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ABSTRACT

Evaluation studies on housing developments rarely tackle privacy in depth, restricting themselves to questions such as "do-you-have-enough-privacy?" Most works on privacy are conceptual. There also exists a general lack of interest in the study of social and psychological behaviour in the spaces between buildings, and the effect of site layouts in housing. This study combines the two in an attempt to determine attitudes towards privacy in private open spaces in multifamily housing developments.

A review of the literature indicated an emphasis on the aspect of control over the curtailment of interaction, as opposed to the more popular notion of privacy as withdrawal. This concept was applied in this study to residents of multifamily developments. It was hypothesized that compatibility between neighbours would reduce the need for physical separation and demonstrate a reliance on social strategies for control over interaction, below the threshold level of intrusion. Moreover it was hypothesized that preferences and dissatisfactions for privacy would be associated with the perceived adjustment of residents to the neighbourhood, as well as congruence with the neighbours.

The concept of privacy was dissected into four states, based on the works of Westin (1970) and Marshall (1970). Two of these (Seclusion and Intimacy) dealt with physical conditions, and the other two (Anonymity and Not-Neighbouring) dealt with the social conditions related to privacy. 50 respondents, were randomly selected from two low middle income, medium density housing developments. One was a co-operative and the other was a rent regulated housing complex. A specially designed questionnaire board was used to ask the subjects to rate their preferences for and assessment of, privacy in private outdoor spaces, for 11 activity categories, for the four states defined. Dissatisfaction was measured as the difference between the preferred and the achieved ratings.

Although statistically the hypotheses were only proven partially right, other evidence in the study supports the following conclusions:

a. Privacy is very complex and changes with the activity and the person involved. There is no clear cut differentiation in the utilization of social over physical mechanisms to maintain it.
Abstract

b. A few activities have very specific privacy requirements, but in general people do not care very much about the privacy in private outdoor spaces.
c. Management and/or tenure which improve relationships between neighbours create a greater community sense, cause a tolerance for more interaction, and reduce emphasis for physical barriers.
d. Perceived fit in the neighbourhood had a greater effect on dissatisfaction and preferences for privacy than congruence with the neighbours.

The hypotheses also generated additional information regarding attitudes towards social and physical elements in multifamily projects, which are only remotely related to privacy.

Dr. N.G. Rolfsen
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"We really help when we create the proper frames for action, and not when we impose our plans on others".
(Doxiadis)

The concept of privacy is complex. It has been the subject of study and discussion in many fields. Some have described privacy as a psychological phenomenon, others as a sociological and a political phenomenon and still others as an economic phenomenon (Wolfe and Laufer, 1974). For a long time the subject has been treated extensively in the spheres of philosophy, politics and law, but despite its importance, its discovery by the social scientist has been very recent (Berardo, 1974). There is as yet little empirical research done on privacy per se, especially in the sphere of the residential environment. Most of the work on this subject has concentrated on proposing new theories and conceptual frameworks (Altman, 1975).

Although privacy is universal, each culture has its own
ways of controlling social interaction (Marshall, 1970; Westin, 1970; Altman, 1975). People in Western society today, seem to value privacy more than they did, say, a century ago (Marshall, 1970). This need for more privacy might be the result of an increased accessibility to the individual's inner life. Developments in technology have made available several intrusion contraptions, thus making privacy a scarcer commodity (Pennock and Chapman, 1971; Westin, 1970). The increase in population in urban centres also offers greater opportunity for social contact and interaction, and consequently increases the need for retreat and the control of interrelationships.

By the nature of the commodities they are able to provide, urban centres have always been and will always be a magnet for the population. (Freedman, 1975: 206 et seq.). Limited resources (primarily land) are forcing both the public and the private sector to provide more housing at higher densities. More housing is being built in the form of project developments and townhouses (Statistics Canada, 1975). It is therefore useless to argue against higher densities - they are with us to stay. The architect/planner, then has to think in terms of designing whole communities rather than individual homes (Festinger, 1951). In the meantime accommodation of this kind is being built to house a somewhat reluctant resident.

Higher density housing does not seem to be acceptable to
the present generation of dwellers. Ownership of a single family detached dwelling is still a distinctive seduction, but the high cost of this type of housing is constraining them to do otherwise. While this process of adaptation to new high density living environments might cause stress (Dubos, 1965), lack of housing alternatives may possibly force new behaviours, and frames of mind, which would make this new way of life more acceptable to the users.

This work tries to shed some light on the attitudes towards privacy in townhouse projects. A specific space within the territory of the house - private outdoor space - was selected for study. A previous review of the literature has shown that residents are more concerned with private outdoor spaces than with communal open spaces (Cooper, 1975). The choice of an outdoor space for study stemmed from a wider interest in the behavioural implications of site planning and of spaces between buildings, in planned unit developments. Research in this field is lacking. Most studies of this kind are written by architects and designers (Katz, 1966; Lynch, 1972) with very little reference to behaviour.

The deficiency cannot be justified, as most people seem to want to be intimate with the trees and green open spaces. Perhaps this desire is generated by a perceived suffocation due to modern day urban living, or from the psychological, if not
the physical consciousness of a detrimental environment, whose fears are not unfounded, for the incidence of certain diseases have been linked with certain environmental conditions such as pollution (Wohlwill, 1970). Urban sprawl and growth of cities is gradually removing the wilderness from the city dweller. Suburbia, which was intended as a compromise between the proximity of city living and the low density of rural living, fails at both (Chermayeff and Alexander, 1963).

Various authors uphold open space as an important contributor to personal development, i.e., as an aid in comprehending the phenomenon of life (Hoffman, 1967; Smith, Downer, Lynch, 1969). The outdoors may not by itself bring about or materially aid in bringing about mental health. The satisfaction that it brings occurs because people may be predisposed to such enjoyment. For a large minority the outdoors is an opportunity for relaxation and a change in surroundings, but as much enjoyment can be obtained from a backyard if one is predisposed to do so (Gans, 1968). Whether this is a primordial desire of the human being or the remnants of a romantic emotion in a hard industrialized environment of steel and concrete, the designer and researcher cannot be exonerated from paying attention to the behavioural implications of open space.

The study presented here sets out to investigate resident
awareness and perceptions of privacy for various activities which are carried out in private outdoor spaces, in multifamily housing projects. 50 respondents from two medium density projects in the Champlain Heights area of the City of Vancouver were interviewed about their attitudes towards four very specific states of privacy in their private outdoor spaces, in relation to eleven activity categories which could be carried on outdoors. The results are discussed in chapter 4 and chapter 5. Recommendations are submitted in Chapter 6.
Footnotes

1In Southview Gardens, one of the projects selected for study, most residents moved into their own home. Few residents in the project expressed a desire to stay in the townhouses.

2In an interview with the manager of Southview Gardens, she suggested that the residents were understanding that townhouse living generated a different lifestyle, and that they had reacted positively to it. In spite of this 2-3 families moved out of the project every month, but the units were never vacant. Names on the waiting list are never scarce and people were prepared to wait for months in an attempt to get in. Probably they were after the cheap rent rather than the lifestyle.

3This theme was explored in an unpublished term paper by the author. Gutman (1966) still seems to be the only researcher who did theoretical work on this topic. Many others deal with town centres rather than planned unit developments. Usually information of this nature is incorporated in evaluation studies of residential projects, but these are very difficult to find.
1. PRIVACY

"A large share of man's activities are social, but they ultimately, however practical and outgoing, have their source in privacy."
(Chermayeff and Alexander, 1963: 16)

The concept of privacy in the residential environment has to do with more than just minimum spacing between dwelling units, or the position of doors and windows, or the provision of screens and barriers. The aim of this chapter is to offer an interpretation of the concept in socio-psychological terms.

1.1 Definitions of Privacy

The distinction between an inner and an outer self has long been pointed out. Socrates, before that last and famous "bottoms up", made a distinction between his body, through which others could relate to him, and the "himself", which was not tangible (Konvitz, 1966). James (1890) placed the boundary of the self so as to include objects, possessions and abstract
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Locke (1924) proposed a similar notion and extended the meaning of the self to include property and possessions. In Locke's view, "... all that (the individual) becomes, and all that he makes are part of his own person." Allport (1961) included in the self those things that one feels strongly about.

Privacy has to do with the boundary between the self and others. It is not only the commonly accepted calm and serene state of mind, but involves a conflict over the boundary of what is self and non-self. This process aids the development of personality. Society provides some norms and values, as a basis for rules that simplify this conflict, and though they may be in a continuous state of flux, they are essential to establish boundaries for privacy (Simmel, 1971).

Privacy oriented behaviour is intended to defend the self-boundary (Marshall, 1970), once it has been defined. Where the boundary is set and what it includes (objects, spaces etc.) as part of the self, depends on factors such as culture (Hall, 1966) intimacy of person (Sommer, 1969) and the number of people interacted with.

It is difficult to find one all encompassing definition of privacy. The definitions given in the literature seem to fall under two categories. One group places emphasis on seclusion, withdrawal and overall avoidance of interaction with others.
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The second group puts less emphasis on detachment and more on control over interaction, on the opening and closing of the self to others and on the freedom of choice of interaction (Altman, 1975).

1.1.1 Privacy as Withdrawal

This is the more popular notion generated in the mind of laymen. Many authors support this concept.

"privacy . . . as a freedom from social interaction and observation, when these are not desired." (Halmos, 1952)

"privacy . . . a highly institutionalized form of withdrawal." (Schwartz, 1968)

"... desirable withdrawal from stimuli presented by other people." (Pullen, 1965)

"an outcome of a person's wish to withhold from others certain knowledge as to his past and present experience and action and intention for the future . . . and a desire to control other's perceptions and beliefs vis a vis the self concealing person." (Jourard, 1966)³

The importance of providing sanctuaries for withdrawal as an essential feature of mental therapy has been suggested by Osmond (1957)* and Jourard (1966).

Privacy of this nature can also be obtained by offensive display, but this is quite rare in humans (Sommer, 1969). At the extreme, retreat takes the form of the psychological state of autism, where the individual is so far removed from the real
world, that insufficient contact damages his personality or its integration and adaptation into society (Simmel, 1971).

1.1.2 Privacy as Personal Control

Recent conceptualizations on privacy place less emphasis on detachment and more on the theme of personal control - the freedom of choice to pursue or not to pursue interaction, or the ability to regulate the boundary between the self and others. They stress freedom of choice concerning when and how much information one wishes to disclose about oneself (Altman, 1975).

Laufer, Proshansky and Wolfe (1973), describe three aspects of control: control over choice to be private or not, control over access to oneself either for protective reasons (concealment of information), enhancement of the self or simply functional (e.g., distraction), and control over stimulation or control over the way privacy is achieved. Westin (1970) defines privacy as "... the claim of individuals, groups, or institutions to determine for themselves where, how and to what extent information about them is communicated", so that the individual has "... the right ... to decide for himself ... when and on what terms his acts should be revealed to the general public." Ittleson, Proshansky and Rivlin (1970) as well as Altman (1974) define privacy as a selective control of access to oneself or to one's group. Marshall (1970) defines it as a
control over the timing and nature of one's contacts with others.

Kelvin (1973) views privacy in terms of individual independence and freedom from control by others. Power over one's own actions makes one less vulnerable to others, and reduces stress. Very low levels of control can result in totally maladaptive behaviour (Richter, 1966?). For Kelvin, isolation is a negative state; it deprives social contact and consequently the freedom of action if privacy can be perceived as a low level of interaction (rather than as non-interaction) it allows this exercise of freedom. Both in the long and in the short run, personal control over behaviour seems to reduce the stressful responses to situations (Mowrier and Werk, 1948).

Johnson's (1974) definitions describes privacy as a behaviour, designed primarily to establish secondary control over outcomes. Consequently it is a means to an end, and does not in itself satisfy any fundamental need, but facilitates the outcomes and attainment of other needs. Johnson argues that the fundamental concern of privacy is behaviour selection control, concerning the ability to choose a behavioural strategy from among various options in order to attain an outcome.

He also suggests that all acts of privacy have a potential to induce stress, particularly during the selection of the right
strategy, as the individual may be presented with options and outcomes of equal importance. The uncertainty about the adequacy of one's state of privacy behaviour in pursuing an outcome, and all general incompatibilities in selection of the right behaviour are likely to produce stress. Certainty of the outcome of an event and of the right behavioural strategy has minimal potential for stress.

It is very difficult to assess whether one's current state of privacy is ideal. As long as one's needs are satisfied, the current condition of privacy seems to be the most satisfactory. Dissatisfaction with privacy arises out of an incongruence between various states of privacy and various needs that have to be satisfied. More complex forms of the states might not necessarily improve the situation. The degree of fit between the state of privacy and a need can only be assessed as soon as a new situation requiring a new set of strategies arises (Johnson, 1974).

1.2 Functions of Privacy

All definitions of privacy suggest a boundary; a territorial claim around the self with ownership and right to limit access by others. In an individualistic society (like the
North American society), the self acquires more importance than in a society which is more socially integrated. In the latter situations notions of privacy and boundaries take on a different meaning (Simmel, 1971). Nevertheless privacy exists in all cultures. The differences lie in its manifestations and the mechanisms utilized to achieve it (Altman, 1975).

Privacy as it is perceived today is a very modern concept in man's development. In North America the individual is brought up to cherish individuality and freedom, as exemplified by the desire for his own room when he is young to the later stage of planning his own life. Other societies place more emphasis on one's role as a part of the group (Westin, 1970).

Social groups have an influence on the attitudes, opinions and behaviour patterns of their members. The extent to which this influence (and change) is exerted, depends on the attraction the group exerts on its members, and on the extent to which it satisfies their needs (Festinger, 1951). Psychologists argue that development of personality of an individual depends on the exchange of information with the other members of the group. Personality is viewed by some as a series of layers reflecting differential intimacy of accessibility to others (Altman and Taylor, 1973). Separation allows the self-awareness of an individual being, physically and psychologically (Simmel, 1971). Major developmental theorists argue that the development
of the self is the process of separation of the individual from the social and physical environment (Laufer et al, 1974).

Privacy acquires its meaning from the existence of social groups. There is no group, with the exception of the family that uniquely contributes to every aspect of the individual's life. Membership to most groups is voluntary. The family is an example of involuntary associations. In the context of the residential environment, voluntary associations acquire more meaning, as the choice of the individual's dwelling will create varying degrees of involuntary associations within the new community.7

Frequent contact with others does not necessarily engender more integration into the social group.8 Repeated interaction between individuals may cause positive reactions and personality development, but it is the possibility of retreat from interaction that helps to achieve this positive feeling. The possibility of retreat makes the individual more effective within the group upon his return to it. Besides the possibility of retreat preserves the group when conflicts arise, by allowing the termination of negative interactions (Schwartz, 1968).

Privacy is a means of avoiding conflicts between individual distinctiveness without being ostracized for it by society (Simmel, 1971). People need to disclose themselves for
their own good, but they also require private places if they are to maintain psychological, physical and spiritual well-being. In these places the individual can be as he likes without fear of sanctions from society. Where there is no privacy there is little or no individuality (Jourard, 1971). The individual control foundation for privacy appears to provide relief from tension and opportunity for development of intimate relations with others. It allows the performance of activities not conforming in standards with the social groups we pertain to (Pennock, 1971). It is equally important that the individual's actions stem from a concern embedded in society's needs. The internalization of social norms and values in the personality of individual is essential to the order in society. The individual's definition of himself eventually becomes part of how society defines him (Simmel, 1971).

The built environment can modify group interaction and association patterns (Festinger, 1950; Whyte, 1956; Meller, 1968), but it is highly unlikely that it determines them (Gans, 1967, 1968; Cooper, 1975). Indirectly the manipulation of the environment will assist or hinder personality development by aiding or obstructing interaction. Any environment that tries to isolate an individual from others may induce stress that would lead to distinguished personality changes (Schorr, 1963).

Altman defines three functions of privacy. Privacy has an
interpersonal function: knowledge of one's capabilities and limitations allows clearer definition of the self. It provides an interface between the self and others, it serves the important functions of interpersonal strategy roles, plans and assessment of behaviour in relation to others, when not in the presence of others. It gives breathing space for the individual to evaluate experiences for future relationships. Definitions of ourselves and our feelings only take meaning by comparison with others. The last but most important of Altman's functions is the definition of the self and the establishment of a self-identity. Self-observation allows "... the individual or group to see, describe and evaluate themselves usually when they are out of the presence of others." This is a broader statement than expressed by the second function, self-evaluation. Here the individual goes "off-stage" (Bates, 1964; Schwartz, 1968), lays aside his social life and finds an emotional release (Westin, 1970). While self-evaluation as described above helps determine future relationships by assessment of current situations in relation to others, the latter description only involves the self, as subject and object.

Besides personal autonomy and self-evaluation, Westin (1970) attributes to privacy the functions of emotional release. This is manifested in the form of relaxation from playing social roles - and limited communication either to share
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confidences and intimacies with others or to set boundaries for communication between the most intimate and the most public.

Laufer, Proshansky and Wolfe (1973) categorize seven characteristics of privacy. In their self-ego dimension and interactional-dimension they reiterate other authors - withdrawal helps the development of the self, as long as it is volitional and that privacy is a mutual agreement to respect each other's aloneness. It is a "control" over information in the process of interacting with others. Privacy also has a life-cycle dimension as they argue that privacy needs, abilities, experiences and desires as well as society's demands and expectations change with time. In their biography-history dimension the future effects of manipulation of information are considered. They suggest that the control dimension of privacy, "... a need to exert control over ... self, objects, information and behaviour" (p. 360), is a critical element in the concept of privacy. Control tends to get more complex with the increase in size of the social unit. Institutions tend to generate hierarchies of relationships leading to status, class and positions which demand different levels of control over experiences and information. The ability to invade the privacy of others is a sign of ranking (Schwartz, 1968). The lower the individual is in the organization, the less his control over his own privacy. Individuals in higher ranks of the organization are allowed invasion of the privacy of their dependents, but the
reverse is not the case.

An increase in the size of the group amplifies the negative or positive privacy controls, depending on rank in the organization. This society has always considered privacy a luxury and its attainment a mark of status, both socially and physically.

Laufer et al also suggest that some physical settings (ecological-cultural dimension) and some tasks (task-orientation dimension) by their nature, evoke and sustain behaviours and experiences that are private in character. Society may also expect people to perform certain rituals in non-public areas (ritual privacy dimension).

In summary, privacy provides a pause for self-assessment, consideration of alternatives for future actions and the consequences of these actions (Schwartz, 1968). Moreover privacy can provide a buffer between social pressures on the individual and his response to them. It can protect the self and restore self-esteem from mistakes which would be damaging or humiliating to the individual or the group (Altman, 1976), by permitting rehearsal of public situations beforehand (Laufer et al, 1973). The control, that it allows appears essential to self-respect, dignity and authenticity (Pennock, 1971). It helps to protect and nurture, or to enhance and extend the self
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(Laufer et al, 1973). It also enables the consumption of goods or experiences in secret, and the physical preparation for public life by enabling the enactment or rehearsal of these behaviours, away from others.

1.3 Mechanisms of Privacy

Humans utilize specific mechanisms that are intended to maintain control over the degree of access to the self, and to define its limits to sometimes include and sometimes exclude others (Marshall, 1972). No one mechanism acts by itself, and all detract from or aid the achievement of a derived state of privacy (Altman and Taylor, 1973; Altman, 1976).

Privacy can be controlled by manipulating either the environment or one's position in it. One can limit self-disclosure by limiting the exposure of one's beliefs, thoughts and other information about oneself (Marshall, 1970; 1972). The mechanisms may take the form of verbal or non-verbal behaviours (such as head/eye motions or hand gestures) (Altman, 1975). Jourard (1966) discovered that people tend to disclose more information about their attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, and work, than about money, personality or their body. Social distancing (Marshall, 1970; Westin, 1970) creates
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norms and rituals by which people can communicate. This might take the form of family rituals to use the bathroom or gain access to certain rooms. Goffman (1963) explains how rituals develop to keep a balance of interaction between private and public domains. Privacy mechanisms may vary with the culture, as societies tend to develop their own cultural mechanisms. Westin (1970), for instance, notes that Americans tend to have an informal attitude towards separation by leaving doors open, but Altman and Lett (1972) recognize the universality of "leave me alone" as reflected by physical barriers such as closed doors, drawn curtains and so on. Psychological barriers can be set up to maintain privacy in a conscious or unconscious state. The meaning and effectiveness of mental images will be influenced by the individual's previous experience (Pullen, 1965). Anonymity is suggested by Marshall (1970) as a possible way of achieving privacy. This is the feeling of being lost in a crowd. Urban families tend to experience continuous anonymity, but are more capable of retaining their privacy than rural families (Bott, 1957).

1.3.1 Environmental Mechanisms

Environmental mechanisms are the most obvious and perhaps the most pertinent to this work. Canter (1975) suggests that human spatial experience is essentially a quest for privacy. Various environmental devices may be utilized: clothes and
adornment (Altman, 1975), physical barriers (Scarth, 1964; Altman and Lett, 1972), physical distancing (Hall, 1966; Sommer, 1969) and territoriality (Marshall, 1970; Altman and Taylor, 1973). Time, although not a tangible element may also serve as a mechanism (Pullen, 1965).

**Physical Distancing**

A fair amount of work has been undertaken regarding the role of physical distancing in regulating interaction between species. Personal space is a frequently invoked phrase, resulting from the increased research into proxemics. It refers "to an area with an invisible boundary surrounding the person's body into which the intruder may not come." (Sommer, 1969: 26). Personal space is a portable piece of territory, and usually applies to a fixed geographical region.

E.T. Hall's much quoted study on proxemics described four zones with varying degrees of intimacy. An **intimacy** zone ranges from actual body contact to 18 inches, a **personal** distance ("... a small protective sphere or bubble that an organism maintains between itself and the others") ranging from 18 inches to 4 feet, a **social** distance ("a psychological distance beyond which the organism feels anxious about because of a need to be in contact with others") ranging from 4 feet to 12 feet and a **public** zone, for distances greater than 12 feet. Hall (1966)
emphasizes that distance by itself is not as important as the communication that is made possible at these distances. Many different theoretical frameworks have been proposed not necessarily contradicting each other, but not enough has been done on each to allow the emergence of one particular trend.\textsuperscript{11}

The use of personal space seems to be determined by individual factors (e.g., age, personality, and cultural factors), interpersonal relations\textsuperscript{12} and situational determinants (e.g., formality, strangeness, and location). Studies support the idea that distance of interaction also depends on the familiarity witnessed by the individual. There is reason to believe that previous experience with a place will cause people to display greater willingness for close contact with others. This situation may arise because they feel that in such a setting, they have better control over their contacts with others.

Territoriality

Sometimes it is hard to distinguish between personal space and territoriality, especially when both are being used for one end, the defence of privacy (Sommer, 1969). While personal space is close to the self, territoriality usually involves the use of places and objects in the environment.\textsuperscript{13} Objects and other physical elements can become 'personal' as a result of
their uniqueness, their constant use or cultural attachment to any one person. Sharing these physical elements with somebody else usually entails a special relationship with that person. (Altman and Taylor, 1973).

Like other mechanisms, territoriality is a flexible behaviour. It can be adjusted and readjusted to compliment and supplement other mechanisms over time, depending on how successful these other alternative or complimentary mechanisms are in controlling interaction.

The seriousness of territorial invasion is not related so much to the method as it to the type of territory that is encroached upon, the intensity of the encroachment, and the mechanism available for response. All territorial violations do not have the same meaning nor are they responded to in the same way (Altman, 1975). A whole host of mechanisms (verbal, non-verbal, etc.) from the most harmless to the most aggressive are brought into action to defend the territory. The importance of the territory invaded will be reflected in the demarcations that are more or less obvious and permanent as well as variations in defensive aggressions.

Altman (1975) defines three types of territories. Permanent territories are controlled exclusively by individuals or groups, on a relatively permanent basis.
Secondary territories are places over which an individual has some control, ownership and regulatory powers but not to the same degree as primary territoriality. Such a situation creates a potential for conflict due to the uncertainty of their nature (Newman, 1972). Secondary zones should have a clear definition of partial control. Public territories "... have a temporary quality and almost any one has a free access and occupancy rights" (p. 118). Given inadequate physical means, users will rely heavily on verbal and non-verbal mechanisms to regulate interaction.

Although the body of knowledge is very limited, certain trends can be discerned. Territorial behaviours seem to have a stabilizing function for social groups. By setting clear demarcations, clarifying roles, and providing visible cues as to who is doing what and where, empirical research has noted the importance of rooms for individual family members for withdrawal from others (Jourard, 1966). Other studies describe how physical elements such as windows, drapes, doors, fences and signs are utilized to protect people from unwanted intrusion (Schwartz, 1968) and how inadequate separation can make privacy difficult.

Chermayeff and Alexander (1963) propose the existence of six domains or hierarchies of public/private interaction, ranging from urban--public at one end of the scale to
individual--private at the other. They stress that the individual integrity and special qualities of each domain must be preserved. Therefore separation, insulation and degree of access and control between each domain is of extreme importance. They emphasize the need for locks and barriers from one space to another, and from one domain to another.

1.4 Summary

In this chapter, an overview of privacy has been presented. Recent literature explains privacy in terms of freedom and control over interaction between the self and others, rather than as withdrawal. Various mechanisms can be used to achieve this control, usually in combination with other mechanisms. The physical environment modifies privacy either by the direct utilization of physical factors, such as physical barriers, physical distancing and territoriality, or by modifying opportunities for social interaction
Footnotes


3 To these one can add Bates (1964), Kira (1966), and S. Milgram (1970).


5 "... (privacy consists of) ... those behaviours which enhance and maintain those controls over outcomes indirectly, by controlling interactions with others." (Johnson, 1974: 90).

6 Such as reserve, anonymity, seclusion and so on. More is said about these states of privacy in Chapter 2.

7 These associations are involuntary up to a point. A person will attempt to move into groups which satisfy his particular needs (Festinger, 1951). In most cases the residents have a choice over the group or lifestyle (e.g., co-op versus condominium), but probably not over the immediate neighbours.

8 One study showed that the proximity ended enmity. "... the designers were right in assuming that clustering (of the housing units) increases sociability; they did not anticipate that proximity would increase enmity" (Dean, 1976).

9 This is Westin's self-evaluation. Others give it other names such as reflection, interpretation, and meditation (Kira, 1966; Chermayeff and Alexander, 1963; Jourard, 1966).


11 See Altman (1975), Chapter 4 for a fuller description of these frameworks.

12 Relationships between people are associated with closer interpersonal distances, or smaller personal space zones. Conversely, people located at close (but not overly close) distances are viewed as having good interpersonal relationships. (Schner, 1969).
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13Privacy regulation mechanisms have a powerful meaning in Western Culture. Primary territories are important boundary regulation processes and illustrate the close linkage between privacy regulation, territory mechanisms and self-identity." (Altman, 1975: 114).

14See also Lyman and Scott (1967) who define four types of territories: public territories, home territories, interactional territories and body territories.

15Jourard (1971) also speaks of "... a sharp distinction between public and private... to make it a fit society for people to live in... for the rich experience of existence that participation in the society affords." (p. 65)
The purpose of this study is to apply a concept of privacy to the sphere of residential design, and empirically test the theoretical framework of three authors: Westin (1970), Marshall (1970, 1972), Altman (1974, 1975, 1976) and Altman et al (1970, 1971, 1973). All three authors start from a common theoretical basis, their study is built on the definition of privacy as a control over interaction.

2.1 Conceptual Framework

Westin's work (1970), although primarily an investigation into the morality of intrusion, devotes the first chapter to the nature of privacy. Westin dissects privacy into four states. In the state of Solitude, the individual deems himself alone, in his material and conscious states, although unconsciously he
might be observed, or might be in spiritual union with other beings. In this state the self is the subject and object of communication. This is the most complete state of privacy that can be achieved by any individual. Intimacy on the other hand, involves the separation of a small group from others - the minimum number that can experience this state is therefore two. The individual is "... acting as part of a small social unit that claims and is allowed to exercise corporate seclusion so that it may achieve a close, relaxed and frank relationship between two or more individuals" (p. 22). Anonymity is the feeling of being lost in a crowd in spite of a multitude of people. The state can be achieved by conforming in action, thought and behaviour with his respective social group to the point of being camouflaged. Reserve, the last of Westin's states, entails "... the creation of a psychological barrier against unwanted intrusion" (p. 32). Again this state involves only the individual, and together with intimacy, are far more common than the other two states.

Marshall (1970, 1972) derived six components of privacy. Her study involved college students and their parents, who were interviewed about their preferences for privacy. The questions made up the Privacy Preference Scale, consisting of a set of variables relating to various factors conducive to privacy. The statistical factorial rotation that was applied to the results indicated that the items on this scale loaded on six subscales,
all of which appeared both on the adult and on the student samples.

The first subscale, **Intimacy**, "... was largely concerned with items for units greater than one (e.g., with intimate friends or family)" the contents of the items loading on the **Not-Neighbouring** subscale dealt "... with disliking the tendency of friends or neighbours to drop in without warning, and with a preference for non-involvement with neighbours", either by the laying down of norms for visiting, or by choosing the "right" neighbours. **Seclusion** items dealt with "... visual and auditory seclusion of the home, placing it out of sound and sight of neighbour and traffic" and to be alone. **Solitude** also reflected a desire to be alone, either with others nearby, or far away from others. **Anonymity** on the other hand, was similar in content to Westin's 'lost in a crowd' effect, but was adapted to the anonymity of urban living. The last subscale, **Reserve** (Marshall, 1972) dealt with a preference not to disclose much about oneself to others. Marshall's subscales were generally characterized by physical barriers (Solitude and Seclusion), size of unit seeking privacy (Intimacy) and disclosure (Not-Neighbouring, Anonymity and Reserve).

The similarities between Westin's theoretical definitions and Marshall's empirical findings are obvious. They seem to be
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the only two who have dissected the abstract concept of 'privacy' into more operational definitions. Other empirical studies (as in housing evaluations) rarely make this distinction, and usually ask general questions of the type "do-you-have-enough privacy-in-your-home?" Marshall (1970, 1972) is perhaps the only one to consider these six subscales in relation to environmental variables that were intended to measure the amount of privacy in the past and present physical environments of her respondents.

While Marshall's environmental questionnaire contained some references to privacy in outdoor spaces (e.g., ability to sunbathe without being seen), the definitions were categorized by the character of privacy (visual, noise, odour etc.) rather than the state, or the type of activity that was performed in a specific place. This research undertakes to utilize the operational definitions of privacy by Westin and Marshall to investigate the attitudes towards this experience in relation to specific activities carried out in a specific location in the house—the private outdoor space.

2.2 The Hypotheses

The definition of privacy supported by this work is one of control over access to the self. Thoughts, beliefs, behaviours,
and even physical entities can be a manifestation of self. Privacy primarily entails a control over divulging information on these aspects of the self. One would expect that, under the same circumstances more control over disclosure of information would be exercised with people one gets along with rather than with those that one does not. If a person likes someone with whom he/she is about to interact, or feels a sense of identity with a group, receptivity to social contact will be high.

There is evidence to suggest that socially (and psychologically) compatible units are closer together. Altman and Taylor (1973), make a case for a cost/benefit assessment by the individual before proceeding to the next level (possibly more intimate in the case of an increasing positive relationship). Work on proxemics (Sommer, 1969) indicates that such a person is taken into more intimate physical distances than strangers. Two studies by Altman and Haythorn (1967) and Altman, Taylor and Wheeler (1971) suggest that "... growing or compatible interpersonal relationships involve a gradual elimination of physical interpersonal boundaries" (Altman and Taylor, 1973: 115). Hence in the residential environment one would expect that these people would be taken into greater confidence with increased mutual compatibility.

The situational placement of residents in high density environments makes it difficult to avoid intrusion by physical
removal of the source or the object of the intrusion. Other means have to be utilized to reduce the effect of the intrusion, in the manner described in section 1.3. The studies by Altman et al, mentioned above, suggest that social compatibility creates a social bond which eventually allows physical barriers such as territoriality, to be removed. Subsequent sharing of spaces, objects and activities may then occur.

In view of the above arguments, it was possible to generate hypotheses relating to factors affecting,

a. the control over interaction, and

b. the manner in which this control was achieved.

It was hypothesized that:

"Given a territorial demarcation of a private outdoor space in a multifamily housing project, for respondents with similar socio-economic background, the dissatisfaction with privacy will depend on the social compatibility between the neighbours, and on how well they feel they fit in the community and neighbourhood. Moreover, an increase in incongruence between the neighbours will be expressed through a greater emphasis on physical barriers and less on disclosure, and vice-versa."

There are two basic types of social strategies which are used to assist in the achievement of privacy. These are conventionalized exclusion techniques, and more commonly self censure. Which technique is used is presumably a complex function of the behaviour involved, the physical props at hand and the intruder's psychological characteristics (Bossley, 1976).
The hypothesis suggests that compatible social units would avoid intrusion (and being invaded upon) by restriction of behaviours and activities rather than physical barriers. For socially incompatible units, control over activities is not effected, dominance over territory is expressed by liberal performance of activities and neighbour intrusion is limited by the use of physical barriers (or ultimately by moving out). In this case physical barriers are a defence mechanism (input), as lack of physical barriers would result in unwilful restrained behaviour (Altman and Taylor, 1973), which might induce stress.

Secondary hypotheses were also generated in relation to the socio-economic status, age, sex, amount of space in the house and present crowding conditions of the respondents, but these will be expounded on throughout Chapters 4 and 5.
Footnotes

1 Marshall (1970) developed a three-part questionnaire for her study. The first, the Privacy Preference Scale, consisted of an 86-item scale intended to measure privacy through agreement about statements regarding privacy in a variety of situations. An Environmental Questionnaire assessed the amount of privacy, both potential and realized, in the individual's present and childhood physical and social environment, as well as the number of people lived with, privacy within the house, perception of noise, odour, perceived crowding, perceived privacy in the home, perceived privacy from neighbours and job density. A Legal Questionnaire assessed attitudes and beliefs about the "right to privacy".

2 If interaction with a friend is expected, closeness is desirable whereas interaction with a stranger would require an intermediate distance that is optimal; being too close or too far is not ideal. For unexpected interactions with a stranger however, the greater the distance the better. Research suggests that people are sensitive to one another's personal space zones and seek to avoid inappropriate intrusion into these boundaries. When intrusion occurs there are attempts to be apologetic.

3 This is not always the case. Goffman discovered that people have a tendency to divulge certain intimacies to strangers who they probably will never meet again.

"... with perceived compatibility, there is likely to be further mutual revealing and probing." See Altman and Taylor (1973), Introduction. They hypothesize that:

a. interpersonal exchange increases from superficial to intense to intimate, as they make more of themselves known to others;

b. the advancement of a relationship depends on the amount of rewards/costs which are assessed at each stage of the relationship.

This reward/cost balance is also used predictively to assess the outcomes of future interactions.
Simultaneously with the development of a conceptual framework for this study, many methods of gathering data were examined. As the aims of the study progressively became clearer, it was possible to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of each survey method more accurately. Ultimately a questionnaire form was deemed as the most appropriate.

3.1 Development of the Theoretical Components

3.1.1 Privacy Components

From Westin's (1970) theoretical and Marshall's (1970, 1972) empirically derived states of privacy, four were adopted for use in this study. These privacy components were Seclusion,
Anonymity, Not Neighbouring, and Intimacy. Solitude and Reserve had been eliminated at each of the two pre-tests. It was felt that given the living conditions of the sample, there was little probability that these states would even occur. In addition, they were found too difficult to implement in the questionnaire.

The implications of the four states are not dissimilar to Marshall's, but the definitions were amended to fit the context of this study. Thus the Seclusion state was concerned only with isolation from the observation by neighbours. The Anonymity state required information about conspicuousness as a household, i.e. about how much the respondents felt they stood out from the rest of the households. The Not-Neighbouring state was concerned with interruptions by the neighbours and the Intimacy state was concerned with group seclusion from observation by the neighbours.

3.1.2 Compatibility Components

To test the like/dislike compatibility measures, two sets of descriptors were developed, one to describe the neighbourhood and one to describe the neighbours.

The neighbourhood descriptors are based on the work of Lansing, Marans and Zehner (1970). The descriptors deal with perceptions of noise, attractiveness, maintenance, pleasantness,
crowdedness, and the adequacy of the neighbourhood as a place to live. Both scales are reproduced in their entirety in Appendix II, as questions B1 and B2 respectively.

The latter was based on a study done by Mann (1954) in which an empirical attempt was made to find descriptors by which individuals define 'neighbours'. The descriptors identify perceived measures of friendliness, noisiness, similarity of interests, helpfulness, and class, of the neighbours.

3.1.3 The Activities

A set of 11 outdoor activity categories were developed to measure variations of privacy with activity. These activity categories were derived from the work by Chapin (1974) and CMHC (1974) but were amended, to fit local conditions and expectations. The activities described within each category varied widely in nature, (and consequently in their privacy requirements).

These three elements were put together in the form of a questionnaire (see Appendix II). Altman's (1975) model of desired and achieved privacy was incorporated to discover the extent of preferences for privacy, to assess the current state of privacy in the projects. According to his model, satisfaction with privacy is only ideal when the desired level
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3.2 The Survey

The questionnaire was tested at two stages in its development. Initially it was tested on four households from De Cosmos Village, a neighbouring co-op at Champlain Heights and at a later stage on six people from various walks of life.¹

When the questionnaire was considered satisfactory, a sample of 120 households was randomly selected from two multifamily housing projects, described in Section 3.3.1. The management of each project was informed of the study and a letter (reproduced as Appendix I) was circulated to each household selected, before the interviews were started.

The information was collected by one interviewer, the author, from a sample comprising roughly 20% of the households from each project. 41% of the respondents chosen participated in the survey. Most of the respondents were not at home after a
second and sometimes a third call, but only about six households blatantly refused to cooperate.

3.2.1 The Questionnaire

As only subtle differences existed between some of the questions, the interviewer had to be consistently alert to check, by probes or other means, that the respondents adequately understood what was being asked of them, and that they answered in the right fashion. The interviews varied in duration from one and a half hours to twenty-five minutes. On the average they lasted forty-five minutes.

The questionnaire was composed of two sections. The first section consisted of a set of 88 questions, related to the preferred and achieved levels of satisfaction with the four states of privacy described above, for various activities outdoors. Owing to the repetition of the activities over the four questions that were asked, and to simplify the method of response, the respondents indicated their replies on an answer board designed for the purpose, on which the set of 11 outdoor activity categories were displayed. The respondents were told that they were not expected to perform all of the activities described. For those activities that did not apply, each respondent was asked to give his preference if the activity had to be performed. A probe question was asked to discover why the
activities were not performed.

A description of the types of activities, were displayed in turn against a five-point Likert-scale. The Scale had two sections, the top for preference answers and the bottom for achievement answers. The five positions on the Likert-Scale related to a description at the bottom of the board, indicating what each location on the five points meant. This description changed from one privacy state to the other, except for the Seclusion state and the Intimacy state, which both used the same scale. The respondent was given a set of markers (upturned, brightly coloured thumb tacks) and were asked to slide the markers on the scale against each activity, with each question relating to the privacy states.

Four questions related to the four different states of privacy: Intimacy state, Not-Neighbouring state, Anonymity state, and Seclusion state (cf. Appendix II). The questions were worded on two sets of cards, one for the interviewer and the other (in abridged form) was displayed in front of the respondent. The placement of each marker on the Likert-Scale was marked on a similar but simplified sheet on the interviewer's response sheet, according to the column numbers the markers were placed in.

In the second part of the questionnaire, (Part E in
Appendix II) the respondents were supplied with two cards for questions B1 and B2 and asked to indicate their answers using the markers. The responses were transcribed on the questionnaire sheet by the interviewer. The last question in this section was an open ended question intended to allow the respondent to voice any grievances which were not covered by the questionnaire. As it turned out very few of the respondents had anything to add about privacy outdoors, but did talk very much about other aspects of privacy.

3.2.2 Problems Encountered

The research design developed in this study measures the separation between the preferred and the achieved condition as degrees of dissatisfaction. In some cases this might not always work as some respondents were willing to accept a compromise - because they could not afford what they preferred. The dollar constraint was forcing them to adapt to a new living situation, where they had to share more of the immediate residential environment with the neighbours. The exercise then becomes one of assessing to what extent this situation induces stress (both long and short term) on the individual. This was outside the scope of this thesis.

If the preferred responses can be somewhat idealistic, the achieved responses can also give incorrect results about what
they are trying to discover. The perceived 'achieved' condition is a function of one's past experience, the present mental, physical and economic condition, as well as the aspirations (Kasl, 1974). Their assessment of what they have also took into account their attitude to compromise.

The major problem encountered in administering the questionnaire was in making sure that the respondents interpreted the questions correctly. Each respondent was told at the start that although this study was about "privacy" in private outdoor spaces, they should concentrate on each specific state of privacy being asked about. Of the four questions in Part A, the most difficult proved to be the Not-Neighbouring question. The question ran:

"How would you rate your like or dislike at being interrupted by the neighbour who starts communication with you while you were performing any of these activities described on the board, so that you had to interrupt them to attend to his need. I want to know your preferred level and your present levels of like or dislike."

While it was fairly easy to give a preference level to this question, most respondents were confused when they tried to give the achieved level response. The response had to be drawn from the respondents in two parts:
a. by the frequency of interruptions they suffer; and
b. by the level of discomfort (dislike) or comfort (like)

that the respondents had in their present set up.

While this made it somewhat easier, some respondents still
remained perplexed.

The next question which led to some difficulty concerned the degree of seclusion (on the Seclusion state and the Intimacy state). The purpose for this question was twofold. In the first instance (and primarily) it was a measure of the difference between desired privacy and achieved privacy with a group of intimates (i.e., the Intimacy state), as opposed to privacy by oneself (i.e., the Seclusion state). In most cases there was a difference between two responses. The second reason was that this acted as a check, to determine whether the respondent had understood the procedure, and was answering correctly. Overall the first section was the most difficult part of the questionnaire. It was also the longer part to administer.

When the survey was completed, the information was analysed using SPSS (a statistical analysis programme for social scientists).

3.3 The Sample

The sample for the study was selected from two multifamily housing projects. The two projects were selected from the area
known as Champlain Heights, situated in the south-east corner of the City of Vancouver. The area, is being developed in accordance with the proposals set forth in the report for areas E and F of the region (1974). The plan and implementation report emphasize "... family housing for a broad range of income and age groups, household mix, accommodation for a variety of lifestyles, liveability in housing, preservation of natural features, recreational open spaces and community service needs, vehicular and pedestrian traffic requirements." (City of Vancouver, 1974).

3.3.1 The Projects

The two projects were selected after an inspection of a number of multifamily housing projects around the Champlain Heights area. Other areas in the City and outside had been visited, but this area offered the widest variety of projects. A set of criteria were developed to guide the selection of the projects within this area. The criteria were the following:

a. **Type of housing:** Only projects with family housing were examined. As family housing constitutes the majority of the households being erected, it was felt that the problems they present are more acute. Only the projects with family units accompanied by private outdoor spaces were selected. The chosen projects have a few apartments or single bedroom units off the ground which were excluded
from the population.

b. Site Planning: A variety of configurations of both private outdoor spaces and site layouts was desirable. It was hypothesized that since site planning configurations provide opportunities for neighbouring and social contact (Festinger, 1951; Whyte, 1956), this would increase or reduce the need for privacy depending on the increase or decrease in contact between the neighbours.

c. Socio-economic status of the respondents: Respondents with comparable socio-economic levels were deemed necessary. It was felt that the introduction of more variables would have decreased the validity and conclusiveness of the study.

d. Type of Tenure: Private market housing was preferable. Research into public housing is very prolific, but inquiry into private housing is rather scanty.

e. Area: The two projects were selected from the same area primarily for convenience of the research. This had the added effect of diminishing possible variations in the respondent's perceptions of the residential environment, thus giving more meaningful results. Although both projects stand outside mutual visual contact, the residents share the same shopping facilities at Champlain Mall, as well as the same bus routes and recreational centres. There is evidence to suggest that different privacy preferences exist at subcultural level (Kuper,
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1966; Bossley, 1976).

f. Size: Projects to be selected were to be large enough to make the study meaningful but small enough to allow a sufficient number of interviews to be carried out within a limited time.

The two projects which fitted all of the above criteria were Kanata Housing Cooperative, and Southview Gardens.

Kanata Housing Cooperative

This project is made up of a total of 150 units, of which 8 are one-bedroomed with deck access. These were eliminated from the sample. The rest, include 52 2-bedroom, 70 3-bedroom, and 20 4-bedroom units.

Except for the single bedroomed units the project is set out in four clusters (see site plan, Fig 3.1). Each cluster surrounds some form of communal parking. Each unit is provided with 1.5 parking spaces, half of which are open, and uncovered. All four clusters have some form of play area for children. The spaces within the clusters are blacktopped with contrived areas of vegetation.

This is a medium density project with 15 units to the acre. The project's present setting provides ample open space around it. There are no buildings or developments on the three
major sides. On the fourth (north east) corner, the project abuts the Champlain High School.

Most of the occupants took up residence in 1975. The project was cooperatively designed - in the sense that some of the present residents had a say in physical planning decisions. Members from the co-op had been elected for the task, to represent the rest, but many of the original members of the co-op, who were involved in shaping the present design never made it into the co-op. Hence the interviewer's probe question on whether the respondent was involved at the design stage in manipulating his own unit, was meaningless, as less than five of them were directly involved.

The units vary in size and layout. All units have a fenced area in front of the living room, within their territory (Plates 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3), all are provided with a yard on the other side of the house (Plates 3.4, 3.5).

Each unit is provided with two solid timber fences, on the side of the living room (the 'back') between adjacent units. These fences are six feet high. The resident is left with the option of providing the third fence at his own expense. This fence can either be 4 feet or 6 feet high, as long as it is made of the same material (i.e. wood) and the same design (i.e. solid) as those already provided. About half of the units lack
this third fence.

The fences between the backs of units were provided to afford some protection from the neighbour's pets. Admittedly this helps, but none of the pets encountered (as the interviewer had the misfortune to experience) confined themselves within their owners' territory, and very few were on a leash.

Henceforth this project shall be referred to as KANATA.

Southview Gardens

Southview Gardens is described as a "limited dividend development" - a rent-assisted project for housing for the lower/middle income bracket.5

The density of the project is slightly higher than at Kanata, standing at 20 units per acre. There are a total of 140 units. The 28 apartments were eliminated from the sample. Of the rest, 77 are 2-bedroom, 25 are 3-bedroom, and 10 are 4-bedroom units. Each unit is rented, but this does not deter the people on the long waiting list.

The houses are planned in linear rows, on either side of three blacktopped cul-de-sacs (see site plan, Fig 3.2). These cul-de-sacs dovetail the carports and the main entrances at the
front of the houses.

Parking places divide the cul-de-sacs into traffic lanes (Plate 3.6). A solid wall separates each carport from the next. The living room on the back opens on an outdoor space, delimited on all three sides with 6 foot vertically slatted timber fences (Plates 3.9, 3.10). A gate allows access to a gravel pathway, separating the backs of the units. A patio over the carport extends over the whole width of the unit (plate 3.8).

The project is run by a manager who, acting under directions from an almost defunct tenants' association, keeps very strict discipline. The residents are allowed to modify the interior of their units, subject to the approval of the management, as long as each dwelling displays the same external appears including draperies on the windows.

Henceforth this project shall be referred to as SOUTHVIEW.

3.3.2 The Respondents

Of the fifty cases, 18 respondents were male and 31 were female. There was a higher proportion of male respondents in Kanata (11 cases) than in Southview (7 cases). Each time the
interviewer specifically asked for the person who uses the outdoors most.

Table 3.1 summarizes the distribution of people within the households. The units in both projects had a remarkably identical average number of people per household (mean=2.95 persons). The average number of children per unit was also identical (1 child) but in Southview a higher percentage were aged below 12 years (Table 3.2). Consequently the average age (Table 3.3) was higher in Kanata by about 10 years (means: Southview=36.4 years, Kanata=46.2 years).

The average income was also higher in Kanata, where the majority (75%) of the households had an aggregate income above $12,500. In Southview only 23% were in this bracket.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distribution of People Within Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>persons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanata (%)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southview (%)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age Distribution of Children in Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanata</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southview</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[( ] N=number of respondents]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age Distribution of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanata</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southview</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[( ] N=number of respondents]
Plate 3.1 Kanata: Typical carport/frontyard arrangement

Plate 3.2 Kanata: Unit arrangements without carports
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Plate 3.3 Kanata: Common frontyard in units without carports

Plate 3.4 Kanata: Backyard arrangement
Plate 3.5 Kanata: Backyard arrangement

Plate 3.6 Southview: Cluster arrangement
Plate 3.7 Southview: Main access carport and patio arrangement—3 storeys

Plate 3.8 Southview: Main access, carport and patio arrangement—2 storeys
Plate 3.9 Southview: Typical backyard arrangement

Plate 3.10 Southview: Path between backyards
This was primarily for the sake of convenience, as attempts to find a suitable housing project close to the University campus, or willing respondents off campus, failed. It was felt that the disparity in the socio-economic status of the trial H's did not really matter at this stage. The survey instruments were being tested for their adequacy rather than for the results they gave.

Although some people volunteered the information, the respondents were never asked about their previous residential experiences. Some respondents brought it up as a factor which bore an influence on what they preferred.

Included in these are the resident's as well as the visitor's parking.

To avoid confusion, the 'front' is defined as the side of the house with the main ingress, i.e., on the carport side. The opposite face, on the living room side, shall be considered the 'back'. This definition applies to both projects.

In a limited dividend development, CMHC provides a low interest rate, and money is matched by that of an independent developer with the constraint that:
- the development be designed for family accommodation;
- the Government controls the rent, limiting the dividends to the owner; and
- the owner cannot take any profit for fifteen years.

The design has created many blind spots. These are in the majority of cases at the vehicular entrances, due to the solid walls separating the carports. A bicycle circuit is included in the project, totally enclosed and blacktopped.

The extent to which this was utilized by the household is doubtful (cf. Question B5), since the main access door was on the other side. Anybody using this as an entrance would have to traverse the garden and bring dirt into the living room. So presumably it was a useful and quick way out for the children.

No pets (viz. dogs or cats) are allowed in the house, and three locations are assigned for the children's play areas. The management, at the request of the Tenants' Association has set a 9:00pm curfew on the youngsters, and has been entrusted with administering punishment by confining the insubordinate children to the outdoor spaces within their homes.
The need for man to extend territoriality rights from his home onto a piece of ground or section outdoors seems to be a strong and immutable one."
[Cooper (1972): 18]

The results described in this chapter are presented in five sections. They represent the respondents' attitudes towards the neighbourhood, the neighbours, the private open space in the units, and their perception of privacy (or lack of it) with respect to a set of activity categories. The last section discusses further response variations within the individual projects.

4.1 The Neighbourhood

The respondents were asked to rate their attitudes on a five-point semantic differential scale, with respect to six descriptors defining qualities of the neighbourhood (Lansing, Mahrans and Zehner, 1970). Table 4.1 compares the responses from both projects for all six qualities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kanata (%)</th>
<th>Southview (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B11 NOISY</td>
<td>3.6 14.3 46.4 32.1 3.6</td>
<td>4.5 9.1 50.0 27.3 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12 UNATTRACTION</td>
<td>3.6 21.4 21.4 46.4 7.1</td>
<td>- - 31.8 54.5 13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13 POORLY KEPT UP</td>
<td>3.6 7.1 21.4 46.4 21.4</td>
<td>- - - 31.8 60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14 UNPLEASANT</td>
<td>3.6 7.1 10.7 50.0 29.6</td>
<td>- - 18.2 63.6 18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15 OVERCROWDED</td>
<td>7.1 21.4 28.6 21.4 21.4</td>
<td>4.5 18.2 22.7 36.4 18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16 POOR PLACE TO LIVE</td>
<td>7.1 3.6 21.4 35.7 32.1</td>
<td>- - 18.2 50.0 31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 OVERALL ASSESSMENT (negative)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>7.1 21.4 46.4 25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>81.8 18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Attitudes Towards the Neighbourhood
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The term 'neighbourhood' was defined to the respondents as
"... the region around your home to which you feel you belong."

In most cases, the respondents' perception of the neighbourhood was restricted to the project they resided in. This was understandable for Kanata, as it was far removed from other developments. Southview however, was surrounded by all types of residential developments, including a public housing project (FP. 18), whose residents became notorious for their continual affiliations with the RCMP. A broader definition of 'neighbourhood' beyond the territory of their project would have had to include this 'less-than-worthy' project.

It is evident from the table that in spite of its higher external density (20 units per acre as compared to 15 upa in Kanata) Southview is perceived as less crowded. This supports more recent literature (Stokols, 1976; Baum and Davis, 1976; Choi et al, 1976) which distinguishes between density as a physical measurement, and crowding as an experiential state.

Children and traffic are considered to be the main source of noise, and "... it varies with the time of the day." One respondent commented that the front was usually more noisy than the back, as this is where most of the outdoor activities took place.
Very few other comments were forthcoming regarding the qualities of the neighbourhood.

4.2 The Neighbours

The respondents were also queried about their attitudes towards their neighbours. By neighbours, the interviewer intended

"... the immediate neighbours, the half a dozen families living nearest to you."

Table 4.2 compares the frequency of response for this question for both projects.

While the positive conditions for each quality are almost the same for both projects, the respondents in Southview seem to display less awareness of neighbours. They reported more 'indifferent' condition responses than in Kanata, on all qualities except noise. In most cases these responses indicated a middle of the road condition between one extreme of the respective quality and the other, but in many cases, the respondents did not know their neighbours well enough to be able to describe them. One respondent echoed many others,

"It is amazing that you can live next door and not get to know your neighbours."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B21 UNFRIENDLY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>% Kanata (28)</th>
<th>FRIENDLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22 PRYING</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23 DISSIMILAR INTERESTS</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24 UNHELPFUL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25 LOWER CLASS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B26 NOISY</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 OVERALL ASSESSMENT (negative)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Attitudes Towards the Neighbours
In Kanata the situation was slightly better.

A substantial number of respondents, expressed a distinction between friendship and neighbouring. Many, especially in Southview, indicated that they preferred to have friends from outside the projects.

"I prefer friends from outside the immediate area. Neighbours here have mutual respect, but I do not have any friends at all within the project. ... although I am on several committees, it is through a sense of obligation rather than a spirit of cooperation." (Kanata)

"Personal friends are all from outside the project. No visiting is done within the project." (Southview)

The residents of Kanata were involved more frequently in interactive behaviours with the neighbours than those at Southview. In Kanata, 75.1% talked to their neighbours at least once a week, while only 31.8% of Southview's residents engaged in this activity with the same frequency. In the latter case, acquaintanceship was restricted to a few times a month. There might be various explanations for this inactivity. It could be that the respondents were away from the project for the major part of the day, creating many incompatibilities in time scheduling, so that neighbours never met; or the respondents did not like to socialize and sought retreat.

Lansing et al (1970) found a decrease in neighbouring awareness with increasing density, although interactions are
less reduced by density than is knowledge about one's neighbours. The variation in the density between the two projects is not sufficient to make this an important factor.

One would be inclined to think that the length of stay in one location would impinge on the degree of acquaintanceship with other residents. In Southview a higher percentile of the respondents lived in their project for a longer period of time. Table 4.3 gives an indication of the length of stay in each sample project.

Table 4.3 Length of Stay of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 - 1</th>
<th>1 - 2</th>
<th>2 - 5</th>
<th>&gt; 5</th>
<th>years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanata</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>% (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southview</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>% (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[ ( ) N=number of respondents]

Statistical analysis uncovered no correlation between the frequency of communication with the neighbours and the length of stay of the respondents. The duration in residence did not improve the satisfaction with the neighbours. Further statistical analysis failed to demonstrate any significant correlation between the periods in residence of the respondents and their like or dislike of the neighbourhood.
It was hypothesized that a positive feeling towards the neighbours might generate satisfaction with the residential environment with a consequent higher rating on the attitude scale. Statistical analysis showed a significant although somewhat weak correlation ($K$-tau = 0.189, $s$ = 0.03) between the aggregate satisfaction with the neighbours and aggregate satisfaction with the neighborhood. This confirms similar works (Lansing et al, 1970) which have already established satisfaction with neighbours as a predictor of satisfaction with the neighbourhood. Perception of the neighbours as compatible was found to be very strongly associated with neighbourhood satisfaction.

This logic was extended to associations between aggregate satisfaction with the neighbours and specific qualities of the neighbourhood. A relationship was expected with attractiveness, upkeep, and pleasantness, and on the assessment of the neighbourhood as a place to live.³

There was a significant association ($K$-tau = 0.17, $s$ = 0.07) between attractiveness and feelings towards the neighbours. No significant association existed between neighbours like/dislike and assessment of the neighbourhood as a place to live, but pleasantness was also associated.

On a similar line of thinking it was presumed that
neighbour satisfaction might mitigate negative perceptions of crowding, but overall there was none. The number of people in the household did not influence the perception of crowdedness. This is also supported by the lack of statistical correlation between another variable, adequacy of private outdoor space and the number of people in the household. Of all the characteristics of the respondents, crowding seems to have been associated with the age of the respondents ($K$-tau=0.28, $s=0.03$). Older people tended to perceive the neighbourhood as less crowded than younger people.

It was postulated that income might have something to do with the respondents' preferences and attitudes, influencing in particular choice of their acquaintances (and consequently the frequency of socializing). No significant correlation was revealed between this variable and aggregate satisfaction with the neighbourhood, neighbourhood attractiveness, upkeep, pleasantness or crowdedness. There was no correlation between the income of the household and the amount of outdoor space required or perceived by the respondents, or the assessment of the neighbourhood as a place to live.

No association existed with any of the other qualities of the neighbourhood.
4.3 Private Outdoors

Each respondent was asked to define which outdoor spaces he/she considered private. Question B4 inquired:

**B4** "Which open spaces around the house would you expect others outside the family to consider as private spaces: the front yard, backyard, patio, others or none".

The pre-test had shown that some confusion could arise in the definition of what respondents considered the 'front' or the 'back' of the house. So question B5 was inserted to inquire:

**B5** "Which access to the house do you use most, the front or the back? Is that the one through which the (interviewer) came in?"

This supplied further information on the extent to which either opening was used as an exit/ingress, as all buildings had openings on both sides. The replies to question B4 have to be interpreted according to the project. Southview had different provisions for private outdoor space than Kanata did.

76% of the respondents shared the definition of 'front' as defined in this monograph, while 22% considered this side to be the back of the house. In making this classification some were influenced by what the architect had considered and named 'the front',

16% of the respondents shared the definition of 'front' as defined in this monograph, while 22% considered this side to be the back of the house. In making this classification some were influenced by what the architect had considered and named 'the front',
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"... when it was designed, this was intended to be the front."

Others associated an entrance on the carport with alley entrances to single family detached houses. In these houses carports are usually located at the back, and from the car one makes a entrance to the 'back' of the house. Another factor which applies to Southview more than Kanata, concerns the location of the kitchen at the front of the house, close to the main entrance but separated by a hallway (Figs. 4.1 and 4.2). Some perceived this as an access on the kitchen side, which in single family detached houses is usually located at the back.

In Kanata, the majority (57%) considered the backyard only as private, but a third considered both front and back as private. This was a much higher proportion than at Southview. In Kanata there was a fenced area near the carport. A higher fence would have provided more seclusion, but this is not necessarily what the respondents wanted. Some families, especially those whose units faced onto the play areas, commented favourably on the possibility of looking out of the kitchen, through the dining room window.

Kanata lacked the patio on top of the carport (provided in Southview). Only 18% of the respondents considered this space as private. In fact very few commented on its existence or its adequacy, and those who did had mixed feelings. The patio was
Fig. 4.1 Kanata: Typical House Plans
Fig. 4.2 Southview: Typical House Plans

TYPICAL 2 BEDRM. TOWNHOUSE

TYPICAL 3 BEDRM. TOWNHOUSE

TYPICAL 4 BEDRM. TOWNHOUSE
perceived as less private than the backyard, in spite of the fact that it was on the second floor, and secluded from the neighbours' windows (Plates 3.7 and 3.8). Zeisel (1975) discovered similar attitudes, but for low income housing, where people tended to prefer enclosed backyards to balconies. They were perceived as more private. Later findings suggested that the location of the patio on the most active side of the house was contributing to its low use.

Moreover the location of this space in relation to the rest of the house made access to it difficult, as it was situated outside the master bedroom (Fig. 4.2). This makes it solely accessible to the adults, but very few respondents commented on its use, except as a sundeck, and always referred to ground floor space while checking in their responses. Many of the children in this project were under twelve, and required supervision. The backyard was therefore a more likely place for play than the patio.10

4.3.1 Adequacy of Outdoor Space

A substantial number (52%) replied that they did not have enough open space around the house. This percentage was lower than expected. 38% responded that they had the right amount, either because they could not properly maintain a larger area, or perhaps more importantly, other factors dictated a
"... it is always better to have more, but for what we are paying, I guess it is alright."

Sanoff and Sawney (1972) found that a higher satisfaction with the dwelling was associated with a higher satisfaction with the neighbourhood. It was presumed, therefore, that there also might be a relation between satisfaction with some elements of the house, private outdoor space, and satisfaction of the neighbourhood. Overall there was a very significant association between private outdoor space and neighbourhood satisfaction ($K$-tau=0.42, $s=0.0017$). Inadequate outdoor space tended to generate dissatisfactions with neighbourhood.

Very significant associations ($K$-tau=0.4, $s=0.0006$) were encountered between adequacy of outdoor space and neighbourhood noise. Increased satisfaction with the outdoors seemed to be related to an increasingly perceived quietness of the neighbourhood. The adequacy of private outdoor space was weakly but significantly related ($K$-tau=0.28, $s=0.016$) to perceived neighbourhood attractiveness, upkeep ($K$-tau=0.28, $s=0.021$) and pleasantness ($K$-tau=0.24, $s=0.042$). No association was found between perceptions of crowdedness and adequacy of private outdoor space, although one would have expected the number of people in the household to have an effect on the perceived adequacy of the private outdoor space.
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Age, income, and sex had nothing to do with how adequate the private outdoor space was.

4.4 The Activities

Although no question specifically inquired about the intensity of use of the outdoor spaces, from the responses and the comments made by the respondents, it was possible to infer the intensity of engagement in any one particular activity category. It seems that these were performed as follows, in descending order of intensity.

Activities performed by oneself
1. Rest and Relaxation
2. Hobbies and Crafts
3. Home Maintenance and Repair
4. Storage
5. Games
6. Pet Care (not applicable in Southview)

Activities performed with family or intimate friends
1. Rest and Relaxation
2. Hobbies and Crafts/Informal Social Activities
3. Home Maintenance and Repair
4. Housework/Household Business
5. Games
6. Formal Social Activities
7. Child Oriented Activities
8. Storage
9. Pet Care (not applicable in Southview)
Shankland et al (1967), MoHLG (1972) and Cooper (1967, 1975) give a different order to the activities that were performed in their sample projects. Their respondents, taken from public housing developments, placed clothes drying at the top of their somewhat shorter list. In the sample under scrutiny here, the respondents either had their own laundry machines, or were provided with communal laundry facilities. One should also keep in mind that the list of activities in this study covers all possible activities outdoors, and consequently are not all necessarily performed by the respondents.

4.4.1 Privacy Preferences in Private Outdoor Spaces

It is immediately apparent from Figs. 4.3 - 4.7, and Table 4.4, that the highest amount were 'indifferent' condition responses. This could be interpreted to mean either the respondents did not care or, as in the majority of the cases, they gave middle-of-the-road responses.

For all the activities, and for N=50, most responses on the Seclusion state were for preferred seclusion, with a small minority demanding extreme seclusion. This contrasts with responses on the Intimacy state, which were mostly indifferent. On the Anonymity state, the majority (62%) preferred to be inconspicuous, with about a third feeling indifferent. On the Not-Neighbouring state, almost as many who preferred not to be
The image shows a diagram illustrating the relationship between privacy conditions and activities. The diagram is labeled as 'Fig. 4.3 Achieved Privacy by Activity Conditions 1 and 5.'

Key points from the diagram:
- Privacy conditions: Seclusion (S), Anonymity (A), Not Neighbouring (NN), Intimacy (I), Privacy by Activity.

The diagram maps out various conditions of privacy to different activities, indicating how each condition is achieved in different activities. For example, in Condition 1, Seclusion is achieved in Activities like Rest + Relaxation, while in Condition 5, Extremely Unsecluded is achieved in Storage.

The specific conditions and activities are linked with arrows, suggesting the flow or relationship between them.
Fig. 4.4 Achieved Privacy by Activity Conditions 2 and 4
Fig. 4.5 Achieved and Preferred Privacy by Activity Condition 3
Fig 4.6 Preferred Privacy by Activity, Conditions 2 and 4
Fig. 4.7 Preferred Privacy by Activity Conditions 1 and 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Secluded</th>
<th>Unsecluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECLUSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTIMACY</strong></td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANONYMITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBOURING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Preferred Privacy
interrupted (46%) did not care whether they were or not. Table 4.4 also demonstrates that, except for the Intimacy state, responses did not vary considerably from project to project.

Only a few activities had peak responses other than 'indifferent'. These were Rest and Relaxation (all four states), Informal Social Activities (Intimacy state, Anonymity state, and Not-Neighbouring state), Hobbies and Crafts (Seclusion state and Anonymity state), Housework (Seclusion state and Intimacy state), Child Oriented Activities and Storage (Intimacy state).  

4.4.2 Achieved Privacy in Private Outdoor Spaces

On this level, the majority of the respondents' replies indicated an 'indifferent' inclination to most activities, and on all four states.

Table 4.5 describes the frequency distribution of the achieved level for each state of privacy in each project. Although respondents were more specific in their attitudes towards one activity than another, Rest and Relaxation again emerges as an activity category which people were very specific about. Residents were predominantly indifferent to all activities on the Not-Neighbouring state.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Secluded</th>
<th>Unsecluded</th>
<th>Secluded</th>
<th>Unsecluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECLUSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 53.6 32.1 7.1</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 45.5 36.4 4.5</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTIMACY</strong></td>
<td>7.1 64.3 21.4 7.4</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.6 31.8 45.5 9.1</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANONYMITY</strong></td>
<td>7.1 32.1 39.3</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.2 50.0 27.3</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBOURING</strong></td>
<td>3.6 7.1 42.9 35.7 10.7</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1 50.0 27.3</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Achieved Privacy
In addition, Table 4.5 demonstrates that in Southview a larger number of respondents than at Kanata were concerned about being seen when doing activities with intimates, but in both projects they were as unconcerned when alone. This is an interesting observation considering that many respondents at Kanata did not have a fenced backyard. Similarly, respondents in Kanata tended to feel more inconspicuous, but expressed a higher dislike at being interrupted during their activities. This desire was echoed in their preferences for less interruptions (Table 4.4).

4.4.3 Dissatisfactions with Privacy

The measures of dissatisfaction developed in this methodology, did not foresee the extent of the non-applicable responses. While dissatisfactions for each state were worked out from the preferred level and the achieved level responses, it is difficult to compare the results of each activity, due to the different number of missing cases. The reader is therefore referred to the dissatisfaction tables in Appendix III, if closer scrutiny is desired. These tables indicate the predominance of slight dissatisfaction on all activities. For example the activity categories with the highest numerical 'satisfied' responses are Home Maintenance and Repair, Household Business, and Hobbies and Crafts, all of which have peak 'indifferent' condition responses at both levels. It can be
concluded that satisfaction arose, in many cases, from the fact that respondents were indifferent about the privacy state for that particular activity.

The Not-Neighbouring state was the only state to show an extreme condition of dissatisfaction, and on one activity only. There was no similarity in the order of condition responses (i.e. from one extreme to the other opposite extreme condition) for the Seclusion state and the Intimacy state. In general respondents tended to be dissatisfied more on the Intimacy state than the Seclusion state, as is also evident from Table 4.6.

The tables in Appendix III also show some demand for negative dissatisfactions, indicated by the negative codes. The larger number can be found on the Not-Neighbouring state where people preferred to be more conspicuous than they were. Child oriented Activities, Household Business, Informal Socializing and Hobbies and Crafts were activity categories with such responses. From their comments, respondents in these situations (on the Not-Neighbouring state) were willing to tolerate interruptions either through a need for a rest, or to show off, or to educate and share experiences.

Through statistical manipulation, it was possible to create an overall dissatisfaction index for each state, shown in Table 4.6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perfectly Satisfied</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Extremely dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECLUSION</strong></td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTIMACY</strong></td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANONYMITY</strong></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBOURING</strong></td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>% Kanata (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>% Southview (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 Dissatisfaction Indices
In summary, this table points to the following:

1. There are no extreme dissatisfactions. There are a fair amount of 'perfectly satisfied' responses, but these may have accrued from the huge number of 'indifferent' responses on both the achieved level and the preferred level.

2. Satisfaction is higher in Kanata on the Anonymity state and the Not-Neighbouring state.

3. Overall, respondents tended to be more dissatisfied with Intimacy state than Seclusion state. Dissatisfaction on the Intimacy state is more extreme in Southview, while dissatisfaction on the Seclusion state is more extreme in Kanata.

The dissatisfaction indices on all four states were very significantly associated with each other. 

Only dissatisfaction on the Seclusion state was found to be significantly associated with attitudes towards the neighbours (s=0.0189). On the other hand, the Not-Neighbouring state was the only one which was not significantly associated with attitudes towards the neighbourhood, where dissatisfaction on the Seclusion state was the most significantly associated. All associations were positive, i.e. a more positive attitude towards the neighbours and neighbourhood generated an increasing satisfaction with a particular state. These associations partly disprove the hypotheses. They indicate that there is no simple
pattern in the relationship between dissatisfaction with privacy and neighbouring attitudes, privacy dissatisfactions and neighbourhood attitudes.

The second part of the hypotheses also seems to be untrue. No associations were found between preferences for a particular state of privacy and incongruence with the neighbours or the neighbourhood. From the results it seems that privacy preferences are predetermined irrespective of the fit in the community. These attitudes also seem to be immutable with time (no association was discovered with length of stay in residence), but preferences for limitation of neighbour interruptions (Not-Neighbouring state) seem to be mitigated by frequency of interaction with the neighbours. Similarly preferences for less conspicuousness were associated with the number of people in the households—the greater the number, the less people preferred to feel conspicuous.

Justification for the kind of achieved seclusion is not obvious. This was the only condition (both on the Seclusion state and the Intimacy state) which was significantly associated with the overall assessment of the neighbourhood.

No achieved state of privacy was associated with overall attitudes towards the neighbours, but neighbours described as prying seemed to decrease the amount of achieved intimacy and
increase the dislike to be interrupted by the neighbours.

4.5 Response Variations in the Sample Projects

The lack of an overall pattern of association in the whole sample, suggested further investigation into the privacy responses in the individual projects. The ensuing discussion will focus on the social differences in the two projects in an attempt to bring out the salient features that might contribute to the various conditions of privacy.

Privacy has been presented as the control over the self/other boundary. Where this boundary is set will depend on various factors—personal, interpersonal and situational (Altman, 1975), personality development and upbringing (Wolfe and Laufer, 1974), personality characteristics (Willis, 1963b), past residential experience (Marshall, 1970b) and socio-economic status (Willis, 1963a) the last variable is the most directly relevant to the architect/designer.
4.5.1 Socio-economic Background

Income

Michelson (1970) suggests that income is less of a determining factor in satisfaction with housing than, say, education, and both are less influential than the lifestyle of the respondent. In both our samples, dissatisfactions with all four states of privacy were not associated with income, but the specific preferences for privacy were.

It has already been pointed out that there were variations in the average income in each project. This was probably more a function of age than social status. The respondents in Kanata were on the average ten years older (Table 3.3) than those in Southview. One could assume these people would be in a better job position. In Kanata income was found to be associated with a preference for the Not-Neighbouring state, suggesting, as in the study by Willis (1963) that lower income families, in contrast to higher income families, preferred no interruptions, and disliked disclosing their activities to the neighbours. Control over input/output interactions is usually stronger in lower income families. For them personal control over housing and other aspects of their life is a fundamental need. Their social status does not allow them many opportunities to exercise this control.
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Age

Dissatisfaction on the Seclusion state in both projects tended to decrease with age. Only Kanata displayed an association between preferences and age. Older people were inclined to be more conspicuous. This finding would suggest that age was a more important determinant of attitudes on privacy than income, as older people tended to be more outgoing. Marshall (1970-c) also found an association with age, but in her study older people were inclined to opt for Reserve (lack of disclosure about oneself) and Non-Involvement with the neighbours. However, other research (Onibokun, 1976), concluded that age is not a factor in determining housing satisfaction, or privacy (Willis, 1963-c). From the comments made by the respondents, it seems that attitudes expressed in this study are the result of confidence attributable to the respondent’s achievements in life. These accomplishments are a reflection of the position in the life cycle rather than age per se.

Class

By Michelson’s (1970) definition, both projects housed respondents in the working to low middle class range. Most respondents in both projects agreed that they belonged to the same class as their neighbours (Table 4.2). Disagreements were found however in the Kanata project. In Kanata respondents who
perceived their neighbours as belonging to a higher class demonstrated a preference for greater conspicuousness when performing their activities. The desire to be conspicuous may again be the result of the respondents' stage in the life cycle. The preference for conspicuousness maybe a desire to instruct other people in certain ways, rather than an attempt to demonstrate equal status. This is illustrated in the following comments.

"People should watch others teaching kids"
(Kanata)

"I love working on my garden and enjoy people enjoying my garden."
(Kanata)

**Similarity of Interests**

Compatibility in the neighbourhood is a function of similar interests and attitudes (Gans, 1967). Shared attitudes as well as evaluations concerning the neighbourhood and the community are responsible for a positive neighbourhood assessment rather than demographic, ethnic or socio-economic features (Lansing, Marans and Zehner, 1970).

Increased verbal communication with the neighbours seemed to engender a greater feeling of friendliness from the neighbours, but only in Southview were there increased perceptions of the qualities of helpfulness and interest similarity qualities. In spite of this, Southview still
seemed to lack sufficient neighbouring to enable neighbours to know each other's qualities.\textsuperscript{17}

Friendliness did not affect the evaluation of privacy in either project on any of the four states, but it did seem to affect the preferred level of interruptions that would be tolerated. Higher perceptions of neighbours as friendlier were associated with a preference for less dislike of interruptions.

Dissimilarity of interests seemed to affect the achieved level of privacy on the Anonymity state and the Not-Neighbouring state.\textsuperscript{18} People with similar interests seemed to feel less conspicuous while performing their activities outdoors and tended to dislike interruptions from neighbours with dissimilar interests.\textsuperscript{19}

\textbf{Noise}

Noise is one of the most common sources of lack of privacy, especially in multifamily housing—both to the recipient (by excess) and the actor (by limiting the number of activities one can perform) (Bossley, 1976). Noise has also been found to contribute towards neighbourhood dissatisfaction (Lansing et al, 1970).

In neither project did neighbour's noise have any impact
on the achieved level of any privacy state. Most respondents in both projects (Table 4.2) perceive the neighbours as quiet, but at the density of these projects, it may be possible that individuals do not really care whether or not they hear the neighbours (Lansing et al, 1970). In both projects many respondents were more aware of neighbour's noise inside the house, rather than outside. Criticisms of this nature were more frequent in Southview than at Kanata.\footnote{20}

Neighbourhood noise seems to be a more important element in the respondent's attitudes to privacy than neighbour noise. Neighbourhood noise was found to contribute to dissatisfaction on all four states of privacy. What is even more surprising is that all associations were found in Kanata, and none in Southview.\footnote{21} Concomitantly, neighbourhood noise did not affect the achieved level of the privacy states, but respondents who felt they lived in a noisy neighbourhood preferred to be more inconspicuous.

These associations should not be construed as cause-and-effect. The association between Seclusion state and Intimacy state, an experience concerned with observation, and noise, is difficult to explain. Respondents who were next to quiet neighbours usually also felt satisfied with the amount of seclusion. This is an important point to remember when considering that the activity engaged in most is rest and
relaxation, which usually requires both seclusion and quiet. Another explanation might be that the respondents construed 'observation' in the sense of awareness, i.e. noise generated a subconscious feeling of somebody on the other side of the fence and therefore the possibility that the respondents might be observed. Consequently the respondent would have felt slightly more conspicuous. In effect, assessment on the Anonymity state decreased with noisiness of the neighbours. There was also a preference for inconspicuousness with increased noise.

**Prying**

Next to noise, this quality seems to have elicited most responses—in both projects (Table 4.2). But respondents were more aware of the extent of their neighbours intrusions in Kanata than in Southview. Prying engendered a positive association with dissatisfaction with seclusion in Kanata ($\kappa$-tau=0.31, $\sigma$=0.061), suggesting that prying was a visual intrusion. In Southview, associations also tended to confirm the same thing. But here the associations were stronger with the Intimacy state. There is no obvious answer for the nature of these results. The only explanation that can be offered is that stemming from an earlier discussion on socio-economic status. Respondents in Southview were in the lower income bracket and were less interested in making their family affairs known to others. Hence they would not be keen on exposing
family activities to the uncontrolled scrutiny of the neighbours.

4.6 Summary

In the results presented here, there does not seem to be an immediately obvious pattern of associations, which distinguish between social and physical states of privacy. There is, however, an emphasis on certain trends.

1. Respondents in Kanata are more aware of their neighbours' characteristics than those in Southview.

2. There is a high indifference for preferred privacy and achieved privacy outdoors. Consequently there is a high rate of satisfaction with the status quo.

3. Respondents tended to be more dissatisfied with seclusion for activities with family and intimates (the Intimacy state) than for solo activities. The neighbours contributed only to dissatisfaction on the Seclusion state but not on the Intimacy state.

4. The neighbourhood characteristics seem to be more related to privacy attitudes than neighbours.

5. Noise both from neighbours and neighbourhood is the most important contributor to dissatisfaction with privacy.

6. Further statistical analysis into the response variations
between the two sample projects revealed far more associations were found in Kanata than in Southview.
Footnotes

1 Each response, for each quality, was given a score from 1 to 5 (1=extremely negative, 5=extremely positive) and added up. The results were then recoded and readjusted to give the total score at the bottom of the tables. This score gives the overall level of satisfaction either with the neighbourhood (Table 4.1) or the neighbours (Table 4.2).

2 Interview with the manager of Southview, and comments made by some of the respondents.

3 For the sake of clarity, the following terms have been assigned the following meanings:
  state refers to any one of the four privacy states; quality refers to any one of the six descriptors on questions B1 and B2; activity category refers to any one of the activity categories described in Part A of the questionnaire; level refers to either the preferred level or the achieved level, and condition refers to any one of the attitudes on the Likert Scale or Semantic Differential scale.

4 Kendall's Tau is a non-parametric measurement between two ordinal level variables, based on the rank ordering of the two variables. Associations were deemed insignificant beyond the 0.08 level.

5 This hypothesis was based on the assumption that the respondents equated the neighbourhood with the projects they lived in.

6 Older people seemed to be bothered less by prying from the neighbours.

7 Separate analysis showed otherwise. In Kanata there was a significant relationship (K-tau=0.3, s=0.01) between income and frequency of communication between neighbours. Where the higher income residents socialized more frequently than lower income residents. No significant relationship was discovered in Southview.

8 The interviewer always made an entrance from the front, according to the definition of 'front' given earlier. This was the only access to the house with a lock which could be operated from the outside. This always meant the entrance by the carport, or for Kanata, on the side of the parking lot.

9 Only 7% of the respondent in Kanata considered the front only as private, compared with 14% in Southview.
As it stands in Southview this patio in the author's view is awkward space. In the Mediterranean for example, the same kind of space is used for laundry purposes, neighbouring and socializing activities, but primarily it functions as a front seat to the show of life enacted on the street. This is hardly the case in Southview. The weather does not allow this. Secondly the people do not interact as much outdoors. Under these circumstances, the streets then become merely communication arteries and conveyors of traffic. Indeed in Southview they seem to have been designed with only that in mind. All three cul-de-sacs, prevent their use by outsiders with no business in the project, thus cutting down on further activities. The management has confined children's play activities to specific areas, away from the streets. Admittedly such procedures may force strangers into the project to be easily identified (Jacobs, 1961; Newman, 1972), but the author questions the extent to which residents can identify each other, as there seems to be little contact between the neighbours anyway. One respondent could not distinguish between privacy from neighbours and privacy from strangers. He suggested that the two were one and the same. Each Cul-de-sac houses a resident manager who presumably is in a better position to identify residents in a particular cluster.

This does not exclude the fact that other conditions could have been given near-to-peak responses, and vice-versa. The reader is therefore referred to the frequency distribution diagrams for each activity in Appendix III.

The other activities with a predominance other than 'indifferent' were Games (on the Seclusion state and Intimacy state), Formal Social, Child and Storage activities (on the Anonymity state and Intimacy state), Housework (on the Seclusion state and Intimacy state), and Informal Social and Pet Care activities (on the Intimacy state).

Whether the achieved seclusion is good or bad, can only be measured in relation to the respondents' preferences. Hence the dissatisfaction indices are more appropriate measures of privacy.

The associations were as follows:

Seclusion state by Not-Neighbouring state K-tau=0.29, s=0.013
Anonymity state by Intimacy state K-tau=0.37, s=0.0009
Not-Neighbouring state by Intimacy state K-tau=0.37, s=0.001
Seclusion state by Anonymity state K-tau=0.54, s=0.0000
Seclusion state by Intimacy state K-tau=0.48,
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s=0.0002
Anonymity state by Not-Neighbouring state \( K\text{-tau}=0.37 \),
s=0.0059.

15 A very significant association existed between age and perception of neighbour's class \( (K\text{-tau}=0.36, \ s=0.0082) \).

16 It is important to keep in mind that the qualities of friendliness and, especially, helpfulness in some cases were those perceived to be so rather than experienced. This tends to idealize the situation so that even neighbours who are not considered friendly were perceived as so "... if the need arises". The associations were more significant in Kanata \( (s=0.027) \) than in Southview \( (s=0.053) \).

17 See Table 4.2. The frequency of response on all qualities except noise are more specific in Kanata than Southview.

18 The associations were as follows. With

Anonymity state \( K\text{-tau}=0.31 \),
s=0.034; Not-Neighbouring state \( K\text{-tau}=0.27 \),
s=0.063

Both are to be found in Kanata.

19 The associations should be read together with the overall assessment of the neighbours' responses, already described in Table 4.2. One should keep in mind the large number of indifferent and non-committal responses.

20 This was construed from the replies to question B12. In general comments about overall privacy were very favourable. Criticisms about internal privacy were more frequent in Southview than Kanata. In the latter project, co-op members provided better insulation than CMHC minimum requirements.

21 The associations with neighbourhood noise were as follows. With:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dissatisfaction} & \quad \text{Seclusion state} \quad K\text{-tau}=0.43, \\
& \quad s=0.0093 \\
\text{Dissatisfaction} & \quad \text{Intimacy state} \quad K\text{-tau}=0.33, \\
& \quad s=0.02 \\
\text{Dissatisfaction} & \quad \text{Anonymity state} \quad K\text{-tau}=0.40, \\
& \quad s=0.0162 \\
\text{Dissatisfaction} & \quad \text{Not-Neighbouring state} \quad K\text{-tau}=0.27, \\
& \quad s=0.086
\end{align*}
\]

22 The incompatibilities of seclusion and noise in Southview was probably the reason why the patio was not used as much. See also Section 4.3.
By now it is possible to arrive at some deeper understanding of how privacy, particularly in private outdoor spaces, is perceived. Whereas no simple pattern of association involving privacy states and the characteristics of neighbours and neighbourhood is evident, it is being submitted that there is another set of results that are pointing in the same direction, viz., the fact that there are far more associations in Kanata than at Southview. It is also being submitted that these results arise from a basic difference between the projects—tenure. Physical factors further enhance the effect of tenure.
5.1 Social Organization of the Sample Projects

5.1.1 Effect of Tenure on Interaction

A walk through the projects will quickly verify that there is more activity in Kanata than Southview. Kanata residents, as indicated are more acquainted with their neighbours. This allows them to be more specific about their attitudes towards privacy. It is possible that excess neighbouring, might have had the reverse effect. Since the same number of interviews in both projects were carried out in the evenings, it is unlikely that the lack of interactions in Southview is the result of time scheduling.

Gans (1967), Lansing et al (1970), and Cooper (1975), all support the influence of homogeneity in creating more cohesive neighbourhoods. Gans (1961) points to stage in the life cycle, class, education and ethnicity, as the four most important elements of homogeneity. As is evident from Chapter 3, Kanata was more homogenous with respect to the first two factors. This feature is enhanced by another factor, the fact that Kanata is a co-operative housing project.

Co-operative housing is a way of life, and failure to understand this can lead to difficulties. Consequently, people
entering into a co-op are screened for suitability. Co-op members buy shares and thus become part owners in the project. This gives them a say in decision making.

In Southview, screening is absent, and residents do not have the same responsibilities, suggesting that their aspirations in terms of housing requirements are probably different. Being, on the average, younger Southview respondents have more time in which to attain (or hope to attain) their ultimate goal—their own house. There is therefore less commitment to their project, as demonstrated by the higher turnover. Concomitantly the management in Southview does not encourage communication there.2 The Southview residents are excluded from all project-related decisions—they are told what kind of curtains they must have. It's not surprising that the Tenants' Association is virtually defunct.

Southview's 'condition' is reflected in a study by Cooper, Day and Levine (1972). She found a similar lack of commitment in rental projects. Moreover their study at St. Francis Square—a co-op housing complex—indicated an increase in neighbouring frequency as compared to other projects examined.3 These results parallel those of the Kanata residence. It is possible this type of tenure allows better control over interpersonal boundary relations, and affects perceptions of privacy. The same study comments on the use of communal facilites as 'ice
breakers*. In another (Beck, Rowan, Teasdale, 1975) laundry rooms, community equipment and parking lots were areas where one commonly met people. Similar facilities in Southview did not function as well, but the laundry was sometimes mentioned. The same study proposes that,

"Specific activities are required to initiate contacts because of the common interests communicated, but once contact initiated and the 'ice' broken involvement in common pursuits are no longer necessary to pursue communication."

This is precisely what seemed to be happening in Kanata. The co-op held monthly meetings as well as an annual general meeting. The author was informed of a men's darts club and a women's sewing club. During the period of the interview the residents were engaged in a plantathon to further improve the landscaping. Other activities, for example, hikes for junior members of the Boy's Scouts, were also organized within the clusters. Under such conditions of community formation, privacy as a withdrawal from human interaction has been found to be unimportant (Willis, 1963-c).

All these opportunities for contact were causing a better definition of where the interpersonal boundary (Altman, 1975) should be set, by virtue of more knowledge about the actors. It should also be emphasized however, that the depth of the dissatisfactions with privacy is not great. Not only was there a high rate of indifference on the states, but none of the
associations discussed so far, are very strong, although some were very highly significant.

5.1.2 Effect of Tenure on Social Organization

Each project displays a different way of achieving privacy—at a high level of interaction in Kanata, and a low level in Southview. The lack of emphasis on the preferred level and the achieved level of the states does not detract from the overall satisfaction. It just states the extent of appreciation of the problems.

The high level of interaction and the overall satisfaction with privacy at Kanata, suggest not only the establishment of a boundary, but its maintenance through social strategies. Physical barriers, e.g., fences, were either not emphasized, or the options available for more seclusion not taken. Despite the absence of statistical associations to support this postulate, the type of social organization within the project was setting up a social interface by which to achieve privacy. This does not mean that one type of privacy is better than another. Typical of statistical analysis, one is averaging the behaviour of many. Privacy, if it is indeed to be a personal control of interaction, varies with the need of each individual and the activity engaged in. The link to a more general community
interaction should be underscored. Interaction is beneficial to both the group and the individual's psychological development (see Chapter 1). It is in this respect that the privacy at Kanata is better. That privacy is possible at this level, in this kind of environment is an important realization, in the light of the current disenchantment with such projects. Privacy does not have to be achieved by withdrawal. The manager at Southview seemed keen to run the project in this way. One wonders in fact whether this is what the respondents wanted. Table 4.4 indicates, that the preferences for seclusion, conspicuousness etc., are comparable to those at Kanata.5

One must also keep in mind that this study is dealing with privacy outdoors. If one is to conclude anything, it is that privacy inside the house is more sacrosant than outdoors. In most cases people do not care how they are perceived outdoors.6 However, despite their insistence that privacy did not hinder their activities outdoors, their responses, as indicated previously, suggest that indeed they are, and that some would prefer more seclusion. Privacy indoors is more important. When one feels more compatible with the neighbours, more emphasis will be laid on social strategies than on physical separation, by limitation in engagement in certain activities.
5.2 Physical Factors Impinging on Privacy

Physical variations in the project seem to be reinforcing interactions (or lack of them). Coupled with more homogeneity, site layout may be sustaining social interaction. The location and layout of the private outdoor spaces, as well the provision of communal facilities further contribute to this factor.

5.2.1 Site Layout

The site layout in Kanata may be generating more opportunities for contact. To quote Cooper et al (1972),

"When the arrangement of dwellings with respect to certain shared facilities is such that regular and respective contacts between small subgroups of neighbours takes place, there will be a greater likelihood of recognition and social contact."

The importance of site layout in social behaviour has been discussed by several authors, but there seem to be disagreement on the nature and extent of the influence. Studies on physical proximity show that the amount of social interaction is correlated with physical separation and that in homogenous populations, propinquity and friendship formation are associated. Spatial proximity is a function of the relationship between the actors (see Chapter 2). In heterogeneous populations housing proximity is probably not enough to overcome
social class barriers, although certain attitudinal changes may take place (Kasl, 1974). Being more homogenous, the Kanata layout may support more opportunities for interaction. These contacts may also account for the greater neighbourhood satisfaction the Kanata respondents expressed.

In effect the site layouts of the two projects are the same in principle. Kanata was planned in four clusters, while Southview was designed around three cul-de-sacs (see Chapter 3). Studies on the implications of site layouts do not distinguish between cul-de-sacs and court layouts. Both are apparently least susceptible to lack of privacy in terms of noise and can offer as much privacy in their outdoor spaces as single family houses (Lansing et al, 1970). It is being submitted that in fact, there exists a difference in the layout of the two sample projects which resulted in greater neighbour contact in one project. There is evidence to suggest that court developments create more opportunities for neighbouring than other site arrangements.

Gans (1967) and Cooper (1975) suggest that for varying classes of people, neighbouring starts in the backyard and moves forward to the front yard, as the stay gets longer. People try to find comfort in each other by sharing opinions, insecurities of living in a new place, fixing furniture, Richard Nixon, and so on. As residents become more confident of their roles, and
friendships become deeper, encounters move to the front, and start without any need or cause. It is more likely however, that the neighbouring patterns both in Kanata and in Southview skip the first stage, or are carried out in the front space right away. The six foot fences between units at the back do not allow much interaction. No conversations were observed between people on different house levels. People were observed chatting in the front, but rarely at the back.

A physical design that increases day to day contact does not necessarily increase friendliness—in fact the contrary might be true (Goard, 1975; Dean, 1976). Kanata's configuration augments contact. All units have a full length window opening onto the front. It is therefore much easier for neighbours to be aware of each other's comings and goings. In Southview, no openings whatsoever were provided at this level. Additionally only Kanata's carports were separated by a solid wall. In Southview this wall was taken further out, between the main access and the carport (Plate 3.7). Even if the front door was left open, the view would be restricted by the width of the access corridor. Some units in Kanata also shared a common front yard (Plates 3.2 and 3.3). A similar arrangement existed in Southview, where the entrance access corridor was shared with one other tenant, but the respondents did not hint at much interaction with this neighbour.
Front yard activity in Kanata was further enhanced by the greater provision for communal parking, for the units without a carport (Fig 3.2). Here the play areas were located within the clusters, whereas in Southview they were located between clusters.

Both layouts had a pedestrian system which ran between the backyards. In Southview because the arrangement was on the opposite side of the main access it was rarely used by adults. In addition, none of the paths went through to the road. In Kanata, paths were more direct routes, but one tended to take short cuts through the other clusters, thus increasing contact possibilities. In Southview, all three clusters lead off the same bus route, which made it highly unlikely that anyone would walk to his house other than through his own cluster.

5.2.2 Overlooking

None of the respondents in either of the projects under study complained about the degree of enclosure. Even when there was no third fence (in Kanata), respondents in units adjacent to moderately used pedestrian paths did not feel uncomfortable, as they believed people refrained from looking inside. Undoubtedly some respondents would prefer the view, others to be able to see people walk by or chat (Cooper, 1967). In most cases the lack of a fence meant that they could extend their activities into
common territory, as most backyards extended naturally into the surrounding green. The fact that only one of the respondents built a six foot fence suggests that enclosure was not intended for seclusion but 'practicalities' as exemplified by wind protection, noise protection, keeping out animals and children, and preventing easy access by burglars.

Admittedly various studies on public housing (Shankland et al, 1967; Cooper, 1967, 1972) indicate that residents require fences around their backyard to improve utilization of space by reducing overlooking. In Willis's study (1963-b) overlooking was an important element of privacy. Whether it was ignored or not depended more on the type of people, what they were doing, who looks in, how, and when, rather than physical proximity of people or buildings. Some respondents in the projects expressed concern about being overlooked, but in general it did not seem to create excessive pressures.

"There is a certain amount of overlooking. When you move to a row house you have to give up a certain measure of seclusion which one would have in a half acre lot."
(Kanata)

"Personally I do not give a *@!# if I am watched."
(Southview)

"Little worry about activities. Sometimes inhibiting. When we moved in at first, people looked in a lot because neighbours wanted to know each other."
(Kanata)

"For us no problem because everyone is away all the time. Maximum amount of privacy for a town house."
Although seclusion on the Seclusion state seemed to be highly preferred (Table 4.4) in both projects, the respondents in Southview felt they had less seclusion while engaging in family activities and were more dissatisfied on the Intimacy state. The intensity of responses on the preferred level for the Seclusion state was approximately the same for both projects. This is not to say that the projects satisfied their seclusion needs in relation to the Seclusion state, as Tables 4.5 and 4.6 indicate. At the same time these respondents also felt more conspicuous, in spite of the higher fences. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the number of non-applicable responses in Southview is a higher percentage than at Kanata. It seems, therefore, that the reasons supplied by the respondents for not engaging in activities may not apply, especially lack of space, as in fact Kanata had smaller units. These results suggest two points. First there may be other reasons for this perceived lack of seclusion. The possibility of actually being overlooked was scarce. Fences were high enough and neighbours were reported as minding their own business. Hence the respondents must be aware of their neighbours in other ways, say by the amount of noise they make (or by their cooking odours if they are Maltese). What seems likely is that respondents experience insecurity when displaying their family activities and consequently indulge in withdrawal.
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Such an experience seems to be curtailing their activities outdoors, in spite of reports to the contrary.

This kind of reaction is not uncommon for this kind of class of people. Willis (1963-b), speaking of the difference in the perception of privacy between the middle and working class, reports that the middle class,

"are afraid of being criticized by others, getting a feeling of guilt at not conforming to the expected pattern. They seem more conscious of other people and they bear in mind other people's feelings"

On the other hand, the working class,

"tend to feel less as being judged personally and are more afraid of nosey parkers. They are afraid of people passing on details of their possessions and of what people think of the condition of the home ... Home is personal and ... they should not look in as this is intruding on privacy."

The amount of seclusion preferred and achieved varied with the type of activity. The activity categories most affected have already been mentioned.

5.2.3 Crowding

Altman (1975) defines crowding as a failure of privacy mechanisms to retain a balance between the desired and achieved interaction, when the former is less than the latter. Various studies have indicated that attempts to reestablish the interpersonal boundary balance, takes the form of either
withdrawal, aggression or other negative behaviours, as well as verbal and paraverbal, in a mixture of quality and quantity. While the majority of the respondents did not perceive the projects as overcrowded, there is no evidence that those who did resorted to any aggressive means to reduce interaction. Rather results tend to support the idea that no one specific mechanism is adopted but one maybe emphasized when combined with others.

The difference between crowding, considered to be an experiential state, and density, a physical measurement and usually a prerequisite for crowding, has already been mentioned. Density can be measured in various ways and each has its own implications (Katz, 1964; Evans, 1973). Internal density is as crucial as external density. When people are overcrowded there is little opportunity to carry on basic activities away from other members of the family, and internal privacy becomes important. Both sample projects in this study had different external densities but the same average internal density (2.95 persons per dwelling). However, Southview units were larger than those at Kanata (for the same number of bedrooms) and this may have given rise to the different crowding responses reported earlier.11

Research has shown that the preferences for lower densities arise from associations for greater privacy and less noise (Lansing et al, 1970). The subject of noise has already
been discussed. In both sample projects, crowding made an impact on the feeling of seclusion in both projects, on the Seclusion state. In Kanata dissatisfaction on this state increased with increasing crowding perception. In Southview, on the same state, the project was perceived as less secluded by those who perceived the project crowded.

The association between the Anonymity state and crowding (K-tau=0.39, s=0.026) would also seem to indicate that there might be an excess of opportunities for interaction at Kanata, causing a tendency for the reverse experience. This might not necessarily be the case, one can be conspicuous by not interacting too much.

The number of people in the household also seemed to affect the preferences but not the assessment of privacy in the project. Thus in Kanata, more people in the household usually generated a demand for more seclusion on the Seclusion state and a desire to be more inconspicuous. Similar associations were not discovered in Southview where, on the other hand, respondents demanded less seclusion with increasing number of people in the household (on the Intimacy state).

These results lead to the conclusion that the intensity of stimulus within the household is affecting external visual interaction. As the units were smaller in Kanata, one would be
inclined to think that the stimulus would be higher thus eliminating the desire for more extraneous stimuli (Mehrabian, 1976). In Southview, the contrary would be true. Moreover, assuming the same density per dwelling in both projects, it can be argued that in Southview, the backyards could be excessively enclosed and the people were willing to tolerate more visual interaction. This contradicts an earlier argument that in Southview, people were actually withdrawing from interaction, for activities with the family. The earlier argument seems more plausible, since preferences for seclusion on the Seclusion state was very high for both projects and there were indications for withdrawal on the Not-Neighbouring state (Table 4.4). This can be seen as another link in the chain. The physical environment is creating more opportunities for stimulus from within the house in Kanata and curtailing it in Southview, causing a desire for a reverse experience.

In neither project was this response associated with the number of people in the household, which is not surprising, considering that perceptions of crowding were also not associated with perceived adequacy of the private outdoor space.

In any case, crowding did not increase or decrease the satisfaction with the projects.
5.2.4 Open Space

The adequacy of outdoor spaces for family activities is a factor in neighbourhood satisfaction only if residents feel they have too little space available. In high density areas, adequacy of outdoor space for family activities becomes important. The more space available the higher is the satisfaction with the neighbourhood (Lansing et al, 1970).

Moreover there is evidence to suggest that not only does the amount of outdoor space limit the kind of activities performed outdoors (Smith, Down, Lynch and Winter, 1969), but that satisfaction with privacy is associated with satisfaction with the open spaces (Zeisel and Griffin, 1976).

An equal number of respondents in both projects felt that they did not have enough space to support their outdoor activities. However more people in Kanata, in spite of the smaller outdoor spaces, perceived it as adequate. Perhaps the opportunity to extend activities beyond their territory made them perceive it as larger than it really was.

In Kanata, adequacy of the private outdoor space was associated with the dissatisfaction indices on the Seclusion state, Not-Neighbouring state and Intimacy state. All tended to increase with the perceived inadequacy of open space. In
Southview a similar association in the same direction occurred on the Anonymity state only.

Larger open spaces may be a solution. It would increase the separation between the units. This increase would perhaps limit interaction on the Not-Neighbouring state. The Seclusion state and the Intimacy state would not necessarily be affected. Some respondents indicated a preference for larger open areas by stating the desire to live on a 10-acre lot if they could. In a small proportion of the interviews, this attitude proved to be a problem. As the respondents were satisfied with what they had in terms of housing, but would prefer this option, given no limitations. Thus in asking for preferences without setting some degree of constraint, the replies seem to express idealistic desires.

It is doubtful whether in fact these respondents realize the full implications of this attitude and whether they would survive in it. It is true that humans adapt, but seclusion of this nature is not beneficial to personal growth (see Chapter 1). Other practical constraints would also be inhibiting, but one would assume that if they could afford to own a ten-acre lot they could also afford to hire somebody to maintain it.

There is no doubt that there is need for private outdoor spaces, but a denser and more compact living condition (in the
range of 100-150 persons per acre) would liberate a lot of public open space for other purposes, agricultural or otherwise. Unfortunately, so far, this is anathema to the average North American.
In the preceding study (Gatt and Iwata, 1976), the major complaint arose from a misunderstanding of what co-op housing is all about. Respondents felt they had too many restrictions, and wanted to be able to sell the units they lived in.

One would assume that the number of times one talks with one's neighbours increases the degree of information about the neighbour. Surprisingly enough in neither project, the frequency of talk was not associated with either dissatisfaction with privacy, assessment or preferences. It seems therefore that in Kanata, increased talk was either the result of acquaintance struck somewhere else, or was trivial to gettin information about the neighbours. in Southview, on the other hand, such an association existed. Lack of other activities left neighbours with only this way to get to know each other.

Another co-op study in the Champlain Heights area (Gatt and Iwata, 1976) revealed similar intensities of frequency of communication with the neighbours.

The impression given by the manager at Southview was that the detachment encountered there was a lifestyle which the residents chose. To what extent this is true is not certain. Maybe newcomers to the project are 'instructed' in this lifestyle. Some respondents commented on the strictness with which the project is run. Even so it is highly unlikely that this was causing undue stress. Because the residents,

- always had an image of how bad it can get without control, in the public housing project opposite;
- almost all were moving out some time or other and were willing to adapt to the inconvenience for a short while;
- presumably some were getting used to living in townhouses anyway.

The statistical procedure used, utilizing a rank-order measurement, may not be totally suited to the high clustering of responses on one condition—'indifferent'. The high number of missing cases on the dissatisfaction indices may also have contributed to the lack of correlation.

It has already been pointed out that in fact respondents in Southview perceived the project not secluded enough for solo activities. Now if the patio is not normally utilized one can conclude that the family and solo activities share the same visual privacy. So the problem does not stand with family
The respondent may have been insecure and afraid to display his lifestyle in a relaxed manner. This is understandable, since the respondent is young, insecure and probably has little residential experience of this nature.

6 Responses to Question B12.

7 Various respondents commented on the adequacy of private outdoors as "... Sometimes more than in a detached house."

8 Both studies took American samples. If they had been Canadian they would talk about the Saskatchewan rough riders or the mole on Rene Lavesque’s left nostril.

9 The unopenable windows in Kanata would not allow such an event.

10 Kanata, the project with the higher average age, and lower density was perceived more crowded.

11 Marshall’s results in this respect tend to follow the ones in Southview. Her argument was based on adaptation level theory. Respondent who were subjected to low levels of privacy in the home (i.e., high number of persons in the household) would tend to indulge in activities with lack of privacy rather than more.
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research not only provided information regarding the utilization of private outdoor spaces in multifamily housing but also enabled data concerning other areas somewhat related to privacy to be collected.

6.1 Conclusions

a. PRIVACY IS A PERSONAL CONTROL OVER INTERACTION. IT INVOLVES THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A BOUNDARY BETWEEN TWO OR MORE SOCIAL GROUPS TO CONTROL THE INPUT AND OUTPUT OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE SELF. AS SUCH, IT VARIES FROM PERSON TO PERSON, GROUP TO GROUP AND CIRCUMSTANCE TO CIRCUMSTANCE.

Privacy has been dissected into social states (Anonymity state and Not-Neighbouring state), and physical states (Seclusion state and Intimacy state).
Dissatisfaction with any one of these states was found to increase with an increase in dissatisfaction with any of the others. Each state, however, was expressed independently of the others.

There is statistical support for the hypothesis that privacy depends on the perceived fit of the individual within the neighbourhood. On the contrary, there is little evidence to support the contention that it is associated with neighbour compatibility. Similarly there is no simple and clearly evident pattern of association which allows one to discern when and under what conditions social strategies are utilized over physical strategies to retain privacy.

b. Tenure and management play an important part in the achievement of privacy, but they are not the only controlling factors. Improved social interaction made possible by the type of tenure determines where the interpersonal boundary is set. This barrier may be established to allow either a high degree of interaction or none at all.

Effective privacy can be achieved without withdrawal. The sample projects demonstrated low levels of privacy dissatisfaction at two opposite levels of interaction.

High interaction improves knowledge about social groups, and allows a better understanding of where the intrusion threshold is set. Consequently there is less reliance on physical barriers and more on social strategies. Low interaction gives rise to the opposite effect. Increased communication is
beneficial. It engenders more feelings of friendliness, helpfulness and compatibility, which in turn can create better feelings about one's neighbourhood. Too much communication can be debilitating. Co-operatives, or similarly organized communities can provide better opportunities for more frequent interaction. They may generate a greater sense of commitment to, community in, and satisfaction with the development. Rental projects, unless of a fairly stable nature, will not achieve as much.

c. PRIVACY BASED ON WITHDRAWAL, HINDERS THE NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES THAT ARE PERFORMED OUTDOORS.

Families in the early stages of the life cycle tend to be more susceptible to lack of seclusion on activities with families or intimates, in spite of higher visual barriers.

d. IN THE PARTICULAR RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENT UNDER STUDY, PRIVACY PREFERENCES SEEM TO BE SET AND IMMUTABLE OVER TIME. THEY ARE PROBABLY DETERMINED BY PREVIOUS RESIDENTIAL EXPERIENCE. WITHIN THE SOCIAL STRATA CONSIDERED HERE, AGE INCOME AND SEX HAD LITTLE TO DO WITH DISPOSITIONS TOWARD PRIVACY IN THIS SPACE.

e. PRIVACY IN PRIVATE OUTDOOR SPACES IS NOT A NEED, BUT A DESIRE. MOST PEOPLE FIND PRIVACY OUTDOORS IN MULTIFAMILY HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS NOT MUCH DIFFERENT FROM SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED HOUSES.

f. THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT HELPS OR HINDERS PRIVACY TO THE EXTENT THAT IT HELPS OR HINDERS INTERACTION.
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The physical environment can create opportunities for more interaction. Under such circumstances, physical barriers are provided for reasons other than protection from intrusion.

6.2 Recommendations

The Unit

a. PROVIDE A HIGHLY SECLUDED OUTDOOR SPACE, FOR USE BY ONE PERSON, AWAY FROM NEIGHBOUR AND FAMILY INTERRUPTIONS, OBSERVATIONS AND NOISE.

Need: The activity category which elicited very definite privacy requirements was Rest-and-Relaxation. Here there was a high preference for visual seclusion on the Seclusion state and the Intimacy state and a tremendous dislike for interruptions.

Although there was a very low preference for extreme seclusion, a remarkably high preference for the 'secluded' condition in connection with solo activities was found, especially for Hobbies-and-Crafts (and Rest-and-Relaxation). The following activities were noted as having specific privacy requirements, in relation to the listed states.

Seclusion for Activities with Intimates
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Informal social functions
Formal social functions
Child oriented activities housework
Storage

Inconspicuousness

Hobbies and Crafts
Formal Social Activities

No Interruptions

Informal Social Activities
Formal Social Activities.

Form: Small balconies or patios immediately attached to one's bedrooms, secluded from observation and neighbourhood noise (e.g., traffic). Any such provision is in addition to family outdoor space.

b. PROVIDE SUFFICIENT OPEN SPACE TO SUSTAIN THE FOLLOWING COMMON ACTIVITIES:
HOBBIES AND CRAFTS
INFORMAL SOCIAL ACTIVITIES
HOME MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR
HOUSEWORK

Need: Adequacy of private outdoor space improves satisfaction with the neighbourhood. Gardening was a very popular form of outdoor activity, especially when the housing rules specify tenant participation in the upkeep of the visible private outdoor space.

The absence of a basement or communal working facilities, increased utilization of the outdoor space for heavier work. Sufficient hard surfaces should be provided
Private outdoor spaces should be provided with some form of weather protection. This may involve a partial covering or construction or at least the users should be allowed to build their own.

Children tend to play on the same level where family activities occur. Small children have to be under direct eye contact and play in the same location where the parent works.

Form: In Kanata 700 sq. ft. (325 sq. ft. at the front and 375 sq. ft. at the back) for a three bedroom house is considered sufficient by 85% of the respondents there. In Southview 575 sq. ft. for the same house is only considered enough by 45% of the population there. Other factors (e.g. enclosure, distribution of space, and so on) are also contributing to this feature.

c. PROVIDE CLEAR LABEL TO 'BACK' AND 'FRONT' OF THE HOUSE.

Need: People appear to associate the back of the house with privacy, whereas the front is considered the public side of the house. This kind of recommendation affects the internal layout of the house, and the disposition of the entrance in relation to the carport, kitchen and the
formal rooms. An entrance on the same side as the carport and/or kitchen is traditionally associated with use by close friends of the family or its members, and generally is allowed to support messy activities (exemplified by car washing). The front tends to be used for social display. Open spaces for 'private' consumption here do not work as such but are treated as semi-public spaces, irrespective of the degree of seclusion.

Form: Separate main entrance from the carport. Provide enclosed space for storage of maintenance equipment, etc., or hide away from 'public' eyes. Provide all 'private' open spaces on the 'private' side of the house (the back). Allow personalization of the front of the house.

d. RELIANCE ON PHYSICAL BARRIERS IS NOT REQUIRED WHEN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD EXHIBITS HIGH LEVEL OF INTERACTION BETWEEN THE RESIDENTS.

Need: Prying and overlooking diminish achieved seclusion and increase the dislike for neighbour interruptions. The feelings of being observed are most serious when privacy is achieved by withdrawal, rather than when it is achieved by high level interaction. Little wilful prying was found. When it happened it was usually the result of adjustment to the project and hence was only present in the initial stages of the residence.

Form: Provide options in the provision of physical barriers,
including option of taking down the fences.

e. EMPHASIS SHOULD BE LAID ON INDOOR PRIVACY AS OPPOSED TO PRIVACY IN PRIVATE OUTDOOR SPACES.

Need: There were a large number of indifferent or non-committal responses. Dissatisfactions were very slight on most activities. Furthermore, an open-ended question extracted more complaints about lack of privacy within the house. The treatment of the interface between the indoors and the outdoors can be important, if the feeling of outdoors is to be designed with the privacy of the outdoors. Low stimulus load within the house may generate needs for greater visual contact with what goes on outside.

Form: This ought to be the subject of further investigation.

f. PROVIDE SUFFICIENT PHYSICAL FLEXIBILITY, TO ALLOW FOR THE VARYING NEEDS OF PERSONAL CONTROL OVER INTERACTION.

Need: Backyards are the most behaviourally diverse spaces in the house. Some respondents hinted at a need for less seclusion and more interruptions than they had. Two respondents had agreed to take the common fence between their units down.

Form: Options to build fences such as was found at Kanata is to be commended.
Permeable fences between units could possibly work as well, particularly if the level of interaction, explained earlier, was high. In this condition of interaction, demarcation of territoriality is more important than visual seclusion.

**Site Layout**

g. PROVIDE VISUAL ACCESS TO PUBLIC OR SEMI-PUBLIC SPACE IMMEDIATELY OUTSIDE THE HOUSE.

Need: Interactions between the units and activities outside are desirable for many reasons.

Form: Windows onto the front porch, and visual accessibility to the outside from the back. Covered porches, balconies in frequent use can also serve this purpose.

h. CLUSTER HOUSING AROUND SHARED FACILITIES, SUCH AS COMMUNAL PARKING LOTS, CHILD PLAY AREAS, ADULT RECREATION AND NODES OF ACTIVITIES.

Need: If involuntary social contacts are reduced among immediate neighbours, it is equally important to design for other forms of social participation, as long as the residents are not forced into situations they cannot get out of.

Form: The above recommendation (h). Properly laid out pathways which take residents through different parts of the project, and facilities such as communal laundries may
be beneficial in this respect. The latter may not be popular for its inconvenience.
Court layouts work better in engendering contact than any other form of layout.

j. LOCATE HIGHLY SECLUDED AREAS AWAY FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD NOISE SOURCES.

Need: Neighbourhood noise is more detrimental to privacy than neighbour's noise. Children and traffic are the two most common sources of disturbances. Noise was found to affect the amount of perceived seclusion.

Form: Provide the distinction between front and back mentioned earlier. Separate noise sources and concentrate neighbourhood noise on one side of the house preferably the front.

6.3 Further Research

The most important relevant conclusion for this section is that a high degree of privacy in private outdoor spaces is not a critical experience—it is not a need. Studies about privacy should be directed towards furthering knowledge about privacy within the dwelling. Within the limits set by this statement, this study can be extended in the following ways:
a. Similar research could tackle the trade-offs residents are willing to make, when faced with certain constraints. Finances seem to be the most common. Various research methods exist for this purpose (e.g., games). Studies of this nature should include overall privacy within the home, and should not be limited to private outdoor spaces. In this study the only constraints on these attitudes were those set by the projects themselves i.e., in the ratings of assessment of achieved privacy. This study only shows how the existing units performed, but does not give any indication of the possibilities of other combinations of the elements involved.

b. The concept of privacy within the family should be explored further. This research points to the need of small highly secluded areas for the individual, away from other family members. The provision of a communal family area is also understood to be beneficial.

c. If social organization within the project is important, then other 'well organized' projects, not necessarily co-ops, ought to show similar trends.

d. This study shows that privacy can exist at two levels—at a high interaction and at a low interaction—but does not indicate which one is better (e.g., which one induces less stress).

e. A similar study should be undertaken with variations in the physical form of the project, such as,
-Site layout, with variations in the third dimension, for example apartments, or stacked housing.

-This study indicates that there are instances where less importance is attributed to physical barriers. Studies of projects where such partitions are absent, have to be carried out to determine the extent of the variations.

f. If another study is undertaken where privacy is dissected into operational definitions, then the survey method should also include a question about respondents' attitudes to overall privacy. This allows better statistical analysis of the relationship of the parts to the whole.

6.4 Epilogue

The concept of privacy now ought to be a little less complex.
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APPENDIX II
QUESTIONNAIRE

Part A

(Interviewer to fill in this part of the questionnaire from respondents' choices at the board. Probe for reasons for activities not performed).

Sec A  NN  Int

0. STORAGE (preferred)  ___•___•___•___
   (achieved)    ___•___•___•___

1. HOME MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR  ___•___•___•___
   ___•___•___•___

2. HOUSEWORK  ___•___•___•___
   ___•___•___•___

3. CHILD ORIENTED ACTIVITIES  ___•___•___•___
   ___•___•___•___

4. HOUSEHOLD BUSINESS  ___•___•___•___
   ___•___•___•___

5. PET CARE  ___•___•___•___
   ___•___•___•___
The following questions pertain to each state of privacy. Each question was read to the respondent in the order it is presented here.

SECLUSION

"If you had to perform in your private open space any of the sets of activities described on the board, to what extent would you, as an individual, want to be secluded, that is having isolation from observation by the neighbours. I want to know your preferred and your present achieved levels of seclusion."
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ANONYMITY

"If you had to perform in your private open space any of the activities described on the board, to what extent would you be able to perform them without feeling conspicuous as a household, that is without getting the feeling of standing out from the rest of the households in the immediate neighbourhood. I would like to know your preferred feeling for anonymity as well as your present achieved state of anonymity."

NOT-NEIGHBOURING

"How would you rate your like or dislike at being interrupted by a neighbour who starts communication with you while you were performing any of the activities described on the board, so that you had to interrupt them to attend to his need. I want to know your preferred and your present levels of like or dislike."

INTIMACY

"If you had to perform in your private open space any of the activities described on the board, involving you with any other member or members of the family, or relatives or close friends, to what extent would you want to be secluded from observation by the neighbours. I want to know your preferred and your present achieved levels of seclusion."
Part B

B1. Now I am going to show you some words and phrases which I would like you to use to describe your neighbourhood. By neighbourhood I mean the region around your house to which you feel you belong. These qualities range from one extreme, say extremely noisy to another opposite extreme, say extremely quiet. The centre column is the neither/nor or indifferent column. The in-between columns indicate a position somewhere in-between. I want you to indicate on the card how these words and phrases can describe your neighbourhood.

(1 2 3 4 5)

(B11) NOISY :___:___:___:___:___: QUIET
(B12) UNATTRACTIVE :___:___:___:___:___: ATTRACTIVE
(B13) POORLY KEPT UP :___:___:___:___:___: WELL KEPT UP
(B14) UNPLEASANT :___:___:___:___:___: PLEASANT
(B15) OVERCROWDED :___:___:___:___:___: NOT CROWDED
(B16) POOR PLACE TO LIVE :___:___:___:___:___: GOOD PLACE TO LIVE
B2. Now I would like to ask you a few questions about your immediate neighbours, I mean the half a dozen families living nearest to you. How would you describe your immediate neighbours? Again I am going to show you some words and phrases, and I want you to follow the same procedure as in the previous question.

( 1 2 3 4 5 )

(B21) UNFRIENDLY :____:____:____:____:____: FRIENDLY

(B22) MINDING THEIR OWN BUSINESS :____:____:____:____:____: NOSEY

(B23) SAME INTERESTS AS MINE :____:____:____:____:____: TO MINE

(B24) HELPFUL :____:____:____:____:____: UNHELPFUL

(B25) HIGHER CLASS OF PEOPLE :____:____:____:____:____: LOWER CLASS OF PEOPLE

(B26) NOISY :____:____:____:____:____: QUIET

B3. How often do you talk to any of these half a dozen families who live closest to you, just to chat or during a social visit? Would it be:

1. ____ EVERYDAY
2. ____ SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK
3. ____ ONCE A WEEK
4. ____ 2-3 TIMES A MONTH
5. ____ ONCE A MONTH
6. ____ A FEW TIMES A YEAR
7. ____ NEVER
Appendix II: Questionnaire

B4. Which open spaces around the house do you expect to be considered by others outside the family as private spaces? Would it be:

1. ___ FRONT YARD
2. ___ SIDE YARD
3. ___ BACK YARD
4. ___ ALLEY
5. ___ SIDEWALK/PATH
6. ___ OTHER

B5. Which access to the house do you use most? Would it be:

1. ___ FRONT
2. ___ BACK
3. ___ OTHER

Is that the one through which (the interviewer) came in?

1. ___ YES
2. ___ NO

(Interviewer description: ____________________________ )

_____________________________ )
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B6. How do you feel about the amount of outdoor space immediately attached to your home, which members of your family can use for their different activities? Do you feel that your space is:

1. **MORE THAN NEEDED**
2. **RIGHT AMOUNT**
3. **TOO LITTLE**

B7. How long have you been staying in this house?

1. **0-1 YEARS**
2. **1-2 YEARS**
3. **2-5 YEARS**
4. **MORE THAN 5 YEARS**

B8. How many people live in this house?

1. **0-12 YEARS OLD**
2. **13-18 YEARS OLD**
3. **OVER 19 YEARS OLD**

B9. What is the aggregate income of the family?

1. **UNDER $5000**
2. **BETWEEN $5000 AND $9999**
3. **BETWEEN $10000 AND $12499**
4. **BETWEEN $12500 AND $14999**
5. **OVER $15000**
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B10. Respondent's age (by observation)
   1. ___ 18-34 YEARS
   2. ___ 35-54 YEARS
   3. ___ 55-74 YEARS
   4. ___ OVER 75 YEARS

B11. Respondent's Sex
   1. ___ MALE
   2. ___ FEMALE

B12. Can you tell me your general feelings about the overall privacy in this project and in your house? (Probe: acoustic problems, problems with neighbours, site arrangement and similar).
APPENDIX III
ACTIVITY CATEGORY RESPONSES

The following activities are presented in the same order they were submitted to the respondents.

Activity 0: Storage

Description

"for example: utilization of private outdoor space for the open storage of disused furniture; excess building materials, and other underutilized household wares."

Results

Fig. A3.0 gives the overall frequency of distribution for the Seclusion, Anonymity, Not-Neighbouring and Intimacy states. The diagram clearly illustrates the predominance of responses in the 'indifferent' condition for three states. It also indicates that, with the exception of the Anonymity state, the achieved level responses follow the profile of the preferred level responses, although at a reduced intensity. The diagram also compares the responses for the two states of Intimacy and Seclusion for this activity.
The Tables A3.01-A3.04 give an indication of the degree of dissatisfaction experienced by the respondents for this activity. The codes indicate the degree of separation on the Likert Scale between the preferred levels and the achieved levels for each of the four states.

Code 0 on these tables indicates no separation between the preferred and the achieved levels, and consequently shows that there is satisfaction with that particular state of privacy. The negative codes on the Seclusion state indicate that the respondents preferred less seclusion than was achieved. While the positive codes indicate preference for more seclusion. The codes on the Intimacy state have the same meaning as those on the Seclusion state. On the Anonymity state the negative codes indicate a preference for more conspicuousness, while on the Not-Neighbouring state, they indicate a preference for liking interruptions.

The Tables show the very high rate of response in the indifferent/none condition, the highest Standard Deviations being for the Seclusion state and Intimacy state, and the lowest for the Not-Neighbouring state.
Remarks

People seem to have confused the activity—the act of storing things, with the event—stored artifacts. Storage space was reported as a problem in both projects, but is felt to be more acute in Southview, as the units lack a basement. Some respondents asked for and were granted permission to close off part of the carport to utilize it for this purpose. This made the storage space

"... private, in the sense that it is enclosed."

14 cases reported that they did not store anything outdoors at all mainly for reasons of security ("... no fence was available"), other alternatives ("... I store things in the basement"), visual congestion, seclusion ("When I am outside, I do not want to do anything I do not want seen"), lack of space, both indoors and outdoors, and management restrictions ("... the manager has authority over the removal of the material in the backyard").
Fig. A3.0 Frequency Distribution of Preferred and Achieved Responses per Privacy State: Activity Category 0
### Table A3.01 Dissatisfaction (Seclusion) Storage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cumulative Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td><strong>MISSING</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 50

**Mean** 0.548 **Std Err** 0.226 **Median** 0.294

**Mode** 0.0 **Std Dev** 1.261 **Variance** 1.589

**Kurtosis** 2.510 **Skewness** 0.310 **Range** 7.000

**Minimum** -3.000 **Maximum** 4.000

**Valid Cases** 31 **Missing Cases** 19
TABLE A3.02 DISSATISFACTION (INTIMACY) STORAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 1.179  Std Err 0.236  Median 0.833
Mode 0.0  Std Dev 1.249  Variance 1.560
Kurtosis -1.579  Skewness 0.374  Range 3.0

Valid Cases 28  Missing Cases 22
### TABLE A3.03 DISSATISFACTION (ANONYMITY) STORAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **MEAN**: 0.655
- **STD ERR**: 0.218
- **MEDIAN**: 0.333
- **MODE**: 0.0
- **STD DEV**: 1.173
- **VARIANCE**: 1.377
- **MINIMUM**: -2.000
- **MAXIMUM**: 3.000
- **RANGE**: 5.000

**Valid Cases**: 29 **Missing Cases**: 21
### TABLE A3.04 DISSATISFACTION (NOT-NEIGHBOURING) STO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 50 100.0 100.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>0.103</th>
<th>STD ERR</th>
<th>0.152</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
<th>0.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>STD DEV</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>VARIANCE</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURTOSIS</td>
<td>19.910</td>
<td>SKEWNESS</td>
<td>4.021</td>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINIMUM</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>MAXIMUM</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VALID CASES 29 MISSING CASES 21
Activity 1: Home Maintenance and Repair

Description

"For example:
external maintenance of the house and other areas within your private open space; removal of ice and snow; taking out the garbage; burning trash; general heavy garden maintenance (e.g. landscaping, etc.), not included in Activity 9 (Hobbies and Crafts) below."

Results

Fig. A3.1 shows the frequency of distribution for the Seclusion, Anonymity, Not-Neighbouring and Intimacy states. The diagrams illustrate the predominance of the 'indifferent' condition response, on both levels of each state. One can also discern the similarities in intensity for the states for the respective preferred and achieved level responses.

Tables A3.11-A3.14 show the frequency of distribution for several degrees of dissatisfaction for the four states. The nature of the codes expresses the same meaning as that described for Activity 0 (Storage).

A predominance of the 'no dissatisfaction' condition is evident, in spite of the high number of inapplicable responses.
The lowest standard deviation was obtained in the Not-Neighbouring state, which also had the highest number of inapplicable cases.

Remarks

Only 4 cases responded that such activities have never been carried out. These respondents said that they were very considerate of the neighbours, and did not want to disturb them.

The wide range of activities under this category also generated a wide range of attitudes.

"I feel extremely conspicuous while I am installing a chimney, but not while I am repairing a chair."

Interruptions were welcome by some.

"It is about the only time I would want them"

"I would not really like them but it would be a good interruption."

There were very few respondents who reported interruptions by the neighbours, hence the high response on the indifferent condition on the Not-Neighbouring state. Some seclusion was requested for security reasons but,

"... not extremely secluded because if someone swipes things ..."
Fig. A3.1 Frequency Distribution of Preferred and Achieved Responses per Privacy State: Activity Category 1
### Table A3.11: Dissatisfaction (Seclusion) Home Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: 50

**Valid Cases**: 42  **Missing Cases**: 8

**Mean**: 0.643  **Std Err**: 0.159  **Median**: 0.333

**Mode**: 0.0  **Std Dev**: 1.032  **Variance**: 1.064

**Kurtosis**: 2.097  **Skewness**: 1.485  **Range**: 5.000

**Minimum**: -1.000  **Maximum**: 4.000

---

**Kanata and Southview**
### Table A3.12 Dissatisfaction (Intimacy) Home Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean** 0.395  **STD ERR** 0.134  **Median** 0.172  **Mode** 0.0  **STD DEV** 0.877  **Variance** 0.769  **Skewness** 1.559  **Range** 4.000  **Valid Cases** 43  **Missing Cases** 7
### APPENDIX III

#### KANATA AND SOUTHVIEW

**Table A3.13 DISSATISFACTION (ANONYMITY) HOME MAINTENANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGCBY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 50 100.0 100.0

**MEAN** 0.348 **STD ERR** 0.133 **MEDIAN** 0.200

**MODE** 0.0 **STD DEV** 0.900 **VARIANCE** 0.810

**KURTOSIS** 2.294 **SKEWNESS** 0.384 **RANGE** 5.000

**MINIMUM** -2.000 **MAXIMUM** 3.000

**VALID CASES** 46 **MISSING CASES** 4
## TABLE A3.14 DISSATISFACTION (NOT-NEIGHBOURING) HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>-0.024</th>
<th>STD ERR</th>
<th>0.108</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
<th>-0.030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>STD DEV</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>VARIANCE</td>
<td>0.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURTOSIS</td>
<td>10.279</td>
<td>SKEWNESS</td>
<td>1.479</td>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINIMUM</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>MAXIMUM</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VALID CASES** 41  **MISSING CASES** 9
Activity 2: Housekeeping

Description

"for example: doing the laundry out in your private open space, hanging the laundry to dry out in the open, other cleaning chores connected with the house, but carried out in your private open space."

Results

Fig. A3.2 gives the frequency distribution for the Seclusion state, Anonymity state, Not-Neighbouring state, and the Intimacy state. It is evident from the diagram that for the Seclusion and the Intimacy states, there is a predominance of preferred seclusion. The achieved condition for these two states is less clear. There is predominance on the achieved seclusion on the Seclusion state but achieved unseclusion on the Intimacy state. On the Anonymity state the peaks coincide at the 'indifferent' condition.

Tables A3.21-A3.24 give the frequency distribution for several degrees of dissatisfaction for the four states. The description and signage of the codes have the same meaning as for Activity 0 (Storage).
Remarks

Only one respondent said that he never did any of the activities that fall under this category. Most who refrained from doing the laundry, did so either because communal laundry facilities (including dryers) were provided in the project, or because they thought they were not allowed by the management to hang their laundry outside. In reality the management, on the authority of the Tenants' Association, did not allow any laundry, or anything else for that matter, that would stand above the 6 foot high fences. It had also been agreed that no hanging of the laundry was allowed on weekends, as presumably these were the days when most people entertained. Some refrained from hanging the laundry outside because,

"I hate to see laundry hanging outside," and consequently "I feel extremely conspicuous."

A number of people had their own laundry facilities or,

"... would rather laundry in a private place than in a communal laundry."
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Fig. A3.2 Frequency Distribution of Preferred and Achieved Responses per Privacy State: Activity Category 2
### Table A3.21 Dissatisfaction (Seclusion) Housework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean** 0.568  **Std Err** 0.157  **Median** 0.283  **Mode** 0.0  **Std Dev** 1.043  **Kurtosis** -0.277  **Skewness** 0.712  **Minimum** -1.000  **Maximum** 3.000  **Variance** 1.088  **Range** 4.000  **Valid Cases** 44  **Missing Cases** 6
## Table A3.21 Dissatisfaction (Intimacy) Housework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>-3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 50  100.0  100.0

- **Mean** 0.750  **Std Err** 0.218  **Median** 0.441
- **Mode** 0.0  **Std Dev** 1.449  **Variance** 2.099
- **Kurtosis** 0.035  **Skewness** -0.021  **Range** 7.000
- **Minimum** -3.000  **Maximum** 4.000

**Valid Cases** 44  **Missing Cases** 6
### APPENDIX III

#### KANATA AND SOUTHVIEW

**A2**  
**TABLE A3.23** **DISSATISFACTION (ANONYMITY)**  
**HOUSEWORK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**: 50  
**MEAN**: 0.400  
**MODE**: 0.0  
**KURTOSIS**: 0.789  
**MINIMUM**: -2.000  
**MAXIMUM**: 4.000  
**VALID CASES**: 45  
**MISSING CASES**: 5

**STD ERR**: 0.186  
**STD DEV**: 1.250  
**SKEWNESS**: 0.493  
**VARIANCE**: 1.564  
**RANGE**: 6.000
### Table A3.24: Dissatisfaction (Not-Neighbouring) Housew

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: -0.093  
Mode: 0.0  
Median: -0.065  
Std Err: 0.099  
Std Dev: 0.648  
Skewness: 0.088  
Kurtosis: 3.234  
Minimum: -2.000  
Maximum: 2.000  
Mean: -0.093  
Mode: 0.0  
Median: -0.065  
Std Err: 0.099  
Std Dev: 0.648  
Skewness: 0.088  
Kurtosis: 3.234  
Minimum: -2.000  
Maximum: 2.000  
Valid Cases: 43  
Missing Cases: 7
Activity 3: Child Oriented Activities

Description

"for example: passive participation (e.g. watching, listening) in child's play, helping children pursue their interests, hobbies etc., reading to children, administering punishment; in your private outdoor space."

Results

Fig. A3.3 shows the frequency of distribution for the Anonymity, Not-neighbouring and Intimacy scales. This was an activity where the Seclusion state did not apply. 36% of the respondents were without children in the house. In the others the children were either not old enough or too old for any of the activities described under this category.

It is immediately evident from the diagram that on the Intimacy state the preferred and achieved responses stressed opposite conditions. It is also evident that while most were indifferent whether they preferred to be conspicuous or not, they felt conspicuous while performing anyone of the activities described. On the Not-Neighbouring state, most people were indifferent and almost the same amount disliked any kind of interruption from the neighbours. In fact very few had
experienced any interruptions, hence the high rate of 'indifferent' responses.

Tables A3.31-A3.34 gives the frequency distribution for various degrees of dissatisfaction. All three states exhibit a high rate of 'indifferent' responses.

Remarks

In spite of the relatively high degree of preferred seclusion on the Intimacy state, some respondents felt it would be beneficial if they were seen with the children,

"I don't think that sitting with the child is an unattractive thing"

"... people ought to be involved with each others' children."

Some activities require more seclusion than others. The last activity in the description generated unusual sensations.

"I am indifferent except for administering punishment ... I think it should be administered indoors."

"I want to speak to my kids alone."

The source of conspicuousness was usually the children's noise (screaming, crying, etc.). This bothered a few of the respondents who were "... concerned with disturbing the neighbours."
Not many neighbours interrupt while this activity is taking place, and even if they do only the minority (12%) dislikes the interruptions. Some would,

"... bring the neighbour in if the interruptions occur outside."

Due to the high rate of 'non-applicable' responses it becomes difficult to determine the degree of dissatisfaction in the sample.
Fig. A3.3 Frequency Distribution of Preferred and Achieved Responses per Privacy State: Activity Category 3
TABLE A3.31 DISSATISFACTION (SECLUSION) CHILD ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VALID CASES 0 MISSING CASES 50
## Table A3.32 Dissatisfaction (Intimacy) Child Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 50 100.0 100.0

Mean: 0.657  Std Err: 0.196  Median: 0.263

Std Dev: 1.162  Variance: 1.350  Skewness: 0.728  Range: 4.000

Minimum: -1.000  Maximum: 3.000

Valid Cases: 35  Missing Cases: 15
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#### KANATA AND SOUTHVIEW

**A3**  **TABLE A3.33**  **DISSATISFACTION (ANONYMITY)  CHILD ACTI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td><strong>MISSING</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN** 0.514  **STD ERR** 0.184  **MEDIAN** 0.275  
**MCDE** 0.0  **STD DEV** 1.121  **VARIANCE** 1.257  
**KURTOSIS** 0.141  **SKEWNESS** 0.089  **RANGE** 5.000  
**MINIMUM** -2.000  **MAXIMUM** 3.000  

**VALID CASES** 37  **MISSING CASES** 13
### TABLE A3.34  DISSATISFACTION (NOT-NEIGHBOURING) CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN**  -0.333  **STD ERR**  0.161  **MEDIAN**  -0.250  
**MODE**  0.0  **STD DEV**  0.884  **VARIANCE**  0.782  
**KURTOSIS**  0.891  **SKEWNESS**  0.095  **RANGE**  4.000  
**MINIMUM**  -2.000  **MAXIMUM**  2.000  

**VALID CASES**  30  **MISSING CASES**  20
Appendix III

Activity 4: Household Business

Description

"for example: dealing with salespersons, peddlars and people of similar profession who show up at your private yard entrance; showing repairmen and inspectors into your private outdoor space."

Results

Fig. A3.4 shows the frequency of distribution for the anonymity state, the Not-Neighbouring state and the Intimacy state, as this was an activity were the Seclusion state did not apply. It is evident from the diagram, that all peaks are at the 'indifferent' category, with a distinct predominance of this condition.

The results indicate a high proportion of indifference on the Intimacy scale, perhaps because there are very few instances when this opportunity arose in the fashion the question was worded. The question was framed to give the respondents to understand that such an activity would be carried out in the backyard. Most of the actors of this activity, however, commonly show up at the front door. In Southview they would hardly ever get past the anti-peddlar instinctual sensors of the
manager.

Tables A3.41-A3.44 give the frequency distribution for various degrees of dissatisfaction for the four states. Lack of interruptions from the neighbours during the performance of this activity generated the high rate of missing cases in the Not-Neighbouring state.
Fig. A3.4 Frequency Distribution of Preferred and Achieved Responses per Privacy State: Activity Category 4
## S4 TABLE A3.41 DISSATISFACTION (SECLUSION) HOUSEHOLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VALID CASES** 0 **MISSING CASES** 50
### Table A3.42 Dissatisfaction (Intimacy) Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 50 100.0 100.0

**Mean** 0.381  **Std Err** 0.132  **Median** 0.145  **Mode** 0.0  **Std Dev** 0.854  **Variance** 0.729  **Skewness** 1.871  **Range** 4.000

**Valid Cases** 42  **Missing Cases** 8
### Table A3.43 Dissatisfaction (Anonymity) Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**: 0.391  **Std Err**: 0.141  **Median**: 0.167  **Mode**: 0.0  **Std Dev**: 0.910  **Kurtosis**: 0.921  **Skewness**: 0.727  **Variance**: 0.910  **Range**: 5.000

**Valid Cases**: 46  **Missing Cases**: 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STD ERR</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
<th>SKEWNESS</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>STD DEV</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KURTOSIS</th>
<th>SKEWNESS</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VALID CASES</th>
<th>MISSING CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 5: Pet Care

Description

"for example: feeding, washing, grooming and general care of pets, play (which does not generate excessive noise) with pets, storage of pets in your private open space.

Results

Fig. A3.5 demonstrates the frequency distribution for the Seclusion state, the Anonymity state, the Not-Neighbouring state and the Intimacy state. The diagram indicates the close association between the preferred level for Seclusion state and Intimacy state. The considerably reduced intensity of response on the achieved levels is also evident. The Anonymity state and Seclusion state also show a similarity in profile for the preference and achievement levels, although the latter exist at a considerably reduced intensity. Both diagrams show the predominance of responses on the 'indifferent' condition.

Tables A3.51-A3.54 give the frequency distribution for various degrees of dissatisfaction for the four states. Because of the high rate of non-applicable conditions, a measure of dissatisfaction on this activity is not very meaningful. The relative distribution of the degrees of dissatisfaction for
those activities that do not apply.

Remarks

In most of the respondent's minds, the term 'pet' implied a cat or a dog. In Kanata 13 cases did not have any such animals. In Southview the management did not allow any pets of this nature, hence the high number of missing cases. Some respondents thought that to keep a dog or a cat,

"... is not fair to the dog or cat ... to leave them in a confined space."

A number of respondents also commented that

"... it is unfair for the neighbours."
Fig. A3.5 Frequency Distribution of Preferred and Achieved Responses per Privacy State: Activity. Category 5
### APPENDIX III

#### KANATA AND SOUTHVIEW

**TABLE A3.51 DISSATISFACTION (SECLUSION) PET CARE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN** 0.385  **STD ERR** 0.241  **MEDIAN** 0.150

**MODE** 0.0  **STD DEV** 0.870  **VARIANCE** 0.756

**KURTOSIS** 7.470  **SKEWNESS** 2.663  **RANGE** 3.000

**MINIMUM** 0.0  **MAXIMUM** 3.000

**VALID CASES**: 13  **MISSING CASES**: 37
## TABLE A3.52 DISSATISFACTION (INTIMACY) PET CARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Err.</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>1.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Valid Cases**: 15  **Missing Cases**: 35
### Table A3.53 Dissatisfaction (Anonymity) Pet Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ</th>
<th>CUM FREQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 50 100.0 100.0

**Mean** 0.087 **Mode** 0.0 **Kurtosis** 3.954 **Skewness** -0.139

**Valid Cases** 23 **Missing Cases** 27

**Mean** 0.087 **Std Err** 0.153 **Median** 0.059

**Mode** 0.0 **Std Dev** 0.733 **Variance** 0.538

**Kurtosis** 3.954 **Skewness** -0.139 **Range** 4.000

**Minimum** -2.000 **Maximum** 2.000
## APPENDIX III

**KANATA AND SOUTHVIEW**

### TABLE A3.54 DISSATISFACTION (NOT-NEIGHBOURING) PET CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **MEAN**: 0.0
- **MODE**: 0.0
- **KURTOSIS**: 7.500
- **MINIMUM**: -1.000
- **MAXIMUM**: 1.000
- **STD ERR**: 0.091
- **STD DEV**: 0.365
- **SKEWNESS**: 0.0
- **MEDIAN**: 0.0
- **VARINACE**: 0.133
- **VARIANCE**: 0.133
- **RANGE**: 2.000

**VALID CASES**: 16

**MISSING CASES**: 34
Activity 6: Formal Social Activities

Description

"for example: formal gatherings, such as brunches, tea and dinner parties, and similar activities for specially invited guests, from the immediate neighbourhood as well as from other remote parts of the region."

Results

Fig. A3.6 illustrates the frequency distribution for both the achieved level and the preferred level, for three states. This was an activity where the Seclusion state did not apply. The diagrams reflect the emphasis that was laid on the 'secluded' condition at the (preferred level) and the existing 'unsecluded' condition of the projects, with similar emphasis on opposite conditions of the preferred and the achieved levels for the Anonymity state, and Not-Neighbouring state. The achieved level also showed a high proportion of 'indifferent' condition responses.

Tables A3.61-A3.64 demonstrate the overall degree of dissatisfaction with various states of higher level of dissatisfaction on the Intimacy state than on any of the other two states. There was a high proportion of non-applicable
responses. Very few interruptions were reported, hence perhaps
the reason for the higher intensity on the 'indifferent'
condition on the Not-Neighbouring state. The tables also
illustrate the high proportion of response for the 'conspicuous'
condition.

Remarks

Only in 8 cases, was there no formal entertaining at all,
because such events never occurred in the lifestyle of the
respondents. In other cases they refrained from such an
undertaking, as the size of the unit did not allow it. One
respondent did not entertain formally because,

"... I do not want the neighbours to know that I
am having one (party)."

On the whole comments varied considerable. It was clearly
explained to the respondents that this function would be carried
on outdoors. In general more privacy was requested,

"I would like to be left alone when I am
entertaining."

"I do not mind people looking in, but I do not
particularly like them staring at me while I am
eating dinner."

Few interruptions by the neighbours were reported, especially if
the neighbours were aware of the nature of the function, but in
each case would be treated on its own merits, depending on the
nature of the call and of its actor. The manager at Southview
explained how such activities had become acceptable to the lifestyle of residents of the project, and hence were not gazed upon and did not require extreme seclusion. In Kanata this desire for more seclusion could have been attenuated by the erection of the third fence but it is highly unlikely that those that do not have it will ever construct it.
Fig. A3.6 Frequency Distribution of Preferred and Achieved Responses per Privacy State: Activity Category 6
## Table A3.61 Dissatisfaction (Seclusion) - Formal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq</th>
<th>Cum Freq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid Cases: 0 Missing Cases: 50
### Table A3.62: Dissatisfaction (Intimacy) Formal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>-3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>-3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Valid Cases**: 37
**Missing Cases**: 13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | TOTAL | 50   | 100.0 | 100.0 |

MEAN 0.711  STD ERR 0.199  MEDIAN 0.389
MODE 0.0  STD DEV 1.228  VARIANCE 1.509
KURTOSIS -0.375  SKEWNESS -0.056  RANGE 5.000
MINIMUM -2.000  MAXIMUM 3.000

VALID CASES 38  MISSING CASES 12
## APPENDIX III

### KANATA AND SOUTHVIEW

**NN6**

**TABLE A3.64 DISSATISFACTION (NOT-NEIGHBOURING) FORMAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREME</td>
<td>-4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 50 100.0 100.0

- **MEAN** -0.323
- **STD ERR** 0.209
- **MEDIAN** -0.250
- **MODE** 0.0
- **STD DEV** 1.166
- **VARIANCE** 1.359
- **KURTOSIS** 2.586
- **SKEWNESS** -0.663
- **MINIMUM** -4.000
- **MAXIMUM** 2.000
- **RANGE** 6.000
- **VALID CASES** 31
- **MISSING CASES** 19
Activity 7: Informal Social Activities

Description

"for example: cookouts and parties for family and relatives; casual and informal entertaining of friends and acquaintances in your private outdoor space."

Results

Fig. A3.7 gives the frequency distribution for the Anonymity state, Not-Neighbouring state and Intimacy state. This was another activity where the Seclusion state did not apply. The diagrams show similarity in trend with Activity 6 [Formal Social Activities (cf. Fig. A3.6)], except for the Anonymity state where the 'indifferent condition predominates. There is a more intense preference for seclusion on the Intimacy state, with considerably less emphasis or preference for extreme form of this condition.

Tables A3.71-A3.74 give the frequency distribution for various degrees of dissatisfaction for the Anonymity state, the Not-Neighbouring state and the Intimacy state. It is evident that most people were either satisfied or were minimally dissatisfied on the Anonymity state (codes 1, -1). A similar condition existed on the Not-Neighbouring state. Although a
high proportion were satisfied on the Intimacy state scale, the attitude of a fair amount were at the extremities of the dissatisfaction scale.

Remarks

Only one respondent did not ever perform this function, but no reason was forthcoming. The highest percentage of 'not-applicable' answers were for the Not-Neighbouring state, as the neighbours rarely interrupted whenever this activity occurred. Otherwise the respondents had little comments to make about this activity.
Fig. A3.7 Frequency Distribution of Preferred and Achieved Responses per Privacy State: Activity Category 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99J</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>MISSING 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VALID CASES 0 MISSING CASES 50
## Table A3.72 Dissatisfaction (Intimacy) Informal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### KANATA AND SOUTHVIEW

#### A7  
**TABLE A3.73 DISSATISFACTION (ANONYMITY) INFORMAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **MEAN**: 0.543  
- **STD ERR**: 0.148  
- **MEDIAN**: 0.250  
- **VARIANCE**: 1.009  
- **RANGE**: 5.000

**VALID CASES**: 46  
**MISSING CASES**: 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td><strong>MISSING</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN** -0.175  **STD ERR** 0.138  **MEDIAN** -0.125  **MODE** 0.0  **STD DEV** 0.874  **VARIANCE** 0.763  **KURTOSIS** 1.244  **SKEWNESS** 0.115  **RANGE** 4.000  **MINIMUM** -2.000  **MAXIMUM** 2.000

**VALID CASES** 40  **MISSING CASES** 10
Appendix III

Activity 8: Games

Description

"for example: sporting games involving physical activities (such as basketball ring, badminton, etc.) and other less active games, such as cards, bingo and other table games."

Results

Fig A3.8 represents the frequency distribution of the preferred and achieved levels over the four states of privacy. The graphs exemplify the predominance of the 'indifferent' condition response on both levels of all four states. The diagram also shows the identical strength of response at the peak for the preferred and achieved levels of the Not-Neighbouring state, the preferred level of the Anonymity state, and the sharp slopes towards either positive or negative conditions on the preferred levels of the three states.

Tables A3.81-A3.84 express the degree of dissatisfaction on each of the four states. The codes express the same meaning as explained in Activity 0 (Storage). Satisfaction predominates on all four states.
Remarks

This was an activity were the Seclusion state almost did not apply. 16 cases were non-applicable on the preferred level and 27 on the achieved level of this state because these respondents did not engage on outdoor activities by themselves. Only four cases never engaged in any kind of outdoor games. The only other instance of high non-applicability is on the Not-Neighbouring state, as usually the neighbours did not interrupt during such activities. Some respondent did not play for lack of space, others because they felt they might disturb the neighbours.
Fig. A3.8 Frequency Distribution of Preferred and Achieved Responses per Privacy State: Activity Category 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **MEAN**: 0.391  
- **STD ERR**: 0.186  
- **MEDIAN**: 0.179  
- **STD DEV**: 0.891  
- **VARIANCE**: 0.794  
- **RANGE**: 3.000  
- **MINIMUM**: -1.000  
- **MAXIMUM**: 2.000  

**VALID CASES**: 23  
**MISSING CASES**: 27
### Table A3.82 DISSATISFACTION (INTIMACY) GAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 50 100.0 100.0

**MEAN** 0.333  **STD ERR** 0.212  **MEDIAN** 0.125
**MODE** 0.0  **STD DEV** 1.325  **VARIANCE** 1.754
**KURTOSIS** 0.909  **SKEWNESS** 0.703  **RANGE** 6.000
**MINIMUM** -2.000  **MAXIMUM** 4.000

**VALID CASES** 39  **MISSING CASES** 11
## APPENDIX III

### KANATA AND SOUTHVIEW

#### A8 TABLE A3.83 DISSATISFACTION (ANONYMITY) GAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MEAN                  | 0.667| STD ERR        | 0.139               | MEDIAN              | 0.370         |
| CODE                  | 0.0  | STD DEV        | 0.902               | VARIANCE            | 0.813         |
| KURTOSIS              | -1.220| SKEWNESS      | 0.520               | RANGE               | 3.000         |
| MINIMUM               | -1.000| MAXIMUM       | 2.000               |                     |               |

**VALID CASES** 42 **MISSING CASES** 8
### KANATA AND SOUTHVIEW

#### NN8 TABLE A3.84 DISSATISFACTION (NOT-NEIGHBOURING) GAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 50 100.0 100.0

**MEAN** -0.086  **STD ERR** 0.138  **MEDIAN** -0.063  **MODE** 0.0  **STD DEV** 0.818  **VARIANCE** 0.669  **KURTOSIS** 2.283  **SKEWNESS** 0.164  **RANGE** 4.000  **MINIMUM** -2.000  **MAXIMUM** 2.000

**VALID CASES** 35  **MISSING CASES** 15
Activity 9: Hobbies and Crafts

Description

"for example:
garden care, other than as described in Activity 1 (Home Maintenance and Repair); handicrafts, which exclude the use of heavy machinery, other light pursuits such as dancing, painting, and other fine arts."

Results

Fig. A3.9 demonstrates the frequency of response for the Seclusion state, the Anonymity state, the Not-Neighbouring state and the Intimacy state. The diagrams show the predominance of the 'indifferent' condition response on almost all four scales. One can also discern the negative quality of the present environment on the Seclusion state, and the preference for the opposite condition of the same state. Another affirmation to the same effect can be observed on the Anonymity state (peak at 'inconspicuous' condition on the preferred level).

Tables A3.91-A3.94 also describe the frequency of distribution for various degrees of dissatisfaction for the four states, emphasizing the overall satisfaction on all the four states.
Remarks

Every respondent, at one time or another, participated in this activity category. Some respondents felt that they had to split their responses, on the achieved and preferred levels, with respect to individual activities. Thus gardening was often singled out in a category of its own.

"I have different attitudes between gardening versus dancing."

"... if I like communicating with others, I move outside. If I want to be left alone I would rather do it inside."

Painting, dancing and other athletic activities usually demanded more seclusion.
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Fig. A3.9 Frequency Distribution of Preferred and Achieved Responses per Privacy State: Activity Category 9
### Table A3.91 Dissatisfaction (Seclusion) Hobbies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Statistics**

- **Mean**: 0.610
- **Std Err**: 0.163
- **Median**: 0.375
- **Mode**: 0.0
- **Std Dev**: 1.046
- **Variance**: 1.094
- **Skewness**: 0.176
- **Range**: 5.000
- **Minimum**: -2.000
- **Maximum**: 3.000

**Valid Cases**: 41, **Missing Cases**: 9
### Table A3.92 Dissatisfaction (Intimacy) Hobbies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 50 100.0 100.0

**Mean** 0.422  **STD ERR** 0.170  **Median** 0.161

**Mode** 0.0  **STD DEV** 1.138  **Variance** 1.295

**Kurtosis** 0.637  **Skewness** 0.637  **Range** 5.000

**Minimum** -2.000  **Maximum** 3.000

**Valid Cases** 45  **Missing Cases** 5
TABLE A3.93 DISSATISFACTION (ANONYMITY) HOBBIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN 0.511  STD ERR 0.133  MEDIAN 0.259  
MODE 0.0  STD DEV 0.895  VARIANCE 0.801  
KURTOSIS 0.255  SKEWNESS 0.960  RANGE 4.000  
MINIMUM -1.000  MAXIMUM 3.000

VALID CASES 45  MISSING CASES 5
### APPENDIX III

#### KANATA AND SOUTHVIEW

**NN9** | **TABLE A3.94 DISSATISFACTION (NOT-NEIGHBOURING) HOBBIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATISTICS**

- **Mean**: -0.054
- **Std. Err.**: 0.109
- **Mode**: 0.0
- **Std. Dev.**: 0.664
- **Kurtosis**: 3.444
- **Skewness**: 0.058
- **Minimum**: -2.000
- **Maximum**: 2.000
- **Valid Cases**: 37
- **Missing Cases**: 13

---

**TOTAL**

50 100.0 100.0
Activity 10: Rest and Relaxation

Description

"for example: napping; sunbathing; daydreaming; listening to music; reading books; studying and paperwork, and/or meditating in your private outdoor space."

Results

Fig. A3.10 gives an indication of the frequency of distribution of the preferred and the achieved levels for the four states. It is evident from these diagrams that,

a. The preferences for the Seclusion state and the Intimacy state were identical in intensity;

b. There was a high preference for extreme seclusion as compared to other activities, with a peak at the preferred seclusion. There was also a clear declaration that the spaces were unsecluded;

c. There was a similar emphasis on 'inconspicuousness' and 'dislike' conditions for the anonymity and the Not-Neighbouring states. There was equivocal agreement on a 'conspicuous' feeling of the respondents while performing these activities. The high response for the 'indifferent' condition on the achieved level of the Not-Neighbouring state was the result of high non-involvement of the neighbours.
Tables A3.101-A3.104 express the frequency of distribution for various degrees of dissatisfaction for the four states. The high degree of dissatisfaction is especially evident on the Seclusion and Intimacy states, as well as Anonymity state. It is least, but more than in other activities, on the Not-Neighbouring state, for reasons already expounded upon.

Remarks

Only one respondent never had a chance to use the private outdoor space. The activities within this category could easily be performed in any of the private outdoor spaces around the units. Most people referred to sunbathing and napping much more than any of the other activities described in these categories. It is inferred that such activities are more easily performed in summer than in winter.

"Summer is coming. At this point in time, I have all the seclusion I need. I do not believe that it (seclusion) will decrease in summer."
Fig. A3.10 Frequency Distribution of Preferred and Achieved Responses per Privacy State: Activity Category 10
### Table A3.101: Dissatisfaction (Seclusion) Rest + Relax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean:** 1.545  **Std Err:** 0.199  **Median:** 1.500

**Mode:** 0.0  **Std Dev:** 1.320  **Variance:** 1.742

**Kurtosis:** -1.001  **Skewness:** 0.342  **Range:** 4.000

**Valid Cases:** 44  **Missing Cases:** 6
### TABLE A3.102: DISSATISFACTION (INTIMACY) REST AND RELAX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>-3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistical Summary:**
- **Mean:** 1.340
- **Std Err:** 0.205
- **Median:** 1.273
- **Mode:** 0.0
- **Std Dev:** 1.403
- **Skewness:** -0.200
- **Kurtosis:** 0.664
- **Minimum:** -3.000
- **Maximum:** 4.000
- **Range:** 7.000

**Cases:**
- **Valid Cases:** 47
- **Missing Cases:** 3
### Table A3.106 Dissatisfaction (Anonymity) Rest and Relax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Freq</th>
<th>Relative Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Adjusted Freq (PCT)</th>
<th>Cum Freq (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**: 0.729  **Std Err**: 0.192  **Median**: 0.333  **Mode**: 0.0  **Std Dev**: 1.333  **Variance**: 1.776  **Skewness**: 0.467  **Range**: 6.000  **Minimum**: -2.000  **Maximum**: 4.000  

**Valid Cases**: 48  **Missing Cases**: 2
### APPENDIX III

**KANATA AND SOUTHVIEW**

**TABLE A3.104 DISSATISFACTION (NOT-NEIGHBOURING) REST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE FREQ</th>
<th>RELATIVE FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)</th>
<th>CUM FREQ (PCT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>-3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISSATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT DEAL</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>99.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MEAN                    | -0.244 | STD ERR | 0.191 | MEDIAN | -0.146 |
| MODE                    | 0.0    | STD DEV | 1.220 | VARIANCE | 1.489 |
| KURTOSIS                | 1.584  | SKENNESS | 0.408 | RANGE | 6.000 |
| MINIMUM                 | -3.000 | MAXIMUM | 3.000 |        |       |

**VALID CASES** 41  **MISSING CASES** 9