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ABSTRACT

In practice, the neighborhood unit concept has fallen short of its theoretical promise. However, one of its major goals—attempting to produce a more satisfying social life for the inhabitants of a residential area—is still valid. To attain such a goal, it now appears to be more valid to attempt to assess the attitudes of people towards each other rather than to attempt to manipulate locations of facilities in order to attempt to develop more satisfying residential environments.

One relationship that appears to have relevance for attaining such a goal is that of the neighbor. If it were possible to assess an individual's attitudes towards his neighbors, it would be possible to use such information as one input in the design of future residential developments. By attempting to assess an individual's concept of the ideal role of neighbor, planning would be taken one step away from corrective action based upon behavior observable in an existing environment, towards assessment of attitudes towards residential environments that may provide a more sound basis upon which to predicate changes to produce more satisfying residential environments.

This thesis attempts only to develop a tool
by which it may be possible to elicit an individual's concept of the ideal role of neighbor. The construction of the tool follows directly from the theory of what a neighbor is and how a neighbor acts. Testing of the tool is limited to attempting to discover problems of administration.
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CHAPTER I

I. Statement of Intent

1. Intellectual Sentiment

The traditional American intellectual anti-urban sentiments die hard. Nostalgic yearnings for wilderness and a lost rural purity are concomitant with rapid urbanization. The Romantic's desire for a return to the simple rural life has now generally given way to never-ending warnings of the impending doom and destruction of society that is imminent due to the anonymity, anomie, and loss of face-to-face contacts in burgeoning urban areas. These warnings describe the speed and formlessness of modern urban life brought about by truncated, unnatural social relationships that now replace the warm neighborhood intimacy of the past. Eloquence—analogy, similes, and connotative words—is the chief tool of these prophets of doom. They have developed a romantic, rose-colored notion of past rural societies and medieval smallness and a penchant for flourishing descriptive phrases describing the dying city. Cries of the city is the people, remember the human scale, bring back neighborhoods and diversity is beauty are echoed time and again.

The impressionistic warnings of the dangers of city life are one side of the coin. As with most ideas, the actions of this group of worriers depicting the cancerous action of
city life on the individual, have produced a built-in pendulum reaction. In some disciplines, it appears that a dogma will eventually throw up a group that will question that which has been accepted. What was once accepted—often based on impression—will be scrutinized more closely with the result that a wide reaction the other way may begin. Witness in geography the rise of the environmentalists, the eventual reaction to their doctrine and perhaps the final swing back to some more central position.

2. Closer Examination

Among those who are interested in cities, there is at least a suggestion that perhaps the generalized warnings of doom may have been overplayed. Perhaps complete social relationships may be more common and fulfilling in certain aspects of city life than expected. Fava states that city-wide heterogeneity of population is true but that this heterogeneous population is broken into relatively homogeneous subareas and that increase in city size at a certain point may increase some types of informal contacts rather than decrease them. She also cites a number of other studies that show in varying ways that one type of social relationship—neighboring—may be more common in cities than expected.

Bell and Boat imply that generalizations about urban social organization must be tempered by the form that research
into those social organizations has taken. They point out that research has taken two forms: a contrast between the city and rural areas (although according to Martin the research has not produced systematic analysis of differences in neighboring, visiting, and participation in secondary groups between areas of the city and rural points) and the study of one section as compared to others. They cite Wirth's classic article "Urbanism as a Way of Life" which analyzes the social effects of size, density, and heterogeneity of population on urban dwellers. Bell and Boat point out that recent writers have questioned Wirth's statement of urban life as consisting of

- the substitution of secondary for primary contacts,
- the weakening of bonds of kinship,
- and the declining social significance of the family, the disappearance of the neighborhood, and the undermining of the traditional basis of social solidarity.

Differences between sections of the city should be considered in making generalizations about urban social relationships. Bell and Boat feel that anonymity, social isolation and the disappearance of local community life—if evident in urban life—may not be equally present in every section of the city. They provide a long list of articles that have attempted a more rigorous analysis of some of the characteristics attributed to urban life by Wirth. Part of this more rigorous analysis has been to develop generalizations based on researchable hypotheses dealing with some of the generalizations Wirth put forward about
cities. These hypotheses have generally been confined to certain parts of the city.

Thus far two ideas have been put forward. First and most basic, that the physical structure of the city—especially its size with its complementary density and diversity of population—has an impact on social life. Second, that some of the generalizations about urban social malaise are being more rigorously analyzed with respect to differences between various parts of the city. It was felt that expanding areas of little variety or physical quality had an adverse effect on social life. There was an implication that large, undifferentiated areas of urban development produced breakdowns in social relationships. However, when this tie between physical surroundings and social relationships is investigated more closely and more rigorously, it becomes apparent that generalizations must be qualified with reference to an area of the city being considered—CBD, suburb, etc.—the socio-economic, ethnic and demographic traits of the population, life cycle stage, and so on. In most general terms, a call is being made for study of how various kinds of people adjust to their physical surroundings so that criteria for future developments may be based on sound principles proven in theory and practice. To achieve this, studies of human behavior must not be made in terms of city versus country but in terms of different types of areas
within the city in which the behavior occurs.

3. Objectives of the Thesis

This thesis will attempt an investigation of one type of social relationship in one part of the urban environment. This thesis will be concerned with neighboring in residential areas. This is in keeping with Fava's call for study of certain areas of the city and is likewise congruent with the questioning of certain impressionistic statements through more rigorous research. A prototype of the impressionistic statement that this thesis will question is Wirth's declaration that

Overwhelmingly the city-dweller is not a homeowner, and since a transitory habitat does not generate binding traditions and sentiments, only rarely is he truly a neighbor. 8

It appears to be a reasonable statement drawing a logical conclusion. However, close investigation of one part—the concept of neighbor—may result in some modification in Wirth's proposition.

Specifically, this thesis will attempt two things: first, to present a rigorous, theoretical definition of neighbor and neighboring and second, to develop a technique by which it will be possible to assess the type, intensity, and extensity of neighboring in residential areas of various types and location within the city. Once it is possible to assess the role of neighbor through the various dimensions of neighboring, it may
be possible to ascertain the importance of neighboring in such things as residential satisfaction and the decision to move and evaluate its importance in relationship to physical conveniences.

In developing these techniques, the theoretical framework of types of research provided by Michelson will be used. This will permit past and future research to be conveniently ordered so that some comprehensive view of areas requiring further research can be succinctly and accurately delineated. Michelson points out the basic distinction between research concerned with what people state they want for accommodation (mental congruence) and how people are actually living in a particular environment (experiential congruence). The technique for assessing neighboring will deal with mental congruence. Once a tool is developed to elicit attitudes about desired forces of neighboring, it should be possible, through extended observation, to point out the difference between present role of neighbor and ideal role of neighbor. By noting the difference between what people want and what they have, it may be possible to develop a tolerable range for role of neighbor which may have implications for design when the relationship to such things as decision to move are investigated. One other important point put forward by Michelson will bear heavily on the development of the above-mentioned techniques. He feels
that when asking for an opinion response, questionnaire surveys may be inadequate in that they ask a finite number of questions about a particular problem which may have facets of importance to the respondent which are not asked and not volunteered. Data from such a questionnaire would provide an incomplete response to the hypothesis being studied. He suggests that "a semi-projective game situation may be a source of needed data". The technique that will be developed will be a questionnaire supplemented with some type of game.

Planners have long been concerned with residential development. They have held out the neighborhood as the basic unit of the city. In a desire to be comprehensive in their plans, they have realized the need to develop a sensitivity to more than the merely physical needs of potential inhabitants of their developments. Partly in the Romantic anti-city sentiment, they appear to have a desire to bring the best of the city and country together in the manner of Ebenezer Howard. To better understand the potential use that understanding and being able to assess role of neighbor could have for residential plans, it is first necessary to understand the classical planning response—the techniques that have been traditionally used to develop better residential environments. This will involve a review of the work of Ebenezer Howard and Clarence Perry and a discussion of the controversy raised by the latter
author. Once this is completed, it is hoped that the planners' need to be concerned with an understanding of role of neighbor will be evident from an historical point of view.

II. The Neighborhood Unit Concept

1. Introduction

Planners are becoming more and more concerned with the "social implications" of their action in building cities. The non-physical and non-economic aspects of their work, appear to be gaining more importance all the time. Better highways and bigger apartment blocks do not solve the major problems of the city dwellers. Canadian cities, not containing the inherent racial problems of U. S. cities, still have the opportunity to profit from blunders made in American cities by planners and others concerned with city development. Naturally, one area in which the opportunity to learn comes is the area of "social implications" of planning decisions. It would almost seem that accounting for the impact of their decisions on the lives of present and future inhabitants of particular parts of the city has replaced the planners' more traditional panacea of reproducing the country or small town atmosphere of cooperation and tranquility in the big city.

The replacement of first a desire to return to the simple rural life, by a second desire to reproduce the assumed virtues of the rural life in the cities, and finally by a desire
to understand the social implications of decisions made by physical planners does not follow a smooth evolutionary development. Some would argue that this change has not occurred at all, that it is only the product of hindsight searching for some ostensibly rational framework within which to explain past events of one particular type. Quite likely that is true. But whatever the source, the professional planner today is more concerned—as evidenced through current literature—with accounting for the impact of his decisions on the lives of people than some of the past city-builders.

One particular concern of planners has been how to improve the residential environment. Many feel that this interest sprung from a humanitarian concern for the health of residents of early industrial towns, especially in Britain. The health acts and land use control devices that were produced were the forerunners of present standards and accepted regulations. When planners look to the past for sterling examples of touchstones of planning progress, they generally point to the work of Ebenezer Howard and Clarence Perry as outstanding attempts to improve the residential environment of the city dweller. Both of these men produced, or more correctly, synthesized past experiences from which they produced, astute statements of how the life of man in the city could be made more pleasant. Through no fault of their own, many of their
theoretical statements were seized upon out of context to become the dogma with which essentially non-sensitive men were able to rationalize decisions which they were otherwise incapable of making. Stereotypes were developed and instituted which neither man would have espoused.

2. Ebenezer Howard

Ebenezer Howard in his *Garden Cities of To-Morrow*, published in 1902, is generally credited with formulating the term "Garden City". F. J. Osborn credits Howard with explicitly putting forth the notion that the size of towns is a proper subject of conscious control and that the size of geographical community units is a major factor in social organization. Howard's proposal was a practical technique with which it would be possible to combine the best features of and country through the development of new towns called Garden Cities. The result of embracing the best of the country and the city was to be a city in a garden. Without going into greater detail, it is sufficient to note that Howard's idea was to develop new cities of particular size laid out in a particular manner that would maximize the benefits of the inhabitants.

Although Lewis Mumford is able to trace the concept of the garden city back to Leonardo da Vinci, most planners
agree that Howard put forth the idea of division of the city into wards. Howard stated that each ward, or one-sixth part of the city should be in some sense a complete town by itself, and thus the school buildings might serve, in the earlier stages, not only as schools, but as places for religious worship, for concerts, for libraries, and for meetings of various kinds, so that all outlay on expensive municipal and other buildings might be deferred until the later stages of the enterprise.

Although Carver believes the concept of the city in a green belt--originally designed to provide city dwellers who had to walk, a chance to easily reach the life-giving country--has been outmoded by the wide-spread use of the car and the attendant increase in personal mobility that it provides, he feels the ward concept is still valid in theory, if not in detail. This idea of dividing a city into self-contained sections is taken by many planners to be the initial articulation upon which Perry built when he presented his neighborhood unit concept in 1929. Even though there is a striking similarity between the concept of the ward as put forth by Howard and the neighborhood principle put forward by Perry, it is generally agreed that Perry was unaware of Howard's work. At least, Perry never mentions Howard.

3. Clarence Perry

Perry abandoned Howard's somewhat wider attack on the whole problem of the city's development and growth and
concentrated his interest on the integration of urban and rural life types. Perry's concern was much more with the development of individual wards or neighborhoods than with the relationship between the wards and the rest of the city.

Both in the nature of its concept, and in the techniques of its application, the neighborhood unit principle has stressed the uniqueness and individuality of the parts, but has neglected the associated, and vital problem of the integration of the whole....

His (Perry's) interest was centered on the unit in isolation, and its relationship to the city as a whole received from him only cursory attention. 24

However, like Howard, he seemed to be attempting to bring the best of the country into the context of the city.

In the next section, the neighborhood unit concept, which Gilbert Herbert has called "the most important of all modern town planning theories", will be discussed by first presenting the theory, then some criticisms which will lead into the need for a rethinking of how the planner should view the neighborhood, pointing out the usefulness of the concept of neighboring.

The neighborhood unit as defined by Perry is based on acceptance of the sociological premise of the need for primary contacts within a prescribed geographical area. In the introduction to Perry's 1929 study it is stated that
the purpose in undertaking this inquiry into neighborhood unity life has been to discover the physical basis for that kind of face-to-face association which characterized the old village community and which the large city finds it so difficult to recreate. 26

Later in his presentation, Perry states the classes of benefits that will accrue from his concept of the neighborhood unit. The first is safety from the automobile for the residents of the unit. The second is civic benefits. Under this heading he states

What urban growth has needed is a process whereby the village civic cell would be repeated at a rate corresponding with the expansion of the population and it is a remedy for this defect that the neighborhood unit scheme is put forward. The fact that it creates the kind of physical conditions; the face-to-face relationships--which are necessary for the natural development of social movements is the basis of its civic virtues. 27

Another class of benefits Perry calls moral and social values. By this Perry means the impact the local community has on the developing character of the younger generation; the primary group's impact (face-to-face relationships) on children.

To backtrack, Perry defines his neighborhood unit in terms of planning characteristics as a residential area which

...should provide housing for that population for which one elementary school is normally required, its actual area depending upon its population density... should be bounded on all
sides by arterial streets, sufficiently wide to facilitate its by-passing, instead of penetration, by through traffic...(should include) a system of small parks and recreational spaces....Sites for the schools and other institutions having service spheres coinciding with the limits of the unit should be suitably grouped about a central point.... One or more shopping districts...should be laid out in the circumference of the unit...(and) the unit should be provided with a special street system...being designed to facilitate circulation within the unit and to discourage its use by through traffic. 28

This proposal for residential areas which are pleasant; healthy with open space and recreational facilities; safe from the dangers of unfettered motor traffic; self-contained to the extent of having local shops and social-cultural facilities; and indentifiable both by inner social cohesion and by definite boundaries, 29 is obviously an attempt to transplant the good life of the country into the city. With its call for open space and curvilinear streets analogous to country paths, there is an implicit nostalgia for the idealized rural village.

This basic concept as outlined above has been seized by planners as a central tool for their work. Perry's concept evolved from his concern with the wider use of school facilities and their potential as a community center and his concern with the need for neighborhood recreational facilities. He soon realized that it would be impossible to consider either of these problems in isolation from the neighborhood as a
whole. When he turned his attention to consider the neighborhood as a whole then, it is not surprising that Perry chose to base his residential development on the central elementary school.

When Perry turned his attention to the wider problem of local community life from the details of neighborhood recreational facilities, he was greatly influenced by Cooley in choosing to study the problem in terms of primary associations. In 1929, Perry quoted Cooley as stating

By primary groups I mean those characterized by intimate face-to-face association and cooperation. They are primary in several senses, but chiefly in that they are fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual. The result of intimate association, psychologically, is a certain fusion of individualities in a common whole, so that one's very self, for many purposes at least, is the common life and purpose of the group. 31

This seems closely in line with the avowed purpose of the study.

As Herbert points out, the functions of the unit was to provide a "physical environment which will regenerate and maintain primary, face-to-face, social contacts and associations within the city". The primary groups which the neighborhood would engender would be reinforced by the understandable and rational boundaries that would sharply define the neighborhood. The final result would be a fusion of consciousness producing identification with the local area. Anonymity of
the large city would be replaced by a rural village notion which Cooley states that "we" as a term most closely approximates. Thus Perry's concept is seen as an attempt to bring into city life some of the virtues of rural society in a physical and social sense.

Once his concept was articulated, it was used by planners all over the world in various ways. This was at least partly due to the simplicity of the concept and the ease with which explanatory diagrams could be sketched. However, both of these factors are symptomatic of the lack of flexibility inherent in the theory. In practice, it is sufficient to note here, that the size of the units varied greatly as did the way in which each neighborhood unit would be expected to relate to the city as a whole.

4. Controversey

Now that the neighborhood unit concept as put forth by Perry has been set out, it is possible to try to document some of the reactions to its use. It appears that a bitter controversy raged in the late 1940's as to the function of the concept. Often it seems that the attacks on the concept would be more correctly designated as attacks on the interpretation of the concept by practicing planners. A much more serious attack on the concept was to be launched in the 1960's. This final assault pointed out the need for a critical evaluation
of the underlying assumptions of the concept and the need for coordinated, systematic research among all social sciences to try to give planners a more rational basis upon which to construct residential groupings. A set of criteria with which it would be possible to construct over time a residential area that would be highly satisfying to those living in it and which would bear a rational and evolutionary relationship to the city as a whole is needed.

Most reviewers of criticism levelled at the neighborhood unit concept start off by stating that the most scathing and most damaging attack on the principle was that of Reginald Issacs in 1948. He questioned whether or not it was sociologically possible to create neighborhoods in modern cities; whether the neighborhood unit was adequate as a physical concept for planning, and whether the concept was a tool for segregation to replace the banned restrictive covenants. This last criticism is taken to be a criticism of the way the concept was used rather than an end result of qualities or conditions inherent within the concept. Most of the rest of the criticism of the neighborhood unit concept contemporary with that of Isaacs appears as either a rebuttal or a confirmation of the main ideas put forth most strongly by Isaacs.

The following is a selection of some articles questioning Isaacs' criticism. Herrick, advocating Perry's
concept, states that the neighborhoods were placed between main thoroughfares in order to reduce traffic hazards for residents carrying out their daily activities. As a result, it was possible to reduce the total area covered by internal streets and devote the area saved to recreation. As well, he points out that since traffic within the neighborhood was reduced to a minimum it permitted the use of less costly pavements. By manipulating densities of population, he felt it would be possible to maintain a constant population within the neighborhoods although the areas of the neighborhoods would vary greatly as you moved from the small areas in the core to the large areas of the suburbs. Finally, he states that it was not intended that each neighborhood be restricted to any one group on economic or social grounds. The function of the concept was to produce a city that would be more economical, healthful and attractive than that produced by extension of the traditional grid.

This somewhat hurried defense of the concept does not seem to really answer Isaacs' criticisms in the comprehensive manner in which they were laid out. The short statement is a reiteration of the function of the unit with the implication that Isaacs' criticism of the unit as an instrument of segregation was criticism of the use made of the concept rather than a valid criticism of the theory.
Wehrly defended the neighborhood unit concept in terms of its providing a physical reality to the human instinct to develop strong local attachments. He goes on more convincingly to refute one criterion upon which Isaacs had based his allegation that sociological neighborhoods would not be formed and the ones that were acted as instruments of segregation, when he states that population mobility is not the test of a neighborhood. The test of the success of a neighborhood was its ability to keep attracting compatible families looking for the type of physical environment that it offered. Those who do not like one neighborhood environment have the choice of living elsewhere.

Once again this answer to Isaacs points out the validity of the theory, but the inability of the theory to be put into practice without significant alterations.

Mumford states that neighborhoods exist wherever people congregate. He feels that the neighborhood unit performed the needed function of setting an upper limit on growth and providing definite boundaries and a civic center to provide the inhabitants with a sense of belonging together. He felt that the problems to be answered were what degree of isolation the neighborhood should exhibit and to what degree the population should be mixed. In this latter concern, he agreed with Tyrwhitt who also felt this to be a primary problem.
Another body of criticism deals with the size of the neighborhood unit in relation to its ability to foster the face-to-face relations espoused by Perry to be one function of the unit. As pointed out by Herbert, the size of these units ranges from 50 to 100,000. Each appears to be founded on the basis of sound theoretical precepts. Each appears valid. The use of one size or the other will depend on the functions which it is intended the unit should perform.

The end result of the criticism for and against the neighborhood unit concept rampant in the late 1940's and early 1950's is eloquently summarized by Cunningham in the following quotation.

Leading the attack was Reginald Isaacs...who viewed neighborhood planning as a fruitless attempt to make static residential areas in the midst of mobile and dynamic cities, and worse--as an instrument of racial, ethnic, social, and economic segregation. A number of distinguished planners, architects and social scientists lined up on Isaacs' side of this controversy. But the antineighborhood position has never won wide acceptance among planners, in part because they have never found a satisfactory alternative to it.

A stirring critical debate as to the validity of the concept rages, but practicing planners faced with the reality of making daily decisions continue to use/misuse the concept as an organizing technique for subdividing their cities.

A much more comprehensive criticism of the neighborhood principle is that rendered by Herbert. His criticism
also opens the way for new theoretical formulations with which the planner will be able to make the daily decisions which he must now make on the basis of an adaptation of the neighborhood unit concept.

Herbert states that the concept of the neighborhood unit was based on three assumptions: that there is an optimum size for a community; that the community is geographically based; that the city is a federation of neighborhood units and specialized units (industrial and commercial). He feels that rather than a neighborhood of 5,000 being the basic unit of city growth, that some smaller group is the basic social unit. He substantiates this assertion by quoting Willmott who states that

there is no evidence that they (neighborhoods) do anything to create "community" or "neighborliness", or indeed that they have any special social significance. 44

Herbert concludes two things. First that

if neighborliness is generated by small groups, the large-sized neighborhood unit is a social abstraction, which diverts our attention from the real problem 45

and second that the controversy over the optimum size of community has presented a wide range of levels of important social groups which suggests that there are many levels of important social groups and that a planning solution based upon a single level of social organization is an oversimplification
and can only lead to grievous errors in daily decisions.

5. Conclusion

There appear to be two very important ideas here. One, that small groups may produce the desired face-to-face contacts and two, that meaningful social interaction may occur for individuals living in one area at different places within the city. As stated earlier, this thesis will pursue only the first idea. Effective social groups may not necessarily be related to specific geographic areas but there is one important social group that is—neighbors. This group may take on special significance for certain parts of the population (the non-mobile) and for others at certain periods of time (new arrivals in residential areas).

Certain studies appear to place an overemphasis on the role of the physical environment in conditioning man's actions. Others, such as Perry's place all actions of a certain type within an arbitrary physical framework. To truly understand the impact of design decisions in residential areas, it is necessary to be able to understand the types of social relationships that exist. One relationship, role of neighbor, appears important. The next chapter will define neighbor and explain the concept of role of neighbor. The following chapter will then go on to develop a technique for assessing role of neighbor in residential areas.
which may be useful for testing hypothesized relationships between role of neighbor and residential satisfaction. Rather than attempting to devise systems to bring country life and structures into the city, there is an attempt to understand one type of relationship which may enable planners to evaluate the "social effects" of some of their decisions.

2. It is a commonplace of modern sociology to refer to the impersonal, rationalized, and segmentary relationships between individuals in industrial societies, and to contrast these with relationships existing in primitive and non-industrial societies. Yet all such dichotemies appear much too simple; for in spite of all the sociological research we still know little, in detail, of the social relations of modern man... p.98

The contrast between urban and rural life is still often presented in vague, impressionistic, sometimes, romantic terms; there has been little advance beyond the essays of Simmel and Louis Wirth. p.101


Donald Foley, *Neighbors or Urbanites*, 1952.

all cited in Fava, op. cit., p.130.


8. Ibid., p.17.


10. Ibid., p.106.

Mental congruence exists if an individual thinks that particular spatial patterns will successfully accommodate his personal characteristics, values, and study of life....this relationship between a physical phenomenon and a social end is a social fact worth noting, even if the relationship is not empirically substantiated.

All studies that set out to discover what people want and why they want it are concerned with mental congruence. A state of mental congruence between physical and social phenomena exists when people regularly expect the same social situation to result from the creation or maintenance of a particular physical environment. People have limited experience with different physical environments and therefore cannot make totally rational choices. Thus their feelings affect how they will react to certain environments and may lead to self-
fulfilling prophecies about the capacity of certain physical environments to accommodate certain activities.

11. Ibid., p.106.
Michelson defines experiential congruence as dealing with how well the environment actually accommodates the characteristics and behavior of people. Rather than asking a person his preference for environment, the investigator would study people living in a specific environment. He goes on to conclude that while Experiential congruence of people and environment is the research approach that is basically needed to form specific physical plans for the future..., a knowledge of mental congruence is necessary to assess the public's predisposition to accept and make successful whatever may be proposed; to ignore this fact is to invite failure, no matter how objectively correct future plans may be.

12. Ibid., p.107.

Physical planners, perhaps a bit puzzled that men are less responsive to physical improvements than they had supposed, readily admit that there is a disturbing gap between their expectations and their achievements, between intention and fact. To close this gap they have increasingly come to pay attention to the human factor and are gradually incorporating the insights of the social and behavioral sciences into their work.

15. Ebenezer Howard's book was first published in 1898 as *Tomorrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*.


Mumford concurs in this analysis stating that Howard's original contribution came with his definition of the garden city as a compact, rigorously confined urban grouping.


17. *Ibid.*, p.34

What was needed, Howard saw...was a marriage of town and country, of rustic health and sanity and activity and urban knowledge, urban technical facility, urban political cooperation. The instrument of that marriage was the Garden City.

18. Howard's sketches of what a garden city might look like were diagrams only and he stated that they were "merely suggestive, and will probably be much departed from". (p.51)

19. Howard, *op.cit.*, p.29. Mumford notes that Howard could not have known this.


30. Ibid., p.168. On the following pages, Herbert presents an excellent annotated account of the works upon which Perry built to derive his concept.


34. See Herbert, *op.cit.*, pp.173-179. Many who worked with permutations of Perry's idea adopted smaller social and planning units out of which the neighborhood unit was synthesized.


42. Herbert, op.cit., p.194.


45. Herbert, op.cit., p.194.

46. Ibid., p.195.

CHAPTER II Neighbor, Role of Neighbor, Neighboring

I. Introduction

1. Physical determinism

One of the major concerns of the planner is a consideration of the effect that the physical environment—street pattern, building arrangement, land uses—will have on the social life of people inhabiting a particular area. Fundamental to his function is the conviction that the physical environment does have some effect on the lives of the people who live in it. Thus by controlling the quality and nature of this physical environment, the planner must be able to improve the lot of those who will inhabit the area. Obviously, the neighborhood unit concept sprung from such a basic belief.

2. Importance of interests and values

However, practice falls somewhat short of theory and as stated in the first chapter, many planners are now calling for some hard research specifically adapted to their needs. That is, they want evidence as to how they may effect physical changes which will create the desired social changes in the lives of the inhabitants of an area. Put more succinctly, planners need research findings that will show them "how various kinds of people adjust to the various kinds of spatial separations that abound today". Relationships showing
the connection between various physical and social phenomena—how physically different living conditions (homes and neighborhoods) accommodate different social groups—will provide the building blocks for hard decisions in the design of future living areas.

As yet, the one clear result of rather unsystematic research appears to be that there is no one to one relationship between physical surroundings and social life. As Kuper concludes

The findings in regard to the social consequences of the spatial arrangement of the houses, taken in conjunction with the results of the American studies, provide some evidence in support of the planning assumption of environmental determinism. But there is no simple mechanical determination; the consequences depend finally on the values and attitudes of the residents themselves.

Kuper's sentiments are echoed by Keller when she states that

Above all, physical facilities and distances cannot be manipulated mechanically always to achieve the expected results....Again, it is the nature of the groups brought together that determine the outcome.... Physical siting and design are effective within limits only, and only by knowing these can the physical and social forces be brought into some sort of creative alignment.

Martin seems to draw the same conclusion in an article on suburban social relationships. He notes that homogeneity of population has been held out as being one of the chief causes of friendly and gregarious suburbs. However, he feels that homogeneous population is insufficient to explain
this phenomenon. He states

Some of the populations frequently referred to because of their lack of neighboring activities live in equally homogeneous, middle class districts, the sub-areas of large cities. It appears that the difference between the interaction patterns observed in middle class apartment house areas and in suburbs must be related to differences in interests, attitudes and values. Nothing about the physical arrangement of units in apartment houses appears to be incompatible with neighboring activities. People are attracted or repelled by suburban locations to the extent they are perceived as places where certain goals can be achieved. Thus, the demographic and socio-economic features of suburbs may be important mainly because they ensure the youth, energy and financial ability to carry on the interaction which develops in a homogeneous population having the interests and attitudes attributed to suburban residents. 5

The important point Martin makes is not that suburban residential areas are more friendly than non-suburban residential areas, but that the differences found may be due to differences in "interests, attitudes and values" of the residents.

Gans, in "Planning and Social Life", agrees with Martin when he states that

...while physical proximity does affect some visiting patterns, positive relationships with neighbors and the more intensive forms of social interaction, such as friendship, require homogeneity of background, or of interests, or of values. 6

3. Type of research needed

It would seem that environmental determinism—the total conditioning of people's lives by their physical
surroundings—appears somewhat discredited. What can planning do and what directions should the discipline be taking to accommodate the planners' concern for the social effects that their decisions may have? One direction that is being taken by the profession is towards promoting something called "planned communities". Rosow points out that the planners' aim to integrate people into communities on a residential basis by this means is a reaction against the segmentalized modern urban life. In these communities, studies have shown that people select their friends primarily from those who live nearby and those whom their home faces.

Thus it appears that friendship groups are determined by two variables: proximity of neighbors and orientation of dwellings. Yet upon closer investigation, he feels that these studies point out a much more restricted conclusion. Namely that

When people of a similar type (viz. students, war plant workers etc.) are brought together into a new community for a relatively impermanent period, considerable social solidarity springs up. 9

Thus, one of the most important variables is that of the homogeneity of the group being studied. However, when planned and unplanned communities are compared,

It remains to be shown that unplanned neighborhoods of equal density and equally homogeneous composition do not provide the identical patterns of friendship formation and group structure. 10
Rosow finally concludes that

There is little conclusive evidence of more than ephemeral changes in social patterns through the medium of planned communities. Particularly the integration of the community does not seem to be significantly greater than is found in homogeneous, unplanned neighborhoods. Stratification and racial division remain effective forces.

Thus, to all intents and purposes, it remains to be established how planning does significantly more than shift or re-group active—not latent—social relations into new settings. 11

Rosow does not seem to be calling for an end to planning of communities as a futile effort so much as an end to folklore and myth as to the ends that physical planning can accomplish. Concomittant with this call is a demand for a more refined research approach to discover fundamental relationships useful to planners in their attempts to develop physical environments that will meet the social as well as physical needs of the groups living in them. As well he seems to imply that the need to understand attitudes is more important than the need to study only actions.

...There is a wide gap between the demonstration that the architect exerts an influence on social relationships, and the determination of the conditions under which this influence can be used to achieve a particular result. Haphazard, unanticipated influence is one thing; control, quite another. It will certainly need many experiments, and their careful analysis, before we are able to assess the contribution of the Town Planner to neighborliness and to community living by control of the physical environment. 12
Research is needed that will test some of the fundamental premises upon which planners base their work regarding residential developments. The neighborhood unit concept has had proponents and opponents but both groups converge in a call for more relevant research.

Perhaps in this area of housing, planners have stated more explicitly than anywhere else what they feel are the social goals their developments will promote. It is just possible that the planner may have inadvertently developed the substructure to bridge the gap Keller speaks of when she notes the discrepancy between theory and fact as to the planning approach to problems. In theory, planning is interdisciplinary, but in fact it is not. This is partly because researchers in relevant disciplines such as sociology have not adapted their efforts to problems encountered by planners and partly because planners have never articulated clearly enough what their needs are.

One of the implicit goals of neighborhood or residential planners appears to be that of creating some sort of relationship among people living in a contiguous area that may not exist in the desired form in other areas. Perhaps most generally and most ambiguously, it can be stated that planners are attempting to create a special neighborhood cohesion, that is, the old desire to transplant
the healthy community life of the small town in the city. Even when, as was pointed out in chapter one, this goal has been replaced by a desire to account for social consequences of physical plans, a major concern is still with the nature and quality of life in residential areas.

Perhaps here is one of the real problems.

As Gans points out

The planner has traditionally concerned himself more with the neighborhood than with either the block or the political community. The neighborhood is not a meaningful social unit, however, since the significant face to face relationships occur on the block. 14

Perhaps if attention of researchers was redirected to focus on more specific issues, planners could begin to develop physical plans with which they could more rationally take account of the social ramifications of their actions. Research locale may more fruitfully be directed at activities less nebulous than those purported to occur at the arbitrary plateau of the neighborhood. Emphasis should be on relationships among people that occur no matter where, be it between two people next to one another in residence or between co-workers who live far apart. The importance of such relationships must be judged from the point of view of the people engaging in the relationships. There is a definite need for research that points out what importance people in different situations place on different types of relationships and what
the connection between such relationships is. Such research would develop answers that will permit planners to formulate social goals in terms of very definite and attainable objectives that will be of relevance to the people involved.

Thus it appears that rather than attempting to manipulate supposed social relationships to attain some ambiguous form of stereotyped "good life" through changes in the physical environment, a more rational approach would be to attempt to discern the possible range of relationships that exist—outside of those between members of individual families living in one unit—between people when they carry on the activities of everyday life in a residential setting. Having isolated these relationships it would be possible to study them as they exist, trying to discover what independent variables they are composed of so that manipulative action could be taken on these if something other than the existing relationships is desired.

The need for research into social relationships between people in residential areas is further emphasized by a study reporting that

...it was the very high frequency among the dissatisfied of complaints concerning social relationships (church affiliation, frequency of contact with friends, and the kinds of people associated with) which distinguish them from the very satisfied. 15
The importance of concentrating research effort in this area cannot be in doubt.

II. Social Relationships in Residential Areas

1. Usefulness of the idea

Obviously, in modern cities very few persons lives are confined to the vicinity of their residential accommodations. Many travel far afield for working, shopping and leisure. However, no matter where they go, they all have one relationship from which there is no escape (unless, of course, one is a practicing hermit)—that of being a neighbor. It appears that one fruitful direction for further research may be away from the study of the neighborhood as a certain patch of ground and towards the study of relationships that may occur in residential areas. Understanding how people act and think as neighbors is one concrete step toward being able to promote a more satisfactory environment. Understanding such a basic relationship would permit planners to at least be more sensitive to the effect that it has on people's lives. Whereas siting houses around a cul-de-sac may or may not promote social cohesion (defined by "good" neighborly relations) among the inhabitants of the house, an understanding of what people feel a neighbor should be and do may allow planners to manipulate space so as to facilitate the development of the concept. This is not
environmental determinism, but enlightened use of physical features to promote desirable social interaction at one level. Desirable in this case being defined by the inhabitants of the area and not by some arbitrary wiggles on a piece of paper.

Before going on to a more careful consideration of the neighbor relationship, a discussion of some of the problems of past studies will be presented.

2. Problems of past studies

The problems with past studies have been of three general types. First, and perhaps most important, since the other two problems likely follow from this one, there has not been a logical, systematic statement of theory upon which to proceed. The result has been a number of vague, ambiguous conclusions on social relations based on varying definitions and emphases. However, many of these past studies may be seen as fragmentary attempts to understand how people function in residential settings. They are important because rather than assuming knowledge of how people function and being concerned with how to manipulate their actions so as to give them a more rewarding life-style, these authors clearly saw the need for understanding—the need for descriptive research—before anything remotely resembling plans that take account of social ramifications could be
developed.

Another problem of past studies has been that they have not focused closely enough on the problems planners should deal with. Rather than only neighborhood and/or regional focus, perhaps another area for concern does lie in face to face relationships as Gans states.

The third problem of past studies has to do with a certain type of study of direct concern to planners of residential areas. The basic problem appears to be similar to that associated with the neighborhood unit concept. Once again it appears that broad, generalized goals have been set and then techniques have been sought to attain these goals before it is really clear what is involved in attaining the goal. These studies deal with the planners' desire to develop "balanced communities".

In general there seems to be agreement that a balanced community, as opposed to a community composed of one type of persons, is desirable. There also seems to be agreement that the variables involved in the construction of this type of community are of two types: social and physical. Discussions deal with the role of propinquity in producing a balanced community with homogeneous or heterogeneous populations at the level of the block, neighborhood, or community.

The term propinquity usually refers to the residential
situation in which a number of persons are brought together into a geographic area determined by the type and spacing of the dwelling units. Often it was felt that propinquity would create a feeling of community or togetherness which would be healthy or good for the people living there and for the city as a whole. One element of this propinquity would be closely allied to an underlying goal of the neighborhood unit plan as well as referring back to one of the first general goals of planners: the desire to bring the good life of the small town and country to the city. It was felt that propinquitous relations within a defined, usually small area, would lead to social control of deviant behavior. However, Riemer and Kuper refute such a contention. The hasty conclusions of Festinger, Schachter and Back are now seriously questioned.

Rosow, when speaking of community integration, reports that in planned communities friendship groups are determined by two variables: proximity of neighbors and orientation of dwellings. People select their friends primarily from those who live nearby and those whom their home faces. However, he goes on to point out that "the full significance of these patterns...is less clear", and that it remains to be shown that similar patterns do not occur in unplanned communities. He strikes upon homogeneity of population as being important in determining how well integrated the area
will be.

Gans also notes and attempts to explain a very important connection that he feels exists between propinquity and homogeneity of population. He feels that

...architectural and site plans can encourage or discourage social contact between neighbors, but that homogeneity of background (age and socio-economic level) or of interests (leisure activity preferences) or values (such as those with respect of privacy or child rearing) was necessary for this contact to develop into anything more than a polite exchange of greetings. Without such homogeneity, more intensive social relations are not likely to develop and excessive heterogeneity can lead to coolness between neighbors, regardless of their propinquity. Homogeneity is even more fundamental in friendship formation, and its presence allows people to find friends nearby, whereas its absence requires them to look farther afield for friends. 23

He calls for a "moderate degree of homogeneity" by which he means some sort of likeness among residents regarding age and income.

...the relatively greater homogeneity of age and income provides the cultural and social prerequisites which allow people to enjoy their neighbors' heterogeneity with respect to other, less basic characteristics. 24

This homogeneity would occur at the block and not at the community level. He equates increasing heterogeneity with lessening contact between neighbors.

His "moderate degree of homogeneity" is to be such that it will assure
1. Enough consensus between neighbors to prevent conflict.

2. Positive although not necessarily intensive relationships between neighbors with respect to common needs and obligations.

3. The possibility of some mutual visiting and friendship formation for those who want it in the immediate vicinity.

He realized that physical proximity is important but that the attitudes and values of the people in a residential setting are of more importance in determining the nature of the relationships that will occur. His basic thesis, like Rosow's, is that propinquity initiates relationships but homogeneous populations may transform these initial neighborly relations into more positive friendly relations.

He states that

Homogeneous neighbors may become friends, whereas heterogeneous ones soon reduce the amount of visiting, and eventually limit themselves to being neighborly.

Thus "neighborly" relationships are essentially second rate and perhaps by implication not as satisfying, whereas in fact they may be just as important in satisfying certain needs when considered in the total context of all the types of relationships that each actor engages in.

Gans is totally unprepared to accept any but his own conception of how neighbors must act toward one another in order to fulfill their roles as neighbors in an optimum manner. Neighborly relations that do not develop into friend-
ships are inadequate. He cannot conceive of any other role of neighbor being accepted by neighbors to attain the same end result. He does not appear to truly grasp the essential difference between friendship and "neighborship" and to realize that each fulfills different needs.

Immediately adjacent neighbors are likely to have frequent visual contact, and if there is to be social contact, they must be relatively compatible. Some people minimize social contact with immediately adjacent neighbors on principle, in order to prevent possible differences from creating disagreement. Since such neighbors live in involuntary propinquity, conflict might result in permanently impaired relationships which might force one or the other to move out. 28

He is pointing out that differences in role of neighbor as seen by neighbors can cause one or the other to move. However, he still contends that only "social contact" supposedly of a more profound nature than "neighborly contact", can produce a healthy neighborly relationship. However, in fairness to Gans, it must be pointed out that he does call for homogeneity in order to attain compatibility among residents. He speaks of homogeneity of background, interests, and values which could produce compatible roles of neighbor.

Social relationships are not based on census data, but on subjectively experienced definitions of homogeneity and heterogeneity which terminate in judgments of compatibility and incompatibility.

Sociologists generally agree that behavior patterns, values and interests—what people
think and do--are more important criteria for homogeneity than background factors. 29

It would appear that one criteria of homogeneity would be with regards to role of neighbor. People are likely to be more compatible if they hold homogeneous concepts of role of neighbor.

Keller as well becomes an advocate of some sort of social class homogeneity. Hers appears to be based on the contention that

Social class...(is) one of the principal factors determining the kind, amount, occasions and intensity of neighboring 30

leading to the conclusions that

...not only do members of different social class and status groups define neighbors and neighboring differently, but social class homogeneity increases neighboring both among working-class and middle-class residents 31

and that

...the greater the social, occupational, and cultural differences among residents, the more ill at ease they are in informal relations with one another. 32

When discussing alternatives to mixing, she notes that the term homogeneity is ambiguous. A group may be homogeneous in some ways and quite heterogeneous in others. Mixing groups of different incomes and occupations may be the least satisfactory element to base heterogeneity on. She concludes that "it is the nature of the groups brought
together that determine the outcome". 33

One of the ways she defines the "nature" of the groups brought together is germaine to our interests. She states specifically that which Gans appeared to be hinting at; namely that

Within limits, one may combine individuals of varied social and cultural characteristics but having similar conceptions of neighboring.... if one demands fairly general, and thus inter-changeable, characteristics in one's neighbor, mixing is less of a problem than if one is very exacting in the qualities demanded. Furthermore... compatibility rather than social homogeneity or similarity matters most. Residents need not have the same expectations nor need they be homogeneous with respect to occupation, family composition, class position and so on. But their different ways of life and bearing to neighbors must be mutually tolerable.

Since conceptions of neighboring, sociability, and community participation vary, one might pre-select residents so that they would be compatible in regard to values, attitudes and orientations that matters most to them and to the sort of community they are likely to create. Here, the planners might join forces with the survey analysts and make attitude surveys a regular part of their feasibility reports. 34

Thus the usefulness of understanding and being able to assess neighboring relationships is evident. Homogeneity in regards to neighboring may be more important than likemindness in other areas in producing satisfying residential environments. The planners' more traditional concern with homogeneous or balanced communities (often times left undefined or at least
ambiguous) may be seen as another step leading to the consideration of neighboring as an important element in the development of residential plans.

3. Relationships between people

The perhaps overhastily drawn conclusion of the importance of the undefined concept of neighboring will now be justified.

As in many other areas of research concern, the first task is to draw together many fragmentary studies by means of an initial theoretical statement—which may need later amendment—so that some comprehensive view of what is known and what needs further work to permit or facilitate development of a more useful and rational concept can be ascertained. Without a doubt, the most comprehensive and systematic treatment dealing with actions and attitudes between neighbors is Keller's book, *The Urban Neighborhood*. This book is an attempt to systematically organize a great many studies dealing with the general topic of neighboring. Keller points out the need for an overall theoretical framework and then shows the shortcomings and strong points of various studies as they fit into this organizing or categorizing statement.

Types of relationships between people can be most generally categorized as formal (those contingent upon be-
longing to an organization such as a church) and informal (relationships that occur outside of institutionally organized functions). These latter relationships could be described as various roles played by an individual as different situations arise in everyday life.

The various informal relationships into which an individual is placed during the course of a day must be seen as an interrelated web. The role assumed under one set of circumstances must be seen as discrete but related to that role assumed under another set of circumstances. One suggested set of relationships is that comprising friend, relative and neighbor. Each is unique, although actions when assuming one role will be related to actions in another.

Friendship is a chosen relationship, that is, one into which there is no compulsion to enter. This relationship is defined in vastly different ways by many people but is generally based on some sort of a reciprocal understanding between members of what is involved in a friendship. Another relationship is that of the relative. This is a prescribed relationship from which there is no escape, although there is almost infinite variety in the roles that may be assumed by members in this relationship. As well, this relationship is generally quite important in cities, contrary to the stereotype. Another prescribed relationship is that
of the neighbor. This relationship is automatically activated when one inhabits a dwelling unit that places him in some sort of juxtaposition to others. However, once again the roles that may be assumed within this relationship are highly variable.

There is also a definite connection between the relationships of friend, relative and neighbor which must be clear. A neighbor by definition is someone who lives nearby and who is not a friend or a relative. Unlike a friendship, a neighbor relationship is dependent upon proximity, has wider social implications than does a friendship and has a lower level of personal involvement than does a friendship. The neighbor may be seen as a helper in two types of situations: first, in routine situations (and the role based on mutual expectations is predicted upon these) which may be subdivided into relationships of two types. First, those based exclusively on chance meetings between neighbors. These take place in various locales and may be of varying extent and intensity, but they differ greatly from non-chance relationships in which one or the other of the participants is required to take the initiative to begin the relationship. These could take the form of evenings out or borrowing tools. The second situation in which a neighbor acts as a helper is in times of natural disaster.
It is clear then that all relationships are based upon some sort of reciprocal understanding between members in the relationship of what is involved in the relationship. To be effective, these relationships are based on a balance between expectations and reality regarding behavior. This balance determines the role that each member of the relationship is to play. Our concern will now be with the neighbor relationship.

4. Role of neighbor

The next section will deal with role of neighbor using Keller's theoretical framework to organize useful materials. Initially, two questions will be answered: what is role of neighbor? and what is neighboring? After this, attention will be focused on role of neighbor and an attempt to ascertain some of the elements that define it.

The relationship between neighbors and neighboring is succinctly pointed out by Keller in the following statements.

A careful look at the patterns of association among different groups and settings suggests that neighboring is neither natural nor inevitable. Before individuals are able to develop sustained and meaningful relationships with neighbors, they must first have a clear idea of what a neighbor is expected to be and do. And if these neighborly relations are to be predictable and orderly to some degree, they must be rooted in a shared fund of ideas and beliefs. Barring this, neighbor relations will either fail to be established or, if established,
they will be unreliable and ineffectual. 40

How good a neighbor one is depends on the general importance assigned to the role; what a good neighbor should do depends... on specific values and preferences. 41

and finally, following from the above statements

...the type of neighboring to be found in an area will generally reflect the concepts prevailing there of what a good neighbor is expected to be or to do. A good neighbor is not necessarily a friendly or a nice person but one who conforms to the standards of the neighbor role common consent acknowledges. 42

Thus, there can be no single, simple definition of what a neighbor is or how he should act. Different values and preferences will combine to produce different neighborly relations. The degree of differences may be important.

...frictions that may arise between groups or individuals holding different conceptions of this role may be due to these, often intangible, differences rather than to their aggressive or pugnacious natures, or to particular arrangements of houses and gossip squares. External physical and social arrangements are thus sustained by an unseen inner core of beliefs and expectations defining these. In view of cultural and historic variety, no single definition of neighbor is universally accepted, and planners of the human environment must, therefore, try to determine at the outset how the neighbor role is defined in order to assess its local significance in any particular setting. 43

It would seem that the neighbor role is the relationship between individuals in a common environment that has been accepted as best fulfilling a notion that predominates as to how neighbors should act towards one another. This notion
is conditioned by the values and preferences of the actors involved. The role may prove to be highly variable within small geographic areas or perhaps even within the same area depending upon the actors involved.

As pointed out above,

...the role of neighbor fits into a network of social roles and its explicitness depends on the nature of the social organization, including the density of settlements, the distance between dwelling units, the economic well-being of the inhabitants, the degree of cooperation demanded or permitted among residents, and the general trust placed by individuals in nonrelatives. Since neither the needs of residents nor the conditions giving rise to these needs are universal or uniform, we find considerable variation among settlements in (1) the distinctiveness of the neighbor role, (2) its saliency relative to other roles, (3) the formality and rigidity of its definition, and (4) the degree of consensus as to the rights and duties associated with it.

This relationship will be more well defined where the services performed by the neighbor is of great importance.

Kuper's concept of role of neighbor is tied to privacy. In his study of British housing projects he found that Informants vary a great deal...in their requirements for privacy. This variation is related to the role which they assign neighbors in their general scheme of life. It is also linked with status; for some informants, the maintenance of a larger area of privacy, or reserve, is synonymous with "better class". Moreover, greater reserve is maintained with some neighbors than with others; it depends on the particular
relationships. And in the same way that people have different values in regard to privacy for themselves, they also vary in discretion or tact or consideration for the claims of others. 46

The relationship that evolves between neighbors is dependent upon, or at least is an integral part of, the person's entire matrix of relationships and is further conditioned by a previously developed concept of privacy, largely upon which the relationship with various neighbors will be constructed.

Wattel also found that the role of neighbor learned in one residential setting was carried over to a new one. In his study of Levittown he reports that

...families have held to individual tastes in other ways; they have not confused neighborhood acquaintanceships for friendships. Previously learned friendship patterns continue to dominate. The neighbor who unburdened her friendly woes to a neighbor out a third-storey window across an apartment court continues to unburden her soul in Levittown. The neighbor who sought and flourished in the anonymity of a Manhattan apartment may continue to enjoy a similar anonymity in Levittown. 47

However, he does not try to investigate variables that may have formed the original role or why they might permit or force its continuance.

Clark in his study of suburban growth in the Toronto area points out the importance of past experience in forming role of neighbor. People moving to the suburbs
from established urban residential areas had been accustomed to playing a particular role with their neighbors.

The neighborhood was a part of the social life of the established urban community. That is not to say that the urban neighborhood associations were characterized by close in-group feelings and involved the full and active participation of all the residents in the street.... Compared with the new suburban community, where neighbor got to know neighbor in sharing the exciting experience of settling in a new home and community, the urban neighborhood, indeed, appeared cold and friendless. But it imposed upon the resident social obligations of a very real and exacting sort. The family living on an urban residential street had a position to maintain. It made a difference, of course, whether residence was in areas...(of) residential exclusiveness or in areas where continuous population movement made difficult the maintenance of stable forms of community life, or somewhere in between. But where family lived beside family in the urban community it was impossible to wholly escape the obligation of acting in a manner that took account of the fact of neighborhood. 48

Clark feels that different neighborhoods imposed different social obligations upon residents in their relationships with their neighbors. Regardless of whether it was the reputation of the neighborhood in the abstract that did this, or whether it was attributable to some other cause such as the actions of the neighbors, Clark correctly points out that different neighborhoods espoused different roles of neighbor and that almost all traditional residential areas had and enforced their role of neighbor. By implication, he also points out one of the major findings of his book--namely that
the concept of role of neighbor that dominates in an area is arrived at through an evolutionary process based on the changing needs and life-styles of the people living in the area. A great deal of superficial interaction is necessary when everyone in an area is new because the movers must fall back on their own resources for information and aid of other types. The residents' needs change as they settle in and so will their concept of role of neighbor as they become more selective in their neighboring.

Martin, like Clark, feels different areas have different roles of neighbor. He tries to explain the role of neighbor that he found in the suburbs by hypothesizing that social relationships in suburban areas are structured to some extent by the nature of the suburban situation. He is able to describe the suburban situation as being unique in terms of definitive and derivative characteristics. Definitive characteristics are those traits essential to suburban status. These he notes as ecological position, commuting and size and density. Due to the peculiar location of the suburb

Most available of all (to the resident) are the interaction opportunities of his own relatively small, homogeneous, suburban community, which ordinarily has the characteristics usually associated with "neighboring" and other informal primary-type group contacts. 49

Without relating what are the characteristics of neighboring, he attributes them to suburbs and feels that somehow whatever
these characteristics are, their end result, that is, the actions of the residents, is reinforced by the position of the suburb in relation to other areas of the city and country.

With regards to size and density, he states

...the relatively small size and low density of most suburban populations would provide a social situation conducive to certain types of relationships (e.g. neighboring, visiting, and primary type relations in general) and disadvantageous to others, (e.g. gathering of individuals with extremely rare interests ordinarily occur only in urban communities large enough to include several such persons) even though the suburban status did not exist.  

However, he does call for research to show how much of the suburban pattern of relationships actually is accounted for by size and density rather than ecological positioning and commuting. No matter whether his "definitive" characteristics are correct or not, Martin clearly points out that variations in role of neighbor may be tied to place of residence in the city.

Before continuing a discussion of the elements that may combine to produce role of neighbor, neighboring will be discussed.

5. Neighboring

There is a subtle but necessary distinction between role of neighbor and neighboring.
Neighboring refers to the activities engaged in by neighbors as neighbors and the relationships these engender among them. 51

Mann presents a similar idea of neighboring when he states that

If the inhabitants of the neighborhood constitute a social group, then there must be some form of interaction between them, otherwise they would merely be an aggregation. The form of behavior which this interaction takes will be denoted by the word "neighborliness". 52

Gulick et al feel that neighboring...involves a number of frequent, sociable activities but that intense, intimate relationships are not generally included in these. 53

This last definition is much more restrictive and necessarily rules out infrequent, nonsociable or asociable activities from being neighboring. However, this drawback may be due to the authors' desire to generalize. Later, they state that

...it would appear that the frequent though rather superficial interpersonal relationships which characterize the urban neighborhood should be regarded as functional, rather than dysfunctional, phenomena...urban neighboring...can be seen as an additive, rather than an unsatisfactory substitutive, dimension of social life. 54

Keller points out a very important aspect of neighboring. She feels that the activities of neighboring consist of organized and random elements and that the "patterns
of neighboring reflect the character of the individuals engaging in it as well as the dynamics of their way of life".

Neighboring activities and relationships... include a predictable core element based on the neighbor role and additional non-predictable elements reflecting the social and personal context in which neighboring typically takes place. The second aspect cannot be deduced from a knowledge of the role but must be observed from case to case. 56

Although an individual may have a definite concept of his role of neighbor, his neighboring activities may bear little resemblance to this acknowledged role due to other factors, as yet indefinite. Thus any study must make a clear distinction between neighboring activities (observable) and neighboring relationships—role of neighbor (theoretical).

Mann makes such a distinction when he describes two aspects of neighboring. His concept of manifest and latent neighborliness substantiate Keller's contention that neighboring activities and relationships must be seen as two separate entities that together produce neighborliness or neighboring. His concept of neighborliness is based on the supposition that

...what carries the relationship is not the ad hoc elements taken alone, but the relatively permanent and deep-seated attitudes of which these may be held to be expressions. 58

Mann concludes by stressing
...the importance of latent neighborliness as the basis of social solidarity for all the inhabitants of a neighborhood

and cautioning that

At times sociologists over estimate the significance of manifest forms of action, while the underlying attitudes are neglected. If, at first visit, a neighborhood appears to be sleepy and apathetic, with absolutely nothing happening at all, this is no reason for thinking that the inhabitants lack neighborliness. If the observer can go below the surface to discover the latent neighborliness, he may well find a very definite attitude expressive of social cohesion. 59

Although Mann's concept of latent and manifest neighboring is extremely important, he still seems to maintain a bias towards trying to show that positive manifest or latent neighborliness is good while negative is bad. Perhaps it would be better to put forth such a notion as a hypothesis for verification since an equally valid statement at this time would be to say that any concept of neighborliness from positive latent and manifest to negative latent and manifest is good if it is the dominant concept of neighboring in an area. Those who find the concept unacceptable will leave.

Gulick et al appear to come closer to a neutral, more useful working definition of neighboring when they note that

People who engage minimally in various neighbor-
ing activities are not necessarily generally dissatisfied people, although most of the generally dissatisfied people probably are also minimally engaged in neighboring activities. 61

They make no attempt to label low rates of neighboring as unhealthy or bad or to infer that low rates of neighboring breed any sorts of social-psychological illness which will ultimately wreak all sorts of havoc on a residential area that is unlucky enough to condone or even promote such neighborly relations.

Kuper puts forth a useful, somewhat traditional, explanation for the various forms that neighboring may take. He too feels that "the way residents feel about neighboring will affect their relations with each other". 62 Attitudes and values of the neighbors are important. Once again it is seen that neighboring activities are affected by something other than the positioning of buildings.

More interestingly, Kuper regards the neighboring activities that occur as being a manifestation of the tradeoff of needs and hazards as resolved by the actors. He feels that

Common needs are the element drawing the people together, while the real or supposed dangers of neighboring keep them apart. 63

In this belief, Kuper concurs with Keller's idea that neighbors fulfill needs--routine and emergency--but goes farther to try to explain the dynamics of the relationship
between neighbors. These hazards Kuper feels are generally gossip and threat to privacy.

The individual's assessment of the hazards of neighboring could be said to be somewhat analogous to his latent neighborliness. It is his assessment of hazards that will partly determine his attitude towards his neighbors and perhaps more strongly than is intended by the concept of latent neighborliness, will determine his overt action. With negative latent neighborliness, it is possible to be superficially quite "neighborly". However, activities based on fear of hazards are likely to rule out even superficial neighborliness—unless, of course, fear of ostracism is stronger.

6. Elements that combine to produce the functioning role of neighbor

It has been pointed out above that rates and patterns of neighboring vary...
(reflecting) particular economic conditions, level of cultural and recreational activities, and local standards of sociability. 64

The circumstances into which an individual is placed when he takes up residences in a particular place are very important in determining what he will do as a neighbor. It was also pointed out above that a person's past experiences as a neighbor would have some impact upon his actions and
attitudes as a neighbor in new surroundings. Many authors have tried to describe neighborly relations in residential settings in terms of conditions upon the site. Such group characteristics as homogeneity of population on a number of conditions—usually social class—or physical features such as propinquity of the residents or sitting of the dwelling units, has been employed to explain the patterns of relationships between neighbors that were found or that could be developed if certain of these variables were manipulated. However, it appears that there is more to neighborly relations than past experience and present circumstances.

Kuper presents a statement on how these two conditioning elements may relate and in doing so he brings in a third factor. He points out that there is something more than the mere play of needs and hazards that produced the patterns of neighboring that he observed.

Our comments may suggest that the attitudes of informants to neighboring are a product of the play of needs and hazards in the residential unit. Certainly their experience of living together at Braydon Road, their assessments of, and adjustments to, each other, influence their attitudes. But the roots lie deeper. Informants refer to precepts from mother and father, and to the ideals and practices of neighborliness in their home town or county.

Evidently, there is an ideal concept of neighboring and a functional concept that is heavily influenced by the ideal.
The relationship between the elements that combine to produce the present role of neighbor and neighboring that an individual upholds should be more clearly set out. The following diagram was constructed to this end.

CONCEPT OF THE IDEAL NEIGHBORLY RELATIONSHIP + MODIFICATIONS OF EXPECTATIONS DUE TO EXPERIENCE + IMPACT OF PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCES =⇒ PRESENT ROLE OF NEIGHBOR

PRESENT ROLE OF NEIGHBOR

It is assumed that everyone has a concept of the ideal role of neighbor. Expectations as to ideal role of neighbor that may be attained have been modified through past experience and are further altered by the impact of present circumstances to produce the present role of neighbor that the individual is accepting. Thus an individual has a set of attitudes about what a neighbor should be and do that is modified. His basic attitudes define his ideal role of neighbor.
Supposedly, an individual would be happier the closer he could come to performing under his concept of the ideal role of neighbor. If it were possible to discern the ideal role of neighbor, it would then be possible to develop environments that would reinforce this notion. As well, if it is possible to discover this basic, underlying attitude, it may be possible to predict ideal roles of neighbor for certain groups based on such factors as individual demographic traits and individual past experience. Under these conditions it would be possible to manipulate such things as homogeneity of population, propinquity and 68 sittings so as to reinforce or at least facilitate the development of the ideal role of neighbor and not just towards environments that people feel should facilitate or encourage more positive neighborly relations. This means that it would be necessary to define the terms circumstances so that it would be possible to discover what factors make it up and then how they could be manipulated. However, that is beyond the scope of this thesis which will be confined to trying to develop a technique to elicit what the ideal role of neighbor is. Perhaps the same tool will also be used to discover what the present or actual role of neighbor is, to test to see if there is any differences and if so what the tolerable difference is.
The assumption is that while situating factors give opportunity for contact, the extent to which residents avail themselves of these opportunities will depend in some measure on their attitudes.  

and hence the concern with latent neighboring and especially latent neighboring as defined by an ideal concept of role of neighbor.

Neighboring is the manifest interaction that occurs between neighbors. It has as its basis a notion of an ideal role of neighbor that should produce ideal neighboring. This ideal may be based on a sentimentalized view of past neighbor roles and actions—the importance of which has been stated above in reference to Kuper, Wattel and Clark—or on some purely theoretical construct that may have its basis in a desire for more prestige or some other cause. In any case, it would appear that a person has an idea of how he thinks neighbors should act and what a neighbor should be. This ideal concept of the role of neighbor is the cluster of attitudes that Mann calls latent neighborliness and which Shuval calls predisposition to neighbor. An understanding of this ideal is necessary in order to truly appreciate the overt action that is observed.

7. Dimensions of neighboring

Now that the importance of the concept of the ideal role of neighbor has been set out, the next step is to set out
the dimensions with which the ideal role of neighbor may be most succinctly and completely described. Neighboring has been divided into overt actions and underlying attitudes. These basic attitudes will provide the footing as to what the content, occasions and locale of the neighboring activities should be.

The content of neighboring activities generally is concerned with exchanging help in time of need or providing information. Examples of common content of neighboring activities are exchanging tools, informal visiting and asking advice. Thus, there is general agreement that the content of neighboring activities has to do with help in crisis situations. However, it is the different definitions of crisis which helps to produce different types of neighboring.

Likewise the occasions of neighboring vary from group to group. Keller notes the chief occasions for neighboring to be personal crisis, collective emergencies (both of which would be included under content above) and big collective events such as marriages. However, in an urban setting, the most frequent occasions for neighboring would be in times of emergency to an individual or to the group as a whole. An example of a common collective emergency would be movement of strangers into a new housing project. If they feel left
to their own devices to gain information about their new habitat or to overcome certain recurrent problems, the result can be much neighborly activity.

The locale in which the specific types of neighboring will take place (content) occasioned by varying causes, will also vary greatly. Keller notes that social class considerations seem to play a part in determining whether the neighboring will take place over the fence, on the front porch, in the house or at the local beer parlor.

These three headings of content, occasion and locale point out necessary areas of classification when an investigator wishes to know how a population actually neighbors or how it would like to neighbor under certain circumstances. To know why a population neighbors in a certain manner, the investigator must know more about the underlying attitudes that the population has toward neighbors and neighboring. He must try to discover what their attitudes are towards neighboring in terms of priority, formality, extent, intensity and frequency of relationships.

Keller notes that

Limited time, energy, resources, and needs as well as variations in traditional standards and personal inclination account for the differential saliency of these three types of social bonds. (friend, relative, neighbor)... not only the role of what a neighbor is and should do varies from group to group, but also
Thus the relationship between neighbors must be analyzed within the total context of all the social relationships that a person enters into. The availability of friends and relatives and the importance attached to an occasion will partly determine whether a person turns to a friend, relative or neighbor. In any case, the relationships are entered into in such a manner that people divide their time between friends, relatives and neighbors according to some formal or informal order of priorities.

As suggested earlier, the relationship between neighbors generally manifests itself through time in the form of some generally acceptable rules of conduct. The formality of these rules varies according to Keller from written rules governing neighborly relations in German villages to any degree of less formal rules. However, it appears that in the modern urban society the rules of conduct are less formal usually resulting from an evolutionary process of cautious involvement with neighbors under certain circumstances. As noted above, this reaching out is partly determined by the action of past attitudes about neighbors and the present situation modifying some ideal concept of neighbor.

The extent of neighborly contacts also varies
widely. However, in general it appears that

The number of neighbors known is not only small but spatially confined to a few houses nearby or to a portion of a street. 80

As well, the intensity of neighborly relations varies widely from nods to exchanges of gossip.

Intensity is partly a function of the collective definition of neighboring prevailing in an area, and partly, especially where such binding definitions are lacking, of the emotional and economic needs of individuals. 81

The frequency of relationships may provide "indirect proof of the significance of neighboring" but is quite meaningless unless considered in conjunction with the other elements described above.

Thus the pertinent dimensions with which it should be possible to describe an individual's concept of the ideal role of neighbor are content, occasion, locale, priority, formality, intensity, extent and frequency of the relations. In light of the connection hypothesized between ideal role of neighbor and present role, rather than attempting to relate differences in each element to some demographic variable, it is felt that a much more important step is to develop a tool that will permit an assessment of each element for a population which will then be used to reconstruct the ideal role of neighbor. The next chapter will attempt to present a tool by which
it should be possible to elicit such factors through interviewing.
1. Implicit in all Town Planning is some theory of the influence of physical structures on the behavior of residents. If this is rejected, then Town Planning is quite meaningless.


The whole rationale for the study of communities...rests on the assumption that living arrangements and social organizations are interrelated.


7. In this regard it is interesting to note Keller's conclusion

In fairly homogeneous, non-stratified communities, such as veteran's housing projects, student dormitories, or colonies of equally wealthy or equally poor people, social life may be more readily influenced by physical design and tools of the planners' trade.


10. Ibid., p.132.

11. Ibid., p.132.


...study of contiguous patches of the urban fabric resulted in the loss of information about social relations that happened to extend beyond the boundaries of the study area.

17. This concern may follow directly from earlier discussion of the pros and cons of the neighborhood unit concept when one part of Isaacs' attack on the concept was on its use as an instrument of segregation. Perhaps since then, one of the more pious concerns of planners has been to create balanced communities. This has partly been a reaction against
the "sterile" suburbs where a child could grow up without ever seeing an old person or a poor person. Other virtues in creating balanced neighborhoods or communities were to give poor people an example to strive for by placing them among the better off, to give areas better tax bases, and to develop a more creative environment.

See Keller (a), op. cit., pp. 504-507.

Gans (b), op. cit., p. 177.


We have no evidence...that the informal controls of small-town living can be effectively transferred to a large-city environment. The introduction merely of the elements of residential propinquity and repetitive social contacts does not create the relations and social controls which are said to be found in smaller communities.

Residential propinquity and the use of common neighborhood facilities in the large city will not duplicate those conditions which--in the small town--have stemmed the tide of social disorganization.


...while siting factors give opportunity for contact, the extent to which residents avail themselves of these opportunities will depend in some measure on their attitudes.

It seems naive to suppose that any arrangement of houses or facilities, in and of themselves, will promote neighborliness. All they can provide is the opportunity for neighborliness. Whether more friendly relations will result from a particular layout depends not only on the opportunities for contact (propinquity),
but on the people themselves, their attitudes to each other, and their compatibility with each other. p.116.

20. They concluded

...passive contacts play a rather important part in the development of friendships. The architect who builds a house or designs a site plan, who decides where the roads will and will not go, and who decides which directions the houses will face and how close together they will be, also is, to a large extent, deciding the pattern of social life among the people who will live in those houses. p.160.

The closer together a number of people live, and the greater the extent to which functional proximity factors cause contacts among these people, the greater the probability of friendships forming and the greater the probability of group formation. If a number of houses are clustered together and also face each other, it is more likely that an informal group will develop than if the houses are more widely spaced and stretch out in a straight line or face away from each other. p.161.


22. Ibid., p.131.


24. Ibid., p.178.

25. Ibid., p.181.

26. Gans (a) op. cit., p.135.

27. Neighbor relations should be positive; no benefits, but many social and emotional costs, result from
life in an atmosphere of mutual dislike or coolness.

Ibid., p.139.

28. Ibid., p.136.

29. Ibid., p.137.


31. Ibid., p.503.

32. Ibid., p.503.

Martin agrees with this conclusion when he states that

In... highly selective residential situations
the homogeneity of neighborhood groupings
probably tends to maximize interaction on a
neighborhood basis.

Martin, op. cit., p.452.

33. Keller (a), op. cit., p.507.

34. Ibid., pp.508-509.

Martin feels that such a selection process has already
occurred in the suburbs where

... derivative characteristics of suburbs
have an important influence primarily through
their homogeneity but also because they provide
the demographic and socio-economic traits which
facilitate certain types of relationships.

An important derivative characteristic of
suburban populations is the configuration
of attitudes, interests and values which
favors a high rate of both informal interaction
and formal participation.

Martin, op. cit., p.453.


The neighbor is...neither a relative nor a friend because the first is a prescribed relationship, which one must acknowledge though one need not cherish it, and the second is a chosen one. You do not lose the relative by ignoring him, but you cannot keep the friend if you do. The neighbor, like the relative, is somehow an objectively given, inescapable presence in one's life space. However, some choice exists here, too, as to what one decides to make of this relationship, how one feels about it and gets along in it, which resembles the selectivity characterizing friendships. Neighbors differ from both relatives and friends, however, in that physical distance does not destroy these relationships whereas a neighbor, by definition, ceases to exist as a neighbor once spatial distance intervenes.

You lose a friend by failing him; you lose a neighbor by moving away; you never lose a relative except through death. p.26.


Mann recognizes the notion of proximity for defining neighbors when he states that "neighbors...normally mean a small number of people who live very near to us".

38. Keller (b), *op. cit.*, p.25.

39. Ibid., p.29.

40. Ibid., p.17.

41. Ibid., pp.20-21.

42. Ibid., p.21.

43. Ibid., pp.21-22.
Estate B (219 houses, built mostly in pairs) had no such general code of conduct. The higher degree of manifest neighborliness exhibited by numbers of housewives—was not acceptable to other housewives, who considered such action to be below their dignity. In the course of interviewing, it became clear that there were two camps of housewives in the estate—those who chatted, gossiped, lent, and borrowed, etc., and those who did no such things and, furthermore, did not approve of them.

This estate with a dual role of neighbor evident had more people wished to move than did Estate A which had a single dominant role of neighbor evident.

51. Keller (b), *op. cit.*, p.29.
52. Mann, *op. cit.*, p.163.
55. Keller (b), *op. cit.*, p.29.
This idea is also substantiated by Shuval who found that "predisposition to neighbor" and actual neighboring activities were two different, but related elements, of neighboring. The former is the attitude to neighboring (the individual's concept of role of neighbor--what a neighbor should be and do) or latent neighborliness.


...a high degree of manifest neighborliness which lacks a sound foundation of latent neighborliness is a facile form of relationship which is unlikely to endure; for the action of manifest neighborliness to be fully sound, it must be based upon the attitude of latent neighborliness.

He does not consider that neighborliness may be an evolutionary process and the "facile form" may best fit the needs of people at one time. This attitude is seen in other studies which are concerned only with positive and negative neighboring attitudes.


63. Ibid., p.43.

64. Keller (b), op. cit., p.53.

65. Ibid., pp.61-62.

...the traditions of neighboring from which they (the individuals) stem, their own individual response to the move, and the conditions that await them in their new surroundings


67. Keller (b), op. cit., p.65.

The impact of the new surroundings will affect neighboring through the facilities available for amusement and diversion and the social composition of the new community.

68. As stated above when discussing Gans' idea of propinquity and homogeneity of population

...shared attitudes towards neighboring irrespective of social affiliations are the crucial determinants of social relations within a given physical space.

69. Both Bell and Kuper note the importance of role of neighbor in people changing residence. It can act as a push or a pull.

Bell reports that when people were asked why they moved to the suburbs 77% answered to
"enjoy life more". When he broke this category into physical and social reasons, the social reasons accounted for 55.9% of the replies. Of this 55.9% 24.1% (or 41% of the replies) were directly connected with expectations about role of neighbor. Obviously one important factor in their decision to move was an expectation to find a dominant role of neighbor closer to their conception of the ideal role of neighbor than they had in their present residence.


Kuper quotes a resident of a British housing estate that he studied as reporting that

She herself (Mrs. Cotton) is most unhappy in the area. She finds that her neighbors "want to be above you all the time, though why, I don't know...They don't help if your kiddies are ill. Now I'm always one to help others, but they're not". A well disposed neighbor sums up her (Mrs. Cotton's) dilemma. Mrs. Cotton, she says, is misunderstood. "She's not happy in Braydon Road; she comes from a small village and she's used to village life, where everybody knows everybody else, and everybody talks to each other. When she tries to be like that here, everybody thinks she's coarse and common, but she isn't at all, she's just being friendly. The Cotton's have now moved.

Kuper, op. cit., pp.56-57.
Kuper also reports the following conversation

You'll see her in the garden one day and she'll speak to you, and then you'll see her the next day and she won't look at you. But it doesn't bother me. If she wants it that way, I'm not going to worry about it. But the previous tenant was very unhappy about it: that's one of the reasons why she wanted to leave.

_Ibid._, pp.133-134.

Kuper goes on to conclude

Residents (of Braydon Road) usually complained about the local shopping, and the lack of provision for recreation; but in only three cases were these mentioned among the reasons for moving. They adjusted more readily to the inadequacies of the neighborhood services than to dissatisfaction with the immediate area of living.

_Ibid._, p.166.

70. _Ibid._, p.54. This is in close agreement with Shuval's notion of the predisposition to neighbor and Mann's ideal of latent neighborliness.

71. Keller (b) _op. cit._, pp.30-33.

72. _Ibid._, p.31.

73. _Ibid._, pp.31-32.

74. _Ibid._, p.32.

75. See Clark, _op. cit._

76. Keller (b), _op. cit._, p.33.

For an example of locale of neighboring determined by class and ethnicity, see H. Gans, _The Urban Villagers_, New York, The Free Press, 1962.
77. Ibid., pp.33-34.
78. Ibid., pp.34-35.
79. Ibid., p.36.
80. Ibid., p.36.
81. Ibid., p.39.
82. Ibid., p.38.
CHAPTER III - Testing For Ideal Role Of Neighbor

I. Introduction

Many would argue that in modern urban Canadian society, neighboring is no longer important. Being based on a reciprocal need relationship, the degree of self-sufficiency and self-reliance available to every individual precludes the need for neighboring. However, by this time, it should be evident that such a general statement about such an amorphous relationship as neighboring is unacceptable. A more acceptable hypothesis would be to say that due to the general change in Canadian urban society to one where the self-sufficiency and self-reliance of the individual has increased greatly, neighboring has changed. Individuals still cultivate reciprocal neighboring relationships that manifest themselves in neighboring activities; the change is in their basic attitudes toward neighboring. Individuals have modified their concepts of role of neighbor; they have not stopped neighboring.

Even though this second hypothesis appears to better explain modern neighboring relationships since it follows more directly from a basis of theory presented above, it is still an hypothesis at this point. The way that it would be possible to test this hypothesis would be by using the list of dimensions set out in Chapter Two that describe
an individual's concept of ideal role of neighbor to develop a tool whereby it would be possible to elicit an actual person's reactions to each of these dimensions thus permitting the investigator to develop a consistent picture of the person's concept of role of neighbor or his attitude toward his neighbors. The next section will be concerned with developing a tool to test for these elements.

However, before going on it should be made clear that the purpose of this tool is to elicit an individual's concept of the ideal role of neighbor. The purpose of the tool is not to describe actual neighboring activities.

II. Tool

In preparing this tool, an attempt will be made to use Michelson's idea of a semi-projective game situation rather than direct questioning. One of the virtues of such a set up as compared to a regular questionnaire is that there is an opportunity to elicit a wider range of information. Rather than responding to a finite number of questions, the investigator has the subject enter into a meaningful game in which he is required to made a number of decisions. From these decisions it is possible to make inferences about the subjects' attitudes to the matter at hand.

The tool will attempt to do three things. First,
it will attempt to discover what priority an individual places on various relationships on the basis of time available to enter into them. From this information, it is hoped that it will be possible to discover the priorities of relations between friends, relatives and neighbors. These results will be cross-checked by means of a test involving a number of situations in which the individual will be asked whom he would turn to.

The second goal is to test the actual dimensions that describe neighboring to see how the individual feels about each one. Logical, consistent, responses would indicate a clearly developed, formalized concept of role of neighbor. However, one of the virtues of the semi-projective game is its ability to elicit more useful information than could be garnered by answers to a list of questions. Yet, in this case, the game does not really fulfill this expectation. Rather than the individual saying what he feels about each dimension, when the covering of the game situation is stripped away, it is evident that he is being asked to respond to a number of questions. Thus even though certain dimensions may have no real meaning for him, he will reply to them as he would to those which are of crucial importance to him. This brings up the third goal of the tool. This is an attempt to have the
individual identify the relative importance of the 2 dimensions for himself. The three parts of the tool follow.

1. Relative importance of relationships

The aim here is to discover the priority an individual would place on the net of social relationships involving friends, relatives, and neighbors on the basis of time available and situation. It is assumed that in the ideal situation, an individual will have access by some means to all three.

a. What would you like to be able to do during a regular week day if you found that you had some free time? If you had ___ minutes, would you...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone/go see relative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/go see friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/go see neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play with child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch T. V.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in hobby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. To whom would you like to be able to turn if you ever found your family in any of the following situations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITUATION</th>
<th>FRIEND</th>
<th>RELATIVE</th>
<th>NEIGHBOR</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Need to borrow tool(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Need to borrow food or household utensils.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Need to borrow money.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Need to ask advice about something about your house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Need to ask advice about party you are planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Need to ask advice about something you are baking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Need to ask advice about your children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Need to ask advice about some personal problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the answers to these questions, it is hoped that it will be possible to assess the relative importance that an individual would like to place in his relationships with his neighbors in terms of his other social relationships with his relatives and friends.

2. Dimensions of neighboring

Besides trying to discover an individual's attitudes towards each of the dimensions of neighboring, it
is hoped to present a game that will be simple, but intriguing; that will involve some physical things to handle or manipulate; that will be more open-ended than a regular questionnaire; and that will force the individual to make real choices.

The game in this case will consist of the following statement that will be read to the subject being interviewed.

Now I would like you to pretend that you are an eccentric, but wealthy, real estate developer. You have finally found the area in which you are going to build your dream house. The physical setting is exactly what you have always dreamed of and construction costs for the house of your choice are easily within your reach.

However, you feel that in order to be truly happy in your dream house you must have the kind of neighbors that you like. Since you own the land all around your lot, you decide that you will only permit to move into your area people who will act as you feel neighbors should act.

To achieve this goal, you hire someone to screen applicants who wish to buy lots. Your employee will meet each potential buyer and ask him a number of questions about how he feels neighbors should act. The way the potential buyer answers the questions will determine whether or not this
person will make a neighbor suitable to what you feel a neighbor should be and do.

Once you receive the answers to the questions, you must decide whether a person who feels a neighbor should act in the manner stated would definitely make a neighbor that you would find acceptable; may or may not make a neighbor that you would find acceptable; definitely would not make a neighbor that you would find acceptable; or that the statement is not important as far as you are concerned.

The following list of answers was submitted to you by your employee. How would you feel about a person who said...?

At this point, the subject would be presented with a list of statements to which he would respond in one of the four categories set out above. These statements would be descriptions of the various dimensions with which it is hoped to measure the subject's concept of the ideal role of neighbor. The statements will be such that they describe a range of possible relationships with neighbors from very positive to very negative under each dimension. The statements should be seen as a set of points on a continuum along each dimension of neighboring so that it will be possible to delineate what the subject thinks is a tolerable limit on his ideal.
To facilitate presentation of the statements here, each dimension of neighboring will be presented followed by the statements describing the range of that dimension. When the statements are presented to the subject they will not be presented in this manner. Rather, they will be presented in a random order as one continuous list. After the interview, the responses will be drawn together under the appropriate dimensions for analysis.

a. Content

1. I ( ) say hello to my neighbor when I see them on the street.

2. I ( ) enjoy just having a friendly talk with my neighbors when I meet them on the street or see them in the yard.

3. Our neighbors ( ) exchange or borrow things from one another such as books or tools.

4. We have ( ) gone to the movies, or on picnics or done other things with some of our neighbors.

5. We have ( ) entertained neighbors in our home and been entertained in our neighbors' homes.

6. I have ( ) talked over problems with and asked for advice from some of my neighbors.

b. Occasion

Keller defined the occasions for neighboring as personal crises, collective emergencies and big collective events. Perhaps at least one more category should be included, that is, casual meetings by chance.
1. I ( ) speak to my neighbors when I see them on the street or in the yard.

2. I ( ) have friendly talks with my neighbors.

3. We ( ) go with our neighbors to the movies or on picnics.

4. When we hold parties we ( ) ask some of our neighbors.

5. I ( ) talk over personal problems or ask for advice from our neighbors.

c. Locale

1. I ( ) talk with my neighbors when I see them on the street or shopping.

2. I ( ) speak to my neighbors when I see them in their yards.

3. I ( ) talk to my neighbors in their front yard or our front yard.

4. I ( ) talk to my neighbors in their backyard or our backyard.

5. I ( ) talk to my neighbors on their steps or on our steps.

6. We have ( ) been in the homes of our neighbors.

7. We ( ) entertain our neighbors in our house.

8. We ( ) go on family outings with our neighbors.

d. Extent

1. I think I would recognize by sight (none, a few, at least half) of my neighbors if I were asked to pick them out of a large crowd.

2. I guess I say hello to (at least 6 or more, 3-5, 1 or 2, none) of my neighbors.

3. I know the family names of (5-10, 1-5, 0) neighbors
in our immediate area.

4. I have friendly chats with about (5 or more, 1-4, 0) of my neighbors.

e. Intensity

1. I do not know the names or faces of my neighbors.

2. I recognize my neighbors in the street but have only a greeting acquaintance with them.

3. I ( ) stop to talk with my neighbors. When I do, however, there is usually only me and him.

4. My wife and I ( ) talk outside with other couples who are our neighbors.

5. I ( ) give aid or lend things to my neighbors.

6. My wife and I ( ) give aid or join in activities with other couples who are our neighbors.

7. My wife and I ( ) visit our neighbors' houses for talk or an evening out.

The subject's response to these statements should give an indication of what he feels is a tolerable range of what a neighbor should be and do as defined by each dimension. Now, in order to be able to assess more clearly the relative priority that the subject assigns to each dimension, the following device will be used.

3. Relative importance of the dimensions

The subject would be told the following:

Now that you have hired someone to do the screening and the results are coming in, it is becoming evident that you are not going to be able to totally control the type
of neighbors you are going to have. You are now aware that you are going to be able to wield only a finite amount of influence so the time has come for you to decide which traits you want to influence most and which least. You will now be given 10 markers, each of which is worth 10 units of influence. You are now to place the markers on this board so that those traits which you feel are most important in a neighbor and hence wish to have in your area, will have the greatest combined value of the markers. Those traits that you feel are not important and hence value least will have few or no markers. This is the same idea as having $100. in $10. bills and being told that you must make a number of purchases of food to last you for one month. You cannot buy everything so you buy only food of the type you think you like or need the most. Your first decision as to where to place the markers may not be the best so feel free to move the markers around until you are satisfied that you are going to have maximum influence over the traits that you feel are most important in your neighbors.

The board would consist of groups of statements covering the five dimensions used to describe ideal role of neighbor. These statements would be substitutable for those presented above.

For example, statements could be:
a. Content
1. I think neighbors should only say hello.
2. I think neighbors should feel free to talk at some length with one another.
3. I think neighbors should feel free to borrow and lend things.
4. I think neighbors should sometimes entertain one another at parties and the like.

b. Occasion
1. I think neighbors should help in times of emergency.
2. I think neighbors should be invited to parties.
3. I think you should be able to ask neighbors for advice.

c. Locale
1. I think neighbors should get together in each others houses.
2. I think neighbors should talk to each other in the yeard or on the street.
3. I like talking with my neighbors on their porch or on my porch.

d. Extent
1. I try to say hello to as many of my neighbors as I can when I see them.
2. I only know my next door neighbors.
3. I know about 6 neighbors well enough to chat with them or to say hello to.

e. Intensity
1. I know the names of two of my neighbors.
2. I stop to talk to some of my neighbors.
3. My wife and I visit our neighbors in their homes.

When the weightings on these points are combined with choices made in the previous section it should be possible to tell not only what the subject thinks about each dimension, but also the relative importance he assigns to each dimension.

The major criticism of the tool at this point is in connection with its third part--assessment of the relative weights of each dimension. To make this a true test, every possible combination of responses from section 2 should be presented and the subject asked to place his markers on them. However, it is felt that not only would confusion result but that the time required to make considered judgments would be such that few subjects would submit to it. As a result, it is felt that by presenting under each dimension a skeleton range of possibilities, it will still be possible to assess relative weights (although perhaps not as accurately if it were assumed that each subject would spend the required length of time to make considered decisions) without the attendant drag on the subject.

III Testing

The three parts of the tool were administered to 10 people, not in an attempt to derive statistical material
as to the subjects' ideal role of neighbor, but in an attempt to discover problems that may develop in the administration of the tool. Part 1, relative importance of relationships, was administered just as it appears above. The respondent was handed a list of responses to section a, then the question was read and he stated what he would like to do. The same system was used for part b. In part 2, dimensions of neighboring, some changes were made. In order to be able to ascertain the breadth of a respondent's particular dimension, as well as the importance tied to frequency, each question was expanded to include "never", "sometimes" and "often" or "none", "a few", "five or more", depending upon the nature of the statement. When the section was expanded, the result was 90 statements, some of which repeated one another but the answer to which would be assigned to different dimensions. At the time, this repetition was rationalized as an internal check for consistency. This section was administered by reading the statement of the situation to the respondent, handing him a list of the 4 possible responses, making sure he understood what the situation was and what he was to do, and then reading him the 90 statements, arranged in a random order, and noting his oral response to each one.

The list of 90 statements was constructed to describe the range of possible relations that could be en-
tered into as denoted by each dimension. The possible content of ideal role of neighbor ranged from saying hello to talking over personal problems with neighbors. The range of occasion varied from speaking on chance meetings to inviting neighbors to parties. The range of locales varied from speaking on the street to going on family outings with neighbors. The extent varied from knowing no neighbor by sight or name to knowing 5 or more by sight or name. The intensity ranged from knowing neighbors by sight to both members of a couple going to a neighbor's house for an evening out. By presenting a range within each dimension, the responses of the respondent would be used to pinpoint his ideal role of neighbor on each dimension.

Part 3, relative importance of the dimensions, was administered by reading the statement of the situation to the respondent while the markers and the board were placed in front of him. The board consisted of 15 statements—three describing each dimension—arranged in a random order. After each statement, there was a numbered box—the number corresponding to the number of the statement—into which the respondent was to place the 10 markers.

1. Problems of administration

Perhaps the chief problem, and this was known
before administration, was the time that it took to complete the application of the tool. Times varied from 25 to 45 minutes. It was difficult to maintain a respondent's complete attention for that time or to find someone willing or able to spend that length of time. In particular, the length of part 2 seemed to have a dulling effect on the respondents' enthusiasm and willingness to think of the best answer. A desire to get through may have produced many hurried answers.

Another problem appeared to be the amount of prompting needed, after reading the descriptive statements in parts 2 and 3, to ensure that the respondent understood the situation and what he was to do. In part 2, this problem may have been compounded by reading the statements to the respondent, rather than presenting him with a list and having him mark his own response. In general, the confusion after reading the descriptive statement of part 2 was a great deal less, than that after reading the descriptive statement of part 3. For instance, after the statement was read, some respondents did nothing until they were shown exactly what to do. Some placed 5 or 6 of the markers and then looked up as if to say they were finished—showing they had not grasped the concept of influencing certain traits more than others, since invariably,
the markers they had placed down would be distributed one to a box--and only placed the rest on after being told all markers must be used. An unexpected result in part 3, was the speed with which it was completed--most took less than 5 minutes. This was partly because once a marker was placed down, the only change was to place more markers on top, never were the markers rearranged after being initially set out.

Another problem of part 2 was having the respondent react to the frequency factor within the statement rather than simply to the statement itself. For instance, it was felt with questions that were repeated, that the respondent heard only the following: "Our neighbors exchange or borrow things", rather than "Our neighbors (never, sometimes, often) exchange or borrow things". This seemed especially noticeable with the last two words.

2. Changes for future use

First, the overall length of time needed to administer the test must be reduced. This can be done by making ambiguous sections more easily understood so that time is not lost in repetition and prompting, and by reducing the length of part 2. This can be done easily by removing many apparently repetitious statements and using the reply
to one question as evidence about attitude toward more than one dimension. The way the test was developed was to have a separate set of statements describing each dimension. However, in the future it may be possible to develop a more limited number of questions that may just as thoroughly elicit attitudes towards the various dimensions. As well, the speed and clarity with which part 2 is completed, may be enhanced by having the respondent read the statement and mark his own response. This would eliminate the need to repeat statements the respondent did not hear or completely understand. When the statements were read to the respondents, there was an unwillingness--almost an embarrassment--to ask for too many repetitions. However, permitting the respondent to read each question by himself may also act in the opposite way by increasing time needed to complete each statement, if he rereads too many questions.

The confusion in part 3 may be eliminated by a more thorough statement of how the respondent is to deal with the board. It was found that the following usually brought much better results on this section.

"You are to decide which types of people you want to be your neighbors. You do this by placing markers in the boxes after statements describing the type of person you would like to have for your neighbors. You must place all the markers, but you may place them any way you like. You may place all ten markers after one
statement that you feel is of such importance the others don't matter, or you may place one marker in each box, if you feel 10 statements are of equal importance to you, or you may arrange the 10 markers in any combination in between."

Another way to overcome the confusion created in this section would be to develop a questionnaire similar to that used in the Occupational Characteristics Index. In this tool, 22 words describing attributes are arranged in groups of 5, so that every word appears in a group with every other word at least once. The respondent is asked to consider each group separately and to rank them from 1 to 5--1 being the most important; 2, the next most important and so on down to 5, the least important.

The same technique could be adapted to a list of statements describing dimensions of neighboring. Every dimension would be matched against every other dimension and the ones most often given the highest and lowest priority could be ascertained.

The problem of having the respondent react to the frequency variable in part 2 did not occur in part 3 where the respondent read each statement himself, rather than having them read to him. In future use of the tool, therefore, this seems to be another reason for having the respondent read the statements himself in part 2.
3. Scoring

This section will not be concerned with attempting to analyze the data gathered in the pretest, since the purpose of the pretest was only to discover problems of administration and whether or not the statements were relative to respondents' notions of ideal role of neighbor. Rather, an attempt will be made to explain how the data of a more extensive survey would be analyzed.

The data of section a of part 1, would be analyzed in terms of tendencies to engage in certain activities as time to engage in the activity increases. The aim is to discover how the neighbor fits into such a time scheme. Strictly by chance, the neighbor would be expected to be selected 10% of the time. If he is selected significantly more or less often, in each time period, may indicate the ideal role assigned to neighbors in relation to family, friends and other relatives or other activities.

In section b of part 1, neighbor would be expected to be selected 25% of the time by chance. If it is selected significantly more or less often, it may point out certain situations in which neighbor is more or less important and may have a bearing on ideal role of neighbor.
The analysis of the results of part 2 could be treated in two ways. First, a two part matrix could be constructed within which it would be possible to place the results of the respondents' reactions to each statement. This would be a two part matrix since the list of dimensions is essentially a list of two types of variables. These variables may be seen as describing two separate aspects of the ideal role of neighbor. Content, occasion and locale may be said to be describing the context within which the relationship is taking place, while extent and intensity may be said to be describing the qualitative nature of the relationship or the nature of the social distance between actors in the ideal role of neighbor.

The first matrix would be constructed in the following manner.

### Context of Ideal Role of Neighbor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>OCCASION</th>
<th>LOCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>IMPERSONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>EXTENSITY</th>
<th>INTENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As mentioned above, the list of statements is divided between the five dimensions used to describe ideal role of neighbor. Within the list of statements describing each dimension, there is a graduation of statements from statements describing very personal or close relationships between neighbors, to statements describing neutral or less close or less personal relationships between neighbors, to statements describing very distant or aloof or impersonal relationships between neighbors. Thus the list of statements describing each dimension can be subdivided into three groups: statements that describe a personal, neutral and impersonal relationships.

Now each statement within the subdivided groups of statements is further differentiated by frequency. Each statement is repeated with only the frequency of the event being described being changed. Depending upon the content of the statement and the frequency of the statement as it changes from "never" to "sometimes" to "often" and the response that the subject gives, the category within which the statement is placed is either personal, neutral or impersonal.

An example may serve to reduce some confusion of the above explanation as well as illustrating how each item would be scored. The list of statements describing "content"
is divided into the three subcategories or items of personal, neutral and impersonal. The make-up of the items that go into each category is still open to further discussion, but at this time the important point is to note only the technique for scoring. One set of statements dealing personal items had to do with talking over problems. The following statements were read to each subject:

1. I never talk over problems with or ask for advice from my neighbors.

2. I sometimes talk over problems or ask for advice from my neighbors.

3. I often talk over problems with or ask for advice from my neighbors.

If a subject responded to number 1, that such a person would definitely make an acceptable neighbor, his score for this question would be entered like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE ITEM</th>
<th>PERSONAL</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>IMPERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The steps by which this is decided are as follows:

1. The dimension of content was being described.

2. The item within content was a personal item.
3. The response of the subject when taken in conjunction with the nature of the statement was such that the effect of the response was to produce an impersonal reaction.

If the subject had responded to statement 1 above, that such a person would definitely not make an acceptable neighbor, his score would be entered in the following manner using the same three steps.

Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE</th>
<th>PERSONAL</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>IMPERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the subject had responded to the same statement, that such a person might or might not make an acceptable neighbor, his response would be recorded in the following manner.

Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE</th>
<th>PERSONAL</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>IMPERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the technique for scoring presented above may be said to consist of the following rules:

1. The dimension is chosen.

2. The statements within each dimension are
subdivided into personal, neutral or impersonal items.

3. The response to the item (definitely acceptable, may or may not be acceptable, definitely unacceptable) in consideration with the meaning of the statement which is determined by the aspect (never, sometimes, often) of the statement is used to determine the final nature of the response (personal, neutral, impersonal).

A confusing case for scoring was discovered and resolved in the following way. If the item is personal, as in the above example, and the neutral aspect of the item is being considered (number 2 above) and the response is definitely acceptable or definitely not acceptable, then, the nature of such an item is scored as either personal or impersonal depending upon the content of the statement.

For example, if the response to statement number 2 above was definitely acceptable, it would be scored in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEAZSOA/AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJEUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ZAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/MPEASCA/AL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

whereas, if the response to the same statement was definitely not acceptable, it would be scored
The rule for such statements would then be that neutral aspects of items answered positively result in personal scores while negative answers result in impersonal scores.

The final result of the scoring should be a number of responses that determine whether the respondent favors close, neutral or distant relationships in regard to the dimension concerned. The total result would point out the respondent's overall notion of the concept of ideal role of neighbor in terms of favoring close, neutral or distant relationships.

The second way of scoring part 2 deals with "social distance" which is comprised of the dimensions of "extensity" and "intensity". Such a scoring technique would intail a use of the concepts developed by Bogardus in his studies of social distance. Bogardus used a questionnaire based on a similar concept to the one developed in this thesis. He presented seven statements ranging in order from statements that showed close or positive relation-
ships between people to statements that showed distant or negative relationships between people. From the results of his questionnaire he was able to develop three indices: one which he called social contact range (extensity), another which he called social contact distance (intensity), and the third which he called social contact quality.

He defined social contact range as the number of statements describing the nature of the relationship to which the subject was admitted. The social contact range indicates something of the extent of the social contacts open to the subject. The higher the number, the more contacts open.

He also found that his statements seemed to represent a consistent gradation in social distance. If a subject were admitted only to a category at the negative end, he would not be admitted to any more positive relationships. However, if a subject were admitted to a category at the positive end, he would be admitted to all other categories that represented less positive relationships exclusive of the most negative relationships. In this index, the lower the number—the fewer the possible relationships closed—the more possible are closer contacts.

He found a correlation between social contact range and distance. The longer the social contact range,
the shorter or closer is the possible contact distance.

He developed a social contact quality index by arbitrarily assigning values to his statements describing the nature of the relationships. The social quality index for each subject was then simply the sum of the values of the statements to which it was assigned.

It may be possible to adapt Bogardus' three indices to the dimensions of extensity and intensity in the tool above. Rather than dividing the statements that describe the intensity of neighborly contacts into the three items of personal neutral and impersonal, it may be possible to simplify the statements and present them as a continuous range. The subject would then either accept or reject the type of relationship as described by the statement. It may also be possible then, to eliminate the need for a separate group of statements about extensity by simply counting the number of statements of intensity into which the subject is admitted as constituting extensity.

The question could be developed in the following manner.

According to my first reactions, I would like to have people for neighbors as described in the following statements that I checked off.

1. My wife and I often visit neighbors' houses for talks or an evening out.
2. My wife and I often give aid to other couples who are our neighbors.

3. I sometimes lend things to my neighbors.

4. My wife and I sometimes talk outside with our neighbors.

5. I talk to my neighbors upon occasion.

6. I have a greeting acquaintance with a few neighbors.

7. I only know the names or faces of two of my neighbors. I don't get more involved.

These statements present a gradation from number 1 being the most intimate, to 7 being the most distant. The number of statements which an individual checked off would give an idea of the desired range of contacts. In a similar manner, a quality index could be developed as Bogardus did.

The data from part 3 would simply be handled by noting the dimensions and the items of the dimensions to which the subject gave the greatest weightings. These would then represent the dimensions which they felt were the most important in determining the type of neighbor which they would like to have.

In summary, the data from the entire tool would be used to show for each subject first, how important neighbors are in relation to other available sources of activities and social contacts; second, how the dimensions
of neighboring combine to produce the subject's ideal role of neighbor; and third, which of these dimensions the subject feels is the most important in his concept of the ideal role of neighbor.
FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER III


2. Although this third goal will give some idea of the relative importance of the dimensions, it is realized that one major and crucial drawback of the entire tool as a semi-projective game is not overcome. This serious limitation is that throughout the tool, the individual is asked to respond in relation to a fixed number of dimensions. However, at this point, it was felt that these dimensions can be used to adequately define role of neighbor.

3. The statements have been taken and adapted mainly from the following:


4. The blanks will be filled by "never", sometimes", or
"often" since it appears that frequency of contact in all instances is best handled in this manner.

5. The answer to one question may be used to give evidence on more than one dimension and hence the same questions are listed. However, if it was felt that a separate set of questions was required for each dimension, parallel questions could be devised.

6. Part 1 5 - 8 minutes
Part 2 15 - 25 minutes
Part 3 2 - 11 minutes

7. One of the bracketed words would be inserted.

8. Bogardus defines social distance as referring to the degrees and grades of understanding and feeling that persons experience regarding each other.

Emory S. Bogardus (a), "Measuring Social Distances", *Journal of Applied Sociology*, vol. 9, p.299.

9. Only responses that fall under the headings of definitely acceptable, may or may not be acceptable or definitely unacceptable need to be dealt with. The fourth category "the statement is not important" will only be used on a more extensive pretest to determine whether certain statements receive a preponderance of such replies. In such cases, the statements will be re-evaluated and possibly removed for the final test in which only the first three responses will be used.

10. E. S. Bogardus (a), *op. cit.*, pp.299-308.

E. S. Bogardus (b), "Social Distance and Its Origins", *Journal of Applied Sociology*, vol. 9, pp.216-226.


I. Further Research

The tentative tool developed in this thesis as a technique to discover a respondent's concept of the ideal role of neighbor should be viewed as a first step toward developing a more sophisticated tool for eliciting attitudes toward neighbors with the view to being able to use such data as one variable in the planner's design decision in residential developments. Obviously, at this point, a refined version of the tool should be tested at some length in conjunction with observation to discover what the tolerable range of role of neighbor is as defined by the limits of the ideal and the role of neighbor currently accepted. Once it has been established that it is possible to elicit an individual's concept of the ideal role of neighbor in something more than a cursory fashion, it may then be possible to try to develop a list of variables from which it will be possible to extract a subset of variables that best permits prediction of an individual's concept of the ideal role of neighbor. Thus it may be possible to predict an individual's concept of the ideal role of neighbor from certain basic demographic variables. This is done with a view to being able to manipulate physical design to contribute to, but not determine a form of social interaction amenable to the inhabitants' concept of neigh-
boring in a proposed residential area.

Another possible avenue for future research would be to investigate the relationship between residential satisfaction of the people interviewed and the dominant role of neighbor in the area studied. It could be hypothesized that those who accept and use a role of neighbor closest to that which dominates in their area would be more satisfied with their particular accommodation than those whose functioning role of neighbor is further away from the dominant role of neighbor that exists in the area. The results of such testing would be the ability to evaluate the notion of the relative importance of compatible role of neighbor between individuals in relation to fulfillment of physical needs as provided by amenities regarding persons' satisfaction with residential locations. It may be that satisfaction with residential location transcends merely physical matters of relative positioning of facilities. Satisfaction may be more importantly related to social factors such as acceptance of the dominant role of neighbor.

Such work would necessarily need to proceed with the understanding that neighboring means different things to different people. The role of neighbor elicited would always need to be analyzed in terms of the priorities the individual
places on it in his total web of social relationships. However, such research directions would be useful for a number of reasons. First, it would be a study of attitudes and not only action, which, as pointed out above, may be vital in developing an understanding and compassion for activities in future design decisions. Physical manipulation of structures and access routes is one thing. Manipulation to produce a social effect desirable form the point of view of the inhabitants is another. The latter effect may be more readily attainable with an understanding of attitudes towards neighboring. Second, it would be part of a much larger study to discover how people respond to the type of physical separations that abound today. Such studies would develop a data bank from which it would be possible to elicit information on how people act now. Taken in conjunction with attitudes, such data should provide further bases founded in research for future design decisions in residential areas. Third, such research tools could be used to systematically evaluate past projects. In the planning process, other than implementation, perhaps the weakest phase is evaluation of past work. These tools would permit such evaluation and may be useful for documenting conditions that produce varying degrees of satisfaction and hence point out areas for future design changes.
II. A Suggested Research Framework

Such future research in order to be of more direct use to planners than some past research must be geared to the needs of the residential planner. In order to be able to attempt to meet these needs and to organize future research attempts, a rudimentary research framework will be suggested.

Residential planners are traditionally concerned with manipulating the physical environment in order to achieve some goals that generally have some social ramifications are not founded on a solid research basis, but are often the result of impressionistic feelings about how certain things should be in a residential area. Goals are usually couched in terms of the improvement of the social life of the inhabitants of the area that will develop, once the physical plan is implemented. Thus there appear to be two sets of variables: physical and social.

The physical variables are those with which the planners are most familiar and most easily able to manipulate. These are such things as densities, street patterns, types of open spaces and areas between dwelling units, location of facilities and so on. These are manipulated in terms of attaining some articulated social goal. However, this is where the major problem arises. Lack of organization of
relevant research in terms of which area of the planner's concern it deals with places most of the research beyond the use of the planner.

The first and most basic categorization of research must be on the basis of whether it deals with how people are actually using spaces or dealing with others or whether it deals with people's attitudes towards the use of spaces or actions of others. Once this has been determined, it should then be possible to decide whether the research is dealing with social or physical variables. If it is dealing with social variables, it may be dealing with either people's actions or attitudes in or towards formal or informal associations. Once this has been determined, then the research may be organized under subheadings in each of these categories.

The following chart symbolizes the above description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTUAL USE</th>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHYSICAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>FORMAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASSOCIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASSOCIATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of such a framework is not only as an attempt to organize future or past research but also to point out which type of research the planner has tradition-
ally based his decisions on and which type of data is needed to enable him to base future decisions on more relevant research findings. Past decisions appear to often be based on appraisal of actual use of existing physical facilities and social goals are formulated in terms of better life style that will accrue through actual use of improved physical facilities. This better life style would be defined in terms of more satisfying interaction with persons at the local level and/or with the city as a whole produced by changes in the physical environment that will reduce the formlessness and anonymity of the old residential area.

Yet, it is now felt, that it may be just as important, if not more important, to know the attitudes which underlie an action in order to be able to effect any meaningful change in the manifest actions based on those attitudes. As well, it is clear that little is known about social relationships in terms of actual use or attitudes. Bottomore states

We are profoundly ignorant of how individuals distribute their time, money, interest, affection, between different social relationships and groups;... There is a need for an accurate map of the 'web of group affiliations'...based on an enumeration and classification of the types of social groups. 1

Research into social attitudes in terms of formal and especially informal associations appears important. Such
research should enable the residential planner to formulate goals in terms of known social attitudes and hence be able to realistically appraise what effect his manipulation of the physical environment will have on the inhabitants of the area.
FOOTNOTES - CHAPTER IV
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