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The purposes of this thesis were: 1. to learn more about neighborhood stability and 2. to examine the interrelationships between neighborhood stability, residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood and their attitudes toward environmental change. Earlier studies revealed that residents frequently resist environmental change in their neighborhood, therefore, it was hypothesized that as neighborhood stability increases, residents' attitudes toward environmental change would become less favourable. In contrast, it was hypothesized that residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood would become more favourable as neighborhood stability increases. Finally, it was hypothesized that as residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood become more favourable, their attitudes toward environmental change would become less favourable.

The literature and interviews with municipal planners helped clarify the meaning of neighborhood stability, while the hypotheses were tested using data collected during the 1984 construction of the Advanced Light Rapid Transit (ALRT) system in east Vancouver. The data were collected from over 600 residents located near the Broadway, Nanaimo, 29th Avenue and Joyce ALRT stations. Indices of neighborhood stability, favourable attitudes toward environmental change and favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood were created and compared using analysis of variance. Pearson correlation coefficients were used to test the three hypotheses.

The findings did not provide conclusive support for the hypotheses. However, the findings suggested that as neighborhood
stability increases, residents' attitudes toward environmental change become slightly less favourable, while their attitudes toward the neighborhood tend to become more favourable. Furthermore, as residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood become more favourable, their attitudes toward environmental change also become more favourable. Regardless of the stability of the neighborhood, residents were neither favourable nor unfavourable toward change in their neighborhood.

The thesis concludes with a discussion of neighborhood stability, the role of municipal planners and the responsibilities of the three levels of government in maintaining stable neighborhoods.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of the thesis is to determine the relationships between neighborhood stability, and residents' attitudes toward both their neighborhood and environmental change.

Context

Historically, major environmental changes within neighborhoods have been opposed by residents. For example, in the mid 1960's, residents of the Strathcona area of Vancouver City created a "citizen revolt" against the freeway construction and urban renewal proposed for their neighborhoods (Horsman and Raynor in Evenden(Ed.),1978). Later, in the early 1970's, a survey of residents in Vancouver's Kitsilano area revealed that "Kitsilano residents were firmly opposed to the transition processes which were already threatening the neighborhood's stability" (Ley,1981, p.137). About the same time in the City of Toronto, proposals for the Spadina and Scarborough Expressways met considerable opposition from residents in surrounding neighborhoods (Lemon in Ley(Ed.),1974). More recently, resident opposition was raised over the route selection for the Advanced Light Rapid Transit(ALRT) system through neighborhoods in east Vancouver (Hasson,1984).

Why are residents frequently opposed to major environmental change within their neighborhood? I believe residents oppose environmental change for two reasons:

1. They believe the change will have more negative than positive impacts on their neighborhood, and
2. They believe the change will destabilize their neighborhood.

One of the objectives of this thesis is to increase the knowledge of neighborhood stability and residents' attitudes toward change in their neighborhood, and how the two are related. Other objectives of the thesis are to determine how the stability of the neighborhood affects residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood, and how these attitudes affect their attitudes toward environmental change. In order to accomplish the objectives, the following hypotheses have been established and will be tested as part of the thesis research:

1. As neighborhood stability increases, residents' attitudes toward environmental change become less favourable.

2. As neighborhood stability increases, residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood become more favourable.

3. As residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood become more favourable, their attitudes toward environmental change become less favourable.

**Thesis Significance**

The thesis research is important for several reasons. First, according to the literature, "...household attitudes regarding the neighborhood are important potential determinants of movement" (Boehm and Mark, 1980, p.316). It is assumed that residential movement is, in turn, an indicator of neighborhood stability, and that one of the goals of community planning is to help residents create and maintain stable neighborhoods. By revealing residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood and environmental change, the research findings may help community
planners predict changes in the stability of neighborhoods.

Second, the thesis will contribute to the practical world of community planning by discussing what planners can do to maintain stable neighborhoods.

Third, the thesis will supplement the literature on neighborhood stability by clarifying its meaning and by discussing how it can be measured. In addition, the research findings will supplement the literature on residents' attitudes toward change in their neighborhood.

Fourth, the thesis will increase the limited number of quantitative studies in community planning.

Fifth, the thesis will describe and analyze neighborhood stability and residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood and change in the neighborhood prior to the opening of the ALRT system in 1986. The description and analysis will supplement the report on the East Vancouver Neighbourhoods Study (currently being edited), the market analysis done by Coriolis Consulting Corporation, and the community study proposed by MacLeran Plansearch, another consulting firm. In addition, the thesis findings could be compared with those obtained from community surveys conducted after the opening of the ALRT system to determine whether residents' attitudes toward the system have changed over time.

Methodology

The context for the thesis will be established by reviewing the literature on neighborhoods to determine its meaning, the meaning of neighborhood stability and the role of planners in maintaining stable neighborhoods. Municipal planners will also
be interviewed to determine the views of planners on their role in maintaining stable neighborhoods.

The literature on residents' attitudes toward both their neighborhood and environmental change will be reviewed to determine their interrelationship and their respective relationships to the stability of the neighborhood. In addition, the literature on rapid transit will be reviewed to ascertain how it is perceived by residents in surrounding neighborhoods.

The empirical investigation of the relationships between neighborhood stability, residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood and toward environmental change will be conducted using data collected during a survey of over 600 residents in neighborhoods located in the Broadway, Nanaimo, 29th Avenue and Joyce ALRT stations in east Vancouver. The survey consisted of person-to-person interviews conducted between May and August 1984 during the construction of the ALRT.

Analysis of variance will be used to determine differences between the neighborhoods on the dimensions of neighborhood stability, attitudes toward the neighborhood and attitudes toward environmental change. Pearson correlation coefficients will be examined to determine the nature of the interrelationships between the three concepts.

Scope and Limitations

The foci of the thesis are the interrelationships between neighborhood stability, and residents' attitudes toward both their neighborhood and environmental change. However, the research findings will be most suitable for application in Canadian cities because the context will be developed largely by
reviewing the literature on neighborhood stability and residents' attitudes toward environmental change in Canadian cities. More specifically, the literature review will focus on how residents in Canadian cities feel about a rapid transit system in their neighborhood. In addition, the hypotheses will be tested using a case study of neighborhoods in Vancouver, British Columbia.

Possibly the most significant limitation to the thesis is the fact it is based on an ex post facto research design. The data was collected prior to the generation of the hypotheses. Consequently, the assessment of neighborhood stability, and residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood and environmental change is not as comprehensive as it would have been had the hypotheses been developed prior to the data collection. However, I am confident the data contain an adequate number of suitable indicators of neighborhood stability, and attitudes toward the neighborhood and environmental change to justify testing the hypotheses.

A minor limitation of the thesis is the fact that it is not designed to describe the boundaries or characteristics of individual neighborhoods in the case study. Instead, the thesis research focuses on residents' attitudes and neighborhood stability in each of the four ALRT stations in east Vancouver.

Organization of the Thesis

The thesis contains six chapters. Chapter 1 contains a statement of the purpose and objectives of the thesis, as well as a description of its contents. The most frequently used terms are also defined in Chapter 1.
Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature on the meaning of neighborhood and neighborhood stability. The most recent literature on residents' attitudes toward their neighborhoods and toward environmental change, particularly rapid transit is also reviewed in Chapter 2. The results of the interviews with municipal planners on their role in maintaining stable neighborhoods are summarized in Chapter 3.

Chapter 4 contains a description of the data that were used to test the hypotheses. The data collection process is described, as well as the mathematical computations that were used to create measurement indices for neighborhood stability, favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood and favourable attitudes toward environmental change.

Chapter 5 contains highlights from the analysis of the data and the results of the hypotheses testing. Chapter 6 contains interpretations of the findings, a discussion of questions and policy issues raised by the thesis research, as well as suggestions for further research.

Definition of Terms

Neighborhood:
A physical and social subunit within a city or town "...where people inhabit dwellings and interact socially" (Hallman, 1984:13). It encompasses more than one household but less than the whole city or town. It may contain a school, park, store and/or other facilities or services. Each of the four ALRT station areas may serve more than one neighborhood, and one neighborhood may consist of residents and dwellings in more than one station area.
Neighborhood Stability:  
A concept referring to the dynamic composition of a neighborhood. The dynamic composition refers to changes that occur over time in the area's physical, social, political and economic characteristics. The crucial factor in neighborhood stability is that the changes are within the residents' range of adaptation. The range of adaptation refers to the extent to which residents are willing to make psychological, emotional and/or physical adjustments to accommodate change.

Environmental Change:  
Implies a major alteration in the physical environment of, in this instance, a moderately low density neighborhood. Examples of environmental change include the construction of a highrise residential building or freeway. The environmental change examined in the thesis is the construction of the Advanced Light Rapid Transit(ALRT) system.

Attitudes:  
A construct referring to "a mental position or feeling toward certain ideas, facts, or persons" (Thesaurus of Psychological Index, 1982). Attitudes toward the neighborhood will be inferred from residents' evaluations of neighborhood problems. Attitudes toward environmental change will be inferred from residents' beliefs about the impact of the ALRT system on their neighborhood.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The purposes of Chapter 2 are to clarify the meanings of neighborhood and neighborhood stability, and to discuss residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood and environmental change.

Neighborhood

In 1968 Suzanne Keller wrote that there are two common elements to most definitions of neighborhood. The elements are people and place. Keller's observation is true for the published definitions of neighborhood and is typified by one of the earliest definitions. In 1948 Ruth Glass described a neighborhood as "a distinct territorial group, distinct by virtue of the specific physical characteristics of the area and the specific social characteristics of the inhabitants" (cited in Keller, 1968 p.88).

More recently, another element, social interaction amongst residents has also been included in definitions of neighborhood. For example, in 1983 the sociologist, Schwirian defined a neighborhood as "a population residing in an identifiable section of a city whose members are organized into a general interaction network of formal and informal ties and express their common identification with the area in public symbols" (p.84). Research by the geographer Gold (1980) confirms that the three elements are contained in definitions of neighborhood in the social sciences and planning literature.
He states: 

neighbourhoods are defined in two ways. On the one hand, neighbourhoods are taken to be social units that are identified by the sociability and neighbourliness of their residents; on the other hand, they have been taken to be physical planning units for provision of housing and service facilities—"neighbourhood units". (p. 109)

The view of the neighborhood as a physical planning unit stems back to the late 1800's and early 1900's when Ebenezer Howard and Clarence Perry put forth the "neighborhood unit" concept. This referred to "a delimited area and population sharing basic facilities and services that are conveniently accessible, on foot, to the individual household" (Keller, 1968, p. 125).

The dimension of scale, that is, the belief that a neighborhood is larger than a household but smaller than a city or town, was explicitly stated in the definitions by Keller (1968), Porteous (1977) and Clay and Hollister (1983). According to Clay and Hollister (1983), the neighborhood is "a uniquely linked unit of social/spatial organization between the forces and institutions of the larger society and the localized routines of individuals in their everyday lives" (p. 4).

Howard Hallman (1984) recently compiled a comprehensive, yet concise definition of neighborhood by combining the three elements of territory, inhabitants and social interaction with the dimension of scale. He defined a neighborhood as "a limited territory within a larger urban area where people inhabit dwellings and interact socially" (p. 13).

Finally, it can be argued that the definition of neighborhood is partially contingent upon residents' perception
of and identification with the neighborhood. This view is shared by McClaughry (cited in Duignan and Rabushka(Eds.), 1980) and Schoenberg and Rosenbaum(1980). According to the latter, a neighborhood is:

an area in which a common bounded territory is named and identified by residents, at least one institution is identified in the area, and at least one common tie is shared. This common tie may be shared commercial facilities, public spaces or social networks. (pp.5&6)

The preceding discussion reveals the numerous definitions of neighborhood. All contain the basic elements of territory and inhabitants, while some refer to social interaction amongst residents and others include the dimension of scale. Fewer definitions contain all four elements. A compilation of the four elements, including part of Hallman's(1984) definition of neighborhood has been adopted for use in this thesis. According to this thesis, a neighborhood is:

A physical and social subunit within a city or town "...where people inhabit dwellings and interact socially" (Hallman,1984,p.13). It encompasses more than one household but less than the whole city or town. It may contain a school, park, store and/or other facilities or services.

Neighborhood stability

Several authors such as Goetze, Colton and O'Donnell(1977), Goetze(1979) and Ley(1983) discuss characteristics of stable neighborhoods and provide insights into ways of stabilizing neighborhoods, but the authors do not define what they mean by neighborhood stability.
For example, Goetze, Colton and O'Donnell (1977) state:

It is in the stable areas, not the rising markets, that natural forces appear to "normalize" behavior and check deterioration, and only here does housing appear to maintain itself, the good properties doing visibly better than the worse ones. Here we have something like homeostasis. (p.27)

According to these authors, neighborhood stability is characterized by well maintained properties and homeostasis. Two years later, Goetze (1979) concluded that "outside interventions, however well intentioned can have devastating effects on any neighborhood's homeostasis—its internal system of checks and balances that lead to stability" (p.xv). Goetze (1979) argues that federal programs are one of the main interventions responsible for the disruption of neighborhood stability in American cities and towns. In comparison, federal interventions in Canadian cities and towns, such as the Neighbourhood Improvement Program (NIP) and the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program (RRAP), were established to "provide funds to stabilize and preserve inner city neighborhoods" (Ley, 1983, p.89). However, despite the intent of the programs, it has been suggested that the NIP and the RRAP may have been effective "only in areas that enjoy considerable stability" (Gertler and Crowley, 1977, p.341).

In 1981 Anthony Downs wrote at some length on neighborhood stability.
He stated:

Most people regard neighborhood stability as desirable, but they do not realize how dynamic such stability really is in urban areas. In the simplest sense, any neighborhood is stable as long as its key characteristics do not change much. Thus, neighborhood stability can occur in a new and affluent area and in a deteriorated slum. However, neighborhood stability never means lack of movement, especially of population. (p. 24)

According to Downs (1981), neighborhoods are constantly experiencing inflows and outflows of people with certain characteristics, and investments in money or in-kind services. In order to achieve neighborhood stability, the inflows and outflows must be balanced, not stopped. For example, if a neighborhood is to remain stable, people moving out of the neighborhood must be replaced by people moving in who have similar characteristics to the outmovers. Similarly, money coming into a neighborhood must be equivalent to the money leaving a neighborhood "to keep property values either stable or rising along with general inflation" (Downs, 1981, p. 26). Therefore, from Downs' (1981) viewpoint, neighborhood stability encompasses two ideas: one, that a balance exists between the inflows and outflows of residents, materials and money; and two, that key characteristics do not change much. Consequently, it appears that characteristics of the neighborhood may change within certain parameters. The idea that neighborhood stability implies change is found in earlier work by Wolpert, Mumphrey and Seley (1972), who define stability as "the rate of neighborhood change in terms of population, services, ownership of housing
There are several indicators that have been used to measure neighborhood stability. Fifteen years ago McLean, Adkins, Ladewig, Guseman, and Rodriguez (1970) used a combination of residential mobility, proportion of home ownership and proportion of single dwelling units in their Stability Index, which was used to determine the impact of freeways on surrounding neighborhoods in Austin, Dallas and Houston. The higher the Stability Index, the greater the stability, with stability defined as "low residential mobility and low propensity to be mobile" (McLean et al., 1970, p.4.6). Building upon the earlier work of McLean et al. (1970), Guseman, Hall, Fuller, and Burke (1976) also used a combination of residential mobility and proportion of home ownership to assess neighborhood stability.

In 1977 Ahlbrandt, Charney, and Cunningham suggested home ownership may be an indicator of neighborhood stability. They stated, "to the extent that homeowners are more willing to work to make the neighborhood a better place to live than are renters, a declining homeownership rate will have a destabilizing longterm effect on the neighborhood" (Ahlbrandt et al., 1977, p.339). In addition, they suggest that neighborhood stability should correlate highly with the availability of mortgage and home improvement financing, and that the key to assessing neighborhood stability is to examine the relative differences in income levels between those moving into and those moving out of the neighborhood.

In the mid 1970's in Canada, Gertler and Crowley (1977)
compared the stability of two areas in Montreal by examining changes in total population, ethnic composition, persons per household, housing tenure, dwelling type, residents' income and their length of residence in the neighborhood. The 1981 Canada Census collected information on several indicators used in earlier studies to assess neighborhood stability. The indicators are: the age structure of the residents, their ethnic composition, housing tenure and type, and number of persons per household. In addition, the Census obtained information on what could be considered other indicators of neighborhood stability such as the proportion of households with children living at home, and length of residence at the current address.

Finally, Downs (1981) has published an extensive list of variables to assess neighborhood stability. The variables are shown in Table I.

In summary, neighborhood stability encompasses the idea that neighborhood characteristics change over time, but the changes are not major. The characteristics that are commonly used to assess neighborhood stability are residential mobility; dwelling type and tenure; the age structure, income and ethnic composition of the population.

Several of the indicators used in earlier studies will be used in this thesis to assess the stability of neighborhoods around the four eastside stations of the Advanced Light Rapid Transit (ALRT) system in Vancouver, Canada. The indicators are:

1. The proportion of households who own their dwellings
### Table I

**Variables in Neighborhood Stability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population change involves shifts in</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of households</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic composition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical change involves shifts in</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical condition of structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture of building types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture of land uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount and nature of open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount and nature of vehicle traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic change involves shifts in</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market values of property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales prices of property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of active buyers and sellers of property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of housing units occupied by owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount invested in maintenance, repair, and renovation of property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of new construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and cost of real estate financing and insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of real estate tax delinquency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public service change involves shifts in the quality of</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police and fire protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street and sidewalk maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash and garbage collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological change involves shifts in opinions and expectations about</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic composition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical condition of structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and property security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirability of neighborhood as place to live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Downs, 1981, p. 25)*
2. The proportion of households who live in single detached dwellings

3. The proportion of households who have lived in their neighborhood more than 2 years

4. The proportion of households who know three or more people on their block by name

5. The proportion of households containing school aged children, that is, children between 5 and 19 years of age

Support for selecting the above indicators of neighborhood stability is found in the literature. First, according to McLean et al. (1970), owner occupants and single family dwelling units in a neighborhood "suggest a propensity to be stable" (p.6.4). Concurrently, Speare (1970) found that "on the average, renters were 4-5 times more likely to move than home owners" (p.457). Second, Speare (1970) also found that there was an inverse relationship between duration at current residence and residential mobility. Later research also revealed that intrametropolitan mobility is more likely among "renters, among persons not long in the state or not long at their current residence, and among those with no school-age children" (Speare, Goldstein, and Frey, 1975, p.139). It was Long (1972) who earlier discovered the negative relationship between the presence of school aged children and residential mobility. He states: "families with children of school age only often have a residential mobility rate only about one-half that of families with no children or children of preschool age only" (Long, 1972, p.382). Finally, length of residence in the neighborhood is frequently associated with social interaction. For example, Burkhardt found that "the percentage of families who have been living at their current address less than two
years was the most important predictor, in a negative sense, of social interaction" (cited in Guseman et al., 1976, p.40). Consequently, the measure of social interaction, that is, the proportion of households who know three or more people on their block by name, is considered an appropriate indicator of neighborhood stability.

**Attitudes toward the neighborhood and environmental change**

Jacobs (1961) and Gans (1962) have both argued that city planners frequently act on their assumptions of the opinions and attitudes of neighborhood residents, and that planners' assumptions may be inaccurate, leading to inappropriate plans being made for the neighborhood. In order to maintain desirable characteristics, such as safety in a neighborhood, it is important that planners determine how residents feel about their neighborhood because the residents are largely responsible for creating and maintaining desirable, stable neighborhoods. With knowledge of residents' attitudes toward the neighborhood and environmental change, planners should be in a better position to prepare and implement plans and programs that will supplement, if not enhance, neighborhood stability.

According to Downs (1981),

> Relationships between most neighborhoods and the larger society are greatly influenced by certain typical attitudes of neighborhood residents. No matter what their income level or ethnicity, most such residents are both parochial and conservative regarding any changes in local conditions. (p.172)

Downs (1981) argues that residents are parochial because "they
normally promote the interests of their own neighborhoods over the interests of other areas" (p.172), and residents are normally conservative because they oppose change.

Several studies cited in Chapter 1 (Ley,1981; Hasson,1984 etc.) indicated that residents in middle and poorer class neighborhoods in Canada frequently oppose environmental changes such as residential redevelopment and freeway construction. However, all the studies, except for the one by Ley(1981), discussed opposition to environmental change prior to its appearance in the neighborhood. Ley(1981) analyzed the results of a survey used to determine residents' attitudes toward the redevelopment underway in Kitsilano, Vancouver. He found that "the majority of both home owners and tenants was sceptical or openly antagonistic toward redevelopment and its consequences" (Ley,1981,p.141). An additional concern about the relevance of the earlier studies is the fact that the documentation of resident opposition to impending change was based largely on the actions of neighborhood organizations such as Citizens Concerned About Spadina in Toronto, and Save Our Neighborhood Committee in the Cedar Cottage area of Vancouver. The organizations may not have accurately represented the views of the majority of neighborhood residents. In summary, there is clearly a dearth of literature on attitudes toward environmental change based on a statistically representative sample of residents.

Literature on residents' attitudes toward light rapid transit in their neighborhood is also conspicuously absent. In the late 1970's, a study on the impact of the Bay Area Rapid Transit System (BART) on residential mobility in San Francisco
was published by Baldassare, Knight, and Swan (1979). The authors found that reasons unrelated to BART's impact, such as neighborhood quality, stage in the family lifecycle, appeared to be more significant determinants of preferences to move. Baldassare et al. conclude that:

the environmental costs and benefits of a major urban service such as BART lead to different reasons for wanting to leave the locale and varying reports concerning mobility. Basically, BART was more often mentioned as a reason for moving away from an area as the system's environmental impacts worsened (i.e., aerial sites), and people reported that they were attracted to areas because of BART presumably as its easy availability increased (i.e., station sites). Further, within neighborhoods with similar BART attributes (e.g. station sites, aerial sites) the greater the level of adverse conditions created by BART, the less the desire to reside in the area. (pp. 445 & 446)

However, the authors caution the reader that they have little data that indicates mobility was significantly related to specific BART-related conditions, and they stress that "mention of BART as a reason for mobility preferences varied with site type and specific site conditions" (Baldassare et al., 1979, p. 446). Finally, as the authors point out, "data on mobility preferences and reasons for moving may merely be surrogates for lack of satisfaction with the neighborhood or transit system which might not result in actual mobility" (Baldassare et al., 1979, p. 446). This thesis will lead to greater understanding of the relationship between satisfaction with the neighborhood and rapid transit on the one hand, and mobility on the other hand, by revealing residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood and rapid transit, and how they are likely to
affect mobility in the neighborhood.

In 1981, the Council of Planning Librarians published the bibliography, *Light Rail Transit in Canada: A Selected Bibliography, 1970-1980*. The bibliography contains references on the economic, architectural and engineering aspects of light rail transit in Canada, but it does not contain references on the social aspects. Similarly, there are publications on the management and policy concerns associated with rapid transit (Hamilton and Hamilton, 1981; Fitch and Associates, 1964 respectively). However, there is a vacuum in the literature on residents' attitudes toward light rapid transit in their neighborhood.
CHAPTER 3: PLANNERS’ VIEWS OF NEIGHBORHOOD STABILITY

The literature reviewed in the preceding chapter contained interpretations of neighborhood stability held by researchers such as Wolpert et al (1972) and Downs (1981). However, the literature did not provide any indications of how neighborhood stability is defined by municipal planners, who have the mandate to work on neighborhood concerns. The contents of this chapter will supplement the literature on neighborhood stability by revealing how the concept is defined by practising planners, and their views on public sector involvement in maintaining stable neighborhoods. Public sector involvement in maintaining stable neighborhoods will be discussed again Chapter 6.

The research for this chapter was conducted through person-to-person interviews with eight planners working for Burnaby, Richmond, and the City of Vancouver in their Planning Departments. The interviews were conducted between June 17 and 20, 1985 in the three Planning Departments. A copy of the interview schedule is contained in Appendix A.

Neighborhood Stability

Neighborhood stability was defined earlier in Chapter 1 as a concept referring to the dynamic composition of a residential area. The dynamic composition refers to changes that occur over time in the area’s physical, social, political and economic characteristics. The crucial factor in neighborhood stability is that the changes are within the residents' range of adaptation. The range of adaptation refers to the extent to which residents are willing to make psychological, emotional and/or physical adjustments to accommodate change. In order to determine whether
this view of neighborhood stability is compatible with the views held by municipal planners, and whether their views are compatible with definitions in the literature, planners were asked to define the concept.

The meaning of neighborhood stability (Question #1)

Practising planners defined neighborhood stability in one of three ways: 1. in conceptual terms, 2. using specific characteristics associated with neighborhood stability, or 3. in both conceptual terms and specific characteristics. Three of the eight planners defined neighborhood stability in conceptual terms. For example, one planner stated that neighborhood stability "implies a sense of equilibrium", it is an "ecological state". Furthermore, neighborhood stability refers to a "static economy" that neighborhoods rarely reach. Here, there are "no pressures for change or growth". Finally, this planner stated that "absolute stability" does not exist, it is a theoretical concept referring to a "perfect state of changelessness". He indicated relative stability is attainable. In contrast, another planner stated that neighborhood stability is "a state or condition in a neighborhood". It is not static, and it requires growth and change. Furthermore, neighborhood stability is "a stage in the evolution of a neighborhood". The same planner stated that neighborhood stability implies "freedom from threat", both from a physical standpoint of no land use conflicts and from a perceptual standpoint of the residents not feeling the neighborhood is threatened by change. According to this planner, residents have a "range of tolerance for change". The third planner emphasized that neighborhood stability does
not necessarily mean no change. He stated that it refers to "a neighborhood comfortably reaching toward its future". It implies "not having major changes that are outside residents' mindsets". According to this planner, change is possible if people understand it.

Two of the planners defined neighborhood stability using specific characteristics. For example, one planner indicated neighborhood stability refers to a physical planning concept similar to a neighborhood unit. His description of neighborhood stability was a residential area bounded by major streets but having limited access. It contains "single family dwellings of the same age" and "a school as the focal point". This planner stated, "you create neighborhood stability when you move in". The other planner equated neighborhood stability with homeownership. This, in turn, implies "residents have a stake in the neighborhood". Neighborhood stability is also associated with long term residents. Finally, both planners said neighborhood stability means residents identify with the area.

The remaining three planners defined neighborhood stability in conceptual terms supplemented by specific characteristics. One planner defined neighborhood stability as "certainty", that no major changes are anticipated in land use or social factors, such as the age structure of residents. Another planner stated that neighborhood stability refers to a "positive stable environment that can respond positively to social and physical change". The environment consists of "cohesive, well-defined land uses", a "minimal level of infrastructure", residents who have lived there for some time and who "see the area as stable".
This planner contrasted neighborhood stability with an unstable residential area, or one in transition, which is characterized by "changing and incompatible land uses" and segmentation by major roadways. Here there is "uncertainty about the future of the neighborhood". The third planner in this group stated that his definition depends upon the type of neighborhood. He stated that stability in a residential neighborhood implies long term residents and "ethnic and social class neighborhoods". Neighborhood stability also refers to "structures that gradually adjust to change" and "no massive removal of people". Finally, this planner stated neighborhood stability refers to a "political structure" and a variety of families and dwellings to accommodate changes in the demographic composition of the neighborhood.

In summary, planners defined neighborhood stability using either concepts such as "freedom from threat", or specific characteristics such as the presence of long term residents, or a combination of both concepts and specific characteristics such as "certainty" combined with "no major changes in land use". Furthermore, half of the planners indicated neighborhood stability is not a static condition implying no change in the area's physical and/or social composition. The same group of planners also indicated that neighborhood stability implies the area can adjust to change. Two planners associated no change with neighborhood stability. One planner said neighborhood stability is "a stage in the evolution of a neighborhood".

A stable neighborhood (Question #2)

This question was included in the interview to allow
planners to describe specific characteristics of a stable neighborhood. The responses would indicate whether the variables proposed to measure neighborhood stability in this thesis are appropriate.

Two planners initially pointed out that neighborhoods can be composed of several types of land use. The responses to this question refer to stable neighborhoods containing primarily residential land.

The most frequently mentioned attribute of stable neighborhoods is the absence of major changes. Three of the eight planners indicated that in stable neighborhoods there are no apparent pressures for change in the social, economic and/or physical characteristics. Two other planners stipulated that there are no major land use changes in stable neighborhoods.

All but one of the planners described a stable neighborhood as having physical and social attributes. The remaining planner stated that physical indicators may be "superficial". He described a stable neighborhood as one where a "social network is in place". This includes service organizations and support for the less able residents. Furthermore, this planner stated that when issues emerge in a stable neighborhood, the reaction is "proactive, not one of fear". Finally, a stable neighborhood is a place where "people come to something good and they leave of their own accord". Another planner also indicated that the social structure is important in a stable neighborhood. He stated that in a stable neighborhood there is a "sense of community" and "residents identify with the area". To this planner, a stable neighborhood also meant that a "substantial
number of people are not forced out due to physical deterioration, unemployment and rapid change", and it is characterized by children who have attended only one school throughout their elementary school aged years.

Two planners associated long term residents with stable neighborhoods, while three other planners mentioned resident identification with the area as a characteristic of stable neighborhoods. One of the planners said "most stable neighborhoods are populated by homeowners" who have a "tie to the land". Furthermore, a stable neighborhood has an atmosphere where "owners feel comfortable". Another planner described a stable neighborhood as having a "historical context", "a range of population age groups", transportation patterns and "human and leisure services" that remain the same. The third planner indicated that in a stable neighborhood, residents not only "perceive themselves as part of it", they also participate in neighborhood activities such as Neighbourhood Watch, and a "minimal level of neighboring". In addition, this planner stated that a stable neighborhood "has the ability to grow and change and yet appear to stay the same".

Finally, two planners referred to a stable neighborhood as a healthy unit where all parts work together. One of the planners emphasized the compatibility of land uses in a stable neighborhood, as well as the homogeneity of lot sizes and property maintenance. In addition, she shared the planner's opinion cited earlier that a stable neighborhood has an "ability to withstand change". Moreover, change can be incorporated in a "positive way".
In summary, the absence of major change was the most commonly mentioned characteristic of a stable neighborhood. However, resident identification with the area was mentioned almost as frequently. The maintenance of property, the presence of long term residents, homeowners, children who have attended only one elementary school, and the existence of both a structured, social service network and an unstructured network of resident interaction were less frequently mentioned attributes of a stable neighborhood.

Measuring neighborhood stability (Question #3)

The purpose of this thesis is to determine the relationships between neighborhood stability, and residents' attitudes toward both their neighborhood and environmental change. In order to accomplish the task, neighborhood stability and residents' attitudes toward both their neighborhood and environmental change must be measured and examined in light of the hypotheses established in Chapter 1. Planners' opinions were sought in order to determine whether it is feasible to measure neighborhood stability.

Seven out of the eight planners said that neighborhood stability can be measured. Without solicitation, the majority of planners also volunteered suggestions for indicators that would measure neighborhood stability. These include: demolitions, property sales, the age structure of the population, length of residence, dwelling types, property maintenance, school enrollment turnover, level of use of social services, residents' attitudes toward the neighborhood and social economic status information on residents. Planners gave no indications as to
which variables would provide the most accurate measurement of neighborhood stability.

Public Sector Involvement in Maintaining Stable Neighborhoods

The remaining questions were designed to obtain planners' opinions on the desirability of maintaining stable neighborhoods, the planner's role in maintaining stable neighborhoods, and policies and programs that can be initiated by the municipal, provincial and federal governments to maintain stable neighborhoods. This information will provide the foundation for the discussion in Chapter 6 on the policies and programs for stabilizing neighborhoods.

Desirability of maintaining stable neighborhoods
(Questions #4-6)

This thesis is based on the belief that it is desirable to maintain stable neighborhoods as they are described at the beginning of this chapter, that is, a concept referring to the dynamic composition of a residential area. Questions 4 through 6 were included to determine whether my belief was shared by practising planners.

Five of the eight planners agreed unequivocally that it is desirable to maintain neighborhood stability. The three other planners agreed conditionally that it is desirable to maintain neighborhood stability. One planner qualified his response by saying "yes, sometimes but not always. It depends on the policy decisions". He said some neighborhoods have to accommodate urban growth. Similarly, another planner said yes, "if it's an objective of the community". The third planner stated it is desirable to "strive toward stability".
The most frequently mentioned reasons for maintaining stable neighborhoods are variations on the belief that stable neighborhoods "facilitate people being happy", as one planner replied. Another planner said a stable neighborhood is "the basis of peoples' lives" and it may lead to "a stable homebase". A third planner said that "the health of the city depends on the health of every citizen" which depends upon their comfort in the neighborhood. A fourth planner stated that a stable neighborhood contributes to peoples' "quality of life" and to a "well balanced community", while a fifth planner said that if the neighborhood is not stable, "residents will be unhappy and move". Another planner said "you can attract people to live in stable neighborhoods".

One planner indicated that people have a "right" to a sense of control over their environment, while a second planner said people "need to feel in control of their own neighborhood". A third planner said people have a right to "desirable, stable neighborhoods".

Three planners indicated it is desirable to maintain stable neighborhoods for economic reasons. One planner said it is important to protect individuals' financial investments as property owners, while a second planner said "people are more comfortable in home investment" in stable neighborhoods. Another planner stated it is "more efficient" to provide physical infrastructure and social services in stable neighborhoods.

Finally, three planners discussed the importance of maintaining stable neighborhoods because they nurture social exchange in the neighborhood. As one planner said, a stable
neighborhood "fosters a high degree of social interaction", while another stated, "stable neighborhoods are necessary to maintain a sense of community". The third planner stated that stable neighborhoods are "good building blocks" and that people in stable neighborhoods "are more willing to give to the larger municipality".

In summary, the majority of planners considered the maintenance of stable neighborhoods desirable because residents are happier in stable neighborhoods, and their happiness contributes to greater happiness in the larger society. In addition, property investments are protected and social interaction is fostered in stable neighborhoods.

The role of the planner in maintaining neighborhood stability (Questions #7 & 8)

The eight planners agreed there is a role for planners in maintaining neighborhood stability. One planner stated that planners have "the central leadership role" in maintaining and reestablishing neighborhood stability. He saw several parts to the planner's role, such as: identifying and highlighting major and supporting "problems", organizing the community and "provoking" people to view the problems as important as the planner sees them, identifying possible solutions, forcing other professions and individuals to take responsibility for solving problems, and solving problems. Another planner indicated that the role of the planner is to obtain information on the physical and social composition of the neighborhood, and on large changes planned for the area, to present the information to residents, and to guide change to make it "compatible with peoples' desires
Three planners indicated the planner may be a neighborhood "advocate". One of the three stated the planner's role is to facilitate the processes of discussion and negotiation between neighborhood residents on the one hand, and other residents, developers and council members on the other hand. Consultation with neighborhood residents and communication of their views to council are of prime importance according to this planner. She referred to planners as "the ears of the bureaucracy". A comparable view was expressed by another planner who stated that the major role of the planner in maintaining neighborhood stability is to work with residents to identify "the problem". He also saw the planner as mediating between neighborhood residents, politicians and developers. He said the planner "may help policies evolve".

Another planner who stated that advocacy may be part of the planner's role in maintaining neighborhood stability, also saw the planner wearing several different hats. For example, he saw the planner as a "technician" analyzing trends in a neighborhood, a "politician" helping citizens understand the planning process, an "advisor" to the politician, a "coordinator" of other municipal departments involved in the planning process, and a "discussant" of alternatives to neighborhood residents. The third planner said planners play an advocate role in maintaining "a sense of community and continuity". He also stated that planners should "intercede to stop or slow down instability", and they should develop a framework for managing growth. A somewhat similar view was
expressed by another planner who stated that planners should "articulate community goals and objectives", work out plans and policies to achieve them, "facilitate growth and development" to meet the goals, and "where change is necessary", minimize the negative impacts. This planner felt social service programs and the communication process with residents are as important as land use regulation in maintaining neighborhood stability.

One planner's description of the planner's role in maintaining neighborhood stability emphasized the regulatory and reactive, rather than proactive powers available to a planner. He stated that the planner can regulate development, maintain neighborhood amenities such as parks and schools, enforce minimum maintenance standards and historical preservation, and intervene in traffic management. However, the same planner indicated that building a positive image of the neighborhood and "fostering a sense of community" are part of the planner's role in maintaining neighborhood stability.

In summary, all planners saw a role for the planner in maintaining neighborhood stability. All but one planner emphasized the proactive powers of the planner such as working with residents to identify problems and establish objectives, negotiating between residents, developers and politicians involved in the planning process, generating alternatives to solve problems and meet objectives, and implementing chosen alternatives. Less than half of the planners saw the planner as a neighborhood advocate.
Government policies and programs to maintain stable neighborhoods (Questions #9-11)

When asked to discuss policies and programs that can be initiated at the municipal, provincial and federal levels of government, one planner responded initially by saying the public sector is often a very small "actor" in the process of maintaining stable neighborhoods. He stressed that the private sector, community groups and individuals have a large role to play as well. Another planner said the municipality has the prime responsibility to maintain stable neighborhoods. He stated that "the local level is capable of understanding neighborhood stability".

Three of the eight planners said the municipality has the largest, most effective role in maintaining stable neighborhoods because the municipality is closest to, and most knowledgeable about its neighborhoods. However, a few planners pointed out that municipalities are legislatively subordinate to their host province, and this relationship limits the ability of municipalities to initiate programs that would maintain stable neighborhoods. In any event, one planner stated that municipal plans must include policies for the provincial and federal governments, and planners must work to have the policies implemented. Municipalities can implement zoning and develop community and local area plans, growth management strategies, and social, recreational and health policies to maintain stable neighborhoods. Furthermore, one planner suggested that municipal input into the social housing policy of Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) would help maintain stable
neighborhoods. Another planner said it is important for municipalities to "establish a tie to each neighborhood" through neighborhood houses or associations, or citizens' planning committees, to ensure residents can communicate with the municipality. A third planner felt it is important for municipalities to hold public information meetings in neighborhoods selected for changes.

The majority of planners indicated that the provincial government has a role in maintaining stable neighborhoods. According to one planner, the provincial and federal governments have a responsibility to intervene to maintain stable neighborhoods when several municipalities "experience a need" or when change occurs "too quickly for locals to handle". A few indicated the provincial government in British Columbia has "a ways to go to catch up with the activities of other provincial governments" such as Alberta and Ontario, and one planner said he could not imagine the Ministry of Lands, Parks and Housing "doing any less for municipalities". One planner mentioned that the provincial government has not "articulated policies for municipalities".

One planner stated that the provincial government should be responsible for policy development and economic concerns. The policies should take regional differences into account. The municipalities should be responsible for developing and administering specific programs. The same planner said that in order to maintain stable neighborhoods, the province should provide more block funding to municipalities to help them pay the cost of improving the infrastructure, such as sewerage, and
implementing special needs housing programs. The province should also initiate "demonstration projects" such as housing.

One planner stated The Livable Region Program, developed by 1975, was "sensitive" to neighborhood stability through its location of transportation routes and regional town centers. Another planner mentioned the former Downtown Revitalization Program as an attempt to stabilize municipalities.

Finally, one planner suggested that the property tax deferral program for senior citizens may help to stabilize neighborhoods. Similarly, another planner suggested that providing housing for seniors in the neighborhood would enable older residents to continue living in their neighborhood. This would be a stabilizing influence on the neighborhood.

The federal government has had an influence on neighborhood stability through the Neighbourhood Improvement Program (NIP) and the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program (RRAP) mentioned in Chapter 2. Generally, the planners saw the programs as having positive impacts on neighborhoods through improving the housing stock and neighborhood amenities such as parks, generating resident involvement in the neighborhood, teaching people new skills and demonstrating to people that a process can work. Two planners noted that, despite the success of the NIP and the RRAP, the federal government frequently makes decisions which may significantly affect the stability of neighborhoods. For example, one planner suggested that eliminating the capital gains tax may affect neighborhood stability. Similarly, policies on foreign and absentee ownership, if allowable under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, are likely to affect
the stability of neighborhoods. In closing, the planner stated, "federal policies may be as significant as local planning efforts in maintaining neighborhood stability".

Two planners stated that the federal government could help maintain stable neighborhoods by providing funding for social housing, while two other planners suggested that neighborhood stability could be enhanced by employment creation programs funded by the federal government and implemented by the municipalities. One of the same planners suggested federally initiated business and industrial development would help maintain stable neighborhoods. Another planner indicated that neighborhood stability is largely dependent upon an economic development strategy that should be prepared collectively by the three levels of government. A third planner suggested that the federal government could help maintain stable neighborhoods by providing money to broaden the economic bases of municipalities.

In summary, the municipal government is considered to have the prime responsibility for maintaining stable neighborhoods, despite its financial and legislative subordination to the provincial government. The municipality can maintain stable neighborhoods through both policy initiatives such as developing zoning bylaws and housing policy, and initiatives that focus on the process, such as establishing neighborhood planning groups. The current provincial government in British Columbia is seen as minimally involved in maintaining stable neighborhoods, but it could become more involved by providing block funding to municipalities for improving sewerage and implementing demonstration projects such as housing for special needs groups.
and seniors. Like the province, the federal government is credited with helping to maintain stable neighborhoods in the 1970's. The federal government can resume its part in maintaining stable neighborhoods by providing funding for social housing and job creation programs, and preparing an economic development strategy.

Conclusions

With few exceptions, planners' definitions of neighborhood stability are largely compatible with the definition proposed in this thesis. In addition, the ideas contained in both are largely compatible with the ideas expressed in the most recent literature on neighborhood stability by Downs (1981), which was reviewed in Chapter 2. According to Downs (1981), neighborhood stability encompasses two ideas: one, that a balance exists between the inflows and outflows of residents, materials and money; and two, that key characteristics do not change much. Given the compatibility of the definitions, I have decided to adopt the proposed definition of neighborhood stability. According to this thesis, neighborhood stability is a concept referring to the dynamic composition of a residential area. The dynamic composition refers to the changes that occur over time in the area's physical, social, political and economic characteristics. The crucial factor in neighborhood stability is that the changes are within the residents' range of adaptation. The range of adaptation refers to the extent to which residents are willing to make psychological, emotional and/or physical adjustments in order to accommodate change.

The feasibility of measuring neighborhood stability has
been confirmed by the planners. In addition, their suggestions for indicators to measure neighborhood stability combined with both those cited in the literature and those proposed earlier in the thesis, create an extensive, yet not comprehensive inventory of indicators of neighborhood stability. In order to thoroughly assess neighborhood stability I believe the following indicators should be examined for changes over time, for example, within a 5 year time period. The indicators are:

1. residents' attitudes toward both their neighborhood and change in the neighborhood
2. property maintenance
3. social interaction amongst residents
4. ownership of residential properties
5. zoning
6. the total number of dwelling units
7. the mixture of dwelling types
8. the proportions of owners and renters
9. the availability of dwellings to rent
10. the availability of dwellings to buy
11. household composition
12. the presence of school aged children
13. the total population
14. the income level of residents
15. school enrollment turnover
16. residential mobility
17. the age structure of the population
18. residents' political preferences
19. levels of crime and vandalism
20. the level of use of social services
21. resident adaptation to change
22. ethnic composition

Unfortunately a thorough assessment of neighborhood stability is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, a partial assessment of neighborhood stability is possible by using available data on some of the above indicators. The indicators are:

1. the proportion of households who own their dwelling
2. the proportion of households who live in single detached dwellings
3. the proportion of households who know more than three people on their block by name
4. the proportion of households who have lived in their neighborhood for more than two years
5. the proportion of households containing school aged children, that is, children between 5 and 19 years of age

The majority of planners share my belief that it is desirable to maintain stable neighborhoods. Furthermore, although perhaps not surprisingly, there is a consensus that planners have a role in maintaining stable neighborhoods. The prevailing view of the planner's role in maintaining neighborhood stability is similar to the traditional view of the planner's role in community planning, where the planner initially works with neighborhood residents to identify areas of concern, and to establish goals and objectives. In conjunction with other professionals, the planner then generates possible solutions to "problems", and develops programs and policies to meet the goals and objectives. Finally, the planner returns to the neighborhood to help implement specific solutions and programs selected by neighborhood residents and politicians. Consequently, it appears that planners see the maintenance of
neighborhood stability as within their capability and the confines of community planning.

Municipalities are seen as having the largest and most effective public sector role in maintaining stable neighborhoods because they are closest to and most knowledgeable about their neighborhoods. However, municipalities lack the legislative powers and financial resources to implement policies and programs that would maintain stable neighborhoods. Municipalities can help to maintain stable neighborhoods by preparing community plans, enforcing zoning bylaws and working with neighborhood citizens' groups.

In the 1970's both the provincial government of British Columbia and the federal government set precedences for helping to maintain stable neighborhoods through their Downtown Revitalization Program and the NIP and RRAP, respectively. However, recent provincial initiatives to maintain stable neighborhoods are conspicuously absent in B.C. The provincial government could once again assist in maintaining stable neighborhoods by providing additional block funding to municipalities for housing projects for special needs groups, and deferring seniors' property tax payments. The federal government could also assist in maintaining stable neighborhoods during the 1980's for example, by preparing an economic development strategy or by providing funding for social housing and job creation programs.
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

According to practising planners and researchers such as McLean et al.(1970), Guseman et al.(1976), Gertler and Crowley(1977) and Downs(1981), neighborhood stability can be measured. In addition, the suggestions of planners discussed in Chapter 3 for ways of measuring neighborhood stability are largely compatible with those found in the literature. Some of the indicators are: residential demolitions, property sales, length of residence, dwelling types, property maintenance, school enrollment turnover, level of use of social services and residents' attitudes toward the neighborhood. Neighborhood stability would be assessed using different criteria from each indicator. For example, the number and frequency of residential demolitions and the number, frequency and total value of property sales would be assessed to determine neighborhood stability. More stable neighborhoods would be characterized by relatively few residential demolitions at any one point in time, and by fairly predictable, not widely fluctuating house prices. Likewise, the frequency and magnitude of pupil enrollment turnover and use of social services would provide an indication of neighborhood stability, with more stable neighborhoods experiencing comparatively low levels of student enrollment turnover and low levels of social service use. The level of property maintenance and the frequency of residents' favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood would also provide a measure of neighborhood stability. More stable neighborhoods would be characterized by a higher standard of property maintenance and residents who have more favourable attitudes toward their
neighborhood. Finally, the composition of dwelling types and the balance between long term and short term residents in the neighborhood would provide additional information on neighborhood stability. According to the literature, more stable neighborhoods contain higher proportions of single detached dwellings and more long term residents. However, I believe neighborhoods can contain a substantial proportion of apartments and remain stable, as long as the residents remain in the neighborhood for several years.

Several of the suggested indicators should be combined and supplemented by a few others such as zoning changes and social interaction amongst residents to provide a fairly thorough assessment of neighborhood stability. Unfortunately a thorough assessment of neighborhood stability is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, in order to test the hypothesized relationships between neighborhood stability, and residents' attitudes toward both the neighborhood and environmental change, a partial assessment of the three concepts will be made using data collected during a survey. This chapter contains a description of how the data were collected and how the concepts will be measured.

Data Collection

The survey

Data on neighborhood stability and residents' attitudes toward both the neighborhood and environmental change were obtained from a survey of residents living around the four ALRT stations in east Vancouver. The station areas are Broadway, Nanaimo, 29th Avenue and Joyce (see Maps 1 and 2). The survey
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consisted of person-to-person interviews conducted between May and August 1984 as part of a federally funded Canada Works project known as the East Vancouver Neighbourhoods Study (EVNS). The purpose of the study was to obtain information on residents' attitudes and behaviours that would help the station area planning committees in their local area plan making. There are three planning committees involved in preparing local area plans: Broadway, Nanaimo and 29th Avenue, and Joyce.

The interview schedule

All the information that will be used to assess neighborhood stability and residents' attitudes toward both their neighborhood and environmental change will be obtained from questions contained in the EVNS interview schedule. This interview schedule contained over 50 questions on several areas of interest to residents, such as: their use of parks, community centres, libraries and childcare facilities, as well as their perceptions of the neighborhood and how it will be affected by the ALRT. The EVNS interview schedule was compiled from questions prepared by several sources. For example, the questions used to assess neighborhood stability were designed by the EVNS Project Managers, Bill Thomson and Robin Coote, while the questions used to assess residents' attitudes toward the neighborhood were taken from the Vancouver Urban Survey-1983, prepared by Bill Glackman and Vincent Sacco of the Criminology Research Centre at Simon Fraser University. The questions used to assess residents' attitudes toward environmental change were prepared by Paul Roer of MacLeran Plansearch and Professor Henry Hightower of the School of Community and Regional Planning at
the University of British Columbia.

The sampling frame, sample and interview procedures

The sampling frame consisted of households that were both listed in the *City Directory 1983-84* and located in the ALRT station areas as defined by the City of Vancouver Planning Department (See Maps 1 and 2). A sample of 1013 households was selected to be interviewed. The sample was obtained by selecting every ninth household from the sampling frame. The starting point for the sample selection was obtained from a table of random numbers. Adults over the age of 18, who were not boarders, were eligible to be interviewed in their home. At least three attempts were made to interview a member of the preselected household unless the household member refused to be interviewed, or there was a physical disability or language barrier that prevented the interview. The interviewers were capable of conducting interviews in Cantonese, Vietnamese, Hindi and Italian as well as English.

The Indices

The data that will be used to provide indications of neighborhood stability, and residents' attitudes toward both their neighborhood and environmental change were recorded on different measurement scales. In order to examine the hypothesized relationships, the data were converted to standard Z scores and three indices were created from the variables that were considered appropriate indicators of the three concepts. Z scores are measured on the same scale, thereby permitting comparisons between variables.
Neighborhood stability

The index for neighborhood stability was created by combining the following five variables:

1. dwelling type
2. housing tenure, i.e. renter or owner
3. length of residence in the neighborhood
4. number of people known on the block by name
5. presence of school aged children

For each variable, the responses indicating the most stable condition received the highest values, while the responses indicating the least stable condition received the lowest values. For example, residents who lived in single detached dwellings and single detached dwellings with basement suites were coded one, while duplexes, conversions, apartments in buildings less than five storeys and apartments in buildings more than five storeys were coded zero. Similarly, residents who owned their dwelling unit were coded one, while renters and residents who had other forms of tenure (e.g. members of a housing cooperative) were coded zero.

Length of residence in the neighborhood and number of people known on the block by name were not coded dichotomously.
Rather, length of residence was coded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Residence</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4.9 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9.9 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14.9 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19.9 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29.9 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of people known on the block by name was similarly coded on a multi-value scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of People Known</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the presence of school aged children was compiled from two variables. Residents who had at least one child between 5 and 19 years of age living at home were coded one. Residents who had two or more children between 5 and 19 years of age were counted once. Respondents who did not have children between 5 and 19 years of age living at home were coded zero.

A Z score for every household on each of the five variables
was calculated using the means and standard deviations of the respective variables. (Recall $Z = \frac{X_i - \bar{X}}{sdX}$, where $X_i$ is the value of a particular $X$, $\bar{X}$ is the mean of all the $X$s and $sdX$ is the standard deviation of $X$.) The $Z$ scores for the five variables were then added and the sum was divided by five to produce the mean score for neighborhood stability. This score was tested for reliability and the resulting alpha of .4856 indicated that the index was not highly reliable because only 48% of the variance was due to differences between individuals on the common factor, neighborhood stability. Over 50% of the variance was due to errors of measurement such as the inclusion of inappropriate indicators, and mistakes that occur during the administration and coding of the interview schedule. However, analysis of variance revealed that the index discriminated adequately between the stability of neighborhoods in the four ALRT station areas. (See Chapter 5 for the discussion of the significant differences between the stability of the station area neighborhoods.) Also, data on other indicators of neighborhood stability was not as readily available as the survey data. For these two reasons, the index of neighborhood stability was maintained as constructed.

**Favourable attitudes toward change**

The index measuring favourable attitudes toward change was created from residents' opinions on the future impact of the ALRT system on the following:

1. public transit service in the neighborhood
2. traffic on local streets
3. the character of the neighborhood
4. noise levels near their home
5. views from their home
6. privacy in their home
For each question, the response representing the least offensive impact was coded one and was equated with the most favourable attitude toward change. The responses representing the most offensive impacts were coded negative one and were equated with the least favourable attitudes toward change. For example, residents who stated public transit service in the neighborhood will be better after ALRT is in operation were coded one, and were assumed to have more favourable attitudes toward change than residents who stated the service will be worse. They would have been coded negative one. Similarly, residents who stated noise levels where they live will be lower after ALRT is in operation were coded one, and were assumed to have more positive attitudes toward change than residents who said noise levels will be higher. They would have been coded negative one. Residents who said there will be no change in public transit service in their neighborhood, noise levels or any of the remaining variables were coded zero.

Once again, means and standard deviations for each of the variables were calculated and used to prepare a Z score for every household on each variable. The individual Z scores were then added and the sum was divided by six to produce the mean score for favourable attitudes toward change. The index had an alpha of 0.6037 indicating it was moderately reliable. 

Favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood

Residents' evaluations of potential problems in the neighborhood were combined to create the index of favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood. More specifically, residents were asked to describe the magnitude of the following potential
neighborhood problems:
1. misbehaving juveniles
2. noisy neighbours
3. run-down buildings and houses
4. crime

As part of the Vancouver Urban Survey-1983 residents throughout the City of Vancouver were asked whether noisy neighbours, etc. were small or large problems in their neighborhoods. In order to compare their responses with those of residents living around the ALRT stations in east Vancouver, the residents in east Vancouver were also asked whether noisy neighbours, etc. were small or large problems in the neighborhood.

In four of the five questions the values ranged from zero, indicating there was a large problem, to ten, indicating there was no problem. For example, a resident who felt noisy neighbours are a relatively small problem in the neighborhood may have assigned seven to the problem. Another resident who felt misbehaving juveniles are a fairly large problem in the neighborhood may have assigned three to the problem. In addition, residents were asked whether their neighborhood is an area with a high, average or low amount of crime. A low amount of crime was coded three, an average amount of crime was coded two and a high amount was coded one.

The most favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood were indicated by high scores assigned to each of the potential problems. For example, the resident who assigned seven to the problem of noisy neighbours is assumed to have a more favourable attitude toward the neighborhood than a resident who assigned three to the problem. Similarly, a resident who said their
neighborhood is an area with a low amount of crime is assumed to have a more favourable attitude toward the neighborhood than a resident who said the area has a high amount of crime.

The means and standard deviations for each of the five variables were calculated and used to prepare Z scores for each household on each variable. These scores were then added together and the sum was divided by five to obtain the mean score for the index of favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood. The index had an alpha of 0.7354 indicating it was quite reliable.

The indices of neighborhood stability and favourable attitudes toward change are less reliable than the index of favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood. The latter index was constructed from questions that were tested for reliability in earlier surveys, while the first two indices were constructed from questions that were not previously tested for reliability. Furthermore, it is likely that neighborhood stability is a multidimensional concept and the five indicators provide only partial information on more than one dimension. Additional research is needed to determine whether neighborhood stability is a multidimensional concept and if it is, to determine the indicators that will provide a more thorough assessment of neighborhood stability.

Despite the lower reliability of favourable attitudes toward change and neighborhood stability in particular, both indices discriminated between neighborhoods in later analyses, thereby facilitating the testing of the three hypotheses listed in Chapter 1. The results of the testing are contained in the
following chapter.
CHAPTER 5: THE FINDINGS

In the methodology described in the previous chapter I stated that the three indices would reveal differences between neighborhoods in their stability, as well as residents' attitudes toward both their neighborhood and environmental change. This chapter contains a description of the residents in the four ALRT station areas, the characteristics of the indices and the differences between the stability of neighborhoods and residents' attitudes as revealed by the hypotheses testing.

The Population

A total of 1013 households were contacted during the 16 week period of the EVNS survey and personal interviews were conducted with 688 residents. This represented seven percent of the private households in the four ALRT station areas counted during the 1981 Canada Census. The largest proportion (30%) of residents who were interviewed lived in the Broadway station area, while the smallest proportion (20%) resided in the Joyce station area. The remaining interviews were conducted with residents in Nanaimo (24%) and 29th Avenue (26%) station areas. These figures are compatible with the figures for the distribution of private households obtained during the 1981 Census. According to the Census, the largest proportion of private households (34%) was located in the Broadway station area, while a considerably smaller proportion (21%) was located in the Joyce station area. The remaining households were located either in Nanaimo (19%) or 29th Avenue (26%) station areas.

The overall response rate for the survey was 68%. It ranged from a low of 61% in the Broadway station area, to a high of 73%
in the Nanaimo station area. Response rates for the 29th Avenue and Joyce station areas were 72% and 69% respectively. Interviews were conducted with more females (57%) than males (43%).

**Age distribution**

According to the 1981 Census, the characteristics of the residents who were interviewed were representative of the entire population living in the four eastside ALRT stations. (Hereafter the residents who were interviewed during the EVNS survey will be referred to as the sample, while the entire population in the four eastside ALRT stations will be referred to as the population.) For example, the distribution of household members amongst age groups was almost identical between the sample and the population. As an illustration, 10% of the residents accounted for in the sample were between 20 and 24 years of age. The 1981 Census revealed that 11% of the population were between 20 and 24 years of age. The largest discrepancy between the sample and the population occurred in the proportion of residents between 15 and 19 years of age. According to the EVNS survey, seven percent of the sample was between 15 and 19 years of age, while the 1981 Canada Census revealed that nine percent of the population was between 15 and 19 years of age.

**Household size**

In terms of household size, the sample was also similar to the population. However, households containing three or more people were slightly overrepresented, while single person households were slightly underrepresented in the sample. For example, the Census revealed that half the households in the
population contained three or more people, while slightly more than half of the interviews (56%) were conducted with residents in households containing three or more people. In contrast, in 1981 almost one-quarter (22%) of the households in the four ALRT station areas contained one person, but interviewers were successful in interviewing only 16% of the single person households.

Dwelling type and tenure

The 1981 Canada Census revealed that the vast majority of residents in the Nanaimo (91%), 29th Avenue (89%) and Joyce (76%) station areas lived in single detached dwellings, while approximately one-third (35%) of the residents in Broadway station area lived in single detached dwellings. Almost half (48%) of the residents in the Broadway station area lived in apartment buildings of less than five storeys. The sample contained almost identical proportions of residents in single detached dwellings, and also the representative proportion of residents in Broadway station area in apartment buildings less than five storeys. For example, 93% of the residents in the Nanaimo and 29th Avenue station areas lived in single detached dwellings, while slightly more than one-third (38%) of the residents in the Broadway station area lived in equivalent dwellings. Furthermore, consistent with the Census data, almost half (47%) of the sample in the Broadway station area lived in apartment buildings less than five storeys. The largest discrepancy between the sample and the population occurred in the proportions of residents living in single detached dwellings in the Joyce station area. According to the Census,
approximately three-quarters (76%) of the population in the Joyce station area lived in single detached dwellings, while the EVNS survey data indicated a larger proportion of the sample (86%) lived in single detached dwellings in the Joyce station area.

Finally, the sample was also similar to the population in housing tenure. For example, the majority of the sample in the Nanaimo (83%), 29th Avenue (76%) and Joyce (71%) station areas, but a minority (31%) in the Broadway station area owned their dwelling unit. The 1981 Canada Census indicated that comparable proportions of the population owned their dwellings in the Broadway (33%), Nanaimo (79%), 29th Avenue (76%) and Joyce (65%) station areas.

In summary, the sample was representative of the population when age distribution, household size, dwelling type and tenure are used as indicators. The relatively minor discrepancies between the sample and the population may be due to actual changes over time in the characteristics being measured, and/or to errors in the sampling for the EVNS survey. In either case, the discrepancies are relatively minor and therefore I am confident the sample adequately represents the population in terms of the stability of their neighborhoods, attitudes toward their neighborhoods and attitudes toward environmental change.

The Indices

I mentioned earlier in Chapter 4 that the three indices of neighborhood stability, favourable attitudes toward change, and favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood were compiled from standard Z scores. These scores, in turn, were used to calculate
means and standard deviations for each index. In a perfectly normal distribution of standard Z scores the mean is zero and the standard deviation is one. Furthermore, in a normal distribution, half the values are located to the right of the mean and half the values are located to the left of the mean. This symmetric distribution of values produces the well known bell-shaped curve.

Before discussing the differences between the station areas on the three indices, another word about methodology is warranted. Levels of statistical significance are strictly used only when the data has been obtained from a sample that was randomly selected. The data that were used to test the hypotheses in this thesis were obtained from a sample that was systematically selected from a random starting point. However, I will follow convention by using significance levels on this data.

**Neighborhood stability** approximated a normal distribution with a mean of 0.140 and a standard deviation of 0.709. Approximately half of the values were located to the left of the mean and half were located on the right of the mean. The most frequently obtained value, the mode, was located to the right of the mean at 0.426. The distribution of values produced a curve that is flatter than the curve of a normal distribution. The values for neighborhood stability ranged from -1.17 to 1.63.

As can be seen from Table II, there were significant differences between the stability of neighborhoods in the four ALRT station areas. Broadway station area had the least stable neighborhoods (mean=-0.2764), while Nanaimo and Joyce station
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Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Stability*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F=38.779 at 3 degrees of freedom. Significance=0.000

Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favourable Attitudes Toward Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F=1.496 at 3 degrees of freedom. Significance=0.215

Table IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favourable Attitudes Toward the Neighborhood*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F=20.261 at 3 degrees of freedom. Significance=0.000

* Indicates a significant relationship at P=0.05 or less.

F= Variance Between Subsamples. In general, the higher the Variance Within Subsamples F ratio the more likely it is that the subsamples are significantly different from each other.

++ The smaller sample size resulted from residents not providing valid answers to some of the questions on neighborhood change.
areas were almost tied for having the most stable neighborhoods. Their means were 0.3225 and 0.3315 respectively. The negative mean of neighborhood stability in Broadway indicates the neighborhoods were considerably less stable than the neighborhoods in Nanaimo, 29th Avenue and Joyce station areas. The latter three station areas were approximately equivalent in the stability of their neighborhoods.

The distribution of favourable attitudes toward change also shared characteristics of a normal distribution. The mean of favourable attitudes toward change was 0.060, while the standard deviation was 0.350. Sixty percent of the values were located to the right of the mean. The mode was also located to the right of the mean at 0.262. The distribution of values produced a curve that is slightly flatter than a curve from a normal distribution. Favourable attitudes toward change ranged from -0.905 to 1.095.

According to Table III, there were not significant differences between station areas in residents' attitudes toward change. In each of the four ALRT station areas the mean was very close to zero indicating residents were neither favourable nor unfavourable toward change in their neighborhood. Residents in 29th Avenue station area were slightly more favourable toward change (mean=0.0938) than residents in the three other station areas.

The distribution of favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood deviated the most from a normal distribution. The mean of favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood was 3.428 and the standard deviation was 1.805. Just over half the values
were located to the right of the mean. The mode was also on the right-hand side of the mean at 5.894. The curve of values for favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood was flatter than the curve of a normal distribution. The values ranged from -2.31 to 5.89. A histogram of the distribution of favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood is contained in Appendix B.

Table IV reveals there were significant differences between ALRT station areas in residents' attitudes toward their neighborhoods. In all four station areas residents indicated they had quite highly favourable attitudes toward their neighborhoods. However, residents in the Broadway station area had less favourable attitudes toward their neighborhoods (mean=2.6204) than residents in the three other station areas. Residents in the Nanaimo (mean=3.8817) and 29th Avenue (mean=3.8890) station areas had the most favourable attitudes toward their neighborhoods.

The analysis of variance revealed that neighborhoods were moderately stable in Nanaimo, 29th Avenue and Joyce station areas. Furthermore, the analysis revealed that while residents in all four station areas were neither favourable nor unfavourable toward environmental change, all had quite highly favourable attitudes toward their neighborhood. The following section will reveal how the indices are related when bivariate correlations are computed.

The Hypotheses

Hypothesis I:

As neighborhood stability increases, residents' attitudes toward environmental change become less favourable.
### Pearson Correlation Coefficients

#### Table V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Stability</th>
<th>Favourable Attitudes Toward Change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>29th Ave.</td>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>All 4 Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eta++</td>
<td>Eta++</td>
<td>Eta++</td>
<td>Eta++</td>
<td>Eta++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(cases)</td>
<td>(cases)</td>
<td>(cases)</td>
<td>(cases)</td>
<td>(cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.2140</td>
<td>-0.0986</td>
<td>-0.1109</td>
<td>-0.2401</td>
<td>-0.1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.008*</td>
<td>P=.144</td>
<td>P=.105</td>
<td>P=.012*</td>
<td>P=.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4718</td>
<td>0.4378</td>
<td>0.4460</td>
<td>0.4821</td>
<td>0.2091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>(118)</td>
<td>(130)</td>
<td>(88)</td>
<td>(462)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Stability</th>
<th>Favourable Attitudes Toward the Neighborhood</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>29th Ave.</td>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>All 4 Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eta</td>
<td>Eta</td>
<td>Eta</td>
<td>Eta</td>
<td>Eta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(cases)</td>
<td>(cases)</td>
<td>(cases)</td>
<td>(cases)</td>
<td>(cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0018</td>
<td>-0.0138</td>
<td>-0.1141</td>
<td>-0.1160</td>
<td>+0.0647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.490</td>
<td>P=.434</td>
<td>P=.075</td>
<td>P=.110</td>
<td>P=.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3200</td>
<td>0.3241</td>
<td>0.2891</td>
<td>0.3618</td>
<td>0.2112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(174)</td>
<td>(146)</td>
<td>(160)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(594)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favourable Attitudes Toward Change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Nanaimo</td>
<td>29th Ave.</td>
<td>Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward the Neighborhood</td>
<td>0.1151</td>
<td>0.2662</td>
<td>0.0703</td>
<td>0.1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eta</td>
<td>P=.107</td>
<td>P=.002*</td>
<td>P=.223</td>
<td>P=.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cases)</td>
<td>(118)</td>
<td>(111)</td>
<td>(120)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P indicates the probability of obtaining the coefficient by chance.*

* * Indicates a significant relationship at P=.05 or less.*

**++ Eta, like r, when squared indicates the proportion of variance in favourable attitudes toward change that is explained by neighborhood stability. In a curvilinear relationship, eta is larger than r.*
Table V reveals that as neighborhood stability increased, residents in each of the four ALRT station areas had less favourable attitudes toward change in their neighborhood. The negative linear relationship was strongest in Joyce and Broadway station areas where the Pearson correlation coefficients were -0.2401 and -0.2140 respectively. The relationship was weakest in Nanaimo station area where the correlation coefficient was -0.0986. The negative relationship was significant at P=.05 in the Broadway and Joyce station areas, as well as throughout the four station areas when they were analyzed as a unit. Therefore, this hypothesis is accepted as applying in neighborhoods in the Broadway and Joyce station areas, as well as throughout the combined station areas. (Please note: Scattergrams depicting the bivariate interrelationships between neighborhood stability, favourable attitudes toward change and favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood are contained in Appendix C. The regression line is drawn on each scattergram, as well as the curve connecting the mean dependent value for each quartile of the independent value. If the relationship is nonlinear, this curve will more accurately depict the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. If the relationship is linear, the regression line will more accurately depict the relationship.)

Hypothesis II:

As neighborhood stability increases, residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood become more favourable.

In each of the four station areas, there was no significant relationship between neighborhood stability and residents'
attitudes toward their neighborhood (see Table VI). In each of the four station areas there was a very slight negative relationship between neighborhood stability and favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood. When the data from all four station areas were analyzed in a block, a slight positive relationship emerged, indicating that throughout the four ALRT station areas, as neighborhood stability increased, residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood tended to become more favourable. However, the small correlation coefficient of 0.065 indicates the relationship was weak, and not significant (P=0.058).

Scattergrams were examined to determine why the relationship between neighborhood stability and favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood was negative in each of the four station areas, but positive throughout the combined station areas. The scattergrams revealed that the bivariate distribution was curvilinear in each of the four station areas, while the distribution was more linear throughout the combined station areas. When the four curvilinear distributions were combined, they produced a weak positive distribution of neighborhood stability with favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood. Furthermore, the eta values for the relationship indicated it was more accurately depicted as a curve than as a straight line in each of the four station areas, as well as throughout the combined station areas. The eta values are shown in Table VI. Eta, like the Pearson correlation coefficient r, when squared, indicates the proportion of variation in favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood that is explained by neighborhood
stability. Eta squared and r squared range from 0 to +1. In a linear relationship eta equals r. In a curvilinear relationship eta is larger than r. Eta ranges from 0 to +1.

The correlation coefficients, scattergrams and eta values all indicated there was not a significant positive linear relationship between neighborhood stability and favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood either throughout the combined station areas or in any of the four individual station areas. However, the eta values and scattergrams revealed that as neighborhood stability increased, residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood tended to become more favourable. Therefore, the second hypothesis is tentatively accepted.

Hypothesis III:

As residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood become more favourable, their attitudes toward environmental change become less favourable.

In each of the four station areas, as well as throughout the four station areas, as residents' attitudes toward the neighborhood became more favourable, their attitudes toward environmental change also became more favourable. The positive linear relationship was strongest in Nanaimo where the correlation coefficient was 0.2662. The relationship was slightly weaker in Joyce station area where the correlation coefficient was 0.1899, but, as in Nanaimo, the relationship was significant. The weakest relationship between favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood and favourable attitudes toward change was found in 29th Avenue station area where the correlation coefficient was 0.0703. Throughout the four station areas, the positive linear relationship was not strong
(correlation coefficient=0.1710) but it was significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood are negatively associated with favourable attitudes toward environmental change is not accepted.

The results of the hypotheses testing revealed the following:

1. There was a weak negative linear relationship between neighborhood stability and favourable attitudes toward environmental change. Therefore, as neighborhood stability increased, residents' attitudes toward environmental change became slightly less favourable. The finding was significant for neighborhoods in Broadway and Joyce station areas, as well as for neighborhoods throughout the four eastside ALRT station areas.

2. There was a very weak positive relationship between neighborhood stability and favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood. Therefore, as neighborhood stability increased, residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood tended to become more favourable. However, the relationship was more curvilinear than linear in each of the four station areas, as well as throughout the station areas when they were analyzed as a unit. Furthermore, the finding was not significant for neighborhoods in any of the four station areas.

3. There was a moderate positive linear relationship between favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood and favourable attitudes toward environmental change. Therefore, as residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood became more favourable, their attitudes toward environmental change also became slightly more favourable. The finding was significant for neighborhoods in Nanaimo and Joyce station areas, as well as for neighborhoods throughout the four station areas.

The following concluding chapter contains a discussion of the implications and recommendations that stem from these findings.
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS, POLICY ISSUES

In Chapter 1 I described several objectives that would be achieved through this thesis research. The objectives were: 1. to increase knowledge about neighborhood stability and residents' attitudes toward change in their neighborhood, 2. to determine the relationship between neighborhood stability and residents' attitudes toward change and 3. to determine how neighborhood stability and residents' attitudes toward change are related to residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood. Chapters 2 through 5 revealed substantial information about the above three concepts and their interrelationships. This chapter will conclude the thesis with a discussion of the findings presented in Chapter 5, questions raised by the findings, implications of the findings for public policy and suggestions for further research.

The Findings

Neighborhood stability and attitudes toward change

The findings revealed that there was a weak negative linear relationship between neighborhood stability and favourable attitudes toward environmental change. (See Table V). Therefore, as neighborhood stability increased, residents' attitudes toward environmental change became slightly less favourable. This relationship was consistent with Hypothesis I which read: As neighborhood stability increases, residents' attitudes toward environmental change become less favourable.

The negative relationship between neighborhood stability and favourable attitudes toward change can be explained by reexamining the concept of neighborhood stability. In Chapter 3
I stated that neighborhood stability refers to the dynamic composition of a residential area, and that residents have a range of adaptations to change that occurs over time in the area's physical, social, political and economic characteristics. The findings suggest that residents in less stable neighborhoods fit this dynamic view of neighborhood stability. These residents believe their neighborhood can adjust to the changes the ALRT will bring without major disruption in the neighborhood. Furthermore, it is also conceivable that in the long run, the change may have a stabilizing influence on the neighborhoods. For instance, the station may attract additional retail, recreational and other service developments to the surrounding neighborhoods, thereby making them more desirable and stable places to live. This would also cause residents in less stable neighborhoods to have slightly more favourable attitudes toward environmental change. At the other extreme, residents in more stable neighborhoods appear to have a more static view of their neighborhood. They either like the neighborhood the way it is, and/or they do not want the uncertain outcomes that frequently accompany change. Furthermore, residents in more stable neighborhoods may have had less experience adjusting to change; therefore they are less favourable to change.

In summary, as neighborhood stability increases, residents respond as though their neighborhood is more static than dynamic and therefore, they are less favourable toward change that will disrupt their static view of the neighborhood.
Neighborhood stability and attitudes toward the neighborhood

Table VI revealed that there was no significant relationship between neighborhood stability and favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood. There was a very weak negative relationship between neighborhood stability and favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood in each of the four station areas. However, when their data were combined and analyzed as a unit, a weak positive relationship emerged. (Recall the scattergrams for this relationship are contained in Appendix C.) This finding provided minimal support for Hypothesis II which read: As neighborhood stability increases, residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood become more favourable. However, the relationship was more curved than linear, indicating that residents in both the least and most stable neighborhoods have slightly less favourable attitudes toward their neighborhoods than residents in neighborhoods that are in between the least and most stable neighborhoods.

One plausible explanation for the findings is related to the way residents view potential problems in their neighborhood. It is conceivable that residents in both the least stable and the most stable neighborhoods tend to be more sensitive to misbehaving juveniles, noisy neighbours and crime regardless of whether they are currently problems in their neighborhoods. On the one hand, residents in the least stable neighborhoods can be seen as having the least stability to lose and therefore, the residents are more likely to have unfavourable attitudes toward crime and other problems that will reduce their neighborhood stability to perhaps a precipitous level. On the other hand,
residents in the most stable neighborhoods can be seen as having the most stability to lose and therefore, these residents are also more likely to be unfavourable toward anything that may diminish their stability. It should be recalled that residents in the most stable neighborhoods also had the least favourable attitudes toward environmental change.

Attitudes toward the neighborhood and change

The findings revealed that there was a moderate, significant positive linear relationship between favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood and favourable attitudes toward environmental change. (See Table VII). Therefore, as residents' attitudes toward their neighborhood became more favourable, their attitudes toward environmental change also became slightly more favourable. This finding was contrary to Hypothesis III which read: As residents' attitudes toward the neighborhood become more favourable, their attitudes toward environmental change become less favourable.

The positive linear relationship between favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood and favourable attitudes toward environmental change suggests that residents' current attitudes toward their neighborhood have a positive influence on their attitudes toward the future of the neighborhood. Therefore, when residents consider potential neighborhood problems such as misbehaving juveniles and noisy neighbours relatively small problems in their neighborhood, the residents tend to be optimistic about the impacts of the ALRT system on their neighborhood. As a consequence, as residents' attitudes toward the neighborhood become more favourable, their attitudes
toward environmental change, as measured by the impact of the ALRT system, also become more favourable.

In summary, I have suggested that as neighborhood stability increases, residents' attitudes toward environmental change become slightly less favourable because residents indicate they have a more static than dynamic view of their neighborhood. In contrast, as neighborhood stability increases, residents tend to have more favourable attitudes toward their neighborhood. However, in less stable neighborhoods and more stable neighborhoods, residents have slightly less favourable attitudes toward their neighborhood perhaps because the residents are more sensitive to the potential reduction in neighborhood stability that may come from noisy neighbours, misbehaving juveniles and other problems in the neighborhood. Finally, I suggested that residents' current attitudes toward their neighborhood have a positive influence on their attitudes toward the future of the neighborhood. Therefore, as residents' attitudes toward the neighborhood become more favourable, their attitudes toward environmental change also become more favourable.

The findings did not provide convincing support for the three hypotheses. However, the findings raised several questions which are discussed in the following section.

Discussion Questions

The thesis research raised five major questions. First, what does the research suggest about the meaning of neighborhood stability? Second, can neighborhood stability be measured using the index suggested in this thesis? Third, can changes in neighborhood stability be recognized early enough to prevent
major disruptions in neighborhoods? and if so, what are the early indications of changes in neighborhood stability? Fourth, why would residents' attitudes toward environmental change become less favourable as neighborhood stability increases? Fifth, why would residents' attitudes toward change become more favourable as their attitudes toward the neighborhood become more favourable?

The meaning of neighborhood stability

In Chapter 2 I stressed that there was a paucity of definitions of neighborhood stability in the literature. Downs (1981) was the only author who indicated the essence of neighborhood stability could be communicated in two ideas: one, that a balance exists between the inflows and outflows of residents, materials and money; and two, that key characteristics do not change much.

Municipal planners defined neighborhood stability using either conceptual terms such as "freedom from threat" and "a sense of equilibrium", or specific characteristics such as the presence of long term residents. A few planners used both concepts and specific characteristics to define neighborhood stability. Half of the eight planners indicated neighborhood stability is not a static condition implying no change in the area's physical and/or social composition. The same group of planners indicated the area can adjust to change.

In Chapter 1 I defined neighborhood stability as a concept referring to the dynamic composition of a residential area. The dynamic composition refers to changes over time in the area's physical, social, political and economic characteristics.
Furthermore, I stressed that the crucial factor in neighborhood stability is that the changes are within the residents' range of adaptation. Therefore, three ideas are expressed in this description of neighborhood stability: 1. it refers to a dynamic rather than a static condition, 2. it implies that residents can adjust to change in their neighborhood and 3. it is a multidimensional concept.

The majority of ideas about neighborhood stability expressed in the literature and by the practising planners who were interviewed are contained in the thesis definition of neighborhood stability. However, the findings suggested that neighborhood stability is considered more of a static than dynamic condition. It appears that in less stable neighborhoods, neighborhood stability is more dynamic than static. However, as neighborhoods become more stable, neighborhood stability is more static than dynamic. Despite this distinction I believe that neighborhood stability is a dynamic condition regardless of the stability of the neighborhood.

Measuring neighborhood stability

According to researchers such as McLean et al (1970), Guseman et al (1976), Gertler and Crowley (1977) and Downs (1981), neighborhood stability can be measured. Furthermore, the vast majority of planners who were interviewed agreed that neighborhood stability can be measured using a variety of indicators such as: property sales, the age structure of the population, length of residence, property maintenance, school enrollment turnover, and level of use of social services.

In this thesis neighborhood stability was measured using an
index that was compiled from standard Z scores for each household on the following five variables:

1. dwelling type
2. housing tenure i.e. renter or owner
3. length of residence in the neighborhood
4. number of people known on the block by name
5. presence of school aged children

According to the literature, these variables should provide an indication of neighborhood stability. However, the alpha value for the index was relatively low at 0.4856, which indicated the five variables did not have a lot in common in their measurement of neighborhood stability. Consequently, it was concluded that neighborhood stability is a multidimensional concept and the five variables provide only partial information on more than one dimension. The five variables must be combined with other indicators to obtain a more reliable measure of neighborhood stability. The five variables should be combined with the following indicators to obtain a more accurate assessment of neighborhood stability. The indicators should be examined every four to five years, for example to record changes that have occurred. The indicators are:

1. property maintenance
2. social interaction amongst residents
3. level of use of social services
4. indications of crime and vandalism
5. indications of dwellings to rent
6. indications of dwellings to buy
7. school enrollment turnover
8. zoning
9. ownership of residential properties
10. household composition
11. income level of residents
12. total population
13. total number of dwelling units
14. the age structure of the population
15. residents' attitudes toward both their neighborhood and environmental change
16. residents' political preferences
17. resident adaptation to change
18. ethnic composition

Additional research is needed to determine how the preceding indicators should be weighted and combined with the five variables to provide the most accurate assessment of neighborhood stability.

**Early indications of changes in neighborhood stability**

I stated earlier that change is inherent in the meaning of neighborhood stability, and what is important is that the change is within the residents' range of adaptation. Early indications of changes that are not within residents' range of adaptation can be obtained by directly observing what goes on in the neighborhood. For example, how well are properties maintained? How do residents interact with each other? Are there visible signs of crime and vandalism? How many dwellings are for sale or rent? Changes in these characteristics will indicate whether the neighborhood is becoming more or less stable. If there is a deterioration in property maintenance and interaction amongst residents, increased crime and vandalism, and an unusually large
number of dwellings for rent or sale, the neighborhood is likely becoming less stable. If, on the other hand property maintenance is improving, resident interaction is more frequent and if there are fewer signs of crime and vandalism, and fewer dwellings for rent or sale, the neighborhood is likely becoming more stable.

Neighborhoods can accommodate a considerable amount of change without undergoing major changes in their stability. However, it is important to directly observe what is going on in the neighborhoods to learn more about the precursors of change in neighborhood stability.

**Neighborhood stability and attitudes toward change**

The findings revealed that as neighborhood stability increased, residents' attitudes toward change in their neighborhood tended to become less favourable. (See Table V).

It was suggested earlier in this chapter that as neighborhood stability increases, residents appear to have a more static than dynamic view of their neighborhood. In less stable neighborhoods, residents may be either indifferent to change as the data has shown, or they may believe the neighborhood can adjust to change without major disruption. Residents in less stable neighborhoods may have had to adjust to other environmental changes in the past; therefore the residents are more confident they can adapt to another change. As a consequence, they have slightly more favourable attitudes toward environmental change. However, once neighborhood stability increases, residents appear to have a more static view of their neighborhood. They either like it the way it is and/or they do not want the uncertainty that frequently comes with change.
Also, residents in more stable neighborhoods may be less skilled at adjusting to change; therefore they are slightly less favourable toward environmental change.

Attitudes toward the neighborhood and toward change

According to the findings, as residents' attitudes toward the neighborhood became more favourable, their attitudes toward environmental change also tended to become more favourable. (See Table VII).

This finding was unexpected given the studies cited earlier in Chapter 1 of resident opposition and resistance to change in their neighborhood. However, it was suggested in Chapter 2 that the resistance may have represented the feelings of a minority of residents. If a larger sample of residents had been asked to comment upon the proposed change, the majority of residents may have been indifferent to the change. The unexpected finding may also be partially due to the particular change being studied. The vast majority of respondents were located more than one block from the ALRT alignment; therefore they are unlikely to be directly affected by impacts attributed to the system. Also it is conceivable that the majority of respondents were unfamiliar with potential adverse impacts of an above grade rapid transit system, such as increased noise levels near the alignment. As a consequence, the ALRT system may be considered more of an asset than a liability to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Public Policy Issues

There are a number of public policy issues that were raised by the thesis research, largely through the interviews with municipal planners. First, should the maintenance of
neighborhood stability be a goal of municipal planners? Second, is there a role for municipal planners in maintaining neighborhood stability? and if so, what is the role? Third, what are the responsibilities of the municipal, provincial and federal governments vis-a-vis neighborhood stability? Fourth, should initiators of environmental change have a responsibility to consider the stability of neighborhoods before imposing changes? Each of these questions is discussed below.

First, the vast majority of the planners who were interviewed indicated that maintaining neighborhood stability should be a goal of municipal planners. I agree with the planners, but I feel more strongly that maintaining neighborhood stability should be a goal of municipal planners if it is also a goal of the neighborhood residents. There are numerous implications to maintaining neighborhood stability such as monitoring development and change in the neighborhood, and to the best of their ability, planners should endeavour to reveal the implications to the residents.

Second, there is a role for municipal planners in maintaining neighborhood stability. The role of the planner consists largely of working with residents to help them identify areas of concern and to establish goals and objectives for the neighborhood, developing policies, programs and plans that will meet the goals and objectives, and negotiating with developers and politicians to help implement the policies, programs and plans selected by the residents. Municipal planners may be considered a neighborhood advocate because they frequently represent residents' desires to politicians and developers.
However, planners should not necessarily advocate residents' desires if they diminish the quality of life for residents in other nearby neighborhoods. In summary, the municipal planner's role in maintaining neighborhood stability encompasses the responsibilities of a traditional community planner.

Third, the three levels of government should share the responsibility for helping to maintain neighborhood stability. The municipal government currently has the most direct influence on neighborhood stability through its zoning bylaws, development and building permits, local area planning programs and a variety of social, artistic and recreational commitments such as Neighbourhood Houses and Parks Board programs. The municipal government should maintain its current involvement with neighborhoods but it should also work with the provincial and federal governments to ensure they continue their financial support for social housing, infrastructure maintenance, the property tax deferral program for seniors, and the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program (RRAP). The municipal government should also take responsibility for monitoring the effects of other federal and provincial initiatives on neighborhood stability.

With lower revenues and increased debt loads the provincial and federal governments are unlikely to provide additional direct funding for policies and programs that will help maintain neighborhood stability. However, both levels of government can indirectly help maintain neighborhood stability by trying to anticipate how neighborhoods will be affected by their policy decisions. For example, will the abolition of the federal
capital gains tax result in more frequent house sales and a
decrease in neighborhood stability? Will the construction of the
Trans Mountain Pipeline from Alberta to Vancouver eliminate the
need for oil refineries in Ioco, and therefore disrupt the
stability of the surrounding neighborhoods? These are just two
examples of how decisions made by the federal government can
affect neighborhood stability. Decisions on the location or
expansion of provincial roadways can have a similar effect of
disrupting neighborhood stability. Therefore, by anticipating
the impacts of their policy decisions on neighborhoods the
provincial and federal governments can assume part of the
responsibility for maintaining neighborhood stability.

Finally, initiators of environmental change should have a
responsibility to consider the stability of neighborhoods before
approval is given for the proposed change. Neighborhood
stability should be included with economic, physical and other
social considerations in a preconstruction assessment statement.

In summary then, maintaining neighborhood stability should
be a goal of planners if it is also a goal of the neighborhood
residents. The role of the planner in maintaining neighborhood
stability is the same as the role of the traditional community
planner, where the planner, 1). helps neighborhood residents
identify areas of concern and establish goals and objectives for
the neighborhood; 2). develops policies, programs and plans to
meet the goals and objectives; and 3). negotiates with
developers and politicians to help implement the policies,
programs and plans selected by the residents. The three levels
of government should share the responsibility for helping to
maintain neighborhood stability. The municipal government should maintain its direct influence on neighborhood stability through policy initiatives such as zoning bylaws, and process initiatives such as local area planning programs. The municipal government should also encourage the provincial and federal governments to continue their financial support for social housing, the RRAP and the property tax deferral program for seniors. The provincial and federal governments should also assume responsibility for assessing how their policy decisions will affect neighborhood stability. In addition, all initiators of major environmental changes such as the introduction or expansion of a transportation corridor should take responsibility for assessing and documenting how neighborhood stability is likely to be affected.

**Further Research**

This thesis research has increased knowledge about neighborhood stability, attitudes toward change, attitudes toward the neighborhood and their interrelationships. However, it has also revealed that much more research is needed in order to more thoroughly understand the meaning of neighborhood stability, how it can be measured and how it is related to residents' attitudes toward change in their neighborhood. Therefore, additional research should initially focus on clarifying the meaning of neighborhood stability to determine whether it encompasses the ideas of dynamism, resident adaptation to change and multidimensionality. Later research should be designed to determine whether the indicators suggested earlier in the chapter provide a more accurate assessment of
neighborhood stability. More theoretical research should follow to determine the nature of the relationships between neighborhood stability, favourable attitudes toward change and favourable attitudes toward the neighborhood. It is suggested that higher order polynomial equations may more accurately represent the bivariate relationships. Finally, when the meaning of neighborhood stability has been clarified, its measurement has been verified and its mathematical relationships with favourable attitudes toward both the neighborhood and environmental change have been established, another study should be conducted after the ALRT system starts operating to determine whether residents' attitudes toward environmental change and their neighborhood have changed over time.
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Appendix A: Interview schedule for planners
Name_________________________ Position_________________________ Date______

1. What does "neighborhood stability" mean to you?

2. How would you describe a stable neighborhood?

3. Can neighborhood stability be measured?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

4. Is it desirable to maintain stable neighborhoods?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No (go to #5)

5. Why is it desirable? (to maintain stable neighborhoods)

6. Why is it not desirable? (to maintain stable neighborhoods)
7. Is there a role for community (and social) planners in maintaining neighborhood stability?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No (go to #9)

8. What is the role of planners in maintaining neighborhood stability?

9. What policies and/or programs can be initiated at the municipal level to maintain stable neighborhoods?

10. at the provincial level?

11. at the federal level?
Appendix B: Histogram of Favourable Attitudes Toward the Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>MIDPOINT</th>
<th>ONE SYMBOL EQUALS APPROXIMATELY 1.50 OCCURRENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>************************************************</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>************************************************</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>************************************************</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>************************************************</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>************************************************</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTOGRAM FREQUENCY

VALID CASES 605  MISSING CASES 83
Appendix C: Scattergram of Favourable Attitudes Toward Change with Neighborhood Stability for all four ALRT Station Areas

462 plotted values
Appendix C: Scattergram of Favourable Attitudes Toward the Neighborhood with Neighborhood Stability for all four ALRT Station Areas

594 plotted values
Appendix C: Scattergram of Favourable Attitudes Toward Change with Favourable Attitudes Toward the Neighborhood for all four Station Areas

430 plotted values
Appendix C: Scattergram of Favourable Attitudes Toward the Neighborhood with Neighborhood Stability for the Broadway Station Area

174 plotted values. The means were derived from the quartiles for the station areas combined as a unit.
Appendix C: Scattergram of Favourable Attitudes Toward the Neighborhood with Neighborhood Stability for the Nanaimo Station Area

146 plotted values. The means were derived from the quartiles for the station areas combined as a unit.
Appendix C: Scattergram of Favourable Attitudes Toward the Neighborhood with Neighborhood Stability for the 29th Avenue Station Area

160 plotted values. The means were derived from the quartiles for the station areas combined as a unit.
Appendix C: Scattergram of Favourable Attitudes Toward the Neighborhood with Neighborhood Stability for the Joyce Station Area

114 plotted values. The means were derived from the quartiles for the station areas combined as a unit.