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Introduction

This is a special issue of the journal bringing together articles on housing and social welfare. Various social aspects of housing have long been a focus of a number of sociology and social work researchers as Shirley Angrist so well documents in the opening article in this journal issue where she describes in detail the directions social housing research has taken in the United States, and as William Michelson, long-time University of Toronto social housing researcher, has pointed out in a recent American Sociological Association round-table session on Sociology of Housing he and the author hosted. Some dimensions of the social aspects of housing are covered in most social policy, urban sociology and community organization courses. Yet the literature is scattered and the researchers not yet brought together as a special body of scholars with a like focus. Thus it is with pleasure that we assemble here writings from a number of scholars whose research is on the social aspects of housing.

Housing effects the social welfare of individuals in a variety of ways. It is a part of the larger environment, the physical arena, the neighborhood, in which individuals interact with each other and as such it effects the quality of their lives.

In recent years one major experiment in improving this physical environment and the quality of American urban life has been the development of the new town, patterned after the European model. This new town innovation, while promising (and this author would say definitely providing) a more pleasing environment, more satisfactory degree of social integration and a more efficient work-leisure relationship, has run into serious financial problems for in America, unlike Europe, the new town has been given only minimal government assistance (HUD underwriting), and been instead left mainly in the hands of the private developer. Art Shostak, as a Drexel University social researcher of British and American new towns, in his article points out some of these problems but analyzes why we shall continue to turn to new towns as a solution for a better urban environment. Chester McGuire, a long-time housing professor in the Planning Department at Berkeley, in his article provides us with the economic reasons why the private developer (unlike the European government development corporation) has serious problems in making new towns financially viable. Stanley Wiseman, recently returned from a year's research on the Finnish new town of Tapiola, gives us a detailed description of the social planning of this successful European new town. He provides findings from his survey to show how a Gemeinschaft atmosphere, especially in regard to political participation exists, rather than Gemeinschaft type relationships.

In considering housing and social welfare, another major area of focus, especially in community organization research, has been urban renewal. Richard Nann, University of British Columbia social work professor, provides us with a description of the different reactions of Chinese-Canadian families to relocation in Vancouver, related to social class, family ties and integration into the larger Vancouver community. He shows the error social planners make in their simplistic assumptions that there are homogeneous reactions from all members of an ethnic group to relocation. Nann shows the importance of other
major characteristics of the group such as social class, education and degree of assimilation, in determining attitudes to urban renewal.

A group for which housing and social welfare is of special concern is the elderly. Their needs reach beyond shelter and include a variety of social services. In the article in this issue the author outlines the variety of services found to be needed by a nation-wide sample of Canadian elderly in government subsidized elderly apartments and congregate developments with dining room. She analyzes what services seem best provided by the development itself and which ones the community needs to supply.

Jordan Kosberg describes the historical role of homes for the aged, their institutional aspects, and the recent changes in their programs to meet new needs of the elderly, in his article on environmental influences on the structure and functions of homes for the aged in this issue.

We move to the micro level with Brian Langdon and Norm Goroff's picture of how one group of individuals live in a building owned by the urban renewal agency. These authors describe how group interaction, with the help of a social worker, can give these individuals a sense of community and stimulate them to demand better housing conditions from the agency as well as encourage them to improve the upkeep of the building on their own.

Larry Northwood in his article focuses on the impact of urban renewal on the children of the families who are relocated as a consequence of renewal. All too often, the effects of urban renewal on school aged children are ignored at best and completely disregarded by urban planners at worst.

Peter Marcuse discusses the relationship between alienation, home ownership and shelter policy. He points out that without an adequate understanding of the phenomenon of alienation, shelter policies and programs may contribute to increasing alienation. The questions he raises are critical in the development of shelter policy.

A new type of housing development in the U.S. in condominium housing where the family owns their apartment but must jointly cooperate on the maintenance of shared communal areas and make decisions on the maintenance and building as a whole. The dimensions of this small group interaction around these issues, a new and intriguing relationship for the unsuspecting purchasers, is outlined by Frank Mittelbach, director of the Center for Research in Urban Land Use and Real Estate at UCLA, in his article. With so little research done on this new housing arrangements this article is especially welcomed.

The issue of social equality can be related to housing, for housing assistance to the poor is used as an alternative to income payments. The Huttmans in their article evaluate the degree past housing subsidy programs have improved the housing situation and provided real income to the poor and whether the present experimental housing allowance will be an improvement on past programs.

Elizabeth Huttman
Issue Editor
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I shall present a selective overview of recent themes and directions in social research on housing in the U.S. I narrowed the topic by focusing on research centering on the family and on neighborhood. These topics offer ways to concentrate on "social" research and to narrow a rather broad topic.

My meaning of "social" research encompasses work not only by sociologists. It also includes the separate or collaborative work of other disciplines, especially psychology, anthropology, social psychology, architecture and urban planning. Research on housing has from its Post-World War II flowering been an interdisciplinary enterprise. And it continues to be so.

Several themes stand out in the last 15 years. A longstanding and overriding framework in housing research involves physical determinism - the assumption that the house, neighborhood, community or town influences and shapes how people live. This view has remained predominant (Schorr, 1963); but there are growing reactions against it to suggest that people select environments according to their preferences more than being shaped by those environments (Pynoos et al, 1973) and that people and environments interact to affect each other (Keller 1966). On the whole, physical determinism remains the strongest of the orientations: it takes a physical setting as given and assesses the impact on life styles, values and attitudes, or it involves design of housing environments which presume to create desirable social conditions. The deterministic view and reactions against it permeate each of the four research emphases which are described next.

(1) Defining Neighborhood and Territory

Not all researchers agree that "neighborhoods" exist. On one side, is the strong conviction that people operate with a cognitive or conceptual map of their neighborhoods - the areas where they live. Proponents of this view argue that real or symbolic barriers exist to define areas of influence used by residents for social services and in which they feel secure; this is the "defensible space" within which people function daily with a sense of physical safety (Newman, 1972). People use this territory or area as a neighborhood even if they do not feel positive towards it. It is at once the area containing necessary facilities (such as transportation) and which has a corporate identity known to members and outsiders. "Functionally it is the smallest spatial unit within which co-residents assume a relative degree of security on the streets compared to adjacent areas" (Suttles, 1972). This definition holds most for the lower social classes. It mirrors a widespread concern with housing and neighborhood as territories, and with human behavior as territorial akin to the ethological studies of primates. Thus the neighborhood is both a physical and social entity defined by geographic boundaries as well as the separation between friends and enemies.
The contrasting viewpoint is total skepticism about the utility of the neighborhood concept. Because of the decline in local self-sufficiency, and the increased interdependence in urban areas, there may not exist a simple territory or delimited area which provides social ties, facilities and a sense of identity (Keller, 1966). Except for primary schools or grocery stores, few facilities are close to home; people travel to find what they need. There are at least 3 aspects to defining neighborhood: cognitive, or the way people identify the area; utilitarian, the way groups use the area's facilities; and affective, how people feel about the area. Keller (1966) argues that neighbors (people with special role relationships) and neighboring (the exchange of help, limited sociability and practiced standards of upkeep) occur in some areas and not in others. Thus, a presumed neighborhood may lack the cognitive, utilitarian or affective components, it may even lack clear physical boundaries.

Despite such skepticism, my distinct impression of the literature is that social scientists, architects and planners still believe in the neighborhood concept; they do research, design housing and offer panaceas with that concept in mind.

(2) Poverty and Housing

A second major thrust of research centers on housing the poor - the working or lower classes. Here the concern has been what Oscar Lewis called "culture of poverty", the way of life of the lower classes. Evidence has accumulated to show that lower class groups, especially ethnic groups which are non-Anglo Saxon stress expressiveness, group integration and close interactions with kinfolk. For such a life style, the dwelling per se is less important than the neighborhood. Physical proximity permits mutual assistance and support among relatives (Gans, 1962). Streets, apartments, hallways and neighborhoods are an integral part of daily life (Schoor, 1963). Whether it is Italians in Boston's West End, or Blacks in public housing, or Chicago's Mexicans and Puerto Ricans, observers report this pattern. It may be part of the "defended neighborhood" as a safe and identifiable territory (Suttles, 1972), but it is also a way of life involving close social ties and rootedness in the extended family (Yancey, 1972). The middle and upper classes have mostly nuclear families and prefer the isolation and separateness of suburban living; they may be more sociable when an area is new but established middle class areas become more selective in neighboring (Keller, 1966; Michelson, 1970).

The concentration of the poor in government subsidized housing is a frequent focus of research. Public housing in the U.S. was originally a way station for the temporarily poor; it was the chance for the working poor to recuperate economically from periods of unemployment or bad luck. More recently, public housing contains the predominantly dependent families on welfare and in frequent need of social services. Social scientist discovered that housing alone could not break the cycle of poverty and create a good life (Rainwater, 1970). Some attribute the inadequacies of public housing to high rise buildings, poor physical designs and lack of social services (Yancey, 1972; Newman, 1972). Others point to the sociological determinants regardless of physical setting - problems are supposedly caused
by the unstable poor who prey on the stable employed poor, making their lives hazardous (Staff, 1971). Despite all its problems, public housing can accommodate only a small percentage of those eligible and eager to move in. And despite the dramatic negative picture of Pruitt-Igoe, other evidence shows that some housing projects are relatively successful (Angrist, 1974; Scoble, 1973).

Also related to housing the poor is the matter of crowding or density. This is a minor research emphasis. In 1963, Schorr concluded that crowding effects are applicable mainly to the lower social classes and include problems of fatigue, lack of privacy, family friction, higher use of the outdoors, and lack of parental control over children. But more recently, Michelson (1970) suggests that social pathologies have little to do with crowding within dwelling units although they may be related to neighborhood densities - in any case, personal and cultural factors intervene so that the relation is unclear.

(3) Uses of Space

A third emphasis in the literature is largely descriptive and based on observational data. The focus is on how people use space. Sommer (1969) indicates that individuals behave in terms of both cultural and personal definitions of space. People avoid getting too close to strangers and when this becomes unavoidable they "freeze" or avert the gaze to impersonalize the contact. Privacy or the lack of it is a focal concern especially in group or public settings. People use territoriality and distancing to insulate themselves from others or to order interactions.

Related to Sommer's concept of "personal space" is the "behavior-setting" framework developed by Barker (1968) and followed by other researchers (Lawton, 1970). The focus is on intimate ties between social context and physical setting; people are seen as behaving or carrying out functions in definable spatial contexts. This has the character of identifying and describing activities common in an institution, a town, a family or a group, to reveal how people use space for various functions, and how physical setting fosters or hinders such functions.

(4) Satisfaction with Housing

The fourth emphasis reflects an interest in ascertaining people's preferences in housing and the conditions which lead to greater or lesser satisfaction with living arrangements. Housing is a "bundle of attributes that members of a household consider when they choose a residence or when they express dissatisfaction with their living arrangements" (Rynoos et al, 1773). The concern has been studied mainly through survey data. The urge to know what people of various ages, stages and classes prefer has yielded at least two surprises - first, that regardless of income level everyone prefers the best: the ideal home for most people is a single family dwelling because it is thought to permit privacy, it is best for raising children and for pursuit of one's own interests. Even those living in very different households favor the single family dwelling as the ideal (Nicholson, 1772a; Scaff and Landry, 1777). The other surprise is the privacy of the house over the neighborhood and community services as a reason for moving (Newman,
More specific preferences of various age groups include: the elderly's greatest satisfaction in living with like-aged people but with access to lively activity and to the young (Michelson, 1970; Steinfeld, 1973); the desire for access to goods and services by adults without children (Hall and Wekerle, 1972; Michelson, 1970) and the preference for direct access to the outside by parents with young children.

Satisfaction with housing has become a measure of how well-off people feel and how effective housing is in serving their needs. Recent work centers on satisfaction with mass housing, both public and private, as it relates to management techniques. This stems partly from concern for managing poor, indigent and rent delinquent families and partly from concern over how to operate physically safe and economically viable mass housing in urban areas. Compared to variables such as tenant demographic characteristics, the most significant variable in explaining overall tenant satisfaction is the quality of management (Ahlbrandt, Brophy and Burman, 1974). Tenants feel better off in their housing when they see good maintenance and perceive management as interested in their project (Angrist, 1974). Housing with good management has not only higher resident and staff satisfaction but also better maintained buildings and lower total operating expenditures (Sadacca et al., 1974). Even in a study of new towns and less planned suburbs, the single best predictor of neighborhood satisfaction was maintenance level (Lansing et al., 1970). These studies shift the focus from the physical environment as causal in social pathologies to the social environment, emphasizing the key role of management in maintaining tenant satisfaction with housing.

Conclusions

My review of the literature was selective not exhaustive. Any my presentation of four research themes is only one way to organize that body of literature. Recognizing these limitations, I want to draw some conclusions that cut across the research themes.

(1) Physical determinism, the idea that people are shaped by their housing and neighborhood environment remains controversial. Strong proponents present evidence to conclude that houses, neighborhoods and communities can be designed to minimize crime and other social pathologies. Critics find the evidence weak and far from causal. Modified views are that housing can foster the good life but not create it.

(2) The key research methods are observation and surveys. There is heavy reliance on what people do in a given setting and on how they feel about the settings in which they live and function daily.

(3) The research is not narrowly tied to one discipline but is increasingly interdisciplinary overlapping sociology, psychology, architecture, physical planning and human ecology. Current usage reflects this blend of disciplines in terms such as "environmental psychology" and "environmental design".

(4) American urban problems and rural nostalgia permeate the research: these are the concerns with how to lower crime rates, to increase feelings of
physical safety, how to ascertain and design people's ideal housing arrangements, how to protect the individual and the family in a hazardous world, how to obtain the good life.
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Introduction. This is a study of the relocation patterns of Chinese-Canadian residents in an area undergoing urban renewal in Vancouver in the late 1960's. The study shows the inadequacies of simplistic social planning. The study indicates the need to understand the variety of responses to forced relocation, based on social class, the stage in the family life cycle and ethnicity. The study points out the different ways various families view the old neighborhood and the Chinese community as a whole, and, as part of this, how they view urban renewal. The study shows how housing and residential preferences relate to these factors.

We have found some important differences in the way in which the groups of families reacted to the relocation experience. By aggregating the information from our findings, a profile of a "typical" family in each of the relocation groups can be illustrated; showing the characteristics likely to be found in each group.

(A) PROFILE OF FAMILY THAT LEFT THE CHINESE COMMUNITY

The chances are that this is a three-generational household containing five or six persons. Both parents are present together with their children and a member of the older generation. The children are mainly of school age - although one child may have already finished school and is working.

The head of the family is likely to be foreign-born; emigrating to this country from Hong Kong at the time when he was between 12 to 18 years of age. Before leaving the home country, the family received some Chinese language schooling; sufficient to enable him to speak and read the ethnic language. He has a fairly good command of the English language having also received some schooling after coming to Canada. In the home, we would expect to find the Chinese language used much of the time; but English is spoken as well. It is likely that the family head is married to a person who is also from China. His closest friends are primarily from the same ethnic group.

The family head is in his 40's, and probably employed in a fairly high status type of occupation (relative to the occupational status found in the other relocation groups). He might be a proprietor of a small family business or engaged in work requiring some degree of skill such as a salesman or a head chef in a restaurant. His place of employment is likely to be located outside of the Chinese community, serving a clientele which is mainly non-Chinese. A second member of the family is probably employed - either the spouse or an older child who has finished school. The amount of income into the home at time of displacement was between $6,000 to $7,500 per year.

Public housing has no appeal to this family as it is seen as an appro-
appropriate resource only for those with no other relocation alternative (that is, for families with limited income or for elderly persons). A chief motivation for leaving the Chinese community and the urban renewal area is the attraction of what the family considers to be better neighborhoods and homes in other residential districts. However, the family is influenced in its choice of a new home by the presence of other Chinese families already living in a given neighborhood. In relocating, this family has moved either to the eastern or southern part of the city rather than to the upper-middle class areas located in the western and southwestern sections (where fewer Chinese families are found).

At the time of the displacement, the family received no help in relocating and encountered some difficulty in finding a new home. Chinese real estate agencies were used as the primary resource in relocation. The family might have been tenants prior to urban renewal but has now decided to buy a home. If the family had previously owned their home, the amount received from urban renewal home acquisition did not cover the cost of purchasing their new quarters. In either case, the family likely found it necessary to take out a new mortgage; and also found the cost of maintaining the new home considerably greater than were housing costs before relocation.

With respect to urban renewal, the family head is not entirely certain whether the "real" motive behind the urban renewal (Strathcona) scheme was to upgrade housing for families in the area or to displace Chinese families from valuable real estate. He feels more or less detached and resigned from the whole thing; having made the decision to leave this part of his life behind. The continuity of the Chinese community, however, remains important to him. He sees Chinatown as a centre for shopping and commerce; for socialization on special occasions; and as a place where others of his own ethnic background should have the opportunity to live if they so choose.

(B) PROFILE OF FAMILY THAT MOVED INTO PUBLIC HOUSING

There are two sub-types of families here. One comprises elderly couples with no children; the other is made up of nuclear families. (There are few three-generational households, and families with children may be headed by a parent who is widowed. Both of the foregoing factors contribute to the relatively smaller size of the Public Housing family, in contrast to the size of households found in the other relocation groups). Where children are present in Public Housing families, the chances are that they will be of school age (between 6 and 17).

If the head of the family is a pensioner, he is unlikely to be employed. Otherwise, the family head is a wage earner engaged in a semi-skilled or unskilled job such as janitor work, dishwasher in a restaurant, or a chef's aid. The average income of the Public Housing family is the lowest amongst the relocation groups - around $3,000 per year at time of displacement.

The family head and his spouse (if present) are probably both from China. Prior to emigrating, the family head received schooling in the old country enabling him to speak, read, and possibly write the ethnic language. His command of English is limited. The family head came to Canada around the
age of 18, which obviated the opportunity for any lengthy schooling in this country. The language used in the home is mainly Chinese. The family head's closest friends are mainly from his own ethnic group.

At the time of displacement, the Public Housing family had little difficulty in relocating as the urban renewal authorities took care of this. Following relocation, older couples probably found public housing well suited to their basic requirements. The cost for warm and clean shelter was reasonably inexpensive. The Chinese community, representing a familiar world of friends and cronies and social outlets, remained within comfortable walking distance. The goal of older couples is to live out the remaining years according to an uncomplicated style of living which has existed for some time before the appearance of urban renewal. Relocation does not disrupt this well-conditioned pattern of life.

Younger family heads with children probably saw little immediate alternative to public housing at the time they became displaced. Public housing provided improved physical facilities within their limited means, and allowed them to remain in the general vicinity of their previous homes. However, public housing has some major disadvantages for this sub-group of families. Because of a sliding scale of rent pegged to one's income, increases in the pay cheque are cancelled out by subsequent increases in rent. The social environment in the large Vancouver public housing projects, which often includes neighbours who have never before lived close to Chinese families, is less stable than was life in the Chinese community. The younger Public Housing family seems to be "marking time". Given the opportunity, some would probably return to live in the Chinese community. Others show evidence of wishing eventually to join the families who left.

(c) PROFILE OF THE FAMILY THAT STAYED IN THE CHINESE COMMUNITY

The families that stayed also fall into two sub-groups - elderly couples with no children; and families with children. In the latter case, one is likely to find fairly large households (over five persons) which include a member of the older generation. The chances are that both parents are in the home and children, where present, are either of pre-school age or in their older teens.

The family head and his spouse were both born in China; the former coming to this country after he was beyond the age of 18. He may have had no schooling in Canada and may be limited to speaking a little English. But he is not illiterate. His schooling prior to emigrating to Canada has given him a good command of the ethnic language. The Chinese language is used in the home almost exclusively; and the closest friends of the family are probably restricted to members of his own ethnic group.

The family head is a wage-earner - even if he receives an old age pension. (In the latter case, employment is seasonal.) Like his counterpart in Public Housing, the head of the family that stayed is probably employed in semi-skilled and unskilled work. His place of employment is not necessarily located in the Chinese community itself. Chances are that a second person in the home, probably the spouse, is also employed (perhaps in seasonal work such as farm labour). The family income at the time of displacement was
between $4,000 to $6,000 per year.

In relocation choice, public housing is not seen as an appropriate alternative. Like the family who left, there is the view that public housing is suitable only for those with limited incomes.

While acknowledging that something must be done to improve housing in the Chinese community, the family who stayed views the neighborhood itself as a desirable place in which to live. Indeed, the desire to remain is such that the family chooses to stay here in the face of an urban renewal program that is geared for total clearance of the neighborhood.

The family that stayed encountered the greatest difficulty in relocating; having to depend upon friends and relatives for information regarding available space in the Chinese community. The family received no help from urban renewal authorities in moving. Furthermore, following relocation, this family finds itself paying more than it previously did for housing in the same community. Available accommodation in the Chinese community is scarce, and the price of housing has sky-rocketed due to a shrinkage in supply and to a general price inflation throughout the metropolitan area. The family head may have formerly owned a home which took him many years of hard work to acquire. As the amount he received from urban renewal home acquisition was pegged to a pre-inflation market, he now finds it next to impossible to purchase another home. But even worse, while cost of housing has gone up, the physical quality of available housing has gone down. Owners, understandably, are loathe to spend money on structures which may be bull-dozed at any time. The children become a generation growing up in a deteriorating physical environment brought about inadvertently by an urban renewal program which was ostensibly meant to upgrade the quality of their lives. Not surprisingly, the family who stayed views urban renewal with anger, bitterness, and frustration.

CONCLUSIONS

In this Vancouver study we have examined the relocation experiences of families from a Chinese-Canadian community undergoing urban renewal. Despite the fact that these families share a common background and, to a greater or lesser extent, are still tied to a common sub-culture, we have found some distinct differences in the way various families responded to displacement and relocation.

Our findings show that relocation served to crystallize housing goals for many of the families who left the Chinese community, and to direct these families along pathways consonant with their aspirations. For older couples who moved into Public Housing, relocation brought improved shelter without seriously disrupting a well-conditioned style of life. However, for many of the younger families who moved into Public Housing, and particularly for the families who chose to stay in the Chinese community, relocation meant great distress and hardship.

The negative consequences of the relocation program can be attributed to a failure on the part of urban renewal planners to understand the forces
which held many of the families to their ethnic community. In all fairness, planners seemed generally aware at the outset of the program that differences in relocation requirements existed amongst the families, although knowledge about specific requirements was not available. For example, public housing was intended for some but not for all; and ultimate relocation plans were intended to provide a stock of privately developed housing for families who wished to live in a "rebuilt" Chinese community. However, these plans were based on the expectation that some families would first move into public housing or live temporarily outside the ethnic community before returning at a time when privately developed housing became available. Given what we have learned about the characteristics of the group of families who stayed, it is unrealistic to expect that these families would take such intervening steps and then return to pick up their lives in the ethnic community. Inasmuch as the urban renewal program was ostensibly designed, in part, to upgrade housing for those in the Chinese community, the fact that the family who stayed became an unexpected or an "unplanned for" element emerges as an ironic inconsistency and a central weakness in the entire scheme.

An Alternative to Relocation

Due to organized protest by householders still living in the target neighborhood the urban renewal program in question has been suspended. Attention is currently turning to the possibility of rehabilitating, where possible, existing homes by the families themselves with government aid. Our findings would support such an alternative scheme.

A comprehensive analysis of the pros and cons of rehabilitation versus redevelopment would obviously require study beyond the scope of the present report. However, on the face of it, a self-help rehabilitation scheme would allow families who so wish to stay right where they are, and thus avoid many of the pitfalls brought about by relocation. Most certainly, a rehabilitation scheme would avoid placing those who wish to remain in the ethnic community in the position of becoming "deviant" cases. Such a plan could furthermore still provide help to families with limited means; and could still provide options for those who wish to leave. In this respect, the actual relocation program made leaving the ethnic community a part of the "normal" consequences, while staying in the ethnic community became the "special" case. The alternative scheme for rehabilitation would turn this around; which would seem to make greater sense in light of the evidence pointing to the importance of the ethnic community in the minds of all of the families.

Persistence of Ethnic Group Identification

This study was not designed to resolve the theoretical issues of persistence of ethnic group identification insofar as the Chinese community families are concerned. However, we should point out the evidence, in fact, would seem to indicate that some of the families desire residential assimilation while others do not. But even in the former case, we found that a strong ethnic group identification persists.

An important finding in our study is that the residential patterns of
one ethnic minority group can be distinguished by elements or indicators derived from three social science constructs - namely social class, ethnicity, and the notion of a family life cycle. To what extent this finding can be generalized to the cases of other ethnic groups, or even to other Chinese communities in North America remains a question requiring further study.
NEW TOWNS AND SOCIAL WELFARE
PROSPECTS: 1975 - 2000 A.D.

Arthur R. Shostak
Department of Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology
Drexel University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

America's 15 HUD-aided new towns are mired in such serious financial problems as to make likely the emphatic close of the 1968-1974 Golden Age of modern new town development. Contrary, however, to present-day indications there is reason to expect a revival of new town prospects in the late 1970's, and social welfare components may be center stage in the matter.

There is no gainsaying the seriousness of the 1975 collapse of the American new towns movement: HUD, for example, from a prior commitment to approving at least ten projects a year between 1968 and 2000 A.D. is now refusing to even accept applications from would-be developers. Jonathan, Minnesota, is reputedly up for sale; Riverton, New York moves in and out of default on its financial obligations; and even the Glamour Child of them all, Columbia, Maryland, has been compelled to arrange financial reorganization. UDC's much-heralded Roosevelt Island project has lost both its educational innovation edge, and its access to LMIH subsidization monies, while elsewhere in the nation's 100 or so new towns plans for social welfare advances are quietly folded away in deep drawers.

As recently as 1970 the picture was quite a different one, with developers seeking Title VII loan guarantees to initiate 200 new town projects in that year alone. Enthusiastically responding to the first legislative program in our history to mandate community planning as well as housing construction, new town developers soon produced an honor-roll of substantial contributions:

The Woodlands New Town appears to be the first and only large-scale land-development project to use the McHarg method of ecological siting and preservation.

Roosevelt Island New Town claims to be the only auto-free community in America, and the only one to rely heavily on an aerial tramway mass transit system.

Cedar-Riverside New Town claims to have the nation's only high-rise structure of a non-public housing variety that adjusts rentals to ability-to-pay.

Soul City New Town claims to be the only planned rural community in America seeking to use On-the-Job Training (O-J-T) in "incubator" workplaces to help break the hold of rural poverty.

'Outchartrain new town claims to be the only.
"Town-in-Town" in America modeled along the lines of Venice; i.e., heavily reliant on waterway traffic.

Harbison New Town in South Carolina is the nation's only New Town being developed by a non-profit eleemosynary corporation. This organization, formed by the United Presbyterian Church, is presently recruiting progressive-minded businesses amenable to cooperative management for its industrial park.

Audubon, Raddisson, and Roosevelt Island are all New Town projects of a unique state agency, New York's Urban Development Corporation: "In short, the ability of this new agency to utilize its powers has been impressive. It is one of the rare occasions in which governmental performance has approached theoretical capacity. For the private sector, this is not only desirable but a necessary expectation; for the public sector it is, in a word, unprecedented."

All of this notwithstanding, the picture today is as bleak as a depression in the housing industry can make it. But there is still more to the collapse than real estate economics alone.

When, as part of a HUD 1974 research project, I joined other consultants in interviewing the developers of 25 new towns across the country I was told by many builders that a collapse was likely at any time, and had been impending for many months. The three major explanations offered by embittered developers and key social planners revealed much about new town sub-rosa realities. To begin with, while irritatingly pressured by HUD "menials" for never-ending proof of wide-ranging innovation (a requirement of the imaginative Title VII loan guarantee process) the developers never received any of the millions of dollars in supplemental grants for innovation research, staff, etc., promised in the Title VII "small print". Second, when particularly progressive developers managed to achieve a proud modicum of race or class integration, they soon found themselves victimized by institutional forces with local clout, e.g., their projects were "red-lined" by disinvesting local banks and racist real estate agents, etc. Finally, when the developers took great financial risks in backing such social innovations as pre-paid group medical insurance, dial-a-bus systems to discourage auto dependency, and high ratios of permanent green space to built-up land, they found no public or private group (foundation, etc.) willing to help, and little firm commitment from potential users.

A pandora's box of related problems took their considerable toll: New town industrial parks, for example, never really earned high activity, or provided the kind of income range vital to under-writing class heterogeneity in the project itself. New town creditors insisted on exhorbitant rates of return on their long-term investments, even as some home-buyers lobbied inside the projects against innovations of any stripe lest their home values be threatened. Old city mayors remained aloof, when not hostile, and local area politicians guilefully undermined the projects, fearing that these embryonic cities would soon grow so large as to dominate the entire host region. Add to
this both the refusal of the Office of to authorize indispensable supplemental grants to the projects, and a very uncertain White House record of support: The outcome, in a sweeping collapse, becomes quite unsensational.

How then, can one remain optimistic about the prospects of new towns in the late 1970's? And why is it that their social welfare component might "show the way"? For one thing, despite the welcomed arrival of ZPG levels of present-day population growth, nearly 75 new million Americans (25 million household formations) will have to be accommodated between now and 2000 A.D. (to say nothing of millions of others who will join the net migration from the country and small towns to the cities). Second, these home-seekers will be compelled by the growing energy crisis to shrink their journey-to-work commute, and seek relatively self-contained communities (home + mass transit + industrial park). Third, both the pressure to newly house by 2000 A.D. as many people as lived west of the Mississippi in 1970, and to house them with unprecedented economy of access to their employ, necessitates a remarkable boost in the fortunes of land, habitat, and community planning.

Indeed, the next 25 years are likely to be marked by more high-quality planning than at any time before in American history, as the major lesson of our post-1975 national economic and societal recovery is likely to be that of the indispensability of a highly calibrated, highly-rationalized America. Planning in community growth matters will draw strength from a steadily-emerging anti-growth ethos in the shrinking countryside, along with a slow-growth ethos in the post-industrial society at large. Both to protect our remaining open land, and to effectively equilibrate a steady-growth GNP, we will have to increasingly rely on the far-sighted, computer-modeled, cybernetic-based format in habitat construction known as the "new town". Strategic here also will be a far-reaching rationalization of governance jurisdictions, with the siting and nurture of new towns receiving a substantial boost from post-'76 resort to TVA-like regional governing bodies (as foreshadowed in the EPA stimulation of air basin control mechanisms, etc.)

My crystal-ball, very much like that of Alvin Toffler's (see his 1975 book, Eco-Spasm), anticipates a once-and-for-all resolve in favor of new macro and micro planning mechanisms, including a host of social welfare reforms of awesome character (subsidization of job transfers to the service economy; national health insurance plans; national day care programs; subsidized sabbaticals and early retirement plans; massive income redistribution efforts, etc.) As a natural part of such progressive scenarios, the nation's new towns will be rehabilitated and championed as unquestionably superior to one-class suburbs and non-innovating planned urban developments.

At present some 15 ailing new towns, with little of their projected 870,000 residents settled in, flounder near financial collapse. But almost alone on the American urban scene these projects stand ready to overnight explore the technological frontiers, like the "wired cities" possibilities of 21st-century urban electronics. Almost alone they presently house, cheek by jowl, the social class, life-style, and inter-racial types that stuffy "know-nothings" have long insisted cannot be harmoniously mingled. And almost alone these projects are freely sought out by a small, but influential cadre
of new town enthusiasts, Americans in whom the appetite for urban innovation is consistently strong. These pioneer types remain poised to finally prove their towns can generate transferable lessons of immense value to the revitalization of older cities - if only given themselves a fighting chance to prosper.

For all these reasons - their technological daring, their zest y heterogeneity, and the eagerness of their cadre to prove the project's worthiness - I expect a heady revival soon in new town prospects. Once again, as in 1968 and 1970, they will appear to be the right idea at the right time, but the difference here will have the nation more firmly than ever committed to the kind of professional, inspired, and daring planning always exemplified in superior new town projects.

Which is not to say that the social welfare challenge will readily be solved. On the contrary, I see a host of new storm clouds on the horizon. I see our 1975 perplexity over race, class, and life-style issues giving way instead to frontier dilemmas: How do we protect a democratic ethos inside a culture increasingly given over to planning and control mechanisms? How do we promote *gemeinschaft* strengths in a new town growing evermore *gesellschaft* in character with each year's population increment? How do we keep alive *elan* and *morale* as the project ages, sobers up, and veers toward protective *conservatism*? And, overall, how do we keep alive an open dialogue on the nature of the Good Life when the lure of new town materialism tempts many residents into an affluent stupor?

Getting there from here appears quite distant, what with new towns now on the ropes, and our old agenda of social welfare issues - racism, sexism, poverty, unemployment, etc. - capturing all our attention, energy, and concern. But the distance is shorter than it appears, the situation of the 30-year old Mark I British new towns underlining the rapidity of change in such planned communities. While the lion's share of our agenda today appropriately goes into 1975's array of social welfare woes, it is not too soon to at least reflect ahead on a 25-year scenario of new town recovery, leadership, and travail anew by the year 2000 A.D.

**FOOTNOTES**


6. Helpful here is League of New Community Developers, "An Imaginary Trip through Title VII New Communities," Sociological Symposium, Fall 1974, pp. 41-54.


An annotated bibliography of New Towns literature is available on request from Art Shostak, Drexel University, Department of Psychology and Sociology, Philadelphia, Pa., 19104.
OPERATIONAL PROBLEMS OF NEW COMMUNITIES

Chester C. McGuire
University of California, Berkeley

The development of Reston, Virginia and Columbia, Maryland in the early 1960's produced much speculation concerning the role of new towns in future urban growth. Supporters of new towns have offered them as prescriptions for many of the ills found in urban America today: as opposed to the sprawling, often poorly designed and frequently single class typical suburban community. However, in the decade that has passed since the inception of Reston and Columbia large numbers of planned new towns have not been built, due in large part to the myriad problems of new town development which are now general knowledge. 2

Planned New Towns Versus Unplanned Suburbs

One perspective on the difficulties faced by new towns may be obtained by looking at their counterpart and alternative, the typical development process which one finds in any of hundreds of rapidly growing suburban communities. This development process, unlike the planned new town, is a very pluralistic undertaking. 3 For instance, at any point in time a growing community may have several large subdivisions under actual construction or in various stages of planning. The growth that occurs will be primarily in these subdivisions along with the accompanying shopping centers, industrial concentrations and assorted public developments.

This growth is not in accord with an overall master plan, but is the product of multiple market decisions of numerous subdividers and merchant builders. The lack of planning may frequently be evident in the finished product. But the point to be made here is that this pluralistic undertaking, with several developers each with short range goals, is very efficient in terms of spreading risk and minimizing front end investment. These are norms in this fragmented and localized industry.

Consider for the moment the case of a small suburban community which is well situated in a growing market area and which has an existing infrastructure. The objective of each developer is to capitalize upon the existing infrastructure in the process of building several score, or several hundred, housing units. Frequently the developer need not pay the full costs of providing services - such as streets, schools, open space and sewage treatment. These costs resulting from the new development are passed on to the balance of the community in the form of rising property taxes or as a reduction in the average level of services rendered.

The unplanned town may grow rapidly if many developers are active and if the town is within a strong housing market area. Recall again that each developer has only a short term interest in the community. The subdivision of several score or several hundred units can be built and sold within one to three years. The speed of entry and exit, which minimizes inventory and carrying costs, is an industry norm.
Another important aspect of this pluralistic process is the fact that not all the developers and merchant builders at work in a given community will succeed, for this is a volatile industry. Some entrepreneurs will misjudge the market or underestimate their own costs or be underfinanced, and they will fail. A high failure rate is characteristic of this industry. The companies that succeed will make high profits for their efforts. However, many companies will be left in their wake which will be bankrupt. Thus, the average rate of return, for all builders in the community, will be more modest than the rates shown by only the successful firms. Since the new town developer is in fact the whole industry, on a very localized level, its return is more likely to be the industry average, which includes losers as well as winners.

Some General Problems of New Town Development

Development of a planned new community is much different from the typical development process just described. New towns usually do not have an existing infrastructure on which to piggy-back. Initial infrastructure investment is a necessary and expensive first step. This creates the tremendous front end investment and subsequent carrying charges of which so much has been written.

But there are other problems facing the new town developer, caused by the scale of the project and the fact that the new town developer is going it alone. Management problems are magnified in the new town development, as opposed to the typical development pattern. Most real estate developers tend to be specialized. Among residential developers there are apartment builders, developers of FHA subsidized housing, merchant builders of traditional houses, developers of luxury housing units and many other types. Most large volume builders tend to specialize in a particular kind of unit or section of the market. In addition, there are separate developers who specialize in commercial and industrial projects. The typical situation is to have numerous specialized builders at work in a community at the same time with little or no coordination among them. The only regulation is that done by the market forces and the zoning ordinances. On the other hand, the new town builder has the problem of overall coordination and management of a large number of what are in effect separate enterprises; residential, industrial and commercial development on a large scale. Thus, the new town developer must have not only the expertise in residential, industrial and commercial development, but have the management skills to administer a comprehensive program composed of these various enterprises.

Numerous small developers are free to ignore the external effects of their decisions. They have no incentives to coordinate their activities or even share information. The consequences of this are evident. However, the new town developer must take cognizance of the effects of his own decisions, in effect by internalizing them. This produces a more coherent community plan but it will likely be more costly than typical development. Negative effects can not be passed off to the community as a whole or isolated in a single project's bankruptcy; the responsibility is comprehensive, so negative as well as positive effects are internalized.
In marketing his product the new town developer is usually anticipating absorption of a sizeable portion of the regional housing market demand. Several thousand new units in any one year, which is a likely forecast for a large new town, are apt to be a major portion of the local housing demand. And here is where the new town developer may experience difficulty in estimating absorption rates with any precision. For instance, the developer must pose the question as to the delineation of the relevant housing market area. Is it the entire metropolitan area or some reduced portion of it? If the market area is in fact the entire metropolitan region, then the average annual required absorption rate may be in the neighborhood of five to ten percent of total market demand. However, if the market is more localized, which is likely to be the case, then the new town may have to capture one quarter or one half of the housing market demand. Since the new town is in competition with numerous other developments such absorption rates may be exceedingly difficult to obtain in the most favorable circumstances, and even more difficult to predict accurately.

Housing market analysis is a very imprecise forecasting tool. Although there are some elaborate methodologies (including computer applications) the analysis of small areas is heavily impressionistic. There are so many unknowns and unquantifiables, such as tastes and preferences of consumers and the policies of local governments. A developer's intuition may place him in good stead as he markets a limited number of units over a short period. He is able to shift as he senses shifts in the market. Small miscalculations may be corrected in time so that no serious harm is done. However, on a larger scale, and over a larger market area, intuition, even enhanced by market research, may not be sufficient for good management decisions. And even armed with knowledge changes may not come as easy for the large development enterprise.

Some Particular Problems of New Town Development

The high visibility of the new town developer, as opposed to the low profile of traditional merchant builders, makes the new town vulnerable to pressures which traditional developers are able to avoid. One is the very important thrust for environmental protection. Environmental groups are frequently able to put effective pressures on communities and large developers for adequate environmental safeguards, which are likely to be costly in terms of engineering studies and investment in physical facilities. The new town developer must then bear the total cost of environmental protection, a situation which rarely confronts the typical merchant builder who passes the cost to the community in higher tax rates or environmental degradation.

Another pressure which now faces the new town developer is the impetus for more affirmative action in housing opportunity. Today considerable pressure is being applied on communities and on developers to provide low and moderate income housing in suburbs. There are now numerous regional "fair share" or housing allocation schemes which have been adopted and which call for dispersal of low and moderate income families into suburban areas. HUD Title VII (1970 Housing Act) guidelines also specifically require that new towns include some portion of their housing for low and/or moderate income families. This in turn must be related to overall marketing strategy and cash forecasts. Given
the requirements of Title VII as well as community pressure the new town developer must find an optimal housing mix solution which will satisfy HUD and advocates of low/moderate income housing, and still be consistent with profit maximizing criteria.

**Innovations in New Town Development**

Much of the promotional literature on new towns stresses innovative measures in social services which are either existing or proposed. This is a sharp deviation from the approach of the typical residential developer, who seeks no such relationship with the prospective homeowners. Such innovations as health care services, health insurance programs, day care for children, internal transportation systems such as mini-buses, adult education programs and a host of various programs for cultural enrichment seem to be the province of the new town developer. Ultimately these services must be paid for by the prospective homeowners: included in the initial price of the house and/or possibly additional expenses of a homeowners association. These kinds of programs are attractive and may, in fact, help the marketing program of the new community. But they are also likely to be expensive. By definition, the innovative activity must be carried out without the benefit of experience, which makes it vulnerable to poor cost estimation, requirements for mid-course modification and opposition from those who feel threatened by the divergence from traditional procedures.

**Growth and Profit**

One important lesson from the experience of the existing new towns is that they cannot grow as rapidly as one might at first imagine. Again, compare the planned new town with the rapidly growing unplanned suburb. The 1970 Census reveals that across the United States hundreds of these communities doubled or tripled their population within one decade. Ignoring for the moment that such rapid growth was in many instances chaotic, the point is that under the competitive pluralistic situation extremely rapid growth is possible, since each developer has an incentive to build and sell as quickly as possible while ignoring all external costs. The new town, on the other hand, is not able to ignore the external effects of its own activities; it is a "closed system" which requires a planned and orderly development consistent with environmental protection and adequate supporting services. The new town is constrained, and not able to grow with abandon as have many suburban communities. This factor extracts a high price on the new town developer in the terms of the increase in carrying costs for a longer period.

Each deviation by the new town developer from the industry norms creates serious problems (or potential problems) when viewing the development process as one conducted by an economic entity which must at least break even. This does not imply that the current industry norms are optimal in any sense, since one of the norms is to ignore the negative external effects when at all possible. Such negative externalities degrade both our physical and social environments. The new town developer cannot ignore these externalities, and therein lies both the strength and weakness of the new town. It is apt to produce an environment which is aesthetically pleasing and more respective to crucial social concerns, but at a cost in terms of dollars for the additional
infrastructure investment and in time for the orderly and coordinated development.

Unfortunately for us these problems confronting new town developers are almost insoluble. All of the new towns developing under Title VII are in serious financial difficulty and some will fail. This is unfortunate, but it is a harsh truth. But the problems facing new town developers can only be understood in the context and the overall manner of building and selling houses in the United States.
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INTRODUCTION

The New Town has been long in the discussion stage and short in terms of actual development in the United States. In Western Europe, however, it has been a major developmental force in urban housing. Briefly, the plan is one of large-scale developments to provide housing, employment, and a system of integrated facilities and services within a self-contained environment, but with emphasis on the inter-relatedness of people rather than the alienation-producing "tower apartment" complex.

Ideally, the concept involves a free-standing community, somewhat isolated from the major urban centers, with all of the local jobs matched to the resident work force so there is no need to travel elsewhere to gain employment. Emphasis is on social mobility, compatibility, and diversity. Design and size constraints encourage personalized relationships and discourage organizational complexity, as does the relatively self-contained economic system, which also tends to inhibit social alienation.

The aspect of New Town planning on which the research being presented here was primarily focused is the goal of social balance, that is, balance between the need of a community for efficient services and the need for people-sensitive responsiveness. The approach accepts the view that the New Town should be visualized as a micro-cosmic cross-section of society, encompassing diversity of social status, income, occupation, age, education, and religious, racial and ethnic categories. It is believed that here may be an environment which can encourage the creation of community cohesions and reverse the trend of isolating minorities. (Huttman and Huttman, 1972:5)

Most New Towns follow the Garden City model. This was originally suggested and promoted at the turn of the century by an English inventor, Ebenezer Howard, who believed a totally planned, new community could be the answer to the slum conditions he saw being created in the growing industrial urban centers. The New Town has remained primarily the tool of the private developers, planners, and architects, rather than social scientists. They take as their goal creation of a good living environment that can be built as profitably as the dull, one-class, one-color, dormitory subdivision celebrated in the song satire, "Little Boxes". (Osborn and Whittich, 1963: p. 23-40)

New Towns such as Columbia in Maryland, Reston in Virginia, Johnathan in Minnesota, Lake Havasu in Arizona, and Irvin in Southern California are planned with the hope that this new suburban "clean dream" will induce people to leave the rotting inner city. Emphasizing belonging and togetherness in communities designed to draw workers and their families back together, New Towns have a clear appeal to families seeking to live in less alienating circumstances than are currently available in metropolitan centers. (von Eckardt,
This article has a dual purpose: (1) to describe report on the creation and progress of one of the most famous New Towns, Tapiola, in Finland, and (2) to "operationalize" in this scene the dual concepts of Ferdinand Tönnies' Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, or as they have come to be identified modernly, community and contract bureaucracy. (Tönnies, 1963:12-25) This approach is used because the major attempt in the world today to restore the people-oriented element of Gemeinschaft to local government is being taken in the New Town setting, and one of the most successful (according to published reports) has been the New Town of Tapiola. (von Eckhardt, 1971:21-23).

METHODOLOGY

This paper examines the Finnish New Town of Tapiola, using a case study approach because of limited comparative data, but essentially seeking to define and isolate the elements that create feelings of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, and to see if they are present to a greater degree in the New Town setting. It was my hypothesis that where the social ambience at the local level is highly politicized, the various institutions of political access will tend to have characteristics that are more Gemeinschaft-like (people/community oriented) and less Gesellschaft-like (efficient bureaucracy oriented). To test this hypothesis a survey was made of a sample population representative of the larger whole. Sample subjects were selected from clustered, randomized groupings of adult residents, and requested in a structured questionnaire to recall and compare feelings about their new homes and their old. Because Tapiola is approximately 80 percent multi-story apartment buildings, 10 percent town houses and garden apartments, and 10 percent detached, one-family dwellings, the sample was similarly proportioned. Tapiola was selected as the site because, in addition to being a New Town, it had achieved an unusually stable, neighborhood-like community, yet had reportedly maintained an economic cross-section. As noted, the New Town setting was considered the independent variable and the gemeinschaft/gesellschaft ambience the dependent variable. Because previous studies have indicated the variables of sex, age, education, occupation, and income affect political participation and feelings about government on a gross-cultural basis, these potential supervening factors were cross-tabulated. None of these proved to have a significant causal effect on the results of the survey, however, and are not included here. Initially, each respondent was asked a number of questions designed to ascertain the degree of politicization as compared with where he lived previously. It was a major assumption of the study that there might be an increase in the gemeinschaft-like quality where political self-help was encouraged, and a decrease towards gesellschaft-like where the efficient government, "you can't beat city hall" attitude prevails. Using such indicators as party affiliation, non-partisan political activity, length of residence, self-rating of interests and political efficacy, and feelings about group action to obtain political goals, it was concluded the New Town was more highly politicized than the area in which the individuals questioned had previously resided. It was felt that it was a fair inference that the New Town of Tapiola represented a more politicized setting than the non-New Towns.
BUILDING A NEW TOWN IN FINLAND

As stated, the concept of the New Town, and particularly the Finnish New Town, Tapiola, was considered an essential construct in the research into the concepts of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. Before proceeding further into the findings of the study, a brief description of Tapiola as an entity is appropriate. After World War II, Finland was one of many countries in Northern Europe facing a tremendous housing shortage with limited capability to solve the problem. In addition, Finland as a nation was on the losing side of the war. Under the Armistice agreement, Russia had to be paid $8 million in war reparations, and one of the most beautiful sections of Finland, Karelia, located on the Russo-Finnish border, was ceded to the Communists. As a result, Finland found it had hundreds of thousands of Karelian refugees who rejected the Russian's offer to stay, and who fled their homes. Somewhat naturally, the government had to adopt a national policy of economizing across the board, and housing was no exception. There was, however, some encouragement by the government to private entities, particularly the corporate cooperatives that are a special feature of Finland's semi-socialist economy. In 1950, the director of one of these cooperatives located a family estate tract of 660 acres near the outskirts of Helsinki. It was ideally located on a picturesque site on the Bay of Helsinki, and seemed ideal for the kind of housing development he had been thinking about. The price of 180 million old Finmarks (about $563,000) was the major obstacle, since he was not independently wealthy. He approached the board of his Cooperative Association, the Finnish Family Welfare League, and they agreed to support the project. Another segment of the downpayment came from the State Football pool board of directors, in the form of a loan at reasonable interest. When the initial money-raising phase was completed, and the land purchased, five national organizations came together to form a development foundation, the Asuntosaatio.

In the design phase, it was decided that the New Town concept should be adopted, but with special Finnish emphasis. The director had definite ideas: he wanted a town for "everyman", a place where all kinds of people could live and work together. This meant catering to the desire of many Finns for "flats" of an economical mode for daily living, recognizing that extra money would be allocated to the atavistic summer holiday splurge so much a cultural characteristic in the Scandinavian nations. The planning also involved detached homes of a first residential nature for those who wanted something more expensive and more private. As a consequence, the Asuntosaatio adopted a policy of selling sites for low prices and seeking to attract state subsidized housing projects. The goal was to bring together various kinds of people in the same community, as contrasted with the atomized situation of the urban centers. Eighty percent of the sites in Tapiola were thus sold under long-term, low-interest state-guaranteed loans, allowing buildings to be erected at a price about half of the land's market value. Despite a temporary setback when the rural commune (a combination of city and county) government indicated disinterest in helping finance public utilities, Tapiola was constructed on schedule and the first occupants moved in two and a half years after the land was purchased.

Today, with all of the land loans repaid by the Asuntosaatio, Tapiola is a viable community of 16,000 residents, a cross-section of low-, medium-,
and high-income families in nine sub-neighborhoods; each with its own community shopping area and community center. The building development that has come into being with minimum disturbance of the natural surroundings is pointed out with pride to visitors from all over the world. An award-winning technical university complex has been located nearby. The government has adopted similar plans elsewhere in the Helsinki area. A new tourist hotel has been started, and the central town plaza features an olympic-sized indoor-outdoor swimming pool and sauna bath complex.

The feature that distinguishes Tapiola, however, remains the Asunto- saatio's firm commitment to the idea of the cross-section community, the idea of high density apartment buildings interspersed with town houses and detached ranch-style homes so all have sufficient individuality as to avoid looking "mass-produced". Neighborhoods are connected by landscaped, patterned open spaces and groves of trees, with pedestrian and bicycle circulation emphasized over vehicles. Community facilities are designed to promote personal interaction rather than atomized to create alienation. The elementary school, the movie theater, and the main shopping area were designed and built as essential elements at the same time as the first home units. Every effort was made to have a variety of housing types. Each segment was the result of a national competition among the nation's finest architects.

As sub-neighborhoods took shape, promenades were built connecting them with the town center, with no through vehicular traffic being allowed except by the main circular access drive. Play spaces for children of all ages, from sandboxes to soccer fields, were developed. There was a special "children's town". The indoor-outdoor swimming complex featured special competitions, and there were expert water sports teachers. Despite a high percentage of children in the development (about one-third), there was little vandalism to the shrub-beries and flower gardens, which are community owned and maintained. When there is trouble, it is taken care of within the community, with representatives drawn from constituent groups within Tapiola to work out solutions with the Asuntosaatio.

Realizing that clean light industry would have to be attracted to Rapiola to create a stable population, the Asuntosaatio made a special effort in this area. All of the New Town developers have had trouble with this problem of creating work opportunities for the residents. In Tapiola, they had somewhat more success than most, although not 100 percent of the projected employment need. In 1968 there were over 3,000 working places, enough to provide jobs for about half of the economically-active population. About 40 percent of these jobs were industrial, while 20 percent were in trade, 35 percent were in service, and 5 percent were in transportation. The Asuntosaatio expects this total to double by the end of 1975.

Because of the low down-payment, low-interest loan policy, the goal of a socio-economic cross-section was apparently achieved, and as a result there is a fairly good political cross section of Finnish society, as illustrated by results of the 1970 parliamentary election. There were 45 percent voting for left parties, which was about the same percentage as nationally. The Asuntosaatio admits the proportion of low income persons is still below average, and an attempt is being made to correct this as a long-term goal.
The reason apparently lies in the fact that of the 10 percent rental buildings in Tapiola, most are owned by industrial firms and are rented to firm employees. At this writing, about 55 percent of Tapiolans were white collar and 45 percent were blue collar. More explicitly, this breaks down as 24 percent professional, 24 percent managerial, and 42 percent skilled labor.

FINDINGS

Having once ascertained that the people who lived in Tapiola had become more politicized as a result of moving into the New Town, that is, more aware and responsive to political causes and action, we next addressed the question of whether the political ambience was more Gemeinschaft than where the residents had lived previously. From the number and variety of organizations and activities available in Tapiola, as compared with a list of national organizations (Allardt, 1960, 27-32), there seemed to be a correspondence with the activity level of Finnish society generally. There were local sections of all major parties, and voting participation was extremely high. In the parliamentary election in 1970, for example, the voting percentage exceeded 90 percent, as compared with the national average slightly above 80 percent. Similarly, Tapiolans were active politically at the local level, coming to dominate the Espoo Commune Council with a 32 percent representation, more than any other part of the commune. (Laine, 1973, 3).

Formal party affiliation among Tapiolans proved not to be exceedingly high, reaching only 24 percent. However, as suggested by Allardt, the Finns take their politics in the form of special interest and sports groups, rather than by participation in ideologically-oriented, official parties. (Allardt, 1960, 27). Thus, 72 percent of the sample said they belonged to one or more such groups, all of which they found to be comparatively politicized. Interestingly, women had a higher participation rate than men in Tapiola, although they tended to see the New Town as being less politicized than where they had lived previously, contrary to the opinion of most of the men respondents.

My method of operationalizing the concepts of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft involved scaling felt personal efficacy in terms of the community's governmental structure. In other words, if the respondent felt he or she could more easily than not obtain a solution to his felt political needs, then the inference was that the political ambience could be considered more Gemeinschaft-like. To the contrary, if the interviewee felt needs, then the inference was that a Gesellschaft-like ambience existed. (Loomis and McKinney, 1956, 404-412).

Of course, the idea of a continuum (as pointed out in Loomis and McKinney) assumes a high degree of political awareness on the part of the respondents, since if there was little awareness then there would be little or no response to the request to distinguish between the two ideal types. To this end, the questionnaire forces a decision between two different ways of looking at government, following out the dichotomy of Tönnies. The results were that Tapiolans felt their Commune government was more Gemeinschaft than where they lived previously by almost a two-to-one margin.
In view of the usual report of sex differences reported in the literature, the findings indicated are interesting since more women than men felt political efficacy in terms of "city hall". Contrary to the usual situation where more men than women feel politically efficacious, in Tapiola 61 percent of the women felt the government of the Commune was helpful and understanding with the average person who had a problem, whereas only 28 percent were disappointed with the way city government responded to their problems. On the other hand, 59 percent of the men felt the Commune government was Gemeinschaft-like in response to problems, and 34 percent felt the local government was too bureaucratic and unresponsive. Two possible explanations suggest themselves to explain this difference: first, that it is a cultural phenomenon, and second, that suburbia itself is the change agent. (Milbrath, 1965, 136) In response to the first possibility, a report by Haavio-Mannila indicates sex differences in political participation have continued in Finland despite the fact women were enfranchised at the same time as men (in 1906 by order of the Czar of Russia). In the area of voting, great progress towards equal participation has been made in Finland and throughout Scandinavia. (Haavio-Mannila, 1970, 209-238; Allardt, et al, 1960, 27-39) The second proposed explanation, that moving to suburbia might overcome the model of the apathetic political women, tends to support indirectly the hypothesis of this study, that the New Town is the independent variable which would increase feelings of interrelatedness in terms of political action. The countervailing argument, that because of the socialization process in which sex roles of women are congealed at an early age and therefore little change can be expected, (Hess & Torney, 1967, 32) would seem not to be supported by this data.
The fact that, while both men and women find the ambience more Gemeinschaft-like, women respond to a greater degree in terms of changing their previous attitudes, also supports the suggestion of a number of political theorists (Lipset, 1960, 216) that the intangibles of politics are cognitive elements of the feminine political model. Thus, changes in the ambience from urban to suburban would tend to affect a woman more than a man. In Tapiola, where the cross-pressures that would tend to reinforce the passive-apathetic model of political women are broken down, the women are more likely to break away from their early role training and become politically active. Support for this concept is found in the data which shows that women of Tapiola appear to be more active in political affairs than men. The women respondents had a 28 percent "active participant" level as compared with the male rate of 22 percent, and there were no apathetic women.

Table 2
Political Participation Levels in Tapiola, Male and Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Participation Level</th>
<th>n=50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Active Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28 (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


On the other hand, the men of Tapiola were stronger in the "voter-observer" category, having 72 percent as compared with the female rate of 67 percent.

Next, the respondents were asked their feelings about how political action groups get started, with the intention of finding whether political action groups are considered more Gemeinschaft or more Gesellschaft. A strong majority (66 percent) felt political action groups were more Gemeinschaft, and less Gesellschaft (24 percent). Also, there was no distinguishable sex differential, as might be expected where the female role as a participant in political action has been equalized.

We also had a validity check on the way Tapiolans feel about government, as contrasted with political groups. Whereas in the above question, the goal was to distinguish the Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft dichotomy by identifying the origin of political action groups, another question gave data about the same feelings, but as applied to local government; 64 percent of the respondents made the same choice as in the above question declaring that local governments started when people gathered to work their civic problems out together. Only 24 percent felt local government was the result of a Hobbsian contractual arrangement between the Elites and the people.
Again, as might be expected, although both men and women felt local government to be more Gemeinschaft than Gesellschaft, a 12 percent sex differential did appear; the men's belief in this was stronger (68 percent) in comparison to that of the women respondents (56 percent). It might be speculated, in this connection, that the further the phenomenon being investigated is from the personal level, the more likely a sex difference will appear. Thus, where the political anxiety is closely related, the sex differential disappears, and to the contrary when the problem is remote.

The final segment of this study involved a multi-phasic question posing a series of situations requiring the respondent to answer on a ten-point, plus-minus scale, with plus being Gemeinschaft-like and the minus Gesellschaft-like. The respondent was not made aware of the complexity of the question, or that individual answers were to be assigned a cumulative weight. The situational problems were constructed on a continuum from fairly trivial to a serious threat, but all within the range of problems likely to face a householder in Tapiola. None of the situational problems were obviously political, nor were the solutions offered obviously either Gemeinschaft or Gesellschaft, thus providing an additional validity check. The composite score was cross-tabulated with interest in political matters.

The results of this question, with its built-in controls, were that the hypothesis was supported. Both those who rated themselves as having little or no interest in politics and those who rated themselves as having moderate or great interest in politics responded in a Gemeinschaft-like way to home crisis situations. There was no indication of a sex differential among the answers, further evidence that the political ambience of the New Town was substantially more Gemeinschaft than the previous place of residence. Those having little or no political interest were found to have 36 percent pro-Gemeinschaft responses as opposed to 30 percent pro-Gesellschaft, and 33 percent neutral responses. Those who were moderately or greatly interested in politics, as might be expected, had 55 percent pro-Gemeinschaft responses to crisis, 22 percent pro-Gesellschaft, and 23 percent neutral.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on the data obtained and presented in the previous section, it would seem a fair inference that Tapiolans are more highly politicized than they were before they moved to the New Town, and that the New Town ambience is conducive to a greater degree of political awareness and efficacy than a non-New Town.

The developers of the New Town of Tapiola were at least partially successful in creating a political ambience that was more Gemeinschaft-like than is usual in other types of housing developments. They did this despite the heterogeneous population that featured a cross-section of workers, white collar, and middle- and upper-class citizens. The Asuntosaatio director, in fact, commented that a sort of false homogeneity was created by the New Town and this also tends to support the concept that the New Town is an aid in promoting Gemeinschaft-like political ambience. (von Hertzen, 1971, 169-170)
In this, he was supported by many of the residents of Tapiola during pre-test depth interviews. As one man who had brought his family to Tapiola from Kotha, an industrial port town, commented:

Here we dress up more, and take better care of everything. People are more interested in each other in Tapiola, and we all pitch in if one of us has a problem.

On the other hand, a housewife and mother of three who had moved from Kapyta, another neighborhood in Helsinki, and who now works as a shop assistant in Tapiola, declared standards she was used to had somewhat deteriorated in Tapiola:

You had to dress better in Kapyta. Here one is more free. Ten years ago everyone could walk around Tapiola in shorts... I mean, all social classes. They really did. The Helsinki people are just one step behind, but they are making progress. We have a special style in Tapiola. You can't label class here.

The reason these opinions are mentioned here is because of the possibility that one way of creating Gemeinschaft-like ambience may be just that—to overcome heterogeneity by creating one homogeneous middle-class community in terms of political and social normative standards, de-emphasizing differential standards of employment, income, and education. Clearly a part of the increased feeling of Gemeinschaft can be attributed to the increased political awareness and political participation of the women who moved to Tapiola, although the same phenomenon was reported as the men in a lesser degree. The exact basis for this sexual differentiation is hard to pinpoint, although there has been a great deal of speculation about the effect of women moving into a subdivision atmosphere where middle-class virtues of political activity and awareness are the standard rather than the exception.

The physical location of Tapiola certainly helps create a feeling of community, although it is located sufficiently close to the main stream of inter-city traffic to have metropolitan access. Great efforts were made to retain the forests of birch to help screen the roads and various commercial enterprises. The care that was lavished by the Asuntosaatio on not disturbing the natural environment, and on creating a new community with a special way of life, was also a part of the ambience. Respondent after respondent mentioned the feeling that the Asuntosaatio really cared about the quality of life in Tapiola and wasn't merely interested in making a profit from housing.

It is also clear from the data that most Tapiolans feel politically efficacious about dealing with problems, whether through the political party organizations, or through nonpartisan special-interest associations and clubs. Although political party affiliation was not as high as might have been expected, the commitment to political response and to Gemeinschaft-like ambience was clear and positive.

By final comment lies in the area of a personal opinion. This was a case study, a tentative investigation of a phenomenon which I believe to
be important to the future of the society. Too many municipal reformers seem to prefer the elite-controlled, bureaucracy-dominated Gesellschaft-like governmental approach. They seem to fear "uncontrolled" popular demands made by "unrestrained" groups of citizens, believing that they inherently know what is really best for all the people. Thus, they opposed more participant democracy and advocate more representative democracy, a "reform" that tends to reduce the Gemeinschaft element in government. I see in the New Town approach a melding of both the Gemeinschaft and the Gesellschaft, and possibly in this direction lies a better reform for local government.

NOTES

1. I wish to acknowledge help from Professors Eric Allardt, Research Institute, University of Helsinki; Elina Haavio-Mannila, Sociological Institute, Dr. Kettill Bruun, Director of the Finnish Foundation for Alcohol Research; Officials of the Asuntosaatio (Residence Foundation); Sirkka Kauppinen, Public Information Assistant at the Asuntosaatio, and Ullica Sagerstrale, University of Helsinki graduate student, my interpreter and pre-tester. In addition, prior to my field work in Finland, and upon my return to the United States, I was helped by Emily Stoper, Sherman Lewis, Daniel Graves, Beth Huttman, and Margo Franz, professors at California State University, Hayward.

2. "Little boxes, little boxes, all in a row," a modern American folk song, copyright by Malvina Renolds, San Francisco, 1963. Of course, it is obvious that this standard of the "clean dream" caters to the middle-class ideal, as many critics charge. But then isn't that also the dream of the poor and the minorities, despite the best efforts of the ideologues. Reports from Columbia and Reston, where an estimated 10 to 20 percent of the population is Black, are that integration has proved a viable social set. Most whites, whatever income group, have no objection, it seems, to racial integration where the white group remains in the majority. (von Eckardt, 1971:21-23)

3. In the context used here, "operationalize" refers to the defining of an abstract concept in terms of simple, observable procedures. The measuring procedure constitutes the full extent of the definition as well as the method of observation of the phenomenon. Thus, concepts are tied to readily measurable and readily communicated phenomena and, in a sense, the researcher determines what he or she wishes to define by finding an acceptable way of measuring it empirically. It is not claimed here that all aspects of the concept will be measured; only those aspects relating to political action. (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969:284)

4. For a more detailed exposition of methodology, and the place of Tönnies' concepts, see the report of which this paper is a condensation (Wise- man, 1973, pp. 25-47)

5. It should be noted that Kish (1965, pp. 161-65) suggests there is a danger of increased homogeneity in cluster sampling. To decrease this effect, as Kish suggests, we increased the randomizing of both the cluster and the sample.

7. This section is based on the von Hertzen-Speiregen book on Tapiola, and conversations with Asuntosaatio officials during my visit in 1973.

8. Because of the short summer period, a great deal of planning revolves around this period, in which the Finns seek to pack special memories. Many spend the period in a shamanistic return to nature on an island summer home, of the family farm. Others flee the city at every opportunity, renting or living with friends.

9. The Asuntosaatio initially petitioned the central government to have Tapiola created as a market communal borough separate from the rural Espoo Commune, which would have permitted issuance of interest-free tax bonds to finance public improvements. When this was rejected, and the Espoo Municipal Council proved unhelpful, the Asuntosaatio had to obtain the financing from private sources. Help was finally obtained from the Postal Savings Bank which approved a medium term loan so that the first streets, roads, water pipes, sewage and storm sewers, and street lights could be installed.

10. Most of the literature on sex differences in political efficacy has reported a 10 percent differential between men and women, with women being less involved, more apathetic, parochial, conservative, and response to the personality, emotional, and esthetic aspects of political life. See (Almond and Verba, 1965, 324-335; Lane, 1962, 209; Duverger, 1954, 199; Greenstein, 1961, 353)

11. Each segment of the question here was so constructed as to allow a predetermined weight to be assigned, each answer in the series having a cumulative weight which would be either Gemeinschaft or Gesellschaft. Thus, in one typical response, given two choices as to a response to crisis, a minus was recorded. On the second crisis, a plus was recorded, and a plus on the third, a minus on the fourth, and a minus on the fifth. The composite weighted score for this individual was a minus 1, which was in the Gesellschaft area.


13. Ibid.
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In North America, developments specially designed for the elderly of the non-nursing home variety are increasing in number, due to the insistent effort of experts in geriatrics and elderly housing to see the need for intermediate housing alternatives to the nursing home is provided. An accompanying need, that for services, has not been as clearly responded to; second, there is a debate here as to whether the community or the development should provide the services.

The extended longevity of the elderly dictates that many, due to physical frailty and psychological problems or financial position, can no longer maintain their own home and possibly do their own housework, cooking and shopping, although they are still ambulatory and active and alert enough to maintain an independent and semi-independent life. As the elderly's own resources become inadequate to cope with the daily demands of living, due to the aging process, provision of adequate alternative housing becomes important in maintaining the well-being and functioning of the elderly and in preventing breakdown and loss of functioning. Such a type of housing can be looked on as prevention of unnecessary institutionalization for a number of elderly. Individual apartments and congregate living arrangements, which have hotel-type rooms, dining rooms, recreation rooms and other facilities can provide an environment for independent living.

This report is concerned with such developments. It is based on data collected and analyzed from a nation-wide study of such housing in Canada, including interviews with 301 elderly residents, a survey of 294 managers of such developments and case studies of 19 developments of different types.

It has been hypothesized that for these developments to provide shelter alone is not meeting the need of these physically and mentally-declining elderly population. That, in order for these persons to utilize these resources over a long period of time—a period during which their physical condition is to varying degrees deteriorating—a variety of services are needed. In fact, an official of HUD has stated that "from the standpoint of the welfare and happiness of the elderly residents themselves, the success of housing for the elderly can be measured largely by the extent it provides the supportive services these elderly need and through this helps the residents to maintain their independence." For a population whose physical frailties include such handicaps as, inability to bend or to climb stairs, or physical weaknesses that hinder continuation of heavy housekeeping and maintenance, or dietary problems that require special food preparation, or health problems that require special medicines or shots, provision of shelter is not enough; supportive services are needed. If they are not provided,
either by the development or the community, the only alternative for the person may be residence in a higher level of institutional care, such as nursing homes, with the resultant problems of loss of independence and an active way of life and instead withdrawal, loss of interest, depression and possibly a shortened life.

These needed services range from homemaking--housekeeping assistance; food preparation aid, either through a resident dining room or meals on wheels service; legal counseling and social work counseling; recreational programs of various types; visitor-companion services, including friendly visiting, telephone calling and/or a buddy system; and some degree of nursing assistance, with regular medical checkups and possibly an infirmary on the premises. Related to these services, special facilities in the development may be provided; such as a library, recreational room, crafts room, beauty or barber shop, gardening plots, bowling alley and small shop for everyday purchases. Of course, in a number of cases, it may be decided that the community instead should take care of such needs; providing a mobile library or branch nearby, providing bowling alleys and movies nearby, or coming to the development to show movies, providing recreational programs through a Senior Citizen Center or other public body, such as the local recreation department, or through church and service organizations. Second, it may be felt that the public nursing services should be used or a local hospital or clinic; and a community homemaker service, meals on wheels program and/or social work-legal counseling service should be utilized instead of providing these services from development staff.

The purpose of this report is to relate some advantages and disadvantages of using the community based services versus the development based services; a number of examples from our case studies will be given and data from our surveys of the elderly residents and of managers will be examined.

In discussing this, one must first keep in mind that we are discussing two types of independent and semi-independent living arrangements; first, there is the apartment development where each resident has his own cooking facilities; then there is the congregate living arrangement where a dining room is provided, as well as a number of other services and facilities, such as a maid service. In the case of the latter type developments, there is less need for community-based programs to meet some basic needs, such as food preparation and homemaking.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Community-based Services. An obvious advantage to the development of using community-based services is the cost saving. However, in some cases the cost is coming out of some part of the public purse, whether paid for in the community or by the development budget. Whether it is a disadvantage or advantage to use the community-based service may, in a number of cases, depend on how many residents need the service. In some of our apartment developments only a small proportion of the population said there was need for a visiting nurse or for homemaker help. In such cases, unless the development has access to staff from another part of its development complex or other institutions affiliated with it, it might be better to use community-based resources for these few residents. However, the serious problem we found here is that a number of...
residents in need did not come to the attention of the community-based service staff. For example, visiting nurses often missed many cases that required assistance. This could be due to the fact the elderly did not come forward to give their needs, and second, the resident staff did not put these elderly in touch with the necessary assistance. In some cases, such as Metro Toronto elderly apartment developments, there was no staff other than maintenance staff and they were expressly told not to concern themselves with the residents' non-housing needs; the Metro authority felt its sole job was housing elderly. If community-based services are to be utilized by those in need of them, there must be a responsible staff member in the development who takes as part of his job connecting these persons up with the needed services; this often starts with identifying the elderly in need of help.

Other problems with community-based services may be that they are not available on weekends, or evenings, or on emergency basis. For example, in Canada our elderly complained the VON or public nurse came only one day a week, or in some cases, one day a month and never in evenings or on weekends. Many of these elderly feared that they would be left unattended if they had an accident on a weekend; this was especially true in the apartment complexes where no staff other than maintenance was available.

In a Toronto development, another problem existed for the community-based nursing service. They had so many cases to serve in the development, it made it hard for them to serve others in the community.

Another problem may be that the development is too much on the fringe of the metropolitan area to be accessible to the community-based services, which often radiate out from the downtown areas. This, of course, can be handled by a development mini-bus taking residents to the services, as exists in the Sussex development and in a different way in one Montreal development.

Another problem is the development residents may not feel entirely welcome in the community-based facility, feeling they are outsiders; this was brought up in relation to one senior citizen center. However, in Owen Sound, where the Kiwanis club had developed a recreation center with library and lounge and kitchen for the community in the apartment development there, mainly the elderly apartment dwellers used it. The reason may have been location, the existence of an alternative senior citizen center, and lack of recreational staff.

The idea of having a facility open to both residents and the community is a good one and can help to keep the residents more in the community, as of course does use of community-based services. In Winnipeg, Lion's Manor has a day care facility in the development; half the members come from the community and half from the development. There is a good recreational program that relieves the development staff of having to provide such. While this day care center has worked, it has been found in other developments the day care users do not want to associate with the development residents, and vice versa.
One way to insure greater use of a community-based facility is to be located on a downtown site; this is true for several of our studied developments including two in Toronto. Another way is to set up a close connection with a particular hospital, for medical checkup and nursing assistance; or relate to particular churches for a recreational program; or to particular ethnic organizations. Some of our developments had hospitals or nursing homes in very close proximity or set up special arrangements, such as Powell River.

Problems with Development Services. A major problem may be that the development is too small or has too few people in need to provide the service. Second, it may be too costly. However, some of our more satisfying developments, according to the residents, did provide services. Recreational staff, when provided, gave the development a friendly air; in a few cases students or para-professionals were cheaply provided. In some cases a particular agency in the community, such as the Family Service Agency in one case, came in and provided the service. In another case, the Vancouver Finnish-Canadian Home, the community members held their festivities and religious services in the development. In others, the manager took on many duties.

Problems may be that the services duplicate those in the community or as with beauty shops are too expensive for many residents to use.
Redistribution of income through direct grants of funds to the poor for general use, such as welfare payments, is seen as the usual means for reducing social equality. However, assistance in kind, such as Medi-Cal, school lunches, and Food Stamps, also help to stretch the real income of the poor and to bring their income closer to that of the rest of society. Another means of achieving some degree of redistribution is through housing subsidies which either provide the poor with a particular unit at low rent, such as public housing, or give the poor funds specifically to use for housing, such as through the experimental housing allowance. In Europe these housing subsidies have been of major importance as a social equalizer mechanism increasing working class incomes. For example, almost a third of the British pay below market rents in government-subsidized council housing, 40 per cent of Swedish families with children receive a housing allowance, and well over a third of Dutch families are in completely government-subsidized moderate rent housing units.

This report discusses the role housing assistance has played in the United States in decreasing social inequality of America's poor, and then, in more detail, discusses the degree to which a housing allowance program, now being experimented with, might do a better job of diminishing social inequality. The report is based on the author's ten years of research on subsidized housing programs, especially public housing, new towns, housing for the elderly, and most recently, the HUD experimental housing allowance program and European housing allowance programs.

Before discussing how the housing allowance might diminish social inequality and the barriers that exist to it becoming a successful vehicle for working towards this goal, it may be useful to examine the dimensions of social inequality. Increasing social equality to many sociologists means simply seeing that the lower strata in the society has a greater proportion of the real income; in this context housing assistance is seen as being a useful vehicle if it gives the poor monetary assistance or below market rents. However, the definition or scope of social inequality can be seen to be broader, referring to the inequality between the condition of the apartments the poor live in compared to the housing that the rest of society lives in. In the United States over a tenth of the households still live in substandard or overcrowded housing (and 25 per cent suffer from one or more of three types of housing deprivation: overcrowding, substandardness, or an unrealistic rent burden in relation to their income.) For example, half of the 14 million welfare recipients live in substandard housing; 34 per cent of all poor live in deteriorated housing. The relative deprivation the poor feel because they are not in what they consider a "decent home" - the kind of home shown daily on television and in the magazines - the negative psychological feeling they have from living in deteriorated housing, or even public
housing with its stigma, can be considered a type of social inequality. Sociologists, starting with Warner and Chapin have long considered residential dwelling as well as residential area a criteria for status and the poor share this judgment. They feel they live in low status housing. High status or desirable residential units or areas may be deemed a scarce good rewarded to the most esteemed members of society, as visualized in the David-Moore theory. Different residential dwellings and areas can be seen as indicators of power of different groups, as John Rex points out. Inequality in residential condition and residential area can be a reminder or indicator of general inequality. Conversely then, government assistance to make the units the poor live in more like those of the middle class or to make the residential areas as desirable as the middle class or even upper working class areas means diminishing the social inequality between these groups. Even more effective could be government measures to facilitate the ability of the poor to move into working class areas — in other words to facilitate a class mix in neighborhoods that formerly had few poor residents. In Britain this was a major goal for new towns; they were to be like a village where the poor lived next to the middle class, as Laborite leader Aneurin Bevan demanded in authorizing legislation. British public housing (council housing) was to architecturally not look like housing for the poor. In Sweden, the idea given in policy statements for new towns was that the dustman should be able to live next door to the doctor. Mechanisms for class mix or locational choice for the poor provide them with not only a more desirable residential environment but in the U.S. a more desirable school for their children as well as a wide range of other more adequately staffed facilities, from library to medical to recreational and park facilities. It may also put them in an area of better-paying and more accessible jobs, for many firms have moved to outer fringe, suburban and certainly non-slum areas that are often inaccessible by public transportation to slum dwellers.

In sum it is argued that greater social equality can mean other things than greater equality in incomes; it can be in terms of housing of a quality more equal to that of the rest of the society. In addition, greater equality may be in terms of living in an improved neighborhood, reaching the desired conditions of safety, cleanliness, service provision and even greenery and a neighborhood inhabited by a mix of people including middle class. That many of the poor strongly desire this type of equality can be illustrated by the opinions of New York City welfare recipients who, when asked by Sternlieb what they most wanted in housing, said a "good area"; their greatest dissatisfaction was that they lived in a bad area, an unsafe area, and an area of drug use problems. The greatest general fear of these welfare recipients was not over a job or their economic situation but concern over family and self. Since many were female household heads on welfare or elderly one could see why a safe area, a good neighborhood, were of more concern than a job. Another study of elderly showed a very major interest was in modern comfortable housing, again showing that while equality in income is important, improved housing and area are also of great concern. To many housing is "not only shelter" — "not only a physical shell for people's lives" as Cans feels but a major need.

Another type of social equality that is important when considering a housing allowance is equality of treatment of groups at roughly the same
economic level, in this case the different categories of poor. A major example of this is between the working poor who make up about 40 per cent of all poor and seldom receive welfare payments, and the rest of the poor; or between large and small families, poor families and elderly poor, white and non-white poor, or between poor in different regions, or in urban and rural areas, with the latter seldom receiving housing assistance (except for minor Rural Housing programs).

Now let us briefly discuss the degree and the ways in which past (and present) U.S. housing subsidies have served as a means of diminishing the social inequality of the poor. However, before doing this we must remind the readers that (1) the subsidized housing programs in the U.S. have had other major goals, including increasing housing production, helping a troubled housing industry and providing building industry jobs, housing special groups such as war workers, renovating deteriorated inner areas and bringing middle class families back into the city, and providing housing in relation to regional growth schemes. We must also point out that (2) the major portion of financial assistance for housing in the United States has gone not to the poor but to the middle class through home owner federal tax deductions and through FHA-insured mortgages for mainly suburban housing. Indirect subsidies in the amount of four to seven billion dollars have been given to homeowners (mainly middle class) through Federal income tax deductions of mortgage interest, local property taxes and depreciation, Aaron estimates. Second, over a fifth of the housing built from 1947 through the 1960s was FHA and VA-insured housing, again a subsidy to the middle and skilled working class.

To some degree one can add to this another subsidy, the cost of renovation of inner city areas, since in a number of cases, especially in the early days, luxury or middle class FHA-insured apartments were put on this cheap urban renewal land, while many low rent housing units were torn down. Even rehabilitation funds have often benefited those of higher economic status than the poor because rents were raised after rehabilitation and thus the poor were forced out.

Regarding housing assistance specifically directed to the poor, the conventional public housing program started in 1937 is one of the oldest and largest. Yet only about one million families, mostly at every low economic level, out of 16 million poor households, are housed in these specially designed units that rent at below market prices, adjusted to the family’s income. In other words, less than four per cent of the poor are helped by this program. Second, many of these projects, sited in slum areas and containing a large concentration of poor families (up to 10-13,000 families), are considered undesirable by their users. Users often do not feel it is home and in fact they are usually forced to leave after their income reaches a maximum that is increasingly far below median U.S. incomes. As users they are stigmatized by outsiders; as residents they suffer from exposure to a variety of deviant acts, including violence, vandalism, drug use, mainly by the large teenage groups found in these large family projects.

While projects in small towns often have a more congenial atmosphere and while in some cities use of scattered sites with a small number of turn-key units per site, such as in Oakland, California, has decreased these
problems, many experts feel the $30,000 or more cost per unit, the high operating costs, and the difficulty of locating acceptable sites means one can not justify the expenditure on this type of program. They feel the results do not produce a great enough improvement in environment even though the unit is a great enough improvement in its standardness and modernness, and may include facilities and services not found in conventional housing. Provision of a physical building rather than financial assistance to the person they feel may not be the best course and certainly not the cheapest. Since the 1973 moratorium little public housing has been built and operating costs, especially with the Brooke amendment that assured families paid no more than 25 per cent of their income for rent, have gone up and caused hardships on many public housing authorities.

Starting with the Johnson administration new programs, including Section 235 and 236, have been introduced that utilized the private market to a much greater degree, using private suppliers of housing while still emphasizing provision of specifically designed units. By the January 1973 moratorium on these 236 and 235 programs they had provided almost half as many dwellings in this short period as public housing had in 35 years. Section 235 was a home purchase program, with interest rate subsidy, for moderate income. It was halted due to realtor practices in many cities of patching up old houses and selling them to unsuspecting poor.

The Section 236 housing program has non-profit or limited profit sponsors who are assisted by below market interest rates; however, 236 users could also get a rent supplement to make up for the difference between the rent and 25 per cent of their income. Less than a fourth of the users utilized the rent supplement and most users were near the top category of the maximum income allowed for this moderate income program (median income of users was $5,500). The hope that buildings would be sited in non-slum areas was unfulfilled in the majority of cases, and lack of sufficient financial reserves or management fiscal skills caused many developments to run into serious financial troubles when rent delinquencies occurred. Second, one-fourth of every subsidy dollar in the program went to financiers and misuse occurred, even wholesale thievery, as Gans says.

Leased public housing (Section 23) has represented a change in course that brought the U.S. type assistance closer to a housing allowance type approach as it utilizes existing housing. The subsidy is in terms of the difference between the rent and a percentage of income of the tenant, with various deductions. Unlike the conventional public housing assistance is mainly in terms of giving help to the person rather than the building. The Section 23 program differs from a standard housing allowance because the public housing authority in most cases locates the unit, negotiates the lease, pays the rent and subleases the unit to the chosen public housing tenant who pays the housing authority a specified percentage of his income toward the unit's rent. In some areas of the country, notably the West, this has been a popular program with housing authorities; some authorities have only had a leased program. The program's problems have stemmed from lack of enough funding to meet administrative costs and a lack of standard units at rents low enough to meet program requirements. Thus it has been forced to send applicants out to look for their own units ("finders-keepers" hunt). According to a 1972 HUD audit
report, in some authorities prelease inspections were not made, allowing
tenants to move into substandard units and rents were paid to landlords in
excess of prevailing market rents.\footnote{21} Defenders of the program point out that
the agency helps the powerless poor by bargaining and negotiating a lease
with landlords, paying and guaranteeing the rent, and in most cases locating
the unit for them. Section 23 is now being superceded by Section 8 of the
1974 Housing Act which will have the applicant personally dealing with the
landlord.

Other minor housing programs for specific groups include the Section
202 elderly housing program of direct low interest loans for non-profit and
limited dividend housing - 45,000 units through 1971 - which serves mainly
those slightly above the poverty level.

The biggest housing subsidy to the poor has actually come as part of
welfare assistance. Over 14 million persons receive welfare; most use over
25 per cent of their check for housing. Yet even then the money is usually
not enough to cover the market rent in decent housing in non-slum areas.
Second, discrimination against welfare recipients, non-whites, and female
heads means they must often pay above market rents. Half have been found to
live in substandard housing. In New York City they were found to be increas-
ingly concentrated in certain slum area apartment houses, usually where the
landlord did a minimum of repairs and provided poor service. Almost half of
these recipients in one New York City survey\footnote{22} were dissatisfied with their
housing, and especially with the area it was in, though many were satisfied
with apartment size, apartment amenities and even maintenance. Most were in
pre-1929 housing.

Thus in concluding this section on the degree that past and present
housing assistance programs have helped diminish social inequality between
the poor and other groups, one must say that in a number of cases the programs
have not provided a decent non-slum area, although in some areas and a number
of cases they have. In some instances the unit has not been standard housing
meeting the very minimum qualification for standardness; in other cases while
the unit has been standard, such as conventional public housing or Section
236, use has stigmatized the recipient. In some programs so little money has
been provided that either the recipient can not find a standard unit or the
program is in serious financial difficulties. In some cases, the moderate
income and not the poor have been served; in fact the various assistance
programs themselves have increased social inequality in one way as they have
graded the poor into different strata of recipients with the very poor in
public housing and slightly better off in Sec. 236. The programs have pro-
duced other types of gradation, with the "cream" of the poor, the more
deserving poor, especially the elderly, more likely accepted in Section 23
private units (now Section 8) or 236 units.

Last, while the present programs with all the above problems for a
number of users, have provided decent housing, and some type of income assis-
tance, and allowed some to move to decent neighborhoods (especially whites in
small towns and white elderly in general), the programs in toto have given
assistance to only a small portion of the poor. As Heinberg points out
"current federal programs to subsidize rental housing are meeting only a very
small part of the need of low income for assistance as we have defined it; only about four per cent of the recipient units estimated to be eligible for a housing allowance were being helped in 1969. Yet all these programs are estimated to cost a number of billion dollars annually.

The question is can a housing allowance do a better job in meeting the desired goals of providing a degree of social equality in terms of added income for housing for the poor and improved housing units, as well as a more desirable neighborhood - for more poor and at less cost per household helped? And we must unfortunately add, is there less likelihood this program will be defeated through adverse actions by landlords, market intermediaries and administrators than past programs; can their negative actions be minimized, controlled or prevented?

A housing allowance pays the family the difference between the cost of private housing and a percentage of their income, the "housing gap" formula, or by a second formula, the applicant pays a percentage of rent and the housing allowance covers the rest of the rent, if they move to or live in a standard unit or stay in standard units. The applicant, possibly armed with a certificate showing the landlord he is on the program, hunts for the unit and then negotiates the lease and other terms of the arrangement. He has consumer freedom of choice in hunting out a unit and the chance of moving, carrying the subsidy with him, for the subsidy goes to the person not the building. Existing units are utilized. The housing allowance amount fluctuates as family income changes but can be available up to a moderate income (this Urban Institute original design set the breakoff amount at around $6,700 for a family of four in 1969). Thus, a housing allowance falls in the general class of income support program, but one that falls into the category of an in-kind assistance as the recipient must use his grant, a housing allowance, specifically for one good housing, and that it must be standard housing.

An experimental housing allowance is now being funded by HUD in 12 medium size American jurisdictions and affects 20,000 or so households; two are "Demand" experiments designed to give indications of the use pattern, eight are "Administrative" experiments to indicate which types of agencies or bureaucracies best run the program, and two are "Supply" experiments to try to evaluate the effect on the market of running a housing allowance program. The Demand and the Administrative experiments are now several years old but the important Rand-run Supply experiment has just gotten underway.

The potential advantages in a housing allowance in diminishing social inequality. A major advantage of a housing allowance would be it could help more people at a lower cost. Today the subsidy programs cost billions and only helps four per cent of the poor. The Urban Institute, using 1969-70 data calculates the housing allowance would cost seven billion dollars for the 16.6 million households they consider eligible (10.9 million families and 5.7 million single individuals, mainly elderly) with families up to incomes of $6,755 receiving some allowance (decreasing as income rises) and 20 per cent of their income required as contribution to rent (if 25 per cent then families up to $5,420). The average payment was assumed to be around $462. Administrative costs for a mass check-giving program have been assumed to be lower than present housing programs. This all must be compared with the.
$30,000 or more cost of new public housing units and their operating expenses. If urban and rural differences in rents were included in the housing allowance formula or the roughly 30 per cent who were homeowners had a proportion of equity in their home deducted or were not included in the program, or if singles were excluded, the cost could be reduced.

The lower cost of the housing allowance versus other programs is assuming there are no subsidized building programs and most writers, including ourselves, feel the supply of housing must be increased if a housing allowance program is to succeed. However, if as we feel and Gans and others suggest, the supply increase in terms of a subsidy program for middle class housing, with reliance on the filter-down process to meet the housing needs of low income families, then funds for it could come from a change in the federal tax deductions for homeowners, bringing in four to seven billion dollars, as Gans has suggested. We would also have to correct the defects of the filter-down process.

Since welfare recipients would have the housing allowance as a substitute for the part of their welfare check they usually use rent (hopefully it would not be a complete deduction from these already low welfare payments) some of the funds - at least for 14 million persons - are simply substitutes that formerly were paid by a different branch of government. The difference would be that with the housing allowance one would be required to live in a standard unit or hopefully there would be more assistance on lease negotiation and general tenant landlord relations.

The housing allowance would, of course, also benefit many who are neither on welfare or do not require a full welfare grant but can get along with some minor assistance, just as in the case of Food Stamps program. Second, it would benefit those not interested in applying for the traditional stigmatized public housing or even Section 236. Application to the program would presumably be simple and be quickly processed, thus encouraging participation. One could stay on the program as one's income rose thus helping moderate income as well. The housing allowance would also benefit the poor in many parts of the country that are now not served by a public housing authority. The Urban Institute estimates almost 30 per cent of the households eligible to receive the allowance would be rural; 42 per cent would be outside SMSA areas; and another 21 per cent would be in suburban areas within SMSAs; 40 per cent of the households receive an allowance would be in the South; only 21 per cent of the eligible recipients would be non-whites. Thus it would be a program possibly covering the following groups more than programs: the rural poor, the working poor, and even the elderly poor, and regionally, the Southern poor, though both of the latter groups are highly represented in present programs. Thus the allowance would diminish inequality income-wise.

Another major attribute of the housing allowance is that to receive the housing allowance, users will not have to live in large, often-stigmatized public housing projects with a dominance of children in slum areas and often crime-ridden areas, or in Section 236 housing which is also sometimes stigmatized, again usually located in inner city areas. They will be using their allowance for private housing and thus be indistinguishable from other renters. They can even change units and take the housing allowance with them, thus
having the consumer freedom of private renters. Second, they can find housing outside slum areas so will benefit from an improved neighborhood and from class mix in the ways given above. In the early small OEO housing allowance conducted in Kansas City where all participants had been in substandard slum area in which they lived at the outset of the experiment to newer neighborhoods of higher socio-economic status, in terms of median family income, education level and head of household occupation; 58 per cent of the families moved completely out of 1970 Census-defined poverty areas. These families moved to areas with more owner-occupied units and lower density and crime rates, and often themselves moved into single family dwellings. These families usually moved to older residential areas on the fringe of the city rather than suburban areas. Minorities usually stayed within racially segregated or mixed areas. Early indications from the HUD experiments show that, at least for the elderly, those that did move after they applied for the housing allowance, usually to obtain a standard unit to qualify, changed neighborhoods in many cases, got larger units and were more satisfied with their housing.

Recipients of leased public housing assistance, which has many of the characteristics of a housing allowance, have also in many cities such as San Francisco and Oakland been found to be dispersed over a number of areas of the city; of course this has been more true of elderly recipients. Second, if the housing recipients are the temporary poor, such as students and young married, their dispersal among a higher income group may be especially likely, as it is in Holland, Sweden, and other countries where the young are among the recipients, because they can only find expensive new units, in a housing shortage situation, at the same time that their incomes are still quite low.

In the case where users do stay in slum areas the housing allowance might be an incentive for the landlord to repair and renovate, as well as maintain his building. The landlord, of course, must provide a standard unit, and he has more reason to. He has a guarantee of continual flow of rental funds, backed by a lease and government agency rent funding, and even by a security deposit. Under a large program the landlord will be surrounded by landlords having the same guarantees and same incentive to improve, and thus he would feel his investment is more worthwhile as the area is being upgraded. In fact, rehabilitation funds are likely to go to landlords taking housing allowance recipients. Optimistically, the total result could be less red-lining or under-investment in central city areas and improvement now of such areas and more provision of municipal services.

Against these advantages, several opponents of the house allowance have pessimistically pointed out why in the market-oriented American housing situation the program is likely to fail. Their most powerful arguments are that 1) there is not a large enough supply of low rent housing to provide standard units for those who might, under a housing allowance, seek standard units in non-slum area, thus only the "cream of the recipients" will get the available standard low rent units. 2) Furthermore, scarcity of such housing will mean the landlord can up the rents and thus the housing allowance will go to the landlord rather than the recipient. 3) "Standardness" criteria will be ignored in many cities and thus recipients will still be in slum units as welfare recipients now are and not have their housing status improved. 4) The
funds allocated by the Administration will not be enough to cover the many needy applicants or the allowance per recipient will be too small to allow the recipient to rent decent standard units (as true with U.S. welfare payments and with the housing allowance in Sweden, Holland and a few other countries). 5) Barriers of discrimination will still mean certain poor will continue to get the least desirable housing; this includes discrimination against welfare recipients, female household heads or minorities. 6) If the public housing authority had trouble locating qualified units at cheap rents, negotiating leases with landlords, tenants on their own will have more trouble. 7) the unscrupulous practices landlords, real estate personnel and developers have used in the past in their participation in HUD programs, whether 235, 236 or Section 23, may defeat this program too, mainly by upping rents and not doing required repairs to make units standard. In conclusion, these critics feel the poor will only continue to get slum dwellings at higher rents.

One can not simply deny these charges. On the other hand one should not throw out a potentially useful program for reaching a greater degree of social equality for more poor without seeing whether these obstacles can not be removed. Regarding the supply problem, there is no question that a subsidized building program or assistance on interest rates for housing, or help to saving and loan associations or some other measure to increase building is needed. We already have evidence that in cities where the vacancy rate is very low many potential housing allowance users ended up dropping out of the HUD experiment program because they could not find standard units, as was also true in the Wilmington Model Cities housing allowance experiment. With 16 million households possibly eligible, this means a large group hunting for standard units, both in urban and rural areas; where there is a vacancy rate of 1-2 per cent (and many vacant units being either not standard units or being luxury units) the poor, especially various minority categories, can not compete. Gans has suggested we help alleviate the problem by subsidizing middle class units, especially in the suburbs and also end federal income tax deductions to property owners; we agree but feel that housing should be in new towns, a more planned environment, and in inner city areas rather than the suburbs and the obstacles to the filter-down process corrected. Hartman suggests we keep building public housing but we disagree, feeling the cost and the negative feeling towards housing projects do not warrant it and, second, wonder if the poor rather than a slightly higher income group should get new housing if the program is not to suffer from alienating these other income groups. In other words, should we give a greater degree of social equality (a new house) to a few poor, followed by opposition of the higher income to a housing assistance program; a house allowance, utilizing existing housing, might cause less opposition, and give more help to more people in the end.

Besides increasing supply, another complimentary policy to the housing allowance program would be a rehabilitation program; with the "carrot" of a rehabilitation grant or loan the landlord may be encouraged to bring up to standard his units and rent them to housing allowance recipients. This and other ways, such as staff of sufficient size for inspection and code enforcement, must be used to assure the units are standard or the program is little better than a welfare check program. The program may also have to be accompanied by grants for financial assistance to improve the area. The housing allowance administrative agencies may also have to decide certain areas of the
city are unsuitable and not approve use of housing in these areas, as occurs with some Section 23 programs.

Another measure that must accompany any nation-wide housing allowance program is some sort of rent regulation. While rent control has failed, discouraging investment in rental units due to limited profit return, some sort of "fair rents" must be determined, changing as the costs rise and allowing a realistic profit to the investor but not exorbitant rent increases due to introduction of a housing allowance. New York City's MBR (maximum base rent) program, introduced for former rent controlled housing, might be a guide but inspection to see the landlord offers full services and does repairs would need to be better than New York City. In addition, agency personnel would be needed to monitor the degree landlords participating in the program discriminate. This personnel would also have to help negotiate leases and back-up tenant demands for repairs and even help locate units.

The program to succeed would also have to give large enough allowances to realistically relate to market rents at that time so that the recipient can locate a standard unit within the program specified rent scale. The program also should not require the recipient to use over 25, or even 20, per cent of his income for rent, since even 75 per cent of a low income, say $4,000, is hardly enough to cover non-shelter needs in this inflationary period. We feel strongly that the elderly single with his or her limited resources and high medical and drug costs should not be made to pay over 25 per cent of their small income for rents (many now pay 35 per cent).

In conclusion, we feel these complimentary programs and regulations, especially measures to increase the supply of housing are needed if the program is to succeed. With a fear that these requirements will not be fully met in large cities, one can predict the housing allowance will best help those in medium to small size cities, towns with a high vacancy rate, towns with considerable standard housing, suburban communities with an increasing number of moderate income housing units and no public housing, and rural areas where suitable reasonable units have been so seriously lacking that many have turned to mobile homes, and special groups such as the elderly, the temporary poor (students). For them in particular a housing allowance program can bring a greater degree of social equality than has occurred from past programs, especially as it can help a greater number of them.
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The functioning of condominium communities and projects has received increased attention from housing analysts in many professions. As of 1973, there were an estimated 15,000 condominium and townhouse communities in the United States, a figure expanding approximately by 4,000 annually.1

In this context, the proliferation of home owners associations in the communities or projects is of special interest due to their emerging role as a new form of residential government. This role manifests itself as both supplementary and in part complementary to the existing government framework. The collective provision and maintenance of selected services, including roads, utilities, lighting, refuse collection, recreational facilities and others, closely resemble and augment many services offered by cities and counties. The police power manifested as zoning and building controls in cities and counties translates itself into architectural and design control, and various property use, occupancy and related restrictions, in community associations. Much has been written on the methods of organizing these associations, but often discussion is couched in very practical terms without reference to underlying social and economic concepts which may influence effectiveness in meeting perceived problems. Generally, the goal here is to try and bridge this gap.

General Characteristics of Condominiums

Condominiums essentially involve fee simple ownership of a specified unit in a housing project and common ownership of certain ancillary spaces, facilities and services. The relationships are similar to a consumer cooperative (including cooperative housing) with the exception that the distinction between individual and common property is assumed to be more clearly defined in the condominium. In cooperative housing, for example, the residents own a share in the project with the right to occupy a designated unit, whereas in condominiums there is legal title to a specific unit which includes a proportionate share of the common area. While in cooperative housing all of the facilities are essentially under the control and management of a board of directors, in condominiums the control and management by the Home Owners Association (HOA) is primarily confined to common areas, but often affects private areas as well.

An important distinction between these two housing forms exists in their differing financial structuring. The condominium owner's liability is confined to the specific and individual financing arrangements for a designated unit and the proportionate share of the common area; to property taxes on the unit and share of the common area; and a share of the management and maintenance fees. The cooperative owners, however, are each, individually, liable (to the extent of their stock or share in the total property) for the collective functioning of the entire cooperative with comparatively little distinction made between private and common areas.

Physically a condominium project need not be different from other housing projects with primarily different forms of legal tenancy. The condominium
project could comprise a project of attached single family homes standing on
their own (but perhaps relatively small) lots clustered together and surrounded
by commonly owned open spaces, walkways and other facilities. Alternatively,
many condominium projects are in multi-storied structures akin to apartment
houses with individual ownership defined in three dimensions and common areas
including primarily hallways, lobbies, garage space, etc. The fact that in the
last few years many apartment projects have been converted to condominium
ownership (and vice versa) suggests that physical attributes are not a critical
factor in creating one or another form of tenancy. Such attributes may be
present, however, if a project originally is designed for specific types of
tenancy. Architects and developers, in designing a condominium project, prob-
ably would emphasize schemes which for legal, managerial and related reasons
enhance the distinction between individual and common areas. In a typical
rental project, this distinction is apparently of less consequence.

To place the condominium HOA in its proper context one can note that organ-
izations reflective of common concerns may spring up in other types of tenancy.
In multi-family rental housing we have seen in recent years the growth of tenant
groups. However, these are essentially voluntary in character and attempt to
constrain or influence the actions of what are perceived to be excessively
powerful public and private landlords. Their orientation is toward improving
the bargaining position of tenants via organized efforts.

Similarly in, let us say, areas with primarily owner-occupied single fam-
ily homes, neighborhood associations are found. Indeed, common area questions
will be of central interest to such groups including the development, manage-
ment and maintenance of streets, parks, playgrounds, schools, etc. which usually
are owned and operated by the public sector but not strictly for the benefit of
residents in a neighborhood. Moreover, unless services and facilities are pro-
vided by special assessment districts, a club or similar organization and can
be substantially internalized by residents, the benefits received from public
facilities and services in areas of cities are not necessarily connected to the
cost of producing them.

The point to be stressed is that the functions performed by HOAs in con-
donominiums are not unique but are analogous to other community and neighborhood
organizations. In principle, the HOAs are a form of governance--i.e., a local
mini-government--of commonly owned areas in private housing developments where
the benefits received by owners are reasonably closely tied to the costs of
production and non-payees can be substantially excluded. As a working defin-
tion this may suffice, but as will be seen, the problem is considerably more
complicated because of the blurring of individual and common areas and persist-
ent difficulties in obtaining close relationships between costs incurred and
benefits received. Moreover, the mini-government performs functions in addition
to the local public sector in which a condominium project is located.

Individual condominium owners through membership in the HOA can influence
the amount and quality of common area services in projects but only within the
constraints of established contractual and other relationships and in juxta-
position to the goals and objectives of other owners and residents in projects.
In terms of actions which influence the condominium owner-occupants' welfare,
he or she is required to negotiate with others occupying the project in decision
making surrounding common, and to some extent even private, area functions
and services. Potentially salient and perhaps transferable experiences are obtained not to mention possible efficiencies, but such experiences must be weighed against prospective uncertainties on the extent to which individual's interests are reflected in communal decision making and other possible negative outputs.

Condominium and townhouse owners are a heterogeneous group embracing all ages, according to one study. A 1973 sampling of 1,803 owners in primarily metropolitan Washington and Los Angeles showed 34% of the occupants to be of age 30 - 39, 29% of 20 - 29, 17% of age 40 - 49, 13% of age 50 - 59 and 8% over 60. The units were marketed from a low of under $20,000 to nearly $150,000 suggesting that the universe represents a broad spectrum of the existing housing demand and supply system.

In light of the increasing role forecast for condominiums and townhouses in the future housing production of the United States, the HOA's considerable control over the property rights of its members, the expanded spectrum of users of this housing mode and the associated services offered our purpose is to provide conceptual foundations to anticipated and actual behavior in the "typical" HOA.

Organization of Condominiums

The introductory remarks serve as a backdrop for examining briefly the process in constituting a condominium project. This process generally begins with a builder and/or investor taking a series of distinct legal and financial steps as part of the building development of acquisition which eventually culminates in the transfer of titles to the new owners, including the common areas. Although our emphasis is on the HOA, which comes into full fledged operation when all or some designated percentage of the units have been sold, we should indicate this transfer is not always smooth and may be aborted, or revised, thus providing basis for tension not to mention financial consequences. Major departures from the "normal" case might include the following: (1) Not enough of the units are sold and, given certain restrictions, the project may then be transferred to rental status; (2) Only a portion of the units is sold and title transferred to purchasers, and the original builder or owner continues to exercise considerable influence on continuous management and operation through the HOA including disposition of the unsold units; (3) All units are sold to individual owners, but with time they do not occupy them but rent them out to others. Problems under (1) are outside of our concern here, but we shall introduce some consequences that flow from (2) and (3). At this point we merely wish to note that owner-occupancy and condominium housing are not necessarily synonymous. For the moment, however, we shall assume a nexus between the two and focus on the HOA.

The HOA is a necessary part of the condominium. Its board of directors and officers are initially appointed by the original builder/investor but eventually, as title is passed to the new owners, the board will be elected by them. The board and its officers operate within the constraints of (1) Federal, state and local laws and regulations which have been enacted, (2) Covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&Rs) which are a matter of public record, and (3) By-laws and regulations surrounding occupancy and use as well as the duties
and functions of the board and the officers. In the long run all of these constraints may become variables, but holding constant for the moment federal, state and local laws, varying degrees and types of consensus are required to obtain major or minor changes. Major capital investments might call for 75 percent of the owners concurring, whereas a change in the by-laws pertaining to landscaping might require only a majority of the votes from members or the board. Certain decision making functions are within the purview of the board of directors and the officers. The board in many cases will also assume semi-judicial functions and arbitrate disputes between the owners as well as between owners and the association where property rights are unclear. Assume, for example, that a particular unit has experienced water damage (a fairly common occurrence) resulting from a failure in the plumbing system or negligence. This common maintenance problem may require determining the source of the problem (originating from a private or common area) as to who is to bear the costs and in what proportion. Such a determination may be made by the board, not to mention experts or by arbitration among those affected. However, the opportunity for legal action is always present.

Lack of clear distinction between common and private areas may lead to inequities and dissatisfaction. These, in turn, prompt the need for internal conflict resolution. The HOA's adaptability to internally arbitrate conflict resolutions and yet remain "cohesive" enough to function may in time determine condominium's ability to survive as a competing housing form.

Social and Economic Concepts in Condominium Housing

Two traditions are referred to here in the study of condominium home ownership and management. These traditions are not necessarily antithetical but they do start from different sets of assumptions. One of these might view condominiums as an extension of the housing cooperative which in turn represents a move away from the "technocratic caretaker model" to the "cooperative developmental model." In this view, the choices for housing residents might be between single family ownership housing, which is desirable but unattainable for prospective occupants for reasons of limited resources, and traditional rentership housing in apartments which is attainable but undesirable because the technocratic manager often "defines the problems and orders solutions according to the techniques he has mastered with minimal reference or no reference to those who are directly affected."4

Ideally, cooperative housing involving perhaps units of a type ordinarily offered in the rental market thus would produce a juncture between lower living costs, control over the management process and a departure from the "technocratic caretaker model." The condominium represents modification of cooperative housing with only common areas managed in concert by the occupants obtaining, hopefully, efficiency as well as social benefits. Some of the potential social benefits would be derived from the working methods which are more likely "personal, contractual and based on democratic organizational forms which stimulate trust and the development of personal and group resources."5 Moreover, an assumption is that certain goals would be met through cooperative housing including: decreased dependencies; increased economic, social and personal development and self-determination; dismantlement of paternalistic and oppressive structures; and so on. At least this is the contention. To be sure the assumptions concerning prospective social benefits might not hold in
every condominium housing environment, but certainly some of these benefits could be attainable if alternate housing delivery systems are irresponsible to consumers desires and tend to alienate them from society.

One may contrast the above optimistic expressions to the framework enunciated in economic analysis on collective action. This framework essentially assumes that consumers at the margin attempt to relate their own satisfaction to their costs incurred. In an acquisitive community where some goods are produced collectively, the consumption behavior of individuals or family units could produce distinct problems relative to an "optimal" level of group consumption. A crude illustration is provided by the situation where an individual expands his consumption of certain goods and services, the costs of producing them are shifted to the community. In this case and in the absence of coercive action, consumption is expanded to the point where the marginal satisfaction derived from consuming an additional unit of the good or service is zero. A more realistic situation is exemplified where with increased consumption individuals bear some fraction of the costs of production but are able to shift the remainder to others. In this case, consumption increases to the point where the marginal satisfaction to the individual is equal to his marginal fractional costs.

An interesting example of interdependencies is provided by an actual condominium case where partly substitutable services were available individually as well as collectively. In the project two sources of heating were potentially available—individually metered heating from electric furnaces and commonly metered gas heating from fireplaces. The rational course of action for individual occupants was to obtain as much heating as possible from the commonly metered facility, for otherwise they might find themselves paying a fraction of other residents' heating costs from this source without receiving any benefits. This condition applied even though the commonly metered facility was less efficient and tended to drive up the cost of heating per unit for the whole complex. In other words, the rational course of action clearly conflicted with optimality criteria for the total condominium community. Assuming the problem is perceived to be significant, several approaches may be pursued to cope with a situation of this sort: (1) Selected individuals who value a common facility or service very highly may be induced to pay for it and still consider themselves to be better off even though some benefits are internalized by non-payees; (2) An attempt may be made to influence attitudes and behavior patterns, and this may be more or less effective depending on group cohesion and the possibility that alternative (3) will be voted in; (3) A system might be instituted to control individual or group rate of utilization of the common facility including the imposition of user charges or penalties when possible; and (4) The community may agree to eliminate or to individualize the common facility or service.

Alternatives (1) and (2) may be viable in dealing with a small closely knit group of individuals and family units who mutually support each other and where communication links are strong. Whenever the welfare of a group is defined by the participants to include people beyond the household or nuclear family, approaches under (2) are possible and usually this applies to small groups. Pertaining to condominiums we should note they usually do not comprise the ordinary voluntary association of people who have joined together to develop and manage housing in common. Quite the contrary, developers generally produce
the units and sell them individually without necessarily having reference to
the prospective residents' affinity. Moreover, purchasers are probably moti-
vated strongly by the opportunity for gaining access to the individual units
and view common area management as an adjunct which, for the inexperienced at
least, is assumed to be largely spelled out by the terms of the contract, re-
quiring little personal effort on their part. Strong affinity among residents
may evolve in time, but it is by no means a condition for their being associ-
ated initially. Therefore, attempts to persuade owners to work for the common
good may be quite ineffective even in a small project where opportunities are
present for internalizing common area benefits and externalizing costs.

Alternative (1) clearly has relevance only to small groups because the
larger the group the higher would have to be the value attached to benefits
by payees in relation to the non-paying beneficiaries. Moreover, resolution
is complicated by the possibility that individuals or families do not reveal
preferences. Simply put, by not revealing preference for a particular facility,
an individual may induce others who reveal theirs to pay. Eventually, a reali-
zation that payees are producing significant benefits for non-payees would
lead directly to consideration of approaches (3) and (4).

Various control devices (Alternative 3) may be instituted regarding common
area facilities in condominium housing in order (a) to keep management and
maintenance costs generally within reasonable bounds, (b) to avoid major in-
equalities perceived to be associated with "free rider" problems involving dis-
proportionately high utilization rates by some but with costs equally spread
throughout the project and (c) because other alternatives are unworkable.

One of the persistent themes to which attention was drawn in our surveys
of condominium projects was the very rapid increase in common area fees and
charges from their initial level at the time of transfer to the HOA. In part
these increases are attributable to general price level changes and the
behavior of developers to underestimate such costs during the period of sale.
However, the issue is more complex. Aside from another possibility, namely
poor financial planning and budgeting by presumably lay management, the under-
lying collective relationships may also contribute to the pattern. Take the
case of a project where, say, 40 percent of the residents have a strong prefer-
ence for exterior common area maintenance, 40 percent for interior common area
maintenance and 20 percent for both. In this case the possibility arises of
high levels of maintenance in both exterior and interior areas being voted in
although the majority would prefer lower expenditures in the aggregate. Alter-
natively, beginning with, say, a fixed budget, its division between exterior
and interior maintenance may well be suboptimal from the standpoint of the
majority. Other conditions could be specified pertaining to different prefer-
ence functions for a mix of common area facilities and services, various voting
blocks and the income of residents in relation to the costs of providing serv-
ices. An increase in common area fees and charges is by no means inevitable.
However, unless residents are very similar in their socio-economic character-
istics and value orientation, individuals may have to compensate others to
obtain a desired state and bargain with them or seek power by gaining represen-
tation on, say, the board of directors in moving them toward their goals.
Moreover, and this probably applies more to small than large projects,
residents' notions pertaining to resource conserving actions may be offset by
inclinations to be agreeable as others express their desires for more
resource inputs. Thus, the price for realizing internal cohesion among residents might be an expansion of maintenance and management costs.

Even more dramatic are instances where a majority of residents or an otherwise powerful group with a fixed set of preferences induces the provision of a mix of services, facilities and maintenance which clearly is to their advantage. Others may be forced to consume services they do not want. Even if they do not consume them, they may still be required to pay. These conditions will not remain stable, for among the alternatives available to the losers is the sale of units, but at the expense of significant transfer costs, or to rent to others. Initially, the conditions result from poor information flows among new purchasers and lack of experience with condominiums and common area questions. Eventually, as more information is obtained and disseminated, formally or informally, and experiences accumulate on condominium housing, one might anticipate that potential purchasers would not only shop for units that in terms of lay-out, design, price and in other respects accord with household preferences, but which currently or prospectively include a mix of residents whose tastes for common area maintenance and management are very similar to the families searching. It might suggest that in time condominium communities and projects will become quite homogeneous in their character. However, given continued uncertainty surrounding the anticipated behavior of neighbors in projects, other alternatives are indicated. These alternatives include (1) greater demand for units in projects where common area facilities and services, including potential conflicts surrounding them, are kept to a minimum; (2) increased demand for units where the conditions and responsibilities surrounding common area facilities and services are spelled out in much greater detail than is currently the case in many new projects; or (3) not to purchase condominiums at all.

In view of the difficulty of forecasting resolutions of many common area questions well in advance (especially as the prospective mix of residents initially is uncertain and substantially under the control of developers), plus aforementioned problems surrounding "correct" pricing may occasion a search for other mechanisms in management. Suffice it to say that one finds in condominium housing a wide variety of rules and regulations in effect beyond those spelled out in the CC&Rs and the original by-laws. These rules or regulations pertain to utilization rates, they are of the "thou shalt" and "thou shalt not" type, and essentially express an exercise of the police power, including the institution of penalties. Since condominiums are in the nature of emergent communities the process in cases we have observed is quite incomplete. Moreover, variations in the physical environment, the mix of occupants and their values, and the types of common area facilities and services provided assure considerable diversity in these rules and regulations. An extensive review of these rules and regulations is beyond the scope here. However, we can indicate some major points of contention which have emerged.

In multi-story condominium projects, particularly where residents occupy different stories, conflict has arisen on the definition of what are common areas and determination of the source of problems, including payment of damages. Technical questions arise in the process. Is a failure in the plumbing system and associated damage to several units attributable to the individual or common areas? Assuming the failure is in the individual areas, where did it originate, and if several units are damaged, who is to pay? One of the specters
in addressing such questions is that legal action may be instituted by one or more parties concerned placing severe financial strains on individuals and the association. Therefore, many regulations reflect attempts to define property rights more precisely than was the case at the time projects were organized and they are designed to reduce the possibility of disputes including costly litigation.

In projects which include a mix of young and old, a difference of viewpoint on common area management often revolves around their varying goals. The young may be interested in the expansion or maintenance of amenities serving them and a general emphasis on expenditures that yield long-run benefits. The older generation obviously has a shorter-time horizon and is inclined to favor current expenditures which produce more immediate benefits. Intergenerational equity thus is often an issue particularly when older residents are faced with steady or declining income, in the face of general inflation, and the young comprise an upwardly mobile group.

These examples are merely indicative of the sorts of issues which have arisen and which have occasioned clarification in the forms of rules and regulations to resolve them. Many of these are framed on an ad hoc basis and deal with problems as they present themselves. So long as these rules attempt to define more precisely human and property rights and methods of conflict resolution they will contribute to smoother relationships among participants in the future. However, where these rules try to influence behavior but the penalties for non-compliance are small and the costs of enforcement are high their weaknesses will become apparent just as in the case of many codes of, say, chartered cities. Moreover, as the rules and regulations expand those who desire to dispose of their units in time may be faced with resistance in finding prospective purchasers who are interested not only in purchasing the units based on their intrinsic merits, but also express concern about various constraints reflected in ad hoc rules and regulations.

The Element of Project Size

From what has been said, we might expect a much closer approximation to an optimal level of common area services for all concerned in small versus large projects. The costs of decision making in small projects are lower and voluntary cooperation may be sought in arriving at common area solutions. However, these advantages must be contrasted to potential inefficiencies in the production of services in small projects. An assumed and much heralded benefit of condominiums was to be opportunity for access to common area amenities whose provision would be financially infeasible for individual consumers or even small projects.

One reason why small projects are more effective in resolving conflicts among participants thus has to do not only with size but also the relatively narrow range of services offered. At the same time, managerial inefficiencies in small projects often accumulate. Small projects usually rely on lay managers in addressing common area problems, whereas in large projects professionals may be called upon and their costs can be spread over many units. A further factor
is that since the resident selection process is unlikely to have any significant relationship to the professional skills purchasers possess, small projects often find themselves short of the talents required for management. We have observed small projects where the purchase of a unit by a lawyer, accountant or construction specialist is greeted with a sigh of relief.

Of course, more is at stake than merely project size for the price and quality of units would certainly influence the probability of attracting people with a particular set of desired management skills. Recognizing, however, that many of the desired skills are not necessarily formally acquired and can be developed large projects initially appear to have better potential in finding people able to manage. But ability to manage must be distinguished from willingness to participate in the process. Since members of the board of directors and officers in condominiums usually are not paid the incentives for participation in management alone are small unless the personal benefits from good management can be substantially internalized by those involved. In large projects, therefore, owners would be less willing to participate in management because the benefits of significant time and personal efforts are spread over many units. Given this condition the owners of units, even if they have appropriate skills, may incline toward being "free riders." However, since someone must manage the outcomes of these attitudes and behavior are quite predictable. Good management may be lacking or is purchased at a not insignificant cost from professionals. Another alternative is "side payments" to good lay managers perhaps in the form of political power within or outside the project area. However, we do not exclude the possibility of other forms of "side payments" some of which might come under the category of abuses.

In a number of projects we have seen attempts made to overcome the above problems by requirements that practically everyone in some sense participate in the management process. Complex committee structures are set up under the chairmanship of officers and others. But the sanctions for non-performance of committees are weak or non-existent. Therefore, committees do not eliminate the free rider problem but may only alleviate it.

Another potential source of condominium management problems which may be aggravated with time pertains to the renting of units in projects. This includes renting by developers of unsold units and by individual owners who for one reason or another do not occupy the units. Fundamentally, this is not a new phenomenon to the housing market exemplified by the fact that in the metropolitan areas of the United States close to one-fifth of the occupied housing inventory in one-unit structures (primarily single-family homes) is rented. Generally, the older the inventory of single-family homes in neighborhoods the larger is the share of units that are rented. One aspect of the problem concerns absentee landlords which in some cases might involve large numbers of people. Absentee owners often give their proxy votes to resident owners or officers. Thus, decision making may well be in the hands of a small group but renters, although they may be consulted, usually do not have voting power. Moreover, renters must deal with both the association and their landlords in obtaining resolutions to problems they perceive. Costs of decision making are raised in the process especially when boundary questions are involved. Equally important is the possibility that where only a few resident owners remain it may become quite difficult to find qualified people to serve on the board of directors. In some small projects this issue may present
itself rather early. Certainly, a scenario of many absentee condominium landlords negotiating among each other on management questions and simultaneously negotiating with tenants on common and individual area issues has within it the ingredients of severe tensions and conflicts.

Final Remarks

Condominium housing is still relatively new to the United States, but has represented increasing proportions particularly in the new housing market. Originally, condominium ownership was touted as a compromise between share cooperative housing and single-family home ownership and a viable alternative to renting. The distinction between individual and common areas in condominiums was introduced to reduce liability problems present in share cooperatives and to provide greater control and flexibility to purchasers. At the same time higher densities with homeownership were assumed to be realizable in condominiums as disproportionately rising building and land costs put single-family home ownership beyond the reach of large segments of the American public. Theoretically, many families who otherwise would rent now could have access to ownership housing. The issues of common area ownership, management, maintenance and services in condominiums were essentially seen as being within the realm of legal experts and social and economic theories of human behaviors did not seem to have any significant contributions to make toward projecting or understanding experiences. This assumption is in the process of revision.

Ideally, one might approach ownership and management of common areas in condominium housing as an opportunity for self-government at a relatively small scale offering, also the possibility for developing salient relationships among the participants and potential social benefits quite aside from assumed efficiencies in construction and management. In this model emerging problems might be considered as temporary distortions attributable to lack of experience with condominium housing and associated poor information flows.

Currently, a number of problems revolve around often unclear definitions of individual and property rights in condominiums; the costs of decision making in projects of various size; the "free rider" issue where selected groups attempt to internalize significant benefits from common area facilities without bearing an appropriate share of the costs; potential inefficiencies in consumption resulting from the collective provision of selected facilities and services; difficulties in arriving at consensus on common area questions which come to the fore as owners with different values and preferences (and no preknowledge of what these might be) are required to negotiate with each other; the meaning of sanctions for non-compliance with by-laws and regulations when these sanctions are often weak and unenforceable; and finally how to find and develop skilled people willing and able to manage within the project.

Despite the long tradition of condominium housing in other nations it may be considered as a social innovation introduced recently to the United States. As for most innovations there is a period of gestation and turmoil during the initial period followed perhaps by stability and equilibrium. Thus, some of the problems we have indicated will in part be resolved as market participants adapt the concept or in turn adapt to inherent problems. Other problems may be tackled via a process of social control and institutionalization. The complexities of relationships in condominiums suggest this housing form will be a likely target
for more public sector interference. Hearings before the U.S. Congress and concerns of public agencies might be indicative of prospective legislation. If this comes about and involves more than just clarification of rights and responsibilities the action space of participants will be further limited. Expanded social controls usually have a cost attached to them, however. Not the least of these costs is bureaucratization of condominium management and reduced interaction among participants outside of a formal and mechanistic framework. High decision costs implicit in collective goods questions and other costs may be further raised. An issue then arises about what the impact of increasing costs will be on prospective condominium developments and whether this form of housing will continue to be attractive or feasible for large numbers of people.

NOTES
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7. An underlying assumption, of course, is that the satisfaction from increased consumption of one good or service increases at a decreasing rate and that the costs shifted to the community are the individual's incremental cost, an amount above the level of the average individual costs.
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There is greater public confusion over housing policy today than there has been in any comparable period in the last thirty years. The Nixon-Ford administration's wholesale program terminations and budget slashes only cloak the problem temporarily. Everyone agrees that the ostrich ought to get his head out of the sand, but few agree where he should go once he does so. Housing allowances, at this point, seem to many the best answer; at least they haven't been proven wanting yet. But others disagree, and certainly there is reason to be wary.

The problem today is but the extension of a realization that began to appear already shortly after the Second World War, and that was already explicitly formulated in the fifties. Before the war, building public housing was seen as the obvious answer to the most serious part of the nation's housing problem. But by 1957 Catherine Bauer was speaking of public housing's "dreary deadlock."\(^4\) Commentary magazine published Herbert Gans' criticism of urban renewal in 1969,\(^5\) and Chester Hartman's exposes of relocation practices and problems began the year before.\(^6\) A public housing project in Newark was at the center of the nation's first major ghetto rebellion in 1965. Pruitt-Igoe, the high-rise public housing project in St. Louis, which won an architectural award when it was built, was already in trouble five years later, trouble which has finally culminated in the physical demolition of many of the units by the Housing Authority this year.

The theory on which present policy is founded, with which we may call the "shelter theory of housing"—if theory is the right term to describe a miscellaneous assortment of operating assumptions—goes something like this:\(^7\) Every American deserves "a decent home in a suitable neighborhood." A decent house is defined, substantially, as one that is not substandard, i.e., one that is not dilapidated and has piped hot and cold water inside the structure and an inside flush toilet and bath (or shower) for the exclusive use of the occupants of the unit.\(^8\) Providing such a home is the goal of national housing policy. The shortfall from that goal is readily measurable: Take the number of families now in substandard units, add the number in standard units who are overcrowded, add enough to get a suitable vacancy rate, and there you have the need. To get the amount of subsidy that should be provided,
subtract the number of people at income level X from the number of
dwelling units available at rentals suitable to X, repeat for each income
level, and there's that figure.

Criticism of this shelter theory of housing has not increased as
fast as criticism of its results, and no new comprehensive theory of
housing has been formulated to replace it. True, Wallace Smith, in the
opening chapters of his recent *Housing,* has begun to point out some of
the key ingredients of such a theory, although he focuses his attention
on only one, the economic. Herbert Gans, William Grigsby, Chester
Hartman, Jack Seeley, some leading scholars and practitioners at the
University of California at Berkeley, at Harvard-MIT, and at the Urban
Institute in Washington are among those who have been beginning to
grapple with some of these problems on a theoretical level. A number
of perceptive public officials have dealt imaginatively with some of them,
with varying success, in the real world.

The increasing attention being focused by government on problems
of racial discrimination in the suburbs, on problems of housing manage-
ment, tenant participation in public housing, relationships to schools
and other social services, rent-paying ability as well as expanding
homeownership opportunities, are all likewise evidences of a shift in the
theory underlying housing policy. And sociologists in general have long
recognized that social-psychological categories such as social status,
self-image, feelings of belonging, anomie, public-relatedness, security,
social cohesion, and others, have significant relevance to problems of
housing, although there has been little good work attempting to draw out
policy conclusions from these findings.

But no unified theory of the role of housing in this context has
yet emerged. Nor will it emerge from this paper. It is my purpose only
here to single out five key components that would require inclusion in
such a new, holistic theory. I shall try to highlight their importance and
put them in perspective by using the concept of *alienation* as a framework
for the discussion.

II

Alienation is a concept of many meanings, among them the quite
different ones given it by sociology, by law, and by philosophy. In this
paper it is used for suggestive purposes only; the discussion is not in-
tended to contribute to the understanding or elaboration of the concept
of alienation, but to contribute perhaps a new insight or two to the con-
cept of housing.

It is indeed curious that the idea of alienation is so scarce in the
housing literature. Intuitively, it belongs there, almost uniquely.
Standard discussions speak of alienation as not "feeling at home;" the concept of "at home" appears the exact opposite of alienation. Would there be a housing problem if everyone really felt "at home" in the housing they occupied? If the shelter aspects of housing no longer seem an insurmountable problem and public policy yet has admittedly failed in coming to grips with "the housing problem," the concept of alienation seems prima facie a fruitful avenue to explore.

A few words on definition are first necessary so that the following discussion can be properly understood. "Alienation" is a term of many meanings. Eric and Mary Johnson 10 draw a useful distinction between an alienating condition outside of the individual and the resulting state of alienation in the individual. "Self-alienation," at least as it will be used here, describes the state of being alienated, perhaps the prevailing use of the term.

In the phrases "residential alienation," or "social alienation," as used here, the term alienation describes conditions of alienation. It has the narrow sense of describing a relationship between an individual and something else—as in the Oxford Dictionary's definition of the verb: "to convert into an alien or stranger...[1,21]." An object outside but related 11 to the individual must be stated for the condition of alienation to have meaning. This paper is essentially concerned with following the analogies suggested between the condition of alienation of an individual from the product of his labor, on the one hand, and his alienation from his home, on the other hand. The latter is here called residential alienation. In the same way, "social alienation" refers here to the separation between the individual and society, the individual and the community, to conditions of alienation which give rise to the state of self-alienation between a person and his/her social self. Some of these concepts are discussed further below, but to summarize the usage in this paper:

"Residential alienation" here means the condition of estrangement between a person and his/her dwelling;

"Social alienation" means the condition of estrangement between a person and his/her community;

"Self-alienation" refers broadly to the state of alienation in the individual.

Self-alienation, in the Hegelian sense, 12 means a rupture with that unselfconscious state in which it was "quite common for people to conceive of themselves primarily in terms of the roles they occupy and the groups in which they live. Their identification with these roles and groups is not conscious and deliberate; rather it is immediate and un-
reflective. Their relation to the social substance is one of complete and immediate unity." The antithesis to this unity comes about when the individual is "driven back into himself out of his actuality." Hegel considered this to be "a desirable development, in that it marks the emergence of a dimension of distinct individuality and independent existence, which is necessary if man's essential nature is to be realized completely...the individual now views the substance as something 'external and opposed' to him. It has become alien in his eyes; or as Hegel now says, it is 'alienated'." The task then becomes to overcome this alienation, to achieve a synthesis of the original unselfconscious, unreflective unity with the new alienated but independent individual state in some higher form.

The potential analogy with housing emerges clearly when we consider the parallel development of the condition of alienation between the individual and external things. Here, the thing, having been separated from the individual, seen as alien and apart from him, must now be re-absorbed, reintegrated, its unity with him re-established.

Hegel then uses the word "property" to comprehend the "embodiment of freedom" in objective reality. He speaks of taking possession of things, as we might speak of "making a home," in three different ways: "we take possession of a thing (a) by directly grasping it physically, (b) by forming it, and (c) by merely marking it as ours."

Schacht summarizes:

"The first of these three ways, he says, is 'only subjective, temporary, and seriously restricted in scope.' And the third is a 'very indeterminate' mode of taking possession, which in reality 'is not actual but is only representative.' It is thus the second--that of 'forming' the thing--which is of the greatest significance. 'When I impose a form on something, the thing's determinant character as mine acquires an independent externality...' The thing's relation to me is neither fleeting nor superficial, for it is essentially transformed through my productive or 'forming' activity in such a way that it bears my imprint. I have 'put my will into it;' I have made it reflect my will and my personality... through the 'forming' activity of production, therefore, I both secure for myself an objective domain of property in which my freedom can be exercised, and give objective expression to my personality." Others speak of unalienated labor in much the same sense. Marx, for instance, wrote that production is "the direct activity of individuality." Through the production of objects the individual "repro-
duces himself...actively and in a real sense, and he sees his own reflection in a world which he has constructed,...this accomplishes his 'self-realization'." The things he produces are "objectifications of himself," which "confirm and realize his individuality." 17

In the same tradition, the product of labor is spoken of as being alienated when "it exists independently, outside its producer, i.e., outside of his control, and alien to him." Two outside powers render it alien and outside of his control: the first is the power of the person for whom it is produced; this comes about for the product of labor when, not its actual producer, but "another alien, hostile, powerful and independent man is lord of this object." 18 Typically that man will be the employer; in the housing analogy, the landlord is in the comparable position. 19 The second outside power which renders the product of his labor alien and beyond the control of its immediate producer is an "inhuman power," "the set of laws governing capital and the market." 20

This set of concepts is extraordinarily suggestive if applied to the evolution of housing. Primitive shelter arrangements indeed represent what may be called an unself-conscious unity between the shelter and its occupant. Increasing attention is being focused today on what we call "architecture without architects," a phrase which itself suggests the kind of immediate and unreflective unity to which Hegel refers. Some distinction can no doubt be made among the intricate construction of a hummingbird's hanging nest or of a beehive, the hollowed-out cave, and the cliff dwelling of the pueblos, the African village construction forms, or the Middle Eastern towns of the second millennium B.C., but, whatever their deficiencies as shelter or their virtues as art, alienated in this sense from their occupants they were not.

The change from this unself-conscious "architecture" to a separation of the shelter from the occupant was a late historical development. The self-conscious construction of buildings by specialized individuals, for occupancy or use by others than themselves, might be seen in several ways. Historically, neither the Greek temples nor the Gothic cathedrals seem alienated from their users or their society. Whether such structures represent an over-coming of the original alienation through art, or represent a continuation of the earlier pre-alienated status on a collective level, is an interesting question, but not necessary for our ultimate point. Neither need we resolve here the equally interesting and even less explored question of the relationship between the Greek slave or medieval serf and his shelter—a plausible formulation might speak of alienation as a relevant concept here also, but of shelter as, over-all, playing a less important role, and having less expected of it, than in today's society. What is important here, for our purposes, is that the philosophic concept of the original alienation is suggestive in our setting, seen as the making conscious to the
occupant of his condition of housing and its separation from a "natural" unity with its occupant.

The resolution of this alienation in the housing field is likewise suggested by the language which discusses its resolution in the production of other things: Recall the formulation about "forming the thing;" its "reflecting my will and my personality," the production of objects as a man "reproducing himself," "seeing his own reflection in a world which he has constructed." Is not the ideal home one in which its occupant will "confirm and realize his individuality?" Is it not precisely this characteristic which places us in common in a Roman villa or an English castle, a log cabin or a Dutch Burger's house in Vermeer's day, a house by Frank Lloyd Wright or an office building by Mies van der Rohe, an African bushman's hut or Monticello? And is it not, in a very significant sense, precisely because Pruitt-Igoe permitted no such self-expression, precisely because it reflected in its structure and purpose and mode of occupancy an alien setting, so alien to its occupants, that it finally had to come down?

But the fact that Pruitt-Igoe is an alien environment is not precisely a new discovery; if this is all that the excursion into philosophic analogies can show us, it has not gotten us far. Fortunately, the suggestive features of the analogy go further. A closer look at residential alienation is richly suggestive of the details of the problem.

III

The discussion of alienation in philosophy suggests that residential alienation may have three components:

First, the inability of a person to form, to shape, his/her own dwelling, to express his/her individuality in it;

Second, the subjection of the individual's dwelling to the control of alien outside powers; and

Third, the inability to mark or symbolically manifest the individual's ownership in his/her dwelling.

The translation of these forms of alienation into more conventional housing questions is obvious: Is the home one which the occupant has helped to plan, to design, to build, to decorate? Does the home reflect the personality of its occupant -- does it represent the individual's self-image to him/herself, or to others? Does he/she control the own home, who may enter it, how it may be used, how long he/she will stay in it, and what he/she will do with it on leaving it? Is the house "his" or
"ners," does the occupant "own" it, as well as merely have temporary possession of it?

It would be hard to list a series of questions more important for housing policy, or more unfortunately neglected by it, than these. This section will examine them in terms of the first component of alienation. Section IV will then look at the second and third components of alienation, and Section V then review homeownership, as one possible answer to the problems here presented, and see whether it does not raise an even deeper question: the relationship between housing policy and social alienation.

The typical urban apartment today certainly is in no sense "formed, molded, or shaped" by its occupant. It resists whatever efforts he might make along these lines. The simple physical characteristics of housing in a modern urban industrial setting virtually precludes it. Economics further encourage standardization and mass production at the expense of individualization. Even with single-family houses, very few occupants get involved in the construction of their own dwellings. With prefebricated assemble-it-yourself houses, experience has shown that most families prefer the manufacturer's work for them. None but the very well-to-do retain an architect to design their own house to their own specifications.

The ability to select a house to one's own taste does not overcome the alienating effect of the inability to design or construct it. The shortage of housing limits the range of choice, particularly for the poor. Normal market forces encourage uniformity in new housing construction. Many more pressing needs than self-expression dictate most families' choice of a house or apartment.

Yet the struggle to overcome this alienation of his/her dwelling at the time of its construction or purchase is evident everywhere. The do-it-yourself boom has made housing maintenance and improvement and repair a major business in the United States, averaging over a billion dollars a year in volume. Single-family owner-occupants typically pick the colors of their own house, inside and out; fix patios, lawns, gardens; panel basements, create dens, build dormer windows and convert attic space; install shelves and closets and bins and chutes; fix windows and doors, sand floors, lay linoleum or rugs; add porches, carports, garages and driveways; and so forth and so on.

But how successful these efforts to convert alien housing into homes are is a matter of some doubt. The limits on its success are several. The first and most important is one of class. Do-it-yourself home improvements take money, leisure, skills, and a certain type of motivation, all items as to which the poor are in short supply. Second-ly, no accurate breakdown is available as to the proportion of this type
of effort that is required for routine repairs and maintenance, and the proportion that goes into efforts that the doer really finds creative and rewarding. Many a homeowner would undoubtedly rather be able to pay someone else than have to paint his/her own house on vacation, or mow the lawn on Saturday afternoon, or fix the leaky sink after supper.

Thirdly, there are rigid externally-imposed limits on the scope of creativity and individuality in such efforts. The front lawns and house plantings of a typical new development of suburban homes indicates the effect of non-legal and informal pressures, even where the deed does not contain restrictions, as one southern California developer's does, limiting the front yard planting to two identical-sized palm Californicus! Social pressures and market characteristics create strong incentives to standardization even in those areas where physically the expression of personality might be possible; care of the front lawn, choice of house color, style, size, construction materials, are all items where flexibility is limited by what the neighbors will accept, what the friends will consider appropriate, what social status will allow, and, ultimately, what the market will recompense. Fourthly, if all this is true for a middle and upper-income single-family homeowner, it is all the more true for lower-income families or the owner-occupant of an apartment. Physical limitations of multi-family structures are even greater than for the detached, single-family house, and the landlord embodies in one person all of the limitations that economics, social pressures, and building codes and other legal restrictions together create for the single-family owner-occupant.

Yet even granting all these limits on the creativity and individuality a person can express in his dwelling, what opportunities to overcome alienation through work in the house there are seem to be avidly grasped. We all know personally many people who do in fact spend hours happily working around their house or in their garden, putting real ego into their efforts, looking forward to getting home from work to get back to their projects, spending weekends and vacations on them. Are not such do-it-yourself home improvement projects the very essence of creative, voluntary, unalienated work, and do they not in fact make a home very much the personal, unique, ego-involving kind of place that overcomes residential alienation? And when we see a homeowner cheerfully mowing the lawn, trimming the hedge, painting the house, or fixing the roof, aren't we intuitively certain that here, at least, is no problem of alienation?

Yet is it really so? The issue is one that involves the definition of creativity. Filling in the colors on a pre-numbered, pre-drawn canvas is "creative" in a way, but it is not the same thing as painting an original picture. Is do-it-yourself activity around the house more like the former or the latter?
Certainly the alienating social and technological limits on creative expression through shaping the dwelling are real, and cannot, with the best will in the world, be so easily overcome by individual action. Going back to the analogy with alienation from the product of labor, it is clear that the development of the productive processes requires great technological capacity for production today, and greater collective control over the relations of production. Alienation from the product of labor can no longer be the simple shoemaker buying leather, converting it into a shoe on his own last and then selling it himself. Yet the do-it-yourself projects of the home handyperson are akin to such an attempt to get back to earlier and much simpler forms of production, and to ignore the complexity of the relations embodied in modern production through simple individual personal activity. It is as if the answer to the alienation of the worker in the shoe factory were to go back to being a cobbler.

More broadly, the question may be raised whether all of the hobby type of activities currently widely engaged in under the name of creativity, running from home improvement to macrame to gourmet cooking to pottery to handweaving to organic gardening, are not similarly efforts to recapture a lost unity at a level no longer historically possible. Creativity in any of the areas of life that matter must today be inherently social in nature, not individualistic and isolated. This is not to say that they will not be uniquely personal and expressive of the distinct personality of each individual, but only to say they must take place in a social fabric and through social means, as part of a social process, not in opposition or isolation from it. C. Wright Mills speaks of the "trivialization" of craftsmanship into hobbies; one might similarly speak of the trivialization of creativity in the shaping of one's own home into puttering around the house.

What is needed, then, is a public policy that maximizes, both on the individual and the social level, the ability of the individual to express himself in his housing. A diversity of real choice, a lessening of uniformity; an involvement in pre-construction planning, an encouragement of the unique and unconventional, on the individual level; and on the social level, the opportunity for real and effective participation in the collective decisions that shape the residential environment--these are the goals that a public policy aimed at reducing residential alienation by restoring the ability to shape the residential environment and creatively mold it to each individual's desires must seek.

IV

The alienating effect of control of one's home by an outsider is hard to deny. The slumlord, the petty landlady, the arbitrary housing authority, the inaccessible estate, personify the problem for the tenant.
The villainous mortgagee twirling his mustache as the auctioneer's hammer comes down at the farm door in a way typifies the same problem for the owner-occupant, or at least did 35 years ago. Today the mortgagor is much more likely to be an institution, the fear of foreclosure less prevalent. Yet the risk of defaults and foreclosure is still real, as thousands of purchasers under the Section 235 program can attest, and legal restrictions created by deed in favor of mortgagees, developers or development associations, neighbors, or utility companies are still prevalent.

Underlying most of these restrictions and motivating their structure and their enforcement, if not always visibly or directly, lies the market, the economic laws that dictate the price of housing, and that will largely determine the actual conduct of landlords, mortgagees and occupants, as well as neighbors.

The impact of the market is filtered down to the tenant through the landlord, by restrictions in the lease or changes in the rent. The tenant sees market restrictions through the conduct of a human party with whom he/she must contend in facing these efforts. For the owner-occupant, the situation is different. At least to the extent that a house is purchased as an investment--and study after study has shown this to be a major motivating factor in the purchase decision--to the extent that a house is seen as a commodity which has been bought and will be sold again, precisely to that extent will what is done with it be determined by the market and the owner's perception of the market. If adding a two-car garage or a swimming pool will enhance the value of the property, that is an incentive for making these changes. If planting pole beans in the front yard depreciates the value of the property, the owner will be little likely to do it, and if he/she does, he/she will hear from the neighbors. Whatever theoretical legal rights he/she may have to shape his/her own dwelling will in fact be sharply restricted for the homeowner by the iron and "inhuman" laws of the market. No human landlord is around with whom he/she can argue about whether the door can be painted red or beans planted; the market is a force with which he/she cannot argue and of whose impact he/she cannot be certain. Just as the product is alienated from its producer when it comes under the sway of an "alien hostile power," housing is alienated from a homeowner because a homeowner, too, in fact finds it separated from him/her through domination by the market. Marx's illustration of the dealer in minerals who sees in minerals "only their commercial value, not their beauty or their particular characteristics" is no doubt an appropriate analogy for the view taken of their suburban homes by many wearers of grey flannel suits, and to some extent creeps into the attitudes of most money-conscious homeowners.

Not only the market, but a myriad of social restrictions, many
of them inevitable in a complex urban society, control what an occupant may do in and with a dwelling. Building codes, zoning codes, fire regulations, breach of the peace and nuisance statutes, health codes, respect for the privacy or the sensibilities of neighbors, the condition of the streets, the quality of police protection, the availability of recreational, educational, transportation, and other facilities—all these will have major impact on the extent to which an individual can do what he/she wants in and with "his" or "her" home.

The residential alienation created by landlord ownership is an aspect of alienated housing with which public policy has very recently begun to deal in the lower-income field. The provisions in the Housing Act of 1968 providing subsidies for homeownership attempt to eliminate the landlord-tenant relationship entirely for many families. So did the prior pioneering attempts in public housing, through the Turnkey III program. Urban homesteading and tenant cooperative programs go in this direction. Where the landlord cannot be eliminated entirely, reforms have been instituted in some public housing programs eliminating the arbitrary exercise of controls by the landlord. Continuing attacks through the courts and in state legislatures have modified some of the most one-sided and resented of landlords' legal powers, and to impose legally on them some of the obligations most tenants feel are theirs morally.

Yet the broader and equally alienating limitations on control imposed by the more impersonal and social forces have hardly been touched by any deliberate public policy. Again, social action is called for—what only last year was quite respectably called community control, which has apparently fallen much into disfavor in this year's fashion. Whatever its problems, its ultimate relationship to residential alienation must be recognized and dealt with in any successful housing policy.

V

But the symbolic importance of homeownership deserves a closer look. Perhaps it does achieve a "marking" of the home as "belonging to" an owner in some direct, human, unalienated sense that has value in and of itself? It does not take much research or argument to convince us that living in someone else's house is not as comfortable, as secure, as satisfactory as owning one's own home. Living in someone else's house is living in alienated housing, in the strict legal meaning of the word as well as in the philosophic sense.

Public policy has dealt with this form of residential alienation more directly—if not under that name!—than with any of the others we have mentioned. From the days of the founding fathers on, the protection and extension of homeownership has been espoused by the country's leaders. The greatest housing subsidies, those created by the pro-
visions of the Internal Revenue Code, are reserved for homeowners. The Housing Act of 1968 for the first time attempted deliberately to extend the benefits of homeownership to those previously thought too poor to obtain them. But the question rarely has been asked as to precisely what benefits are to accrue from this basic policy. Does homeownership indeed overcome residential alienation by permitting the owner to "mark" the house as his/hers?

The effects of homeownership on alienation may be considered under two headings: real effects, and what may be called "magical" or symbolic effects.

The package of real relationships between a person and his dwelling may for convenience be divided into three bundles: the physical, i.e., those arising out of actual physical possession and occupancy of the premises; the legal, i.e., those arising out of private law relations—lease, deed, mortgage, covenants, contracts; and social, i.e., those arising out of public law or informal social, political, or economic conditions. If giving the occupant legal title to a unit is a form of "marking" it which will bring with it not only symbolic strength but also an increase in real power over that unit, it can indeed be an important weapon in overcoming residential alienation.

Ownership is a complex legal concept, and I have elsewhere suggested that it might be taken to be a bundle of rights, powers, privileges and immunities which could be grouped under ten key attributes: rights (using the term generically) to occupy for basic shelter, and for use for other purposes; control; security; disposition; privacy; maintenance; secondary and neighborhood services, and so forth. The points made there are relevant here. To summarize: the mere switch from a lease to a deed does not in and of itself necessarily provide a greater bundle of rights to the owner than a tenant may have; a good lease, in other words, may provide many more advantages to a tenant than a deed subject to a mortgage under many conditions will provide to an owner. The most important of the attributes of the tenure relationship are in fact more affected by the characteristics of the occupant—particularly his income—the public and community services available, legislation governing occupancy rights, and the characteristics of the neighborhood and the community, than they are by tenure forms. His privacy, for instance, will be more determined by the attitude of the police than by the contents of the deed to his house.

"Ownership" is thus far from the type of absolute relationship that we have in mind when we say "a man's home is his castle;" it is in fact the creature of, and subject to the whims of, public policy, governmental action, neighborhood changes, economic conditions, market forces, city budgets, federal and state legislation, private organizational
actions, union practices, building codes, insurance rates and regulations, bank policies, social standards, technological developments, and so forth and so on.

Private legal relationships that are encompassed within the conventional meaning of the term "homeownership" are thus a decreasing determinant of an occupant's relationship with his dwelling, and social and public law considerations are an increasing determinant. The mark of title is no longer as effective as it once was, and public policy, if it is to deal with residential alienation, must convey to the occupant today many rights, powers, privileges and immunities which bare legal title will not give him. Again, a real voice in the making of the broader social decisions that affect his residential environment is what is needed for the alienated resident to permit him/her to impose a "mark" on his/her dwelling that has much real meaning.

If a deed is taken to be the way in which a house is "marked" as the occupant's, then the marking is indeed a very "indeterminate" mode of taking possession, "not actual but only representative." Since homeownership is not put forward as an objective of public policy for its legal effects alone and has symbolic or marginal meaning as well, its "representative" aspect warrants further exploration. Anthropologists tell us that many people believed knowing the name of an object gave power over that object; the naming of things was a magical act recognized as potent of itself. The view of homeownership held by some today has a relationship to this magical notion; independent of the actual legal powers given to an owner by his deed, homeownership has symbolic value of itself:

"For a man who owns his own home acquires with it a new dignity. He begins to take pride in what is his own, and pride in conserving and improving it for his children. He becomes a more steadfast and concerned citizen of his community. He becomes more self-confident and self-reliant. The mere act of becoming a homeowner transforms him. It gives him roots, a sense of belonging, a true state in his community and its well-being." 31

"The mere act of becoming a homeowner transforms him." Why? What is it that homeownership symbolizes to have this effect?

Well, in the first place, homeownership carries with it a connotation of independence, of freedom and security and status, that harkens back to the days of the settling of the country, the opening of the West, the Homestead Act and the family farm. Listen again to Senator Percy:
"Ever since the Pilgrims set foot on Plymouth Rock, homeownership has been an integral part of the America Way of Life. Long before the rise of the great cities, our forbears came to America because America held forth the bountiful promise of land—land a man could afford, land whose produce could make a man independent of the great lord of the estate, land on which a man could build his own home and there raise his family in self-reliance and security.

"A century and more ago, the issue was between freehold and land tenantry. Today, in urbanized America, the context is different, but the basic principle involved is exactly the same. The freeholder of the 19th century becomes the homeowner of the 20th, and the tenant farmer of an earlier day becomes the man with no choice but to rent his dwelling from another. Just as the giants of the 19th century favored freehold, the leaders of the mid-20th must fight with determination to bring the opportunity for actual homeownership within the reach of every American.

The idea of homeownership here carries with it the nostalgic remembrance of an earlier, unalienated time, a simpler and better life free of all the alienating problems of a complex technological urban system, a throwback to a time when each individual controlled his/her own life and no alien outside forces dominated the scene.

This is, of course, deceptive symbolism, far from reality. Alienation cannot so easily be overcome. The freeholders of the 19th century are not at all similar to the homeowners of the Twentieth. The former often built their own cabins, dug their own wells, grew their own food, put fires out with water from their own ponds, left their land once a week to go marketing, had their family home to work the land, cut their own wood for fuel, protected themselves with their own rifles, and took care of other needs in their own outhouses. Most of these same activities are practically impossible in most parts of America today, where they are not illegal or in violation of the sanitary of building codes. We rely today on the public provision of water, sewers, garbage disposal, recreational opportunities, transportation, police and fire protection, and so on and on and on. What would we think of someone who could say, in 1968, "the best protection for a person's basic rights are those he can erect himself?"

* President Nixon said it on April 25, 1968.
The average homeowner is higher status, better paid, better educated, richer, more middle class, than the average tenant. Consequently, the change from tenant to homeowner increases the likelihood that the individual will be taken to a higher status, well paid, well educated, and middle class. After all, homeownership is one of the three indices of a higher socio-economic status in the Shevsky Bell schema, and has similar connotations in virtually every discussion of class stratification. Can one blame poor tenants for trying to achieve homeownership in order to get a higher SES rating so that they can show how high in social standing they are, any more than one can blame poor students for trying to get a high mark on an exam as a way of showing how educated they are?

Finally, homeownership symbolizes the single-family house, with its own yard, its privacy, its personal scale, its amenability to individual physical control. In reviewing the extensive literature exploring empirically people's preferences for housing recently, one finds none that might enable a curious researcher to separate the attractiveness of homeownership from the attractiveness of the single-family house. Typical are the findings of a Detroit study: 73% of all those interviewed preferred homeownership to tenancy, and when asked why, 90% said they wanted a private yard of their own.

Herbert Hoover brilliantly summarizes the entire symbolic content of homeownership exactly 40 years ago, in The President's Conference on Home Building and Home Ownership:

I am confident that the sentiment for home ownership is so embedded in the American heart that the millions of people who dwell in tenements, apartments, and rented rows of solid brick have the aspiration for wider opportunity in ownership of their own homes. To possess one's own home is the hope and ambition of almost every individual in our country, whether he lives in hotel, apartment, or tenement.

Everyone of you here is impelled by the high ideal and aspiration that each family may pass their days in the home which they own; that they may nurture it as theirs; that it may be their castle in all that exquisite sentiment which it surrounds with the sweetness of family life. This aspiration penetrates the heart of our national well-being. It makes for happier married life, it makes for better children, it makes for confidence and security, it makes for courage to meet the battle of life, it makes for better citizenship. There can be no fear for a democracy or self-government or for liberty or freedom from
home owners no matter how humble they may be.

There is wide distinction between homes and mere housing. Those immortal ballads, "Home, Sweet Home," "My Old Kentucky Home," and "The Little Gray Home In The West," were not written about tenements or apartments. They are the expressions of racial longing which find outlet in the living poetry and songs of our people. They were written about an individual abode, alive with the tender associations of childhood, the family life at the fireside, the free out-of-doors, the independence, the security, and the pride in possession of the family's own home—the very seat of its being.

That our people should live in their own homes is a sentiment deep in the heart of our race and of American life. We know that, as yet, is not universally possible. We know that many of our people must at all times live under other conditions. But they never sing songs about a pile of rent receipts. To own one's home is a physical expression of individualism, of enterprise, of independence, and of the freedom of spirit. We do not in our imagination attach to a transitory place that expression about a man's home being his castle, no matter what its constitutional rights may be.

Whether support by public policy of this type of symbolism is an effective mark of ownership is open to real question. Homeownership carries with it certain, if limited, real legal differences which lessen somewhat the alienating characteristics of the stereotyped landlord/tenant relationship. Many other social areas of control could also be explored to reduce that alienation even more, and attention to these public areas is needed quite as much as attention to private law relationships. Whether support by public policy of the symbolic baggage of homeownership—its nostalgia, its status connotations, its assumed linkage with suburban housing—is desirable is, on balance, a moot point.

VI

Social alienation is the final concept to be considered here as relevant to residential policy. Space permits only one illustration of the usefulness of the concept in housing policy. The illustration to be taken is homeownership policy, since it is a key feature of housing policy and one of the few that has been defended as related precisely to the type of ultimate issues that the concept of social alienation encompasses. First, a word on the concept itself.
Social alienation we have defined as the separation of man from his social being. Man is essentially social as well as individual. "His human life is his social life." Alienation from other men is as serious a form of alienation as alienation from the product of labor. Egoistic man is "an individual separated from community, withdrawn into himself, wholly preoccupied with his private interest and acting in accordance with his private caprice...the only bond between egoistic men is natural necessity, need and private interests, the preservation of their property and their egoistic persons." 34

Hegel's conception is formulated by Schacht as follows:

"One who limits his self-conception to his particular self also turns away from the social substance...he seeks to develop his particular nature and character and to assert his independence, as completely as possible--at the expense of unity with a substance. He closes his eyes to his essential universality, and 'is proud and self-satisfied in this alienation.' There is just as great a disparity between his 'existence' and his 'inner nature' as there is in the case of the other worldly individual." 35

To the extent that modern housing in fact leads to such isolation, such egoism, it contributes further to the alienation of man from man.

Homeownership has been put forward as a means of attacking precisely this form of alienation. Providing the occupant with "a stake in the community," making a "better citizen," are among the stated goals of public homeownership programs. From Madison, who held that "The Freeholders of the country would be the safest depositories of Republican liberty" 36 to Jefferson, who wrote to Madison that "the small landholders are the most precious part of a state," 37 to Andrew Johnson, who supported the Homestead Act because it "would create the strongest tie between the citizen and the Government," 38 to others like Senator Percy, who many years later and in quite different society spoke of a homeowner becoming a "more steadfast and concerned citizen of his community," 39 homeownership, participation of community life, and civic virtue have been linked; George Wallace's American Independent Party summed up the general consensus in saying, in its 1968 platform:

"We will support programs designed to provide means by which homeownership can become a reality for our city dwellers, thereby instilling a greater feeling of dignity, stability and responsibility in those benefiting from such a program." 40

The evidence certainly seems to support the assumptions under-
lying these statements. There is a statistical correlation between homeownership and those outward-oriented, community-viewing, participatory, upwardly mobile, forms of behavior that at least crudely could be taken as indications of lack of social alienation. Yet correlation is not cause. But the question always remains whether homeownership itself is causally related to these patterns of behavior, or whether these patterns might not already have existed in the individual and produced ownership as well as the other visible signs of integration into the community. Let me here simply suggest three reasons to at least question the conventional wisdom that homeownership fosters community-mindedness and reduces social alienation.

Economics is the mechanism most likely to be put forward in attempting to explain why homeowners have a greater "stake in their community" than do tenants. I have elsewhere argued that the economic stake of the homeowner is much less substantial or secure than many lower-income families assume, and that an investment in some other asset may be in fact much more expedient for many. I have further argued that such an investment is not a feature of the owner's occupancy of the home, but only of the ownership of it; an owner-occupant might in fact be much better off moving to a rented unit and leasing the house he/she owns to a more affluent family. Be all that as it may, it is no doubt true that having an economic investment in a home gives many families an increased interest in what happens in their community.

This economic interest, however, has negative as well as positive concepts. The economic aspects of homeownership appeals to an essentially selfish view. If the house is partially an investment, then its value hinges on what its owner can get for it, and is independent of his/her relationship with neighbors or the community. A housing shortage and overcrowding in the neighborhood may be exactly what a money-conscious homeowner would most like to see?

The social relationships generated by homeownership likewise have their ambivalent aspects. Community spirit there certainly often is. The self-generated activities of home improvement associations, as well as traditional across-the-back-fence neighborliness, attest to this. So do the militant activities of many community property-owner associations when faced with what they see as a threat to their community. But the negative aspects of this solidarity appear clearly when that threat is, for instance, simply the entry into the neighborhood of a family of different ethnic background. Community within a given homogeneous group is engendered; isolation and antagonism and alienation from broader segments of society may be equally created by homeownership in its traditional form. The ugly type of snobbishness, exclusivity, conformism, rejection of the different, the unconventional, the new, that we find pervading our suburban communities, are certainly added
The linkage between homeownership and the single-family house may also have alienating by-products for reasons of technology. Single-family homeownership permits and fosters an internalization of many activities that in an earlier day were public and external, and that for most apartment dwellers, for different reasons, still are. The earlier swimming hole, the church social, the volunteer fire company, the public laundry, are replaced for the modern upper-income suburban family by the private swimming pool, the recreation room, the private fire alarm system, the washer and the drier in the basement. In the new towns of California, usually a misnomer for glorified suburban developments, a far broader range of activities is internalized and made private: security protection, golf courses, marinas, yard maintenance, and so forth. While the link between private homeownership and this trend to internalization and privatization is not inevitable, it is strong, and runs against the integration of the individual into the broader life of which his immediate neighborhood and his individual house is a part.

Finally, and perhaps obviously, a homeownership program that fails is worse than no program at all. Promise a low-income family "a home of its own," give it a comfort and a status and a pride it never had, spread out before it a future of peace and security and independence, and then let it find itself in a jerry-built little house, suddenly bombarded with leaky roofs, warped doors, broken windows, weedy lawns, peeling paint, splintered woodwork, plumbers and electricians and painters, bills and taxes and assessments, and finally, defaults on a mortgage and foreclosure, and the family may be expected to be a little more socially alienated than before it started. The recent investigations of abuses of the Section 235 program are rapidly finding this out.

More broadly put—and this summarizes the criticisms of homeownership suggested in this paper—a program that encourages homeownership for lower-income families as a solution to the problems of residential alienation, without seeing those problems in the total social context, without giving the full range of support that is needed to make them effective, without coupling them with an attack on alienation in the community and the society as a whole, is bound to fail. The shelter theory of housing is a totally inadequate explanation of the problems of housing today. The concept of residential alienation provides a much more realistic framework for a more accurate analysis and a more effective program. Homeownership is at least a move in the right direction, in its recognition that the entire network of relations between a person and his dwelling must be taken into consideration; not only whether the dwelling keeps out the rain, but whether it helps to express his individuality, whether it carries his mark, whether it brings
him closer to or further from his fellowmen. But obviously a much more comprehensive program than one of fostering homeownership is needed fully to overcome alienation in these ways. To claim that "the mere act of becoming a homeowner transforms a man" is not only wrong; it is pernicious.
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26 Bruno Bettelheim, for instance, has the nice story about the man who "moved to the suburbs to get away from city pavements and enjoy a more natural setting. The first summer his front lawn was full of dandelions and he rather liked the color and naturalness they added. But his neighbors had spent money and care to have perfect lawns and they objected to the weeds that would soon go to seed and spread to their lawns. After several experiences of this kind the man ruefully moved back to a city apartment." The Informed Heart: Autonomy in Mass Age, (Glencoe, The Free Press, 1960), p. 92n.


28 It is a moot question to what extent improvements are motivated by the hope of ultimate economic benefit and to what extent they arise from either the expectation of pleasurable use or the pure pleasure of the work. The point here is simply that the ultimate economic return is a factor in most decisions--the bigger the improvement, the bigger the weight of the economic factor--and when economic benefit and the pleasure of use conflict, there arises precisely that internal conflict that is associated with alienation. Robert A. Nisbet in fact attributes the origin of contemporary alienation to a lack of congruence between what would strengthen the individual's sense of community and identity, on the one hand, and what the functioning of the larger social system requires, on the other. The Quest for Community (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953).

29 Of course, the rules of private law and their enforcement are also socially determined, but the distinction is useful in practice.


31 Senator Charles Percy, Campaign Address, "A New Dawn for Our Cities," Chicago, September 15, 1966, printed in Congressional Record, October 16, 1966. It was Senator Percy who later introduced the Home Ownership Foundation bill, part of the effort that led to the adoption of Section 235 in 1968.


33 Coleman and Neugarten, for instance, say: "Americans tend to re-
gard housing as the foremost visible indicator of a family's level of economic well-being, "(p. 92)...home ownership is virtually a surrogate for quality housing." (p. 37). Social Status in The City (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971).

34 Schacht, op. cit., p. 80.

35 Schacht, op. cit., p. 42.


37 Letter to James Madison, October 28, 1785.

38 Congressional Globe (Appendix), June 20, 1850, p. 951.

39 Loc. cit.

40 Congressional Record, October 15, 1968, p. E 9212. These and other comparable quotations may be found collected in the Appendix to Expanded Ownership, (Fond-du-Lac, Wis., The Sabre Foundation, 1972).


42 Glazer and Moynihan speak of the ideological outlook of small homeowners "as being in opposition to high taxes, welfare programs, ...and 'frills' in the building of schools (art murals), in favor of a conservative financial policy, and without any views of the general problems of the city. Such views are hardly necessary (speaking of New York Controller Gerosa) when one's major concern is the neighborhood and its homeowners." Beyond the Melting Pot (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1970), p. 214. But the conservative ideological stance of the homeowner hardly needs documentation.

43 Tenancy, of course, creates tensions, hostilities, and antagonisms also. The point here is not that tenancy is less alienating than homeownership, but only that there are significant alienating features about homeownership.

44 The impact of single-family dwellings on land use patterns, open space, transportation problems, and social and economic discrimination, is also important in relationship to social alienation, but outside the scope of this paper.
I. HOMES OF THE PAST

Objectives of the Homes. Many of the stereotypes of homes for the aged* are carryovers from the past. By and large, these homes had rather limited objectives which revolved around the notion that homes should be custodial institutions. It can be said that these institutions had been extensions of the poor farm, giving shelter (and little more) to the aged who had nowhere else to go. In the past, social norms required grown children to care and provide for their aged parents, and the three-generation family under one roof was common-place. The nature of American society during these years (before urbanization and large-scale industrialization) provided for a useful role for the elderly person in the home of his children.

Homes for the aged were necessary for those unwanted, with no family, without means to secure independent living, or who displayed nonconventional behavior. It was for those who fell into the "cracks" of society who were institutionalized, and who were viewed as deviants.

"Custodial care is a solution to the problem of what to do with the deviant."¹ Although Ullman is here referring to psychiatric hospitals, he calls attention to the fact that homes for the aged did perform a societal function in providing custodial care to these "outcasts." The elderly were dressed, fed, safeguarded from injuring themselves; and given but token treatment, activity, and therapy. The picture of the old age home in which many elderly people sat staring into space could well be an accurate portrait of the homes of the past.

These homes were seen as a "dumping ground" for the elderly and the aged were viewed as "both incapable and harmless."² The aim of these institutions was solely with the maintenance of the individuals until death.

Structure of the Homes. These homes were "total institutions," to use Goffman's term.³ All aspects of life in these institutions were conducted

---

* For the purpose of this article, homes for the aged include institutions which are sectarian or fraternal, non-profit, and care for elderly populations which do not require the same degree of medical care as is true for those in nursing homes, etc.
in the same place and under the same authority; each daily activity was carried out in the immediate company of others, all were treated alike, and required to do the same things together; every phase of the day's activities was tightly scheduled, with one activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole circle of activities being imposed from above through a system of explicitly formal rules and a body of officials, with the contents of the various enforced activities being brought together as parts of a single over-all rational plan purportedly designed to fulfill the official aim of the institution.

Such a picture of institutions (to include homes for the aged) would lead to the conclusion that these institutions were bureaucratic and rational in their custodial care of the inmates; utilizing rules, regulations, and routinization to standardize and thus make efficient the care of the institutionalized. Goffman's description of these organizations resembles Max Weber's picture of bureaucratic organizations. Homes for the aged, then, were rationally conceived to provide efficient custodial care.

Most total institutions, most of the time, seem to function merely as storage dumps for inmates, ..., they usually present themselves as rational organizations designed consciously, through and through, as effective machines for producing approved ends.5

The formal structure with its hierarchial chain of command ensured that the organization maintained an effective means of care. Townsend, who extensively studied homes for the aged in England and Wales, found the characteristics of bureaucracies in those homes that he analyzed. He found sharp divisions of labor between matrons, wardens, attendants, and domestic help;6 all of whom were concerned with the smooth functioning of the organization. To maximize efficiency, "the routine was fairly rigid in most institutions;"7 and so, the characteristics of the "total institution" as well as the bureaucratic formal structure appear to have characterized the homes for the aged of the past.

Routinization and Standardization. The routinization and standardization of events within homes was seen necessary to maximize the effectiveness of the institution. The administrator rigidly enforced rules and regulations for not only the expeditious disposition of the elderly, but also for maintaining uniformity of task performance among employees. "The routine of life was guided by explicit rules of behavior. /Administrators/ were rarely conscious of the fact that informal sanctions of behavior could be more effective than formal rules."8

Due to the custodial nature of homes, directors saw little need for the utilization of professionals. Those who became sick were taken to the hospital; and doctors visited homes only periodically, giving but a moment or two to an individual. The tasks performed by staff within these homes - which emphasized mainly physical ability - required a non-professional staff.

It is true that whether a staff member saw the elderly as merely the objects of daily manipulation or in a humane and compassionate way depended upon the individual. Yet, the very nature of the institution worked against
individualized care and treatment. "The obligation of staff to maintain certain humane standards of treatment for inmates represents problems in itself, .... /There is a/ constant conflict between humane standards on one hand and institutional efficiency on the other."9 In the face of extensive routine and standard procedures, a staff member giving special attention to an individual would come into conflict with the rules and regulations of the home, and might be charged with differential care of the elderly. It was best to function within the boundaries of the rules.

As indicated, standardization and routinization could be found covering every activity and operation in the home. The elderly were but objects to be manipulated. Everyone was awoken each morning at the same time so they could be washed, dressed and ready for breakfast, allowing breakfast to be served in the most efficient way possible. Such routine and standard treatment continued throughout the day. Also, standardization of clothing, elimination of personal possessions, and lack of privacy - which was contrary to human dignity - all contributed to the efficient care of the elderly and the efficient operation of the home.10

Since there was little attention given to professional treatment, staffs had been little more than able-bodied individuals and, as one writer suggests, they did not possess characteristics needed for giving individualized care. "...., the caretakers in such institutions are poorly paid, poorly educated, and overworked, they have little incentive to humaness."11

While the unskilled employees were well-suited to the rationally-conceived organization in which they worked, the professional personnel who were beginning to be hired by homes came into sharp conflict with the bureaucratic structures of the homes. Although, with time, professionals were employed to perform professional services, they were likely to become dissatisfied, feeling they were being used to maintain the discipline of routine rather than to perform their professional function properly.12

In summary, homes for the aged had been invested with the task of caring for those elderly individuals who were seen as deviants in the eyes of society. To effectuate custodial care, institutions utilized standardization and routine. This approach, while rational for the overall operation of the home in fulfilling its objectives for custodial care, came into conflict with any consideration for individual or professional care.

While these homes might be viewed as closed to the outside environment, it should be realized that they were not. The objectives of these homes were merely reflections of the attitudes of society toward these elderly. It will be seen that the changing social environment came to have a great effect on homes for the aged in the years ahead.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES

While some might quibble, today the homes for the aged bear little resemblance to those institutions of the past in terms of objectives and
orientations. The reasons for change in these organizations are as significant as the differences between homes past and present, for the homes of today reflect environmental pressures for change. As Katz and Kahn point out: "Organizations do not exist in a static world. The surrounding environment is in a constant state of flux and a rigid technical system, though preserved by an excellent structure, does not survive."13 Further: "The adaptive mechanisms which organizations must have face out upon the world and are concerned with solving the conflicts that arise between present organization practices and future environmental demands."14 Thus, according to these writers, we might begin to explain the homes of today by exploring the conflicts between these institutions and the changing environment.

The Changing Society. With the passage of time, America became industrial, urban, and youth-oriented. One of the consequences was reflected in the place for the aged parent in the home of his children. As suggested earlier, only those elderly without families, friends, or means for independent living were institutionalized in homes for the aged. But the times have changed, and currently the place for the elderly person is not in the home of his children. "Modern cities with modern, small living units incapable of expansion are not suited to the three-generation family of fifty years ago, and so the two-generation conjugal family becomes the social mode."15 Or to state this point another way: "Neglect of the aged in contemporary American culture is ... basically caused by the disappearance of the tradition of parent-centeredness from Western culture."16

Concomitant with this change of values toward the aged in the home of the children is the steady increase in the length of life and therefore the increasing number of elderly persons in American society. Medical progress has guaranteed the elderly that they, as a group, are the "youngest" group of aging and aged in the history of mankind. Also, the growth of mandatory retirement policies has led to what can be considered a new group: the class of leisure.

New Alternatives. Taken by themselves, the factors mentioned above would have seemed to be of benefit for homes for the aged (i.e., more aged living apart from their children). However, a whole host of new factors began to emerge in society which seriously undermined the necessity for these homes as custodial institutions and, indeed, threatened their future.

New Federal programs were enacted17 which benefitted the elderly and guaranteed their ability for independent and healthy living. Such programs as Community Health Services for the Aged, the Kerr-Mills Act, and Medicare ensured that medical services would be available and that medical bills would not detain the elderly from receiving needed medical care. The Food Stamp Program also made the limited financial resources of the elderly go further. Social Security benefits, Old Age Assistance, Retirement benefits, and various kinds of personal savings all went toward the ability of the aged to make their own decisions for living arrangements outside an institutional setting. Public Housing for the elderly, Mortgage Insurance for Rental Housing for the Elderly, privately-sponsored Senior Citizens Housing, and the introduction of retirement villages and communities all increased the alternatives for living arrangements of those in advanced years of age.
These public programs, coupled with private savings and retirement benefits, allowed the elderly to live independently (if mentally and physically able to). Homes for the aged were hardly sought out by these persons as desirable places to live. Increasingly, those elderly who became ill went from independent living to hospital to nursing home; thus bypassing the home for the aged. It is only after serious decline in physical and social functioning that would bring the elderly to these institutionalized homes.

"With the increase in housing developments and other services for the elderly as well as the increase in personal income, the traditional 'old folks home' is undergoing a drastic change in clientele and service." Whereas, in the past, the elderly generally tended to live with relatives or were institutionalized, presently homes for the aged are caught in the middle of an increasing number of elderly and the alternatives to institutionalization which reflect an enlightened social attitude toward the aging and aged. Certainly, the home for the aged rationally structured for custodial care of the past would be out of place with the changing times.

**Criticisms of Institutions.**

It would seem that the old age home...has progressed little beyond the poor farm or the almshouse. On the available evidence we are obliged to conclude reluctantly that the residential home, ..., is misconceived and inappropriate.

It would be an understatement to say that institutions for the aged have been widely criticized. Such critics, as above, attacked the nature and purpose of these institutions. These critics, and others, see homes for the aged as traditional, formally organized institutions geared for custodial care in a rational way; there being little attempt made to deal with the social and psychological needs of the residents.

Other critics assailed the formal rules and regulations, and the social and psychological damage caused by institutionalization. Some spoke of institutionalization as leading to de-individuation, disculturation, psychological damage, estrangement, isolation, and stimulus deprivation. Others used terms such as depersonalization and mortification to describe effects. While these writers criticized institutions in general, others spoke specifically of the deleterious effects of homes for the aged. Their studies found significant correlations between institutionalization of the aged and regression, mortality rates, and the collapse of self-determination powers.

Such criticisms and studies which disclosed negative characteristics of institutions on those institutionalized did not fall on deaf ears. The critics were many, the findings from studies too similar to be denied. Those characteristics of institutions were viewed as not only contrary to a humanistic orientation, but were detrimental to the physical, social, and psychological well-being of those institutionalized.

Ultimately, one of the great needs in the field of institutional care, is to tear down most of the social symbolic and physical walls that surround the aged. Actions that tend toward that
achievement are creative: day care centers within homes, day resident programs, active outings, participation in neighborhood golden age clubs, the use of volunteers, donation of personal service by residents and patients to other organizations, normal movement back and forth, liberal visiting hours; all these and similar concepts help to destroy the institutional outlook, and make the institution less like a beleaguered fortress and more like a true home.27

In this lengthy quotation we see the concern of one writer (a former director of a home for the aged) for the need of homes to change their images and characteristics of the "total institution" and meet the demands of the environment - with its new values, concerns, and expectations.

These pressures from the environment coming from changes in the characteristics of the elderly, changing values, alternatives to institutionalization, and wide-spread criticisms all have influenced the revision of the objectives, services, and clientele of the contemporary home for the aged. The exploration and discussion of structural and organizational modifications as a result of these external influences will be discussed next.

III. HOMES IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

Up against environmental pressures, institutions are faced with two alternatives: ignore the changes or adapt to them. It is the adaption of these institutions that is of concern.

Reactions to Environmental Change. Many organizational analysts, regardless of their orientation, have explained the reaction of institutions and organizations to changing needs and expectations of the environment.

Open system theorists, such as Katz and Kahn, indicate that organizations possess adaptive mechanisms which look out from the organization to the environment to learn of trends, developments, and changes and determine how discrepancies can be resolved. This is to suggest that homes for the aged had been cognizant of the environment, and saw the necessity for change. Faced with the prospects that the aging now had alternatives, the negative characteristics of institutionalization, and the greater values placed on humane and therapeutic treatment, homes had not only to change their images but also the quality and nature of services.

The result was the growth of institutions in terms of programs and services, and also a reaching out to the environment to expand the number of individuals served and, therefore, strengthen its raison d'etre. "The adaptive function tends to achieve environmental constance by bringing the external world under control. One method is to extend the boundaries of the organization so that it incorporates more of the external world."28 It is submitted that the reasons why contemporary homes for the aged now display extensive medical, therapeutic, and social services can be explained by the fact that these institutions have incorporated services which had formerly been obtained outside the boundaries of the homes.
Likewise, many homes have established apartment buildings and units for independent living arrangements for the ambulatory aged. Again, this broadens the base of service in the face of changing population characteristics of the aged and changing values of society. Such current practices of many homes to provide a "meals on wheels" service and a day care program for the elderly not institutionalized reflects what Katz and Kahn suggest: that organizations which survive environmental pressures do so by expanding and that they attempt to control the sources of input and market for output. Homes for the aged are attempting to absorb the alternatives for the aging both within the institution and outside.

James Thompson, another proponent of the open systems method of analysis, refers to this growth by absorption as "vertical integration," and says of it: "Vertical integration ... is a major way of expanding organizational domains in order to reduce or eliminate significant contingencies." Although he was referring to manufacturing industries, he does refer this principle to organizations which deal specifically with human welfare. "Hospitals may open new outpatient clinics or establish new services - ... - to round out utilization of services; and welfare organizations may extend with new services." Homes for the aged often display such "innovations" as providing training grounds for social work and nursing students, as well as providing meals to elderly individuals living independently in the neighborhood of the institution.

Etzioni would refer to this phenomenon of growth as "goal succession," and states that there is a succession of goals "when the services of the old one is highly unsuccessful, leaving the organization to find a new goal or serve if it is to survive. It is even more common for an organization in such a situation to set additional goals or expand the scope of their old ones." Thus, the concept of "goal succession" also explains a tendency for growth.

Finally, there may be three additional explanations for the growth and expansion of homes for the aged. One is the cultural value placed on size and growth. Another refers to the positive relationship between allocation of monetary assistance from funding resources and number of residents in the institution. And the last explanation states: "It is often argued that increased size leads to a reduction in cost per unit produced or patient treated because functions such as organizational self-maintenance can be centralized and need not be duplicated." What ever the reason or reasons for change and growth, there would appear to be a natural tendency for homes to grow and become more complex. This natural tendency follows the fact that environments are never static and set certain conditions which must be met by the homes to survive.

Orientation of Homes. The homes of today are vastly more complex than those of the past. Their objectives are no longer solely custodial in nature; they provide a multitude of services and programs. The needs of the institutionalized are now considered and, simultaneously, the institution is expanding into the community (or environment). "The institution
is beginning to envision itself as a facility and a service that is a true community resource. Thus it sees itself not so much as a terminal housing accommodation but more a highly specialized, technical geriatric facility, ...." As a result of the shift in emphasis, complexity of activities and enlargement of the scope of functions, objectives have changed but not the structure of the homes.

If form follows function, if homes for the aged develop a structure that is best suited for its function, how can structure be interpreted in light of organizational objectives? Objectives which now appear heterogeneous and diverse. There are ways of ascertaining organizational goals and function, but it is not the purpose of this article to go into an analysis of specific goals, aside from indicating that changes have occurred.

It appears that while such considerations as functions, goals, and objectives are very important to interpret and analyze, the concept of orientation might be a more comprehensive dimension to ponder. It is believed that homes for the aged can be characterized by their orientations which can range from organizational to individualization.

"Problems of 'individuation' versus 'standardization' plague the mental hospitals." It is submitted that such problems also "plague" homes for the aged, and each home resolves this perplexity differently - giving emphasis to one or the other (i.e., orientation). The attempt at individuation or a more humane nature of care can, and does, run into conflict with the effective operation of the institution. It is better for an individual to awake, dress, and wash when he likes; to eat when and what he wants; to continue to live as an individual and to be treated as such by the professionals and non-professionals who care for him. Such non-institutional behavior has been proven to be advantageous to the overall well-being of the institutionalized. Yet, meals must be prepared and served, appointments must be made to see the doctor, activities and sessions must be scheduled, beds must be made and rooms cleaned.

Since the official aim of the institution is to protect the health and welfare of the residents in the most efficient manner possible, the programs are designed to attain the goal. Thus the programs of nursing care, medical care, physical therapy, occupational therapy, meals, shelter, and the daily routines of activities, are set up on a definite schedule so that the staff of the institution can administer them efficiently.

Without elaborating, in this article, on the triad of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, it can be stated that an institution's orientation to individual and organizational considerations (never really an either-or orientation) reflects the attempt to be economic, efficient, and effective. It is believed that the first two concepts support standardization, while the latter, individuation.
It is further suggested that because effectiveness is difficult, if not impossible, to measure in terms of medical, social, and therapeutic services, efforts to maintain a smooth running institution will be of the highest priority. This is to suggest that it is difficult to assess the effectiveness of treatment of the elderly inasmuch as their release from the home is quite unlikely (rates of release often are used as measures of effective treatment in hospitals and mental institutions) and improvement in functioning is hard to ascertain. In addition, staff can look at the aged as terminal cases in which it is just a matter of time before death. The limited training and education of non-professional staff further mitigate against the ability of the organization to fully implement an individual-theory of treatment and create a structure which would reflect and enforce this orientation.

Coupled with these considerations are the realities such as a limited budget and with it, the need to be efficient. Thus, for these many reasons, organizational needs are the major orientation of these institutions, regardless of their rhetoric. This is not to indicate that these institutions do not try to give every possible effort to de-institutionalizing their facilities, but that such attempts must come into conflict with the structures of the homes.

It has been pointed out that growth has been an evolutionary process and a result of environmental pressures. Furthermore, in terms of sheer economy, a larger home is more economical to run. Such factors for organizational growth can be seen as leading to ineffectiveness for an individualization orientation, while stressing standardization. In a way, then, homes for the aged have become similar to the institutions for the aged of the past with their rules and regulations, and standardization and routine. Larger size and organizational complexity have perpetuated bureaucratic structuring.

Possibilities for Congruence Between Care and Structure. "Small size has a direct effect on patient treatment. Some of the favorable aspects of small organizations can be obtained if functional parts of the organization, wards and groups of wards are decentralized into what is called the unit system." Ullman was referring to psychiatric hospitals, yet, the concept of decentralization for the sake of effectiveness of treatment and care in homes for the aged is an interesting one to ponder. It is not known to what extent such efforts have been made for decentralization in homes for the aged, but in one study such efforts did appear to improve the services for the aged. (This was measured by changes in staff attitudes and knowledge.)

There have appeared some attempts at reducing the size of homes for the aged in the effort to de-institutionalize and de-bureaucratize, and to maximize the self-reliance and self-determination for the elderly. These attempts have generally appeared in European countries.

After spending 9 weeks studying European planning for the aged, Dr. Irvin Cohen, of the Veterans' Administration, found many differences between homes for the aged in Europe and in the United States. "There is general objection to the construction of large units for the care of older people. Physicians, administrators of residential homes and nursing homes, and physi-
Cians in charge of geriatric units recommend that the units are best at the level of about fifty beds. The predominant theme in European homes for the aged was the attempt to keep the size as small as possible, and create the opportunity for independent living while in the institutions by allowing the elderly to eat in their rooms, decentralizing the dining areas, and assigning the able to rooms with simple cooking facilities. There was also an attempt to assign only one or two persons to a bedroom. In the following statement by Dr. Cohen, it can be seen just how far Europeans have gone in ensuring that those institutionalized are treated individually, and not as a group of aged individuals.

There is almost total absence of any planned activity programs in Europe. It is considered as an intrusion on the privacy of the individual to direct daytime activities. The residents are highly individualistic and resent this type of regimentation.

In the United States it would appear that the size of an organization and the characteristics resulting from size are taken as a "given" and attempts - if and when made - to individualize service and treatment are but slight modifications of existing organizational structure. Greenblatt, et al., suggest that structures should be flexible. "It needs to be a structure with a built in 'glissando' effect: capable at different times of granting many degrees of individual freedom, yet maintaining organizational stability, ...."

The problems are complex and it would appear that homes for the aged are destined to retain the characteristics of bureaucratic organizations, thus resolving the paradoxical problem of creating a home-like environment in an institutional setting. This seems to be especially true, as the physical and social conditions of persons institutionalized in homes for the aged continue to be more deteriorated than in earlier decades. Homes for the aged, in the future, will be composed of ill, elderly persons and the care to be given might be more similar to that of a hospital (or a nursing home) and less as a residential facility.

The homes for the aged of the past have changed in their goals, yet, their structures have remained basically the same. This is not to suggest that the homes have not come a long way from viewing their residents as mere passive objects. However, until the structures of the homes allow for individuation which appears to be so important to the well-being of the institutionalized and consistent with care and treatment, the ideal is a long way off before we can view such institutions as effective community resources for the aged.
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Introduction:

The city of Stamford, Connecticut has an Urban Renewal project as have most Urban centers. The Family Relocation Division of Stamford's Urban Redevelopment Commission (URC) entered into a contract with the Family and Children's Services (FCS) to provide one day a week consultation to the Relocation staff and client services to the families in the renewal area. This consultation involved in-service training programs geared toward helping the relocation staff increase their skills in identifying problems within families and in assisting families to obtain help. As a result of this consultation, the relocation workers frequently would discuss the problems of the families referred to the Family Service worker and accompany the caseworker to the initial interview.

It was the result of one such referral of a couple living in a building taken over by the URC in an area slated for redevelopment, a building euphemistically called "The Cumping Grounds", that the Family Service worker evolved a group work approach. The group included all the tenants in the building. This paper will highlight the development of this group over a two year period, focusing particular attention on the impact of the experience on the behavior of the participants. The group which developed included: Blacks, whites, Puerto Ricans; (single and married), elderly and middle aged members. Although the group work was a reality-oriented problem-solving endeavor, the therapeutic gains for the individuals were very dramatic.

Group Formation:

The social worker and the relocation worker visited Mr. and Mrs. Jones* who lived in one room inadequately furnished with a small sink, hot plate, refrigerator, 2 chairs and a mattress on the floor. This couple had contact with F&CS eighteen years prior when, as a result of Mrs. Jone's hospitalization, their infant daughter was placed in a foster home. They ultimately lost custody of their child and drifted about the community until they fell under the aegis of URC and were given shelter in their present room. At the time of referral, the Jones' were far in arrears with their normal rent to URC; they had no regular source of income and had been begging from local churches for food and money. They both had serious medical problems and had not had medical attention. Following their introduction by the relocation worker, the social worker assisted the Jones' in applying for Aid to the Disabled for which they both were soon found eligible, obtaining furniture and getting medical attention. While working...
on these problems, the Jones' began to talk about the dplorable conditions in
the building. They noted that the other tenants were equally upset and the
neighbors were fighting with each other.

The worker asked the Jones' whether they thought the other tenants
would want to get together to discuss their concerns. Having experienced some
significant changes in their own situation, Mr. and Mrs. Jones were beginning
to feel a sense of hope that other things might also change. They were able
to risk themselves, albeit tentatively, in trying to tackle problems which
seemed much more difficult and complicated to them. (Scheidlinger, 1964) As a
beginning, they introduced the worker to some of their neighbors to discuss
the idea of a group meeting which could explore what might be done to improve
conditions in the building.

The building had three stories. The first floor was a six room apart-
ment occupied by Mr. and Mrs. Cortez and their 12 children. At this time, Mr.
Cortez had been designated superintendent of the building by URC. He later
separated from his family. The second floor had six single rooms, five of
which were occupied by individual tenants, and 2 bathrooms, one of which was
inoperable. The third floor was unoccupied at the time.

The Jones introduced the worker first to Miss Dean, and their conver-
sation took place in the second floor hallway. Curiosity brought the other
tenants out of their rooms to see what was happening. The worker introduced
himself to the others and indicating he was interested in whether they would
like to meet together to discuss their concerns about conditions in the
building.

The first meeting took place in the Jones' room. Mr. and Mrs. Jones
played the role of host and hostess. The other tenants brought additional
chairs and the worker brought coffee. Attending this first meeting were,
in addition to Mr. and Mrs. Jones, Miss Dean, Mr. Frank and Mr. Mendoza. The
other two tenants on the floor, Mr. French and Mr. Ross were not available.
At this point, the tenants projected much blame for their living conditions
upon Mr. Cortez, the superintendent, and his family. They would not agree to
inviting him to the meeting.

The focus of the meeting was a detailed listing of all their concerns
about building conditions. Rats, roaches, broken windows, faulty plumbing,
dirty hallways and excessive noise by the children downstairs were among the
topics discussed. The worker tried to help the members develop suggestions
for coping with these problems. (Goroff, 1971) The anger felt by those present
resulted in suggestions ranging from revenge to keeping the Cortez family on
their own floor.

"Do you think it would be helpful if the director of URC Family Relo-
ication could attend our next meeting" asked the worker. The director had the
responsibility for property maintenance. The members could not believe he
would want to come to talk with them. Assuring them the director would come,
the worker asked if anyone would want to ask him. The group was completely
immobilized. They could not accept that someone as important as the Director
would come to talk with them, they felt they did not warrant his attention and they certainly could not bring themselves to call him. To help the members obtain some sense of their significance, the worker offered to arrange to have the Director present the following week. The group agreed. (Goroff, 1967)

It was important for the worker to begin to deal with the sense of powerlessness and worthlessness indicated by the members of the group. Their feelings, coupled with the reality of the conditions in the building, made them extremely angry. Frequently, they would express this anger by further breaking windows, tearing plumbing out in the bathroom and either ignoring one another or fighting with each other. Some of them teased Mr. French, "a crankly old man," by knocking on his door and running into their own rooms. This was a classic example of alienation and the displacement of anger.

The Director and Mr. Cortez were present at the next meeting. In contrast to the each with which the group members enumerated their problems at the previous meeting, this meeting was very "difficult and painful." They had difficulty verbalizing their concerns in a coherent way and the worker tried to support them by recalling what they had said the previous week. An agreement was reached that the second floor tenants would take care of their own hallway, the Director would have window screens put in immediately, have exterminators to deal with the rats and roaches and repair the bathroom plumbing. The meeting ended on a note of cautious optimism.

Between this meeting and the next week, all of the commitments made by the Director were fulfilled. The group took upon itself the task of developing a schedule for cleaning the hallway. Thus began in June of 1970 a group experience that was to have tremendous ramifications for those involved.

Group Membership: Before proceeding further, a description of the group may be useful. Mrs. Jones had a history of hospitalizations for mental illness extending back for more than twenty years. Her major symptoms included inappropriate and bizarre dress in public and hysterical episodes involving screaming and crying in the middle of the night. She was 56 years old when the group started. Mr. Jones was an alcoholic with a very spotty work history. He had cirrhosis of the liver. The Jones had not seen their own child since he was placed in a foster home. In recent years, they supported themselves by "panhandling" and doing odd jobs.

Miss Dean was a 39 year old alcoholic with cirrhosis of the liver. She had a common law marriage for nine years before it was dissolved. She had no children. Miss Dean was moved into the building after the Relocation Agency removed her from a previous home because of complaints about her cussing, fighting and being a general nuisance. About a year after the group started, it was discovered that she had grand mal epilepsy.

Mr. French was 71 years old when the group started. He was a very
pleasant person, always well dressed, spry and outgoing. Although he never married, he had fathered several children. On occasion, Mr. French would become intoxicated, fall and injure himself requiring hospitalization for several days. He could never hold on to his money for more than a few days after receiving his Social Security check.

Mr. Mendoza, a middle-aged man, was an alcoholic with a severe heart condition. When drinking, he would sometimes become enraged and destroy things in the building. When sober, he was pleasant and seemed a friendly man. He was widowed.

Group Development:

The group primarily focused on problems the members were experiencing in the "here and now". Flushed with a feeling of success, they began to establish a schedule for cleaning the hallway. During this process, the problem of drinking and now functioning well at those times came up. The members demonstrated considerable understanding and arranged for a system of substitutes when the person schedule was not "functioning well." As their awareness of each other increased so did their concern.

The group turned its attention to the problems created by the one bathroom which had no shower curtains and had clear glass windows facing the street. Three sessions were given to this problem. One suggestion was that they each put in a sum of money to buy a curtain. Miss Dean offered to buy it and the group members suggested she hold the money. She refused saying, "No, I can't because I'll probably go to the liquor store for a bottle before I can the curtain." They suggested that someone else could hold the money and then go shopping with her. Miss Dean's frank and honest statement to the group helped establish the norm of being honest about one's problems. This pattern continued and allowed the members to discuss their concerns openly. Before any final action was taken, Mr. Mendoza surprised them by bringing in a shower curtain and congratulating it to the group. He also assumed the responsibility for spraying an opaque paint on the bathroom window.

The group then turned its attention to Mr. French, who used the bathroom to express his anger. He would lock himself in the bathroom for long periods and it was well known that when angry at any of the neighbors he would dirty the bathroom or be destructive to the facility in some way. They verbalized a great deal of the resentment they felt toward Mr. French. During the course of the discussion, the worker helped the members recognize how their harassment contributed to his behavior. They were able to recognize that the old man was "doing childish things" and their anger turned to sorrow.

Miss Dean, at the next meeting, informed the group that she had told Mr. French "I'm not fighting with you anymore. You're a poor old man and I'm going to take care of you." He slowly began to talk to the others when they passed in the hall. His behavior in the bathroom changed. Although he was invited to all the meetings and parties, he never attended. Yet he brought a
bottle of wine for one of the parties and gave it to Miss Dean.

In late August, the meetings shifted from the Jones' room to that of Miss Dean. This shift resulted from Mr. Jones comment that Mrs. Jones was becoming increasingly agitated and he was concerned about her upsetting the group. Miss Dean offered her room saying it wasn't fair to place the total burden on the Jones. The approach of late fall helped turn the group's attention to planning for a Christmas party. This raised the problem of a more permanent meeting place.

One of the rooms on the floor was not occupied. Mr. Jones suggested they try to obtain permission to turn it into the permanent meeting room for the group. This was unanimously accepted and Mr. Jones volunteered to go to the Family Relocation Director to ask permission for the use of the room. (Goroff, 1967) It is important to note the contrast between this situation and the earlier one during which the group members became immobilized when they were asked to invite the Director of U.R.C.

The following week, the worker was greeted in the hall by all the members and ushered into the newly cleaned and furnished community room which they had created. This marked the turning point in the group members assuming responsibility for self-direction.

The Christmas Party was a highly emotional affair. Miss Dean broke down and cried saying that in all her life this was the first Christmas tree she could say was her own. After the holidays, Miss Dean started drinking heavily and was hospitalized. While in the hospital, the group agreed to put the tree in to Miss Dean's room. (Scheidlinger, 1966)

Within six months, this collection of individuals who were initially isolated, antagonistic and powerless had developed into a cohesive group of empathetic human beings for whom life had begun to take on new meaning. The group members had become very important people to one another. (Scheidlinger, 1966) This was graphically illustrated by the feeling of guilt and mourning following the suicide of Mr. Mendoza.

Immediately after the holidays, Mr. Mendoza left to visit his brother in New York City. He returned after six months and resume his interaction with the others. The tenants in the building had now become aware of each others patterns of behavior. One Saturday, Mr. Mendoza was heard banging nails into wood. The following Sunday morning when he did not leave to go to Church, the group members called the police. After the police succeeded in breaking down the door which Mr. Mendoza had nailed shut the previous day, he was found dead of an overdose of drugs.

The group members experienced a long mourning period. Although there had been some difficult times with Mr. Mendoza only the good things were remembered. There was much concern about what problems would make a person so unhappy he would commit suicide. The worker encouraged the members to talk
out their feelings, to share their viewpoints and in the process to reaffirm the value of living. The room is still empty and is referred to a Juan's room.

The group leaned in the summer of 1971 that the Relocation Agency was planning to move a Mrs. Kelly and her eight children into the third floor. They became very upset at this prospect, envisioning themselves becoming overwhelmed by children. There were already the twelve children of the Cortez family living on the first floor. They were concerned with noise and disruptions. Now their negative feelings were projected upon this new family.

During the several weeks between the time it became known that the family was due to move in until they actually arrived, group meetings were completely concerned with "kids today," "lack of discipline," "parents don't teach their kids manners," "something had to be done," "who does Urban Renewal Commission think they are to do this to us." The worker slowly began to help them recall their own earlier experiences and relationships before they organized their group. He suggested one way they might prevent problems from developing was to invite Mrs. Kelly to the group and discuss some of their concerns with her. After some initial resistance, they agreed to invite her to a meeting. There was some discussion whether to invite her before she moved in, but circumstances made the decision for them. The family moved in before the anticipated date. She was invited to attend the next meeting.

Mrs. Kelly came late to that meeting. While the group members were awaiting her arrival, they talked about her children running around. When she arrived and had been introduced to the others, she began by saying that she knew she could not always watch her eight children and that she would welcome any of them telling her children to behave. Mrs. Kelly added that if anyone was having difficulty with any of the children to talk to her because she generally believes the adults. She immediately picked up on the few tentative suggestions that her children were a little too noisy, recognizing how annoying it could be to others, and assured them she would try to take care of it. The impact of this was immediately evident. The tension evaporated and Mrs. Kelly was incorporated into the group as a full fledged member.

In contrast to the Cortez family, there has developed a very close relationship between Mrs. Kelly's family and the members of the group. Mr. and Mrs. Jones have "adopted" Mrs. Kelly's two year old daughter. They look after her, buy her things, and take her for walks. Miss Dean has done babysitting with the Kelly children so that Mrs. Kelly may go out. Whenever the group has a party, they make certain there is food for the Kelly children. The older adolescents have visited hospitalized members of the group. They also run errands for group members. The entire building shared the excitement of the Kelly's adolescent daughter's first date which was to a formal prom. The problem of obtaining a gown for the girl became the concern of all. A social work assistant from Family and Children's Services was helpful in obtaining a gown for the girl. On the night of the prom, the entire building shared in the excitement of this girl's first date.
In January of 1972, Mr. Frank died of a heart attack. His death was discovered when they went to his room to get the cart on which they usually serve the refreshments during their meeting. Mr. Frank's death did not have the same impact as that of Mr. Mendoza's. Although there was a great deal of sorrow, there was none of the guilt. Several of the members went to the burial. There was considerable confusion concerning his funeral. He was buried in Potters Field in a hospital robe in sharp contrast to the nice way he dressed while alive. At Easter time, the group jointly purchased a pot of artificial flowers and visited the grave. This shared experience had deep meaning for them. They were able to affirm each other's worth and dignity. As they were on the way home Miss Dean remarked, "At least everyone who sees those flowers will know that Bill had friends."

**Summary:**

As individuals, each group member had experienced immense deprivation in his personal life. Individually and collectively the group members had many reality problems. All the members of the group had been known in the past to a variety of social service agencies. The worker assessed the situation as requiring a group approach rather than casework because of the tenants' social isolation amongst themselves and from the broader community.

Although the group was focused on reality problems, the therapeutic gains for the individual members was most graphic. (Jacobs, 1964). All have consciously tried to control their use of liquor. Miss Dean stopped drinking except for beer and has not been intoxicated since her hospitalization in the winter of 1971. Mr. Jones had stopped drinking. Mrs. Jones became more aware of how to dress appropriately and rarely dressed in the old bizarre way. Her hysterical episodes were much less frequent.

Before the group started, the tenants did not visit with one another. They were now helpful to one another and mutually supportive. Several group members had no income although eligible for public assistance. Now all had a means of financial support. Previously, all of the tenants were behind in their nominal rent payments to U.R.C. All now pay their rent and as a result have a better chance of relocation to more adequate housing.

The members expanded their involvements in the community. On numerous occasions, group members brought others to group meetings to meet the social worker in an attempt to have her help them with their problems. There has been a significant social action and advocacy component to the group. Some members have participated in activities of a welfare rights organization. Several members attended a public legislative hearing on welfare. With the worker's help, the group composed a letter to the Governor expressing their opinions about the proposed welfare flat grant.

Most recently, the members of the group were beginning to discuss the kinds of places they would like to live in. There has been an increasing sense of pride in themselves as individuals. They know they have rights and
feel they can ask for things to which they are entitled. They have a sense of rootedness and belonging which is based not just a feeling of belonging in the building in the immediate neighborhood but is expanding to a greater feeling of belonging to the larger community and state. As a result, they feel more able to cope and less victimized.

These unique resources to help people grow, available only groups, (Goroff, 1972) were utilized by the worker and the members of the group to help change a "dumping ground for derelicts" to a place where people could develop a sense of hope, belonging, rootedness and purpose.

NOTES


THE IMPACT OF URBAN REMOVAL FROM A CHILD'S POINT OF VIEW

L. K. Northwood
School of Social Work, University of Michigan

Although several million families and their children have been displaced by urban renewal projects and other civic improvements during the past decades, there are few careful empirical studies of the subject. In particular, there is a paucity of research about the effects of forced moving on children and their social networks. The purpose of this paper is to report one such study. For reasons of economy of space, the report will be limited to the forced move phase of the resettlement.

Before presenting the findings of the study, some comments are in order about the nature of forced moving and its hypothesized effects on children.

Urban settlement is accomplished as the result of both voluntary and forced moves. The Federal Government estimates that about 20 percent of our population moves each year, a third of these across county lines. What proportion of these are forced moves is unknown. In the mid-sixties, a quarter of a million households were displaced annually to make way for urban renewal, highway construction, school construction and other civic improvements. Writing in 1965, William Slayton, the Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration, predicted that by 1972 there would be one million families displaced by urban renewal, about one in every fifty families in the United States. Whether this prediction was verified or not, the scope of forced moving is large, and the problems associated with displacement remain with us.

It is the premise of this paper that forced urban resettlement has more devastating consequences for children and their families than the usual voluntary moving process. The moving process, whether forced or voluntary, involves the following phases: a decision to change the place of residence, an exploration of housing opportunities in various areas, the final selection of one of these, activities associated with making the move, and activities associated with getting settled in the new house and neighborhood.

For most families, the moving process entails both threats and opportunities. Aside from the financial outlays and the inconveniences incurred by the move and the transition from one neighborhood to another, many families have a strong attachment to the old home and neighborhood and to its social networks which they regret losing or which they fear cannot be replaced in the new setting. These may be offset by anticipated benefits as a result of the move: better and more attractive living quarters, more convenient or desirable location, superior institutional services, more friendly neighbors and so forth. In addition, most families usually change their place of residence for their own personal reasons, if not always at their own choice.
and timing. The moving process often coincides with changes in family composition or the age of its members, with changes in the affluence of the family, with changes in the patterns of employment or unemployment of its major breadwinners. These changes often seem natural and gradual, and they can be anticipated and planned for.

Forced resettlement, on the other hand, interrupts or interferes with this natural transition process. It imposes a relatively fixed time schedule on events. It substitutes a formal, collectively sanctioned plan in the place of a set of culturally conditioned personal preferences. Furthermore, the urban redevelopment program which requires population resettlement usually has more far-reaching consequences for the community than the gradual transitional process. Houses may be razed, institutional facilities torn down or altered, land uses changed. Above all, the fabric of social relationships that existed in the old neighborhood may be lost forever. For these reasons, recent projects which require urban resettlement have been accompanied by auxiliary programs of education and community organization to win public support for them. Environmental impact statements are required before implementation in an attempt to assess the adverse effects of the redevelopment on the community and the proposed services to mitigate these effects. The families to be moved are given financial and other assistance to relieve hardship during the transition period. But the amount of financial assistance never seems to cover the financial costs to the family for its resettlement, and the neighborhood mutual aid networks usually are not organized effectively enough to take up the slack. While the economic problems and the logistics of moving are likely to be uppermost for impoverished families facing resettlement, it is hypothesized that grade school children, aged 6-14, will be more concerned with what is happening to the neighborhood and its social networks. Children are often the most intensive users of the space, objects, facilities and people in and around their homes. Children are active rather than passive agents in their socialization. The neighborhood provides them with new experiences, activities and associations from which they acquire values, frames of reference, role models. They learn about danger and strangeness as well as familiar things such as nature, peer relationships, and their rights and responsibilities as children.

It is all of these things that make up a child's world that are threatened by a residential move. The threat is greater when the move is perceived to be compulsory and when homes, schools, all the familiar places and relationships, are to be destroyed during the moving process.

Methods

The occasion for the research came in 1959 when an urban renewal and highway construction project were undertaken in Topeka, Kansas. During the next six years, The Menninger Foundation mounted research to answer two broad questions: (1) What are the social, psychological, and economic consequences of forced relocation? (2) Can a program of planned counseling affect the
outcome of forced relocation?\footnote{11}

One phase of this research was the study of the child population of Lincoln Elementary School, which was scheduled to be torn down in 1962. Thus, there was the unusual opportunity to learn how the children were affected by a forced move - a move accompanied by the destruction of their former homes and familiar places, and which could reasonably be expected to alter the meaningful social networks and institutional relationships of the children.

The children's study covered a four-year period, 1961-1964. The plan called for four interviews with each child at yearly intervals. These were held in the school the child was attending. The first two interviews were open-ended; the latter were structured.

Because of the longitudinal nature of this study, it was possible to interview most of the children before as well as after they moved. Since most of the children were interviewed twice after they moved, we are able to get a picture of the final disintegration of a neighborhood and the effect of this on the children's attitudes.

All four interviews deal with their feelings about school, family, friends, house, neighborhood, moving experience and the project causing their move, leisure activities, work, family activities, relatives, and aspirations for the future.

In addition, there are also interviews with 31 heads of families containing 39 children, obtained from the larger survey of which the children's study was a part. By utilizing these parents' interviews, consensus and dissensus within the same family on the issues related to the move can be obtained.

In the analysis of data, the information was organized to represent three time periods: one year before the move from the project area, one year after the move, and one year later. In a few cases, the first interview was taken just after the move, and children were asked to recapture their pre-move experiences. The sample size varies with the maximum number being 72, 75, and 62 children respectively in the time periods.

The characteristics of the household and respondents are presented in Table I, based on the total sample of 75. Findings are based on usable answers; thus, the number of cases varies. The pre-move data are most sketchy because they were gathered through an open-ended technique, which resulted in salient rather than systematic information. In contrast, standard questions were asked in the post-move periods.
TABLE I. HOUSEHOLD AND RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE OF 75 CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Composition of Household</th>
<th>Family Composition of Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Intact Nuclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American and Indian</td>
<td>Extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Child with Relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>One Parent Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No reply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income of Household</th>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250 and Less</td>
<td>Percent Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$251 to $450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$451 and up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Status of Father</th>
<th>School Grade of Child After Move</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

The findings answer four basic questions: (1) To what extent are the children aware and concerned about the forced move - is the issue salient to them? (2) What were the children's feelings, and how did they change over time? (3) What factors are associated with satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the removal? (4) Are children more distressed by a forced move than their parents?

To avoid needless repetition, the level of statistical significance is indicated by placing an asterisk after the sentence reporting the finding. One asterisk denotes the .05 level of significance, according to chi square analysis, two asterisks the .10 level, and three asterisks the .20 level. Unless there is an asterisk, the finding is not statistically significant or a statistical test was not performed on the data.

How salient was the forced move to the children?

It is evident that the children were sure that they would have to move, and that their homes and school would be torn down as a part of urban renewal. During the first interview all but two of the children agreed with the interviewer that they would have to move from their present homes. Forty families were reported to have begun the search for new housing. Only five of the 46 children were unsure about the razing of the school; one denied this fact. Moreover, 27 children told the interviewer the name of the school to which they expected to be transferred.

The impending move had been the subject for discussion with their peers of 15 children. Twenty-five children made assessments of their parents' feel-
ings about moving. The parents were reported as having mixed feelings: 13 favored the move; 8 were negative; 4 ambivalent. When asked "for whom - parents or children - does the move give the hardest time?" 12 children said that their parents had "more work or responsibility in the move," or "they had lived longer in the neighborhood and would hate to give it up." Mine children, who believed children "would suffer the most", gave reasons such as: "they would lose their friends," or "they have to change schools."

Many of the children knew the family plans for moving, and some children were asked their opinion about the new house or otherwise participated in the moving process. Children in household with higher incomes apparently were more likely to be involved in decisions about housing than those households with lower incomes, as indicated in Table II.

This relationship is not statistically significant. However, income of household seems to be related to the information process. For example, children in lower income households have less knowledge of a new housing site.

**TABLE II. WAYS IN WHICH PARENTS INVOLVED THEIR CHILDREN IN SEARCH FOR HOUSING FOLLOWING A FORCED RELOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Household Income</th>
<th>$250 &amp; under</th>
<th>$251 to $350</th>
<th>Over $350</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Saw House &amp; Asked His Opinion</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Saw House &amp; Not Asked His opinion</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Did Not See, Asked His Opinion</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Did Not See House, Not Asked His Opinion</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship of income to availability of housing is also marked. Two-thirds of the children in upper income households reported their families had found a home or were building one by the time of the first interview, as compared with 32% of the mid-income and 6% of the low income households.

Twenty-six children stated how they were involved in the moving process. The usual answer was that they helped in packing and loading. Two children volunteered that they were helpful by "staying out of the way."

**The Meaning of Urban Renewal**

Moving to make way for urban renewal meant many things to the children. These meanings changed with time.

At the beginning, children differed with their evaluations. About 40% of the children identified urban renewal with building highways and the general improvement of Topeka. A similar proportion saw the program as a form of destruction that would result in the inconveniences of a forced move, the loss of...
cherished friends, or the tearing down of home and school. A few children identified urban renewal with agency social services or payments to help in moving.

Over time, the most frequently mentioned negative aspect of urban renewal came to be not the loss of friends, not the physical destruction of buildings, but the continuing inconveniences suffered during the move itself. This is seen in Table III.

TABLE III. REASONS FOR DISLIKING URBAN RENEWAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Year Before Move (N 20)</th>
<th>Year After Move (N 32)</th>
<th>One Year Later (N 49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconveniences suffered during move</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical deterioration of buildings, neighborhood</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption of social network, loss of friends</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal attachment fo building, things, housing, people</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing, or general negativeness</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The negative comments about urban renewal outweigh the positive by about five to one. However, they declined over time. The reasons given sharply divided the sample of children: Negro and Mexican-American vs. other White; lower vs. upper poverty households based on income and educational status. Children of both deprived minorities and in lower status households were more concerned with the loss of their friends and familiar aspects of the old neighborhood than they were with the inconveniences of moving, although, to be sure, they also resented these inconveniences. This finding was often repeated in the subsequent analysis.

Children's Feelings About Moving

Children were asked to tell about their experiences since departure from the project site. This required the rating of "moving in general" as either very positive, positive with reservations, neutral or ambivalent, negative with reservations or very negative. Table IV indicates a sharp decline over time in positive feelings toward moving. In the latest period fewer than a quarter of the children felt "positive" about moving, and the great bulk were either negative, neutral, or ambivalent.
TABLE IV. CHILDREN’S RATINGS OF MOVING IN GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of &quot;Moving in General&quot;</th>
<th>Year Before (N=45)</th>
<th>Year After (N=56)</th>
<th>One Year Later (N=62)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral or ambivalent</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following factors are associated with attitudes about moving:

1. **Sex of child.** While there was little difference in the statements of girls and boys prior to the move, boys were likely to look back on the move with less favor than girls.* The discussion with boys about their daily round of activities pointed clearly to an outdoor orientation missing in the girls. Girls saw the dying Lincoln School Area with its taverns and unsavory night life as a threat to them, whereas the boys found adventure in the empty houses and excitement in the big machinery working on the new projects. Perhaps these are environmental factors that the boys missed after the move that led to its negative evaluation by them.

2. **Race of child.** Of the three ethnic groups, Black children most favored the move before it occurred (78%) and least favored the move in the year after (23%). They had the sharpest disapproval by the time of the child interview (64%).

3. **Age of child.** The children in early school grades were most positive to moving at all times that they were interviewed, or this is what they said. Dissatisfaction with moving was positively related to school grade.** Over half of the children in grades 7-9 were negative to moving in general.

4. **Home ownership vs. renting.** Two-thirds of the children of home owners opposed moving, whereas only a quarter of the children of renters felt the same way.** However, there were no differences in attitudes toward moving among the children who moved out of sub-standard housing, than those who left standard units.

5. **Number of moves in lifetime.** Only 19% of the children who claimed to have moved five or more times in their lifetime felt positively about the relocation from the Lincoln School District, whereas 33% of those having only one move did so.*

6. **Time of move.** Some families move from the area as soon as they heard it was to be a project site. Others lingered until the last minute. The children of families which moved at the latest possible time were much more positive to having moved than those who did so earlier.**
This finding reinforces the comment made under (1) above.

7. Number of shifts in school. Some children had completed grade school and were ready to shift to junior high school at the time of the relocation. Speaking in retrospect, two years later, these children with a normal pattern of shifting schools were much more positive about moving than the other children.*

8. Frequency of Contact with relatives. Children who saw their relatives less frequently in the period immediately following the move than they did before, were much more likely to disfavor moving than their counterparts.* This is illustrated in Table V. Sixty-seven percent of the children with fewer contacts with their relatives following the removal were negative to moving, whereas only 17% of those with more contacts with their relatives after the move felt that way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE V. CHANGE IN FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH RELATIVES BEFORE AND AFTER URBAN RENEWAL MOVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child's Attitudes Toward Moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Loss of playmates. Children, in general, were not as distressed by the loss of playmates as they were by separation from relatives.*** Being close to friends is desirable but not necessary. A detailed analysis indicated that the daily round of activities remained relatively the same, but there were drastic shifts in the participants. Whereas activities with "some friend" was maintained during the period of the move, activities with siblings declined markedly. Most children, however, were able to find new playmates shortly after moving. The presence of friends was always associated significantly with the positive ratings given new schools in the new neighborhoods.* It was much more difficult to reproduce the "social life" of the old school district than to replace lost friends. The comments of early teen-age girls of Mexican-American origin suggest that they missed the social life of the Mexican-American community lost to them during the course of the moves.
10. Participation in the Moving Process. Some parents involved their children in the work of the move, and in the decision of selecting a new house. But there were no significant differences in the attitudes of children whether or not they were involved in such participation.

11. Parents' Attitudes Towards Moving. In general, the children alleged that they reflected their parents' attitudes: Where parents were positive toward moving, so were the children.*** In passing, it should be noted that in the year immediately after the removal from the urban renewal and highway areas, children turned from their peers to their parents for help with homework.* Shortly after this, the help was discontinued, according to the children's reports.

The Durability of Negative Attitudes Towards Moving

In the last section it was demonstrated that, viewed retrospectively, children are negative about "moving in general." Although 51 percent assigned positive ratings to moving prior to the event, the positive ratings declined to 30 percent in the year after the move and to 23 percent one year later. Thus, by the time of the last interview, 77 percent of the children were either negative, neutral or ambivalent to the process of "moving in general."

However, a distinction is made by the children between "moving in general" and "having moved," as indicated below:16

<p>| TABLE VI. PERCENT AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN WITH POSITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS MOVING |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent and Number</th>
<th>Children with Positive Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>One Year After Move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving in general</td>
<td>30% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having moved</td>
<td>48% (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the last interview, about half of the children expressed positive attitudes about "having moved" while less than a quarter are favorably disposed toward the inconveniences and consequences of "moving in general."

Having distinguished between the moving process and the existing situation of having moved, we can ask the question of whether having moved has an effect on the ratings of children of their current schools, homes, and neighborhoods. The data are presented in Table 7. It is shown that if children
hold positive attitudes about having moved, they are likely to have favorable attitudes about these facilities. Of the children with positive attitudes towards having moved, 93 percent like their new school, 79 percent like their new home, and 67 percent like their new neighborhood. In contrast, those negative to having moved are less likely to have less positive feelings about these facilities.

### TABLE 7. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEELINGS OF HAVING MOVED WITH ATTITUDES TOWARD NEW SCHOOL, HOME & NEIGHBORHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings About Having Moved</th>
<th>Positive to New School</th>
<th>Positive to New Home</th>
<th>Positive to New Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>93% (14)</td>
<td>79% (11)</td>
<td>67% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>69% (11)</td>
<td>94% (17)</td>
<td>77% (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>68% (11)</td>
<td>73% (24)</td>
<td>47% (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whether the dissatisfaction of children can be attributed to a shift in neighborhood or the moving process is moot. Comments of the children would tend to support the conclusion that they are related. All of them loved the old Lincoln School; only 74 percent had good things to say about the 28 different schools into which they were transferred. Sixty-nine percent praised the old neighborhood whereas slightly over half liked the new locality. Of one thing we can be certain: children look with disfavor on a forced move, and their antipathy increases with time.

Do children look with disfavor on moving more than their parents?

An opportunity to answer this question was presented where interviews were taken with the parents of about 30 children. A direct comparison was made of the four items reported in Table VIII.

### TABLE VIII. EXTENT OF FAMILY CONSENSUS ON FEELINGS ABOUT ISSUES IN THE MOVING PROCESS BY PARENT-CHILD PAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Agreement Between Parent &amp; Child</th>
<th>About the Necessity of Moving (N 32)</th>
<th>About Having Moved (N 27)</th>
<th>About the New Neighborhood (N 24)</th>
<th>About the New House (N 29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Consensus</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Consensus</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissensus</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rating of "full consensus" means both members of the pair exactly agreed in their feelings of "positive," "negative" or "neutral." Partial consensus means one member of the pair rated the event as "positive" or "negative" and the other member was "neutral." The rating of "dissensus" signifies that the members had opposed views. This comparison indicated that children are likely to disagree with their parents more frequently about "the necessity of moving" and about "having moved" than they do in their evaluations of the new neighborhood or the new house. About one-third of the small sample of children disagreed with their parents on these items. Where this is the situation, it is because the child was more strongly opposed to the move. In fact, only six percent of the parent-child pairs felt completely positive about the necessity of moving. The proportion rises to 28 percent of the parent-child pairs that felt completely positive about having moved. Again the children who differ from their parents are those who rate having moved negatively.

**DISCUSSION**

Three conclusions derive from the study: (1) Most children have more negative than positive feelings toward the moving process in forced resettlement. These negative feelings occur more frequently after the move than beforehand. (2) Children are less likely than their parents to welcome a forced move. (3) Children who evaluate the moving process negatively, are more likely to negatively evaluate their housing, school, and neighborhood after the move than children with positive evaluations of the need for moving.

Significantly associated with the negative feelings toward the moving process were: (a) male sex, (b) number of residential moves in a lifetime, (c) number of shifts in school in lifetime, (d) less frequent contact with relatives after the move. Although several other factors failed to achieve the .05 level of statistical significance, the following six appeared highly relevant to the negative evaluation of the move: (2) Negro race, (b) parental ownership of housing in the project areas, (c) preference of the Lincoln School District over the new neighborhood, (d) delay in moving from project area until latest possible time, (e) anticipated loss of playmates, (f) membership in junior high school after the move. No association was found between attitudes toward the move and (a) living in substandard housing in the project area, (b) ascription of great public value to the urban renewal project, (c) participation in the moving process, (d) participation in the selection of the house in the new area.

Notwithstanding the negative attitudes expressed by the children about moving, the forced relocation did not result in significant damages to the children in either their progress or behavior at school as measured by indicators as grade point average, absence rates, grade failures, withdrawals, drop-outs, and other test scores.

There are many limitations to this study. Where the sample size is adequate for detailed analysis, the data are sketchy. Where the data are rich
and detailed, there is a limited number of cases.

Reservations must also be exercised with respect to information gathered in an open-ended interview. We cannot be sure how much interviewer "loading" occurred in this process. On the other hand, the greatest methodological strength of the study, perhaps, came from the use of diverse sources of information: personal interviews, school and social agency records, rating forms filled out by teachers, and urban renewal workers. These sources supplement and buttress one another.

In toto, we are able to derive an insightful account of how children, living in poverty, largely are shifted from one set of ghettos, Negro and Mexican-American, to another. For most families the conditions of life at no time permit the optimal selection of house, school or neighborhood. The forced removal from the project areas is one more large-scale disruption in their lives. Most of our children are on the "losing end" of this transaction, not because of the forced removal, per se, but because they are part of the culture of poverty. The position of the children is quite clearly shown by the juxtaposition of two questions asked them during the interviews. They were asked about future career aspirations and how far they expected to go in school. Table IX presents the results. The children would seem to have had completely unrealistic aspirations for managerial or professional careers, and these

<p>| TABLE IX. CAREER AND EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS OF CHILDREN |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Aspiration</th>
<th>Year Before Move</th>
<th>Year After Move</th>
<th>One Year Later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial or Professional</td>
<td>55% (18)</td>
<td>55% (30)</td>
<td>63% (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Labor or Service</td>
<td>15% (5)</td>
<td>7% (4)</td>
<td>4% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30% (10)</td>
<td>38% (21)</td>
<td>33% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Go to College</td>
<td>75% (9)</td>
<td>64% (28)</td>
<td>52% (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Complete High School</td>
<td>8% (1)</td>
<td>27% (12)</td>
<td>36% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17% (2)</td>
<td>9% (4)</td>
<td>12% (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aspirations continued to trend upward as they grew older. A majority of the children at the time of the latest interview expected to attend college, although more children realistically estimated they would be limited to a high
school education than at the beginning of the survey. The data highlighted
a second contradiction: as career aspirations increased, educational aspira-
tions declined! It would seem that most of the children lived in a fantasy
world.

It is such a world of fantasy that is evoked by "grand public events" like urban renewal. The hopes of children may be raised by promises inherent
in the events even if they are not spoken. The personal outcome for the child
and his family is seldom as great as the promise. Frequently, the move brings
no distinct advantage in living conditions, and for some the conditions are
worsened. The growth in negative attitudes toward the process of moving may
be a reflection of this disillusionment. The lessened involvement of children
in school and neighborhood may well be a part of their gradual phase-out from
society. The findings have implications for ameliorative intervention.

For many children the impending move was a very real worry. The programs
under the auspices of Lincoln School gave the children information about the
nature of the highway and urban renewal projects. Urban renewal workers came
to their homes to help with the tasks of the move and to provide financial aid
to their parents. But there was very little personal counseling with the
children themselves except during the annual interviews with the friendly mem-
bers of the survey team. Levin and Sprague carefully document the help
given children through an examination of the tape-recorded accounts of the
open-end interviews with them in the early phases of the moving process.
Questions were asked to help the child relate to the reality of relocation
such as: "When you move, what will you do to help?" "What will you take with
you?", "What will you have to leave behind?" "Will you miss your friends?"
"Will you have difficulty in making new friends?" "Will you be attending a
different school next year?" The children were encouraged through the
structure of the interview to visualize the nature of the change and to anti-
cipate in advance some of the problems they were likely to encounter through
the use of pictures and "pointed" questions and comments.

In short, it would seem that the research interviewers provided informal
counseling services to children in need of them. They were helpful in winning
the children’s initial consent and support for urban renewal. From a research
standpoint, however, it is quite likely that the activities of the researchers
mitigated the deleterious impact of the move on the children; that is, they
biased the outcome of the study. The experience, however, would seem to demon-
strate utility of personal counseling services for youngsters in neighborhoods
undergoing change. From a broad perspective, the incident of urban renewal
can be viewed as a scheduled crisis that facilitates the early detection of
children with serious personal problems that require treatment. Thus, during
the process of the physical rehabilitation of an area, steps could also be
taken toward improving its social health as well, if provisions were made for
this.

Our data suggest that there was very little involvement of children in
housing decisions by their families before the move. In fact, it has become
apparent that most poor people do not have much housing choice. To be sure, the families were helped by information about available housing, by financial subsidies and other aids. This sort of assistance was especially helpful for the discriminated-against Negro and Spanish minorities, according to our interviews. However, these are benefits that filter down to the child, slowly, if at all: they are not the sort of program in which he can be actively involved.

Once having left the project areas, however, social services seem to have terminated. This was the time when our children complained of lost friends and severed relational ties. It was from this point in time that the evaluations of the moving process became more and more negative. It would seem that more attention should be given to resettlement aids in the receiving neighborhood. How can the old familiar social patterns be reproduced in the new area? One line of helpful intervention might be in providing more family-based services and programs with the theme being "family resettlement by locality based organizations". All forms of locality based organization should be mobilized in this effort - from churches and neighborhood houses to citizen groups and social recreational clubs.21

Our interviews with parents and children on parallel items suggest that they live in quite different social worlds, even if these worlds are located in the same house or the same neighborhood. The findings confirm our assertion at the beginning of the paper that the most intensive use of the neighborhood is by its children, especially the boys. Frequently, what these boys seek is not activity organized for them, but the unsupervised opportunity to create and organize activity of their own choice. The planning and design problems in creating a "children's environment" in neighborhoods is a difficult one, but long range urban development will require adequate plans for this kind of socialization, if it is to be successful.

FOOTNOTES

Family Role Patterns," Community Study Bulletin 1 (1960) 3.


11. W. Key, *op. cit.*

12. In addition to interviews, information was obtained from the following sources. They are reported in L.K. Northwood, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-56. The sources are school records and attendance records from 1954-5 through 1962-3; teacher evaluations for 1963-4 following the children's move to a new location; comments on some of the children by the principal, the interviewer, and leaders of such organizations as the Boy's Club to which the children belonged, urban renewal records about the families.

13. Barrisi and Lundquist, *op. cit.* find a relationship between knowledge of urban renewal and positive evaluation of urban renewal. They studied 694 white and 811 black households involved in an urban renewal project in Akron, Ohio.

14. Barrisi and Lundquist, *ibid.*, have the same finding.

15. Similar findings to those reported in this study appear in existing research. For example, Barrisi and Lundquist, *ibid.*, found that positive attitudes towards the home neighborhood were associated with the location of friends and relatives living nearby, as do Litwak *op. cit.*, and Jitodai, *op. cit.* Hunt and Butler, *op. cit.*, note that separation from informal and neighborhood structures of the old neighborhood increases the sense of alienation for those low income men and families who move. Fried, *op. cit.*, comes to the same con-
clusion, although Wolf and Lebeaux, op. cit., report that there is no such strong attachment of low income blacks to the residential area they studied in Detroit. The comparisons made between this study and others are of a child population with an adult population. No comparable data exist for child populations on the relevant variables.

16. No attempt was made to control for the number of moves in this phase of the analysis. Consequently, this may be considered as another way of presenting the data already reported in points 3 and 5 on page 230.

17. There is an apparent, but not real, contradiction between negative evaluation of the move and two other factors: number of shifts in school in lifetime, and membership in junior high school after the move. Where the shift was an expected "natural" one from grade school to junior high, and this occurred during the period of the move, children tended to be positive in their evaluation of the move. Where there was a recurrent pattern of shifts in schools other than this "natural" one, children tended to be "negative."


19. M. Weissman and E. Paykel, "Moving and Depression in Women," Society 9 (1972) 9:24-28. The authors find that the stressful effects of geographic mobility are experienced most severely by women who are already depressed. These women sometimes view a residential move as a way to patch up marital problems. They project a fantasy world, free of troubles, that will be realized through the move.

20. Levin, Helen and Harvey Sprague, op. cit. If it is true that the research interviewers "helped" the children to deal with their problems accompanying the forced move, and thus offset some of the deleterious consequences for them, it is remarkable how many such consequences remained, and were reported by the children. Despite the softening effect of the interview on these hardships, they were still very evident.
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