the smallest possible scale to determine the different criteria in terms of which groups have been divided. The next step might be to try to identify divisions
among lower income groups, since clustering is clearly evident at that end of the social scale. It is possible, however, that difficulties might be encountered in persuading such households to agree to interviews and the interviewing technique or use of a questionnaire is a necessary part of the investigation since aggregate data fails to give the required detail. While middle class groups have failed to show the same degree of clustering in terms of occupation status, it is possible that by this method of considering detailed social characteristics, patterns of segregation might emerge. In each case it is necessary first to have an idea of the broad outline of social patterns in the urban area before investigation of characteristics which distinguish apparently similar groups is made. This study has been concerned with social characteristics, but it is already known that segregation exists along lines other than those indicated here. The ethnic background of households is a basis of segregation which is well recognised, while life-styles, age and cultural characteristics have all been noted as being of importance. It is suggested, therefore, that an attempt should be made to identify all possible criteria for residential segregation, and it is emphasised that investigations should be carried out at the smallest scale possible. When all such factors have been recognised and documented, understanding of the household's preference in choosing a residential area and hence the residential structure of the city should be much greater.
Knowledge of the segregation process and its operation in the city is thus increased. If information is available about the social character of a household and this is compared with the social patterns of a city, then it should be possible to forecast that household's choice of location within the urban area. Thus detailed knowledge of the social characteristics of the population of a city should assist in estimating the housing needs of that city.

A final word should perhaps be said about the implications of segregation for planning. Distinct patterns of segregation have been shown to exist and from these we have interpreted the individual's preference for living in proximity to households who share certain similar characteristics, in this case, households who possess a similar social character in terms of strength of family ties, social mobility and social background. From this it can be deduced that for such upper income groups as were interviewed, unless the social makeup of households in their residential area is similar to their own, then the household will not be entirely satisfied with its home and may be dissatisfied to the point of moving to a new location in another residential area. Many examples of such a situation have been noted and this is often most evident with respect to the social mobility factor, a household showing strong upward mobility feeling uncomfortable and out of place in an area where families are socially stable in a position either below or above its current position on the social scale.
most content in an area where the households are strongly mobile.

There might be some implications for the field of public housing. When moving households from one location to another it is essential that the individual's preference for living among similar people be taken into account. Where a policy for assisting low income groups with housing involves providing financial aid, then leaving them to select their own location, this problem does not arise. If, on the other hand, a spatial dimension is put on this assistance by giving financial aid, but also directing the household to a particular location to take advantage of such assistance, then difficulties might occur. Such a move is only likely to be successful if the social environment into which the household is moved is compatible with its own social character and in all probability similar to the one which it has left. If the household finds itself in an area whose residents are dissimilar from it, then discontent is likely to arise, perhaps even resulting in a move out of the area. This would suggest then, that in the area of public housing, it is insufficient merely to identify low income groups and locate them in any area at all, for neglect of specific characteristics of these households could lead to them being misplaced with respect to other households in an area and finding themselves in an alien social or cultural environment. It is essential that low income groups be examined so that the lines of segregation within the groups are clear and the features on which segregation is based are evident.
In this way there will be greater awareness of what households are seeking in their residential areas. When distinguishing features have been identified, every effort should be made to take account of these when relocating groups of households. When a household is directed to a particular location, both the social and cultural background of the household and the social and cultural makeup of the area into which it is moving should be examined to ensure that the two are compatible. An attempt should be made to avoid cutting across the known dominant social or cultural characteristics such as mobility, family ties and cultural ties, which might pave the way for discontent.

The existence of segregation has been demonstrated and the effect of the social differentiation of residential areas on the household's choice has been outlined along with its implications for the planning of new housing developments. It is understood that when a residential location decision is being made, the social makeup of the area is far from being the only consideration. Features of the home itself, its type and style, the layout of its interior and characteristics of its site, as well as services and facilities available in the area, are all of importance. Nevertheless, it is hoped that understanding of the search process which operates when residential locations are being selected has been increased by this examination of segregation patterns, which show the undoubtedly strong influence of the social composition of an area on the residential location decision.
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APPENDIX

RESIDENTIAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

h. = husband
w. = wife

100 KINSHIP LINKS

110 Family

111 How many children do you have?
112 How old are your children?
113 How many of your children live at home?
114 For how many years have you lived in this house?
115 Were you born in Vancouver? h. yes...no...
w. yes...no...
116 Where did you live while you were growing up? h.............
w.............

120 Proximity to relatives

121 Do you have relatives living in Vancouver? h. yes...no...
w. yes...no...
122 Do you have relatives living in your residential area? h. yes...no...
w. yes...no...
123 Give the exact relationship of relatives living in your residential area and the number of each. h.............
w.............
130 **Links with relatives socially**

131 Do you have social contact with your relatives in Vancouver?

132 How often do you exchange visits with relatives in Vancouver?

133 How often do you contact your relatives by telephone?

140 **Links with relatives through business**

141 Have any members of your family been employed or are currently employed by the company with which you work?

142 What is the relationship and the position in the firm?

150 **Links with relatives through associations**

151 Have either of your parents been members, or are they currently members of any associations of which you are a member?

152 Have any other of your relatives been members?

153 Give the relationship and the association involved.

154 Have any of your relatives served on committees for these associations?
155 Have either of your parents been members or are they currently members of the social clubs to which you belong? h. yes...no... w. yes...no...

156 Are any other relatives members of your social clubs? h. yes...no... w. yes...no...

200 SOCIAL MOBILITY

210 Individual's father's occupation

211 What is/was your father's occupation?

212 If professional, is the company with which he is/was employed a family business?

220 Individual's occupation

221 What is your occupation?

222 What is your gross income?

223 If in business, is the company with which you are employed a family business?

224 What is the scope of your company?

228 Where is the head office of your company?

240 Career pattern of the individual
241 What was the nature of your first employment?

242 Did you begin your career with your present company or, if professional, in your present position?

243 If no, with how many companies or in how many positions have you been employed?

244 For how many years have you been in your present job?

250 Occupation of householder's wife

251 Is your wife working at present?

252 What is her occupation?

253 Has she worked continuously since you were married?

300 SOCIAL BACKGROUND

310 Ethnic Affiliation

311 To which generation of your family to live in Canada do you belong?

312 In which country did your family originate?

313 Would you say that you are a Vancouverite?

314 Were your parents born in Vancouver?
320 Religious affiliation
321 Do you attend church?
322 Which church do you attend?
323 How often have you attended church in the last month?
324 Do you take part in church activities?
325 In which particular activities do you take part?
326 Do you serve on any church organisational activities?

330 Residential background
331 In how many houses did your family live during your upbringing? 
   h............
   w............
332 Is this your first residence as a family unit?
333 If not, where have you as a family lived before?
334 Do you regard this house as a permanent home?
335 If you had a completely free choice, in which area of Vancouver would you like to live?
336 Why would you like to live in that area?

340 Education
342 What is the highest degree you have completed: 
   High School...
   Bachelors.....
   Masters......
   Doctoral.....
   Professional..
344 Which schools do/did your children attend?

343 Give the names of the schools, universities and colleges which you attended.

350 Cultural activities

351 Would you say that you take part in the cultural life of the city?

352 Do you attend the Vancouver Symphony?

353 Do you have season tickets?

354 How many Symphony concerts have you attended in the last month?

356 How often do you go to the ballet or opera?

357 Do you attend the Playhouse?

358 Do you have season tickets?

360 Associations

361 Of which societies or associations are you a member?

362 Do you play an active part in these associations?

363 Are you currently or have you been in the past a member of committee for any of these associations?

371 Are you a member of any political associations?
372 Do you take an active part in this?

373 Have you been in the past or are you currently serving on a committee for the political association?

381 Of which social clubs are you a member?

386 For how many years have you been a member of these clubs?

383 Do you take an active part in these social clubs?

390 **Friendships**

391 Where do your three closest friends live?

392 How did you get to know your closest friends?

393 What proportion of the people with whom you exchange visits are members of your clubs and associations?

394 What proportion of the people with whom you exchange visits are school friends?

395 What proportion of the people with whom you exchange visits are neighbours?